Senate: victory or tokenism?

Before we order the champagne and light the victory bonfires we should take a cold shower and reflect a little on the implications of five student senators at York (five out of 104).

There are a number of disturbing facts that must be examined.

The York senate, on its own initiative, granted students this honor. Why?

Remember also that unlike other universities there was no great unified student voice pressuring the senate into this decision.

The senate acted before a committee, (senate-boardstudent) set up to study the role of the student in York governing bodies handed down its first report.

The ugly question arises, is our senate guilty of tokenism? Did our senate see the changing tide in Canadian universities and decide to swim with the current. Have we students been sucked in?

It has been the experience of the first student senators at the University of British Columbia that their four student seats granted them no real power, that students have gained no real say in the running of the university.

The Student Administrative Council at the University of Toronto told its senate that it is not interested in token representation.

Does the York senate think five seats on a 104-member body makes York a real 'community of scholars'?

Accusing the senate of tokenism is, of course, taking a hard line view and perhaps not fully justified, but York students should be aware of the possibility.

What now? York students must clarify in their own minds what they want. (This has never been done). They must decide if they want a constructive part to play in the university game, and if the answer is yes, then this move to put five students on the senate must be regarded as only the first step--and perhaps a conciliatory one at that.

York students, if they want a true 'community of scholars', must regard this as only an eye to the window. Whether the senate is guilty of tokenism or not, students must now demand that their five representatives report on senate proceedings, that the five must press for open senate meetings (the faculty has won that 'privilege', and that the five must insist students are given a more equitable number of seats.

Of course York students must also prove themselves worthy of taking part in the running of a university. (This has never been done.)



KINGSBURY OVERLOOKED

Dear Sir:

One thing I will say about Professor Kingsbury's article in the last issue of EX-CALIBUR ('They send her to the butcher shop') - it leaves no room for apathy! His attack was pointed, and his examples were vivid enough, no doubt, to stir many to oppose the 'butcher', he describes as he describes. I feel, however, that Kingsbury overlooked much.

It is indeed true that the younger generation lacks respect for the society of the older generation. The question is why. I think Professor

Kingsbury begs the question when he suggests we lack respect for that society because that society is unwil-ling to facilitate abortions. The question is not why that 'timid freshman' had to have a dangerous abortion or not even why she had to have an abortion or not even why she was pregnant, but why our universities (in fact, our whole society) are so impersonal that this girl was starved for security to the extent that she had to find it in such a relationship. Sure, we might make it safer for her abortion, but are we solving her real problems - problems of insecurity and alienation?

One word was conspicuously absent from Kingsbury's article - responsibility. One almost gets the impression pregnancy is an unavoidable contagious disease - completely isolated from the personal decisions of two young people.

I have watched one of my closest friends go through the problems of bringing an illegitimate baby into the world. As I read Professor Kingsbury's article I could not help but compare her attitude with the attitudes exhibited in many of his cases. Like many of the girls he describes, she was a victim of a world filled with insecurities. Like the examples, she was a victim of a world in which her religion, and her parents, could meet none of her real needs. And yet ... and yet...she feels that she is the one who is responsible for her situation. She feels that ultimately she had a choice; that she made her choice; and that now she must accept the consequences of that decision. She knows htat there is no easy solution for her problems (of the kind Professor Kingsbury's cases seem to be looking for.) She is determined to do what she can to help in the laborious task of changing society so that young people like herself will not look for security in an escapist relationship with a young man or, for that matter, in the sterility of a legal, hygenic abortion. She has a respect for life, a love of life which makes her realize that our society can not use it, in creating it and destroying it as it does, as a plaything. Yes, Professor Kingsbury, you and anyone else shocked by this 'butcher', judge this world which tor-tures and alienates and decide how we are going to stop the real causes of the torture and the alienation. Judge the world we have which uses human life as a plaything. Judge the responsibility and maturity displayed by Professor Kingsbury's cases and compare it with that of my friend and the many others who realize that pregnancy is not a contagious disease. Judge...and I am certain that you will agree with me that Professor Kingsbury has overlooked much! Maureen McNeil, Vanier I

we get letters.

STUMBLING IN THE DARK

Dear Sir:

Only a man, deaf and dumb, could fail to realize that the student 'politicians' of York have 'stumbled in the dark' this past year. However, the EXCALIBUR has little cause to adopt a 'holier than thou' attitude.

If the student councillors have thrown rationality to the winds, EXCALIBUR? and the Canadian University Press have just as surely sold out any vestige of journalistic integrity that remained.

In your January 12th issue in report on the Canadian University Press national conference you ask, 'Just what of

N THE DARK did they

did they decide?' Your report states that 'To start with, they admitted objective reporting was a myth and went on from there into what sort of slant a newspaper should take.'

I suppose one might have hoped that EXCALIBUR would've taken a stand against this position, but your January 12th issue makes it clear that, on the contrary, EXCALIBUR probably supported this totalitarian point of view.

On your front page, you laced your 'news' story on the SRC constitution meeting with editorial comment ('This is the 3rd year York students have endured a state of semi-anarchy while college councils stumbled in the dark.') Also to be found on the front page sadly disguised as a news story, was that pitiful attempt at satire entitled 'Will a new name make any difference?', the objective news content of which could have been conveyed in one short paragraph on page three or in the story, 'SRC meeting complete failure.'

Of course, most of us in university are aware that the daily press slants its news, sometimes subtly, some-times, like EXCALIBUR amateurs, crudely. However, their example does not mean that the ideal of objective news reporting is dead. Even the daily press, which pays lip service to objectivity, does a fair amount of reasonable, objective reporting. To reject objective news reporting as a goal, as CUP and EXCAL-IBUR have done in fact, is to declare yourselves to be nothing more than a lowly propaganda rag. Also, I believe it's time EXCALIBUR becomes a little less self-centered. Already, you have complained

in two editorials about Excalibur's lack of a telephone. Can your editorial 'writers' not find anything more significant to comment on. And last week, I see you waste editorial space pushing yourselves as York's answer to a central student government. 'Fred the First.' Good grief! Do you really think the 'Magic Circus' will lose their cool at seeing themselves on Excalibur's front page?

You infer in your January 12th editorial entitled 'York, you stupid university.' that Founders President, Mel Freedman's statement, 'I have no use for CUS,' is somehow linked to the chaotic state of student government here. How? Also, you yourselves have never at-

Excalibur -

editor-in-chief fred nix managing editor assistant editor associate editor news assistant news features entertainment sports photos clark hill assistant photos layout assistant layout bob elgie circulation office manager advertising

tred nix dave warga anita levine mike snook ross howard linda bohnen kandy biggs, gale campbell frank liebeck frank trotter clark hill rick argals richard levine bob elgie karen junke frances de angelis june carlson

excalibur was founded in 1966 and is published by the students of york university, opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the student councils or the university administration, excalibur is a member of canadian university press, circulation 4200.

room 019a, founders college, york university; downsview, ont. phone: 635-2363 Some velvet morning when I'm straight. ..Ross, are you opposed to getting a new printer? ...what style the kicker when the head's 62-24?...no, no,that's destroying the story. ..YOU'RE DESTROYING THE STORY!... Can't we get another staffer to help do this?...Crap, this writing is crap, it completely distorts the truth...thanks to Kerry, Claire, Bob, Wendy, Louise, Sam, Dave Cooper, and Sandy (layout people.) ging as justifying expenditures of York student funds on the Canadian Union of Students.

I'm not at all surprised that you 'get tired of harping' in editorials. Instead of always harping, why not present some well reasoned arguments once in awhile.

On one side of the legendary sword EXCALIBUR an inscription reads 'Take thou and Strike.' On the other side an inscription reads 'Cast Me Away.' If you continue to wield the 'EXCALIBUR' as ineffectively as a letter opener, hopefully York students will take the latter inscription to heart.

Yours sincerely, Ronald Graham Editor, Excalibur, 1966-67