

Powerful benefactors if strike broken

The postal workers are being made scapegoats in the present strike.

The media have presented one-sided analyses of the issues, focusing attention on union demands presented with misleading percentages. It looks as if the government is out to break the back of the union.

Strikes in the public service affect us all, some worse than others; this makes workers in the public service especially vulnerable to the pressure of public opinion, shaped and exploited by those who have the public ear. Yet how else can workers bargain for a better price for their labour in a market-place economy, except by withdrawing that labour? It is their right to seek a better share in the inflationary life-style of our society - even if we may be sharply critical of that consumptive way of life. Unless society (and especially our leaders) are prepared to forego the competitive quest for material goods as a whole, it is unfair to single out wage-labourers for special treatment.

The postal workers are raising some fundamental questions about the mindless preference for automation in our society. Machines can liberate workers, but more often they replace them.

"Too many useful machines make too many useless people". There is need for a more reflective approach. Unless workers are included in the decision-making about their work, they will continue to be alienated from it, and we will continue to have industrial warfare.

Our government is presumably acting out a strategy. They did not grant the CUPW the right to strike without

expecting them to use it. They bear equal responsibility for the work stoppage. One must ask if this is part of a wider anti-union strategy that will begin by undermining the solidarity of the postal workers, and end by undermining the strength of labour as a whole. Whatever the faults of individual unions, they are the *only* institution that has consistently worked for the betterment of employees.

The only people who will benefit from the weakening of labour as a whole are the powerful few.

Neil White
Barbara Palm
James Adams
Diane Patychuk
Judy Lovchik
Fletcher Stewart
Pat Stewart
Jim Elphinstone
R. Hesketh
Martn McPherson
Betty Matwichuk
Ed Matwichuk
Jim Sharpe

Junk it

Whatever the purposes of Students' Council are, real estate development is not one of them.

I think students' council should get rid of HUB and return to devoting their full energies to representing students' needs and providing the activities that help make university worth attending and worth remembering. The students of this university have had to support this albatross long enough.

Who really knows whether HUB has a chance of turning a profit or not? I can't think of any large project in recent memory that hasn't grossly overshot its projected estimates. Expo? The Olympics? the National Arts Centre? ad infinitum. The original estimates for HUB wildly missed the mark by several hundred thousand dollars (one

of the reasons for our current troubles) and even the students' council's current fortune tellers apparently could not even give an accurate estimate of their consultants fees. At best, we have an educated guess.

Furthermore, whether HUB has a chance of making a future profit is irrelevant. The students who paid for this adventure by forfeiting \$5,000,000.00 of student services which were rightfully theirs have nearly all graduated and left. How are they to make good their losses, now? Similarly, how are we (students of '75-'76) to make good our losses as we, too, will be long gone before this building is providing a profit.

The issue is simply this: are we going to have the full measure of activities and services we paid for returned to us or are we going to continue to have our student funds impoverished and impose this white elephant on students in the future as it has been imposed on us. All of this in the hope that HUB might some day turn a profit: a profit we will never see or benefit from. I don't think it will take any one "five days, twelve hours a day" to figure that one out.

Davide Oke
Arts

Gov't ISF

I feel so strongly about the experience that I had that it motivated me to write as a public appeal against something I think is rotten.

One day I needed some cash, and having received a cheque from the Gov. of Canada (hand delivered due to mail strike) I went in my lunch hour to cash it at the bank situated in SUB. I am a student, and a member of the union, and consider this a building with

businesses for the convenience of all students.

When I presented this cheque to the accountant's department, they told me that they would not cash it because:

1. I do not have an account at that bank.

Question: Why is their door open if it is an exclusive key club?

2. The cheque might be stolen! Question: Are they inferring that I am a criminal? I have not been tried nor convicted - nor have I had a trial.

3. Their policy is not to cash cheques, especially government cheques.

Question: What are banks for, besides dealing in money? I am reminded of the sign I see in many shops - Banks do not sell gas, we don't cash cheques, or banks do not sell groceries - we don't cash cheques. What sign would the bank put up?

I felt pressured and coerced into opening an account IF I wanted the cheque cashed but I decided not to have another bank account - a student generally has not enough money for numerous accounts in various branches so that if the occasion arises he can cash a cheque there.

I think that if we have a bank in SUB, then it should serve the public, the students. Isn't a bank given a charter by the government (whose cheques it rejects) to operate a public business? If their policy is not to cash cheques, maybe they should change to other merchandise. They claim friendly service, but a flat refusal to a polite request (and a not unreasonable one) is neither service nor friendly.

The government's cheque, my government ID with picture and my personal integrity are not enough to satisfy their demands - I wonder if they are above all this and have created a society in which only C.I.B.C. "approved" people are not thieves and are identifiable.

Serve the students or get out of SUB. Commerce Bank.

Karl Hartig
Ed. 3

Gateway

Member of
Canadian University Press

Published twice weekly by the University of Alberta Students' Union in the Gateway offices, Room 282, Students' Union Building.

Volume LXVI, Number 25
December 2, 1975

SENIOR EDITORS

Editor-in-chief: Greg Neiman
News Editor: Cathy Partridge
Features Editor: Harald Kuckertz
Arts Editor: Kim St. Clair
Sports Editor: Cam Cole
Photo Editor: Brent Hallett
Graphics Editor: Craig McLachlan
Footnotes Editor: Marg Reed

STAFF

Kevin Gillese
Jim Szpajcher
John Kenney
Bo Diddely
Brian Taylor
Mike Taylor
Gary McGowan
Gordon Turtle
Bob Simpson
Brent Kostyniuk
Darrell Semenuk
Keith Steinbach
Brian Gavriloff
Marilyn Zuber
Ron Fitzsimmons
Richard Heidecker
Keith Miller
Gerhard Hiob
Greg Connolly
Norm Selleck
Leeanne Gallon
Linda Blanchet
Nancy Brown

CIRCULATION

Circulation 18,000. The Gateway publishes on Tuesday and Thursday during the fall and Winter Sessions. It is distributed to the students, academic, and non-academic staff on campus.

Subscription Rates: \$10.00 for 67 issues

Circulation Manager: Jim Hagerty

ADVERTISING

No mats accepted. National and local advertising \$28 per page line. Classified Ads, 10¢ per word. All classified ads must be prepaid. Advertising Manager: Tom Wright 432-3423

PRODUCTION

Ad make-up, layout, and typesetting done by Media Productions, University of Alberta, Room 238, Students' Union Building.

Production Managers:

Loreen Lennon
Margriet Tilroe-West

FOOTNOTES

Publicizes campus events or those of interest to students, without charge. Foot note forms available at the Gateway office and should be submitted before 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays.

LETTERS

Submit all letters, typed and double-spaced to the Editor, who reserves the right to edit copy. Regular copy deadlines apply.

Opinions expressed in the Gateway are those of the writer, and are not necessarily those of the Gateway.

GRAPHICS

Submit all graphics, cartoons, and illustrations to Graphics Editor by normal copy deadlines.

COPY DEADLINES

Monday noon for the Tuesday edition; Wednesday noon for the Thursday edition.

TELEPHONES

Editor's office:
432-5178
All Departments:
432-5168
Media Productions:
432-3423

READER COMMENT

Refusing a monkey's label, Adrian retorts

To the Editor:

A rejoinder on "Subliminal Seduction"

Apparently, the two readers who responded to my letter on subliminal seduction failed to read the last two paragraphs, or at least did not grasp their content and implications. First though, let me state that no time did I deny the presence of sexual implications in ads for they are there. I merely implied that because sex is such an all pervasive human activity that it is very difficult to draw the line between cultural norms and subliminal intent. Further, the all pervasive interest in sex makes it possible, given enough hope, to hang one's self up almost anywhere in that regard. So given enough time "you can find sexual implications in almost anything."

But more important is the implication in the last two paragraphs which both responders missed entirely. The premises that Mr. Key operates on are (i) that the sub-consciousness is an aspect of mind that the conscious mind has no control over; (ii) that the sub-consciousness has its own dictating process which operated independently of the consciousness; (iii) material that the consciousness is only peripherally aware of goes into the sub-consciousness and is then subject to the sub-

conscious independent decision making process; (iv) decisions reached by the sub-conscious faculty can (somehow) influence conscious actions or even override consciousness as such.

Now either the consciousness and the sub-consciousness are entirely separate and independent from each other, or they are related in some manner.

If you hold a dualistic concept of mind, then you will run into the same problems which plagued the 17th Century Continental Rationalists and brought forth the now long refuted doctrines of "Occasionalism" and "Interactionism" and the like. Except with them the problem was between mind and body. Here the same problem has been transposed into "consciousness vs sub-consciousness" framework. That problem is, if there are no relations between these two phenomenon in a certain respect (ii), then one cannot influence the other in that respect (-iv)).

In other words, you cannot claim the sub-consciousness has a decision making process which operates entirely independently of consciousness and then claim that the consequences of this independent

process are somehow binding on that of which it is independent. Also, how does information get from one region to the other if they are entirely independent?

As well, if the conscious mind has no control over the sub-consciousness, but the sub-consciousness does exert control over the conscious aspect, how could you know? By what means could you be conscious of this affectation? If it was a matter of the sub-consciousness controlling, then the consciousness could only act in blind obedience to it. It could not know or ever be aware of the source of its actions; much less identify them as a consequence of subliminal seduction.

In view of this, and in view of the fact that men do possess free will or reason (see Mortimer J. Adler's *The Difference of Man and the Difference it Makes*) they do not have to act in blind obedience to factors unknown. By that I mean that if man's reasoning mind mediates between 'object' and 'action' (as it does) then "subliminal" factors cannot by-pass it but rather are subject to its scrutiny. If that scrutiny is not forthcoming, the blame lies squarely upon the shoulders of those beings who do not exercise their faculty.

The matter of the relationship between the sub-

conscious and conscious is something for trained and skilled researchers, professional psychologists, to investigate. Very little is known about this relationship at present. On this ground alone the assertion of Subliminal Seduction is unwarranted and unprovable.

But even so, one must claim that either the consciousness of man is determined, in which case he could never be aware of the source of his actions, or it is free, in which case his consciousness is the source of its action (ultimately).

There is no half-way between the two: either it is or it isn't one or the other. Having a will that is only slightly free is like being a person who is only slightly dead. The adjective does not modify but contradicts.

So again I re-iterate, if a man makes a judgement based on some invalid kind of criterion, or refrains from making a judgement at all and simply 'acts' with no deviating thought, he reduces himself to a state no different from a brute: that is his choice. But please, dear advocates of Subliminal Seduction, don't make a monkey out of me. Such actions are against my will.

Jack Adrian
Music