



ON DIT apologises to its readers for the CENSORSHIP which has prevented our last two issues appearing as the editor intended them to appear. Our printers, Smedley Press, have taken upon themselves the role of keeping our pages pure and clean. We've long been used to the old rock disappearing from the pages between paste-up sheet and printed copy; even cunt, arse, screw, prick have gone the same way. In ON DIT 8 the printers deleted four sections of the R. Crumb CUBIT BE BOP COMICS that showed sexual activities and organs; one of them by writing a coy SENSATED over the offending parts. ON DIT 9 had a sub-heading reading Piss'n'pussies removed from the front page, and two frames from the comic LOVE'S BODY were replaced by the slogans "Gone to the cleaners" and "This one too": again, the coyness of their censorship is what shits us off.

Here, at last, it is another ON DIT filled with idle rhetoric about human liberation,

STRIPPERS AGAIN

TODAY'S LAWN MEETING DECIDES

THE STORY SO FAR:
The Organisers of the Prosh Ball faced possible antagonism when they decided to put on a piss'n'pussies style of ball, but went ahead with their plans nonetheless. Two Christians from the Students Association got a General Student Meeting organised and, combining their forces with Women's Lib's, passed a motion preventing the ball organisers from presenting strippers and blue movies. The reactionary campus forces (including the newly-formed Society for the Total Elimination of All Morals, TEAM) called a further G.S.M. to reconsider the previous G.S.M.'s decision. Now read on

The meeting held last Thursday, called (not by the Social Activities Committee as reported last week, but) by twenty members of T.E.A.M., was effectively prevented from deciding anything about the Ball by the Students Association Bureaucrats who decided at a meeting the night before the meeting was to take place, that it was unconstitutional.

When it seemed as though the decision which had been reached at the early G.S.M. would be reversed by another G.S.M., Women's Lib moved into action to prevent any further discussion of the question of strippers. The C.E.C. meeting discussed whether it was constitutional for one G.S.M. to overrule the decision of a previous G.S.M. It seems that the constitution of the S.A.U.A. (Battersby's Folly, it has been fondly called) makes provision for a referendum to alter a G.S.M. decision, but doesn't specifically mention what should be done in this situation.

Fearing a reversed decision at a G.S.M., Women's Lib moved to prevent Thursday's meeting. They came in force to the C.E.C. meeting and had little trouble in persuading the meeting of the chaos that would result in student affairs were this precedent to be set.

So Thursday's meeting was effectively castrated by Women's Lib and the Bureaucrats. So much for democratic discussion.

But there was a meeting on Thursday, even though it had no constitutional status. Neville Jordan seemed to be running it, and the issue was not only whether there should be strippers at the ball but also the constitutional-gag decision of the C.E.C. meeting the night before.

It was decided by the meeting to call a G.S.M. as soon as possible to consider the C.E.C. decision, and then, if the C.E.C. decision is over-ruled, to consider the basic issue of Prosh Ball strippers.

SAUA crisis

ROSEMARY O'GRADY
This University is in danger.
It is the proud possessor of a Students' Association constitution which is so important that it can be challenged, time and again, by any kite-flier tenacious enough to keep trying. It is in the hopeless position of an authority able to be besieged, not by quality but by quantity. Its vulnerability is reactionary, emotional and irresponsible. This was amply demonstrated at last Thursday's lawn meeting when a majority of students present voted to challenge a Central Executive Committee ruling regarding to propriety of a General Student Meeting.
The Central Executive Committee is an enfeebled remnant of the old Students Rep-

resentative Council. Its powers are limited as are its pretensions. It is, however, required to interpret the constitution in situations like that which arose last week, and its duty is to make rulings. For members of the Students Association to reject such a ruling, either directly or by implication, is an act of licence, not an exercise in liberty. As the tone of this debate indicates—with smears, tactics and foul play—there are distinct elements of mob-rule about such angry and partisan argument.

It is quite proper procedure for any body finding itself in the role of chairman to refuse to allow further discussion on a motion which has already been put and carried. In fact, it would be improper to do otherwise, except in extraordinary circumstances. The way around such a ruling, if there are grounds for thinking it unpopular, is to bring a different motion at another meeting, but a motion so worded as to encompass the previous ruling, without blatantly putting it to scorn.

The important point here is that the motion carried on Friday, July 13, was a majority decision and representative of student opinion at that meeting. Even a majority of one is sufficient to carry a motion. To claim that twelve people made the decision is to distort the truth. Yet this is what was being claimed at the lawn meeting on July 16. And this is to show considerable disrespect for the direction of the July 13 meeting.

From this initial error, others arise. One is that of censorship.

Censorship is an interesting concept. "Censor" is a quite supportable accusation to lay at the door of the July 13 G.S.M. direction. In the sense of licensing or suppressing immoral or seditious material or acts, and assuming that the stripper-blue movie problem is viewed by the movers as immoral or seditious, then they are acting as censors.

However the alliance of minority groups probably would not agree that stripping is immoral and seditious, and so the seeker after truth will have to look elsewhere for a motive.

The Womens Lib element of protest is attempting to argue against strippers and blue movies on political grounds.

It is against the frenzied refusal to entertain this argument, or even allow such an opinion to be heard, that this commentator protests. Not only is there no effort at reasoned exchange of views, but there is a fanatical exclusion of all debate.

There is another, rather more ominous aspect to "censorship". Censorship is "a power by which elements of the Unconscious are inhibited from emerging into the consciousness." And in this light, those ball organisers who refuse to argue the point raised by their critics, but simply retaliate with cries of 'Censor!' are proving their own tendency to impose authority.



"I am one of the 'man-haters', some have said. I don't have time or patience here to say again why and how I hate not men but what it is men do in this culture, or how the system of sexism, power dominance, and competition is the enemy—not people, but how men, still, created that system and preserve it and reap concrete benefits from it.

Words and rhetoric that merely gush from my arteries when grazed by the razoredge of humanistic love. Enough.

I will say, however, that you, men, will have to be freed, as well, though we women may have to kick and kill you into freedom.

Since most of you will embrace death quite gladly rather than give up your power to hold power."

(Robin Morgan)

The question of strippers at the Prosh Ball is not a matter of censorship, nor of puritanical ethics. It is purely and simply a matter of sexist exploitation.

The Prosh Ball has been organised by men, for the entertainment of men; and WOMEN will provide the entertainment.

Providing a male stripper is a token gesture to avoid the issue:

—most women will not be turned on by a male stripper . . . we are not interested in a performance by an anonymous stranger;

—male stripping is like those magazines with pictures of male nudes . . . it caters mainly to a male audience;

—male AND female stripping exploits PEOPLE;

—the exploiters in both cases are men.

Women have been ignored by the Prosh organisers except as a form of entertainment.

The Prosh directors have shown themselves to be arrogant, egocentric and hard-headed. This is partly because they have been socialised to be so, and also because they maintain their powerful positions in society by this means. Their tactics have been unscrupulous from the start, (openly antagonistic to women—"Free Women's Lib Demo"—and insulting because they underestimated our strength). Having unexpectedly (unexpectedly, by them) lost the first G.S.M., they unconstitutionally called a 2nd G.S.M., hoping to stack it with their supporters. Foiled again. The C.E.C. would not allow them to hold a second G.S.M. as there was no evidence that the first G.S.M. had been unrepresentative. Wallowing in sexist desperation, they called a lawn meeting, unpublicised and held at a time when large numbers of the thinking student population were in the Union Hall listening to Chitepo.

This Tuesday's G.S.M. is their last gasp.

JUST HOW SUCCESSFUL THEIR UNSCRUPULOUS TACTICS HAVE BEEN WILL BE SEEN AT TUESDAY'S MEETING.

JUST HOW SEXIST IS THIS UNIVERSITY?

"The women say, the men have kept you at a distance, they have supported you, they have put you on a pedestal, constructed with an essential difference. They say, men in their way have adored you like a goddess or else burned you at their stakes or else relegated you to their service in their back-yards. They say, so doing they have always in their speech dragged you in the dirt. They say, in speaking they have possessed violated taken subdued humiliated you to their hearts' content. They say, oddly enough what they have exalted in their words as essential difference is a biological variation. They say, they have described you as they described the races they call inferior. They say, yes, these are the same domineering oppressors, the same masters who have said that negroes and women do not have a heart speen liver in the same place as their own, that difference of sex difference of colour signify inferiority, their own right to domination and appropriation. They say, yes, these are the same domineering oppressors who have written of blacks and women that they are universally cheats hypocrites tricksters liars shallow greedy faint-hearted, that their thinking is intuitive and illogical, that nature is what speaks most loudly in them at cetera. They say, yes, these are the same domineering oppressors who sleep crouched over their money-bags to protect their wealth and who tremble with fear when night comes."

(Monique Wittig: The Guerrilleres.)

Enrolled students must enter for exams by 28 July

Osman

Rosemary Osman, secretary of the Central Executive Committee, wrote this report of the C.E.C.'s decision to declare Thursday's G.S.M. unconstitutional.

At the General Student Meeting on Friday 13th July, the following motions were passed:
Motion 1: That this G.S.M. direct the organisers of the Prosh Ball not to stage strippers at the Ball or on campus at any time;

Motion 2: That this G.S.M. directs the organisers of the Prosh Ball not to feature "blue movies" at the Ball.

However, some students disagreed with the decision reached and wanted to call another G.S.M. to reconsider the above motions.

The Constitution clearly states that a referendum can overrule a decision reached at a G.S.M. but does not say whether one G.S.M. can overrule another. It is the C.E.C.'s duty to interpret the constitution while there is any doubt.

In doing this, the C.E.C. decided on the following criterion:-

If 1. 1st meeting unconstitutional &/or 2. new evidence on the motions has come to light since the first meeting, then another G.S.M. can be held to reconsider the motions. Otherwise the first G.S.M.'s decision hold.

The C.E.C. felt that the G.S.M. planned for Thursday 19th July did not satisfy the above criterion and ruled it unconstitutional.

Another meeting has been called for Tuesday, 24th July to consider the C.E.C.'s decision and if the C.E.C.'s decision is overruled, then the question of strippers at the Prosh Ball can be reconsidered.

(Constitutionally, a G.S.M. can overrule any S.A.U.A. Committee's decision.)

Jordan

Before everybody gets passionate and emotive, it is essential that all people involved in the disturbance regarding the strippers at the Prosh Ball outcry understand exactly what the outcry was about.

Several people have told me (I am writing this within 1 hour of the meeting) what really happened on the lawns today. No-one's got it right yet.

What really happened is that on Friday 13th 188 people attended a meeting. 100 didn't want strippers at the ball. 88 did. This means a majority of 12 approved the motion. Some people thought this was not sufficiently representative of the student body so they stated their intention to have the decision of that meeting questioned. The C.E.C. held a special meeting and held that the proposed lawn meeting was unconstitutional.

I personally felt the C.E.C. was being extreme in not allowing a group of students who showed that they wanted to have a voice in their own affairs should be stopped having one.

I found this action of the C.E.C. undesirable. Student participation is difficult enough to get going on campus at the best of times, but when you have a student body of 500 people trying to have a say in uni politics and the C.E.C. says no, we don't want to listen to you 500, that's unconstitutional, we'd rather rely on the decision of 188 people or perhaps a 12 person majority. I wonder what's happened to student participation. I personally thought that the 500 people should be listened to regardless of whether its constitutional or not. So I put the proposition at the meeting.

Motion 1: Desire of students at this meeting to be constitutionally recognised.

This motion was solely intended to provoke the C.E.C. to recognise the student body and stop using the constitution as a method of ignoring student feeling. This has been achieved, the C.E.C. now will have another student meeting. The second motion deals with what will be dealt with at that meeting, i.e.

Motion 2: That the issue of strippers at the prosh ball be reconsidered.

This tends to solve the present problem of students not being allowed to decide issues which are very relevant to student affairs. (i.e. strippers at Prosh Ball.)

If the present problem is all you worried about—stop reading now.

If you're genuinely concerned about the Constitutional situation that causes this problem, then I will now suggest a proposal that the C.E.C. may consider as a constitutional amendment to remedy the present situation.

Two interests are involved. The C.E.C. must have some concrete decisions on which to base the way it acts. 20 people can demand a G.S.M. on a petition and 100 people must be present. Unfortunately, student apathy appears to be here to stay and the situation that arose with the G.S.M. in the Games Room appears to be a result of this. Students could not be bothered going to the first student meeting and then when they heard what really happened, they objected to it. So a balance has to be achieved between the need to have definite decisions on campus and the need to promote student participation.

My proposition is that at the first G.S.M. be conducted in the normal way and be relied upon. But, if people disagree with the holding of the G.S.M. then there should be a way that they could object. It takes 100 people to make a G.S.M. valid so the best thing is to provide for a petition of 100 people before the original G.S.M. decision could be questioned. This assures that there is a genuine feeling of discontent and more than 1 or 2 people must be involved for that original decision to be questioned.

So what I'm proposing is:

- for an initial A.G.M. 20 people must petition.
- for a second A.G.M. 100 people must petition.
- for a third A.G.M. 1000 people must petition.

Neville Jordan

Jesus, too

The Jesus People (would you believe a re-vamped E.U.?) were out again at Thursday's meeting. One, Grantley Morris, printed his own confession and circulated it through the gathering throng. In this article, specially written for ON DIT, he tells more of whether Jesus would have liked strippers at the Ball,

Women's Lib has hit upon something important; Women are frequently treated as sex objects and this is wrong (note the moral judgements). Of course this idea did not originate with Women's Lib. Jesus, for example (SIC), put looking-at-a-woman-with-lust on the same level as having-illicit-sex-relations-with-her.

Out of the 88 who voted to have strippers at the Prosh Ball I could only see 2 females. I suspect that women were more able to make a rational decision because their own self-interest and sexual drive was not so involved. Those males who did not want the strippers either had an unusual ability to overcome their selfish tendencies on this issue (though these even fail in many other areas of life) or were normal males who had their lives transformed by Jesus.

If it had not been for Jesus overcoming my selfish desires and thus enabling me to see things objectively, I, too, would have voted to have strippers at the ball. Nothing Women's Lib could ever do would give me the power to be more concerned for others than for myself; All Women's Lib can do is to tell me what they think is right and perhaps force me to do it, but it (SIC) can never bring about a real change within me (or within anyone else.)

Hence I believe the root of the problems which concern Women's Lib (and aboriginal rights, the Ford dispute, Nuclear testing, Rhodesia, etc.) is that we are primarily concerned only for ourselves. Only Jesus is able to make us completely unselfish because He destroyed all that causes us to be that way. Uni students are right in seeing the problems associated with external restraint. What is needed is self-control and this comes from Jesus. Because of this (and many other things) our society and everyone in it needs Jesus. Opponents of Jesus can get angry at this statement and resort to physical violence if they like, but the cannot stop me from loving them and being concerned about them. Actually they are only demonstrating their need for Jesus' power, love and self-control. Women's Lib may have an ideology, but I have a powerful God and I'd like to share Him with you.

*Yours in love,
Grantley Morris.*

If you think this is amazing, be at Tuesday's meeting to hear and see more wild confessions.

Media

The battle lines which were drawn up over the Prosh Ball strippers have become more obvious over the last few days. The Social Activities Committee claim that their position is as follows: they decided to put strippers on at the ball as an added attraction, to get more people, to make more money; after the original motion was passed, they were content to let the matter rest, and cancel the strippers and the blue movies. Other students, angered at not getting their bit of flesh, tried to reverse the decision and get strippers back at the ball. Posters for the Ball have been

disappearing as fast as they have been put up, and Women's Lib have received a bill from the Students Association for the cost of the posters. The bill did not originate from, but was endorsed by the S.A.C. The Bill has been returned unpaid with the notation that there is no organisation responsible for the posters being torn down, but that it is individuals who are doing it. Ball director, Allen Taylor, told ON DIT that he was afraid of bombs being used against him in the Stripper War: he threatened that Women's Lib would "have their heads thumped in" if they attempted violence against him. Last Thursday police were parked just outside the main gates of the University while the meeting was in progress, and there have been rumours that police are watching for any acts of vandalism against advertising for the Prosh Ball. The new Prosh Ball posters have the strippers and blue movies blackened out, and the square, labelled "for women's lib" is also blackened out.

Meantime, the up-town press has seized on the Stripper War as a good story; McEvoy was contacted early one morning last week by John Laws who wanted him to do a segment on his Sydney radio programme; TDT investigated the possibility of running a segment on the clash last Friday, but the male chauvinists chickened out, leaving a TDT reporter to remark that "women's lib seem to have won." They've planned a segment for Tuesday, it seems, after the meeting, but still they haven't got any pro-strippers willing to argue their case.

If the meeting today decides in favour of strippers (a decision anticipated by the vote at last Thursday's meeting and by women's lib, though the issue is far from obviously decided), the Ball Directors will be in the impossible situation of having to fight a guerilla war doing something that they don't particularly want to, but one which the majority of students at the meeting do want.

If the meeting decides against strippers, the furious activity of women's lib will not have been in vain, and perhaps the campus which a few days ago seemed so reactionary and repressed can be seen as a slightly more enlightened place for men and women to exist.

Elections

- C.E.C.
- President: Broderick
- Vice President: Hyde
- Secretary: (equal vote): Lister, Roberts. (No-one's sure what will be done here)
- Treasurer: Osman
- Communications Officer: Walsh
- ON DIT
- Rosemary O'Grady
- PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE
- Love, Symon
- PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
- Walsh, Hogan, Taylor, Adam, Elliot
- SOCIAL ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE
- Emerson, Allen, Steele, McEvoy, HAINES
- A.U.S. INTERNATIONAL OFFICER:
- Green
- CULTURAL AFFAIRS OFFICER
- Emerson
- REFERENDA
- ON DIT paid editor: passed
- Freshers Camps: passed

Cut these out & put them in last week's front-page comic which our printers cut!



... THEY DID NOT UNDERSTAND ...

This special edition of ON DIT was printed by Andy McHugh on the Empire Times press, Flinders Uni. It was a pleasure to be able to print what we liked. Thanks to Mary Venner, Rosemary O'G, Rosemary Osman, Neville Jordan, S.M. Morris. Ed: Paul Pech

Refec Food

Refectory Prices Up
Prices have gone up on certain items of food sold in the Refectory. It was with great reluctance that the Refectory Management Board made such a decision last Thursday.

The last price rise was in March 1971, and since that time wages have risen by 70% and food costs by 28%, meat being a significant factor in such an increase.

In the next ON DIT there will be a comparative survey of up-town food prices with those at Uni. This survey will try to show that eating at the Refectory is still cheaper than at other places.

A. L. Graeme-Evans
Member Refectory Management Board

