

trendy hypocrits

97,98,99 -- CHANGE HANDS!

Yes friends, on the count of 100 I do change hands, but not for the reason you think. By the time that the 100th car has driven past as I stand on Saskatchewan Drive thumbing to university I must warm one of my hands and try thumbing with the other. It is odd that every second or third car, all of which

are warm and empty except for the driver, is driven by some pseudo-smooth up and coming university student and it is to these flash, Eaton's catalogue type trendies that I wish to express my thanks. If it weren't for them I might be tempted to put my hands in a naughty place as I stand outside in the cold. Hmm -- 197,198, 199 -- blorp!

Peter Koziol  
Science

perturbed

The flat statement by an anthropologist that a railway is "less ecologically dangerous" than a gas pipeline makes as much sense as an ecologist proclaiming instant solutions to complex socio-economic problems.

I get somewhat perturbed at conclusions on ecological questions emanating from people who have neither the data nor the background to justify their role as commentators on ecological matters.

R. D. Jakimchuk

counterpoint

Gateway's future - an election issue

Any candidate in this year's Students' Union election (March 1973) that doesn't recognize student services as an issue is finished before he begins. The question of what one obtains for one's students' union fees is bound to be in the minds of student voters after a year of questionable expenses by the Students' Union.

The expenditures of the students union for everything from personalized stationary to "Get to Know your Students' Union" posters, the \$2000 tenure study fiasco, the Second Look magazine caper, to name only a few, are items that should make our hip pockets itch. And the quality of the services that are obtained is questionable. Remember the I.D. photo's? Remember when we used to have a year book? Do you pay rent in HUB, the so-called low cost Students' Union housing?

Paradoxically, the SU has chosen a year of decreasing services to ask for more money from the students. In the recent fee referendum, the students were asked to allow the SU to dip their hands into the SUB expansion fund. And when students denied them this request, the SU began to grumble petulantly that a fee increase would be required next year to forestall a continuing decline in services.

The resolution of this paradox is of course that the SU, which under the leadership of Gerald Riskin fancies itself to be a big corporation, is diverting money into Milo-Minderbender enterprises such as housing, promotional magazines and private research assistants, instead of concerning itself with the prosaic task of providing student services.

The Gateway is a prime example of a student service that is being slowly undermined by misappropriation of funds. In three years, the Gateway subsidization by the SU has gone from \$40,000 per year to \$20,000 per year to \$11,000 this year. The Gateway is having trouble functioning on this budget and anticipates a \$3,000 deficit which the SU will have to pick up at the end of the year.

The amazing thing is that the Gateway, which is one of the few tangible returns that the student obtains for his fee of \$31, is produced at a cost of only 65 cents per year per student. What are you obtaining for your other \$30.35?

The Gateway, because its situation typifies the inroads that the SU has made into student services, and because it is itself a valuable service, should thus be a vital issue on the platforms of candidates in the next election.

At that time the students (and not the SU toy politicians) will decide the fate of the Gateway, one of their last student services. They can axe it and leave another 65 cents per student in the already full hands of the SU, or they can decide for a more reasonable amount of subsidization.

But don't be misled by any candidate who tells you that the Gateway can be self-supporting like the Poundmaker. For even if the Gateway used scab labour to print its paper, and even if it relied on the haphazard quality of an all-volunteer staff, it could only succeed in becoming a propaganda sheet.

Without SU subsidization, the Gateway would bear no financial and hence no journalistic obligations to the students. It would be free to go its own way, ignoring campus news, and publishing propaganda. For the students to have some control over the quality of their paper, they must have a financial investment in it.

Arthur Savage

massive terror bombing as UAVAC urges united Nov. 20 action

The renewed bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong on December 18, unparalleled in its savagery and callousness, was met by people throughout the world with a new sense of indignation and outrage. From the U.S. Congress to the Swedish Prime Minister, from the New York Times to Le Monde, and in antiwar protest from Europe to North America, to Australia, the demand for an end to Nixon's brutal war has resounded with renewed urgency.

And while Richard Nixon tries to convince the American people peace is once again "at hand", millions of students now returning to campus realize how cruel a fraud Nixon is plotting.

It is in this light that Liz Rowley's attack (Gateway, January 9) on myself and the U of A Vietnam Action Ctte. must be seen. First of all, we must say we view with incredibility (sic) many of the statements and attacks, and fail to see their basis in reality or their relation to the active anti-war movement. Having said that, we must say we feel it necessary to ignore this statement at this time. Much more important issues are at stake and to this end I enclose the text of the following letter sent to the Peace Congress:

"On December 22, 1972 the National Peace Action Coalition in the United States issued a call to the international anti-war movement to join together in peaceful demonstrations on Nixon's Inauguration Day, January 20, 1973. This call has been endorsed by the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice and other major anti-war organizations in the United States.

The U of A Vietnam Action Committee (UAVAC) and the Indochina Action Committee (IAC), in solidarity with the American anti-war movement and the call of the Vietnam Mobilization Committee for similar Canadian actions, call upon all groups and individuals who oppose the war in South East Asia to join in planning a united peaceful demonstration at the Imperial Oil Building, 100 St. & Jasper followed by a march to the Federal Building to protest Canadian involvement.

Now more than ever, the responsibility for the continued destruction of Vietnam must be squarely placed on Nixon's shoulders. The outrage expressed by people all over the world against the renewed bombing

can best be shown in united action. No time should be lost in uniting all who oppose the war in protest to demand that the U.S. STOP THE BOMBING and END THE WAR NOW.

The Government of Canada, in a precedent setting move, has passed a resolution "deploring" the bombing. This move and similar actions by governments around the world are laudatory, but they are not enough. The most powerful and dramatic way that Canadians who oppose the war; who oppose the wanton destruction of Vietnam; who oppose U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia can make their voice heard is to come together as a united force in the streets of Canada on January 20th.

Nixon's massive bombing escalation on December 18, 1972 have shown the people of the world that he will go to any lengths to beat Vietnam into submission. After twelve days of massive terror bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, Nixon has eased up the bombing in the face of a groundswell of angry opposition. But the bombing goes on south

of the 20th parallel in Vietnam and in Laos and Cambodia. If our opposition does not continue Nixon can renew his terrible bombing of North Vietnam's major cities.

We strongly urge the Peace Congress to take part in the action, building it with their own posters, leaflets, speakers, slogans, etc. and that they take part in planning meetings January 17th at noon at SUB, rm. 270 and in the evening at 8 p.m. in rm. 142 SUB.

In the past differences of views among anti-war groups have existed. Let us, without sacrificing any of our various positions take every step to find ways to demonstrate together now against U.S. aggression."

It is to the topic of this letter that we feel and hope the Peace Congress should respond in future Gateway articles.

Henry Malta  
Chairperson  
U of A Vietnam Action Ctte.

poster de posters intellectual cowards

On Thursday night I went to considerable time and trouble to tack up about sixty or seventy posters throughout the campus advertising a meeting of the "Radicals For Capitalism." Time and trouble that could have been more profitably used in other endeavours. Anyway, on Monday morning walking to and from various classes, I noticed that many of the posters had been torn down. Even in SUB, where the posters had been duly authorized for posting until Jan. 11, most of them were gone.

No, its not the time and effort expended, that I wish to talk about here, but rather an intellectual attitude indicated by this act of vandalism which is prevalent throughout this university. The attitude is one of intellectual intolerance.

I am a libertarian. I firmly believe in the principles of individual sovereignty, of the inalienability of individual rights, and of the necessity for unhampered and voluntary exchange among men. Therefore, I believe in the absolute, total exclusion of force, or coercion, from human relationships. Consequently, as the only system yet devised

which is capable of fulfilling these principles, I believe in, and advocate, a politico-economic system of unadulterated laissez-faire capitalism.

A university, ideally, should be an open intellectual forum. A marketplace where ideas are presented, tested, judged, and accepted or rejected by the individuals studying as students, or teaching as faculty. And ideas are ultimately judged and accepted or rejected on their own merits by individuals in this community. These ideas, literally speaking, are in constant competition. A particular model, better than any others available, will be accepted and used by the community until a better one is brought forward. In order to facilitate the continued growth of the intellectual community, the suppression of ideas must be prohibited. Ideas must stand or fall on their own merits.

In this context, it is interesting to consider the act of vandalism described above. Most people consider the politico-economic system of laissez-faire capitalism to be bankrupt. I believe them to be wrong, their rejection of the

system being based on a fundamental misunderstanding of what capitalism is. I believe that my ideas will win out over the long-run, that they will become accepted as right by the public acting as individuals. In order to effect this, they must be presented in the "public forum". Thus the meeting that was advertised on the posters.

I consider the vandalism I have discussed to be an attempt at intellectual suppression. You claim that my ideas are bankrupt, if they are, then why tear down my posters? The best

thing you could ask for is the promulgation of the concept of laissez-faire capitalism. They will so disgust people that they will come running to your competing system. Or must you suppress competing ideas, suppress even the knowledge of them? Or is it that even you don't believe that your ideas can withstand the challenge of serious competition?

Is it that you don't have the courage of your convictions? And intellectual cowardice always disgusts me. Brent Bissett  
Chairman Libertarian Alternative

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 bi-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: Belinda Bickford; Allyn Cadogan, sports assistant; Doug Cale; Kimball Cariou; Denise Guichon; Leroy Hiller; deena hunter, arts; Terri Jackson, editor; Peter Johnston, photos; Sylvia Joly, typesetter; Harold Kuckertz, jr.; Laura Leake; Loreen Lennon, arts assistant; Victor Leginsky; Colleen Milne, headliner; Harold Moore; Murray Polushin; Walter Plinge; Jerry Rattray; Sylvia Ridgley; Michel Ricciardi, photos; Les Reynolds, footnotes; Larry Saidman; Arthur Savage; Candace Savage, news; Margriet Tilroe, typesetter; ron treiber, production; Brian Tucker, sports; Ernie Vilcsak; Lawrence Wilkie; and Jay Willis.

gateway