



nb

today we have letters on renovaters, the bookstore, student rights and the new mural for sub. there is also a report on council-newspaper relations by gateway editor, bill miller.

letters

It is 2 p.m. Wednesday, the middle of exam week—I am sitting in a crowded library—every seat taken—and some people in overalls have just begun to renovate the front desk—with hammers and saws of course.

It can only be supposed that these people (the ones in overalls) are employed by the university—otherwise some trusty janitor would be sure to see through their endeavor to distract hundreds of students from studying for exams—or would they?

The little thing, if you consider it such, is not my only reason for writing—it's just that it struck me that this happens during every major exam period in any if not all the campus libraries, at least it has over the last four years.

Take for example last year (or was it the year before?) during finals—"they" were renovating inside Rutherford with jack-hammers, it went on for days. During that same week "they" were laying foundations to something or other—with a pneumatic pile-driver—within 20 feet of the library.

But these are only my most vivid examples, it really does happen the first week of every January and May, think about it and you'll remember other examples. You may also consider that there is rarely any renovation during the libraries' slack periods—for instance the beginning of the year or after exams.

If "they" are really employed by the university, it could only be the fault of a fantastically inept administration. But then, the administration is very large and is undoubtedly subject to Parkinson's Law, in which case it is not only inept but malignant.

Considering the other possibility, that "they" are from the outside—the whole thing is quite understandable—"they" are out to disrupt the basic function of the university—the passing of exams for the purpose of acquiring licenses.

"They" are goodies after all—and the university (admin.) loses both ways.

john loomes
ed 4

Originally I had thought of writing this letter to compliment the M. G. Hurtig Campus Tower Bookstore for their generosity in subsidizing university students at a loss to themselves.

I arrived at this strange conclusion because I understood that the university bookstore sold books to students at a very small markup. This markup is theoretically necessary to cover their overhead and expenses.

On Jan. 13 the U of A bookstore was selling the Life Science Library series books at \$6.60 each. As Hurtig's sells these identical books for \$5.75, I could only conclude that Mr. Hurtig was operating at a loss.

Now, however, in the Jan. 14 issue of Weekend Magazine, I find an advertisement offering the same books for \$3.95 each. This is on a ten-day trial, money-back guarantee for each copy and the purchaser can cancel his subscription at any time.

I find it impossible to believe that Time-Life Books Co., are sustaining a loss with each sale at the

price of \$3.95 per book. However, even assuming \$3.95 as a wholesale price, this leaves Hurtig's a profit of \$1.80 per copy.

This has a semblance of reason as they are in the business to make a profit. However, I am at a complete loss to understand why the U of A bookstore requires a profit of 67 per cent to cover expenses. Can anyone explain?

art smyth
ed 2

Under the guise of finding out if people distributing literature on campus are students, people are having their names taken.

If the plain clothes police wish to find out if a person is a student then it is only necessary to have them produce a union card. It is not necessary to take names.

Those who naively think we live in an institution where coercion is non-existent, where people are free to act according to the dictates of conscience, are mistaken.

Perhaps the administration should explain why it's wasting the university's money on this futility.

Perhaps the student leaders could concern themselves with the defense of the democratic rights of all students whether they are communists or rightists.

patrick connell
arts 3

Do Albertans lack the aesthetic sense?

The mural for the new SUB equals the chef-d'oeuvre in front of Edmonton's city hall! For \$25,000, The Gateway splash below it could have been elevated!

Why aren't students who are appreciative of and responsive to the beautiful in art consulted before such a monstrosity is hung?

Even the simple University of Alberta crest with "Quaecumque Vera" would have been more appropriate!

lilianne coutu
ed 3

In reference to an editorial in The Gateway Jan. 18 entitled "Neanderthal Council," we feel obligated to express our disapproval of the metaphor employed by Mr. Ward and quoted by you.

While we in no way disapprove of Mr. Ward's argument and indeed concur with him on specific points, we are appalled by the use of the term "Neanderthal" to describe the students' council of the University of Alberta.

This is unfortunately in keeping with the unfounded myths and unscientific superstitions concerning the men of the Mousterian culture, whose reputation we are constantly forced to defend. Since this particular population of Homo Sapiens had, on the average, a larger cranial capacity than ourselves, and possessed a considerable and varied technology, it is unfair and uncalled-for to use the name "Neanderthal" for the purposes of adverse comparison and ridicule.

We agree, then, in principle, with the analysis of both Mr. Ward and The Gateway, but we can under no circumstances condone the metaphor used.

norman w. zierhut
president
gordon s. drever
co-publicity chairman
u of a anthropology club

The year is 1978 and the vast amounts of unconditional monetary and technical aid placed in the hands of Red China by the United States of America in former years has greatly averted the extinction of homo sapiens. The most incredible solution of the present world condition is the only real solution at the world's disposal. Why should the U.S. and other more prosperous nations not aid the less fortunate nations, of which China is probably foremost.

Men are hypocritically and absurdly suffering the agonies of the war in Vietnam. Death for the sake of the emasculated segment of humanity. Are the teeming millions of China not included in this pathetic category? This is the real futility, absurdity and hypocrisy of the war in Vietnam.

By perpetuation of the antagonism with Red China all our humanistic and altruistic motives are mere rationalizations for maintaining a select world position. The war is humanistically motivated. The remedy is unconditional aid to China by the U.S. and other Western countries.

This perspective is refutable from almost every rational position, but the solution to the world and its plight lies only in this direction. Not more than 40 years ago the leaders of Russia were advocating world domination at any cost; today peaceful coexistence is advocated in Russia. Our ideals, the foundations of our society, and we as existing persons demand that we in the western world give aid to China. The results are too inviting.

laurence macneil
grad studies

relations between newspapers and council

by bill miller
the gateway editor-in-chief

(originally presented as a working paper to the 30th congress of the canadian union of students)

Delegates to the 28th national conference of the Canadian University Press, in informal discussions, decided the relations between students' councils and student newspapers generally fall into two basic categories.

One category is composed of newspapers which are an extension of council, in the sense that it permits the council to request that certain ideas be expressed in the paper, that certain projects of the students' union be supported, that certain editorial decisions be made with the agreement of council. It sees a newspaper conforming to what the council happens to believe is the truth.

The second category is represented by those newspapers which define their role more in terms of an organ providing intellectual leadership instead of a redundant reporting of campus events. Such a newspaper has to be independent, for the main question that it must question basic societal beliefs, in the process sometimes inflaming the Establishment.

Members of CUP are striving to exist in the second category, where the type of newspaper is the only type which can adequately meet the needs of a rapidly-shifting society.

Members of CUP are faced with councils who believe that the newspaper's sole function is to exist as a bulletin board, announcing upcoming meetings and events and reporting what goes on at these gatherings in great detail. These people look on the editorial page as a necessary evil, where the student editor can gratify his desire for power. This concept of a student newspaper is dying out, and a new concept, that of an "opinion leader" and an "agent of social change," is coming into use.

The student newspaper and student government are realizing that they can be a vital force in the eradication of society's abuses and in the promotion of a new social order.

Part of this rethinking is that the student paper need not be a place where redundant facts are reported; but where meaningful ideas are discussed and analyzed.

Ideally, such action would be

embraced by both major forces on campus—the newspaper and council—but often a council embracing some progressive action will be faced with a "bulletin board" newspaper or one that is conservative in thinking.

On the other hand, a newspaper attacking, destroying and rebuilding will more often be faced with a group of petty administrators who think the greatest good is in maintaining harmony with the Establishment, and are not given to social change, either because they do not agree with its principles or they are looking for a job after graduation with a big company that frowns on radicals.

When a progressive council is teamed up with a progressive newspaper, no problems should exist. But when a conservative namby-pamby council meets a progressive paper, or vice-versa, trouble is likely to occur. What should council do in the event of a dispute? Nothing. And council should have no right, expressed or implied, to do anything.

Council might argue that since it pays out the majority of the money for the newspaper it should have some say in editorial policy, and should be able to hire and fire an editor. While we all agree that the campus needs a newspaper, and a newspaper needs money to operate, and in most cases the majority of the money comes from council, this hardly gives council any knowledge of how to run a newspaper. Student council types are notorious for knowing little of what constitutes a good newspaper, what qualifies a news story for the play it receives, what constitutes a good editorial, or, in some cases what an editorial is.

The political nature of their office, where they are constantly forming agreements or lobbying, does not permit them to look at an opinion leader or agent of social change in any objective fashion. It is said by some that a council will pick a fight with the newspaper because it has nothing better to do.

In a survey of 40 campus newspapers, all papers report the council cannot directly dictate policy, but some parenthetically explain the policy is dictated by the choice of editor, but the cases of implied control through the control of the purse strings or the firing of the editor should be, and can be, eliminated.

CUBICLE

