

Gateway

Volume LXV, Number 17
October 31, 1974.

Published bi-weekly by the University of Alberta Students' Union, in the Gateway offices, Room 282, Students' Union Building.

SENIOR EDITORS
Editor-in-chief: Bernie Fritze
News Editor: Greg Neiman
Arts Editor: Harold Kuckertz
Sports Editor: Paul Cadogan
Photography Editor: Morrie Eaman

STAFF

Peter Best
Nancy Brown
Cam Cole
Rhys Davies
Diane Kermay
Elaine Lefebvre
Michael MacNeil
Macperri
Brian McCullough
Doug Moore
Gary Rasmussen
Norm Selleck
Truckey
Ken Turner
Gordon Turtle
Lawrence Wargrave

CIRCULATION

Circulation 18,000. The Gateway publishes on Tuesday and Thursday during the Fall and Winter Session. It is distributed to the students and to the academic and non-academic staff on campus.
Subscription rates: 54 issues, \$7.00
Circulation Manager: Jim Hagerty

PRODUCTION

Ad make-up, layout, and typesetting done by Student Media, University of Alberta, Room 232-4, Students' Union Building.
Production Manager: Loreen Lennon
Typesetter: Margriet Tilroe-West

ADVERTISING

No mats accepted. National and local advertising \$.28 per agate line. Classified ad rate \$1.00 per issue. All classified ads must be prepaid.
Advertising Manager: Lorne Holladay
432-4241

FOOTNOTES

Publicizes campus events or those of interest to students, without charge. Footnotes forms available at the Gateway office and should be submitted before 2 p.m. Mondays and Wednesdays.
Footnotes Editor: Cathy Zlatnik

LETTERS

Submit all letters, typed and double spaced to the Editor, who reserves the right to edit the copy. Regular copy deadlines apply. Editorial comments are the opinion of the writer, not necessarily that of The Gateway.

GRAPHICS

Submit all graphics and cartoons, by copy deadlines to:
Graphics Editor: Gary Kirk

COPY DEADLINES

Monday noon for the Tuesday edition, Wednesday noon for the Thursday edition.

TELEPHONES

Editor's office
432-5178
All departments
432-5168
432-5750
Student Media
432-3423

The Gateway is a member of the Intercollegiate Press and The Earth News Service.



"PATRICK, I THINK WE HAD BETTER SKIP THE O'FLANAGAN'S..."

letters

Drama

Opening night is over, the critics have seen our show, the reviews are out and they are good. "Hit" is one of the phrasea that's been thrown around, not to mention "Best thing I've seen on Studio Stage."

We are now into the second week of our performance schedule, and when I start feeling a deepening of the play, a sense of total rhythm, I wonder about the audience excitement.

Were they impressed with the dances and the ladder routines? That is what we were taught during our rehearsal period; how to fight in slow motion, how to climb and hold ladders and how to bang sticks in rhythm. That is what you can thank Studio Theatre for.

If you think the rhythms and symbolic ladder movements were developed out of the cast or the company, you are wrong. We just filled in the words at the appropriate places.

Stage relationships and group stage dynamics (in other words acting) were not considered important enough to warrant time on our rehearsal schedule. We did not run the play as a whole until the technical rehearsal.

But I suppose I should be thankful. When summer rolls around, and money is needed to pay off student loans, I'm sure that with our expertise in fire-control and ladder movement that we will have no trouble getting a job with the fire department.

You see in U of A's drama department, the student is second class. We are not given a say in what plays are chosen for our fourth and final year, and we could be the only department in the university that carries an attendance book from class to class to be signed by the appropriate teachers or directors. And they want to develop a sense of professionalism?

When the plays are announced for our graduating year (and the students are always the last to know), the drama department talks about the studio season rather than our

development or the areas where we need training and experience.

And speaking of training, of the four plays that have been scheduled; for this season, there is not one women-oriented play, or even one in which the women's roles are equal, let alone gerater than the men's. Yet half of my class are women.

I'll say one thing for the department; they are trying to overcome that problem by allowing fewer women into the department each year.

You may ask why we spend five hundred dollars a year to stay at U of A. Any of you who have been in the theatre school market will have seen that instruction centers are few and far between. There are few places in Canada that you can go for good movement, voice and theatre training. We come here and hope that the next year or the next director will be different. And until the actors take a stand or are considered as part of this unique department's workings that is all we can do.

Connie Kaldor
Drama Student

On Life

One of the most interesting consequences of man's partial success in making things is the notion that he can "make" life itself. This attitude betrays a philosophic assumption which, once exposed, is so idiotic as to cause one almost complete despair over the human condition.

This assumption is that living things are built up of things that are not living. Now, if there were things devoid of life, you're not going to get life out of them by stuffing them into a tube. On the other hand, if you put living things into a tube, it should astonish no one that life can then be extracted from this tube. The best example of this intellectual fraudulence is the current stupidities in "modern" genetics (double helices double talk).

Some quack said he discovered the secret of life in the coding of the double helix model. The weird thing is that the poor fool was serious. His mis-education has been so

complete as to ignore thy split between life as reproduction, metabolism, and stuff like that; and life as the thrust after novelty, beauty and love. In fact, he would probably be ambarassed to talk about beauty and love. I'm not. It's the essence of life.

Secondly, this genetic code business has two other fatal flaws: it flatly contradicts what these same people believe about evolution, and it flatly



contradicts the most basic epistemological understanding. Let's look at the first issue.

According to everyone teaching biology, life began simple, and moved through time to organisms of increasing reactivity, or complexity in chance variations to given circumstances and environments. Never mind if the doctrine is true - the point is that it's believed.

Now the other thing believed is that life is determined by genetic code. But if living things are what they are because of genetic determinants, then all these determinants must have been in the first living molecule. However, if this is true, then this first living thing must have been the most complicated bit of life one could imagine. So the simplest thing is the most complicated thing, or not the simplest thing at all: and we have a contradiction so serious as to require us to scrap the entire phony edifice of pretensions called "modern" biology. It should be scrapped anyway, being more concerned with chemistry than life.

Lastly, with regard to epistemology, it should be noted that one can't see a code, genetic or otherwise, through a microscope or anything else. Remember, you are reading this article and understanding it only because you and I implicitly agreed that certain arbitrary ink marks would trigger off certain ideas. There is no meaning in the

ink. Every code, such as the one we are now using together, has the feature that its "power" derives from its utter arbitrariness. Codes are ideas. Ideas are real, but you can't see them. Hence, the idea that codes can be observed through microscopes is so much rubbish, as is the idea that our world is materialistic.

Contemporary biology is in the position of bragging about the ability to look into the eye of a god whose existence is denied.

Brien Chomica
Grad. Studies

Services

The recent rise in cost of refreshment up at RATT is, in itself, not a very drastic crunch on the students' pocketbooks. Anyone willing to pay 45 cents for a beer will probably pay 50 cents a beer. However, this move is only the latest in a series of price increases for student services. We have witnessed a doubling in cost for Students' Cinema, a rise in the cost of pool-table rentals, and now the rise in price for beer. It is painfully apparent that Students' Council, contrary to the deceitful promises we heard at election time last spring, is more concerned with making a profit than they are with providing a service for students. The present executive is measuring most "services" on the amount of profit they make; which explains (partially) the reason CKSR was closed down - it wouldn't make money.

When I pay my students' fees, I expect in return services and special rates. I receive no discount playing pool, a barely perceptible bargain in RATT, and a minimal discount for movies I have already seen.

Must my money go towards executive salaries and debts incurred before I ever set foot on this campus? RATT and the games room are dismal examples of services, but what else is there? The new pub in HUB is undoubtedly a new business, and not a new service, for the Executive.

If the Executive were really interested in providing services for our money, they would cut their salaries, instead of raise prices. I think the time has come when the Executive should live up to its promises and act in the interests of their electors, instead of playing politics and economics, instead of turning simple services into profit-oriented ventures. I know I am not alone when I feel ripped-off by having to pay \$34 to see my picture in a telephone directory that is due "any day now".

Incidentally, since things to laugh about are few and far apart during exam week, why not provide yourself with a good mirthful round of chuckling by re-reading the election promises of the McGhie Slate in last year's Gateway?

Gordon Turtle
Arts 2



"THE DEVIL MADE ME DO IT"