AUTONOMY?

Students of all political persuasions were shocked by the non-response of the NUS Executive to the recent government discussion paper on Student Union financing.

The document, ‘The Financing of Student Unions in Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Education and Further Education’, was published on May 15th and was expected to be read by many delegates who attended the NU".

Hugh Lanning, ex-National Treasurer of NUS and a founder member of the Socialist Students Alliance, had outlined to conference the contents of a document which the SSA believed to be a “fundamentally accurate” assessment of the government’s proposals. The document in the possession of the SSA had come from an impeccable source, he said, and the effects of any such proposals being put into practice would be disastrous for all Students’ Unions. The Executive’s response led many delegates to believe that their leadership was being less than candid. Indeed, Ms Sue Slippman, retiring NUS President, went so far as to make a personal attack on Lanning via MAINMAIL immediately after conference, whilst denouncing the government had any intention of issuing such proposals. Today, one month after the Department of Education and Science published the document, the response of the NUS Executive has been felt by many to be lamentable.

POOR RESPONSE

A Briefing Conference ‘to distinguish the real issues from the apparent’ has been called by Ms Slippman on Saturday June 17th. The tone of Ms Slippman’s standard invitation, does not imply that she envisages any campaign being necessary to combat the proposals:

Dear President,

As you know, the DES have now published their proposals on the future of Student Union funding. In view of the policy issues raised, and the variety of practical problems likely to derive from such a new system of Union funding, NUS invites you to attend a briefing conference...

Yours sincerely,
Sue Slippman, President.

Under the NUS constitution, a briefing conference cannot mandate the Executive and for this reason, due also to the fact that the long vacation is less than a month away, many sections of the NUS membership began to press for an emergency conference. The University of Kent at Canterbury Students’ Union joined the call for an emergency conference. The University President said, “I was telephoned from NUS headquarters in my capacity as a member of the SSA National Committee, and asked if we (the SSA) were pushing for an emergency conference. At that time the three SSA members on the NUS executive felt that, although Slippman was obviously attempting to avoid an emergency conference by calling a briefing conference, we ought to use the briefing conference to ensure that conference policy regarding Union Autonomy and Fees was followed. To this end we tabled a resolution for the Executive Committee for debate on May 21st 1978. Suffice to say that the majority of the Executive went against the resolution without seriously discussing it. Slippman is triggered the whole issue as being fairly unimportant. One delegate made perfectly clear that he agrees with her comments to the National Press after the DES published their proposals, “You could quite easily imagine that she is keeping the Broad Left in line by portraying the SSA as hysterical dinosaurs who cannot accept the inevitability of change.”

‘The SSA however, is not prepared to allow Slippman as an individual to stand in the way of the collective NUS response to these proposals and we have approached Trevor Phillips, the National Organiser of Labour Students, N.O.L.S., and the Communist Party. Despite our political differences on this subject which should and will be argued, the need for a response is clear and the method by which it is decided must not become a political football.’

Campbell’s analysis of the attitude of the NUS Executive seems to be borne out by the current (June) edition of National Student which is freely available on campus. The editorial, ‘This Is What It Is About’ is little more than a collection of well-worn clichés and platitudes.

Victor Koltsou, the UCJSU Delegation Leader to the Easter conference seems also to share the Union President’s reservations about Ms Slippman’s comments in the appendix of the conference report which deals with this topic. ‘I had heard that the CPGB has fallen drastically since the split in the ranks last year, and as a true ‘Eurocommunist’ Slippman envisages an active role for the membership as stemming from a public recognition of the necessity and non-extremist nature of party policy. What better way to convince the great British public of this fact than to fully support the political destruction of students’ unions?’

Slippman herself gave the game away the day after the government proposals were published. She said to the Times:

‘Our wings are clipped depends on how politically we choose to use them. If we are stupid we shall invite problems. If we operate rationally and correctly we are stronger than ever before.’

The most crucial difference between 1972 and the present is that today we have the active collusion of the NUS leadership in the government’s action.

MOTIVE

Two people epitomise this unusual attitude in a student leadership; those two are Sue Slippman, President of the NUS, and Trevor Phillips, President-elect. Their motives are of course, dissimilar; the effect of their actions depressingly similar. One cannot escape the fact that Ms Slippman is a member of the Communist Party of Great Britain, and a member of the CPGB’s Central Committee. Slippman has had her bags packed to leave NUS headquarters since the Broad Left refused to ratify a party member for a second term of office as President. Her work has suffered, she has lost all motivation. It is all the more strange, therefore, that she is in the forefront of a scenario which has all the trappings of a conspiracy and a sell-out! Her membership of the CPGB is not unrelated to his phenomenon. Slippman has a tremendous influence on National CPGB policy; she is an architect, not a bricklayer. The membership of the CPGB has fallen drastically since the split in the ranks last year, and as a true ‘Eurocommunist’ Slippman envisages an active role for the membership as stemming from a public recognition of the necessity and non-extremist nature of party policy. What better way to convince the great British public of this fact than to fully support the political destruction of students’ unions?

Whether The British Road to Socialism will benefit the CPGB is debatable. It certainly will not benefit the student movement. Trevor Phillips, on the other hand, is less Machiavellian, more defensive. Trevor does not believe that the student movement can mount a successful campaign against these proposals. To do so, he argues (privately) is to court defeat and thus disaster. He bases his analysis on the knowledge that the government is out to constrain students’ unions. If we fight and lose then the government could well tighten up further. He may accept the effects of gangrene being more advantageous to the body politic that is the necessary surgery to stop the rot... should we? Certainly he demonstrates the position that we are weaker now than in 1972. And he should know — for much of the period he has constituted part of a broad left dominated Executive which has orchestrated that weakness. Both Slippman and Phillips have party influence to information and government discussions on the question of financing prior to December Conference 1977, and are compared with the DES document itself. At no time were the membership informed of the true rationale behind the debate.

The mass of 1972 may well have gone forever, but the student movement cannot allow its response to the present attack to be dictated by the unionism and ‘party building’.
The students' Union has discovered the great outdoors and your reported was there to capture the occasion. At last week's Junior College Council, the fact that the upper senate chamber in which those meetings are usually held was not available, led to the fifty or so representatives of the assorted committees looking for a place to hold their fort nightly gathering.

The first choice, the committee room in the union office was abandoned as sections of Rutherford JC IRC began to pop out of the open windows under the unending pressure of those trying to get through the door behind them. The solution was simple, so simple that it was only necessary to vote three times in order to carry it out. They escaped the restrictive confines of bricks and mortar and plunged instead for a roll in the sweet smell of new mown hay. All fifty of them.

That they share the same roof automatically gives Spence Court residents common interests. As it reaches the end of its first academic year in existence, those interests are making themselves apparent. The contractual nature of the catering scheme which prevents the fullest use of resources. The general level of facilities, particularly the slowness of the maintenance service. The third thing that Spence Court needs is recognition by students and administration alike, of its status as an independent community.
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Students have for many years had reason to protest at the links between Britain’s police and security agencies, and foreign governments such as the FBI, SAVAK, BOSS, etc., because of the sensitive and difficult position overseas students find themselves in when at relatively liberal British colleges. REcent press reports, backed up with unquestionably genuine information from a variety of sources, suggest that for the first time, all days students should expect some scrutiny of their activity, not just those from countries such as Iran, Chile and India, to name but three.

A little research can indeed uncover a lot of information that was not covered in the Derek Leinard motion on ‘Surveillance of Police and Political Activities’ passed overwhelmingly by the last Union General Meeting.

Undoubtedly, the publicity given by the unlucky ‘Colonel B’ to the activities of our police departments of state not normally—nor in that context for some time, generous to subject themselves to public scrutiny, has increased general awareness of the ‘domestic’ surveillance undertaken by the police and other agencies. This has been achieved by self-appointed vigilantes, rather than by the Union.

The case recently of two members of the Hunt Saboteurs Association arrested and convicted by the National Farmers’ Union is a good example of the way in which such stories have received publicity. The two activists involved are now in prison, but the case has had a salutary effect on the Union’s policy.

On the other hand, the case of the London Transport police, who were found guilty of misconduct in a public office, has probably done more to encourage the police to increase their surveillance of non-political activities. The police have been found to have broken many of the rules of fair procedure, and it is likely that they will be found to have committed further acts of misconduct.

In more recent cases, two student unions have discovered instances of political activity, and have taken action to stop these activities. In one case, the police were found to have broken the law, and have been found guilty of misconduct.

And of course the activity of the Drugs Squad on this campus is well known, and is easily seen. It is not surprising that this activity is increasing, and that the police are taking steps to stop it.

And finally, returning to Colonel B for a moment, consider the implications of the fact that much research has been done on this campus in covered by the Official Secrets Act by virtue of direct or indirect links with the Ministry of Defence.

On March 2nd 1977 Elliot J.C.C. made proposals for ending the problem of the internal posting system in the college. In true form the matter left the matter, the J.C.C. to deal with. With no

Every draft was prepared, copies were dispatched to all J.C.C.‘s and executive members. The junior college Council and working party meetings were advertised as police open meetings. Due to the far-reaching nature of the problem, the working party consisting of the President, the president-elect, four J.C.C. members, and any other member of J.C.C. who wished to attend.

Those who attended on a regular basis were: William Campbell, President. Roger Smith, president-elect Mike Blundell, Chair of J.C.C. SOK. Jacki Hawkins, Union secretary. John Bollard, president of Darwin J.C.C. Beth Logon, VP Academic Affairs, and two J.C.C. Liberals.

It thus came as quite a shock when the J.C.C. Liberals issued a run of 2,000 leaflets, peine by that well-known descendant of George Washington (Dave Vasmer), and ex-Christian Union Person (Bill Logan), which contained such lies and distortions that the rest of the working party were rendered quite speechless.

Perhaps it is a new tactic to argue your case through every available forum, and when you lose, claim there has been no debate.

I do not intend to argue the case fully here, but will argue the case for the inclusion of the J.C.C. Liberals to the membership at the U.G.M. NOT: We even moved the U.G.M. to an afternoon slot for those who live out, we intend to debate the constitution after 5.15 pm in order that part-one students who wish to have examinations could attend, and arranged for at least one dining hall to open later in order that people be not starved. One further point, we had the meeting arranged outside so that even the sun-worshippers could attend without loss.

Hurry it up, Serge, I’ve got a seminar at two o’clock . . .

STUDENTS IN ELLIOT CALL FOR TAYLOR’S RESIGNATION

On Tuesday June 18th, the day after The Gremlin goes on sale, a no-confidence in the master of Elliot college is being presented to the J.C.C. to their College General Meeting. We hope to be able to bring you a result of that meeting in our stop press column so look elsewhere if you are curious. Many students have scrutinised the facts and are wondering why Elliot’s ‘now-we’re-radical-now-we’re-not’ Junior College Committee have decided on such a strong move, an action normally reserved for times of generalised strife as in the no-confidence
deserved on Derek Crabtree in the catering campaign.

So what’s on their minds? What has this harmless-looking jacket gone done to hurt them? the answer is nothing. Nothing at all. In fact a record of almost total inactivity, Mr Taylor is noticeably quick in disciplinary measures. He’s a competent gardener. He’s a family man. He’s a wise man. Beyond that he is thoroughly useless. Let us be more specific:

On March 2nd 1977 Elliot J.C.C. made proposals for ending the problem of the internal posting system in the college. In true form the matter left the matter, the J.C.C. to deal with. With no

New Constitution at U.G.M.

At the U.G.M this afternoon (4pm outside Union Office, Wed 16th June) there will be a debate on changes to the student union’s constitution. The amendments were the result of six weeks work, including the Junior college Council, and a working party which sat all day long for fourteen days. After

many students have had many incidents to report, apart from the expected ones concerning overseas students’ activities, being scrutinised by agents of their governments. For several years now, it is common knowledge that serving police officers are present in the students’ Union and the campus on courses such as law. When actions such as the occupation of university buildings have been taken as part of the various campaigns, photographs of those part-take have been passed to the police. Perhaps by the administration, perhaps by those police officially on the campus, but also by other students who wish to interrogate themselves on giving such information as has been proved to be the case in other colleges. Individual officers at Kent have confidentially admitted that such offers have been made to them but have not revealed by whom.

In 1976, at the first conference of the Student Movement Campaign on Ireland held at Kent, open to all students an ex-member of the FCS, well-known in the campus, stole documents from one delegate’s briefcase and passed them to the Special Branch. That student is still here and has a room in Keynes. Later in the year, the house of Pamela Holman, Union Treasurer and secretary to the campaign, was raided by police from the London Special Branch. They took away (without receipt) documents and books, some of which can be bought in Dillon’s.

And of course the activity of the Drugs Squad on this campus is well known, and is easily seen. It is not surprising that this activity is on the increase. There is no evidence of police breaking the law.

And finally, returning to Colonel B for a moment, consider the implications of the fact that much research has been done on this campus in covered by the Official Secrets Act by virtue of direct or indirect links with the Ministry of Defence.

New Constitution at U.G.M.
Pilgrim's Progress Report

Keynes is quite a nice college — lots of people contentedly pass three years under its mellow portals — there are rumours, some actively like it. It is certainly one of the friendliest of the colleges, welcoming people from all walks of student life, from all political and religious persuasions. But Keynes is also the college containing one of the biggest and most persistent of flaws. That is an almost total disregard of student needs and lack of student services.

Maybe because Keynes tends to be the 'most open' of the colleges its lack of services can be most readily criticised, and not only those of us ruddy-faced from the comforts of home are affected. There have been loud rumbles from the postgraduates.

The Easter vacation saw a new low in services, with long queues in the dining hall, the servery selling very few sandwiches and the shop opening the most erratic hours. Complaints culminated in a petition of over 270 signatures and representations from relevant trade unions pressurised direct executive action from the central college office.

The following measures were pushed for:
(a) The servery and shop should remain open for regular hours and the shop should be open at lunchtimes. Sandwiches and pies should be provided at the servery until it closes in the late afternoon.
(b) The dining Hall should be sufficiently staffed to avoid lengthy queues.
(c) Clear lists of rooms available to members of the University should be made public.
(d) Regular meetings should be held between students and management to settle minor problems and irritations and when they occur. Easier access to the central college officers' manager was also sought.

As a result the postgraduates set up a Vacation Action Fund which will be used to make non-University members of the campus aware of any severe derogation of services that occurs this vacation.

Of course, a lot of problems referred to are peculiar to the vacation and therefore tend to affect postgraduates most. But even the average three-term student will recognize something in this situation.

The shop prices are deliberately inflated because of the 'captive' custom it relies on. Its hours are erratic and closing and opening is tailored to the equality equality—bus services.

The Bar — what can one say? No soda water, not much ice, a limited range of beers and licensing hours which do their best to make sure you take the bus down town in dry-docked desperation. And if you're lucky to be here when the wooden shutter is up, the chances are you will have to wade through a crowd of fellow students only to be confronted by a student-hating barman who thinks Osborne is the only "proper" University.

The coffee bar — the staff are nice as are the furnishings. But everything else is stale. Permanently assailed by the ravages of "staff benefits".

Students are renowned for their apathy. The usual explanation is 'I came here to get a degree, and anyway it doesn't affect me...'. Name one student who ever got a degree without coffee!

Now, come on. fellow Keynesians. demand proper carries and beer, as well as cheaper prices. You have nothing to lose but the queues. shortage the hours are erratic, the sandwiches spotty, and the queues long. The coffee is good but that is not much consolation for the hapless student who is confronted with a blockade of fellow caffeine addicts of a polite 'shut at 2.00 pm' notice.

That's where the problems started. What were we supposed to be doing anyway? There was an air of eagerness, even willingness, reminiscent of Battersea dog-shows or Headgirls on Open-Days. But there was also a pervading air of uneasiness. I mean we had read the constitution, and listened attentively to the Treasurer's instructions read out in half-empty rooms, but there was still an overall confusion. Should subscriptions be included? Were Executive directives guidelines or gospel? How much discretion did have? Should we have?

The meeting was predictably negative — a few dominant people

On the contrary, there are enough 'unions' to stir up trouble.

The 'umbrellas' are a good idea in theory. They do allow for better financial planning by the Executive and Finance Committee, they do force societies to think ahead; they should stop the last minute mumbo-jumbo rush for funds. But practice is not always hot on the heels of the theory. There should have been a member of the executive there. Powers should have been clearly defined. Discretion should be limited and there should have been an air of urgency and importance. What about those societies who handed in budgets and didn't turn up? What about those who did nothing at all? There was no shortage of information and publicity, but were these the only reasons people failed to show? Or is it the theory that 'everything will work out all right in the end' all-pervading on this campus?

South Africa

A 24-hour vigil will take place outside South Africa House, Square, in memory of the dead of Soweto, from midnight, June 17th June. The vigil is being organised by the International Anti-Apartheid Year Co-ordinating Committee. Different organisations and groups are taking responsibility for different periods of the day — participants are welcome at all times.

In very easy for the British student to offer token solidarity with the black majority of South Africa. Any vaguely aware person will feel outrage and disgust at the treatment of blacks in that country. Read any newspaper, listen to any radio programmes, look at the television documentaries, and one need not have any political awareness to identify with the oppressed majority. The white South African is not a politically likeable species. The black freedom fighter is easily romanticised, and we all love a hero (or a heroine, for that matter).

But how many of us go beyond this emotional expression of sympathy? How many pass beyond a Times editorial to a real understanding of the political situation in South Africa? Life is not just a white man with the whip, and the black in the bush. In Africa there is a real political struggle for real political power, and our sympathetic remembrances are just not enough. A struggle for freedom is taking place and we cannot afford to abtain on the sidelines; we are not umpires. We either give active support of we are consciously supporting a repressive regime. We cannot be indifferent. There is no such thing as an impartial viewer of the South African arena.

Friday June 16th is the second anniversary of the Soweto massacre in South Africa. South African police opened fire on a peaceful protest by school children. Over two hundred people were killed. Subsequent events have shown beyond doubt the overwhelming opposition of the South African black community to the evil policies of apartheid and racial tyranny practised by the Nationalist government.

Don't commemorate the events in your armchair. Do something — maybe you can make your voice heard. It may be nothing — but let's do something — it's our struggle too! The South African Freedom Rally will take place at 7.30 pm. at Central Hall, Westminster. The programme will include thirty speeches, music, song, and poetry. Among the participants are:

Jubula — playing 'Children of Soweto'

Peggy Seeger and Ewan McColl

The Duck needs no caption — he needs a name.
umbrellas' are needed

Wednesday sees the last U.G.M. of the academic year and clutching soggy voting papers we (un)willingly wave farewell to the present sabbatics. As always (?) the event promises a potpourri of scintillating motions but the farewell bash surpasses itself. There is literally something for everyone. The welfare of the student is kept firmly in mind.

ash

Chris Moran looks to our civil welfare with a motion on a local councilor: Paul Holmes to our fundamental rights (especially already). Rod McCartney protects us from ourselves and the clutching imperialist hands of the tobacco factories. Not to mention safety from the prospect of Jeb Bush voting. A helpful breakdown of how to spend your grant on suicide is offered and salvation in the form of an anti-smoking clinic (presumably the occupants don't smoke rather than the motion of a fireproof structure). Rutherford J.C.R. look after our minds by consulting the Morning Star and offering the Guardian - guaranteed pure by the Kent Area Health Authority.

revered

All call for more publicity, more information and less work for next year's sabbatics. The devil finds work for idle hands, so they say. Maybe that explains the last two motions - sure to be the highlights of the year. If there is one thing most people will agree on it is that our revered president is well-known. But apparently not well enough honoured. In the wake of renewed interest in the satanic hills of the far north (world cup, drugs, oil and nationalisation) there is move to put our President Maclim at the head - say above the bonny hills of Scotland.

deity

One motion calls for Mr Campbell to be made Emperor, the other that he should have the chance to prove his omnipotence. Both express regret at his being unable to run for the position of God (it being well known He was Jewish). But even an earthly figurehead should get privileges (like vans) and these are catered for.

splash

So all you doubting Thomases who feel Colin is incapable of reaching such heights of excellence - come and pass a motion allowing him to at least get his feet wet trying it. And all you paid up members of the Campbell fan club come and support your leader. Even God has disciples.

"I wish to move a procedural motion."

boa constrictors against the nazis!!

Anh fetishism?

"HELP! SEND IN THE S.P.G. MONGOOSE!!"
Back in 1966, when INCANT first appeared, and when the '50s had returned, "on the whole commentators thought their hit" [INCANT editorial No 2], the independent newspaper of UKC began to confront the question of its role consisted on the hand in mirroring that contentment, or on the other in criticizing and campaigning. For ten years INCANT adapted itself to the changes, then more tacit, to the fall of the old and the rise of the new. In recent years INCANT has come to accept a range of varied, but generally positive, role, and in favour of simplicity, and often ill-researched reporting. The output varied in quality, but overall the newspaper was more national.

NATIONAL STUDENT, INTERCOM and Nigel Dempster write large, supplemented by numerous minor columns, and occasional reviews. On never or exceptionally, INCANT is now distinctly solitary in its aggregate ordinariness.

This much has long been obvious to most students at least. The following reproduction is from INCANT 108 (March 10th 1976) signed by seventy-two students who were concerned enough about the situation of students and workers that they reached to attempt to inject a new block, debating its inappropriateness in the pages of the paper itself. More than two years later something more than this "dialogue" is patiently needed. You are holding it in your hands.

INCANT's inability to respond in any serious manner to the charges, as evidenced by the reply is indicative of something amiss with its methods. It becomes beyond the critical.

The charge that the paper was essentially Jon Longman's vendetta against the left. As for the "reform" which was taken into account the history of student journalism on this campus since 1966, and doesn't touch upon the character of INCANT as a whole, rather than the concept of "independence" in reporting, a concept which had dogged its development for a decade.

Longman's editorship, following the revival of INCANT simply brought to the fore a trend which was already established as the dominant one. INCANT has always lacked consistent presence, students have always been recognized as its author, and it's all they have to read because there is little else in the form of handouts or newsheets. The faults pointed to in the letter were definitely those of the students, not of the staff as the Longmans reign, all that he was uniquely responsible for was an open fight with sections of his readership over the question of a constitution and a change of structure for the paper itself.

EARLY DAYS

The relitigation of the early INCANT is perhaps excusable. Back in the dark days of 1966, when students and students, confronting an overwhelmingly monolithic administration which was intent on reproducing a plastic Oxbridge in the form of student organizations, were content to campaign against it, and the fact that was being debilitated into real curricular structures - the strict system of "farming" students for police training, a total lack of facilities.

As the original vision of Kent University was systematically

tically distorted largely by the total failure of financial provision to keep up with student numbers (i.e., seven or more colleges, a million books in the University's library), an evident trend. INCANT charted the decline of UKC adequately enough, concluded that: "One of the chief criticisms of INCANT is that it has been far too interventionist in the main reason... is undoubtedly because INCANT's capacity to reflect the thoughts and opinions of students is in general: these are interrogated..."

"...current events of a national and local scale feature less and less in the commentary and thoughtful of students, but trivial issues loom up in the mind out of all proportion, excluding more important considerations."

"...External affairs are viewed in their correct perspective, in proportion to events outside the University. This educational experience would be much richer (INCANT Editorial Issue No 3, Feb 15th 1966.)

"...there has been a prejudice against a catalytic to place itself in the vanguard of a search for this broader perspective student affairs..."

"...indeed have fulfilled all its early promise. However longman is not the reflective character...""INCANT never disintegrated..."

"...Apathy continues to be rampant. I was chattering to a former UKC student last week. She was telling me that weekends since and eight years ago were just as dead as they are now. She remarked that on a return visit to the campus last year, she was appalled by the amount of vandalism..."

"...spreading rapidly across the University..."

"Apathy and vandalism appear, there has all the fun gone? Have you ever spent an impossible time in a library, when you have the money to go there, for the books? Let's have some enjoyment. After all, life is a form of survival and it is supposed to be enjoyable. Is it not then their creative nature?"

One dripping paragraph later, having positively rejected the well-ordered (or competitive) existence that is "a game of life, Longman has the unmitigated gall to announce: 'We (INCANT) only appreciate constructive and helpful criticism... we believe in independent thought and also in the right of individuals to have their say...'

That INCANT is not Longman's whole, consistently refused any attempt to demarcate its work by student's constitution, seems not to have any way contradicted any of the critique's "independent" thought.

INCANT's 1966 at least had the excuse of having to make its way through student rights, and a decade later, there was no justification for such an indication of a profuse responsibility, Indeed the letter opened up by INCANT, which have been well received.

Perhaps most particularly, INCANT's historical of "independence" was nothing more than a "bucket mentality". You, the students, pour it all out to us, the journalism, pour it all out again for your consumption.

Take the following from the same letter: N. 56, June 17th 1976: "Over the last term or so INCANT has received a lot of letters from students through such genuine free-bodies as the EUSU (the journal published by the Registry)... "Left-wing" editors have been unresponsive to its genuine duties of News broadcasting.

The paper is open to anyone to publish his or her views and it has been used to this end. If the majority of articles have been leftist, then one can only assume that this is because the right is inarticulate."

So INCANT wasn't really about playing a positive role in campus life all at. Merely offer to mirror the views donated to it by those who for one reason or another contributed, Incant was 'leftist' when the general tone of the contributions was "light" and 'unprofessional' when the views mirrored the views of the campus. One and how jolly lucky we are, the more of the National . Would all the things be so bony hard that this was all a "balanced" news and not a National. The only natural that in keeping with this principle of reflective innocence, the editorial that glorious period 1968-70 resembles a storming within pages between AIZ and the Daily Mail.
Perhaps then we should take seriously the following initiative from Incant No 25, Dec 5th 1967: "Incant is in no way an anti-student". Student Union Newspaper, and as such we have no monopoly on the releasing of news. But this position cannot last forever, and we are looking forward to the day when we have competition. We are confident that with these principles of independent journalism, we will thrive in the years to come.

Eleven years later....

To return to the letter of the seventy-two. They suggest that Longman's personal views and the ensuing conflict between Incant and the left executive is a root problem. Looking back on Incant in 1970, and again in 1975-7, when the dominant political trend in the paper is left', we can see that this is not the case. The paper was "left" in those periods because it reflected the views that its student contributors held.

The "Far-out trendy" issues of 1970, with their full front page photographs, pages of artwork with little or no text, lengthly and (now) incomprehensible articles of every single cultural happening for miles around, are quite understandable in the framework of this essential negative mentality upon which Incant had premised itself from its inception.

Incant has always tallied student mentality, and in that sense has never been independent at all. Above all Incant has always relied on the casual reader's views etc for the bulk of its work. This relates directly to that 1966 editorial - the idea that students are no longer interested in the big issues, their minds are concentrated on trivia. Even if this was true twenty years ago, it is certainly not so now and should never have been used as the cover for an abdication of journalistic responsibility which it is.

Another important facet of this whole facade of "independence" that Incant has consistently sheathed itself in, is the way it is organised. It is accountable to no-one but the libel courts as to what it prints. This is not to argue that it should be structurally accountable to the Union, the Registry or anyone else. The point is that the only influence the student body has ever had over its editorial direction is the individual freedom of choice of whether or not to buy the latest issue.

In a situation where there is no alternative to it, this amounts to no influence at all.

Incant is printed and published by the Kent Messenger group, "with whom ultimate editorial responsibility rests". There is no doubt that if Incant cannot be said to be formally censored, self-censorship has certainly characterised the paper. The net result is that Incant print what they think (1) what is contributed, (2) what the 'self-appointed self-regulating clique' thinks will sell papers (bearing in mind that what Incant has always failed to realise, that the paper is bought and read because it is "good" [usually it is not]), and (3) what the editors know the Kent Messenger will have no objection to printing. Incant has always argued that the KM censors not. But consider the likelihood of the KM agreeing to print and publish The Gremlin at such favourable rates ...

Those of us who in the past fought Jon Longman and his clique over Incant fall into two categories. Those who believed he was a "bad guy" and whose college Incant had to be wrested, and whose radicalism had to be buried by some structural democratisation, a constitution. These were the people most vociferous in their defence of the Incant tradition from which Longman was departing - 'independent' journalism. Following from this they believed they could take Incant to new heights as soon as Longman departed for his job on the Yorkshire Post. They were totally wrong, as we shall see.

The other category was the alliance between "silent majorities" and the politicians who were in no sense attached to or involved in Incant and preferred to see it as a natural death, but on the other hand were quite happy at the prospect of Longman being "punished".

Both these groups were wrong. The last year of Incant, the paper with the democratic constitution, shows that contrary to what Longman was no aberration; he didn't depart from the Incant tradition - it was a stage of development." at all, he merely took it to one logical conclusion. History always provides its own Napoléons and Incant without Longman has not escaped the mentality which gave birth to the Longman era in the first place.

On the other hand, those that argued for the Union to withdraw all advertising and the like, letting Incant pass out of this world unmourned, failed to understand that the only reason Incant exists at all is that nothing else does. It's that rare creature which survives in a vacuum. What the last year has taught us is that for anything to improve on this campus in terms of a true "independence" in student journalism, Incant has to go - not necessarily the people now behind Incant, not necessarily the political balance of forces on this campus that it reflects. The tradition and concept that is Incant and has been for twelve years has to go. And to be replaced: Hence The Gremlin.

Incant has decided to pull the plug.

misconceived 1966...

What is an independent newspaper and what should its function be? Pose with these two questions, the 'triumpvirate' which brought out this editorial in 1965 was in order. We do not profess to have produced the definitive in journalism, student or otherwise, but we hope to have interested you enough to ask the same questions.

This newspaper was financed by the students' union and yet the executive committee will be aware of its contents only after paying the 5 pence you have. This was done deliberately, if not from the Executive's point of view, certainly from ours, because the Executive had not only the support of the conception of independence, it had to be seen to be supporting it in practice. Be under no illusion, many Executive will, when threatened, attempt to interfere with the editorial policy of a student newspaper. That is why editorial independence must be entrenched. At the same time, however, independence can never be absolute. For example, Incant's much vaunted 'independence' is poorly dependent on the continuing goodwill of the Kent Messenger who could, if they so choose, pull the financial plug which guarantees Incant's existence. (This is dealt with more fully elsewhere on this page.) If the Kent Messenger were to follow this course of action the readers of Incant have no recourse, the reason being that they can put no pressure on the Kent Messenger.

This brings us to the second part of the question - what is the function of a campus newspaper? As it is also argued elsewhere, it is not to mislead or reflect the opinions of the contributors. Unless you, the reader, are looking for a sixth-form magazine, a newspaper must be critical. And a paper which criticizes must be able to pose positive criticism. That is, it must have a policy which is more substantial that stating 'our policy is to have no policies'.

At any rate the concept of accountability must enter the equation. Incant is accountable not to you, but to the Kent Messenger. A newspaper must be accountable to its readers. We envisage an editorial board accountable to the membership but not, in any way, to the Executive. They, after all, should be subject to journalistic expression. Thus if the Executive 'pull the plug' on the newspaper which the Union finances, then the readership will have recourse to the U.G.M. to discipline the Executive for such behaviour.

A campus newspaper is a crucial element in this community. Incant continues along its eclectic path by default. It has no convention, just content. If you are happy with this state of affairs, The Gremlin will fold, leaving Incant to enjoy another decade of mediocrity. We hope however, that this opening salvo will see changes - changes which are long overdue.

P.S. If you don't like the name The Gremlin, change it....
KAMPUS KULCHUR
A theatre of the absurd

Student passivity is only the most obvious symptom of a general state of affairs, for each sector of social life has been subdued by a similar imperialism. For her/him there is only one real alienation; her/his own. She is a full time and happy consumer of that commodity hoping to arouse at least our pity since she/ he cannot elate our interest. By the logic of modern capitalism, most students can only become petits cadres (with the same function as the skilled worker had in the nineteenth century). The student knows that manipulable will be that golden future which is supposed to make up for the shameful poverty of the present. In the fact of that knowledge s/he prefers to date on the present and invest an intangible prestige for her/himself. After all there will be no mechanical commodification for present drabness; tomorrow will be like yesterday, nothing. These foods the way to dusty death.

LYN GARUNER
STEPHEN HIPKIN
DAVE RIMMER

"Art is dead!" the little theatre.
**Do We Know What We Really Want?**

"You bourgeois, middle-class, self-satisfied sophisticates..." Or words to that effect. We've been hearing that sort of thing before, I could almost hear the woman sitting beside me whisper, "Is it too much to expect to be able to go out to the theatre without having to suffer insult?" If they could have heard her, I'm sure the majority of the audience who had come to see 'An Evening Of The Absurd' at the Gulbenkian last week, would have agreed.

From what I could gauge, the rapturous audience reaction to the actor who turned them to the end of one particularly absurd piece, to say, "I entirely agree with you, my dear Gentlemen, this is quite idiotic", seemed to indicate that at last something sensible had been said. It is not that I didn't enjoy the evening, not a bit of it: I thought it was great enter- tainment, and entertaining, as with most art, at a price. It struck me that most of the audience, although they wanted entertainment, were not willing to pay the price: they were not prepared to accept the 'rules', they were not prepared to have their own lives cross-examined like those of the characters in the plays.

Should they? In a very real sense, the lady beside me was right. We have paid our money and we should have our choice — without further obligation. There is something of a dilemma fac- ing those who choose our entertainments: should we provide highly select material? Absolutely not. To interest only a few of those 'self-satisfied sophisticates' or should we put more stuff in the big-time bit which will be a sell-out? This dilemma was well publicised last year in the controversy of the Larry Clark play.

As things stand at the minute, we have a variety of different groups — UKC Dramatics, Films Soc., the Students' Union itself, providing entertainment with a reasonable compensa- tion between the popular and the esoteric, and on the basis of a vague accountabil- ity to the student body through Union finance, and sheer public opinion. On the other hand, we have various institutions — the Faculty of Humanities, the Cornwalls film theatre, the Director of the Gulbenkian Theatre, the Director of Music — which are responsible only to the appropriate authorities of the University, and are in no way accountable for their offerings to those who, for the most part, patronise them: that is to say, us.

Would it not represent a substantial improvement to set up an overall structure for entertainment at the University, or, failing that, at least to open some prac- tical means of com- munication between those groups which provide enter- tainment, at present isolated and autonomous, so as to better ensure that the purists get what they want. It may be said that democracy and art do not go together well, but it is in the nature of the taste to be individual, and this fact alone must mean that enter- tainment presented within such a structure will not suit to the level of the lowest common denominator. Room for improvement is ample, if not copious, for at the moment, it is a question of the purists taking what they can get.

**And Talking Of The Absurd!**

The subtitle were the Infested and Secret Fashion. The ridiculous were most of the rest. We started off with the croche- fete — a very worthy cause — but you wouldn't have guessed so from the quality of the music, since most of the folkies who paraded their goods did it in a way guaranteed to send into a state of glorious somnolence (sic).

Opposition, first off, saw the energy he had created rapidly dissipated by the anemic and insipid (though musically OK) offerings of those who followed him. Saturday evening saw a parade of UKC rock bands who made The Vamis (Brighton's most inept new-wave combo) sound like The Clash. And the professional headliners, Mechanical Horsestongue, should go and stick their head in one and activate the mechanism.

A bigger bunch of racket rubbings it would be harder to find outside Melody Maker; they were so bad they made my teeths shrink. And so to Sunday...

More sleepy fold for the sleepy hippie folk — if you're going to San Francisco, be sure to kick some hippies on the way. And the Pump and Fock, sorry, Pluck Band, got ten of the flower people to dance in a circle in front of the stage — a wet activity if ever there was one — give me a good pogo any day.

At six o'clock the first decent band took to the stage — Tony, Paul, Don and Tit — The Infested. The fantastic schoolkid rockers/SKAN ac- tivities/NE-haters. Bloody fantastic. But the vast majority of the audience were such apathetic Zomboid Synthesised wankers that the response was virtually nil. Only the kids from downtown, could get going. Not surprising: The Infested appear far too advanced for the vast majority of student creeps in this hole. They want to sit in their rooms and listen to ABBA. Or so it seems... I hope I'm wrong but I don't think so. Next on were Gong or Here and Now Band or Longhaired Acidhead Wankers. They were even worse than Mechanical Horsestongue.

Then ATV. They were even worse than the Here and Now Band. Stuck to sniffing glue. Mark, you're good at that... (I'm completely lost: Ed.) At last from the ridiculous to the sublime. Secret Fashion were magic. Starting off with a Velvet's classic 'White Light' through Heat, adhes with an Opposition composition, Yard dogs are numbered, Iggy Pop's 'Last Of Life', London Wainwright's 'Swim- ming', and a host of Ian's compositions, finishing with Complete Control, and my new fave: Slowing. You're so vile. 'When I saw your face for the first time...'

**Gramlin9**

**Fun and Humour are not things you can sell to an audience without professionalism as the two most successful acts showed. Elliot's end of term outing to the smoke-filled J.C.R. for an evening of jolly audience-participation ended the year with a whimper.

The poor advertising and unshod lighting meant that the audience, only half as large as was anticipated, never really felt part of the proceedings. The exception was the Punch and Judy show where they could, at least, slip easily into the role of pre-subjects at the rescue for a few minutes. Credit is due to all those who took part. The professional antics of the Punch and Judy man, Rhabar the Clown, the unenthusiastic folk- club personnel represented by Graham Lever, Paul, Jack and Dave, Bill White and compare Sun Brighouse. Nick 'ol red-rays in back' Wilton held the evening together with some good timing and some desperate esoteric hokumies and audiencerompting.

Unfortunately, the closure of the bar at 11.30 coinciding with the demand for public transport deprived the ranks of the audience even further. With his Soul and Blues singing was well received, and at the closing act took the stage the effervescence had gone out of the proceedings.

Gustav Holst and the Planet Sweets have now a reputation to live up to, especially on their own territory. The combination of an over-imbibing of the good things of life and the fact that the PA appeared to be out of control, led Martin and the Sweets to announce that the 'happening' over after only two numbers.

A disappointment for those who are leaving soon and need something to remember Elliot by. But for next year's organisers some useful lessons. The Clown and the Puppeteer were very successful. Publicity is crucial to an evening such as this. Next year must get more in. Even if it ceases to be a 'college' do in the process.
THE RÔLE OF THE WEST IN AFRICA..
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SPORT's FED. caught out

Five members of the Sports Federation Executive attended the emergency meeting held in Elliot Lecture Theatre Two on June 7th. Other parties present included a couple of rugby players, Paul Box-Grainger (ex-Union President and renowned cricketing type), the peripatetic Beth Logan, Dave Vasmer, and the interested parties of the day — the two candidates for SF Sabbatical Marian O'Neill and Chris Moran.

Answering queries from the floor, the Sport's Fed. Finance Officer, Mr. Graham Costa, told the meeting that he was responsible for calling it. He had done so, he said, after receiving complaints about the Executive's action in proposing constitutional changes to be put to a referendum of Sports Club members without any discussion.

Specific objections raised included the clause concerning the eligibility of candidates for the Sabbatical post. Other sections, it was argued, needed updating or rewording, and it was felt that the amendments should be presented as separate items in the referendum. In response to a question as to why the Executive had failed to call a meeting earlier to discuss these points, Mr. Costa replied that it had been overlooked.

Two members of the Executive said they distinctly remembered being told that the 'eligibility' clause would be on the agenda. However, covering the Union's rules for Sabbatical elections, but they had never been shown the appropriate section. Members pointed out that the new clause was in fact quite different and drew the inference that the Sports Federation Executive had been misled by those charg ed with drafting the changes.

Paul Box-Grainger then proposed that the 'eligibility' section be rescinded. The motion, which excluded candidates who had held Sabbatical office for less than seven months in a previous term, and those who had held a position for more than seven months. After some discussion as to wording it was agreed unanimously to delete the offending sentences. Paul then moved that provision be made for a full discussion to allow postal votes in all elections and referenda. This was also agreed after referring to rule 35 of the Students' Union constitution.

Finally, Mr. Box-Grainger suggested that on the referendum ballot form each separate item should have a 'yes/no' box to allow members to express their views on a particular clause without being forced to vote against the whole. Graham Costa began to argue that the only point to be taken as a separate question was the admission of the Judo and Hand-Girling Clubs into the Sports Federation. Paul quickly pointed out that no executive should dictate what parts the membership should be allowed to vote separately on.

The referendum on these constitutional proposals was held the following day, Thursday 8th. Of the 26 members of Sports Federation, 8 cast their vote. Everyone proposed was carried, but the low turnout, lower for example, than the percentage of the electorate which voted in the average Union by-election, perhaps suggests that the Sports Federation would be wise to involve its members in discussions as well as formal decision-making about its future.

On Friday, less than twenty-four hours after the referendum results were announced, the polls opened for the election of Sports Fed.'s first Sabbatical Officer. Only 114 people voted, but it was enough to give the victory to Marian O'Neill who polled 82 votes to Chris Moran's 25.

This two-a-side cricket tournament ended at 10.00 pm with the final still to play. Peter Box-Grainger looks like having his name on the tankard for the third time in four years. It is doubly amusing in that he bought the tankard in the first place.

Games were supposed to commence at 11.30 and players should have been there at 11.00. Paul Box-Grainger set a bad example by turning up at 12.00. By 12.30 only 10 players had been put into the draw, there were even suggestions that I would end up playing. Fortunately though, A. Grainger, was able to round up Haydn Jaffer, an enthusiastic if unorthodox bowler, to man the man.

The draw was as follows:


Some excellent bowling by Don Massey, plus powerful batting by P. Cohen and Thomas had them out for 4-3. 23 overs. 5 wickets were shared in sets of two and so D. Fellows-Smith and A. Culligan came on and scored 18 without loss in their four overs. In the reverse side of this fixture team A scored five for the loss of S. Bell and Ian Shepherd and S. Russell scored 3 without loss. The latter were helped by D. Fellows-Smith trying to bowl too fast. 8 catches were completed by 3.00 pm, when lunch was taken. At this stage group 1 looked to be sewn up with Don Massey and S. Bell winning their first two matches and Don bowling impressively. Group 2 looked more easy to protect and Beech and Paul Box-Grainger both scored 13 not outs in different matches and Barrow and Dodgson coming from throwing away a match to Harding and Godfrey when all that had seemed necessary was to wait for the Godfrey full toss and send it away for four. Harding was making a name for himself by running out Godfrey three times in running.

After lunch, things started again and an exciting game was had between team C and team A. C scored 15-2 and A came in and lost Simon Bell. D. Fellows-Smith then gave his usual exhibition of pure dislike for any opponent by winding him up itself like a latter-day Dennis Lillie. At 12. Massey's wicket fell and Fellows-Smith leapt into the air with joy.

Paul Box-Grainger's team then came in and could only score a pair. Pete Smith set a close field and gave a good catch to the first two overs. This was mainly achieved, however, less by good fielding than by at least some use of leg-side pace. Few batsmen can hit down balls outside the leg-stump when they are sent down with pace and pitch. But then only someone like Paul could have the panache to do this and then act as if he were surprised that anyone could complain.

After this, as a result of it getting late, the number of overs was cut to 3 for 6 ball overs. Ian Shepherd and S. Russell raced to 25-1, but this was overhauled by a score of 25 by Cohen and Thomas.

Paul Box-Grainger and Pete Smith scored 21-4 and then continued with Roberts to 26-4. Harding and Godfrey surprisingly beat Mclean and Smyth by 14-0 to 15-2. At the end of this, Cohen and Thomas topped group I whilst Shepherd and Russell were second on average runs for each wicket, having won two games.

In group 2, Paul Box-Grainger's team had won all their games and Roberts and Beech had come second on runs per wicket. Overall finals were complicated by the fielders being virtually unable to see the ball. Both team B and team G, the group winners, had elected to bat first and by the time their opponents had come in to bat it was impossible to see the ball and hence the task was too great.

Both Cohen and Pete Smith therefore meet Cohen and Thomas in the final, so be it after the next 1 XI game. Hopefully the game shall be played in more pleasant conditions than those of Saturday.