

More letters to the editor

Graffiti war escalates in the student center

Editor:

The university services department has declared war on graffiti in the stud cans. Friday night they painted over the collection begun in September. By Saturday the artists had struck again but the service boys counter-attacked.

The artists escalated and Saturday night the following poem appeared. "Alas, the painter works in vain, the shit-house poet strikes again." The service-cong again retaliated with paintbrushes.

The battle has been lost, but

the war has just begun.

Jimmy Olsen
Grad journalism

Track championship not UNB's first ever

Editor:

It was a pleasant bit news to see that UNB won the inter-collegiate track championships this year, but your writer was somewhat fouled up in his history. In 1962, in the days of Chris Williamson, Pete Schuddaboom, and Mike Nobel, among others, UNB won the championship. I recall this vividly because I was a member of that team, and we were all given crests by the Athletics Department which I am sure

we all still treasure highly. I certainly do.

1962 was not the first year UNB won. I think it was the first time in twenty or thirty years, however. In any case, let it be sufficient to point out that this championship, while a great honour, is not unique on the UNB record book.

Gary Davis
Grad math

Hockey, football more violent than rugby

Editor:

It is probably true that there is no such thing as bad publicity and so perhaps there is no need for comment on your illustrated article about rugby football (pages 8-9) in the "Brunswickan" issue for

Oct. 1. However, since your captions did the game less than justice, may I say that rugby need not be anything like as you make out-fisticuffs are part of the rugby tradition and are, I suspect, largely an introduction by players more accustomed to the practices of ice hockey; as only the ball-carrier may be tackled and blocking is not permitted, there is much less body contact than Canadian or American football and no padding is needed or allowed. Rugby has nothing of the stereo-typed "plays" of the North American game so that much more is left to the players' skill and initiative. It would be interesting to have the source of your quotation "one in every two rugby players had . . . over-strained hearts". I do not think there

is any greater incidence of coronary troubles in South Africa or New Zealand, where rugby is the national sport, than in North America where games are watched more than they are played.

I can only suggest that you watch a few games with an unbiased eye and preferably in company with an "aficionada" before writing your next article about rugby.

Having played the game since entering high school, coached a University side, watched dozens of International matches and refereed more games than I care to count I do know something about rugby but I may be a little bit biased towards it.

Dr. R.M. Strang
Department of Forestry and Rural Development

Percy Bysshe Shelley expelled: no reason given

Early in his second term (at Oxford) (Percy Bysshe) Shelley resolved to publish (a pamphlet) under the title "The Necessity of Atheism." It was issued anonymously, and in the preface Shelley called himself, "Thro' deficiency of proof an Atheist." . . . The sale was soon checked by a Don of New College, who, after looking at the tract, asked to see the principals, and induced them (the storekeepers) to burn the remaining copies. They sent for Shelley and remonstrated with him. He told them that he had sent a copy to all the bishops, to the Vice-Chancellor, and to all the heads of colleges, with a letter in his own hand, signed Jeremiah Stukeley. It was some days before the pamphlet was brought home to him; but on the morning of Lady Day he rushed into his rooms, where (Thomas Jefferson Hogg, an older undergraduate at the same college) was waiting for him, and cried, "I am expelled." Then he told

Hogg that he had been sent for to the Common Room, where he found the master and some of the fellows of the college. The master produced a copy of the pamphlet, and asked if he had written it, speaking in "a rude, abrupt, and insolent

tone." Shelley asked why he put the question. No answer was given; but the master loudly and angrily repeated, "Are you the author of this book?"

"If I can judge of your manner," Shelley said, "you are resolved to punish me, if I should acknowledge that it is my work.

If you can prove that it is, produce your evidence; it is neither just nor lawful to interrogate me in such a case and for such a purpose. Such proceedings would become a court of inquisitors, but not free men in a free country."

"Do you choose to deny that this is your composition?" the master reiterated in the same rude and angry voice. Shelley finally refused to answer any questions, whereupon the master said furiously, "Then you are expelled; and I desire you will quit this college early to-morrow morning at the latest." . . . Hogg wrote a short note to the master and fellows expressing his sorrow at their treatment of Shelley, and his hope that they would reconsider their sentence. In an instant the porter summoned him before the master, who asked him whether he too had written the pamphlet. Hogg "submissively" pointed out to him the unfairness of the ques-

tion, and refused to answer it. Thereupon the master told him to return and consider whether he would persist in his refusal. He had scarcely left the room when he was recalled. The master again asked him whether he admitted or denied having written the pamphlet. He again refused to answer, and the master cried, "Then you are expelled." . . .

After they had passed their sentence the Dons seem to have felt some compunction about it. But Hogg and Shelley gave no signs of submission which, perhaps, was expected and hoped of them. As they were leaving the next morning, Hogg was told that if Shelley would ask permission of the master to stay a short period, it would

by Ip Se Dixit
Brunswickan staff

probably be granted. Both refused to ask any favour, and at eight o'clock in the morning they started in the coach for London.

It is not very wonderful that in the general state of opinion at that time Shelley should have been expelled for his pamphlet. Undergraduates were not sent to the University to write pamphlets on the necessity of atheism, and at

that date they were all supposed to be members of the Church of England. It must be remembered, too, that atheism was associated in the minds of the orthodox with the horrors of the French Revolution, and that there was a real fear that these horrors might be repeated in England if the contagion of the revolutionary doctrines spread. No doubt the dons regarded the expulsion of Shelley as a sanitary measure, and included Hogg in it as an infected object. Their manner of proceeding, if it has not been misrepresented, was unnecessarily fierce. They might have attempted to reason with Shelley. They might have remembered that they had made no efforts to prevent him from falling into error. We may assume that they had not done their duty by him, and they ought to have asked themselves whether his offence was not the result of their neglect. The expulsion of Hogg was quite arbitrary. If they knew that Shelley had written the pamphlet, they had no evidence that Hogg had any hand in it, and it was clearly unjust to punish him for refusing to answer a question which they had no reason to put. No doubt they were severe because they were frightened. They wished to make an example, and, as

usual in such cases, made a mistake.

—from *SHELLEY, The Man and the Poet*, by A. Clutton-Brock (1909)

Thus, in 1811, Percy B. Shelley left Oxford. But this story appears here for a reason, and for most of its readers the meaning is already clear. The University of New Brunswick has sometimes been described as an attempt to copy Oxford, and with Colin B. Mackay as "The Master", Norman Strax as "Shelley", the Deans and the Board of Governors as "The Dons" we could cast a rerun, 157 years later, similar in its theme and plot, taking place in our very own fair Fredericton.

The story speaks for itself, but there is one relevant comment, made inadvertently in a recent publication of the Engineering Undergraduate Society, by one of UNB's astute philosophers and scientists:

The student should always be alert to learn and practice new ideas and not to refuse to listen because he (mistakenly) feels the old methods will work.

—Prof. Allen Boone,
Head, Physics Department,
UNB,

from *The Godivan*.
He said it himself.

Carmichael gives ideology to black revolution

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 whiteness, began to grow an articulate, coherent position of black strength.

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.

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, 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.

Harry 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 perpetuator 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.

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

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.

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 (facist 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 a 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 realised 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."

The process of cleansing themselves of self-hatred sometimes leads to violence against the oppressor but this violence "must be directed."

"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.