

The Gateway

THE GATEWAY is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta. It is published by the Students' Union twice weekly during the winter session on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Contents are the responsibility of the editor, opinions are those of the person expressing them. Letters to the editor on any subject are welcome, but must be signed. Please keep them short: letters should not exceed 200 words. Deadlines for submitting copy are 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays. Main offices are located in Room 282, SUB for Gateway, Room 238 SUB for Media Productions. Phone 432-5168, 432-5178, 432-5750. Advertising 432-3423. Circulation 18,500.

Editor - Kevin Gillese
 News - John Kenney
 Features - Lindsay Brown
 Arts - Beno John
 Sports - Darrell Semenuk
 Photo - Don Truckey
 Graphics - Craig McLachlan
 Advertising - Tom Wright
 Production - Loreen Lennon and Margriet Tilroe-West
 Circulation - Jim Hagerty
 CUP Editor - Cathy Brodeur

STAFF THIS ISSUE: Brent Knosyniuk, Alan Kostyniuk, David Oke, Peter Birnie, L. Torrence, Elsie Ross, Bob Park, Greg Hoosier, Carol Mackay, Richard Desjardins, Sue Michelicka, Mina Won, Nancy Brown, Brian Gavriloff, Gordon Turtle, Andrea Stine.

editorial

Thomas Enders' speech Monday night was an insult to me, as a Canadian. Mr. Enders (US ambassador to Canada) spoke about the responsibility the rich industrialized western powers have to the developing countries of the Third World. He argued that what we need now is tougher negotiations with developing nations before we can give them increased capital aid to build industrialized economies. In a press conference after the speech, Mr. Enders' made himself a bit clearer than he did in the speech (where he masked his content in economic jargonese). He said, "They (developing countries) can't just expect us to give - we've got to get, too." Oh yes, those bastards in the Third World have sure been gouging us, haven't they, ambassador Enders?

Enders' speech presented the argument that one world economic order should be structured, that the economic order should be established in the next decade by hard-line negotiations with developing nations, and that after the negotiating period is over, the industrialized nations should heavily increase subsidization of Third World countries. Why did Enders advocate "tougher" negotiations? So we could have "insurance against any cartel arrangement ... a better understanding of the rights and duties of foreign investors ... (and) some acceptance of basic trade principles." Except for the insurance against cartels, the two other statements are conveniently ambiguous. Rights of foreign investors? Enders is the man to talk after having accused Canada of gouging the US with high oil and gas prices when the money is largely going to Canadian subsidiaries of American firms. Acceptance of basic trade principles? Enders has stated that industrialized nations don't really get that good a deal when they import another nation's raw materials and export their manufactured goods back to them. Right We charge them double what they earn from initial exports and we're getting ripped off?

What Enders advocates is a better deal for industrialized nations in their relations with developing nations. That would continue for ten years and then of course, after those nations had accepted our way of doing business, then we would increase their capital subsidies to allow their economies to grow. We'll take from you now and give later on - that's a promise. Such logic is absurd and a slap in the face of Canada vis-a-vis our current foreign polity with Third World nations. Our stance, as a rich industrialized nation, is that we have a responsibility now to help developing countries' economies to grow. We try and implement that through exchanges, political support and economic subsidies.

We do not think we are being taken advantage of when developing nations have enough sense to form cartels to ensure adequate returns for their plundered resources - we think that's fairly good business practice. And I think Enders probably does too - only he doesn't want other countries (such as Canada and/or Third World countries) to have good business sense, to "play the game." He wants them to play the game the American way - (or his idea of the American way) - which means they should maintain a superior/subordinate relationship with the U.S. And that opinion offends me.



The ranting Maoists on campus were at the Enders Lecture Monday night. Members of the Edmonton Student Movement (Communist Party of Canada - Marxist-Leninist) tried to drown out Enders' speech with cries of "Down with U.S. imperialism" and "Enders - butcher of the Cambodian people." This is the method the CPC (ML)ers have to use - don't let your oponents talk, try to physically force them to shut up. After all, that's democracy, isn't it? We shouldn't allow people who don't think along "right lines" to have their say - they'll only infect everyone's mind. Of course, that logic makes three assumptions which I find narrow-minded, totalitarian and elitist to an extreme: that people (in this case, the audience) do not have minds of their own and therefore will not evaluate different opinions in their own manner, and (2) that the CPC(ML)ers know what the "right" way of thinking is, and (3) that people should have the right to force their opinions on anyone.

by Kevin Gillese

BUB SLUG by Delaney & Rasmussen



After six years silence...

For the past six years, I have remained silent on an issue of great concern to me, that is, the continuing battle of Dr. Anthony Vanek with the U of A. I have done so because my credibility is very low - I am married to Dr. Vanek.

I would like to begin by commenting on my credibility. There seems to be a common belief that someone who is involved in a dispute is biased and therefore should not be listened to. I submit that those who are involved are the best sources of information and that to ignore them is to make understanding impossible.

Further, I am a member of the academic staff in good standing. I was hired before I ever met Dr. Vanek, although I knew him by reputation. The Faculty Handbook guarantees my right to be considered independently of my spouse. But in practice, I am forced into the role of merely Mrs. Vanek repeatedly by colleagues and administrators at this University.

Yet I personally feel that my professional judgment is separable from my personal relationships. It surely is, for example, in dealing with students. In fact, I do not agree with all of the positions taken by Dr. Vanek. The only thing that makes my position different from other members of the academic staff is that I know more about this case. This should not be negative.

I would further note that I have had some professional experience with cases such as Dr. Vanek's. In the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, I have served on the Status of Women and Professional Ethics Committees, or both, for the past five years. As chairman of the Professional Ethics Committee last year, I was responsible for the adoption of a code of ethics for the CSAA which includes issues of the relations between academics and

their institutions. I was also responsible for bringing forward at the request of the Annual General Meeting a report on blacklisting of professionals in these disciplines.

There are, then, several points I wish to make to the University community.

First, teaching and research are supposedly the criteria most important for tenure. Dr. Vanek is outstanding in both areas. Conflicts with administrators are not supposed to decide who can teach at a University.

Second, academic freedom means to me that the academic has a right to do his job and judge the priorities and organization of his own work. Dr. Vanek received systematic interference in his professional activities throughout his probationary contract.

Third, tenure proceedings are not supposed to be adversary proceedings. These were.

Fourth, the internal structure of this University does not countenance a challenge of the accuracy, integrity or bias of an administrator. Dr. Schaarschmidt is no longer chairman of the Department that fired Dr. Vanek, but he has not been called upon to answer for his actions as chairman, including the dismissal of Dr. Slavutych and his reinstatement by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Fifth, the Association of Academic Staff does not have the power to help individuals in difficulties with the administration. They are, by their own admission, not interested in individual cases. I am interested in individual cases, and not only Dr. Vanek's.

Sixth, the University lost in front of the Visitor. The response was to set out procedures which virtually guarantee that Dr. Vanek will lose again.

I can only conclude that they think he would win if more equitable procedures were per-

mitted. An ethical institution admits its mistakes and attempts to make redress for them. It does not stick to a point regardless of all evidence.

Seventh, nobody seems to care very much about the issues which in my mind jeopardize the credibility of this institution and of academic in general. Only since the decision of the Visitor has there been a substantial input from the public and from members of the University community. Yet this input has date been ignored by the Board of Governors.

It is certainly true that the Board is not accustomed to having its actions protested. But the University is responsible to the public and its Board should be accountable for its actions.

I am still naive enough to hope, though not necessarily to expect, that a fair resolution will be arrived at in the case of Vanek. Even should this be the case, however, there are many issues which remain unresolved and they are issues which affect the entire academic community here and elsewhere. Given the University's current actions, I am not proud to claim membership on its academic staff. In spite of my personal support of Dr. Vanek for the past six years, I am partially to blame for his current situation. I could not, as a professional, find a way to bring these issues to a resolution. This is a guilt that I share with the entire academic community.

I believe that the majority of my colleagues are not apathetic - they simply don't know how to change things that seem to them to be unjust. I don't know either much of the time. But I do know that if academia is to persist as an important institution of our society, we must all find out, and act before the right to act disappears by default.

Regna Darnell
 Associate Professor
 of Anthropology