



Women Today and Tomorrow

Dear Sir:

I would like to commend Cheryl Croucher for her excellent write-up of the first forum on Women Today and Tomorrow. I feel she picked up the essence of the talk very well.

However, I would like to make a few minor points. I was not part of the panel but only moderator. Also, Dr. Jeffress said that mastectomy (removal of the breasts), not vasectomy (male sterilization) is followed by more psychological problems than any pelvic operation.

It is also interesting to note that the author makes the point that the prefixes Miss or Mrs. define a woman in terms of a man. Yet the caption of the picture labels Henriette Aubin as Mrs. Aubin. I also noticed she got a promotion in your paper--from Assistant Dean of Women to Dean. I wonder how Isabel Munroe would feel about that!

Sincerely,
Vera Radio
Secretary

Abortion

Dear Sir,

I read the letter on abortion in your issue of January 13 with considerable amusement -- except that I have got very tired of reading this kind of thing, which is pushed at us so very efficiently by people living as far away as Quebec. What possible interest can the Reverend Bergeron have in Gateway except as a vehicle for his distorted views?

If you subscribe to the thesis that a hen's egg in the shell is a baby chicken, then his argument might make some sense!! True, it once had *potential* like, as has the foetus, but the latter is no more a baby than the egg is a chicken. Similarly with garden seeds. Who has not gone out to check as to whether or not the carrots were ready to use -- and found a long white string attached to the tiny leaves showing above the soil? It, too, is a *potential* carrot -- but it is *not* a carrot!

So let's be sensible about the abortion question. Obviously, planned parenthood is here to stay, but the aim should be to prevent conception, rather than risking abortion, which I understand to be no picnic even under the best of circumstances.

Yours for abortion reform law

Dibdin Papers

It was with considerable amazement that I read the Dibdin Papers published in the January 20th issue. I'm usually able to convince myself that this University is dedicated to something called "education", but every once in a while an incident such as this one serves to remind me that I'm only kidding myself.

R. Dibdin's only crime, it seems, is to be possessed of a sensitivity to the needs of his students, and, perhaps of a certain disdain for the trappings of power that some members of the academic elite like to affect. I'm quite sure that Mr. Dibdin's classes were at least interesting, if not viable experiences for his students (which I am also sure they were). Moreover, it is undoubtedly those students who are the big losers as a result of Mr. Dibdin's resignation. But after all, who is this school for, anyway?

As a GTA in the Drama Department I'm very fortunate in that I do not have to deal with the likes of Professors Rose, Bilsland, and the rest of that virtuos gang. May the Gods of Academe perpetuate their tenure, gild their titles, and give them foot-notes in the P.M.L.A. Let them masturbate among their memos. But don't ever make the mistake in assuming that they are teachers. I only hope they don't succeed in scaring away all the Michael Dibdins. This university needs them desperately.

Sincerely,
Bob White
Department of Drama

Essay Assignment

Dear Sir:

As a student of the English 210 class in question, I must briefly comment on the article *Cream Rises to the Top* (Gateway, Jan 20th).

Firstly, the essay assignment was indeed taken in all seriousness apart from the humorous footnote. The latter had as much chance of instilling lackadaisical tendencies in the student as a flea does disease in a dog.

Secondly, Mr. Dibdin's refreshing and informative lecture procedure provided for a more humane, workable environment, which should definitely be the case in a freshman English class. The communication between the instructor and student was truly apparent (although attending only one English class could possibly hinder an agreement).

As a university student aspiring to be involved in educational progress, I will attempt to put myself on an intellectual par with the few people who are wading in creme up to their necks: Do not make the mistake of questioning this letter. My Daddy is bigger than your Daddy.

Dusty Hornby
Arts

G.S.E.A. Petition

Dear Dr. Rose,

I have received a petition signed by 34 members of the Graduate Students in English Association (including 2/3 of the Graduate Teaching Assistants), requesting that I communicate to the department their dismay at the state of affairs illustrated by the correspondence published on page 4 of last Thursday's edition of *The Gateway*. Their petition reads as follows:

Mr. Michael Dibdin's motives in publishing this material may well be questioned; nevertheless, the fact that a G.T.A. can be treated in such a disgracefully high-handed manner by senior members of the Department is surely intolerable. Particularly disturbing is the vicious and threatening tone of Dr. Rose's letter to Mr. Dibdin.

We wish to raise the following questions:

1) Why did Dr. Marion Norman see fit to refer the matter of Mr. Dibdin's essay assignment to Dr. Bilsland, instead of dealing with it herself?

2) If Dr. Norman was disturbed by the omission of her title, why did she not make this clear to Mr. Dibdin personally, rather than having him reprimanded in writing by the Associate Chairman of the Department?

3) Does Dr. Bilsland seriously find the omission of Dr. Norman's title equally as disturbing as the matter of a G.T.A.'s competence in his teaching duties?

4) Does it not show a lack of imagination on the part of Professors Norman and Bilsland to make so much fuss about the note which follows Mr. Dibdin's list of essay topics--a note which many members of the Department might well see fit to append?

5) Does not Dr. Rose's letter to Mr. Dibdin embody precisely those qualities for which he criticizes Mr. Dibdin, only more so?

6) Surely an attitude towards students such as that displayed by Dr. Rose in his letter can only damage the reputation of the Department irreparably?

I should mention that these questions are not intended to be simply rhetorical; the G.S.E.A. would appreciate a reply.

Yours sincerely,
Ralph Lysyshyn
Chairman, G.S.E.A.

Correspondence with Dibdin

Dear Sir:

The correspondence arising from the publication of letters between Mr. Dibdin and Drs. Bilsland and Rose has produced some unwarranted invective and unconsidered observations. Miss Curtis and Mr. Lentz both pour scorn on Sr. Marion's religious title, yet both acknowledge "Mr." Dibdin. Do they imply that he is their master? I have prefixed the title, Mrs., when addressing married women, though not all have been my mistresses. The use of such designations is regarded by most members of our society as common courtesy and if the writers believe them to be archaisms they may have a point, but it hardly justifies the offensive tone of their letters.

Mr. Hill fails to distinguish between a silly writer and a writer of silliness. I would hardly classify Shakespeare as the former. Nor do I class all who write seriously as serious writers.

On the question of the original correspondence, it is difficult to judge a situation from the evidence supplied by one party. One is left wondering if there were significant antecedents. Are we, in fact, seeing only the tip of the iceberg? At the time of going to print, Dr. Rose had not, had he so wished, been given an

opportunity to state the Department's position. It could be argued that he and the others involved have equal recourse to the Gateway's Lettitor column, but it is possible that they may not choose to indulge in muckracking. Perhaps, too, they could be accused of slander if they chose to do so. Furthermore, I am left wondering why a period of three months elapsed between receipt of the communications by Mr. Dibdin and their display in the Gateway. If Mr. Dibdin had a burning desire to expose the pedantry of the English Department he must have remained in an uncomfortably overheated state for some considerable time. He has not done himself a service by having waited until January, as one finds it difficult to divorce one's mind from considering the possibility that other, more personal, considerations motivated him to seek publication.

Lastly, it would have been of interest to readers to know exactly why Mr. Dibdin resigned (or does one use the term "dropped out" when referring to a GTA?). We are, at present, left with mere implications that may not be warranted.

John Hodgkins,
Graduate Studies

Gateway One--ups Presidential Candidate

Dear Sir:

It was with great surprise and amazement that I read the ears on Tuesday's newspaper, urging support for Willard Jefferson. Let me assure you that it came as a surprise to Willard also. At the time of this writing he is still undecided as to his candidacy in the forth coming student union elections.

However, with such unexpected support as was evidenced in your paper, I am sure that Willard will throw his touque into the ring (as soon as it warms up). I would like to stree that Mr. Jefferson does not want to run on his personality. Instead, Willard Jefferson, IF HE INDEED DOES RUN FOR

PRESIDENT, will stress the issues in his campaign, and not his nice-guy image.

Thank you again for your support. We need it!

Dudley Paterson
CHAIRMAN
Willard Jefferson for President
Committee

MORE LETTERS ON PAGE SIX

Lettitors

All letters to the editor should be typed double space, not more than 250 words. Otherwise they may be abridged (exceptions will be considered). The writer is asked to include his name and telephone number with his letter. Pen names will be used at the writer's request. Letters should be sent to THE GATEWAY, Room 282, SUB, Edmonton, or should be dropped off at our offices, no later than 6:00 P.M. Tuesday and Friday, if they are to appear in the following issue. THE GATEWAY shall not be held responsible for any libel or damages incurred.

Recommendations to G.F.C.

Dear Sir:

As a student member of General Faculties Council, I have been, in the recent past, a full voting member of a Review Committee which was formed to recommend to G.F.C. the decision it should make regarding the contract renewal of a faculty member who acted as the Chairman of a large Department on the Campus. I felt it my responsibility to solicit the student opinion within the Department and base my recommendations to the Review Committee on my findings.

I should mention that a Review Committee may, if it decides to rehire the Department Head, make recommendations to the individual in question as to how the functions of the Department may be improved.

Due to the confidentiality of the matter I am not at liberty to divulge the details of my

investigations; however, I can assure you that my recommendations formed a major portion of the recommendations which the Review Committee ultimately made to the Department Head.

With the above in mind, I urge all interested students and faculty members to write to Dr. Henry Kreisel, Vice-President Academic, outlining their content or dissatisfaction with faculty members and Department Heads so that incidents such as the recent Michael Dibdin - Department of English affair will not be forgotten when the time comes to recommend tenure (an anachronism) or review the Chairmanship of a Department.

In this way, no one will be immunized against the inevitable.

John Mason,
Science 3