

"Fed up with abuses" Women protest abuse

by Ben Yee

"Women unite, take back the night. Women unite, take back the night."

One hundred seventy women chanted the above slogan in, a rousing "Take Back The Night" march in downtown Edmonton Friday night.

The march was part of the marches held all across North America symbolizing women's anger against rape, pornography, and sexual harassment.

The march began at Beaverhill Park 105 St. and Jasper with speeches and songs telling of women's plights and calling for changes. The march gathered intensity as it proceeded through the downtown streets.

Marching plans were rerouted however at Edmonton Centre as security guards barred the 101 St. entrance. The women

stood their ground at the entrance and began to chant, "the law does not protect women". It was explained to them that it was within the rights of Edmonton bylaws that they must detour.

"Edmonton Centre, being private property, may withdraw invitation to come in," explained the policeman who was escorting the marchers.

Britt Griffin of "Womyn Against Violence Against Womyn" (WAVAW) said the march was primarily intended to raise public awareness and to show solidarity of their cause. She said that they are a direct action group set out to fight violence and abuses of women in a patriarchal society which tends to perpetuate these abuses.

For this same reason she said that WAVAW is not sponsored or funded by any institutions or

government as they are usually patriarchal; support from them would have strings attached which would reduce the freedom and effectiveness of their group.

She said that she hoped WAVAW would eventually change the attitudes of men toward women.

The march was successful in raising curiosity if not public awareness judging by the number of people who stopped and came out of buildings to see the march.

When asked what she thought of the march, a middle-aged woman waiting for the bus replied, "I think it is very good. I guess the younger generation of women finally will show they are fed up with the abuses."

The WAVAW office at 10156 82 Ave. is open Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday from 12:00 - 6:00 p.m.



Photo Ray Giguere

There is no truth to the widely speculated rumour that binary chemical warhead research in the Mechanical Engineering Building went out of control, causing this tragedy.

Fee boycott backfires

Montreal (CUP) —

Universite de Montreal student Guy Heroux has been convicted of theft and placed on one-year probation for his part in a residence fee boycott staged at the U de M last year.

Universite de Montreal students mandated a committee which included Heroux in March 1980 to withhold residence fee cheques from the University. The action was taken to protest fee hikes announced by the administration.

Heroux was arrested a few weeks later after taking the payments out of a safety deposit box. He had been carrying out a decision by the protest committee to turn the cheques over to the University.

A little more than a year later, having plea-bargained with crown prosecutors, Heroux pleaded guilty to stealing the cheques, and was given a suspended sentence in the last week of July 1981.

The boycott was launched after the U de M administration announced an eight and one-half per cent hike in residence fees, bringing them to \$712 per year. The increase followed a 13.5 per

cent hike in 1979-80 and a 21 per cent hike in 1978-79.

An ad hoc committee was mandated by a general assembly on March 3, 1980 to collect resident student fee cheques and to withhold them from the University until the conflict was settled by negotiation. The cheques were placed in a safety deposit box.

That night, students occupied the administrative offices of the residences, demanding that the University meet with student representatives to negotiate.

The administration refused to recognize the occupiers as representatives of the student body, and police evicted them on April 7.

The protest committee then attempted to have the Quebec rental board overturn the residence fee hikes, but the board declined to do so.

In early May, the committee calculated that withholding rent cheques no longer had "any value from the strategic point of view," because the University was likely to instruct students to cancel the cheques and to write new ones. Heroux and Etienne Paquette, another student involved in the boycott, were mandated to take

the cheques out of the safety deposit box so that they could be turned over to the University.

The following day, both were arrested at the bank by plainclothes policemen keeping guard over the safety deposit box. They were released shortly afterwards, but Heroux was picked up again on June 14 under a province-wide arrest warrant. He was charged with the theft of \$70,780 worth of U de M residence fee cheques. Paquette was not arrested or charged.

Heroux's case became the rallying point for a series of protests by university and CEGEP students last year organized by the Regroupement des Associations Universitaires du Quebec (RAEU) and the Association Nationale des Etudiants du Quebec (ANEQ), the two provincial student unions.

The campaign to "Free Guy Heroux" climaxed with a demonstration in front of the

Universite de Montreal administration building attended by 5,000 students.

However, the U de M administration refused to drop the charges against Heroux, claiming that the matter was before the courts and out of its hands.

In the winter of 1981, the Guy Heroux protest began to wilt. U de M students negotiated an agreement with the University, whereby residence students paid \$688 last year, and will pay \$728 this year.

Heroux pleaded guilty to theft this summer, was given a suspended sentence, and was placed on one-year probation.

"This is a qualified defeat for the student movement," said Richard Flint, University Affairs of the McGill Students' Society.

"The charges against him were charges against all of the students; he was just used as a scapegoat. Any individual can be charged for the action of the entire students' associations, apparently, and that's dangerous," he said.

Title not available at presstime

Sept. 17, 1981

"Joe, I've got great news! The Journal is going to shitcan Ashwell."

"Where did you hear this?"

"My wife's sister is a cocktail waitress at the Chateau Lacombe. She heard Steve Hume tell some little guy that he could lose Ashwell in the shuffle as soon as Frank Hutton drank himself to death."

"Damn, that doesn't give us much time."

"Huh?"

"Wayne, we've got to do something. The Citadel cannot afford to lose Keith Ashwell."

"Are you nuts? He's been dumping on us for months!"

"But he's been our best shill for years. The Citadel's reputation in this city was built mainly on Ashwell's inferiority complex and desperate need to pretend Edmonton is just a step away from London's West End. No matter what shit we produced Ashwell would praise it and people would come to see it. When we built this place I wanted to name one of the men's rooms after him."

"But ..."

"So he's had a bad year. We fired his friend Peter and the Journal passed him over for entertainment editor again. Let him have his snit."

"But he's such a pompous, insufferable ..."

"And stupid, don't forget stupid. That's why the Journal wants to fire him. But you and I need him. Think boy, who would replace Ashwell? John Dodd! He analysed *The Cannonball Run* like it was *Birth of a Nation* and thinks *Superman II* is *Gone With the Wind*. His reviews say one thing: boring!"

"Well we can't very well ask the Journal to

keep Ashwell now."

"No ... but we can ask ... we can demand that the Journal fire him."

"You want Ashwell so you're going to demand they fire Ashwell?"

"Don't you see. If they fire Ashwell it will look like the Journal is kowtowing to us. Can't you see it? Hume will scream freedom of the press; he'll praise Ashwell as the greatest critic since George Bernard Shaw. They'll never be able to fire that putz."

"We could even threaten to cancel our advertising."

"Let's not go crazy here. Principle is principle but the Journal would fire J.P. O'Callaghan's mother before they'd lose an ad. No, you just go to your office and write the nastiest letter you can. Revoke Ashwell's press pass. Call him names. Then we'll wait for Hume to explode. That shmuck will probably put this on the front page."

"Shouldn't we go easy on Ashwell. What if he holds a grudge?"

"No, he still needs to pretend that he's an important theatre critic and the only way he can rationalize theatre in Edmonton being important is if it's good. Also we can let him think that we're looking for a new head for our publicity department. He'll come around."

"Are you sure?"

"In three months Ashwell and the Journal are going to love us again. Especially when I tell him about the new project we're preparing for Broadway."

"What's this?"

"It's a great original musical called *Shake It*. This girl with cerebral palsy goes to New York to try out a Rockette..."

BAZ

by Michael Skeet

