

## Is the university public or private?

Last week 114 students at Simon Fraser University of Burnaby, B.C., widely known as Canada's most radical campus, were arrested and charged under the Criminal Code of Canada. The students had occupied a university building and were charged under section 372 of the code — obstructing lawful interests or use of private property.

Also last week, Dr. Norman Strax, a former professor at the University of New Brunswick, was arrested and jailed for ignoring an injunction which barred him from the campus. Strax had been the focal figure in a minor occupation of an office of a university building.

Both cases treat the university as private property. The Universities Act does nothing to verify or reject this notion. The act is hesitant to even define intelligently what the university is. It states simply that the "university" is a "provincial university" established under another section of the act and managed and controlled by the

Board of Governors which is incorporated.

The university is financed jointly by the provincial government, the federal government and students attending the institution which suggests it is public property with the authority to manage and control it delegated to an appointed body known as the Board of Governors.

If the university is public property, then the moves by the administration in the above cases are illegal in removing students from buildings. If the university is private property, then the administration has legal right to remove anyone from the property. The question can then be raised as to why is it private property when financed by taxpayers.

Consider the libraries. Last year high school students were prevented from using its facilities. Any poor sap off the streets was not able to go in and borrow books—but he must pay his taxes.

Yet, The Universities Act says "it is the duty and function of each uni-

## Reconstruction of a case against the radical students

By Jon Bordo

"It is men themselves that make history, but not according to conditions of their own choosing."

—K. Marx

I would like to take up Brian Campbell's 'analysis' of the SDU and the problem of change at the university. Accused of irrationality, rabble-rousing nihilism, sodomy and general indecency with intent to spark a riot and destroy private property, it would be a fruitful beginning to attempt rational reconstruction of Campbell's case against the SDU, which, as I will show in this and conclude in my next article, is also a case at the same time against qualitative social change of the university.

Mr. Campbell's views on the SDU and the university could be summarized as follows:

(1) As a general attitude toward life, Mr. Campbell believes in tolerance, in respecting the other's opinion, person and property.

(2) At the university, he believes that the only method for achieving its reform is through rational dialogue and consensus based upon a community of interests.

(3) He further believes in the necessity of analyzing the operation of the university and through such analysis, the formulation of reasoned proposals for change.

(4) Mr. Campbell believes in solipsism. He believes that he knows; that he possesses such an analysis. The real world and Campbell's perception of it correspond without even a marginal 5 per cent skew either to the right or to the left.

(1) **Tolerance:** at the SDU-SCM open meeting into which Mr. Campbell inadvertently stumbled, he was shocked by the gestapo tactics of the SDU. Their

behavior, particularly that of myself was clearly a breach of liberal etiquette. The question at hand was whether Jack Bennett, engineering rep on students' council had voted against an anti-discrimination clause in the proposed Student Bill of Rights. Through a series of questions posed to him by myself, it was discovered that **in fact**, (not "seems", Mr. Campbell) Mr. Bennett had voted against that clause with five others including the treasurer of the students' union, Mr. Edwards. It was pointed out to him for the benefit of those in attendance, that such a position was racist, and that to hold such a position makes one a racist, if the term has any meaning at all. That the position held by Mr. Bennett which was to the effect that anybody in a free society has the right to keep out those he doesn't want, including the university (aside from restaurants, suburbs, and fraternities) was exactly the position held by Lester Maddox, George Wallace and all segregationists. In fact, that is their argument, and people who hold such positions are generally referred to in the liberal press as "racists". Mr. Bennett has been character-assassinated according to Mr. Campbell:

"So Bordo decided he would tar Mr. Bennett with a racist brush rather than waste valuable time analyzing his stand, attempting to change through persuasion, Mr. Bennett's position. . . ."

Mr. Campbell is giving SDU wise-counseling: "You must be tolerant to positions which differ

# The Gateway

member of the canadian university press  
 editor-in-chief - - - - Rich Vivone

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

**STAFF THIS ISSUE**—So many telephones were ringing, the place sounded like a church. Here to make marry (Mary?) were Dan Jamieson, Gail Evasiuk, who showed me the way to the girl's can and the wonders therein, R. W. Anderson, Lynn 'fudge' Hugo, Jim Peachy (who watched things develop), Ina Nieuwkerk, who started press night Friday, Rolf Stengl, Dave Lehn, Randy Jankowski, Hugh Hoyle, Dave Hebditch, and Dan Carroll, Ken Bailey and their fellow mole (the Gateway underground) and, the last with the least, Harvie (Solidarity, baby), Thomgirt, who is wondering, if a skulker skulks, does a ghost go?

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, NOVEMBER 26, 1968

versity to contribute to the educational and cultural advancement of the people of Alberta at large." Obviously, when library regulations are considered, it must mean that university students should use the library and then graduate and pass on to the taxpayers what knowledge they have graciously acquired while at class and in the library.

The act also says the Board of

Governors has final say in all these decisions which is just about the slipperiest loophole anyone can find anywhere.

Therefore, an institution maintained on public funds is treated as a private plaything of the administration.

This is not in the best interests of the public or of the students or of the university.

from your own. You should have debated with him, changed his mind through rational discussion, etc.' At that point, it became abundantly clear that Mr. Campbell and myself do not even speak the same language, nor for that matter does any radical worth his redness. Racism is not a debating topic which involves two points of view. ("You should dig my point of view," L. Bruce). One should be tolerant to my racist point of view in a free society; one should be tolerant my nazi point of view. Bullshit!

It is **intolerance** to racism, fascism and exploitation which is required to transform a system which generates racism including Mr. Bennett's racist attitudes. To call someone a "racist," is for Mr. Campbell, a personality attack. He tells us in his second installment that; ". . . It is obvious to most that a man must be separated from a position he holds so he can consider it in a clear logical light." Apply this statement to Mr. Bennett. It had been shown that Mr. Bennett's position was racist and that such a position is irrational. It is obvious that to hold such a position is not merely to think it; thought is not detached from one's lived experience. Bennett conceives the world in racist terms; he lives it. He is a racist. I cannot detach a person's views on racism from his being; his attitude is part of his life experience. Campbell's view would do him well in a social science department. A radical attempts to understand ideas and action within their socio-historical context. Again, Mr. Campbell, the two ships pass in the night.

But what is this genteel tolerant man who upholds rational discourse up to when he refers to Lana Stewart as a "mouse-blond girl" and "this screaming bitch

of revolution", myself as "Mr. Bordo, in his wharf-rodent, revolutionist union-suit" etc. the SDU in general "ratpack". Are these critical terms like racist? His statements about Lana Stewart reveal, I suspect, the same racism towards women that Mr. Bennett has towards black people. No wonder he has such sympathy with those living examples of oppression, Miss Pilkington, Mr. Laing, and Mr. Bennett. Besides, had Campbell studied B. F. Skinner, he would have known that rats can't think let alone behave with etiquette and that is are helluva anthropomorphic imputation!

To conclude this section, I have attempted to characterize Mr. Campbell's vision of the world. Mr. Campbell is a tolerant man. Never to be caught taking a committed stand, caught in the Tiresius rhetoric of the opposition benches at Armageddon, his lucid vision can always see two sides to even a Millenial story. He understands the sickness of a world gone amuck on violence and contact highs. He understands it as a man entombed in a sand-castle understands his fate as he awaits the walls to slowly recede in on him. Only having so much time to do the only thing he can do which is to moisten the sand with his saliva, he knows full well that there is really nothing to be done except to await the end. Brian Campbell conceives the university as one instance, a painful spoke of the General Apocalypse, awaiting the society. Obsessed with violence and pain, he has an uneasy consciousness; one that feels suffering and impending doom, records it and in the last instance, is caught up in a sado-masochistic pagan ritual with it. He cannot choose. He is a Liberal after all.

to be continued . . .