

Letters to the Editor

Address letters to the Editor, EXCALIBUR, York University. Those typed (double-spaced) are appreciated. Letters must be signed for legal reasons. A pseudonym will be used if you have a good reason.

A reply to the 'Invisible Woman'

Sir:
Well, it is good to see that one of the dumb broads has finally spoken up. "Dumb broads" is, of course, how bosses refer to the secretaries of this world — when they are not speaking politely of "the girls" (much as Southern whites refer to adult Blacks as "boys").

Everything you said in your letter about low wages and indifferent treatment is quite true. Your problem is to do something about it. I suggest that you do precisely what the faculty has done: organize.

You need not organize as a union, although union status would give you more power than you would possess as an association or as a mere collective bargaining unit. You girls (Pardon! But it slips out so unconsciously) — you women — possess more potential power than perhaps any other group of employees in Canada. The results of a secretarial and clerical strike, for example, would be devastating: you may be cogs but you are vital cogs.

And you are vital because you possess highly-developed skills which are in great demand. It is time you received remuneration which is commensurate with your level of skills and the demand for them.

But, unless you organize, you never will receive such remuneration. Don't rely on the altruism of your bosses for wage increases; we know what businesses have done with Santa Claus. Don't expect that your true worth and efforts will be rewarded according to some concept of justice either. This university, and all businesses, are perfectly content to pay you miserable wages so long as you conform to your pre-ordained roles as silent, docile, obedient (and quite humble) secretaries.

So forget for a moment that you are all supposed to love Trudeau (the Liberals will never help you; how many provisions for working mothers were there in the White Paper?) and contact the NDP at Queen's Park. They will provide you with free legal instructions on how to form a collective bargaining unit or a union. They will also defend you if the university attempts to break your efforts through dismissals or demotions; the Ontario Labour Relations Board will also help you if the need arises.

Do not expect that the university will behave any differently than most employers have in breaking efforts to unionize. Nor should you expect all the girls (sorry again — women) to be on your side. Aunt Marthas (female equivalents of Uncle Toms) will ridicule you as New Feminists — or as socialists, communists, man-haters, etc. They will be encouraged by the administration — which, apparently, fired a number of Atkinson secretaries who attempted to form an association a few years ago. In short, it will be no picnic. And you may want to avoid the mess.

The alternative, however, is to go on being overworked, under-paid dumb broads for the rest of your working days. Think about it.

E.C. Smith
Social Science

William's conclusions are considered hazy

Sir:
In your article of Feb. 12 Glen Williams draws some rather hazy conclusions re the proportion of Canadians in the graduate program and how it is working to the detriment of Canada.

First, (with no substantiation) the entire tone of the article insinuates that Canadians are being discriminated against. Then he immediately calls on York to discriminate against all non-Canadian scholars when accepting applicants for graduate work. It would be my hope that universities in Europe, Britain and the USA will not follow this precedent that Mr. Williams wants York to set. There are too many Canadians counting on these countries to provide the education they wish to receive.

Mr. Williams also cries about the need for Canadians to solve all the problems of Canada. Does he not feel an American could do anything for us, or does he wish to force all Americans to attend university in the "Land of Hope and Liberty"? I hope he has a different policy for draft resisters than scholars.



EXCALIBUR is a good paper but it must try to show some consistency (and calling professors "liars" will gain no journalistic respect).

Donald P. Walker
Glendon II

It would impune the journalistic respect of EXCALIBUR and one of its reporters if we allowed Prof. Wesley Coons' charge that we fabricated statements of his position on the faculty wage demands to stand unchallenged. Coons did say what we reported. In saying that we made his statement up, Coons is lying. — ed.

Sympathizer offers to share some joints

Sir:
Horace, you are LOVED. Don't be swallowed up by your black revolutionary guerrilla trip.

I know that the KKK sucks. Don't you? I dug what you said about "white middle class students" . . . and . . . "white bourgeois audience." But what do you expect, an apology? So you're conscious of your trip, but what right have you to attack the people in the show? Can't you leave it at an attempt to be sympathetic, however middle-class you think it was. Kumquat was meant to be FUN. Have you forgotten how to enjoy yourself? Must every aspect of your life be racist? Your political trip is your own FUCKERY.

You are your own worst enemy. Not only was your polemic misplaced, it was also misdirected. Read the programme, it is no pogrom. Your "bother" was as much fun as the rest of the players were. Does the color of his skin make him your brother? I think we should ask his opinion. Or are you going to hold the color of his skin against him too! And why didn't you say something about the dance number "We Can Work It Out", — it killed me. Surely you're not against mixed marriages. The Rock and Roll numbers weren't by any middle class white racist group like the CREWCUTS of the same era. (see Abbie Hoffman's books.) They were black artists.

Horace, the answers you want are not political and you know it. Throw down your rifle and come over to my place and enjoy a few joints with me.

George Coull
A Sympathizer

Reader is perturbed by Blacks' criticism

Sir:
To: The people of the Black People's Movement:

I was rather perturbed by your criticism of KUMQUAT (EXCALIBUR, Feb. 12, 1970), in which you vehemently attacked the white Canadians of this university for attempting to satirize certain existing situations. Having met the Brother, and having watched him perform, I would

agree with you that he was easily the best dancer in the review. However, I would not agree that he was used at least not used in the sense that you would use the word. He was 'used' to make a point, which may or may not be valid, about the essential nature of beauty contests, and about the inherent hypocrisy of the KKK. Perhaps if you would peer outside of your psychological shells, you would see that what you would call 'white racism and white decadence' is really a reflection of your own movement's success. That a white person can laugh at what 30 years ago in Saskatchewan was a serious movement, that a white person can be forced to ask the questions that he must answer if real racism (and I would be the first to agree that racism is alive and well in Canada) is to be beaten, should be treated as a signpost of success. I am white. My grandfather fought the Zulus at Roarke's Drift in South Africa. Is that any reason why I should do the same?

Peter Robertson
Glendon III

Dennis Simpson replies to Horace Campbell

Sir:

I address the following thoughts to the Black Student Community and to the rest of the concerned York University Community.

A reaction to an article printed in the Feb. 12 issue of EXCALIBUR, was anticipated, and yet, another one is given. I have to write this, (not much mind you, but just as relevant as Horace Campbell's, and Anna Jovanovitch's thoughts); I have been placed in an extremely awkward position, and I think it is necessary for me — the centre of this tremor — to attempt to do something about it.

I must thank you, Mr. Campbell, for the communication. . . I got the message, but am afraid it was a muchly over-reacted, over-stated, and misinterpreted one. At all times, excluding one, I did not feel that I was: "used; was had; was taken; for your viewing, and listening pleasure."

On the occasion that I felt I was being used, I let the director know my beefs. . . he appreciated them, and that was the end of that. "Brother", as you call me, I hope to be an actor, entertainer, or what have you. No matter what color an entertainer is, he will be "had", and will be taken for your (even your) viewing and listening pleasure. You're right Mr. Campbell.

It was stated that the Brother was easily the best dancer and actor of the entire cast. Thank you very much. If, in your opinion, the Brother wasn't the best in the categories mentioned, the show, its bourgeois audience (which was attended by you), and the Brother would be criticized and blamed for yet, another racial act of discrimination.

At this time in my life, I am concerned with living. . . with discovery. And new

discovery usually hurts; this one did. I am black — I know it and you know it, but for God's sake, for mine, and for other people that you come in contact with, don't use it as an excuse and opportunity to capitalize on sensation.

I never considered myself as belonging to any tribe, and I probably won't even be considered as a possible member of the Party. . . but to quote, "that's their aesthetic bag."

I thank you all for the experience. . . I have certainly gained from it, and it is my hope that all of you have too. I will leave you with a thought:

Co-existence
or
No existence.

Dennis Simpson
Kumquat cast

Yes, manure does belong in the stable

Sir:

As an Atkinson student I came upon a copy of the Excalibur and read, once again, about poor Prof. Haggar. His statement that he can't find permanent work (at Waterloo or elsewhere) because of his anti-Israel stand is pure horseshit. It is convenient if the head of a department is a Jew to pull that crap. Haggar wasn't hired for 2 reasons: 1) he was an S.D. at his last college in the United States and administration is afraid what he might do here 2) he is dull.

Barry Callahan, Atkinson English, is outspokenly anti-Israel (and often anti other things dear to Jews, including Jews) and no one suggests he be fired. Prof. Haggar is an Arab and his anti-Israel statements would be weighed just the same way as a rabbi's pro-Israel statements, as coming from a biased and emotionally-involved participant in Middle East affairs. Prof. Callahan can appear to be 'neutral' and therefore 'fair' in his statements, and therefore far more damaging (and annoying). The Jewish community hasn't asked for Callahan's dismissal. Nor should we. Or would we or could we do so. Whatever else they may have in common the two faculty men differ in one respect. As a lecturer, Barry Callahan is anything but boring. A lot of other things, perhaps, but definitely no bore. Prof. Haggar cannot claim as much, unless it is his invective that excites. But invective, like masturbation, peaks after a time and interests droops.

If Prof. Haggar gets a good, permanent post at a university good for him. I, for one, might complain about what he says, but never his right to earn his living in his chosen profession, providing he has talent as well as desire. But enough of this Jew-are-out-to-stop-me-working S H I T. Manure belongs in the stable, not in the university.

Ray Havelock
Atkinson Soc. Major

Professor wasn't; really secretary

Sir:

On Feb. 12 you printed my letter with a heading on it saying: "Professor tells us what a Canadian is."

I am not a professor. I am a member of the secretarial staff. Please correct this error. I distinctly said I was a staff member in the letter.

You shouldn't take it for granted that secretaries don't know anything about our history and, our culture, and maybe a few other things as well.

Walt Whitman was a janitor. (We know something about America, too!)

Cecelia Wallace
Founders College

Love

and

Peace