The Dalhousie Gazette

CANADA'S OLDEST COLLEGE NEWSPAPER



Published by the Dalhousie Students' Union Halifax, Nova Scotia, 429-1144. Printed by The Dartmouth Free Press, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia Authorized as Second Class Mail by the Post Office Dept. Ottawa, and for payment of postage in Cash.

STAFF

Business Manager. NELSON BLACKBURN Advertising Manager. ALEX McCLEAVE Photography STEPHEN ARCHIBALD Gazette Reviewers . . . JOHN STILL, COLETTE

Reporters: Linda Bayers, Dave Wilson, Chris Lobban, Nick Pittas, Sharon Cook, John Bruce, Hugh Fraser, Ron Hicken, Kathi Boyle, Bill Kerr, Don-

day, February 8, three black students were shot to death when police opened fire on an assemblage of students near the entrance to South College here. Thirty-seven other students were wounded. **Policy**

One of the targets for criticism in the latest Presidential "Campaign" has been the Gazette's editorial policy and content. Therefore the editorial staff of the Gazette feel that it is incumbent upon them to clarify the rational that guides the general policy of this paper.

Criticism of our paper is based on the fallacious doctrine that university organizations, be they student councils or campus newspapers, have no basis for expressing opinions on the pressing issues of our times.

However, it should be apparent that the university is not an isolated unit apart from society, but rather an integral unit within society which can have no meaning for its existence, unless it can be related to the cultural, political, and economic processes of society. What is true for the university must also be true for student organizations within the univer-

It was in this spirit that last year's student council passed the Declaration of the Canadian

The major criticism of the Gazette's editorial policy is that it does not reflect the opinions of the majority of Dalhousie students. If this is the case who is to argue that the Declaration of the Canadian Student reflects the thinking of the majority of the students at Dalhousie. Certainly none of the Presidential Candidates opposed the Declaration on this or any

Furthermore the Declaration reinforces our view by stating that the student has "the right and duty to improve himself as a social being and contribute to the development of society by . . . engaging in fundamental action, as an individual or in a group, to confront society with discoveries and to promote consequent action to bring reforms into practice."

Seen in this light, therefore, university students and their organizations have as much right and indeed as a significant intellectual element in society have a moral responsibility to express their opinions on important issues. It would be the worst sort of negligence if the student newspaper did not confront the student body with comment and opinion on these types

Student newspapers have, as they should have, passed well beyond the bulletin board and gossip column stage. If relevant involvement is to occur there must be a meaningful confrontation with the realities. It is on this axiom that the Gazette revolves.

The Gazette cannot reflect the opinion of the average student, as we feel that there is no such thing. One cannot editorialize by concensus. As for the accusation that the Gazette is biased, we must emphasize that all non-campus stories are not news stories, and as such are only as biased as the individual writer, moreover we feel that any dichotomy between the Gazette policy and individual student thinking must ultimately synthesize in a higher level of consciousness in the student body, and in their awareness of the ramifications of the educational system, government and society as a

The Gazette accepts and encourages criticisms and suggestions concerning the policy and format of the newspaper. What we have written above does not mean that we do not recognize or do not seek to fulfill the two other major roles of the campus newspaper, these being adequate coverage of campus news, and comment on developments within the university, and student government. Ultimately, the question of content and form of the Gazette must be the decision of the Editor and his staff.

COLLEGE

AT FIRST IT WAS WONDERFUL. MY DAD TALKED TO THE DEAN ANDI LIVED IN RESIDENCE AND TOOK PRE-MED SOI COULD BEA DOC LIKE MY DAD WITH LOTS OF CASH. ... THEN I WENT INTO SCIENCE. I PASSED ALL BUT ONE. IT DIDN'T MATTER CAUSE I ONLY NEEDED IT FOR MEDICINE ANYWAY ...

I STILL LIVED IN RESIDENCE AS MY OLD MAN WAS FOOTINGALL OF MY BILLS MY THIRD YEARI SWITCHED TO MY 2 YEAR OF ARTS AND GOT A ROOM OFF- CAMPUS CAUSE THE OLD MANCUT ME OFF WHEN I DIDN'T WORK THE SUMMER BEFORE.



THE GUYS WHO LIVED NEXT TO ME DRANK A LOT BUT I STILL GOT THREE FOR FIVE CNLY I MISSED MY SUP IN FRENCH, IN TAKING SIX THIS YEAR AND WITH ONE ATSUMMER SCHOOL I'IL BE ONE SHORT ...



BUT ILL PICK IT UP AT NIGHT SCHOOL WHEN I GET BACK FROM EUROPE THE YEAR



ANALYSIS:

To Clarify The Orangeburg Question

By RICHARD ANTHONY College Press Service

ORANGEBURG, S.C. (CUP-CPS) - On Thursstudents near the entrance to South College here. Thirty-seven other students were wounded.

Most of the early press coverage of the event was a restatement of the police view of what had happened. It was reported, therefore, that the three died in an exchange of gunfire with the police, that sniper fire from the students started the exchange, that "black power militants" had incited a student riot, that students had stolen ROTC target rifles for use in the battle, that the presence of 600 Guardsmen and several hundred policemen had averted

further violence, etc.

Next day, the first public dispute about what happened Thursday night began NBC Correspondent Sidney Lazard who was on the scene that night. said in a morning broadcast that the other newsmen on the scene agreed that the police gunfire wasn't provoked by sniper fire from the students. State officials, including Gov. Robert E. McNair, em-

phatically denied Lazard's conclusion. In his evening broadcast Lazard omitted any reference to the question of who fired first, because, he explained later, the situation that night was too confused for him to be sure what had happened, and because he didn't think the issue was worth the controversy it had aroused.

But controversy continued, nonetheless, and spread to include a number of questions about what happened that night. Some of the questions have been more or less resolved -- others probably never will

Investigative work by two reporters from out of town has revealed that one of the dead students -Sam Hammond - was definitely shot in the back. The evidence is not as conclusive as in the case of one of the other students - Delano Middleton -- but

Gov. McNair has told the press that one of the reasons the troopers opened up was that they thought country. one of their own men had been shot. Two newsmen who were there, however -- Lazard and Dozier Mobley, an Associated Press photographer - say that the trooper, who was hit in the face by a piece of wood thrown by one of the students, had been put in an ambulance before the police barrage began, so that the other police had plenty of time to find

out he wasn't shot. Police officials, explaining why the troopers used shotguns with the heavy shot used by deer hunters, as well as carbine rifles, told the press the wind was blowing away from the students so that they couldn't use tear-gas.

Lazard says he can't remember any wind. "We were out there a long time", he says, "and we would have been a lot colder if there had been a wind". Two S.C. State faculty members, who were on campus Thursday, also can recall no wind.

photo taken just after the police barrage shows smoke rising from a fire the students had set earlier. The smoke is rising straight up. Another photo, taken before the police moved in, shows smoke drifting in the direction of the students.

Gov. McNair indicated last week that one of the reasons the police had to resort to gunfire was that ROTC target rifles had been stolen by students. This week, the governor's representative in Orangeburg, Henry Lake, admitted that the rifles had been stolen

after the police barrage. These, then, are some of the questions of fact that have generated controversy since last Thursday's killings. They are not unimportant, as shown by the controversy they have aroused. Yet, even if resolved one way or the other, do they explain what

has been going on in Orangeburg? There are other questions that bear on the Orangeburg shootings.

To what extent is Orangeburg a segregated community? Several residents said that the bowling alley, which was the target of student integration efforts early last week, was really a symbol of a widespread pattern of discrimination in Orangeburg. saulted by a squad of bare-footed, peasant-dressed They cited the city hospital, the movie theatres, the schools and the news media as the most discriminatory institutions.

Were "black power militants" responsible for

ed, is that the Orangeburg SNCC representative, Cleveland Sellers, opposed both the demonstration at the bowling alley Thursday and the demonstration on campus Thursday night. (At this writing Sellers is still in the state penitentiary in Columbia, S.C. on \$50,000 bond).

What part was played by the dissatisfaction of students with the kind of education offered at S.C. State in contributing to their frustration? Last year they held large demonstrations and were about to march on the state capitol to protest the fact that some young members of the faculty weren't being

These are all important questions, and deserve the kind of research that hasn't been made. But most important of all is a question that defies a pat answer: how will Orangeburg affect the thinking of people in this country?

There is little doubt Orangeburg will convince many black people who have been opposed to violent methods that, at the very least, they should arm themselves for self-protection. A co-ed at the University of South Carolina who is a friend of several students at S.C. State said after Thursday's shootings: "They (the S.C. State students) are coming

What about white Americans? Presumably most of them will see Orangeburg as another black riot. That's how most of the early press reports describ-

On Saturday, two days after the students were shot, a white newsman named Jim Hoagland was hit on the head with a weighted stick. His assailant was Aaron Pyror, a student at Central State University in Ohio who drive to Orangeburg after hearing what had happened. Pyror was reportedly high on drugs.

Early this week another white newsman mentioned the Hoagland incident, which was filed as a separate story by the Associated Press. He said to me, "That shows those Negroes can't cry about police brutality," or words to that effect. His words suggest, better than public opinion polls ever could, what may be the significance of Orangeburg for this

Saint Mary's: Gazette Observation Inadequate

TO THE EDITOR:

While undoubtedly your editorial in last week's issue (Gone with a Whimper, Feb. 19) made some valid observations on the whole question of student power, I do not feel it dealt adequately with the St. Mary's situation. I would like for the moment to discuss the situation not from any connection with Dalhousie or the GAZETTE, but simply as an alumnus of St. Mary's, and suggest that whatever its defects, the protest at SMU last week DOES mark a milestone

and a significant achievement for that campus. The student movement at SMU last week was, admittedly, hardly a success from any practical point of view. But it was a great step in the right direction, for as long as St. Mary's has been a university, there has been hardly a whisper of student activism on anything more than the fundamental issues of "sandbox student politics". few activists who in the past years have tried to stir up some response within those imposing Gothic walls have been met with stony silence, defeated in Council elections, and stifled in or removed from any other posts they may have held. For 126 years, the student body was perhaps the least revolutionary element in a conservative institution.

The problems of mounting any sort of student protests at SMU were, I would have thought, insurmountable, the greatest difficulty being the inertia of the student body itself. Those who believed as I did were pleasantly - or unpleasantly - surprised by the remarkable events of February 12 to 14. Two things became evident between the organizing - or conspiratorial - meeting of Monday night and

the angry proceedings of Wednesday afternoon. First, student leaders were willing to call for student support in a cause which (whatever the point of view at Dalhousie) was revolutionary and utterly beyond the tradition of SMU student politics. Second, the student body accepted this challenge enthusiastically, even angrily, and showed an un-precedented concern for the affairs of their uni-

As an exercise of student activism or a display of student power, the protest was undoubtedly a failure. But if the school can get over the embarrassment caused by backing down from the course originally taken, the experience may provide a precedent and a base for future, more relevant and productive student movements at SMU.

Ignoring the initial disgrace which was felt and expressed by a number of students - leaders as well as followers - after the protest folded, there are a number of factors which may be seen as causes for optimism. First, the image of St. Mary's as a conservative and inert school must be dispelled. The reaction of the faculty and the administration indicates that there is no hostility to student activism as such; and this attitude which I view as somewhat sympathetic may be well used in the future once control of the university DOES rest in the hands of its administrators. This sympathy may be enlisted by future student governments in pursuit of academic democracy. Here too there is reason for optimism; among present student leaders at SMU there are individuals who may still feel the need for changes which have not yet been realized even at Dalhousie; and among the student body which supported the protest and the boycott there should be many potential student leaders who are not tainted by the traditional attitudes of caution and conservatism.

So in criticizing the failure to carry off one protest effectively, the GAZETTE has virtually ignored the fact that no matter how badly botched the affair was, it still represents an improvement over past conditions; and further, that from this experience a new attitude has been revealed at SMU which may eventually encourage that school to catch up with the spirit of student bodies throughout the rest of the country.

Very truly yours, J.P. Goldring.

Six Hours To Liberate South Vietnam

College Press Service For Canadian University Press

Editor's Note: Tran Van Dinh, Vietnamese journalist and former acting ambassador to the United States, writes a regular column for the College Press Service.

WASHINGTON (CUP-CPS) -- When \$2,639,000 Bomb-proof, shatter-proof U.S. Embassy in Saigon was dedicated last September to replace the old one which had been bombed March 1965, a Vietnamese journalist friend of mine wrote me in obvious sadness that "the sun will never set on the American Empire in South East Asia."

Indeed with the imposing Pentagon East, the expanding bases at Cam Ranh, Da Nang, Bien Hoa, just to cite a few huge and permanent installations, it seemed to some Vietnamese who have forgotten the durable spirit of resistance of the Vietnamese people, that the U.S. power cannot be touched, let alone attacked. At any rate, the U.S. Embassy (with reinforced concrete construction surrounded by a terracotta-faced sunscreen that also serves as a blast shield, protected by an eight-foot high wall, a helicopter pad on the roof) was until January 30, 1968, the symbol of American power, the power to stay, to destroy, to change culture and civilization, the power to dispose and propose.

Then at 3 a.m. on January 30, on the occasion of TET (Vietnamese Lunar New Year, the Year of the Monkey), the citadel of American power was asmembers of the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam (NLF, called by the Western press, Viet Cong). The siege lasted six hours and the Embassy was rescued by a detachment of the 101st Airborne the student demonstrations? One report, unconfirm- Division which landed on the helicopter pad on the men were killed and five wounded.

The representative of U.S. power in Viet Nam, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, who lives nearby and who had been earlier whisked away to a safer place, told the press in Saigon the evening of January 31 that "the attack on the Embassy failed because they were never able to enter the chancery building." Anyone who watched the Huntley Brinkley show on January 31 could judge by himself and see by himself what actually did happen. Of course, Ambassador Bunker cannot admit that the members of NLF forces have penetrated the Embassy: no Emperor can say that his throne is touched by the commoners, and by "rebels" at that.

The attack on the U.S. Embassy was part of a simultaneous assault on the South Viet Nam presidency, the Pentagon East, the South Viet Nam Army General Staff, and the South Viet Nam government radio (which was blown up in shambles). President Thieu had to use the master's voice, the U.S. Army Radio, to announce Martial Law (not against the NLF but against neutralists and people who talk about peace) and the suspension of a Constitution which has never been implemented. Thieu also called on the people "to evacuate areas infiltrated by the Viet Cong" so that the U.S. Air Force could bomb the NLF strongholds around the city.

If Thieu meant what he said, he should start by evacuating his own office to Honolulu or Washington, D.C., or have it bombed. Thieu should be intelligent enough to know that his office as well as all agencies of the Saigon regime are penetrated by

The attacks in Saigon signaled the assault and occupation of more than half of the 44 provincial capitals and the shelling of at least 25 airfields. In the old imperial city of Hue, the third largest city in South Viet Nam, the NLF flag was flying on the traditional flagpole. Once in 1945 (August) the yellow flag of the Vietnamese monarchy was lowered and replaced, at the same flagpole by the Red background. yellow star flag of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. Several big cities (until February 2nd, time of this writing) such as Pleiku, Kontoum, Quang Tri, Qui Nhon are still being held by the NLF. In Saigon itself, small groups of NLF soldiers were still attacking police stations.

For at least six hours on the New Year of the Monkey (1968) South Viet Nam was in fact liberated. The American power crumbled, the South Vietnamese regime vanished. The bourgeois-gentlemen of Saigon, for some time tranquilized and corrupted by U.S. power and money, woke up with the New Year to the realities of their country. They saw for the first time the face of the liberators, the peasants of

Both Hanoi and the Liberation Radio of the NLF attributed the attacks to the cancellation of the TET Lunar New Year Truce. The Liberation Radio noted that Saigon first out its truce from 48 hours to 36

bodies were found in the compound. Six U.S. service- mittee of the NLF was quoted as saying that the cancellation angered the Vietnamese people so it ordered political cadres and front line troops to "stand side-by-side with our people and stand up to the invading Americans and the servant government by killing them". One must remember that TET is the most important festival for the Vietnamese and that the NLF had proposed since November 17, 1967

a week truce. Some people may say that the NLF must have prepared all these attacks months ahead, that such an offensive could not have have been mounted so quickly. To say this is to suppose that the cities in South Viet Nam are completely under the control of the U.S. and the Thieu-Ky regime. But everyone who is familiar with this war knows that the NLF has always maintained a very strong political and military apparatus in all cities. In Saigon, the famed "Trung Doan Thu Do" (Capital Regiment) and the CIO Sapper Battalion are not very far from the U.S. Embassy, and their members are among the three million inhabitants of the city. Most of these three million citizens live in poverty besides the luxurious villas of the U.S. and Vietnamese generals.

Now that President Thieu has declared martial law, he will use it against the Buddhists, the students, the Vietnamese who want this atrocious war to end. Any dead Vietnamese shot by the Saigon police will

be a "Viet Cong terrorist". The Saigon Post on January 27 printed a story titled "The Viet Cong flag flying at American headquarters" which reads: "Passersby along Nguyen Du and Truong Cong Kinh Wednesday (January 24) spotted a Viet Cong flag flying high up a residential house. Judiciary police, alerted, subsequently arrived to investigate. Three Americans flatly refused to let the lawmen take down the flag. They were identified as SS/4 Hussey TP Hqs., SS/4 Hollar TP Hqs., and HP L.T. Humber. Later the cops with the help of a Joint Patrol Chief succeeded in bringing

down the Viet Cong flags." Maybe the three U.S. servicemen were rehearsing a future scene, maybe they were joking at the whole situation. Joke or no joke, the situation in South Viet Nam after the New Year of the Monkey will not be the same. This is high time for the U.S. to recognize that the war in Viet Nam cannot be won. As columnist Joseph Kraft wrote in the Washington

Post of February 1: "The war in Viet Nam is unwinnable and the longer it goes on, the more Americans, already badly over exposed, will be subjected to lossess and humiliations, even in places of maximum security. That is the message the other side is trying to get across by the wave of assaults on the Saigon Embassy and other places in South Viet Nam. And because the message so obviously serves the adversary, it is

tempting to dismiss it as propaganda." Optimistic statements are pouring out of Saigon, but the realities are there for everyone to see. The sooner Washington sees them, the better for the U.S. and for Viet Nam as well.

DGDS Unorganized

Halifax, N.S. February 19, 1968

DALHOUSIE GAZETTE

I attended the Saturday evening Performance of the D.G.D.S. Production of "Oh What A Lovely War" and feel compelled to register a complaint about the house management. I was appalled to find that after paying a minimum of \$3.30 per couple I was charged further for a programme. I realize that these programmes had 16 pages and bristol covers, but included were seven full pages of advertising. Without purchasing a copy of this programme it would have been impossible to learn the names, not only of the actors, but especially of the production crews. Surely this is a blatant breach of theatre etiquette.

Furthermore, when I bought the tickets, there was no-one in the box office who knew which seats were \$1,65 and which were \$2.20. So poor was the organization that there was no seating plan available anywhere in the D.G.D.S. office.

I find it very difficult to sympathize with the Dalhousie Glee and Dramatic Society when they offer the paying public such an unorganized production and then have the audacity to charge further for a

> Yours sincerely, Michael J. Ardenne