

As for department chairmen, 33 per cent count as Canadian, 26 per cent as American, 26 per cent as British and 13 per cent other nationalities.

Even the academics who agree that the situation is undesirable (and not all do), don't agree on why.

According to David Hoffman, chairman of York's Social Science division, the situation "is more a criticism of our educational policies in the past." Canada, says Hoffman, "cheated" on education and training, preferring to import people from other countries, especially Britain. When Britain suddenly found herself forced to expand her university facilities, that source dried up and Canada had to look to the U.S.

Not only are there not enough Canadians to go around, says Hoffman, but "there are just very few who are equal competitors with the Americans." The American schools are better and the competition is stiffer. So if all things were equal Hoffman would hire a Canadian over an American — but they're rarely, if ever, equal. And even the good Canadians were frequently educated at least partially outside Canada.

Hoffman is Canadian and he regrets the situation: "I would like to see a majority of Canadians working in Canadian universities because I'd like to think that Canadians have the opportunity, that they're as good as other people, and that they'd prefer to teach at home."

But Hoffman is impressed with the Americans York is getting and says he's optimistic. "If I saw cases where Canadians had something to say and weren't being allowed to say it, I'd worry. Or if we were in the situation where Canadian subject matter were not being taught . . ."

But in some instances it isn't being taught.

The Humanities division, for instance, offers only one course in Canadian civilization, and that not until the third year which effectively limits its enrolment. Michael Creal, the head of the division, is Canadian, and would like such a freshman course — but says he doesn't have the personnel. "And fundamentally there is no tradition of Canadian culture studies at universities." The course that exists was set up on an exploratory basis and even though it's a success, Creal can't see a freshman course before 1971.

Not all academics are as optimistic as Hoffman or as calm as Creal. H.G. Thorburn, head of the political studies department at Queen's sees it this way: "It's a bit fantastic that a country imports a majority of foreigners to teach

its youth about politics. . . . We are developing an elite trained by a small cadre of social scientists who are teaching a particular core of values that are not rooted in our society's history and who don't necessarily understand or value our society."

Most Canadians find it difficult to define the Canadian identity and those who aren't concerned about the preponderance of foreigners frequently seize on this. If we don't know what we are, they say, then we can't be very different from anyone else, and so it doesn't matter who teaches us or what we're taught. That questionable conclusion aside, there is an entirely different cause for concern.

Canadian universities were originally patterned on the British tradition, which emphasize broadly-based undergraduate education, frequently, many say, to the detriment of graduate education. The American tradition, conversely, emphasizes solid graduate education, neglecting liberal arts undergraduate education. This neglect has undoubtedly contributed to student unrest in American colleges. The danger for Canada is that the influx of American professors will bring the American pattern with it, and that this pattern may not be desirable in the Canadian context. (Some, in fact, blame the unrest at Simon Fraser on this).

(Some, it must be noted, are optimistic on this score, too. David Hoffman feels a desirable synthesis is emerging from the British and American influences — a peculiarly Canadian pattern stressing both liberal arts education for undergraduates and rigorous graduate education. But he warns that the synthesis won't last unless Canadians are willing to pay for it — and that if they aren't the undergraduates will likely be the ones to suffer.)

On one thing everyone is agreed: Canadian universities and scholars won't come into their own before the late 1970's at the earliest. Only quotas will reduce the ratio of foreigners before then, and even if they could be justified to a majority of administrators their price would doubtless be academic excellence. The use of Canadian texts can be encouraged and the Canadian point of view (if it can be defined) stressed — but as one professor pointed out, you can't ask foreigners to forget their backgrounds and set aside their memories. Department chairman can be on the look-out for bright young Canadians and universities can try to raise the money to lure back to Canada those who have left. But time probably holds the only ultimate solution

the americanization of york

This report is the result of a one-month study of the American situation at York by Linda Bohnen, V2, Political Science major.

These statistics were compiled two weeks ago by Dean John Saywell's office. Figures are approximate, and refer to the country in which the faculty member has spent most of his life.

Dep't.	Computer Sci.	English	Economics	Foreign Lit.	French Lit.	Geography	History	Humanities	Mathematics	Philosophy	Poli. Sci.	Psychology	Soc. Sci.	Soc.	Ling. and Lang.	Chairmen in Fac. of Arts	Total faculty
Canada (%)	100	38	44	36	42	36	52	42	44	31	42	38	36	10	28	33	43
U.S. (%)	—	32	6	9	17	7	44	50	28	46	42	41	46	38	16	27	30
U.K. (%)	—	21	12	9	17	43	5	5	16	15	5	3	—	29	8	27	13
Other																	
Commonwealth (%)	—	9	12	—	—	7	—	—	—	8	5	3	9	9	—	—	.03
Other																	
Foreign (%)	—	—	25	45	25	7	—	3	11	—	5	16	9	9	48	13	9

York has 407 graduate students studying for MA and PhD degrees. According to place of origin they break down as follows:

Canada	224
U.S.	65
U.K.	48
Other foreign	70