

## Faculty representation on students' council?

The Editor,

Although in the current period of jockeying for "power" there is some uncertainty as to where the power lies (administration? General Faculty Council? Board of Governors? students?), there are definite attempts of members of various groups to attain participation in various previously discriminating bodies. The best examples of this are the success of faculty members in gaining a minimal number of seats on the Board of Governors, and the students' union a minimum number of seats on the General Faculty Council and apparently also on the Board of Governors. These are good moves but no one seems satisfied yet.

It will not be long before some wise faculty member raises the cry for faculty representation on the students' union council. Indeed, why not? Surely what the students do is of interest to all the university. I suppose even the

administration and the governors might wish to have voices on the students' union council.

I imagine the conservative student opposition will raise the cry that the students' union is a student affair and no one else has a right in it. It is doubtful that this argument could hold water, even recognizing that students and faculty (and administration and Board of Governors) are different. But if faculty do gain admission to the students' union council it will no longer be a students' council. That could be remedied by change of name, say to the University Affairs Council, or some such.

However, analogously, General Faculty Council has also been changed. If students and faculty are different (and I suspect this difference is the point of a university's existence) then joining them in a governing council changes it from a General Faculty Council to something else. If

that is the case, the name should be changed to reflect its changed nature. I would suggest a University Affairs Council or some such.

If that were done we would have two University Affairs Councils, a ridiculous situation, which would not be much improved by changing the name of either one of them. Better they should amalgamate into a single UAC and all work together towards the same ends.

Nevertheless, we must take into account the interests of students and faculty do not exactly coincide, although they overlap widely. Under these circumstances there will surely arise through some sort of activist promotion a new students' council to press for the interests of students and new faculty council to press for the interests of faculty.

If this became the case then the university's academic decisions would be made by a University

Affairs Council, lobbied from one side by the students' council and assailed from the other by a faculty council. All the groups will have their radical and conservative elements, and all will claim a considerable portion of rightness.

It is a bit disconcerting to realize that after all this, the situation will not be much different than that which exists at present, where a GFC toils amid reams of paper, viewed with suspicion from one side by the students' union and from the other by a staff association. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*

The ultimate disappointment is, however, the realization that things such as Boards of Governors and administration are peripheral to the main function of the university, which is the transmission of experience and the utilization of it to modify and improve man's state. The academic functions of the board are largely obsolete; the duties of the administration are

to make easier the job of faculty and students. Sitting on any of these governing or administrative boards is just simple watchdogging, becoming part of a mechanism for obtaining and distributing financial and physical support for the university. Although these functions form the boundaries of the university's growth, and the details of their operations by their nature are often irritating and fail to satisfy many, they remain secondary, the province of administrators no matter where they are drawn from. It will soon be seen that the student as administrator is more administrator than student.

The conclusion from all this is that it is in the classroom that it can groove. That's where ideas grow, changes take place and the questions that you have to ask are set up. Find the good profs, stimulate them. Don't worry about the prez. He has to go where we go.

J. R. Nursall,  
Dept. of Zoology

## Fantasticks — It should have been reviewed this way

The Editor,

On Saturday, Oct. 19, 1968, there appeared in the Edmonton Journal, a critique on "The Fantasticks", this year's production by the Jubilaires Club here on campus.

Edmonton's "critic extraordinaire" claims students are mere "tyros". What does he expect—professionalism overnight? Furthermore, every effort should be made to encourage these youngsters who are interested enough in musical theatre to devote valuable study time to their amateur effort. In other words, Mr. Westgate's advice could be said to be—"Forget about the theatre, Jubilaires, you will never make it."

The question in this author's mind, after reading many a West-

gate review, is simply this: What are his qualifications as a critic and what are his standards? As a professional stage artist myself, I am somewhat amazed at Mr. Westgate's comments and I think it's about time an investigation into his credentials be made.

Now to be specific. "The Fantasticks" is a well-written play showing both sides of life—fantasy and fact. Using the same devices as Mr. Westgate, I shall attempt a critique on the Jubilaires' performance.

Bernie Dombrowski as Louisa brought out the typical 15-year-old girl's romantic dreams right up to the point of her seduction by El Gallo (Ron Sills). In Act Two, after her growing up, there was even a change in the tonal quality of her voice and in her behavior towards Matt (Larry Ethier). Larry Ethier's voice is pleasant, but unfortunately lacks stamina and at times Bernie's exuberance (natural for a teenager) tends to overpower his softer tones.

El Gallo was stunningly portrayed and in Ron Sills there is much potential. It is difficult to tell just how much of this was exhibited. His narration was at all times perfectly clear. (I may add that I was sitting in the last row of the balcony whereas Mr. Westgate had an almost ringside seat).

The fathers of these two lovesick children were quite adequately played except for some of their movements which were not always in unison when they should

have been. Brad Willis's Indian was an object lesson in getting the audience involved. These two death scenes were entirely for their benefit, right down to rolling off the stage into the audience.

The orchestra, without the benefit of a conductor, which could not be worked into the set, erred on the side of volume at times, but was fairly stable throughout.

Overall, the simplicity of the set and the involvement of the characters matches anything that I have been at England's Drury Lane. The performance, however, was not as professional as Broadway or Drury lane, but for an amateur group, even a nit-picker like me was satisfied and relaxed after the show.

G. E. Austin

**This is page FIVE**

## Inequality is synonymous with the land called Mexico

*I am a communist*

Because I see humanity in pain,  
Under the boot of imperialism,  
Because I see the peasants suffering,  
And because the braceros are leaving.

*I am a communist*

Because the people don't even  
have the right  
To ask that they be treated justly,  
And because the salaries are meagre,  
And because there is no equality.

MEXICO CITY (CUP-CPS) — Although these words, taken from the wall of a strike-bound Mexican university, reflect the politics of only a few students, they do reflect the surroundings of every Mexican student. In a country which makes the American press with its annual report of a 7 percent gain in gross national product and its election every six years, this may seem a contradiction.

This seeming contradiction is, however, a reflection of the great inequalities which have long existed in Mexico. Even as far back as the beginning of the 19th century, a visitor to Mexico called it "the land of inequality".

A century later the Mexican Revolution was fought to eliminate these inequalities. In this struggle most of the fighting was between rival factions, not between revolutionaries and the old guard. Early in the war the landed aristocracy which had been governed by Porfirio Diaz was defeated. What followed

was a struggle between the militant agrarian reformers, Pancho Villa and Zapata, and the emerging entrepreneurial class led by Carranza and Obregon. The eventual triumph of the entrepreneurs set the stage for both the successes and failures of Mexico in the last 50 years.

In 1927, ten years after the end of the revolution, the dominant faction founded a political party which has grown into a monolithic structure known as the PRI, Partido Revolucionario Institucional. The PRI, which has never lost an election for president, governor, or senator, is the dominant factor in the Mexican political scene.

The PRI's domination has had its rewards, but the price has been high. The PRI has given Mexico stability and economic growth which can be equaled by few other Latin American countries.

One obvious price of this domination has been the inability to effect change from outside the PRI. Since the results of the elections are a foregone conclusion, the PRI holds the power to choose officials through nominations which take place behind closed doors. Similarly the labor movement offers little opportunity for change, as it is made up of government-controlled unions.

In the few instances in which the labor movement has become a force of change, it has been brutally crushed by the government, as was the

1959 railroad strike. In the past the student movement has also been impotent, due to both government control and brutal repression.

The PRI has also been unable, or unwilling, to cope with rural poverty. (Ironically, this was the main issue of the Mexican revolution) The government's program of land reform has consisted of giving landless peasants small plots of land in agricultural communities called ejidos. In these communities the peasant has use of the land and its crops, but may not sell the land. Combined with this land distribution is a program of government technical and financial aid to the peasant.

In actual practice the program has largely been a failure. Most of the peasants receiving land have had little education and don't adjust readily to modern agricultural techniques. More important, the government has failed to put sufficient resources into technical aid and agricultural credit. Rather than diverting resources to agriculture, the government has promoted investment in more lucrative industrial projects.

The net result has been to divide the land into small, often inefficient units, which have done little to raise the standard of living of the rural population since the Mexican revolution.

In addition, the land problem is heightened by population increases.

There is little land left to distribute to the increasing population, and what is distributed is often of poor quality. The recent growth of large farming operations has taken up much of the productive land. As a result there are still two million Mexican peasants without land.

This situation, has resulted in the country dwellers having an income only one-quarter as high as the city dweller. However, inequalities do not end here. The working class is divided between those who are members of the government-controlled unions and some ten million who have no union representation at all. Confronting the workers are the wealthy and the powerful who have the backing of the PRI. As a result, the benefits of a rapidly expanding economy have remained mainly in the hands of politicians, the professionals, and property owners.

Another price paid for stability and rapid industrial development is the increased control of the Mexican economy by American interests. The result of this is that more than half of the top 400 corporations have strong foreign interests—many cases controlling. Combined with this foreign control, mainly from the United States, is increasing American cultural influence in Mexico, ranging from the Reader's Digest to the ever-present Coca-Cola.

Although American domination has long been a sore point in Mexico,

during the term of the PRI's incumbent president Diaz Ordaz, American investment has been flowing in at an increased rate. Criticism of American financial control and Diaz Ordaz's furthering of it are two of the topics drawing the loudest cheers at student rallies.

Despite these various shortcomings, the PRI still seems to be firmly entrenched in power. Political opposition is token and mainly serves to give the PRI a facade of democracy. The labor movement has sold out to the government and workers are either trying to make ends meet or to achieve middle-class status. The campesinos are unorganized and their takeovers of large land holdings have been repelled by the army. Jaramillo, the peasant leader who managed to organize peasants around militant demands in recent years, was killed by the government.

The current student movement is the first nationwide organized opposition to the establishment. At present, the students' liberal demands do not threaten PRI control. However, many students have gained a radical political perspective and may come back to haunt the government, just as a young lawyer named Fidel Castro did in Batista's Cuba.

In the meantime, Diaz Ordaz will stay in power and his successor will almost certainly be the PRI candidate for the 1970 elections.