

## the free mathNEWS returns

Yes we have returned, but not for long. The Board of FDP has decided to bring back the free mathNEWS for one last issue.

You may be wondering why. After all there has been little controversy now that the "chevron wars" have ended. However our raison d'être hits much closer to home. It is concerned with the problems experienced by the real mathNEWS since the last issue of the free mathNEWS.

It is not that FDP is upset with the political stance of mathNEWS. (Though we thought that the last mathNEWS editor was being a little silly in his support of such a ridiculous organization like WORP, but maybe he was writing tongue-in-cheek.) No, generally we have been upset at the lack of presence or vitality, let alone a political stance, in the mathNEWS in the past year. It is the hope of FDP that this issue will stir a bit of controversy on campus and within MathSoc and mathNEWS itself. Hopefully this controversy will spread over into the pages of mathNEWS and make it more interesting to read in the next few weeks. Hopefully readers will be motivated to write in and this will continue on a regular basis as mathNEWS is revitalized. While mathNEWS is physically richer than it has been before (witness its new office MC 3035), journalistically it leaves much to be desired.

Once again FDP would like to state that the free mathNEWS is editorially and financially independent of MathSoc, mathNEWS, the Federation of Students (Undergraduate), The Chevron, the Imprint and the AIA. This definitely will be our last issue. Our long-time editor John E. Longe no longer wishes to be associated with us. Also we feel the lack of controversy on this campus basically renders our paper, which was founded during the controversy of the free chevron, inoperable.

Volume 4, Number 1 (~~mathNEWS volume 23 number 0~~)  
the UNofficial newspaper of the University of Waterloo

# free the math NEWS

free and democratic publications — Thursday, May 1, 1980 —

## Interaction

Today I will talk to you about a topic that I have remained silent on for over a year. That topic is the newspapers of this campus.

First of I still believe that the Gazette, new headlines and all, is the best paper on campus and I'll leave it at that.

I will say little about Enginews as it is the engineers' paper and they have to live with it. I find a little amusing, but that's all.

The Chevron is still publishing after all these years. I have to admire them for their perseverance. I still disagree with their basic political ideology, but from time to time they come up with good arguments (especially regarding cut-backs). I believe that they should not have any official status, but I would not object if they were to be recognized as a campus club. While I cannot by any means call them a great paper, I do feel that they have improved in quality in past year. As long as their club was not given any office space nor any student fees, the club would not be in violation of the November 30, 1978 referendum.

The once-great mathNEWS is in a totally different position. In the past year mathNEWS as declined greatly in both quality and frequency. Last summer only one mathNEWS, the frosh issue, appeared. The paper that is supposed to be normally weekly during the fall and

winter terms, was lucky if it appeared once in a month. I personally tried to write regularly for mathNEWS last term, but it was hard to be topical when you wouldn't know if a paper would appear that week. I also feel that mathNEWS has adopted to narrow a perspective (ie the "in" jokes). While mathNEWS officials have somewhat justifiably complained about a lack of student contributions, I know from experience that such a problem has been chronic to mathNEWS in the past. However previous editors were able to go out and find the writers, and many of the writers in the past were quite prolific. I'd hate to see mathNEWS die, but unless mathNEWS finds dedicated leaders to run the paper and new blood is brought in, this may well happen. Also unless mathNEWS becomes a paper of interest to most math students and to certain elements in the campus at large, it may not be worth saving. I'm afraid some people have already come to this conclusion. The mathNEWS has been around for seven years (longer than any math paper) and was considered a campus innovator in its halcyon days. It is unfortunate that it has now reached this point.

I will end this article on an upbeat note. The Imprint is finally starting to assert some independence from the Federation in de facto manner as well as

in a de jure manner. While I still feel it received its quasi-official status too early (before it had really proven itself), I have noticed that it has become less reactionary since the "Gang of Four" (Barkman, Bast, O'donnell, and Redding) left. As I have stated in the past, I do not believe that any one paper should be given official status over the other. However as a believer in participatory democracy I recognize the will of the students as expressed in the referendum that recognized the Imprint. Until that referendum is overturned or until the Imprint has a high number of fee refunds I must give them a chance. I also feel that after a long fight both The Chevron and the Imprint have found their respective niches and both can co-exist and serve different elements of the campus population. I hope this is the end of the "newspaper wars".  
jjLONG

## Garstin Acclaimed

MathSoc newcomer and veteran math student Marc (MAB) Garstin was acclaimed MathSoc president in last term's elections after former mathNEWS editor Ross Brown withdrew from the race. Also retiring president Greg Bezoff defeated George Stevens in the vice-presidential race by a six vote margin 102 to 96. Newcomer Bard Hart defeated incumbent treasurer Drew Post by a 141 to 66 margin to become the new treasurer.

## Federation

Federation has returned, perhaps for the last time. This article will deal with refundable fees in general and the Federation fee in specific.

In 1977 when the Federation held its refundable fee referendum, I campaigned against refundable fees. I did not oppose refundable fees in principle, but I thought the timing was wrong. If any of you remember the awful state of the Federation at that time you will know what I mean. I also thought that certain people such as Peter King of EngSoc and Joe MacDonald of ArtSoc were using refundable fees as a way to get back at a Federation administration (which I had been part of) that they did not agree with. I also was afraid of a high level of refunds because of the Federation's relatively high level of fees.

These fears may have been real, but that doesn't matter now. Refundable fees were implemented and I think that they have worked. Federation fee refunds have generally stayed below seven per cent and at times have been as low as three per cent. The Federation is still able to budget its activities for the year. Also some added benefits have resulted. The fear of high refunds has kept the Federation from engaging in political activities that are unpopular with the student body. The Federation has also been required to trim off some of its fat and to only keep those paid positions which are justified by its budget.

I agree that there are people who withdraw their fees for the wrong reasons. Since the Federation allows regular students to withdraw two terms fees in September, there are some students who take out their fees to get over 20 dollars in "instant money". I know that this is a problem, since if a student who is paying 800 dollars in tuition really needs an extra 20 dollars, that person should rethink whether he or she should be here. However I still believe that the fees should be refundable in order to allow for the legitimate political protest from a dissatisfied student. Besides if a large number of students really felt that the Federation was not worth \$10.75 a term, the Federation should reconsider its whole existence. After all a refundable fee demands a positive act which is going to the Federation office to get a refund by a certain date (which is usually well-publicized by the campus newspapers). You pay unless you take an action not to pay. One interesting fact about the fall refunds is that aside from the societies, the Federation had the lowest refund rate on campus. A rate lower than that of

WPIRG or Imprint, organizations with much lower fees.

While you may think I underwent a great conversion, I really liked refundable fees all along. One should have the option of withdrawing from an organization one does not agree with. I had thought that refundable fees wouldn't work in the Federation, but I was wrong. I notice that the only compulsory fees left on campus are basically administration fees. While I can agree with the compulsory Health services fee, I cannot agree with a compulsory Inter-collegiate fee (perhaps if the fee was for Intramurals, maybe), as most students are not able to take part in intercollegiate sports, and many do not wish to attend intercollegiate games.

I am mentioning refundable fees at this time because recently former Federation president Mark McGuire stated that he would like to see compulsory fees again. He didn't think that refundable fees were working. The new president, Freeman, expressed a similar opinion to me later on. However I think that they are both wrong. I do not deny that a worthwhile project like a new pub or arena, might necessitate a compulsory fee in the future, but before that is done the Feds should examine what current fees they have available and prevailing interest rates and bank requirements. I will agree that the orange bombshelter called the CC Pub is not the best drinking place around, but student groups also make use of such places as South Campus Hall and the Waterloo Motor Inn for big pubs anyways. Also before they talk about getting rid of refundable fees to build a new pub they should consider improving the taste of the draft beer in the CC Pub and getting some bottled beer in there.

At the present time I think it is premature to even consider getting rid of refundable fees. After all we've only had them for two years, and compulsory fees were tried for much longer. jjLONG

## Lake Party to Return

Federation Entertainment Co-ordinator Denise Donlan has announced that the Federation will be once again be holding an outdoor party this summer after an absence of one year.

The Federation Lake Party began in the summer of 1974 on Columbia field on the shores of Columbia Lake. The parties were usually held on the second or third Sunday in July, and featured such performing artists as the Good Brothers and the Garfield Band. The bands performed for a small fee and no admission was charged for these events. Originally these events were erroneously called "Beach" parties until it was learned that there was no sand bordering Columbia Lake.

The last of these parties was held in 1978 and in a break from tradition on the last Saturday in June. The weather was good, but the bands were not and the Federation did not hold one last year due to lack of interest. 1978 also saw the end of the MathSoc Barbeque. MathSoc had in the past sold food at the Federation Lake Parties. Leftover hamburgers and hotdogs were sold at barbeque outside the Math building during the next week. However Bill Deeks of Administrative Services has now banned these barbeques.

The Federation summer party for 1980 will be held on a Saturday in late June. The location has been changed to the Village Green from Columbia field, as the Green is closer to campus and forms a more natural concert bowl. The popular French-Canadian group CANO from Sudbury is tentative booked to play the June date.

*paid for by Free and Democratic Publications*



## Grads Out

The Federation Council has voted to delete grad students from the Federation. At the same meeting they passed a motion that recognized the UW Grad Club as the official representative of the grad students. This has apparently been done with the agreement of the grads.

Though the Federation charter will be changed to delete grad students, it is not known if the Federation of Undergrads will be the Federation's new

full name. Also necessary bylaw changes have yet to be made. These would entail a new membership bylaw giving only fee-paying members the right to vote in the Federation and a new seat distribution bylaw that eliminates the present graduate seats. A similar kind of membership bylaw had been passed by Fed council in 1978, but the Federation Board of Directors forgot to pass it first, so that year's bylaw is not valid.