

# Excalibur



editor  
 managing editor  
 news editor  
 assistant news editor  
 features editor  
 business manager  
 entertainment editor  
 photo editor  
 sports editor  
 lay out

ron graham  
 mannie zeller  
 fred nix  
 frances de angelis  
 gary gada  
 henry gertner  
 don mckay  
 clark hill  
 jim richardson  
 ross howard  
 roly stroeter  
 rosamund dunkley  
 heather anderson  
 rich levine  
 sam stern

circulation manager  
 excalibur is published weekly by students of york university on york campus. opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the student council or the university administration. phone-635-2300  
 Associate member--Canadian University Press

## WARGA SPEAKS

### University Breeds Vandals

At approximately 1:45 P.M. on Monday someone broke into the Versafoods' Change machine in Founders and ran off with about \$35. It seems we have a bold criminal at York for this dasterly deed was committed in broad daylight with the aid of something like a crow-bar. The machine was pulled away from the wall, bent out of shape in several places, and the change door pulled off. This could not have been done without some sort of noise and Versafoods is looking for witnesses.

It takes either a complete fool, or great gobs of gall on the part of someone to commit this crime during the day with the knowledge that apprehension would mean a criminal record and dismissal

from the University. The vandal did not escape completely without a trace for he cut himself and his blood remains at the scene of the crime.

Along with the \$35 taken, it will cost \$160 dollars, says Versa-foods, to replace the machine.

Of the five mechanisms outside the Games Room, at this moment four are out of operation due to some sort of damage. This is not the first time that the change machines, and other vending machines have been tampered with and it won't be the last, until some of the people at this University devote more time to studies and less to the application of extra-curricular skills.

Dave Warga

## Editorial

### Bah, Humbug, Pro-tem!

'Those of you who get as far as reading the editorial will probably wonder why there are no Christmas messages in this, the last issue of PRO-TEM before the holiday. The reason is that we are incapable of much hope that anything positive will come out of this Christmas season.'

--from the PRO-TEM, Dec. 15, 1966.

So there was no message of cheer from the PRO-TEM...and the editorial entitled 'Whores and Hypocrites' went on to specify why.

'As long as Canada remains morally committed to the United States by aiding and abetting this criminal action (the American effort in Vietnam), don't tell us Christmas still exists.'

'The poor in our society still sweat under an unfair system that conspires to rob them of their dignity.'

'No, you won't find any Christmas messages in this PRO-TEM. The editor is much too sick, vomiting in disgust at those to whom those syrupy messages are generally directed.'

In essence, Bah Humbug! To which we reply, Bah, Humbug to you PRO-TEM.

PRO-TEM's is the ultimate hypocrisy. Few deny that misery particularly and evil abound throughout mankind. For you it may be in Viet-nam, or the United States. For others, South America and China. For many, the rot in man is everywhere.

Nonetheless, to rant and rave against the world's woes on the one hand, and on the other, to reject that Holiday season which, in its true meaning, calls for a rejuvenation of love in the world--for a rebirth of goodwill--is to us, the ultimate hypocrisy. If the editor of the PRO-TEM is sincere in his editorial attitude, then why should he bother to concern himself with Viet-nam or racism, or 'Christian' hypocrites? If the spirit of love and goodwill will not at all avail, what does he propose--hate? Utter cynicism?!

So, bah humbug, to your 'anti-Christmas' message, PRO-TEM. If Christmas '66 infused anyone with something of the spirit of love and goodwill, it was worth it. We hope you all had a Merry Christmas. (Yes, even you, PRO-TEM.)

### The SRC Failure: Why and What Now

Greg Barnett F11

#### SRC's black end

With robes and black crepe, four of us marked the end of this year's SRC at the last meeting on January 4th. Contrary to what some students wish to think, this was not an act of irresponsibility. Indeed, it was a hyperbole, carried out to draw attention to some facets of student government at York that are question marks in the minds of many of you. Why did the SRC fail? What lies ahead for university-wide government here at York? These are the questions I want to elucidate this week. They are not the only questions worth discussing. However, space and time demand that consideration of the college councils, what's the matter with them and what should be done about them wait until a future issue.

#### Personality clash?

Right now, what are the reasons why the SRC failed? The articles and editorials that have appeared in EXCALIBUR throughout the first term talked about the various difficulties that the SRC got into over such things as our membership in CUS. But the question of how the SRC got into a multitude of difficulties, many of which you have never heard about, that occurred during the past summer and fall, remains unanswered. Some of the people who populate the ranks of York's little tribe of college council members like to attribute the SRC's failure to 'personality clashes' of the SRC members. This in nonsense. Anyone who takes a moment to consider will

realize that a personality clash is not a primary reason but it is a non-relationship between persons that is in turn caused by deeper-lying reasons. The reasons for these 'personality clashes' between members of the SRC and the members of the college councils are what we are looking for if we really want to know why the SRC failed.

#### Expansion Committee at fault

The seeds of the SRC's failure to function adequately were sown last winter when the Glendon and the Founders Student Councils set up an Expansion Committee whose purpose was to study the question of a university-wide student government for York University and make recommendations that the two college councils could act upon. Unfortunately, these students lacked the expertise to go along with their aspirations to statesmanship. Reading the reports of this committee gives me the strong impression that they talked a bit about the powers of the SRC and gave some slight consideration to the financing of the SRC's 'powers' out of the \$17 student fee. One thing they did talk a lot about was holding an election. Incredible as it seems, the colleges swallowed all this and they decided to stage an election for a council to which they gave no powers of authority and no financial resources.

Now it must be fairly obvious that, in order for any government to function, it must have two

cont'd p.3

## Letters

Dear Editor:

Irresponsibility is a favorite word that administrations of universities use against students and their ideas. At times when the student body of a university unites in a single stand in support or disapproval of an idea, they should be reckoned with in at least a small scale. It is quite obvious that Mr Ross, the president of our university, has no concern at all for the feelings of his students. As Duff-Barehal mention in their report, students are an essential part of the university. Perhaps this university considers other things more essential. For once all four student bodies were united on one stand. Founders, Vanier, Glendon, and SRC, who represent all the students of this university, all felt unanimously that ACSA meetings should be open. The reasons for their stand have been repeated over and over again in the Excalibur, Pro-Tem and other student newspapers. Dr. Ross has now surreptitiously reactivated his ACSA. I think that the least the president of the university could have done was to ask these councils exactly why they were against ACSA as

originally constituted. But apparently irresponsibility is a one way street. Administration can never be labelled irresponsible. In our university students' opinions are not important since they are immature, irresponsible, and thus not to be reckoned with.

Gary C. Lipskar

Dear Sir:

For the past three months it has been my weekly misfortune to read your juvenile attempts in the field of journalism. Major newspapers, years ago, gave up the notion of only publishing 'All the news that's fit to print' but apparently you have not. It has always been my belief that a paper not only reports the news but also comments on it. In the academic community, a newspaper should represent the best interests of the community whether that community cares or not. What I am trying to say is that the paper should be a force not only for enlightenment but for change and reform where necessary. It is in this most vital capacity that Excalibur has failed.

Excalibur's 'editorial policy', if one may or can call it that, is, in my opinion, hopelessly inadequate. I have yet to read a worthwhile comment on the ineptitude, inefficiency, and ineffectiveness of any of our three councils. Instead you have deemed it proper to comment on everything from Vietnam and the Kennedy assassination to a rumour of hikes in residence fees. Hell man, wake up. This is York, not 'Face the Nation' and I am more interested in seeing something good done now than rumours about the future. This year, everything at York has been a bust, with the possible exception of classes and the 'Biz Bash'. It has been in your power to rectify this situation but you have done nothing about it. Until Excalibur stops existing merely for the entertainment of its editors and staff, it should drop the title newspaper, and only resume the title after assuming and fulfilling

its proper role in the community.

Peter Ferens F II  
 Editor's Note:

Where have you been Mr. Ferens? Did you read the very first editorial, 'Incompetance'? Did you read the editorial entitled 'Constructive Criticism Please'? Did you read the editorial in the Oct. 21 issue (about administration's attitude to the S.R.C.)? Did you read the editorial 'A Xmas Broadside' in the Dec. 16 issue? We have yet to write an editorial on the Kennedy assassination.

If you are not concerned with the possibility of fee hikes, then I assume you are too wealthy to care, in which case--to Hell with you.

Finally, the 'New York Times' still claims to print 'all the news that's fit to print' and if Excalibur in any way approaches this ideal in your opinion then thank you for the compliment.