

# To learn or to pray?

This university (the board of governors) has accepted a private donation specifically marked for the construction of a chapel on campus.

The donation, from a somewhat anonymous source, is worth over \$350,000, and will advance the chapel from its original place of 15-30 years hence on the building plan to the near future. Private donations from individuals who have made their success in society and want to help build better societies through better universities are desperately needed.

But this university must not accept donations which are not obviously for the best, most primary needs of York.

This university (the board of governors) has allowed a private individual (a friend of the board's?) to tell the university what it needs most urgently. Dictated donations not in the best interests of this university must be rejected.

Such donations are a mockery to this university, who should put its primary needs ahead of the misdirected offerings of an individual.

Who is kidding whom — we don't need a \$350,000 chapel now, and this university knows it.

But do the Governors of this university know it?

Hell no.

This university belongs to the students. Dig it.

We came here to learn, not to pray.

The board of governors should reject the "chapel" tag on the donation and use the money for a Chair of Religious Studies, or 50,000 new books. This university wasn't asked if we needed a chapel immediately. The board of governors was asked, and the board was wrong.

Would it have been any different if students, and perhaps faculty, had sat at the decision to accept the donation?

If a man is "humanitarian" enough to donate to a university, certainly he is humane enough to know better than to dictate to the university regardless of its pressing needs.

Thanks, but we must build a better society, instead of building bigger memorials.

The board of governors was wrong, and now must approach the donor to "redirect" the \$350,000 to a greater need. The donor cannot reject such an approach, or certainly his donation is a most contemptible one.

If the Board will not change its erroneous decision on what is best for the students of this university, then let students make the decision.

This university belongs to students. Dig it.

YSC has considered a statement of policy which calls for a restructuring of the university community, including:

1. The Senate
2. The Board of Governors
3. Abolition of Grading system
4. Student Centred Teaching

The first meeting to discuss these policies will be held in the Vanier Social and Debates room, Tuesday, at 3:30 p.m.

## Excalibur OCTOBER 10, 1968

editor in chief	ross howard
assistant editor	mike snook
managing editor	rolly stroeter
associate editors	grant carter, don mckay
news	linda bohnen
assistant news	dave cooper, kandy biggs
features	frank liebeck
assistant features	anne wright
entertainment	david mccaughna
assistant entertainment	rick blair
sports	stu smith
photo	howard tewsley, alan lamb
layout	bob elgie, richard levine
copy desk	gale campbell
circulation	phyllis kokko

excalibur was founded in 1966 and is published by the students of york university. opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the student councils or the university administration. excalibur is a member of the canadian university press. printed by web offset publications ltd., don mills, excalibur has a circulation of 7000.

office: t42 steacie science library, york university, downsview ontario. phone 635-3800 or 635-3880.

see-here we got shat on tonite by the parranoids while awaiting pizza . . . hi to hawaii paul from dave & olga . . . bill foned . . . bob slaved till 4, mike still sleep from last week . . . phyl out of circulation for a week, grant anita ross mike are doing 99 (is that like 69) "all together now" — ross . . . georgestew the bobbsey twins run for fac-members . . . warga wants a dirty girl . . . roly waited & waited but for copy not godot . . . kandy pslashed psych, gale did 16 pages seul . . . now here's ralph: Hi, everybody. This is a STAFF AD, which means we talk about Excalibur staffers, like TONY, the pie-eyed hero, who does sports because CLAIRE cops out for laziness and GLEN the prodigal son returns to get lectured by RICHARD while BOBBY E. snickers and OLGA makes sarcastic remarks to ANITA who thinks of GALE madly copy-editing. Where are Linda and Sheila? Stewart Smith is long gone. Give thanks, everyone (also Suzy Q.), that we go to ORCUP to learn something.

*I'm not sure why teachers are so chicken-shit. It could be that academic training itself forces a split between thought and action. It might also be that the tenured security of a teaching job attracts timid persons who are unsure of themselves and need weapons and the other external trappings of authority.*

- from "The Student as Nigger", Gerry Farber

## EDITORIALS

### The view from the bottom of the pile

a weekly column by Larry Goldstein and Stuart P. Hertzog

"Freedom is a word I rarely use, without thinking . . ." Donovan

The myth of freedom at any university is the easiest to see through. You have heard, no doubt, that one of the functions of the university is to act as a watchdog over the freedom of the individual in this democratic society. The members of the university thus have complete freedom to study and comment according to the dictates of their conscience without the fear of political, social or economic retribution. This process of study is supposed to be ennobling.

That is the liberal arts view. And most people believe in it. It holds true to an extent for some members of the university.

But not for the students.

In high school you were told that rote learning was a necessary evil; a fact of life that enabled you to proceed into the freer atmosphere of a university. Having proved that you could jump through the hoop on the command, you were to be rewarded with the lump of sugar.

Where's the sugar? On all sides we were surrounded by needless restrictions, authoritarian rules and petty regulations.

How free are you now in your studies? Once you've made the initial choice, the pathway to the degree is rigidly prescribed. You can't study what really interests you in your fields, you must study what is required. You must give the answers they want to the questions they set. Please don't try to be original, especially in first year. You'll only get into trouble.

How free are the residences? You can't have visitors when you want them, but when an administrator says you can. They have usurped themselves in *loco parentis*; tough if your parents were more broadminded than they.

How free are you politically? Leftists distributing handbills and making speeches were asked

to leave the campus. Dalton Camp and his cronies come and go as they please. Don't try to invite interesting speakers such as Stokely Carmichael to the campus: they are 'outside agitators' and you are supposed to be apathetic kids.

But let's project. We'll say that you understand that freedom for undergraduates is administratively impossible and you accept that you're not responsible enough anyway. Push on to post-graduate work. There you are limited again by your specialty and by financial worries. By now you are probably married and struggling to equip an apartment. Pity the poor lecturer who steps out of line. He loses his livelihood.

The only people for whom academic freedom is a reality are the senior faculty. But again, to what extent? How much attention is paid to those senior members who opposed costly football teams for York? They are allowed to publish what they want to in their field but must not step over the boundary into the administrators' area. At best they'll be ignored. At worst: got rid of.

If you ever hear the cry of "academic freedom!" raised in anger you'll note that the authors of those letters to the editor in the more esteemed newspapers are either senior professors, or those who are hoping to be. They are not rushing to your aid: they are most likely defending their own territory. Such is the power of the modern administrators that towers of ivory are too brittle to withstand the onslaught of those trained in the school of business method.

There is danger on all fronts. Yet although the cracks are so extensive that the defences are in fact breached, the myth still stands. In all fairness, it must be said that York is one of the most "liberal" universities in Canada in terms of the freedom it tries to provide. But these concessions have had to be wrung out of an uncomprehending and hostile administration. They can never be safe as long as administrators are appointed by the Businessmen without our consent.

Next week: the myth of elitism.

### letterslotslettersletshavelotsoflonglyricallatters

Dear Sir:

The article appearing in the issue of your Newspaper of the 28th September 1968, credited to Larry Goldstein and Stuart Hertzog, deserves my commendation. I am particularly impressed by the facts expressed. The article is straightforward, honest and interesting, but intelligent.

I read the article over and over again. Each time I was relentlessly assailed by the same questions:

1. Is Canada, a senior member of the commonwealth, unable to use her influence to persuade Britain to stop supplying arms to Nigeria.

2. Is Canada, a big nation that has never abused her power, unable to use her influence through acceptable diplomatic practices to press on Nigeria to let in food to the starving people of Biafra.

3. Should not the Just Society similar to Kennedy's New Frontier both in principle and philosophy not be carried beyond the confines of Canada?

4. Or is it true that necessity knows no laws?

People are much particularly concerned with the deplorable situation in Biafra — a reality that has been adequately translated as: a terrible tragedy, an ugly human misery and an atrocity of a very monstrous nature. The Canadian public and the world now look upon the Government of Canada for leadership in this important crusade to save

humanity from inhumanity.

The situation in Biafra is both emergent and a necessity. All evidences so far are conclusive that Nigeria is determined to exterminate the people of Biafra as if Biafra and the Biafrans should perish were an historical accident. This claim is buttressed by Nigerian policy. Chief Enahoro, is quoted as saying that "starvation is an instrument of war".

In fact, Nigeria has rigidly pursued this policy. They have been able to prevent food generously contributed by various humanitarian agencies to be flown into Biafra, in spite of the fact that the agencies now in Biafra announced that the recent death-toll due to starvation is between 8000 and 10,000 every day.

It is inconceivable to hope that a political problem should find its solution in futile military warfare. Historical verdicts abound to support the contention that every effort should be intensified towards winning a political victory rather than a military one.

The fragile basis of unity that existed in post-independence Nigeria was completely destroyed by two successive pogroms unleashed against the Biafrans during which 30,000 Biafrans were killed in cold blood. Subsequently at Aburi, Ghana, the military leaders agreed on a confederation as a

necessary expedient because: 1. There was a problem of command and control; and 2. there was a crisis of confidence among the various tribes of the country.

In fact, everyone was caught by the ear when a rumour passed that Biafra would be invaded. Thus Lagos decided to carry out this war of genocide and thereby provide an example that military warfare is a preferable solution, in settling political problems in Africa. What would have been the pride of Africa if, "all sanctions short of war" policy was adopted by Nigeria.

I do not care again if Britain and Russia defeat Biafra. But the political victory must always belong to the people who have the just cause. I am particularly concerned, like most Canadians, with the studied silence and non-challenge with which Biafra's agony has been met. What are all these things that Biafra is suffering?

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty", said President Kennedy in his inaugural address.

And in fact there is not much difference between Kennedy's New Frontier and Trudeau's Just Society.

Simon Ayah  
406 Brunswick Avenue  
Toronto 5, Ont.