

An open letter to Professor Blue

Dear Prof. Blue,

In the statement issued to the press last Tuesday, you infer a number of things which are in the least deceiving, and in the most, simply untrue.

You begin by saying: "I am making this statement to correct the rumours which are spreading . . ." In fact, you are guilty of instigating rumours by inferences and untruths. Furthermore, you work from the paternalistic and incorrect assumption that the administration has a monopoly on correcting rumours. It has no such monopoly.

You state: "They (non-student occupants) were obviously in possession of keys which could have enabled them to enter other locked rooms in the building, some of them containing personal records of faculty and graduate students as well as valuable equipment."

What you failed to state, sir, was that after 48 days, no personal record or single piece of equipment in any other locked room was touched by any member of Room 130.

You were probably aware that the clever use of the phrase "could have enabled them" would be picked up by the local press.

Of course, this problem could have been solved by simply changing locks, an action so efficiently carried out anyway the morning of the police action. Why was this not done earlier? Besides there were two security police roaming the halls every night, and it is unlikely that any other office could have been touched even if there was motive for doing so.

You also state that damage occurred. "Some of it was caused from the outside, but some damage could only have been done by those inside. Less than two weeks ago, the breaking of a water pipe inside the room, causing flooding damage, estimated at several hundred dollars."

I can speak with authority on the matter since I was there at the time the water pipe burst. But rather than just putting the facts straight, allow me to play your little game and infer (with probably real legiti-

macy) that you, the administration, were responsible for the breaking of the water pipe. It seems quite incredible that while everyone was in bed (about 2:00 a.m.) that the pipe broke not in one but two separate places. It seems quite incredible that the water pressure was so intense that a laundry bag could be filled up in about twenty seconds. It seems quite incredible that the water pipes burst only in Liberation 130 and not in any other room in the building.

Consider these facts which could also enable one to believe that the administration cleverly engineered the pipe breaking in 130. The security police (responsible to the administration) refused to call a plumber despite our immediate request, for almost an hour. They lied by saying they had no keys to any other rooms. (They later opened these same rooms.) They also refused to allow us entry to the office below us so as to evacuate the papers and books until considerable damage had resulted. They later contacted Prof. Verma . . . much later.

And just what would have happened, Prof. Blue, if the thirteen occupants of the room at that time were not there to assist in the cleaning up operations. We worked our backs off for more than four hours with only the help of a janitor (who was very kind to us). When two of the more sympathetic security police started to help us, they were ordered to stop.

Now, can you tell me any logical reason why any member of Liberation 130 would deliberately break a pipe (such as you infer) that nearly flooded 130 out and caused them to do a great deal of work?

But there were instances of malicious and deliberate violence and destruction. On several occasions, up to 300 students raided Liberation 130. They threw rocks, beer bottles, concentrated acetic acid, eggs, tomatoes, apples, and a variety of other projectiles. In one instance, some got inside and smashed the door with a heavy concrete ashtray. Of course, every window was smashed, the window frames dented and broken, the bricks surrounding

the Liberation window still bearing the scars of the many eggs and tomatoes thrown.

You state: "While the Board of Deans could not and does not condone such violence, it would obviously have been unfair to take action against those attackers while ignoring the provocation of the illegal occupation."

Now action has been taken against the occupants of Liberation 130. Will similar action be taken against those people who destroyed from the outside? Your answer was, "This is something we will have to consider." And if it is names that you wish, I can make known the names of at least seven people involved in the actual throwing in this very column next week.

And though seven would be an incomplete list, the seven occupants of Liberation 130 at time of police action also constitutes a mere fragment of those involved in the demonstration. I was there. Yet I do not face the possibility of a criminal record so far. Just lucky, I guess. Because I wasn't there at the time the police were. Is your kind of justice based on luck? On random sample?

There also appears to be a discrepancy in the manner in which the police conducted their operations. You state: "I heard the police instruct those inside to dress and put on their shoes and feel that they were given ample time." While the police in fact did issue such instructions, your subjective feeling that they did have ample time is contrary to the actualities of the situation. At least two did not have time to put on their shoes.

You also state: "I believe that the police did not use unnecessary force." At least seven people would disagree with your judgement. They feel that hair pulling and being kicked (even if just once) constitutes unnecessary force.

At this stage, I have no other alternative but to accuse you, Dr. Mackay and the administration with employing deception and falsehoods in an attempt to distort the facts of the case. If you are really concerned about open discussion with students, you must start by being honest with them. It appears as if the administration is a long way from this point.

I want to be fair. If you wish to reply openly to this letter, I will reproduce it untouched and without comment you wish, I will publicly discuss with you, at your convenience, the issues I have raised in this letter, or any related topic about which you wish to talk.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Murphy

Madrid students riot

MADRID (CUPI) — About 1,800 Madrid University law students went on the rampage Thursday (Oct. 31) and before they were dispersed by police, burned a portrait of General Francisco Franco, sacked the dean's office in the law school and stoned passing cars.

The rioting broke out after rebel students held a banned meeting in the law school to discuss their problems. Spokesmen lashed into the repressive actions of the government and criticized attempts to reform their educational system.

GRADUATES AND POST GRADUATES in SCIENCE

MASTERS AND DOCTORATES ONLY RESEARCH

BIOLOGICAL, PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL SCIENCES

INTERVIEWS ON CAMPUS

November 20—21, 1968

BACHELOR GRADUATES (MAJORS AND HONOURS)

ALL SCIENCES for NON-RESEARCH

INTERVIEWS ON CAMPUS

November 20, 1968

Details and additional information are available at your Placement Office.



Public Service of Canada

THE BIO-PHYSICAL SCIENCES PROGRAM PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF CANADA