

# Survival tactics

Thirteen ways to survive essay/exam hell:

1. Run down Steeles Ave. with an arm load of jelly doughnuts yelling "OH!" at the top of your lungs.
3. Imagine the fun you would have working at McDonald's for the rest of your life.
5. Get lots of natural light and maintain a good relationship with your Mom or Dad or both if you are so inclined.
4. Make sure your medicine cabinet is full of essentials: aspirin, Penaten cream for hives, eye drops, A5-35 for typing elbow, antihistamine, sleeping pills, waking pills, birth control devices (sex relieves tension), potato chips and bubble gum.
6. Vote early! Vote often! in *Excalibur's* mascot elections.
7. Alphabetize your tupperware.
8. Go to the dentist.
9. Sleep. Cry. Poke a friend in the eye. (Some members of the *Excalibur* editorial board do not agree with this statement.)
11. Pretend you are the president of the CYSF and organize a protest.
2. Find a comfortable place to lie down. Breathe deeply but evenly. Imagine all of the tension leaving your body. Then eat about a million chocolate chip cookies.
10. Shout at complete strangers in foreign languages.
12. Avoid making long distance telephone calls.
13. Think up excuses for not having your essay in on time, like: "I left it in my unlocked car in lot 1A and it was stolen."

This is the list of eligible voters for the 1990-91 *Excalibur* editorial election. If your name does not appear on this list and you feel it should, talk to Nancy and Heather.

Jeannine Amber	Shaun Lacob
Roslyn Angel	Linda Lake
Trevor Burnett	Donna Mason
Frank Cameron	Stephen Mitchell
Jennifer Crane	Ira Nayman
Paul Gazzola	Stephen Perry
Brian Gold	Josh Rubin
Kristy Gordon	Riccardo Sala

Andrew Goss	Jennifer Salter
Michele Greene	Jason Schwartz
Tania Hewett	André Souroujon
Mary Jankulak	J.A. Stephen
Howard Kaman	Susan Vanstone
Jacob Katsman	Daniel Wolgelerenter
Anton Katz	Mark Wright
Jeff Kippel	Toby Wunch

## EXCALIBUR

Editor	Nancy Phillips
Assistant Editor	Heather Sangster
Production Manager	Stephen Perry
News Editors	Susan Vanstone, Daniel Wolgelerenter
Arts Editors	Jeannine Amber, Roslyn Angel
Sports Editors	Jacob Katsman, Josh Rubin
Features Editor	Howard Kaman
Photography Editors	Jason Schwartz, André Souroujon
Illustrations	Frank W. Cameron, Jennifer Moore
Production Staff	Richard Abel, Andrew Goss
Staff	Melissa Di Marco, Paul Gazzola, Kristy Gordon, Michele Greene, Katarina Gulej, Tania Hewett, Jim Hoggett, Anton Katz, Donna Mason, Stephen Mitchell, Ira Nayman, Sal Nensi, Derek Poley, Jim Russel, Riccardo Sala, Jennifer Salter, J.A. Stephan, Brian Tait, Dave Tompkins, Sid "Midnight" Tyson, Tobi Wunch
Advertising Manager	Merle Menzies
Advertising Assistant	Jeff Kippel
Advertising Rep	Meiyin Yap
Typesetters	Mary Jankulak, Shaun Lacob
Board of Publications Chairperson	Kevin Connolly

EDITORIAL 736-5239  
TYPESETTING 736-5240  
ADVERTISING 736-5238

MAILING ADDRESS  
Room 111, Central Square  
York University  
4700 Keele Street  
Downsview M3J 1P3



The kittens found in Winters cafeteria last week have found a temporary home in residence.

## letters

We will publish, space permitting, letters up to 500 words. They must be typed, doubled spaced, accompanied by the writer's name and phone number. Libellous material will be rejected. Deliver to 111 Central Square during business hours.

### Sorority apologizes for poster furor

Dear Editors:

I am both amazed and embarrassed at the furor caused by the poster that was jointly created and distributed by Delta Kappa Gamma Sorority and Phi Delta Theta Fraternity. I wish to assure my fellow students that at no time did we intend the message to be sexist or offensive. I deeply regret that the poster has been construed in this manner and wish to apologize for any misunderstanding on behalf of Delta Kappa Gamma.

Karen Steckoll  
President  
Delta Kappa Gamma Sorority

### Writer responds to critique

Ken Shorley's name was lost on the way to the printer. He wrote a letter to the editor entitled, "Les Miz reviewer called elitist," which was published March 15.

Dear Editor:

This is a response to Ken Shorley's letter in opposition to my March 6 critique of *Les Miserables*.

I strongly agree with Shorley's suggestion that he should ponder my critique again to make sure that he hasn't misread me.

However, I'd like to point out just a couple of the chasms in his argument:

Re: "Your article almost implies that any non-white patron would not be welcomed at *Les Miserables*."

I call things as I see them. A lack of visible minorities in the audience says a lot about the social setting of a show like *Les Miz*. It is not that minorities "would not be welcomed," as Shorley suggests, but there are far deeper social implications involved that I could discuss with him over coffee some time if he can't figure them out.

Re: "... your article has forgotten what *Les Miz* really is: ENTERTAINMENT. (That's it.)"

Shorley seems to have missed my point. The performance of *Les Miz* can indeed be entertaining. So is the performance of a cat with a ball of wool. However, he should take up his own offer to reread my critique and will then be likely to find that I've nothing negative to say about the performance itself — just the setting.

And even so — is that really all that *Les Miz* is about? Entertainment? Look again, Shorley. Shows like *Les Miz* have become big business, inherently tied to the mega-industries of advertising and marketing. So think again when you are 'suddenly' overcome by the desire to see a show like *Les Miz*. You just might find a similarity to the reasoning behind choosing Tide over ABC.

Re: "Renounce your whiteness to the world. Give all your worldly possessions to charity."

That's asking a bit much, don't you think? I think I'll do my bit by not giving my dollars to shows like *Les Miz*, thanks.

Re: "Don't write until you can be objective..."

If Shorley's definition of objective is 'giving the facts without bias' then I'm sorry, but I'll have to pass and leave such boring rhetoric with the bleeding-heart liberals. My definition of objectivity,

however, is the idea of observing a subject from *outside* and then relating to it. I'm sorry Shorley but given a poll I think most people would agree that my critique was in fact quite objective. What is criticism if it is *not* objective? Shorley should open up his eyes to the real world, and he might be surprised to find that even the finest journalism (you know, 'just the facts') is objective as well.

Re: "See another perspective." I just did

Darren Alexander

### Prof. Barrett criticizes Doucette's "dribble"

Dear Editor:

May I comment on a reference to me by your writer, Tim Doucette (*Excalibur*, Tuesday, February 20, 1990: 6). Mr. Doucette refers to "Stanley Barrett, the Neo-Nazi and author of *Is God A Racist?*" I am profoundly disturbed that a university student (I assume he is one) would make such a libellous comment without checking his sources, or consulting some of the local experts at York University on the analysis of racism, such as Professor Frances Henry.

One might almost think that Mr. Doucette had not read my book. Indeed, in a letter of apology to me, he states exactly that: he had not read my book, and penned his dribble solely on the basis of the title. In my book — a study of the right wing in Canada — I describe the peculiar process by which some formerly left-wing individuals, with a penchant for superficial analysis and sweeping claims about the world scene, have swung over to become avid

cont'd on p.3