

editorial

"Journalism consists in buying white paper at 2¢ a pound and selling it at 10¢ a pound."
Charles A. Dana

No public funds for stadium at York

Since its inception, York has existed without what is today essential to any university: a "big league" stadium. While U of T students cheer on their football team in 12,000 Varsity Stadium, York's Yeomen grind it out on a pasture, with spectators braving their bottoms on high-school style bleachers.

Arguments against constructing a new stadium facility (not to mention new classroom and student space) have been based on the considerable cost of such construction. And given the cuts in funding by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities to post-secondary education, York's building freeze seems almost justifiable.

Nothing stirs administrator's blood more than a domed stadium, however, and York recently added its name to a long list of proposed sites for Toronto's newest athletic monument.

And rightly so. As the University points out, there are acres of unused land on campus, and parking is widely available. Also, York wouldn't contribute to the traffic snarls on the waterfront during CNE/Ontario Place/Blue Jay/David Bowie season. And no one can deny that York's Yeomen have suffered their "temporary stadium" long enough.

There is a key contradiction in the evidence, however. Why does the University suddenly seem to have money available for a stadium when there was none before for educational basics? Quite simply, post-secondary education doesn't seem to be a priority with any level of government.

They are all ready and willing to spend millions of public dollars on a stadium that will most likely provide little more than a revenue-making venue for professional sporting events. But funds for education?

Although a stadium is needed at York, it must not be built with public funds—there are higher priorities for the money, namely quality of education. Let those individuals who most want to sponsor a domed stadium build it and maintain it. If York is chosen as the site for a domed stadium, it must be ready to reap the benefits.



BIRTH OF A SALESMAN

STAFF MEETING

X-cal staff meets today at 4 p.m. All members of the York community are invited. Be there, or you'll be missing out.

excalibur

Editor-in-chief Roman Pawlyshyn
Managing editor Bernardo Cioppa
Photo editors Mario Scattaloni
Nigel Turner
Sports editor Mark Zwol
Editorial cartoonist John Ens
Production Elizabeth Santia, Greg Gaudet,
Stuart Ross, Lerrick Starr, Julia Steinecke
Staff Wendy Ward, Stephanie Gross,
Paulette Peirrol, Paul Pivato,
Kevin Connolly, David Spiro
Craig Daniels, Howard Goldstein, Steve Hacker,
Adrian Iwachiw, Richard Underhill, Debbie Kirkwood,
Paul O'Donnell, Ellissa Freeman, Carol Brunt,
Jonathon Goodman, Laura Lush.

Excalibur is published every Thursday during the academic session (September to April) by Excalibur Publications Inc., 111 Central Square, York University, 4700 Keele St., Downsview, Ontario M3J 1P3. Telephone (416) 667-3201 (editorial), 667-3800 (business and advertising). Copyright © 1983 Excalibur Publications Inc. All rights reserved. Reproduction or use, without written permission, of editorial or pictorial content, in any manner, is prohibited. Excalibur is a member of the Ontario Community Newspaper Association. ISSN 0823-1995

letters

Editor:
I take exception to your ill-conceived insinuations (re. "Invalidation, Censorship—Bad Ideas", September 8). Had you quoted my report accurately, your readers would have known the true reason for my suggestion that certain items which evolved from the elections be declared null and void. Alas, such was not (as we probably could have guessed) to be the case. Without truly understanding the pragmatic realities of the situation, you proceed to pontificate on the idealistic assumption that a "Chief Returning Officer can only . . . assess whether the democratic process proved strong enough to resist attempted tampering." This denies the harsh truth that democracy is far from perfect.

In my report, I offered a large number of reasons as to why the elections I named should have been declared null and void. To go into all those reasons here would be dull and pointless, two qualities which certain other campus institutions seem to possess in far greater abundance than I ever could. Again though, your failure to print the whole truth suffocates reality.

As for my suggestion that the campus media be asked—on a strictly voluntary basis—to check any election-related story with the CRO, I stand behind it wholeheartedly. I believe my report stated unambiguously that this was not intended to be used as a means of censorship, and that in fact I abhor censorship on a personal basis; as an editor, I too am acutely aware of the precarious position into which freedom of the press would be put under such

circumstances. However, when something as crucial as an election (and thereby vast sums of student money) is at stake, I believe people have a right to be properly informed. As CRO, I would never have dreamed of dictating to anyone how a story should be written, or which facts should be used. However, as your newspaper seems to have some degree of difficulty in grasping a little truth injected into a story now and then can make for interesting reading.

In conclusion, one can but wonder why a supposedly respectable newspaper must resort to a six-month-old story for the gist of its first editorial of the year. Is it for lack of new information? Somehow, I'm skeptical that we'll ever really know.

Larry Till

stupid by the institutions of his society." Stupidity, just like intelligence, is a learned behaviour. It's not innate, such as ignorance.

A possible contrasting hypothetical character analysis of Brian Henry would be that of the loyal reporter who creates controversy, if authentic controversy cannot be discovered. After all, isn't controversy the main ingredient in formulating a successful news medium? In this respect I would congratulate Mr. Henry for doing his job: Garbage in! Garbage out!

Mark Stephen Christensen

Editor:
As the home of one of Canada's leading business schools, it might be expected that York would be able to market itself effectively. Apparently this is not so.

The fact that the university must refuse students whose averages fall below 63% is laughable; announcing it publicly is sheer lunacy. Academic excellence may not be a concern in the undergraduate programs at York, however, blatant remarks to that effect tarnish the reputation of the entire university.

In this time of adversity, York should be strengthening its credibility through the use of entrance examinations and by emphasizing the positive demographics of the student body. If York were perceived by the public as an academically sound university and not just a rampantly growing one, perhaps funding would not be so difficult to obtain.

Brook Tyler

Editor:
In response to Brian Henry's status quo polemic, published last year (Letters, April 14, 1983), I wish to state that, according to Judaic theology, Zionism and Judaism are absolutely incompatible. With regard to Jewish law, a Jewish nation-state can only be by divine sanction via messianic revelation. Not by force of arms.

There exists, around the world, (esp. in the State of Israel), an ultra-orthodox branch of Judaism which asserts this principle. It is known as the "Neturei Karta."

In my opinion, Mr. Henry's journalistic perspectives are a monument to the famous philosophical-sociological maxim, "Man is not born stupid . . . but he is made