

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship

Number 16

NEWSLETTER

March 1997

ISSN 1203-3197

PURPOSES of SAFS

- 1. Maintaining freedom in teaching, research and scholarship;**
- 2. Maintaining standards of excellence in decisions about students and faculty.**

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE PART TWO: LINKED AND THREATENED ¹

*Michiel Horn
York University*

Tenure, also known as a continuing appointment or an appointment without term, may be of two kinds. One is tenure during good behaviour, either for life or until a specified pensionable age. The other is tenure during pleasure, either of a governing board or of a supervising bishop or other potentate. The former, in which dismissal is possible only for cause, was by the 18th century customary in the Scottish universities and the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, and in some institutions of the English-speaking New World.

1997 DUES

Many SAFS members have already renewed for 1997. Thanks! Your membership is very important to us. If you have renewed, please pass on the enclosed **membership form** to a colleague. If you have not yet renewed, please do so now. The larger our membership, the more effective we can be in petitioning, lobbying, and making our views known to university administrators and to government. Mail SAFS membership dues to:
Box 581, Stn. P, 704 Spadina Ave., TO, M5S 2T1.

SAFS' AND SOCIETAL ISSUES FOCUS OF ANNUAL MEETING

The opening session of the annual conference on May 10 will be a **Members' Forum** devoted to SAFS' policies. The Society's directors will participate and Professor Heinz Klatt will chair the forum. He invites you to contact him ahead of the conference with your concerns. Prof. Klatt can be reached by email at HKLATT@JULIAN.UWO.CA or fax (519) 433-0353 (Psych., King's College, UWO).

Professor Barry Smith, president of the New York chapter of the National Association of Scholars will give the lunchtime address on "The open society and its new (multicultural) enemies."

The full program is an insert in this newsletter.

Register now!

In North America, tenure during pleasure was the rule by the second half of the 19th century. The chief alternative at that time were the annual contracts typically in use in the land-grant universities. Subject to the loss of faculty to institutions that offered greater security, however, over time these institutions also tended to adopt tenure systems.

In British North America and Canada, tenure during pleasure was confirmed as legal fact in two key judicial decisions: Weir vs. Mathieson (Queen's University) in 1865, and Craig vs. The University of Toronto (1923). In the Weir case, a lower court held that Weir had life tenure and that the board of trustees had failed to show cause, and ordered him to be reinstated. This was overturned on appeal, on the grounds that Weir did not occupy an

Continued on page 2..

HORN...continued from page 1

endowed chair and as a consequence served during the board's pleasure. Weir unfortunately lacked the money to take the case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. (Weir had been critical of the executive head of his institutions; Craig had challenged the university's right to retire him at age 65.)

From the 1920s into the 1960s, when lawyers advised governing boards or embattled professors on the matter of tenure, they referred to the Weir and Craig cases to argue that boards had the power to end tenured appointments at their pleasure and need not show cause. That was the law; in fact, however, most professors were more secure than that. At various times in the late 19th and early 20th centuries such academic luminaries as Principal G.M. Grant of Queen's and Sir Robert Falconer of the University of Toronto, as well as McGill's Sir Arthur Currie, opined that their professors effectively held tenure during good behaviour until the age of retirement. At the University of British Columbia, which lost sixty percent of its provincial grant in the years 1932-33, there were no tenured professors among those who were dismissed in 1932, even though the university's lawyer had advised that tenured faculty were easier to dismiss than those who were in the midst of two- and three-year contracts.

And yet: the troubles of Frank Underhill, who came within a whisker of being dismissed from Toronto in 1941, the dismissal, on 24 hours' notice (no cause given), of the biochemist George Hunter from Alberta in 1949, and the dismissal of the historian Harry Crowe from United College, Winnipeg, in 1958, initially without stated cause, served as occasional reminders that tenure offered less security than academics liked to think. This was certainly the conclusion reached by the U of T legal scholar, later Chief Justice of Canada, Bora Laskin.

Laskin was one of two men chiefly responsible for identifying tenure with academic freedom in the Canadian professorial mind. (The two are linked in the 1915 and 1940 statements on academic freedom and tenure by the American Association of University Professors, but this organization, though it had a few members in Canada before 1950, had no real presence in this country.) The other was the Saskatchewan political economist Vernon Fowke. The two men made up a committee of inquiry into the dismissal of Harry Crowe, and their report firmly established security of tenure as a bulwark for academic freedom.

Harry Crowe had tenure. The ease with which the board of regents nevertheless expelled him (though the pressure of public opinion forced them to reinstate him some months later), offering their statutory power as justification, gave many professors pause. A study done years later for the Canadian Association of University Teachers by the Queen's law professor Daniel Soberman found that all Canadian professors held their tenure during pleasure and were therefore vulnerable in times of crisis.

This helps to explain the effort by faculty associations in the 1960s and early 1970s to codify the granting of tenure and the conditions under which professors might be dismissed, an effort that seems to have been everywhere successful. It was assisted by a historical anomaly: a continent-wide shortage of qualified personnel. This forced universities to grant fairly readily what otherwise

Continued on page 3...

Published by the **Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship**, a society open to all (whether in a university or not) who accept the principles of freedom in teaching, research and scholarship and maintaining standards of excellence in decisions about students and faculty;

Editor: Dr. Chris Furedy, **Readings editor:** Judy Wubnig,
Layout: Lianne Carley

Box 581, Station P, 704 Spadina Ave., TO, M5S 2T1
Tel: (416) 978-7062 Fax: (416) 978-4811
Email: SAFSN@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA
Fax for newsletter submissions: (416) 962-4253
Individual subscriptions: \$10 p.a.; institutional: \$15
Supported by a grant from the Donner Canadian Foundation

SAFS Board of Directors (1996/97)

John J. Furedy, Ph.D., (U. Toronto) *President*
Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC, (UWO) *Past President*
Philip Davis, Ph.D., (UPEI)
J. L. Granatstein, Ph.D., FRSC, (Emeritus)
Ruth Gruhn, Ph.D., (U. Alberta)
Murray Miles, Dr. Phil., (Brock U.)
Peter Suedfeld, Ph.D., FRSC, (UBC)
Philip Sullivan, Ph.D., (U. Toronto)

Email Addresses

John Furedy FUREDY@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA
Doreen Kimura KIMURA@UWO.CA
Philip Davis DAVIS@UPEI.CA
Jack Granatstein JLGRANAT@YORKU.CA
Ruth Gruhn RGRUHN@GPU.SRV.UALBERTA.CA
Murray Miles MMILES@SPARTAN.AC.BROCKU.CA
Peter Suedfeld PSUEDFELD@CORTEX.PSYCH.UBC.CA
Philip Sullivan SULLIVAN@UTIAS.UTORONTO.CA

HORN...continued from page 2

they might have been reluctant to do: the effective transformation of tenure from being during pleasure to being during good behaviour, with dismissal possible only for cause.

The results were two-fold: job security was enhanced and so, for those who sought to use it, was academic freedom. Of course it is easy for critics to note that most academics never do anything that seems to require freedom, but that simply reflects the nature of the academic (and human) beast. At all times, in Canada and elsewhere, most academics have been more or less willing worshippers in the temple of received opinion. Less out of fear or careerism -- though both have played a role -- but out of a natural inclination shared with other humans, professors have tended to endorse the dominant ideology or acquiesce in it, whether in politics, economics or religion.

The same herd mentality exists in the pure, applied and social sciences as well as in the humanities. It is easier, safer, more agreeable and more comfortable to believe and to belong than to be a heretic, an outsider. As Carl Jung put it: "Where the many are, there is security; what the many believe must of course be true."²

There are exceptions, of course, else the concept of academic freedom would have no history. The proportion of dissenters is larger, perhaps much larger, in universities than in the societies around them. Nevertheless, the academic preference for acceptable knowledge and belief is clear. The philosopher Martin Heidegger, who after Hitler's rise to power lectured to his students in Nazi dress, may seem an extreme example; he was, sad to say, probably closer to being characteristic of the academic type than we may want to believe.

For precisely that reason the security that tenure affords to academic freedom is all the more important. In the recent past in Canada, the enemies of that freedom have been more conspicuous within the university than outside it. There are some (faculty, students, administrators) who are striving for the achievement within the academy of a "culture of comfort,"³ from which ideas that they find disturbing and offensive will be excluded. The potential for the harassment of non-conformists is clear.

That said, I should add that I do not regard the champions of political correctness, so-called, as the greatest menace to academic freedom today. That threat lies, rather, in the low regard in which universities, and more particularly the liberal arts, are held. There is widespread disdain for

SAFS SEEKS SUGGESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT

*Doreen Kimura, Past President
University of Western Ontario*

I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors to inform you that we are searching for a new president for 1998. John Furedy, who has served so well and zealously, will step down as President in May 1998. We are reluctant to see him go, but his teaching relief funds will stop by then, and, in any case, battle fatigue eventually sets in.

According to the by-laws, the Board selects the next president from among the Board members. Unfortunately, None of the current Board is willing to take over the job. This means that we need to start a search *now*, for a new Board member who will want to take on the job in 1998.

If you are interested, or know of anyone who may be, please contact me *before March 15th*, if possible. This is necessary because any such person must be elected to the Board before the May meeting of this year.

The job is best suited to someone who does not currently have heavy teaching or administrative duties, since the job can be time-consuming. If you would like a rundown on the duties of the president, please contact John Furedy. Note: it is necessary for the president to be on email as most of the work with the Board is done by email.

Contact: Doreen Kimura, Tel: 519-661-2062; Fax: 519-661-3029; email: KIMURA@UWO.CA

critical and disinterested thought about economics, society and culture. Such thought, never in high demand, may be in particularly low demand today, when the corporatist ideology is dominant.⁴

Demands that universities become more business-like and more practical, and do more with less, have become steadily louder since an Ontario minister of education, John White, called for "more scholar for the dollar" twenty-five years ago. A few years ago the then president of York University, Harry Arthurs, bragged to a business audience that his institution had, since the late 1970s, become 44 percent more productive and wondered how many of his listeners could say the same. Was anyone

Continued on page 4...

HORN...continued from page 3

impressed? I don't know the answer to that. I do know that the attitude of the current Ontario minister is that we haven't become nearly productive enough.

In this context neither tenure nor academic freedom is safe. There is growing evidence that university administrators and boards are finding the restrictions imposed on them by tenure irksome. It is widely understood that, in cases of financial exigency, tenured faculty are not safe from dismissal. They *are* safe from being treated arbitrarily, but in time of crisis administrators tend to the view that due process is a luxury they cannot afford. Contempt for due process and a preference for arbitrary action seem to be in the air: they were as clearly evident in the attitude of the University of Manitoba's board and administration towards their professors last fall as they are in Ontario's omnibus legislation, Bill 26, today.

It has been argued, among others by Michael Bliss, that tenure, aside from protecting the occasional incompetent professor, is regarded so negatively by the public that we would do best to abandon it. The protection it affords to our academic freedom may be secured by documents specifically safeguarding that freedom. Our employment may then be entrusted to renewable 5 or 10 year contracts (though it's not clear how and by whom these would be renewed) in the presumably confident expectation that the fit will survive and the unfit will not be missed.

I find the argument unpersuasive. If professors are in charge of the periodic examination of their fellows, the results will likely be a considerable expenditure of time better applied elsewhere and a rejection rate so low that critics of the university will soon regard the new system as being tenure under another name. Professors would be foolish, however, if they allowed administrators to determine who stays and who goes. Left to their own devices, presidents, vice-presidents and deans probably do the right thing far more often than the wrong, but in the matter of reappointing faculty, particularly in a time of budgetary stress, the temptation to do wrong might well prove irresistible.

Tenure *is* unpopular and *may* damage us in the eyes of the public. But the same thing can be said about academic freedom. The claims that professors make to that freedom have usually met with a measure of scepticism and even outright hostility. This waned after the 1960s, possibly because journalists were paying less attention to what academics had to say (a tendency particularly strong in the financial and business press). The hostility may be waxing again, however, partly because the phenomenon of political correctness serves some of our critics as a club to

use on us, and partly because in a time of financial stress academic freedom, like tenure, seems to many outsiders to be a justification for doing too little work or, worse, the wrong *kind* of work.

Tenure may be legislated out of existence, as in Britain, to be replaced by you know what. Meanwhile a key condition for academic freedom, adequate time to think and to carry time-consuming research projects to their completion, may dwindle as other demands on the time of professors mount. Where there is no time to do the research that is at the basis of disinterested advice and criticism, academic freedom largely loses its meaning. We have not reached that point yet, in Ontario or Canada, and I hope we never will reach it. But the threat is real.

The combined effect of the federal retreat from funding higher education (a retreat begun, in a sense, in 1966 and now nearing its end), combined with a provincial determination to cut back on the public sector, makes optimism difficult. Universities will survive in some form, but the only parts that seem likely to flourish are those, like faculties of administrative studies and engineering, that serve the corporate world most closely and uncritically. It remains to be seen whether, from the point of view of the historian of academic freedom, the institutions as a whole will in fifteen or twenty years be worth the powder to blow them to kingdom come. No, that seems too dramatic, even for me, but we *are* in for hard times.

NOTES

1. This paper was delivered at the conference "Here Comes the Crunch: Forces Shaping the Future of Universities" sponsored by the University of Toronto Faculty Ass'n, and held at University College, January 25, 1996. Part 1 was published in *Newsletter 15*, Dec. 1996.
2. Anthony Storr, *The Essential Jung*, quoted in John Ralston Saul, *The Unconscious Civilization* (Concord, ON, 1995): 91.
3. See: J. J. Furedy, "Academic freedom versus the 'culture of comfort' on Canadian campuses," *Interchange* (in press, 1997).
4. John Ralston Saul, *op. cit.*

CONGRATULATIONS!

Congratulations to Board Member Jack Granatstein on being made a Member of the Order of Canada for services to education, announced in the recent appointments made by Governor-General Romeo LeBlanc.

PROFESSOR RICHARD HENSHEL**1930-1997***Ben Singer*

Dr. Richard Henshel, Professor of Sociology at the University of Western Ontario and a valued member of SAFS, died on February 21 of lung cancer.

He was born in the U.S. but became a dual citizen after joining the Department of Sociology in 1971. He received his B.A. from the University of Texas in 1962, *magna cum laude*, was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and gained his doctorate from Cornell University in 1968. He joined the Sociology Department at UWO in 1971, where he taught sociological theory, as well as social psychology and the philosophy of science. His research and publications included many original contributions in social prediction, social problems theory, and civil liberties research. His books comprised *Perspectives on Social Problems*, *Perception in Criminology*, *Reacting to Social Problems*, *On the Future of Social Problems*, and *Thinking about Social Problems*. The work that he was perhaps best known for was on the self-fulfilling prophecy, the self-altering prophecy, and on the bandwagon effect in collective behaviour, as well as many works on futurism and social prediction. During his career, he held a number of visiting appointments at Columbia University, University of Toronto, Yale University and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Richard was dedicated to civil liberties work and was known for his principled stand against political correctness and threats to free speech and academic freedom on the campus. He served on the Executive of the UWO Faculty Association and as a director of OCUFA. His enthusiastic work as an officer of the UWO SAFS chapter was exemplary. He contributed to SAFS by his keen participation in annual meetings, by designing our new brochure, and by contributions to the newsletter. Even when gravely ill, he was deeply concerned about the threats to Canadian research posed by the Tri-Council proposals and continued to write and to organize opposition to them.

The Board passed the motion set out below in appreciation of his contribution to SAFS.

Memorial donations sent to SAFS in Richard's name will be devoted to a memorial newsletter or event. Please mail to: Dr. Heinz Klatt, Department of Psychology, King's College, University of Western Ontario, 266 Epworth Ave., London, ON, N6A 5B8; email: HKLATT@JULIAN.UWO.CA; Fax: (519) 433-0353.

BOARD MOTION OF APPRECIATION TO RICHARD HENSHEL

Shortly after the following message was delivered to Professor Richard Henshel by Professor Ben Singer, on behalf of the SAFS Board of Directors, we received the sad news that Richard had died.

Richard, the Board of Directors of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship wish to extend our sympathy to you in your illness.

We have passed a motion of appreciation, on behalf of the total membership of SAFS, for your excellent work in the cause of maintaining our principles, both of merit and academic freedom. The design of the general membership brochure, and your work in the local London organization as secretary, and in upholding SAFS' views in the Faculty Association Executive, are deeply appreciated. We have also valued your recent comments on the strategy for dealing with the Tri-Council Ethics code.

SAFS Board of Directors

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
RESEARCH: SAFS RESPONDS TO DRAFT
CODE OF ETHICS**

Letter sent to: Hon. John Manley, Minister of Industry and
Hon. David Dingwall, Minister of Health

January 28, 1997

In September we sent you a copy of our response to the Tri-Council Working Group's document "Code of conduct for research involving humans," indicating what we felt were serious problems it raises for both the freedom to do research and the validity of some research if constrained by the code's recommendations.

In reply we received a letter from Louise Dandurand, Secretary General of SSHRC. Also enclosed was a response from the Working Group on the revision process, and a memo from Michael McDonald who is apparently appointed to the Centre for Applied Ethics at UBC. None of these responses encourages us to think that the final document will meet international standards for valid research and scholarship in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

The serious consequences of the current document were discussed at a symposium at the recent Society for Neuroscience in Washington. In attendance were science writers from the U.K.-based *New Scientist* and the U.S.-based *Science* magazine, both of whom also discussed the consequences (articles attached). Contrary to Michael McDonald's claim that most of the responses to the document have been positive, our information is that responses have been overwhelmingly negative. But even if McDonald's claim were true, the fact remains that, by international standards of research and scholarship, the original draft code deserved the harshest of criticisms.

We are seriously concerned that if the final decision of this code is left in the hands of those who are swayed by considerations of political correctness rather than those of the pursuit of knowledge, the research and scholarship enterprise in Canada, as well as its international reputation (see articles attached), will be irreversibly damaged.

Professor John J. Furedy, Ph.D., President, SAFS on behalf of the Board of Directors

**Response of Premier Harris on issues of
academic freedom and the OHRC, to President
of SAFS, November 22, 1996.**

Dear Mr. Furedy,

Thank you for your letter regarding reform to the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC). I appreciate your bringing the views of the Board members of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS) to my attention. I trust you will share the contents of this letter with your colleagues.

Restructuring of the OHRC is well underway. As you know, this reform requires a comprehensive approach that includes ongoing business improvements, development of new regulations and longer-term changes focusing on the most effective service delivery model for people who experience discrimination.

I note that, in your letter, you copied my colleague, the Honourable Marilyn Mushinski, Minister of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation. While the Ontario Human Rights Commission reports to the Minister, in fact, it is an arm's length regulatory agency which manages its own processes. I have therefore taken the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the Chief Commissioner, Mr. Keith C. Norton, so that he will be aware of your concerns.

Thank you for sharing SAFS' views with me.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Harris, MPP
c.c. Mr. Keith C. Norton

The letter to which Mr. Harris responded was published in Newsletter No. 15 (December 1996): 7.

People who defend free speech will always have fellow travelers on the journey with whom they would otherwise have no commerce.

Gene Burns, president, US National Public Radio Association, interviewed on CBC's "As It Happens", May 17, 1996.

**FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN POST
SECONDARY EDUCATION IN ONTARIO:
COMMENT ON THE REPORT OF THE
ONTARIO ADVISORY PANEL**

John Furedy

The final report of the Ontario Advisory Panel on Future Directions for Post Secondary Education (to which SAFS submitted a brief, and with whose chair, David C. Smith, I had an interview in October) came out in late December. The report did not follow our brief's recommendations on academic freedom, but I think that our representations did have some influence on parts of the report. The following points to some extent address our concerns:

1. The term "academic freedom" is mentioned in several places, and used in its proper sense. For example, on p. 14, the panel supports: conditions required for scholarly inquiry, including academic freedom and institutional autonomy, properly understood. In the preliminary statement of the panel, academic freedom was not mentioned.
2. In a weak formulation of the merit principle espoused by SAFS, the report, on p. 54, states that "We strongly recommend that recognition of merit be a guiding principle in the operation of colleges and universities in their compensation policies".
3. There is no mention (and hence no defense) of so-called "equity" policies in the report, nor any talk of "pervasive sexism and racism" on campuses. There are no proposals for a revamped "Zero Tolerance" policy. While this silence is a long way from recommending abolishing of all the equity campus bureaucracies (as the SAFS' brief advised), it still represents some progress.

A copy of the report titled "Excellence, Accessibility, Responsibility" (Dec. 1996) can be obtained through the Ministry of Education and Training, Advisory Panel on Future Directions for Post Secondary Education, 56 Wellesley St. W., 10th flr, TO, ON, M7A 2B7; Tel: (416) 325-4549 or 1-800-529-449.

Email: PSPANEL@EDU.GOV.ON.CA. See Caught in the Net (p. 12) for the website address for this report.

Email members who would like to see the summary recommendations of the report, can send a message to SAFS' email address, attention Lianne re: Smith Report.

**WHEN THE BARBARIANS ARE
INSIDE THE GATES...**

Peter Suedfeld

During an internet exchange in 1995 that related to academic freedom and the suspension of the political science department at the University of British Columbia, Dr. Peter Suedfeld, of the psychology department, wrote:

Individual freedom is the value that I prize above all others in the conduct of normal life, whether personal, political, or academic. This is based on my early life experiences in Hungary under successive quasi-fascist, Nazi and Communist regimes; my appreciation for the liberation won at great cost by the Allied forces; my dismay at watching the excesses of McCarthyism in the USA as a student; my affiliation with civil rights and civil liberties organizations as a young faculty member, and the consequent battles against attempts to circumscribe both constitutional and academic freedom; and my growing anger and frustration as the New Left turned those noble ideals on their heads to serve intolerance and discrimination, thinly disguised by sanctimonious rhetoric.

Now that the barbarians are inside the gates--and, in many cases, commanding the sentries--it is more important than ever for academics to show courage (as they seldom have before). This is especially true for those professors whose senior position makes them relatively secure, and who can thus try to protect the freedoms and rights of more vulnerable colleagues.

I think that the first goal of SAFS should be to inform, remind, and win the allegiance of administrators, professors, and students (and sometimes, the general public) to honour the paramount importance of those values, and if that is not possible, to respond to any serious attack on them with all possible vigour. Someone just asked me how many battles we must be willing to fight; the answer is, just one more than the other side.

[Thanks to Prof. Peter Suedfeld for permission to reproduce this email message. Ed.]

PHILOSOPHICAL ROOTS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Graeme Voyer
Winnipeg

Affirmative action is a distinctly Leftist policy. Integral to the Leftist agenda, it is rooted in the values and assumptions of the Left.

The Left is driven by an animus against Western civilization, and seeks to implement grandiose projects for remaking society through government. Affirmative action is counter-cultural social engineering, and is therefore a classic expression of a Leftist *weltanschauung*--it proceeds logically from the world view of the Left. As Polsby and Popper have observed, "quotas [i.e., affirmative action] are the cardinal issue of the Left..."¹ Indeed, affirmative action has become increasingly central to the Leftist agenda, reflecting the reorientation of the political strategy of the Left toward domestic issues since the collapse of most communist regimes.²

Much of the controversy over affirmative action has concerned its application to the university. The project of remaking academe in the USA in accordance with some *a priori* model of "diversity" through affirmative action policies, Anthony Harrigan has pointed out, constitutes an example of militant utopianism which is "utterly lacking in American roots and that is derived from the ethos of revolutionary systems."³ It is a project of messianic social engineering which is the very essence of Leftism. Much the same can be said of the origins and impact of "employment equity" and "diversity" in Canadian universities.

The proliferation of affirmative action has been traced by Frederick Lynch to the migration of radical egalitarians from universities to the media and governmental agencies, a migration which, he says, occurred about twenty years ago, but which probably began much earlier.⁴ The agenda of radical egalitarianism, one writer has noted, has been to manipulate institutions "to pass laws that will force others to behave along egalitarian lines. The objective is institutionalization of discrimination in favor of whatever group the egalitarian considers to

have been 'disadvantaged'."⁵

The Leftist character of affirmative action and employment equity is virtually axiomatic. These values are the product of a messianic, counter-cultural ideology; they multiply opportunities for a statist class to expand its power and refashion society in accordance with some abstract scheme.

REFERENCES

1. Daniel Polsby and Robert Popper. "Racial Lines," *National Review*, Vol. XLVII, Feb. 20, 1995: 53.
2. Dinesh D'Souza. *Illiberal Education*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992: 214. Cf. also Dario Fernandez-Morera, "Materialist Discourse in Academia During the Age of Late Marxism," *Academic Questions*, Vol. 4, Spring, 1991: 18.
3. Anthony Harrigan. "A Lost Civilization," *Modern Age*, Vol. 35, Fall, 1992: 9.
4. Frederick Lynch. "Workforce Diversity: PC's Final Frontier?," *National Review*, Vol. XLVI, Feb. 21, 1994: 32.
5. Peter Hannaford, review of Aaron Wildavsky. "The Rise of Radical Egalitarianism," *National Review*, Vol. XLIV, April 27, 1992: 50.

THE UBC PRESIDENTIAL AD

Prof. Phil Resnick writes:

After numerous delays, the policy on the wording of the advertisement for the presidential search will be returned to the UBC Board of Governors in March for a final decision (see *Newsletter 13*). The administration and the Equity Office want to keep "especially," while adding a mealy-mouthed phrase about merit. I will be pushing for merit, in conjunction with something like the McGill phrasing, which refers to equity but without singling out any specific groups for inclusion or exclusion. There has been quite extensive consultation on the whole matter in various departments over the past month and a half, and the discussion next month promises to be quite interesting. There is significant support on the Board for going beyond the old, discriminatory language. Whether that will translate into majority support for what I will be proposing remains to be seen.

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN PERSPECTIVE
A CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE NEW YORK
ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS (NYAS)
Canisius College, Buffalo April 25-26, 1997**

Provisional Program

Friday, April 25, 1996

Academic Freedom and Student Life (2:00-3:45 pm)
Father Robert A. Sirico, (Acton Institute), "Academic Freedom and Religious Liberty: Compatibility or Conflict?"

Robert Haskell, (U. of Maine), "Gallopings Polls: Student Evaluation of Faculty and Academic Freedom"

D. Bruce Johnstone, (SUNY Buffalo), "Is There a Manager in the House of Academe?"

Tenure and Academic Freedom (4:00-5:45 pm)
Lucinda Finley, (SUNY Buffalo), "The Hollow Promise of Academic Freedom for the Untenured"

Neil Hamilton, (William Mitchell College of Law), "The Historic Bargain in American Higher Education: Academic Freedom, Peer Review, Tenure and Shared Governance"

Burton M. Leiser, (Pace U.), "The Limits of Tenure"

After Dinner Address (6 pm)
Alan C. Kors, (U. of Pennsylvania), "Academic Freedom in *loco parentis*"

Saturday, April 26, 1997

Academic Freedom in Canada (9:30 - 11:30 am)
John Furedy, (U. of Toronto), "Academic Freedom and Academic Power in Canada"

John Fekete, (Trent U.), "Academic Freedom and the Inclusive University"

Academic Freedom & Academic Reform (1:30-3:15 pm)
Candace de Russy, (SUNY Board of Trustees), "Academic Freedom: A Trustee's Perspective"

Mary Burgan, (American Association of University Professors), "Reform Movements: Shared or Imposed?"

Barry Smith, (SUNY Buffalo), "Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility"

Academic Freedom and Political Correctness (3:30-5:15 pm)
Stephen H. Balch, (National Association of Scholars), "Academic Freedom: Its Suppositions"

John K. Wilson, (Teachers for a Democratic Culture), "Academic Freedom and the Myth of Political Correctness"

Paul Kurtz, (Center for Inquiry), "Reflections on the Revolution at SUNY Buffalo: 25 Years Later"

Registration for the conference is \$20 (\$30 after April 1). For registration or for general info, contact Dr. Henry C. Clark, History Department, Canisius College, Buffalo, NY 14208; Tel: 716-888-2682; Fax: 716-888-2525; email: CLARK@CANISIUS.EDU; www.nas.org/conf/nyas497.html

**EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH:
FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH**

N. MacCormick's email to Furedy, Oct. 3, 1996

Many thanks for your long and carefully stated message concerning the case of Chris Brand. I am grateful for the care with which you have thought about this and for your balanced statement of opinion on it. I have to say, however, that what you say is necessarily based upon inevitably thin evidence [Because of the confidentiality governing the case. Ed.]. ...Can I say that I see three important points of principle at issue.

The first and most important, that of freedom of speech in the academic setting, must be fully upheld. I have done my best to ensure that Mr. Brand's freedom to express his scientific and his political opinions is unimpaired, and I think that the University of Edinburgh at all levels has acted properly and honourably in this respect. Academic freedom includes but goes beyond, the general right of freedom of speech and opinion.

Secondly, the University as an institution must make it quite clear that it does not endorse collectively, nor does it collectively contradict or condemn, any particular opinion in a matter of scientific or political controversy about which its members choose to express themselves whether in a professional capacity or otherwise. Somehow, it must also make clear that this position is one of institutional neutrality, not one of tacitly endorsing what it refuses to condemn...

Thirdly, we as institutions owe responsibilities to our students, and when students make complaints about the quality of the teaching they are offered, it is the responsibility of a Dean or other like office-holder to look into these with care. Of course, especially where unpopular views are in issue, one must be careful not to accept critical opinions at simple face value. Not all complaints are legitimate complaints. That some complaints are not legitimate, however, does not entail, as you are well ware, that none is...

In pursuing this way of proceeding, I was guided *inter alia* by a sense of the very damaging effects of disciplinary processes and accusations, especially in a context of this kind. If you are of the view that my actions have smeared Mr. Brand's reputation, I think that you ought to reflect on

Continued on page 10...

EVALUATION...continued from page 9

the other risks that are involved, for all parties, in a disciplinary trial in the University setting. I very much hope that it will not come to that, though I have to say that this now largely lies outside of my control. My opinion was formed after very careful inquiry and examination of evidence. Clearly, at the stage at which I was engaged, the inquiry had to be conducted in a confidential way... I regret that in the circumstances of the case, the University found it necessary to make public in a very compressed and summary form the upshot of my inquiries, but I fully shared and share the opinion that in the climate of public controversy, it was necessary for there to be some public statement...

I regard academic freedom and freedom of speech as a fundamental commitment for academic office-holders and I have been guided by this in what I have done. I am well aware of the risk that I have made mistakes in carrying out my duties. But, I must say that I think some of your criticism is vitiated by your lack of knowledge of the detail, which I am afraid is inevitable in the case.

J. Furedy's email to MacCormick, Oct. 30, 1996

Thanks for your October 3 letter regarding the case of Chris Brand. I do understand that in the absence of specific details which cannot be provided in view of the confidential nature of the inquiry, I can make no informed judgments about the gravity of the charges that the anonymous students made against Brand. However, I think I can comment on the principles underlying the inquiry and the statements made in public by your university.

In that regard I agree with both the first two principles that you have stated, and that, in this respect, the university's handling of the affair was academically appropriate.

However, regarding the third principle, that complaints by students be responsibly handled, although all the evidence indicates that your private, oral interactions with Brand were appropriate, the public pronouncements of your university were not completely so, and constitute a muted application of the "culture of comfort" criterion.

Your university, in my view, should have restricted its public pronouncement to announcing that the inquiry had found that Mr. Brand did not evaluate his students in a biased way. The other "charges" and "directives" should not have been made public, because they constitute reputation-damaging assertions which have not been

subjected to systematic and disinterested examination.

I think that the principle here is that in evaluating teaching (or any other aspect of academic performance), the only negative evaluations that should be made public are those that are based on expert and systematically examined evidence.

This still leaves it open for departmental chairs and even more senior administrators to talk privately to individual teachers about anonymous student concerns. In those private talks, advice can be offered about stylistic changes in teaching that may mitigate serious complaints without compromising the academic integrity of the course. Such advice can often be quite valuable for individual academic teachers. However, those teachers should be completely free to accept, partially accept, or even totally reject such advice, without any fear of consequences if such advice is not accepted. If the advice is really a "directive", then it should be based on systematic and expert evaluation, which, in contrast to North America, is readily available in Great Britain in the form of the external-examiner system.

J. Furedy's email to MacCormick, Nov. 8, 1996

...I appreciate that it's a lot easier to state principles from afar than to apply them in a complex and emotional situation.

I understand that recently the so-called "Anti-Nazi" group has attempted to disrupt Mr. Brand's classes. Perhaps this is a good time for your university to publically reiterate the basic finding of your inquiry, that there is no evidence to suggest that Mr. Brand evaluates his students in a biased way. This would serve to emphasize the university's commitment to defend the academic freedom (without suggesting any agreement with the opinions) of its faculty and students against attempts to disrupt classes.

[This email exchange has been edited to reduce length. Ed.]

Help Spread the Word

We would appreciate it if SAFS members on email would "adopt" a non-emailer member or two and circulate SAFS messages to them. Non-emailers: you can take the initiative and ask a colleague or friend to keep you informed.

**A NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ACADEMIC
FREEDOM AND
THE INCLUSIVE UNIVERSITY**

*University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC
April 10-12, 1997*

Speakers will include:

Dr. Bernard Shapiro (Principal, McGill) on "The Role of the University in a Changing Culture"

Jack Granatstein (York), Frederick Schauer (Harvard), and Dorothy Smith (Toronto) on "Tracing the Discourses on Academic Freedom and Inclusiveness"

Peter Emberley (Carleton), Cannie Stark Adamec (Regina) and Stan Persky (Capilano College, BC) on "Intersections and Tensions: What's at Stake?"

Tom Berger (UBC), Jennifer Bankier (Dalhousie), Lorna Marsden (Wilfred Laurier) and Margaret Wente (Globe & Mail) on "Successes and Failures: Promoting Academic Freedom and Inclusiveness".

Also, keynote speakers: Judy Rebick (CBC "Face Off") at Friday night dinner and Georges Sioui (Saskatchewan Indian Federated College) at Saturday Lunch; and Stanley Fish (Duke) and John Fekete (Trent) in a public lecture on Saturday night.

Also scheduled to present on the panels are:

Ann Brown	George Hoberg
Diane Dyson	Michiel Horn
Stanley Coren	Harvey Shulman
Graham Good	Louis Marinoff
Joseph Tindale	Marie Fleming
Jennie Honosty	Barbara Thomson Goddard

There will also be time for focus group discussions on the Friday afternoon, and concurrent sessions of presentation and discussion with academics from across the country on the Saturday morning.

For a brochure, registration and accommodation information, contact: The UBC Conference Centre, 5961 Student Union Blvd., Vancouver, BC, V6T 2C9; Tel: 604-822-1050; Fax: 604-822-1069; email: REGISTRATION@BROCK.HOUSING.UBC.CA; web site: www.conferences.ubc.ca

For information about the program content, contact: Nichola Hall, Continuing Studies, 5997 Iona Dr., Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z2; Tel: 604-822-1460; fax: 604-822-1499; email: HALL@CCE.UBC.CA

Dennis Pavlich, Co-Chair, Advisory Committee
Conference on Academic Freedom and the Inclusive
University Old Admin Bldg., UBC, 6328 Memorial Rd.,
Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z2.

EQUITY TO THE RESCUE

*Krista Soots
University of Toronto*

Notes on the conference "Rescuing Graduate Studies: Equity and How to Get It," held at the University of Toronto, March 1-3, 1997.

Equity, as advocated at this conference, entails much more than just quotas and affirmative action. It is important for those who have concerns about the equity movement in the Canadian university to realize that the view of equity espoused here means also a basic restructuring of academic values.

Central to this change of perspective is a scorn for the concept of universal standards for scholarship, standards rooted in a striving for objectivity and evaluated by degrees of merit. Rather, merit is seen as something that has historically been defined by "the white patriarchal culture", and objectivity is mocked as a philosophical impossibility.

Merit, viewed as a quaint and antiquated notion, now has no legitimate place in the new instructional equation because the quest for knowledge is said to have meaning only in a given context, and contexts can't be compared and evaluated for they are all equally valid. Ranking with reference to quality was declared at the meeting to be a positivistic preoccupation with evaluation and measurement.

Equity, then, is no longer a matter of body counts. It is extended boldly into the domain of ideas. Epistemological equity means that all "knowledges" are equal (except, of course, the views that disagree with this). As to the "epistemological equity" between, for example, a supervisor and a graduate student, it was maintained that equity must be viewed as complete, because the professor has merely a different experience from the student, and not a superior understanding. Instructors (including professors) in a workshop devoted to this issue denied having greater expertise in their field in any sense that they considered meaningful. They deemed attempts by an instructor to impose her/his requirements on a student as autocratic and silencing.

Academic freedom was summarily dismissed as a concern from the outset, since to the speakers it was self-evident that the many different perspectives contributed by all the different groups given a "voice" in a diverse university would mean *more* academic freedom.

For all the emphasis on diversity of opinion and

Continued on page 12...

SOOTS...continued from page 11

viewpoint, however, there was a seamless conceptual unity in the voices of all the speakers--everyone spoke in the same highly abstract, ponderous and often profoundly incoherent idiom of "deconstruction." No dissenting viewpoints were considered or solicited on the topics of discussion.

A sobering lesson that I drew from this conference is that "equity" as it is understood and promoted by the University of Toronto has ramifications far beyond reverse discrimination and the disadvantaging of white males. Its advocates seek nothing less than to change the whole mission of the university itself. They are determined to dethrone the ideal of disinterested research and knowledge and "reload the cannon" with the new ideal of the "situated knowledge" of personal perspectives.

(The meeting was part of "Equity Days" at the U of T, and organized by the exchange programme in Women's Studies with Humbolt University in Berlin. Twenty-two sponsors, including the vice-principal, Research and International Relations and the German Consulate, were listed in the programme.)

THE TRI-COUNCIL'S REVISION PROCESS: COMMENT

John Furedy

The Tri-Council's reactions to earlier comments on the draft code of ethics for human subjects research (Oct. 11, 1996) can be accessed on the internet at the site given below. Here are a couple of brief comments.

1. Note that the reactions are said to be a "revision process," whatever that may mean. My interpretation is that they don't intend to make any serious changes, as Dick Henshel predicted (see *Newsletter 15*, Dec. 1996). E.g., they don't deal at all with the problem of subjects being allowed to withdraw their data if the subjects don't approve of the research hypothesis.

2. The important distinction between ethical and experimental-design expertise is one that the committee "does not accept." So no matter how "exhilarating" the committee may have found the earlier comments on their draft, and no matter how "proud" they are, I'm pessimistic that the revised code will be much of an improvement. I agree with Henshel: one has to talk to people other than the committee.

Secretariat, Tri-Council Working Group on Ethics, Jean R. Joly, Chair, East Pavilion, Laval U., Quebec, PQ, G1K 7P4; <http://www.ethics.ubc.ca/code/revis-eng.html>

CAUGHT IN THE NET

" Advisory Panel on Future Directions for Post Secondary Education, "Excellence, accessibility, responsibility," (Dec. 1996) can be accessed (formatted in Adobe Acrobat) at: <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/reports.html>. For more general info on provincial govt. reports: <http://www.gov.on.ca>; As well, reports by the Ministry of Education (including the Smith Report, which is the first on the list) can be found at: <http://www/edu/gov/on/ca/eng/document/reports/reports.html>

" Electronic Frontier Canada has a web page devoted to freedom of expression on the internet which includes a history of censorship of books, periodicals and videotapes from 1914 to 1994. The url is: <http://insight.mcmaster.ca/org/efc/pages/chronicle/chronicle.html>

" Donna Laframboise has a web page called "Censor Scan": <http://www.razberry.com/raz/censor/top.html>. See J. Kapica, "Escaping the clutches of Big Brother," *Globe & Mail*, Feb. 28, 1997: A12.

" This url for the National Association of Scholars gives information about conferences: <http://www.nas.org/conf/nyas497.html>

" Haskell, Robert E., "Academic freedom, tenure, and student evaluation of faculty: galloping polls in the 21st century," *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, (refereed electronic journal) at website: <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/> Haskell's website is: <http://www.une.edu/sbs/haskell.html>

" A new sociological journal, *Sociological Research Online* lists its "Guidelines on anti-sexist language" ahead of its ethical guidelines. They disapprove of a large list of words as sexist. Among other faults, they prohibit: masterful (substitute domineering or very skilful), master copy (substitute top copy or original), and manhours (substitute workhours). Find the complete list of banned words at: <http://www.vix.com/men/general/observe/current.html>

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Overcoming Tri-Council Secrecy

■ It is instructive to look at the whole activity of the Tri-Council (representing NSERC, MRC, and SSHRC) on an Ethics Code for Human Research in a much broader context. Although I do *not* do research on human subjects (and hence, apparently, should not care too much), I would like, nonetheless, to provide some general comments on key aspects of how the three councils operate.

I see it as quite symptomatic that, in developing its ethics code, the Tri-Council did not really seek input from the research community. If they genuinely wanted to seek opinions, there are several readily available mechanisms. For example, NSERC's *Contact* bulletin could provide for an open discussion on the topic and publish (without any censorship or selectivity) all the views and ideas which people may wish to share. The costs of doing this are negligible. Unfortunately, despite its name, *Contact* is a one-way vehicle. Its only function is to download the circulars of NSERC's politbureau to the research community. This is just one of many signs that NSERC resists openness and public criticism, preferring secrecy for most of its key operations and decision making.

This is not to say that the Tri-Council has no avenues to improve its public communication and image. One such opportunity, which I suggest through this letter, is to start publishing a regular bulletin which will be broadly circulated and publicly available (perhaps with a small charge, and on the internet) and which will provide an open forum for the discussion of all on-going issues. No censorship or selectivity of published views should apply, except perhaps some reasonable limitations on the size of letters to discourage verbosity.

Let us see if the Tri-Council will follow this suggestion and institute a regular open forum for public feedback. This will be an acid test of its willingness to truly defend academic freedom (freedom of research and reporting), as opposed giving token lip service to this principle. Should the

Tri-Council proceed with an open forum, there will be a noticeable improvement of the Canadian research climate. On the other hand, if they eschew openness, as I propose here, there will be confirmation of what some are already suggesting: that the three research councils constitute (as some are already saying) a closed circuit "you fund me, I fund you" grantsmanship club.

Alexander A. Berezin
McMaster University

Continued on page 16...

A GRAVE NEW CHALLENGE

Harvey Shulman
Concordia University

I submitted the following suggestions for a new clause in the Concordia Collective Agreement to Joy Bennett and the Administration Negotiating Team in Oct. '96.

I wish to become a designated group (please, no tittering or internal laughter as even the thought of this jocularly is deeply hurtful to me). You (the evidently, visually-challenged) may not have noticed, but I am gravitationally-challenged. Concordia has failed to proactively address this weighty problem and I rarely ever see my identity affirmed among my students. Do they not also require mentorship? Have we ever recruited students and faculty from Weight Watchers? Yet we have an athletic complex and an academic program in Exercise Science. What about a guilt complex? Does anyone feel my pain each time I enter the library building and have to decide upon the respective temptation of Plato versus Tim Horton?

For centuries, the gravitationally-challenged have been systemically discriminated against in university hiring. Things are so bad that I cannot even compute my salary and compare it to the average of my group because the number in my group is statistically meaningless. Of course, everything important to me

Continued on page 14...

SHULMAN...continued from page 13

is called meaningless. I have no Status of the Gravitationally-Challenged Office to go to, no student association and no administrative champion. If, as it rarely happens, I meet a sympathetic Concordian, her/his office is a 3rd floor walk-up. Is this not harassment? Surely, nobody believes that the continual breakdown of escalators and elevators is not personally directed at me.

Now that a major space reorganization is underway, I demand that the historic injustices visited on my people receive due compensatory action. Nobody has offered me a deanship. Pretty suspicious, I dare say. I insist on the following non-negotiable demands:

1. A moveable ramp connecting the Sir George and Loyola Campus.
2. The replacement of Marriot Services with a Moishes' outlet.
3. A No Health Food section. All fruits and vegetables have to be eaten off-campus.
4. All faculty advertisements state "all things being equal, the heavier candidate shall be hired".
5. All chairs in classes shall be armless and all classrooms be gravitationally-correct.
6. A new inter-disciplinary program in Gravitationally-Challenged Studies and Physics be introduced with three new full-time positions. This will allow us to introduce an accompanying minor in Jewish Studies and the Gravitationally-Challenged.
7. A subsidy to publish my manuscript (up to now ignored) titled "My Life as a Jockey".
8. Mandatory sensitivity training so that all faculty, staff and students never look at the gravitationally-challenged in a way that could be inferred to be gravitationalist.
9. Automatic short-listing (Whoops! That's another problem!) of gravitationally-challenged in departments that fall below Statistics Canada availability data. Of course, it is logical to assume that all statistical inequity is systematic discrimination. Therefore, the absence of the

gravitationally-challenged in departments such as Dance is inconsistent with Concordia's Mission Statement.

10. Finally, the curriculum at Concordia must reflect Concordia's policy on the inclusive and visible curriculum. Accordingly, all students must study the life and thought of King Henry VIII (during his later, weightier years), Falstaff, Orson Welles, Sophie Tucker, and Fats Domino.

ANOTHER REJECTION OF PUBLICATION ON INTELLIGENCE BY JOHN WILEY AND SONS

The Newsletter of the National Association of Scholars for September 1996 carried this item regarding the publishing house of John Wiley and Sons:

Nigel Hawkes, science editor of *The Times* (London), following the lead from *Science*, reports, "Publisher drops new work on race and IQ" (August 17, 1996: 7). This is what he wrote:

An academic publisher has decided that a second book on intelligence is too hot to handle. In the spring, John Wiley withdrew a book by the Edinburgh University psychologist Christopher Brand on the eve of publication after deciding that his views on racial differences in IQ were "repellent". Now it has rejected an 800-page work by Arthur Jensen, an American educational psychologist and emeritus professor of the University of California in Berkeley.

Professor Jensen was among the first to raise the question of IQ differences between racial groups and two of the fourteen chapters in his new book address the issue. Wiley had been told that reviews of the manuscript were excellent.

However, after the fuss over the Brand book, Wiley wrote to Professor Jensen saying that "after careful review and discussion we have concluded that we are not the right publisher for your book". Wiley denied pandering to political correctness. "We look at thousands of books; we reject some and we accept some," a spokeswoman told Science magazine....

(Copyright 1996 *The Times*, London)

FURTHER READINGS

Azar, B. "Ethics-code changes may damper research efforts: American scientists are closely watching an ethical debate in Canada that could have implications in the United States," *Monitor of the American Psychological Association*, Vol. 28, No. 3, March, 1997: 27.

Berezin, Alexander and Richard Gordon. "Better research spending, not more," *Hamilton Spectator*, February 19, 1997.

Billingsley, K. L. "A lamb to the slaughter? False rape outrage at the University of Hawaii," *Heterodoxy*, Jan. - Feb. 1997:1, 10-12.

Billingsley, K. L. "Where accusation equals guilt," *The Washington Times*, Feb. 3, 1993: A15.

Hamilton, Neil W. (Ed.). "Academic freedom symposium," *William Mitchell Law Review*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 1996.

Klatt, Heinz. "The surreal world of a Canadian university," *The Montana Professor*, Vol. 7, No.1, Spring 1997. (On the suspension of the graduate programme in political science at UBC and aftermath).

Sokal, Alan. "Transgressing the boundaries: toward a transformative hermeneutics of quantum gravity," *Social Text*, Spring/Summer 1996. This article is in a special number devoted to the "Science Wars".

Sokal, Alan. "A physicist experiments with cultural studies," *Lingua Franca*, May/June 1996: 62-64.

Sowell, Thomas. *The Vision of the Anointed: Self-congratulation as a Basis for Social Policy*. New York University: Basic Books, 1995.

Students Advocating Valid Education. *The Save Letter*. Manhattan, Kansas: SAVE. Internet: TTUTTLE@KSU.KSU.EDU.

Trout, Paul. "What students want: a meditation on course evaluations," *The Montana Professor*, Vol. 6, No. 3, Fall 1996: 12-19.

Weinberg, Steven. "Sokal's hoax," *New York Review of Books*, 8 August 1996. Weinberg is a winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics.

The following are papers of the symposium on "Zealotry and Academic Freedom," held at the William Mitchell College of Law, St. Paul, Minnesota, in October 1995 and published in the *William Mitchell Law Review* (see Hamilton reference above). The papers, divided into five sections, are:

I: Foreword

Neil W. Hamilton. "Symposium on zealotry and academic freedom."

II: Contrasts and Comparisons among McCarthyism, 1960s Student Activism and the 1990s Faculty Fundamentalism

Irving L. Horowitz. "Culture, politics and McCarthyism: a retrospective from the trenches."

Neil W. Hamilton. "Contrasts and comparisons among McCarthyism, 1960s student activism and the 1990s faculty fundamentalism."

III: McCarthyism and Academic Freedom

Lionel S. Lewis. "The 1950s and the 1990s: similarities and noteworthy differences."

Wagner Thielens. "Why wasn't the damage worse? Some answers from *The Academic Mind*."

IV: 1960s Student Activism and Academic Freedom

Seymour M. Lipsett. "From the sixties to the nineties: a double-edged sword at work."

Todd Gitlin. "Evolution of the student movement of the sixties and its effect."

David Horowitz. "Left-wing fascism and the American dream."

V: 1990s Fundamentalism and Academic Freedom

Nathan Glazier. "Academic freedom in the 1990s."

Daphne Patai. "There ought to be a law."

John K. Wilson. "Myths and facts: how real is political correctness?"

Jordan E. Kurland. "Commentary on 'Buttressing the Defense of Academic Freedom'."

VI. Buttressing the Defense of Academic Freedom

Neil W. Hamilton. "Buttressing the neglected traditions of academic freedom."

Rita J. Simon. "What should professors do?"

Prof. Hamilton, Trustee Professor of Regulatory Policy, can be contacted at the College: 875 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55105, USA.

LETTERS...continued from page 13

The Costs of Harassment Charges in Universities

■ Is anyone studying the costs to universities of the current climate of charges of sexual harassment and other related charges?

I have been reading a 1985 book by Sara Charles, M.D., called *Defendant: A Psychiatrist on Trial for Medical Malpractice* (Free Press, 1985). Three-fourths of the book is her own experience when in 1975 a depressed client jumped off a building and lived (with serious injury and ended up in a wheelchair), then decided to sue Charles for malpractice. Charles was vindicated by the jury, but the devastating five-year experience made her start to wonder how frequent such cases were and what their effect was on the practice of medicine. The concluding section of her book reports on her research into this subject, and many of her comments about how doctors change their ways of practicing medicine (for the worse), lose confidence, find their relations with their patients damaged, even leave the profession--all this, of course, reminded me of what I believe are the negative effects on professors these days of the spate of law suits and the possibility of flimsy charges (that are nonetheless extremely hard to defend oneself against) which the *zeitgeist* seems to be promoting. That some professors are fighting back and countersuing ... is heartening, but this still makes me wonder about the negative effects on the profession as a whole.

Sara Charles found that even doctors who have not been sued are affected by the threat of lawsuits (as one would expect). I do not think that the possible loss of livelihood and the assault on one's reputation, etc., that academics are experiencing has gotten much attention--where sex is concerned, we all seem to get mired in the details and perhaps lose sight of the larger issues.

Daphne Patai

University of Massachusetts

SAFS OFFICE

Phone: (416) 978-7062

Fax: (416) 978-4811

Email: SAFS@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA

Our secretary, Lianne Carley, regularly checks messages and deals with email.

Members can contact the office for extra copies of our brochure to distribute to those who may be interested in joining SAFS.

Disclaimer

The SAFS *Newsletter* publishes authoritative notices from the Board of Directors. Apart from these, the views expressed are not necessarily those of the Society.

All or portions of the *Newsletter* may be copied for further circulation. We request acknowledgement of the source and would appreciate a copy of any further publication of *Newsletter* material.

Submissions to the SAFS Newsletter

The editor welcomes short articles, case studies, news items, comments, readings, local chapter news, etc. Longer items are preferred on a 3.5" (MS-DOS) disk in Word Perfect, or by email. Address: **Chris Furedy**, c/o John Furedy, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 3G3. Fax: (416) 962-4253; email: SAFSN@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA

