



nb

The Gateway welcomes letters on topics of student interest. Correspondents are asked to be brief, otherwise their letters will be subject to abridgement. And correspondents, in replying to one another, should keep to the issues under discussion and abstain from personal attacks. All letters to the editor must bear the name of the writer. No pseudonyms will be published.

Exceptional circumstances apart, no letter should be more than about 300 words in length. Short letters are more likely to be published promptly—and to be read.

letters

rah! arts and ed

With respect to the column by Helene Chomiak (Sept. 23), we beg to differ with several of the generalizing opinions therein. Probably the worst fault of the column is that of blatant generalization. One can't crowd observations concerning people into a few sweeping remarks that herd us all into one category. The university student body is composed of individuals.

University is not to us what it seems to be to Miss Chomiak. We feel quite qualified to disagree on the subject of husband hunting in the faculties of education and arts, as we are both in our graduating years in these faculties. Granted, if one wants to choose "Mickey Mouse" courses in order to remain in university long enough to catch a university-graduate husband, it is possible. But almost every faculty offers this type of course, and it's damn well time education and arts were recognized as worthwhile faculties. No matter what faculty in which we enroll, we don't pick easy courses in the numbers Miss Chomiak seems to think. Perhaps these are some non-achievers and husband-hunters, as there are in every faculty, but there are also some genuinely conscientious prospective educators and leaders, and what does our society need most to develop future scholars if it isn't teachers?

Back to the question of husband-hunting. Have you ever tried to find either a prospective husband, or even a date, in an education CI course, or a senior French, German or Spanish literature course with ratios of fifteen girls to one boy? And these are no Mickey Mouse courses by the way. For you freshettes looking for a husband, you'd

be wise to forget education and arts, and try your luck in engineering, commerce, phys ed or pharmacy where there are better ratios.

Then there is Miss Chomiak's nasty and uncalled-for remark which reduces our professors to mere personality parade judges. If good marks could be bought with smiles, we'd be on the honor roll, as smiles suit us better than frowns. If we were professors, we would be most insulted by this thoughtless remark.

And discussions: After three years, on campus, we've had plenty of discussions on philosophy (of education as well as "contemplation of the Good,") as well as on religion, politics, the fine arts and upon occasion, the New Morality. We can't recall more than a half-dozen times in our university careers when last weekend's parties even entered the conversation.

With respect to your advice, "Go to classes, read, talk and above all, think." Yes, do it, but if one hasn't done this before coming to university, it's too late now. Besides, one who hasn't begun this before, wouldn't be here now. No frosh, university isn't a never-neverland of intellectuals, philosophers and political supermen, but it also isn't a place where we idle away a few years partying and smiling at professors while we pursue our goals of husband-hunting and landing a "jammy" job after graduation. So please allow us to prepare for what we consider the essential vocation of education, and stop calling down the faculties of Arts and Education as Lonely Hearts' Clubs.

Barbara Brown,
arts 3
Ruby Swelka,
ed 4

Editor's note—You seem to be laboring under the delusion that the public education system teaches students to think. Unfortunately, this is not so. The departmental exams in Grade XII are the best example of what students are taught to do—to memorize answers, to multiple choice and short answer questions.

reviewing the review

With reference to your review of the 3Ds' (Sept. 23), I wish to lodge a violent protest. I'm sure I speak for others when I say that the review was unfounded and unfair.

I have been "folk-type" singing for a period of three years (Just Three, Inner Circle) and I share the consensus of opinion in feeling that the 3Ds' put on a wonderful show. I do not claim to be an expert at folk singing or at any other form of music, but I have been on stages and have done enough shows to know a solid performance when I see and here one.

The three gentlemen from the U.S. were faced with a large undertaking, especially when they arrived in a strange city to find that their first show had been cancelled (a real blow to the ego) and the auditorium filled slowly for their only show. That the show began 25 minutes late, is not the fault of the organizers or the 3Ds', but of the apparent apathetic students. It's a feeling one must experience to appreciate. Obviously Mr. Mappin has not experienced it.

If you consider the fact that the 3Ds' were relatively unknown to U of A students until last Tuesday evening, you would realize the enormous job it is to do a long show without international reputation behind you. In spite of the difficulties they encountered the 3Ds' did a superb job and most of us look forward to a return visit from them soon.

I hope that Mr. Mappin is not trying to imitate the internationally known and acclaimed journalist Barry Westgate. If he is, The Gateway is entering a dark period. Reviews in the past years have been fair and well written. In respect Mr. Mappin's right to view his opinion, but I question his authority on the subject. A music critic should have a knowledge of music in order to criticize. So the next show may be reviewed fairly. I suggest Mr. Mappin attempt some singing on his own. I know a good music teacher.

Dave Norwood
arts 3

CUS -- sleeping beauty?

Following is an article written for The Carillon by the Regina campus CUS chairman Kent Yunn.

Having recently returned from Halifax and the 30th Congress of the Canadian Union of Students, I assure you students of awareness that CUS is not dead—locally it may be more dormant than desirable but our valiant shall die but once!

As a national union, that is, as the summation of member institutions projected into a bureaucratic set-up, CUS is very active and relatively effective. One has merely to take a cursory glance at the resolutions

passed in the last congress and at the reputation of CUS to confirm this. But our definition of CUS is not complete—this union, as does any union, gathers its strength from member locals, or, in this case, member institutions. Here I suggest is the rub! Unless member institutions (e.g. Regina Campus) make CUS active on the local level the potential of the organization is not fulfilled. A popular cliche expression at the congress put the problem as "implementation of national policy at the local level."

I suggest that we in Regina have let CUS become dormant and that it's time we broke the shackles of inaction and awoke our sleeping beauty. Contrary to many, I believe CUS does have much to offer the student and I know these "offerings" are not served on a gold platter.

Our first step is to increase awareness of CUS and then to explore its possibilities on our campus always keeping in mind that we must be the servants of our needs and desires. The success of CUS depends on the active participation of you the student.

This is one of many articles pertaining to the role of CUS in Regina Campus. I hope that you will leave yourself open to whatever information may be forthcoming.

u of a on sabbatical?

Following is an editorial reprinted from The Ubyssey, student newspaper at the University of British Columbia, after U of A's withdrawal from the Canadian Union of Students.

All 11,000 students at the University of Alberta at Edmonton are no longer members of the Canadian Union of Students.

Edmonton council president Branny Schepanovich was elected on a platform of a possible CUS pull-out.

Schepanovich is an honorable man, and has spent the seven months since his March election carefully weighing CUS.

He thinks CUS does not represent Canadian students, and has no business speaking to governments on behalf of students.

He therefore urges the union to pull back to campus service station policies and drop issues such as universal accessibility, academic freedom, and reform of education finance.

When he found little support for these ideas at this month's CUS congress in Halifax, he warned student leaders his school would probably leave the union.

And while we cannot agree with Schepanovich, we believe Edmonton's decision has been responsibly and carefully considered.

But in the past, Edmonton was always one of the silver-lined pockets which supported CUS in its usual times, of duress.

A few years ago, Edmonton's voluntary levy of 40 cents per

student in addition to the compulsory levy of 60 cents was all that kept CUS in business.

A former Edmonton council president, David Jenkins, was CUS national president in 1964-65.

Under president Richard Price, Edmonton last year became sponsor of CUS's \$300,000 centennial project — Second Century Week.

Schepanovich has said he will honor that commitment and the week will go on.

Edmonton's past ties it too firmly to CUS; it cannot reject that past and long remain out of the union. While we regret its decision, we are confident Edmonton will return to CUS.

The withdrawal seems to be a passing crisis, a catharsis necessary to Alberta students—before they can confidently support the main block of Canadian students.

CUS including UBC, must respect its decision and allow the back in a year or two.

In the meantime the rest of CUS including UBC, must respect its decision and allow the crisis to pass without malice and without isolating Edmonton from the rest of Canada.

There is no reason why Second Century Week cannot receive full support from councils still in CUS.

There is no need to make an enemy of Edmonton.

There is a serious need to represent a hard decision, buoyed perhaps by the hope that when Edmonton returns, it will again take its leadership role in the union—with greater vigor and wisdom than ever before.

re-emergence of the right

Following is an editorial reprinted from the Dalhousie Gazette on CUS and the CUS Congress.

This year's CUS congress might be titled, 'the re-emergence of the right wing.' It might also be called, 'the triumph of regionalism.' This was the year that a grassroots movement set about to bring the CUS secretariate back into line.

Call it what you will, the 1966-67 CUS Congress was a very depressing affair. It does not make sense that at a point in Canadian history when the nation is threatened by a growing fragmentation, that any student representatives should opt in favor of regionalism.

It is useless and perhaps meaningless to consider the motives behind the new mood. Undoubtedly some delegates came to reform and others came to destroy. It does not matter. The important thing is to consider the issues and what the alternatives for action are.

CUS performs a wide variety of tasks but if it is viewed from outside the academic community it becomes clear CUS's chief duty is to lobby. It exists to give expression to the Canadian student body. It makes possible collective action by a significant minority within Canadian society.

It is important for students to realize that they are an identifiable minority. And even when they are acting in the best interests of the society, they are not assured of popular support. Yes, we need to lobby, and therefore we need an agency to be effective. Surely, there is no one that can overlook the effectiveness of collective action in the American civil rights movement.

The present protest is founded on the proposition that CUS does not have a popular base. However, the critics are not calling for a revamping of CUS's executive wing: they want to emasculate it.

The critics argue that the elective process that is used to pick CUS representatives does not give the man-

date to decide moral or political issues for the student body.

The logic appears sound, but its spokesmen are not being realistic if they attempt to drop the question at this point. The fact is, it becomes very difficult to label issues as political or non-political. More important, are the critics saying that students do not have the right to express opinions or act collectively on political issues.

Suppose we consider the question of universal accessibility. No one can deny that this is a question which has a unique and vital importance for students. At the same time, it can hardly be classed as a non-political issue. Now presuming there is a majority student opinion and—in the best democratic tradition—the majority wishes to act on the question of universal accessibility, how is it to be done? Obviously this is a political issue that must finally be resolved by political action. Although education is a provincial affair, it seems nonsense to argue that regional action is going to produce the same results as a national program.

Beyond this there is the example of the world student body. In country after country it is the academic community that sparks and directs social development. Should the Canadian university exist as a passive observer of society or should it enter fully into the social process?

As the argument stands, the critics of CUS are actually calling for a withdrawal of collective student opinion and action from all national issues that can be labelled as political or moral. Apparently, this prohibition remains valid no matter how directly or universally the issue affects the students.

If the critics are true reformers, why not propose that CUS representatives be elected by a process that would give them the mandate to act as more than caretakers? The important thing is that Canadian students should not be denied the right to voice a majority opinion on whatever they wish.