

A challenge

from McGill

Compulsory CUS -- Watch your step

This is one of several impromptu speeches given at the IXth CUS Seminar at the University of Waterloo in Waterloo, Ontario. In it Colin A. Gravenor Jr., a law student from McGill, defines a growing reaction to increased social and political involvement by CUS and other local compulsory student unions. Mr. Gravenor led the successful fight at McGill last year against that union's membership in UGEQ. He also publishes *Resistance*, a private newspaper.

Thinking and studying should be the main preoccupation of every university student. The product should be mature thought leading to thoughtful action. However such action must only be within the rights and privileges of the student.

Thoughtful action should be the only action of a student or a student society. We should know exactly what we are doing, why we are doing it and what our rights are to do it.

If we do not know each of these things we do not have the right to act. This is one of the reasons why students at this time should consider a future with more thoughtful and less thoughtless action.

It is apparent all emotionally normal students are selfish, self-centred, active, aggressive and ambitious persons.

I have read and re-read the Eighth Annual Seminar Report of CUS dedicated to Democracy in the University Community. The proceedings and discussions were lead by some of the most knowledgeable representatives of student and faculty life.

For the most part the discussions revealed well thought out and sincere convictions, advocating a new and greater social and political participation and responsibility for students.

It seems the ideology of a liberal education free of inhibition and restraint is endorsed, and at the same time the inflexible authority of majority rule is accepted.

My impression is the report contains many assumptions we cannot accept. There are attractive fictions repeated often enough by impressive people to be more widely accepted than truth. The proper presentation of inaccurate statements can often generate more noise and brilliance than it merits, and the soft sound of truth and the pale imprint of reality vanishes.



SAM GUPTA STATES HIS CASE

... a University of Toronto graduate student speaks to the point at the IXth annual CUS Seminar.

While the report of the last year's seminar does contain material of sound value there is much that is a distortion of truth, and some that is contrary to fact. The main fault I find is support for the idea of taking away the freedom of choice of students in the name of greater social or political responsibility.

We have a different theme this year. From what I have heard the melody if not the words have not changed.

Through these discussions we find recognition of student ego—self-centered interest often disguised as public service—and the student claim that he is the elite with quite unique responsibilities.

Have too many members of the administration, faculty and student body succumbed to the error of believing student propaganda?

What evidence do we have, other than the student's claims, that the world awaits the student to deliver it from its agonies.

What makes CUS think it knows what is best for the students of McGill or the 50 individuals in this room?

We have abandoned reason if we think that somehow the university

student is the chosen member of society to guide lost souls from the wilderness of want, trouble, persecution and strife.

Put aside the dreams of what we want to think we are, or what we want the world to believe we are, and let us examine each other, and the sum of our many parts, the student organization. Unless we can recognize the truth in ourselves, our organization has no basis.

The theme chosen for this seminar suggests this student generation faces a crisis of identity and anxiety.

Let us question this!

First consider the crises—if any—in our identity. The theme speaks of a single collective identity applying to all students.

There is no single student identity.

There are as many identities as there are individual students, and each day and each hour they are changing in the competition and conflict of our existence.

What, then, is the individual identity of a student? What are his common factors and motivations?

It is apparent all emotionally normal students are selfish, self-centred, active aggressive and ambitious persons.