the Gateway

EDITORIAL

Of course, vote

Faithful readers may have reached this spot expecting to hear the *Gateway* line on who to support in Friday's student executive elections. I admit there is a legacy for such predictioneering: two years ago Gordon Turtle saw the annual February election mostly as a "giant scam" and since it was a scam, he couldn't blame students for being disinterested in it. Last year Keith Krause went to the other extreme, producing a lengthy and elaborate analysis which by process of elimination came out strongly in favor of the Soper slate.

Both approaches were reasonable, but inadequate. As seems the case in most elections, observers and participants are preoccupied with issues, election promises, and other such important electoral factors - like just how favourably each of the candidates reacts to the continuing operation of a semi-autonomous student press.

There is something to all of this, but it denies too much the exigencies of office. Unless there are wide differences in each candidate's platform (in which case you likely would not have much difficulty choosing between them), all their campaign rhetoric surely will be submerged by the Students' Union bureaucracy when they assume office April 1, 1982.

Even if an effective group manages to take back control of the Students' Union operation, there are other 'checks and balances' to be confronted. Students' Council, membered by representatives of faculties across campus, sometimes thwarts the best efforts of a zealous executive. The University, which bankrolls the massive SU debt, will wield a substantial amount of influence over the SU finances for some time. Individual interest groups and the student media sometimes work to pressure unpredictable responses from the politically able.

From what we've seen in the campaigning and in the campaign propaganda there are few genuine differences between the two contesting slates that could seriously test these 'checks and balances.' The 'issues' are heaped with qualifiers(pending this or that restructuring or redevelopment); any time apparent conflict arises you may be sure of one of two things or both: 1)either one or both candidates has his facts mixed up; or 2) one of the candidates is contriving a stand for its sake against a point the other has come out in favor of(but were such a 'point' of major significance both candidates would be saying the same thing already).

So who should you vote for? My humble suggestion is this: go to Wednesday's noon pre-election forum in SUB Theatre and sit and listen. Then on Friday remember which candidates you felt good about and vote for them.

A note...

...on elections, from the *Globe and Mail*.

I never vote on elections; it seems to me that any man or woman so corrupt as to seek public favor is too corrupt to hold public office. The Ancient Romans had the right idea when they dragged the protesting Cincinnatus from behind his plow and forced him to serve as their ruler. He turned out to be a pretty good one, too."

P.M.

ITEM: SU election campaign in high gear

"Every year it's the same story: overenthusiastic student politicians kissing hands and shaking babies!"

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Objection to women's debate

I am writing in response to the letter in the last *Gateway* from Kris Farkas and Rae Ann Robertson (of the Women's Centre). In this letter they issue 'a challenge to the women in Engineering'.

I consider the women in Engineering to be on the cutting edge of feminism on this campus. These women had the personal courage to enter a male dominated faculty, knowing that things would be tough occasionally. The women in Engineering know that the way to get rid of stereotypes is to get in the game and knock them down, as opposed to standing on the sidelines screaming shrilly.

I also think that the women in my faculty do more for equal rights than a million Women's Centres. The proof of this is that I have never met a male engineer who didn't have a very healthy respect for the abilities of the women in our faculty

Perhaps the Women's Centre should have a constructive dialogue with some of the women engineers (and maybe meet a few real feminists?) I think the wording of your challenge makes it clear you are only after a confrontation. Perhaps the fact that the majority of women in engineering don't consider Engineering Week as a personal insult could tell you something.

I don't know Ms. Robertson, but I am really surprised that Kris Farkas would stoop to this type of thing. This needless, antagonistic confrontation is (in my view) completely unnecessary and counter-productive. Kris, I hope someone signed your name to this letter, because if you are responsible, my opinion of your intelligence and integrity (which is currently very high) is going to take a severe beating. In any case, I would urge both members of the Women's Centre and women engineers not to participate in this until the element of confrontation is removed.

John Koch
Engineering 4

P.S. Suzanne Bizon, I would like to discuss 'Not a Love Story' with you if you have time.

Terrorism corrected

I have just seen the report in your issue of 21 January - the day before my talk - on what I am supposed to have said about terrorism and its control.

It is unfortunate that your reporter has apparently lost his sense of humor and cannot distinguish between serious comment and throwaway asides. It is even more unfortunate that you have used this irrelevancy as the topic of your headline.

I had pointed out that even the United States now concedes that there was no concrete evidence of a Lybian plot against Reagan, even though there is no question that Lybian killer squads have been operating against Lybian political refugees in England and in Europe, with the result that England, for example, expelled all Lybian diplomats.

My comment about Reagan was by way of a general remark to indicate that I was not one of his supporters and that I regarded his disappearance from the political scene as something to be looked forward to. I certainly did not indicate any support for his assassination and am amazed at your reporter considering this snide humour as a matter worthy of report and of a headline.

Yours sincerely
L.C. Green
University Professor

Sweet to speak out

Dear Editor,

In response to recent letters concerning sexism on campus, and the stated wish for a public forum or debate, *Gateway* readers might be interested to hear *Edmonton Journal* columnist Lois Sweet speak on "One Person's Response to (the film) *Not a Love Story*, and Sexism", Thursday, February 4, at 12 noon, in SUB 158A (Meditation Room).

Eric Stephanson
Chaplain's Office

EDITOR - Peter Michalyshyn
MANAGING - Mary Ruth Olson
NEWS - Wes Oginski and Greg Harris
PRODUCTION - Robert Cook
ARTS - Jens Andersen
SPORTS - Andrew Watts
PHOTO - Ray Giguere
CUP - Richard Watts
ADVERTISING - Tom Wright
MEDIA PRODUCTIONS - Margriet Tilroe-West
CIRCULATION - Mike McKinney

The Gateway is the official newspaper of the students at the University of Alberta. With a readership of over 25,000 the Gateway is published Tuesdays and Thursdays during the winter session, excepting holidays. Contents are the responsibility of the editor; editorials are written by an editorial board or signed. All other opinions are signed by the party expressing them. Copy deadlines are 12 noon Mondays and Wednesdays. The Gateway, a member of the Canadian University Press and of CUP Media Services Ltd., is located in Room 282 Students' Union Building, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2J7. Newsroom 432-5168; Advertising 432-3423.

Staff this issue: We only read the news to see if we will survive. A million people starve to death but John Roggeveen and Colin Ellis survie. The military take over Poland but Diana Taschuk and Jordan Peterson survive. Air Florida crashes into the Potomac but Kent Blinston, Geoffrey Jackson and Beth Jacob survive. A person is killed in a car accident but James Stevens, Brent Jang, and Jamie McGeean survive. Ronald Reagan becomes president and...