

# STUDENT DRINKING HOW SERIOUS?

by FEMALE ANON

With all the recent fuss about smoking regarding a person's health, etc., it is somewhat surprising that nothing has been mentioned about drinking. "To intoxicate" is defined by the dictionary: to make drunk, to excite greatly to a point beyond self control, to elate to a frenzy. At first glance, the aforesaid might appear to be quite humorous but basically I feel it is pitiful. Drinking is becoming more common amongst teenagers as the years progress. The beginning of this habit, past-time or whatever else you would like to call it for many comes during their years at university. Can Dalhousie be fit into this generalization? Obviously 'yes' as there is drinking by the students here and several who have never touched a drop of liquor before will suddenly do so here as they begin to feel their independence.

## DO DAL STUDENTS DRINK EXCESSIVELY?

The opinions of students on drinking vary tremendously. Some say, "there's far too much emphasis on it," while others almost dismiss the problem with "It's not as bad as it could be." I don't see the extreme emphasis as implied by the first statement but at the same time, the drinking shouldn't be "bad" at all. In general, I don't think it is at Dal. A favourite question pertaining to the topic is — "Why does someone start to drink excessively?" The replies ranged as follows: 1. "I think the fault lies with the parents." 2. "To some it's a prestige symbol." 3. "You're free and you usually go after the things that are normally forbidden — on top of the fact that you want

to go along with the crowd." Let's analyze these. Firstly, the blame can't always be shoved onto the parents although at times some might deserve it. Basically I think there is more truth in the second and third statements than many people would care to admit. But what about those that drink for the simple reason that they honestly like to? The opinionated persons above seem to have forgotten about them.

## MODERATE DRINKING OK

One student of Dal thinks "Drinking is all right if in moderation." With this I have to agree and in general 'moderation' can be easily applied to drinking at Dal — no complaints here. The attitude of someone else was that the "Childish behaviour of rushing out every Friday and Saturday night to get drunk is stupid." Getting drunk is bad enough in itself but getting drunk for the sake of getting drunk is as the person said, childish and stupid — notwithstanding the fact that it is a waste of money.

## THE DOUBLE STANDARD APPEARS AGAIN

"The habit of girls going out to get 'stoned' is deplorable." It seems that boys can get away with being drunk but girls can't. I don't think it is fair that those of the male sex are excused. Why should it be this way? After all, men are supposed to be the stronger and more dominant of the two sexes! How strange! . . .

And then someone comes along who is certain he is right, "Why shouldn't they drink? — They should be old enough to know what they're doing." But — have you ever heard of a young child who, when he thinks he is old enough to walk, falls . . . ?

# The Figment

— a poll by  
MICHEL GUITE

Have those students responsible for the Figment presented their university with an honest attempt at communication, or with a pseudo-intellectual publicity stunt.

The Figment states "The best criticism we could wish will be better poetry." If this sheet has been responsible (whatever its motives) for stimulating student thought, then it has made a contribution to the university, and is thus a success.

The comments recorded below represent a "cross-section" of student opinion — from different faculties and from three universities. Some answers demonstrate a degree of student thought — (either for or against the publication) and therefore speak well for all those involved.

Q — What is your opinion of the "Figment"?

1. An encouraging attempt — I hope they continue.
2. I see the Figment as an attempt to impress for the sake of impression.
3. Some of it is merely an attempt of a pseudo-intellectual campus element to impress. But more important — some of it is good.
4. The title is good.
5. I don't know if it is good or not — even if it is terrible — if the students want to publish and others will buy it — it is a good thing — the worst attempt is no attempt. I hope they keep it up.
6. A very good paper — much better than the Broadsheet — I want to contribute myself.
7. Oh no — Insane type of pseudo-intellectual rag we get at Mount Allison.
8. "I don't wish to seem pessimistic — but I don't feel the poetry is any good." (Would you like to see this publication continued?) — Very definitely."
9. The general opinion (all but 4 of those questioned were acquainted with the Figment) among those who had read the sheet, was approval for its continuation.
10. Mediocrity personified. Style without substance.
11. The drawings are good.
12. I hope it will stimulate more interest and more contributions. There is a place on campus for this kind of work.
13. Poetry should stimulate — this doesn't.
14. I enjoyed it very much. I certainly couldn't write anything better.
15. 10 cents?
16. Is the yellow symbolic?
17. I am afraid much of the poetry was written as a private joke among a small number of pseudo-intellectuals — and a smaller part written in a sincere attempt to communicate. I agree with the concept of such a publication and hope that the quality of the work will improve. — But to criticize with any validity, one must be able to do better — I couldn't.

This publication is a part of the current campus movement "to arouse students from their lethargy." The general opinion appears to include an appreciation of the effort involved by the editors and writers. The above comments illustrate a degree of student awareness absent in many other fields — and thus in arousing this awareness — the Figment is a success.

**We were the  
Greatest.**

# THE LISTENING POST

by ANDY WHITE



## Ban-the-Bombers -- How Political?

During the past week, a considerable brouhaha has arisen on the campus concerning an article by D.V. Brazier which appeared in the last issue of the GAZETTE. While intending neither to defend this writer, nor to condemn him for what he wrote, we feel that certain matters were raised in the plethora of retractions which followed the publication of this article which we feel deserved further clarification. One group which raised a particularly loud howl about allegations of Communist sympathy was, of course, the ban-the-bombs organization. Dire threats were apparently made, and at least one member of the staff of this newspaper is sufficiently impressed by their meaningless tirade of half-truths and big-lies to have some sympathy with them. A leading member of the Student Body of this University quite angrily expressed the view that these people had a valid "philosophy", and they only wanted "peace". He hastened to add however, that his views do not coincide with theirs on these matters.

### NON-POLITICAL MOVEMENTS?

Apart from the obvious naiveties expressed from time to time by the leadership and the rank-and-file alike of these organizations, there seems to be one of their cardinal statements which seems to invite question, probably more than any one other. And that is, that their organization is non-political; that their sole interest is the removal of any threat to mankind from nuclear arms, either in actual combat, or even from the testing of these devices.

But is this a fact? Are all these pious protestations true, or are they simply another example of very well-thought-out propaganda, brewed up by organizations that are past masters of such techniques?

At first, perhaps it would be as well to examine the constitution of the one real ban-the-bomb movement, which, willy-nilly for better or for worse, exists on every Canadian University Campus with the exception of a few, which, to their everlasting credit, risked howls and screams of "Facist!" and "Reactionary!" by staunchly banning this sort of thing from their campus. The organization is, of course, the Combined Universities' Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

Among the more prominent clauses of this most remarkable document, we find the following; Sect. 2, subsection 1. "Preliminary conditions for all the following policies must be the rejection of nuclear weapons for Canadian troops at home or abroad and the termination of Canada's NORAD commitments."

Subsection 2b. . . . She should work for the re-unification of East and West Berlin as a free city under UN control . . ."

4. "Canada should end the sale of Uranium for non-peaceful purposes."

8. "Canadian diplomatic recognition of Cuba must be continued, and accompanied by full cultural relations between the 2 countries."

9. "Canada should extend diplomatic recognition to the People's Republic of China. Canada should advocate that the People's Republic of China (sic!) take over the seat in the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly . . ."

10. "Canada should extend diplomatic recognition to the German (sic) Democratic (sic) Republic as a de facto and de jure government. Canada should sign a peace treaty with both German states. The Oder-Neisse line should be stipulated in that treaty as the boundary of East (sic) Germany."

### COMMUNIST POLICY IDENTICAL

In the light of the above policy, which, as far as it goes is identical with the policies on these matters of the Canadian Communist party, it is hardly to be wondered at that more than one person has seriously questioned the statements of wounded innocence which occasionally emitted from the enthusiasts of these policies.

This is not to say that we believe that all members of the C.U.C.N.D. are Communists. In point of fact, it would surprise us very much if any of them fell under the Criminal Code's definition of a Red, which is to say a person who is a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. It is a well-known fact that this organization does not accept all applicants; only the true fanatics who pass the rather stiff standards set up by the party make the grade; even in Russia, less than 3% of the population of this allegedly all-Communist country is to be found in the ranks of party members.

In a country such as Canada, the true "operators" of the International Communist conspiracy are, in fact, likely not to be members under the legal definition as interpreted in this country. Rather, they are likely to be men behind the scenes in many organizations which deal with "peace" disarmament, and the like. For it is truly amazing how many frankly Communist aims mysteriously end up as objectives of such outfits.

However, lest we be misunderstood, we do not claim that all members of the CUCND fall into this definition, either. Rather we envisage an organization with strong behind-the-scenes influence radiating out through a host of shoddy fellow-travellers, down to the wet-behind-the-ears sympathizers which, along with a host of frank and simple dupes, probably makes up the rank-and-file of the organization. Certainly, the latter pretty well describes the leadership on this campus since the inception of the organization 3 years ago.

And what does the law have to say about all this? It as usual, bends over backwards to give every opportunity to this malignant force, one of whose aims is the total extirpation of our ideas of justice or anything like it. Truly it may be said that, as far as the Communist threat is concerned, the law is not only blind, but deaf, dumb, and slightly stupid as well. The theory upon which our system is based, although far from perfect even in ordinary civil affairs is ludicrously inadequate to defend our society from the conspiracy which faces it today. Designed to fit the conditions of an era which existed before the advent of mass communication media and the concept of "semantic" war under which treason is masked by "peace" "weakness" is made moral, and cowardice plumped as a virtue, it is almost ironically insufficient for the needs of today. A different approach is called for, or the future of this Canada of ours is very grim indeed.

**THERE'S A WINNER EVERY WEEK!!**

**During**

**MUSIC FOR YOU CONTEST!!**

That's right . . . Every week until March 31st, some lucky person will win FREE a RCA Stereo Record!!!

PLUS . . .

A BIG JACKPOT PRIZE

RCA VICTOR CONTEST  
Winners to Date

Janet Gardner	Kevin Murphy
Mary MacRae	J. D. Cunningham

An RCA Stereo-Hi F1 PORTABLE Record  
Player retail value \$99.50

Just drop into our store in the Lord Nelson Shopping Arcade and fill out a coupon. . . THAT'S ALL!!

We Honor  
Your  
NFCUS  
CARDS!

B  
E  
O  
U  
R  
N  
E  
X  
T  
W  
I  
N  
N  
E  
R

I  
T  
,  
S  
O  
E  
A  
S  
Y