



SHE'S FEELING IT—It's a leaf. She was out in a sunshine class yesterday, under a palm tree outside the Arts building. The object of the class was to sharpen her senses of touch and smell, but what it does for our readers, we're not sure.

A letter to the editor

What is The Gateway's editorial policy?

To quote the Editor's Note under Dr. Tyndall's letter in The Gateway, Sept. 23, Tuesday, the policy was stated as:

"An editorial appears under the masthead. We suspected most people knew that. If the editor's opinion appears elsewhere, the opinion is signed with his name or labelled an editorial. Otherwise it is a column, and our columnists at least have editorial freedom."

How then does the Editor explain the italicized comments preceding Tuesday's front page story on the installation as president of Dr. Max Wyman?

There is no by-line, nothing labelled Editorial and it certainly doesn't appear under the masthead. The remarks introducing Dr. Wyman's speech including, "But just where do we draw the line, Max?," are obviously editorial comments.

We, as former editors on The Gateway, are somewhat confused with the treatment of the story. As a matter of fact, there doesn't seem to be a story. All that is printed is the pre-distributed text of Dr. Wyman's speech.

Although the publication of the text is excused as a "hopeful blueprint for what he (Dr. Wyman) as an individual would honestly like to see this university and society espouse," you have condemned him.

You have described him as a man "No matter how humanistic . . . (he) is pigeonholed into a societal role which forces him to perpetuate the very system he has such harsh criticism for."

You have condemned him as a man with no free will—a man appointed the president of a university with no capacity for honest decision.

You have prejudged before the first paragraph of his speech is read, and, to us, that is dishonest journalism.

Write your editorials but

mark them as such.

A news story should present the facts. Let the readers make their own judgments.

Miriam McClellan, ed 3
Bill Kankewitt, alumni

Editor's note—This is a very important letter. For in it, the authors have caught the editor "pants down" in several respects. At the same time, it has raised the very important question of treating Dr. Wyman's inaugural speech as a "news" story. They make the point that "there doesn't seem to be a story." That raises the whole question of what is news and what is a story? What is journalism? Perhaps it is people reacting, then talking, then writing as happened here. Perhaps it should be a struggle, not a cold presentation of "hard" facts. They have caught the editor in his definition of an "editorial" and in his juvenile response to what he considered a shallow letter from the vice-president. Most important, by writing what they believe, they have given a much abused ideal—the tournament of reason—a push forward. Maybe now people will look at that front page as a total entity, the way it was intended. The preamble was a question, a challenge, not a condemnation. Take the time, readers, to consider the whole as the authors of this letter have done because, and they might agree, while they have the consciousness and understanding to make up their own minds, they wrote this because they are afraid you do not. They are afraid you are too lazy to read more than the first paragraphs and they are so right. Finally, the editor attempted to say Dr. Wyman's beliefs are honest ones but his striving towards them is limited by his role's frame of reference, i.e., the societal controls over that role. If he failed, that is too bad, but the point to be made is, that not enough of you are willing to question, to debate within this paper.

UA Poli Sci backs PSA

Sympathy strike considered "unwise" by CAUT but possibility not ruled out by department

The University of Alberta Political Science Department Tuesday night publicly condemned the "oppressive" actions of the Simon Fraser University administration towards its Department of Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology and left open the possibility of a sympathy strike to support the striking SFU students and faculty.

The department's Faculty Committee, after a special two-hour meeting passed on an 18-3 vote a resolution which, in effect:

- Calls on the Canadian Association of University Teachers to support the strike at SFU now two weeks old.

- Commits the department to boycott SFU at both the faculty and student level until the administration meets conditions set out in the resolution.

- Those conditions include demands that the administration lift faculty suspensions and halt dismissal procedures against striking faculty.

The resolution asks that the SFU administration enter into immediate negotiations with the department "for a resolution of the problem on the basis of the continued operation of the PSA department as a democratic department working in the interests of the university community and the greater community as a whole."

- Resolves the department here will take further action "as necessary" including a possible strike.

The Faculty Committee here is composed of 23 faculty, four graduate and four undergraduate students.

Department Chairman Grant Davy would not comment on the possibility of a sympathy strike last night but did say it appeared the department has come down emphatically behind the PSA department demands.

Meanwhile, the president of CAUT, Willard Allen of the Chemistry Department here, said last night a sympathy strike is "unnecessary and unwise."

"This is their right, I guess," he said, but negotiations were already in progress when the strike began.

Prof. Allen said the CAUT has already "suspended action on behalf of the people in the PSA department."

The strike at SFU began after the administration refused to lift a trusteeship imposed on the department September 1 when President Kenneth Strand said the department was not operating in the best interests of the university and community.

Other questions in the dispute are tenure, academic freedom and student participation in department decisions.

One faculty member here who voted no to the resolution said last night he is not opposed to the faculty going on strike in support of people elsewhere but it is a question of what is really happening at SFU.

He said a decision should have been reserved until more information was available.

Ravaged Montreal now calm

MONTREAL (CUP)—It took six hours of mayhem.

It took dead provincial policemen.

It took what will be millions of dollars damage.

But as of 1 a.m. today Montreal policemen were returning to duty.

The police came back on duty as a result of an order-in-council passed by the Quebec government and Tuesday night's horror scene—riot in downtown Montreal.

Sometime before the police had reported back to duty Quebec Premier Bertrand announced that if the officers, striking over wage demands, did not return to duty as of 12:01 a.m., an army battalion stationed at Val Cartier would be called in.

However, hell broke loose in downtown Montreal shortly after 7 p.m. Tuesday when a group of 150 Montreal taxi cabs stormed down to the depot of Murray Hill Limousine Company on Barre St.

Montreal taxidrivers and 2,500 students clashed with Murray Hill and the Quebec Provincial Police at Montreal International Airport October 30, 1968, protesting the Murray Hill monopoly at downtown hotels and the airport. The crowd outside the Murray Hill offices last night was fired upon by rifle and shotgun when they began throwing molotov cocktails.

One of the two Murray Hill security guards fired a 12 gauge shotgun erratically into the crowd.

From a building across the street a sniper with a .303 rifle shot at the Murray Hill spotlights.

During the shoot out a QPP officer was shot in the back, although it is not certain yet where the shot came from.

Another QPP officer was beaten to death in the Windsor.

Following the Murray Hill outbreak, rioting spread to Peel Street in the heart of downtown Montreal.

The crowd came up Ste. Catherine St. chanting "Quebecois dans la rue" while breaking store windows and looting.

Much of the crowd's fury was directed towards the Queen Elizabeth, Sheraton, Mount Royal and Windsor Hotels.

Mayor Jean Drapeau's new restaurant in the Windsor was reported as a "total loss."

Looting spread all along Ste. Catherine St. and as far up as McGill University.

Broken glass littered the streets while the sound of breaking windows was answered by loud cheers from the by-then thousands of spectators and participants.

Provincial police seemed too few

in numbers and too thinly spread to achieve crowd control. The Montreal QPP were reinforced by busloads of out-of-town officers but even this proved insufficient to stem the flow of violence.

Small squads of helmeted riot officers tried to control the main intersections but they were quickly surrounded by crowds of people, most of them young.

Bricks and bottles thudded against the police cars while arrests of looters were greeted by cries of "to the rescue" and "maudits fascistes."

Along side streets young children were selling looted goods to pedestrians while looting itself went on unimpeded even in areas apparently controlled by the QPP.

When one rioter broke into a dress shop display window he accidentally staged a small electrical fire in the display. He calmly stamped out the fire and continued his selected looting.

Eaton's department store was badly hit as looters broke windows and attempted to set displays on fire. A charge on the nearby Simpson's store was blocked by the QPP.

By the time the riot was half (Continued on page 4)

Repression?

DR. D. M. COLLINSON
DEAN H. R. MacLEAN
FACULTY OF DENTISTRY

OCTOBER 7, 1969

THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION WITH SEVERAL OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (SIC). IT IS ADVISABLE TO MAKE ABSOLUTELY NO COMMENT ON THE RECENT GATEWAY ARTICLE IN ANY PAPER INCLUDING THE EDMONTON JOURNAL AND THE GATEWAY.

HRM LAJ
C.C. MR. THOMAS A. BRADLEY

This notice was found pinned in the faculty of dentistry's student lounge Tuesday.

A front page story in the Friday edition of Gateway outlined the complaints a group of dentistry students had voiced about the faculty and the reaction of Dean MacLean and clinical director Collinson to those complaints.

We leave it to you to decide how this notice came to be posted in a students' lounge.

If it was posted by the administration of the faculty of dentistry, then it sounds uncomfortably close to a veiled threat against any student expressing his opinion in the press.—ed.