

The committee had a short existence — exactly one motion and two votes

By RICH VIVONE
Gateway Editor

The Joint Committee on Student Relationships, formed to advise the university president on university activities, was disbanded after one motion, one amendment and two votes—one vote to pass the amended motion and the other to adjourn for the first and last time.

The committee was supposed to meet at 3 p.m. Friday with seven members representing the students' council, the grad students association, the dean's council and the faculty. But the meeting was not open to the public. This proved to be its first and last error.

Because some students, including a number from the Students for a Democratic University group walked in to the meeting—intent on observing a meeting which was to discuss student relationships. They sat around the table and waited for the committee members.

The committee entered and the debate concerning 'open' and 'closed' meetings and 'democracy' ensued. In the end, the meeting was opened up.

One member, Mort Newman, a member of SDU and representing students' council at this meeting, told the committee he would not participate unless the meeting was opened up to "concerned students who wanted to act as observers."

President Walter Johns said the meeting followed the principles of democracy. "All the segments and elements of the university community are represented here," he said. "I object to the number of people (29) at this meeting because it throws the representative aspect of democratic government out."

Richard Watson, president of the grad students association and a member of general faculty council opposed this view.

"I can see nothing wrong with an open meeting," he said. There is no harm in it as long as one group does not swamp the meeting."

And the committee members tossed it around for an hour.



THE MEETING WAS OPENED
... to almost everyone

Finally, a motion by Richard Watson put an end to it all. The motion said, "this committee not be formalized and any role the committee might undertake be referred to the Council on Student

Affairs and President Johns attend as a not-voting member."

The amendment said the meetings of COSA should "be well-publicized, open meetings on student relationships."

Sensationalism and The Gateway

The Editor,

I would like to briefly respond to the characterization made in a Gateway editorial Sept. 25 of non-council individuals who have been attending student council meetings.

Aside from particulars, the general characterization was one of rudeness, obscenity, and uselessness of no other point but to interrupt orderly and constructive official proceedings by egocentric performers.

This is patently false in every aspect mentioned and one need only consult the transcript of council meetings for verification of my point.

First, let us consider the notion that the council proceedings were to be orderly and constructive were it not for the comments presented from the floor. The record will show conclusively that almost every basic position which has been raised for discussion in council has been raised from the floor.

Had there been no comments from the floor, the underlying assumptions of the bulk of council business would have been smooth-

ly glossed over in an effort to avoid any challenge to policies, the basic result of which would be to continue general mystification with status quo contradictions and inadequacies without any genuine concern for student interests, attitudes, or awareness. A puppet show parody of the council meetings in the Planet of the Apes.

The CUS referendum, principles underlying student discipline, compulsory physical education, and a student bill of rights are but a few cases in point.

Furthermore, Mrs. Pilkington seems willing to make gross exceptions to rules when beneficial to statements of her own liking, but has a mysterious reversion to formalism in many cases of a different nature. Finally, council itself, even when only discussing matters with invited guests, frequently loses track of even the motions under consideration.

The issue of obscenities is little more than prevaricating sensationalism on the part of both Miss Pilkington and The Gateway. One would hope that at least The Gate-

way could avoid playing the role of a Pilkington parrot as at long last, a few scattered council members seem to be considering.

It is time that Miss Pilkington learned to differentiate between colloquialisms which are much to the point and the type of general babble which all too frequently comes from council members and their invited guests. May I point out that the colloquialism in question—"piss on them"—was repeated by council executive Leader himself.

Last, I should like to emphasize the inadequate reporting of any council issues of importance on behalf of The Gateway. The Gateway would prove of far greater importance to the student body if it would relate but a few of the very salient issues which some of those attending council meetings have dared to raise.

George M. Hudes
Political Science
Member, SDU

EDITOR'S NOTE—this letter is reprinted verbatim — complete with mistaken identities.

This is page FIVE

The Joint Committee on Student Relationships is kaput. The committee, intending to meet behind closed doors, was turned over to COSA and the account of what led to this decision was reported by The Gateway's editor who attended the proceedings.

There is a letter from a member of the SDU and he says he doesn't like the way we report the news. He also says some other interesting things. There is another letter which says some nasty things about the SDU. And round and round the circle goes.

The final letter is from a student who knows of discrimination by Canadian students. The point he makes, we think, is very valid.

A reminder that The Gateway welcomes all contributions from the students. Letters, articles, etc., should be sent to The Editor, The Gateway, University of Alberta etc. We reserve the right to edit letters longer than 300 words and also edit material which may be libellous.

The Gateway also welcomes cartoons from students. Sign all contributions. We receive all sorts of material unsigned and it won't be printed.

—The Editor

There is a lack of sincerity . . .

The Editor,

This is a repercussion of Rondo Wood's letter, "A postscript for the frosh" (Sept. 26).

Mr. Wood's compassionate appeal to Alberta students that more attention should be paid to foreign students sounds encouraging. As a foreign student, I want to point out that there is a general lack of sincerity on the part of the local student in establishing friendship with people of different color and customs.

Canadians, like the Americans, are overwhelmed by the material affluence of their society. Most, being ignorant of other parts of the world, tend to consider that

what they are accustomed to is normal and superior to others, confining themselves in self-satisfaction. Foreign students naturally occur to them as different, to some may be undesirably different.

In the first year, despite big classes and all that, many foreign students may find that they face quite a number of Canadian "friends" who "Hi" them in classes. It is realized later that the "Hi" is for a crushed course in regional geography of the "exotic" country they are from. Once curiosity is satisfied—"See you around."

Even if the conversation is carried on beyond the topic on the foreign country, the limit would only be academic work. Nobody would ask the foreign student to go downtown for a show or line up some co-eds for them to go to the dance with on Saturday. Relation is always kept at a distance. Some, however, invite the foreign student, with whom they might have no personal relationship, to their homes once or twice a year, and ignore them for the rest of the time.

It becomes hard for the foreign student not to suspect that they are invited only because they create an exciting conversation piece for the evening, or that their hosts use them to show off his sociability, or that they are taken piece of.

Some are artificially polite and nice to foreigners on purpose of demonstrating that Canadians are a friendly people. Such gestures of charity and hypocrisy are intolerable for anyone with human dignity. Those who are disgusted by the shallow relationship with the Canadians naturally segregate with their own people with whom they are able to develop close personal relationship, which gives so much meaning and depth to life. It is not that the foreign student fails to adjust socially to Canadian life, but outright discrimination on the part of the Canadians.

Speaking from my personal experience, I feel that if both parties have a will to try, cultural and racial barriers can be overcome without much difficulties. Once mutual understanding is established, it is surprising to some of the people that how compatible and similar could be the thoughts and behavior of people from geographically different locations.

Benny Ling
Arts 3

Constructive dialogue?

The Editor,

With reference to your editorial of Sept. 24, may I suggest that the S in SDU more than likely means saps.

One has only to read the absurd drivel spouted by this pathetic little group or listen to the ranting to realize they have little if any constructive dialogue to offer the majority of thinking students.

Although the SDU tries to legitimize its claims to being a serious, responsible body with sensible(?) proposals for change, I doubt whether anybody seriously believes the type of university advocated by SDU would be superior or in fact more desirable than the institution we now have.

Mr. Bordo's speech(?) last Friday was an insult to intelligence. His stooping to name calling, profanity and emotional outbursts of nothingness simply point up the fact that SDU is grasping around for issues which they are able to comprehend or perhaps do not exist.

It's rather ironic that groups such as these—who always claim to be democratic—fail to comprehend the meaning of the term and try to impose their warped ideas on an unwilling majority. Far from being free thinkers, they are trapped in their narrow little slogan chanting pessimism and refuse to see the positive side to life.

These revolutionaries without a cause have good reason to hold their secret meetings. Do they themselves know what the S in SDU as well as the D and U really mean?

George S. Opryshko
ed 4