

Colored TV

Most of us recognize blatant discrimination when we see it.

But equally disturbing and even more insidious are the subtler kinds of prejudice. Unspoken assumptions and innuendos are just as harmful because they pave the way for mass, unthinking biases in our society.

When these prejudices are disseminated by television, the most powerful propaganda medium around, the effect can be calamitous.

Last fall, the CTV public affairs program W5 aired a "documentary" titled *The Campus Giveaway* in which it claimed foreign students (including "most" landed immigrants) are cheating Canadian students of places in professional programs and robbing taxpayers of millions of dollars.

In supporting these claims, W5 made use of statistics of questionable accuracy, statements by undisclosed professorial and administrative sources and the unsubstantiated opinions of several students. These misrepresentations have sparked massive protests from various groups and individuals. (The president of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the president and the executive director of the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the executive director of the Canadian Bureau for International Education, among others.)

While it is difficult to avoid some inaccuracies in a news program, W5 has twisted supposedly factual material to shape public opinion.

Equally serious is W5's portrayal of foreign students solely as those of Chinese origin, regardless of their citizenship or residence status. The implication that students of Oriental appearance are not Canadian is extremely racist and has prompted a lawsuit by Chinese students at the University of Toronto and nation-wide protests.

But CTV has thus far refused to acknowledge any fault on its part and has indicated that a follow-up program will be aired in the near future.

CTV's irresponsible attitude is lamentable. Sixty per cent of foreign students do not come from South East Asia and they do not come to rob the Canadian educational establishment. Moreover contrary to CTV's beliefs, recent immigrants (who pay taxes) do have a right to an education in Canada.

This narrow-minded approach is xenophobia at its worst, and as such ignores the many benefits of internationalism.

Foreign students help increase the understanding between various cultures and countries and they enhance the academic life of a university — long term benefits that can hardly be measured in monetary terms.

Why not show your support for the Chinese community, foreign students and Canadian immigrants by joining the march on CFRN Saturday?

Portia Priegert

the Gateway

If it happens on campus...abort it!

VOL. LXX NO. 31
THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1980
TWELVE PAGES

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. With a circulation of 18,500, the Gateway is published by its proprietor, the Students' Union, Tuesdays and Thursdays during the winter session. Contents are the responsibility of the editor; editorials are written by the editorial board or signed. All other opinions are signed by the party expressing them. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. The Gateway, a member of Canadian University Press and the Youthstream Network, is located at room 282 SUB. Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2J7.

Newsroom 432-5168
Advertising 432-3423

Editorial Staff
EDITOR - Gordon Turtle
MANAGING - Keith Krause
NEWS - Lucinda Chodan
Portia Priegert
ARTS - Bruce Cookson
SPORTS - Karl Willberg
PHOTO - Brad Keith
PRODUCTION - Mary Duczynski
CUP - Alison Thomson
FEATURES - Julie Green
ADVERTISING - Tom Wright
MEDIA PRODUCTIONS -
Margriet Tilroe-West
CIRCULATION - Ken Daskewich

STAFF THIS ISSUE: W. Reid Glenn, Austin Hitchens, Debbie Jones, Maggie Coates, Russ (foxy) Sampson, Garnet Du Gray, Dora Johnson, Bob Kilgannon, Danny Nakamura, Pam Spencer, Ernie Lotz, Lasha Seniuk, don't forget rookie night, Kent Blinston, congratulations Brian and Karen, down with John Savard and his counter-revolutionary attitudes, Barb Horricks, Maxine Murphy.

Abortion by logical extension

Hurrah for Bizon and Marples! The only flaw I can find in their arguments is that they fail to develop their ideas to their fullest potential.

Take, for example, Mr. Marples' argument that a human being is defined by its capacity to "sustain life." I liked that! Only why didn't he use it to destroy that silly myth that a fetus becomes a human being upon birth — a ridiculous notion based on the belief that this is when it can sustain life on its own. What piffle! bzh, modern science has made it possible for fetuses of 6, 5, or even 4½ months — all acceptable abortion ages — to similarly exist outside the mother's body. The catch is, that they could hardly do so without intense external aid and care — and can one really say much different of a 9, 12 or even 24 month old fetus?

Let us consider a "new-born" fetus. Physically, it will not be fully developed until puberty; at the moment it can't even control its bowels. Mentally, it lacks those powers of reason, logic and conceptualization which mark man aside from the animals. Socially, it is undeniably a parasite; utterly dependent on parents and society for the essentials of life, it would die as quickly as a tapeworm if left on its own.

Can this be called sustaining life — or at any rate, truly human life — in any real sense of the word? I say no! Eschewing such emotionally loaded terms as "baby" or "child," I suggest we call a spade a spade, and call these post-natal fetuses "larvae," reserving the term "human being" for those who have reached puberty.

Now surely, the highly debatable "rights" of these larvae, cannot be allowed to take precedence over the clearly established ones of full human beings — especially since the world around us is full of the misery, anguish and hardship caused by a lack of safe and freely accessible larval abortions. Our current unjust laws, for

instance, make absolutely no provision for the fact that many of the personal and financial difficulties — the lost job, the heavy term, the sudden crisis, the broken marriage, the rising career — that may lead a person to abort a fetus in the first place often occur only after it has already become a larva. The law also makes no allowances for the many well-intentioned people, married or otherwise, who have a larva in good faith only to discover, when put to the test, that they are still too young or unprepared to be good parents. And what about the case of the larva, which though normally born, becomes tragically crippled by accident, disease or hereditary flaws? Surely for the sake of these unfortunate larvae, as well as for their deeply anguished and unfairly burdened parents (and by parents, we mean only female parents of course; the male naturally has no more claim to the larva than he does to the fetus) a painless but efficient larval abortion should be possible. Better by far, the gentle prick of the euthanizing

needle, than a life of possible neglect and abuse for the larva, of hardship and unhappiness for the parent.

Finally, society as a whole would benefit from larval abortion. No more sordid "backstreet" larval abortions by desperate parents. Crimes of larval abuse will be a thing of the past. So will larvenile delinquency. And with larval abortion as a viable alternative, less funding will have to be diverted into welfare, daycare, kindergartens or schools; the state can turn it to more services for full human beings. Parents, though fewer, will be happier because only those who really wish to endure the full rigours of raising a larva will remain parents. Children, again though fewer, will also be happier — for only the truly loved, wanted and cared for are likely to survive larvahood; the rest — the troublesome, the disappointing, the sick and unwanted — will mercifully have vanished.

Onwards Utopia!

M. J. Day
Graduate Studies

Fetus not human

Abortion involves legal, moral, and religious issues. To make this article short, I shall not discuss these aspects in detail, because time is precious. Let me just deal briefly with the issue: can abortion be justified? What is abortion? One answer to this question would be that abortion is the killing of human life. But a fetus is not a human

being, it ONLY has the potential to become one. It is, therefore, malicious to accuse a woman of killing when she aborts a fetus. At least in a legal sense a fetus is not regarded as an individual until it is born. Rather the point is whether aborting a fetus is destroying a human life. This is a question of when human life begins.

A fetus is in no way a human being. It is a human being only when it is born and when it can breathe independently of its mother. The reason for this is that when the mother stops breathing the fetus also stops breathing; and when the mother dies the fetus also dies, yet only one human life is considered to have ended. Life, therefore, does not begin until after birth. Undoubtedly, a fetus has the potential to become a human being, but potential to be one is not in itself an independent life. Thus, abortion is not a killing of human life, and can be justified. In fact to have an abortion is just like having a minor surgical operation.

Samuel D.C. Wan
Law II

Solutions to world problems

Since I last commented on the pages of your newspaper, a number of significant events have occurred on the Canadian and world political stages: the taking of the American embassy hostages in Iran and the ludicrous suggestion that there are spies amongst them, the malicious Soviet attack on Afghanistan and the fall of Mr. Clark's government in Ottawa.

The most alarming of these events is the crushing of resistance to Communist influence in Afghanistan. This attack appears to represent a further stage in Soviet plans leading to the acquisition of the Middle East oilfields and thus world domination. Apart from the fact that the invasion is an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, the wider implications are obvious.

Still in the Middle East we have the unscrupulous religious fanatics of Iran holding a knife to the free world's throat. Mr. Carter's ineffectual and weak decisions have served only to encourage these upstarts. The only sensible course of action is to move U.S. troops immediately into Iran. If this had been done a month ago it would have been quite clear to the Soviets that America is capable of defending its interests overseas, and the

Afghanistan situation would never have arisen.

These events should shake Canada from its complacency. It is now clear that we have to be prepared to face confrontation with the Soviets at any time; our defences are weak, and it must be remembered that any strike against the U.S. would affect Canada first. The fall of the Government will allow the electorate to look for candidates who are aware of this problem. However the three major parties seem to offer very little. What we need is a strong leader, who will unite the nation as a bulwark against the menace of Communism. An effective defence policy will do much to solve the problems of this fine country. Conscription would remove unemployment at a stroke. Diversion of taxpayer's money away from unproductive social services, and cuts of students and civil servants involved in useless research would do us a much needed service. Finally, the economy would be stimulated by the increased industrial activity.

Alas, no such leader exists to represent what appears to be the viewpoint of the electorate. Mr. Trudeau has the capacity to be strong but is, of course, a socialist. Electing Mr. Broadbent is tantamount to inviting the Russians to take over. Mr.

Clark, despite his weakness and leftist sympathies is the only choice. Perhaps the solution lies south of the border. The election of the admirable Mr. Reagan will at least result in the right measures being taken in the U.S. Perhaps Mr. Clark may be persuaded to lend passive support by allowing American troops access to Canada to defend our interests. Canadians would welcome this essential measure against Soviet aggression, and would also support U.S. access to our natural resources. Let us hope that there is prompt action; the fate of the free world is in the balance.

Charles U. Farley
Commerce II

Damlitterite student

I take exception to your editorial on writing competency, I think (sic) I'm dam literate and your the one with problem. I think writing of us Ed. students is well over parr. Quit shitting on us normal (sic) guys.

Sincerely,
Fred Baudy
P.S. I dont know bout you but Im sorry I missed milk and cokies.