

# letters

## forewarned

I have read the article "scrutinizing second look" with great interest. Snatch, as Saffron Shandro is known to his friends is certainly an amazing boy.

I have special interest in this boy's career. You see, I feel some responsibility for him being unleashed and for the world being made vulnerable to him. Those students who have a memory for trivia will recognize that signature of the writer and will know what I'm talking about. Those who don't - never mind, it doesn't matter. All I wish to say in my defense is the old cliché - 'if I had known then what I know now....'

The intent of this letter is not to bemoan the past but to shed some light on the future. Upon completion of the election campaigns last spring - Saffron thrilled us with songs of "Don't worry folks - I'm going to do it all again next year - but with me as Presidential candidate!" So world, view with interest this boy's career now so you won't have to say next year - 'if I had known then...'

'To be forewarned is to be forearmed.'

Ann McRae  
Science 4

## YS retort

In his letter to the Gateway of Tues, Nov. 7, Mr. David Day makes a series of claims about the "self-styled young socialists" who "toddle" in an "intellectual void". His statements are either completely wrong or in most cases so totally muddled as to be incomprehensible to the average reader. **First**; He points out that we "imply" that the "poor taxpayer" carries the major tax burden. We "imply" nothing - we state point blank that it is the case that the individual taxpayer pays the major burden. Between 1950 and 1969 individual taxation was increased by 250% while corporation taxes have decreased by 21%. This has ended in the result that individuals finance over 50% of government costs whereas corporations have dropped to only 12%. That is no implication-that is a cold, cruel fact.

**Second**; He is confused as to what we mean by equity. He asks "should the 'poor' (or the 'rich') be discriminated against?" Surely the brief should have been clear enough to show which side of the fence we are on! However, to your claim that we leave the question "undefined", I can only refer you to the last statement in the brief which says (in black and white) "Tax corporate profits, not students!".

**Third**; He claims that we "insinuate" that the university is a haven for the elite. That is a complete falsity. The university primarily serves the task of churning out highly skilled intellectual workers for big business. I fail to see how this insinuates any "elitism", rather it points out that education does nothing to satisfy human need but only serves as a tool for the corporate plunder of society.

In addition, he questions where the funds will come for "free" education. I suggest he take a look at such companies as Gulf Oil (50% increase in profit over 1971 to \$17.2 million in 1972) and Imperial Oil (34% increase in profit over 1971 to \$43

million in 1972-in Alberta alone!!) These figures are no illusion; they are a stark reality.

**Last**; He attacks us for our "intolerance" in failing to support religious schools. Supposedly, in Canada today,

there exists a separation between church and state. Why, then, should tax money be spent subsidizing religious schools? If the church wants separate schools then the church should pay. The present system which forces students into separate, religious, but publically financed schools is the real "intolerance" that exists.

In general, what we are saying is that the Worth Report behind all its liberal verbiage is a smoke screen for the increasing attacks on education. What it proposes is increasing the cost of education for students (doubling the tuition fees) and the individual workers while totally ignoring the vast profits that the corporations reap. It supports the present injustice whereby the education system is run in the interests of big business and does nothing to provide solutions for the present crisis in education. For holding these views Mr. Day calls us "schizophrenic", "stupid", "brainless", "intolerant", and "young tyrants". Since he offers no solution to the present crisis in education and even fails to deal with the Worth Report itself it is not hard to see whose interests he so emotionally scrambles to defend.

Larry Panych  
Edmonton organizer  
Young Socialists

## Marx marx

So the University has come out in favor of "balanced" transportation system that calls for more parking structures and ring and penetrating roads. In its brief to the City's Transportation Planning Department the Campus Development Committee dismisses rapid transit as a "long-term solution to some transportation problems", but obviously they are less than enthusiastic about it. The "long term" may well mean too late, and "some transportation" may mean some other city whose residents can see a little farther than their nose.

With a daytime population of 35,000 the University nearly rivals the downtown area in its traffic generating capacity and, opting for a primarily automobile-based transportation system, it is providing leadership in the great march backwards to the land of ten-lane freeways, multilevel interchanges and more concrete monstrosities that are about as useful as the pyramids, but much less stylish.

The brief which is, incidentally, approved by the Board of Governors, admits that the recent improvements in the ETS bus service have resulted in an increased use of the Transit System and the levelling off of automobile traffic, but the submission fails to draw the conclusion that a significantly upgraded public transportation system provides the only hope of getting from here to there without demolishing what is left of Edmonton.

Although the City seems to be leaning towards freeways, nothing really has been decided yet and public support can move the issue in either direction. The University, by not coming out

unequivocally in favor of public transportation, may have contributed to the loss of a great opportunity.

Considering such a shortsighted approach, how can this institution advise others on environmental and pollution problems? It is always easier to demand that companies spend large sums of money on emission and effluent control and that the cheapest transportation methods be abandoned for ones that are safer to the environment, than to make the least little bit of sacrifice right here at home. In my dictionary this attitude is called hypocrisy.

Andrew Klar  
Grad Studies

## "in" thing

The latest "in thing" on campus seems to be to fight the proposed new Commerce Building. I wonder whether this may not be a poorly chosen target, with most alterations being much less desirable than the proposed project.

The majority of buildings on our campus are physically and aesthetically isolated and this, combined with the rigors of Edmonton climate, helps to split the University into small compartments where students and staff strive in splendid isolation, safe from contamination by other disciplines. Lately some half-hearted efforts have been made to counteract this, the Central Academic Building being the most notable one. Apart from external appearance, this building has certainly been a great success.

The new Commerce Building appears to be an attempt to do something similar in the Tory-HUB-Arts area, where it could hardly fail to become a success too. I am not familiar with the details of the project and wouldn't be surprised if it were ugly and poorly designed as so many others have been, but why not object to specific aspects of the project and lend support to the sound concept of a physically integrated university where disciplines are not isolated by barriers of parked cars and twenty-below air? In the face of determined opposition the administration will simply take the path of least resistance and put up another fortress somewhere in the wasteland that used to be western Garneau.

Much of the opposition seems to initiate from the occupants of offices in the Tory Building who understandably don't like to lose their view. It should be possible to appease them somehow. To those concerned mainly about the loss of green space I suggest, let's start a drive to have all the completely unnecessary little VIP parking lots in the inner campus converted to lawn and trees and let's not forget that the new building would cover far more asphalt than lawn. To those generally fed-up with academic planning geared mainly towards the plumbers (our utility tunnels provide truly integrated piping) and ignoring the human environment on campus I would like to suggest a few more worthy targets like the destruction of Garneau, the administration's submission to the recent public hearings on transportation in Edmonton, which fails to support rapid transit, the lack of pedestrian walkways to recently completed buildings, and bus stops with inadequate shelters, just to name a few.

Rolf Kellerhas  
Civil Engineering

# forum5

## counter point

staff comment

A special meeting of the General Faculties Council has been scheduled for Monday November 20th at 2 p.m. At this time tenure and tenure procedures will be debated.

Whatever the outcome of this meeting it is certain to have far-reaching effects. Most faculty members are concerned about this issue as it could certainly have a lasting effect on their careers and lives.

Students will also be affected by decisions made on Monday. The scope and quality of their educations may well hang in the balance. Are they concerned? They may be but their representatives do not appear to be.

Patrick Delaney, Students' Union vice-president academic and foremost critic of current tenure procedures arranged for a meeting of student reps in order to discuss the upcoming debate. Of the 38 undergrad reps, only six met with Delaney. Denise Guichon, David Ross, Gary Draper, arts reps; Charlie Hall, David Longworth, science reps; and an unidentified rep were the only students interested enough to show up.

This rate of attendance is consistent with turn out for meetings as well. One becomes curious at just what issues, if any, are important enough to merit the attendance of a majority of student reps. No doubt they are encouraged by the response of the students they represent who appear not to give a rat's ass about anything. O.K. students and reps, I defy you to prove me wrong. Students, contact your representatives and tell them how you feel about tenure. Representatives, come out to a meeting and find out what they are like. Speak your mind on the issues. Who knows, maybe you'll get off on it. You must have wanted to be a GFC rep for a reason. It can't be for the prestige which is second only to anonymity.

My feelings on tenure are simply this: no one should be guaranteed employment for an indefinite period of time. Periodic review of one's employment record and performance are necessary and desirable. When one is no longer doing the job for which he was hired, in an acceptable manner, some recourse should be made available to the employer. When one has been guaranteed employment the threat of termination has little effect.

The argument used for tenure has been that it assures academic freedom. Progress has been made to the point where this is no longer a valid argument. Certainly if we realize the value of academic freedom, we will do all that is necessary to see that this freedom is preserved. But to guarantee employment is not to request the highest standard of performance from our instructors.

The last witch-hunt we had on campus was intended to prevent Ted Kemp from becoming tenured. If there was no tenure system this would not have happened. He would have had an opportunity to prove himself under contract and have that contract renewed or terminated according to his performance.

If all instructors were on renewable contracts there would not be pressure on the new comer to either attain tenure or perish. There are alternatives to the tenure procedure and they can be implemented. I fear that most faculty members will vote in favour of retaining the present system and it is for this reason that we need all the student support we can muster. Students do have parity on GFC and if only they would utilize their power they could make this university serve them in whatever way they wished. Students, this is your university and you can control it if only you would care.

George W. Mantor

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: Ailyn Cadogan, sports assistant; Bill Dushenski; Denise Guichon; Leroy Hiller; deena hunter, arts; Terri Jackson, editor; Harold Kuckertz, Jr.; George Mantor; Colleen Milne, headliner; Bob McIntyre, footnotes; Larry Saidman; Arthur Savage; Candace Savage, news; Margriet Tilroe, typesetter; Ron Treiber, production; Brian Tucker, sports; Lisa Wilson; Brenda Whitney; John Wolff.

gateway