

casserole

a supplement section of
the gateway
produced by the gateway staff

irene harvie
fine arts editor
terry malanchuk
photo editor

With a lot of help from our friends we bring you this, this, this . . . well, here it is.

We've jazzed things up this week with Terry Malanchuk's stirring photograph of the Preservation Hall Jazz Band's blind trumpeter DeDe Pierce on the cover. The story of that night of the Saints in Din-woodie when the band played Pied Piper for 1,000 entranced students is on C-3.

Winston Gereluk, Gateway's notorious columnist, has compiled a symposium of views from the week's teach-in on American Domination of Canada for C-4 and C-5, including his own introduction.

Irene Harvie premieres with an assist from Ronald A. Dutton as the latest of a great string of fine arts editors. See C-6, 7 and 8. Unfortunately, the last edition fell in love and is leaving for Australia in what would have made a perfect romantic conclusion to an Emily Bronte novel.

If it isn't one bug, it's another. First the hep bug kipes the editor and then the love one absconds with the fairer part of the staff.

Help!

Opposite are beefs and bouquets combined for the administration and The Gateway editor on the issue of a certain cartoon.

Below is Robin Mathews' great Canadian poem reprinted from The New Romans as another introduction to the centre spread.

Centennial song

Canada, my beauty,
everybody's love,
white flower of the
diamond-studded North,
let me tell you that
a tired prostitute beyond
her prime,
dejected, hungry,
full of malice and
uncertain fear
would throw her charms
away less openly,
would exercise more choice
than you have ever done,
would charge at least a
reasonable rate,
would try to be
(within the perils of the trade)
a self-respecting whore;
And What Is More
even in her wildest state
of drunken self-delusion,
howling at a corner
where the newsies thrive,
she wouldn't let you see her
stopping people—
friends and neighbors,
even relatives,
shouting with paranoid
insistence
upon decency and moral
strength,
that she is living better now
than ever,
friends with everyone, and that
despite all rumor, not a shred
of proof has ever been
produced
to show that she
(as gossips say)
is being regularly screwed.

Pavan for a dead cartoon

By ZOLTAN MELKVI

Mr. Melkvi is a graduate student in physics at the U of A

I am joining the discussion of the Department of Printing Services' refusal to print a Gateway cartoon because I feel that a significant means for exchanging ideas in our university community is endangered. I am not offering support of the currently fast declining stylistic standards of our student newspaper, or of the editorial prudence involved in attempting to publish the cartoon. In fact, the view that our student press has temporarily fallen captive in unworthy hands should all the more lead one to protect it from sustaining permanent damage.

Of the four signed comments that appeared on this subject in the Nov. 20 issue of The Gateway, only Dr. Tyndall's letter appears to me to have advanced arguments along a line that I consider basic to the issue, or to have arrived at a stand that is firm enough in its logic to support a continuance of dialogue without compelling one to start from scratch. So let me say that I agree with Dr. Tyndall's contention that no censorship was involved, but only a refusal of co-operation. In support of this interpretation I offer the following illustration despite the vice-president's lucid arguments: if a theatre chain refuses to show a particular film no censorship is involved if it leaves the screening to other firms' enterprise or discretion, and therefore there still is no censorship even if it operates the only theatre in a town. This prerogative would be just one of the advantages of owning a theatre.

Those giving orders should reconsider

But if Dr. Tyndall was correct in describing the nature of his interference in The Gateway's affairs, I fear that such action by the administration in the future will jeopardize the functioning of our university to a far greater extent than can be justified by a prospective relief from the more trying instances of vulgarity in The Gateway, and I would like to reason that those giving orders to Printing Services should reconsider.

First of all, I take it for granted that any department, academic or otherwise, that is connected with the university has the purpose to aid and promote—within their ability—all the aims of a university, so far as these aims can be defined. Further, I assume that the examination of all ideas by as large a segment of the university community as possible falls among those aims to which most members of our community on campus subscribe. In asking for unconditional tolerance from the administration it remains only to be shown that nothing less than total freedom, even freedom bordering on anarchy, will enable the student press to pursue this aim, or indeed, this duty. I offer two, distinct, arguments.

One is that an almost undiscerningly eclectic student press might well serve as perhaps the only fiducial entity by the aid of which that elusive, almost myth-like, but nevertheless all-important concept, freedom of the press can be measured. Even the best practi-

tioners of our democratic free press are a product of compromise among the often clashing interests represented by the duty towards society calling for a free presentation and critique of news and ideas, the pressure of making the final product salable for commercial profit and lastly, the inevitable political or even intellectual bias that is always present when a paper is put out by a small group of people. A student paper can be easily free of the influence of the second factor above, and, given an editor that is willing to give space to anyone (and Al Scarth—one has to hand it to him—is such an editor) can be immune to the danger inherent in the last clause, too.

Graduating from chaos

Of course, this positive potential of the student press is to be considered against the backdrop of a whole lot of shortcomings derived from one of the very sources of positive contribution: a lack of editorial polish, very often the absence of purpose or even of a point of view, and the two-bit gimmickry and sham intellectual pranks that can become rampant when editorial guidance is replaced by permissiveness allowing nigh everyone of 20,000 people to 'do their own thing'. But I claim that after graduating from this chaos, from being either a student reader or editor, to the respective sides of the secular press, one has a fair idea just which aspects of the the democratic press are worth fighting for, and which are expendable. Brought upon such a diet, the would-be-reader of some years from now could very likely remember the moral that crude cartoons perhaps can be done without, and that a publisher that let an offending artist go is not necessarily a witch-hunter, but just an individual who graduated from college, and college penmanship, a long time ago.

And, I suppose anyone bent on making a living as an editor would do well to refrain from offending the curiously high degree of sophistication of the Establishment in matters erotic: for the current controversy seems to indicate that the administration would much less excuse the lapse of a second-rate 'dirty joke' than its fourth-rate political content.

The second argument is that the sudden move of the Printing Services forces upon the university community to arrive at some sort of accepted decision on the old question of who forbids whom to publish what, a field of speculation notoriously replete with logical contradictions. While society at large can apparently forsake logical consistency in its censorship for real or imaginary benefits, a university community can ill afford to do so, for the simple reason that it can count nothing before logic or truth. I am not quietly slipping back to the position that the Printing Services committed censorship after all: I am saying only that it pretended to have discovered where to draw the line. Since it produced no discussion of the matter, only an arbitrary decree, we must conclude that it had not unearthed an intellectually acceptable criterion to guide its action.

In a university, especially on the sensitive question of curtailing the press we can accept nothing short of such

criterion, from a department or an individual.

Of course, one would not expect subtle arguments about esthetics from the Printing Services, for ordinarily their efforts are best invested along different lines, ones that would make an occasional passionate involvement with the vagaries of the printed word understandable. And it is not that I wish to thwart their evident drive to let their voice be heard when these matters come up for discussion in any public forum: it is only their proclivity for binding arbitration that grates me, for I confess, as far as the final word is concerned in deliberations of the subject of sexual delicacy, I could hardly trust them with the simple dilemma of drawing the distinction between a pedestrian and a pederast. Clearly, if they are not to involve their superiors in a constant and embarrassing debate about what is practically non-debatable, they must relinquish their new-found role of pioneering action in this field.

There is one limitation on this advice: the matter of legal responsibility. As one totally ignorant of the law and not having time to invest to study this aspect of it, I can only vaguely recall that all litigations against the press that I have heard of, whether arising from charges of obscenity or libel, involved either the publisher, the editor or the author, never the printing plant. This was the case even when "publication" on this continent involved little besides 'running off' some pornography as a direct copy of material originating elsewhere. So my first instinct would tell me that the legal question raised is perhaps but a red herring; if it is not, the Printing Department would have to arrange to ensure that any possible lightning would strike elsewhere.

The finale with glance askance

This would bring my comments to a close but for the fact that I do not want to appear as one of those entirely negative fellows who, after decrying what is wrong with things fail to suggest anything better. In a way, in my advocacy of unlimited freedom for the student press I am prevented from doing so, but this part of my stand is just a matter of opinion. So, let me say that I see nothing wrong with students' council, or for that matter, General Faculty Council, responding to a widespread dissatisfaction with the way the paper is run by investing the editorship in different hands. But such action should not be connected with a single offending item, and certainly be brought to bear only after a detailed review of the paper's performance, within the terms of reference that are associated with a student paper, an appraisal in which, incidentally, the considerations of good taste and esthetics would not rule supreme. For this reason I look askance at Mr. Scarth's suggestion of bringing the matter ultimately to the Board of Governors. Frankly, if students' council, and more importantly, General Faculty Council, cannot give him a just and intellectually enlightened hearing, and see to it that their decisions hold, he would be either a martyr or a fool having anything further to do with this campus' paper.