



editorial

Hands off!

Get your grubby hands out of the policy of this newspaper!

After returning back to work yesterday, members of the staff of Media Productions, typesetter, advertiser, and productioneer for the Gateway, discovered their operation was under the scrutiny of the Students' Union. Not the student section of the SU, mind you, but the administrative section.

Only after asking around did these staff members discover that Media was under close investigation by a professional auditor for the purpose of discerning whether the equipment and personnel of Media were earning their worth. I suppose if someone in some office somewhere so decides, one of the largest, most efficient typesetting and production organizations run by students in Canada will be canned.

Leaving the Gateway with some bullshit outfit downtown, I suppose.

Well, if a scrutiny was underway, why were not the staff of Media informed first? Aren't they important enough to be told what might be happening to their jobs? Why the silent, negative approach?

And what about Media's prime contract, The Gateway? Are we under investigation as well? Will our services to students be canned by someone who is not a student if some overpriced CIA imitator decides to?

I contend that the policies of The Gateway are not to be tampered with or subject of approval from the Students' Union in any way. Any student service should be notified immediately if a study is underway to discern the service's viability.

The way Gene Nichol and Harry Goldberg have it now, it looks like we are all subject to suspicion of mismanagement, and God knows what other vicious crimes against the Students' Union or humanity.

For those students who may not yet know, there have been movements afoot to restrict The Gateway for a long time. Administrators in the Students' Union have pussyfooted around important advertising contracts, have griped of poor fiscal management, (during Gateway's most lucrative semester of production) have claimed overpayment of staff (now below minimum wage), and have generally gone out of their way to see the money granted to Gateway by the SU might not be spent.

We have to grapple for money Council has already given us, and we have been amply shown that we are mistrusted and always under suspicion.

I personally don't care who mistrusts me or suspects me of what crimes, but I resent that staff members, who closely affiliate themselves to The Gateway (close enough that distinctions are unrecognisable) are under scrutiny by bespectacled agents. And I doubly resent any plans actively in process to rob us of our typesetting and layout service.

If the administrators feel the shiny, efficient equipment is not earning its keep, why not increase the services it can satisfy? Has the administration seen fit to increase the need for typesetting equipment by removing restrictions on its prime contractor? No. Have they considered that a larger newspaper with a larger typesetting requirement could well recoup any losses on increased staff? No. They would much rather hold on to the reins and crack a whip and refuse either the horse to advance or stop completely.

I find this study reprehensible. I find the attitude of the administrators toward student services a frightful display of hypocrisy. We should have been told. We should have been asked how we could improve things ourselves. We should have been granted a right to dignity.

by Greg Neiman

GASP! It's more than pollution

READER COMMENT

The issue of smoking in public places receives more attention as medical evidence against smoking increases and various groups try to take action. What is the official university position on smoking? Merely this:

"Because the smoke of cigarettes, cigars, and pipes is disturbing and occasionally harmful to some persons, smoking during classes or instructional laboratories and examinations is prohibited."

This gem is from the *Code of Student Behaviour*. Note the word *during*. Smoking is presumably allowed before classes and during breaks, as well as in non-class areas that may have even less ventilation and a greater concentration of people.

Why the fuss, you ask? Recent evidence shows that non-smokers are severely affected by smoke, *more so* in some ways than smokers. The smoke from the burning end can have higher concentrations of noxious compounds than the other end. Altogether, non-smokers may get more of this "sidestream smoke" (as well as exhaled smoke) than the smoker, especially if they are downwind from the source.

If you are in a smoky area,

you are being *forced* to smoke. You may then enjoy free of charge the benefits of smoking: stinking clothes, hair, and skin; headache, gasping, high blood pressure and heartbeat, loss of alertness, debilitating respiratory diseases, cancers; other allergic, asthmatic, and cardiac reactions. And that's only a partial list.

The university's position would thus be laughable were it not so seriously inadequate. Even sillier was a recent memo to departments in the Humanities Centre which cited smoke as a fire hazard and destroyer of carpets and furniture. In other words, don't throw bombs, because you may break a few windows.

Smokers often try to defend their position by pointing to car pollution. Well, dear smoker, I don't do my limited driving in elevators, nor do I drop exhaust particles all over the food you eat. Nor, to counter another common retort from you smokers, does my drinking force *you* to drink. And did you know that car accidents can also be caused by drugged smokers' inability to react fast enough?

Most objections coming from smokers are irrelevant. Here the whole issue is the right to clean air indoors in public places. Other pollutions and addictions *are* problems, but the existence of one is no reason not to act against another. Smokers have no right to assault others, which is what they are doing.

Smokers and nonsmokers both should become informed about the problem. The Alberta Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association (482-6527) has plenty of material, and the local chapter of GASP (Group Against Smokers' Pollution - 482-6527 or 432-7648) wants your ideas. Everywhere, however, nonsmokers must speak out. They are nearly a 2-to-1 majority and will gain nothing by suffering miserably in silence.

The university rules need complete rewriting to make all indoors smoke-free except possibly private offices and a few specific, relatively isolated areas to be set aside for smokers. And the rules must also affect faculty, non-academic staff, and visitors. Students don't cause all the problems.

B. Forth

The old Zionism-racism ploy

Although it is often dangerous to dip into the kettle of racial and political strife in the middle east, one article from the Arab Information Centre looks interesting enough to stir up a little opinion here. Its a badly needed commodity on this campus.

Hope you enjoy it.

Ed.

The present uproar in part of the media against the United Nations condemnation of Zionism betrays a sad picture of inability or unwillingness to comprehend the situation as it exists in the Middle East and the world. This is partly due to a history of one-sided coverage of Middle Eastern developments as a result of certain political pressures. It involves a regrettable lack of objectivity and neutrality.

The fundamental change taking place in international power structure and relations is reflecting itself on the United Nations' purpose and function. The past domination of the World Organization by certain big powers is giving way to a more universal representation. Obviously, contemporary

issues and resolutions translate a picture of strong drive towards true and effective political, economic and social emancipation and justice.

The emerging new majority is facing the most undemocratic pressures in a futile attempt to stop the inevitable advance of history. Old gun-boat diplomacy would only harm the U.N. and undermine humanity's only hope to have a true democratic world political structure. Threats to withhold funds from and end the existence of the World Body is a stab in the back of freedom and democracy.

Attempts to link Zionism to Judaism and Semitism are unethical gimmicks that should be rejected by any democratic society. There is a fundamental difference between Judaism and modern Zionism, Rabbi Elmer Berger stresses in an article published in the New York Times on November 23, 1975. "This Zionism," he says, "has played the game of nations," and its laws "makes discrimination a matter of national politics and of demographic fact."

The anti-Semitism charge

levelled against the sponsors and supporters of the Resolution is ludicrous, for the Arabs themselves are Semites - a fact deliberately obscured by the same circles who lament the attack on the world's semites.

Zionism as exercised by Israel is a man-made purely racist and colonial political movement, envisaged to establish an exclusive Jewish state at the expense of the Palestinian people. In addition, Zionism tries to dislocate existing Jewish communities all over the world to separate them from their own societies, creating the double loyalty syndrome.

The U.N. Resolution is the outcome of a long history of repeated documented condemnations against Israel by various independent and U.N. bodies for its maltreatment of the Palestinian and other Arab populations under its occupation. There is hardly any loud protest in the same media against such actions. This cold deliberate indifference reveals selective morality and questionable double standards

continued on next page

