

The Editor,

In The Gateway, Nov. 5 a story was published about the proposed formation of a second national union of students, and the text of a telegram was printed.

It has come to my attention that certain people are going to attempt to exploit some inaccurate impressions which have developed about this proposal, and I think the campus should hear the facts.

On Oct 23, I received a letter dated Oct. 7th from George Hunter, first vice-president at Carleton. In the letter he indicated that some Carleton students are considering forming an alternate national student group, and he asked for my opinions “at the earliest possible date”.

The letter had obviously been delayed in the mail, and before I had answered it I received a telegram asking for an immediate reply.

I then telephoned Mr. Hunter to say that I had only just received the letter, that I could make no commitment to his proposal, and that I disagreed with several of the ideas he suggested. I also indicated that Mike Edwards would be in Ottawa this week for the AUCC Conference, and would call Mr. Hunter if he had time.

I received a further telegram from Mr. Hunter saying that some students at other institutions are

interested in the concept of a second union and that a meeting would be held in Toronto on November 3rd. We received no further information about the meeting; we sought no further information; and we were not represented at the meeting.

On Monday afternoon, I received a phone call from Ed Aunger, of Waterloo Lutheran University, saying that several students had discussed the proposal in Toronto and that there is a possibility of another meeting being held at Christmas.

I personally attached little significance to the proposal to form a second union, although I thought we should obtain more information about it. Because we did not have a regular executive meeting last week, the item was not even discussed by the executive. If it had been of top priority concern, it would have been thoroughly discussed by the executive. I was not keeping the information to myself for any malicious reason as certain people have inferred.

This is the third year that the idea of a second national union has been proposed. Last year and the year before, U of A representatives proposed the formation of a new union. It is thus not unusual that Carleton students informed us of their proposal.

The second national union is

not a new idea. But why is Martin Loney so concerned? Why is Jon Bordo and his SDU concerned? Perhaps because CUS has never been in a weaker position and they consider this proposal to be a threat of some kind. They are trying to pressure us into quashing the idea, and they are trying to pressure council into holding the CUS referendum before Christmas, before any concrete proposals might be developed by those who are proposing this second union.

The date of the referendum was established before the idea of the second union was brought up, and on principle I don't think we should now be pressured into holding the referendum before Christmas. It is the right of students on this campus to have the opportunity of examining any alternatives to CUS before voting in the referendum.

I myself am not involved in the formulation of proposals for a second national union, although I have been informed about them. I'm not convinced, either, that a second national union is necessarily a good idea. However, I think we have a right to hear about it, regardless of whether it is threatening to the Canadian Union of Students.

Marilyn Pilkington
President

Any increase in fees will meet resistance

This term, tuition fees in most faculties increased by at least \$100 per student. The announcement was countered by a student march on the Legislature in March, 1968. More than 3,000 university students marched from SUB to the government house despite a cold, windy afternoon.

In the following article, Marilyn Pilkington, students' union president, gives a general outline of the union's thoughts on any further fee increases.

—The Editor

Because of the current provincial deficit and because the formulation of the 1969-70 university budget is still in preliminary stages, it is difficult to predict whether an increase in tuition fees will be proposed this year.

However, it is perfectly clear that any proposed increase would be met by strong and articulate opposition from the student body.

The responsibility for determining whether an increase in fees is necessary rests with two bodies: the Government of Alberta and the Board of Governors of the university.

In comparison with other provincial governments in Canada, the Government of Alberta has been very generous to universities in the past. But if it is sincere in its emphasis on the development of human resources, it must place increased emphasis on education.

Maintain quality

The government must provide sufficient funds to maintain the present quality of the university, offset inflation, provide facilities and faculty required to accommodate rapidly increasing enrollment, and initiate expansion of the university into new programs of study which are vital to the progress of our society.

The government must not look at the university as an institution separate from the society or the public generally. The future of the province and the quality of life of its people depends to a great extent on the quality and accessibility of education within the province and on the willingness of governments to utilize the theories and techniques being developed within the universities.

Financial accessibility

Unfortunately, the quality of the university, which is based on good faculty, libraries, facilities, faculty-student ratios, etc., depends on the amount of money available to provide these things.

And the ability of young people to take advantage of educational opportunities depends to a large extent on the financial accessibility of education.

The province must therefore continue to invest heavily in education.

The Board of Governors, as well as the provincial government, is responsible for the level of tuition fees. The provincial government grants the money, but the Board of Governors allocates it. To what does the board assign priority—holding the line on tuition fees or increasing expenditures, salaries, etc? The board must balance the diverse financial

needs of various departments and groups within the university, but where do the priorities lie?

Last year, when tuition fees were raised, the Board of Governors indicated that it was the provincial government's responsibility. As might have been expected, the Minister of Education, Mr. Reiersen, shifted the responsibility to the board.

Students became involved in the discussions at a late stage when the budget was presented to the Universities Commission. It was too late to participate in the formulation of the budget; therefore our main emphasis was on lobbying with the cabinet and individual MLA's to increase the provincial per capita grant.

This year, we are aware that the problem of university financing is still with us. And we intend to consider and work at the problem from all angles.

Become informed

First, we must become fully informed about the financial needs of the university, investigate them as fully as we can, and compare them with those of other universities.

Secondly, we must participate in the formulation and review of the budget to as full an extent as possible, utilizing our student representation at various levels of university government.

The student representatives on the Board of Governors and the General Faculty Council are assessing the situation and collecting information from this and other universities. Paul Tremlett, commerce rep on students' council and Chairman of the Council's Investigation Committee on University Financing, will be meeting with Dr. Tyndall and other senior administrative officers to discuss university financing problems throughout the preparation of the proposed budget.

New system

But these steps are not enough. We must also examine the underlying principles behind the traditional and current system of university financing. Rather than merely attempting to ameliorate the present system, we must look for new and creative ways to approach university financing in response to the changing needs in our society.

The Students' Union Forums Committee will be presenting a series of programs and speakers about university financing which will probe the underlying premises which support the present system and will hopefully explore alternative approaches. We hope that everyone will participate in these programs and contribute to the discussions and searches for new answers to the problem of university financing.

Marilyn L. Pilkington
President,
Students' Union

The system “turns out Hitlers” — and they're not all white

MONTREAL (CUP)—

Envy, meeny, miny moe catch a whitey by the throat if he hollers cut it.

—Ted Jones, black poet

Black rhetoric, so popular because it's vicious and so vicious because it's popular, threatened to sweep the Black Writers' Congress at McGill into the dank, mysterious regions of Lethe.

But amid the shouting, exclusion and pro forma attacks at whitey, began to grow an articulate, coherent position of black strength.

The conference developed as the newly emergent black consciousness has developed. At the beginning was the black consolidation: Black caucuses, blanket condemnation of whites (“every white man, objectively speaking, is my oppressor”—Dr. Walter Rodney). White credentials were checked closely, black not at all. The press was relegated to an overhanging balcony, and not permitted to use television cameras or tape recorders.

Blacks revelled in the brutal sweeping rhetoric: whites fidgeted uncomfortably—unwanted outsiders. All the preliminary speakers (other than C. L. R. James, a brilliant black historian) devoted themselves to painting the stage a glossy glorious black.

Rodney spoke of oppression and undefined revolution. Whites must kill other whites to win the respect of blacks.

Michael X, a black muslim from Britain, called the whites in the audience “pigs” and said their very presence inhibited his thought and delivery.

Ted Jones, an American poet, read his powerful poetry, a savage, tormented cry of oppression.

Rocky Jones, a black SNCC worker in Halifax, said he was tired of speaking to whites and told blacks to form a common bond to fight white racism.

James was the only thoughtful and restrained speaker of the early sessions. He told of bourgeois control of information, a control that revolution would break. This control of information, he said, is the major obstacle to the development of a

better world. James, a revolutionary historian and long advocate of black power, uses African history as a guideline for a new Marxist revolution.

After three days of press coverage and white audience tension, the conference almost fell into the black uber alles pit. The media tried to be restrained but failed. Blacks were resentful of the treatment and tightened up.

Then, in quick succession, came Harry Edwards, James Forman and Stokely Carmichael. The three took the consciousness and tried to guide it on a new path. The path to disciplined revolution rather than reflexive destruction.

Edwards, a sociology professor at San Jose State and leader of the black athletes' Olympic boycott, said blacks were confronted with a system “that turns out Hitlers—and they're not all white.”

He attacked forms of protest designed to single out individuals when it was an entire system that must be overturned. He defined the black man's enemy as the perpetrator of the system and stressed the need for education about this “genocidal system”.

The sociologist said the system turns out Hitlers in much the same way it turns out “Chevrolets, Jaguars and hydrogen bombs.”

SNCC's James Forman took the process a bit further.

Forman based his discussion on Franz Fanon, “a black Che Guevara”, who isolated lack of a revolutionary socialist ideology, rather than colonial control, as the greatest danger facing Africa.

Forman hit out at black bourgeois leaders in Africa and said legitimate independence must be won by long violent struggle against the oppressor state and not negotiated by bourgeois spokesmen who represent the opportunistic minority.

He denounced the dilution of black power to black capitalism and ended by reading the revolutionary manifesto adopted last June by SNCC. The manifesto deals with Fanon's pan-Africanism.

But it was Stokely who tied everything together. Carmichael is an overpowering speaker, his voice booms fearfully, or alternately soothes. He brought the audience

leaping to its feet throughout his hour long speech.

Carmichael sensed the mood of the sessions and bowed briefly to that mood. At times, he was the old Stokely. The Stokely that delivers the blow to whites that every black man wants to deliver but doesn't quite succeed in doing. These were the usual lines about taking power, grabbing guns and fiery destruction. The rhetoric is the credential. Everybody before had simply shouted their credentials. Carmichael just flashed his and went to work.

After he had thrown his sop to the emergent black we-ness, he proceeded to stake out his own revolutionary dream.

He first differentiated between exploitation, non-racist oppression and colonization (racist oppression). Second, he explained all blacks are Africans whether or not they live in Africa and must deliberately turn to that culture and use it as unifying tool.

Third, colonization makes the victim hate himself and ape his masters—a divisive process. “We cannot let white people interpret our struggle for us,” he said.

When all this is realized the process of education begins, the stage most dangerous for the oppressor. The oppressor will then react in a three stage sequence: he will at first be nice, then employ agents provocateurs, and lastly send in the troops. “The three Ms,” says Carmichael, are “missionary, money and marines.”

“We must begin to develop undying love for ourselves—we must develop an ideology to fight racism and capitalism.”

Carmichael calls for a Marxist-Leninist revolution and wants political, economic and military equality with whites to fight the revolution. He also sees common cause of blacks everywhere.

It wasn't Carmichael's analysis that was important. Whether it be right or wrong or just another stage in his search, the impact was enormous. Suddenly, blacks in the audience, perhaps a little bored by the continual bitch, rose to cheer an ideology, a framework for action.

The conference had been neatly tied up.

**This is
page FIVE**