

Council voices proposals for upcoming Kemp appeal

Dear Dr. Wyman:

At its meeting of Monday, Feb. 2, students' council mandated me by an overwhelming majority to write you concerning the forthcoming tenure appeal of Prof. Ted Kemp.

It is clear that in the case of Prof. Kemp the questions of what constitutes good teaching and what weight good teaching ought to receive in tenure evaluations are issues. We, as students, are not only concerned that Prof. Kemp's appeal is heard fairly and impartially, but that students are able to represent their interests in this matter and that interested people are able to witness the deliberations.

Thus, we are formally proposing that in the tenure appeal of Prof. Ted Kemp:

1. There be placed as full voting members an equal number

of students to those members currently on the Tenure Appeals Committee.

2. The deliberations of the Tenure Appeals Committee be open to interested people.

In addition, we would request that these proposals be brought forward as soon as possible, if needed, to a special meeting of GFC.

These proposals should in no way be considered an endorsement of the tenure system or, necessarily, an interim reform.

In fact, in the near future, I will likely be writing you with a proposal to abolish the system of tenure at the University of Alberta, and be making suggestions concerning a procedure to replace it.

David Leadbeater
president

Christianity and action

by Winston Gereluk

What is a Christian?

For me, that word Christian almost automatically conjures up images of oppressed working people being tricked into believing that there is an eternal respite awaiting them over yonder; or worse yet, a conditioned heartburn that comes from seeing comfortable businessmen paying for their weekly pipedream transfusion into what is otherwise a meaningless world of middle class grandeur.

However, last week when the law and order, and Ted Kemp issues were high in the air, I came into contact with a different type of Christian. The Student Christian Movement is a campus club that believe it or not, is actually involved in social action. I was interested, and arranged a meeting with SCM president, Tim Christian, who gave me a first hand account of what that club is all about.

The closest thing that I could get from Tim about the purpose of SCM was that it is a group of students who have organized because they hold one thing in common, a concern about social issues that is strong enough to make them want to take an active stance on them.

The second feature of SCM that makes it unique among campus clubs is that it is not leader-oriented. At least Tim has not seen it as his job to give the group any direction. SCM functions when its individual members function; they gather around issues, not around the president.

This year, for instance, SCM became involved in the Ted Kemp case only because several of its members chose on their own initiative to get involved.

Very many of its members have also become concerned with the law and order issue and as a result of the concern among members, last fall SCM hammered out a position paper, a communal effort on the problem. And, this winter they have had much to say about the proceedings of the notorious Law and Order Committee.

As well, SCM initiated the Native People's Defense Fund, a drive to solicit funds for the legal defence of the Indian people in light of the sobering fact that very many of them are being denied a fighting chance in the law courts due to a lack of money for lawyers and bail.

After initiating it, SCM put NPDF under all-native control (something like Vietnamization of the Vietnam war), and according to Tim, its present leaders are preparing a brief on the subject for the Attorney-General's Department.

Besides that, the SCM is interested in providing forums in which concerned people can discuss issues when they arise. One of the things they have done towards this end, is booked SUB Theatre for every second Friday.

During the interview, Tim Christian repeatedly expressed the fear that too many concerned people, including SCM'ers, are satisfied with turning issues into topics for in-group discussions to be indulged in merely for the emotional catharsis they yield. Without discounting completely the value of these 'trips' Tim said that he would like to see SCM engage in more effective action.

SCM members hardly ever agree on anything. However, if they argue a lot, that is good. Argumentation, and even a touch of chaos, might frighten many a busy organizer, but in a club that continues to be invested solely in its members, that is a sight of vitality and strength. And that, it appears, is what SCM is all about.

Tenure system defended by professor Academic freedom required to teach

Well the silent majority has spoken again "led by the nose as asses are," ring supplied by The Gateway editors.

Until now I held off contributing to the tenure debate because I expected university students to vote thoughtfully rather than emotionally on a subject which affected them as much as removal of tenure. They didn't. According to Mr. Derek Bulmer, the student vote to do away with tenure in favor of a contract system was probably based "on the isolated case of Ted Kemp." If that is true, then students didn't really think very deeply about the question, even with respect to Professor Kemp, or they would have realized that in a non-tenure system a man without a Ph.D. or publications would probably not have been hired in the first place. Without the type of probationary period guaranteed by a tenure system, why should a department chairman take a chance on someone who *may be good* but who has not yet proved himself professionally? There are plenty of Ph.D.'s around these days.

Other Cases

But to get to the really disturbing issues. . . . When students voted to abolish tenure, did they realize what they were doing? It might be instructive for students to read about the case of Dr. Elias Snitzer, professor of physics and electronics, who was summarily dismissed (same-day treatment) from the faculty of Lowell Technological Institute in 1958 because he had been subpoenaed by the House un-American Activities Committee for belonging to the Communist Party (see AAUP Bulletin No. 45 (1959), 550-567). Or take the case of Dr. Al Carpenter, a friend of mine at the University of Delaware and unfortunately an atheist and civil rights' spokesman. His contract was not renewed because he chaired a teach-in on the lack of Negro enrollment at U of D. Neither of these institutions had tenure systems. Well, these cases are not isolated. Dismissal for unorthodox political or religious views has frequently been the fate of non-tenured professors. Or take a hypothetical case. In the province of Alberta, picture to yourself the fate of a non-tenured political scientist who publicly advocated union with the United States or challenged Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic, on behalf of U.S. developers? What kind of public pressure would be brought to force him off the campus?

Protection

How would a contract system protect these mep? In a non-tenure system the inter-college council that would judge contracts would themselves be sub-

ject to the pressure of dismissal. Teachers could be dismissed at the end of a contract period for non-academic reasons. Without some kind of tenure system, the faculty member would be subject to the same sort of paternalism that existed in the master-slave relationship of the American South, and in the benevolent factory owner-loyal worker relationship of the early industrial era. Moreover, students themselves, who have been screeching like banshees about the paternalism of faculty and administration towards *them*, would apparently be happy to inflict such an injustice on the faculty.

Now, no one will deny that some faculty abuse their tenure but, as in law where some guilty are protected along with the innocent, such is the price one must pay to insure justice for the greatest number. Nevertheless, I resent the implications of Gateway contributors that tenured professors, on the whole, tend to lapse into lackadaisical senility. That just isn't true, and I speak from 12 years' experience as a student and teacher in four universities in both the U.S. and Canada. And if you do have a few tenured sluggards, no department chairman recommends automatic increments for them. Besides, most of us professors are interested in our subjects, want the respect of colleagues and students, and consider tenure as some guarantee that we can say what we think without being fired.

Publications

The discussion of criteria for tenure has also been handled in a rather shoddy fashion. Most student writers have consistently used the either/or argument with respect to the criteria of teaching and research; i.e., you grovel around in the lab or library and neglect your students or you don't grovel around but concentrate on being a good teacher. A question — If one doesn't "grovel" what does he teach? Does he teach the facts as outlined in some textbook or books? Does he teach inspiration? Last week some English

graduate students appealed to Plato and Aristotle, and even Jesus, as examples of scholars who lived their philosophy instead of publishing it. That was a nice emotional touch, but really a poor analogy. These men dictated their "books" to students in an age when there weren't any printing presses. Does anyone seriously think that in 1970 Plato and Aristotle would not have taken the opportunity to spread their ideas by writing books on their investigations of the world around them? After all, what is research but the delving into uncharted areas by a man who is interested in his work. To say that such delving pays no dividends to the student is to say that the interest a man takes in a subject he loves and thinks about on his own is never manifested when he is talking about that subject to others. Bullshit!

Chitchats

For those of you who like ad hominem arguments: Isn't the beef of many students really that the man who has a profound background in his subject is much more demanding of his students than the man who doesn't? that the man who continually probes the uncharted areas is more difficult to follow sometimes (You gotta attend his lectures 'cause it ain't all in the text.) than the man who conscientiously follows a particular text or the man who just likes to drink coffee, smoke, and chitchat with his students on the superficial fringes of a subject? I mean, what's the point of attending university if *all* you want to do is have superficial friendly chitchats, or have someone get up and explain everything in detail to you so that you don't have to do any thinking or digging in lab or library on your own?

Finally, a slogan for "middle-Canada": A vote against tenure is a vote for mediocrity. Or if you want something more spicy: A vote against tenure is a vote for an arse-licker. . . .

J. H. D. Kennedy
Department of English

