

WORDS FROM THE WISE ...

Ex-Soc Grad student explains withdrawal from program



To the Gazette:

In the November 9 issue of the Gazette, I read with interest an article written on the current attempt of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology to secure a new chairman. In that article, I noticed some mention of the recent dispute in the Department concerning the graduate program. Before Monday, October 2, I was a student in that program. For some two to three weeks before that day, my fellow graduate students and I (all seven of us) as well as several faculty members of the Department worked to change this program. Although we learned a great deal about Sociology, especially the Sociology of Sociology, our efforts seemed to produce few overall changes. After much consideration, I withdrew from the program on that Monday in October. After I withdrew, I sent a letter addressed to all faculty members of the Department, in which I gave my reasons for withdrawing. Most of my points were criticisms of various aspects of the graduate program.

I am writing this note to ask you to fully print my letter in the next issue of your paper. I am making this request for two reasons. Firstly, I want to help explain a situation that has existed and probably, still exists in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Secondly, I want to urge all students who may be thinking about applying to become graduate students in Sociology at Dalhousie next year, to seriously consider what has happened with the graduate program this academic year.

I do not claim my letter is an objective, value-neutral account of the problems with the graduate program in the Department, but I do think I can speak as a former student who has been quite involved in the Department and who has strongly objected to that program. I think most of my points in the letter can be understood by people who are not close to the Department. One part of the letter deals with the attempted dismissal of one graduate

student. This particular problem has since been partially resolved. Finally, I would welcome any questions or comments concerning my opinions on this issue.

Sincerely,
Ian D. Johnson

To all Faculty Members of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology:

On Monday, October 2, I withdrew from the graduate program of this department for the academic year of 1972-73. In this letter to all faculty members, I wish to indicate my reasons for withdrawing from the program, as I did in a shorter letter to Drs. J.J. Mangalam, J. Elliot, D. Clairmont, W. Stephens and S.D. Clark. My reasons for following this course of action are both political and personal.

Before elaborating on these factors, I want to briefly describe my own involvement in this department and in this university. In the spring of this year, 1972, I completed an Honors program in Sociology at the University of King's College. Although I was a King's student, I was active in promoting student-faculty parity on all matters affecting this department. Two years ago, I served as a student representative on the departmental decision-making body which had an equal number of students and faculty. I have also worked on separate occasions as a student representative on the Curriculum and Space Committees of this department. In terms of academic performance, I won the University Medal in Sociology for King's and Dalhousie and the Governor-General's Medal at King's upon completion of my Honors program last

spring. In outlining my past university experience, I am not trying to win praise for myself, but to point out that I think I can speak as one who has had some experience with the workings of this department and who has achieved some measure of academic excellence thus far, in his academic career. Moreover, I think I can speak by myself without being controlled by any faculty member and also with a real concern for the standards and future of this department.

I strongly disagree with the mode of introduction of the graduate program into this department. From discussion with at least one student representative on the Graduate Education Committee last year, there seems to have been no student participation in designing and recommending the new graduate program. From various sources, there also seems to have been little faculty participation in designing and approving the graduate program. Major changes, like a new graduate program, should be discussed and decided by at least, all faculty members and not just the faculty members of the Graduate and Executive Committees. For example, two years ago, a new graduate program was designed and approved by an equal number of students and faculty.

I and other students applied and were accepted into the graduate program with the understanding that the program was to be the same as in past years, only to learn after we had agreed to be in the program, that the program was to be drastically changed. There was no definite information about courses and other aspects of the program until the day before registration. This uncertainty about the program until the last minute created a lot of anxiety for me and other students.

Furthermore, I believe the new graduate program is largely inflexible to students' needs and inadequate from the point of view of standards. Students are required to take a compulsory full-year course in theory, methods and techniques. Although I agree with the content of the course, I disagree with the compulsory nature of it, which could prevent students from learning and contributing to that course as much as they could and also seems to implicate students as being unaware of the importance of these aspects of Sociology. Besides the compulsory core course, the students

are given a choice of one of two courses a term for electives, whereas in other years, graduate students could choose from some five to six courses a term. The Graduate Education Committee has maintained a rigid attitude towards students' taking reading courses.

Another student and myself requested permission to take reading courses in areas not covered by course offerings. It was only after making our requests in writing, meeting with Dr. Mangalam, the Chairman of the Graduate Committee and appealing the committee's previous recommendations, did we finally get the courses we wished. We did not request these courses to avoid work but actually, to do more work than is usually done in other courses, in areas of our choice. Although I would personally, prefer to do thesis work, students should not be limited to doing thesis work for their major work area as is the case in the new program. They may wish to do a comprehensive exam or an extended term paper. Finally, faculty without P.H.D.'s, cannot teach graduate courses or be major thesis advisors to graduate students. This ruling would prevent students from learning from all faculty. From discussion with some non-P.H.D. faculty, this decision is a violation of their contractual arrangements with the university. As well as being inflexible, this program is inadequate from the point of view of standards because it does not allow for constructive criticism of all of a student's work by all faculty members. A more flexible and adequate program of courses would be a tutorial system of courses where students work with whoever they wish in what area they wish, but whose work is continually being evaluated and criticized by all faculty.

The dismissal of Daniel Lingeman (a graduate student in the Department) seems to be a highly irregular action. In the first place, it seems quite unusual for a student to be dismissed from a program on the basis of a few incomplete courses and not for any recorded course failure. Aside from the dubious academic evidence against Daniel Lingeman, the dismissal procedure followed by the Graduate Education Committee is incorrect. My understanding of departmental procedures for dismissal of graduate students leads me to believe

that no graduate student can be recommended for dismissal without first appearing before the Graduate Committee and then before the faculty of the department as a whole. Neither of these steps were taken in Mr. Lingeman's case. Finally, the Graduate Committee's recommendation to dismiss Mr. Lingeman is just a recommendation and not a decision. To take away his mailing privileges and to generally refuse to allow him all the rights and privileges of being a graduate student without final, formal dismissal by the Dean of Graduate Studies is to say the least, discourteous and deplorable.

Unfortunately, during the dispute concerning the graduate program, there have been repeated attempts at intimidation and manipulation of students by some members of faculty. On September 19, I felt I was threatened by Dr. Mangalam, when he said that my assistantship would be removed if I did not indicate my program to him. At that time, my program was far from definite, so I could not indicate my program to him even if all other problems with the program were resolved. On Friday, September 22, when Dr. Mangalam refused to meet with students if they had a spokesman to both represent their views and give other students the opportunity to speak. This indicates to me, Dr. Mangalam's unwillingness to accept students as equal participants in a discussion about the graduate program. There have been statements by some members of faculty that the graduate students have been led by a few members of faculty. This has no factual basis and seems to be an attempt to ignore the real issues concerning the graduate program. Such statements also suggest students have neither the ability nor the intelligence to formulate opinions and voice opposition to the new graduate program. Finally, on Friday, September 29, the Graduate Committee, through Dr. Mangalam, sent letters to those students, who had not indicated what their program was stating that they would be recommended for dismissal if they did not disclose their program to him by Monday, October 2. When I received this letter, my program unfortunately, still had not yet been formally finalized. This letter seems to be, clearly, yet another attempt to force students to adhere to the graduate program regardless of the serious questions raised about the program or of the

progress made in finalizing each students' program.

Given all these unresolved problems with the program, I would find it very difficult to pursue a high standard of academic work at this time. Also, in view of all the problems I have perceived and experienced thus far in academic Sociology, I am not definitely committed to working in the discipline and I have been considering work in other disciplines or in areas outside the university. Finally, I do have a job commitment from the summer which I have yet to meet.

For all these reasons, I feel it is best to withdraw from the graduate program at this time. At the same time, I would urge faculty members, individually and collectively, to press the Chairman of the department and the Deans of Graduate Studies and Arts and Science for a complete investigation into the implementation and content of the graduate program, for open discussion and final decision of the graduate program by at least, all faculty, if not students as well, for complete reinstatement and redress being given to Daniel Lingeman, for full participation of all non-P.H.D. faculty in the graduate program and finally, for a firm guarantee for the security of the rights and privileges of all graduate students in the program against any act of intimidation or manipulation by any individual faculty member or small group of faculty.

Although this is a long account of my reasons for withdrawal from the graduate program, I believe it is important for all faculty to be aware of my position, to critically examine all aspects of the new program and to take any necessary steps to remedy the situation.

Sincerely,
Ian D. Johnson

c.c. Dean of Graduate Studies
Dean of Arts and Sciences

Clairmont resigns amid SVC faculty split

by Glenn Wanamaker

The resignation of Chairman Don Clairmont and evidence of further faculty splits are among the latest developments in the Sociology-Anthropology Department.

Clairmont made known his decision to resign, effective January 1, to a faculty meeting last week. His intention was also confirmed in memos to faculty and Dean of Arts and Science, Guy MacLean. Clairmont refused to give his reasons to the Gazette.

It was also learned last week that Professor S.D. Clark, former Sociology Department Chairman at the University of Toronto and presently on a two-year appointment as a McCulloch visiting professor at Dalhousie, is "no longer interested" in being chairman here. Clark had previously told faculty he was interested in succeeding Clairmont,

whose contract is said to expire July 1, 1973.

Clark apparently reacted to the Gazette disclosures concerning his past record at the University of Toronto. His withdrawal was announced to a faculty meeting November 14 and later confirmed by Dr. MacLean.

Faculty purges are also occurring within the department. Assistant Professor Don Grady, whose contract was not due to expire until July 1, 1974, was proclaimed eligible for tenure this year and moments after this decision was made in a closed faculty meeting November 14, it was voted to refuse him tenure. The vote against Grady was 11-5. Apparently it is normal procedure to leave the matter of tenure until the final year of the contract, unless requested by the Professor. Grady did not make such a request. However Grady is still under

contract to teach until the end of 1974.

There are also rumours that two or three other professors are to be dealt with in the same fashion.

Speculation within the department points to Dr. J.J. Mangalam to succeed Clairmont as chairman. Mangalam is presently chairman of the Graduate Education Committee in the department and has been instrumental in Graduate Studies course changes, hotly disputed by graduate students.

Further speculation has Clairmont "Housecleaning" to get rid of faculty and student "troublemakers". Prospects in the continuing story are for Clairmont to try and pull the department together by finding a "no nonsense" candidate from among the faculty and by organizing a search for what one person in the department called "subversive elements".

THE COLUMN

California says no to marijuana

With the prospects of population increasing day-by-day, California voters decided to oppose the legalization of the heathen devil weed, marijuana. Political pundits on the scene November 7 were predicting an affirmative vote as marijuana was sandwiched between several other proposals voters were expected to approve... Geologists and seismologists are also breathing a sigh of relief; according to them the state could expect upwards of 75 million new residents if weed was legalized. This would have been enough, they said to sink the state into the Pacific...

The boycott against the Kraft Corporation is gaining strength as more universities announce the banning of their products. The latest ban came at York University. But at Dalhousie, Caterplan persists in selling and using Kraft products... Caterplan is a tough company to work for too. Two weeks ago, we carried a story on their cost problems and the difficulty in getting students to work. No criticism. But the powers-that-be decreed the man we interviewed was not permitted to talk about the company even in general terms... There was even talk that he would be fired. As it turned out, he's been put on 30-day probation. R.J. Hill,

Regional Director for the Maritime Division of Caterplan, says the employee was "not disciplined", but then again Hill was the man who said he knew nothing about the article, 30 minutes before he was to "talk" to his employee... If you work for Caterplan, keep yo' dirty mouth shut, boy...

If you're one of those who rushes right from the SUB cafeteria to the nearest beverage room, then the extended hours should come as even a greater relief to your over-worked stomach. All beverage rooms and taverns are now open until 12:30 on Friday and Saturday nights... Now that Bob Stanfield has stunned the world, who is going to lead Dalhousie?

There are many considerations to this question. Before the election, it was widely predicted that Mr. Stanfield would take over the Presidency of Dalhousie if the PC's did poorly under his leadership. As well, Henry Hicks' dual role of Dal President and Government Senator in Ottawa is an obvious conflict of interest. Hicks has hinted 'that if he finds the travel back and forth too rigorous, he will resign one of his positions... Can anyone thin' of a political outcast (assuming that Bob is no longer in the running)?...