

# York becomes playpen

By BOB FORSYTH

Bob Forsyth is the former president of Winters College council. Below he gives some reasons for his recent resignation.

At a meeting of a College Council two weeks ago, a member was asked to give an outline of what was evidently considered to be an "extra-council" undertaking. He gave a short and rather unimpassioned account of the progress of the Edgeley Project, in which students from York help out at a nearby free school. His account being finished, he awaited comments.

No real discussion followed. The apparent attitude of the room was 'so what'? What has a children's program got to do with the ultimately important aspects of this council?

When one student came right out and said that such matters should not be of concern to a college council, it was expected that at least some token reaction against his remark would come from the room. But none came. The issue was passed over and the meeting went on to study the athletic budget.

Sitting in swivel chairs in a walnut panelled room, this "political body" discussed ways to further increase the padding of their kindergarten. And so they committed themselves to the incredible pattern of student government on this campus.

C.Y.S.F. maintains that college councils should be purely function fulfilling bodies. The federation should deal with all internal and external political matters. The C.Y.S.F. may have some idea of the social arena in which they are operating, but their offhand treatment of college councils is a mistake.

It is amazing that the C.Y.S.F. people do not find their approach to colleges in contradiction to their personal perspectives. The council that deals with the national problem of Americanization, the social problem of birth control, and the institutional problem of rights and responsibilities should expect more from their constituent members.

This is not to say that the C.Y.S.F. should demand more of the councils. After all, college councils have the childish power of destroying the federation. But for a politically and socially concerned group of people, the C.Y.S.F. should in no way condone and foster the various constituent councils' philandering of funds.

This university is fast becoming one great playpen. When a student says that his college council is offering him nothing, he is in effect saying that he does not have enough to play with. Every year, each of the four large colleges spends approximately \$21,000 to entertain the masses. As entertainment techniques become more sophisticated, the university becomes a more sophisticated kindergarten.

The notion of the university as an institution of social change is still widely held among York's members. Yet they allow, and approve, the expenditures of vast sums of money devoted to nothing more than tenable pleasures.

No one can deny that there is some value in social activities and pleasant surroundings. Certainly, in their absence, the often oppressive bullshit of academia would become intolerable. To say, however, that it is not the duty of a college council to concern itself with the real world, is to say nothing more than pass the candy.

Unless college councils are willing to recognize even their verbal responsibility to the people of the Ontario community from which they come, then no student should blindly consent to paying \$17 for their continuance. C.Y.S.F. must begin to question the value of failing to accept their responsibility.

Students are admittedly a privileged lot. The best we can hope to do is to not make our luxuries offensively obvious, and to begin concerning ourselves with the vast world of education that exists beyond our walls.

## An open letter

# Rally: success and failure

It is with mixed feelings that I reflect on the rally in support of Canada held at York University. In this open letter I would like to present my reasons for this ambiguity in my judgment.

The advertised purpose of the rally was to "support Canada" and to "show the world we care". I, and apparently many others, attended the rally in this spirit. We wished to express grief for the Laporte family and to support Canada and its government. Further, I believe that many of us wished to endorse with out attendance the principle that civilized men do not instigate violence and murder in an effort to impose their views and ideals on others; the principle that civilized men reason together when faced with

that divilized men have formed governments and laws as the morally proper institutions through which to retaliate when such violence occurs.

In the face of the FLQ's blatant and grotesque rejection of these fundamental principles of civilization, the proper function of the rally and the speeches was to express support for these general principles.

The crisis that faces us is, in essence, a threat to government per se as a civilized institution. It is not merely a threat to Canada's government at this point in time, it is a threat to civilization itself. In the face of such a crisis that first responsibility of intellectuals is to

explicitly restate and re-endorse the general principles of moral and civilized behaviour.

In the context of our present crisis this is, first and foremost, what "supporting Canada" means. Consequently, this is what could reasonably be expected from the rally and from the speakers. The ambiguity in my reflections is rooted in my observation that, in terms of this standard, the rally succeeded but the speakers failed.

The net result was that many who attended in a search for moral reassurance went away justly feeling cheated.

Instead of explicitly endorsing the principle of govern-retaliation to terrorism, most of the speakers chose to criticize the government's use of the War Measures Act as being a threat to our civil liberty. This implicitly casts our government, and not the FLQ, in the role of villain.

Instead of explicitly renouncing the initiation of terror, some speakers chose to express general criticism of Canada's social conditions. In the context of our profound crisis this implicitly shifts moral censure from the FLQ to Canada at large. I totally reject such connotations.

Further, without losing sight of the fact that the issues raised by these speakers deserve serious attention at some other forum, raising criticisms of Canada in the context of this rally was inappropriate.

If basic speakers had first addressed themselves to endorsing basic principles they would have established a "support Canada" context in the light of which their raising these criticisms could be judged as misplaced. The fact that they chose to criticize without explicitly establishing this context renders them intellectually and morally in error in their use of the platform and audience provided them.

These speakers misused the occasion and betrayed both the purpose of the organizers and the hopes of the audience. In effect, they attacked rather than supported Canada, they flirted with implicitly sanctioning the terrorists and their acts, and they changed the whole tone of the rally.

Going even further, they condemned the audience repeatedly for its expressions of indignation, thus attributing to the audience a blind, emotional fanaticism they were unwilling to attribute even to the terrorists.

Out of respect for the audience it should be stated that being reasonable is perfectly consistent with being morally outraged at the murder of Laporte. There are good grounds for regarding moral indignation as virtuous rather than as reprehensible, in which case the audience deserves respect, not censure.

In concluding this letter I would like to congratulate the student organizers of the rally for their efforts and for their intent to "show support for the Federal and Quebec governments during this very serious Canadian crisis".

I congratulate also Professor Eaton who addressed the appropriate issues and openly refused to join his fellow speakers in apologizing for our government. In so doing he salvaged the original intent of the rally.

Professor Eaton remarked that "you can't play with revolution". Hopefully, this remark will serve as a sombre reminder to us that the horror and terror of those weeks is merely the opening scenario of a lengthy and bloody opera which those who advocate violent destruction of our present way of life wish to see performed in all divilized countries.

D. Lawrence Todd  
Law I. Osgoode

John B. Ridpath  
Lecturer

# A PARABLE OF PIGS

By DOUGLAS STUTSMAN

There once was a pig farm that was operated by an old farmer, his son, and a hired man. The farmyard was filled with hundreds of pigs of all sizes, and they all ate their swill from a huge trough. The big hogs ate faster than the little ones, but they had bigger bellies to fill, and when the swill was finally gone all the pigs were content. One day some of the biggest hogs jumped into the trough, and the swill spilled over the sides. Some of the little pigs did not get enough to eat, because they could not lap up all the spilled swill before it soaked into the ground. The farmers saw the swill overflowing, and they were greatly upset.

The old farmer had learned his agricultural theory in the old Classical School, and he knew that when swill overflowed a trough there was too much swill in the trough. He did not see the big hogs in the trough, and he did not notice that some of the little pigs were hungry because he had been taught that hogs do not jump into troughs and that little pigs do not go hungry (unless they are too lazy to eat).

The farmer's son had been educated in the new Keynesian School of agricultural theory, but he saw the problem much as his father did, for he too had learned that spilling swill means too much swill, and, like his father, he did not see the big hogs in the trough, for he too had been taught that hogs do not jump into troughs. But unlike his father, he knew that little pigs sometimes were forced to go hungry. (He was fond of joshing his father by reminding him of the notorious pig famines of the past and thus revealing the absurdity of the Classical "hungry pig-lazy pig" theory.) But at first the son did not notice the hungry pigs either, because he knew that pigs do not go hungry unless there is too little swill, when quite obviously the present problem was too much swill, i.e., spilling swill.



The son had recently reached manhood and had taken over management of the farm, and so the problem was his to solve. The next day he put less swill in the trough, and sure enough the overflowing stopped.

But soon they noticed that the trough was overflowing again, and they were greatly distressed. When they put in enough swill to feed all the pigs, the trough overflowed, and when they took out enough to stop the overflowing some of the little pigs starved. They found nothing in either the Classical or the Keynesian theory to explain and solve the problem.

They worried about it constantly and came to call it the "spilled swill/hungry pig dilemma." They became desperate and tried all sorts of ingenious procedures in an attempt to find a solution. They tried pouring in the swill from either side of the trough and from both sides simultaneously; they poured swill in one end while the hired man scooped it out the other, and they even tried running up to one side of the trough and acting as if they were going to empty their buckets and then hurrying around and pouring them in the other side, but still the dilemma remained; and it appeared to be getting more severe, because more big hogs were jumping into the trough. (Of course neither father nor son noticed the big ones in the trough, because they both had learned that hogs do not jump into troughs.)

Finally desperation turned to resignation, and they lost all hope of finding a solution. Instead they tried to find some balance, some acceptable compromise. They sought that combination of spilled swill and hungry pigs that would be preferable to all other combinations, but they could not agree. When the son was at the farm he instructed the hired man to pour in enough swill to keep all the pigs from starving, for if the "new" agricultural theory had taught him anything, it was that pig famines were unnecessary. But when the son had to be away and the father was in charge, he instructed the hired man to pour in less swill so that the trough would not overflow, for the father still suspected that hungry pigs were lazy pigs.

The simple hired man had never been to school and was completely innocent of agricultural theory. He had great respect for both father and son and was awed by their obvious learning, but sometimes he wondered quietly why they did not pull the big hogs out of the trough.