

The Dalhousie Gazette
CANADA'S OLDEST COLLEGE NEWSPAPER
Edited and Managed by students of Dalhousie University, under the smothering control of the Council of the Student Politicians.

Editorials printed in The Dalhousie Gazette express the individual opinions of staff writers, or the Editors. This must be noted in all reprints.

Volume 95 No. 18 Halifax, Nova Scotia Friday, February 26, 1965

MICHEL GUYTE	Editor in Chief	MICHAEL WALTON	Features Editor
DAVID DAY	Associate Editor	JAMIE RICHARDSON	Sports Editor
PETER SHAPIRO	News Editor	BOB CREIGHTON	Business Manager
PETER PLANT	Assistant Editor	DAVE MUNROE	Photo Editor
TERRY MORLEY	Editorial Page Editor	LIZ ALLPORT	Circulation

the berkely fight

The following comments are part of a report on the student protests which occurred this past Fall at the University of California at Berkeley. This commentary is taken from a section titled "The Limitations of Liberals: Faculty Actions and Attitudes". Eric Levine who wrote the report is a graduate student in Political Science at Berkeley, and Chairman of the Berkeley chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). His full report, titled "The Berkeley Free Speech Controversy", is available from SDS, 119 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y., for 15 cents.

THE most significant on-campus student movement since the 'thirties emerged during the fall semester 1964 on the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

THE University of California administration reserved to itself the right to impose and change rules at will, and had no real channels through which demands for changes could flow. Similarly, the administration retained the right to discipline students under its own rules. . .

American Universities, generally are set up along corporate, or bureaucratic centralist lines. All have, to some extent, the same problems in making and applying educational policy. The Berkeley situation is perhaps unique in the degree of centralism, the sophistication and self-aware dedication of the administrators to a corporate ethic, in the inflexibility of its deans, and in the failure to recognize the need to open up effective communication within the academic community. . .

ACCORDING to university policy, matters of educational policy reside with the Academic Senate made of full-time faculty members. Faculty impotence — even in areas generally recognized as its own purview — was underlined during the course of the dispute.

FROM the first, the students faced an administration reluctant to discuss the issues, so the protestors attempted to extend their support among the students and faculty by holding a series of rallies, passing out leaflets, and circulating petitions. The petitions were hastily drawn and numerous; yet they amassed hundreds of signatures. Most professors, however, expressed a wish to wait and see, and advised students to seek redress through normal administrative channels. . .

IN practice, however, there were no channels. . .

ONLY after three months of demonstrating, climaxed by the arrest of 800 students who held a sit down in the administration building, did the faculty begin to act collectively.

IN letters, speeches and informal discussions, one theme arose continually among professors: why did it take us so long? The answer lies in the conservative consequences of the liberal myths with which nearly all of the "liberal" professors clothe themselves. They have faith in the community, in the wisdom and good will of the administrators whom the Regents (wealthy businessmen chosen by the Legislature) have entrusted with running the school, with the accessibility of the administration to grievances and divergent interests within the academic community; they stress the complexity and difficulty of running a large university and the many pressures from outside which must be neutralized if the University is to survive and thrive. They tend to see conflicts as administrative not political problems, automatically resolved in the best practicable way through set procedures.

THEY deny, on principle, that interests within the academic community significantly diverge: disputes are within the family and are better not pursued than risk offending or disturbing the routine. They presume current procedures are adequate, that disputes only arise through misunderstanding and failure to communicate. They argue that, in the last analysis, the administration must be obeyed for it has had power delegated ultimately by the legislature.

THE power of the administration is legitimate and therefore must be just. To call it unjust, or to call for a redistribution of decision-making authority where unchecked injustice is manifest, is to challenge the legitimacy of the system: it is anarchy.

NOW, most of the faculty modified this position with examples of exceptions and problems and grievances of their own. But they saw these as necessary evils, exceptions to a basically sound system; furthermore they identified with the system even by seeing the administration as their "servants" (while conceding this did not usually work out in practice). Thus criticism of the system was criticism of their system. They saw the problem as one of letting the system work out the problems by its own machinery, to intervene risked destroying it.

ONLY when the system was threatened overtly and unquestionably — that is in times of crisis, when the mechanism of student protest and administration repression had led to a clear breakdown — did the faculty feel compelled to enter. Only during crises, in fact, were a significant number of professors ready to see that simple administrative matters were not the story — rather that some profound moral and political issues were at stake and that the faculty had to take sides, even if only to end the disruption of the routine.

THE main consequence of faculty attitudes and actions until the arrests was to muddy the issues and to strengthen the hand of the administration, by legitimating extraneous issues, expressing their own confusion about the issues, and supporting the administration position because of "power realities" on specific points where the Chancellor refused to budge. Only a handful of professors gave public support to the FSM from the early days.

THE bulk of the faculty remain more committed to the smooth running of the University than to effective measures to change the educational experience and guarantee all members of the academic community their Constitutional rights on campus.

SINCE the arrests, however, a large contingent, mostly younger professors, are deeply committed to the FSM position.

OTHERS have moved back into the background and can be called on to come out if there is more trouble: these will likely resign, for they moved from liberal faith to disillusionment and despair.

Yours truly,
Jamie Craig.



"THE GOVERNMENT FINALLY COUGHS UP"
(just a dream Cythral, just a dream)

Christianity is back

Dear Sir:

I am writing you concerning the article "Christianity and Christians" by Richard Litz in the February 19th edition of the Dalhousie Gazette.

First of all I wish to comment on the last paragraph of the Editor's note to the article.

It is truly unfortunate that there has been a down-grading of the religious argument, not necessarily on the campus, but in the Gazette. I find it VERY difficult to remember in my three years at Dalhousie an article which has dealt with the Christian faith and the Christian Church in an honest and scholarly way in which it ought to be dealt with in a university paper. Instead, I find that many articles dealing with religion are filled with subjective prejudices and that the situation is becoming progressively worse. Take the article quoted as an example. If you claim that this article is in any way intellectual or philosophical, then the world is in a sad state of affairs. This article instead of being an objective discussion merely reveals the author's ignorance of the subject. Why did he not try to find out what is meant by the Christian concept of love?

He states, "I too will dismiss them temporarily and define Christian love in reference to this great Christian continent of ours." Surely he would not claim that the North American or European continent is Christian in the true sense of the word? If it does not carry the name Christian it only reflects that it has been or is under a Christian influence. It is obviously wrong to judge the Christian concept of love and the hope it carries for the world merely by the actions of nominal Christians or by the lack of its consistent application by any people; at any rate, Christians never claimed to be perfect but just the opposite. If Mr. Litz were able to show examples where people failed to apply the Christian concept of love, I, too, could show numerous occasions where it has been applied and consequently wrought great changes for the better in our world. I am inclined to think that Mr. Litz is far too quick to make broad and sweeping generalizations.

My greatest quarrel is with the whole tone of the article. The author cynically refutes Christianity and Christian love, at least on the surface, but does not offer anything constructive or positive. Perhaps it was not meant to be positive and only meant to refute. If he wanted to refute why does he do it in such a superficial manner? Does he think that university students are such morons to accept such an article as (quoting the editor) "attempting to prove that the basic premise that Christian love is the answer to the world's problems is quite obviously wrong -" It is only obvious to me that he is not trying to prove anything but is only putting his bias against Christianity and his prejudices down in print, without support.

I am disappointed that the Gazette allows such articles to waste the space in their paper. Why don't you write some good articles on Christianity or religion, either pro or con?

M. C. Felderhof

and more

Dear Sir:

In view of the very sardonic strain that pervaded your article "Christianity and Christians", I think it might best be answered by referring the article back to the editor and staff of "Canada's Oldest College Newspaper" and asking them to soul-searchingly ask themselves what they take the aim of their journalism to be. After all, can an article so obviously loaded with cynicism, prejudice, and back-biting, and so devoid of constructive, honest, and sincerely raised questions, hope to bring into the open, for rational deliberation, with a view to reconciliation issues which are certainly of utmost importance to all concerned people?

It is true that attitudes, such as the one displayed by Mr. Litz, obviously exist in our society and it would be a grave

error to ignore them. It would also be a mistake to say that such attitudes do not exist in "Communities of Learning". However, I think that the contention can be quite earnestly held that a distinction, and a very important distinction, is necessary; a distinction between issues that have a bearing on the public and private good and are generated in an honest and disinterested attempt to undermine existing evil, and those issues which are raised with a view, conscious or otherwise, towards the unleashing of prejudice and hostility and which tend to overlook any truth or meaning that may be present in a structure, in toto, when, perhaps, it is in need of renovation. Such attitudes, I repeat, are fairly prevalent, but to present them for public perusal where constructive action is called for, is to misrepresent the situation.

In short, if the Gazette officially approves of such attitudes and under the spread of such destructive tendencies, it is obvious that there is a need for self-examination — an examination which asks itself anew to state aims and which endeavors to get at the road of its *raison d'être*.

Sincerely,
John MacLennan,
1st. Year, M.A.

on the Neptune

Mr. Douglas Barbour's assumption that the Neptune Theatre "leans toward the special type of production that can be generalized as comic", and further that the fine plays of the late summer season were all given a comic treatment, is a trivial and quite false basis on which to support any effective evaluation of Neptune's success in the past year.

Mr. Major chose the four comedies to be presented this winter season not because, as Mr. Barbour states, "it appears that Mr. Major is also aware of the comic potential that characterizes his company", but in a desperate attempt to put the theatre back on its precarious financial footing.

Halifax audiences, such as they are, obviously prefer light comedy to serious drama. (Neptune's worst play "Come Blow Your Horn", drew the largest crowds, with a 74 per cent house; its two best, "Twelfth Night", and "The Glass Menagerie" drew a pathetic 54 per cent and 50 per cent respectively). This same frivolity of spirit may be observed in nearly all the worldly activity of the endearing Haligonian.

Mr. Major and his company would truly love to perform Brecht, O'Neil, and Strindberg, but probably they had to offer up their very lives to convince the executive of Neptune that the works of France's immortal playwright Moliere would be popular theatre fare. The situation demands constant wariness on the part of those people who have the un-

The Open Door

The doors of Dalhousie have been thrown open. For two days, carefree high school students will be permitted to trip gaily amongst the Georgian buildings that so distinguish our university. They will peer at elaborately decorated Chemistry experiments, poke at guinea pig cages decorated with "Do Not Touch" signs, and sit in washrooms adorned with college level pornographic drawings.

The doors of Dalhousie have been thrown open. Open House is a worthwhile institution which has been a long time in coming to Dal. It speaks well for Khoo Teng Lek and others who pushed this idea that their efforts have seen fruition this weekend. High school students, parents childless adults and even college students have an excellent opportunity to examine the workings of a large university. After the examining the "books, manuscripts and statues" offered by the Classics department the visitors can relax over a cup of coffee with some of the entertaining members of the alumni, then off once again they can catch the famous trial of Michel Guite in the Law School. Those who get tired can drop over to the Chemistry building for an Aspirin, which will be made up before their eyes, and they can continue recuperation in the basement of the Arts and Administration building watching a computer demonstration. In short, something has been provided for every conceivable taste with displays overmatching even those at the famous Halifax Winter Fair.

The doors of Dalhousie have been thrown open. At least for two days that is. Next week normality returns to campus and once again thousands of bright youngsters will be denied admission because they were not bright enough to pick well to do parents. Right now there are approximately twenty-five students who have been suspended from this university for a failure to pay their fees by the January cut off date. In addition to suspending penniless students, next year will see this university keeping even more outside the pale by raising the fees another \$75.00. That's right, students to be, next year you will be paying \$600.00 for tuition alone if you apply to Dal. If other universities do not raise their fees to the same extent this will give Dal the honour of having the highest tuition in the country. So if you can't pay, then don't bother to apply. All that paper work, will probably put the fees up another \$50.00 or so, if you do so. The doors of Dalhousie have been thrown open.

How ironic. On this the occasion of our first Open House all across the country universities are becoming more exclusive. They will soon be the preserves of the rich. Unless, that is, we all do something about it. Everyone, high school student, parent, childless adult, and college student, must declare his willingness to act if they disagree with this policy of exclusion. The only way that you, as a high school student will get into this place, unless of course, your father happens to be earning over \$10,000 a year, is to break the doors down. You must force your way in, and do so now. The barriers must be smashed.

To put it a little more gently, and somewhat more realistically, what this newspaper is calling for is a re-examination by Canadians of our educational system. We believe that it is imperative that everyone, and especially high school students, and more especially their parents, understand the implication of the fee increases. These are going to continue unless the government (all levels of government) begins to spend a lot more money on the universities. Post-secondary education is a right, and it is a necessity. It is not a privilege of the wealthy, nor can it be a luxury in this modern technological age. The time has come for our society to pay a good deal more attention to education. This means that we will have to spend more money on education — that in fact, we will have to change our system of values somewhat, so that universities come before record companies in the economy. Otherwise the majority of the high school students here today will find that their younger brothers and sisters won't be able to get into any college, even if they are willing to go heavily into debt on a student loan scheme.

The Gazette welcomes all the visitors to our campus over the next two days. We hope they have a good time touring the grounds and the buildings and we trust that they will find the displays interesting and informative. We commend the Open House committee for the terrific amount of work they have done (and done well) on this first time affair. We know that Dalhousie will show its best face to our guests. We also know that unless everyone is willing to do something about the present inexorable rise in fees, residence and tuition, that for many of these guests, the young ones, Dal will be open only for today.

The doors of Dalhousie have been thrown open. Let's keep them open.

let them eat truffles

Fees next year will soar another seventy-five dollars. The already widened rift between the student and the local community will increase as the educational system bars more qualified people from the University classroom. Next year the Nova Scotia government's failure, and thus the people's failure will exclude more than 1500 potential graduates and perhaps better trained additions to the local communities, from the University classroom.

We realize that the University pays nearly 1000 dollars a year for arts students, and 3700 dollars a year to educate a dentist student, and we realize that a basic conflict exists between financial responsibility and academic freedom. Yet we cannot forget that for every student today in Dalhousie, there is a potential student of equal ability not in University.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics has proved that the 21.8% of Canadian families earning more than \$5,000 a year account for more than 60% of all Arts and Science students, for 67% of all Medical students, and for 74% of all Law students. Less than one-fifth of the population, then, accounts for more than three times its relative number on the Canadian campus.

The upper 1.2% of Canadian taxpayers, earning more than 15,000 dollars a year account for more than seven times their relative number of University students, while only 14.5% of students come from the 36.5% of Canadian families earning less than 3,000 dollars a year.

These D.B.S. figures, then, prove that the limited number of students from the highest income bracket have more than twenty times the opportunity to attend University, than students from that third of the population in a lower bracket.

Students Council has delayed an intended demonstration until next Fall; while Council realizes both the injustice of our present system, and further the complications of too much Government to the Provincial Government. The presentation of

mr. novak's groceries

School teachers in Nova Scotia earn less than the annual average of all other Canadian occupations combined; yet the responsibility of inspiring intellectual curiosity in young minds rests in these poorly paid hands.

The teachers' University degree (demanded for moderate success), his poor salary, and the low status of the teaching profession in the public eye, all contribute to the low calibre of teachers sprinkling our schools. Even the most socially responsible, and public spirited students must consider their own families and futures; they cannot afford the financial and social oblivion of a career in grade or high-school education. The current result is that many of those becoming teachers are no more than second-rate students, and continue to develop equally uninspiring scholars.

First-rate education is vital to all levels of social organization, from the individual to the nation. We all realize that automation is increas-

this brief however, has been delayed because the government has been too slow in preparing its own statistics.

The most recent comparative figures available show that Nova Scotia has been offering the lowest University operating support per full time student in the country. In the same year, (62-63) the net budget percentage, used for education remained ninth lowest in Canada, as did University operating support per full time student. While these figures, in the past year have greatly improved, and while we are becoming every day, less noticeably backward, the total number of qualified individuals barred from University is continually rising.

We see that there are at least 1500 potential Dalhousie students barred from University by the rocketing costs, and we realize that every single dollar increase will mean even more students unable to attend. We realize that Nova Scotia gives education a lower priority than any other Provincial government across Canada; we realize further the necessity of education. Surely we are past the days of considering education as the privilege of a few, rather than as the right of anyone who might benefit.

It is stupidity, however, to complain that the government is at fault. It is the fault of the electorate that they have failed to create a government prepared to lead; it is content merely to represent, and the constituents are not yet aware of the importance of their own deciding power.

Students are no longer content to sit back without demanding an active part and allow the surrounding communities to affect their own lives. The surrounding communities too should feel obliged to take a part in developing the student community.

The first steps toward this goal have already been taken. Dalhousie has offered an Open House, to contribute to the co-operation between the student and the local communities. The second step will be harder for both.

ing the minimal amount of education soon to be demanded for the most menial of jobs. Within a decade high school education will be expected for any employment.

Again, we all realize that increased automation will offer more leisure to be better used. Again the crucial factor of a good basic education becomes essential.

A large part of the solution is money. Teachers must be provided; the schools should be a place where the student is made curious about his own potential, and where he is inspired to do his own original work. To this end, it must be made financially reasonable to become a teacher. The profession must realistically be given the pride of being tangibly valued by the community in general.

Perhaps the Nova Scotia Teachers Union would be better advised to concern itself with the teachers' salary, rather than with his "professional status". Strong wage boosts would be a first step in this recognition.

-Z.J.-