

# The two solitudes of understanding

by Jerry Slavic

The Cold Lake Indian Reserve is over one hundred miles from this university. The downtown Edmonton bars frequented by Indians are forbidding and distant to the Friday Social students. There is no measure of the distance and differences between the Indian people who inhabit the reserves and those bars and the upper and middle class students who occupy this institution.

Harold Cardinal and Chief Dan George attempted to bridge that gap. At least some of the more than one thousand students who came to see and hear them speak on the problems of Indians in a white racist society struggled to understand.

Two distinct approaches were apparent as Cardinal and Chief Dan George tried to inform and arouse the students.

Dan George pleaded for a meaningful humanism based on a profound feeling and sincere love of all one's fellow man regardless of color, appearance,

age, or status. He wanted each of us to accept the other as a brother or sister. "Speak no more of friendship", he concluded, "for today you are my brother."

The meaning, feeling and significance of what it means to be a brother has no impact on a white society dominated by the nuclear family and the protestant ethic of individualism.

Brotherhoods are characteristic of tribes composed of people who feel responsible for the well being of each member of their community and act with that concern in mind. Chief Dan George was demanding we recognize that we are all of the tribe of man; we are all children of the same spirit partaking of the same soul. To the child of a technological capitalist society such language is strangely primitive or romantic mysticism.

It is increasingly apparent that within the context of our white modern society the practises, concerns or significance of a tribal community cannot be

realized. There are facades of community in the white world including the "business community", "Christian community" or the University community. We have substituted these shams for any meaningful community.

Everything we have been taught and which we learn through experience in the socio-economic conditions and moral context of this society tends to decrease the possibility of our understanding, much less actualizing, the full dimensions of a community.

Chief Dan George's moving poetic talk was eagerly received by those who came to see a star. Fervent pleas for abstract utopian hopes are the bread and butter of a university and the food for its children. Unfortunately his comments only emphasized how far out of touch the university and its constituents are with certain important realities and beliefs of other people.

Moreover, an understanding of what he means by being a

"brother" cannot be understood within the context of this university. Therefore, demands for new relationships based on this awareness and motivation appeal to something that does not exist. In hopes, principles, or dreams, maybe; but in practise — obviously not.

Harold Cardinal used another approach to reach and activate his white liberal audience. He talked of the problems of Indians in socio-economic and legal terms. He bombarded them with facts and figures sufficient

Continued on page 12

## The Gateway

member of Canadian University Press

### STAFF THIS ISSUE

Those who gathered here to partake of the best produced by the Liquor Board in the dark were, Dennis Zommerschoe Bob Blair, Elsie Ross, Ed Reed, Merideth, HENRI Pallard, Beth (my price is high) Nilsen, Barbara (I'm going to Calgary), Rick (I'm going to Toronto) Grant, Bob Beal, Ann Parker, STOP, Lana Yakimchuk, Ron Yakimchuk, Karen Moeller, Dennis Windrim, Fiona Campbell, Dave Biltok, and a very inebriated and confused Harvey G. Thomgirt.

Departments: editor-in-chief - Bob Beal (432-5178), news - Elsie Ross (432-5168), sports - Ron Ternoway (432-4329), advertising - Percy Wickman (432-4241), production - Bud Joberg and Ron Yakimchuk, Photo - Barry Headrick and Don Bruce (432-4355), arts - Ross Harvey, and last but not least, publisher - Harvey G. Thomgirt (432-5168).

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students of the university of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Short Short deadline is two days prior to publication. The Gateway is printed by North Hill News Ltd., Edmonton.

cont. from page 4  
that the firmness and determination of this articulate Indian spokesman did not detract from what Chief George and Harry Cardinal were saying. What they had to say was very relevant. But one could almost sense the discomfort with which a lot of males in the audience were having to contend with when Miss Horn spoke. As if saying ("to top it all"), "what the hell gives a 'squaw' the right to be that good looking".

It goes without saying that the use of words like "class" to describe anybody/thing Canadian comes close to sacrilege. Isn't that a word reserved for describing Americans, Europeans ect.? NEVER Canadians; never Canadian women, and especially NEVER Canadian Native women!

.... never?

N. Robertson  
Arts

### White Man Jokes

Dear Sir,  
Attended forum on Native Education. Miss Horn cracked very funny white man jokes. Ha-Ha. Lots of audience clapped without knowing. Right on! (raised fist).

Cut down the Horn tree.

It is deadwood.

It hides the light from growth below.

It mans their death.

Cut down the Horn tree.

B. Wilson  
Arts 1

### The Silent Minority

Sir:  
Here is another gripe and growl sob story from a member of the usual silent minority. This time it is something about student apathy. In particular against the general mood against this place,

that the Gateway is a biased, good for nothing paper, merely in existence to give a few odd people the chance to spew out

some of their frustrations. The above is a perfect rationalization for any student to do exactly nothing. It is a lot more fun to agree with the gang that the Gateway is bad instead of doing anything about it. Is the present generation of students so full of ever loving everybody group encounters and being "in", that they have absolutely no idea whatsoever of doing anything constructive short of worrying about their own little self in relation to their gang? If and when all these 18,000 students are so smart as they think they are, then how come the Gateway is so called "bad". It can only be as bad as the general student involvement. The act is, of course, that the paper does not make the student, but the students make the paper. But let me digress back to my topic. Although there seems to be an apathy club on campus, it almost looks like, as if everybody is a member. In fact, walk into any class of thirty and ask the students to vote on any controversial issue (like the Gateway), you'll see at least 20 abstentions. Is it impossible for those 20 to make up their minds or haven't they got one. The last possibility however is a physical impossibility, so I simply believe that they never use theirs. Only perhaps to put some facts or figures into it. It is astounding that their stupidity is so deeply embedded, that 80 per cent of the students don't know what's going outside their own little world.

While I'm writing this little piece in the Education basement cafeteria, all power goes, exemplifying against the competency of society at large. Perhaps, one of these days, or now, lights will go out for good. It would be a fitting finale to the

present student level of complacency.

J. prins

### The Freedom Myth

Sir:  
The Gateway maintains that the recent action of the Students' Union to take half a page each week for a gazette is a violation of their basic freedom of the press.

While the manner in which the SU made their decision was inexcusably arbitrary, they have sound legal grounds. As the legal publisher of The Gateway, they, at least in theory, have the right to decide what is published accompanied by final legal responsibility for what is printed.

Traditionally, The Gateway has maintained its independence from the SU, which traditionally ratifies as editor the person chosen by Gateway staff.

The whole concept for freedom of the press is based on tradition. In the U.S.A. this right is guaranteed constitutionally, but not in Canada and Great Britain, where it is included only in unwritten common law.

But freedom of the press is an unrealized ideal. For one thing, it does not include freedom from responsibility for what is printed. In contrast to all other processes of law where the defendant is innocent until proven guilty, in a libel action the onus is on the publisher to prove that what he printed was the truth and thus not libelous.

Another grey area in the law as far as freedom of the press is concerned is in regard to contempt of court. It is in contempt of court to publish anything about a court case that would prejudice the cause of justice. Yet the public is entitled to information. The line between what is information and what is in contempt of court is flexible, dependent on many

factors, so newspapers are often constrained to print less rather than more to avoid any possibility of legal action.

More subtle pressures suborning the ideal of journalistic freedom exist within a newspaper itself. While publishers in chain newspapers have editorial freedom, only those journalists who over a period of years have shown not only competence but a reflection of the attitudes of those in positions of responsibility are promoted in turn into responsible positions.

At the same time, new reporters are subtly influenced into following their predecessors not only by pressures from their immediate superiors but from their more experienced peers.

Advertisers also influence the 'freedom' of the press—not directly in most cases but in many small ways. One of the major reasons perhaps for lack of true freedom is that most newspapers are run as profit-earning enterprises. Policies that would endanger the balance sheet are discouraged at many levels.

That the Gateway is battling for 'freedom of the press' is laudatory, but in their fight for an ideal they should remember that the winning of a battle by no means indicates that the war is won.

Theresa Yakimchuk

### Squatters

Sir:  
Sometime in mid-October comes an initial move to test the sincerity of the Hon. Attorney General of Canada in relation to the section of the Indian Act upon which he is called to act. As the Hon Minister of Indians has jurisdiction over Indians only, the Attorney General has handed the power over non-Indians on reserves according to section 31.

This allows only the impossible "over 50% of the

registered Indians" or the possible "individual Indian" to lay a charge of trespass, illegal occupancy, illegal possession against a white person squatting on an Indian reserve. As section 50 of the Indian Act makes it illegal for any Indian to have a verbal lease, written lease, or any kind of permission to white people (except with the Ministers written permit) there can be no expectations, and the individual Indian cannot be called upon to show part ownership of a piece of property on which this illegal lease exists (its all confusing) and men from the Attorney Generals department met to fight me recently in the initial round of this test case to move off a Mr. and Mrs. Walter Pichovich Jr. (the wife is my sister) who are now squatting (along with 1,065 others) on the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve.

It is my expectation that the charge or complaint I have taken out against Her Majesty the Queen for failing to respect the statues of Canada will result in the Attorney General ending his six months evasion and laying an "information" against the two squatters.

For seventy one years various councils, chiefs, individuals have tried to take some form of successful legal action against thousands of squatters and have always failed. It seems the government and lawyers never explained the right procedure. If anyone wishes to follow what I am doing buy a cheap copy of the Indian Act (paper covered) look at Section 31, 50 and a few other sections and you will know what the Queen will face when I charge her later this month.

The principle, of course, is to stop white persons from stealing not only our land but ruining our Indian way of life, to keep the non-Indians on the 99.5% of the land they own and off the .5% we have been left to live on. I hope you understand and agree.

Kahntineta of Caughnawaga.