

Letters to the Editor

Letters to the editor should be sent c/o Excalibur, Central Square, Ross Building. For reasons of space, letters should be no more than 250 words and Excalibur reserves the right to abridge letters for length. Any letter, which in the opinion of Excalibur's advisors, is libelous or slanderous, will not be printed. No unsigned letters will be printed, but the writer may ask to remain anonymous. All letters will be run — but due to limited space, they may not run the same week they are received.

Forty sign daycare support

We were voted the students' number two choice (after the student clinic) in last spring's referendum. Our plan for a daycare building, which would also be a teaching facility has already been approved by the Senate. We have done a survey which proves the need for daycare on this campus; a need which is confirmed by our ever present waiting list. All we need now are the funds to begin building.

The estimated cost of the daycare building is \$300,000. Therefore, please enter our name in your poll as being for a \$100,000 chapel with a \$300,000 daycare centre in the basement.

40 Signatures
YORK UNIVERSITY CO-OPERATIVE
DAYCARE CENTRE

Referendum's no. two choice

CYSF's response to daycare has indeed been remarkable. The results of last spring's referendum demonstrated quite clearly the students agreement of daycare as one of the most important services on campus. One would have thought that those duly elected by

the same student body would have had some sensitivity (if not regard) for the wishes of the electorate. However, in refusing to allocate any funds to the daycare centre CYSF has shown that the ways of student politicians are not that different from any other politician. There is, however, one cardinal difference. In ignoring any part of a party platform after being elected, the party politician can generally claim that his support was based on a number of issues and he is not disregarding the wishes of his constituents. In the light of the results of the referendum, the members of CYSF can hardly make this claim.

The claim that CYSF recognizes the extreme importance of daycare, so much so that it believes the university should accept full responsibility and relieve them of all responsibility hardly merits comment. This is the typical way of shirking responsibility of an issue and in this case of saying "it is not my baby."

Daycare is too important an issue to merit a decision which is vital for the centre at York to be based on what we regard as the purely personal whims of the members of CYSF. The student body has taken a clear stand on this issue. We demand that the members of CYSF respect that stand.

MARIA DE WIT
Administrative Supervisor
York University Co-operative Daycare

Compliments on centre spread

I wish to compliment Ken Hundert for his very interesting article on Peru (The Military Road To Revolution? Excalibur, Dec. 7). I found it a refreshing change from the deplorable quality of foreign reporting characteristic of the international wire service and hence of Toronto newspapers.

Surely there are many York students who have had experiences in other parts of the world. Their reports would be a welcome addition to Excalibur.

ANDREW MCALISTER

Reporter did a hatchet job

Your reporter did a bangup hatchet job of my talk on the Americanization of the university. What I want to know is why all the innuendo, misinterpretation, and factual distortion? His responsibility is to report what I said, not to censor my remarks.

A lot of us are now coming to understand the disastrous consequences resulting from the de-Canadianization of the university. It is no coincidence that Canadians think like a branch plant people when a majority of those

who are teaching in many of the crucial disciplines are U.S. nationals.

People in this university are entitled to know the facts. Maybe they would like to know which section of the Canadian academic community adopted the American world view as its own? Maybe they would like to know the position of the CCF-NDP intellectuals on the subject of American intellectual imperialism? Maybe they would like to know that men like Innis and Creighton fought a bitter fight for Canadian cultural and intellectual independence and lost? Perhaps students would like to know that there is a tradition of Canadian scholarship and a body of knowledge which isn't an import and one which is relevant to the Canadian people? Perhaps students want a clearer explanation of why U.S. academics teaching in this university prevent Canadians from studying imperialism as a social system dominating Canada and other parts of the world.

Your reporter made sure that if there are coherent answers your readers wouldn't have the opportunity to make their own assessment of the issues raised. He is a U.S. citizen who came to Canada for political reasons. This piece of journalism spells out the American interpretation of the Canadian reality.

At the end of the article he does not hesitate to give us the full benefit of his American New Left experience and lecture Canadians about socialism. I couldn't get a better example illustrating what Canadians are up against.

DANIEL DRACHE

The pros and cons of the chapel question

CON

We don't need a chapel. With all due respect, Scott will have to try and slip past St. Peter some other way.

We do need; funding and space for daycare; an increase in scholarship funds — just to name the first two things that come to mind.

LARRY OLIVIO
Instructor, social science

Although I read your paper frequently, I am not a student, but I felt an irresistible urge to answer your request for opinions as to whether or not York needs a chapel. However, my answer will pertain as to whether or not Scott's need to "donate" \$400,000 for the expressed purpose of building a chapel is justified.

The chapel would not be the first imposition Scott has made on the university because of his wealth. At York, there also exists a scholarship to which Scott's name is attached.

Let him keep "his" damn money.

Scott and his family have become wealthy through means which are well-known to all capitalists — the exploitation of people. Scott decides that he will "donate" this money back to the people in the way he chooses. To that I say the money is ours in the first place; we decide where it goes or we don't use it.

He says that "if it (the chapel) saved one life, it would be worth it." Who is he to decide that a chapel might save one life and who is he to decide that there are no better ways of saving or even helping lives?

There is also the famous W.P. Scott scholarship offered at York. This gentleman gives \$1,000 annually to help finance the further studies of proficient students in economics and political science. I would like to substantiate my claim that scholarships are antisocial by referring to a study made last summer. This study says that approximately 80 per cent of students who receive scholarships are not in financial need. ("York's Scholarship Program", Gary O'Brien, Glendon College Student Union, August, 1972.)

The study claims that money donated for scholarships have only a 20 per cent efficiency when it comes to helping a student financially. Where do these students come from — the 80 per cent who don't need this assistance to go on in their studies. From the upper class economic class perhaps — perhaps from the same neighbourhood as Scott. The injustice at hand is that this capitalist minority perpetuates a system which is responsible for its wealth.

The money the university accepts will be in the name of workers whose blood it is printed with. That blood wasn't enough and there's yet a price to be paid for this chapel and scholarship — a price termed sell-out. It's a price David Slater and John Theobald don't

even think of. I am indeed tired of these liberals.

It is high time people stopped permitting capitalist apologists to think they have repaid their brothers for having exploited them by offering them opium to prevent them from seeing the injustice committed.

ANDRE FOUCAULT

I am outraged by the article on the chapel issue. After three years, there is the revival of the idiotic idea.

I believe William P. Scott's intentions are perhaps bona fide. But God will never come on campus unless he has a \$75.00 parking permit and a heavy winter jacket.

Religion, like booze, sex and drugs belongs in the home, or more aptly in one's heart. For those people on campus who really feel a spiritual need, I am sympathetic. If one wants to worship collectively in some fine institution, all the more power to him. However, I think the "real world" off-campus supplies the worshipper with a sufficient variety of buildings and collection plates to suit any budget.

I know of no one who has killed himself because God was not on campus. Hence, I don't understand what is meant by "one life saved". Further, think of all the hectic weekends there'd be — Moslems on Friday, Jews and Seventh Day Adventists on Saturday, Protestants et al. on Sundays, then Hare Krishna's on Monday, Bhuddists on Tuesday, Transcendentalists on Wednesday and so on. Can we have dressing-rooms for all our Gods and what Gods have priority?

I am not anti-religion. I have simply a contempt for the big, brash structures that financiers say "house" God. If we adhered to the teachings of our deities, and occasionally read what is said in the Holy Bible, we would not be spending money on superstructures, but would be helping those who need it the most. That is what the Bible tells us — provide charity, brotherhood but not institutions.

Yes, Scott, there is Santa Claus, but he won't be found in the smokestack of physical plant nor in the chapel. He'll be found in our hearts. And, I do believe you're wealthy and we all hate paying taxes.

I know this letter may sound facetious and even indignant. I truly do respect Scott and what he is trying to do. Perhaps there is a need for more chapels, but I certainly do not think they belong at York.

NORMAN FEFERMAN

As an alumnus of York who occasionally makes use of its resources, I would like to express my hope that the university turn down the offer to build a chapel.

The type of religious activity that is valuable is concerned with self-development and is not usually practiced in a chapel.

I agree with Excalibur's priorities, but would also like to see the university direct more energy toward self-development of its students; perhaps open a new division within the faculty of arts or science.

The chapel is not worth the \$12,000 a year it would take to maintain it.

HOWARD HALPERN

Having read your article on the question of building a chapel on campus, I wish to reply. I strongly believe there are other priorities which supercede the proposal of a chapel. The \$400,000 could be spent on: a daycare centre; better transportation facilities; programs for underprivileged groups; parkland.

If people wish church facilities, let them go off campus or use the lecture halls.

SAUL NUREMBERG

NO chapel. Priorities: more library books; university centre; daycare facilities; improved transportation; interdisciplinary graduate program.

ADRIAN WOLFBERLS

We have noted with interest the proposition of W.P. Scott to York University. Such a project (on the scale of \$400,000) fits in well when compared to the other much needed capital expenditures that this university has embarked upon. Here we think particularly of the lake.

Perhaps the chapel could be put in the middle of the lake and those interested in attending could walk across to it.

MARSHALL LESLIE
ROBERT EDWARDS

PRO

I've always felt that a responsible newspaper ought simply to present the facts of matter without seeking to paint them any specific colour.

Your Dec. 7 issue features the chapel question as front page news; "An anti-chapel campaign was mounted around the question of who should have the right to determine priorities in the university, one powerful individual or the entire community."

I'm afraid your reporter raises somewhat of a non question. Certainly the university may have priorities which constantly change; however, the conditional donation of money from a private individual can in no way determine university priorities as it is conditionally given. Scott offers a chapel, not \$400,000 over which the university community may war.

I would also suggest that "the golden goose" is a most unrefreshing sort of epithet to give anyone in responsible reporting. Perhaps if Excalibur reporters wiped some of the frantic spittle off their chins and went about their calling with a little more control, politicians wouldn't be seeking to throttle the font. While I thoroughly disapprove of John Theobald's behaviour, I can't help wondering if it might not help. I find it remarkably depressing and very ironic that a university newspaper should be so fascistly determined to celebrate social change. It's somehow not in keeping with the open-minded awareness

concept commonly believed to manifest itself on university campuses.

PETER RUSSELL
Glendon College

Excalibur thinks we can do without a chapel. The purposes of a chapel are already being served by Harbinger, they argue, and by psychological services. Scott is offering us the money, we have to take the chapel. The editors are right; we don't need Scott's chapel. But their senses are numb in indignation.

There is something very good, arbitrarily, about praying. We get a load off our minds. We come into touch again with the simplest things, natural things, and by forsaking the artificial environment we have allowed our social architects to design for us we learn that even without it we can survive healthily. We need a place to pray, though God forbid it should be allocated with a bronze plaque and the dipping of the president's spade. We need a place, not an edifice. And I am irked that the Excalibur people must quickly imply that praying is out of style.

My God is the Creator. He likes good acoustics and plenty of sunlight, green things, subtle transparencies, people, wind, sidewalks. He has no particular fetish, though, for concrete. He'd find Scott's chapel helplessly amusing. The bitching of Excalibur, though, for daycare centers and more books in the library and a way to bring more underprivileged people to York, doesn't do much for my spiritual needs, either. It doesn't help my spirit to be reminded over and over that I live and work in a place where people are easily distracted from their babies, eager for books to copy footnotes out of, mistaken that they are, by being here, privileged. Also, I find it difficult to pray here because the food is lousy and the art is worse. The people are not very amicable; the systems are stupid and so they make all of us out to be stupid; the talk is brash and unpoetic; the music; reduced to vibrations, is a cop-out to destructive positivism.

But Excalibur wants to make Scott, of all people, look foolish. They are eager to graduate from here. They do not squawk about the air conditioning, the windows permanently sealed. They do not smile much. What is it they think they can do if they are passive and community is past them?

MURRAY POMERANCE

I do not dispute the fact that York lacks many worthwhile facilities such as a daycare centre, but I do not think that the question of a religious centre should be posed in an "either-or" context. A religious centre would be an asset to this university in a dimension beyond help provided by psych services. Religion is not just direct communion between an individual and his God, but also the formation of community. This experience of "community" for many students, who feel alienated by the size, isolation and design of the York campus.

MARIAN LIPS