

## Help VGW do the job

To all Students and Faculty,

The planning for Varsity Guest Weekend (Feb. 13 to 15) is now underway. The committee has one thought in mind, and that is to make this weekend the biggest and most enjoyable one this campus has ever seen.

All phases of university life will be well represented. A big-name rock group will be in for our Saturday night dance.

The academic side of student life is receiving more attention this year. Our list of prospective guest speakers is enough to excite everyone. Under the capable leadership of Glenn Sinclair this part of VGW will be very interesting.

I now get to the purpose of this letter. The VGW committee is planning to hold a winter carnival starting the Wednesday before VGW. Some of the events already planned are an all-night curling bonspiel, a snooker tournament, snow shoe races and human dog sled races. Many teams are presently being formed for these events (the Sam Hanson Quartet is already odds-on-favorite to win the curling bonspiel) and I would like to see many other teams entered and many other suggestions for events that we can put on in this carnival.

These events need your support. I would like to see many student-faculty and inter-faculty events planned. I'm sure many of you would love to tear into your profs in a broom-ball game. Why not challenge them? I am in Commerce 4 and would like to see another faculty show some raw courage and issue a challenge to those finely-tuned athletes who lecture in commerce. They quickly master any sport they attempt and I'm sure they will be happy to demolish any-and-all comers in any sport.

Let's make this a success. Please send all suggestions and/or challenges to me in SUB (VGV mailbox).

VGW-69 is one weekend you won't want to miss.

Wes Alexander  
Director  
Varsity Guest  
Weekend

## Is SDU losing its value?

The Editor,

A noon hour meeting held last Friday in the SUB theatre concluded with a march to present a petition to the sociology department of the Faculty of Arts. The meeting was an attempt to drum up some popular support for this predetermined march.

In this meeting dominated and controlled by the converted there was a fertile attempt to portray the march as being founded on unanswered student grievances. Those attending were told that not to march was to break faith with Simon Fraser. What peculiar relationship students here have with Simon Fraser that would validate such a march was not indicated. Secondly, one dissident professor claimed he knew of sociology students intimidated by professors. Those intimidated students didn't speak nor were those alleged professors asked to give account of themselves.

Thirdly, the entire department is now controlled by a small decision-making group of extreme right wing convictions. One of those decision-makers gave an adequate account of that group and its purpose but his statements were scoffed at rather than refuted. And as usual a few other unsubstantiated charges were on their way waving a petition that was neither assented to nor formulated by the attending group.

The meeting itself, however, was clear evidence of flagrant manipulation by an increasingly alienated group of students. It presented a clear example of the degeneration of the SDU from useful contributor to campus life to one which has alienated itself from the students. Its spokesmen have become an insult to both the SDU itself and to other students.

Most students have obviously seen through the SDU's attempt to impose their vague concepts on student life and society by manipulative use of legitimate grievances. To debate with them is an exercise in futility because to disagree is conclusive evidence you're uninformed and wrong. To not march at their command is a clear revelation of your apathy. To request meaningful discussion in hopes of being able to make meaningful decisions is to submit to a devious administrative trick. To submit to popular ideas or demands is necessarily to bastardize your principles. To ask for a vote on issues is to misunderstand that their principles are the ones that are right and absolute for all.

The increasing frustration felt by the SDU in failing to win students to their cause by these arguments and their unsuccessful attempt to discredit the administration and the students' union even with all their shortcomings is the real father of this illegitimate march. This absurd and comical meeting concluded with a march in a desperate and absurd attempt in hopes of creating some student martyrs behind whom the masses will finally flock.

The SDU and others have done much to point out what weaknesses in our academic life ought to be corrected. However, the current posture of the SDU is making the possibility of constructively eliminating these flaws increasingly more remote. They are not only eliminating themselves but also the rest of the students from the society to which they are trying to make a contribution.

To this I object!

Ben Vanden Brink  
law 3

## The structure — in a shell

To the Arts students:

If you wish to gain a voice and influence on your program of study, on the curriculum, on examinations, etc., here is your opportunity.

This Thursday, the Faculty Committee on Student Representation will meet you, the arts students, to find with you the best means of giving you a franchise in the affairs of the faculty.

If you are impatient, or at least interested, to do something about your educational process: here is a course of action. Take advantage of it.

Everything which determines your education as art students, is decided in the committees of the faculty. Let us get together to explore the most effective way by which the students can be represented on these committees.

Here are, in a nut shell, the policy and decision making bodies of the Faculty of Arts now operating:

1. The Executive Committee (in fact the top of the pyramid).
2. Dean's Committee on Academic Planning (adapts policies of university-wide General Faculty Council) to the arts faculty.
3. Committee on Academic Standing (deals with individual students' academic standing).
4. Advisory committee on building and space.
5. BA and LLB committee (administers first two years of the combined program).

6. Curriculum Committee (the general BA program).
7. Election Procedures Committee (membership on faculty committees).
8. Honors committee (all aspects of the honors program).
9. Interdepartmental Committee on Soviet and East-European Studies (programs in the special area).

10. Arts Faculty Library Committee.
11. Committee on Matriculation Requirements.
12. Religious Studies Committee (acts in place of a department in this area).
13. Committee on Restrictions on Enrolment.
14. Standing Committee on Admissions.

More specific information can be given at the meeting.

If you assume that we, as teachers in the faculty, are not as eager as you are to improve the present operation, you are wrong. We should act together.

Representation on the committees is one way of bringing about changes; not the only way, but one which we can pursue now. So, here is a chance to take positive action.

Meet us Thursday at 3:30 p.m. in TL-11 Tory Building.

John H. Terfloth  
Chairman of the  
Faculty Committee on  
Student Representation

## This is page FIVE

This is our annual two issues prior to the loaded sock-it-to-you original issue which is really a few weeks before exams.

We hope you don't flunk. We expect however that you will. That's the facts, baby.

People are concerned this week with the teach-in, the sociology situation and our editorial on the status of the university, to wit: is it public or private?

There is also a shot from Wes Alexander, the guy who did a fine job on Freshman Introduction Week and is now going to direct Varsity Guest Weekend. He wants workers.

Letters to the editor should be sent to The Editor, The Gateway, etc., and should not be too long—more than 300 words although we can occasionally run longer articles.

Have letters in by Wednesday because we quit publishing Friday and won't start up again until January 10.

—The Editor

## About our editorial

The Editor,

Concerning your editorial "Is the University Public or Private?", you might care to think out the implications of your belief that institutions supported by public funds should therefore be accessible to all members of the public at all times.

Consider. All university residences are public property, as they are University buildings. Therefore, any member of the public may enter them, day or night, and disturb those who live there. The University Hospital is similarly public property. Therefore anybody who wishes may wander into operating rooms, wards, storerooms, or anywhere else he craves to go. The libraries, being public property may be taken over by any seeker after knowledge whether he belongs to the university or not. By all means. Has anybody lately complained of the shortage of space and the books out that he wanted?

The fact is that public has a good many meanings. Access to any public facility has to take into account the conditions requisite for that facility to carry out

its functions. No university can carry out its functions if subject to sudden incursions by those who are not engaged in that particular work. Public in this sense has to mean "accessible so far as is consonant with the job the public institution is doing." I cannot see that the work of learning was being furthered by a camp-out in the Simon Fraser Administration Building, although it may have been amusing to those who did the camping.

The Administrative Offices of a university are like the laboratories, the student rooms, or the offices of faculty members, provided by the public for the purpose of the work to be done in them by those qualified to do it. Access has to be limited, yes, even to those sacred records. Does anybody, thinking personally and not idealistically, like the notion that his academic boners, his physical ailments, the private appraisals of his letters of recommendation, shall be available to anybody who wants to look at them?

Jean MacIntyre  
Associate Professor  
of English

## The university is public property

The Editor,

In your editorial of Nov. 26 you ask the question "Is the university public or private?" In your discussion you state, "If the university is public property, then the moves by the administration in the above cases are illegal in removing students from buildings." I wonder if you have considered carrying your thought to its logical conclusion. You seem to believe that because the university is supported by public funds, its facilities should be open to the public. Therefore the university cannot, you say, prohibit high school students from using the library.

If you continue along this line of thought, you then should not prohibit any individual or any group from moving into any part of the university complex at any time and using the facilities for whatsoever purpose some of the events that might occur as a result of this philosophy. By the same logic, the road is public property and therefore I as a taxpayer may block off any section of the street where I may have

a party. Your philosophy carried to its conclusion would produce chaos.

The university is public property, but property paid for by the taxpayers for a specific purpose. One may argue about the purpose for which universities are built, or about the success of the administrative and academic structure in advancing that purpose. But one must recognize that the action of 150 students at Simon Fraser University in taking over the administration building does not advance the purpose of the university. The administration of a university must be given the power to take action so that the purpose of the university be served, whether the action is to stop a boy from making a fire in the middle of an assembly room or is to expel from a building a group of individuals who are hindering the work of the university. If you wish to justify the action of the students at SFU, it must be done on another base than that the university is publicly supported.

Richmond W. Longley  
Professor