

Letters to the editor:

"Not a black people's system, but a communistic system"

To the Editor:

The following remarks are directed at the pamphlet that was handed out to announce the meeting at 11:30 on Wednesday December 5, 1968 in the McInnis room of the SUB.

"Judge Murray has clearly demonstrated to the Black Community that Justice has nothing to do with us". This would seem to state that there is no justice for a Black man in Halifax. Presumably they feel that the defendant was found guilty just because he was Black and not because there was sufficient evidence presented to warrant a conviction. In fact they make that very claim in the next sentence.

"Today he found a Black man guilty without any evidence to do so". It would seem that the learned judge had decided before he ever heard the evidence that he was going to find him guilty, and for the sole reason that his skin was black. This is a serious accusation, and let us look at their reasons for claiming this.

"Don Oliver defended the brother with facts from previous legal decisions". "Those Facts proved without a doubt that this brother was innocent". In Canada a man, whether Black or white, is innocent until he is proven guilty, and has the right to see his accusers. The first sentence of this paragraph should more correctly read - Don Oliver defended the brother, and in his defence he presented several decisions of other courts on cases of a similar nature. Those decisions showed that the Crown did not prove its case with the evidence presented. This is what the statement should read but it did not. They did not prove that the decisions from previous cases were based on similar circumstances. The circumstances of the case are what count, that is what the Crown was able to prove that what was alleged to have happened did indeed happen. The law is such that if the Crown is able to prove its case, then the defendant is guilty. Previous decisions of higher courts are binding, if the circumstances were the same. We were not told whether or not any of the cases cited were of a similar nature. Since previous decisions are not Facts, pertaining to evidence, but legal opinions, of what is needed for proof, they did not prove his innocence in any

case, but they might have proved that the Crown had not proved its case, and hence a decision of guilty could not be judiciously handed down.

"What can we do if the courts are so racist that there is no justice for Black People?" The word "if" is a big one. The burden of proof that the courts are "Racist", rests with the accusers. So far they have not proved that they are racist.

Instead of proving the accusations he has made, the author uses one of the oldest devices known to those who are trying to gloss over a critical point that they would just as soon forget, proceeds to tell the reader what the Black People must do.

"It is clear that we must respond. If there is no justice for Black People in the system then we must prepare to destroy it, and replace it with another system - our system". The author has assumed, without trying to prove his accusations, that there is no justice for Black People, and it is not only necessary to prepare to destroy the system, but actually to do it. They are going to replace it with "our system". Who are the authors, and what is their system? Is their system to be a Black peoples system, or some other system? I do not believe that their aim is at a black peoples system, but rather a communistic system.

They end their brief note with a pleasant thought for the slow to react - "For the white man and his justice the party is just about over. We must move now to protect our families, our brothers, and our sisters against the white man's justice". They seem to conveniently forget that the white man's justice took one thousand years to evolve and it is not yet complete. After forgetting the above, they forget to mention that they have not proven that the "courts are racist", and instead make an emotional appeal to prepare for the great day.

There still remains the question of the front of the pamphlet. It reads:

6 MILLION JEWS
DIDN'T BELIEVE IT
DO YOU?

The implication is clear. I will only point out two differences between the "Black" people and the Jews. (1) the Black people of Halifax, as well as the white

people are free to move about as they please, and they are free to leave the country if they cannot accept the rule of the majority of the people, both "Black and white". If the claim is made that they have nothing, then they have nothing to lose by leaving. I do not suggest that they leave, nor do I want them to leave, but I can see no other alternative for them, if they are not willing to abide by the decisions of the majority of society. (2) There is no concerted effort, either formally or informally, to exterminate the "Black" people. The Jews were unable to leave Hitler's Germany, and there was a determined state-sanctioned attempt to liquidate the Jewish race.

To claim that the people of Halifax are treating the "Black" people, as the Jews were treated by Hitler's Germany, throws discredit upon the authors and any who are of a like opinion.

You may wish to call me a "racist", but the day that someone tries to exterminate, in part or in whole, any group of people because their skin happens to be the "wrong" colour, or their religion unorthodox, or for any similar non-rational reason, then I will be in the front lines of those resisting the policy. I will stand up for them, and be counted - will you?

Pick your "injustices" with care - if you come along with more like these - then when you find a real one - no one will listen to you.

Ian G. Danack
Comm.III

Not to, but about the Gazette

The Editor, Dalhousie Gazette:

There seems to be a lot of controversy over the role of this paper, or of college newspapers in general, and so it may not be inappropriate to add one more opinion.

It would seem to me quite obvious that student newspapers exist for two primary purposes: firstly, the dissemination of news about inter- and intra-university affairs to the university body, and discussion of issues primarily concerned with the university. These types of things are of little interest to the non-university community and are therefore not apt to be adequately dealt with in the local media. Secondly, the newspaper should serve as training and experience for future journalists, and to that end as many types of journalistic experience as practical (reporting, layout, creative writing, editing, mechanical work if possible, etc.) should be handled by the student staff. It should also be reasonable for students engaged in these operations to receive academic credit, thus at least partially offsetting the time taken from regular class and study hours.

It is blatantly unfair for criticism to be levelled at the editors and contributors for their "biased" political writing; there is probably no one in the world who is unbiased, unless completely ignorant of the issues in dispute. It is absurd to ask a radical editor to write a conservative editorial, or vice-versa. On the other hand, it is also quite unfair for the student body as a whole to be supporting a billboard for the advertisement of the political views of the editors. We all have our opinions; it is difficult to justify some privileged few having the right to impose or to attempt to impose their own on their fellow students, or those who do not happen to be journalistically oriented. The phrase, "Come work for the paper" is meaningless for many in demanding programs. It is really hardly a question of tackling world issues; students are, as students, only at the beginning of what should be a lifelong process of gaining the tools and the understanding needed to reform the world. Our only distinction is that we have been lucky in being given a headstart, but student-editorials on economics and politics, whatever their political leanings, are still notoriously naive, and would hardly be missed by the world at large.

One thing that college papers need NOT be is vehicles for reprinting each other's editorials. This is a discreet device for editorializing whilst claiming to be reporting, but is really a lazy man's journalism. With regard to a particular recent one (the nudge for writing this letter), reprinted from an undisclosed but not very obscure source, I should be interested to know if there are any data available on general intelligence and aptitude differences between engineering and science oriented students and those in the arts. I would suspect that there is little difference, but that if one exists, there is a pretty good chance that it is in the opposite direction to that indicated. Be that as it may, there is no denying that our culture today IS technology, like it or not, and that no one who is ignorant of technology or of scientific method can consider himself well-educated. As MacLuhan did say (somewhat missing his own point), "the medium is the message."

By all means, if you wish to understand or to move our world, try learning some of those rational and dispassionate problem-solving techniques. At the least, you should gain the satisfaction of a large broadening of perspective. And after all, "It's what's happening, baby!"

S. PEARRE, JR.



By GARNER TED STRONGARM

Good day, ladies and gentlemen. There have been many occurrences since last I had the pleasure of communicating with you. Some have been good, and some threaten our very existence, as usual.

The most fearless bulwark of righteousness here in Sin City, N.S., scribe Murray Eady, was the innocent target of the most vicious, unethical, communistic, hateful, racist smear campaign that has ever taken place in or around our beloved and stately city, whose symbol is the Jolly Tar, father of our hopes, our noble aspirations, and our tourist trade. Last month a tiny miniscule disgruntled band of outside troublemakers and malcontent rabblers descended upon our fair village to plunder and despoil all that is decent and good. Please, do not misinterpret me. Even if they had NOT been niggers, I would still come out against them in this column. Fair and unbiased journalism has no place for bias or unfairness. But, be they black, white, or pansy mauve, this writer has a higher obligation to fulfill than a mundane adherence to secular restrictions on the Truth of the Gospel. Leviticus must always come before licentiousness.

But I digress. His Honour Eady has been a stout friend of the godly for all of his life. Up until last month this had brought him nothing but laud and magnification and the occasional kickback. But suddenly last December, he awoke to find that a time of testing was watching his trial. Normally he was used to conducting his business in the privacy of his own courtroom, away from the harsh light of day. Quietly and compassionately he would hand down his 10 to 20 year sentences, speaking in the soft, humane whisper we all gradually came to love and respect, if not actually understand. Make no mistake; his sentences were always tempered with a kindly witticism, to ease the guilt and contrition of the culpable one. Many were the times they wept at the error of their ways, and at the magnanimity of a scribe who was noble enough to let them pay their debt to society, modest enough to dismiss their tears of gratitude with a wave of the finger. This has all changed. The Terror struck.

What terror, you ask. Fools! Can you be so blind as not to see the termites of treason gnawing away at the footboards of our country? Have you not heard the bedbugs of black power barking up our tree? Does it not say clearly in Acts, II, iv-vii, that "my brethren, lest ye hearken to the barking of the bedbugs, surely ye shall be as consumed by their ravenous wrath. Munch, munch." What further proof is necessary?

Scribe Eady is being heinously persecuted solely because he is white. The black animals who conceived this devilish plot are quite clever, make no

mistake about that. They slanderously state that just because his fellow whites had the individual initiative to invent and develop such marvelous and progressive things as the electric cattle prod, zyklon-b, muzak, and the Student Union Bldg., he, the Honourable Murray Eady, is ethically bankrupt and a moral leper. These puerile attempts to sidetrack the public on minor and inconsequential details are doomed to oblivion. The fact that the black reds consistently suppress is that it took long, arduous years of toil and wise investment for the Honourable Mr. Eady to get where he is today. They are just being uncouth hypocrites anyway... everybody would like to wear a groovy white wig, and just because these black agitators were too lazy to earn one themselves, they decided to intimidate, harass, and be contemptuous of a poor old man who was only doing what he thought, and, I may add, was, right.

They struck the first week in December. They insulted the very soil of Nova Scotia when they walked on it, stealthily at night, and brazenly in broad daylight. Wearing their gangland black leather jackets (notice the clever and seemingly innocuous allusion to black), and their faggoty berets (notice the clever and seemingly innocuous allusion to that master criminal advocate of Red Revolution, C. DeGaulle), they actually WALKED UP AND DOWN THE STREETS OF HALIFAX, inciting disrespect and contempt for to society had to be met, and surprisingly, the first agency to step into the fray was none other than the heretofore ultra-liberal Halifax Police Dept. Speaking up at last for the cherished ideals of motherhood, God, and private property, the police eliminated this little band of desperados with firmness and vigour. Reportedly, they were taken into custody for loitering, vagrancy, public mischief, being smart-ass to an officer, criminal anarchy, littering, and a host of related charges. They were booked, fingerprinted, photographed. They have been remanded in custody until the Honourable Eady completes his long-awaited circumnavigation of the globe.

"I've got a lot of time to think about the case," he told me just before he got in a cab for the drive out to the airport. "It may take me several years to find the information I'm after." The scribe was obviously referring to an obscure Patagonian statute of 1729 which prescribes a mandatory death penalty for dropping Hershey bar wrappers onto the sidewalk. Due to a little-known amendment to the Monroe Doctrine, this law is equally applicable in Canada.

That there are still officials with such a burning devotion to duty, with such a fervent love of justice, there can be no doubt. Our own Honourable Eady is one of these, and we have not even begun to realize our good fortune. With men such as he, how can we fail but know that God is just, a loving, a good God? Let us pray.