

EXCALIBUR

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

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 Newswest, Excalibur is published by Excalibur Publications under the auspices of the Council of the York Student Federation.

editor-in-chief, Marilyn Smith; news editor, Jim Daw; managing editor, Lerrick Starr; cultural editor, Lynn Slotkin; photography editor, Harry Kitz; sports editors, Alan Risen, Judy Campbell; cartoon editor, John Rose; CUP editor, Jane King; staff-at-large, Paul Thomson, Dave Phillips, Valerie Sullivan, Mike Barris, Peter Hsu, Harold Stein, Peter Matilainen, Nancy Hobbs, Robin Rowland, Danny Zanbilowicz, Jerry Silverman, Carla Sullivan, Marg Poste, Bernie Stein, Ken Myron, Lionel Llewellyn, Harry Stinson, Mike Woolgar, Art Irvine; Business and advertising, Rolly Stroeter; advertising, Jackie Stroeter. Editorial—phone 667-3201, 3202; advertising — phone 667-3800.

Community accountability still a long way off

Accountability is the best check of incompetence and abuse of power. The budget crisis at York had that valuable lesson to teach.

The senate, in the face of faculty cuts, refused to accept the administration's report of the crisis and set up its own 21-man committee to investigate. The committee came back with a new budget and reports of inefficiencies all through the York operation. The group also drew up programs for transportation, enrolment projections, and efficiency studies. In short, the committee pooled its talent to pull York from the brink of financial chaos.

The committee made its final report to senate last night. Now if there's one thing senate should have learned from the output of the committee, it's that pooled resources have a tremendous potential. No one individual is capable of the output generated by group interaction.

York president David Slater is the one man responsible for the budget, management, initiatives and innovations — in short, he is the chief administrator of the entire university. Slater has innumerable committees to advise him. Last night, senate created one more presidential committee.

This committee is to co-ordinate and continue the work begun by the Joint Committee on Alternatives. But of its five members, two are appointed by Slater, and three by senate. The committee reports to Slater — and by amendment, to senate twice before it's disbanded in June.

At a point in York's history when York altruism is at a high tide mark, it's a misguided end result to hear senators argue that for once, the committee must not be falsely divided by constituency representation — and then create a committee that reinforces the status quo. This type of presidential committee is the same

sort of structure that bungled the budget report in the first place.

At a time when York is telling its members to pull together as a community, one more presidential committee isn't an innovative answer. The committee must have authority to tackle its work, not simply a loose mandate to work primarily under the president's direction. And the directive that it report to senate is a check on its powers.

There is a real danger that such a committee would become too powerful. In predicting its membership, it will probably be high level administrators and deans (certainly no students since a special provision was voted down). So the power will essentially filter down from the president to the upper echelons of control at York.

Much of York's past mismanagement is due to little delegation of authority and little definition of the roles and duties of administrators.

There are two main arguments against academics

becoming administrators. The main objection is that the details of running a university leave little time for the *raison d'être* of the institution — education. The other is that York has a \$2.3 million administration — its job is to efficiently run the university.

It's not the administration of policy but the making of policy that's the issue. The paper-pushers, one man alone or even a small group of men should never have sole domain over policy and its development. (We say men because there are no women in the upper power echelons of York.)

At present, there is another notable committee at York. This one is studying the very issue of how York runs itself. The example of the work done by the crisis committee — the combined talents of administrators, faculty, staff and one student, is a fine testimonial to mass democratization of decision-making at York.

The governance committee should suggest permanent structures that will make policy a matter regularly decided by the entire community.



To be sung to the tune of The Twelve Days of Christmas

On the twelfth day of Christmas, York U gave to me,
Soap in all the washrooms,
Paper to go with it,
Heat in all the classrooms,
Students that weren't sloppy,
Decent tasting coffee,
No overpricing,
Or budget slicing,
Fresh Submarines,
Profs on time,
Drinks a dime,
Courses that weren't cut,
And a homework-free holiday.



Alright you scurvey knaves, hard to starboard!

Letter of the week

Organized repression used against revolutionaries

Ken Hundert's recent article on Peru reveals a surprising amount of misunderstanding and gullibility to the military junta's professed "Peruvian revolutionary experience". I will limit my comments to his appraisal of the vitally important SINAMOS (National System of Support of Social Mobilization) as it contains the essence of his mistake.

Hundert explains the purpose of this considerable bureaucratic organization consists of making up for the lack of the "revolutionary mood" among the greater part of the Peruvian population, to "make them realize they can now participate in the decisions which affect their lives and the life of their country". Peru does not, however, lack this "mood" to the extent which is implied; the point is that any form of revolutionary mobilization has been expressed outside of the military's model and control — in fact, the revolutionary effervescence prior to 1968 was one of the principal causes of the military coup in the first place.

The junta has set up SINAMOS as a means of controlling popular mobilization, to then keep it within the bounds of the government's aims of instituting a modern and dependent capitalistic structure in Peru. (It is true that the model at first involved economic independence, but the obvious impossibility of this has forced the government to accept dependency). In fact, any of the many cases of popular mobilization of peasants, students, or workers which have

taken place outside of the government's bureaucratic control, have been quickly and viciously repressed.

The extent to which Juan Velasco can keep up his hypocritical revolutionary rhetoric, and thereby maintain the aura of legitimacy he has skillfully cultivated among the greater part of the population — including, as Hundert pointed out, a considerable proportion of the radical left — will determine the future course of the "Peruvian model".

The junta has very clearly shown that when things get out of hand, it is quite willing to use the force of organized repression to maintain the "revolutionary order", and there seems to be little doubt there is emerging a direct correlation between a dwindling of the junta's legitimacy with the growth of yet another Brazilian model in Latin America.

Jim Adams
University of Toronto

Our last meeting staff
meeting this year is at 2 pm.

Everyone is welcome.

Merry Christmas.