

Missioners

The University Christian Mission, in its whirlwind campaign on campus last week, met some very stiff competition as a topic of coffee cup conversation in the form of seven lovely young ladies. The competition was so tough that debates on the mission orations were virtually non-existent. People seemed more intent on locating Engineers' Queens than God, leaving some doubt as to which is the more important.

It is possible that University of Alberta students no longer hold serious conversations, over coffee cups or otherwise, or that the students attending this institution are just a pack of sex-perverted, unimpressionable pagans. Discounting these possibilities leaves several alternatives as to why the mission was unable to produce significant discussion among the majority of students on matters of Christianity, and on religion in general.

The mission was a publicity stunt on a grand scale and the reaction it received was worthy of nothing more than just that. Publicity is a short-term proposition as opposed to the long term basis on which religion must make its stand if it is to be effective.

The embryo Billy Grahams of the student mission didn't seem to realize that their flash-in-the-pan approach would make people buy what they had to sell only so long as they kept selling. If Christianity is to be propagated at all it should be done on the individual level, by individuals.

The issues posed by the missioners were no doubt debated long and loudly by some of the people on this campus, primarily the serious Christians who could both ask and answer the questions offered for the benefit of the unenlightened.

It seems a matter of complete futility to exert your wind-pipes for the benefit of somebody who is quite willing to agree with you on all the major issues, while the person at whom you are aiming your talk is kidnapping a Queen, talking about one who was kidnapped, or doing something equally mundane. Furthermore, masses of advertising are not going to convince the majority of people that a lot of snorting and hollering is going to produce sweeping changes in their outlook towards life.

"If not God — Then What?" was the theme of the mission, which did a very good job of proving the importance of God in man's life. However their manner of doing this was a combination of the "because it just is important" type of argument, and complete verbal obliteration of all the "then whats" they could think of, making no attempt to explain why anyone should believe in God strictly on the

merits of believing in God. A negative approach of this type is not only illogical; it's lazy, and proves nothing.

Assuming that the Mission does get converts, "then what"? Which one of the sponsoring churches is going to take over where the mission left off? And if a particular group does take the strayed lamb into hand, where does it leave him?

Dr. Rogness' argument that "Everybody who is religiously concerned is 'doomed' to membership' in a church", is too ludicrous to believe that it was made by an intelligent man. Faith in God, or anything else, is to a large degree a matter of individual concern, and one in which the individual is "doomed" only to decide how he is going to express his faith with or without a ready-made institution. In these respects the Mission only displayed a didactic lack of fore-sight.

The varsity Christian Mission was on campus for a week, and now its missioners, unlike the fallen soldiers, are gone and largely forgotten.

Lovers

We wonder if the lecture series in St. Steve's entitled "The Great Love Affairs of The Bible" has any connection with the placing of *Lady Chatterly's Lover* (unabridged and unexpurgated) between *Christian Concept of Marriage* and *The Holy Bible*, in the University Christian Mission's literary display.

Campaigners

One of the unphenomenal features of the recent Engineers' Queen campaign was that the girl who entered the Ball as candidate of the second year engineers, left it as Queen.

For the last three years, the ESS crown has added glory to the head of the second years' candidate. Despite the Queenly qualities of all who were elected, this trio of victories is more than co-incidence.

In the ESS elections, as in past elections involving candidates of defined groups, voting is conditioned by group loyalty. Barring the unusual, the section of engineering with the largest organized membership is the section whose candidate will win.

This year, there are more engineers in second year than in any of the other competing classifications. And, they are more highly organized than the next largest group. Thus, before the Queen campaign began, there were more voters committed to the second years' candidate than to any other girl.

All Queen campaign managers recognize the strength that a second year candidate carries into the campaign. Since a Queen is elected by preferential ballot, much of the campaigning is designed to win the second choice votes of engineers who are committed to the smaller groups.

This is a technique which is seldom successful. If the second year's candidate is strong, as their candidates have been strong in the last three elections, she will show well on the second count. And she will still have the hefty buffer of committed first count votes.

There seem only two ways that a second years' candidate can fail to become Queen of the Engineers' Ball. Either she has to be pitted against an opponent with exceptionally appealing characteristics, or she has to be a weak enough candidate to lose the support already ranked behind her. Neither that exceptional appeal nor the unusual weakness have deflated the second years' cushion in the last three campaigns.

In effect, the Queen of the Engineers' Ball is chosen by that little coterie of second year engineers who select the candidate, much as the governorship of several southern United States is decided by those who name the candidate of the Democratic party.

Perhaps we should borrow further from the southern States, and spend the bally-hoo and breath-holding on the "primaries", in which the second years' name the Queen.



UNIVERSITY CHOICES

Confusion Ends

To the Editor:

Although an article which appeared in *The Gateway* of Friday, January 15, 1960 stated that IFC had presented a TV set to a needy family, it seems to me that any thinking person would have considered this as an error. Most people overlooked this but those who desired the truth inquired to various parties in the know.

To set matters straight, the proceeds for Songfest 1958 went to the Zoely Gardner Home for Children in the form of a TV set. The 1959 profits have been split in two; the first presentation to The Edmonton Home for Ex-Servicemen's Children, and the second to the Sunset Home for Old Folks, which is run by the Salvation Army.

A good "Sorority Girl" should take any queries to her executive who in turn may go through Panhell or IFC.

Dave Chetner,
President, IFC

EDITOR'S NOTE—The "needy family" reference slipped by *The Gateway*. For contributing to confusion, we apologize.

Oratory Begins

To the Editor:

The few hundred who packed the West lounge to hear Mr. Smallwood were well repayed for the close attention Mr. Smallwood's oratory demands, for he deservedly has the reputation of being Canada's ablest speaker. Beside him the best of Mr. Diefenbaker sounds like a Quebec delegation. Mr. Smallwood is in the oratorical tradition of William Jennings Bryan and Billy Graham, but only in his ability to bend an audience to his will is it fair to compare Mr. Smallwood to these sorry bearers of the Word. He differs from them in that, recognizing our intelligence, he speaks as an intelligent man. Clearly the evangelist cannot hope to compete in this area.

The press accounts of the events in Newfoundland, as I now understand it, came from reporters who were evidently flown in for two days at the IWA's expense for a look around the union offices before picking up IWA press releases. We were privileged to hear the other side—and indeed all sides—from Mr. Smallwood, whose own labor sympathies cannot be doubted. His credentials as an old-time fighter for the rights of labor place him somewhere between Kier Hardie and the Haymarket Assassins. In spite of these some persisted in a suspicion of recent anti-labor bias. Mr. Smallwood dis-

armed these skeptics with admirable candor. "Only," he said in effect, "on a superficial knowledge of the facts is such a suspicion possible. Let the facts speak for themselves and then discount them according to their source before deciding just who was anti-labor." He then gave us the facts with such force and transparent honesty that the man was blind indeed who could not see that their source mattered not all.

Yet curiously some who went to scoff remained to scoff. I suggest that the reason for this—apart from any interpretations the scoffers may have put on the facts as they had them at the time of the strife—is that in going to scoff they were forearmed. And if one isn't immediately caught up by Mr. Smallwood's mesmeric oratory, he perceives that all isn't as it should be, and he is lost to Mr. Smallwood. For in fact Mr. Smallwood employs with consummate skill all the devices which serve, in the hands of a politician of his type and ability, with equal effect on the Newfoundland backwoodsman or the University sophisticate. With candor which will disarm no one, I admit to a certain bias vis-a-vis Mr. Smallwood, yet I claim to have observed, disinterestedly, the use of the following devices; half-truths, evasions, the smear and red-herring techniques, an appeal to patriotism, and a fine use of ridicule on halting questioners who, forgive them, didn't happen to be as clever as Mr. Smallwood, and didn't happen to have a delighted audience in the palms of their hands which they could turn on Mr. Smallwood with good effect.

His use of the smear was carried off with the finesse of a Congressional sub-committee (liken your opponent to Communists and Nazis, and in any case, low as wages may have been, Hoffa's lieutenant are heinous criminals) but apart from one or two such departures from standard, Mr. Smallwood's performance was on a high level and the strong men present applauded him to the echo. They might better have wept.

The battle line on the Newfoundland situation were long ago drawn up. Inflamed opinion tends to atrophy in a conviction of right and nothing much was changed by Mr. Smallwood last Thursday. The pros are now more pro, and, I trust, the cons at least as con, but with a new respect for him. This is perhaps not important. What, in the affair, I think is important is the spectacle of demagoguery holding sway over the minds of "tomorrow's leaders". Bad as it is that this happens where the electorates of Newfoundland or Alberta are involved, it is worse, I think, where the audience represent the nation's hope for enlightenment. It augurs ill for the future.

'X', law 1

THE GATEWAY

Member of Canadian University Press

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF Joe Clark
MANAGING EDITOR John Taylor
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Sylvia Raycheba
MORALS AND CONDUCT EDITOR Colin Campbell
ASST. MORALS AND CONDUCT EDITOR Nebbish

Advertising Manager Dave Jenkins
News Editor Ellen Nagloren
Asst. News Editor Jim Richardson
CUP Editor Roma Standefer
Sports Editor Gerry Marshall
Features Editor Roberta Sheps
Asst. Features Editor Wolfe Kirchmeir
Copy Editors Adolph Buse, Donn Downey
Literary Editor Roberto Ruberto
Business Manager Walter Dinwoodie

News Staff: Gloria Lehner, John Vandermeulen, D. J. Wilkie, Cyril Sapiro, Marian Paxton, John Whittaker, Bill Holmes, Richard Kupsch, Bill Roddie, Reg Jordan, Judy Odynsky, Naida Maher, Mary Price, Neil Frandsen, Al Smith, John Francis, Tony Chernushenko, Barry Malloux, Jean Craig, Adriana Slaniceanu, Meredith Johnston, Sonja Kulka. Sports: Ed Wigmore, Ernie Marshall, Don Giffen, Owen Ricker, Alex Potapoff. Cartoonists: George Samuels, Gerry Dixon. Photos by Photo Directorate.

FINAL DEADLINE COPY

For Friday Edition 8 pm. Tuesday
For Tuesday Edition 8 pm. Sunday

Opinions expressed by columnists in this paper are not necessarily those of *The Gateway* or members of its staff. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein.

Office Telephone — GE 3-1155