

Daring exposé of a playmate's "very private affair"

PLAYBOY

September 14, 1969

Hello, Al

I'm coming to Edmonton's International Snowmobile and Winter Fun Show September 26-28 and I want to see YOU.

You'll probably remember me as the Playmate from the November, 1968, issue of PLAYBOY, but I'd love to meet you in person.

Why don't you drop over to the Ebony Room at the Sheraton Caravan Wednesday, September 24 at 9 p.m. and have a drink with me?

Don't be late now!



Paige Young



Profs shouldn't scab — grad student

Regarding Tuesday's news about the firing of the eight profs at Simon Fraser University, and your article "Which Way Sociology" by Prof. Watson:

One way for sociology to go would be for sociologists to refuse to scab-fill those open positions at SFU until that administration comes to terms and re-hires.

Any professor accepting a position at that institution in replacement of those purged staff members should be noted by name, in student and professional publications and given the old treatment reserved for those who swipe an-

other man's job while he's fighting for freedom.

It's put up or shut up—sociology will never get relevant, and speak free and true as Prof. Watson wants, so long as the price for doing so is dismissal from one's job and a swift kick towards professional oblivion.

Are we going to put our purse and professional support where our mouth is?

Right on, sister.

A former professor
H. S. Duggleby
Grad Student
Ed Psych

Hello, Paige

Thanks for your note. I certainly do remember you from that center-fold.

I must say I have always admired that particular expression of American culture.

However, I've always thought that there should be some sort of equality of the sexes and for that reason I am going to suggest that Playboy devote half of their center-folds to pictures of men.

This strikes me as being only fair; women don't really have that much to look at so Playboy could lead the way in this regard.

I'd love to meet you in person too but considering that you have invited scores of Edmonton's journalists, it poses a slight problem in logistics.

I'll tell what I can do though, sweet.

You just bounce your commercialized little bunny bum bum which you seem so anxious to sell Edmonton with over here and you can perform for the whole staff.

If you can make it about 9 p.m., it'll give us time for a drink and then we can discuss how you can do the most good for the Universities Fund Campaign and campus beauty contests, which you are obviously in favor of.

Don't be late now!

Our serious candidate is . . .

by WINSTON GERELUK

Clarence L. Barnhart take heed! That dictionary you published a few years ago is wrong. At least this is what our students' council decided in a meeting here this week.

In that meeting, it was decided that 'serious' as it is used in, "he is a serious candidate" does not at all mean thought-provoking or grave as you say it does. Rather, it means 'having \$25.00 that you don't really need' and 'having 25 friends around when you need them.'

The implications of this change are truly exciting and just a little frightening. For if students' council decides they can legislate new meanings for words, what will they do with words such as 'election,' 'democracy,' 'fascist'?

It can be assumed that students' council only passes rulings that they consider necessary. Nevertheless, a ruling which defines the financial position and the immediate popularity of a candidate should not ever be necessary in a democracy.

In this, as in other historical cases, one must be allowed to ask the purpose of rules that limit the number of candidates. In early Industrial England, rules were in operation to keep people who didn't own property out of government. In certain parts of North America, there are rules to keep out of power those blacks who might question 'natural' white supremacy. And, in evil old Russia, there are rules to keep anti-Party advocates out.

The question is obviously, "what class of students does our students' council wish to bar with its 25-dollar, 25-friend ruling?"

The problem is that the two simple criteria that council de-

cidated on won't serve their purposes at all. In no way will they insure that the person with the bucks and the signatures will be 'serious.'

Two much better conditions would be that candidates exhibit an understanding of logic, and that candidates be in the habit of taking seriously powers vested in them. But alas! This would immediately disqualify some of our most respected councillors.

Council would do well to note that the 'urge to dictatorship' takes two general forms. First, somebody in power decides that elections (in their present form) are too expensive and time-consuming. And second, somebody decides to implement measures that will insure that the 'proper' people get elected. More simply, it manifests itself anytime somebody in power decides that it is their right—nay, their obligation—to tell the electorate what is good for them.

Students' council has at least two challenges facing it:

(1) In their discussions concerning 'joke' or 'non-serious' candidates, they were obviously referring to somebody. Would they submit a list of the 'joke' candidates in last Spring's election?—appending their names to same?

(2) Referring to Barnhart's definition of serious, would they point to a students' union election campaign in which the issues raised were more thought-provoking and grave than those discussed last Spring?

To summarize the issue, let me parrot the words of one more wise. When Fascism comes to the U of A campus, it will be called Democracy—Liz! David! Where were you the night that it happened?

**This
is
Page
Five**

The other side

As one who attended both lectures given by Miss Kahn-Tineta Horn in the SUB Theatre on 11 September, 1969, I should like to present a view somewhat contrary to that of Dr. Fisher (which appeared in the Tuesday issue of The Gateway).

Dr. Fisher felt that the audience was not civilized. The fact that Miss Horn did nothing but savagely attack everything in the "white society" for two sessions (while, I might add, wearing generous quantities of "white society" eye-make-up, nail polish, nylons, etc.) and refused to answer questions intelligently (that is, refused to answer questions posed; but, rather, tried either to be a very poor comedienne, or side-stepped every issue), apparently should not have warranted the rise in blood pressure of U of A students.

I think it did. Respect need be accorded a person only if that person shows him or herself to be worthy of it. Having witnessed, on other campuses, many events where singularly militant speakers have not been accorded such a reception it was because they used a less obnoxious attitude towards their audiences. We did not expect Miss Horn to sing the praises of the federal government, or Jean Chretien. On the other hand, few could anticipate how full of spleen and racist fury the lady's attacks would be.

Undoubtedly the young people of Alberta are unaccustomed to such speakers. It was only natural that there should be some reaction. (Would it not have been better if audiences such as ours had stood up to Hitler? Or were the Germans being "civilized" in allowing that militant to be heard unchallenged?)

Furthermore, the offensive words from the audience were few; and that they were spoken can be blamed only on those few who spoke of them. Most of the questions were long; but it was because the audience, dumbfounded by the speaker's views, could not help asking and re-asking her why and how she had come to such militant conclusions. It was impossible for the majority of those present to appreciate that here, before them, stood an in-the-flesh racist who hated them, and all they held to be part of their government.

In their frustrated attempts to have their questions answered, the audience did become impatient. Nonetheless, those asking questions were desperately trying to absorb Miss Horn's ideas, which seemed so bigoted and full of class hate.

Some tried to point out to her that these ideas were, perhaps, not good for a shrinking world; especially in a country which has the many ethnic minorities Canada does. The weakness, or futility in their questions was that many did not realize soon enough that a person such as Miss Horn cannot be swayed by reasoned argument or empirical questions.

Her tactic is to be insulting and abusive. She does not want discussion for her mind was made up long ago; her opinions and views have been formulated forever.

The repugnance of these views to the audience, and the reaction they aroused clearly testify to the more humane and universal political ideals of the students of the University of Alberta.

Frances Cruchley

The Gateway still needs You