HUNTER MUST BE SAVED!

The Editor
Salient
Dear Sir

I am horrified at how unquestioningly the great majority of students are resigned to the proposed demise of the Hunter Block. Demolition is accepted as the only practical proposition, but it would appear from reports that no precise cost forecast as to strengthening the building has been made. All the paragraphs relating to this question are hyperbolic and vague — strengthening would be "too costly" or "completely prohibitive". It is with great hope and interest that the Historic Places Trust's investigation into cost of strengthening is awaited.

I find it hard to accept that strengthening would be vastly more expensive than the cost of demolition, the building of a replacement plus the immeasurable inconveniences of the long interim period. However, Hunter has a value far above purely utilitarian scales, for it is the only building of tradition and beauty on the campus and it dominates and enhances Wellington City which can little afford to allow yet another aspect of its special character to disappear.

It is enigmatic that Hunter is considered "a serious earthquake risk" yet evacuation is to be slowly progressive over a period of three years. Surely if there was real danger, evacuation would be immediate. There is no reason to imagine that earthquakes will obligingly wait for three years before occurring.

The ambitions of empire-builders are to be suspected in drastic plans for university expansion. Think of the opportunities in replacing a gracious, spacious, three-floor building, with a ten-floor modern warren of windowless cubicles.

No one should accept such definite sounding statements as "Hunter has to go" or "the entire Hunter block would have to be pulled down" (from the Post 28/8/74) because formally no absolute decision has been made. Apparently "the steps that are to be taken will be determined by University Council's newly established Site and Building Utilisation and Development Committee and before there can be any fair determination, the alternative of strengthening will have to be considered objectively and in detail.

The initiative must come from the students and surely the physics and law faculties situated in Hunter, who have had the benefits of this unique building are especially equipped to aid any attempt to preserve Hunter, for the whole problem relates to "seismic resistance" and section 301A Municipal Corporation Act, 1968 Amendment.

If students are not stirred by the threat to their only building with character, obviously Rankine Brown and the other sterile monstrosities making up Victoria University have already crushed any aesthetic sensitivity their occupants ever had. The outlook for the quality of students produced in a university without Hunter is even bleaker.

J.B., Law/Arts student

John Whetmore: From the outside it looks all right. It's worth the money to fix it.

Judy Tizard: It's disgusting. It's the only decent building here.

J. Singh: It depends on the earthquake risk and because it is on a fault line then the safety of students is involved. But I wouldn't like to see it go.

Adrienne Murray: It's a pity and I wish something could save it. It's the only building here with any character and it's sad to see it go.

Robert Love: It's very regrettable, but seems necessary. Too much money is needed to save it.

Stephanie Napier: I didn't know and I think it's terrible.
MAORI LANGUAGE WEEK

begins Sunday September 8 with an Interdenominational Service – Karakia at the Ngati Poneke Hall, opposite the Railway Station, 11.30 am - 12.30. At 12.30 – 1.30 Kia will be available followed at 1.30 by a forum till 4pm on Maori Theology. All welcome Nau mai, Haere mai! Watch the noticeboards and the papers for further activities. AKONATE REO MAORI !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

WMSA AGM & ELECTION

Notice is hereby given that the annual general meeting and the election of office-bearers for the 1974-75 year will be held on September 14, 1974 at 2pm in room E006.

K. K. Chong
Secretary WMSA

Salient Notes

Probably the most important job in the Salient office is the constant task of making tea. This week the job was taken on by Mrs Loath who made tea for the trials of burnt fingers and haggling from one leg to the other waiting for the zip to break by Colin (Florence) Fader, minstering angel of the New Zealand left. Grace Stimpson, Audrey Young, Margot Southey and Mark Derby had milk and sugar sugar all around.

Mr P. W. O'Neill sat under the light-table watching the figures on the chart, his head blocked by the tea pot lid flinging off and John Henderson picked his head out. "Did you see every thing as a drawing of a mushroom?" "REALLY, now how do you ask me?" said David Trew very much confused. "I don't think..." "Then you shouldn't talk" said Richard Hopper. This piece of rudeness was more than Mr Henderson could bear. He got up in great disgust walked over to the door and David Rutherford with him. John Henderson felt some initiative and now did took the least notice; the last time he saw them they were trying to put John back into the tea pot. "Who do they keep writing these inner staff notes?" asked Christian Haggard of Anthony Ward. "I suspect it is an Alger Hiss can get a mention as editor, and Keith Stewart who is a new comer," said David Waghorn. "they insist to give the first say something to do." "But I didn't do it" said Les.
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What Jack Marshall
Didn't Tell You About China

Hear Vic Students recently returned from the People's Republic of China.

Thursday, September 5.
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at the UNIVERS BOOK CENTRE
Jack speaks his mind

"Goodman" Jack Marshall lived up to his nickname when he spoke "his mind" in the China Hain last Wednesday. His manner was polite, and he attentively listened to questions put to him. But the conclusion he reached showed what a conservative politician he is.

Most of Marshall's speech was about his trip to China three months ago. He began by conceding that his visit had been too short for him to be an expert, and he needed to give a conventional, rather facile interpretation of China.

China, to Marshall, is a society of massive uniformity, everyone conforming to the party line. Thus he saw at the most superficial level of everyone wearing identical clothing - except for the chairman of his government minister he met whose clothes, while of the same cut as any peasant, were of "finer material."

According to Jack, there is a great uniformity of expression (though not necessarily of dress) in China. "What man thinks today, 800 million Chinese will think tomorrow."

This is the rigid "thought control" through complete control of the state of all communications - press, radio, posters and meetings organized by the local party cadre. Marshall claimed that no opposition view is allowed to be expressed through any of these channels.

He described his visit to a commune of 40 thousand acres, a "large farm," with a population of 16,000 people isolated in villages throughout. Everyone was employed, well fed and clothed. For no one could be unemployed or go without the cadre's permission. This is the way, Marshall said, the state controls the people - by

being the sole source of food and shelter.

He added that the attitude of communist government in China is a rising standard of living, with adequate housing and food. Health and education services provide the minimum requirements necessary. However, he compared the Chinese standard of living with that in Indonesia - a country under a different system of government, which believes he is not as completely democratic but has the potential to be.

He even elatedly angrily reaction from the audience. Asked to define 'standard of living,' Marshall said the Chinese were more than satisfied with life but less free, because there was poverty, but more freedom.

Marshall ended from the flow of the national figures of 600,000 prisoners in Indonesia which 13,000 are political freedom?

Marshall did not deny the existence of political prisoners in Indonesia, but said there is greater personal freedom. For example, there are four political parties in a parliament which has the power of vetoing.

When asked if he had spoken to any political prisoners or anti-government people, Marshall replied that he had met members of the political parties. Although Subas and the Chinese finance minister carry the title, the 123, 67, 72, the state of the parliament is a propaganda.

Marshall apparently could not see that the right to debate (but not in any action) is a very limited, shallow freedom. Especially when those likely to provide real opposition in such debates are beyond the political pale, in Soviet jails.

When Marshall was asked if he would prefer freedom to going hungry, he chose freedom - an indication of how many times he has been starved.

Anne Gilbert, who visited China last year, asked about his version of the campaigns against Confucius. This campaign is a deliberate attacks on Confucius. Marshall is against it, but not completely. Chinese believe that it is the "communist line." and in China, no one denied Confucian. A recent survey shows that 10s percent of the population is non-communist and 10s percent of people, 10s percent under the age of 10s.

Mr. Peter Wilson asked if he could answer that the Chinese leaders are the most successful in the world. Peter Wilson asked if Marshall thought a free press was a class in 

It was asked to the question of the Marshall said how wonderful it was that people could be, that the Chinese could educate such people. Then he patronizingly said that in ten years Wilson will have forgotten these things and settled down.

Class in 

class in also only existed in the imagination of a minority, Marshall continued. Marshall said a free press is a class in 

A free press is a class in 

Although statistics show that only 3% of India’s children are illiterate compared to 50% of the population with more than 10 years of school, yet India and China are equal in equality of opportunity. There are no class divisions in China, he said. Apparently this is in contradiction, he added, to the fact that the National Party was working to end cast division in China.

When asked about the role of trade unions in China, Jack replied that trade unions played very few roles as far as he knew, but he hoped they would be more active in the future. When asked about the role of workers in the economy, Marshall said he didn't think workers were so important.

The questioner, a Chinese visitor from China, asked that his objections to the report be considered, and he noted that the Chinese government is deprived of their "freedoms" which would overthrow those responsible, also examined by the audience.

Marshall was asked if he had met anyone in China who objected to the report. When asked if he knew of someone who objected to the report, Marshall replied that he had met people who had objections to the report, and he knew that several speakers from the floor pointed out, as we will, that in China, "freedom of choice" allows people to be alcoholics, he subject to reincarnation, advertising, and allows monopolies to force the small businesses out. In our present status - obscured society it also allows people the freedom to be rich by exploiting the poor.

Peter Wilson, also described thearming of China's population into local militia - something that China, for example, would never do.

How, then, can Marshall assert that the Chinese people's four freedoms are manipulated by the military leaders from the top, when Mao Tsetung insists that the people be given the weapons that could be employed to its own government?

Marshall's attitude to communism was further illustrated when a question was asked about China's entry into Vietnam and its relationship with Vietnam. Marshall explained that the United States government believes that the various estimates of the percentage of the Vietnamese people who support the communists (80% to 90%) are irrelevant. Basically the reason for this was that the Vietnamese have the advance of Communism in East Asia. If it had been developed as they expected, the people of Vietnam would be communist today. This dramatic statement was followed by a rather judgmental discussion in a group meeting in Vietnam and the United Nations was just a few.

Marshalls unable to conceive of democracy other than the two party system which most of the world's people think that group of representatives of the ruling class will be majority. But it is a fact that few people know to just how stage one political science is marked by a perceived one-party system. To achieve this, the author has written eight steps - five manifestos, two party tests and one mid-year examination. Are they to be continued in the next edition? Just a few words to the paper to be flushed away?

Reincken: I am not fully capable of understanding how the Chinese buy newspapers, whether they're signed or not signed. I don't see the way in which the Chinese buy newspapers. I don't see the way in which the Chinese buy newspapers. I don't see the way in which the Chinese buy newspapers. I don't see the way in which the Chinese buy newspapers.

Thankfully, I’d like to comment that surely we can discuss the structure of the Political Science course, rather than whose style of writing is not found appealing. To Chris Wainwright: I am also in the field, and let me say that there is no point in pointing the entire meeting, since what you do is now the problem really. Some, however, are prepared to speak to Dr. Levine who is taking the report of this meeting, so I would like to include the name of the meeting, the lectures and assignments.

Some, however, have little to say that we might be expected to have a recent text that was used to explain what we do. But after 50 minutes it was still very clear. I do not think that we can do justice to the text, but I just don’t understand what he says! A different student: Perhaps I could not insert the name of Professor Brookes to the list of poor lecturers. The content of his lectures earlier this year, was irrelevant to our study of NZ and US Governments.

Tuesday August 27 almost 90 people attended a formal meeting to witness "Political Theory in Practice - Venice Webby. I am a tutor in the Political Science Department and not a lecturer --
Part Two

Last week, “Salient” looked at the experience of in-term assessment at Victoria University. We pointed out a number of criticisms of this method of assessment, which had been implemented by NZUSA’s Education Department on the basis of faculty and welfare services reports.

The assessment was not well received, and the introduction of in-term assessment and its widespread use at Victoria:
- A number of students are experiencing difficulty with their workloads, which suggests that workloads have increased;
- Pressure on students has been spread throughout the academic year and has probably increased;
- Pressure on students is unequally a result of poor co-ordination within departments and between departments;
- Students tend to neglect unassessed work in favour of assessed work, thus tempting staff to make every piece of work subject to assessment;
- Courses have become fragmented (this is also a result of the introduction of the credit system);
- Students have less time to spend on extracurricular activities.

This week “Salient” looks at proposals for reforming the present system of in-term assessment, and ways in which students can start working for change.

“Double Chance” Assessment

In an effort to overcome some of the problems which have resulted from the introduction of the assessment system, the staff and students of the French sector of the Romance Languages Department last year came up with a proposal to give students a “second chance”. Their idea of “double chance” assessment was to give students a mark out of 100 for their performance in course work and then to give them the opportunity to improve this mark by sitting an end of year examination. Students with a poor standard of assessment for both types of assessment would be given the higher of the two marks obtained as their final mark. An important element in this proposal was that students would be told their mark for their year’s work before the final exam. The principle of the method of assessment would be to give students two chances to score well and to give more equal opportunity to those who prefer course work assessment and those who prefer final exams. But its disadvantages are that it would present students with a more difficult, if not unfair decision, at the end of the year: whether to settle for the mark obtained during the year or to challenge the judgement of their lecturers by sitting a final exam. Furthermore it would not remove many of the disadvantages of continuous assessment that were outlined in last week’s article.

Although the French sector’s proposal was only a limited attempt at reform, it did offer students a much better deal than the established method of in-term assessment. The proposal that was jointly worked out by staff and students at all levels of the French sector’s courses’ curricula has not been implemented in its original form. The Professional Board subsequently altered it to make the final exam compulsory, but its basic outline of making the final grade determined by his highest mark in course work or final, and a student can score as low as 42% in either mark and still pass.

Group Assessment

A more controversial proposal to alter the established methods of in-term assessment is group assessment. This method would introduce a qualitative difference to other forms of assessment in that students would be assessed collectively on the basis of a group report. Therefore this method provides students with the opportunity to learn in co-operation with each other rather than in competition.

But it was precisely because group assessment would fail to distinguish the individual differences between students and eliminate competition that it was curtailed by the Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Social work, Professor Robb, when it was proposed by some sociology students in 1973.

Professor Robb outlined his objections to this method in a memorandum of August 21, 1973, to the university’s Academic Committee. He claimed that under any method of assessment what “not only is the individual student’s contribution not identifiable but as any group is inextricably linked to the one person who is determined to get a pass mark and will therefore make certain that an adequate piece of work is returned, under this system it is extremely unlikely that any student will fail. At the end of the scale a brilliant student will have his qualities recognised in his mark only if he so dominates his group that the work is effectively his and all his fellow members share the results. Students themselves for both types of assessment would be given the higher of the two marks obtained as their final mark. An important element in this proposal was that students would be told their mark for their year’s work before the final exam. The principle of the method of assessment would be to give students two chances to score well and to give more equal opportunity to those who prefer course work assessment and those who prefer final exams. But its disadvantages are that it would present students with a more difficult, if not unfair decision, at the end of the year: whether to settle for the mark obtained during the year or to challenge the judgement of their lecturers by sitting a final exam. Furthermore it would not remove many of the disadvantages of continuous assessment that were outlined in last week’s article.

Although the French sector’s proposal was only a limited attempt at reform, it did offer students a much better deal than the established method of in-term assessment. The proposal that was jointly worked out by staff and students at all levels of the French sector’s courses’ curricula has not been implemented in its original form. The Professional Board subsequently altered it to make the final exam compulsory, but its basic outline of making the final grade determined by his highest mark in course work or final, and a student can score as low as 42% in either mark and still pass.

Group Assessment

A more controversial proposal to alter the established methods of in-term assessment is group assessment. This method would introduce a qualitative difference to other forms of assessment in that students would be assessed collectively on the basis of a group report. Therefore this method provides students with the opportunity to learn in co-operation with each other rather than in competition.

But it was precisely because group assessment would fail to distinguish the individual differences between students and eliminate competition that it was curtailed by the Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Social work, Professor Robb, when it was proposed by some sociology students in 1973.

Professor Robb outlined his objections to this method in a memorandum of August 21, 1973, to the university’s Academic Committee. He claimed that under any method of assessment what “not only is the individual student’s contribution not identifiable but as any group is inextricably linked to the one person who is determined to get a pass mark and will therefore make certain that an adequate piece of work is returned, under this system it is extremely unlikely that any student will fail. At the end of the scale a brilliant student will have his qualities recognised in his mark only if he so dominates his group that the work is effectively his and all his fellow members share the results. Students themselves for both types of assessment would be given the higher of the two marks obtained as their final mark. An important element in this proposal was that students would be told their mark for their year’s work before the final exam. The principle of the method of assessment would be to give students two chances to score well and to give more equal opportunity to those who prefer course work assessment and those who prefer final exams. But its disadvantages are that it would present students with a more difficult, if not unfair decision, at the end of the year: whether to settle for the mark obtained during the year or to challenge the judgement of their lecturers by sitting a final exam. Furthermore it would not remove many of the disadvantages of continuous assessment that were outlined in last week’s article.

Although the French sector’s proposal was only a limited attempt at reform, it did offer students a much better deal than the established method of in-term assessment. The proposal that was jointly worked out by staff and students at all levels of the French sector’s courses’ curricula has not been implemented in its original form. The Professional Board subsequently altered it to make the final exam compulsory, but its basic outline of making the final grade determined by his highest mark in course work or final, and a student can score as low as 42% in either mark and still pass.

Group Assessment

A more controversial proposal to alter the established methods of in-term assessment is group assessment. This method would introduce a qualitative difference to other forms of assessment in that students would be assessed collectively on the basis of a group report. Therefore this method provides students with the opportunity to learn in co-operation with each other rather than in competition.

But it was precisely because group assessment would fail to distinguish the individual differences between students and eliminate competition that it was curtailed by the Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Social work, Professor Robb, when it was proposed by some sociology students in 1973.

Professor Robb outlined his objections to this method in a memorandum of August 21, 1973, to the university’s Academic Committee. He claimed that under any method of assessment what “not only is the individual student’s contribution not identifiable but as any group is inextricably linked to the one person who is determined to get a pass mark and will therefore make certain that an adequate piece of work is returned, under this system it is extremely unlikely that any student will fail. At the end of the scale a brilliant student will have his qualities recognised in his mark only if he so dominates his group that the work is effectively his and all his fellow members share the results. Students themselves for both types of assessment would be given the higher of the two marks obtained as their final mark. An important element in this proposal was that students would be told their mark for their year’s work before the final exam. The principle of the method of assessment would be to give students two chances to score well and to give more equal opportunity to those who prefer course work assessment and those who prefer final exams. But its disadvantages are that it would present students with a more difficult, if not unfair decision, at the end of the year: whether to settle for the mark obtained during the year or to challenge the judgement of their lecturers by sitting a final exam. Furthermore it would not remove many of the disadvantages of continuous assessment that were outlined in last week’s article.

Although the French sector’s proposal was only a limited attempt at reform, it did offer students a much better deal than the established method of in-term assessment. The proposal that was jointly worked out by staff and students at all levels of the French sector’s courses’ curricula has not been implemented in its original form. The Professional Board subsequently altered it to make the final exam compulsory, but its basic outline of making the final grade determined by his highest mark in course work or final, and a student can score as low as 42% in either mark and still pass.
Men’s fantasies?

"Representation of the world, like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with the absolute truth" — Simone de Beauvoir.

Like everything else in our society, the movie industry is controlled by white middle-class males. The people who finance this industry determine what we see and how we see it — the movies at the cinemas are no more than their fantasies about the way the world is, and should be. This power is exercised from the so-called first-hand view of the world and passes it off as total reality. For instance, the 'black' movie Shaft presents us with the white culture hero with a black mask. Here, as usual, the realities of the sub-culture are denied. What this kind of propaganda does is to convince the oppressed that there is no other way of looking at reality, makes them doubt their own perceptions, makes them accept the values system of their oppressor.

In this as in many other aspects of the culture the role of the critic is crucial. A critical elite composed of the same white middle class males who control the film industry decide what is good, bad, real movie — all on the basis of a set of biased cultural assumptions. We have had plenty of movies about male courage, violence, strength, hard-headedness; where do we ever see women who have these qualities? Who decides that these qualities are to be admired above gentleness, warmth, fragility, vulnerability? In movies as everywhere, not only are human qualities strictly sex-types, but it is made quite clear which sex has the more admirable ones. Male characters who do not dominate are portrayed as losing, and strong women are shown as bitches (e.g. Scarlett O'Hara).

I hope to see in these feminist movies or in any good political movies, 'the concrete analysis of concrete conditions', and the myths about women exploded. I would like to see a recognition of the fact that in male-dominated society the unhappy, disturbed woman is not a freak but its natural product. I would like to see what movies usually ignore: the daily-life activity of women as it really is. However, the oppressed need more than the realisation of their oppression. More than any other oppressed group women lack positive role-models. I would like a feminist movie to show women not just as victims but also as rebels. A counter-culture movie can show us that change is possible: can challenge the stale metaphysics of the film industry telling us that human nature operates according to immutable laws. As long as male-dominated class society exists, the film industry will only let us see the unreal Hollywood fantasies it would like us to believe in. But, as change accelerates, counter-cultural art such as these movies can help us not only to be aware of what is actually happening now, but also of what can happen, of what changes can take place, to give us a vision of life in which the potentialities of things have opened in and through the conditions of life.
Who was arrested?

As Inspector Dallow, commander of the Task Force has admitted, over 80% of all Task Force arrests are of Maoris or non-Maori Polynesians. Of course, this is not surprising since the Task Force spends the major part of its time and in those inner city pubs which are patronised largely by Maoris and other Polynesians.

But the figure of 80% is an overall one. We have analysed the arrest figures for each successive week that the Task Force has been on the streets.

The proportion of Maoris and other Polynesians became progressively greater each week. It is inconceivable that this racial group has suddenly become much more prone to drunkenness, obscene language and offensive behaviour. The only conclusion to be drawn therefore, is that the Task Force is to an even increasing extent selectively arresting Maoris and other Polynesians.

What were the “offences”?

In the first six weeks of the Task Force’s operation twice as many arrests were for drunkenness as for any other offence. Eighty-five percent of all arrests in this period were for trivial offences (Police Offences Act). The totals were as follows:

- Drunkenness: 38%
- Offensive behaviour: 18%
- Obscene language: 17%
- Disorderly behaviour: 6%
- Obstruction/Resisting arrest: 6%
- Miscellaneous: 15%

Of all those who were arrested for drunkenness on Friday nights, 76% were Maoris or other Polynesians. Of all those who were arrested for obscene language and offensive behaviour, 75% were Maoris or other Polynesians. To see just how selective the Task Force really is in its arrests, we have compared the Task Force arrest figures with those for regular police arrests in Auckland. (Based on latest available ‘Justice Statistics – 1971’).

The Police

Regular Police Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Maoris/Polynesians among all those arrested for drunkenness</th>
<th>Maoris/Polynesians among all those arrested for offensive behaviour and obscene language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the Task Force has more than tripled the arrests of Maoris and other Polynesians for drunkenness, and has more than doubled the figure for offensive behaviour and obscene language. This is on top of regular police arrest figures which themselves are so high as to indicate bias.

What sort of “justice” was handed out?

Many and probably a majority of the 403 people arrested by the Task Force during its first six weeks were first offenders and were arrested on charges laid under the Police Offences Act. These people were all bailable as of right and on the night they were arrested the police could have released them on bail on their own recognisance, without a surety. In fact, the police very rarely did this. Almost all those arrested by the Task Force on Friday evenings were held in the police cells until their appearance in court next day (12 or so hours later).

In the case of those arrested for drunkenness, only 16% were released on bail, a majority of whom were Pakehas. This failure to bail those arrested for drunkenness is especially unjust. A first offence for drunkenness is not punishable by imprisonment yet most of those arrested for this ‘offence’ are in fact deprived of their liberty for some time. This situation is worst for Pacific Islanders whose knowledge of English is not good. Because interpreters are usually not present in court on Saturday mornings (nor always on other days) these defendants can be kept locked up for hours if not days longer just waiting while the court takes its time over getting interpreters.

But do those who are first arrested unnecessarily and then denied bail unfairly get any sort of ‘justice’ when they finally appear before the magistrate? ACORD monitors have sat and watched 172 hearings and the answers can only be ‘no’. Some case histories illustrate why.

Case Histories

Drunkenness

Of the minority of Pakehas arrested for drunkenness most were alcoholics who were unemployed and referred for medical treatment. On the other hand, the Maoris and other Polynesians charged with this ‘offence’ were in most cases young, employed and first offenders.

A Samoan was brought into the dock and charged with drunkenness. He had been in New Zealand a very short time and understood no English at all. When this became obvious, the magistrate explained the charge to the man — in English — and very kindly entered a Not Guilty plea on his behalf. The man just stood in the
dock shuffling nervously and smiling vaguely. Although it is claimed that defended hearings do not take place on Saturday mornings, this one was ahead without any hesitation. The defendant had no lawyer (the duty solicitor scheme had not started at this time). The police called a constable to give evidence against the man, which he did — in English. The magistrate then explained to the man — in English — that he could now examine the police witness. The man still stood there, saying and comprehending nothing. The magistrate then saw that there was no defence, found the charge proved and convicted and fined the man. The man left the dock having understood nothing (except perhaps, that justice is only available in Auckland to those who are white and speak English).

Obscene Language:

A young non-Māori Polynesian was arrested during a "routine patrol visit to a taxi rank". His offence was to say "pig off!" to the police. He held over night in the cells and pleaded Not Guilty the next day and was remanded.

A young Samoan was standing in a crowded bar and was being pressed by a pakeha for a loan of some money. After a while the Samoan got annoyed and told the Pakeha to "f**k off". He was immediately arrested by a constable who happened to be nearby, and was convicted and fined.

On a "routine visit to the Pomponea Club Hotel" the Task Force arrested five people for using obscene language. There were four Polynesian men and one European woman. One of the Polynesian men was asked a question by police, which he answered. He was asked the same question again by the police and gave the same answer. They asked a third time, and again were given the same answer. On the fourth time the man's patience was exhausted and he swore at the police officer. He was immediately arrested. In court the police did not deny this harrassment, but the man was still convicted and fined $40. For this man, and for the three other men and the woman who was arrested for obscene language at the same time, the police said in evidence that "there were some women present".

Offensive Behaviour:

Two well-dressed Pakehas, aged about 30, appeared in court charged with offensive behaviour (urinating in a public place). They had both been bailed the night before by the Police. One pleaded guilty and the other asked for a remand without plea. Both were remanded and the magistrate very generously granted suppression of name to both without even being asked to.

Numerous Māoris and other Polynesians were also arrested for urinating in public. None of them were bailed by the police none of them had their names suppressed.

Assault:

There were very few cases of assault heard during our survey. One which will become another statistic of 'irregular Polynes' was this:

A seventeen year-old Māori girl was arrested by police for lightly kicking her boyfriend in the bottom as he was getting into a taxi. She was arrested and charged with assault. The next day she was convicted and fined.

We have for some time been highly critical of the lack of interpreters in the courts, and our experience in the past weeks when very many non-Māori Polynesians have been appearing confirms this view. But one magistrate had a novel approach to the problem. He didn't bother to ensure that competent, paid, interpreters were present in his court, he did it another way:

A Samoan was convicted and fined $5 for drunkenness. The next defendant was also a Samoan, but one who couldn't speak or understand English. The magistrate then called back the first Samoan and had him sworn in as an interpreter, after which his $5 fine was deleted for his services to the court.

Another magistrate tackled the problem a different way. A Samoan defendant was charged with drunkenness. He could not understand English and as before, no interpreter was present. This magistrate, not bothering about the need for interpreters to be impartial, invited a Samoan police constable to act as interpreter, which he willingly did.

These cases are typical of dozens. In many cases non-Māori Polynesian defendants were remanded with reporting clauses explained to them in English by the Magistrate. They were all liable to arrest if they did not report precisely as instructed, yet no-one bothered to ascertain whether or not they understood what those instructions were. We found that obvious difficulties in understanding English, and therefore the conduct of the hearing, were apparent in at least half of the Task Force arrest cases.

Defendants:

The long-awaited government supported national Duty Solicitor Scheme came into operation in the Auckland Magistrates Court three weeks after ACORD members started monitoring Saturday morning sittings of the court. We were able, therefore, to compile 'before' and 'after' figures. Of the 172 cases we observed, 86 were heard before the scheme started and 86 after. Only 67% of the first group had anyone to speak for them in court. Of the second group, however, 41%(48%) did, and the duty solicitors accounted for 33 of these. Nevertheless, it is clear that duty solicitors cannot do much for Task Force victims. Most of them are technically guilty of trivial 'offence' they have been arrested for. But because none of the duty solicitors speak any Polynesian language, and they have no interpreters available to them, they are often unable to communicate with a defendant and cannot with any accuracy advise on plea anyway. In fact, 67% of all defendants pleaded Guilty before the duty solicitor scheme got under way, and 62% after — not a significant difference. Not Guilty pleas did not change significantly either, but there was a significant increase of remands without plea (13% to 22%). Such a remand allows the defendant time to obtain legal aid, and may well lead to a Not Guilty plea later.

We welcome the fact that duty solicitors are not just sitting in an office outside the court but are helping defendants in court during their hearings and in some cases pleading in mitigation of penalty. But duty solicitors cannot undo or prevent the injustices which are perpetrated by the Task Force and the magistrates. Only the removal of the Task Force from the streets and radical changes in the judicial process can do that.

Conclusion

The Task Force is racist and is being used by racist politicians as an instrument of oppression against Māoris and other Polynesians. No other conclusion is possible from the evidence we have gathered, taken in conjunction with statements made publicly by the National MPs of Auckland, in particular those made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Muldoon. As Mr Muldoon's calls identifying Māoris and other Polynesians as the 'problem' have been made with increasing stridency over the period of our survey, so too has the arrest rate of this racial minority group shot up to over 80% of all Task Force arrests. Yet, it is inconceivable that Māoris and non-Māori Polynesians have suddenly become so much more prone to drunkenness, or obscene language or 'offensive behaviour' over this brief six-week period. The arrest situation can therefore only have resulted from a deliberate effort on the part of the Task Force to selectively arrest Māoris and other Polynesians, thereby satisfying the demands of those whose prejudice and bigotry leads them to overlook all pakeha crime and pretend that drinking, obscene language and violence is the prerogative of Māoris and other Polynesians.

The Task Force came into being as a result of a hysterical reaction to a small number of cases of street fighting involving Māoris and other Polynesians. To justify its existence, and prove that it was "cleaning up the streets", the Task Force had to come up with big arrest figures for Māoris and other Polynesians in a short space of time. It did so in the easiest possible way by picking on those who transgressed archaic drunkenness and obscenity laws. This, then, provided the 'proof' that Māoris and other Polynesians were indeed the 'problem' and so 'justified' concentrating even more attention on them which, of course, led to more and more arrests. The vicious circle became an even more vicious spiral.

There can be no doubt, no equivocation over our conclusion: in arresting hundreds of Māoris and other Polynesians on trivial charges the Task Force is not preventing violence, rather it is fueling and waging violence. The oppression of a racial minority group by police is now a reality in Auckland. The Task Force must, therefore, be disbanded immediately.
It's time to nationalise all land

ECONOPOLIS OR HUMANOPOLIS? Towns', Colin Buchanan, puts it in these New Zealand cities and rural areas in the light of the world-wide movement for public ownership of land.

New Zealand is continuing to lose control of its land and can do nothing about it. The decision of the Chief Justice last week against the Minister of Finance but in favour of the American/Japanese interests which own 2591 acres near Lake Te Anau, proves this without a doubt.

Mr Rowling had previously refused to allow the Mitsubishi Denyo Corporation to take part in the expansion of the American owned Te Anau tourist resort. But the Chief Justice, Sir Richard Wild, ruled that even though the government wanted the land to revert to NZ ownership under present legislation there was no way to bring this about. The report promised could continue with their development of a golf course in that area. Once again New Zealand land laws appear in need of a major overhaul.

As shown by the court battle waged by the owners against developers, land is purely a commodity of commerce. If they are on to a good thing they stick with it no matter what the wishes of the here and now.

Authors writing about land economics, such as Reinmann and Langard, declare that land use is primarily determined by commercial factors. And as a consequence the painful experience of even a century has "... made it abundantly clear that market forces, left to their own devices, fail utterly to produce a humane environment."

That's how the British author of the famous work "Traffic in the New Zealand." Mr Minoprio, Mayor of Hamilton, suggested that having public ownership of land was like "using a sledge hammer to crack a nut."

Mr Muldoon tied Russell Marshall's suggestion to the dragon he has been blindly firing for several months -- the superannuation scheme. With the money gained from the scheme, he said, land could be bought up on a massive scale.

As could be expected the newspapers kept debate on land nationalisation to a minimum. The Listener published a couple of articles on the topic for and against, and the Sunday Times ran one article, but a good one. And so the issue lies dormant here in NZ.

On the international scene however, the public ownership of land is a matter of practice. Land has come to be regarded as a community resource and not as a vehicle for private gain. There has been large scale acquisition of land, well in advance of need. The State now owns all housing land it has put a ceiling on house size irrespective of the householders' status. The municipalities hold discretionary powers as to land use. So overall community interests dominate rather than narrow economic considerations of private interests. In Sweden, whole communities can be created out of say, two hundred households made up of students, families, single people, commune dwellers and pensioners. With this control over land use the bungalow box and urban sprawl and inner city jungle -- so profitable to the developer -- gives way to a humane city environment where deep community and individual needs are met.

In Germany, whole-ranging legislation has come down over the last two years specifically aimed at the land dealer/Spectator.

The Federal Government in Bonn, which has a Town Planning Minister (a suitable addition to NZ cabinet ranks?) justifies its stern legislation when it says that if a "utilisation conflict" should arise when a piece of land is up for sale, the supermarket owner takes the road against the children's playground and the office building against the cafe. The centre of the towns, Bonn says, are in danger of losing all their inhabitants, while scenically attractive areas are being built on. On top of the shortage of reasonably priced homes, built up areas faces deliberate destruction of housing by landlords who can make more money by renting business premises. All of which occurs in NZ as well.

The German property law reformers, for support, refer back even to Pope Paul's encyclical "Populorum Progresso", which states: "The right of property must never be used to the detriment of the general good."

The Town Planning Minister in Bonn, Hans Vogel, states: "Passive capitulation to the unco-ordinated and mostly profit-oriented individual interests of a large variety of investors ends in chaotic urban structures in in-hospitable towns."

Mr Walding, Minister of the Environment, makes the point about a public address, also called for radical changes in the planning and designing of cities. "Society should be able to stand a stable, humane environment around them. He did not mention public ownership of land. But in his address he attacked what public land ownership was leading to controlled industrialisation, "daytime desert at night time deserted city centres".

The Minister said: "What we need to do now is have firmer control on the rate and direction of city growth."

We can learn to grow with grace instead of scrambling relentlessly over the dead in pursuit of profits. We can grow without sprawling in chaos to the outskirts of the city. The cure of neglect here will be ultimate disaster.

New Zealand land laws very
definitely are in need of a major examination and overhaul. 

A Wellington City Councillor, Dr W.A. McKean, who recently returned after five months overseas to lecture in law at Victoria University, said Britain had now adopted the Scandinavian system regarding land acquisition. The local council bought up land at the present existing use value for future development. This, he said, was in contrast to the NZ system where if land was, for example, rural and was wanted by the council as industrial A, would have to be paid for at the industrial A price.

In Britain the community benefited by the system and not the land owner. The council was then, if it chose, able to sell or lease the land to its citizens for housing at a lower price.

Already one candidate for the Wellington City Council has called for the land in the central business area to be acquired and administered by the City Council to prevent the "unco-ordinated scramble inherent in private or corporate ownership of land". The demand was also made for the acquisition of land presently zoned for industrial or retailing, or the like, as governmental residential areas, as a safeguard of the community against speculative development. Dr McKean, as a member of the Wellington Plan Planning Committee, feels the committee cannot act properly without a master plan.

"If the council had more control over land and what to do with it, we could make the city more attractive," he said. "The key is control of land by social ownership."

With social ownership greater public participation would be possible. No more schemes dreamed up in the isolation of the boardroom of speculating land developers or insurance companies. The public could be involved in schemes from the very beginning. In this way the average citizen can make a case for what he feels should be the character of our urban development.

When it comes to small scale property owners we can learn from the German land reforms. Those plans propose that property holders should be accorded a "utilization right" to the community. The property holder could modify this property. However, the community would retain the "right of disposal", the decision as to how the property should be used. There would also be no need to wage war to make land developers stay out of suburban villages.

Town Planning Minister Vogel in Bonn has made another statement: "The case for the NZ situation".

The refactoring of the law on property ownership would become a revolution in the way of a citizens' readiness and capacity for reform. Such a reform would make New Zealand ready for the land reform so drastically needed.

One of his supporters is the Bank of New Zealand's chief economist, Mr. C. Bayly. Mr. Bayley says that there is a basic conflict between land ownership and the community's needs. Public ownership of land was necessary to achieve a significant improvement in the quality of life.

Another supporter is also a Labour MP, Dr Rodgers He, however, is convinced that full public ownership was the answer to land misuse and speculation. Dr Rodgers wants to see an introspection into the present land ownership system. So we refer again to the international scene.

**Australia recently conducted a Federal Commission of Inquiry into land tenures. The Chairman, Mr Justice Eise-Mitchell, came to the conclusion (The Australian July 29, 1974, p. 5) that; "Unrestricted landownership is incompatible with the public interest in Australia's complex society."

The view of the commission was that a national land policy was needed rather than new controls. Existing controls had failed to prevent the middle-class (speculators) reaping huge windfall profits and dealing in land as if it were a lottery. Presently provided opportunities for developers to get favourable planning decisions from local authorities. The controls also failed to protect environment and preserve historical buildings. From the time some planning officer defines a zone, or marks a colour on a drift scheme map — no matter how provisional — an incentive for speculation is created.

The commission wanted a system where the use value of the land was significant, not its potential for development. So the Public Authority should acquire land development rights to avoid speculation. Profits going to land dealers through rezoning, compensating out of public funds or the like, who suffered from development, inflated land prices and high service cost, as profits would go into local government or public revenue. Land prices would fall as a consequence of these moves. The most significant conclusion is that the commission's recommendations should be introduced along with the local body development rights.

Around the world there is the definite but responsible move away from the private property rights which have produced such ugliness and distress in the structures and landscape of most cities and nations. NZ is very tardy and the government culpably neglective therefore, in delaying to implement land reform at or about initiate a thorough examination of the present land ownership system.

The scheme Russell Marshall wants NZ to study entails freeholders becoming leaseholders with all other vested in the Crown. Compensation could but need not be, given, rather a 99 year lease would be held, rent free. After the rent-free lease expired the land would be available for a new lease, at a market rental. The government could end the lease with reasonable notice if the use or user of the government needed the land for development. The government already has this right under the Public Works Act. This right to end the lease if the use or user of the land changes would ensure that no one made a fortune from a decision of a local planning authority. This would also eliminate the possibility of corruption.

At the end of the 99 year period the state would own and manage the land on annual or longer leasehold. Actual control of the land would be by either a new body such as a "public land management authority" or the local body reorganised to cope with the extra work. A further possibility is for control to be with a regional planning authority.

How would nationalisation affect thousands of ordinary suburban homeowners?

The only visible change would be that the land owners would no longer have a piece of paper saying that he/she owned the land. He/she would still own the house on that land, of course. The piece of paper now held would be a lease, stipulating no rent payments for 99 years. At the end of that period the leaseholder could buy a new lease but at the market rent. Already many homes in NZ are built on leasehold land, in Auckland the Anglican Church owns thousands of acres and leases them out home-owners. In Wellington the Hospital Board leases out hundreds of sections. When a leaseholder wanted to move he/she would sell the house and buy a new one in another area just as he/she does now. The land management authority would approve the change in leaseholder as long as there was not going to be a change in the use of land — from residential to commercial, from rural to residential, etc.

The benefit to town planning under this scheme would obviously be substantial. Also, Maori land rights would be safeguarded by special arrangements in the scheme. Maoris would then not feel alienation of their land or change of use because of strict control over it would be possible. The argument that farmers would work their farms energetically under a scheme of public ownership of the land is unrealistic. For the farmer his income will still be determined by his production and his price will not slacken. Managers and farmers already leasing land are seen to farm just as efficiently as their neighbours who own farms.

New Zealand's acceptance of a system of public ownership of land would enable land use to be more closely regulated and more clearly defined. This is the essential beauty of the scheme.

With the public ownership of land Mr. Rowling could safeguard the 2000 acres near Lake Taupou from speculators. New Zealanders would be able to purify the whole squashed business of land profiteering could be wiped out. The human conflict of interest of Maoris would also be eased through the ending of the urban profit scramble.

Moreover, the emotional link that Maoris have with their land could be carried over into the welfare of the future. Everyone would then have an abiding concern for "our land".

by Brendan Smith
between New Zealand Universities, Professor Brosnanah, an observer from the University of the South Pacific, spoke on ways that New Zealand could aid the USP. There is considerable debate in the USP between the expatriate New Zealand staff and USP staff control of the university and the students and staff association over what forms New Zealand aid should take. In view of this debate NZUSA had written to the USP Staff Association asking him to invite representatives of the USP Staff Association. The request was turned down on the grounds that the topic of discussion was New Zealand Universities and that those attending was an internal affair of each university. As Brosnanah himself had raised the subject of the USP, NZUSA delegates decided to raise it again on the final day.

The final paper was on difficulties that graduates face in finding employment. The paper concluded that, apart from a slight surplus of science graduates, there was no downward pressure on the general market. According to this paper, there are considerable areas of employment where graduates could be employed that still have yet to be penetrated by those with degrees. If the economy slides into the chaos of a depression next year, the irrelevance of this paper will be fully appreciated. After the days proceedings at the Conference concluded, the real point of the Conference was again reached, a cocktail party for delegates and their wives, and a buffet dinner. Copious bottles of wine, spirits and beer were consumed. Delegates and their wives ploughed through scallops in wine sauce, curried prawns, oysters in the shell, steak, and many other delights. Although NZUSA delegates left fairly early, we have it on good authority that the feasting and drinking on the backs of the New Zealand taxpayer continued into the early hours of the morning.

The final day of the Conference saw some rather seedy looking delegates assemble to discuss various motions. Five of them put by NZUSA. The first of NZUSA’s motions recommended the practice of excluding first year students who had failed all their units be ended. Canterbury’s Vice Chancellor, Neville Phillips spoke against the motion saying that it was not the place of this Conference to tell the universities to do anything. NZUSA delegates pointed out to Neville that the Conference had in 1969 recommended the introduction of this practice, and Canterbury had been one of the universities that followed the conference request. The motion was put: Ayes, 4 (NZUSA representatives), Noes, the rest.

The second motion called for investigation into the use of assessment and moderation procedures in universities and secondary schools. NZUSA pointed out in speaking to this motion that pass rates fluctuated wildly from year to year, and subject, from university to university in the same subject. If there were no moderation procedures in the university, then why were they needed in secondary schools? No-one doubts that a degree represents a common minimum level of achievement. Neville Phillips (whom some have called Nasty Nev) tried to amend the motion so that it asked the universities to do nothing. However, after the UGC had opposed the amendment it was put and lost, and the NZUSA motion carried.

The matter of confidentiality was also raised again in a motion calling for the universities to review the amount of information they held confidential. After NZUSA had spoken to the motion, there were no further speakers and the motion was put. Such was the unexpected volume of support received from the floor for the motion that D.W. Bain from Lincoln ruled the motion carried without asking for the Noes. A few grunts of displeasure from the heavens table saw Bain recognise his mistake and the motion replicas, and lost.

NZUSA’s final motion called for the Vice Chancellor’s Committee to enable the other view of New Zealand aid to the USP to be directly heard in New Zealand. The Chairman, D.W. Bain ruled that this motion were out of order as the topic of discussion was New Zealand co-operation. In spite of protests that Brosnanah had raised the subject and not been ruled out of order, D.W. Bain confirmed his ruling.

The Conference closed on that note. D.W. Bain was overheard to mutter to Mr D. (call me Dave) Pullar, “We go away with it” as delegates left the Conference chambers.

With the conference over, delegates could then proceed to the main point of the three days once again. Lunch. There were curried prawns, scallops in wine sauce, a good drop of stout, and as much grog as you could put away before you left.

...and forget USP

The speech they tried to suppress

As the accompanying report on the New Zealand Universities Conference points out the NZUSA representatives were prevented from moving two resolutions about co-operation between New Zealand universities and the University of the South Pacific.

The following statement is the speech NZUSA President Jim Crichton was going to make when moving these resolutions. The very moderate tone of Crichton’s speech shows that NZUSA was merely trying to remind New Zealand university administrators of their commitments to the South Pacific people. But regrettably it seems that our university bosses are unwilling even to discuss the situation at the USP, let alone take any position on it.

Mr Chairman:

On behalf of NZUSA would like to make that:

1) The New Zealand Vice-Chancellor’s Committee request a statement on the situation at the University of the South Pacific from the University of the South Pacific Staff Association and circulate this statement to the staff and students of the New Zealand universities.

2) The New Zealand Vice-Chancellors Committee invite representatives of the University of the South Pacific Staff Association and Students’ Association to New Zealand for discussions about the situation at the University of the South Pacific with the Minister of Education, Island Affairs and Foreign Affairs, Education Department officials, and staff and students of New Zealand universities, so that the point of view of the South Pacific people can be directly heard in New Zealand.

Yesterday Professor Brosnanah, the Deputy Vice Chancellor of the University of the South Pacific, spoke during the discussion of topic 2 of the Conference agenda — Co-operation between the Universities — on four areas in which New Zealand universities and the University of the South Pacific are working together.

I intend to restrict my speech very strongly, Mr Chairman, that is co-operation between New Zealand universities and the University of the South Pacific countries — the people whom the University of the South Pacific is supposed to benefit — the opportunity to express their views about the situation at the University of the South Pacific and how the New Zealand universities, administrators, staff and students — can assist them in developing the University of the South Pacific in the way they want it to be developed. We believe that this is the only basis on which fruitful co-operation between the New Zealand universities and the University of the South Pacific can usefully be extended.

NZUSA does not believe that Professor Brosnanah can claim to step on behalf of the people of the
Dealing with workloads

by John Ryall

How much effect has in-course assessment had on student satisfaction and on the way students respond to assessments? This question is answered in the first part of this article. In the second part, students' attitudes to assessment are reviewed.

The effects of summative assessment on students' performance and on the way they respond to it are well-known. However, the impact of in-course assessment on students' performance and on their response to it is not as well-known. This article aims to address this gap in knowledge.

The article is divided into two parts. In Part I, we discuss the relationship between in-course assessment and student performance. In Part II, we explore the impact of in-course assessment on students' attitudes.

Part I: In-course assessment and student performance

In-course assessment is designed to provide ongoing feedback to students about their progress and to help them improve their performance. It is often used as a means of reducing the emphasis on summative assessments, which can be stressful for students.

However, the relationship between in-course assessment and student performance is complex and not fully understood. There is evidence to suggest that in-course assessment can have a positive impact on student performance, but the evidence is not conclusive.

Research has shown that in-course assessment can help students develop their skills and knowledge, and that it can provide them with a sense of achievement and motivation. However, there is also evidence to suggest that in-course assessment can be stressful for students, and that it can lead to a decrease in their motivation and performance.

Part II: Students' attitudes to in-course assessment

In this part of the article, we explore the impact of in-course assessment on students' attitudes. We discuss the results of a survey of university students, which found that in-course assessment is generally well-received by students.

The survey found that students generally agree that in-course assessment is useful and that it helps them to learn. However, there is some variation in the responses, with some students reporting that in-course assessment is too stressful and that it can be a source of anxiety.

Overall, the survey suggests that in-course assessment is generally well-received by students, but that there is room for improvement in the way it is implemented.
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Student poll demands change

Article by Lionel Klee

(Reprinted with permission from The Brooklyn Daily Eagle by L. Klee and Rawynn Tucker)

This year in the two six credit 200 level courses of Economic History (ECHI 201 Modern British Economic History, and ECHI 202 Development of the International Economy) an overall grade was computed - it seemed impossible to effectively communicate the threat to the acting head of Economic History, as he felt there were only a few minor dissatisfaction from a few students. He was decided to do something different with the content that existed in fact by drawing up a questionnaire and distributing it to the class during a lecture.


The article is a report of the results and "achieved" of that questionnaire and expresses a majority of the views therein. The opinion expressed is largely based on the statistical results and the comments which appeared.

At present the 200 level Economic History course have a part in term examination papers and a final examination grade system, whereas the 300 level exam mark is counted if it is greater than the grade achieved in the final exam. Otherwise the examination counts as 100% of the final grade.

On the face of it this seems extremely fair, but a mere 30% in term rating, for a six credit course, is gained from three substantial essays plus a term test. Moreover if a student averages 60% in this term mark he still has to obtain at least an A on the history essay, to even be credited with a marginal pass mark. In essence students are presently being burdened with term assignment without significant reduction of pressure from exams.

As a consequence more than 80% of the class asked for more weight to be given to the assignments. This was also the case for the 300 level History course, and the majority favoring this to be done on a 50/50 basis. It is suggested that the above system of term assignment exam as such, and both sides applied the caution that the above term weight should not imply a heavier workload.

The present system whereby the three essay examinations are given full weight is undeniably burdensome. A general knowledge of the current social conditions would be required to comprehend the complete course thoroughly. A general knowledge of the course does not give enough detailed knowledge to answer an examination question; hence to study detailed sections is at the moment essentially a hit and miss affair.

Moreover the present system is also undeniably burdensome. A general knowledge of the course does not give enough detailed knowledge to answer an examination question; hence to study detailed sections is at the moment essentially a hit and miss affair.

Most students feel that the general areas to which they are exposed are different courses, rather than the particular continental game. More knowledge is gained from a reasonably detailed knowledge of general areas than a vague knowledge overall.

As the above indicates the present system is not the most time effective. More time is given to the workload while preparing for finals and does away with the possibility of short and simple answers. More specialization would be possible in a wider indexed scope for displaying knowledge. If topics are to be specified, the specialization theme or topics which can be derived from examination questions.

One possibility is that examination questions more related to essay topics while requiring the student to maintain a general knowledge of the course. Many students agree that this consideration is necessary, since examination questions of essay topics be more fruitful than the regression of books and lectures, and that if the essays have been composed with depth of content.

At present there are three pairs of essay topics, allowing students a choice of a diploma type essay. Almost all the time the present range is constructed and would prefer a larger range of options from which students can choose.

Greater choice does not make the writing (if you can easily at least a greater number of students use the same scope for displaying intelligence). The same initiative is important for personal interest.

Many students feel that present examination essay topics allow scope for personal interest.

To sum up, the essay systems are narrow and limited, requiring in the main superficially descriptive answers. Students therefore feel that a larger choice from the five essay areas would allow greater personal interest, while the essay should be made to match the personal interest of the student.

The QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS

I. INTTERM EVALUATION:

1. Do you consider the 30/70 interim/final exam weight to be fair? Yes 49%, No 51%

2. Are you willing to work more to improve your grade? Yes 82%, No 18%

3. Would you prefer the exam system to be changed to 50/50 instead of 30/70? Yes 72%, No 28%

4. Do you feel that the general areas to be examined are too specific? If yes, please list three. Yes 72%, No 28%

5. Do you prefer the exam questions to be more general topics rather than specific course ones? Yes 69%, No 31%

6. Do you feel that the present range of essay topics is too narrow? Yes 76%, No 24%

7. If you feel that the present range is contrar, would you prefer to have a larger, the same or a smaller range? Larger range 70%, Same range 20%, Smaller range 10%

8. Do you feel that your knowledge of the course is adequate? Yes 75%, No 25%

9. Do you feel that the general areas to be examined are too specific? If yes, please list three. Yes 72%, No 28%

10. Do you prefer the exam system to be changed to 50/50 instead of 30/70? Yes 72%, No 28%

II. GENERAL

1. Do you feel like economic history as it is now? Yes 41%, No 58%

2. Do you feel you would have preferred the exam system to be changed to 50/50 instead of 30/70? Yes 72%, No 28%

3. Do you feel you would have preferred the exam system to be changed to 50/50 instead of 30/70? Yes 72%, No 28%

4. Do you feel that the general areas to be examined are too specific? If yes, please list three. Yes 72%, No 28%

5. Do you prefer the exam questions to be more general topics rather than specific course ones? Yes 69%, No 31%

6. Do you feel that the present range of essay topics is too narrow? Yes 76%, No 24%

7. If you feel that the present range is contrar, would you prefer to have a larger, the same or a smaller range? Larger range 70%, Same range 20%, Smaller range 10%

8. Do you feel that your knowledge of the course is adequate? Yes 75%, No 25%

9. Do you feel like economic history as it is now? Yes 41%, No 58%

III. TUTORIALS, TUTORIALS, TUTORIALS

1. Do you feel that the tutorial system is an effective way of learning? Yes 50%, No 50%

2. Do you feel that the tutorial system is an effective way of learning? Yes 50%, No 50%

3. Do you feel that the tutorial system is an effective way of learning? Yes 50%, No 50%

IV. LECTURERS ETC.

1. Do you feel that the lecture system is adequate with the standard of the lecture professors? Yes 75%, No 25%

2. Do you feel that the lecture system is adequate with the standard of the lecture professors? Yes 75%, No 25%

3. Do you feel that the lecture system is adequate with the standard of the lecture professors? Yes 75%, No 25%

V. COURSE ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Do you feel that the course is over—50%? under—15% administered! Yes 75%, No 25%

2. Do you feel that the course is over—50%? under—15% administered! Yes 75%, No 25%

3. Do you feel that the course is over—50%? under—15% administered! Yes 75%, No 25%

VI. CONCLUSION

1. Do you feel that the tutorial background for the class is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

2. Do you feel that the tutorial background for the class is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

3. Do you feel that the tutorial background for the class is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

4. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

5. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

6. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

7. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

8. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

9. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

10. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

11. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

12. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

13. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

14. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

15. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

16. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

17. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

18. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

19. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%

20. Do you feel that the exam system is adequate? Yes 50%, No 50%
Dear Sir,
The Coalition Government under Mr. Hawke fought the defeat of the Liberal Party. Following the negative recommendations of businessmen—cut every possible item of expenditure. Instead of developing new ways of maintaining production and incomes and reducing imports which NZ could produce, these boards maintained their famous advised drastic deflation, which history witnesses, led to mass misery, oppression, exploitation and slavery in this country in a NZ working class. No wonder they noted. These tears cannot be a more pronounced than the horrors were the pensioners, hospital patients, school children, widows, the family man. Yet they were to be told. The poor grew poorer.

Fortunately these sorts of things don't happen anymore. But wait! This definitional programme to beat depression has been enacted very recently. Haven't the Auckland administration drastically cut all cafeteria expenditure in an effort to cut down on what hasn't been staff dismissed, food imports restricted? Salaries haven't been cut however. Ginger Johnson, a taxi driver, got his $11.17 daily plus his $6000 car to run a pie-shop. BA hasn't cut his salary to help cut costs. And who pays for their bloody salaries? Back to students. And who suffers from these bourgeois, oppressive measures? The only students, the least able to bear the burden. Watch out GC and BC, riots are just around the corner. Who will lead us?

Exploited student

Farewell old glory

Dear Sir,
The Post, Saturday, August 31, 1974:

"In an unusual comment for an American President, Mr. Ford hit on the theme of Communist Chinese productivity, stressing its growth in the face of increasing technology. "

"Chinese productivity is gaining momentum rapidly. The productivity of China is an example of the potential of China's people, highly motivated and disciplined," Mr. Ford said.

"In this case, we are celebrating the rising capacities of the Chinese nation, people with whom we are inevitably brought into contact. "

"Americans motivated by free competition, we are at a distinct challenge and I believe all Americans accept that challenge."
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Victoria: An intellectual, social and cultural crapout

Victoria University is an intellectual, social and cultural crapout! Why? The elitist argument might be that the NZ University has "hunkered into the worthless depths of socialist mediocrity". This view sees the benefits of "higher education" as something which can only be the prerogative of the privileged classes. The Egalitarian argues for "equal opportunity for all", and this is supposed to be the basis of New Zealand's education system. Both sides talk essentially in terms of classes without looking behind the dogma to see the causes.

The classical university of the past was a place for the children of the well-off. It was a place primarily where people went because they were the 'done thing to do'. It was also a place of academic learning only. But it did provide a rich matrix of social, intellectual and cultural interaction. It mirrored what the contemporary society (at least the ruling parts of it) wanted.

Taking this as a basis, one would think that the modern-day university would be constantly striving to redefine its role and modify its teaching methods so as to reflect or even to direct the changing needs and aspirations of society.

The NZ university might have evoked in one of several different directions, it might have developed to the stage where it felt it could do away with formal assessment as the basis for the learning process. In which case actual learning would be the responsibility of the student himself, staff-student contact serving for group discussion linked with original research.

It might have decided to produce 'complete people' who, like Leonardo daVinci, would have ability in everything—music, sculpture, mathematics, astronomy, physics, biology, engineering. Or it might even have decided that the university as such has outlived its useful life and should give way to some other form of learning institution.

It might have...but of course it hasn't. Instead Victoria has become something very different—an airtight wasteland of disillusioned and frustrated people. Prestige-conscious academics, who, on the way to the Staff (only) Club, anxiously discuss the lack of communication between themselves and their students. Students, who, as far as can be made out, find next to nothing to interest them in university life. Learning, instead of being an integrated whole, is divided into separate, almost mutually-exclusive subjects, and the expected enthusiastic exchange of ideas and viewpoint between departments seems almost entirely lacking.

Lectures involve throwing as much material as possible at the students in the shortest possible time. "Tutorials" are a farce, for try as they might, the staff cannot get the students to utter a word. Then there's the strictly limited social life. This is not to say relaxation should consist of having learned philosophical discourses all night, but that in a full life we have not both a physical and 'cerebral' part? But there must be something more satisfying than the semi-religious ritual of boozing to the point of throwing up.

There are many more who fail at university than those who fail exams. Many successful students also "fail" in that they cannot benefit from the varied exchange of ideas and viewpoints which (supposedly) university life has to offer.

So what is the cause of this chronic, debilitating, degenerative disease from which Victoria University is suffering? Surely the blame must lie with the education system itself.

"Open admission" will always remain a misnomer as long as schools cater for the few children who are by reason of their home environment already highly-trained when they come to school, other kids dropping by the wayside. Most children are brought up in a home environment which hampers the development of an enduring childlike inquisitiveness in later life. Most of their potential for creativity is suppressed or ignored. Even as babies they lie for many hours a day staring at a blank ceiling. Later they live in an environment geared to receiving entertainment rather than creating it. Many hours a day are spent watching the television. Children are constantly socialised away from really looking at the world about them. How many children are encouraged by their elders to question what goes on around them? Again, is it the best possible policy to unphon off today's university drop-outs and give them jobs teaching tomorrow's potential thinkers?

If the NZ educational system were truly egalitarian it would be geared to compensate for the fact that most children have their creativity crushed, or at least severely confined, from their first breath onwards. People who endure such an upbringing are hardly likely to retain the indomitable curiosity with which they were born and which should be central to all education, and certainly university education. Will the ideal of equal educational opportunity for all ever be realised until schools provide not only knowledge but motivation?

It is only to be expected that so many university students suffer from the 'relevance neuron's and go around saying how bored they are, how jaded off they are, what a waste of time it is. They apparently cannot comprehend what can excite the imagination in the elegance of the Schrodinger Equation, the miraculous symmetry of a leaf, or the insight to be gained from the study of other cultures.

Whatever the reasons, the facts are clear. Victoria has moved away from the classical traditions of university education, but in doing this it has not developed and adapted to keep pace with the changing needs of society, but rather it has degenerated and divorced itself from the values of today's generation.

Overtaken by "future shock", Victoria University has died quietly during the night; will no-one mourn its passing?

— Mareko Maru

THOUGHTS OF HEMI

11pm, the coffee shop untidily empty
Jim sits tense with piercing state
—What could a commune really do?
The Campus was soulless, bare,
This day I spent seeking there.
Where is its soul, its heart?

What are the feelings of our young?
Have we never had Moari love of Mother Earth?
What of the deep-lined anxious faces outside Campus
Who know the Depression mood?
And now, consumer-caught by pressures often unsought,
Do we know the native love of land?

Tentely the questions surged and surged,
—Got pencil, paper, envelope,
Must write a note, or find that kid, NOW.
He's caught with cops over dope —
Must find a place for him somewhere
The Campus is no place for love to learn.

A month or so later Jerusalem
Somewhere north, was born —
A restless spirit journeyed far afield,
Police, parson, social worker, uniteacher, civil servant.
About the land its soul to find.

WILL Governor-General and Parliamentarians assembled there in opening prayer
—For the peace, tranquility, good government of the nation
RISE IN SILENCE, then feel his prayer
For the AROHA of the MAORI
And read the prayers of Jerusalem?
WILL, churches scrap dreamy, musty sermons
And search for Jerusalem spirit themselves to live by?
WILL academics search their souls and say "poor misguided fellow". OR
So by example live and work that more like him may arise,
To dare lift our horizons
From Apathy, colourless and deadening lives.
And on Campuses, soulless and dead.
May be heart, feeling, mind and WILL
(In places where anger is not respectable still)
Cos perhaps Jim's restless soul won't leave the land,
So there may be some that will DARE
To Anger at social injustices in our midst.

Academics — shroud in banal words,
Parsons — with musty, lifeless sermons,
Campuses — become real, alive — communal,
Parliamentarians — feel and act the truth of the words they speak,
And the peoples will begin to care with strength from Jerusalem's soul, and body buried there.

2 am, or thereabouts, coffee shop closed
5 am, or thereabouts, we found the B.A. Hons. KID IN THE CELLS.