

Conscience or Convenience..

After attending the open student meeting on November 22nd, it seemed to me that several important matters had not been made clear to the students before they were asked to cast their votes on the referendum.

One group of students wanted to bar the "War Companies," as we may call them for convenience, from recruiting on campus, and a second group believed they had a "right" to be interviewed by these Companies on campus. Other students spoke of the purpose of a University education.

To fight for a principle

The difficulty for the first group is that if they bar the War Companies, they must bar all other job recruiters from the campus. Is that really so terrible?

There is no cause to disbelieve Mr. Best when he says the NES is not allowed to discriminate between prospective employers. That seems a wise precaution of the Government, to avoid abuses which might arise. But this is where you, the students, come in. The NES apparently came on to campus at your request, and will betake itself elsewhere if you so desire. What an opportunity to demonstrate your true feelings in this matter!

The threat, then, is apparently valid and enforceable. And if and when enforced, what of the consequences to you? They are not so overpowering as you may have thought. There are other ways of seeking a job! You may go to the NES offices off campus; the Yellow Pages show offices at 4985 Yonge Street and in Yorkdale Plaza. You may approach prospective employers yourself directly (and you can certainly avoid those which your conscience tells you are not suitable

employers for you); or you can look out for and answer advertisements, just as non-University employees do. A very small penalty for doing what you believe to be right.

Listening to the second group — those who believed they had a "right" to be interviewed on campus — one would think that the first group were about to take away their livelihood. One could almost see the protesting student's poor starving wife and family! The answer to these is that you did not have the NES on campus as a "right" but only as a privilege, by invitation. You do have a right to their service, and you can have it whenever you have the energy to drive, ride or walk to the nearest NES office.

War is more than inconvenient

But do you really want to work for companies who make war materials? This is a question which your university education, and in fact all your previous education, should be helping you to solve. We know the arguments: these companies make useful things, too, and it is not your fault if some people use them for evil purposes. Almost everything that is manufactured can be used harmfully if one has the will. Agreed, but if you are a retailer of knives and a customer who is known to be threatening his neighbour, and may even have him by the throat, comes in to buy a knife, will you sell him one? If you do, and he uses it for murder, you are an accessory. Surely there are many other ways of earning a living.

I am not a member of the Committee to End the War in Viet Nam, but I am against war, anywhere. I calim a slight knowledge of it (no greater than that of thousands of other people)

since I was involved in the Second World War. It is hard to remember that the students at York are too young to know anything about that war, and there is nothing like personal experience to convince one. Someone told me that during the war years it was very hard to get sugar and gas in Canada. In case there are any who think that that is what war is about, I feel I must, though diffidently, cite a few instances from personal experience of the kind of "inconveniences" which can arise from war, even for the non-combatant.

... You may go up from shelter one morning after an all-night raid, and see the whole horizon on fire (very like Atlanta burning in "Gone with the Wind.")

... You may hear that thousands of people have been caught in a large local hall which was being used as an air-raid shelter, when it receives a direct hit.

There is the other side to consider, too. In April, 1945, I joined the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and was posted to France on VE Day. After four months there I finally went to my first field assignment in a Displaced Persons camp in Germany. On the way we passed one of the cities which had been most heavily bombed by the RAF. The destruction seemed to be total, but there were people living there ... and the stench was indescribable even then, four months after VE Day. Did I feel like a member of one of the nations of the Victorious Allies? No, my feeling was rather one of the deepest sorrow at the utter, mindless waste ... "the abomination of desolation" ... "Lord, what fools these mortals be!"

Elsie Hanna

Statement on parking signs illegally removed at York

Murray G. Ross

1. Two weeks ago I had a report from our Safety and Security Office that on Sunday night, November 3, a number of parking signs were torn or cut down. There were 12 double faced signs and 1 single faced sign reported missing and the cost of replacement was estimated to be \$550.00

2. Subsequently, five students signed a letter to Mr. Gerry Bloch (a student representative on the Parking Committee) indicating that they had removed some parking signs and were returning them to the University's gatehouse.

3. This incident took place at an awkward time for the University: a special committee of four (a Board member, a student, a member of faculty, and a staff member) was appointed last spring to study Section 13(2)(c) of the York University Act. This committee reported this fall recommending that many of the powers delegated by the Act to the President should be assigned to a committee of fifteen (eight elected students and seven members appointed by the President) and that this committee should have legislative and judicial powers in respect of student behaviour on campus. These recommendations have been accepted and this new committee is now in the process of being established. If it were in existence it would, of course, be asked to investigate and act on the matter of the parking signs.

4. In the absence of this committee, I appointed an ad hoc committee chaired by Mr. Henry Best, with Professor James Cutt and the Presidents of the various college and faculty student councils as members. This ad hoc committee was asked to ascertain the facts and to recommend the course of action to be followed. The committee has now reported to me. There is a majority and a minority report, the latter agreeing on the facts but disagreeing on the committee's ability or right to make a recommendation based on the facts. The majority view (agreed to by six of the nine members) is remarkably close to my own judgment of the action which I am required to take.

5. There are three aspects of the situation on which I wish to comment:

(a) The following students are clearly implicated: John Adams, Larry Englander, Marshall Green, Glen Murray, Larry Rapoport, John Bosley, Alan Mann, and Keith Oleksuk. They admit, however to taking only six of the 13 missing signs. I am advised that if recourse were taken in the Courts, these acts could involve penal as well as civil consequences. I believe an appropriate decision in the circumstances is to require these students to pay for the replacement of the signs they admit taking and to pay a fine of \$25.00 each. The fines so paid will be used for a student bursary.

(b) It is apparent that this was not a mere prank, but was a deliberate, overt, and illegal act to demonstrate that the persons involved disagreed with certain parking regulations. We have at York University make remarkable progress in reform and this

has been achieved by long and often tiresome committee discussion by students, faculty, and Board members. But progress we have made; and we are closer to being an open society than most universities on the continent. There is a locus for discussion of almost every problem, and there is a disposition in most of our committees to be flexible and responsive to reasonable requests. We have a long way to go, of course, but the advances made have been considerable. In effect, the students named above disregard the hard work and achievements of many of their predecessors who laboured persistently to bring about reform; they disregard the opportunity open to them to present their arguments rationally to others in the University; they disregard certain fundamental rights of others embodied in the laws of the country. This I find disturbing. Such actions deny the value and essential nature of the democratic process. I know that direct

action against any law considered "immoral" is urged upon students by a number of groups outside the University. I would hope that University students would recognize the danger of such activity; indeed, they might see how similar some of the current phrases and actions of radical student activists are to those used by many devoted to violence as a way of life. Force, violence, and illegal activities should not be tolerated in the University as the means to achieve change. I would hope that at York we will all agree that change can be induced by rational discussion and through the democratic process.

(c) It has been suggested to me that the actions taken by the students named above was a formal action of the York Student Council. If this was so, it was not considered by me in reaching the decision I have already reported. I know, of course, that five of the students are members of the Executive Committee of the York Student Council but my

decision relates to them as individuals and not as members of the Council. I consider their actions quite irresponsible and I believe that inevitably because of the positions they hold on the Council, they have adversely affected the reputation of the Council.

I doubt if the students at York would condone their actions, but they York Student Council is a body created by the students of the university, and it is the responsibility of the students who finance the Council and elect its officers to assure themselves that their council in its program and activities represents the wishes and convictions of the students at York.

In short, it is the students of the University, and not I, nor any committee appointed by me, that should decide the degree of responsibility, if any, that the York Student Council has for this incident.

Murray G. Ross
President, York University

Letters Letters

the student body to show a lack of confidence in the whole student activist movement. The vote is not just whether the silent majority of us feel the same as the vocal minority. A vote in favor of free recruitment will in the minds of the activists make York an accomplice to mass murder. If they are so appalled at such a decision as they say they are, they would be obliged to divorce themselves of any connection with such a sinful institution and head for some puritan university elsewhere. By the stand they have taken they would be forced to shut up or get out — this means you too Prof. Lorch.

As one who usually says little on any issue around here, I appeal to the whole student body to be sure and vote on Dec. 10, and show where the university really stands.

L. Balmer V III

Council Report

We still need students for the various committees outlined last week. If you are looking for ways to get involved in and to help strengthen, the committee system, this is it.

Next council meeting is Tues. Dec. 10, at 7:00 p.m. in Vanier's Master's Dining Room. All are welcome. Constitutional amendments will be discussed.

A view from the bottom of the pile

by Larry Goldstein

Open Letter to the Right Honourable William Davis, Minister of Education
Dear Sir:

You may remember that I talked with you at some length in the spring of 1967 about the nature of education in this province. At that time, I was president of the Glendon Student Council. Since then I have spent nearly a year abroad and am presently enrolled at York University.

I fear a major confrontation is in the making here due to the incompetence and total lack of understanding of students by the administration. I am writing to you in the hope that your office may be able to act to head it off.

This fall the student council at Glendon asked for a mild restructuring of the academic year but were thoroughly discredited and demoralized by a rigid and uncomprehending administration. A few weeks ago the executive of the York Student Council, as a symbolic protest, removed some faculty and staff only parking signs. The president of this university, ignoring the type of injustice being protested, and the underlying motives involved, squashed them. His action can only call into question his competence to fulfil his duties.

By taking punitive action as he did, instead of accomplishing valid goals, he is pushing the alienated students towards violent and antisocial behaviour, which can only escalate from the harmless to the really destructive.

I should point out that the disaffected students and faculty are in a minority at this campus, but that this minority feels most strongly about many issues. For instance, many students and a large number of staff feel that the college system that is costing the province so much extra money is nothing but a hoax. A student can no more relate to a one thousand member college than he can to a multi-versity if he has no real say in the decisions that are taken that affect his life. Our present administration can't seem to comprehend that fact.

The waste of money, resources, buildings, land, and most important, people, that goes on here every day is appalling. The authoritarian nature of the regime here can only eventually push responsible students into open rebellion. Irresponsible statements like those made in the president's report, as quoted in the Globe and Mail can only hasten the process.

Soon your office will be petitioned for more money. Before you allow those petitions, you should seriously investigate the nature of York University. It is my contention that millions of taxpayer's dollars are being spent to give numerous students a non-education.

It may be an enlightening experience for those here, if the men who make policies behind closed doors are forced to defend those policies in public.

It is certain to be education.

Yours truly,
Larry Goldstein