



Page

# letters

nb

today there are more letters on terry donnelly's column, as well as letters on the bookstore, donald duncan, students on the gfc and sub's mural. there are also two cartoons, 'borrowed' from the varsity and the manitoban, to brighten your dull little lives.

Talking of tastelessness and sensationalism, I find these both apply to Terry Donnelly's book review of Jan 27.

It is one thing to berate the obvious gimmickry of Manchester's book, but in equating Ralph Nader to this creep I think he is on Unsafe ground.

As far as I understand it, Nader is a crusader, and while crusaders sometimes become a little oversure of themselves, it is not quite cricket to call them charlatans. It is not hard to verify the crusader label, but extraneous here.

Obviously, the Saracens, or whoever such crusaders are against, are not the ones to ask opinions of in this matter. In this case, Mr. Nader is opposing the Establishment, since attacking the auto industry has ramifications throughout the whole U.S.

Other people have attacked the U.S. Establishment, and many have eventually been canonized: Henry David Thorough, Upton Sinclair, Richard Wright, etc., but there is always a period of name-calling before the wrong is righted, if it is.

If Mr. Donnelly does not recognize the wrongs which are in need of righting as described by Mr. Nader, he needs glasses!

On the other hand, he is maybe a card-holder in the Establishment—a pro-status-quo type—make money and be damned with the consequences, just like Manchester?

john loomes ed 4

In a letter to the editor in The Gateway Jan. 25, Art Smyth attacked the U of A bookstore for making an excessive profit on the sale of Time-Life books. I don't know whether the management of the bookstore intends to reply, but I do feel Mr. Smyth's remarks are quite unfair.

He asks "Can any one explain?" Since they began their book program, Time-Life has instituted a policy of not selling their publications via normal book outlets. As you can well imagine, this incensed most retail booksellers. The Canadian Booksellers Association has in fact been active in attempting to have the Time-Life organization change this policy.

Shortly after they began publishing their books they appointed exclusive Canadian agents, the W. J. Gage firm of Canada, to distribute their books in this country—principally to educational institutions for library and school use.

The Canadian agent set a retail price of \$5.50 on these books and allowed a maximum discount of 20 per cent, or in other words, \$1.10. Hence the normal margin for retailers who purchased these books through the Gage company was \$1.10 less freight, or approximately 85 cents per copy, hence an extremely small gross profit margin when compared with about 99 per cent of all goods sold through any type of retail outlet.

For years, most Canadian booksellers refused to stock Time-Life books because of this policy and we advised customers asking for these books they would be better off purchasing direct.

Naturally, in our attempt as booksellers to provide service to the community we disliked having to send potential customers elsewhere. About two years ago our firm decided to stock these books because the demand was so great and because many people wanted to purchase individual volumes off the shelf instead of having to send off via the mail and wait for the books to arrive.

We stock the full Time-Life series and find despite the higher price people seem quite happy to be at liberty to select the book they require, particularly with the opportunity to examine it in advance, without bothering with the business of mail order and returning the book should they not find it satisfactory.

I am happy to report that probably substantially due to pressures exerted by the Canadian and American Booksellers Associations, Time-Life has just announced a change in policy which will allow retail booksellers to stock their publications in a manner similar to that employed by other publishing firms.

This will automatically reduce the price in Canada to a figure which will probably be very close to the American list price.

m. g. hurtig vice-president canadian booksellers association

In The Gateway of Jan. 25, I had a letter pointing out supposed discrepancies in the price of Time-Life Science Library books at the U of A bookstore.

I asked for an explanation and the bookstore was kind enough to supply one. They showed me a letter in which Time-Life refused to sell these books directly to the bookstore.

Therefore, the bookstore purchased these books from their wholesaler. I saw the invoice for this purchase and the U of A markup is in no way excessive.

Now as the figures quoted in my original letter have not changed, it is apparent that Time-Life Books, the wholesaler, or both, are making an exorbitant profit on these books. The price of most textbooks seems unreasonable but this is the first instance in which I can quote facts and figures.

Perhaps a good boycott of Time-Life materials is in order.

art smyth ed 2

The report on the Don Duncan meeting (The Gateway, Jan. 25) said I appealed for funds "to aid the cause of the Edmonton Committee to End the War in Vietnam."

This is mildly misleading. I appealed for funds to help us defray the costs of the Duncan meeting, and, should there be a surplus, to make it possible for us to hold similar meetings which I described as largely educational.

The cause of the Edmonton committee is not served solely by sponsoring such meetings, and I certainly was not asking the audience to subsidize all or any of our other various activities.

Normally, I would overlook such an inaccuracy. But your reporter goes on to cite the words of an observer, unidentified in the story, who is supposed to have said this appeal was "gross commercialism of the lowest kind, and it appeared these people were just using Duncan."

This calls for two comments; the first general, the other specific. (1) The journalistic practice of quoting unidentified observers is often unsatisfactory for the good reason it is frequently used by reporters as a means of presenting their own opinions in a supposedly factual account. I am not, however, saying this was the case in your report.

(2) But even granting that someone did make this observation, this fact alone does not licence your repetition of it. For there is the further question of the character of the observation.

And in this case, it is clear that this remark, inasmuch as it suggests that Duncan was presented here largely as a pretext for raising funds, questions the honesty and integrity of those members of the executive who decided such an appeal was financially necessary. As their spokesman for the occasion, I must take exception to this defamation.

I have often spoken at meetings where appeals of this kind were made. It would not have occurred to me, anymore that it did occur to Duncan, to think in terms of exploitation. The truth is that people who share an aim of the kind shared by Duncan and the organizers of the meeting, are not out to exploit one another.

A moment's reflection should have made this clear to your reporter. This being so, it seems that



—reprinted from the varsity

governor reagan's subtle influence in university administration (see story in cup dateline)

only malice could have prompted the inclusion of your nameless observer's remark.

I must therefore ask you to withdraw the remark and offer an apology to the executive of the Edmonton committee.

Finally, as I said in my appeal for funds, meetings of this kind are neither easy nor inexpensive to arrange. It is a poor show if those who try to hold them and defray their costs by general appeals are to be accused of gross commercialism and exploitation.

This state of affairs might please those opposed to the holding of such meetings. In the long run, however, it is the cause of education that will suffer.

The sad thing is that even this might be welcome in some quarters.

kenneth i. mills philosophy dept.

**Editor's note—The Gateway apologizes to Prof. Mills and the committee's executive for any embarrassment caused by the inclusion of the remark in question, although we can assure them no malice was intended. Indeed, the remark was included in an attempt to present a fair portrayal of crowd reaction.**

In the Jan. 25 edition of The Gateway, it was reported the University of Calgary has agreed to have three students on the General Faculty Council.

This represents an important breakthrough for increased democratization of the university community and makes it possible for students to play a greater role in the university's decision-making process.

Since the University Act regulating U of C is the same here I am hopeful that we can gain student representation on the GFC.

This will require action by both student and faculty leaders on this campus. Work should be started right away by our students' council to make appropriate representations and negotiations with the GFC.

The faculty, on the other hand, must show greater sympathy for the concept that the university is a community of scholars, with students and faculty both being integral members. In the past, faculty members have failed to see the positive contributions students could make on governing structures of a university.

Since the policy decisions of the GFC affect the whole campus, it is reasonable that the largest segment of the campus should be involved in those decisions.

Hopefully the various members of the university community will see fit to follow Calgary's lead and institute similar reforms on this campus.

richard price special studies

The twentieth century has at last come to U of A but we certainly don't like it.

The reception of the relief on the new SUB says much more about the aesthetic taste of Albertans than it does of the work itself.

We don't understand it, therefore it can't be any good, but it cost \$26,000 so it must be good.

Maybe we do deserve a U of A crest with its ironic motto.

tim lander arts 2

TOMMYCLO

