

Excalibur

Everything secret degenerates; nothing is safe that does not show it can bear discussion and publicity — Lord Acton

Nothing really new after lost possibilities

Amid chortles over what to call the board of governors' new toy on Tuesday, the senate's Committee on Organization and Structure of the Senate and the University unveiled a shiny new deal: The University Study Committee on University Governance.

One really didn't know whether to bat an eyelash or to let out a squeal of joy at USCUG's arrival. It all seemed very much like another ugly trinket to sell to the starving natives. What made it worse, not only had the board made it, the faculty insisted on shining it up.

The board offered COSSU one student and four faculty members on USCUG to look into the whole realm of York's governing. But the committee, unperturbed by their own lack of an attending student senator decided to set the record straight: no token student on new USCUG. There would be three students with three faculty members, not because they like them, or think they should be there, but because that's the sort of parity the University of Toronto had on their committee. And after all, what's good for the hallowed U of T must naturally be good for York.

After that great leap, the committee paid scant attention to USCUG's carrying capacity. Oh, professor Lee Lorch did question just how a non-academic representative would be elected by different groups such as the maintenance employees, the secretarial association, Versafood employees, professional librarians and non-professional librarians etc. But quite naturally, their being non-academic, they'd see the university in the same light. Or would they?

And yes, the age-old argument of just who president David Slater really

represents — the board or the senate — saw a pleasant rehash — a discussion that's over-smoked but uncooked and perennially fouling the university air. Lorch's pleasant understatement sums up the academic approach rather nicely: Slater is not totally "independent of the board."

But the basic split — three students, three faculty and three board members with the president (as ex officio) and a non-academic representative — hardly does justice to the basic intent of the COSSU's subcommittee report.

The report is hardly incisive but perceptive it is. No less than five major subsections deal with York's relations with the community — whether seen as North York, Toronto, Ontario or Canada. But it appears beyond the scope of COSSU's imagination to recommend that members of the community sit on USCUG. Instead, it remains content to backfight with the board over student-faculty parity — something already well established on such a fact finding committee.

What was more disillusioning at Tuesday's meeting, was the two-hour dialogue towards the democratization of the university. The occasion to discuss USCUG's format was belittled by the need to prove COSSU's existence with the reaffirmation that not all was totally democratic at York. How true. This seems quite an age for understatements.

Because the committee appears to be in no hurry to reach any decisions, there is no reason why the committee had to stay within the board-senate confines. It could have gone back to senate with a new proposal for membership — one quarter students, one quarter faculty, one quarter non-academic and one quarter community representatives.

Because the board — as a capitalist elite — is no more representative of York or the community than anybody else, there appears little need to have anyone represent it — except perhaps in the non-academic list and even then, it is rather questionable.

Perhaps it was only fitting that COSSU's chairman, Howard Adelman reminded everyone that except for a declaration that COSSU intended to continue their work on York's democratization — nothing would be sent to the senate.



From the days of '65' university governing re-examined.

Branch plant science

Like a true branch plant suffering and adapting to every cold wind that blows across its path, York seems content to grab at any research money that is stuck out its way.

It appears that York's policy — if it has one — is lacking in several fundamental issues. First of all, except for the president's annual report, there is no comprehensive survey of all research being carried out at York. Secondly, there is no mechanism to require any faculty member to divulge the details of his or her research being conducted on or off York's premises. And finally, there is no policy as to what funds York will or will not accept.

Psychology professor and American John Gaito says he has lost his U.S. navy grants due to budget cutbacks. What is startling is his question, "What difference does it make who we do it for so long as we can do the research we want to do?"

This has to be the most incredible piece of self-proclaimed political naivete heard since the late 1930s.

Of course, it's oftentimes been repeated by researchers who choose to ignore their contributions to immoral wars but to compound the statement with the charge that to control research, "you start restricting individual liberties and academic liberties" is to bring the point nicely home.

Financial control in the form of grants from military sources for military

research is an effective restriction of academic liberties.

America's dilemma today has been caused by a complete lack of collective conscience on the part of its researchers. To import the philosophy here is to import a disaster Canada can well do without. For York to import funds from no matter where, won't help the university or Canada.

... and more

For Canadians to ally themselves with visiting educational and scientific groups from the U.S. is to suffer three adverse fates: first, it reinforces the view that Canada is an American satellite with little independence of thought or action; second, it places Canadians in the awkward position of harvesting the resentment which Americans have earned for themselves throughout the world for more than a generation; third, and worst of all, it subjects Canadians to the indignity of being treated by the Americans themselves as fortunate second cousins living in the warm glow of American affluence and generosity. As long as we leave cultural exchange with North America up to the Americans, we can continue to expect the children in Warsaw to know that the great North American humorist is Mark Twain, and who in the devil has heard of Stephen Leacock?

Excalibur

The York University Weekly

SEPTEMBER 23, 1971

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
ANDREW MICHALSKI

MANAGING EDITOR
TIM CLARK

NEWS EDITOR
MARILYN SMITH

CULTURAL EDITOR
JOHN OUGHTON

PHOTOGRAPHY EDITOR
TIM CLARK

CARTOONIST
JOHN ROSE

STAFF AT LARGE

Brian Milner, Joe Polonsky, Paul Tomson, Viviane Spiegelman, Cam Smith, Rob Roland, Harry Kitz, Dan Markur, Louise Paradis, Steve Geller, Mark Alter, Sandy Cormack.

BUSINESS AND
ADVERTISING MANAGER
Rolly Stroeter

ADVERTISING
Jackie Stroeter

TELEPHONE:
editorial phone: 635-3201, 3202
advertising phone: 635-3800
controlled circulation: 15,000

Excalibur, founded in 1966, is the York University weekly and is independent politically. Opinions expressed are the writer's and those unsigned are the responsibility of the editor. Excalibur is a member of Canadian University Press and attempts to be an agent of social change. Printed at Newsweb. Excalibur is published by Excalibur Publications under the auspices of the Council of the York Student Federation. All letters should be addressed to the Editor and sent to Excalibur, Central Square, Ross Building, York University, Downsview, Ontario. The Excalibur reserves the right to edit all letters more than 500 words long. Unsigned letters are the responsibility of the editors.

STAFF
MEETING

Thursday

afternoon

5 pm

everyone
welcome