EDITORIAL

Why PC at all?

I am not a revolutionary. I don't believe that change effected by

violence ever does much good in the long run.

However, in the broader sense in which the term "revolutionary" is used in the western world, perhaps I am one. Having been raised in a tradition in which altruism and justice are valued highly, I am incensed by the institutionalized selfishness and injustice so prevalent in our

It is impossible for me to resign myself to the condition of the less developed countries, the second-class status of women, racial minorities or untolerated ethnic and religious groups. And yet all of these persist in the face of a colossal media whitewash which convinces people that the problems are disappearing, and in a short while it will be safe to merely ignore them. To say otherwise now earns one the label of "crank" or malcontent'

But people are remarkably deluded if they think millenia of attitudes which regarded women, black people, Jewish people, Ukrainian people, peasants, in fact, just about everyone but the ruling minority as subhuman or nonhuman are going to change overnight (or have substantially changed in the last century or so). George Orwell once said: "The propagandist's purpose is to make one group of people forget that another group of people are human".

In my opinion, the best way to do this is to elect a government of rich old white Anglo-Saxon protestant men with close ties to big business to the government of the nation which economically dominates half the world (or that of the richest province in the West). They can then perpetuate the kind of ideology which either a) conveniently forgets the needs of these people by insulating government from the people with layers of bureaucracy (the upper echelons of which are also rich white Anglo-Saxon Protestant men with close ties to big business, largely) or b) foists the ideology of high interest rates to tighten the money supply and tax cuts for those who are well enough off to get them, which supposedly stimulates the economy enough that everyone benefits. As some unkind wit once remarked

"The trickle-down theory means you get pissed on by the rich".

There still seem to be a lot of advocates of a particular kind of statist oligopoly capitalism, though. What their position amounts to is "If it's good for my company (Exxon, Chrysler, Nestle's) then it's good for everybody". It is this same view in microcosm that brought about the

"Me generation" and the entire current wave of possessive materialism.

Believe it or not, folks, there really is some truth in those adages about money not buying happiness; and there is also a kind of "Citizen Kane" complex that each generation has to rediscover. Frighteningly enough, sometimes a generation does not discover that the acquisition of possessions is a rather empty and futile pursuit. They convince themselves of their immortality and their God - and Adam Smith-given right to enjoy whatever they can seize their rapacious little hands.

Fortunately, there is occasionally a reaction against this, as some of the best spirit of the sixties showed. It is up to every generation to either take a stand on one side of this question, or implicitly by their behavior

to take the opposite stand.

What are you really in University for, anyway? If you're just here to get a prestigious degree as quickly as possible and earn piles of money (I speak to many future lawyers, doctors, engineers and business people), then perhaps it doesn't bother you that the Board of Governors is dominated by Tory hacks who think the way you do.

Perhaps you sleep more comfortably at night knowing that those same Conservatives have 73 of the seats in the Provincial Legislature. But I tend to agree with a friend of mine from West Germany, who said (upon being exposed to Alberta politics) "This isn't democracy this is a farce!'

A few election jokes called from local washrooms: "Progressive Conservative" makes about as much sense as "military intelligence.'

PC government: one driver, one wagon, 71 bales of hay

With the PC's you don't have a representative of your constituency in government, you have a representative of government in your

David Cox

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - Andrew Watts NEWS EDITORS - Richard Watts, Allison Annesley MANAGING EDITOR - Jens Andersen ARTS EDITOR - David Cox SPORTS EDITOR - Brent Jang PHOTO EDITOR- Ray Giguere CUP EDITOR - Wes Oginski PRODUCTION - Anne Stephen, Jim Miller ADVERTISING - Tom Wright MEDIA SUPERVISOR - Margriet Tilroe-West CIRCULATION - Gunnar Blodgett

Twas the night of the pumpkin, and all through the Twas the night of the pumpkin, and all through the staff, not a rumor was stirring - god, what a laugh! Out in the garden, midst the squash and the gourds, the staff are now gathering, exchanging rude words. Thank goodness, their mothers, at home and in bed need never know what their darlings have said. This weeks sweethearts include: the irrepressible John Algard, dynamic Martin Coutts, delightful John Roggeveen, efficient Ken Lenz, eclectic Martin Beales, graphic Aaron Bushkowsky, enigmatic Tom Wilson, serious Sandra Corbett, petite Stacey Bertles, audacious Jack Vermee. Corbett, petite Stacey Bertles, audacious Jack Vermee, wonderful Mark Roppel, sartorial Bill Inglee, daring Gilbert Bouchard, prescient Zane Harker, and smiling Heather-Ann Laird.

Special thanks to the chemists for the dry ice!

The Galeuay is the newspaper of the the students of the University of Alberta. News copy deadlines are 12 noon Monday and Wednesday. News Room: Rm. 282, Advertising: Rm. 256D, Students Union Bldg., University of Alberta, Edmonton, T6G 2J7. Newsroom, phone 432-5168 (5178); Advertising, 432-4241 (Ext. 28). Readership is 25,000. The Gateway is a member of Canadian University Press.





« LETTERS TO THE EDITOR »

Thinking people usually socialist

Peter Keohan, in a recent letter, seems somewhat baffled by ".....the definite leaning on the part of students here at the U of A towards socialist values." Happily, I have some views on the subject and I hope they will help Mr. Keohan out.

Although it is true that at "the relatively young age of....students" most people are prone to examine the beliefs that they have followed blindly for most of their lives, one cannot attribute this tendency to "gullibility" or to naivete (or even to "naiveness"). In fact, the opposite is true; it is when children recognize their gullibility that they first begin to question the philosophies by which they have been living, and then start to consider what other philosophies have to offer.

For most of us, this questioning process begins when we discover that we have been misled regarding Santa Claus and continues, to some degree, for the rest of our lives. Unfortunately, in a cross-section of Alberta's young people, only the privileged few have the opportunity to examine their beliefs at any length; these few we find, for the most part, at university, the largest seat of intellectual debate. Now if what Mr. Keohan says is true, that "....there is a definite leaning....towards socialist values" on campus, while less progressive values predominate elsewhere, one can only infer that "left-of-center thinking" makes the

While those of us who do not have the chance to examine our beliefs maintain the conservative tradition of our forefathers, those of us who do manage to examine our philosophy of life carefully and responsibly take a more reasonable approach to our neighbours. In other words, it seems that the thinking person generally favours socialist values.

With this conclusion in mind, I would like only to siggest to Mr. Keohan that, should he be planning on attending the U of A at least until this Christmas, he had best sell off all editions written or edited by William Buckley before the bottom falls out of the market, and then to hurry down to the bookstore, to beat the rush for the Marx-Engels reader.

Your comrade, James Weir I have seen many fine examples of narrow-mindedness printed in the pages of the Gateway that have at least adhered to some sorts of rules concerning coherence and logic. Not so with the confused and/or confusing letter submitted to our newspaper by Peter Keohane. In his letter, dated October 26th, Mr. Keohane states that "for whatever reasons, there is a definite leaning on the part of students....at the U of A towards socialist values." (Oo-o-o-o-h, scar-r-r-y stuff, boys and

He goes on to say that the lack of "journalistic responsibility" allegedly demonstrated by the *Gateway* staff is "one of the key social values." I'm not sure what he means by that statement; I'm not even sure that HE knows what he means. He concludes his letter by calling upon the members of the *Gateway* staff to practice the "preachings" of their "mentors". What preachings? What mentors? What in the heck is he talking about?! After having pored over Mr. Keohane's letter for a few minutes, I still wasn't sure of what he was trying to say; however, I did make the general assumption that Mr. Keohane doesn't like socialism and that, "for whatever reasons" a "disproportionate" number of students do.

In order to better understand why Mr. Keohane's mind works the way it does, it is essential to know a little bit about his social background. Mr. Keohane comes from a relatively wealthy family and is a freshly graduated alumnus of Cartier McGee/Louis St. Laurent (more commonly known as St. Howard Hughes/Our Blessed Lady of Money Bags.) In this school "socialism" is a dirty word. Most of the students have, never experienced poverty and the only starvation they have ever known has been due to anorexia nervosa. Their idea of personal misery is finding out that their Vidal Sassoon jeans are

> Luba Slabyj Arts II

P.S. If there is such a disproportionate number of socialist students on campus, why is there a ten yard-long banner hanging in C.A.B. with Julian Koziak's name painted on it? I don't see any N.D.P. banners hanging there.

No-news is bad news (and opinion to boot)

Re: Gateway's report on the Koziak forum

I was amazed and astounded by the lack of objective reporting in Mr. Block's report on Mr. Koziak's visit to campus. I wonder if we were at the same forum. Did the NDP pay for this article?

It is precisely this type of slanted and opinionated commentary that makes Gateway lose its credibility particularly as this was not an editorial comment. The article was supposedly a report about what happened at a campus event. It was not. Not only was the article opinionated, but it also contained quotes taken out of context, partial quotes and things NOBODY said.

Is this a sample of Gateway's objective reporting? I hope that all U of A students saw Mr. Block's article for what it really was - TRASH, and I hope that Mr. Watts, the Editor-in-Chief will take steps to make OUR newspaper (that's right, the paper WE ALL pay for) more objective in its reporting of campus events.

Reg. MacDonald

Three cheers for objective journalism.

Kathi Fierlbeck Pol. Sci. II

News Editors' Note: The Gateway wishes to apologize to all those offended by an article concerning a forum held by

Progressive Conservative candidate Julian Koziak appear ing in the issue of October 26.

The method of presentation of Peter Block's

article concerning a forum held by Mister Koziak was

While Mister Block is entitled to his opinions and, as a student as the University of Alberta, is equally entitled to express them in the Gateway it should have been made plain that they were his opinions.

This was not done.
Mister Block's article appearing as news represents a serious lack of responsibility and fairness on the part of the Gateway.

Once again to all those who have expressed distaste over the presentation of the article please accept the apologies of the news desk and indeed the entire staff of

Letters to the Editor should be a maximum of 250 words. Letters must be signed, and include faculty, year and phone number. No anonymous letters will be printed. All letters should be typed, although we will very reluctantly accept them if they are very neatly written. We reserve the right to edit for libel and length. Letters do not necessarily reflect the views of the Gateway.