

tion being taken against the students should be according to the regulations laid out in the School Calendar.

Last Wednesday the Three were required to be present at what they thought was to be the actual hearing, however it transpired that the meeting was only to outline procedure. Speaking to the Beaver, the Three said that they agreed that they should not have been in the SDR and had even offered to accept a verbal warning, but the School Prosecutor, Michael Coops, had not accepted this; indeed it has been

the Three to allow them time "to arrange legal representation."

During the last week around 900 signatures have been collected on a petition urging the School to stop "the unjust vicelimitation of these students." Flyers have also been handed out which explain the students' "grievances". The Three received an additional boost to their battle when last Thursday's TCM passed a resolution urging the Union to support the students in their fight as well as mandating the Sabbath-calls to sign the petition - two of

obliged to ensure Freedom of Speech for invited guest speakers under a 1986 statute. In light of this, the Department of Education contacted the School and requested a report of the incident. Similarly the School was obliged to supply the Department with a copy of their Free Speech Code Of Practice.

One of the student's main complaints has been their denied access to any of the witness statements which they regard as fundamental to each of their rights. However, concern has been shown that revealing the names of witnesses

investigative procedures would be instigated against them too." The dilemma for the School now is that if the Three are found guilty of the allegations then they run the risk of making martyrs out of them; the flip side is that the School is under a moral as well as legal responsibility to protect the rights of the individual and ensure that future visitors aren't discouraged from attending through fear of undue harassment.

Beaver Staff



LSE 3: Steve Kinke contemplates the crime: Photo: Steve East

THEIR PROPIETY MRS THATCHER

Was Mrs Thatcher an enemy of the people or, as her defence counsel, Kenneth Minguog, suggested just "someone who suffers the prejudice of the people for being a woman in power"? This was the issue under debate in the New Theatre last Monday when a packed house came to decide the fate of our former Prime Minister.

The prosecution case was put with fervour and vigour by Brendan O'Leary and it seemed that he was speaking very much from conviction and not just playing the Devil's advocate. He out-

lined the case against, concentrating on such things as taxation levels and trade unions, while he concluded that she must have been "doubly spited" over her demise to leave the country under the control of John Major.

Speaking for her, Minguog painted a picture of a defunct and bureaucratic country, in the grip of government intervention, which Thatcher inherited when she came to power in 1979. He ventured that she was a Joan of Arc type of figure, but unfortunately

this idea was greeted with a suggestion from the audience that "she should be burnt at the stake then". He argued that she was not "hostile to manufacturing industry", rather that there was no point in making something just for the sake of it, if it can't be sold.

When it came to cross examination time Sheila Lawlor, who had taken on the role of Mrs Thatcher, seemed to be distinctly ill at ease when questioned by O'Leary; the real Mrs T was unlikely to have tolerated the line of questioning that was pursued. She gained some

brief respite after the Judge commented that "I make the rules" in response to O'Leary who had informed the defendant that "you do not make statements of fact from the dock, just answer the questions". This was definitely not the "Iron Lady" in action; for a start where was the hand bag? The crisis deepened for Mrs T when she attempted to defend the rises in VAT saying that "it was only luxury items that were targeted, such as yachts"!

Minguog tried to rescue the situation by extolling the benefits of maintaining low

inflation and asking his client "what had happened to the national debt during the 80s?" to which the prompt reply was "I paid it off". By this stage, however, things were looking bleak for Mrs Thatcher especially following the prosecutions summing up which was rounded off with an anecdote about Mrs Thatcher's funeral: upon realising that her coffin is being carried by 8 men, she raises the lid of the box and asserts that "only 4 bearers are required to maintain the standard of dying". In their closing statement the defence could only re-

erate that "she was not an enemy of the people, but unmistakably their friend".

The humiliation was almost complete when in response to a question about the community charge from a member of the jury, she obliviously referred to it as the "poll tax". The proceedings were completed by a none too impartial summing up by the judge. It was then up to the people to decide guilty or not. By a two thirds majority they decided the former. And her punishment? Banishment to Germany!!
By Beaver Staff