

Varsity Voices

Education Defended

To The Editor:

I vigorously protest the publishing of the irresponsible, running-off-at-the-mouth, unfounded statements that were made in the letter to the Editor of *The Gateway*, signed by "Socialist" (Friday, November 15). What is wrong with this fellow? Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that he has spent all of his time (instead of attending classes, like an Education student would) smelling washrooms; it seems to have affected his brain, if indeed he has one.

Just what does "Socialist" expect from us? Most of the Students in the Faculty of Education are here to be trained as teachers—even the most "apathetic," if there is such an animal, will tell anyone that said training is a very adequate and dedicated one.

We are not here, Ladies and Gentlemen, (this unfortunately leaves out Mr. Wells, that other famous washroom inspector, as well as, "Socialist") to force the Mayor of Edmonton to resign or to burn the President in effigy or to picket or to become big wheels on campus (everyone, at least Education students, know what dogs do to wheels; "Socialist" should know: he has been inspecting enough of it in the past weeks to see if it comes up to his standards!) or to do whatever else it is that vigorous, virile, sexy, broad-minded (as opposed to narrow-minded, of course), handsome and beautiful, idealistic and proud university students are supposed to do when they are not apathetic or are trying to chase pigeons off residence roofs.

May I remind this idiot that an Education team won the signal honor of collecting the largest amount on Blitz Day; that Education students help to publish Edmonton's only newspaper; that the students in the Faculty of Education sponsor the Ice Carnival on Varsity Guest Weekend; that John Ferbey, the Ed rep to Students' Council attends the meetings of this august body, arrives on time and takes an active part in the administration of student affairs on campus; that Education students vote in their faculty elections.

I conclude by saying that "Socialist" should team up with Mr. Wells . . . they should make a good team; one could sniff while the other tasted.

Thomas A. Landsman

P.S. Note: I sign my name with pride. I am proud to be register-

ed as a student in the Faculty of Education. I do not need a pseudonym to look or feel important. My navel is magnificent.

Thanks, Guys

To The Editor:

Through the media of *The Gateway* and with your permission, I would like to personally and on behalf of the Promotions Committee extend my deepest and sincerest thanks to those of our campus who, by participating in the planning, the organizing, the guaranteeing, the playing, or just by being there, made the Golden Bowl Weekend—1963 a weekend to remember, a weekend so spirited that it will not soon be forgotten in the history of this institution and in the hearts of those who were there. And to those who by previous commitment or by prior demand missed the personal thrill of victory, our thanks for being there in spirit, at least.

It is our hope, that with continued effort we may progress toward our goal of making an annual East-West Intercollegiate Football Final a reality. For if such is ever to occur it is to you that credit is due.

Again, our profoundest thanks.

From the Bear Pen,
J. Robert Lampard,
Chairman, Promotions

Better Paper?

To The Editor:

The word is out; someone has actually defended the *Gateway*! Yes, well, uh, "we feel that, on the whole, the paper is better balanced and does not seem to so concerned with trivialities." Lovely.

I wish to reply to your gentlemen for the defence.

Item: Given our society of "semi identical super-sub-morons" dedicated to the cultivation of "perpetual nonun-happiness" (cumplings), given a "university" devoted to the efficient mass-production of blithe, budding conformists, how can you possibly object to controversy, to radicalism, even for their own sakes? The societal ship of fools, our boat barnacled with complacency, direly needs rocking. In our situation, almost any change would constitute an improvement. What is wrong with taking a stand? Nothing, I presume, provided it isn't a controversial stand. We are told that the corrective mechanism of our

organic society must be found, if anywhere, in its universities. This university? Ora pro nobis!

Item: "The policy of a university newspaper is to be intelligent (sic!)." Really!? What happened to ours? Considering the ambient collective stupidity of our human environment, I submit, sirs, that to be intelligent is to be unthinkably radical, even subversive. You contradict yourselves.

It seems to me that Mr. Wells objected chiefly to fact that *The Gateway* blends perfectly with its background of imaginative bankruptcy, that it merely imitates the mediocrity of the technically slick *Grown Up* newspapers. Your ad hominen arguments did not defend, could not defend it from this criticism. You assert a sort of pre-Swiftian supremacy of Reason over Feeling, demonstrating your own imaginative bankruptcy, your sensual poverty. I hope you enjoy your *Gateway*, Messrs. for the defence; it is exactly what you deserve.

Mediocrity, especially wheezingly earnest mediocrity, is not merely unstimulating, it is dangerous, insidious, and should be attacked with every available weapon (even profanity!). As for mediocrity in student newspapers, there is an old maxim which says, "the best student editors are invariably forced to resign before Christmas."

Provocatively yours,
Robert Taylor

CUCND Chastised

To The Editor:

In the Tuesday issue, Mr. John Gishler, leader of the campus CUCND contingent, offered a fairly thoughtful explanation for the action taken by his colleagues during the Remembrance Day services.

Inasmuch as it was an explanation not altogether lacking in humility and reverence, it was a CUCND departure to be welcomed.

The argument was, however, invalid.

"We hoped by breaking through the crust of convention to remind you not only of the fallen but of the purpose of their sacrifice," Gishler wrote.

But surely that is the crux of the whole matter!

Surely, to imply that western soldiers in World Wars I and II were merely "fighting for peace," (in a manner not uncoincidentally like modern CUCND members) is a travesty of historical fact?

I submit that in both cases our soldiers were fighting not so much for "peace," as for freedom, that is, for the maintenance of national independence and democratic institutions.

I further submit that the present policies of the CUCND lead profoundly to an endangering of that freedom.

I would go further: I would say that the present policies of the CUCND are a long step down the road to appeasement, the same policy that brought World War II on—the same policy that led to the deaths of the very soldiers the CUCND today claims to "honor."

There is a profound irony in this; but it is no greater than hearing that the ultra-leftists and neutralists who serry the ranks of the CUCND are today "honoring" the western dead who were willing to die for what they believed.

There are today few CUCND-ers who are willing to make such sacrifices . . . or even to take any substantial risks whatever for the preservation of western institu-

tions.

The CUCND parade during Remembrance Day was therefore to many who watched it, a grisly spectacle.

It was not only in bad taste; it was a living affront to the memory of the dead we honored.

Our dead would turn in their graves if they knew they were being "honored" by those who, today, propose policies not at all unrelated to those that made Chamberlain infamous.

Many CUCND members may have "high ideals;" but high ideals, if they counsel weakness and appeasement, are just what tempt aggressors on, and bring war all the closer.

A CUCND vigil over the grave of Joseph Chamberlain would be in better taste, next Remembrance Day.

Yours,
Cincinnatus

"Pretty Smart"

To The Editor:

That there fella who wrote and said education students were stupid and had no brains or nothing sure don't think right. At home whenever anybody had a real hard question to be answered we always asked the teacher and she always give us a real good answer. So we must be pretty smart.

Yours truly,
Jack Shield (Ed 5)

P.S. I sure hope you'll print this and straighten out all this here silly talk about dumb education students.

A Bouquet

To The Editor:

I am very pleased to read in your recent issue a feature "Glimpses of Pakistan." I congratulate the contributors, the WUS delegates from this university, who have made an earnest

effort to study the people of this country in their cultural and religious context.

The striking feature of the article is the frankness on the part of the writers and the admission of the difficulties they had in understanding the feelings of the common man for which they have given genuine reasons.

Whereas this article has brought to the readers in general the experiences and views of two of our friends, which I am sure will help in mutual understanding, to a rather smaller group it has also brought back the memories from home and to an individual acute homesickness.

A strange coincidence, the bride and bridegroom whose pictures appeared in that issue are relatives of one of our charming coeds.

I am not an advocate of "purdah"; the veil, however, is an embodiment of modesty and in the words of an Urdu poet "something standing a guard to beauty." Here it is only a part of the bridal dress and it may be one of the reasons that modesty is rare in the North American girls. However I am sure I do not know the meaning of Canadian modesty, if there is one.

Pakistan and India have yet quite a few issues to settle between them. Both the countries are trying to influence the world opinion to their individual advantage and way of thinking, sometimes one doing a better job than the other. They have also so much in common that one may expect them to live as friendly neighbors helping each other in the near future, not because there will not be any disputes left or a miracle is to happen, but they are going to realize that brotherly relations will help both of them in their progress which they need and aspire to so much.

K. T. Punjabi



The Edmonton Film Society is not fulfilling the goals it should have as an organization.

If it is to do nothing more than present foreign films then it is fulfilling its ambitions, but I feel the society should also present challenging films rather than just entertaining films.

ITEM 1: In the program notes to the first film of the main series it was stated that last year's fairly heavy program was quite well accepted by the audience. Therefore, the statement continued, we have decided to lighten this year's program. If last year's program was accepted why should the standard be lightened?

ITEM 2: In the program notes to the second film this statement appeared: Members who are adverse to forceful films, tragic films, war films, long Japanese films, would really be best advised to pass-up this program.

They might as well have said: we have attempted to make this present series as weak as possible. Unfortunately this strong film crept in. We don't want to disturb anyone, so we tell you not to come. Next year we'll please everyone with a series of the great films Doris Day has appeared in.

ITEM 3: The first film of this season appeared at the Varscona Theatre approximately a year and a half ago. The society is supposed to present films which do not ordinarily appear in local theatres in order that the limited audience will have an opportunity to see them. The society does not ordinarily show films which have been popular in commercial theatres. Or perhaps *Cleopatra* will be the main showing of next year?

ITEM 4: The two films which have received most acclaim during the past year are *Mondo Cane* (*A Dog's Life*) and *Fellini's 8½*. Neither of these films is included in this year's series. Why not? Perhaps the program committee did attempt to obtain them. We have no way of knowing. Perhaps a report from the program committee would be in order.

I would not be surprised at all if the Film Society should find less and less of an audience every year if it continues its present policy. Certainly its audience should be given more respect.

Or maybe next year we'll buy tickets to the Classic Series only which has shown itself to be more worthwhile.

Adam Campbell



Short and Sour

Before I came to this university I was warned that it was crawling with atheists. I doubt whether "crawling" was the appropriate word but I'll admit I have met a few.

I have yet to meet one, however, who was not smug about the fact. The only reason I can see for this smugness lies in the basic assumption that the majority of persons here are atheists. Naturally we all want to belong to the largest group. How many of you people actually know what you are saying when you admit to being an atheist? If you do I cannot possibly imagine you are being smug.

According to Webster's an atheist is "one who believes that there is no God." Are you any better than the persons who believe that there is a God? I doubt it. Both of you are acting in ignorance, because neither of you know.

Yet both atheists and believers persevere in their condemnation of each other and overlook the prerequisite of both beliefs, namely, "that you believe because you don't know." I cannot imagine you believing in a God if you know he existed or vice versa.

As I see it, if there is a difference between "believing" and "knowing," then we are all basically in the same boat and the sooner we realize this fact the sooner we can achieve some measure of mutual understanding among men.