

Leadership is needed to revive YSC

by Ross Howard, editor, Excalibur

Elections for the university-wide York Student Council will be held within 20 days, and still no one has openly declared himself for any of the positions of leadership.

In many ways, the slow start of election campaigns is surprising — the largely ineffectual efforts of the present YSC should have spurred several people to consider taking over. Certainly few candidates could fear an inability to match the accomplishments of the present YSC.

This university is desperately in need of vigorous and strong leadership for the student body, more so than ever before.

The present council did an adequate job of administering a bureaucracy, much of it instituted for the first time. But the council did almost nothing of lasting importance to fur-

ther the ideals of a democratic university.

The council did nothing that in any major way affected this university, and at no time did it show a determination to adopt a coherent plan of action in any field. Certainly the council alone is not to blame for this lack of interest in social action. This campus, as opposed to Glendon, has a reputation and past history for being largely lethargic, and very unconcerned about what is happening to it, or the world around it.

There have never been any collective sentiments from York students about academic tenure, the nature of the corporate elite that runs the board of governors, the undemocratic nature in which issues like chapels and parking sign raids have been decided.

There has never been a council concerned with more than publishing

yearbooks, telephone directories, and housing leaflets.

This council has boasted of the fine communication it has with the administration, but little has come of it. When the parking sign fiasco arose, several members of the YSC executive cried that they were cut off from the administration, and did not sit on the parking committee. What do we believe?

The present YSC has done nothing toward determining York's position in CUS (which is costly at present), YSC has done nothing to improve classes (Modes improvement was not initiated by YSC), YSC has done nothing to improve classroom democracy, has done nothing to draw commitments from the students on critical issues (recruitment was forced onto YSC by the Viet Nam people).

The council executive has initiated some good efforts: ABC, representa-

tives for new committee positions, and has set up several valuable committees (which have confined themselves to trivia.) But this year's YSC is not likely to go out of office well remembered for its deeds.

This university is desperately in need of a strong, vigorous council leadership, beginning with a president willing to devote to his position more openness, more determination, a clear understanding of aims, and a desire to get big things done.

It may be that the incoming president should be a graduate student, or a special student prepared to devote almost full time to the position.

The other alternative is an undergraduate who can both lead and direct a well-organized group of councillors able to identify with the problems and tackle them with enthusiasm.

Any candidates?

NEWS (and blues)

The Council held its latest meeting on Tuesday January 7 at which a number of important items were dealt with. Among them: the process for entering and leaving the Council was amended with the result that the requirement for either is now a referendum — the number required for leaving is 66% of those voting: the council decided to pay the 25 dollar fine "recommended" by Henry Best's non-court type court which "researched" the parking incident naming eight people as implicated in this connection, the Finance Commissioner, Eric Cruickshank, has sent a cheque to the administration for \$200 with a note to the effect that this sum represents YSC's contribution to the president's new Bursary Fund. Anyone needing a bursary for \$200 can now apply at The Man's office, one would suppose.

The YSC executive met on Sunday January 12 and has issued a press release concerning Prof. Pritchard's motion reported last week in Excalibur, which condemned Larry Goldstein's article and requested his removal from York. I quote: "Prof. Pritchard's demand is unworthy of a man with rational goals, for its intended effect is to punish someone — in this case, a student — in the free expression of thought . . .



photo by Rick Argals

Only 78 days till exams, so I figured I might as well use the rock for something besides newspaper photographs.

Mr. Goldstein's column is clearly not libelous . . . we recommend to Senators who agree with our position that, as soon as Prof. Pritchard's motion is presented to Senate, they move a motion to refuse to consider it. His motion richly deserves such a fate."

by Glen Murry
former YSC External Affairs
Commissioner

This article, which will be appearing in two issues of Excalibur, will be devoted to the election of a new YSC, its possible and declared candidates, and the issues which they will be fighting over.

There seems to be little need to go over the strengths and weaknesses of the old YSC except for a few details which must be looked at and considered with a view to the coming election, on Feb. 4. It was an unfortunate year for our student council and the blame cannot be placed on the shoulders of any one person. The college councils attacked with uncompromising force at the indecisive nature of the government's constitution. Yet it is the opinion of this writer that it was not the constitution which was at fault but rather the mixture of personalities present in the body.

The last election was marked by a collection of individuals, each seeking office in order to offer his or her own personal opinion of what was best for this university and the new council.

Murray picks the winners

At the head of this mixture stood Mr. John Adams, the great organizer, and no better man could have been elected to the post. He worked hard to put together an effective organization, yet when that body had been organized he stopped and sat in the mire of his success while other members struggled hard for new policy and direction.

A split occurred between those who were anxious to move on and those content to stay put. This split caused the self imposed exile of Adam's vice-president, his academic affairs commissioner, and his external affairs commissioner, the last of whom eventually resigned in utter frustration.

It is this problem which we hope to avoid in the upcoming election. We're not looking for a high school politician and an administrative rubber stamp this time. It's time this university got off its ass and supported the isolated protests in the English and the Poli-Sci departments, and time it was led by its student council.

To date there have been few substantial rumours about who will seek the office of president for the upcoming year. Three names seem to be present however, and I will discuss their possible platforms on a purely speculative basis.

The first of these is Richard Smith who is presently serving on the Mac council. It seems that Smith is still undecided — not only about his candidacy, but about his platform. I doubt whether he will ever have any platform, or for that matter any substantial political persuasion. The best place for Smith is certainly not the presidency; perhaps a commission, but a seat as representative from Mac college would be his best political bet. His political and philosophical immaturity would be improved by sitting back for another couple of years and taking notes. No power plays here.

The second name that may be put forward when nominations open is that of John Bosley who is presently the speaker for the TSC and a special student at York. John is quite aware of what the issues are and has the political and intellectual ability to pursue them if he wants to. But I look with some hesitation in John's direction for a couple of reasons. First of all, he seems to lack the sin-

cerity of attitude that we have been suffering from for so long. Without this he may continue in the Adams tradition of failing to get student support on any issues save those of stealing parking signs. We are aware that the lines of communication between the YSC and the administration are good, but they stop where the students begin, and that is not good.

My second hesitation about Bosley comes from his desire to run alone. It may well turn out that he will find himself as the president of an organization like the last YSC, where the room was filled with people who either couldn't or wouldn't grapple with the problems of the university. It's an awful lonely feeling, John. The only probable guarantee for a solution to this problem seems to be to organize a group of followers, and work out a policy platform on which the whole group would run. Basically, party politics. If John is willing to take these two steps it seems that he has a better than average chance of winning.

The third possible candidate comes from the "Sunday radicals" and is Lesley Towers. Their choice is not final but Lesley seems like a pretty good bet. Like John, she has the intelligence, but she gains in her sincerity to do the right things. She has been working for the External Affairs Commission for the past couple of months and is pretty well aware of the CUS policies. As a person she is probably the best of the candidates, although her personal forcefulness could be improved.

She will probably have almost a full party behind her on election day if she decides to run. The "Sunday radicals" have a definite advantage in that they have a policy and a slate of possible candidates. But their political leanings are what may end up killing them.

It's my opinion that they will be unable to compromise enough to suit the middle of the road majority on this campus. The fact that they may come on like "gangbusters" may ruin their cause and destroy a good presidential possibility like Lesley. If they have the patience to sneak up on the electorate their chances are good but there remains little doubt that they will have to compromise — and if they do, look out Murray Ross.

A view from the bottom of the pile

by Larry Goldstein

Jottings (or, as some call these little gems, Droppings)

If you disagree with Mel Lubeck, he thinks you're an anti-semitite.

I have it on good authority that Professor H. Crowe believes that there is a paid full-time Trotskyite organizer agitating on campus. If there is such a person, I hereby publicly denounce you for an incompetent. You're taking the Trot's money for doing absolutely nothing.

Another Telegram personality, Peter Dempson, was on "Viewpoint" Monday night. He was bemoaning Canada's apparent willingness to accept black immigrants. "Do you know", he said, "that if we keep up our present rate of negro influx, we'll have 100,000 of them here by 1972." He went on to talk about importing a grave problem and then to say that it was OK to take them in as long as we just take the professional ones, and keep the riff-raff out (his word). Many of Canada's earliest English-speaking settlers were bums, debtors, fleeing criminals, whores and draft dodgers. They're known today as United Empire Loyalists. And this guy doesn't want black riff-raff. Where do you suppose the Telegram finds this sort of racist riff-raff? They crawl all over that particular paper like bugs.

Now that they're abolishing the strap in public school, how are those kinky teachers going to get their kicks?

You may not have noticed, but my last column before Christmas was censored by one of the girls on the type-setting machine at the printers. I don't mind her refusing to set that sort of stuff up, but I wish she wouldn't insert her own prose. So in the future, if there is something that you won't print, just leave it blank, the way it is done in South Africa or Rhodesia or Czechoslovakia.

Did anyone notice Professor Pritchard's memo in this paper last week? His use of mid-Victorian phrases like "excluded forthwith" is a good clue to the way his mind works. It is interesting also that he doesn't attempt to refute anything that I said, just that it is not in the best interests of the University. The letters section of this paper is open to anyone to comment on what appears in the paper. I invite anyone who so desires to use my column to discuss any subject I've raised. The prime minister of the country says that dissenters should be listened to. The chairman of the chemistry department wants dissenters kicked out of school. Whatever is a body to believe?

If you're interested in the next episode in this little drama, the next Senate meeting will be held at 4.30 on Thursday, Jan. 23, in the McLaughlin Senior Common Room. You may pick up a ticket (only 25 available) from Mr. Farr's office on Friday, Jan. 17.

If you disagree with Larry Goldstein, he thinks you're wrong.