

tony chan

I am writing in response to the letter articulated in the Nov. 9 Gateway in an attempt to clarify some points concerning the death of Tony Chan. There are three areas I would like to discuss: Tony's death, involvement of the public and the university.

To my knowledge, Tony did not have an epileptic seizure. Based on the autopsy report, Tony Chan died almost immediately after his last fall of a brain hemorrhage. (He had taken about three bad falls prior to his death.) For the few people that attempted to help Tony, perhaps this will relieve some of the guilt feeling they may have had. For the rest of the public present, it will probably be easier for them to rationalize and justify to themselves their non-participation in attempting to aid Tony, after all what's the point of helping a dead man. And that is the reason why more Tony Chan's will die (on or off the U of A rink) and that's the reason why most people will refuse to give assistance and will continue to horde around a dying victim, as if they had paid admission to see his death.

Prior to the arrival of a volunteer Tony was left face down on the freezing ice. Little effort had been made to comfort this man until a volunteer had arrived (about 34 minutes after his last fall) and asked the mesmerized spectators to strip off their coats and help roll Tony onto his back in order that A.R. could be administered. I suppose the crowd realized that even if Tony survived, he undoubtedly would have suffered brain damage because of his lack of oxygen. So that prior to the appearance of the volunteer, Tony's fellow human beings stood in their Roman amphitheatre peering over an individual who could have been fighting for something everyone refused to give him - his life. (The point that Tony Chan died is well established, the point made here is that even if there was a possibility of him surviving, it was obliterated by the ignorance of the crowd.) I hope that those people involved with Tony's death feel partly responsible for his death because of their negligence.

What about the university? Well to my knowledge there were no first aid supplies available - nothing from a band-aide to a resuscitator. Even if first aid was available there was nobody, -nobody who could properly administer it, not even the staff on duty in the rink! Apparently from indirect reports, the P.E. Department like other departments, is operating on a "shoe-string" budget, so they decided they couldn't afford to have a first aid attendant. You see folks, money can rule your life - or death. So now we have a P.E. Building that could serve the function it preaches, i.e. physical enjoyment, health, well-being and safety; actually displaying to the public its real image. The death of Tony Chan couldn't have been helped even if competent attendants were on duty. But what if Tony could have survived, what if a similar incident arises again? Who will be there to help - the public, university staff - you?

Well maybe everybody is right, what the hell, I don't

skate anyways and the chances of me getting hurt in basketball, handball, driving, swimming or any of my other activities are as small as... As small as Tony Chan's and even if I do get injured my chances of being aided are as great as... As great as Tony Chan's. So is there really any need for me to get involved in something as close to me as life itself?

Name withheld by request.

Marx

To "articulate a future society that is both fair and humane" may be an adequate socialist goal but, as has often been noted, it was not enough for Karl Marx. Hopefully some of the papers presented at the recent socialist studies conference went beyond concepts of distributional justice and material welfare. Hopefully some attempted to articulate a future society that is both at ease with its material conscience, and explosive with creative energy.

Marx was sharply intolerant of those socialists who saw the proletariat as "the most suffering class" only because of their low wages and poor living conditions. Marx referred almost scurrilously to "the mere precariousness of labour" and insisted that even equality of income and wealth "would be nothing more than a better remuneration of slaves." For Marx did not use "class" as the American sociologists do - as the description of a socio-economic level. Rather he emphasized that "all human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all the types of servitude are only modifications or consequences of this relation." The most important consequence of this relation was not the worker's particular level of wages, but the degree to which his work was the free expression of his individual identity. Given Marx's maxim "Life is activity", the conditions of activity naturally lay at the centre of his analysis and at the pinnacle of his goals. Concern with distribution suggests passive consumption; Marx emphasized active expression.

Although Marx maintained that a "fair and humane society" could not be accepted as the ultimate goal of socialism, he insisted that it was a precondition to the realization of the goal. For in the absence of generally shared wealth, suggested Marx, "all the old filthy business would be reproduced" - The miserable haggling over the output of society, the age-old struggle for fair distribution of limited goods. What Marx looked to in its place was the articulation of new assumptions and new social structures that would permit what he called "truly human" activity. Economic justice was, for Marx, a static, limited concern on the way to something else. Attention should ultimately focus, he repeated, on the volatile, unpredictable, creative process of self-expression through freely chosen activity.

The achievement of the Marxist-socialist goal depends, not on the collapse of capitalism, but on transcending its success - capitalism's ability to increase material wealth and

general affluence. Important objective values of "fairness" and "humaneness" are deadly measurements by which to judge the achievement of our goals. We are alive and we seek to live - not to be equal or merely considerate, but to be ourselves as freely and expressively as possible. Travelling from necessity to freedom is travelling from the need to labour as a means of survival, to a desire for activity as a reason to survive, as an affirmation of life. Charting the intellectual and practical road to this still far too general goal is where socialist energies should now be largely directed.

William Thorsell

rerun

During the academic year 1967-68 I was a member of the Committee of GSA which negotiated the \$10.00 SU fee presently disputed by the GSA.

Recently the GSA executive has claimed that fee to be unacceptable and embarked on a campaign similar to that of four years ago. The GSA has claimed that a regular review of SU fees was a part of the previous agreement. That is not true of the discussions I took part in. It was expected that reviews might take place but no regular procedure was adopted.

In my view the services of the Students Union in negotiating extensions of graduate student representation on this campus, in directly representing graduate students on and off campus, and through the Gateway are well worth \$10.00 p.a. The Students' Union has wished to have support for the capital and operating expenditures of SUB, which does not break-even on its rentals and capital grants. That, in my opinion, is their business. At the beginning of this term I put my money where my mouth is.

Some years ago the GSA, which was formed at the instigation of the then Dean of Graduate Studies A.G. McCalla and Provost A.A. Ryan, clung to a graduate student centre as its main aim. At that time provincial liquor laws prohibited most undergraduate students from licensed premises and the GSA therefore pursued its aim in isolation from the Students Union. Today that distinction does not apply. The only cause for distinction which remains arises out of the somewhat snobbish views many graduate students take of undergraduates. It is now possible for graduate students to pursue the establishment of a licensed student centre with the assistance of the Students Union which, incidentally, also has suitable facilities.

Four years ago, I believe, graduate students reached a satisfactory compromise with the Students' Union. The present difficulties seem to be aimed at separating graduate students further from undergraduates. I do not agree that such a course is in the best interests of graduate students or of this university.

I find it amusing that I have not once been consulted by GSA in its present disputes despite the lack of clear information about the previous negotiations.

Tony O'Malley
Grad Studies

point

second look

Second Look magazine is sheer insanity: at best, naive; at worst, fraudulent.

One can only hope that by the time this reaches print, Students' Council will have taken action to make this comment unnecessary. If Second Look is not past history by now, a special meeting should be called for next Monday to see that the project is cancelled before another week passes and it increases again by ten-fold and we're stuck for a million.

If it were an isolated instance, it could be allowed to die quietly. But the questions Second Look raises about the function and future of the Students' Union cannot be allowed to rest in peace.

"Fraud" is a strong word. Yet there is so much dishonesty woven into the project that no gentler word seems appropriate.

For example: Councillors were assured that the magazine would present "an honest interpretation of university life." At the same time, organizers admitted that its purpose is to PR for the university—to convince more potential students to come here.

A PR job on this university has to be a lie. I'm sure that all of you who are BS'ing your way through three term papers in courses where the prof doesn't know you from the 199 others in the class understand the irony of the SU selling this place as an educational institution.

For another example: The fact that the first edition will consist entirely of pictures belies the claim to an "honest evaluation" of university life promised by Saffron Shandro, et al., if the schizophrenic concept of the project was not convincing. "Honest" pictures may be, but hardly "evaluative." Perhaps the only honesty in this phase of the project will be the evident superficiality of the educational process which produced its creators.

But there's still more to come, folks: Second Look organizers are basing their \$100,000 budget on the ability of their 100 paid salesmen to sell "patronage" at \$250 a crack.

For comparison, a full-page ad in the Gateway costs \$250 and we sell precious few. And yet these mini-executives are offering advertisers for their money only a one-line mention at the back of the magazine. Even if they're getting 85,000 more copies of the space, it would hardly seem worth the money.

A talk with last year's Gateway ad salesman, Percy Wickman, convinced me that my amateur evaluations of the potential market for this advertising is limited, unless, as Percy added, "Spragins has his dad phone up a bunch of his friends."

And yet, on the basis of this advertising revenue—and this revenue alone, Second Look promises the Students' Union a \$30,000 profit.

Finally, what do we get for sponsoring the \$100,000 venture which Shandro admits is a "gamble"? Nothing—the magazine is sent to prospective students in grades 9 and 12, presumably to convince them to become students, join the SU, so that they can help to carry the financial burden of enticing them to come here in the first place.

...SU as business...

This all brings us to the question of where the Students' Union is going. I don't find it surprising that the prime mover behind Second Look is commerce rep on council.

Since this year's executive took office, there has been this obsession with making money—the art gallery is only the tip of the iceberg. It goes beyond Garry West's straightforward concern with keeping the SU solvent—it's the disease of the carnival pitchman. And Shandro is its most recent and at present most critically affected victim.

and prostitution

If the purpose of the SU is to make money (to keep presidents in gold-embossed stationery) then I seriously propose that Shandro start a prostitution project—we might call it Second Hook.

There are the guest accommodation rooms on the upper floors of the black tower—no need for capital outlay, so to speak. The only expenditure would be "staff costs" and beyond that, the SU makes pure profit. I imagine that there's quite a campus market, and it might even justify itself as a student service, none of which Second Look can do.

But if the Students' Union is for something more than making a buck, if it's more than another business which happens to have head offices on campus and takes \$31 from us once a year, then I urge that we stay out of both the magazine and the prostitution business

Terri Jackson

Letters to the Gateway on any topic are welcome, but they must be signed. Pseudonyms may be used for good cause. Keep letters short (about 200 words) unless you wish to make a complex argument. Letters should not exceed 800 words. The Gateway is published by-weekly by the students of the University of Alberta. Contents are the responsibility of the editor. Opinions are those of the person who expressed them.

Staff this issue: Jim Adams; Belinda Bickford; Allyn Cadogan, sports assistant; Kimball Cariou; Bill Dushenski; Betsy Ewener; Leroy Hiller; Susan Holder; deena hunter, arts; Terri Jackson, editor; Harold Kuckertz, Jr.; Loreen Lennon; Guy McLaughlin; Bob McIntyre, footnotes; Colleen Milne, headliner; Terri Moore; Rick Odegaard; Neil Ross; Candace Savage, news; Duncan Sherwin; Margriet Tilroe, typesetter; Ron Treiber, production; Brian Tucker, sports; Rod Wachsmuth; L. Wilkie; Lisa Wilson; and John Wolff.

gateway