

# EDITORIAL



Freedom of the press.

This was a term which I had always been complacent about; giving it little or no thought. I felt secure in the knowledge that the Canadian Bill of Rights and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms Act guaranteed the right to a free press.

In light of the latest in a series of attempts by the Saint Thomas SRC to sabotage the operations of the Aquinian this 'sense of security' was obviously a false one.

The continued harassment of staff, budget cuts, calls for the resignation of the editor, amending the paper's constitution (the changes to be made arbitrarily by council without input from Aquinian staff), threats of legal action against individual staff members, attempts to dictate the content and editorial policy of the paper, and refusing to recognize the Aquinian's legal membership in Canadian University Press, has, understandably, lowered morale of the staff.

The denial of this constitutionally guaranteed right is a cause of great concern to members of the Aquinian staff. This concern should extend to the entire university community and beyond the confines of campus.

Freedom of the press in the western world is a right which is not, and can never be, taken lightly. In 1929 Herbert Hoover said "Absolute freedom of the press...is a foundation stone of American liberty."

The power hungry political manoeuvrings of the SRC must come to an end. If council is to responsibly and fairly represent the students of Saint Thomas University they must respect the right to a free press.

Freedom of the press is a basic right that must be jealously guarded or the integrity of our democratic system will be destroyed.

Kaye MacPhee



Before I bore you with the important stuff, here's something of vital urgency: You might notice that our Blood and Thunder is full. Leith Chu did the paste up, and everything fit perfectly. Wonderful. I find a letter to the editor under some news copy. Wonderful. There's no room in the paper, so I am presenting it here. To the author of said letter, if you are unhappy, I apologize, if you want it run next issue, you can ask.

It is as follows:

How many times must a reader endure opinion articles which oversimplify and sanctify? After reading that confusing and convoluted jumble of words entitled "Where Have All The Hippies Gone?", I can only shake my head in bemusement at the pretentious ramblings of its author. Perhaps Mr. Pomeroy has oversimplified things abit by suggesting that the degeneratgion of Western society started with Kent State. Your trite observation on the state of popular music are particularly annoying in its suggestion about the motives of today's songwriters. If you took the time to look at the type of music produced in the Sixties, and compared it to today's music you would find very little difference in the breakdowns of what is considered commercial and what is seen as visionary. Your ideas on the composition of society, and the evolution of the Hippie phenomena are sophomoric. I think you should have done some more substantial research on the 1960's, than to read the liner notes from the backs of album covers; before you climbed up on top of your soapbox and sermonized about something you knew very little about. This is a sad piece of journalism which has banalized the Sixties to such a degree that it is almost impossible for anyone to understand why you wrote it in the first place.

Peter Lee

Wonderful. Well, Mr. Lee, that's your opinion, I'm sure other students may agree or disagree. They also can write letters in to the editor on any subject they feel like. We do our best to ensure that every letter we receive is printed, as I think is illustrated with the above example.

On another topic, the STU SRC has a notice of motion before it to ask for the resignation of Neil Toner, the Aquinian's Editor-in-Chief. While they declared at their last meeting that a notice of motion is not to be discussed, Kathy Wright, the Comptroller, sent a letter to Barb McBrine, the *Acting Editor of the Aquinian*. Wright is confident, I'm sure. Without so much as a vote of council, she, apparently with the backing of the STU executive, has replaced Neil already. This seems to be a gross misinterpretation of their constitution, as well as being a perfect example of those who don't know a damn thing about running a newspaper attempting to keep their "underlings" in line. An effort to satisfy their egos? Could this have psycho-sexual undertones. I don't give a damn. The SRC of St. Thomas doesn't want the Aquinian to be a member of Canadian University Press. They have gone so far as to tell Henley Publishing, the Aquinian's printer, to remove any C.U.P. articles or advertisements. I call this censorship. The Aquinian is paying for its membership fees in CUP with ad revenue from the ads that CUP gives them. This doesn't affect the SRC at all and isn't even a line item on their budget. Perhaps the Aquinian's masthead should list Greg Davis, STU prez, and Kathy Wright as dictators-in-chief.

To the STU SRC: I would love to see your definition of editorial freedom. Is it culled from *Mein Kampf*? It certainly seems to be.