

## 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. 4 p.m.

# Student accuses writer of hatchet job, shoddy tricks and misinterpreting facts

As a long time reader of Excalibur, I was reassured to see that your tabloid has maintained its traditional stance of irresponsible and generally inaccurate reporting. Mr. Hollett, your managing editor has displayed his typical lack of fairness and his blatant pro ULC stand (an organization of which he has been a member and fervent supporter) by shoddy common tricks such as misinterpreting facts and placing the emphasis in a story where it will do the most harm.

You have succeeded in doing a hatchet job on the president in the first week for your friends in the United Left Coalition and ignored every possible achievement of his administration. You ignored the progress in improving TTC service to campus that resulted from Edson's council's efforts, you

ignored the improvement in relations between the administration and the college councils with CYSF. You ignored Edson's contribution to keeping parking rates down and quite a few other accomplishments.

Students who are unfamiliar with the political scene on campus might wonder about your tactics and the paper's policy. I am sure they will be enlightened come the next election when they see how many of your staff plan to use their position on the paper as a base from which to retake control of the council. Those of us with a good memory, have not forgotten the record of arrogance and incompetence of last year's left wing clique when they dominated student government.

We won't let you do that to us again.

Bill Bain  
Vanier College

Who needs a report of what's what on campus, if who uses what is ignored?

Deborah and  
Kenneth Colburn  
Fellows of Bethune College

### CYFS Pres. intolerant

I am writing to inform you that I deeply regret the coverage that my council received in last week's Excalibur. The minor attacks on myself can probably be ignored for the idiocy that they are. However, I am forced to take issue with much of the content for two reasons. Firstly, the stories covering council's summer activities reflect badly on my friends and colleagues. The people working with me this summer put in long and hard hours working for the students, and I cannot tolerate the impression you have given to the contrary. It is blatantly unfair to those who have worked so hard for all of us.

The second reason why I must take issue is that Excalibur is the main means of communication on campus. Many students may believe your articles and it would be unfortunate for all if they did. The result might be a recurrence of the tyranny under which we all suffered last year. It is for this reason that I wish to inform you and the students of this campus that until I see a change in behavior by your paper, I will be forced to deal with you only in writing to prevent misquotation and misunderstanding. I also take this opportunity to invite any students who want to know what is really happening to come into my office and talk with me.

Barry Edson  
CYSF president

### Champions of Democracy

The position Mr. Hollett holds requires that he assist you to

ensure not only accuracy of spelling and grammar, but also to some extent, facts. He tries to portray his comrades as the champions of democracy who never limited debate. I recall in many cases last year the moderates were so disillusioned they refused to go to meetings, with the result they couldn't get quorum. If you want your memory refreshed with specific incidents, I suggest you ask Mr. Hollett's leftist friends about a summer resolution passed by the ULC majority sympathetic to the Palestinian Liberation Organization when they weren't going to be invited to the Crime conference in Toronto. The champions of democracy refused to even let that student defend his resolution, because they disagreed with his point of view.

Members of the ULC sympathetic to all left wing causes do not tolerate opposition, when they're in control but how they scream when they're in the minority. Mr. Hollett, your managing editor, chooses to forget that 70 per cent of the votes went to the moderates last year. Leftists were only elected in constituencies where they were unopposed.

The non-ULCers including president Edson and myself represent the students, the majority. We believe in honest debate but not in the leftist tactics of filibuster and dictatorship of the minority. We made promises to the students last year, and Mr. Hollett's leftist friends will not prevent us from keeping those promises.

Andrew Madden  
vice president, CYSF

### Invitation to Shell Oil

Who says York University looks after its own? The tennis complex shatters that myth. The article in last week's Excalibur collected the York Tennis Complex with the York Religious Centre, but omitted one essential difference: the Religious Centre is open for use by York members, while the tennis complex is so restricted as to be, for all practical purposes, closed.

After seeking information this past summer both inside and outside the university concerning the provision for York members' use of the complex, Dave Smith of the Physical Education Department informed me that York people would be able to use the courts in April and May (June, July, August and September is reserved for the Canadian Lawn Tennis Association). Since the outdoor tennis season barely begins in mid-May, this amounts to nil provision for York members.

In what way has the university

been responsive to the needs and interests of the York tennis players? While I appreciate that the CLTA wants to keep its courts in tip-top condition for tournaments and its own members (whatever pretensions York members aspire to in the academic world, let's face it, we are the simple masses or proletariat of the tennis world), the York administration should have given some thought to its own members. Perhaps one argument is that the complex cost us nothing. But this logic represents at best simple-minded opportunism which fails to take into account the desire and wishes of the community in which the structure is to be housed. Following this line of argument, York should only be too happy to lease some land to Shell Oil so it could build some new oil tanks on campus, opposite the ones it already has on Keele Street.

Excalibur reported the "news" and failed to remember the communal interest it is meant to serve.



Confrontation is confronted by student leaders, below.

## The Politics of Confrontation

from the OFS newsletter, September, 1976.

### Edson: con

Barry Edson is president of the Council of York Student Federation [CYSF]. The opinions expressed by Edson are not necessarily those of CYSF.

I have been asked to submit a short article as to why I believe the tactics of confrontation are harmful to the interests of the student movement. By confrontation, I refer to actions such as engaging in the boycotting of classes, the coming to fruition of marches and rallies and other types of demonstrations outside the confines of the university or community college. It is not the primary aims and objectives of OFS with which I am in disagreement, but that it is with the methods of achieving these objectives which place me in disagreement with some OFS members.

The present political mood within the province can best

be described as conservative. It is within the confines of this conservative political atmosphere where the OFS must function. Public opinion polls released frequently point to this fact. Pervading the political consciousness of Ontario is strong antipathy towards organized labour and towards the strike weapon. Unfortunately, there exists no other adequate means by which the working man may secure a fair deal from the employer other than the strike threat. Fortunately, we as students need not to be compelled to take such action. (This will be discussed further in a later section of this paper.)

Another element of the conservative mood within the province can be observed in the widespread antipathy towards the growth of government social services expenditures and even towards the maintenance of present levels of government assistance. The Davis government, in attempting to exploit this conservative mood, has launched a

restraint program, one result of which has been "real" cuts in government support of post-secondary educational institutions.

The leaders of the student movement have a responsibility to combat these duties in social service expenditures, especially where they will result in cuts in university spending and student aid. Yet at the same time we must come to grips with the fact that a very large segment of the voting population supports the Davis government's restraint program.

Taking into consideration the fact that there exists strong support for the Davis restraint program, and taking into account the strong antipathy existing within the province towards the politics of confrontation, we must locate a fresh, modern, reasonable and rational means by which to reverse government policies harmful to the collective interests of students.

### Miskin: pro

Murray Miskin is chairperson of the Ontario Federation of Students [OFS] and attends York's Osgoode Hall Law School.

Students are now being "confronted" by provincial government cutbacks and other actions which student organizations see as being wrong. We must determine whether confrontation tactics, in defense of student rights alienate the public and students? As student leaders, we believe students are being attacked and we must resist.

One way to resist is to explain why the cutbacks are bad not only for students but for all of society. OFS spends a great deal of its time doing just this by presenting briefs, meeting officials, lobbying and other similar methods.

If that method does not succeed, letters and petitions can

be used to show we have the support of students. Other sectors of society can be asked to join us.

The next level of confrontation, demonstrations, becomes somewhat controversial. This is a right and tradition in our society and is not illegal. Demonstrations provide a very visible method of presenting our position. The press loves to cover demonstrations because such actions are "events". If we are careful in presenting our case to the public and the press the media can provide positive coverage for our views. It thereby educates the public and should give us support.

The government is also educated when the officials who have received our complaints in the form of letters, meetings and briefs, actually see we have active and enthusiastic support from students. January 21, 1976 was the date of the most recent OFS demonstration — it has been my observation that since then government officials have been more eager to listen and meet with us.

Since OFS policy is arrived at democratically by

democratically elected delegates, I think we can assume our positions have a large measure of student support. If students understand that we have tried the calmer ways of presenting our views without getting a fair hearing, they will see our tactics make sense.

Demonstrations can be very effective if they are well organized. They should not be used in every instance but only after all factors have been considered.

The next level of confrontation is to overthrow the government. The two basic ways of doing this are violence and elections. If we find the government to be unresponsive or irresponsible on a continual basis, perhaps it is right to elect another government. Students as a voting bloc, can play a major role in removing a government and in deciding who will replace them.

Nobody would suggest violence as a student tactic to be used now so a discussion of the subject would be purely an academic exercise.