



NEWFOUNDLAND - LABRADOR HUMAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

===== P. O. BOX ST. JOHN'S, NFLD. A1C 5X4 =====

Telephone 754-0690

President: Norman J. Whalen

Secretary: Mary Luther

Treasurer: Alma Badcock

PRESS RELEASE

① The Newfoundland-Labrador Human Rights Association has reviewed the Marlene Webber case at her request and has today informed her that in the Association's opinion, the University may be governed by The Newfoundland Human Rights Code and we have recommended that she consider lodging a complaint under the Act against the University.

② The Association has not been fully informed of all the facts involved in the University's stand and is, therefore, not at this time in a position to formulate an opinion on whether or not the University's actions are in violation of the Human Rights Code.

③ Although, the Association is very reluctant to comment further while the matter is before the Appeals Board at Memorial and while we will request an opportunity to present our views on the principles involved to that hearing, we do think that the points made in the written position put forward by the

..../2

Administration as their policy, raise fundamental issues which require comment.

(4) In his letter to Mrs. Webber giving his reasons for not recommending an extension of her contract, Department Head Dr. Thompson stated, "your political activities have indicated considerable divergence from the philosophy and purposes of the School and your involvement both on and off campus with a political movement which is totally inimical to and destructive of the system upon which our government is based, necessitates my decision not to recommend

→ an extension". This statement ^{appear to} indicate~~s~~ that it is the nature of the political movement ^(Communist) in which Mrs. Webber is involved (i.e., the Communist Party) ^{that is at question} and not ^{at} her activities promoting this cause which was the basis of his decision.

(5) Dr. L. Harris in his statement of December 9th, 1977, in reaffirming that the University does not practice discrimination on the basis of race, nationality, religion, sex, marital status or political belief states "the University cannot accept, however, that a person may use the position he or she occupies within the University and more particularly within the classroom to propagate political beliefs, of whatever nature they may be". This is the first reference by the University Administration to the activities having taken place within the classroom. The Association would not challenge the University's right to recommend non-renewal if this portion of Dr. Harris' statement can be established - which, to date, it has not been.

Moreover, Dr. Harris appeared to ^{reveal a bias} ~~reveal his bias~~ when he went on to state that Mrs. Webber "in fact, expouses and actively promotes a political

(b) doctrine which has as its objective the overthrow of our system of Government by revolutionary means". This statement indicates that it is "the political doctrine" of Mrs. Webber, and not necessarily her activities, which is of chief concern to the University Administration.

(1) The Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association in their press release of December 15th, 1977, endorsed the principle that "Democracy, by its very nature, must accept the activities of those who wish to change the system".

(8) ~~President M. O. Morgan in his release of December 20th, 1977, affirmed that there would not be a termination "simply for reasons of political belief", but stated, "it would not be proper for me to comment in the current context, even semantically, upon the statement "Democracy, by its very nature, must accept the activities of those who wish to change the system". The Human Rights Association is disturbed that the President of the University cannot confirm this statement unequivocally. Our Association sees this right as the ideological basis of all Democracy, as well as all Human Rights Legislation, and it is our position that unless we are prepared to ensure that Mrs. Webber is accorded under our system the very freedom which the communist system which she espouses would deny to her, the very foundations of democracy are threatened.~~ ^{at a lawful dissent}

(9) In conclusion, we would refer the Faculty, Staff and Students at Memorial to the writings of Thomas Payne (1737-1809) who greatly influenced the political thinking of the leaders of the American Revolution. He wrote, "HE THAT WOULD MAKE HIS OWN LIBERTY SECURE, MUST GUARD EVEN HIS ENEMY FROM OPPRESSION, FOR IF HE VIOLATES THIS DUTY, HE ESTABLISHES A PRECEDENT THAT WILL REACH TO HIMSELF".

Unless Mrs. Webber is abusing her position in the classroom as a teacher or conducting unlawful activities outside the classroom we see no reason why she should be terminated.

STATEMENT ON APPEALS COMMITTEE HEARING IN THE CASE OF PROFESSOR MARLENE WEBBER

To: The MUN Community

From: Professor Roger Clark (Advisor to Professor Webber during the hearings)
and Professor Marlene Webber

Date: April 4, 1978

We are issuing this summary of the substance of the Appeals Committee hearing into the case of Professor Marlene Webber, for a number of reasons:

(1) From the outset when the administration openly admitted that "political activities ... on and off the campus" was the main reason for the non-renewal of Webber's contract, vigorous opposition to political persecution was expressed from many sections of the community. The people who participated in the broad-based support for Webber's struggle and who otherwise demonstrated a keen interest in the progress of the struggle have every right to know the details of the administration's case and our defence.

(2) We also want our views of the case to be on public record, as we believe that to hide this case in backrooms can only serve the interests of the administration and of the forces which support political persecution. We have every confidence that had the hearings been conducted in the open as we insisted, the verdict, based on the weight of the evidence, could only have been a unanimous recommendation for reversal. It is our view that the decision to let the non-renewal stand was largely made before the hearings began.

(3) Everyone should be aware of the fact that the Appeals Committee allowed the administration to develop its case on charges other than those originally presented. The administration did not even introduce evidence relating to "political activities ... on and off the campus", nor, in our view, did they present any evidence which proved the bases of their new case, i.e., alleged proselytizing in the classroom and damaging the reputation and prospects of the School in the community.

(4) Over our protests, the onus to prove Webber's academic merit was put upon us. Despite our view that the burden of proof should have rested upon the administration to prove both their cases, we did accede to the Committee's demands. By, "both their cases" we mean the original case based on Webber's political activities and the case they invented for the purpose of hearings based on teaching.

In the administration's opening statement, the main charges raised against Webber related to teaching both in the classroom and in the field, and to the academic quality of her publications. On community activities, which, in our view, was the only areas of administration argument relating to the original charges, the statement read: "Her political activities such as giving testimony at the Canadian Unity hearings, and organising a July 1st rally for the Marxist-Leninist group and its supporters led me (Thompson) into a dilemma. On the one hand she was entitled, under the Terms and Conditions, to freedom as a citizen, but on the other, such public statements may lead to erroneous judgements on the part of others about the School and the University. Discussions about this with Dr. Brureau and others who know and understand the Province of Newfoundland better than I do lead me to the conclusion that Professor Webber's political activities, even though she has the right to engage in them, nevertheless has cast our school in a negative light and therefore jeopardises the support it needs both from the University and from the various agencies upon which the school depends for field placements."

In fact, not a single scrap of testimony, written or verbal, was ever introduced on the July 1st rally, and no evidence which showed any jeopardized financial or agency support was forthcoming throughout the hearings. The only sideline comment on Webber's political activities per se came from a senior faculty member in the School who made the remark that she thought the School could go "down the tubes" as a result of the literature table and the Political and Academic Forum in which Webber participates, the "straw to break the camel's back" in terms of the future of the School. So therein lay their case for political activities on and off the campus!

field work. The student also made independent judgements about the work of the agency and concluded that it represented certain activities which she could not in good conscience support. She protested the administration's allegation of brain-washing by Webber and pointed out that Webber had provided her with a diversified literature on questions of food and population in Asia, Africa and Latin America, including materials from the United Church. She completely opposed their view of the situation and insisted that Webber had not only not been responsible for her transfer request but had encouraged her to stay with the agency. It was only at the student's insistence that Webber supported the transfer.

Testifying for the administration, the field coordinator for 4th year placements could say only that in retrospect the 'UNICEF incident' seemed to him to have some significance. He admitted that he never personally investigated the situation, despite the dim view he had of it, speaking neither with the student nor with the contact in the agency (until a few days prior to his testimony when he spoke with agency personnel to help gather evidence). He further admitted that UNICEF was still willing to accept students should the School decide that the setting was appropriate.

This same witness tried to make a case against Webber by putting together a patchwork of 'incidents', drawn from his admitted eavesdropping outside classrooms and hearsay evidence from disenchanted students plus unsubstantiated allegations that some unnamed (he was 'not at liberty' to mention names) agencies would not accept Webber as a student supervisor. It did come out in the hearings that the RCMP had indicated to the School that they didn't want Webber working in their detachments, which, in our view, was hardly a problem since Webber had voluntarily ruled out working with the police and had made this known to the School much earlier.

The only other 'incident' raised by the administration to prove the irresponsibility of Webber in field instruction and the resultant damage for the School was a situation which 'occurred last Fall in Happy Valley where Professor Webber, while on School business, apparently provided a public meeting with a Marxist-Leninist perspective which upset a number of people.'

The substance of this 'incident' was Webber's presentation, given at a public meeting held in a Happy Valley school, of a slide show and commentary on her 1976 trip to China. The meeting was organized by Webber's Labrador students unit with the explicit encouragement of their two local field supervisors from the Labrador Resources Advisory Council and the United Church. In fact, Webber took her slides to Labrador upon a request from the students for a private showing; it was only upon arriving in Labrador that Webber learned of the public meeting which had been organized.

Testimony and/or letters were provided by all the principals in the "incident" - the two field supervisors and 3 of the 4 students (one could not be contacted) - proving conclusively that the only people "upset" by the presentation were the MUN administration.

The other salient issue revealed through this "incident" was the fact that the administration was desperate to construct a case against Webber after the fact of non-renewal when they found themselves isolated in their attempt to pursue a course of political persecution. We introduced as evidence a letter from a MUN employee in Labrador testifying to his receipt in late December, 1977, of a written request from President Morgan to investigate and report on Webber's activities in Labrador, especially with respect to the Labrador "incident".

In the end, the administration withdrew their charge on the Labrador "incident", presented no evidence, and excused themselves on the basis that they had made an "error".

On the issue of Webber's acceptability within social welfare agencies where she officially represents the School, we brought forward witnesses (in one case involving a Labrador agency, a letter was substituted) from every agency where Webber has conducted School business either as a liaison person or field supervisor (in the case of one agency the witness did not testify due to considerations of time; and we expected the administration to bring a representative from UNICEF since it was part of their case against Webber. However no witness from UNICEF was produced to testify against Webber.) Without exception they spoke highly of the calibre of Webber's work, expressing no reservations in this regard nor any concerns that Webber was attempting to subvert the work of the agency by promoting disruptive ideas amongst the students. In each case, they indicated willingness to accept Webber's continuing presence as the School's representative in their respective agencies.

STATEMENT ON THE NON-RENEWAL OF MY APPOINTMENT

TO: The University Community

FROM: Professor Marlene Webber

DATE: JAN 16/78

I am issuing this statement to inform students, faculty & staff of the events to date in the administration's attempt to prevent the renewal* of my appointment with the M U N School of Social Work, and also to provide an analysis of why this is taking place.

Since many people have inquired, I should first say that I submitted an appeal to the University Appeals Panel on January 3, 1978. According to the procedures for the Panel, a committee of 5 faculty from the Panel's membership has been struck and will be conducting a preliminary inquiry to determine if there are grounds for a hearing. I am also attempting to secure provision for an open hearing, so that all interested parties can hear both sides and witness how the committee operates.

The appeal was submitted on the basis that the university used ^{an}improper grounds, that is, an assessment of my "political activities" as cause for non-renewal. This is in contravention of the "Terms and Conditions of Employment for Teachers", especially those clauses relating to "academic freedom", under which I was hired.

In my view, the firing is an open and shut case of political persecution of a communist. I maintain that a hearing must be held, that it should be held in full view of faculty, staff & students and that the committee must only consider the grounds for non-renewal as stated in Dr. Thompson's letter to me of December 6, 1977. This stand on "political activities" as the only grounds which the administration can present to the appeals committee is being supported by the MUN Faculty Assoc. and has been formally communicated to the Appeals Panel chairman.

WHAT IS THE REASON FOR THIS ATTACK?

This is part of an escalating national attack on the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) of which I am a supporter. Canada, like the entire capitalist-revisionist (the Soviet Union & the other former socialist countries under its control) world, is in the midst of a deep economic crisis. The burden of this crisis is being shifted onto the backs of the Canadian working class and people through a variety of state-imposed measures such as the "AITB" which forcibly restrains wages while prices and profits skyrocket; the new anti-immigrant Bill C-24; the curtailing of unemployment insurance benefits through Bill C-27; severe cutbacks in health, education & welfare spending; etc.

In the face of these attacks, people are becoming increasingly disillusioned with the capitalist system & the rule of the rich. Many are seeking alternatives. CPC (M-L) presents a revolutionary alternative which is growing in influence. The politics of Marxism-Leninism is being taken up by more and more workers, students and others every day.

Class struggle takes place in the universities as in the society as a whole. In the universities it is expressed on the ideological front where reactionaries attempt to maintain a monopoly on ideas in opposition to progressive ideas. In particular, they want to suppress the ideas and programmes of the Marxist-Leninists.

Less than two weeks previous to my firing, another professor at York University who supports CPC (M-L) was arrested on trumped-up charges after an attack on the Marxist-Leninist literature table by an alliance of Zionists, university administration and police. The prof. was subsequently barred from the campus as was the literature table. However, widescale resistance forced the administration to reinstate the literature table; the struggle to reinstate the prof. has become very popular and wages on.

In the York case, the administration denies political persecution and resorts to charges about the "behaviour" of the professor. At MUN, the administration openly admitted that my "political activities" are the reason. It is also the case here that the state is allied with the administration, though the exact features of that alliance have not yet been clarified.

The attempt to prevent the renewal of my contract is a direct threat against faculty and students who would take up progressive politics, as reactionaries are always afraid of the possibility that faculty and students will investigate the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and find them in their basic interests.

That my firing is an expression of an open anti-communist attack is reflected in Dr. Thompson's letter where he writes: "your political activities have indicated considerable divergence from the philosophy and purposes of the School & your involvement both on and off campus with a political movement which is totally inimical to and destructive of the system upon which our government is based, necessitates my decision not to recommend an extension."

The acceptability to higher administration of "political activities" as grounds for non-renewal was affirmed by Dr. A.A. Bruneau, Vice-President responsible for Professional Schools & Community Services, in his letter to me of Dec. 12, where he writes: "I have discussed with Dr. Thompson his recommendation & the reasons for his decision not to recommend a renewal of your contract...and, since I concur with the position that he has taken, I wish to notify you that I intend to act on his recommendation." Dr. Bruneau has no quarrel with the fact that my "political activities" were Dr. Thompson's stated and official grounds for recommending non-renewal.

Dr. Harris, who emerged as the administration's spokesman on the case, further affirmed the political basis for the firing by stating in a TV interview (Here & Now, Dec. 5/77) that he views the job of the School of Social Work to turn out students "to fit into that system... that is the system that supports us & sustains us, that provides all the funds that we spend."

That my firing is the result of an alliance between the state & the Admin. has been openly admitted by spokesmen for both. Dr. Thompson admitted publicly to "indirect" govt. pressure in influencing his decision (CBC-Radio and TV news, Dec. 2nd.); Dr. Harris, is quoted in the press (Evening Telegram, Dec. 14/77) as saying that the Ministry of Social Services "made it clear the department did not want her teaching in the certificate programme which prepared students for government jobs." Dr. Harris is reported to have said that this led Dr. Thompson to the conclusion that I could not be used "flexibly" & therefore, shouldn't be rehired.

By Dec. 16, the Social Services Minister, Charlie Brett, was making statements to the press denying intervention by his department, but at the same time, admitting that "his department could not approve of anyone with a Communist bias, such as Ms. Webber, teaching in certificate programmes which prepare students for government work".

BACKGROUND TO THE REPRESSION OF MARXIST-LENINIST IDEAS ON THIS CAMPUS:

- My firing is the most current action of the admin. in its attempts to prevent the dissemination of the M-L ideas on campus, but it is by no means their only attempt:
1. June, 1977, I booked a room at Queen's College for a political meeting for July 1st. The booking was cancelled by security & at that time Dr. Thompson showed me a letter signed by Pres. Morgan making Thompson responsible for ensuring that the meeting did not take place at Queen's & that I not be permitted to book rooms there for political purposes. (This was shortly after the NDP had held a large meeting at Queen's). Dr. Thompson told me his view, which he said he had communicated to Dr. Bruneau, was that if the University wished to repress the expression of my political views, they should use their security services and not him as the vehicle, because although he did not share my views he felt I had every right to express them. When we subsequently arranged for another location on campus, which was not made public, (due to lack of time between cancellation of the originally advertised room and July 1st) we found the police had been informed of the location because they tried to send an agent into the meeting
 2. On Nov. 9/77, a MUN print shop foreman told a prof. that he had received instructions from his boss, saying not to print the posters and newsletters for the Political & Academic Forum (for open discussion and debate of current political issues organised by campus supporters of CPC (M-L)). The foreman said that after the last work was done, various administrators including Mr. Bruce Woodland (University Affairs) had come to the print shop to investigate. He also tried to suggest that previous printing of this nature had been charged to a departmental budget, but under questioning, admitted he knew it had been paid for privately.
 3. On Nov. 15, 1977, a prof. on campus who was helping to organise the Political & Academic Forum, received a letter from Dr. J.D. Eaton, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Services, denying him the right to book rooms unless the prof. had the written permission of his Dept. Head! This man is a full professor with tenure!
 4. Late this Fall after the literature table in the TSC had been operating regularly since Sept./75, the vendor was one day approached by building management. He said he wanted to be advised in advance when the table would be set up "in case other groups might want the space." The vendor explained that the space was sometimes shared with a religious group which sells literature, but that there had never been any competition for the space and she would continue her usual practice of selling at noon on Tuesdays or Thursdays.

These forms of petty harassment are indications of the administrations attitude towards students and faculty who organise politically on campus to disseminate the ideas and popularise the programme of CPC (M-L). It is not the same attitude they adopt towards other political parties and religious groups who organise on campus and who disseminate their ideas in classrooms, in meetings and through the sale of literature. It is the M-L's and their views which are singled out for attack, which is again, manifested in this attempt to fire me on the basis of my "political activities."

HOW HAS THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY RESPONDED TO THE FIRING?

Within days, widescale resistance developed on campus. A number of faculty from a variety of disciplines formed on Dec. 5th, a committee of Professors Opposed to Political Firings. On Dec. 6th, the MUN Faculty Assoc. issued a statement to all faculty reaffirming MUNFA'S support for the clauses relating to academic freedom as spelled out in the "Terms & Conditions of Employment for Teachers." The statement also stressed that these clauses apply to teachers in all faculties and schools, meaning that the University has no right to advance its line that anti-capitalist theory is alright in "ordinary" academic disciplines but has no place in professional schools (as Dr. Harris said in his original TV interview).

On Dec. 6th, close to 300 students, faculty & staff turned out for a meeting of the Political and Academic Forum which was held on the topic "Oppose Political Firings: Fight for Democratic Rights & the Free Contention of Ideas on the Campus." It was addressed by a spokesman for the Profs. Against Political Firings, the acting editor of the MUSE and myself. In 2 hours of vigorous discussion, the main sentiment expressed by those at the forum was support for the right of different schools of thought to contend within a university. A number of students said they considered it a violation of their rights to have Marxist views repressed.

The forum resulted in the formation of the Ad Hoc Com. to Oppose Political Firings; the work of this committee is just beginning. Already a petition condemning the University for firing me because of my support for CPC (M-L) and calling for reinstatement as well as demanding that Dr. Thompson explain who is behind the firing, has begun circulating amongst the students. In the few days before the Christmas break, close to 300 signatures were collected.

Another petition, reaffirming clauses pertaining to academic freedom, was circulated by Professors Against Political Firings amongst faculty. Despite limited circulation 208 signatures were collected before the break, including 48 of 54 faculty members on the Corner Brook campus of MUN.

On Dec. 7/77, the CSU, after a long and heated debate, passed by majority vote, two resolutions: 1. As a matter of general principle the CSU does now and will in the future oppose vigorously any and all political firings; 2. Be it moved that the CSU goes on record as whole heartedly endorsing and supporting Prof. Marlene Webber in her struggle against her dismissal for her political beliefs and activities. The above statement is not a statement of support for the specific politics of Marlene Webber. It is simply a statement of principle which we believe to be of uppermost importance in this matter.

By the next day, 55 Political Science students had signed a petition circulated by the Political Science Society expressing concern over political discrimination: "Specifically, we feel that Prof. Webber's teaching like any other faculty member's, ought to be the sole basis upon which a renewal of a contract is decided. Any other basis would deny teachers the freedoms guaranteed all citizens of our society, one of these being the right to participate in any legitimate political party or organisation in Canada."

The Nfld./Lab. Human Rights Assoc. also went on public record as ""opposing the University's action of dismissal based on political beliefs" and the Nfld. Assoc. of Social Workers issued a public statement in which they affirmed the fact that I am a member in good standing, their representative on the editorial board of the professional journal, the Social Worker, and explaining that the Code of Ethics prohibits discrimination of the basis of political beliefs and activities.

On Dec. 15th, MUNFA issued a second statement, mainly in response to statements made by the administration which, in MUNFA's view, had constituted a violation of the "Terms and Conditions of Employment for Teachers." The statement opposed the use of improper ground non-renewal and the attempt by the administration to suggest that academic freedom doesn't apply equally to provisional and tenured appointments. On the question of academic freedom, MUNFA presented the view that "democracy, by its very nature, must accept the activities of those who wish to change the system." The statement also said that MUNFA "deplores any governmental interference in the appointment, dismissal or non-renewal of the contract of any faculty member in the University."

All of these expressions of protest took place in the context of lively political discussion and debate on the campus and in the community. The list above is only partial, as I am aware of numerous individual protests by students, faculty, social work practitioners and others expressed in the form of letters, calls and meetings with the administration and public statements, such as that made in defence of my teaching by three of my students on "Here and Now (Dec. 8/77).

The story was also carried on national press wires, notably CUP, and resulted in many sympathetic reports in student newspapers across the country as well as calls and letters from faculty and students and trade unionists who do not find political persecution of a communist acceptable.

WHAT WAS THE ADMINISTRATIONS RESPONSE TO BEING ISOLATED?

As the resistance became more vocal, the administration found itself increasingly isolated and under attack for its attempts to pursue this course of political persecution. Evidence of in-fighting within the ranks of the state and the university administration began to emerge as well as all kinds of attempts to cover up their misdeeds and shift the grounds for the non-renewal.

Both Dr. Harris and President Morgan began to resort to truth-by-assertion, flying in the face of the facts, by declaring that the University does not practice political discrimination and implying that the real reasons for my non-renewal were political bias in teaching, failure to be "responsible" in the exercise of my "academic freedom, etc." They issued statements advising faculty not to be concerned about the acceptability of their beliefs. (See statement from Pres. Morgan to faculty, dated Dec. 20/77).

It is clear from their later public statements and their comments to various delegations who met with various administrators that the university understands now that it cannot engender support for political persecution except amongst a handful of reactionaries who can hardly constrain their joy. As a result, they are trying to introduce new charges, particularly academic ones, in a desperate move to misconstrue the meaning of "political activities... on and off the campus."

It is a case of their being isolated and on the defensive, hoping they can introduce a variety of grounds, hoping one can be made to stick. However, the Appeals Com. has, in the view of MUNFA and myself, no right to allow the administration to construe, or reinvent reasons for non-renewal, other than those stated in Dr. Thompson's letter.

In their programme of trying to mystify the real grounds, President Morgan made a contribution with his statement to faculty that: "I draw a distinction between rights and liberties which comprise freedom. All teachers, at the University, without exception, have the same rights. It is axiomatic, however, that a liberty is the constrained exercise of a right. A liberty without constraint becomes license." As many faculty have suggested to me, what this means is that "freedom" can only be exercised within the constraints of what the University administration finds acceptable.

This is more clearly stated in Dr. Harris' statement to the faculty (ref. #48, dated Dec.9/77) where he states: "Professor Webber, in fact, espouses and actively promotes (Harris' emphasis) a political doctrine which has as its objective the overthrow of our system of government by revolutionary means. In advocating such methods, Prof. Webber clearly demonstrates her incompatibility with the School... and just as clearly sets at naught those responsibilities that go with the freedoms that her terms of employment guarantee.

The University has also made efforts to mystify the question of what constitutes correct procedure in appealing negative recommendations. However, in spite of their declarations, I have taken the advice of MUNFA from the beginning and followed the procedures, as MUNFA understands them, to the letter.

Another issue on which there has been considerable in-fighting, charges and counter-charges, is the question of state intervention in the internal affairs of the university, especially with respect to my firing. While this has been explained above, it is important to point out that state interference is not acceptable to the vast majority of faculty and many have voiced their opposition to its expression in this case.

The state has wasted no opportunities to cast aspersions on me, going as far as bold-faced lies. Social Services Minister, Charlie Brett, was quoted in the press (Daily News, Dec. 16/77) as saying that there were 5 applications for some unspecified job (presumably for teaching in the certificate programme offered by Extension and his Dept.) & that my "application" was overlooked for that of a better qualified Newfoundlander.

I never "applied" or requested to teach in the certificate programme and I was never officially invited to take on this role. The whole affair had nothing to do with me, though I have no doubts that the state made its preferences known with respect to whom they consider acceptable instructors.

The other main mystification has been promoted primarily through the anti-communist hysteria drummed up by mainly unsigned letters. Press editorials and the incorrigible backwardness of some open line moderators. This has to do with the political line for which CPC (M-L) stands. Every attempt has been made to equate communism with fascism and with support for the present leadership and political system in the Soviet Union. Both these suggestions are slanderous and completely false. Campus friends and supporters of CPC (M-L) recommend that students, faculty and staff investigate our political line by reading the literature distributed by us, as well as by attending our Political and Academic Forums where we will clarify such questions as: What is people's democracy? What is the Soviet Union today? etc.

This struggle against political persecution of a communist is only beginning. I encourage all students, faculty and staff to carry on with discussion and investigation into this issue, to come forward to participate in the work of the committees which are active on campus in opposition to political firings, to sign the petitions and to otherwise express their protest in the forms which emerge.

It is not simply a case of wanting my job back; it is my view that democratic and progressive minded people in this community should support the basic right to disseminate revolutionary ideas on the campus and should oppose all attempts to repress this activity.

*The administration likes splitting hairs over non-renewal verses firing. Technically, they are attempting to prevent the renewal of my contract. In the universities, this is the classical method of terminating employment or firing a professor. The issue, however, is not a semantic debate; the issue is political persecution.

NOTE: Due to the cost, it is not feasible to reproduce in large numbers the various pertinent documents. However, anyone wishing to see the letters, TV transcripts, press clippings, etc. are welcome to contact me.

