

Letter Writers Attack The Editor, Defend Discrimination, And Discuss Co-Eds Honor

Discrimination

To The Editor:

I have observed with some distress the recent happenings that have been reported in The Gateway concerning the racial discrimination, openly admitted, against a negro medical student, who is a student at this university.

Although there can only be a very few who can agree with the hurt caused to someone in these circumstances, there is another side to this question that must be looked at, and which has not yet been done in your newspaper concerning these happenings.

The landlord in question has a small rooming house. The first question that arises to my mind is whether or not the size of his rooming operation is small enough so that the house that he possesses there may be considered his home, and therefore private, or whether it is large enough that it can no longer be considered only a home, but becomes clearly a rooming house in public domain, and therefore subject to all regulations which prohibit racial discrimination as a matter of civil rights.

If it be accepted that this particular rooming house operation is small enough so that it be considered the landlord's home, and therefore his private domain, then he is free to choose persons he wishes to be his roomers.

I purposely do not attempt here to decide where the line should be drawn concerning the size of the rooming houses, whether they be large enough or not to come into the public domain.

R. E. Manelski
Law 1

Architecture

To The Editor:

With reference to your editorial, "Architecture and Geraniums", I would like to add a more biting and personal post script.

Each fall as I return to this campus I find myself stricken by an ever-increasing nausea, for when the summer is over we generally find that some new architectural horror has been perpetrated upon us.

This campus has the appearance of being a multi-million dollar bad joke. It could not have been planned to look more ugly. As a collection of public buildings, the University of Alberta, Edmonton, is a disgrace without peer in this province. Instead of its being a show-place, it is a mess.

Yet we, like sheep, accept this as largesse, as an example of the supreme gratitude of the provincial government to us. We live in these surroundings and are profoundly depressed by them. Any joy which one encounters on this campus is a triumph over

adversity.

For example, that height of misguided imagination on campus, the mosaic on the Engineering Building, harmonizes with nothing, is almost without meaning, and would discredit a Roman bathroom of the most decadent style. Moreover, it is falling off the building. I shall prefer the blank wall beneath.

Why have we, students, faculty, and administration, allowed ourselves to be surrounded, hemmed in, by such ugliness? Should we be grateful to the provincial government for bestowing these buildings upon us? I think not.

The government has a duty to see us educated, and see us educated well, for if this province is to continue on as a materially prosperous place, or ever rise above being a cultural backwash, it is we who will make it prosper and we who will produce any cultural enrichment here.

Why can we not demand change, demand beauty. Is it right that we should not protest? If we have any duty to those who follow us, we should protest.

We students are all guilty of having allowed these monstrous buildings to be built. So, if protest is to be made, as I think it should be made, should not the executive of our Students' Union begin it? If they cannot act as our voice, no one can, and if they refuse to voice our discontent, then they have abdicated a major share of their responsibility.

Therefore, I ask that the Council send strongly-worded letters of protest to the Department of Education, complaining of its university building program, to the Department of Public Works, complaining of the vulgarity of its buildings, to the Premier, complaining of his short-sightedness, to President Johns and the Board of Governors, complaining of their silence, and to all the members of the daily press of this province, complaining that the taxpayers ought to know that their funds are being used to perpetuate and enlarge a grotesque mockery of a university.

"Polemia"

Honor System

To The Editor:

"You've got 48 hours to turn yourself in!" This expression is due to the fact that the offices were closed on Sunday and the entire football stands were full of "spirit" every Saturday afternoon.

We didn't have campus police climbing all over us for "popping a bop." I guess because we know how to drink!

Our residence women took part in the Honor System, and consequently were on "their honor" not to stay past daybreak. They didn't have to have an 11:30 p.m.

curfew to protect their honor.

Of course, not too many had faith in the system, for at all referendums and elections student cards had to be presented, for they didn't expect the honor system to apply to all, which in many instances included the majority.

However, I can say in all truth and sincerity that the honor system worked in most cases simply because it embodies the moral code.

Ross Donaldson,
Carlton, '63

Editor Attacked

To The Editor:

It is always with great enjoyment that I read the editorial page. I find lots of pleasure in finding so much foolishness in so little space. It is as if the dear editor had gone to a great amount of trouble in searching out topics, on which he will make a sure ass of himself.

The last topic was C. Northcote Parkinson, or in the words of our "Hellish" columnist: "The Spewer." Parkinson gave us two brief lectures, full of humor and learning. He did not go into great detail for reasons unknown to us. However I should like to venture a few.

The Spewer gave two general lectures, i.e. undetailed lectures for the masses. Like Oscar Wilde in America, he came to teach amusingly. He gave us, if one had the eyes to see, many interesting subjects on which to ponder, and, if we had enough energy to get out of our Edmontonian Apathy, to study further on our own.

He talked on the East (reminding us that China and Japan were East before Marx came along), decadence (a most interesting concept relating to our overwhelming interest in NOW), bureaucracy (our own revered Students' Council is perhaps as good an example as any), and western love life.

Let us not forget that we are at university and no longer need the beautiful hand of mama to feed us. He touched on many more topics and touch was all he should have done.

I feel that the so-called intellectuals of this university were hurt that C.N.P. would not talk to them as mental equals. Let us be quite clear that we are not! He sarcastically patted our back, "You are far west, and in you the pioneering spirit lives on."

What more obvious remark was needed to show our intellectual limitations. So backward are we that we still have no rehabilitation techniques in our "modern" prisons.

I enjoyed his lectures and hope to study his theories further. However, I would like to suggest

Varsity Voices

that you, dear editor, go back to the intelligence mire of Gold Key and forget the Pearls of Wisdom cast at your four feet.

Omayya al Karmy

Editor's Note: A picture of Omayya al Karmy, editor-hater apparent, is seen below. Again, it appears that he is missing his mark.



C. Northcote

To The Editor:

We have here in Dr. C. N. Parkinson an itinerant intellectual, a wandering wit lacking wisdom, a prophet, far from home—suddenly at home in the highest lore of history and philosophy; a prophet—unwilling even to face the brief martyrdom (which is so often the lot of true prophets) of 20 minutes of questions from the decadent audience.

It is strange how, in condemning our art and architecture as signs of our decadence, he fails to include literature. Is it perhaps because he has published three

volumes? Certainly literature should be included in the condemned category since MacMillan, the publisher, is enumerated among the influential "image-makers" in English society.

It may well be that in spite of his superiority over the weak in the world, he, Dr. P., may, with his Marxist economic solution to the world's ills suffer the same fate as the ignominious Jew.

As long as we can confine ourselves to making witty remarks about symptoms, commentators adept in making such appraisals, are guaranteed a livelihood in perpetuity, or, at least, as long as the decadent society continues to be able to support them pending its complete collapse.

S.O.

More Semantics

To The Editor:

I strongly feel that The Gateway created an unfair impression of one of the "Miss Freshette" finalists in last Friday's paper. I had occasion to be present at the interview and the two words quoted, originally quite innocuous, were taken out of context and not reported in very good taste. Some Professors do read The Gateway and such reporting could influence them towards an unwarranted prejudice.

Sincerely,
R.D.G.

Editor's Note: We assume you are referring to the paragraph which said, "Not especially," impressed with any of her lecturers, she is still looking forward to this year on campus.

(1) The Gateway report was correct.

(2) We do not feel that the girl's professors will discriminate against her in any way because of the remarks she made.

Short and Sour

by Adam Campbell

Could it be that Dr. Vant's lectures are outmoded? Could it be that our young freshettes "actually know" what causes babies? Are they acquainted with the vile designs of men on their virtue? Must they be given a refresher course in how to say no? Haven't they been duly indoctrinated concerning the sinfulness of sex?

Come on now. Let's get off the pot! These girls were raised on "the Bible-Bell." Nobody need re-inform them about "these things."

On the other side of the coin; who is going to help them to acquire a healthy sex attitude? Who is going to point out the ascetic origins of our sexual mores? Who is going to teach the difference between "sex and "love"?

In short: who is going to help these girls to think about and question the entire realm of sex (dig it out of the dirt, that is)?

Might I be permitted to nominate Pierre Berton? Or are we afraid that our university might be boycotted by a minority group of Victorian and Medieval vintage?

