

EXCALIBUR

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

Editor-in-Chief Andrew Michalski
 Managing Editor Tim Clark
 News Editor Marilyn Smith
 Cultural Editor Lynn Slotkin
 Photo Editor Lerrick Starr
 Sports Editor Alan Risen
 Cartoonist John Rose
 Business and Advertising Rolly Stroeter
 Advertising Assistant Jackie Stroeter
 editorial phone: 435-3201, 3202
 advertising phone: 435-3800

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.

controlled circulation: 12,000

Social Science 175 and York

Once again Social Science is in the news. It happens just about every spring. When we asked former chairman David Hoffman to comment about the complaints, he refused. It's not much wonder.

The Council of the York Student Federation counter-calendar course rating put Social Science at 2.9 (1 being excellent and 5 poor). That's not very good when you consider that every student has to take one of those courses.

Soc. Sci. 175 has a 2.9 course rating — so it's about average. Compared to Soc. Sci. 176 at 4.0, it does rather well. The course director John Ridpath gave an honest evaluation when he said the course had a major problem of faculty team cooperation and coordination.

In a more comprehensive look at Soc. Sci. 175, 63.8 percent listed Ridpath as good to excellent in delivering lectures and 75.8 percent listed him good to excellent in running tutorials. This was far and above what any other member within Soc. Sci. 175 could muster.

But the course has been dropped since a departmental committee decided to drop the course. Soc. Sci. chairman Mel Hill refused to give a copy of the committee's report even though the information used was technically public and all meetings public. Putting it mildly, something fishy is going on. It's called departmental politics or who can I get rid of with the least bit of shit hitting the fan.

John Ridpath is a threat to the Soc. Sci. department. He's a good teacher but he's vulnerable because he doesn't have a list of paper degrees behind him. It's the old pseudo liberal trick of saying "We like you John but you just don't have the qualifications."

Politics has a lot to do with Soc. Sci. The complaints that surround it every year over the quality of teaching there

are notorious throughout York. Not that Ridpath could change a department, mind you, but he's certainly cracked its confidence.

Hill's answer that nobody is being forced out is another liberal bullshit move. Now tell me, professor David Shugarman doesn't cut short a Tuesday Soc. Sci. 175 lecture for J. Hutcheson to give a 20-minute spiel on how Soc. Sci. isn't really trying to give Ridpath the boot, just for nothing?

If it's anything that angry Soc. Sci. students did yesterday in visiting York president David Slater, it was prove there's a need for an ombudsman to

ensure students get a fair shake in deals with faculty slackards. Going to the president of York with a complaint about professors is like going to the president of General Motors about a car defect: you get lots of nice words but no action.

York's faculty are paper people, hung up on paper degrees like crooks on good counterfeit money. Their social value is limited and definitely worthless to any student. Their actions are best portrayed by the fact they defeated a senate motion to place a token student on the tenure and promotions committee to help judge a faculty's teaching ability. It's all very much like an all-white

Rhodesian committee looking into "discrimination" there.

The faculty — like racist whites — are afraid of criticism. They are gutless liberals who hide behind complex rationalizations that fool no one but themselves and their pawns.

The Soc. Sci. dilemma will be here again next year and the next. Like York's perennial financial problems, the annual event will be based on the same premises. The only winners are the paper faculty that hang onto their degrees as tokens of their own esteem — which in reality, is quite bankrupt.



Wright report response

Yesterday it was time for York to make its position known on the omnipotent Wright report. On Tuesday, its senate showed its better side by rejecting a report compiled by administrative studies dean James Gillies and written by administrator T.K. Olson.

So far then, York's only submissions come from political science professor Naomi Rosenbaum for the Ontario Committee on the Status of Women and professors Esther Greenglass and Jo-Anne Stuckey.

York's official brief was quite something to read. A few excerpts will show just how bad it was:

"Normal people do not wish to spend most of their lives reading books and getting involved in long, esoteric discussions and abstract ideas about theories and basic research. University professors do — and they prefer to be around students who share some of these characteristics and enthusiasms. Most of the undergraduate students do not. The result is that the professors would prefer to have most of their students at some other institution than their own."

Ivory tower elitism anyone? Here's some more:

"Universities are places for intellectually and creatively gifted people

and that is important and worthwhile for both the individuals and for the society."

Very nice rhetoric. And their concept of all this? —

"The reality is that the university is there for higher education and many students are there for just more education."

They're quite right. Faculty aren't normal. Nobody normal could come up with a statement like that.

"An institution which must preserve, create and criticize to be effective, cannot endure being fettered by bureaucracy and rigid controls."

We agree. But that really sounds so self-righteous — like the one here at

home is so perfect that students have no problems with the same criticisms levelled here.

And finally, York is so liberal again when it says, "The commission seriously over-estimates the proportion of costs in post-secondary education now paid by the taxpayer because it neglects many private costs that now exist."

Well that's quite true but then the taxpayer now pays 87 percent of the costs and the other 13 percent is pretty well paid by the student. They want to keep mixed financing. York doesn't call for free tuition. That would be "too radical". Besides, York couldn't keep an elitist liberal image. Too bad.

Counter calendar

The counter calendar is finally out. Council of the York Student Federation has produced a basically good document for students to follow. With early pre-registration this year, it gives an accurate picture of what courses are all about.

Our criticisms are two: first, some

courses were left out; and second, the organizers could have solicited more advertising to cut down the costs of the book to CYSF.

But all round — it's one solid achievement which CYSF can hang its shattered hat on.

Mass rally on Tuesday at Queen's Park to protest awards program and fee hike

Mass rally - Tuesday, 1 p.m. Queen's Park — to protest changes in the Ontario Student Awards Program and higher tuition fees.

- Loan ceiling of \$1,000 — this means the first \$1,000 is a loan.
- \$500,000 in graduate grants — where will the teachers come from?
- No part-time student loan scheme — if you can't get a job, and don't have the money to come to university, you cannot get a loan.
- \$30 a week for room and board — residence at York is \$40 a week.
- Plus: Proposed tuition fees for undergrads \$935 - \$975. Proposed tuition fees for grads \$728.

It's your education — demonstrate your concern.