



Justice?

By ED PAPROSKI

Our humane society says a working person deserves a minimum wage.

If a working person is one who must:

1. think
2. produce satisfactory results at specified times
3. better his society by bettering himself
4. follow the orders of a superior

5. put in eight hours of work per day (and often many hours of overtime)

6. use his time carefully, and
7. sacrifice for the future;

then a university student is a working person.

White or black, male or female, single or married; this person deserves at least a minimum wage.

Reactions?

(Editor's Note: The writer is a master's candidate in philosophy at U of A.)

In Chile and Peru

Students Help Governments

(Reprinted from *Youth and Freedom*, Volume VII, no. 2)

The participation of university students of developing countries in literacy and community programs is growing into a world-wide movement on a vast scale. In some cases the projects are initiated by organizations of the students themselves; in others, the students are invited to take part in projects initiated by the national government; in many cases, student organizations and governments work together on a cooperative basis.

In Latin America, a program which has recently attracted hemisphere-wide attention—and the interest of more than one fifth of Peru's university students, who offered their services to it—is called Cooperacion Popular Universitaria. It is the cornerstone of the Peruvian Government's imaginative national community development program, aimed mainly at the Indian communities in the rugged Andean highlands.

Almost half of Peru's population of 11 million are Indians; most of them live in some 60,000 isolated villages far from the notice—as well as the material and cultural advantages—if city dwellers, including most university students. Under Cooperacion Popular Universitaria, students studying engineering, medicine, agriculture, education, law and other specialties are formed into teams, each of which has at least one member who is reasonably fluent in the Indian dialects, Quechua or Aymara.

The government gives them some

equipment and a weekly allowance equivalent to nine U.S. dollars. Accommodation is provided by the villagers, who themselves decide what is to be done, and work with the students to accomplish it. In 1964, almost 5,000 adults were taught to read and write; 30,000 people were vaccinated against smallpox; 40 miles of new road were completed; construction was started on 2,349 classrooms. And dentistry students pulled 15,000 teeth.

The first teams of Cooperacion Popular Universitaria were recruited little more than a year ago. Out of 2,800 volunteers from 22 centers of higher education, 550 were selected, given intensive training at the University of San Marcos and La Cantuta Teachers' College; then sent to 112 scattered Indian communities in the Peruvian Andes mountains, where they spent the two months of their summer vacation—February and March, 1964—building roads and schools and improving hygienic conditions.

So successful were they that in 1956 the program has doubled in size. This year there were 4,000 volunteers from 29 universities, out of which 1,200 were selected to spend the long vacation working in 200 villages.

The cash value of the work done in 1964 is estimated at \$1,635,000, of which the Government paid only \$635,000. The balance represents the labor of the villages themselves. But the program cannot be judged in purely material terms.

Its single feature is that it is a unique kind of internal exchange

program, under which the rural villages are introduced to the technical wonders of the 20th century, while the students, most of whom are urbanized and relatively wealthy, are introduced to valuable aspects of Peruvian history and native culture and also to the pressing problem of Peru's "forgotten villages." And since one quarter of the volunteer students are women, it is enabling another traditionally submerged sector of the population to participate actively in spheres formerly closed to them.

The man behind the Cooperacion Popular is Ferdinand Belaunde Terry, the President of Peru, who stressed the theme of a cooperative self-help program as a means of social integration as well as economic progress during the presidential campaign of 1962. Since his election to the Presidency Belaunde has thrown the full weight of the Government and of his party, Accion Popular, behind it. Inevitably, Cooperacion Popular has become a target for his political opponents, who either denounce it as a haven for extremists or demand a larger part in running it (or both).

But leaders from other countries regard it as a model for programs in their own nations, and West Germany, France, and the U.S. and Latin American countries have sent students to take part in it. Although much of its value comes from the fact that it is an indigenous movement, Cooperacion Popular's plans call for augmented participation by foreign graduate volunteers.

In Chile, a similar national self-help development program called Promocion Popular is starting under the Christian Democratic Government of President Eduardo Frei, elected in Sept. 1964.

Here, the national union of students, UFUCH (Union de Federaciones Universitarias de Chile), led the way with an organized assault against illiteracy which began in February 1963 in accordance with an UFUCH Congress resolution aimed at the complete elimination of illiteracy in Chile (the present illiteracy rate is now less than 20 per cent). Under the plan students from the local student federations in UFUCH, such as the Federation of Students of the Catholic University (FEUC) of the Technical University (FEUT), of the University of Concepcion, the Catholic University of Valparaiso, the University of the North etc., spent their summer vacations building community centers, offering medical assistance and public health education, and giving literacy courses in the most deprived communities of Chile—from the working class suburbs of the capital city of Santiago to the tiny islands of Mocha and Chiloe.

The results of the work done by the Chilean university students have been so impressive that President Frei has said that he plans, for 1966, to recruit 10,000 youths—half of the university student body of Chile—to work as volunteers during the vacation period and give a decisive impetus to the task of raising the educational, social and economic levels of the inhabitants of all the remote areas of the country.

Hoses And Truncheons

(Editor's Note: Canadians are well aware of the role U.S. students are playing in the civil rights movement in their country, but our knowledge of student groups in other nations is limited. The following is an account of an assembly by thousands of students in Madrid and Barcelona, Spain last spring to protest government limitations on academic freedom. It is reprinted from the *World Assembly of Youth* information bulletin.)

"Headed by four professors, the young men and women, now more than 5,000 strong, began a silent and orderly procession across the university campus to the residence of the rector.

Upon reaching the Plaza Cisneros, a central point on the campus, the procession was confronted by a large force of armed police, assembled in jeeps and trucks.

Prof. Aranguren explained the purpose of the march to the police commander, who replied that he would have to call headquarters to determine if the march could be allowed to continue.

Prof. Aranguren then added that if the march could not be allowed, he would dissolve the procession himself and the students would disperse and quietly go home, the four professors and the student delegates going on alone to the rector's.

At this point the entire procession sat on the ground in silence, awaiting the decision of the authorities.

However, the commander did not return to speak with Prof. Aranguren.

A few moments later the police vehicles pulled up along the procession, and as hundreds of armed police lined up before the students, high pressure fire hoses were turned on the students from a water truck.

When the water supply was exhausted, and the students remained sitting silently in formation, the police charged into the students, beating them with their truncheons.

At first the students tried to cover themselves and ward off the blows with their arms, but the brutality of the attack soon caused them to break and run, pursued by police who beat them to the ground, young women included, and cornered in various buildings those who were lucky enough to have escaped."

Viewpoint

By DAVID ESTRIN

Students who were to hear M. Jean Lesage, prime minister of Quebec, speak on campus today in Con Hall have reason to be proud.

They are amongst a privileged few in the West who will have heard directly the remarks of this most representative spokesman for Quebec's "Quiet Revolution" as he explains the aims of his province and its role, as most Quebecois see it, in the future of this country.

For at almost every stop of this tour of Western and Central Canada, M. Lesage has spoken to limited audiences at closed meetings, mostly sponsored by the men's and women's Canadian Clubs.

This type of tour has left the onus on the news media, particularly the daily newspaper, to convey to the public what it is that Quebec desires and, more importantly, the reasons behind these demands.

Certainly it cannot be expected that overnight the daily papers in the West are going to change policy and provide this information, a task they have neglected to do since the "revolution" began some five years ago. By ignoring or sensationalizing the cause of Canada's unity crisis, the daily press has made it possible for most Westerners to erroneously believe that Quebec, as two misguided Calgary school teachers last week charged, is committing treason in trying to sell the rest of Canada on the ideas of bilingualism and biculturalism.

In this city, the Edmonton Journal has done more to create dissention and stir up inbred Prairie prejudice towards things French and Catholic than any bomb-throwing separatists could ever do.

A typical example was the Journal's front page article of last week on the rejection of a Western Canada Week proposed for Laval University in Quebec City.

The Journal story, with the headline "Alberta-Quebec Relations Hit Turbulence", reeked of the impression that it was outrageous for such a proposal to have been turned down after the U of A had devoted a whole week to French Canada last January. In fact, it was the strongly-separatist president of the Laval students' union who refused to consider the U of A proposal. Many other Laval students were annoyed and even embarrassed because of his action.

But even if the project had been turned down by the whole student body, English-speaking Canadians, and especially those with views like the Edmonton Journal's must realize that as a majority group they naturally must strive much harder to understand the French minority than vice-versa.

If Western Canadians had the opportunity to meet, face-to-face, M. Lesage and other representatives of the New Quebec, to question and to argue with them, we would quickly discover that we have very much in common, and very little to keep us at each other's throat.

Last January, French Canada Week on this campus (aided to a large degree by M. Lesage's government) proved this very point: those U of A students who did not meet the Quebec students or did not attend any of the discussions became even more antagonistic than they had been previously, while those who did take advantage of these opportunities had their formerly antagonistic attitudes changed in 15 minutes.

Next time Prime Minister Lesage or any other responsible spokesman for French Canada gets up enough courage to attempt these explanations, let us hope that they will appear in some really public halls, such as the Jubilee Auditorium.

Or taking a cue from Mr. Manning, they should buy time on national television, and have a studio audience packed with both friendly and hostile listeners, so that English-Canadians can hear the legitimate complaints of the six million French-speaking partners in this unique experiment. Some people will protest missing The Adams Family, but most Canadians have more intelligence than that (we hope).

French Canada Week showed us that M. Lesage's government and the Quebec society is dynamic, bold, and progressive. It is up to this generation of students to overcome the apathy, prejudice and ignorance on our part that has made us reject, rather than appreciate, the benefits to Canada that will come from a stronger, progressive, Quebec.

For when all Canadians understand that this country will achieve unity only in diversity, then and only then will we be able to cure our national psychosis and be able to build a unique country, a truly bicultural and perhaps, far in the future, a truly bilingual Confederation.

(Editor's Note: David Estrin is a first-year U of A law student, and former Canadian Union of Students local chairman here. He organized French Canada Week last year on this campus.)

letter

To the Editor:

The end of any celebration, conference or calamity, brings with it the inevitable wisdom of hindsight. Freshman Introduction Week has ended. Now everybody can voice his opinion—the damage of any criticism or the benefit of volunteering your services towards it are now both negligible.

In any case, the failures, the oversights and the disorganization are always apparent. Blatant mistakes often speak more loudly than the consequences which fall from them. Yet it still seems necessary to either defend or deny some philosophical basis for Freshman Introduction Week. Ideally it should provide a program by which all freshmen will begin to adapt themselves to the demands and opportunities of a university community. It must teach all newcomers that this is a place to learn. Discipline and the choice of what we shall learn, is however left largely to the individual student. This, a newcomer learns fairly quickly as he stumbles through registration. But how he should discipline himself, and how he should choose his courses are left mainly to chance. And this is where Freshman Introduction Week fails miserably.

Certainly another major function of a Freshman Introduction Week is to make a new student feel "at home". To this end, a few of us

meet him, shake his hand, feed him and entertain him. So for this week at least, he feels gloriously "at home". The newcomer is content, smiling and anticipates the greater promise of a tomorrow. But what happens when Freshman Introduction Week ends?

The new student is now largely alone. And the activities of Freshman Introduction Week have done little to teach him how to survive the remaining thirty weeks in this frequently selfish, self-centered community.

Of course, most freshmen do survive. Because they too adopt an attitude of survival—selfish and self-centered. Freshman Introduction Week creates an atmosphere of good-neighbourliness, friendship and good times. But it never lasts. Probably because it is a creation, rather than a reflection of how we, as senior students, genuinely feel towards our newest numbers.

Consequently I will gladly accept the criticism of those upperclassmen who exhibited a sense of responsibility and pride by contributing towards the activities of FIW or by continuing to contribute to the comfort and confidence of single freshmen. But I will not accept the criticisms of students like those four last Friday night, who refused their help, even for five minutes.

Don Thachuk
Director, FIW