

Brunswickan

Editor-in-Chief - john h. oliver
 Managing Editor - allan b. pressman
 Business Manager - charles khoury
 Photographer - trevor gomes
 Sports Editor - joan dickison
 Contributors - audrey hutchison, tom murphy, peter graham,
 jane fraser, mike peacock, dave hallam, lawson
 hunter, jay baxter, eric thompson, gus mackay,
 peter clark, harry holman, lee clifford
 Typist - chris zachery

The Real Challenge...

A few facts need to be set straight. The SRC decided that it did not wish to see tuition fees rise. To protest such a rise, it voted unanimously for a mass demonstration and march to the Centennial Building. Last Sunday, Council President Cox proposed a motion to prohibit further demonstrations on the fee issue. (The motion was successfully amended to allow for some form of mass action after the government announces its decision).

Now, either the Council and its president believe that fees should not go up, and they will take the most effective action to prevent such an occurrence; or else, they do not care whether fees rise and are not prepared to do anything that will be effective.

The rationale to have fees frozen has already been established.

We live in one of the lowest per capita income areas in the country. We already pay one of the highest tuition fees in the country. Dominion Bureau of Statistics documents show that no matter how willing they are to work, many students now in university (who are predominantly from middle-class income groups, according to further DBS statistics) cannot in the summer earn enough to cover their educational requirements. Government surveys show that few individuals from lower income groups (the largest group in the province) can afford to attend university - the \$100 fee rise makes it that much harder for them.

At this time the Federal Government has recognized the necessity (if only the economic one!) of extending to all of the able the right to attend university. Further, it has declared its intention to work towards providing free tuition for all post-secondary students, and has followed through with greatly increased grants to all provinces, including New Brunswick.

(Equal Opportunity has swallowed up most of these grants for N.B. We do not deny the urgent need for reform in our public and secondary schools - only that the universities also need more money, and that the granting of such money is in the best interests of the province. This is not a selfish demand on our parts - the province literally can not afford not to freeze our fees).

A shifting of priorities is in order for the government. It will have to postpone construction of a bridge, perhaps, or make its recent education bond issue a little bigger. Such is the importance of helping the universities now.

Although a free education should be provided to every capable individual, we recognize the financial predicament that the N.B. government is in. Thus, we do not demand that fees be lowered but only that the regressive, reactionary and economically discriminatory step of a raise in fees must not occur.

We proceed to the question of what action will be most effective. Briefs, letters to the editor and other "nice" means of protesting will not be useful if the government turns us down. For it is a long time before the government must face the electorate.

As pointed out by one individual at the Council meeting, students have very few instruments to back up their demands. We have no money and no votes. All we have is our numbers. And that means demonstrations. And possibly sit-ins and boycotts.

Demonstrations - and sit-ins for that matter - are legitimate forms of protest and, if properly organized, can be responsibly carried out.

Council should not be thinking of withholding sanction from further protests. Council should not be talking about the first demonstration becoming irresponsible, irrational and immature.

(Most of the opponents of further mass action point to the damage done at the Centennial Building. Signs were removed from almost all doors and other such childish acts committed. This newspaper condemns all such immature and, in fact, irresponsible acts. Council must ensure that these acts are not repeated).

Our demands are reasonable. Council should not be afraid to fight for them.

Our only effective action is a mass demonstration. It is up to Council to hear our demands and - if it does represent the student opinion and does wish to lead that opinion - proceed with plans for a demonstration that will be responsible, rational, mature and effective. That is the real challenge to our Council.

If Council does not so act, others will. This is not a threat, but a fact.



"... all this about birth control, students on niggers and pot - why don't they print things such as John Donne's love poems like a nice school paper?"

Letters to the Editor

MORE FOR WILLOUGHBY...

Editor:

I am writing concerning a letter by Prof. W. R. Willoughby printed in the Feb. 1/68 issue of the *Brunswickan*.

I find it incredulous that he, an academic, has apparently accepted and gives lip service to the varied assortment of clichés, distortions and falsehoods used to justify the war against Viet Nam by the U.S. Government and magazines such as "Time", "Life" and "Newsweek".

I shall comment on a couple of the statements in his letter which I believe are falsehoods or distortions.

In his letter he states, "Now - in keeping with solemn commitments made in 1954 - they (U.S.A.) are attempting to end outside aggression against South Viet Nam."

The U.S. Government did not sign the Geneva Accords of 1954 but did promise to uphold them. The Final Declaration of the Geneva Accords provided in Point 6: "... The military demarcation line (the 17th. parallel) is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary..."

In 1956, it was Ngo Dinh Diem, with American support, who declared the area of Viet Nam, south of the 17th parallel the Republic of South Viet Nam, a clear violation of the Geneva Accords. It was the same Diem who in 1956 rejected plans for the unification of Viet Nam under the terms of the Geneva Accords.

As to the geographic origin of the Viet Cong one need only consider the statement made by Dean Rusk on January 28, 1966, in testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He said, "I would suppose that 80% of those who are called Viet Cong are or have been southerners."

The Geneva Accords limited the U.S.A. to having 685 men in Viet Nam. President Johnson in his 1965 State of the Union message said that the "United States would stand by the Geneva Agreements of 1954". At that time the U.S. had approximately 40,000 troops

in Viet Nam. At the same time the State Department issued a "White Paper" which could cite only 23 infiltrators from the North, which on further checking, only 6 of the above 23 were actually born in the northern portion of the country.

Thus the claim of "outside aggression" is fallacious and misleading.

Prof. Willoughby also speaks of how the U.S. has helped stabilize several countries in various parts of the world. What he didn't say was how stability was often achieved in these countries, i.e., by the imposition of oftentimes unpopular military dictatorships.

Not all influential, knowledgeable people in the U.S. agree that the international record of the U.S. merits praise. For instance, consider the recent statement of General David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps, who said, "I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar crooked fingers out of the business of these nations, so full of oppressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own."

Rear Admiral Arnold B. True has said, "The U.S. nurses an anti-communist paranoia which has no real basis in fact."

So please Prof. Willoughby do not try to conceal the real motivation of American Foreign Policy with fallacious statements about "ending outside aggression", "defending freedom etc."

With respect to the arms shipments to the U.S., I believe they should be stopped, as I believe Canada should adopt a strictly neutral position in international affairs. Our neutrality in their specific conflict is implied by our membership on the International Control Commission (ICC), but can our neutrality be taken seriously if we act as a munitions house for one of the combatants. If strict neutrality entails scrapping or altering the Defense Production Sharing Agreement, I feel it should be done, as the horrific nature of this war, along with the terrible possible consequences, warrant it.

- Sam Stevens.

ACCEPTS CHALLENGE

Editor:

Re: Prof. Bosnitch's reply to my letter of December 7.

First, my apologies to the gentleman on my reference to him as an "assistant" professor when he is in fact an "associate" professor - a grave injustice.

Secondly, I'm pleased to note Prof. Bosnitch's "emotional gratification" at my assessment of his participation in the Morality of Violence teach-in. He wondered, however, whether my term "childish performance" referred to his "first or second infancy".

I would like to think that the gentleman's tirade was out of character, but if it wasn't, I still wouldn't accuse Prof. Bosnitch of passing through his second childhood. To be enjoying his second, one must have graduated

from his first.

Thirdly, I welcome Prof. Bosnitch's challenge to a public debate. However, since the "theory and practice" of the teach-in is a poor topic for argument, I suggest that we dispute the "value" of teach-ins.

In his letter Prof. Bosnitch stated that he had "concluded that at such a teach-in any educational discussion was precluded". If this is indicative of his attitude towards teach-ins in general, I expect the gentleman would be prepared to defend the negative.

Nelson Adams has volunteered his services as chairman so, pending finalization of time and place, I hereby accept your challenge.

- John Filliter
 Law I

A b

Editor's Note: excerpts from the Jones, to the Where the order the original address of coherence an

I speak as a lieve in black Whites make me

America to was born and ploited Africa slave, as the tion. I am a d that built Amer

In North Am for exploitation taken the exp reason the bla run over is be him to be humb ride the back o

Black powe political, the s America. Black supremacy ove cates black eq

and

Editor's Note: of the Student mittee (SNCC

The events burg, South C again the Uni terest in seei of blacks ar ment's highl for the lies th are murdered Clive Sellers ing to use a

The lesso If we seek r peaceful and be shot dow dress of our in, we will funds for our kind of jive and murder ally, we wi Justice Dep

An O

ORANGE Thursday, were shot on an asse trance to other studen

Most of event was what had h that the th with the p dents starte militants" students h use in the Guardsmen averted fur

Next da what happ Correspond scene that that the o that the p sniper fire including ly denied

In his any refer first, beco