

The jig is up . . .

The last regular issue of this year's *Gateway* will be published next week, thus ending what has been a good year for the operation of the paper.

The most common complaint brought against the paper this year has been our coverage of off-campus events, whether they be local, national or international news happenings. Some students think a student newspaper should cover nothing except campus events, meaning not only news but social functions and campus personalities as well.

I had planned to write an awesome defence of our more open policy, when I realized that the complainers were making a lot out of nothing. Besides a handful of features and the occasional editorial, our coverage this year has been primarily dedicated to the university community, and that coverage has been by and large of high quality.

An interesting editorial appeared in the September 19, 1969 *Gateway*, illustrating how some things never change:

Mr. Scammell (a former editor) had the audacity to print a significantly larger number of editorials dealing with provincial and national topics than his predecessors.

That year, it was the wrath of Students Council members that descended upon this unmitigated gall. These things are not of interest to students, they said, they do not affect students and you will now please return to reporting what concerns us, the events within this tower of ours.

We will have no great effect on the community this year; we do not kid ourselves in that respect. But we are a newspaper that is always young.

Obviously, the coverage debate has been going on much longer than any of the complainers have been on campus. And, apparently, the arguments from both sides have always been much the same.

Whatever the philosophical merits of outside coverage are, it seems most students had an interest in the various features we ran. A lot of the letters received this year concerned our features, not to mention an inordinate number of phone calls and visitors who all wished to "set us straight" and "present the real facts."

Of course, not everyone agreed. Former Agriculture Club president Rod MacMillan told me we "could take our paper and shove it up my ass," a comment that surely expressed the opinion of all agriculture students in the most erudite manner Mr. MacMillan could muster.

Other students, notable engineers, thought *The Gateway* was run by Marxist pink limpwrists who probably can't get laid or drink beer worth a darn, while, from the other end, Brian Mason and others thought we were frequently too conservative and too soft on the bourgeoisie.

Writer Dave Marples was frequently attacked for questioning the word of God as expressed by religious leaders, while arts editor Bruce Cookson was at one time held personally responsible for SUB Theatre's dismal financial record because of what was seen as an inadequate job of promotion.

Fraternities were not happy with *The Gateway*, indicating that all was normal, and Scott Thorkelson and Nolan Astley, the two presidential candidates in February's SU election thought I treated them unfairly in editorials, to the advantage of each other.

Overall, it's been a year full of predictable, but often intelligent criticism. Thanks to all of those who offered their comments this year through letters or personal appearances in my office.

It's been an excellent year for *The Gateway*. Anyone care to disagree?

Gordon Turtle

Our apologies. The editorial that appeared in the last issue called "Less Bears, more porridge," was written by Lucinda Chodan.

the Gateway

The spirit of Harvey G. Thomgirt lives on!

VOL. LXX NO. 49
THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1980
SIXTEEN PAGES

It was the second-last press night, and only the Party faithful were there. Portia smiled as she thought about her lucrative summer job, Keith's eyes glittered in anticipation of what press nights wouldn't be like next year, and Karlos cracked his last series of lewd jokes (Gothic TWAT?). Bruce closed his tired eyes and thought about the next history paper, Julie took a knife to some harp seals, and Rikki clutched his burnt fingers and spoke softly while carrying an enormous Canon. Kennie D. thought about the vagaries of life — and Taras — while Sue Eberlein, W.R. (guess who's coming to dinner?) Glenn, Peter Faulkner and Mike McKinney pulled through scientifically. Mike (Moon) Walker was still enthusiastic but he didn't stay, and Marni didn't know what she was missing. Garnet skipped a handball game to come but David M was off tilting at windmills. As for Ali, she drove us all crazy whistling tunelessly, (I hate Root Bears), Gordon sighed wearily (where in hell is my green jello?) Lucinda shook her head sadly (a quarter of a century is a longggg time) and yours truly, Harvey G. (for, God, how we miss you, Harvey) Thomgirt stayed on till the bitter end.

Special thanks to Margriet (Daisy, Daisy) and Barbee H, and Stompin' Tom Wright. And lovely Mary D.

World class without tenure

There are many problems with tenure and many good things about tenure. As you know during the February Students' Union election I advocated that a five or ten year renewable contract system be employed for all new professors. I suggested further that once a professor had proven himself in the three aspects of his employment; teaching, research and administration, that he be given tenure. This of course conflicted with academic freedom: where a professor may hold views contrary to the university administration, the government and society and not be penalized for holding those views. I have reversed my stand because of reasons discussed below.

Most institutions that employ the renewable contract system are private institutions. There are two reasons this system is used. One, is that

because these institutions do not depend on governments for funding they can afford to affront governments and not fear retribution and two, the nature of their funding is not constant and if financial cutbacks are required one method of making them is to let go some professors. Let it be noted that most, if not all the institutions have an appeal procedure where the institution has to bear the burden of proof that the dismissal is justified.

This system, used in conjunction with tenure has quite a bit of flexibility over the wholly tenure system. A university can meet the demands of society by say, shifting resources from an Education Faculty to a Public Administration Faculty while still maintaining the other very necessary faculties constituting a well rounded university.

University of Alberta is in a very different position.

It depends wholly on government funding and that is reason enough not to consider the renewable contract system. It is not in direct competition with other universities near it and does not have great fluctuations in enrollment. U of A does not have to depend on drawing card professors to attract students. It has a ready made student populace that is subject to small long term adjustments. The system is

reinforcing. We can not separate the chaff from the wheat and try and attract world class wheat because the chaff along with the wheat is on tenure. The University of Alberta has no flexibility financially because of the huge number of professors on tenure and can not make long term adjustments in the professional faculties. The University of Alberta has some responsibility in responding to the needs of Alberta.

It is ironic that the President of this University can say the U of A can aspire to be a world class institution in 10 years and not offer any prescription on how it can be done. In 10 years we will have the same professors, on tenure, and the only difference will be that they are 10 years older. How can we aspire to be a world class institution without world class staff? The government of Alberta has shown us that they don't hold the same aspirations so any changes made will have to be made internally by the administration.

It is also ironic to see the Senate create a task force to find out what the University's purpose is. This demonstrates lack of leadership. I suggest we examine both leadership and tenure.

Scott Thorkelson
Arts III

Indignation faked well

Congratulations Mr. Jens Andersen. Your letter to the *Gateway* of March 27 is one of the best parodies of religious indignation it has ever been my pleasure to read. I actually believed you were SERIOUS the first time I read it. How to go Jens! Just keep 'em coming, they're a hell of a lot funnier than old Kirk what's his name.

Will Bauer
E. Eng. II

P.S. If you really were serious, write in and mention it. Then I'll write back slicing, dicing, and julianing you into very small pieces with my Bic Moulinette.

Bikers must beware

For the safety and convenience of our large pedestrian population certain restrictions are in effect re the use of motor vehicles on Campus.

Operators of motor vehicles are warned that it is contrary to the University Parking and Traffic Regulations to operate a motor vehicle including motor

cycles and scooters on paths, sidewalks, pedestrian or landscaped areas.

This has specific reference to the Quad area north of the Administration Building and offenders are liable to ticketing.

W.F.G. Perry
Director
Campus Security & Traffic

Students in Chile suppressed

Enclosed is a translation of a letter I recently received from Chile. The situation there is becoming increasingly difficult for young people to speak up on problems they see in their educational system, and in their society generally.

International awareness of their plight, and support for their attempts to improve it, is absolutely essential if the people of Chile are ever to do away with the brutal military dictatorship of General Augusto Pinochet, and return to a democratic form of government.

I hope you will find the space in your newspaper to print this letter, and I hope students on your campus will take the time to write a letter of concern and support to the ACU, at the address below.

Thank you very much for your attention to this letter.

Lake Sagaris
Committee Supporting Chilean Youth

The Cultural Association of the University (ACU) must call the attention of the university community of this country, and public opinion generally, to certain events which have taken place during the last few months in Chilean universities.

•Significant reduction in the universities' budgets, with the resulting threat to the academic tasks of research, extension and the wellbeing of the university.

•Widespread expulsion of academics and employees of the

Catholic and Technical Universities, the Universities of Chile, Concepcion, of the North, and the Liceo Manuel de Salas (part of the University of Chile), that isn't based on the academic excellence of those affected; but rather alleged administrative restructuring, budgetary reductions, or, the most serious, ideological differences.

•Moving the courses of philosophy, sociology and social work from the Macul Campus; the only objective reason for this seems to be to break up a community which has contributed so much to the historic development of the university.

•Expulsions and suspension of students, as happened in the Schools of Economics and Architecture in the University of Chile and in the Technical University, for reasons which aren't very objective and are ambiguous, depending exclusively on the individual decisions of the authorities. The Cultural Association of the University expresses its profound concern about these events which are shaking the entire university community and which contradict the spirit of criticism and dialogue which the university should foster.

We express our support for all those affected and in particular with the students of the State Technical University Sergio Saez, Alvar Herrera, Lia Rojas and Richard Campos. These last two were censured for initiating cultural activities in the

forementioned campus.

The ACU, in defence of our cultural inheritance and incentive for artistic creation, cannot remain indifferent to these events which are an outrage to freedom of expression, a necessary condition for the social and cultural development of the country.

Agrupacion Cultural Universitaria
Casilla 6064, Correo 2
Santiago, Chile.

Just a lot of bullshit

When attempting to synthesize the subjectivized view against a statement publicized for the objectivized whole one may tend to bend the thoughts one has in complaint to send; and this is especially applicable to the pseudo-metaphysical like statements made by *Gateway* letter writing regular, John Savard. There is a definite "mystique" created by Mr. Savard's cosmological phraseology (re. for eg. "cosmic muffin/hairy thunderer after his brain" — *Gateway*, April 1) which transcends from the upper-most echelons of obscurant language.

I hope someday Mr. Savard you can write a reply to the *Gateway* and make claims which are comprehensible to us illiterates.

Tony Peacock
Arts 3