



One of Western's finest prepares for speeding students.

Atkinson faculty debate

York gives one viewpoint

York political scientist Ian Lumsden last Thursday charged that York is giving students only one ideological viewpoint.

At a meeting of Atkinson college council, Lumsden, editor of the book, *Close the 49th Parallel* etc., said almost all faculty at Atkinson are "conventional liberals" who do not look at root problems of society but deal only with "symptoms."

Historians and political scientists engage in "endless studies of elites and prime ministers" but "not the masses."

He charged that "questions of ethnic minorities, questions of French Canada, questions of labor ... and Canada's complicity in the American empire ... have not been dealt with adequately."

He said radical Canadian nationalists, like himself, "are addressing ourselves to problems that liberals will not deal with."

In the Atkinson economics department "there is one type of economics being taught," Lumsden said, alluding to the fact that professors deal with economics from a free enterprise rather than socialist point of view.

These economists never look at the relationship of "power to economic theories," he charged.

A typical method of co-optation, Lumsden said, is the university's hiring of token radicals to offset criticism such as his.

The university can then say, "we have a Gabriel Kolko, therefore we don't need any more American radicals," he explained.

In history "Canadian courses were being downplayed in comparison to courses on Europe," he said.

"There is not one course given in this college ... on French Canada."

Other faculty present said a course would be given next term.

Most of the Atkinson faculty did not agree with Lumsden's contention that York is an ideological institution.

English professor, Barry Callaghan, charged Lumsden with being pious and said, "I don't know what you're talking about."

Another professor said "there are ten points of view," at Atkinson, not just one.

Another pointed out "some of us are very progressive liberals, some of us are reactionary liberals."

A British professor attacked Lumsden's nationalism. "I think he's a threat. He's going to scare away people."

W.B. Carter, who at the begin-

ning of the meeting tried to find a loophole in the Atkinson constitution to prevent Lumsden from speaking, supported the influx of American professors at York.

"There are many people who come here because they don't like what's going on in the States," he said.

Earlier Lumsden, a former Britisher, suggested that such people might also leave Canada if the going gets tough.

"Canada is my home," Lumsden said. "If Canada does not work ... I do not intend to scuttle back to England."

He suggested some people, on the other hand, are keeping "one foot across the border."

A former Scottish professor, now a Canadian citizen, supported Canadian nationalism by saying citizens should hold all senior positions in Canadian universities. "I want to be part of a community that is Canadian," she said.

Parking tried in court

An Osgoode Hall law student is preparing to take York University to the Ontario Supreme Court over a parking ticket.

Andy Roman, who is now appealing the ticket, claims York has "no legal right" to fine students for parking violations or withhold marks if students refuse to pay those fines.

If the university rejects his appeal Roman says he will ask for a court injunction to prevent York from distributing tickets.

At its regular meeting Tuesday the Council of the York Student Federation voted to pay Roman's legal costs "up to \$500."

Roman says if he wins the test case any student who has paid parking fines will be able to demand a refund.

CYSF also asked councillor Ken Hundert to examine the whole question of parking, particularly the cost of maintenance in relation to parking fees.

At Western they use radar

Security police at the University of Western Ontario think they have the solution to the campus speeding problem — radar.

Security chief C.W. Brown says the radar is a preventive measure. "If we go for a whole day and catch no one we will be happy."

He agreed the use of radar is a "dishonest" way of controlling speeding. He reasoned that Western is a pedestrian campus and that sending one speeding car after another would only double the danger.

The radar unit cost \$1200. It has a range of one third mile. The device is as simple as it is expensive. You

plug it into a car cigarette lighter and point it down a straight road.

The problem of speeding is compounded by the theft of speed limit signs, Brown said.



A proposal for student equality

By PAUL AXELROD

Two basic types of departmental structures have been advocated by students across Canada. One is the system of "parity"; the second is that of "parallel structures".

In the former case students and faculty would be allowed an equal number of representatives on each departmental committee. The latter involves the establishment of separate but "parallel" student and faculty committees (e.g., a student committee on curriculum, etc.) which after meeting autonomously with their separate constituents would come together in joint session to decide departmental policy in all academic matters. Each has mutual veto over the other so that agreement must be unanimous before a decision can be acted upon.

Parity is inadequate

We suggest that the system of parity is deficient for numerous reasons.

1) Essentially it is a mere extension of the present inadequate "representative committee structure" defined above. Real equality between faculty and students will never be achieved simply through tinkering with the numbers of representatives on committees. Parity fails to come to grips with the underlying problem of social inequality in the university between professors and students.

Given the context within which both groups function in the classroom, it is likely that the professor's attitudes, opinions and interests will continue to dominate over those of students on decision-making committees in the department. Overcoming feelings of intimidation and inhibition will not be easily accomplished by students simply in committee meetings with professors.

In short the possibility of co-optation still exists.

2) Parity does not account for the fact that students and faculty given their different roles, status and powers, have certain unique and separate academic interests.

As professionals, professors are interested in pursuing rank and promotion and in doing individual research. The priority of students in a department may be in terms of classroom work. A situation may therefore arise in which it would be in the self interest of students to increase their classroom hours; conversely, it might be in the self interest of faculty to decrease them.

Parity does not provide the opportunity for students to discuss and formulate such interests independently and autonomously and then to bargain with faculty on equal grounds. Participation of students and faculty on the same committees may therefore result in students interests being identified with and incorporated into those of faculty on all matters.

3) Parity does not bring decision-making and general involvement in academic matters close to the student body at large. Only a small number of representatives participate, and therefore decisions about the student's education continue to be determined externally by a body to which he is unlikely to relate.

Parallel structures improve democracy

Parallel structures begin to turn the rhetoric of participatory democracy into reality. Through this system, students in the department can recognize themselves as an autonomous, self-respecting group whose stake in the development of meaningful education is as important as that of faculty.

By meeting in plenum periodically, students of the department would be able to define their aims and goals (without fear of academic penalization) and elect committees that parallel those of faculty to represent these interests.

Rather than co-optation, true cooperation between faculty and students is ultimately the norm. When human beings respect each others rights, privileges and interests and express a willingness to compromise and collaborate with, rather than to intimidate or dominate each other (consciously or subconsciously), then the results must inevitably be beneficial to all concerned.

We wish to emphasize that parallel committees should be formed in all academic areas, including appointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure to faculty.

These matters deserve special attention because the call for student involvement on these committees is likely to receive very stern resistance from members of the faculty.

The argument opposing student participation in these crucial matters is expressed in the following quotation: "Staffing procedures must be such that (staff's) scholarly and professional competence will be appraised by their peers and only by their peers. Students in general do not have the knowledge to make meaningful judgments on the

scholarly and professional qualities of staff members." (U of T faculty statement).

Professors would argue that their academic freedom would be jeopardized as would "professional standards of scholarship" if students had decision-making power pertaining to the ability of their teachers.

Teaching ability a student concern

But from the student point of view, the teaching ability of professors is a crucial factor in the quality of education that the university offers. To date, however, "teaching has been underrated in the reward structure for faculty members because of undue emphasis on research, and faculty interests in teaching has not been adequately ensured in recent years. This is partly the result of the fact that research is easier to evaluate than teaching: hence our concern about the development of sophisticated and well-applied programmes of teacher evaluation." (U of T's Commission on University Government).

It is difficult to believe that faculty members are capable of judging the teaching skills of a colleague more proficiently than students, when the former may never have attended a single class of the professor in question.

A competent researcher is not necessarily a competent teacher, and while the former aspect of a professor's work is perhaps more ably evaluated by faculty, the latter is undoubtedly more effectively judged by students.

Certainly students suffer or prosper most by whatever decisions are made as to whom their professors will be, and their opinions therefore deserve at least equal consideration to those of faculty. Student involvement in these matters can only enhance the standards of "professional" scholarship if the quality of teaching is at all important in the creation of such standards.

Fresh approaches needed

The establishment of parallel structures in all departments in the university would be a first step in creating fresh, original approaches to an educational system that has in many ways become stale and uninspiring for both faculty and students.

Discussions related to revising the outmoded grading system; to establishing meaningful, socially relevant course content; to building a system of learning founded on equality and respect rather than domination and authoritarianism, would inevitably be sparked and explored.