

letter writers again dominate page five. today we have letters on religion and the university, errors, a misquote, errors (again), branny, the case of the missing nudes, branny (again), as well as a viewpoint. more letters on page six.

letters

concrete instances

The article in interdenominational universities gave a good survey of dangers in such institutions. It was necessarily general but this does not make it less valuable.

Perhaps some concrete instances of possible conflict might be of use to you. These are based on my experience—two years in St. Joseph's Seminary, St. Albert, which exists for the education of Catholic men for the priesthood. In this instance, education means the learning (memorizing) of a system of philosophy and theology. It would be inaccurate to say a questioning attitude is encouraged.

The teachings of the Catholic Church says that, in matters of conscience, all men should have the same ideas of what is right and wrong—those given by the Church in its pronouncements.

Sociology recognizes that men in fact have varying ideas of right and wrong. Anthropology tells us that all cultures have values concerning right and wrong, and that they all vary between cultures. Psychology realizes that there individual differences between men.

In an interdenominational institution, what will happen to the findings of science when facts conflict with ideas of what should be?

If religion is so weak that it is unable to survive in the rough-and-tumble of a secular university, there is something wrong with it—not with the university. But no, everyone's out of step but our Harry!

The field of religion lies in explaining the (otherwise) inexplicable. When man could not explain wind, storms and lightning, these were a part of his religion.

Now they are a part of science, if we can explain them. The problem is that religion sees itself curtailed by the findings of science, and the men who have given up their lives to it do not wish to lose their power.

It must be very sweet to tell people what to do, and know that one is right.

In conclusion, here is a suggested motto for an interdenominational university—Whatsoever we tell you, that is the truth. It would, of course, sound better in Latin.

charles copeman
ed 1

nursing numbers

Several errors regarding nursing students have been printed in The Gateway in the last few issues.

To clarify the situation: there are 167 undergraduate full-time nursing students registered at U of A, enrolled in either the first year of the new four-year BSc program, the fifth year of the five-year BSc program, public health, or in teaching and supervision.

These students pay the full undergraduate students' union fees of \$24.50 (including UAB fees).

Registered in one of the three clerical years of the five-year BSc program at the university hospital are 129 nursing students.

These students, as well as the 354 taking the three-year RN course at the university hospital, pay \$4.50 students' union fees.

This \$4.50 goes directly towards

activities planned by the students' union. The \$6 towards the year-book is optional.

This latter group has been coined "associate members," though in essence they are full members of the students' union, paying an associate fee, but having full campus privileges.

irma georg
nursing rep to students' council

misquote

In the recent article "Schepanovich backs dismissal at McGill" (Nov. 30 issue of The Gateway), I was misquoted as saying that "papers have a responsibility to act in the best interest of their student councils". This is a complete misinterpretation of comments I made during a telephone interview with a Gateway reporter.

At that time, I stated that student newspapers have an obligation to act responsibly in the best interests of the students and of the university community as a whole. This does not mean that papers should be the propaganda-arms of student councils or that they have an obligation to support all council policies, but rather that they have an obligation to report, to comment on, and to criticize responsibly the decisions and actions of the council.

If a student newspaper abuses its responsibilities, I believe it should be disciplined because it is then not acting in accordance with the best interests of the students. However, I do not believe disciplinary action should be taken until a CUP investigation commission has examined the situation and made recommendations. Student councillors are not always qualified judges of journalism and the assessment of a competent commission is likely to be more objective than that of the parties involved in the dispute.

I think it was unfortunate that the McGill Council fired Sandy Gage, editor of the McGill Daily, before a commission was called to investigate. A similar action could not be taken by our students' council because the CUP Investigation Commission procedure has been adopted in the by-laws of the students' union.

marlynn pilkington
students' union vice-president

inaccuracies

I would like to thank you for covering my talk on LSD in the Nov. 23 Gateway. However, there is one important point that was inaccurately reported concerning my talk and I feel that this should be corrected.

I definitely did not recommend that normal persons should simply take a "trip" with a "guide" who need not be an MD. Rather, I emphasized that the prescription of LSD and its administration should be under medical supervision.

The MD should be responsible for screening those who wish to take LSD and making sure that the conditions of its use are favorable. The "guide" need not be an MD, but he should be a sensitive and experienced person and he who has had LSD experience, but who should not take the drug while he is a "guide."

The great danger of the present

restrictions on the use of LSD is that they very nearly make impossible the taking of LSD under these conditions. I feel that this correction in your report of my talk is essential, since those taking LSD now should realize that the restrictions on LSD oblige them to take additional risks.

kellogg v. wilson, phd
associate professor of psychology

second-rate

Branny Schepanovich has, once again, added to a long list of irresponsible actions and statements.

This time he has given his support to the McGill council for their facing the "blackmail tactic of mass resignation" over an article appearing in the McGill Daily. Schepanovich has labelled this "yellow journalism" without any proof or authority.

A CUP investigation has since exonerated Sandy Gage and his staff, but Schepanovich had already voiced his condemnation. In a court of law this would amount to contempt!

I am fed up with second-rate administration from the man for whom I voted.

Beginning with his withdrawal of the U of A from CUS I have been disappointed. His clever timing of the general meeting to discuss this issue worked well for him. There was virtually no possibility of getting a quorum.

He has failed abysmally to establish a rapport with his electorate. The development of the new CIA is ample proof of this.

I would not be surprised if he tries to suppress opinion in The Gateway, before the year is over.

Even the 'sand-box politics' of the U of A students' union is supposed to be based on democratic principles. If Schepanovich refuses to be responsible to his electorate, then I suggest he get out!

john r. green
arts 3

sign trouble

May I raise an outraged howl on your letter page?

Once again, I am having trouble with signs I have put up to advertize that Edge 5 is available at the bookstore. In the current sign, I have chosen to display a print of a splendid and weighty nude by Alec Colville—to show the quality of the art work in Edge 5.

The trouble is that some drooling clots around here are stealing the prints and ruining the ads. I want to curse and anathematize these salivating idiots.

If their motive is canting righteousness, then excrete on them for sanctimonious, sniffle-nosed, whining puritans.

If they are grey-faced onanists wanting the prints for their perverse rites, then may the worms that make up their sick minds begin to writhe out of their ears.

But, if they should be lovers of art who simply must have a Colville print and cannot afford to buy Edge 5, forgive them, indeed.

noel parker-jarvis
business manager,
edge 5

a malicious attack

As an interested observer of students' union activities I can no longer remain silent while the union president, Branny Schepanovich, maliciously attacks another university student.

Now, before Branny's incipient paranoia and megalomania force him to conclude that this opinion represents just another case of personal vindictiveness, let me assure our esteemed leader that there is no malice aforesought.

I wholeheartedly supported Branny for union president last March, and although I have had reason to regret it since, I still stand by that decision. Moreover, I've worked closely with Branny while we were associated with The Gateway. This association made me appreciate his talents, and recognize his weaknesses.

Yes, Mr. and Mrs. Apathy, U of A division, our leader—contrary to current implication—is not perfect. He does make mistakes. His recent statements concerning one Brian Campbell, would-be journalist and dung-disturber, constitutes his latest mistake.

Branny Schepanovich, for those of you who have recently arrived on campus, achieved his fame as a Gateway editor who blatantly criticized administration and union officials. He fought long, hard battles in Council to ensure the freedom of the student newspaper. He was, indeed, a great pain in the posterior for the union president of that year, Wes Cragg. And so, I feel, he should have been.

However, now that Mr. Schepano-

vich has moved into the chief executive's office he seems to have forgotten all those principles for which he fought so hard. Is it not his principles which are as "firm as the Sargasso Sea?" Is it not he, and not his critics, who most often resorts to personal attacks? While serving as his managing editor I was frequently told by Branny's critics that his editorial policy reflected his personal prejudices and vendettas. And, on at least two occasions, I know this criticism to be just.

It seems time has not made Branny less sensitive to criticism. Indeed, he now apparently finds malicious criticism of his person where none in fact exists.

My reading of The Gateway articles to which Branny objects does not lead me to conclude there is any conscious intent to maliciously attack Mr. Schepanovich or any individual. Conversations with Brian Campbell, the accused assassin of Branny's reputation, reinforces this opinion. While Branny has given Brian Campbell every reason to personally attack him, I am positive Brian acted in good faith and with integrity.

Therefore, I implore Mr. Schepanovich to return to the important union business at hand and forget his present campaign to destroy Mr. Campbell. Furthermore, I ask that the students of this campus ignore these recent charges of their leader, and return once more to their apathetic alcoves with a good book and/or a willing girl (guy). There will be no witch-hunt this term!

bill winship
grad studies

Viewpoint

Impeach Branny Schepanovich!

Either that, or try harder to ignore him as he has only four months left in office.

Since assuming the presidency of the students' union, Branny has used the office to make his unmistakable name notoriously prominent across Canada.

And he has done this by making the type of irresponsible statements for which he deprecates others.

As the head of a council which is not only isolated from the student body, but isolated in its conservatism and uninspired outlook, Branny has forced policies to be adopted which have seriously depreciated the image of this university, not only among students in Canada, but more importantly in the eyes of the general public and the news media.

Two recent developments have carried the matter to an extreme, however.

The first, the very strong implication from Branny's comments in last Wednesday's Gateway that as "publisher" of the paper he would, if necessary "manage" the news.

In fact, Branny has already been busy managing the news, at least to the extent of having tried powerfully to persuade those who have written and edited pro-CUS articles to limit their number, extent, and

fortitude.

How strange this is, coming from a former Gateway editor who, when himself a council member, strongly advocated the strictist separation between the "two estates" of government and the press.

His most recent outburst, and perhaps the most damning, came November 30 in the Edmonton Journal. There, Branny's remarks about a CUS policy adopted last September ran under the three-column headline "Student Group 'Red-Tinged'".

"A U of A student leader," the story begins, "has attacked the affiliation of CUS with the 'Soviet-orientated' International Union of Students."

Branny says the move (which gives CUS the same status with IUS as it now has with the American-dominated International Student Conference) is a "tragedy for the student union movement in Canada," and he hopes "the government is well aware of the circles in which CUS is moving."

This university, its students and its administration, together with a threatened free press, should be well aware of the neo-fascist, anti-democratic philosophy that seems to have permeated the present student "inner group."

If the government is going to take any notes, then let it be of this group at the U of A, led by a president who, at least in the Journal's story, did not disclaim that he was not talking for the council, the student body, or indeed the university. (No Branny, I'm not attacking your integrity).

For if Branny thinks that Vietnam peace demonstrators from this campus have given the U of A a bad reputation, he would be well to hear the more than common crack by responsible Edmontonians about his Journal comments—the question "What kind of a nut is that guy?"

It's about time this campus found out, and did something about it. And it seems high time that Branny found out what IS the direction in which students unions in Canada are moving, and realized the circles in which his own thinking is directed.

Dave Estrin, law 2, is a former CUS chairman.