

Marshall on sports

I am replying to your editorial of the November 17 issue, "Money Wasted On Sports?" Although the intention of the editorial may have been to only pose the question, it appears to be answering it as well.

The basis of the article's argument is a monetary one, which I believe to be a very shaky basis.

The budget, when analyzed properly, shows a much different picture than the one you outlined. As presented early in your editorial, the supposed facts are greatly misrepresented. Let us take, for example, the football team. You quote the cost of each player as being \$300. A more direct look at the budget would show the football team with a deficit of about \$1,000. Divided among 40 players, this works out to about \$25 per player.

But all of this is actually insignificant. It would be very difficult to justify anything on a monetary basis alone, perhaps even The Gateway. I would like to pose one question. What would happen to your basic argument if inter-collegiate sports showed a profit, as it has in the past and probably will in the future?

While discussing the budget, I would like to point out two misconceptions which appear in your editorial. The first is the budget, which you so carefully analyzed, does not only apply to inter-collegiate sports, but to all of the athletic organizations on campus. It accounts for such groups as the intramurals, the Women's Athletic Association, the Fencing Club, the Bowling Club and the Curling Club. It also contains certain honorariums to student managers and helps provide part of the Business Manager's salary.

OF OWN ACCORD

Secondly, you have stated that "more than \$43,000 is contributed in the form of Students' Union fees, at seven dollars per person." This contribution is NOT in the form of Students' Union fees! This

fee is required of each student, by the University Board of Governors, to cover athletics and physical education. Any student who does not take advantage of this expenditure is doing so of his own accord and he has no one to blame but himself if he feels it wasted.

You have pointed out that "a rah-rah type of spirit is not desirable for a mature, self-confident institution." I would like to ask, why isn't it? Surely, I know of no better way of contributing to spirit and tradition than through the common student cause of cheering a Varsity team toward a mamimum effort. Indeed, such mature, self-confident institutions as Oxford and Cambridge take pride in their annual rowing races on the Thames.

You stated the primary function of a university is academic. This is obviously true, but it is also very limited. I believe you should have written that the primary function of a university is to educate. Here is, I think, the crux of the argument. I believe a university should educate the entire personality of man.

FOUR SIDES

To educate the entire personality of man means more than educating the intellectual level. It also involves the physical, emotional and social sides of man.

It is not the lecture room which provides opportunity for educating the social, emotional and physical sides. It is all of the other facets of university life which do. I believe that outstanding in these other facets is the field of sports. Here a university has the opportunity to educate all four sides of man.

The playing field offers the student an excellent opportunity to learn successful social contacts. No where else is such a heavy stress laid upon cooperation. Here there is no room for racial differences, religious differences or petty grievances. There is only room for cooperation and cohesion.

Anyone who has played competitive sports will realize the terrific emotional strain it involves. If it becomes too much for the individual, then he may learn, emotionally, how to control himself. I know of no place where the university has such an opportunity for teaching emotional control.

Physically, the learning situation is obvious.

These four sides of education, I believe, fall under the purpose of a university. How can you justify the elimination on any one of them?

Thus I justify sport.

Highly competitive sports have long been an integral part of man's behavior. Man's nature is to be active, and as the more active became more superior, it was obvious to challenge their abilities. It is here that inter-collegiate sports came in; as a challenge to those who are physically superior. These superior athletes must be challenged by others equally superior in order to fulfil their potential. Much the same as the McGoun Cup debaters challenge the superior debaters across Canada.

Thus I justify inter-collegiate sport.

A QUOTE

In conclusion, I would like to present a statement by the noted playwright, John Galsworthy which sums up the feelings of many. "Sport, which still keeps the flag of idealism flying, is perhaps the most saving grace in the world at the moment, with its spirit of rules kept, and regard for the adversary whether the fight is going for or against; when if ever, the fair play spirit of sport reigns over international affairs, the cat force which rules there now will slink away and human life emerge for the first time from the jungle."

P.S. If you do want to keep university contact and discussion at an intellectual level, I would recommend you refrain from calling athletes, "sweat sock and jock strap crowds!"

Gerry Marshall
Education 4

Allen on cucnd

I have recently noticed, with considerable dismay, the tendency of members of CUCND to indulge in polemics against those who do not adhere to their views. They appear to classify the latter under the following headings: amorphous blobs of barely cogitive, jelly-like matter and members of the John Birch Society. I hope that I don't fit into the first category. I know that I don't qualify for the second; I might even qualify for the list of suspects (see recent editions of Pogo). What is more important, there seems to be a substantial number of students on campus like myself, who neither fit into one of the above categories nor belong to CUCND.

What then are our views? We simply do not believe that nuclear disarmament can be gained through negotiation with a government which has vowed to destroy our society in all of its aspects: social, political and economic. The use of any means to gain this end is condoned. How can the Western powers negotiate in good

faith with a government which has stated that there is nothing whatsoever morally wrong in lying, deceit and treachery, as long as it advances the communist cause?

We fear nuclear war as much as any militant supporter of CUCND. However, we feel that their stand is highly idealistic. We prefer to believe that as long as the power to retaliate swiftly and powerfully is retained, there will be no nuclear war. True, it is an uncertain and dangerous existence at best. However, the alternative seems to be to place our collective necks on the chopping block. Despite what Lord Bertrand Russell may say, we are not at all certain that we would rather be Red than dead. Perhaps that is part of the bourgeoisie ideology on which we have been nurtured.

We are not pessimists, but place our hopes for the future in the peoples of the countries which comprise the communist bloc; and in their ability to restore the true processes of democracy. In their leaders we have no faith, for by their very attainment of eminence, they have proven their lack of scruples.

Ted Allen
Arts and Science 2

Kemp on nazaza

What is wrong with the Engineers? Better still, what's wrong with Nazaza?

I feel disappointed that Nazaza was too ashamed to identify himself with any faculty. Could it be that there are a few in his faculty who would not meet his standards and thus cast a shadow of doubt over his qualifications as a judge of all?

He interviewed some engineering students and was kind enough to draw a generalization from his interviews and not trouble us with more specific details. Details like: what questions did he ask these engineers; in what frame of reference were they asked; and more important, just who did he ask to get such a broad section of engineers? You see I happen to be in engineering

and no one I know of ever heard of his unbiased interviews.

It might seem that a person with "the benefit of a liberal education" as Nazaza so kindly prescribes for engineers, would not deign to make rash generalizations such as the classification of all engineers by observing the antics of a few.

I know personally of a few "rabble rousers" in practically every faculty on campus but I wouldn't for a moment be so pretentious as to presume that I live or act in a manner superior to them. Much less would I be so vain to propose methods of correcting their behaviour, since in a society of free think-

(Continued on page 9)

RANCHO

