

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Editor-in-Chief - - - - Don Sellar

Managing Editor Bill Miller

News Editor Al Bromling

Asst. News Editor, Helene Chomiak

Sports Editor Bryan Campbell

Associate Editor Doug Walker

Page Five Linda Strand

Fine Arts Editor John Thompson

Photo Editor George Yackulic

EDITORIAL: Desk: Ginger Bradley, Jim Rennie. Cartoonists: Dale Drever, Peter Bassek. Production Manager: Joe Will. Office Manager: Peter Enns. Editorial Board: Don Sellar, Doug Walker, Bruce Ferrier, Bill Miller, Linda Strand. Editorial Assistant: Carole Kaye. Librarian: Lois Berry.

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Now is the time for all good men (and women, of course) to come to the aid of The Gateway. We need more energetic staffers. Apply at the office (room 209, SUB) any Sunday or Tuesday night. Our energetic crew for this paper were Monica Ulrich, Suzette Lipnicki, Sheila Ballard, Maureen Love, Lorraine Allison, Lorraine Minich, Pearl Christiansen, Andy Rodger, Gloria Skuba, Alan Gardner, Marion Conybeare, Marilyn Fix, The Man Who Wasn't There, and yours truly, Harvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published twice weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline (including short items): for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday: advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager: Alex Hardy. Office phone—433-1155. Circulation—8,300. Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1965

love in a battlefield

Three important things came out of the interminable Student Union for Peace Action meeting Tuesday—important to the group, to their cause, and to the university as a whole.

After much debate, SUPA came to what we think was a prudent decision. Rather than further irritate the Administration by maintaining their Vietnam booth in a teaching building, and risk what might have been grossly immoderate punishment, they decided to move the booth to SUB and seek a change in the rule by other means.

This shows SUPA is acting in good faith, knows the value of negotiation, and is seeking reform rather than sensational publicity.

SUPA now plans to approach Students' Council for support in a campaign to change what is at best a poor rule, wrongly applied.

We hope that Council will see this is a legitimate plea for reform, made by a student group that has been unjustly treated by an Administration more interested in maintaining peace and quiet than promoting the best interests of the university community.

This is a real test of Council's powers of appeal. In a case like this, where right is clearly on the side of the oppressed (SUPA), it is the duty of Council to defend student's interests.

Will they be successful?

If the Administration is willing to admit to a mistake in the application of the rule, all will be well.

But is the Administration willing to admit a "mistake"? The comments of Provost A. A. Ryan at the Tuesday meeting can be taken either way.

Provost Ryan said the Dean's Council had taken the only possible course in its interpretation of a "no-soliciting, no-canvassing" rule. He suggested, however, that there are channels through which SUPA could

move to get the rule changed.

What is bothering us is that these "channels" were not open before SUPA began its protest. That is, Provost Ryan told the group earlier there was no appeal to the Dean's Council decision—it is only now he brings up alternative courses of action.

Also, under questioning, Provost Ryan stated positively that the group was refused permission to operate a booth not because of its political views but because opening the gates in this manner might lead to clogging of the halls by booths of conflicting ideologies.

This is the latest in the string of Administration "reasons." First it was the time factor—the booth was to be up for an extended period.

But other groups, for example Wauneita, have operated ticket booths for long periods in teaching buildings.

Then it was that the booth would be "waylaying" people. But we recall a Wall erected by students promoting a WUS fund drive that was "waylaying" bordering on extortion.

Then there was the "soliciting" aspect. But the wording of the rule suggests Fuller Brush salesmen and not students are to be restricted.

What are the real reasons behind the Administration's actions? Until they are brought out, negotiations will not be very fruitful.

And this is the last lesson of the long SUPA meeting. Too much emotion and rancour clouded the issues, and harsh words were exchanged. The group doubted Provost Ryan's motives. Provost Ryan doubted Peter Boothroyd's motives. Everyone was suspicious.

In order to get all this settled, perhaps the two groups could follow a suggestion of one of SUPA's more sensibly idealistic members: be silent for two minutes, cool off, and try and find a little love in the midst of battle.

turning the sod

Let us all now breath a deep sigh of relief.

Thursday, the sod, frozen as it may have been, was turned for the new Students' Union Building.

The event climaxes four years of work done principally by students, and is the first step toward giving this campus a student centre comparable to any on the continent.

Despite numerous setbacks, notably a change in the structure's design, the project is now underway.

Rising costs also jeopardized the project temporarily.

Two students, Iain Macdonald and Andy Brook, and their committees are to be commended for the time and effort put into the project. Their responsibility and dedication will determine to a large degree its success. Students' Council, for its decisive action in the face of setbacks, is also to be commended.

It is a monument of which we will all be proud.



"psst, peace is just for the vietnamese."

a reader writes

by don sellar

I received an excellent letter the other day from Jean MacIntyre, assistant professor of English at U of A. She apparently is one of many persons on this campus who were moved by Dr. D. E. Smith, our Dean of Arts, when he suggested that responsible student criticism of teaching in his faculty is welcome.

Her letter brings out a subject which is probably just as important as the one which the dean raised. Just as important, and probably seldom, if ever, mentioned on our campus.

Here are her comments on good teaching:

"One reason for faculty members to concentrate on research and writing is the great difficulty of proving their professional competence in any other way.

"Unless deans and department heads are to waste much of their time sitting in on lectures, or listening at classroom keyholes, or keeping ears to the ground for rumors among the students (all destructive of staff morale), they have almost no way of discovering who is a good teacher and who is not.

"Therefore, what the Dean of Arts has said about his willingness to hear responsible student complaints about poor teaching seems to me more than timely, if teaching is indeed a major function of the university and not merely an excuse for its existence.

"The Dean's stress on whose complaint will get serious attention removes a main reason for faculty distrust of such student evaluation, since the incapable and the disgruntled are not to receive the same attention as the competent and the willing.

"I should like to point out, however, that if administrative complex-

ity prevents deans from hearing about bad teaching in their faculties, the same complexity will keep them ignorant of excellent classroom work.

"Perhaps it is more human to complain than to praise. Probably it is easier to see when an instructor is unable or unwilling to communicate his knowledge than it is to assess his ability and desire to do so.

"Perhaps, also students who find thorough preparation, articulate delivery, and willingness to give extra time in their lectures tend to assume that this is no more than they should be finding, and that they should take it for granted.

"No doubt they should, but still, every student takes enough courses to provide him with some standard of comparison.

"When one of his instructors appears to rise above the common, it is surely not too much to ask him and his classmates to report this fact as willingly as they might report a spectacular sinking below the acceptable.

"My teaching experience suggests that threat of a bad mark is far less efficacious than hope of a good one in encouraging students to greater efforts. Since professors (whatever to the contrary may appear) do share humanity with their students, what holds for the one should hold for the other. I am sure that if the Dean is willing to hear responsible complaints, he is also willing to hear responsible commendation."

The topic which my correspondent has discussed is one which interests me greatly. Perhaps there are others among our readership who could add something to this little discussion. Drop me a line if you hold any similarly strong views on the subject.