

## Further defense of Meekison

Dear Sir,

We, the Political Science Graduate Students' Association consider the insinuations made against Dr. J. Peter Meekison in the 25th November, 1971 issue of the Gateway to be both inaccurate and unjust.

Further, we find ourselves in strong disagreement with the views expressed by the author of the editorial pertaining to our Department.

Yours sincerely,  
F. A. Cruchley  
Co-ordinator  
Political Science Dept.  
Graduate Students' Assoc.

Would the person who wrote the anonymous letter to The Gateway about Winston Gereluk's article please contact me at the Gateway office. No one need know who you are except myself but I must know before we can print your letter.

--Bob Beal

Dear Sir:

Some people in the Department of Political Science (who, needless to say, wish to remain anonymous) have been whispering that I'm one of those people who tries to use university propaganda sheets to polish my image in the academic community. These people maintain that I, like Peter Meekison, should spend most of my time making sure that UofA publications don't say things about me that I didn't know they were going to say. I'm becoming more and more terrified lest the Great Fear, the Eternal Policeman, or some other Immense Abstraction should come after me. I wish, therefore, to confess that I am an associate professor, not a professor, as incorrectly reported in a so-called "news story" in the Gateway of Thursday, November 25.

T.C. Pocklington  
Department of Political  
Science  
432-4337

Dear Sir:

I want to protest against the snide, anonymous attack, masquerading as a news story, against Dr. Peter Meekison in the Gateway of November 25, 1971, and also against the unscrupulous editorial comment by Mr. Gereluk, full of innuendo and dark but unsubstantiated charges against a whole Department.

The idea that Dr. Meekison deliberately distorted his credentials is simply too absurd to deserve comment.

I have known Dr. Meekison for several years. He is a man of the greatest integrity and he has made, and continues to make, an outstanding contribution to this University.

Yours truly,  
Henry Kreisel  
Vice-President (Academic)

Dear Sir,

Re your editorial of November 30, 1971

The Gateway has truly mastered the art of the sneering, graceless apology and has delivered its latest with a perverse brand of stupid arrogance.

Yours faithfully,  
A.J.F. Humphries  
Dean,  
St. Stephen's College Residence

Editor of the (just call it insipid) Gateway:

The Gateway's "apology" to Dr. Meekison ("Gateway defends itself") is one of the most sophomoric and cavalier bits of hypocrisy I have encountered in a long time. Your protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, it is patently clear and obvious to the readers of "Distorted Credentials Inspire Questions" and the accompanying "editorial" that these articles serve as thinly veiled, if not transparent, vehicles for a malicious attack upon Dr. Meekison. To hide behind the pretense that the articles were routine "corrections" of the Folio is deceitful and cowardly.

The entire tenor of the so-called apology compounds the travesty committed in the first place-- it is more of the same. I notice that in the masthead, page five, you even resort to *ad hominem* attacks upon those who submitted letters of protest to the Gateway: "Those who slaved through the multiple errors and corrections in these letters...." Instead of resorting to this kind of vague attack, you might have saved yourselves a lot of work by merely placing *sic* behind the errors committed by each contributor. I note with interest your urgent desire to sweep this matter under the carpet as quickly as possible, however, I must insist that this letter be published.

It is a sad testimony to the quality and relevance of any publication that it must resort to antagonizing its readers in order to elicit responses (especially when that publication enjoys a virtual monopoly, as does the Gateway).  
Donald S. Andrews  
Graduate Studies  
Political Science

--FIVE--

## The Gateway

member of the Canadian University Press

STAPH THIS ISH

Aha!!! I've been slandered!! I've been insulted!! I've been...well it doesn't really matter. The point is that I don't like being criticized for such comments as "Those slaving over errors and corrections were...", when all I was referring to was the errors the typists were making and not to any errors in the letters themselves. However that is irrelevant. Those of us not slaving over the errors tonight were: Luci Batman K. (you should see her utility belt!), Elsie Still Laughing Ross, The Traumatic Ross Harvey, the Dynamic Duo of Ron and Lana Yak, The Nefarious Nimble Fingers of Irene and Meredith, Frozen Pants Grant, The Nicotine Freak Jim Selby, The Illustrious Dave McCurdy, Our Friend From STOP, Big Bad Bob Beal (our chain and whip specialist), Stufield, Our Resident Moron Fugilas in the Mountain), King Beeper Ternoway, Mickey Quesnel the 13 oz. kid, Colette Lady Godiva Forest, and your eminent host for this evenings entertainment, Harvey G. (for gymped) Thomgirt.

Departments Editor-in-chief-Bob Beal (432-5178), news-Elsie Ross-(432-5168), Sports- Ron Ternoway(432-4329), advertising Percy Wickman (432-4241) production-Bud Joberg and Ron Yakimchuk, Photo-Barry Headrick and Don Bruce(432-4355) arts -Ross Harvey, and last but not least, publisher Harvey G.Thomgirt (432-5168).

The Gateway is published bi-weekly by the students of the University of Alberta. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Short Short deadline is two days prior to publication. The Gateway is printed by North Hill News, Ltd.

## EDITORIAL

University of Alberta vice-president, Dr. H. Kreisel, says the reason the names of the candidates for the position of Dean of Arts will not be released is that the selection procedure would then become a "political thing".

However, the university community has far more to gain by having the selection of a new Dean open to public scrutiny than by having him quietly selected by an obscure committee.

The Dean of the faculty has a good deal of power in such decisions as the hiring and firing of professors, course requirements and general rules and regulations within the faculty.

The Dean of Arts selection committee will neither be benefited nor harmed by their choice of Dean. Those who will derive either benefit or harm are the students and teachers in the faculty-- the people who have to deal with the dean and his regulations and decisions.

These people-- the students and teachers-- should at least be allowed to know who the choices are. The fact that candidates may be embarrassed if it is known publicly that they were 'losers' in the selection process is far less concern than the benefit which would result if the candidates were open to discussion with and by the people in the faculty.

Kreisel says that candidates would not want themselves discussed by the people in the faculty and subject to the political overtones in this discussion, He says some would withdraw their names if the contest were open.

However, the people in the faculty should not want a person as Dean who would not want them to be able to discuss his qualifications before he is elected, or who refuses to talk with them before he is elected.

At the very least, the people in the faculty who will be directly affected by the selection of a new Dean should be free to discuss the candidates.

A more positive step would be to give the people who will be directly affected by this decision the power to make the decision. That is, to make the selection process a general election among the teachers and students in the faculty.

This would ensure that the members of the faculty received the type of direction they wanted from their Dean.

It could also make the new Dean's job easier because the people he would be working with and making decisions on behalf of would recognize him as the person they wanted to do that job.

The Students' Union and the Arts Students Association (if there is one) should press for an election of the Dean.

Even if the university administration would not sanction an election, it could still be held from among those candidates who would let their names stand for election. The people in the faculty would at least be able to let the selection committee know how they felt. Those candidates who refused to let their names stand before the people in the faculty probably would not be very desirable Deans.