

EDITORIAL

Attitudes & abilities

Every organization is dependent, to a certain degree, upon the abilities of its personnel. Good abilities tend to lend themselves to a good organization. But you need not be brilliant to achieve success at a given job. Success begins with an attitude.

The most brilliant of minds can apply itself to a task and fall flat on its face, so to speak. Conversely, you can have an average mind do a perfectly brilliant job if there is one overriding factor. Attitude.

An attitude based on co-operation, participation and a willingness to learn will ensure any individual success.

Someone who enters into a job willing to adapt to the parameters and boundaries the organization provides will succeed. The *ability* to listen and the *attitude* to accept new ideas and learn from them is most important. This need not mean that you immediately accept, as gospel, the things people tell you. But you cannot shut them out either. It doesn't matter who you learn from, as long as you are able to cast aside any personal likes or dislikes and accept a worthwhile lesson. In this sense, a spirit of co-operation must exist.

No one will get anywhere without being able to co-operate with those around him or her. Being able to tolerate someone on the job is not enough. You must at least try and understand an individual's needs and wants. You must try and co-operate with that individual to achieve what is best for them, yourself and the organization you are involved in. Admittedly, this is not possible with everyone. But if you take the initiative and the other person does not respond, you can do no more. It is up to you. This is part of participation. A willingness to get involved, is tantamount to a successful endeavor.

No one person ever achieved anything without getting involved in their organization. This does not mean joining up and punching in your time. Be it on the job or at university, if you don't try at least some of what the organization has to offer, you are cheating yourself. The people who watch the clock all day until quitting time are doomed to anonymity and failure. You must care enough about your own organization to want to get involved in it. If you don't, you are barking up the wrong tree. You have to be concerned when something goes wrong and pleased when things go right. This is where criticism enters into the picture.

Criticism of an organization is usually the product of a caring individual. But you must be careful not to reduce your criticism to a personal level. You don't get anywhere by openly attacking someone. The person being attacked automatically becomes defensive and, ultimately, nothing is achieved. Healthy criticism must be accompanied by a view of what has been done correctly. A sense of worth must be instilled first, otherwise the criticism has no basis from which to work. Before you start to criticize, however, you must know something of what you are criticizing. The adage *it doesn't take a chicken to judge an egg* was surely concocted by a person looking to justify some sort of criticism made. If you know what you are talking about that is your justification. Criticism by people sitting on the periphery knowing nothing of the heart, is useless and derogatory. It accomplishes nothing. Good criticism is dependent upon participation.

A successful organization is dependent upon the abilities of its personnel. But abilities are only capitalized upon when the right attitude is present. Both are dependent upon each other, and without them, very little is possible.

Andrew Watts

Testimonial

Without my attempts into natural science, I should never have learned to know mankind such as it is. In nothing else can we so closely approach pure contemplation and thought, so closely observe the errors of the senses and of the understanding.

J.W. Goethe, 1829
Conversations with Eckermann

Catch 22

Communism is like prohibition; it's a good idea but it won't work.
Will Rogers, 1927

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - Andrew Watts
NEWS EDITORS - Richard Watts, Allison Annesley
MANAGING EDITOR - Jens Andersen
ARTS EDITOR - David Cox
SPORTS EDITOR - Brent Jang
PHOTO EDITOR - Ray Giguere
CUP EDITOR - Wes Oginski
PRODUCTION - Anne Stephen, Jim Miller
ADVERTISING - Tom Wright
MEDIA SUPERVISOR - Margaret Tilroe-West
CIRCULATION - Gunnar Blodgett

Staff this issue:

Meanwhile, back at the ranch... Martin Coumts and Cathy McLaughlin desire green doors. Martin Beales and Bill Inglee, our flashers, seek local talent. Ken Lenz thinks he's a canon. Gilbert Bouchard speaks English and German, but no French. Jack Vermees sets personal records. Heather-Anne Laird is the Gothic type. Ninette Gironella and John Algard are passing from Being to Nothingness. Zane Harker seeks a calling. Teri Lyn Paulgard is against static. Gerard Kennedy and Margo Schmitt desire power. Kevin Kaardal is a basket case.

The Gateway is the newspaper of the students of the University of Alberta, published during the Winter Session. Contents are the responsibility of the Editor-in-Chief; opinions and editorials are signed by the writer, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. Newsroom: Rm 282, Advertising Dept: Rm 256D, Students' Union Bldg, U of A, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2J7. Newsroom ph. 432-5168 (5178), Advertising ph. 432-4241 Ext. 28. The Gateway is a member of Canadian University Press, a group of rabid students with lots of ideals and principles but no idea how to enact them. Gateway circulation is 25,000.

gateway
 VOL. LXXIII NO. 22



« LETTERS TO THE EDITOR »

Editorials are uninformed

Readers of the Gateway (or any paper, for that matter) have a right to receive informed opinion, not the mindless blatherings and distortions of the Gateway editor, e.g. "Terrorism Arrives" (Nov. 16).

Mr. Watts' attempts to discredit the peace movement (in two successive editorials) are almost laughable. However, since many people suffer from the same intellectual myopia, we will analyse his most recent slur bit by bit.

In opening, Andrew made reference to the "wicked" cruise missile and expresses his sympathy for the "messy situation" in which Europeans presently find themselves. To clarify the situation, it is not the cruise per se which is "wicked," but rather, the warmongers now making plans to use it. In the opinion of many well-informed people, including General Nino Pasti (retired from NATO as Supreme Vice-Commander, responsible for nuclear affairs), this same cruise missile could well be that proverbial "straw". Andrew, you are right, the Europeans are in a messy situation - but, for your information, that is why we march - in sympathy and in solidarity with the people of Europe. If you had bothered to attend the talk given on campus recently by General Pasti (or even read the article in your own paper) you would know why the cruise missile must be opposed.

Regarding your comments about our freedom to protest as compared to that of people in Eastern bloc countries, there are two sides to this story. In the Soviet Union millions of people marched for peace last May. That this represents the "official peace movement" is an important aspect of the issue. But this fact should not be used to question the sincerity of these people. The other side of the coin is the suppressed "unofficial" peace movement in these countries. There is growing evidence that such a movement does exist. The more we protest, march and demonstrate for peace here in the West, the easier it will be for our counterparts in the East. All peace movements need our support, now, if we as a race are to make it to the next century.

On to the next point, which constitutes the main thrust of Mr. Watts' editorial. We do not purport to support the action of the group claiming responsibility for the Litton bombing, nor do any of the peace or disarmament organizations in this city, or in Canada (virtually all denounced it). You ask, Andrew, why you haven't "heard anyone belonging to anti-nuke groups come out vocally against the party responsible...." There can only be one reason Andrew: you forgot to take the cotton out of your ears, just as you refuse to take your head out of the sand to see what is going on in the world you profess to write about. Had you bothered to attend any of the disarmament functions following the bombing of Litton, or listen to radio broadcasts, or read a newspaper, you would have heard this for yourself. There was a Gateway reporter at the Oct. 30 rally, where once again this action was denounced and disowned. The Gateway seems to have found this of insufficient import to report. Furthermore, the responsible group, Direct Action, has never claimed to be a 'peace group', though they do claim to believe in nuclear disarmament. Their previous action (bombing hydro sites on Vancouver Island) had them tagged as fanatic environmentalists.

It is arguable whether this group and its actions are 'terrorist'. Perhaps so, perhaps not. The Litton bombing was certainly not designed to terrorize the public at large, which is the usual aim of terrorist groups. However, consider this: who are the real terrorists, this handful of extremists or the governments of the world that threaten us all with nuclear annihilation?

Your mention of the police is also of interest. We don't believe for a second that the authorities would allow demonstrations or other forms of protest to continue should more actions such as the one in question occur. It has been suggested, for that very reason, that the Litton bombers are in actuality a police front, acting with the intention of creating a reason for repression. If you were familiar with the history of the FLQ, you would know that this kind of police activity has occurred before in our country. We know, however, that you know nothing of the FLQ, since you are of the impression that the first such occurrence in "good old peace-loving Canada." (sic - *Managing Editor's note: in his editorial Watts made no*

mention whatsoever about police provocateurs).

We could continue to criticize other aspects of your treatment of the disarmament movement in Edmonton (e.g. your Remembrance Day editorial); we could also criticize your inability to write and construct well-reasoned arguments for your editorials. But let's leave with this: agreed, editorials are the proper place for opinion in a newspaper. However, those opinions should be *informed* opinions. When you, Andrew, or any of your staff, want to inform yourself of what goes on in the disarmament movement, what we condone and what we disown, come and talk to us.

Bruce Connell, Barbara McKinley, Steve Cumming
U of A Group for Nuclear Disarmament

Student appoints himself Gateway Editor-in-Chief

I have decided, in my own inimitable and decidedly arrogant manner, to proclaim the displacement of Andrew Watts as Editor of the Gateway and assume the job myself. This proclamation comes as a result of Watts' miserably-composed and typically derelict editorial of Nov. 23 regarding his alleged political beliefs. I say "alleged" because, quite frankly, Watts does not know what his "philosophy" is.

We rejoice, I'm sure, to find that Watts has perilously pondered the exactitude of his political stripe for three whole years. Simply remarkable. And after this eternity of arduous thought he finally decided what he is — a "right-winger." (*Managing Editor's note: Watts mentioned no such decision in his editorial, or any other decision to adopt a political label.*) Of course, he became right-wing only because someone told him he was right-wing.

It is interesting how Watts vehemently asserts that "if you're considered right-wing, then you're considered naive and silly." Well, Andrew, if the label sticks, wear it. Of course, the remainder of your drivel in this "gem" of an editorial is just that — drivel, and requires no further bemoaning.

If Watts believes everything he is told, and there is every indication that he does, then he will believe that the quality of his editorials and his writing in general is sufficiently disastrous to warrant a request that he submit his resignation as Editor.

Now, I know, people out there are saying, "Who is this arrogant and pompous John A. Middleton?" Well...., I'm the new editor of your newspaper. I have stood by and read the ridiculous editorials of Andrew Watts long enough. Watts...., you are simply not capable to edit (sic) this newspaper. Your incompetence is paralleled only by that of Elio Agostini and J.P. O'Callaghan. Watts, the time has come for you to step aside honorably and recognize the new editor — me.

Perhaps I should not be so critical of poor Andrew, I'm sure he tries. Realistically, though, I'm a firm believer in the somewhat esoteric notion that writing editorials should be undertaken by an individual who possesses the requisite knowledge and writing ability. My proposal is modest. First, Watts, you must resign. Second, I must be installed as the new editor. And finally, Watts, you must simply take (sic) a course in creative writing and Poli-Sci 201. I realize this is a draconian punishment. But, Andrew, take this prescription and then come and talk to me. Perhaps we can renegotiate (sic) your return to the Gateway. It is doubtful....but stranger things have happened.

John A. Middleton
Arts II

Evil profit motive at work

Why is the Gateway being published in tiny, tiny type this year? It is almost impossible for me to slog through each edition with the thousands of teeny letters too small to distinguish.

One Gateway editor has told me that there is just too much to publish this year. If this is the case, there are a few articles I have read that could have been trashed; besides, it's also possible to expand the paper.

I suspect the real reason for the change is simple: smaller type means smaller articles; smaller articles mean