

# Official silence on Kemp's tenure case is to protect—not the officials', but Ted Kemp's reputation

I have found several things about the issue of Professor Kemp's tenure case disturbing, and it seems important at this point to bring one of these things to the attention of you and your readers. It has been repeatedly reported and mentioned in Gateway's coverage that officials in the Department of Philosophy and in the Faculty of Arts have refused to comment on Professor Kemp's case. This silence has been quite probably misunderstood by a great many of your readers. It is felt by some that since Professor Kemp's case is exceptionally controversial, the Department of Philosophy and the Faculty of Arts have sought to protect themselves by retreating into silence. This is a serious enough charge by itself, but it is further felt by some that the Department of Philosophy and the Faculty of Arts have sought to protect themselves because they have something to hide—that perhaps there were irregularities and inequities in the handling of this particular case.

It should be pointed out then that there is nothing peculiar in the official silence about Professor Kemp's case, rather it is a matter of course in tenure cases that comment from officials is only in confidence to the indi-

vidual whose case is being considered. We cannot infer from the silence surrounding the Kemp case that there was anything fishy in its determination.

Let me suggest further that the official silence that attends tenure cases in general and as a matter of course has behind it none of the base motives that have been suggested. The silence is not, as it is widely thought, a general measure for the protection of officials and tenure committee members in the event of a controversy. Rather it is a measure for the protection of those considered. It is, first of all an attempt to insure, as far as is possible, impartiality in the event of an appeal by seeking to prevent the sort of controversy that might influence subsequent tenure appeal proceedings. Secondly, and especially in cases where controversy has arisen, it is motivated by the desire to protect a professor's future employability elsewhere. For the Faculty of Arts, for instance, to join issue publicly where opposition to a given tenure denial has been extremely vocal would be for the Faculty of Arts to publicly denounce a man, and thereby, very likely, to jeopardize his chances for future employment. It is felt that a man is owed protection

from this sort of unnecessary and damaging publicity—whether he asks for this protection or not.

It amounts to a telling criticism of the institution of tenure that must, owing to its destructive potential, be surrounded by sec-

recy. But criticisms of tenure are one thing, and criticisms of the moral conduct of particular departments and individuals in their various capacities, given the institutions that exist, is another. Given the present tenure system, it is quite likely that the Depart-

ment of Philosophy and the Faculty of Arts and their spokesmen have acted entirely scrupulously and commendably in withholding comment in the Kemp case.

Joel Rudinow  
Graduate Studies

## Garbage, garbage everywhere, and someone notices it—but it's all a dream (or is it??)

Yesterday I was sitting in three-course lunch, when I realized I was having a terrible nightmare (probably caused by DDT on the skin of a poorly washed apple). I had dreamed that I was trapped in a huge garbage can—along with 18,000 other students. The can was lined with reams

and reams of posters; smiling faces of candidates for "Garbage Students' Week Queen" and of candidates for "Garbage Council" not to mention those posters advising me to attend the "Garbage Social" or some other worthwhile function.

The posters covered walls,

doors, windows, light fixtures, light poles, clocks, and trees. Even buildings and sidewalks were covered with sprayed-on slogans of such wisdom as "Garbage Students Bug The World". Posters on top of posters and paint on top of paint until there was not one square inch of inanimate object that was not completely covered with garbage.

As I sat, garbage began to close in around me, clutching me in its stranglehold until I could scarcely breathe—yet no one cared to retard this monster, and even, to my horror, as the lights were starting to dim and I knew I was gasping my last breath, I could make out students plastering more garbage upon my own soon-to-be-silent body.

Just then the buzzer rang and I went to my next class—relieved that it was only . . . a . . . dream?

Terry Hoze  
Ag 2

## Ed psych grad students protest low priority placed on teaching

At their last general meeting, the Department of Educational Psychology Graduate Students' Association (of which there are 152 members) unanimously declared their support of Professor Kemp. In view of his wide repute as a good teacher (see Course Guide, 1969), and as graduate students recognizing our professional concern as educators, we deplore the low value attributed

to good teaching by the tenure committee. We regard it as reprehensible that an institution whose function is primarily educative places a disproportionate emphasis on research and publication to the detriment of creative instruction.

Education Psychology  
Graduate Student Body,  
per John Ingram, president

## Platform changed—in fourteen years

by Coleman Cohan

I am becoming frightened at the attitude of many students that "you can't change things", "what can one person do?" Let us, then, examine the change that has occurred in students' union presidential campaigns from 1956 to 1970.

1956: The major issue was school spirit; candidates promised to organize cheerleaders, pep bands, and special athletic nights.

1957: One candidate stated that "student government is concerned with extra-curricular activities".

1958: One candidate felt that an investigation into the housing shortage was necessary. There's a case where a problem arose (due to the campus population explosion) and an individual believed it was his responsibility to initiate action.

1959: One nominee states that the administration must be pressured into investigating the housing problem. Students pressuring the administration! (As close back as December 1955 a student wrote that one disadvantage of the mock parliament held at U of A was that, if the Social Credit party did not win the mock election, the provincial government might think that we didn't like them. And now, the

students are going to pressure the administration! You tell me things can't be changed?).

1964: One nominee wishes to complain to the province about the proposed fees in the new Lister Hall complex, not yet built. Prior to this election a proposed student demonstration at the legislative grounds had been effectively banned by the Premier, who notified the university administration that such demonstrations would be detrimental to the student cause; and still the candidate wishes to complain. (Incidentally the further complaints were effective and fees were initially lower. Bravo!!)

1967: Candidates urge student

representation on curriculum planning boards, and course evaluation by students. Compare this with ten years ago.

1970: Tim Christian was elected president on a platform of social reform: help to the native people and an end to war research on this campus. Note that the reforms are no longer restricted to the campus, but are national in scope.

Things have changed. If you've got something you'd like changed, openly state your case, talk to others, and try.

I believe that changes can be made.

## The game is POWER

by John Miller

Last week I suggested that the presidential candidates had a strong motive for encouraging faculty organizations in the face of student opposition to them.

The basic motivation is the quest for power. Without a strong well organized student body, the position of the students' union is weak. It is through activism that the students and their union gain sufficient strength to realize their goals.

The game is power-politics, and without power, you can't play the game. The team with the most active participation from its members wins every time. There are no upsets in this league.

It is extremely doubtful that Ted Kemp would have been denied tenure last year, when the SDU was strong and active. The SDU, acting as an Arts students' association, established itself as the watchdog of the administration. It was due to their efforts that the cases of Drs. Fisher and Whiteside were reviewed.

Meanwhile, on the other side of the campus in Education, two top-notch professors were purged without so much as an eyebrow being raised. I doubt very much that the cases of Dr. Kaufman and Mr. Powell even reached the attention of the students' union. This might have been prevented if there had been a student faculty group to express student opinion.

Another advantage to strong student representation at the faculty level is in the establishment of precedence. If, for example, one department or faculty grants parity on its committees, it strengthens the case for parity all across campus.

A point in favor of the establishment of faculty organizations is created by the very structure of university administration itself. Each faculty is semi-autonomous and thus decisions made at the faculty level are seldom debated in General Faculty Council.

General Faculty Council acts primarily as a co-ordinating body and usually supports decisions made at the faculty level, although it does have veto power. In order to fight fire with fire, students must attack issues at the level where these issues are being raised, before binding decisions are made.

As it presently stands, any representation at the faculty level by the students' union is met with hostility and a charge of tampering. While administration recognizes the union's right to represent students at the general faculty level, they refuse to allow SU to intercede on behalf of the student at the departmental or faculty level, where, in fact, many of the major decisions are being made. If students are truly interested in participation in the decision making process, then it is at the departmental and faculty levels that they must be represented.

### Dialog

by Opey

Hi!	Hi!	Sit down	Yes, thanks
I must be going now	Me too	It's been nice communicating with you.	yes