

# Editorial

A problem has come up regarding the abuse of university property: destruction in buildings and automobiles driving on certain lawn areas. In the former instance, a closet door was smashed in the New Residence; a window smashed in Memorial Hall; and urine on first floor Dalton Hall (i.e. someone urinated on the new carpet

on first floor Dalton). In the second instance, some drivers have driven their cars onto the lawn and, especially in this wet weather, the lawn is easily torn up.

This is of direct concern to Junior MacLeod and his men who brought this to the Cadre's attention. It is not only their concern however; it is the concern of us all, since we are all

affected in one way or another - both personally and financially. However, the problem of property damage at U.P.E.I. is by no means new - we are all familiar with it. The question most appropriate is: Why?

First of all, the students at U.P.E.I. do not feel a part of this institution; and with good reason. Like capitalist institutions in our society, U.P.E.I. is set up as a company whose commodity is "education". You buy a degree as you buy a car license - (you must give token proof of competence; however, this is quite easy to feign). However the administration is the real power which remains coldly aloof from the student except in financial matters. Not only is there little or no challenge to excel academically (which is not just the fault of this institution, but of all the social institutions the student has passed through), there is no sense of responsibility or commitment to what he could otherwise take a personal interest in - his educative institution.

University is for degrees; degrees are for good jobs; jobs are for acquisition of wealth, prestige, status, etc.. So why bother as academics when it is not seen as important?

Unless U.P.E.I. commences reconstruction with an eye to human growth and development instead of as a mere degree factory, it will continue with these stupid problems which reveal themselves as symptoms of a capitalist disease!

Stan Dalton



Photo by JIM CROMBIE

## Letters to the Editor



Mr. Editor:  
Might I ask you very seriously if you read the letters you print? I feel sure that you do not really wish to take responsibility for a letter which accuses the faculty in general of drunkem driving, depriving their children, neglecting not only their homes but their classes, and of being regularly drunk and incapable.

Do you realize that these are grave charges, obviously without foundation? You will agree that the Faculty as a whole is tolerant and can take a joke as well as anyone, but we will not stand for unsubstantiated comment which reflects on our moral or professional standing.

Yours truly,

A.I.R. Galloway  
President Faculty Club

Mr. Galloway:-

Indeed I do read the letters we print. In the Sharon Cregier instance I consulted her personally about the letter

that has you so upset.

Unfortunately you interpreted the letter literally - as she feared some would; her real intention was to present an allegorical sequel to the compulsory exams issue which is, in her mind, a ridiculous issue. The point is: if we are going to get upset and paternalistic about students applying for a permanent liquor license, we must not practise discrimination by ignoring that there are other groups on campus who consume alcohol who ought to be subject to the same criticisms.

It is understood of course that no professorial, executive, or any privileged

con't on pg.4