

# The far, far left look at the "New Left"

**"The student is petty-bourgeois...a parasitic class...exhibiting schizophrenia and insecurity"**

An organization called the Canadian Student Movement (CSM) sent two people to the Canadian Union of Students congress in Guelph last September. They made their presence known by branding certain "leftists" as "fascist pigs". They had other names for moderate CUS members.

In their magazine, the CSM boys presented the following article and, considering CSM believes not in university revolution but universal revolution, it contains some bitter indictments. Some have termed the CSM people as Marxists. Others call them Trotskyites. The CSM interpretation of CUS is that it is anything but "New Left".

—The Editor

Right from the beginning of the congress two lines came up: the 'New Left' said it had a new plan to replace all the old plans that did not succeed last year, and we presented the line which showed how the 'New Left' proposals (which were neither new nor left) and CUS have and will continue to fail. We then articulated the genuine alternative to the elite CUS-type of organization.

Threatened by the worked out ideas which exposed the New Left rhetoric in very clear terms, the 'New Left' hacks formed a reactionary 'holy' alliance with an overt fascist and numerous reactionary student bureaucrats.

CUS hacks have tried in the past to build up far-fetched analogies to obscure the actual relationship of students to the society. 'Student as Nigger' or 'Student as an intellectual worker' were two of the more blatantly incorrect lines which CUS has picked up in order to give it some flavor of 'newness' (à la Trudeau-esque) and to try and prevent the growth of genuinely progressive student movements.

But no fancy 'analogies' can mask the fact that a student is a petty-bourgeois, a part of a vacillating parasitic class which exhibits the greatest schizophrenia and insecurity.

Nor can the fact that we live in an imperialist society be ignored or simply dismissed because a few liberal-bourgeois get 'turned off'. We are, as the CSM representatives at the Congress clearly pointed out, "in a pre-revolutionary period in which the intermediate strata (e.g. the petty-bourgeois intellectuals) have a choice. They can betray their class backgrounds and join the revolutionary struggles or they can become faithful servants of reaction by misleading the working and oppressed people with 'new left' and other bourgeois and petty-bourgeois 'theories' of revolution."

Rather than take a clear stand for or against imperialism, CUS (both the 'New Left' hacks and the reactionary bureaucrats) supported the CIA line on 'totalitarianism'. This is essentially the 'third way' theory that says we can't really fight US imperialism because "what would we put in its place? CIA continuously pushed this line in *The Student* one of their behind-the-???? scenes-financed publications. All the CIA financed journals have said that in the face of the growing antagonism between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat (reflected in the imperialist and anti-imperialist struggles around the world) the petty-bourgeois intellectuals should oppose authoritarianism and totalitarianism.

In the face of this, the 'new left' hacks at Guelph insisted that they had the analysis of Canadian society and that students were not willing to accept their analysis, but that they would 'spontaneously' understand if they were in 'unions' which would demand a third way between revolutionary socialism and US imperialism and their agents in Canada.

Since it was an open meeting, we gave our views on how the 'new left' has been misleading students. We showed that the alternative was genuine mass work to develop the mass initiative of large numbers of students and to put an end to CUS elitism. We demonstrated how a purely structural analysis of the university without a political analysis was obscurantist and reactionary. We called for the adoption of a principled anti-imperialist position.

Until then, the 'new left' had met no serious oppo-

sition. Facing a strong line based on real facts drove the hacks into a frenzy. First they tried to prevent ideological struggle with bourgeois parliamentary procedure (move onto the next speaker making sure he neither develops or criticizes the ideas already presented).

CSM pointed out that the alternative was to undertake mass work based on a principled anti-imperialist stand and following the line of "action with analysis". Only an elitist politician can say that he has 'truth' about a society which was not derived from concrete struggle within that society.

Our comrades resisted the reactionaries' tactics by insisting that the 'new left' advocates should defend their positions by presenting work-out arguments or adopt a worked out analysis for a basis for further development.

The chairman then escalated the reactionary arrogance by giving the floor to an open anti-communist, who regurgitated cold-war slogans and slandered the liberation struggles around the world. We pointed out that he was a fascist, since only fascists unquestioningly support wholesale slanders of revolutionary struggles. The speaker, a U of T student, agreed that he was indeed fascist, but by then pandemonium broke loose—the 'new left' literally ran around the room, shouting and screaming, to prevent any further discussion.

Why were the 'new left' types and the student bureaucrats so threatened by the worked-out ideas of CSM? The reason is that it is vogue to be a 'radical' or a 'revolutionary' nowadays and quite unacceptable to be an overt reactionary. As a result, many careerists and political opportunists are terrified of being exposed for what they are; like Martin Loney, CUS president-elect, a typical 'new left' hack. These bogus people know that the development of mass anti-imperialist student movements will expose them and topple them.

Although not many of the 150 odd hacks who attended the CUS congress at Guelph agreed with the CSM line on CUS, nonetheless it has widespread support among the masses of Canadian students. CSM maintains that in the present historical context the most progressive thing that CUS can do is to disband!

**Phil Ponting says . . .**

## "Wait 'til the September congress"

By PHIL PONTING, President, Alberta Assoc. of Students

On Friday, our campus will be given the opportunity to decide whether or not the U of A will rejoin the Canadian Union of Students. All across this nation, students are looking toward our campus.

When Alberta first withdrew our vote was indeed of national significance, and now as we attempt to re-evaluate that decision, after almost three years of withdrawal, the vote is indeed viewed nationally as the most important referendum to be held on any campus this year.

During the campaign to date, two extremely important questions are being asked:

(1) Do we want to rejoin the organization as it now exists?

(2) If we might more favorably view, as reformed national union, how can we best aid the achievement of this reformation?

In dealing with the first question, many people have stated that CUS is misrepresenting students because of their adoption of certain attitudes and policies. But is

this realistic, during the past three years many "reforms" that have occurred on this campus have resulted because of "crises" that have arisen on other campuses over many of the central principles expressed in CUS resolutions. An example of this type of thing is the issue of student representation on university governing bodies. Certainly, CUS did not do it all by their actions and statements, but neither can our local union claim sole credit for these important steps. Without a doubt much of the reform thought taking place in our society has definitely been aided by CUS expressing a different point of view.

To this end, the CUS has aided a climate of thought to be developed which has given students with more responsible views a chance to begin to play a meaningful role in university life.

But whether that means the CUS views should be expressed on behalf of every student certainly causes me to wonder. While I do value the contribution that CUS should be representative of student thought, I doubt that the same CUS resolutions would be passed if each student voted for himself rather than delegating his vote to their union president at the CUS Congress.

Therefore, I want to join a reformed national union of students. The problem becomes a political one of how to achieve this reformation.

When the U of A withdrew from CUS, an extensive national campaign was begun to smear the image of this campus. During the past two years as more schools have withdrawn from CUS, the

stature of this campus has begun to rise in the eyes of students in Canada. But this opinion is held by many students who share the moderate views expressed by our student government.

To try to reform CUS, the movement would need this type of respect combined with a common purpose of need to reform. However, our new friends have already left the union, and the majority of voting members remaining in the union are happy with the present direction of CUS.

In late December, many of our associates desiring to join a national union that reflected the thinking of their campus, met to discuss ideas by which this could be brought to fruition. The plan is to meet again, (in late February or early March) to formulate a basic framework of concepts under which a national union would be formulated composed of people presently outside of CUS. Because these potential reformers do respect our campus and have a similar outlook, I feel our chance of reforming CUS is at present better by joining with them and working from without. Contrary to my viewpoints this position is the one that will require courage and political expertise. I feel we have the people on our campus who can provide these qualities to the national student movement.

Two years ago we voted to withdraw hoping that other campuses would join with us in a re-evaluation of CUS. Now that they have joined with us, I feel we should continue outside CUS until these people make their move in early September.



## Science rep — "it is time to rejoin CUS"

The most important question students must ask themselves in regard to the coming referendum is "Do we need a national union?" and I think the logical answer is yes.

A central, national union can provide many services that we, by our isolated and single nature cannot. A unified organization of campuses across Canada would be a far stronger lobby on matters of student concern than any one campus by itself. The same applies in matters of communication and information gathering. These may seem like nebulous concepts at first glance but further consideration leads to the obvious conclusion that we cannot remain isolated from the rest of the country.

I do not support in any way the resolutions coming out of the most recent CUS Congress, nor can I sympathize with the policies of the organization at the present

time. But I feel very strongly that if we were to return to CUS that we could reverse the trend of the present organization just as the so called "radical element has done recently in the reverse direction.

In general, CUS's present policies are not commonly shared by the student populace, I would like CUS to be a true voice for students. The only way we can change the policies is from within. The U of A pulled out in '66 because the policies of the organization were not representative. Now is the time to return to CUS. The longer we wait the worse the situation will get.

I urge all Science students to seriously consider all aspects of the question and vote in the upcoming referendum.

Feel free to direct any inquiries to me.

Dennis Fitzgerald  
Science rep.  
Students' council

**China Teach-in**  
**Saturday, 9a.m.-9p.m.**  
**Dinwoodie Lounge**  
**see Thursday Gateway**  
**for details**