

The Dalhousie Gazette

CANADA'S OLDEST COLLEGE NEWSPAPER



Published by the Dalhousie Students' Union
Halifax, Nova Scotia, 429-1144. Printed by
The Dartmouth Free Press, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
Authorized as Second Class Mail by the Post Office
Dept. Ottawa, and for payment of postage in Cash.

Volume 100, No. 9
Halifax, Nova Scotia

STAFF

KIM CAMERON EDITOR-IN-CHIEF	
KEN CLARE Associate Editor	ALEX McCLEAVE Business Manager
LINDA GILLINGWATER Managing Editor	JIM KING Advertising Manager
MAUREEN PHINNEY News Editor	LINDA AITCHINSON Office Manager
GUY MASLAND Sports Editor	STEPHEN ARCHIBALD Photography
PETER CRAWFORD Student Council Editor	JOHN STILL, COLETTE Gazette Reviewers

Gazette Reporters: Bruce Gillis, Linda Bayers,
Dave Wilson, Kevin White, Chris Lobban, Nick
Pittas, Sharon Cook, John Bruce, Hugh Fraser,
Ron Hicken, Kathi Boyle, Bill Kerr, Donna Whit-
man.

Raise the fees

The Dalhousie Student Union has finally made a decision about universal accessibility. Frankly, we were appalled.

We can see no basis for either greedily approving a measure which in effect demands that our provincial government lower tuition fees by three hundred dollars, or, worse still, approving in principle the concept of universal accessibility.

Just what does the phrase "Universal accessibility" mean. And what does it mean to YOU?

This is what it means:

- (1) Anyone who wishes to attend a university and who has the capability of doing so, should be accepted irrespective of his class background. This, at a time when prices and taxation are such that there is almost nothing which is the sole domain of the sophisticated, well-bred, cultured segment of society. Do you honestly believe that you can do as well in university with a fisherman's son lounging beside you? Do you really believe that you can concentrate on a book which has been mauled by his once oily hands? Have you no self respect?
- (2) Further than this, what about the sons of miners, farmers, apple pickers, taxi drivers, etc.?
- (3) And this is not the extent of the lower class' infiltration. The logical extension of this ridiculous argument is that you will be FORCED to participate in the same educational process as the CHILDREN OF THE UNEMPLOYED! You won't even have the advantage that you had in high school, where district schools separated you from at least MOST of the riff-raff. And most ludicrous of all is the thought that education is a "contributive social process". The council uses this hackneyed jargon in a desperate attempt to dupe the government into destroying the vestiges of this last bastion of good, clean honest middle-class society. At the same time it ridicules the average student by attempting to implicate him. But we for some, will not be led around by the nose. We know what being in the top eight percent means.

And what does the phrase "contributive social process" mean? And what does it mean to YOU?

This is what it means:

- (1) It means that you must consider yourself as a SLAVE of society, compelled to give something to it in order to gain something yourself.
- (2) Do you honestly think that someone who spends his time sucking up used knowledge can contribute anything. He is a parasite. But still, wouldn't you rather be a parasite than a slave?

We are forced to condemn the Student's Council for their totally irresponsible and unrepresentative actions, though we must point out that several members of that organization supported our point of view.

Join with us in presenting a brief Anti-Brief to the government. It will read:

We, the undersigned rightfully arrogant members of the educated elite, recognizing that we must retain our legitimate identity against the vicious onslaught of the barbaric hoards of less deserving individuals constituting 92 percent of our society, do hereby demand of the government that either they stand up for the real purpose of a university, or abolish it.



The Student Housing Problem Still Exists!

Reagan - next U.S. President?

By ROBERT CHODOS,
For Canadian University Press

BALTIMORE (UPI) — The Ronald Reagan jokes (First Hollywood producer: "What do you think of Ronald Reagan for Governor?" Second Hollywood producer: "Ronald Reagan for Governor? No, Jimmy Stewart for Governor and Ronald Reagan for best friend.") are seldom heard now. They were never very funny anyway.

What is heard is increasingly respectable speculation that Ronald Reagan will be on the Republican ticket in 1968, either as Presidential or Vice-Presidential candidate. Since James Reston first discussed the possibility of a Rockefeller - Reagan ticket -- "it has everything against it except for one thing -- it might win," -- in The New York Times a couple of months ago, the idea has been receiving wide attention in the press. Two weeks ago it even made the cover of Time magazine, which treated it as a "dream ticket": "Here is Rocky, launching his campaign from the steps of a Harlem tenement and blazing a triumphant trail through the nation's big cities; there is Reagan, wowing the farmers at the plowing contest in Fargo, North Dakota, and as he stumps through the cornfields of the Midwest and the canebrakes of the South, leaving in his wake legions of charmed citizens, particularly women, who will have 62 million votes next year -- 4,000,000 more than U.S. men."

One factor that may act against such a ticket's ever coming about is that Reagan himself may be in no mood to settle for second place. He is at the moment one of five serious contenders for the Republican nomination (the others being Rockefeller, Richard Nixon, Gov. George Romney of Michigan and Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois). He has so far denied any interest in a national campaign in 1968, but such non-candidacy is one of the strange traditions of American politics. In the last few weeks he has been perhaps the most visible Republican -- he upstaged Romney and the rest of his colleagues at the floating Governors' Conference in the Virgin Islands and has since been on Page One all over the country with his speaking tour of the Midwest.

One thing Reagan has already done is to silence those people who were singing funeral hymns over the dead body of the American right after Barry Goldwater would carry only five states in 1964. The corpse turned out to be very much alive. Despite Reagan's supposed "moderation" in office in Sacramento, his ideology differs from Goldwater's only in details. He said last week that public welfare in America has been "a colossal and almost complete failure" and he out-hawks Lyndon Johnson and nearly everyone else on Viet Nam: "I don't think anyone would cheerfully want to use atomic weapons. But the last person in the world that should know we wouldn't use them is the enemy. He should go to bed every night being afraid that we might." He believes "it would be pretty naive to rule out the part the Communists played" in the widespread October 21 peace demonstrations: "You don't have to look under your bed anymore for Communists. You can just look out in front of your city hall."

This sounds uncomfortably like the sort of rhetoric we heard in 1964, and we all know that 1964 was supposed to be a debacle for the Republican party and the American right. How then to explain Reagan's appeal? First there is his personality; personality has always been a more important factor than issues in American politics, and hence Reagan's past career as an actor (if what he and his ilk did in the movies can be called acting) provides him with perhaps the best possible background for a Presidential campaign. The Baltimore Sun described his performance at the Governors' Conference as "daz-

zling". It is probably largely because Ronald Reagan is Ronald Reagan that he could do in 1966 precisely what Nixon had failed to do four years earlier; unseat wishy-washy Democrat Pat Brown in California, and by a million votes at that.

But there is a deeper reason as well. It is becoming clear that the forces that propelled Barry Goldwater to national prominence were forces whose strength was only beginning to be felt. James Q. Wilson, a Harvard professor of Government and a native of southern California, thinks that Reagan's appeal in his home state is the result of the transplantation of fundamentalist Protestantism from the small town to suburbia, of a growth-oriented society and of a deeply-rooted belief in business values and the sanctity of property. Southern Californians believe that the function of government is to create the proper climate for business and are more likely to respond to symbolic, moral issues than to bread-and-butter ones. Professor Wilson also thinks that this approach to politics is spreading to other areas of the country and will challenge the security-oriented politics of the last two generations.

If he is correct, then anyone to the left of William Buckley (who sees Reagan as the voice of "respon-

sible conservatism" and defends him against attacks from the Eastern liberal establishment, although he does not yet write about him in the worshipful manner in which he still talks about Barry Goldwater) can look forward to 1968 and beyond without enthusiasm.

The Johnson-Goldwater campaign of 1964 moved the entire American political scene several degrees to the right; the dominant theme of the Johnson Administration has been not the War on Poverty in Appalachia and the ghettos but the War on People in Viet Nam. To reverse this trend, it would be necessary for Johnson to be seriously challenged from the left in 1968. About the best that could be expected is that the Republican candidate would be a dove on Viet Nam and a "me-too" on everything else. But a Johnson-Reagan campaign would simply accelerate the trend and still more firmly establish the far right as a force in American politics -- if Reagan loses. In a year when, as Esquire magazine said, "the Republicans could easily defeat Lyndon Johnson if only they didn't have to run a candidate against him", it is hard to discount the possibility that we will wake up in the morning of January 21, 1969, and find that Ronald Reagan is President of the United States.

Peter Robson: year book chief

MAUREEN PHINNEY

"I'm different things to different people." Peter Robson, Pharos editor, aptly describes himself.

Robson is also a soccer fullback, an Ed student, last year's DGDS president, and an ex-president of the Canadian University Drama League.

As yearbook editor, he is aiming at better organization, better quality photography and copy, in the 1968 Pharos.

"I'm not too worried about the yearbook, but I am having trouble getting staff. We have a nucleus - but that's all."

Robson has stern words for the Education department. "The B. Ed is a poor excuse for a degree. The year in the Education Department is a year to be endured."

"Even though I'm not satisfied with the present educational structures, I don't think they're leading to student apathy. What apathy really means is that kids who are idealistic enough to want a good degree not just a pass, go to the library and study instead of getting involved in extra-curricular activities."

One kind of involvement that Robson disapproves of is "this big concern by Canadians about Vietnam. Canada is only involved in the war in an academic sense anyway. I think we should be more concerned about things closer to home. For example, what about the people at Dorchester that they strap to tables and beat every day? We should be more concerned with cleaning up our own backyard first."

Robson's future plans. "I'm throwing around the idea of joining CUSO for two years. I've been investigating the organization and it gives a concrete base to a lot of my unformulated ideas and plans. CUSO isn't a peace corps. Those who join are employees

Should Tenure go?

By PETER CRAWFORD

Most people know there is such a thing as tenure in a university, but few know much about it. The university does not publish anything to explain the issue to the students, but when I approached them they were willing to lend me a publication of the regulations. This was very pleasing considering how the administration is often overly cautious in giving any material to students.

The regulations explain the method of granting tenure in the following way. A new professor is granted a temporary contract for two years, and is then recommended for a full-time position, or in other words is granted tenure. If the university wants to make a further study of the Professor, it then grants another two year temporary contract. This would mean that the professor would not be considered until after four years of teaching at Dalhousie. Dean Cooke of Arts and Science says that this is the usual way at Dal. There is an exception, however. This is used when the university wants to encourage an already established professor to pull up stakes and come to Dal. In this case they would already have a great deal of knowledge about the man, and therefore could make a rational choice.

After four years, the university will either recommend the granting of tenure or give the person his release.

This particular method of granting tenure was developed five years ago, and it is in line with the standard practices of other Canadian universities. It is quite difficult for any University to be radically different from other universities for the academic force is highly mobile and hence can work in the atmosphere of their choice.

In any event, the university seems to have a valid reason for the present system of granting tenure.

But why does the university grant tenure? The main reason is the need to protect the academic freedom of the individual instructor. This seems to be the only real use but it alone is probably worth the continuation of tenure.

It would appear, however, that professors do not have any real use for tenure, or more specifically, not enough professors take advantage of the Academic freedom granted to them. It is only the minority of the staff which speaks out on issues as though they have nothing to fear. Indeed, professors who do speak out are usually thought to be radicals.

Once a professor has been granted tenure, he can only be removed 'for cause'. This means for an immoralistic nature or for gross incompetence and negligence. The faculty member would be brought before his colleagues and tried on the charge. Unless he is guilty, the university may not fire him. Indeed, it is almost impossible to fire a professor if he has been granted tenure.

Let us turn to the method of tenure, and how the university decides whether or not it wishes to

keep a particular person.

- Three criteria are used:
- (1) the role of the man as a teacher.
 - (2) the role of the man in his professional standing in the academic community
 - (3) the role of the man as an individual in his department, and how he performs in committee work for the university.

In talking to some professors, it is evident there is a difference of opinion as to the relative weight of numbers one and two. That is, is it more important for the university to look at the academic standing of a candidate, or to look at his ability to stand before a class and teach? I do not want at this time to debate the relative merits of either opinion, but would like to leave this question to a later date. Instead, let us consider them of equal merit, and progress from there.

What is the method of judging the various attributes the university wants in a professor? Academic standing is determined by the publishing of the individual and is relatively easy to judge. That is, one leaves it up to the editor if he wants to publish the professor's treatise. Concerning his role in the department, it should be possible to distinguish between a good and a bad worker in four years.

This leaves the problem of judging the professor's teaching ability. Dean Cooke mentioned three methods which were used. They are the exam results in a class, the opinion of the head of the department and student opinion as it reaches one's colleagues and the Dean.

It does not seem relevant to consider exams, for they can either depend on the mental aptitude of the student, or on the relative easiness or stiffness with which the professor marks his papers. The opinion of the head of the department cannot really be used in an ordinary class, for they are never able to hear the lectures given. In special lectures or seminars given by the professor or in open meetings, however, there is an opportunity. The final reason does seem the most valid, and it concerns the student reaction.

This reaction is measured in two ways. The first is by the present system of course evaluation, and the second is by an informal method of students going to either the professor or to the head of the department and expressing their opinions.

If students are such an asset to the university in helping it choose those eligible for tenure, should they not be encouraged to present their ideas? Some students might be afraid to complain about a professor, so maybe there should be an encouragement by the individual professors to alleviate their fears.

Thus both before and after tenure has been given the university could help improve their professor's ability to communicate with their students and hence decide whether or not they need tenure.

LETTER

Cameron House,
Howe Hall,
Nov. 6, 1967.

Dear Editor,

Since I have become a thesis only-student in the Faculty of Graduate Studies I have observed a rather surprising amount of discrimination against this group of students on campus.

At registration, when I offered to purchase a student card I was told that as a thesis only-student I could not purchase one - reason unstated. In the next breath the administration official reminded me that "of course you must purchase a year book - all graduating students must purchase a year book - I don't make the rules - I just apply them, chuckle, chuckle followed by a big smile". I don't smile. Being prevented from enjoying the privileges of participation in student activities while being forced to purchase a year book was not particularly hilarious to me. It also seems a rather poor way of encouraging participation in student activities. I might point out also that final year students in other professional faculties are not prevented from purchasing a student card.

It also seems that a thesis only-student by definition of the administration does not require medical care afforded to the rest of the student body. I have been informed (also with a chuckle, chuckle) that "We will be happy to look after your medical needs at going professional rates, we haven't worked out a system for you people - perhaps we will get around to it this year".

The whole problem boils down to the misconception that thesis only-students are in some way not full time students. As anyone acquainted with them is aware they are double time students - spending a long day at a lab and working an even longer night on THE THESIS.

Gentlemen of the administration and student council a little fair play if you please!

Yours sincerely,
Hugh Hope.



of their host country, and its up to them as individuals to make good.

"I dislike the do-gooder missionary attitude of a lot of the people who go to work in other countries. I'm going abroad because I want to travel, and learn about

other cultures. If I'm any example of what Canada is like, then I guess they'll learn about Canada from me."

"This seems to fit into my philosophy basically I'm an idealist, but I'm a cynic at the same time."