

MOORE: THE FACTS TO DATE

ON DECEMBER 3, 1968, the Rev. Basil Moore who had for four years been a lecturer in Systematic Theology at Rhodes was recommended for re-appointment by the Senate. On the same day Council overruled Senate's recommendation. Constitutionally Council has the final say in academic appointments.

It is believed that some of the criteria influencing this decision were: his involvement in UCM; his alleged belief in the principles of student power; and the suspicion that he was an instigator of the 1968 Fort Hare crisis. The Rev. B. Moore has categorically stated that the last is untrue.

All the applicants withdrew, and to relieve the situation a past student interrupted his studies in America for a year to help the department. Basil Moore was still available at this time.

On March 27, Senate once again recommended Basil Moore. Council

rejected the recommendation for the second time on April 18 this year.

On May 8, SRC took a resolution noting the seriousness of the rumours and decided to seek clarification through the proper channels before taking the matter to the Student Body.

On May 15, the issue was raised at a Senate-Student liaison meeting but it was decided that this Body was not authorised to make any statements regarding the actions of Senate or Council.

On May 26, the Student Body passed a motion calling upon Council to reveal their reasons for not appointing Moore.

Council met on June 20, and issued the following statement a few days later through the Registrar: "I was instructed to inform you that all appointments to the staff of the University are the concern of the Council and do not fall within the province of students".

1968 . . . MAFEJE

1969 . . . MOORE

1970 ?

SRC NO TO SIT-IN PLANS

AT AN EXTRA-ORDINARY SRC MEETING on Monday afternoon a motion was passed calling on the Rhodes Council to "make known the reasons for the non-appointment of Basil Moore" as a University lecturer. It further stated that the Council had made "its attitude quite explicit" about replying, but that "the widespread concern of the academic community" should be directly communicated to the Council.

In reply to a previous request for clarification, the Council had stated that "all appointments to the staff . . . are the concern of the Council and do not fall within the province of students".

The motion was a revised version of one passed on Sunday night but which was considered to be obscure, since the Council's denial of academic freedom and refusal to clarify the decision were not clearly stated. A sit-in at 5 p.m. on Friday in the Arts Block to await the Council's answer, was proposed.

The SRC has split over the amendment to the second motion, proposed by Andy Burnett and Geoff Verschoor, which substituted a petition for the proposed sit-in. It was argued that the SRC did not want a sit-in because it had no further goal and that it would prejudice and close channels of communication with the Senate, which is at present co-operating with the students.

Opposing the amendment, Bill Meaker objected that the petition did not stipulate a time limit for an answer from the Council. He dismissed the contention that a sit-in would be irresponsible by inferring that a certain group of students were planning to act whether or not the SRC sup-

ported a sit-in. If the SRC were present, they would be able to exercise a measure of control. Unless the SRC sanctions a sit-in, they could have no official control over the Student Body.

The amendment was passed with six votes for and four against, and the substantive motion was then passed with seven votes for and three abstentions. Although the SRC believes that further negotiations with the Council would achieve little, at least they would be able to say that they had tried every available channel. The only course of action left open to them if Council rejects the motion is a direct protest, which will probably take the form of a sit-in.

Bill Meaker commented: "I am prepared to go along with the motion as amended because it represents a change of tactic not principle. I am at present not fully in agreement with the tactics, but the principles violated remain the same. The SRC will endeavour to ensure that whatever is done will make the principle clear to students and the public".

"Council's reply to the request for clarification by the students precludes negotiation", added Miss Sue Griffiths.



CONSCIENCE IS HIS CRIME

RHODEO

July 31, 1969

Senate or Council

THIS IS NOT A POLITICAL ISSUE. It is not NUSAS inspired.

It is not a movement towards Student Power. At overseas universities students are demanding the right to have a voice in the selection of academic staff. No such demand is being made at Rhodes. Here students want to know, and they have a right to know, on what criteria members of staff are selected. If academic staff is not chosen primarily on the grounds of academic ability, then every student should be informed of the fact and given the opportunity to leave the university if he feels he can no longer remain in an institution where the people with the best all-round qualifications are not necessarily elected to teaching posts.

Only rumours surround the Rev. Moore's non-appointment. There may be plausible reasons why he was not appointed. But it is strange that Senate should not have been aware of these reasons when they twice recommended his appointment.

Many Council members live far away from the university and are not academic people. It is difficult to understand why their decisions should supersede the recommendations of Senate, which is composed of all the heads of departments at Rhodes.

If there are plausible reasons for the Rev. Moore's non-appointment, why has Council not made these reasons public and so avoided all the murmuring and ill-feeling? Council's continued silence can only strengthen suspicion.

SRC Sell-out

The time has come to be blunt. The Moore issue has brought to light just how little commitment the Rhodes SRC has. Past issues have given cause for grave concern. It began with four abstentions on the SRC motion condemning the deportation of Ian Kirby. Then the SRC refused to openly support the protests about the Harris, Murray, Kirby deportations which took place over graduation. When Turfloop erupted, the SRC's efforts were once again a miserable failure.

The Moore issue presented our SRC with a challenge. We saw them respond in a motion on Sunday night which led us to believe that at last they were going to act with determination against the authorities. They called on Council to make public its reason for the Rev. Moore's non-appointment to a Student Body Meeting which would be assembled outside the Arts Block.

But on Monday this resolution was reviewed and an amendment passed which means that the "sit-in" outside the Arts Block has been called off. Instead a petition will be sent to Council asking permission for the SRC executive to address Council.

What do the SRC hope to achieve by a petition? Their action is based on the premise that the channels of communication between the University Council and the Student Body, through its elected representatives, are still open. Council's reply to the Student Body shows that these channels are closed. Does Council's reply indicate one iota of willingness to listen to what the students think? Only a blind or stupid person could argue that it does.

The time has arrived for long overdue student action to convince Council that we are determined to be heard. The time has passed for us to stand patiently begging for consideration by our administrative fathers. And due to the SRC's vacillation, the time has come for individual students to grasp the initiative and ensure that justice is done at Rhodes University.



On Friday, 20th June, a handful of students stood in silent protest outside Drostdy Hall where the Rhodes University Council was dining. Soon after the Council had entered, about fifty students walked out of the dining hall to register their disapproval of the Council's attitude towards their request for clarification regarding the non-appointment of the Rev. Basil Moore.

Photograph by Hepburn and Jeanes.

STAFF TO RESIGN?

CERTAIN Rhodes staff members are taking a firm stand on the Basil Moore issue.

If a satisfactory conclusion is not reached these members will resign their posts.

Wits support

THE RHODES SRC has received a telegram from Wits University expressing support for the protest action intended.

The telegram further deplored political victimization in academic appointments.

The telegram was sent by the SRC of Wits.

Further support was shown at the National NUSAS Congress held in Cape Town during the vacation.

Bill Meaker proposed a motion condemning Council's action and urging the University to show their strongest disapproval of this action.

The motion was carried by an overwhelming majority.

WHY WAS MOORE NOT APPOINTED

Tocs snubbed by Council

ON THE 3rd JUNE, the Livingstone Fellowship passed a resolution asking the Council for clarification on the Moore issue. The following reply was received from the Registrar:

"Sir,

RE: RESOLUTION OF LIVINGSTONE FELLOWSHIP
ON 3rd JUNE, 1969.

At the last meeting of the University Council on June 20, 1969, members were advised that I received your communication dated June 18, 1969.

The University Council instructed me to inform you that as your organisation has no official standing, it was not prepared to receive your communication."

Can this be taken as an indication of relations between Council and students?

Who is Basil Moore?

- ★ 1953 - 1955: BSc. Rhodes.
- ★ 1959 - 1962: BD. Rhodes.
- ★ 1962: SRC President Rhodes.
- ★ 1962: President Elect. — NUSAS — Methodist Church would not allow him to assume office.
- ★ 1965 - 1968: Part-time lecturer in Theology — Rhodes.
- ★ 1967 - 1968: 1st National President UCM, and one of the driving forces behind the inauguration of UCM.
- ★ 1967: Attended UCM Congress in U.S.A.
- ★ 1968: Passport removed by S.A. Government preventing him from studying in America.
- ★ 1969: Doctoral thesis in final stages of completion working in a parish in Carletonville, Tvl.