

# Letters to the Editor

Address letters to the Editor, EXCALIBUR, York University. Letters must be signed for legal reasons. A pseudonym will be used if you have a good reason. Those typed will be given preference.

## York has problems

While I was munching a sandwich in the cafeteria today a question kept coming into mind. Namely, how in the hell did we get stuck with Versafood!

Not being able to digest that problem I started to think of other significant issues that good little students shouldn't discuss such as: Why does the Toronto-Dominion Bank have a monopoly on the York and Glendon Campuses?

As EXCALIBUR pointed out, in its Oct. 22 edition, a member of our board of governors is a big wheel with the TD Bank.

Since Canada is supposedly a democratic system advocating equal opportunity for all, why hasn't York followed this tradition by allowing other banks or trust companies on either of these campuses to provide additional service for our student population?

Why was \$5-million spent in building a library to house an insufficient number of books? It's not the number of escalators or the thickness of the rugs that ensure a passing or failing grade — it's the availability of the necessary reference material.

Of course if you think we have a lot of books, go to the library, jot down the catalogue number for 20 books and go sic 'em. How many did you find? Can you see that F grade for your essay work looming on the horizon?

I sometimes wonder if the people fruitlessly wandering around the library are not just trying to work off all that vim and vigor they get from Versafood.

Here's another point to ponder. Last year College E students were invited to participate in a contest, the purpose of which was to give the students a chance to pick an original name for their college. Very democratic.

I suppose you've all heard what we ended up with. Stong College. Now what student in his or her right mind would have found the name "Stong" particularly groovy? Think about it.

Over and over again York students are subjected to rules, regulations and policies which have come directly from the powers that be who seem to have little or no consideration for the student himself.

When was the last time you were robbed by the bookstore? Why is it that we have very little say in how this university is run? Are we here to become educated, to learn how to govern ourselves, or is it just to keep us off the streets?

The main goal of a university system is to enlighten and aid the student. York's goal seems to be the exploitation of the student. Why do we continuously make fools of ourselves by blindly paying high prices for crap food, cheap paperbacks, and old American movies?

I think the answer lies in the majority of our student population who have defined and initiated a typical York tradition — "Students should be seen and not heard." The last word in York University students — Baaa.

Lynn Robertson  
Arts II

## Women's liberation

On Wednesday, Oct. 21, at Osgoode Hall, a contingent of "heavy swingers" from the self-styled "Womens Liberation Movement", snobbishly echoed once more their customary tear-jerkers on the lack of recognition that their kind receive in the world and then proceeded to denounce the male as representing the cradle of all their misfortunes.

Their chairman whose most resounding exclamation of the event was "I never wear a bra!" set things in motion by introducing a panel whose apparent function was to educate us in the abuses and injustices endured by defenceless women, at the hands of male chauvinists.

Beginning with lists of statistics from unnamed sources and extravagant generalizations, the panel attempted to inject some credibility to their position by again reviewing the generally accepted need for wage parity, relaxed abortion legislation, and economical day care services. But once these facts were stated, out came the crying towels, as the panel solemnly dragged out purported psychological and sociological shackles restricting the potential of women to develop themselves.

Such bonds were said to be especially manifested in the role of "the housewife", who the panel chose to drape in veils of utter misery and futility. Apparently the panel chose to overlook the fact that the role of the



"That door's locked. Try the other one."

housewife, like anything else, is what you choose to make it.

As the female editor of the French magazine "La Monde" observed, the "American housewife" has the potential for the greatest freedom in the history of mankind, in that she is liberated from the concerns of gaining food and shelter, and can almost totally involve herself in pursuits of knowledge and the aesthetic arts with modern appliances and the services available for the care of children (even at bowling alleys) her household duties are minimal and she can live like a goddess.

Of course her lack of initiative in the management of her freedom is often devastating, leaving her to squander her time watching game shows on TV and complaining of the lack of excitement in her life.

Aggressively espousing the supposed tinsel and glitter of outside jobs as the only possible means of self-development for women, the panel overlooked the fact that not all such jobs are interesting, inspiring and exciting. Very few such occupations exist at present, and with any significant increase in the labour force such jobs would be even less available. But of course, one can always sweep streets like the women in Moscow.

As solutions to all the ills supposedly facing women, the panel casually tossed up "socialism" and "sexual blackmail." Socialism to "free" women from the role of housewives and put them (whether they like it or not) into the outside labour force, and sexual blackmail to force males away from their present view of women as sexy creatures to be lusted after.

To assist in this change in attitude, the panel pushed for the discarding of the brassiere so that women's breasts swing at their knees, and the abandonment of makeup, so that all women could be as beautiful as the members of the panel.

For the sake of so called "efficiency", the panel also proposed state-controlled institutional care of infants and children. With this proposal the panel apparently has once more overlooked a few facts, such as those arising out of numerous psychological studies revealing the need in infants and children for "an important person." In studies, such as those observed by J. Bowlby it was shown that institutionally maintained infants suffer significantly more from depression and represent a much higher infant mortality rate than children raised by parents.

The question arises — why more "efficiency" in the raising of our children? — especially if we love them as much as the panel announced they did.

In reviewing the manifestation at Osgoode, it is easy to accept the legitimate complaints mentioned above, but it is regrettable to have seen supposedly mature women disregard their own flaws and the flaws of many in our society, in order to childishly attack a scape-goat such as the "manufactured meany" — the male.

Even after admitting that women in our society raise children of both sexes and usually educate them in public schools — thus most significantly influencing the formation of attitudes and roles — the panel persisted in attacking the scape-goat male for the creation of such attitudes and roles, depending more on emotionalism, fear and

hate, than on intelligent comment to promote their so-called "liberation."

It leads one to the opinion that the panel might have tot little substance to maintain their so-called "movement" without such attacks and such a scape-goat.

In last week's EXCALIBUR a continuation of the old tear-jerking theme appeared through the efforts of one Wendy Dennis. Not only did she probably insult some of the socialists among us by referring to the dropping of Karl Marx's name as "a shitty reaction," but then went on to complain about supposed rude remarks striking her ears at Osgoode Hall.

She later drew us to the fact that she was used to being laughed at — Wendy, its not surprising.

Peter G. Budnick

## Animal knowledge

Last night I noticed a sign up about a Pet-In in which people were asked to bring their animals to York. . . So animals, too, can press for education.

Are you kidding? The shoe is on the other foot. It is animals who should be teaching us.

It would take more than one college degree, for example, for anyone to learn even one-half of what a beaver knows about ecology. Beaver dams are built with all ecological factors taken into consideration. Even some ecological factors that are, at present, a mystery to man.

That beaver that shows up on symbols for Canada ought really to be wearing a cap and gown and carrying a scroll indicating that he is a Master of Science. For he is, and maybe we ought to provide him with a lectern and the opportunity to teach a few courses in environmental science. We could learn a lot.

For it happens to be the beaver, and not man, who is responsible for the preservation in North America of its natural timber-lands — any wildlife expert will confirm this — and it is man who is destroying them through his stupidity.

It is time, it seems to me, for beavers to organize against man and insist that a beaver be a permanent appointment as head of the Department of Lands and Forests. That way we will be getting somewhere in preserving the environment.

There's hardly an animal you could name that doesn't know more about preserving the environment than man, the least intelligent animal. Wolves, which are becoming extinct today because there is a bounty price on their beautiful heads, are experts at keeping population down through natural selection. We need a liberation movement for wolves, and particularly a female liberation movement. In some parts of the country, body parts of an animal are required as proof of kill before a bounty can be collected. Get-rich-quick cruelty experts deprive a bountied female animal of the designated body part and then release it to produce new litters of future bounty payments. This practise, according to U.S. Wildlife Sources is widespread. Many other species, all of them, essential, are endangered.

I like the idea of a Pet-In. A day set aside specifically for animals, to constantly remind us of how essential they are, ought to become a regular part of university life. I

hope it will, and that the idea spreads throughout the country.

C. Wallace

## War Measures Act

In my open letter concerning the "support Canada" rally I did not state my opinion on the use of the War Measures Act. In order to avoid my support of the Rally being misinterpreted as support for either the existence of, or the use of, the War Measures Act, I would like to explicitly present my view on this issue.

My support of the rally is a support of the context set by the organizers of the rally in their opening statement. In that statement they acknowledged a deep concern over the use of the Act, but they then announced that the rally had not been called to debate the use of the Act. Clearly, this implied that the rally was meant to have a deeper concern and significance, which I interpret as being a demonstration of support for civilized institutions and behaviour. In this context "supporting Canada and its government" means supporting the general principles of civilized society. My criticism was addressed to those speakers who dropped this context in presenting their remarks.

The question of the existence and use of the War Measures Act arises within the narrower context of appraising specific legislation and specific government actions. Within this context I would totally condemn both the existence and the use of the War Measures Act. In fact I would argue that this Act and its use are to be condemned on the same moral grounds that one would use to condemn the actions of the FLQ.

Thus, while I "support Canada" in the spirit and context I attribute to the rally, my endorsement of this general context leads me to the conclusion that, on the more specific question of the War Measures Act, both the Act, and the government in using it, have violated the very principles on which the civilized character of any government rests.

Endorsement of the general principles requisite to a civilized Canada requires that one attack, in the proper context, the specifics that violate those principles. It is sobering to conclude that both the FLQ and the Trudeau and Bourassa governments are to be condemned.

The advocate of civilization, in this instance, finds nowhere to stand.

John Ridpath  
lecturer

## Excalibur

The York University Weekly  
NOVEMBER 12, 1970

### EDITOR

BOB ROTH

### ASSISTANT EDITOR

TIM CLARK

Greg McConnell, Brian Milner, David Chud, Murray Meldrum, Mike Savage, David Starbuck, Barry Lerner, Dave Danko, Wendy Dennis, Marguerite Scandiffio, Mark Gottlieb, Judy Turner

### PHOTOGRAPHY

Tim Clark, Harry Kitz, Dave Cooper

### CULTURAL ARTS

Dan Merkur, Brian Pearl, Steve Geller, Michael Goud, John Oughton

### SPORTS

Rob Rowland, Tim Clark, Phil Cranley

### GRAPHICS

John Rose, Pete Reeder, Laurie Kopitz, Jane Yap

### LAYOUT

Louise Paradis, Murray Meldrum, Karen Snyder

### BUSINESS AND ADVERTISING MANAGER

Rolly Stroeter

### ADVERTISING

Leo Smits, 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. Office: Central Square (Southeast corner), Ross Building, York University, 4700 Keele St., Downsview, Ontario.