



editorial

"Let them drink beer."

Since the disappointing defeat of the NUS referendum last week, perhaps it is time this Students' Union reassesses its priorities in what it offers people. Since voting is the major method in a democracy for people to express their political opinions, perhaps the powers-that-be here should reconsider their priorities in the light of this recent powerful judgement laid down by the voters.

Perhaps it is time students were asked exactly what they do want from a students' union.

Do the students want a better deal for themselves? Do they want a powerful voice from their own lungs on their behalf asking for a little justice from government? Apparently not.

I think the executive should seriously consider that the limit students want from them is fast beer service, bowling alleys, pinball machines, and tall hamburgers.

Forget this political drivel, bring on the dancing girls.

At this moment NUS is doing exactly what the "NO" campaign said it couldn't do. It is preparing a lobby to the federal government on a provincial issue. The Fiscal Arrangement Act is just that act which legislates the allotment of funds from the federal government to the provinces.

The "NO" campaign harped on the alleged fact that the provinces simply have to ask for funds of the federal government and they are granted, according to percentages under the act.

Well, the act comes up for review in 1976, and NUS will be prepared, through its reports and information bank, to present an active lobby for changes in the act which would give a better deal to students who right now cannot go to school for lack of funds. Campaigners, you know who they are. They just barely might have been you or me, and the information bank could probably give you statistics on what the number actually is.

But the executive should recognise that the "other things" the "NO" campaign cried our money was better spent on doesn't include student financing, rather it includes the comfort and edification of those already here.

Realising this, the government can simply say about the students on this campus, "Let them drink beer."

Note: Opinions expressed here are those of the writer and are not necessarily those of the entire staff. We seldom agree on anything.

Advocacy journalism- the replacement for worn-out objectivity?

There's been a long and treasured tradition in journalism saying, in brief, that journalists must be objective and must not interject their own opinions into interpreting the history they record.

The objective style of journalism has been seen by virtually all serious news mediums as the only reliable method of reporting the world's events in such a way as the truth or the visible facts can be recorded.

But experience tells the journalist that the truth revealed by visible facts is a rare instance.

Most often stories hinge on what people have said or imply rather than what they have done. The journalist cannot witness an event in most cases, rather he must weigh the implications of what a number of opinion-holders around him have said.

In these cases, many critics of objective journalism hold it is impossible for a writer, as a recorder of history, to get at the truth, to state what actually happened. In these cases they say the objective style of journalism is not so much a tradition as a facade, a trick to lure the masses into believing what they are reading is actually the truth, rather than one man's interpretation of it.

READER COMMENT

What is needed, what would be more honest, they say, is for the writer to do away with the facade, to come right out and admit his opinions so readers viewing his record of history can weigh the writer's opinions with all the others recorded in the story.

This would not be a method for journalists to promote his viewpoint to the masses, it would be a method for readers to understand what type of person is recording history for them so the reader can get a more clear picture of the truth.

For example, this publication has just completed recording the NUS referendum. We, as a staff are generally in favour of our students joining NUS and feel it is unfortunate for this students' union that we didn't join. I feel this opinion is more qualified than those held by many on campus because it is the result of years of conscious viewing and commenting on

NUS, from talking with opinion holders both for and against NUS from within and without NUS, and from witnessing results of NUS's work on many other campuses.

Yet, when the campaign arrived here, we tried to report in the objective style.

Realising the impossibility of remaining opinionless on the issue, we nonetheless recorded the events and statements on the issue "objectively."

Perhaps "advocacy journalism" as it has been named would have been a better approach to this issue. Not that the collective opinion of the staff would be the main thrust in coverage of an opinion issue, the event in the story is still the most important aspect of our coverage, but perhaps it would have been more honest to simply scrap the veil of objectivity and tell the readers which angle the story was written from.

If the tradition of objective journalism is dying at all, it is dying hard, and I personally will work toward its survival.

The purpose in this treatise is simply to stimulate thought on your behalf, and to bring to mind when you read this and other publications the style in which you are offered the earth's history.

letters

Change RATT

I am sure that most students will agree with me when I call upon the management of RATT to stop serving beer and other alcohols on Friday and Saturday night.

I realize that there is a certain vocal minority on campus who spend these nights consuming liquor, but surely these people realize that this time could be better spent studying or catching up on educational television. Don't they know that William Buckley's Firing Line is available for viewing while they become intoxicated?

There is nothing more relaxing after a hard week than to read a good Sociology text in the comfort of Room At The Top. Trying to have a raspberry drink while drunken bodies stumble about singing some ditty about 'Lulu' can be both frustrating and disenchanting.

Let us see if we can bring the same warmth and atmosphere to RATT that we find in the Rutherford Reserve Reading Room - perhaps installing a few dozen carrels might help, and blocking out that distracting view with wood panelling would be an improvement.

I certainly hope action will be taken on the 'mistake of RATT' before students really get ticked off and start burning their library cards in protest.

Joe Mundane
Boring Arts II

Pop bomb our baby

John Savard's letter "Savard Saves" in the October 9 Gateway, correctly identifies the root of our world's present crises of energy, famine and pollution as being overpopulation. Too many people is our major crisis.

John says the solution to this problem and its effects lies in colonizing Earth-type planets of other suns, therefore space budgets must be increased. John is counting on an unfounded technological innovation to transport out surplus population from our solar system to others. I suggest this is fantasy!

Garett Hardin of the University of California, ("Interstellar migration and the Population Problem," *Heredity*, 50:68-70, 1959) has calculated using optimistic assumptions, that if the wealthiest nation on Earth, the U.S., were to cut back its standard of living to 18%, it could set aside enough money in one year to transport one day's increase in the world's population to another star system.

The world's current growth rate hovers around 2%. Everything remaining equal, by 2870 A.D. Earth's human population will be 60 million million (60×10^{15}). (J.H. Fremlin, "How Many People Can the World Support?" *New Scientist*, Oct. 29, 1964). Enough to populate 17 million present day Earths. Even if interstellar migration were feasible, evidently it is not the ultimate answer.

Obviously lowering the growth rate (simply birth rate minus death rate equals growth rate) is the only answer to alleviating the snow-balling crisis facing man - the population explosion. We can increase our death rate, but our only humane alternative is to lower the birth rate. Dozens of feasible solutions have been proposed. Many are frightening.

The fact remains - our world's growth rate must be brought to zero and then reversed. It must be started now through responsible and concerted world effort, or else the death rate solution which upon us now in the form of the population bomb resulting in war, famine, and environmental deterioration will continue growing exponentially and end our species long before 2870 A.D. Remember, "the Population Bomb is everyone's baby" (ZPG).

(The concerned reader is referred to Paul R. Erlich's, *The Population Bomb*, and Dennis Meadows et al's, *The Limits to Growth*.)

Marc Parent
Ed.



HOOSIER

"Can I see about monthly terms on the egg salad sandwich?"