

EDITORIALS:

"I believe in compulsory cannibalism. If people were forced to eat what they killed there would be no more wars."

—Abbie Hoffman,
Revolution For the Hell of It

AND THE BEAT GOES ON

"The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might, and the republic is in danger. Yes, danger from within and without. We need law and order! Yes, without law and order our nation can not survive."

—Adolf Hitler, Hamburg, 1932

AN IDEA FOR THE UPC

Here is something from the Guardian's "Bristol Notes" that we find particularly apropos:

"Reading about the education changes that seem to be coming our way some people here gather that by reading some of the letters our two new big schools are doomed to go down the river, the consolidated one was built only two years ago. What we need is a school for clean out, clean shaved, washed-up teen agers and one for cave dwellers or so called hippies."

THE RED & WHITE

The Red and White is the student publication of Saint Dunstan's University, Charlottetown, P.E.I. Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the writer, and not necessarily those of the Administration or Student's Council. Unsigned editorial comment can be considered to be that of the editor.

Editor-in-chief: Jim Hornby

well friends another weary night. nobody showed except cecil who was in only long enough to display his new trainer bra before cavorting off to the libe . . . mac was in petering about . . . the rawards were given to a packed house . . . a lass it seems know end-of-the-raw party . . . chairman horby had his usual george raft of idears — all impossible a lass . . . richie havens ad the farinas . . . sam evansually got his copy in . . . jim burked off without rewronging his stuff agin . . . is anybody really out there? . . . alfred n whitehead said something about exams being a human cultural hangup. 'struth . . . terry flitted about thrashingly . . . i love you myra breckinridge . . . whatever happened to the student cowsill? . . . probly off spending the money they stopped the raw editor from embezzling . . . leon was hi (ding his buzz, no doubt) . . . thanks for the underwhelming support gang — we appreciated it (all night long). MASTHEAD

THIS LETTER IS A PHIL-ER

Editor
The Red and White
Saint Dunstan's University
Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Dear Sir:

I object to the manner in which you fail to fulfill your entrusted responsibility to inform the student body. The unsigned article entitled "Opinions: Nothing Ever non-re-appointment within the philosophy department and Happens At S.D.U." reports rumours of an instance of presents a sample (?) of the student's speculation concerning the non-re-appointment. While as a philosopher I encourage imaginative speculation on the part of all students, I am disappointed with theorization divorced from facts and married to fancy. In the interest of verification of the student's speculations it would be desirable to know the source of your information and the methods by which it was obtained.

To clarify certain factual mistakes, let it be known that there is no Chairma of the Philosophy and Theology Departments. At S.D.U. there are Heads of Departments. Somehow I suspect that there is a reason for the terminological distinction; (certainly there is a distinction between the "simple nature" of a "head" and the "simple ature" of a "chair") (or should it be a "man") and, upon this distinction is based the analogical utilization of the words, (1) Furthermore, the Head of a Department (yes, not even the Head of the Department of Theology) has not the legal authority to deny a professor within his department the re-newal of his contract. Naturally his recommendations influence those who have such power; yet those in authority must exercise their own judgment if they are to fulfill their responsibilities.

The reasons for the non-re-appointment of a faculty member are usually confidential matters between the professor and the University. They remain such until the University (which does initiate non-re-appointment) submits reasons officially. Unfortunately this is seldom publicized; e.g. the 29 professors dismissed from Saint John's University, N.Y.C. and the more recent case at U.N.B. To my knowledge, the reasons for the rumored non-re-appointment in the philosophy department have

not been officially submitted by the University (this is true confidence), since there is supposed to be no legal responsibility on the University's part to present reasons for non-re-appointmet to non-tenured faculty. Likewise, there is no legal responsibility for a professor to accept re-appointment. Moral responsibilities are another question; they are more difficult to determine as the history of ethics and moral theology testifies.

Your anonymous article is a poorly disguised character assassination which is not supported by the rumors which you report, even granting that they are factual. If your insinuations concerning a department head were the least bit creditable, the Administration of S.D.U. would certainly not allow his continuance in office. Even if one were to entertain the Hallucination that the University Administration might through ignorance suffer the continuance of departmental maladministration, it must be self evident that the S.D.U. student body would have rectified the situation through their representatives and voiced their objections in *The Red and White*; thereby initiating appropriate action. It is inconceivable that students should passively endure mal-administration of a department which maintains required courses.

In the future, I hope *The Red and White* extends every sympathy and encouragement to the philosophy department. To turn a deaf ear to its cries of under-staffing forces failure upon the department which aims at stimulating thought. Large classes eliminate any possibility of class-period dialogue, discussion, and free pursuit of philosophic problems. Courses degenerate into dogmatism, the professor of necessity dictating philosophic truth, perhaps even an occasional philosophic error and its refutation thrown in for excitement, for memorization and re-presentation by the student.

In closing may I plead with you to disclose the criteria and method of verification for determining whether a philosopher is a "good" Thomist. Such criteria conceivably could be useful to me in the near future.

(1) John A. Oesterle; *Logic: the Art of Defining & Reasoning*. p.p. vii-78.

Sincerely Yours,
J. A. Mahar.

Rah, Rah, RAH

It appears that this is the last issue of the Red and White. After this, we're through. (Sorry to spring it on you so suddenly — it was the only humane thing to do.) Anyway, unless someone hands in a lot of great copy, Progress will have stilled yet another Voice of the People. Kinda makes you reflect on your own mortality, doesn't it?

I don't think "The Red and White" would be a big hit as the name of the UPEI paper — it hasn't gone over that well here at St. Dunstan's, and our 'colors' are red and white. In the interests of diplomacy, how about "the College and White" — (I doubt that "the Red Times" would

be much of a sensation).

In this last issue we must congratulate all those nice people who showed up at RAW parties. We would like to thank you all individually, and by name, but those are the only times we've ever seen you, and our memories are only human, so. .? Anyway, we missed you all, dear readers.

So, unless somebody out there in the Global Village gets a brainstorm for a Special Edition, this is it from us. In any case, don't throw away your treasured copies — they'll be collectors items some day, and you can pull them all out and get nostalgic over them. We've had fun — how about you?

McGILL UN AUTRE ST. LEONARD?

(Reprinted from Le Quartier Latin)

Ce n'est pas par hasard que McGill University est actuellement la cible d'un mouvement de revendication dont le rôle fondamental est de souligner les multiples contradictions existant au Québec au détriment de la majorité francophone. A cet égard, le domaine de l'éducation est particulièrement riche d'exemples aberrants. Au niveau universitaire, McGill est l'instrument et le symbole d'une minorité colonisatrice d'une part et sa nature actuelle est un obstacle au développement du Québec d'autre part.

Symbole, McGill l'est par son orgueilleuse solitude au sein de la majorité francophone à Montréal et dans tout le Québec. McGill n'est que très peu utile aux Abitibiens par exemple, si ce n'est par ses rapports avec l'exploiteuse Noranda Mines. Ses étudiants, pour la plupart, refusent de se définir comme Québécois: ils ont longtemps boudé l'UGEQ et leur attitude a toujours été à courte vue et corporatiste. Solitude orgueilleuse par son centre d'études sur le Canada français, repaire d'ethnologues abstraits qui n'ont jamais envisagé de connaître le Québec et les Québécois en agissant avec eux sur un pied d'égalité; par ses professeurs de "gôche" (Taylor, Lapierre, Oliver, Scott) pitoyablement divisés devant leur théorie et la pratique actuelle de la libération

des Québécois. On pourrait multiplier ces exemples à l'infini, démontrer que McGill est l'instrument par lequel l'establishment forme ses héritiers et nos futurs patrons, souligner que cette université est l'un des plus puissants groupes de pression au Québec car le gouvernement sait qui parle lorsque McGill ouvre la bouche, prédire que si jamais des difficultés surviennent bientôt, Jean-Guy Cardinal prendra sûrement la défense des Mcgilliers en des termes sauves, etc.

De plus, l'opulence dont jouit la maison est de nature à aviver les humiliations lorsqu'on sait dans quelle condition va naître la Seconde Université de langue française à Montréal. Car n'oublions pas qu'à ces choses se greffent plusieurs problèmes immédiats et à venir qui nous indiquent que la nature même de McGill est un obstacle au développement du Québec.

Il y a d'abord la question des débouchés pour les finissants des CEGEP montréalais. Les meilleurs iront à l'U. de M. Ceux qui ont des sous, iront à l'extérieur (Québec, Sherbrooke) ou à McGill où les frais de scolarité sont très élevés. Les autres iront à la Deuxième, ou bien ils iront sur le marché du travail. Pendant ce temps, les anglophones n'ont pas trop de problèmes à Montréal avec leurs deux universités et puis celles du Canada et des USA qui leur sont plus accessibles.

Il y a encore la question des subventions aux universités. On se souvient de la querelle d'il y a deux ans, elle reviendra. Quand il s'agit de partager le gâteau entre dominants et dominés, il est difficile d'être juste; ce que l'on donne à l'un est enlevé à l'autre. Que se passera-t-il lorsqu'on voudra mettre sur pied un réseau de CEGEP anglophone public? Nous voyons que le seul effort de redressement dans le domaine de l'éducation tenté par la révolution tranquille a eu comme résultat de remettre en cause tous les privilèges de la minorité anglophone au Québec: ce fut Saint-Léonard et ce sera McGill. Que se passera-t-il alors si jamais un véritable gouvernement progressiste s'installe à Québec? One ne peut défendre en même temps les intérêts des ouvriers et des patrons, des dominants et des dominés. Il faudra choisir.

Le problème, c'est celui de la nature de l'Université institution bourgeoise. Ses diplômés sont l'avant-garde de la bourgeoisie. Comme tout, université, McGill exploite et elle exploite parce qu'elle est l'instrument de la minorité anglophone. Elle est au coeur des deux principales aliénations que subissent les Québécois. Dans un Québec indépendant et socialistes elle devra se franciser et reviser totalement ses rapports avec la population, qui sont des rapports de domination.