

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing editor ..... Ronald Yakimchuk  
news editor ..... Miriam McClellan  
assistant news editor ..... Glenn Cheriton  
casserole editor ..... Marjorie Bell  
sports editor ..... Bill Kankewitt  
photo editor ..... Chuck Lyall

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—After an exhausting weekend including a victorious Roman orgy around our trophy for best bawds at the Great Bathtub Race and a Sturday night dungeon-in, this snake has had it. Ah well! Only two more press nights to go. Those who helped lead us on to victory and a third last paper were: Dan Jamieson, Lynn (Green Bath towel) Hugo, Judy Samoil, Dan Carroll, Steve Markis, Bryan MacDonald, Dave Lehn, B.S.P. (for Bev's Sure Pooped) Bayer (he led the Beer Bottle Walk), Terry (the Tub) Pettit, Ken Bailey (he held the keys to the dungeon), Randy Jankowski, Joe Czajkowski, Brian Campbell, and least but not last, Shorty Picas. Jack Strap got caught in the two-way stretch and couldn't come, but was replaced by the Incredible Lump. Resting up for the bash after Wednesday press night is, your yards of gleaming muscle, Harvey G. (G. for glormifusions) Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton, Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1968

## All quiet on the coast

We will not apologize for belaboring the Simon Fraser situation in this corner because the events of the past week at that Burnaby cement plant does much to illustrate facets of the student radical mind.

The professional press has already laid out the events. There were the grievances of Simon Fraser, Victoria City College, etc. against the rules restricting transfer of credits from one institution to Simon Fraser. The students contended that, to put it mildly, they were being short-changed when entering Simon Fraser.

The students asked for parity of courses and it was denied. So they sat down and refused to move until the Royal Canadian Mounted Police came along and removed them.

This caused a hair-raising reaction and students voted unanimously to hold a strike vote. They liked the idea of sitting out a few classes and besides, it's good ink for the press.

Meanwhile, British Columbia attorney general Leslie Peterson who was, oddly enough, a former minister of education for the provincial government, let it be known that the government was considering shutting down Simon Fraser and let the cement blocks and the slick Gaglardi Drive that leads up to it rust and rot away.

You can see the government's point of view. Here are a few dissident students who are raising a

little trouble and in the process are making the government uncomfortable. Discontent in any matter under their jurisdiction has a unsettling effect on governments.

The students at Simon Fraser heard the rumor that their place might be closed. They calculate that a vote to strike might do the trick.

So they decide they better write exams like almost all other students and forget about strikes because to strike at a university that has been closed is useless and everyone loses.

This situation should, to all other students in Canada, give a precise view of the radical mind. That view should be that the radicals are not arsonists, clods, unintelligent and the rest of it. But they are serious students who are concerned about the university and its present structure. They have an education to work at and they want to do it.

Radicals may rebel against administrations, governments or individuals but in the long run when it really counts, they take themselves and the books more seriously.

The vote not to strike at Simon Fraser makes this quite clear. But whether it is the right move is another matter.

The students at Simon Fraser had the government against the wall. But they failed to call their bluff and now the students are back where they were a year ago — writing exams.

## An issue for radicals

No radical movement can survive without an issue to debate. An issue is welcome fuel to an intellectual flame. Radicals love them.

Up until a few weeks ago, the radical element on campus had been in relatively bad trouble. They sought issues but could find none. They gave up on students' council because it just wasn't relevant. Political science was in the midst of change—no action there.

Then, when times looked blackest, the Department of Sociology decides to institute a small central committee to handle all its administrative duties. No students, just four faculty on this committee.

In short, the new committee appeared unrepresentative, authori-

tarian etc.

The radicals jumped into action. Here was an issue they could beat to death and students would be interested in it because there are an estimated 4,000 students enrolled in courses offered by the Department of Sociology.

People in the sociology department should be kicking themselves in the backside about this. There is no way they can undo what has been done and still save face. They have to fight the radicals now.

But had they waited just a while longer—when new structures could have erected without the innovating of a small committee that appears dictatorial—all would have been easy.

## A personal protest against certain activities

By James C. Hackler  
Associate Professor, sociology

As a sociologist with an applied interest in social problems, I would like to express my personal protest at some of the activities that have consumed my time this fall. This year my time has been taken up by numerous departmental meetings that have accomplished nothing.

Personally, I feel the main reason the sociology department has functioned so badly this year is that Professor Whiteside has been unwilling to accept democratic procedures. I did not object to his minority opinions. Dissident views are important to the democratic process. Sometimes I even shared them. But I was annoyed by his rude manners at faculty meetings where he interrupted others, spoke out of turn, and attempted to dominate certain discussions with utter disregard for others.

While this behavior displays lack of concern for others, it could be endured. What could not be endured was his continual effort to thwart democratic processes and enforce his minority views on the rest of the department.

Several of his colleagues attempted to express their disapproval in a gentlemanly manner. But it had no impact. When a self-appointed Messiah comes to your rescue, it is difficult to convince him that you do not want to be saved. Their patience exhausted, most of the faculty felt the need to take action.

A petition to remove the present executive committee was signed by 18 faculty members. No one stated publicly that Professor Whiteside's self-centered activity had made a farce of the democratic process. While I respect the gentlemanly reserve displayed by my colleagues, it may be time to call a spade a spade. I feel dirty joining this mud-slinging contest, but I feel many of the colleagues are being unfairly maligned.

On Nov. 18, at our staff meeting, a motion to table the issue of departmental reorganization was voted down 13-7. The discussion on the motion to recall the executive committee was admittedly very brief. Professor Whiteside was only permitted to speak two or three times; more than anyone else, as usual. In addition, he interrupted and spoke out of turn, as usual. The motion to close discussion was

passed 15-3. At this point six persons left the room.

It was admittedly a harsh action. Professionals are naturally hesitant to censure the behavior of a colleague. I am certainly sympathetic toward those who felt the action was too harsh. However, I feel the issues were quite clear—a minority has attempted to manipulate the majority and prevent effective action. Most of us felt the circus had to end. There was work to be done.

Several red herrings have been tossed into the picture. The first is graduate student participation and representation. Contrary to fraudulent statements made by others, the faculty has clearly taken a stand in favor of graduate student representation. The spirit of the recommendation by grad students, regarding 35 per cent participatory voting in departmental decisions, was unanimously approved by the faculty. The mechanics for implementing procedures are still to be worked out. The faculty has suggested that two graduate representatives join the four faculty members on the executive, all with voting privileges. Grad students have had difficulty choosing two representatives. This is not surprising under the present circumstances, but our graduate students have ingenuity and will certainly work out a solution.

Another red herring has been the claim that the department has broken faith with the grad students by electing a new executive. On Nov. 11 our staff voted not to make any decisions regarding graduate student requirements. Nothing was said about other departmental matters. On Saturday, Nov. 16, an open discussion was held on graduate student issues. It had been agreed that the deliberations of this meeting would have no binding force on anyone.

I feel the choice of representatives should be in the hands of those represented. I would resent having deans, or students choose which of MY colleagues shall represent ME. While graduate students should select their leadership without permission from me, I hope that I shall be permitted to select, and even recall, my elected representatives without permission from either students or others at this university.

## They have lost their appeal

An attempt has been made to characterize the new executive committee as autocratic and authoritarian.

Personally, I feel these men may be too polite, too tolerant, and too willing to be fair in handling issues. This will put them at a great disadvantage in dealing with those who do not share these characteristics.

Professor Whiteside seems concerned that three of the four executive committee members are new to this university. He does not point out that his most ardent co-conspirator is Dr. Saghir Ahmad, a post-doctoral fellow invited to our department this year to do research. Dr. Ahmad has concentrated instead upon disrupting the sociology department as much as possible. Since he has a one year appointment, what are his motives? He has applied for a position at this university and is threatening to lead student protests, sit-ins, etc., unless his demands are met. Dr. Ahmad would probably deny this attempt at blackmail, and a few of my colleagues may feel I am being unfair; but personally I cannot conceive of these actions as designed to help any oppressed groups.

It is unfortunate that faculty members who have lost the respect and tolerance of their colleagues feel compelled to appeal to students.

Since graduate students in the sociology department have not permitted themselves to be led by the nose, it was necessary to find other students to "take over" the Tory building on the basis of distorted information. I was reassured when I saw how students did not permit themselves to be used as puppets at the "rally" held in front of the Tory building Friday, Nov. 29. Stu-

dents displayed an interest in learning some facts and when Ahmad attempted to keep Professor Charles Hynam of the sociology department from speaking, they objected.

Mr. Bordo and his colleagues are playing a curious role in this affair. Frequently, I have been in sympathy with causes espoused by this group. But do these outsiders feel that our sociology students are incapable of speaking for themselves? Does Mr. Bordo feel that graduate students such as Peter Boothroyd are timid, afraid to speak because of fear of our faculty? As a self-appointed savior, Mr. Bordo has evidently underrated our graduate students. While I may not always be in agreement with all of our graduate students, I have no doubt about their ability to speak for themselves. I believe that our students and our faculty will be able to stumble ahead and in our own clumsy way resolve our problems. Others may welcome your aid but I doubt that we need outsiders to come in and tell us how to run our department.

Protest movements are an important part of democratic procedures. We could use more protests for worthwhile cause.

It would also be nice to have time to prepare lectures more effectively instead playing at petty (and dirty) departmental politics. I find it ludicrous to see time and energy wasted on a protest primarily to solve the ego of a few individuals whose primary goals are to call attention to themselves and who are seen as behaving like juveniles by the majority of their colleagues. I prefer to spend my time on more important social issues.