

# LETTERS

Dear Editor,

It was delightful to attend the grand opening of Dalton Hall on Friday, Nov. 9th. A fine job was done for the old building. In fact with all those bright fluorescent lights and semi-glass walls I'll be sure to wear sunglasses the next time I go over there. But that Friday saw the grand opening of another project as well. I speak here of fourth floor Main Building.

The inhabitants of the floor really did things up grand. Signs were posted to mark all the major attractions such as the distinguished columns, the ultra modern uni-sex wash-room facilities, the hide-away skylight, the functional wheel chair ramp and the boutiques dealing in rodent and fly sales. The place, I think it is fair to say, literally reeked with character.

It was with dismay, however, that upon further examination I found that much of their advertising was false. A pile of lumber (?) supposed to be auctioned off remained in its corner, still adorning the stairwell. Professor Andrew Robb's Sauna Bath (\$2.00 per hour) didn't live up to expectations while old faithful (the radiator) seemed to be on holidays. Bob Lippen's "mice for sale" business was dragging because he couldn't catch the little critters. Walter Fobes' dead flies boutique held



**"Yeah, I got my degree. I delivered the London Express."**

terrible business hours. These people, I would urge should thus be sued for false advertising!!

Before leaving this thriving business and tourist area though I heard some faint remarks of criticism, by its inhabitants, on the environment of fourth floor Main. How dare they? Don't they realize how lucky they are to occupy such magnificent premises? With only one phone on the floor the professors are spared having to deal with that impersonal ornament. With four flights of stairs to climb to get to the-

ir floor they get lots of exercise. With the dim lighting of the hallway they can enjoy more fully the historic presence that surrounds them. Sure, some rooms may encourage frost-bite one day and malaria the next but professors should be hardy people. They should think of themselves as pioneers and what better environment would they ask for stimulating such conditions?

I really don't know why some should complain. Administration should look into this.

Don Pridmore

Dear Mr. Dalton:

Without wishing to detract from Prof. Von Dreger's reputation for "innovative, bold and humanitarian" approaches to curriculum reform, I must contest his authorship of proposed curriculum C published in the November 20 Cadre.

This scheme parallels very closely a proposal I circulated among UPEI faculty in the fall of 1969. Veterans of those halcyon days, when our university was struggling from the womb, may have within their files a copy of my stillborn plan. It had no impact whatever upon serious curriculum planning at UPEI during the university's crucial first year.

Since Mr. Von Dreger was not here then, he probably never read my proposal, & undoubtedly formed his own plan quite independently. Unstructured curricula of this kind have been discussed for years, but rarely

adopted. They have been tried with mixed results at a handful of New England "experimental" colleges. I was a participant in one such experiment, as a teaching fellow at Mark Hopkins College in Vermont during the middle sixties.

I am pleased that the Faculty of Arts Curriculum Committee has resurrected my forgotten program. There is, however, a joker in Von Dreger's curriculum which I was careful to omit from mine.

Von Dreger proposes that "levels of achievement (will be) stipulated by the several Departments," which will also "set down... substantive requirements for a...major," etc. As all students of the politics of higher education must be aware, it is the departments of the chief agencies of academic orthodoxy in the modern university. If such a "bold" curriculum as Von Dreger's were instituted at UPEI--

a most unlikely prospect, I am afraid--leaving it in the hands of the departments to implement would be like handing over the Palestine Liberation Movement to the Israeli Cabinet.

In my 1969 version of an unstructured curriculum, the department as an intermediary between student & teacher was eliminated, as was that monstrosity, the departmental major. (Since academic "disciplines were to a considerable extent artificial creations of the late 19th century, the departments based upon them were largely administrative conveniences that have become political fixtures in university life: there is no genuine need for them.) Planning and co-ordination of degree programs was turned over to ad hoc committees.

Although I did not dwell upon it, the implication

**LETTERS con't to pg. 7**