

LETTERS

cont'd from page 4

University) and Daphne Gottlieb Taras (Research Coordinator at York University at time that the article was written).

Fletcher points out that very little socialism appears on the pages of our newspapers. "Even as mild a challenge as that mounted by the New Democratic Party (NDP) is too much for most editorial boards. Editorial endorsements for the NDP are so rare as to be noteworthy," Fletcher says. Fletcher also clarifies who owns all of our newspapers: large capitalistic corporations such as Southam and Thomson who "own 54 dailies with more than half the daily circulation." David, do you honestly think corporations such as these actually support socialism? I rest my case.

Mr. Pengelly, if you are in first year and have never written an essay, I suggest an essay workshop so that you can avoid academic probation next year. If you are in second, third or fourth year... well, just how did you get there?

Kevin MacNeill

Thanks Megan Thompson

Dear Editor:

Thank God someone like Megan Thompson, Artistic Director of Stong College, is looking out for my standards and morality. It would be scary to think of the possibilities of letting the poor ignorant masses to make their own decisions about what they want to see and hear. Imagine the carnage that would be wrought by free-thinking individuals that are imbedded with the idea that there is another way of life beyond the realm of Dynasty or Dallas. People just can't be allowed to make their own moral decisions. That would undermine the moral fabric of this great country of ours, what's that you say Mr. Hnatyshyn.

Seriously folks, let's grow up and act like the adults that this institution was built for. Censorship by any other name is still censorship. Nobody should be allowed to make sweeping moral judgements about what the rest of us should or should not see. It is an unfortunate attitude that prevades much of the thinking of Canadian society that people should be protected from themselves. I would be very interested to see the surveys that Miss Thompson has done that tell her what the code of ethics is at York University. Miss Thompson speaks much about her responsibility to her college and the University. I value responsibility highly, but only were it is well placed and appropriate. I think that Miss Thompson's responsibility is to the students of this University. Miss Thompson I would like to introduce you, Mary Brown.

Ken McCrimmon

York's moral voice

Editor,

I would like to thank Megan Thompson, the artistic director of Samuel Beckett Theatre, for writing her letter which was published on November 26 in The Excalibur. It left no doubt that she is in fact censoring plays at Samuel Beckett. Her letter shocked me. It did a better job of exposing the truth of her censorship than any article I could have ever written.

Ms. Thompson claimed that I "misquoted and misinterpreted" her statements. I taped my entire interview with Ms. Thompson, as she is well aware. If she is denying that she said the approval clause would prevent controversial or sexually explicit material or that it is "just a precaution in case someone wants to put on Caligula" among a plethora of similar comments then I'd be

happy to play the tape for her or anyone else.

Ms. Thompson professes that she can only approve the plays which are to be presented at Samuel Beckett, and therefore she is not censoring, since she is not editing the texts line by line. According to *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* censor is, "the official power to suppress whole or parts of Books, plays, films, etc." Is it me or does this sound familiar?

Ms. Thompson's dig at my alleged sexual practices (regarding the reading of Penthouse) is the best indicator of how she views her position as artistic director and censor. By belittling people who read Penthouse Ms. Thompson elevates herself above them, her values become legitimate while their morals become perverse. She considers herself morally superior to people who read Penthouse; it's a sweeping judgement that she has no compunctions about making.

Megan Thompson has appointed herself the moral voice of York University. Thompson, along with a few Stong Council members, have the exclusive right to approve pieces of theatre on moral grounds. It has always been my impression that this was the audience's responsibility. Thompson sees nothing wrong with imposing her values on the 40,000 people who make up the York population. In my article I did not advocate the unnecessary use of vulgarity, although I am not against it, I merely exposed a person who says it is her right to determine what other adults can or cannot see. People should be free to measure the value of art by their own standards, not by the standards of a pious censor. There are federal and provincial obscenity laws to govern gray areas, there is no reason to create more here at York.

Megan Thompson says it is her duty to decide what is "unnecessarily vulgar" before it is performed, and yet proposes that the York audience will be the arbiters of what is produced at Samuel Beckett.

Perhaps a sign post of the muddled nature of Ms. Thompson's epic letter was the constant reference to a mythical responsibility to college, university, and the creator. Responsibility to do what? Keep her idea of what is vulgar off 'her' stage. As I waded through Ms. Thompson's grammar I found this hard to discern, but to be honest she is probably not too sure herself.

However we should consider ourselves lucky, after all Megan Thompson is not going to censor plays line by line, just as a whole. And her personal view of what is or is not obscene is really society's view of what is acceptable. And as long as we don't read Penthouse, we'll be allowed in 'her' theatre. We should all be grateful we have Megan Thompson to decide what we can or cannot see in a university theatre.

Andrew Clark

Marchant shows ignorance

Dear Editor,

I am writing to you to publicly redress an incident that occurred at a meeting of the Council of the York Student Federation (CYSF) on Wednesday evening, November 25. The purpose of the meeting was to allow various students clubs and activities to comment on CYSF's recently released funding plan for the aforementioned organizations. Radio York has requested funding for this year to help compensate the initial cost of FM transmission equipment. It was the decision CYSF not to offer any funding to Radio York.

On the evening of November 25, the Council was questioned by individuals in attendance at the meeting as to why no funding was offered to Radio York. Julie Marchant, CYSF's Director of Finance stated that Radio York had the means to support itself. But when questioned further as to when the last time CYSF offered funding to Radio York, Marchant responded by claiming that two years ago the Council gave Radio York a \$50,000 interest-free

loan, which had since been paid back. Such a statement is GROSSLY FALSE!

In actual fact, CYSF attempted to charge Radio York \$30,000 in the fall of 1984 to transfer ownership of all broadcast equipment that had accrued in Radio York's offices and studios. The real value of equipment that was in working order and salvageable for FM broadcasting was close to \$6,000. After lengthy negotiations, Radio York paid \$5,000 to CYSF for the transfer of all assets to the newly independent and incorporated York Campus Radio Inc. (Radio York).

For Julie Marchant to state to the leaders and representatives of York's student governments and clubs that two years ago CYSF gave Radio York a \$50,000 interest-free loan is an act of shocking ignorance. This incredulous statement is quite simply beyond any acceptable limits of incompetence. What is even more alarming is that the individual who made the statement is the Director of Finance of an organization that controls over one-quarter of a million dollars of the students' money at York University.

I thank-you for the opportunity to set the record straight.

Sincerely,

Mel D. Broitman
Station Manager/President
CHRY

Marchant rebuts charges

Dear Editor:

I am writing this letter in response to one written by Mr. Mel Broitman, Station Manager of Radio York. Mr. Broitman forwarded a letter to myself last week and warned me that it would appear in Excalibur as it had been sent to the editor. I thank him for his consideration. Mr. Broitman alleges that at the CYSF Council meeting of November 25th, I stated that two years ago the Council gave Radio York a \$50,000 interest free loan. If Mr. Broitman had seen fit to attend the Council meeting he would have realized that I did not say this at all. In fact when questioned as to the last time CYSF had funded Radio York (CYSF) I stated that I believed there had been some financial arrangement two years ago but that I did not have the specific information with me and was unclear of the nature of the arrangement. At that point Doug Bies, Director of Services and Communications, addressed the question. It was Mr. Bies who mentioned an interest free loan but he too, stressed that he was unsure of the particular situation and would have to look up the information. When questioned further about the amount of the loan, Mr. Bies suggested the figure of \$50,000. What Mr. Bies was referring to what was an agreement between CYSF and CHRY that was drawn up in 1982. The agreement stated that CYSF would transfer licensing and operation of the Radio Station from its own management to that of CHRY as a separate entity. CHRY was to buy equipment at a cost of \$30,000 from CYSF and pay CYSF in interest-free installments. The agreement was never signed and it was finally agreed that Radio York would pay CYSF \$5,000 for the equipment. Obviously Mr. Bies was mistaken about the nature of the agreement but he made it quite clear to Council that he was unsure of the particulars and was merely attempting to recall the agreement.

Mr. Broitman's letter is inaccurate and it is apparent that his real beef is the lack of funding. I feel that it is necessary to outline CYSF's position on funding Radio York. The CYSF budget allocated \$60,000 for funding to various clubs and services on campus. We chose not to fund Radio York for several reasons. First of all it is not standard to fund Radio York. Since CYSF released operation of the station to CHRY we have not funded them. Second, Radio York recently held a referendum that resulted in their levy increasing to \$4.50 per student. Why

cont'd on page 6



HOW CAN YOU SAVE

33%

ON YOUR NEXT TRAIN TICKET?

- Pretend your father owns the company.
- Answer a skill-testing question.
- Show your student card.

The train's definitely the smart way to travel. Even smarter these days with VIA's student fares. Just show us your student card and you're on your way, 1/3 richer. Have a relaxing ride. Meet some new friends. And let the good trains roll!

For more information and reservations, call your Travel Agent or VIA Rail. VIA's student fares are available to full time students. Some conditions apply regarding times and dates of travel. Ask for details.

Next time, choose VIA.



CLIP!

For an out-of-sight trip

You could win one of 24 VIA CANRAIL-PASS worth \$420 each. Just fill out the entry coupon and mail to the address below. Contest rules are available at VIA and the list of winners will be available after January 1st, 1988.

Win a Canrailpass
VIA Rail Canada
1700 Autoroute Laval
Laval, Québec
H7S 2E1

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

TEL. NO. _____

AGE _____

SCHOOL _____