Kemp's refusal of tenure

mp
ons fo
lation
and fo
departm
Officia
at whil
an info
in the
nature o
its pro
ial. I re
king fo
hich co
on of
did no
edings
I think
state ex
uously,
nes to
of the a

which significant progress on Ph.D. thesis or the publica- of an article or two of a sophic nature would have nced. I recognized that you very strong student recom- lations of your teaching. I e, too, that you wish to asize your teaching and to a great deal of yourself to it. rtheless, I regard it is im- ive that scholarship be shown nyone who is to be given e in the philosophy depart- at the University of Alberta. d teaching is valuable enough mpensate for the absence of arly publication after an l competence is demon- ed, but not valuable enough mpensate for lack of any arly accomplishment.

a neg
simply
ed even
of sch

he committee also agreed un- ously in this opinion as n by the vote which, though was split between the neg- recommendation and a recommendation of a year's ex- tentension for the purpose of completing the Ph.D. The vote was four to four, with my neg- ative vote breaking the tie.

The positions of the different members of the department's ad- visory committee were presented to the Faculty Tenure Committee. My own recommendation remain- ed negative for the reason given above. I did not feel that after the extensions you have already re- ceived there was any basis for supporting the recommendation that your term be extended one year while still making receipt of the Ph.D. mandatory in your case for the granting of tenure next year. It was and remains my opinion that the time for a final determination of your status in the department has now been reached.

Arthur B. Cody
professor and acting chairman
department of philosophy

s—unite to support Kemp!

a studen
e years,
the e
hed, ma
around
s and a
ne gene
cademia
r, the a
rofessor
ected by
has laid
students
h an e
en kick

he Berk
d:
n the op
become

ious, makes you so sick at art that you can't take part; u can't even tacitly take part, d you've got to put your dies upon the levers, upon all e apparatus and you've got to ake it stop. And you've got indicate to the people who n it, that unless you're free e machine will be prevented om working at all.

dividually I have to stand up say *no*. Collectively we have l stand and say "*fuck the ad- stration. We are the students we are the most important ent on the campus.*" Regard- of what we have been taught our "processes of education we do count.

In one of the few relevant courses I have taken at this uni- versity I have read Henry David Thoreau, who said:

> *He who passively accepts evil is as much involved in it as he who helps to perpetuate it. He who accepts evil without pro- testing against it is really co- operating with it.*

Let's stand united on this issue. If we bow out once more to the administration, we will not only be stabbing worthy professors in the back, but shafting ourselves by smearing ourselves with hy- pocrisy.

Chris Gardiner
arts 3

otten is a dirty word

the ton
rage of
ent's te
cular th
defenc
se are t
ther a
olar, bu
the first
ation sh
d that
utomati
A con

teaching surely does not e a concern for scholarship; rofessor Kemp so loves teach- that he devotes nights and ners to it, more power to but these activities do pro- extra income and nobody els one to take on the extra

would also be interested to whether there is likely to be otest if a poor teacher gets re, or a poor scholar, average teacher does not. Indeed, though it is tactless, I can't help wonder- ing if a "good teacher" does not mean "popular teacher"; the terms are not synonymous by ir- revocable decree of fate. As for whether tenure is or isn't a good thing, I pass, but when it is called "rotten" the imprecise word makes me take the argument less than seriously.

Jean MacIntyre
associate professor of English

Te esearch trap hard to escape

phy de
ied in d
ure on
not ful
ally se
should
onditions
no que
h ability
ns coun
rt put

ting in deciding questions of re. This despite the fact that t of the research done in the ersities is of little value for ty which is innocently paying bills.

hen teaching ability and t count for nothing; when value of a course of instruc- is determined by the number ours of lectures per week; three or four weeks per year are set aside for examina- tions; when a grading system is adopted which is designed to automatically fail five to ten per cent of all students: it is obvious that radical changes are in order.

Unfortunately, once one has fallen into the teaching-research trap set by the university, it be- comes very difficult to escape.

Douglas P. Hube
asst. prof., physics

Kemp rejects Dean Smith's claims

I have the following comments to make on Dean Smith's letter (Gateway, Jan. 23) giving rea- sons for denial of tenure. (i.e. reasons for firing me.)

First, the heading *"Personal and Confidential,"* in spite of which I turned the letter over to you. The confidentiality of the dean's letter is to protect *my* in- terests by not revealing to the public the aspects of my "delin- quency" which led to the denial of my tenure. I thought and still think that not only my interests but those of students are better served by making the issues pub- lic.

Second, although the dean says "there seems to be no doubt about [my] professional skill as a teacher and [my] enthusiasm for the teaching process," he later as- serts that there were "doubts about the philosophical content" of my lectures, and that my "con- tributions to the department *must* be limited because of the little progress in professional develop- ment" I have made. "This limita- tion" he goes on, "would certainly apply to the kind of advanced work which depends on scholar- ship, but also seems to apply in- directly to [my] performance in undergraduate courses."

What all this amounts to is a claim that although I'm a good teacher, I don't know enough about my subject to teach *it*. This claim is not based on any atten- tion paid to my actual teaching by members of the committee. They have never attended my classes and know nothing what- ever about the content of my lec- tures. They are operating on the questionable hypothesis that be- cause I have made little prog- ress in professional development" (read: I have not gotten a Ph.D., have neither published nor read any scholarly research papers to august bodies) that therefore — these being the only bona fide in- dications of scholarship—I can- not possibly know enough about my subject to teach it. This "argu- ment" is invalid and its conclu- sion is false.

Third, the dean says "There is no evidence of any alternative scholarly work. Your annual re- ports do not record published re- search . . . you rarely attend philosophical meetings and have presented no papers to them; in- deed there has been little or no participation in local activities such as philosophical discussions within the department." It is true that my annual reports don't record published research. I have published a thing or two but these publications were addressed to current issues in philosophy of education, I sought a wider au- dience for them than inward- looking philosophical journals provide. So much for that. I have attended several philosoph- ical meetings, national and local. It is true that I have presented no papers to them, but false that I have taken "little or no" part in discussions. I have taken *little* part because the discussions are all too frequently arenas for the practice of quasi-philosophical one-upmanship, and the papers on which such "discussions" are based make little if any contribu- tion to the increase in under- standing of philosophical issues relevant to my philosophical pur- suits. (I suspect that a lot of them are written in order to get tenure or promotion.) One notable ex- ception — the meeting of the American Society for Aesthetics was extremely interesting and productive and I took a signif- icant part in its discussions. (I also spent three days and nights in New York after the meetings vis- iting galleries and theatres, which *is* relevant to my professional de- velopment in philosophy of art, but which is the sort of thing not provided for in annual reports. The same is true incidentally of the many talks I have given, some formal, more informal, to local organizations. One has in mind that in order to *count*, talks should be scholarly and so one does not record such contributions, though, to my mind, they are often more significant than papers read for the purpose of forwarding one's career.

In short, I reject the tenure committee's claims.

Yours very truly
E. W. Kemp

Systems don't fail; only men fail

I do not imagine there is any- thing in Dean Smith's contract with the university (if he has one) that specifically requires sincerity. Such virtues (being a Catholic I have long since ceased to believe the word sincerity has any value) are taken for granted, are a built-in part of the system. The dean's confidential letter to Mr. Kemp reeks with sincerity, mature control, and consummate generalship (or is it colonel- ship?). I am not saying of the dean that a man may 'smile and smile and be a villain'. I am say- ing that a man may smile and console and not realize what he is doing. And what is Dean Smith doing but helping the university to take one more giant step to- wards self-destruction as he helps Mr. Kemp take a small step to the door.

The university's present pro- gram of self-pollution and self- destruction bothers me. I am cer- tainly not qualified to judge a tenure board or its judgments on people like Kemp. I do, however, think that it would take a fool not to see that the university stands in danger of losing a highly cre- ative mind and shall be much the worse for that loss. As Chairman Max has said—systems (although I think the chairman really meant generations) don't fail, only men fail. Dean Smith would seem, in the minds of many people, to have failed. Perhaps they are wrong, but if they are right that failure points to a very significant failure in prevalent philosophical- political (for what is not tinged with politics these days?) think- ing.

Perhaps the dean is not guilty of the failure of many people in places of authority to realize that the post-war consumer warfare has totally liquified the solid, healthy stock of our people; and that, as a result, the only re- sources of initiative as opposed to the resources of exploitation re- main in the universities (which are themselves in grave danger— perhaps because of the fate of people like Kemp—of dissolving). It may even be that the dean is of the opinion that the failure of Mr. Kemp to play the philosoph- ical game is a sign of that liqui- faction, and that Mr. Kemp's con- tinued presence on campus is in the nature of a lurking disease.

This writer would like to think that Mr. Kemp's creative attitude towards teaching is—far from being a disease — one possible source of health in a very sick situation. The situation is indeed drastic—even a matter of survival for whole generations. The old liberal laws no longer apply. Liberalism as such is out-of-date precisely because of its built-in process of self-pollution. The present liberal rut which seems to have its hold on many people in authority is far more oppressive and undemocratic than any ex- treme right-wing fascism which may be lurking around. The lib- eral is basically a coward when the creative mind confronts the liberal with the limitations of lib- eralism. The liberal philosophy can only function as long as it can ignore limitations. It has not the courage to admit that trans- gressions of limits bring on self- destruction. As a result liberalism has become highly repressive in the name of freedom. The cre- ative mind, on the other hand, by recognizing human limitations recognizes the human element and allows that element to be served by the system (the very purpose of any system's infallibility is to help, not to dominate human lim- itation).

Mr. Kemp's refusal to play the scholarly game, which after all is only a part of the publisher's game of encouraging liberal thinking and controversy in order to sell books and magazines, is a refusal to go along with a human failing of using the university as a device for advertising the com- mercial out-put of various edito- rial boards. Mr. Kemp's attitude is simply part of a very rapidly increasing realization that schol- arly reporting in the humanities is a farce. I do not know if Dean Smith is among those who belong to my description of liberalism. It does appear to me likely that, without realizing it, he is aiding those who are liberals by inad- vertently resigning power to com- mercial publishing companies. I do not even know the extent to which Dean Smith is physically involved in the decision of Mr. Kemp's tenure committee. It does, however, appear to me pos- sible that the dean is in a position to remedy the disease I have talked about.

Peter Montgomery
grad studies

ar ments, failures, research, Kemp