

Editorial

The Subtlety of Deceit

Each and every aspect of social existence is determined by the dominant mode of thought, which mode is, of course, that of the dominant class. In our case the leading class is the bourgeois -- the political leaders, economic elite, church elite, professors and teachers -- indeed all who lead whether they be bureaucrats or church leaders.

In the economic sphere, the leaders are those who own the property and means of production. As a result they determine the leadership of the other elitist groups. Most significant is their influence on the political leaders who wield the administrative power, which power is used inevitably for the interests of the economic elite. Through the political sphere, the economic elite dominate all other spheres of social existence. Prince Edward Island is ruled therefore by the bourgeois-economic policies of this elitist group, the capitalists.

My intent is not however, to give a critique of P.E.I. economy; my purpose is to point out the subtle, but certain ways by which this dominant mode of thought is propagated by the means of for example, UPEI Senate.

Senate is guided by very definite, formal rules. This in itself is a means for

perpetuating bourgeois thought since it is set up and designed by the bourgeois & for the bourgeois. "One must conform to procedure" -- their procedure, or risk being out of order. This also facilitates objectivity -- a necessary condition to enable one man to deny another man his humanness or identity. It makes it very easy to treat men as objects -- typical of the bourgeois. This is proven by the dismay other senators express if one speaks as a man for men. To speak of truth, freedom, oppression and liberation fills them with horror for these notions do not fit into "formal procedure" -- they are human-centered and, thus, foreign to senate.

There are twice as many faculty (oppressor) as there are students (oppressed).

This is an important point for two reasons:

- 1) it ensures that faculty will have their own way by numerical superiority, and;
- 2) it subtly reveals that argument will not be persuasive by students because of 1 above: students may argue stronger than faculty and, if reason prevails, the student will force faculty to adhere to their needs. However, faculty are not concerned with student needs -- they are concerned only with their own needs -- th-

erefore, it is necessary to resort to vote which will permit faculty inclination to reign supreme and, thus, win their way.

This is very frustrating for students. No matter how right you may be, faculty, due to their numerical superiority can defeat us by vote. Voting procedures therefore protect faculty and, hence, maintain the existing bourgeois state of affairs.

What is further revealed is the non-respect for honesty, truth and justice. The very way in which senate is structured is proof positive that argument and reason are in the service of faculty interests. A student may talk for a few minutes revealing very penetratingly the discrepancies which exist, but when he finishes there is a momentary lull where no-one says anything; after the lull, some faculty member will begin to discuss something not related to the student's words at all! He gets denied! Students are overlooked. But after a faculty member finishes talking, there is a hum of verbal activity -- because he is talking to faculty, for them.

The conspiracy is subtle & manifests itself in the smallest details. It's work -- though dishonest -- is ingenious in perpetrating and maintaining the existing bourgeois world.

There are the "nit-pickers." Bob Ellison and Harry Love are experts at this -- they're not the only ones but they are the most effective. What most characterizes the nit-picker is that he is relentless, and concentrates on the smallest, most insignificant details.

They are effective by "wearing senate down" until they win their point. Their point is not honestly won, mind you; they get us so tired, bored and disgusted that we're only too happy to concede! An incompetent mind will resort to this practice. (small minds cannot see beyond details)

There is also the "authoritarian". This fellow uses the form of authority -- but he has no content. For example, he uses a very restrained voice, calculated to sound authoritarian. He is also very formal and at home with "proper procedure". He is detached and unconcerned even when he uses such terms as "concern", "proper", "desireable", "justice" etc. However, when you examine the content of his re-



"Do you realize, young man, what C-minus can mean in terms of lifetime earnings?"