

nb

today on page five we have a speech given to the 30th cus congress by a mock candidate for president of the organization—his intention to run was not serious, but his message was.

philosophy student wayne hankey, of the university of king's college, canada's smallest university, raises some problems of the role of the student in the academic community and in society at large

a philosophy for kings and students

Mr. Chairman, delegates, observers: From the eighth book of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, or rather, the ninth: "Intellectual actuality is life."

From the *Commentary* of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, "Operation follows being—Operatio sequitur esse."

"All men by nature desire to know."—first book of *Metaphysics* of Aristotle.

These principles are in precise contradiction to those expressed by Mr. Armstrong (president-elect of CUS). He says: form must follow function. I say, on the other hand, operation follows actual being.

The concrete thing with its own particular form or nature is what is prior; its function, operation follows from this. It is from the nature of the student that his function follows; there is a casual relation between what a thing is and what it does. Any other view is to deny order in the world—and I mean that.

My three principles: number one: My principles are in opposition to any false separation between thought and the practical, and between student as student and the political man. The student is the most radical member of society and if the student union is not the most revolutionary element of society, it is simply because its members are not truly students. The student is essentially radical and revolutionary because he is concerned, as Aristotle says, with the principles and causes of things—with the principles and causes of actions. No finite limited conditions of the practical world restrain him—he is free.

What we need in this union is real students. It is an amazing thing, I think, that in the qualifications that were given for candidates, only my mover mentioned what I studied. This, I think, is really remarkable. I have, however, taken some time to discover what the other people who have proceeded me study. I found that one is an English student. We must beware of English students. English students are Sophists—ask Aristotle.

But now quite seriously, English students are Sophists, and I think the speech of a certain member who came before us has indicated this. It was a mere arbitrary adoption of principles—a mere stance. That's how you get ahead in English departments. If you can only adopt the most peculiar stance in the department, you're sure to be made head.

Another gentleman who I've heard of is studying political science and international affairs—a pragmatic approach. This is the kind of person who thinks that everything can be arranged. Mine is the view that all forms of abstract pragmatism separate from thoughts are by definition impossible for the student. He is committed already to the actuality of thought, that is, thought as an activity—thought as, on



—Bill Miller photo

PHILOSOPHER WAYNE HANKEY

... bureaucrats are out—most of you are finished

the one hand, being free, and on the other hand, manifesting itself.

To refer to my second principle, "Operatio sequitur esse"—the relationship between the being, the concrete actuality of a thing and its operation. We ought to be very clear about the dialectical relation between thought and the concrete thing. As long as people in the Maritimes are incapable of succeeding in practical affairs, in arranging things to their satisfaction, in acting freely, they are going to think that they are unfree. It's a vicious circle. On the other hand, the only way that people on campus and people in the provinces in general can demonstrate their real freedom is to begin to act, begin to mobilize, begin to do. Only once they have had the experience of doing and acting freely, of running their own lives, of politicizing their own campuses, are they going to be relevant either to this nation of Canada or to the Canadian Union of Students.

Now, to go on with some comments about freedom. If a student is free, it is because he is free from the particular society in which he lives. He belongs to society, but he is not of the society. As the theologians say, he is in the world, but not of the world. And if he is free simply because he does not merely act, but judges the principles of his actions, his life as a student must be consciously political and moral.

The student community must be thoroughly and completely political. How is this to be effected?

Secondly dialectics show us—and I am here referring of course to the study of Hegel (no one here would dare mention a certain man whose name begins with "M.") The study of dialectics makes it clear that thought, consciousness, does not arise from a vacuum.

Thought and the good become universal, become common through their internal conflict. Put the same point theologially, man must become what he is, he lacks original justification, this is called original sin. He only becomes properly conscious or universal through suffering, through the process, or through the dialectic. The problem of being a student, of being for the society through being abstracted and freed from its particular order now is reduced to the problem of securing conflict in the academic society.

That is to say, the development of consciousness in the academic community is the problem of creating conflict within the conceptions in that community itself, so that they may advance beyond the limited static, dead concepts which are the ones that rule us most immediately

in our special studies and interest.

The conflict which will be most responsible in relation to our social role will be that which concerns our action, directs our action toward the existing social order. It is the student government which is the means of this action, and the essential conflict within the student government structure must be ideological, moral, and political. The fact that we must act requires the conflict. We must act in some way in common. In order to agree how to act, a true conflict which belongs to us as students must take place. The nature of the student demands that it be the conflict about the principles and causes of action.

The implications of this politicalization: Bureaucrats are out. Most of you are finished. People will not be elected because they can run dances or because they can run finance committees. These people will be the servants of principle; not the dictators of principle. Discussions will be carried on within the whole context of action and its principles—not in the mere abstract rhetorical eristic argument of such forms as the forensic society. Political causes will be carried on within the whole to what we can and must do—not in the mere toy of the Model Parliaments which now exist.

I think that we have to take example here from UGEQ. UGEQ has taken the stand that it is against the promotion of this kind of abstract and eristic argument in the academic community. It is time to insist that we as students take ourselves seriously and the questions that we debate, we debate them seriously.

And just since we've mentioned UGEQ, I would like to at this moment mention that if I'm elected, Monsieur Daniel Latouche has offered to run as my Vice-President. (Cheers and table-thumping).

My program can be reduced to this formula: As politicians, in the student community, we must be students, that is, we must fight our campaigns on the basis of principles.

We do this in any case, as my dear friend Mr. Charlie Boylan has pointed out. Mr. Boylan is very skilled in dialectic. However, I'm not so very certain whether I could put dialectic (Hegelian) after his name. We must remember that in any case if we run our campaigns on another basis—not on the basis of principle, but merely within the existing order of things, we are in fact supporting the principle of the status quo. No position is a position for the status quo. But we must take positions, we must be political, constantly. That is to say, we must be political as students, as thinking people. This happens on some campuses already, and I think McGill is an excellent example of such campuses, and I think that the authority with which the McGill demonstration, excuse me, the McGill delegation, has spoken at this Congress indicates the effect for CUS and for our student bodies and for our obligations and responsibilities as student leaders which this kind of politicalization will entail. Our mandate will be clear, our discussion will be done before we arrive

at CUS. We will already be conscious of the principles, action will be our orientation here, not a mere catharsis or as someone said, a diarrhea.

The second side of my little jingle is that as students, we must be politicians. This is necessary because of the unity of thought and action which I have already cited from Blessed Thomas and the Philosopher.

This is, I believe, a necessity simply because the university has a position in society which no other institution can fulfill. It is the only institution which is able effectively to abstract itself from the particular condition in which it finds itself and to judge the whole principle of the society in which we are set.

So first as students we must be politicians because it is our duty to the society. Secondly, it is our duty to the university. The gentleman who spoke earlier this evening said that this was the age of the specialist. It is the age of the liberal Anglo-Saxon division of everything. Nothing is related to anything else, except through the corporations. We must oppose this; we must assert the unity of the educational endeavour. It is clear in the very word university; the unity of all the diverse and finite and particular sciences which make up the university.

And this unity is not merely external, but it is in fact a unity which belongs to the very nature of thinking, that thinking always brings itself back to its principle. This unity is found in action. Action as a community requires the unity which conflict is. That seems a very peculiar statement—that conflict is unity, but in fact, it is only when groups of people must act together that all the particular sides come into the conflict. While we must affirm this unity, we must be conscious of the fact of the division of everything in the multiversity. The administration are too committed to the status quo to do anything about it. The faculty show no sign of effective mobilization. The students must provide the unity of the university.

At one time this was provided by theology departments, or it was formerly thought that in the modern age this could be provided by philosophy departments. This is completely mistaken. Philosophy departments in the Anglo-Saxon world devote themselves to trivia. They devote themselves to a technical consideration of mere technical considerations. In fact, any of you who have read any of the Oxford philosophers will know that they have told us that the questions which anybody considers important and which he must answer in order to live, are not really questions at all.

Finally, I would like to make somewhat of an apology. I am a student, I am an academic—this (academic gown) is the testimony. I am not ashamed of being a student, and I really think that it's about time that this organization begins again to be the union of students.