

Our Proposal- and Baker's -A System of Soci

Perhaps the single major item which came out of the strike melee of the past week was President Baker's proposal to create a group consisting of support staff (including administration) faculty, and students to review the present budgeting procedures and to attempt to come up with some alternatives, specifically, with regards to wages and salaries?

Since he, perhaps deliberately, left out any specifics, it is difficult to tell exactly what he meant. Was this to be simply a committee or advisory group? Or was it to replace the Board of Governors and or Senate. Was it to cover the entire range of the budget, including perhaps a sub-committee on corruption. Or was it to deal only with salaries. If it was to replace the present governing system. If the later was the case, then would it be set up as two bodies or one. Was it to be elective, appointed, or a combination of the two?

It may be that the President was being vague, as to divorce himself from or marry himself to any more specific proposal depending on whether it failed or succeeded. Maybe.

Or possibly he is attempting to diffuse the opposition into tiny groups which squabble among themselves on the smallest of points, thus rendering the totality impotent.

More likely though, the simple answer is that he has little or no conception of what a system based on

"social justice" would look like; that he, in fact, regards the idea as Utopian and therefore unworthy of consideration. If this is the case, then the only reason he would bring up the idea in the first place would be to convince his opponents that it is indeed impractical.

We must, then, turn his idea on its head and prove to him that such a system is indeed possible. Implicit in the President's original outline is the suggestion that not only is our present system not based upon social justice but it is not even the best allocation of university resources. Apparently the only basis for a salary raise (or I suppose lowering) is that other people in equivalent positions outside the university are already making the new wage. Hardly, to say the least, a purposeful method, let alone a just one.

If it is ever going to be possible to have a system *raison d'être* is social justice, then we must first of all define what 'social justice' is, and secondly lay the perimeters of a 'just' system.

A definition of social justice is really quite simple. Social justice simply implies that each and every man, woman, and child gain full and equitable return for the contributions which she or he has made to society at large.

Secondly, the difference between the smallest and the largest returns must not be too great. Rather than

providing 'incentive', such differences provoke greed, selfishness, envy, and pride -- emotions we have traditionally associated with the downfall and degradation of mankind.

Most importantly, and in some absolute sense, social justice is each person contributing equally to the decision-making in a spirit of compromise and openmindedness. It is upon this condition that the other two are predicated for their continued well-being. If it is that one person has more power in the process, then he will, almost inevitably, use that extra leverage for personal gain. Power corrupts.

And if the process is carried on in a manner less than befitting of a human being (and this means anywhere the participants do not respect each other as individuals), then it will either break down and be replaced by something bearing the marks of oligarchy or will be simply sterile and void of meaning.

Hence 'social justice' carries within itself the three ideas of a fair return, a decent return, and equal say in decision-making.

To bring this closer to the present context, we must turn as great amount of control over to the general membership of the university community as possible, to broaden the base of our elective bodies and to expand their activities to allow as many as possible to participate directly, rather than through a 'representative'. If the Greeks could

operate on that basis with 40,000-person populations, then surely we can do the same with 1800 or so.

Secondly we must eradicate this atmosphere of mistrust and disunity in the university community. If the present strike has had one major effect, it has been to heighten the tensions already extant in the community.

Clerical workers can see little or no common interests with the maintenance workers. Faculty feel threatened by both. Students, in what was a genuine attempt to reach out and aid another group have only managed to badly split themselves. And of course, all three groups mistrust - no hate - the administration especially its leaders, Ron Baker, Dennis Clough, and Merritt Crockett. The latter in turn shrink back into the bureaucratic maze they have created while, paradoxically, ignoring the outside world.

Given this atmosphere, the Cadre would like to present an alternative to the present arrangement in the hopes that sufficient people will take it unto themselves or, even better, react to it and start to come with better ideas of their own.

The present system, with its multitude of interconnections involving the same people over and over does not only refuse to allow most people to participate (witness this week's Bored meeting) but also confuses them to a great extent as to who holds what position within the system. Not surprisingly the people at the

PRESENT STRUCTURE OF U.P.E.I.

— Controls
 ---- Member Of

