

## Remember the Phantom?

Dear Friends,

As you probably know, I was finally driven from SUB by the persecution of the infamous SUB supervisors, who ferreted me out of every nook, cranny, and gloomy recess, binding me with silver chains and putting me in the baggage compartment of an Air Canada flight to this truly medieval and Transylvanian city. I had hoped, on arrival here, to make my home in one of the ancient and mossy edifices on the University of Toronto campus, and with this in mind headed for those Groves of Academe. But I found the spire of University College, the Watchtower of Massey Hall, and the crumbling passageways of Trinity Chapel already so crowded with ghosts and phantoms, bearing such strange names as Claude Bissell and Marshall McLuhan, that I was forced to flee, seeking solitude in some less populated haunts.

I sought out the vast corridors of Rochdale College, thinking that such a new building, and such a large one, would afford room for such a wanderer as me. Masking my hideous visage in my cloak, I entered; but immediately the

pungent odour in the air, the smell of the burning weed, caused my head to reel; I was fallen upon by hordes of crazed teenie-boppers chanting the songs of Allen Ginsberg; they ripped the mask from my face, and fell upon me with kisses; "What's your bag, man? What are you in to? I mean, where's your head at?" they cried; and I ran away in horror, little believing that perversity greater than my own could exist in such a place.

So I made my way to the great emptiness of the North, which is called York University. Here I lurk undetected among throngs of would-be fraternity men and damsels with Pepsodent smiles, passing silently to and from along the sterile corridors of College Complex No. 1. I have found a place here among the Living Dead; but often my thoughts return to those long vigils in SUB, my old friends Emily Broadbottom and Joshua Quickfingers, and the long halls which echoed with my cry: "It's 11 o'clock! All you miserable little sonsabitches get outta here!"

Your erstwhile  
devoted reader,  
The Phantom X

## To the arts undergrads . . .

Consider what is at stake:

Whatever will result from the current meetings between students and faculty is going to affect you directly; whether you are part of the discussion or not.

We, as the Faculty Committee on Student Representation, are trying to find the most effective method, the best means by which students and staff can work together to create a better faculty.

A group of your fellow students has organized a teach-in, so that the problem can be explored and proposals can be considered.

We, as delegates of the faculty, will meet you following the teach-in to discuss the issues with you.

If you have strong opinions against the way the faculty presently is operating, you will undoubtedly be there. If you want to reorganize the entire educational system; if you are looking for radical solutions; if you want to create battle fronts, you will be there.

But you might not be there if you are convinced that reforms, needed improvements, can be made through reasonable co-operation between student and faculty; if you think we can find ways together to improve your pro-

grams, the process, the atmosphere in the classroom—then you likely will not come to these meetings. *But you should be there.* Unless you want to see others making decisions for you, decisions with which you have to live, you must be there. It is your faculty, your education, part of your life.

The doors for communication and co-operation are open. Trying to crush down open doors seems to me to be wasting energies. So, even if you cannot be at the meetings, let us know, student or staff, whatever suggestions you may have for student representation on the faculty; whatever changes, improvements you believe can be made and should be made: Changes which will give you voice and influence in all questions affecting your studies. Help us work jointly toward a better faculty in the university.

The meeting following the teach-in, between Faculty Committee and students is set for Thursday, Dec. 5th, 3:30 p.m. at TL-11, Tory Building.

I hope I shall see you all there.

John H. Terfloth  
Chairman,  
Faculty Committee  
on Student  
Representation

## Student power is no answer

The Editor,

It does not matter about student rights, the problem of anonymity, of faceless masses, of impermeability of bureaucratic barriers, etc.

People have begun to think of revolution in terms of inherent betrayal. There is something wrong and somehow, something should be done about it, yet the only way to change things is through organization of opposition; but organization necessarily involves alignment and proselytization. It is contradictory to submit to the brainwashing and bureaucracy of one organization to escape or fight the brainwashing and bureaucracy of another. It

must be predicted that student power organizations will, soon after they gain effectiveness become stuffy and oppressive.

Student power is not the answer nor is submission to the present powers. The apathetic student realizes this and until they come up with something better both sides can count him out of their dirty little game.

In apathy the student deals both sides the worst possible blow. He is telling them that they do not matter. They are nothing. That hurts more than any opposition could.

Michael J. Buchek  
arts 1

## This is page FIVE

We, in this little corner of the building which promotes security, are being attacked from all sides.

Thus our only contribution today is this newspaper which managed by stealth and the usual Gateway ingenuity to slip past the barricade and subject you readers to our usual objectivity. Eat it up, cats.

Contributions today come from lots of people including a sociology prof, a councillor and others.

Our CUS education program continues with the resolution passed at the Guelph congress on marijuana. CUS takes a stand on everything, you know.

Next week is the last week of publication until after the Christmas vacation. We will print three papers on the usual days next week and have a special color section in Casserole. You sure are lucky we treat you so nice.

—The Editor

## This is what happened . . .

The Editor,

I wish to thank you for giving our small protest needed exposure, however, I would like to clarify a few points.

First, positive steps are being taken to insure open discussion on the current problems in our department. I firmly believe these steps will help us all to react more rationally and creatively to the demands required by the changing university and world scene.

Second, there are a number of inaccurate statements in your article. Most of these inaccuracies cannot be considered of your doing however because the rapid and bewildering chain of events makes accurate reporting difficult. Let me briefly try to recreate the events.

On Nov. 11 our staff adopted a number of proposals which added about 12 new voting members to our existing 20-man department. On Friday of the same week a petition was circulated asking for a number of radical changes in our department's organizational structure. This petition was signed by about 18 (out of 32) staff members. Parenthetically, it is my content that the verbal explanations given for the necessity of the radical changes were systematically varied depending on who was being talked to. While this petition was being circulated we had a joint graduate student-staff meeting on Saturday. Out of this meeting came two clear recommendations:

graduate students be given 35% participatory voting in departmental decisions and that no major departmental decisions be made until graduate student participation was effective. On Monday, Nov. 18, at our staff meeting, the circulated agenda was set aside and the first order of business was the reorganization of the department on lines suggested in the petition, which incidentally, was never read to the staff although repeatedly requested. When a motion to table this item of business failed by a vote of 13-7 (and 3 abstentions), and it became obvious that no free discussion was to be tolerated, six of us left the meeting in protest. The final vote is not recorded but all decision-making power was then assigned to the Head and four staff members, three of whom are new to the department. This decision reversed the trend of democratization in the department.

Finally, I do not recall making the statement "It was a railroad job," but is an apt expression of my feelings about the procedures used.

Once again though, I must stress that I believe in the forces of rationality at work in this university and that the Freedom, Responsibility and Integrity will ultimately prevail in our department and the university.

Don Whiteside  
Assistant Professor  
Sociology

## Is it Public domain?

The Editor,

Your recent editorial, "Is the university public or private?", infers from the fact that certain regulations, limiting the freedom of taxpayers on campus, are established, that the university property is treated as if it were private property. It is also maintained in that article that a provincial university is a public property, therefore, its facilities (e.g., library) should be available to all taxpayers and members of their families (e.g., high school students). This argument, carried a little further, would also mean that the university may not establish restricted parking lots, employees of the government may not have cafeterias "for employees only" in government buildings, and anybody wishing so may use the prime minister's official car.

It appears the writer of the editorial failed to distinguish be-

tween "public property" and "public domain". The first is property supported by the taxpayer's money and managed by the right to determine in what way a particular piece of public property will be used, as well as to restrict its image to certain categories of people.

On the other hand, public domain is open to all. While the government may establish certain rules of usage (e.g., to establish speed limits), it may not bar particular categories of people from using it.

This may be done by the courts only and usually means imprisonment.

Had the writer demonstrated that a university is a public domain as well as public property, his argument would have been strengthened. This, however, does not seem to be the case.

Yizhar Eylon

## I would suggest that . . .

The Editor,

In your editorial of Friday, Nov. 22 you state that the time has arrived "to educate the student populace about the Canadian Union of Students," to build "a solid structure of CUS" and to "see its purpose and how it serves this purpose". All this, of course, based upon the most "educational" article by Brian Campbell concerning the bitter past of CUS and the U of A.

I would like to make the following suggestions to you concerning your new campaign.

I would suggest that we are not here to "build a solid structure of CUS"; we are here to see if a solid structure exists or if one is capable of existing. We are not here to see *how* it serves its purpose; we are here to see *if* it serves its purpose.

I would further suggest that the responsibility of The Gateway is to "tell it like it is" and let the students decide whether CUS is an organization worthy of support or capable of becoming such an organization. It is the function of a student newspaper to analyze situations and put forward the issues clearly so that the informed opinions and discussion will result.

I don't dispute Mr. Campbell's right to express his opinion as he did, but to use his subjective opinion in the guise of "education" as your foundation is to fall short of your responsibility. And furthermore, such an approach serves only to discredit both sides of the issue. I suggest we discuss the issues rather than wallow in the mud with personalities.

If CUS can't stand on its merits alone without the battle of personalities, then let it die! However if it is an organization worth supporting, do your job and present the issues so that on Jan. 29, the vote will represent a properly informed and representative choice.

Rolly Laing  
law rep  
students' council

## CUS resolution CUS and marijuana

WHEREAS the use of marijuana has been proven to be neither deleterious to health nor addictive:

AND WHEREAS: the widespread use of marijuana has been relentlessly and mercilessly persecuted by the police forces and judiciary of Canada thus creating a new class of criminals who are not criminals in the understood definition of the word: that is individuals who are a danger to society.

Therefore be it resolved that:

(1) the Canadian Union of Students demand legalization of the use and sale of marijuana.

(2) further that on passage of such a law that all persons presently imprisoned for possession and/or sale of marijuana be pardoned and released and that all pending cases relating to the possession and/or sale of marijuana be dropped.

(3) further, that all criminal records relating to possession and/or convictions for possession and/or sale of marijuana be destroyed.