

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES

With RICHARD HUTCHINS

What is the basic principle for the two party domination in Canadian politics, and why is a party such as the New Democratic Party rather ineffectual in mobilizing support nationally? This question is one whose answer lies in the make up of Canada's federalist system and the elitist structure of political parties and affiliation which has been historically reinforced.

Canada is a federalist system with very distinct federal-provincial boundaries in legislative powers. This distinction allows for a federal Liberal government in Ottawa with no provincial Liberal counterpart governments. This phenomenon can be attributed to stronger provincial support for third parties and regional representation. The Parti Québécois, Social Credit, and N.D.P. have all been able to form provincial governments at one time or another, but have never gained a national support base. This can be attributed to third parties' representation of regional-provincial needs. The Parti Québécois could never gain federal support since it represents a French minority; the N.D.P., although respectable at a federal level, has been more effective at mobilizing provincial support.

The federal government lends full support a third party politics at a provincial level since it keeps many regional issues out of the federal perspective.

Our elitist based liberal and conservative tradition stems from over a century of domination. Fundamentally, there are no radical differences in ideology between the two parties and elections are decided on political issues and policy. It is ironic that our political system is rampantly controlled by patronage. This system of patronage defies the individuals who speak out against party policy and usually relegates them to a backbenchers, making them ineffectual in policy decisions. The issue of patronage has allowed a stranglehold domination by the Liberals over the last 14 years. I feel the future will see some changes in this elitist domination and Canadians will lean more towards party national policy than affiliation. At present there is no national party in Canada. We have Liberals in the east, and Conservatives in the west, if we are to have a truly national party, representation must reach from coast to coast. If the two party system is to stay, they will have to solve this problem of regional representation. If not, the growth of third parties may give rise to a system such as that in Britain where there are four or five major parties. I trust coast to coast representation is the goal of both parties. If not, then we are not a nation but a fragmented, regionalized confederation. I support third parties as a pressure outlet for Canadians to show their dissatisfaction with two party bureaucracy and domination. Pressure groups are an important determinant of government policy and third parties can be very effective as pressure groups.

Flashback on violence

by CAMPBELL MORRISON
Brunswickan Staff

On November 30, 1967, there was a teach-in at Head Hall on 'The Morality of Violence'. Speaking were Professor Stephen Patterson of the UNB history department, Mr. Robert Lockhart, a broadcaster from St. John who had visited Vietnam, and William Pepper, author of the controversial article "The Children of Vietnam". Professor Patterson opened the teach-in by defining the topic, then Mr. Lockhart and Mr. Pepper apparently spoke on violence without reference to or acknowledgement of Professor Patterson's opening remarks or each other's comments; but, more probably, the article's author didn't write until a few days after the event when memory was fading. At any rate, the article did not do justice to an obviously heated active discussion.

The article, nevertheless, puts one's mind to work on the topic of the morality, or legitimacy, of violence, and some tentative thoughts have surfaced, be they momentarily, from the recesses of my mind.

For violence to occur there must always be a victim. (There is no such thing as a victimless crime because people have the right to do to themselves whatever they want, and if they are too dumb to know what is harmful then that is their fault.) Violence, as long as there is a victim, exists on two variable scales; one is the ordered versus disordered scale, and the other is the directed versus misdirected scale. The ordered vs. disordered scale represents the degree to which a hierarchy exists within the organization responsible for the violence; a police force is organized and a rioting mob is

not, although both are equally violent. The directed vs. misdirected scale is a measurement to gauge the goals of violence - the difference between an organization or individual with a cause and one without - the difference between a psychopathic killer and the PLO. These scales, however, do not judge violence, they categorize it; the moral judgement of violence, using these scales, is both easier and more complex.

People tend to disregard and ignore violence when they live in a peaceful town like Fredericton; New York and Chicago are the centres of violence. This is not true, there is lots of violence here. There is the police force, a highly ordered but misdirected organization. There is constant violence on women in the form of open rape or implied abuse, disorganized directed violence on my scale. Television is a constant source of violence by example, an interpretive violence which effects individuals differently. The news is unnecessarily violent, bringing a whole new collection of gory stories into everyone's home every day. Lastly, the source of the most frightening, but least dangerous, violence of all: the disorganized and misdirected violence of murderers, rapists, and thieves. All of this, it cannot be denied, exists daily in Fredericton.

When is violence justifiable? How much violence is appropriate?

Violence is only justifiable when it is retaliatory. A victim can use violence justifiably to defend against unjustifiable violence. The appropriate amount and type of violence should not exceed that which is being defended against. There is much unjust violence, but if it is dealt with justly then there will be less. Merry Christmas.

Disarmament speaker

Mr. James Stark, Founder and Director of Operation Dismantle, will present the third in the 1982-83 series of Guest Lectures at St. Thomas University, Thursday, December 9, at 11:30 a.m. in the Edmund Casey Auditorium. The title of Mr. Stark's lecture, "The Choice for Mankind: Disarmament or Annihilation," is taken from the final document of the 1978 United Nations Special Session on Disarmament.

Since founding the Ottawa-based Operation Dismantle in April, 1977, Mr. Stark has serv-

ed as its Director and President. In order to provide a mandate for disarmament, a campaign for municipal referendum has formed phase one of the operation. The goal of Operation Dismantle is to accumulate referenda sufficient to convince the Canadian Government to sponsor a resolution for the Global Referendum on Disarmament at the United Nations General Assembly.

Members of the public, students, and faculty are invited to attend Mr. Stark's lecture. There is no admission charge.



STONE'S STUDIO UNB-STU GRAD PHOTOS

sitting charge \$10.95

special #1
3-8x10 \$39.95

special #3
6-5x7 \$69.95

special #2
1-8x10 \$47.95
3-5x7

special #4
2-8x10 \$74.95
4-5x7

gowns and hoods for most degrees supplied

480 Queen St
455-7578

Pub for Fund

By DAVID MOGILEVSKY

Last Saturday, MacKenzie House organized an event for the Third Century Fund. They held a pub whose profits went to the Fund and a good turnout, between 150 to 200 people throughout the evening, attended.

A few weeks ago they decided that they should do something for the Third Century Fund so the house committee then started to organize the fund raising event. They learned a few things from organizing this pub.

Next term they will look at the possibility of holding another event for the Fund.