

Dear Mr. Flint,

As you may have noted all letters sent of the Editor of the Gazette are published as "To the Gazette", though your letter in actual fact was written to the Editor. However, instead of writing just "Dear Editor" or some other nonsexist term you have addressed the Editor as "Sir". Since you obviously read our newspaper so thoroughly that you even read the ads we wonder why you have not noticed that the Gazette's editor is female.

The Gazette has had a woman editor for a year now and it does get extremely tiring to constantly receive letters addressed to "Dear Sir" or "Gentlemen". I am neither a sir nor a gentleman, and to be addressed as such tends to make me disregard letters from those who should know better. The list of staff and editorial board is printed in every issue of the Gazette on page 5 along with our office address and phone number. Your assumption that the editor of the Gazette is male is sexist and insulting. If it's any consolation, rest assured you are not the only sexist at Dalhousie, yours was merely the letter I chose to react to.

The Dalhousie Gazette will run any advertising that is not discriminatory or sexist and for which the advertiser will pay. Without advertising we could not publish a newspaper and students would remain ignorant of the repercussions of plagiarism.

Sincerely,  
Mary Pat MacKenzie,  
Editor, Dalhousie Gazette.

To the Gazette

I need your help.

I am a student in Dalhousie who needs help, to fill my belly and pay my tuition and rent. So far I have succeeded in this conquest by working a 40 hour week as a heavy duty cleaner at Dalhousie.

On October 1 our union had a very disappointing meeting in its negotiations with Dalhousie. Dalhousie's latest offer to us over a two year contract was 28% increase with no adjustments due to inflation except if the consumer price index would rise over 10%. They proposed that for every percentage over the ten percent rise we would receive the same percent in our pay. The rise would be computed from the C.P.I. of August 1975 to August 1976 and would only affect our pays after August 1976.

EXAMPLE: If pay was still \$2.90 an hour (This is our wage to date for Heavy Duty Cleaners) and C.P.I. would rise from 118 points of August 1975 to 130.98 in August 1976 we would receive a 1% raise in our pay. Plus Dalhousie would like to set a limit on this of nothing over a 14% rise in the C.P.I.. I would also comment that the C.P.I. over the last years never went over a 12% inflation with only a 2% raise to fight it. Therefore any raise I might receive will have 10% eaten by inflation.

As I mentioned above, a 28% raise this year, if we accept the Dalhousie latest offer means a raise of .812 cents over two years. That means that I will have a pay of \$3.70 after two years minus inflation cost of those two years which would mean I would be making as much then as I am now. But other

institutions in Canada and N.S. get over \$4.00 now and any inflation will cause their pay to immediately increase excluding a 10% difference which Dalhousie offered us. So please support me and my fellow workers for a better offer so that we can at least live at a Canadian standard of living. I don't have a family and find it hard to live so I cannot see how my fellow Brothers and Sisters with families exist on what Dal. calls a great offer. If we do not get a better offer soon, the members of this local have no choice but to strike.

We could use your support.

A fellow student in need  
to survive the winter.

To the Gazette:

A few weeks ago two men, men whom I am proud to call friends of mine, were arrested, subsequently charged, and yesterday convicted of "cultivation of marijuana" --a half a dozen "pot" plants in their vegetable garden.

Could the fines of \$500 each have possibly even covered the cost of several hundred manhours of labor and equipment of police and court clerks required for such an action?

Or perhaps this was another scheme to "create" employment?

It has long been recognized by the courts and lawmakers, not a few of whom have first hand knowledge, that the moderate use of "pot" is no more harmful than that of beer. Surely the wisdom of the courts perceived no genuine danger to society, for these men are not in prison.

So who then was protected, and from what? Who benefited?

If this was a mere moralistic wrist-slapping, can we afford such indulgence in the use of our limited human energy?

It happens that these particular men regularly work 12-16 hour days for little more monetary recompense than provide for their food and shelter, believing that cooperation is more noble than selfish competition, and have helped build a service organization that is growing to the point where it will soon provide numerous positions of permanent employment, all oriented towards service, rather than profit, first.

In this age, can we afford to thus meddle in the private lives of men whose public actions are so clearly dedicated to the general good?

Can we be judge if a man prefers to relax after an honest day's work in the tranquillity of his own home with a few puffs of a plant which graces our fields with the same innocent ease as our Annapolis Valley apples, rather than disquiet his soul in a noisy, smoke filled tavern?

Search your hearts brothers and ask: "What Good was served by this action of the state?"

Address your reason to this: "Just what was the point?"

For myself, I see this action as neither Christian, Human, economically or politically sensible, if Anything but Just Plain Dumb.

It shames me to belong to a society which could act so irresponsibly.

Michael Feldman  
Wolfville

## Leftist editor to appear on campus

The social and political tensions prevailing in post World War II America made the appearance of an "independent progressive weekly" both necessary and possible. Amidst such an environment the first issue of the **National Guardian** was published on October 18, 1948. The Guardian's first editor, Cedric Belfrage, and its first executive editor, James Aronson, set out to create a journal of dissent and opposition. They were joined by John T. McManus who acted as its first general manager. These three were professional newspapermen, respected in their fields and widely-known in United States left-wing circles.

During the early years of the Guardian there was much with which to find opposition: U.S. intervention in Greece, Guatemala, Iran and Lebanon; the Korean War; McCarthyism, which was victimizing tens of thousands and terrorizing many more; and increasing brutality against Blacks.

World-renowned journalist Wilfred Burchett, who is still on the staff of the Guardian; first appeared in the Guardian in 1952 with a report from Korea. The Guardian played a major role in developing the anti-war movement and providing subscribers with otherwise unavailable information about U.S. aggression in Korea.

The indictment of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg on charges of spying for the Soviet Union was a case too hot to handle for most, even those on the left. It was the Guardian which broke the press blackout using a combination of courageous analytic reporting and insistent editorializing. The paper uncovered a key piece of evidence which contradicted part of the government's case, thus helping to bring into being an impressive movement in the United States which believed in, and worked to

convince others of, the Rosenbergs' innocence. It helped set in motion the momentum which created massive support in Europe for them, even reaching the Vatican, which sent appeals for clemency and headlined the story in its newspaper.

There were years of defensive struggle; when trial after trial, Congressional hearings and deportations were the steady diet for the U.S. left. The Guardian was no exception. Its three founders were called before Congressional committees, and Cedric Belfrage was deported. The Guardian became the heart of the left because its courage did not flag.

The defensive politics of the McCarthy era were soon translated into their opposite and the Guardian played a major role in this transformation. From the Civil Rights Movement in the south to the National Anti-War Movement which developed in the sixties, the paper was used as an informational and organizing tool. In the sixties the Guardian became the newspaper of the anti-war movement and in 1968 the name was changed from National Guardian to Guardian to reflect its new activist orientation.

Today, the Guardian is still strongly independent and is the most widely read paper of its kind in America. With its main office in New York and having bureaus across the country and staff correspondents and contributors throughout the world, the Guardian provides an in depth and critical news coverage and analysis of both international and domestic issues.

This past year the paper lauded the victories of all the Indo-chinese people- in VietNam, Laos and Cambodia. Canadians will find the Guardian an extremely helpful publication if they are interested in receiving weekly coverage of the machinations of United States'

foreign affairs and fiascos.

Irwin Silber will present a lecture on **The Role of the ("all it pays to print") Press in Our Society** on Thursday, October 9, in the McInnes Room of the Dalhousie Student Union Building, during a three-day stay in Halifax.

Irwin Silber is executive editor of the **Guardian**, an independent radical newsweekly which has consistently advocated civil rights and union causes since its founding in 1948.

It is hoped that in addition to his lecture Mr. Silber will be able to

offer some occasions for meeting with his local cofreres in his roles as reviewer of movies and books and commentator on the arts and media, Wednesday evening in the Council Chambers of the Student Union Building.

As well he will be meeting with the many subscribers, readers, supporters and friends of the **Guardian** on Friday evening in the Haliburton Room of Kings College.

Mr. Silber is the first of an impressive list of speakers who are being brought to Dalhousie through the Community Affairs lecture series.

## Update on the Journal

by Mike Greenfield

Those of you who saw the eight page Journil last week are probably concerned about the fate of the student newspaper at St. Marys and also the uphill battle its student union is faced with.

The Journil you saw last week was the product of some dedicated students, headed by Sara Gordon, interested in seeing that St. Marys have a student newspaper this year. The Journil was strictly a private enterprise and the unavoidable losses the paper will incur will have to come out of the pockets of those who worked on it.

The Student Union of St. Marys closed down the Journal because of the dire fiscal straights that the Union is in and because of the disorganization they found when they looked into what was left over from the operation of last year's Journal.

The task now before interim editor Sara Gordon and those interested in having a Journal this

year is to organize the Journal and come forth with some sound and inexpensive ways of operating the newspaper. The proposal must then come before council which must decide if they can spare the payolla. An idea of what the figure will be like would be to think in terms of \$1,000. - \$2,500. (this is a totally tentative figure- a sort of educated guess).

Last Sunday, at the St. Mary's council meeting, the members did not know how much money, if any, they had to give to anybody. Nor did some of the members seem totally in favor of having the Journal around.

The next council meeting is scheduled in two weeks. Hopefully then the council will have some money to give; hopefully, some of it will go to the Journal; hopefully, a Journal more organized and better staffed, and able to carry out the duties of a student newspaper.