

# TENURE CHANGES: A MUST.

by: DON GRAY

From the information I have received, I have found that the tenure system at this University is an outrage.

The committee to decide on who gets tenure and who doesn't is comprised of 9 members. These consist of the three Deans, 5 faculty members and one student.

This blatant form of tokenism towards the students must end. We are the people who pay \$55. a course to listen to these people. To my knowledge, I have never seen a faculty member other than those directly involved sitting in on my classes.

How is it then that the University tenure committee sees fit to seat 8 faculty members. The chairman of the Dept. of the member being considered is not even on the committee. The case must arise when you have a Physics professor determining the capabilities of a Philosophy professor.

The times for students getting what others deem as qualified people must come to an end. In recent weeks a number of other University student bodies have demanded and won equal representation.

We are the people who sit through the lectures of the individual who has been given a life term. Our student is consulted and he is supposed to represent us all.

I propose a number of changes. The first of these is that there be equal representation for both faculty and students. Secondly that tenure be changed from a lifetime appointment, to one reviewed every 7 years.

For those faculty members who maintain a high level of work there is nothing to fear, for those who, once they receive tenure, slip into incompetence. Enough said.

The committee should be comprised of the three deans and the head of the department that is being considered.

The student reps should be comprised of two senior students whose major is that of the department under consideration and two other members of the student body.



## LIBERATION CONT

throughout history), "men" will cease to be "men", and "women" will cease to be "women". Liberation is, in this case, now possible. What form will it take? Rather than a "man" relating to a "woman" (for so long as this persists the difference and, hence, the inequality persists), it will then be a "Self" relating to a "Self".

Now "Self" is sexually undifferentiated. "Selves" will not relate in terms of sexual roles anymore, but rather as "Selves". This will signify liberation.

Another reason why the Women's Liberation movement must fail is because it is not "women" only who are in need of liberation, but "men" as well. Until this is recognized the Women's Liberation may get legal and moral equality, but not liberation. Until "men" recognize the need for their own liberation, the "womens" efforts will remain, for the most part, thwarted.

It is mankind as a whole

which requires liberation; "women" (half the population) cannot do what requires all to do - strive for liberation. What "women" might strive for now is to awaken the "men" to their own need for liberation - this is a necessary condition before the liberation of all is achieved. You see, we could not have liberated "women" and unliberated "men" because the problem would be still there though in a different form.

There cannot be the liberation of one sex only - liberation only is as such when both are liberated. If one sex is "liberated" while the other is not, there is no liberation. To take this one step further, there is no liberation as such so long as one "man" (or "woman") is not liberated.

The implications of this for sexual behavior is both radical and interesting, and will constitute the subject-matter for my article in next weeks CADRE.

David Lewis, Federal N.D.P. Leader, will be in Charlotte Sunday, April 1 and Monday morning, April 2. Sunday night he addresses a public banquet at Montgomery Hall (\$5. for fundraising progress). Monday morning Mr. Lewis will be at Confederation Centre talking with Charlotte towners on coffee break.

**TRUE  
GRIT  
JOHN  
WAYNE**  
Duffy Amph.  
Sunday 8:30p.m.  
75¢