

A few discrepancies in a marihuana article

The Editor,

This letter is in reply to the article, "Marihuana—should it be legalized?", which appeared in the Gateway, Friday Jan. 10. This article concluded that marihuana should not be legalized, by using such techniques as inadequate information, faulty analysis, erroneous statements, and general irrelevancy. I would like to point out some of the more obvious examples of the above.

First, the article is said to be based on the research of several organizations who used "available information". Later, the paper states: "Sufficient time has not elapsed to obtain a substantial body of pharmacological and clinical evidence concerning its (cannabis) effects. There are no carefully controlled clinical studies of long-time effects of cannabis on the central nervous or other organ systems". Yet on the inadequate information available, the article makes vast sweeping conclusions about marihuana's detrimental effects. This is ridiculous.

Second, the article states: "In many countries where chronic heavy use of cannabis occurs, such as Egypt, Morocco, and Algeria, it has a marked effect of reducing the social productivity of a significant number of persons". Bypassing the issue of whether or not quantity of production should be man's main social end, I submit that chronic use of marihuana in these countries is the result of poor social conditions, rather than the cause.

Third, the article states that marihuana use "... consists of experimentation by teenagers and young adults". This is completely false. There are large numbers of users among housewives, business-

men, professional men, etc. MacLean's Magazine, the all-Canadian family periodical, recently did an article on marihuana use among groups other than "teenagers and young adults"; for such a conservative magazine to make a definite statement on a radical issue, they must be very sure of the facts.

Throughout The Gateway article in general, the negative statements concerning marihuana are always hedged with, "could", "deficiencies in our knowledge", or "maybe", yet the paper still somehow manages to come to a definite negative statement about marihuana.

Near the end, one comes upon such magnificently meaningless assertions as: "marihuana is not part of the American tradition", and, "... no reason to assume that, just because custom and mores made a mockery (!?) of alcohol prohibition, marihuana prohibition is unworkable or undesirable", these being irrelevant to the issue and completely unsupported by facts in the article anyway. One might just as well say "marihuana is a Communist plot"!

The paper ends with a rather perplexing statement about the resolving power of the electron microscope. I can only conclude that either the author is very confused, or the whole article was meant to be a very bad joke.

Dougal MacDonald
arts 3

(Committee to Legalize Marijuana)

EDITOR'S NOTE—The article was documented and written by Council on Mental Health for the American Medical Association. It was reprinted with their kind permission.

About middle ground

The Editor,

I note upon the resumption of university following the Christmas holidays that we are again being deluged with the propaganda sheets of the group which calls itself Middle Ground. I trust that the university community will note that Middle Ground's handouts are unsigned and to my knowledge the identity of the author or authors is not publicly known. This seems to me a rather curious situation in view of the fact that the object of their attack, the S.D.U., is an organization whose members make no secret of their identity. I leave it to others to reply to the red-baiting phraseology of the Middle Ground authors. Here it is only necessary, perhaps, to note that the red smear tactics which they use are very much in keeping with the most notorious traditions of McCarthyism of the 1950s vintage in the U.S.A.

Charles S. Brant
Professor and Chairman
Dept. of Anthro

The Editor,

Today I picked up a sheet called "Middle Ground No. 1", not to be confused with love potent No. 9.

The writer or writers of this document listed the names of a number of people on this campus who voiced their views on a specific issue.

As a student interested in these issues I was greatly disturbed by the fact that this document was signed "M. G." with stark animosity.

Is it not a gentlemanly or gentlewomanly thing to do, in mentioning the names of others in such a way, one openly identifies oneself in respect to others and for oneself?


G. S. Hough
ed 1

EDITOR'S NOTE—We received Middle Ground too. We agree with the sentiments expressed above.

This is page FIVE

... a forum for dissent





SOME FRONT PAGES FROM THE CARILLON
... and the board reacted

Can it be a case of censorship?

The Carillon, student newspaper at the University of Saskatchewan at Regina, has been deeply involved in the threat by the board of governors of that university to suspend collection of student union fees. The incident occurred shortly after the Christmas holiday and the board of governors issued a statement at that time claiming that the move was taken "to dissociate the university from the publication".

"The Carillon has pursued an editorial policy clearly aimed at undermining confidence in the senate, the board of governors and the administration of the university," the statement read.

The board claimed that although the provincial government was not involved in the ruckus, "the government was getting a lot of reaction to The Carillon from people who are paying the taxes".

The threat to curtail the fees set off activity on that campus and a general student meeting held last week voted in favor of having the administration collect the fees.

At the moment, the board and students' union at Regina and Saskatoon are negotiating some sort of compromise to make everyone happy.

The Carillon however, does not appear to be able to escape the charges unscathed. Some members of the council have said they did not like The Carillon either.

If nothing else, it appears that the administration will back down and resume collection of fees. Also, it appears now that dissent over The Carillon has arisen. The council will take steps to ensure The Carillon will take a more responsible stand.

An average student speaks . . .

"I am sick of student power"

The Editor,

I, for one, am god-damned sick and tired of hearing all this crap about student power and I feel that my sentiments are typical of 80 per cent of the students on this campus. This whole entire mess is certainly not helped by all the publicity given to it by the media. That television show on CBC last year was typical. A group of long-haired, pot smoking morons were the self-chosen spokesmen for the entire university.

Since I am, I feel, an average student I objected to this most strenuously. Additional sensational reporting like that in recent editions of the Edmonton Journal also gives the radical more exposure and, of course, he revels in it.

The whole idea of student power is good to a point. I feel that students should have a greater say as to the quality of the courses and professors as well as some representation on the Board of Governors. This seems to be coming about on its own due to prior requests by our vociferous

minority and our students' council. Being a typical radical minority, they are not content to stop here—they now want control of the whole university. Since when are students entitled to run this institution?

As professor Ted Kemp said in his recent "Angry look at the university education", the university is the property of the people of Alberta and we are all fortunate enough to be attending it as their "proteges". The money to support this institution is obtained to the greatest extent from public funds and to a very minor extent from our own pockets. Thus I feel that we do deserve some say in how this campus is run. But not these radicals!

They feel they shouldn't have to pay tuition fees and yet should have complete control of this public property and make it their own private little domain. Most of these are just half-assed politicians who feel they can be big wheels in the university sphere where they only have a bunch of indifferent, apathetic students to answer to.

Well I am taking enough time from my studies to write this letter and I wish that all the apathetic bastards like myself would do the same. Maybe we could show the local press and most of our local revolutionary mongers that we are all fed up with all this student power bull-shit and would appreciate it if they would quit trying to pretend they are representative of student sentiment on this campus. Probably the best way to put these bastards in their place would be for all non-radical students (which I am sure would number 8,000-10,000) to gather at a large mass meeting and let the people of this province know that the radical element is not typical of this campus. Apathetic and busy as I am, I would dearly love to take part in such a gathering if only a few such as myself would take the initial steps to organize it.

So come on you apathetic studious types—let's put these bastards in their place once and for all!

A. Lund
ed 1