

LETTERS LETTERS LETTERS

'layman' takes on

architectural juggernaut

Of all the architectural absurdities perpetrated on this campus, the Business Administration and Commerce Building seems to be the straw which breaks the patient resignation of the student. I haven't had time to study this proposal in depth, but am nevertheless prompted to raise the following questions or points. Ignorant laymen are wont to do that kind of thing.

1. Does this campus *need* a Business Administration and Commerce Building? Is there a legitimate crush of commerce students, or is this another instance of the academic chauvinism whereby faculties measure their worth by the number of buildings they can claim their own?

2. It is obvious by that monument to the Manchester cotton industry, HUB, that Jim Humphries neither understands nor heeds non-utilitarian considerations such as beauty. Has it ever occurred to him that some things are more important to people than warm walkways? And, after all, is it that far from Tory to the surrounding buildings? How many cases of frostbite have been recorded as students crossed those trackless wastes?

3. Perhaps I'm the only one on campus, but I find the Tory building rather pleasant visually. At least it doesn't contradict itself. The attachments to the Rutherford Library, to Education and to the Chem building presently under construction demonstrate that the architects responsible are unable to match the size of bricks, the shape of windows or

the kind of exterior panelling to the existing structure. The results are visually jarring and, in the case of Rutherford, ludicrous. One can add a back room to a shanty, but somehow large projects are not amenable to this kind of patchwork.

4. Is there never to be an end to this rumbling of concrete trucks, to this roar of jackhammers and to the time-consuming detouring on this campus? It's all very well to speak of the greater access to Tory and all, but how are the thousands of people going to get in and out while construction is underway?

5. Being one of the uninformed, alas, I should avoid mentioning Mr. Diamond's remarks. However, the argument that the building should be on the steps of Tory so that it won't be somewhere else, and the analogy with "Trinity Great Court" at Cambridge seem to be rather weak supports for his position. Similarly one might say that we had better move the Pyramids to the Quad so they won't be in Gizeh, or that the whole campus should be razed in favour of a Moscow University structure. I don't long nostalgically for the middle ages as much as I fear a future where we have to live in the rabbit warrens that architects, planners and designers have decided will make us happy.

I have gone on at length, I fear, and my voice may only be an undergraduate whisper raised in the path of a juggernaut. And I fear that it is too cold to have a sit-in (sit-out?) on the steps of the Tory Building.

Arnd Bohm
Arts 3

the wrapping paper caper

During the Christmas holidays four brass rubbings destined for the walls of my office in the Humanities Building were removed from my desk. In their place were left six medieval figures cut from a piece of wrapping paper. Although the rubbings - two knights and two ladies in black on gold paper - were of no great commercial value, I cannot replace them without spending several hours on my knees in the London churches where the monuments are to be found. They were poor things but mine own. Information that would solve the Case of the Missing Rubbings would be welcome. Better still, if the borrower would return the property and remove the pieces of wrapping paper, no questions would be asked. M.A. Whitaker

Department of English

seasonal poverty derided

by 'fucked-up' student

The present attitude to student finances is marked by a failure to accept any degree of maturity in a student. After a comprehensive questionnaire, loan amounts are determined according to need. Presumably this implies that the student is capable in determining his needs. Then, this money is doled out to the student in two parcels the size of which are determined by the awards board. It is then

mandatory that the student pay all his obligations to the University from the first installment, leaving him with sometimes less than \$50.00 for the term. The second installment is payable only after January 10, the following year, at which time the bank, the registrar's office and grocery stores are glutted by student's seeking and spending their new found wealth. This is a fuck up.

Ken Murray
Arts 3

appetizer moves executive sharks

It is odd but when I first came to this university, I never dreamt I would be put in the position of having to chastise severely my entire executive, from president to vice president services. I suppose it all began on November 28/72 with the defeat of the fee referendum and the executive's incredibly irresponsible attempt to slash the political throat of the president.

They say when a shark senses blood it drives him nearly insane and that his animalistic passions goad him on to satisfy that desire. I can't help but think that the recent movements of the executive were analogous to this situation. The defeat of the referendum was misconstrued by them as being a vote of non-confidence in the president. With this sanguine appetizer, the executive sharks moved in for

the kill.

I believe that the referendum was defeated because of a belief held by the members of the student body that our elected representatives should be responsible for their actions to the electorate. This was a pretty major issue. We were being asked to place into the hands of the executive an additional \$100,000 that they would not normally receive. The only explanation that we, the voters received, was a vague statement attributing the need for the money to inflation.

This referendum was of such a nature that the entire executive should have been involved in giving a comprehensive explanation as to why the present funds were not adequate. Yet we still don't know why the president is now engaged in

petty counter accusations, claiming Delaney misused funds when he purchased an attache case. We have Delaney's counter counter moves.

I don't believe that this referendum indicated a total lack of confidence in all members of the executive and that all should resign, as the young socialists purport. I do believe that the referendum indicated the students' desire to make their executives more responsible to them. Might I suggest that the executive meet behind closed doors—settle their internal squabbles, and emerge from that meeting as a consolidated unit ready to provide some explanations. I maintain that if these internal conflicts cannot be consoled, then it is time for a general election.

David Allin
Arts II

squabbles with YS —Panch replies

I read with awe the Gateway letter of Jan. 9 entitled "Peace Congress Condemns Malta," by Liz Rowley of the Canadian Peace Congress, U of A Committee. In the letter Rowley "exposes" the supposed "alliance" of the Young Socialists and the Anti-Bolshevik Youth League. As a long standing member of the Young Socialists, I was obviously shocked at such a slanderous attack on our movement.

Because we have only been in contact with the Anti-Bolshevik Youth League once in the last year, I assume that Rowley is talking about the "Rap Ukraine" meeting that took place in early November. It was a panel discussion organized by the U of A Ukrainian Club to discuss treatment of dissidents by the Soviet Union. Because the Club was interested in a *wide* range of views on the question both the Young Socialists and the Anti-Bolshevik Youth League were invited to express their opinions. Had Rowley been there she could easily have seen how our views were diametrically opposed to those of the right-wing Anti-Bolshevik Youth League (ABYL).

The Young Socialists fully support the struggle for socialist

democracy in the Ukraine and condemn the treachery of the Stalinist Russian bureaucracy in their treatment of dissidents. In contra-distinction to the ABYL, however, we stand firmly behind and give unconditional support to the Russian Revolution. We are not interested in a reversal of the revolution but a return to its traditions under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky (as are such dissidents as the Ukrainian, Ivan Dzuba). The Russian Revolution stands as the greatest triumph of humanity over the iron grip of monopoly capitalism. We applaud all the successes of the revolution (socialization of the economy, etc.) but criticize its degeneration under the leadership of Stalin. Somehow I fail to see how this puts us into alliance with the ABYL who are undying opponents of *every aspect* of the Russian Revolution and the Russian state. I would remind Rowley that the ABYL is the same group which accuses the Young Socialists of being terrorists, has thrown red paint at us as well, and has consistently attacked us through their mouth piece (now defunct), *Campus Lyfe*.

Supposedly Rowley's article was written as an answer to the U of A Vietnam Action Committee's position on the war

in Vietnam. I am stumped trying to see the connection between this and our views on the Russian Revolution. Is Rowley concerned with the genocide against the Vietnamese or petty squabbles with the Young Socialists? If the Canadian Peace Congress want to discuss the politics of the Young Socialists, they should say so or otherwise stick to the point at issue — Vietnam.

At this present time in the war in Vietnam, it is *absolutely* crucial that unity of all those opposed to the war be maintained. As actions always speak louder than words we invite the Canadian Peace Congress to join with us in united actions to oppose the continued American involvement in Indo-China. Such an action is being organized by the U of A Vietnam Action Committee for January 20. We are always open to discussing our political views at our Friday night forums and elsewhere. For the good of peace in Indo-China, let the Peace Congress put aside its various differences and join with us in the one things we are all obviously concerned with — ending the war in Vietnam.

Larry Panych
Young Socialists

ocean of disgust

to flood of joy: a testimony

In response to Jim Adams' article, "Times Present", in the Christmas issue (December 12) I would like to point out what Christ in Christmas means to me as a new Christian. Also perhaps he may understand why him and many others would find Lenin moves them as much as Christ does, why Christ has little impact on them.

As a kid, I grew up in our society's surface idea of Christmas, gift giving, spending money, Christmas hampers for the poor, Christmas trees, family reunions, and the like. But this Christmas was different. It was changed by an event last February. Out of an ocean of guilt, hate, neurosis, unhappiness, and disgust for my life I reached joy, the joy that floods a man's soul, cleans out his mind, shines up his surroundings, and gives him life as he never knew existed. Out of a meek, faithless prayer I met the greatest being of all, God. I asked Jesus Christ, as God, to clean up the mess I was in, to change my life, and later to

accept my dedication to him. Through his light shining in my soul I became a new person from the inside, the place where it counts most. I learned Christianity was not a system of "Brownie Points" but the fact, God, by sending his own Son, brought God to man. All I had to do was ask Jesus in. One of the things Christ has said is, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come into him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Revelation Ch. 3 V. 20, Holy Bible) Jesus is not only equal to, and God, he is my closest companion and friend.

This is why Christmas means a lot to me. It is my best friend's birthday and the anniversary time of God's visit to this earth as a man to offer himself for our shortcomings. When I am moved by Lenin (if I am) I am moved from without, but when I am moved by Christ, I am moved from within.

Andy Kettle