

The Reformers are coming and someone at York likes them

Coming to the defense of the Reform Party

by Chris Honke

It is obvious that the Left is near-terrified of the Reform Party and its quickly growing support — which includes former NDP supporters.

By invoking a smokescreen of alarm phrases such as "racist," "sexist" and "ethnocentric" (the trendy liberal word for self-perceived "racism"), liberals are scrambling to discredit and "reveal the real substance of" the Reform Party.

The terms racist and sexist have recently become very much misused and overused.

For the Left, they represent elastic, all-encompassing references to anyone who disagrees with the Left's own cultural or philosophical expressions. To be sure, there is legitimate racism and sexism in our society and I neither support nor defend those who practice or advocate it.

However, let us not allow the liberals to rewrite the definitions of racism or sexism merely for their own political advantage and to use as a stick with which to beat down all those who disagree with them.

Those who find disagreeable the current government approach to multiculturalism or social programs should not be shouted down or intimidated by the Left's self-righteous, hypocritical and fundamentally flawed applications of these blanket accusations.

The Left's obvious fear of the Reform Party should not be surprising: the Reformers are a threat to all of the "gains" made by the Left since the beginning of Trudeau's disastrous reign.

The substantial tax increases since then, which are exterminating the middle class — the heart of Canadian society — combined with a rising



Ontario Reform Party bigwig Michael Dean speaks at Toronto rally May 1991. The Reform Party is gaining fast popularity both on

and off campuses. In response to critical *Excalibur* articles, one York student says they're not as bad as people say.

Doug Saunders

federal debt, are clear evidence that society is wholly incapable of providing all the social programs so militantly advocated by the Left.

Keeping in mind that social programs are the Left's camouflage for its long-term agenda of a redistribution and equalization of wealth, we have seen in Eastern Europe and the USSR just how prosperous such goals are. (Although these Second World governments were communist, their economies were socialist in nature.)

Regardless what misguided liberals would like us to believe, Social Democracy is by no means the inevitable evolution of developed soci-

eties. Social Democracy is a failure in Sweden, and is fast discrediting itself in France and elsewhere.

No government is capable of solving all of society's ills and it is a costly mistake to think otherwise. Those who think the government can do this are primarily responsible for the massive government debts incurred in Canada.

If you peer through the Left's frenzied smokescreens, you may indeed perceive the Reform Party's true nature. Representing the overburdened taxpayers, the Party believes in reducing the obtrusiveness,

inefficiency and size of government and transforming it into a more democratic and responsive body.

The Reform Party rightfully believes that open and fair competition in a free market with minimal government interference is the founda-

tion of a prosperous society. Only an open and fair market can bring prosperity to the majority. Socialism, as we witness, cannot.

bearpit

criticism • condemnations • diatribes • manifestoes • rants • discoveries • speeches • ideas • dialogues • polemics • dissertations • epistles • monologues • proclamations • accusations • declamations • declarations • defences • defenestrations •

No less important, the Reform Party also stresses unity and equality above pandering to self-centred interest groups.

It is a party and a movement that can only continue to grow in size and influence. And if the Reform Party is indeed frightening the Left, so much the better.

Chris Honke is an undergraduate Arts student at York.

Say it in the Bearpit!

All student submissions considered. Please keep length under 600 words.

Student fed up with poor conditions at York

Dear Editor,

Idealistic. That is the best word to describe myself as I entered York University a little over a year ago. I envisioned a learning environment in which students and professors would work together to achieve a new understanding of themselves and the world around them. My attitude has undergone a 'radical' restructuring.

In my first year, I realized that students get very little respect from the administration. They give us professors who, while they may be nice people and brilliant researchers, have little or no teaching ability. They put some of us in residences where the showers have no doors, and have mould and mildew growing on the walls and floors. When approached on these points, they simply shrug and say 'We have no money.' But they do have my tuition, and my residence fees.

This year, my attitude has changed to an even greater extent. The usually low quality of food in the cafeterias has dropped further still, even though we now pay more for it. Marriot's monopoly on serving the resident student through the scrip plan should never have been allowed, and is undoubtedly the result of money secretly changing hands somewhere. There are people in residence who are at or near the point of starvation due to the fact that they literally cannot stomach the food without suffering from chronic indigestion, diarrhoea, or vomiting. Anyone from the upper

We will publish, space permitting, any letters up to 400 words. They must be typed, double spaced, and accompanied by the writer's name and telephone number. Material deemed libelous or discriminatory by the staff of *Excalibur* will be rejected. Letters may be mailed or delivered to *Excalibur* • 426 Student Center • York University • 4700 Keele Street • North York • Ontario M3J 1P3

administration is welcome to come and try the food in the Bethune/Stong cafeteria on the weekend, my treat. My guess is that I will not be buying many meals, for myself, nor for the administration.

Not all of the problems which have led to my disenchantment with York stem from the administration. York also has an ineffective, left wing student government who views itself as a crusader for the minorities, but could care less for the average student at York. By the way, I did vote last year, but not for any of those who are in office now.

There are more reasons I could cite as the cause of my lack of respect for those who are running York. The underlying root of the problem is money. It seems that if you've got enough of it, and you kiss their ass until your lips are chapped, you may get somewhere. I am not loaded with money and if somebody wants me to

kiss their ass, they'll probably get kicked there.

One final message for those in power. You have my money for the first two years, but don't count on it next year, and certainly don't expect me to do my post graduate research here. Someday the tables will be turned, and I will be the one laughing all the way to the bank, and you won't be getting one penny of it.

Sincerely,
Joseph A. Beernink

Union wants action now

Dear Editor,

Regarding your article on the administration's attempt to end conversion of part-time faculty to full time faculty (*Excalibur* 11 September 1991): CUEW/SCTTE is particularly displeased with this concession demand because it effectively undermines one of the major ways in which the union is trying to improve employment equity for women, people of colour, people with disabilities, and Native peoples. For too long the full time faculty at York have come from too narrow a range of people. CUEW/SCTTE is committed to do its part to ensure better employment opportunities for people of colour women, people with disabilities, and Native peoples. We want to see action from the administration. If not now, when?

Doug Allan

Objectivists' Objection

Dear Editor,

As President of the Osgoode Hall Objectivists, I feel compelled to respond to Barbara Pirsch-Steigerwald's little rant against Objectivism, the philosophy of Ayn Rand. Some points to note:

1) The March 21 event referred to by Pirsch-Steigerwald was not a lecture by John Ridpath entitled 'Capitalism: the moral social system for men.' It was a screening of the Ridpath/Bob Rae debate on the question: 'Capitalism vs. Socialism: which is the moral social system?' People of all political stripes attended. Socialist speakers were invited to attend along with Dr. Ridpath but they declined.

2) Pirsch-Steigerwald's alteration of the event's title fit nicely into her petty gripe about women being "linguistically excluded" from Objectivism by sexist language. What she failed to note, however, is that the language of Objectivist writings was created by Ayn Rand, who began writing in the 1920's. Ms. Rand would surely have been surprised to learn that she was excluding herself from her own philosophy by not using the 'politically correct' language demanded by Pirsch-Steigerwald. Does Pirsch-Steigerwald dismiss all authors who wrote prior to the 1970's (when sexist language became an issue) as sexist, or just those who don't fit her little niche in the political spectrum?

3) In saying that socialism fosters a society of "looters and moochers",

Letters

Dr. Ridpath—and Objectivist philosophy—simply meant that socialist programmes encouraged one to either feed off the producers of wealth (through gifts of other people's taxes, taken by force). How does stopping the use of force by all—including government—equate with "survival of the fittest"? Pirsch-Steigerwald's prejudice is clear: either agree with her or be labelled a Social Darwinist.

4) Pirsch-Steigerwald makes use of one quotation that states that socialism takes benefits from their producers and gives them to "the incompetent, the stupid, the slothful". She then refers to the disadvantages of women, impliedly connecting women in general to the statement. This is a perfect example of tearing a sentence from its context, creating a new context, and then attacking the straw man just created. The reference to "the incompetent, the stupid, the slothful" does not mean that anyone in need of help is necessarily incompetent, stupid, or slothful. It does mean that those who fit these categories are able to manipulate socialist programmes to steal from producers. If Pirsch-Steigerwald had read *Atlas Shrugged*—Rand's greatest work—instead of glancing at a few sentences in the *Lexicon*, she would know that

Continued on page 9