



Why are these people smiling?

Excalibur staff-on couch from left to right: Julia Buck, Brian Milner, Warren Clements, Dale Ritch (on stick), C.T. Sguassero, Bonnie Sandison, Michael Barris, Chris Gates, Ed Piwowarczyk, Rosemary McCracken, Sue Cooper, Steve Hain, Peter Matilainen, Mike Distaulo, Alan (Wallhanger) Risen, J.W. Beltrame, S. Jennifer Hunter, Floor sitters (l. to r.) Honey Fisher, Agnes Kruchio, Rick Spence,

Shelley Rabinovitch, Colan Inglis, Ron Rosenthal, Peter Hsu, Michael Hollett (in the lap), and Michael Lawrence Forman. Missing: Bob McBryde, Jackie Greatbatch, Robin Endres, Jim Omura, Dion McGrath, Garfield, Payne, Norma Yeomanson, Vince Dorval, Dynamite Strange, Sol Candel, Jackie Stroeter, Anthony Chan.

Letters To The Editor

All letters should be addressed to the Editor, c/o Excalibur, room 111 central square. They must be double-spaced, typed and limited to 250 words. Excalibur reserves the right to edit for length and grammar. Name and address must be included for legal purposes but the name will be withheld upon request. Deadline: Mon. 5 p.m.

"I'm ashamed of the SDS"

It's been over a decade since I've written a letter to the editor of a college or university newspaper. In the early Sixties, when I was still an undergraduate, there was much reason to write letters: there was a war going on in Southeast Asia, with Kennedy pouring in more troops and dollars every day, the age of majority was 21, students and even faculty didn't have much say about running the colleges and universities, and, specifically relevant to this letter, there was a general gag-rule on speakers on campuses.

Related to that gag-rule, I recall supporting the SPU (Student Peace Union) actions all over Canada and the U.S. to allow "free speech on campus." There were perhaps three or five of us so-called radicals per campus "demanding" free speech, a really radical thing indeed; our approach was that we wanted the right to hear anyone on our campuses whether they be communist, Burker or Bircher, socialist, or KKK — obviously if we wanted free-speech for the left, we must allow (if not want) free speech for the right — and I believe most of us really believed in the cry, "I might not believe a word he says, but I'll fight to the death for his right to say it."

The SPU ultimately grew into the SDS with basically the same principles and most S P U members supported the S D S, even though some went to the extremes of the "Weathermen."

Now "The Revolution," as we so affectionately called our movement, is over. The battle is won; free speech abounds on campus, Vietnam is officially declared over (at least now fewer are being killed per day), the age of majority is 18 (in both Canada and the U.S.), and students and faculty now have more say in the running of their campuses. Kent State seemed to be the capstone of the movement — all after that seemed anti-climactic. My reason for writing now is my shock at a group of rightwingers using the name of the SDS and putting that name in disrepute by their action of denying free

speech to one Professor Edward Banfield.

Such a denial is anything but the action of Students for a Democratic Society — we defended anyone's right to speak on campus. If we disagreed with the speaker — let him speak anyway since if he's a wrong as we feel, it will be evident from his talk, and, after all, he can be questioned after the talk. In other words, trust the audience to be at least as intelligent as you are.

When a reactionary SDS acts, the expected happens. A reactionary university administration reacts by revoking recognition of the SDS on campus — for denying free speech, of all things — not something respectable, like bombing a computer centre or a lab on campus used by the U.S. military for war research!

I'm ashamed for the memory of the SDS and hope that this new group of reactionaries are exposed as imposters soon, before they completely ruin the name.

L. MURPHY

Atkinson faculty, Natural Science

Superstars fun-loving

Congratulations on the article (March 28) concerning the Founder's Savage Superstar beauty contest. It was a fantastic tongue-in-cheek article, and we of the Superstars all had a real good laugh over it as I'm sure many other people did.

Of course the article would not have taken shape had it not been for the wonderful comic talents of S. Jennifer Hunter. It's easy to see that she'll go a long way in the reporting world.

The fun started when it was pointed out that the beauty contest had become a "controversial ceremony." We Stars were rolling on the floor for half an hour after that and we were only at the caption under the picture! What followed on page three made the previous humour seem like

only a mild introduction.

The well-chosen quotes by Esther Greenglass show that she can keep up with any joke, while at the same time adding her own brand of bitter-sweet humour: "adversely affects woman's self-image... sex objects... meat contest... cute little puppy."

By this point, the tears were rolling down my face, and I ended up missing two classes because my laughing muscles were in such pain.

Luckily, the article took a turn to the serious (after all, one can only take so much of a good thing), with two straight comments, one each by Michael Mouritsen and Anne Scotton. Anne didn't want to comment on our beauty contest because she felt that 'it was only a gimmick.'

I suppose that is explainable because she must be too caught up in her new CYSF duties, exams, papers, and the like, to be bothered to have to think up witty comments. Or perhaps Michael and Anne did take the contest seriously and therefore were not able to see it in the same witty vein as Excalibur.

Oh well, I guess some people just can't take a joke.

MICHAEL TARJAN

Raffle just astounding Dopey way of funding

Hail, Excalibur, I think you blew it. I am writing in response to that 'cute' article (March 28/74, page 13) or should I say ad for a hookah raffle for the Jim Ince Defence Fund. I am rather amused by such a preposterous and logically intolerable event. If anyone is ever in need of an example of the word 'chutzpah' or 'unmitigated gall' this is by far the show stopper — a hookah raffle (a doper's toy) to raise money to cover legal fees. (If by chance, the hookah has been slightly used, Mr. Ince could be in further need of legal fees.)

To me, a hookah raffle in Central Square, to raise money for legal fees, is absolutely astounding. I am by no means making any moral judgments on "smoking" or on the reasons for

Mr. Ince's legal fees. And I am also fully aware that a hookah could be used for tobacco. But to be confronted by a raffle for a rather ostentatious apparatus for blowing dope to raise money for legal fees is truly ridiculous. There should be a lid on this type of event.

Excalibur, in the true York "Tentanda Via" spirit, should realize this folly.

NORM FEFERMAN
Faculty of Environmental Studies

Editorial needs review implication is dangerous threat to our principles

I wish to take issue with your recent editorial, "Bad tactics used at Banfield talk." In the last sentence of that editorial you remark that views like Banfield's "should never be presented unquestioned on any campus, for any reason."

Perhaps so, but your editorial itself contains a view that certainly should not go unquestioned on any campus, and that is the view that it was merely bad tactics for the SDS to prevent Banfield from speaking. This implies that in other contexts you may have approved of this denial of free speech. By leaving this implication, you undermine the principle which is the sine qua non of a university as an intellectual forum, and this, before anything else, should not be allowed to go by unchallenged.

Universities are based on the view of individuals being actively engaged in independent analysis and judgment, irrespective of a fanatical bent in some quarters for conspiratorial interpretations.

Any person or group that sets itself up as an arbiter of what men and women should hear, and then uses the initiation of force to this end, forfeits the claim to open membership in the intellectual community by denying the efficiency and responsibility of independent thinking, which remains the essence of a university.

JOHN RIDPATH
Lecturer, Social Sciences and Economics