

Excalibur



editor
asst. editor
business manager

ron graham
mannie zeller
graham white

photo editor
women's sport

charlie ogilvie
anne morris

layout

ross howard
rolly stroeter
rosamund dunkley
heather anderson
rick levine

excalibur is published weekly by students of york university on york campus. opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the student council or the university administration.

excalibur is an associate member of the Canadian University Press.

York: Centennial Sloth?

Gary Gayda

York University has no Centennial plans. The Administration at this University has not announced any and Student Representative Council Vice-President Greg Barnett (F II) has not been informed of any.

This places York in the inevitable position of being one of the few institutions of learning in this country which have not planned a project. And money is no excuse. Although York is having financial troubles making a reality of the model so proudly displayed in the Steacie Library, a Centennial project needn't add to this burden. The Canadian Union of Students Representative at York, Ken Johnson (F II), outlined to me the S.R.C. bid to have a student sponsored conference on English-French relations. The Administration has done nothing to encourage it and, without its approval, and active participation, the project will have to be shelved.

Just what is a centennial? Obviously it's a celebration of an event a hundred years in the past. But it can mean much more than that.

The institutes of higher learning in Canada have decided on a dynamic and, it is hoped, far-reaching Centennial project. "Canada: ????" is the theme of Second Century Week, the major Centennial program for the Students of Canada's universities, colleges, and technical institutes. To be hosted jointly by the campuses of the University of Calgary, this \$250,000 national project will bring together 1,100 from across Canada in the week of March 6-11 to participate in academic, cultural, and athletic activities. This six-day bilingual exploration into the future of the world's third largest country will

include a Canadian Affairs Conference, Literary Seminar, Fine Arts Festival, Student Composers Competition, University Drama Festival, Theatre Seminar, Photography Competition, Art Exhibition, Film Seminar, Drama Conference, and the CUS National Debating Finals. Olympiad '67, the first large-scale Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union meet, will be held at Edmonton, Calgary, and Banff. We hope that York will be represented at these events.

Participation in this Conference does not absolve us of responsibility for a distinctive York project. But do we want one?

Why should the Centennial have a direct bearing on the youth of Canada? Much of the ballyhoo planned for next year will bear the Centennial stamp. Some of it will be worthwhile; some of it will not. If it doesn't give its participants cause for reflection--for reassessment--of current conduct and mores, it will have failed. If it doesn't serve as a launching pad for a more vigorous and co-operative Canada, but stoops for more junk from the 20th century's bottomless bin of trivia, the Centennial will not have served its purpose.

What is a student, where is he heading, and how will he relate to his society, more particularly his country, in the second century? Will the theme of Canada--"Canada: ????" continue, or will it become a dynamic and optimistic "Canada: 21"? This concerns YOU--the student of today, the citizen of tomorrow. And if we don't start to access our possible contribution now, our 11th hour attempts next year could earn York the title of "Centennial Cesspool".

EDITORIAL

Election! What Election?

Did you know there was an election here today? Well, there was. At least, there should have been one.

Yes, today we have a new President, a new Vice-President and even a new treasurer, on the Students' Representative Council. Of course, we didn't vote for these new officers. Indeed, we didn't vote for the other two members of the SRC executive either. We haven't voted for any of our present SRC executive! Not one!

The entire executive has reached office by acclamation. Were they all so popular that no one dared to run against them? Possibly. Have the students been to apathetic about the SRC? Undoubtedly.

Nonetheless, the question remains: how many students were really aware that an election was coming up? Only two posters announcing the election and the

nomination week were to be found on campus--one in Vanier and one in Founders. Neither were particularly noticeable. Surely the student council could have spent another \$2.00 for extra posters. If the nominations had been extended another four days, the Excalibur could have publicized the election and more students might have run for office.

Several members of the S.R.C. the Excalibur, and interested students advocated this be done. However, neither Keith Kennedy new president by acclamation, nor Rex Lingwood, Chief Returning Officer would consent to this proposal.

Why? What pressing issues necessitated that the election be held today? Why was it imperative that the nominations be closed last Friday? Perhaps it was because it makes elections so easy for the council members who do run again.

Students in the University

A Look at the Duff Berdahl Report...C.U.P.

Wilf Day--C.U.P. Feature Writer

A Look at the Duff Berdahl Report Almost two years ago, thousands of rioting students nearly took over an American university. In the process, they added the infamous word Berkeley to university glossaries.

Ever since those massed student protests in California, Canadian writers have been saying: "It could happen here."

Every student march in this country is seized upon by liberal observers, such as Professor Jack McLeod in the current Saturday Night, as evidence that American students have taught their Canadian counterparts how to shake up the campus.

The truth is, Canadian students have not really begun to make an impact on university structures and government; and perhaps this is just as well.

Even the recent Duff-Berdahl Report on university government, co-sponsored by the Association of University Teachers, warns that direct action by students is increasingly likely unless they receive more consideration and a greater voice in college administration.

But the commissioners--Sir James Duff of Britain and Professors Robert Berdahl of the United States--weren't really very worried about this.

The report, which appeared last spring, says the chief prob-

lem facing the university structure is tension between administration and faculty.

While recognizing that some students are becoming aware of their role as "consumers" of a university which has ceased to be a community, the Duff-Berdahl Report does not find this a cause for deep concern. In fact, the report states it is "sponsored by the entire university community in Canada"--namely, the administrations' AUCC and the Faculties' CAUT.

The report does raise the question "What is the university?" and suggests two answers:

(1) the American model, where the faculty are employees of the Board and the students are customers;

(2) the British model, where "the faculty and their students are the university".

The proper role of the faculty, in the eyes of the commission, is the biggest, if not the only, issue now being raised about the structure of the Canadian university. Their concern is based upon fact: last year, faculty associations across Canada--notably at the University of Western Ontario--notably at the University of Western Ontario--were taking the lead in criticizing administration policies, drafting briefs and holding vociferous meetings. In Britain, there is a clear pro-

cedure for working out such problems: the faculty normally dominates the Senate and is well-represented in the Board itself. The Report says:

"The crucial question is whether the Canadian academic scene is sufficiently like Britain's to permit successful adaptation of the tradition in Canada. We received the distinctive impression that Canadian academics and university presidents were so receptive to the values and traditions of British universities that they could make such an adaptation relatively quickly. The Board members, on the other hand, seemed generally much more North American in their orientation and thus might need more time and guidance to find the proposal acceptable."

Whether the faculty should be given a share of power in the university does not depend, it would seem, on how aggressive they are in bargaining for it. Quite the contrary, an aggressive faculty is more likely to be preoccupied with increasing their salary levels. And although low salaries are a prime cause of poor teaching, the report feels a concern for the overall well-being of the university community is a pre-requisite for admission to the seats of power.

And yet, only overt student discontent is mentioned as evidence that students should have a voice in policy.

Students apparently are too transient--perhaps too American--to deserve a share in policy-making as of right.

However, the report thinks those who dare to trust students will find they react with "unsuspected maturity", and adds, from the Parent report in Quebec: "University students ask to

be treated as adults, and it is fitting and fortunate that this should be so. Moreover experience has shown that there is little risk in extending confidence to them..."

Queen's University in Kingston is an explicit exception to the commission's findings, as the report points out several times.

Based on the Scottish model, it is the only university in Canada where students elect a representative to the governing board. The faculty at Queen's are known to feel they have the Principal's ear. In long meetings last year, the entire faculty--tenured or not--discussed fully and voted upon proposed academic changes. The report especially urges other universities to follow Queen's example. The Duff-Berdahl report does not help with questions of educational policy, which are not directly within its scope. But neither does it restrict itself to reducing tension and maintaining the status quo. It looks beyond its original problem, which it puts in new maxim: "Lack of power makes peevish and absolute lack of power makes absolutely peevish."

The university, it says, is "so inherently and rightly a battleground of clashing ideas that no structure of government could produce a cosy consensus."

It is thoroughly opposed to the idea of the isolated self-defining university. It contrasts narrow professional interests with the interests of the public. Not only governments, but organized teacher, labor, business, lawyers and doctors should name members to the Board. And in turn, non-academic employees should be included in the Faculty Association, it says.