

# What the Hell Is The Cadre Trying to Prove?

The Cadre has heard many complaints about the lack of campus news in the paper. However it seems that we have to be careful in running what we do have. The Cadre has been attacked from all sides for last week's front page article, 'Cadre Makes Its Choices'. The complaint appears to be that we influenced voters directly, thus deciding for them their choice in the election. This has resulted in us being called power-mongers and abusers of the power of the press, to put it simply the purveyors of some of the worst journalism ever seen.

The article was published to act as an aid to understand the interviews which were run in the centre spread and to show where we, as concerned students stood. It was not intended to assure the election of the candidates we supported.

If the article did significantly influence the final outcome of the elections, then there is a problem. However the problem is not with the article or the paper, it is with the members of our student union who would allow themselves to be led like so many sheep.

Unfortunately, this situation may in fact exist in today's university and in society as a whole. People as a whole put too much trust in the media and completely accept what they are fed. If Lloyd Robertson says it, it's true.

Part of the problem is the complete stereotyping of different newspapers (the commercial press). For that reason, alternate newspapers are, with many struggles, appearing. The Cadre is a member of the Canadian University Press which sets, as a first priority, offering students, and the public in general, an alternative to the commercial press. This is why the Cadre has printed articles such as the one on the Canadian Paperworkers Strike in Ontario. No establishment newspaper that I know of has guts enough to run a story like that.

Another misgiving of the commercial press (these are my opinions) is that it fails to take a strong stand on any issues. Maybe this might threaten the control that they have on the public. By not taking stands they are able to subtly support their viewpoint - and in manner that no forthright presentation of your position could ever achieve. Presenting your arguments makes people think about your position (and ho-

pefully accept it thereafter) while presenting only the facts which support it without any argumentation makes them accept your position with thinking about it, out

For example, if you wish to blame labour unrest on the workers, then talk to management about the problem and present only their views. If you wish to support labour, then talk to them. Thus the news comes out biased - and all perfectly objectively (by present standards)!

I feel that taking a stand in a newsworthy conflict is very worthwhile (in fact, it is the only honest journalism) so long as the facts are not mis-represented..

Controversy means discussion and argument, a worthwhile product and one not seen enough at U.P.E.I.

Another problem with our article was that candidates we didn't choose might take it personally. We feel that feelings should have nothing to do with an election, strange as this may seem in our popularity-controlled society. Also, if candidates are to run for public office, then they should be prepared for public evaluation and even criticism.

To those candidates who feel ripped off by our article I say: Would you have wanted to be elected by the type of sheep who would vote

on the basis of what we (or anyone else says)? (If they did) Are elections not an utter farce if candidates are elected in the way that our critics suggest?

If you do not think that any of the above are sufficient to tell why we acted as we did, then there is a letters to the editor column in which you may express your

views.

While our belief is that this action is justified, we would ask that if you do not agree with us, that you still stay with us in our struggle to keep the press free from outside interference. If the press does not agree with you, make it change. All you have to do is to join it.

Tony Reddin

## Criticisms Laid at the Wrong Door

As a result of the Cadre publishing it's choices of candidates in last week's issue, we received several complaints. These came from both candidates we picked and those we didn't. The former felt that we would lose them votes because we picked them (students being naturally contrary to anything) and the latter felt we would lose them votes because we didn't (students naturally being sheep).

For several reasons, I am disappointed with this criticism. Firstly, the idea that students would vote one way or the other merely because we liked certain candidates implies that students at U.P.E.I. are a rather docile bunch of followers. How anyone so cynical could possibly run for office is beyond me.

Even if U.P.E.I. students are influenced by our writing this lies with the students

not us. Surely those who criticised us for expressing our opinion would not say that our right to opinions should be abrogated because of a possible weakness in the student body.

I suppose someone will ask why our opinions should be published. Well, we like students are not automatons. Despite working for a newspaper, we do have our opinions and since this is a presumably free country with a presumably free press, then we presumably have the right to express them.

Now, we of the Cadre staff regret that any candidates in the election may have been hurt by our selections. There was no intent on our part to help or hurt any candidate. Our choices may have been good or bad, but this is

cont. on page 11

