



The Dalhousie Gazette

CANADA'S OLDEST COLLEGE NEWSPAPER

Published by the Dalhousie Student's Union
Halifax, Nova Scotia 429-1144

Editorials printed in the Dalhousie Gazette express the individual opinions of staff writers, or the Editors. This must be noted in all reprints.

Volume 96, No. 9, Halifax, Nova Scotia, November 5, 1965

J. TERENCE MORLEY
Editor-in-chief

DAVID DAY	Associate Editor
CHRISTOPHER CORNISH	Managing Editor
TIM FOLEY	News Editor
PIERS GRAY	Feature Editor
BOB TUCKER	Sport Editor
JACK YABLON	Business Manager

Asst. News Editor, Linda Gillingwater. Literary Editor, Jane Massey:
Music Reviews, Pat Mowat Staff: Liz Shannon, Chris Brookes, Frazer Sutherland

McGill policy disturbing

"If it comes to a choice between CUS and UGEG we will choose UGEG."

The speaker is Sharon Sholberg, President of the McGill Student Council. CUS is, of course, the Canadian Union of Students, and UGEG stands for Union Generale des Etudiants du Quebec, the breakaway student union formed last year by the universities of Montreal, Laval and Sherbrooke.

Since this statement, McGill and Sir George Williams University, both in Montreal have been accepted by UGEG as full members of the French-speaking, unilingual organization. Sir George has not been a member of CUS since 1961, thus no problems arose in its membership application. However, McGill is a leading member of the Canadian Union of Students and this created certain problems at the UGEG conference.

According to the UGEG Constitution no institution may be a member of UGEG and of another national union of students (i.e. CUS) at the same time without special permission from the Assembly. Since McGill was reluctant to leave CUS the motion presented to the Assembly by the Executive of UGEG to admit McGill contained a clause which would have permitted her to belong to both organizations.

This neat solution ran into formidable opposition from the Universite de Montreal who felt, quite naturally, that by admitting McGill, their own influence in UGEG would be severely curtailed. At their behest Robert Nelson, the incoming President of the Union moved that the clause permitting dual membership be deleted. The amendment was carried overwhelmingly. The motion before the Assembly was now "be it resolved that McGill be admitted to membership in UGEG". The Montreal people assumed that by deleting the dual membership clause McGill would withdraw her application (as did Loyola under these conditions). However, Miss Sholberg's people remained firm and by a near unanimous vote McGill was admitted to UGEG.

At first many observers felt that Nelson's motion meant that as soon as she joined UGEG McGill was out of CUS. It would appear, however, that this is not the case inasmuch as McGill is still bound by the CUS Constitution, which only allows for withdrawal at a Congress. So McGill seems to be in both organizations for at least the next nine

or ten months and perhaps even longer. Some student leaders at McGill argue that since the Assembly voted simply to admit McGill without any riders attached and with the full knowledge that she was legally bound to CUS for at least another ten months that the motion itself constituted permission from the Assembly to retain dual membership until the Assembly expressly requires her to leave CUS.

However, it is highly unlikely that the firebrands from Montreal will accept this piece of sophisticated procedure, and it appears that at the next Congress McGill will, if Sharon Sholberg has her way, withdraw from the Canadian Union of Students in favour of UGEG.

The Gazette is very disturbed by this move. At the Lennoxville McGill played a leading role, indeed a key role, in almost every major debate and decision. As the leader of the progressive universities she was mainly responsible for ensuring that National Student Day would take place. By leaving CUS, McGill could drastically slow down the emergence of a real student movement in English-speaking Canada.

But even more important than this is the theoretical havoc created by the move. At Lennoxville the delegates decided to recognize UGEG as a national union of students by the latter's own definition. The delegates who favored this resolution, including those from McGill, argued that UGEG must be considered at national union because French Canada was a nation in a very real cultural and linguistic sense. That's fine, but only if UGEG is composed of French Canadian universities, of which McGill is most assuredly not one. By joining UGEG, McGill and Sir George have turned it, at least in theory, into nothing more than a provincial renegade.

The Gazette trusts that McGill will present to CUS and to its members, an explanation of why she felt that she must join UGEG. The Gazette hopes that CUS and the universities in CUS will delay making any statements on the move until this is done because of the potential harm such statements could cause to Canadian national unity.

The Gazette expects that if an explanation is not forthcoming very quickly that Dalhousie will condemn in the strongest terms McGill's "inconsiderate" move.

Federal election: a mess confounded

The annual federal election has ended. The mess in Ottawa has been compounded with no party able to claim a victory. For the Liberals the election results were an unmitigated disaster. They are still a minority government even though their only campaign proposal was for a majority Parliament. Now they are even minus the ability to dissolve the House of Commons when the Opposition becomes recalcitrant, and in addition without an M.P. with the geographical credentials to become Minister of Agriculture. Also the prestige of the Prime Minister is surely at its lowest ebb.

The Conservatives are in somewhat better shape but despite their gains are still out of office. Also the election results seem to have confirmed Mr. Diefenbaker in the leadership which must always bar them from forming a government in this country.

The New Democrats made substantial gains in terms of popular vote but the number of seats they won hardly justifies their sometimes indiscriminate use of the term "major party".

And as for the others, well, they don't count.

In their collective wisdom the Canadian electorate decided to give all the politicians a good swift kick.

This newspaper believes that in doing this they responded most appropriately to the phyness of the last campaign. Instinctively the people of Canada knew that not one party talked about the real issue facing this nation. In other words not one party talked about national survival.

This country is rapidly being taken over by the American corporations. Almost all our rubber and automobile production, and well over half our natural gas and oil, our mining and smelting, and our manufacturing is in American hands. As one young politician has remarked, "Americans own Canada, lock, stock, barrel and Bomarc."

There are those of us in Canada who wish to preserve the good things about this country. There are those of us who wish to

build in Canada, a society which does not accept "holus bolus," the values and structures of the behemoth to the South. There are those of us who are prepared to make economic sacrifices in order to buy back our country.

But our politicians didn't challenge us with these ideals. They didn't ask for any sacrifice from Canada's young people.

Instead they paraded before us a host of squalid scandals, and a few crumbs of welfare legislation. They talked incessantly about Dorion, furniture, pensions and medicare. They forgot to talk about values and about power---real power. Even the New Democrats were too busy with social security to give much thought to the quality of our society over the next few years.

How long can Canada survive its irrelevant leaders. . . how long indeed?

Faculty finked out

It's probably a bit late to complain about faculty participation in National Student Day . . . but just for the record.

The Gazette had hoped that many more of the leaders of the academic community would join with us to express their solidarity with the ideal of lowering the financial barriers to higher education. We had hoped that the faculty would consider themselves to be close enough to their students to join with them on the march.

However the faculty finked out. Though they were invited they kept to themselves, some even holding classes at the same time as the march.

We were a bit upset by this aloof attitude which is contrary to any idea of the university being a community of scholars.

But then what can you expect in a university with four sexes, male students, male staff, female students, female staff.



...and...all...sit...down!

Free university education

Reprinted from THE MONTREAL GAZETTE

The idea of free university education has its strong appeal, and it has entered into some of the promises in the current election campaign. But it is an idea that deserves fuller examination. The chief difficulty is that all governments, even now, are making huge outlays on education. They will have to make outlays vastly greater if they are even to maintain the rate of university expansion to meet the growing need.

The question, then, is whether this is a time to increase the burden still further by adding the costs of free university education.

Some of the difficulties in free university education were outlined this week by Dean Stanley B. Frost of McGill University, in his address before the Canadian Club of Montreal.

He asked whether it would be fair or possible to leave other students outside such a plan. Education has become very wide in recent years. The student taking his vocational course at such an institution as the Montreal Institute of Technology, or taking a course in typing and shorthand to meet the needs of earning a living, or going to evening classes in electronics, or studying for a career in drama or the stage could claim that his education should be free also.

"Education today," said Dean Frost, "is a vast and complex undertaking, and to single out the full-time university student alone for free education seems to me

unfair. But for the community to pay everybody's education bill would be to make insatiable demands upon our resources."

There is another question. Would free university education be, in every way, an improvement? It is easy to say that it would be, in that it would make education easier for all. But if universities are to maintain some degree of freedom of choice, they have to consider whether this freedom would continue if their sources of income become excessively concentrated in government's grants.

The immense amount of money governments are now giving to universities is increasing the degree of control that they are exercising. Up to a point, this is inevitable; and, if judiciously exercised, it is not objectionable. But if the dependence on government becomes so great that the freedom of the universities to make their own decisions dwindles away, the life of the universities will dwindle also. If the universities can do only what governments are willing to pay for, their freedom of choice has become precarious.

It is in the student's interest to have his own freedom of choice as to the studies he wishes to pursue. If governments exercise excessive control over universities, they may reach the point of deciding how many students are to be trained in different subjects, or different professions.

"I maintain," said Dean Frost, "we should lose some of the most important values in our educational system if the universities

of this province ever became state universities, such as are found elsewhere in North America. At the present time university education in this province is partly state-directed and partly a matter of private enterprise and in my opinion we lose a great deal if the present balance were to be fundamentally altered."

In the nine Quebec universities and major colleges, state grants in 1963-64 totalled some 41 per cent of the operating, non-research budget. About 30 per cent came from student fees, four per cent from gifts and five per cent from endowments. The proportion of government grants will undoubtedly increase, and will have to increase. But this will make more important, rather than less important, the sources of income that are not government-provided or government-controlled.

At the present time the number of scholarships, bursaries, loans and student-employment plans offer wide help to the student who seriously needs assistance in paying his fees. There is, as Dean Frost says, "A wide range of opportunity for all, and individual initiative, individual choice and individual effort are in our present system values of the very greatest importance."

Before suggesting that university education should be free, it is necessary to consider, first whether (in view of all the other demands for education) it is possible; and to consider, secondly, whether, if it were possible, it would be desirable. There are certain situations in which something for nothing becomes a poor bargain.

Young idealists of '60's Students find niche in history

By A. ALAN BOROVVOY
Copyright, 1965
Saturday Night

I envy the students of the Sixties. Their demonstrations, picket lines, parades and marches bespeak an excitement and idealism that have been absent from campus life for more than twenty-five years. By comparison, my own student group of the Fifties was pretty anaemic.

This new activity has not been merely exciting, however; it's also been effective. It has made history. The civil rights movement which has inflamed the United States was itself inflamed by the contemporary generation of students. They have manned picket lines, taken freedom rides, staged sit-ins and filled southern jails. Last Spring, the students even managed to ignite Toronto. Their sit-down before the U.S. Consulate inspired restaurants to send them free food and housewives to spend their days cooking for the picket-line. Businessmen brought them coffee-urns. Members of Parliament, labour leaders, clergymen (including the Anglican Suffragan Bishop of Toronto), all marched with the Toronto students. A few days after the demonstration began, hundreds of adults overflowed the Metropolitan United Church at an interdenominational service in support of the American Negro. Then, two thousand solid Torontonians, with four hundred clergymen in the lead, marched to the U.S. Consulate. Many of them had done nothing of the sort in their lives. Some of them even sang out loud. All of this started with the students.

North America desperately needs this exciting capacity for leadership and social reform and therefore, I think, we must try to understand the character of student idealism. What caused it and where is it going? Will it continue or will it collapse? What are its prospects and its problems?

Only a few years ago, educators and journalists complained that North American students had no guts. They described students as conservative, conformist, materialist, and middle-class. Social scientists complained that young people were lost in the



"lonely crowd". University pre-sidents pleaded for character and dissent. The students did not respond. In the early Fifties, a University of Toronto student was detained on Ellis Island after making an inflammatory speech. A University of Toronto professor and a Queen's professor were denied admission to the United States on what appeared to be political grounds. These incidents were well publicized but they inspired hardly a murmur of student indignation. Certainly there were no pickets and no demonstrations.

In 1956, the Hungarian Revolution jolted the world. A hopeful Varsity editorial predicted a student renaissance: "Today's youth, in the opinion of many pundits, are confused and lost. They have no cause, no interest, no spark. The Hungarian Revolt can change that. They can become a symbol of youth's attempts to identify itself -- to right the wrongs their elders perpetrated."

But look at the Sixties. Early in 1960, students paraded their protest against the French nuclear explosion. When the Soviets broke the testban moratorium, they marched again. When Kennedy imposed the naval blockade on Cuba, two student demonstrations appeared at the U.S. Consulate in Toronto -- one supporting Kennedy, the other opposing him.

When an American pacifist professor was stopped at the Canadian border, 200 Manitoba students mobilized a march against the Canadian Immigration authorities within a few hours. Why were students so withdrawn in the Fifties and why are they so involved in the Sixties? Varsity eloquently expressed the causes of student silence in an editorial it published in 1955: "He needs something to cling to, yet he knows there is nothing. Man becomes cynical... he retires to the shell of indifference."

The Fifties reflected the aftermath of war. The mood was despair and futility. Optimistic humanism lay buried under the ashes of Buchenwald, Belsen, and Auschwitz. The hopes for socialist Utopia had died in the labour

camps of Siberia. Technological change was reducing men to automatons. And, of course, there was the Bomb. Existentialist philosophers proclaimed that "death is the final absurdity of life." They revived the idea of original sin and the depravity of Man. Ionesco dramas and beatnik poetry eulogized the age of absurdity.

Now, in the Sixties, the new concern with social justice can be seen as an outgrowth of the quest for personal salvation. The retreats of the Fifties simply did not work. Existentialist theology, beatnik poetry, and money-madness did not overcome despair, or give security, or resolve alienation. Then, late in the Fifties, as the sit-in movement began, the students discovered that the old quest for social justice was a better road to personal salvation, by identifying with the real grievances of the real world they found meaning in chaos.

The students of the Thirties could identify with the unemployed because they themselves were part of the suffering of the Depression. The students of the Sixties identify with the oppressed Negroes because they need

Letters to the editor

PLEASED WITH TEACH-IN POLICY

Dear Sir:
The King's College Student Union is pleased to learn of President Smith's decision to terminate the moratorium on teach-ins at the University of King's College.

We recognize the power of the President as executive head of the university to represent the Board of Governors and to take direct action when necessary in the interests of all bodies within the academic community. A university is a composite organization consisting of a number of groups--students, alumni, Faculty, Executive, and Board of Governors--each of which has autonomous rights and responsibilities as established by the traditions and operative principles of institutions of higher education.

It is our understanding that the moratorium was imposed because the International Teach-In had failed to fulfill its advertised purpose of not focussing "exclusively on American foreign policy" and of providing a forum for the expression of divergent views. In light of the different estimations of the actual nature of the Teach-In as expressed by those who were in attendance, it is not altogether clear whether the Teach-In did in fact fail to achieve these ends. We hope, furthermore, that the grounds for such executive action as the recent moratorium on teach-ins will be discussed thoroughly and objectively in a public forum to be held in the near future.

The suspension has been removed pending fulfillment of several conditions: that future teach-ins be "well moderated", "impartial", and "academic". In their present form, these conditions appear rather vague and we hope that, in the interests of all parties concerned, they could be clearly defined. A number of practical difficulties might arise from the application of these conditions; namely, the restriction of spontaneous crowd reaction, the impossibility of regulating the partiality of individual speakers, and the complications inherent in a chairman's arbitrary limitations upon the areas of debate. We are also apprehensive of the dangers implicit in establishing the means of deciding how these conditions are to be fulfilled. As members of the academic community, we are sincerely concerned with the necessity of reconciling these actions with the traditions of academic freedom.

The King's College Student Union appreciates the time and consideration Dr. Smith has given to the matter and hopes that any misunderstandings which may have arisen through the public attention paid to this problem, will be overcome.

Yours truly,
KING'S STUDENT COUNCIL

STUDENTS WERE "DIGNIFIED"
STUDENT DIGNIFIED
Miss M. Carole Henderson, Chairman,
National Student Day Committee,
Dalhousie Student Union,
Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.

Dear Miss Henderson:
Many thanks for the kind remarks contained in yours of October 29 in relation to your activity on National Student Day October 27 last.

You and your group have a great deal to be proud of as the students represented at that parade did display to the citizens of Halifax that they can act in a mature dignified orderly fashion, and this is somewhat unique when very frequently the daily press carries stories of students who are demonstrating in a violent fashion. Please accept and pass on to the Dalhousie Student Union my congratulations and assurance of our support in any such orderly endeavours in the future.

Yours very truly,
V.W. MITCHELL,
CHIEF OF POLICE.

IF I HAD KNOWN
Dear Sir:
May I use your columns to solicit the assistance of your readers? In brief, I would like to know "What They Wish They Had Known Before Coming To College."

I am now writing a book for Canadian high school and college students. Some of the proposed sixteen chapters are, Selecting a Canadian College, Selecting Courses, The Care and Feeding of Professors, Information Display, Instant Sophistication, The Search for Maturity and Residence Life.

Anyone who has time to write during this busy period may reach me c/o U.N.B., Fredericton, N.B.

W.J. REDDIN
Associate Professor

them. The underclass Negro gives the middle-class student a sense of purpose.

This is not to disparage contemporary student idealism, but to understand it. Art Pape, 23, from middle-class U.T.S. (University of Toronto Schools) and Forest Hill Collegiate, and Peter Boothroyd, 22, from Trinity College and the student naval cadets, are willing to live on \$25 a week as staff workers for SUPA (Student Union for Peace Action). Dianne Burrows, 22, the daughter of an insurance company executive, restricts herself to a similar pittance as local coordinator of the Friends of SNCC (Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee). When asked about the future, she replies, "more of the same."

We cannot dismiss such people as flippant adolescents looking for kicks. They are articulate, intelligent and dedicated, and they are hoping and planning to change the world. They have already made some changes in Toronto. What I fear is that today's idealists are obsessed with a single value; not public ownership, but non-violence. I agree that non-violence is highly desirable and, in many situations, an effective tactic. But it is in great danger of becoming a religion. Many young people already regard it as an absolute. The realistic proponents of non-violence recognize that if it is applied universally it will cause great human suffering. But they believe the moral exaltation is worth the price. They argue that unless we attack a problem without inflicting violence on the man, we can never really solve it.

The philosophers of non-violence keep reminding us that their technique is more than an effective tactic to win civil rights. They insist that it is a way of life. For instance, today's non-violent absolutists call for unilateral disarmament by the West. Even if this were to lead to a Soviet takeover they argue that Communist rule is better than nuclear annihilation. Unfortunately, however, the absence of any military resistance would virtually guarantee Soviet conquest.

—Please turn to Page 5—