

A matter of time

Politics and repression

The Campus Police has received a face-lifting — and a disguise. But the same old body still controls it.

It's now Student Campus Security — that's the disguise; its responsibilities are now more or less defined — that's the face-lift; and it's still under the control of the university — that's the same old body.

Not that we are about to complain. We really are pleased to be told that only nine other universities in North America have students making up a good part of the security force. And we are glad that there will be some organization to this new force, as previously, no one knew who was where and what was what or even why a certain few people got away with as much as they did and had to threaten lawsuits to coverup what they did do.

Yes we are happy that the contingency fund is to be straightened out and that the Athletic Department will no longer be "administrating." And God knows it's about time that the student police were provided with adequate insurance coverage.

The review board will be a useful thing too in case students have beefs with security per-

sonnel about treatment they received or in case the policemen themselves are having problems.

And we also must admit that the best part is that the student police will not be carrying weapons and that they will be trained to deal with situations in a human manner.

We really should all be thankful. We have been provided with a haven. The force will only be acting as a deterrent and will not try to enforce every rule in the country's rule book. We won't even have to worry about the student police spying on us or beating up on us unless we really hassle them.

And without qualification, we agree wholeheartedly that the best way to maintain good relations in the university community is to have minimum police power on campus. Yes, it should be primarily concerned with service to the community.

You see, there isn't too much to criticize about this new security force.

Except we have a couple of questions.

We understand that the university wants its interests protected. But protected from what? We don't like seeing people being beat up on either. But it says here: "... students in



support of a particular political position may engage in acts which are considered to be contrary to the University interests and to which the University must respond."

Which political position? This university, as with all other universities, is part and parcel of the "system." This university, as with all others, receives millions of dollars from the Defense Research Board to carry out war research, and from large multinational corporations who are also directly or indirectly involved in the oppression of peoples in countries around the world.

This university receives this money to teach us certain

things. The eventual end of this "privilege" (those who cannot afford this "privilege" will be paid even less and do more demanding tasks) is the production of brains who can fit into the system and contribute something — to its preservation, of course.

The reward is money, middle class satisfaction at a job completed for another day. Except the results of a day's work are not quite so simple. People are starving, people are dying, and the reason they are dying is because of this profit-crazed system. People need money to make money — the end justifies the means...

This university is very much a part of that. Its interests are

the interests of maintaining the status quo, at any cost. Those who believe that this university is a community unto itself is fooling himself.

This report, if rubber-stamped by the Student Council, could be used against ANY opposing political action. This report has already been accepted by the university Senate so there is no reason that similar measures will not be included when the final report of the discipline code on non-academic offences is handed down in the next few weeks.

This report must be opposed NOW, or watch for political oppression on any front. If you want Council to work for you, this is the opportunity.

Council — clueless and inept

Please note: The salary of the Student Union President is \$4,845, not \$6,145. The Director of Dal Radio received \$1,040 this

past summer. Total reads: \$17,345 for the salaries and honoraria for Student Council and its related organizations.

Student Council 1972. The Student Council that about 25 percent of us elected last February. The Student Council

that each of us paid \$40 to. What has it done for you? What will it do for you? What can it do for you?

The likely answer to the first two questions is "Nothing." But it can do a lot. One problem is that the Student Union is occupying about 5th position among the decision-making bodies in this university. The second problem is that those who are elected to the Council and its executive do not acknowledge the obvious relationships between students and the university, students and the community, and the university and the community.

Council members are rarely even interested in the general affairs of the student union itself. They sit by and allow the President of the Student Council to ignore the mandates of the Council.

Last year the GAZETTE condemned the Student Union Council for its ineffectiveness and negligence, and refused to

publicize the annual elections or the views of the candidates.

We did this in the hope that a small turnout would force the Council to question its own existence and possibly provide alternatives for student consideration.

The only response to this was the same type of turnout and a vague promise from President Brian Smith to establish a committee "to look into the problem over the summer."

The summer is over with no word of this committee. The Student Union Council is not fulfilling its obligation to the students. It has not ever attempted to effect any significant change.

Over the next few months the GAZETTE will provide complete coverage of the Student Union, how it operates, its relationship with the university and where student money actually goes. At the same time we will provide alternatives to this "union."

... members were, for most part, almost totally unfamiliar with the circumstances surrounding the dispute.

Their ignorance was reflected in the motion: to send a letter to Vice President Andy MacKay, requesting that he "investigate the charges laid against Professor Poushinsky by the students of Sociology... Also that a second letter be sent to President Hicks, requesting that he lend his assistance..."

There had already been a report, essentially made by MacKay's next door neighbour, Dean of Arts and Science, Guy MacLean. This report ignored many of the issues and was not accepted by the Course Union. It was very poor action on a basically important issue.

And this is the same Council that will effectively be nothing until next February unless the token forward by 25% is radical student

The failure of Student Council President to follow the directions of Council was illustrated most effectively last week when it was learned that Mr. Brian Smith did not follow up on the Poushinsky/ Sociology dispute. A strong protest against a possible rise in tuition fees was also not passed on to the administration.

The Dalhousie Gazette

**CANADA'S OLDEST
COLLEGE NEWSPAPER**

The Dalhousie GAZETTE, a member of Canadian University Press, is the weekly publication of the Dalhousie Student Union. The views expressed in the paper are not necessarily those of the Student Union or the university administration. We reserve the right to edit or delete copy for space or legal reasons. Deadline date is the Friday preceding publication.

Co-Editors: Bruce M. Lantz 424-2507
Glenn Wanamaker

Advertising and Business Manager:
Marg Bezanson 424-2507

General Calls: 424-2350
Room 334 — Student Union Building