

Editorial

Manipulation and councillors

The executive of the Students' Council consists of the Students' Union president Marilyn Pilkington, vice-president David Leadbeater, treasurer Mike Edwards, activities co-ordinator Don McKenzie and secretary Sandra Young. All are elected on a campus-wide vote while the rest of the council with the exception of the president of men's athletics are chosen by their respective faculties.

The executive meets quite regularly but even the constitution fails to outline its specific duties. The constitution just says the executive committee "shall decide what matters are of an executive character"—whatever that means.

Last week, at the SDU-SCM open speakout, the executive was charged with "manipulating council". According to our dictionary, to manipulate is "to manage shrewdly and deviously for one's own profit". Greg Berry, education rep, used the CUS issue to illustrate his point. He said the Students' Union view that CUS is a partisan group is a partisan view in itself. And he went on to make other references.

Whether this is in fact the case of "manipulating council" is a matter for much debate. But it seems to us that the very people most affected by this are doing nothing about it and these are the councillors themselves.

People can only be manipulated if they are ignorant of important information concerning an issue. If student councillors are doing the job they accepted on election, they wouldn't be subject to such charges. If the councillors bothered at all to do some of their homework, they would be able to laugh at those words.

But strangely enough, we suspect some councillors are worried that

Mr. Berry may be correct. It is certainly true that a lot of them simply don't contribute to council discussion. Among voting members, this is a violation of the trust given to them by their constituents.

Any student who bothers to attend council meetings—and these are few—would know that a lot of annoying minute details are brought up and these hamper intelligent discussion.

But when a major issue is before council—such as the Canadian Union of Students referendum and the World University Service of Canada analysis—too many of the councillors are quiet.

Certainly, during the CUS discussion, the meeting was dominated by a debate between the executive and SDU personality Jon Bordo. Meanwhile, the rest of council sat around and enjoyed the flurry of words.

This has occurred at other instances also.

Councillors are representatives of students. Part of their job is to take stands on issues. If the councillors fail to do this, they are neglecting their job and should either wake up or get out.

Also in this regard, we have heard very little of councillors holding meeting with their constituents—or even advertising same. Apparently, they can't be bothered.

At least one councillor, science rep Dennis Fitzgerald, ran on a platform which included a promise to hold regular office hours. If he has an office and has set up regular hours, we are not aware of it. And if we are not aware, it's a good bet his constituents are ignorant of this also.

In short, it seems they have been a bit slack on the job. That makes possible manipulation a shade easier.

Editorial

The backlash

Last week, the University of Guelph voted to withdraw from the Canadian Union of Students. So did the University of Western Ontario.

This must come as welcome news to pro-CUS forces on campus. If the trend continues, we won't need a referendum because there won't be any union to consider.

It appears that if CUS is torn apart, Canadian students are in fact voting to abolish any national student union. The rumors of the "moderate" union, no matter how true, probably have little to do with it.

Consider now where students stand. No new union will succeed because such a creation will have to allow all interested universities to join. This means some of the radicals will get up and say their two cents worth again and the moderates will sit and listen and the union will fly apart because the radicals will be said to dominate it.

This seems to be the basic problem in a national student union. The conservative or moderate ele-

ment and the so-called leftist element simply cannot agree on anything. They sit across a table and glare at each other and then quit because the other refuses to compromise.

It boils down to one thing—effective debate of whatever the issues are. But they don't want to debate.

Both want things their own way.

Thus there is a serious split not only in CUS but also among the average students. The average student is casting an suspecting eye at his radical counterpart.

And like Simon Fraser, there may be a backlash at many of these places that currently have radical leaders in student government. Prominent here are places such as the University of Toronto and Waterloo. Already Waterloo has thrown out their student government (by petition) and another slate will be elected this month.

This is the new trend. The backlash. And it may destroy any national voice the student has.

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing editor Ronald Yakimchuk

news editor Miriam McClellan

assistant news editor Glenn Cheriton

casserole editor Elaine Verbicky

sports editor Bill Kankewitt

photo editor Chuck Lyall

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Here to put out another six-armed triple-breasted issue this evening was Dudley Patterson (montage-maker) Shragge, Laurie (..... K for Kostek), R. Jankowski, Ken Bailey (who was accused of laying an underage wreath), Alan Douglass, near-Miss Hugo (a Miss is as good as a Mrs.), Judy (in vino veritas) Samoil, Catriona (kegger) Sinclair, Dan Christmas Carroll, Patty (legs) Gilhooly, Glen (I'd like to Patty those legs) Cheriton, Joseph (making Mary) Czajkowski, B. S. Pornographic Bayer, and, of innercourse, Harvey K. J. B. Thomgirt, (and that rhymes with dirt and that stands for filth). (P.S. Peter Johnston, Come Home Whatever You Are!)

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 19, 1968

A continuation of an analysis

By Brian Campbell

"We have been here over four years, but we're kidding ourselves if we think change can come fast, or through one technique of organization. Participatory democracy points out what is essentially wrong with places like Newark—the absence of self-government. But as a pure organizing tool it left a lot to be desired. It didn't explain how leadership could be exercised or how bureaucracy could be used. It didn't anticipate factional conflicts and how to resolve them."

"Hayden is committed, but he is not closed-minded. He would not, as a segment of S.D.S. did at its last national conference, shout down those he disagreed with. He accepts the necessity of violence but sees its limits. "Violence can contribute to shattering the status quo," he has written, "but only politics and organization can transform it."

—Will Tom Hayden Overcome?
Esquire

Tom Hayden is correct about the uses of leadership, bureaucracy, politics, and organization, and the SDU seems not to have grasped what he points out in this crucial article. That was the subject of my attack on SDU's business practices in last week's column, and I am going to continue that analysis now.

The ugly meeting on manipulation and the students' council laid bare the argumentative practices of the campus radicals. They seem to believe that those who disagree with them should be held up to ridicule and personal discomfort. They feel that these tactics cause their opponents to adopt a more enlightened position.

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. When both sides, or one side, of a discussion identify a man with the position he holds, and then try and smear him personally, the result may inspire the new barbarians who like these games, just as lions eating Christians inspired the blood-hungry Romans, but it does nothing towards altering the originally held opinion.

SDU use of these tactics are slowly alienating them from sources of real

power and leaving only the violent alternative open. And after we've burned the place down we will be left with a university where nobody knows what to do next. SDU seems sublimely inexperienced when it comes to using bureaucracy or politics or organization to bring about social change.

As far as can be seen now SDU policy is to take participatory democracy, add the students, stir for awhile and hope for the best. But democracy here depends on educated students, and the students (and this isn't to say they couldn't rapidly learn) are not educated about the university, and SDU, through its policy of alienation, has made academic impossible even if the students were educated.

What, then, are the goals of any organization attempting to change the university given the situation we have now?

First they must educate the students about the university. This is not simple and it can not be achieved instantaneously. Reading a few papers by Marvin Garson on the number of big businessmen on the board of governors at Berkeley does not constitute an education. And the same goes for reading Marx or Che's diary. The truth is the university is an immensely complex social institution. It is an institution with problems, and serious problems at that. We can expect no solutions or improvements until the variables of these problems have been isolated and investigated. The SDU does not seem to have done this sort of an investigation.

Once we have a realistic analysis of the community, the next step is to present that analysis to those in power through our representatives on the governing boards. The position must be presented rationally and unemotionally. If those in power reject the analysis, they must do so on specific grounds—a summary rejection would not be acceptable—or accept it in part or as a whole. Only after we have given the so-called authorities every chance to consider any proposals do we have to resort to use other means.

SDU wants to burn before they can spark social reform.