

RED & WHITE

Published bi-monthly during the University year by the students of St. Dunstan's University, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, and for the payment of postage in cash.

Member of Canadian University Press.

The opinions expressed in this publication are the views of the writers, not necessarily the views of the students, the Students' Council, or of the University.

editorial

BESIDES THE BOYS WRECKING

MEMORIAL HALL

AND

GETTING IN FIGHTS AT

NORTH RIVER,

THERE'S NOT A GODDAM

THING WORTH WRITING

ABOUT

I.E.

THIS

HAS

TO

BE

THE

DEADEST

SICKEST

SLOWEST

CAMPUS

IN

CANADA

RIGHT?

CAN'T NECK IN THE RECEPTION ROOM AT BERNARDINE? DON'T LIKE DUCKING BEER BOTTLES IN MEMORIAL? CAN'T HACK THE BABBLING IDIOTS IN THE COFFEE SHOPPE?

COME REVOLUTE WITH
THE RED AND WHITE!!

(If you don't like necking, do like ducking beer bottles, and are one of those babbling idiots, drop over anyway, just to sneer at the stupid hippie-type and intellectual-type slobs)

MEETING:

Friday at 5:00 p.m.

BASEMENT MEMORIAL

RED AND WHITE

Editor-in-Chief Ted DeCoste

EDITORIAL DIVISION

News Mike Coady

Sports Don Niles

Arts Leon Berrouard

Politics We sing all together

Features Jim Cusack, Cecil Bradley

Entertainment Jim Hornby

Educational Affairs Terrance McGarragle

STAFF

Business Manager Ray Landry

Circulation Manager Sandra Shea

Photography Ted Tam, Ray Landry, Ray Dubrule

Typing Ernie Gallant, May DeCoste, Helen Hickey

Layout Cecil Bradley, Jim Hornby

Art Don Anderson

Writers Marg Beamish, Alan MacKenzie,

Mike MacCormick, "Mordo", Paul Gray

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Thou shalt not take the name
of the Principal or
teachers thy gods in vain.

Thou shalt not demand an
adequate education or
utter words of
discontentment.

Thou shalt kiss thy god's ass
for recognition.

Thou shalt not develop thy
mind except as the
gods dictate.

Thou shalt piss when
the gods allow it.

Thou shalt allow thyself to be
censored and disciplined

Thou shalt obey the orders
of the gods.

Thou shalt look upon
university as a place
of higher education.

Thou shalt not demand
equality for thou hast
been told that thou art
an inferior animal.

Thou shalt worship the
graven images of
conformity.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir:

The "special feature" on the United States in the November 1 issue presents a grossly distorted image of American society. The distortion seems to be due to misunderstanding — or more likely ignorance — of American history and politics.

It is not made clear what is meant by the "American dream" or the "American myth." Probably the author is thinking of the dynamic elan of a young nationality that has not been confronted by many external frustrations. The Americans were in such a fortunate position until forced by geography and economics to assume a role of international leadership after World War I. The loss of this elan as a consequence of disillusionment and disenchantment can be compared to the transition from adolescent gaucherie to adult "wisdom." However, even as early as the War of 1812, the Americans experienced a temporary loss of their "elan vital" when they failed to conquer Canada. In any case, the 'death of the American dream' is not a product solely of the events of the last few years, though of course the Vietnam fiasco is one in a long series of "external frustrations" dating as far back as 1918.

It is nonsense to suggest that the "Founding Fathers" of the U.S. were blazing idealists. Like the Canadian "Fathers of Confederation" and present-day statesmen of both countries, the American power élites of 1775-1800 were moved primarily by motives of national, class, and person interest, enlightened and otherwise.

Every nationality is influenced by ideals, representing deeply-held or hard-sought values. It is unobjective to call these ideals "good" or "bad." Everyone will have his own opinion on the merit of a national ideal, depending on a set of personal values affected by many factors. The "liberation" of Canada by the Americans in 1775 and 1812 may have been an idealistic aspiration from the viewpoint of American patriots, but it was "aggression" from the standpoint of the British government and probably of most Canadians.

I don't think the Americans are any more "blinded by super-patriotism" than Russians, Chinese, French Canadians, or even Englishmen in the Victorian age. Every nationality passes through one or more phases of intense nationalism, and at any period of time there are groups within the nation that display this syndrome. I fail to see how the Sputnik incident of 1957 pointed to "basic faults" in American society. Within weeks after the first Russian space satellite was launched the Americans have kept close pace with each other. There was a lot of loose talk among Americans in the late '50's about the Russians suddenly catching up technologically, but actually the foundations for Russian scientific advances had been laid years before, even prior to the 1917 revolution.

It is absurd to say that the Viet Nam War has "divided the American people more than any other." The War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Phillipine War of 1899-1902 were as strongly opposed by large segments of the Americans as Vietnam has been. The most divisive American war was certainly the Civil War of 1861-5. The failure to quickly win the Vietnam conflict has been frustrating to Americans, but this failure is not nearly so traumatic as your writer suggests.

The American racial problem is, admittedly, quite serious, but it is hardly "tearing American society apart." Blacks, after all, constitute only one-tenth of the American population and are concentrated in the South and in the great urban centers. In many parts of the U.S. a Negro is hardly ever seen. It is true that most white Americans tend to be ethnocentric (i.e., racist) in varying degrees, a phobia they unfortunately share with practically everyone else in the world of whatever color. (I would rather be a black in the U.S. than an Ibo in Nigeria.)

I doubt if it is accurate to say that the civil rights movement is at "a dead stop." More blacks voted in the 1968 elections than ever before, they elected more Congressmen and state legislators than at any previous election, and almost elected Humphrey President. The votes cast for the black racist candidate, Cleaver, were few and scattering. Incidentally, the influence of Martin Luther King was never as great as your writer says, and was declining long before his assassination.

To say that "American society is plagued by crime and violence" is sensationalism. The U.S. is no more crime-afflicted than any other great urban country. Violent crime is an endemic problem of mass society, whether the scene is Chicago, London, Moscow, or Montreal. As for murders committed in Dallas and Great Britain, I think if you will check your statistics you will find that Dallas is ahead only in murders involving guns. English murderers prefer quieter, more subtle methods of disposing of their victims.

The "youth revolution" is likely to break out in any mass society in which permissive behavior by the young is tolerated, or encouraged, by affluent middle class parents. Anthropological studies of youthful rebels show that the majority do not hold values markedly distinct from those of their elders. Conformism, hedonism, materialism, and philistinism are characteristics of the 20th century middle class, in youth as well as middle age, in places as remote from the U.S. as Saigon, Vietnam and Charlottetown, P.E.I. It appears to me that the Students for a Democratic Society in the U.S., like the Canadian Union of Students, are after a share of power, not a change in the basic value structure of their society. It is preposterous to say that "flower children" who sometimes spend hundreds of dollars on elaborate

"gear" have "no desire to accumulate vast quantities of material goods"!

To conclude quickly, your writer has misconstrued the political phenomena of the late Sen. Robert Kennedy and George Wallace. American voters were attracted to these men because they were vigorous, outspoken, charismatic types, contrasting sharply to devious, Machiavellian power-brokers like LBJ and Nixon, and to mushy, plastic professional "pols" like Hubert Humphrey. Young people, and many not so young, identified with RFK because he wanted to do something NOW. A surprising number of ex-Kennedyites, after his death, made a 180-degree shift (in ideology, not style) to Wallace, because he too was a man of action.

Most of Wallace's support came, not from the far right as your writer says, but from normally middle-of-the road lower middle class people disgusted with conventional politicians. Wallace, unlike Goldwater, is not a reactionary, or even a conservative. He wants to extend, not curtail, many features of the welfare state. In Wallace's platform he urged that old-age pensions paid by the state be sharply increased, and came out strongly for public medicare programs. Wallace is in the tradition of the Populists, the agrarian radicals of the 1920's, and Father Coughlin, not of the John Birch Society, even though the oil millionaires connected with the latter endorsed his candidacy for reasons of their own. Wallace is too important a political figure to loosely stigmatize with words like "nut" and "fascist". He is no more unbalanced or extreme in his political views than Canada's Ernest Manning or Wacky Bennett, with whose fundamentalist politics he has a good deal in common.

Yours truly,

Don M. Cregier,
Associate Professor
of History.

Dear Sir:

We would like to extend our thanks to our fellow students through this letter. It had been a long time since we foreign students, as a group, took part in a social event. Our thanks to the chairman of WUS, Caroline Duffy, who gave us an immeasurable amount of help. Under the organization of WUS, the International Food Night was presented. Raising funds for WUS was secondary. Our priority was to take this chance to introduce some international food styles. It turned out to be a success, owing to the encouragement of our fellow students, the special help of a group of students, and the contributions of the wives of the staff. Here we thank them all.

Yours truly,

Susan Nip
Kay Barker