

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship

Number 18

NEWSLETTER

February 1998

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 VS. THE CULTURE OF COMFORT: NAS JOINS SAFS ON THE BRAND CASE

*John J. Furedy
University of Toronto*

In the most recent update on this case (NL, #17, pp. 9-10), I concluded by hoping that the University of Edinburgh would deal with Mr. Brand (a long-standing, tenured member of its teaching staff) based on a "fair and expert evaluation ... [of his conduct] ... in teaching, research, and administration, rather than feelings about the degree to which his opinions have been offensive within and outside the community." That hope was dashed when, on the basis of an unpublished report of a tribunal (the meetings of which were *in camera*), the university's Principal Stewart Sutherland, summarily dismissed Mr. Brand. This was announced in a press release issued on Aug. 8, 1997 (the text of this may be obtained from the SAFS office by requesting the BRANDTRIB file; other files available from the same source are specified in parentheses below).

I emailed the Principal on Aug. 20 (see BRANDSSE file), and received a reply from his Secretary, Dr. Lowe, a reply to which I also made comments (see BRANDLOWE2 file).

After some correspondence with Principal Sutherland in August and September, the SAFS Board issued a press release (see BRANDBOARD file) on Sept. 17, which characterized the dismissal of Mr. Brand as "an assault on academic freedom of international significance." The release outlined conceptual, procedural and substantive problems with the press release from the Principal's office. It concluded that the application of "the ultimate academic sanction on the basis of subjective evidence, inadequately documented, is reprehensible."

1998 DUES

Membership fees (\$20 regular; \$10 students and retired) are due at the beginning of the calendar year. SAFS dues cover a calendar year (January - December) so to gain the maximum benefit, early payment of dues is advised. Paid up membership is necessary to vote at the AGM and to receive newsletters, mailings and emails from SAFS.

Keeping up our membership strength is vital to achieving our goals. It saves us considerable expense and time if we can avoid having to send out reminder notices for the annual fees. So please show your commitment by completing the enclosed form and mailing your cheque today.

**Register Now!
Fifth Annual
SAFS Conference and
Annual General Meeting
May 9, 1998**

As last year drew to a close, Brad Wilson, Acting President and Executive Director of the National Association of Scholars (NAS) in the U.S.A., posted a statement on the NAS web site regarding NAS' views on the Brand case. This statement (see BRANDNAS97 file, or www.nas.org/comments/brand) is, in my view, a clear and devastating condemnation of Principal Sutherland's action in dismissing a tenured member of faculty for expressing opinions on a controversial topic, a topic about which the faculty member had some claim to expertise.

European academic organizations continue to be silent on the Brand dismissal. I am glad to report, however, that SAFS and NAS have joined in an effort to break this

Continued on page 2...

FUREDY...continued from page 1

silence, by issuing the joint press release that is reproduced below. The text has been commented on and approved by the SAFS Board, as well as by the NAS Executive. Brad and I are particularly indebted to Prof. Barry Smith, President of the New York Association of Scholars chapter, for his advice.

Press Release (January, 1998)

SAFS, JOINED BY NAS, CONDEMNS VIOLATION OF SCHOLAR'S FREEDOM

In Scotland, on 10 and 11 February 1998, a Queen's Counsel will hear for Edinburgh University (E.U.) an appeal against that body's peremptory dismissal of psychology lecturer (tenured) Chris Brand. The Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship in Canada and the National Association of Scholars in the United States are organizations that defend academic freedom and standards of scholarship among all members (faculty as well as students) of the academic community. It is our considered opinion that the conduct of E.U.'s senior administration transgresses the fundamental principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech which govern institutions of higher learning in liberal democracies. We urge the Queen's Counsel to reverse Brand's dismissal and thereby vindicate the freedom that is the source of the university's ability to transmit and advance knowledge useful to individuals and their societies.

By the secret process of an internal E.U. Tribunal lasting three days, Mr. Brand, tenured for 26 years, was found to have behaved "disgracefully." In his emailed newsletter of 16 October 1996, concerning US Nobel Prize winner Carleton Gajdusek, Brand had expressed his doubts as to the invariable harmfulness of paedophilia to adolescents of above-average intelligence and education; and, when firing Brand on Aug. 8 1997 for this "gross misconduct," Sir Stewart Sutherland, E.U. Principal, particularly criticized Brand for "courting publicity." (The offending message is posted at www.crispian/demon/co.uk)

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

Among the disturbing features of E.U.'s action are the following:

1. To fire a professor without warning for offering an evaluation of how evidence stands on a controversial topic must seriously inhibit academic discussion;
2. To censure Brand with the ultimate academic penalty for "courting publicity" is extraordinary. It was not Brand who had brought his email to the attention of Scottish tabloid journalists. Such punitive reaction must put many academics in fear of arbitrary dismissal once targeted by a tabloid;
3. That Principal Sutherland had in April 1996 publicly condemned Brand's alleged views on IQ and race as "false and personally obnoxious" creates an appearance of an E.U. official passing final sentence on Brand without the necessary detachment and objectivity required for fair judgment.

It bears emphasis that our condemnation of E.U.'s conduct constitutes neither support for Brand's opinion nor approval of the manner in which he has chosen to express them. Nonetheless, it is particularly salient that E.U. has never publicly specified a single passage of Brand's writing which they condemn; nor does E.U. say what it thinks wrong or disgraceful in Brand's statement about paedophilia.

We trust that, even without being ordered by the appropriate appellate authority, the University of Edinburgh, mindful of its reputation as a distinguished academic institution, will act immediately to correct its ill-founded administrative error, and reinstate Brand forthwith. Dismissal of a tenured member of an academic staff merely for stating his opinion as a psychologist is an act unworthy of Edinburgh or any British university. □

For more information, contact: John Furedy, President, SAFS, or Brad Wilson, Acting President & Executive Director, NAS

SAFS Board of Directors (1997/98)

John J. Furedy, Ph.D., (U. Toronto) *President*

Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC, (UWO) *Past President*

Ruth Gruhn, Ph.D., (U. Alberta)

Paul Marantz, Ph.D., (UBC)

Murray Miles, Dr. Phil., (Brock U.)

Harvey Shulman, M.A., (Concordia 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

Ruth Gruhn RGRUHN@GPU.SRV.UALBERTA.CA

Paul Marantz PMARANTZ@UNIXG.UBC.CA

Murray Miles MMILES@SPARTAN.AC.BROCKU.CA

Harvey Shulman HSHULMAN@TOTAL.NET

Peter Suedfeld PSUEDFELD@CORTEX.PSYCH.UBC.CA

Philip Sullivan SULLIVAN@UTIAS.UTORONTO.CA

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM, UNWELCOME
CONDUCT, AND SPEECH CODES: ROLE OF
SAFS MEMBERS AT UWO**

*Kenneth H.W. Hilborn
University of Western Ontario*

Recent events at the University of Western Ontario illustrate the importance of SAFS members being elected to an institution's governing bodies.

Retired But Not Retiring

In Autumn 1996, a retired professor of sociology, SAFS member Benjamin Singer, was walking on the campus when two graduate students (1 male, 1 female) approached him and initiated a discussion. Though Dr. Singer still had the use of an office and rendered some unpaid service to his department, neither of the students was in any way under his authority. He felt free to speak to them as he would to any other adult with whom he was having a private conversation. In commenting on "equity," in the present misbegotten sense of sex and race preferences, he remarked that nobody should be given a job merely on grounds of possessing a vagina.

One may reasonably suspect that if a woman had made a similar remark, substituting "penis" for "vagina," any complaint would have been treated as frivolous, if not indeed as an example of "chilly climate." In this case, however, a complaint did result. The university has a sexual harassment policy, but a relatively moderate one; it was not invoked. Nevertheless, the Dean of Social Science responded by sending Dr. Singer the following letter (copied to the Provost and the VP Administration):

Dear Professor Singer:

As I explained when we met yesterday (and as your tape recording will confirm), I entirely disapprove of the statement you made to [the two students in question] and to which they have taken strong exception. This is not a free speech issue. What is at stake here, at a minimum, is common courtesy and civility of discourse. Believe me when I write that, in the event of a further incident of this kind, I will act promptly and decisively to ensure a harmonious working environment in the Faculty.

*Yours truly,
Peter Neary, Dean*

Dr. Singer believed that the issue was indeed one of free speech, but as a professor emeritus he had in practice little to fear from an indignant dean. Though he consulted certain colleagues (including the present writer, who then served on the Faculty Association executive), he chose at first to avoid publicity. Nothing more might have been heard of the incident if Singer had been alone in incurring the displeasure of the easily offended. Unfortunately, Dean Neary also received a broader complaint about

attitudes allegedly widespread in the department of sociology, particularly on matters of concern to feminists. He asked Prof. Trish Fulton of Huron College (which is affiliated with Western) to prepare a report on the situation and recommend possible remedies.

This report, submitted to the dean in mid-January 1997, suggested the creation of a joint committee representing the department's faculty, staff and students "to work in a collegial manner," along with adoption of a code of conduct. To consider the Fulton proposals, the department set up an ad hoc committee chaired by Prof. Ingrid Connidis. In April the Departmental Assembly agreed "in principle" on certain appalling recommendations that this group put forward. Final action was deferred to May 29.

Required Reading and Speech

Part of the Connidis Report called for establishment of a "Standing Committee on Equity and Professionalism," on which women would be guaranteed a majority. One of the functions of this committee would be to "commission the compilation of lists of appropriate readings on women's issues, feminist theory, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity," etc. These readings, it was added, "could be incorporated into all departmental course offerings." This passage appeared to raise the possibility that professors might no longer be free to choose the assigned readings for their own courses.

The Connidis Report also contained a draft "Statement of Professional Ethics," parts of which amounted to a speech code. Its most outrageous provision was one reading as follows: "*No faculty, staff, or student should make any comment or engage in any conduct that is known or ought to be known to be unwelcome to another member of the department.*"

If taken literally, these words would have given every individual who disliked hearing something a moral entitlement to impose a veto on its being said. It should have been obvious to the Connidis committee, and to the rest of the department as well, that any attempt to prohibit or even to discourage comments that people on the other side of a debate find "unwelcome" would amount to an unacceptable attack on academic freedom, as well as on freedom of expression in general. After all, any challenge to strongly-held opinions is likely to be "unwelcome" to those holding the opinions. Thus statements that are both true (or at least arguably true) and academically relevant may well be "unwelcome" to one or more of those who

Continued on page 4...

HILBORN...continued from page 3

hear or read them; but under the Connidis rules, truth would be no defence. Anybody attempting to debate a significant political or intellectual issue would risk violating a code of "ethics" of the sort that the Department of Sociology seemed inclined to adopt.

SAFS Members Challenge UWO Senate

It was then that SAFS representation on the University Senate became significant. For several years our London chapter has actively pursued the policy of recruiting candidates to run for both Senate and the executive of the Faculty Association. On balance, though we have had our disappointments, the policy has been highly successful; SAFS members have not only won elections but have achieved some prominence in both bodies.

On May 15, in the *London Free Press*, columnist Rory Leishman drew public attention to the Connidis proposals. On the same day, during the "Enquiries" period at the monthly meeting of Senate, Doreen Kimura and I raised the questions about the threat to academic freedom, a right supposedly protected by the policies of the university as a whole. We obtained no firm answers, because members of the central administration knew nothing of the Connidis document. Indeed, Dean Neary himself indicated that he had not seen it; he told Senate that he had been "waiting to hear back from the Department about the full consideration" of Trish Fulton's report.

The dean was soon to learn why SAFS senators were concerned. On May 28 he wrote to the chair of the Sociology Department, thanking him for a copy of the Connidis recommendations. The letter went on: "I am indeed pleased that that Department is making a serious and determined effort to address the issues raised by Professor Fulton. I applaud this effort. I am concerned, however, that some of the language used in the documents you sent might give the appearance of limiting freedom of speech in the Department and therefore the Faculty and the University. I am sure that you and your colleagues will agree that freedom of speech is at the heart of the University's mission and that we must all defend it vigorously. Western cannot have a speech code and no University document should be misleading in this regard." Dean Neary asked for further "consultation" before the Departmental Assembly did anything more about the Connidis Report. When the Assembly met as scheduled on May 29, it complied with his wishes.

The Dean reported these developments to the Senate meeting on June 19. I then pursued the question of what authority (if any) an individual department possesses to limit the freedoms enjoyed by faculty and others under the general policies of the university. I expressed a hope "that the senior administration will be willing to put on record here an assurance that members of all academic units have

equal rights ... to those freedoms, and that no particular academic unit possesses the power to impose rules of its own restricting those rights ..." I had given notice of my question in advance, and both the provost and the vice-president (administration) gave the assurance I sought.

Privacy and Power

With the Singer incident in mind, Doreen Kimura asked about the extent to which administrators "are empowered to concern themselves with private conversations between adults on campus, assuming that there is no behaviour which would result in a charge under existing Senate policies"--a reference to such documents as the sexual harassment policy and its race relations counterpart.

The only reply came from the vice-president (administration), a former dean of Law, who spoke primarily as a specialist in that field. In his view, when communications are "purely private ... the law generally is not intrusive," and a "truly private" conversation presumably could not be dealt with by the administration because of the privacy. But he also implied that the definition of true privacy may be narrow. In a later exchange with Prof. Kimura, the vice-president said he "wouldn't imagine" that the "mere use of colourful language" would result in sanctions, though he added that it might lead to a "pursuit" of sanctions. As a whole, his comments left me with the impression that he did not wish to endorse Dean Neary's apparent assumption that alleged discourtesy or decanal action, but neither did he wish to say anything sufficiently unequivocal that could be interpreted as a clear repudiation of Neary's letter to Ben Singer.

Because of that letter, Neary's objections to the Connidis Report have not entirely convinced SAFS members at Western of his personal devotion to the cause of free expression. I have known the dean ever since he was a graduate student, and he is no enthusiast for "political correctness." On the other hand, he would probably not have been appointed to his present position had he a reputation for actively championing stands distasteful to feminists. Being clearly a prudent administrator, he may plausibly be suspected of trying to placate both of two pressure groups with conflicting interests--first the repressive feminists, then (when the feminists overplayed their hand) SAFS and other defenders of freedom.

Welcome Pressure Against Repression

One task for SAFS at Western will be to maintain the pressure on Neary and other administrators, so that the

Continued on page 5...

FIFTH ANNUAL SAFS CONFERENCE AND ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Saturday, 9 May 1998

Except for the lunch and post-lunch panel discussion, sessions will be open to paid up SAFS members only. **(Be sure you have paid your membership dues!)** For lunch only, registration is \$20; full registration is \$25, if received before April 20, 1998. Registration fees after April 20 will be \$30 and \$35, respectively. A registration form is included with this newsletter, as is a membership form for those who have not yet renewed for 1998. Conference sessions will be held at the **University of Toronto, Rm 2118, Sidney Smith Hall, 100 St. George St., TO**. Lunch, which is open to the public, will be held in **Seeley Hall, Trinity College, 6 Hoskin Ave.**

PROGRAM

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.

Registration and Coffee -- Main Foyer

10:00 - 10:45 a.m.

President's Remarks: "SAFS: Past and Present"

10:45 - 11:00 a.m.

Coffee

11:00 - 11:45 a.m.

"Pacific Developments in Academic Freedom and Scholarship 1995-98"

Peter Suedfeld, B.C. Chapter coordinator and SAFS Board member

12 noon - 2:00 p.m.

Lunch, followed by Panel Discussion: Problems of 'Learning Disabilities' for the Academy: Tactics

Chair: Doreen Kimura, (Past President, SAFS); Panelists: Steve Lupker (Coord., SAFS chapter, UWO), Marty Wall (Chair, Psych., U of T), John Yeomans and John Furedy (involved in Special Services discussions at U of T)

2:15 - 3:15 p.m.

Annual General Meeting

3:15 - 3:30 p.m.

Coffee

3:30 - 4:15 p.m.

President Elect Ruth Gruhn: "The Future"

4:15 - 5:15 p.m.

Discussion Groups

(Suggestions for topics are welcomed. Send suggestions to Chris Furedy, SAFSN@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA)

Enquiries at the SAFS office: (416) 978-7062, or by email: SAFS@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA

HILBORN...continued from page 4

political risk of making concessions to repressive forces will always remain at the forefront of their minds. Representation in Senate offers opportunities to pursue this goal.

The recommendations in the Connidis Report have not been withdrawn, and their final disposition remains uncertain at the time of writing. In view of the dean's intervention, however, we can expect, at least, that before it is adopted, its worst features will be eliminated. That is extremely important, because the assurances given in Senate do not mean that adoption of the original draft on

"professional ethics" would be harmless. Even though unenforceable in a formal sense--being in conflict with rights recognized by the University--it might still have a chilling effect on freedom of expression. Untenured members of faculty in particular might reasonably fear what might happen if they were accused of something officially regarded by their department as "unethical" conduct, and in the form proposed last spring, the Sociology "statement" would give grounds for such an accusation whenever anybody said anything "unwelcome" to anybody else.□

**ETHICAL CONDUCT OF RESEARCH
FROM CODE TO GUIDELINES: A SHIFT IN**

THE TRICOUNCIL APPROACH?

*John J. Furedy
University of Toronto*

There are signs of progress regarding the deliberation of the Tricouncil considering a code of research ethics (see Newsletters 17: Aug. 97; 16: March 97; 15: Dec. 96; 14: Sept. 96). Below is a response to my letter to the Tricouncil (October 27 97) which emphasized the importance of moving from a code to "guidelines." The term "guidelines" is used thrice in the SSHRC letter, and the term "code" not at all. It remains to be seen, of course, whether this shift is permanent. The other encouraging aspect of this SSHRC letter is that SSHRC appears to recognize that different sorts of guidelines are appropriate for the different research done under the auspices of the three councils (SSHRC, MRC and NSERC).

Please keep up all the pressure you can generate to ensure that the final set of statements are guidelines only, and are appropriate for different research areas.

Furedy's letter to Presidents of MRC, NSERC, and SSHRC, October 27 1997

Dr. Friesen, Thank you for your letter of May 23 which I have circulated (by email) to my Board of Directors, and to which I am now replying with their agreement concerning the basic content of my letter.

We very much appreciate that you have undertaken to send me a copy of the next version of the report, so that SAFS can provide final comments. This would certainly constitute a significant improvement over the past process of evaluation and dissemination.

In terms of the content of the report, I shall await the next version with considerable interest, and would refer you in particular to my March 19 letter to Dr. Penrod in which we provided our most recent criticism of the content of the last version. I suggest that point #4 of that March 19 letter is particularly relevant, where I indicate that Canada should follow the American example in constructing a set of guidelines rather than attempting to generate a code of rules, which, moreover, will be differentially interpreted by local committees which will, in fact, be in charge of enforcing the "rules."

I agree that the Working Group has worked hard, but even Moses had trouble coming up with rules of conduct. He was not working in a research context and arguably had better help. A set of guidelines is all that can reasonably be expected if the international reputation of Canadian human research is not to be put in jeopardy.

Reply from Marc Renaud, SSHRC president, November 17 1997

Dr. Furedy, Thank you for your letter of October 27, 1997, concerning the draft document "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans." Your comments on the draft document are well stated and address issues that the Councils need to seriously consider as we prepare the final guidelines in this area.

The feedback from the community in recent consultations has identified a number of substantive issues for review by Councils. The message from the research community regarding the importance of maintaining flexibility in the ethics review system and the need to recognize differences in research and institutional cultures will be given serious consideration.

The support of the research community in helping granting Councils shape the final guidelines is very constructive. We greatly appreciate the time and effort you have committed to this work.

The drafting committee will be working toward a final draft by end of December 1997. The three granting Councils will then be in a position to review and consider the final guidelines by early 1998.

The report of the Humanities and Social Sciences Federation regional consultations will be posted on their web site by end of November, and Councils will keep the research community informed on the progress in this area.

Thank you again for your support and assistance. □

**TWO DEFENCES OF POLITICAL
CORRECTNESS: A REVIEW**

John E. MacKinnon

Saint Mary's University

When marketing managers of academic presses meet up with the partisans of radical multiculturalism, the results are often depressingly predictable. Fashion dictates expedience, which in turn excuses the publication of shallow, meretricious work. This cynically spurious exercise is particularly evident in the publication of two recent books, one edited by Stephen Richer and Lorna Weir and published by the University of Toronto Press, the other written by Richard Feldstein and published by the University of Minnesota Press. I have commented on these books more extensively elsewhere. Here, I hope only to give an indication of what the prospective reader might expect to encounter.

Feldstein's book, *Political Correctness: A Response from the Cultural Left* (hereafter, PC) has the distinction of, if not so much honestly announcing its intention in its title, at least not going out of its way to disguise it. Richer and Weir's collection, on the other hand, entitled *Beyond Political Correctness: Towards the Inclusive University* (hereafter, BPC), is far more devious in this regard. Published in 1995, when the groundswell of reaction against the petulant extravagances of political correctness was well under way, the title appears to urge its readers to move "beyond" all efforts to institutionalize the very measures that had proved so contentious. And yet, no less than Feldstein's book, BPC is an unabashed, sometimes unhinged, defense of those measures. In other words, all that the editors and contributors mean is that we should move "beyond" the use of the term, "political correctness" as an epithet to disparage the visionary campaigns of the cultural left. The campaigns themselves, they insist, are both righteous and long overdue.

Beyond general motivation, these books are similar in strategy and tone. The first concern of Feldstein and his Canadian counterparts is to register the complaint that they have been the victims of caricature and demonization. They proceed with their complaint, however, by subjecting their opponents to glib caricature and demonization. For instance, Dorothy Smith remarks that critics of campus reform have succeeded in representing political correctness "as a definite movement or group," thereby lending it "a discursively constituted reality" (BPC, p. 45). It is this illicit construct, she maintains, that has persuaded the public that political correctness constitutes a threat to academic freedom and public debate. And yet, she and her fellow contributors are guilty of no less when they characterize all such critics as "neo-conservatives." Feldstein, meanwhile, affects disdain for the "malicious

distortion" and "parodic depictions" to which he thinks such "neoconservatives" are prone, though he himself describes critics of political correctness as "Bible culturalists" who represent "the Reagan/Bush/Gingrich coalition," the consuming aim of which is "to discredit forms of thought considered threatening to Reaganism" (PC, pp. 149, 32, 16, 33, 20). Thus, the deliberations of Edith Kurzweil and Glenn Loury, Susan Haack and Eugene Goodheart are conveniently reduced to mousy echoes of Rush Limbaugh.

Both books take issue with a network of what are called "white, male, androcentric assumptions" that "underlie the practice of exclusion" (BPC, p. 122). Among these are the notions of standards, merit, achievement and, more fundamentally, objectivity. Feldstein, for instance, mocks the "impartial WE" of neoconservatives, the "ideology of disinterestedness" and "the realist fairy tale of disinterested objectivity" (PC, pp. 22, 82, 27). He challenges his opponents for failing to concede "that different groups within a particular culture have different moral beliefs that are equally valid.... Instead, they propagate a heavy-handed absolutism based on one unassailable belief system pitted aggressively against alternate systems that are found threatening" (PC, p. 18).

One is reminded here of a passage from Plato's *Theaetetus*, where Socrates says: "Protagoras admits, I presume, that the contrary opinion about his own opinion (namely, that it is false) must be true, seeing he agrees that all men judge what is," since men, as Protagoras is fond of claiming, are the measure of all things (171 a-b). But since Feldstein assuredly does not believe that another's judgment of his view as false would be true, he must believe that his own perspective is privileged, that is to say, impartial and disinterested. Indeed, conversation, argument, the passionate defense of any opinion or the tireless writing of any book are difficult to explain once one abandons the notion of objectivity. If it is all simply a matter of different but equally valid opinions, why bother? Feldstein bothers, of course, because he has criticisms to register and arguments to advance. He simply fails to recognize that where we have argument, we

Continued on page 8...

**REPORT FROM
THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
LOCAL CHAPTER FOR 1997**
Doreen Kimura

University of Western Ontario

Membership:

The UWO local chapter is the largest in SAFS, consisting of approximately 80 members, most of whom are faculty at the university. A sad loss for us this year, and for SAFS as a whole, came with the death of Richard Henshel. At the memorial organized by the sociology department, Paul Maxim delivered an especially thoughtful tribute to Richard's tireless work for academic freedom.

Activities:

1. *Combatting a speech code at Western.* Much of our activity this year centred on dealing with threats of a speech code. These took various forms: a) pamphlets issued by the Equity Office, which outlined certain "acceptable" terms for referring to women or minorities; b) a reprimand given by the dean of social science to an emeritus professor (who happened to be a SAFS member), arising from remarks made in a private discussion with some graduate students; c) an explicit code generated by the sociology department which would have put prohibitions on what could be said even in conversations between faculty; and which also would have required the introduction of feminist philosophy into all courses, clearly an infringement of academic freedom in teaching.

SAFS members made objections in various ways: letters to President Davenport and Vice-President Administration Mercer; letters to the *Western News*, the campus paper; and questions raised in the UWO senate. Ultimately, SAFS can take credit for the assurance given in the Senate, and written into the Senate minutes, that Western does not have a speech code. Discussions in the Senate about the sociology document also resulted in its radical alteration, though we are not certain of its total demise, and are keeping an eye on it.

2. *Accommodation for students with learning disabilities.* Individual SAFS members have been discussing this problem with the Disabilities Office and the administration for several years. Many, if not most, such accommodations seem inappropriate in a university setting. Some progress in dealing with this issue was made in a special meeting of the SAFS chapter with Profs. Davenport and Mercer in November. However, we expect that there will continue to be dissatisfaction with the policies and their administration, and we will be called upon to further educate our administrative staff on this question!

3. *Senate membership.* One of the most effective ways we have found of making ourselves heard is through electing,

or helping to elect, persons to Senate who are SAFS members or who support our positions on some issues. In the most recent election in October 1997, 8 such senators were either elected or acclaimed. Kenneth Hilborn has an article in this *Newsletter* on how the Senate has been effectively used at UWO to bring a variety of issues to the attention of the academic community.

Although I have generally avoided naming individuals in this report (because so many of our members have contributed to SAFS success), I cannot help especially pointing out Kenneth Hilborn's contribution to Senate discussions on many difficult issues: the race relations policy; the policy on learning disabilities; the ramifications of the proposed Sociology code, etc. His achievements through his four years in the UWO senate have been outstanding.

4. *New Coordinator.* The UWO chapter has a new coordinator for 1998: Steve Lupker from psychology. His email is: LUPKER@SSCL.UWO.CA.□

MACKINNON...continued from page 7

have objectivity. Indeed, we have objectivity BECAUSE we have argument.

Such determined special-pleading, together with a ~~tendency to hector and chortle, is a sure sign that we are~~ not dealing here with serious minds. Both books are peevishly doctrinaire and, at turns, downright adolescent--hardly the sort of fare one would expect from presses that purport to be scholarly (notwithstanding, of course, the venal temptations of fashion).□

[Note: For longer reviews of the books discussed above, see Mackinnon's "Advocacy, Therapy and Pedagogy," re Richer and Weir's *Beyond Political Correctness*, in *Philosophy and Literature*, vol. 20, no. 2, October, 1996 and his "Tantrums and Epiphanies," re Feldstein's *Political Correctness*, in *Philosophy and Literature*, vol. 21, no. 2, October 1997.]

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION 101:
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SYMPOSIUM**

*John J. Furedy
University of Toronto*

In November I participated in a conference at the University of Michigan sponsored by the Michigan Students Association (MSA) Women's Issues

Commission (WIC), the MSA Minority Affairs Commission and several student groups on affirmative action. This was a student-run event.

The discussion was not only civilized, but also intellectually engaged, and several times there was applause by many opponents of a particular position, because the argument for the position had been made particularly well. The audience did not sit in "blocks" of like-minded people, which enhanced the impression that they saw themselves as members of the same academic community. The one group exception to the tolerant atmosphere was BAMN--The Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action By Any Means Necessary.

The prime student-group movers were strong advocates of the affirmative action position. The student coordinator opened by saying she did not care what the audience's position was on affirmative action, but hoped only that following the discussion, each member of the audience would be more informed about the issues. Now that, for my money, is a university!

Of course, we in Canada are far from this point in terms of getting genuine discussions of "equity" issues. And even in Michigan, there is pervasive fear among faculty members. The only reason I was asked, quite late in the piece, was that they were unable to find a faculty member ready to publicly criticize affirmative action.

Still, perhaps we can do something. If any of you hear that, in your area, there is a proposal to discuss equity issues consider attempting to achieve some balance among speakers. Either you yourself can do it, or a nearby member of the SAFS board can help.

The notice of the conference is given here.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION 101:

UNDERSTANDING THE CONTROVERSY

*A symposium to educate members of the U of M community who are interested in learning more
November 17-20, 1997*

In light of the lawsuit recently brought against the U of M, students have been exposed to much information and disinformation concerning affirmative action. Both proponents and opponents of affirmative action have played a part in disseminating information that is untrue,

leaving only a subjective understanding of the issue.

For this reason, the MSA Women's Issues Commission and the MSA Minority Affairs Commission have organized a 4-day symposium on affirmative action to serve as a forum for the objective exploration of the issue.

Schedule of Events

History of Affirmative Action:

Prof. Terrance Sandalow, U of M Law School; Prof. Carl Cohen, Residential College

Academic Affirmative Action:

Prof. Earl Lewis, Interim Dean of Rackham School of Grad. Studies; Prof. Peter Railton, U of M Philosophy; Prof. Maris Vinovskis, U of M History; Prof. John J. Furedy, U of T Psychology; Also: a film called "Racism 101:" A front-line series outlining the history of the black action movement and racial tension at the U of M (1986) Sponsor: U of M Undergraduate Women's Studies Assoc.

Politics & Affirmative Action:

Sen. Alma Wheeler Smith; Rep. Ted Wallace; Rep. David Jaye; Tim O'Brien, Chair, Libertarian Party of Michigan Also: Panel and discussion: "Defending Affirmative Action--How to defeat the effort to resegregate higher education"--a perspective for defeating the effort to resegregate higher ed. and for building a new militant, integrated civil rights movement that can eliminate the racist segregation and inequality that exists in America. Sponsor: BAMN

Student Panel and Discussion:

A selected panel of ten U of M students will present their views and answer other students' questions on the subject of affirmative action. A discussion format will be used.

Moderator: Student Mediation Services (SMS)

Sponsors: MSA, WIC and MSA Minority Affairs Commission
Cosponsors: Undergrad. Women's Studies Assoc.; U of M American Civil Liberties Union (UM-ACLU); College Republicans; College Democrat; BAMN; NAACP; LSA Student Government; Sappho Gamma Phi (Dykes); College Libertarians; Liberty Party; Hillel; Black Volunteer Network; Korean Students Assoc.

Book Review

UNCONVINCING CRI DE COEUR

Bill Smyth

McMaster University

Petrified Campus. By David Bercuson, Robert Bothwell, and J.L. Granatstein. Toronto: Random House Canada, 1997, 216 pp.

I welcomed the invitation to review *Petrified Campus*

for the SAFS *Newsletter* because I felt sure that, to a considerable extent, I shared the authors' views.

I thought, for instance, that:

- the tenure system is ineffective in its protection of academic freedom and at the same time overly protective of incompetence;
- university administrations are typically amateurish, displaying a pathetic commitment to content-free "vision" and "mission" statements and having no understanding whatever of the word "planning";
- some administrations are downright cowardly in their treatment of faculty members who expressed politically incorrect views;
- in establishing schools of Canadian Studies, Women's Studies, Native Studies and Black Studies, universities demonstrated an abandonment of the pursuit of intellectual excellence;
- the grade inflation that began in primary schools 50 or 60 years ago is now rampant in the universities;
- there are many students in universities who could be given vocational training in community colleges, at much less cost, and serve both their own ambitions and the public good just as well or better;
- the deregulation of student fees and the introduction of a genuine free market in higher education can only, on the average, serve both the public interest and that of the individual;
- universities have failed entirely to reconcile two distinct requirements: intellectual development and professional training.

Of course, all of the above are mere opinions that, as a humble reviewer, I am neither required nor allowed to substantiate. Many will dismiss them as mere rant; others, more charitable, may forgive me my *cri de coeur*. Certain it is, however, that no-one who did not agree with me before starting to read that list will be persuaded to change his or her mind. One person's *cri de coeur* is another person's twaddle.

This is the point that Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein (BB&G) unfortunately appear to miss. Perhaps one may be allowed a single book-length *cri de coeur* as a kind of indulgence, but then the authors used up their allotment with the publication of *The Great Brain Robbery* in 1984. That should surely have been their *dernier cri*.

BB&G attempt to justify their excess of passion and want of attention to detail by a disparaging reference to "thick tomes with hard covers and hundreds of

notes" that have "little immediate impact on public policy." One wonders what the "hard covers" have to do with it (*Petrified Campus* has very hard ones) and why the phrase was not simply edited out. One wonders even more what impact, immediate or otherwise, a book with few references, no bibliography, and precious little supporting argument is going to have on anyone. Indeed, the appearance of this new volume forces the inference that the original *cri*, *The Great Brain Robbery*, had no impact either. If *Petrified Campus* had put forward significant new ideas, elegantly argued, perhaps its publication could have been justified. But most of it is just an update--a rehash, one is tempted to say--of the 1984 volume.

The one new proposal the authors make is that Canada should establish one or two elite universities, "Harvards of the North," to educate and develop the country's best young minds. This may indeed be a good idea--or it may not. In the fields I know something of, mathematics and computer science, Canada has two universities, Toronto and Waterloo, that are clearly among the North American elite, among the world elite for that matter. In other specific areas, as the authors say themselves, other individual Canadian universities do research and provide education at the highest level of excellence. BB&G do not really explain why one or two universities should necessarily be elite in *every* area; they do not tell us what is wrong with a system that allows individual universities to shine in individual areas. Indeed, in their book's curiously hesitant

Continued on page 11...

SMYTH...continued from page 10

closing chapter, entitled, perhaps predictably, "A *Cri de Coeur*: A Call for Change", their new proposal is not even mentioned, as if they had already forgotten about it, or as if its authors were not quite sure what the other chapters contained.

Thus the willingness to suspend disbelief that characterized my attitude toward this book before I began reading it became exasperation. The exasperation began in the first paragraph where the authors congratulate themselves that *The Great Brain Robbery* was "punchy," "funny," and "irreverent,"

that it “caused a sensation” with its “outrageous notions.” Certainly the *desire* to outrage permeates the authors’ prose:

- “*University governance ... blocked the emergence of virtually all creative thought.*”
- “*Curricula had become smorgasbords ...*”
- “*Tenure had become job security for incompetent academics ...*”
- “*... what is published is ... of little importance to anyone ...*”
- “*... there is no single university in Canada that is truly outstanding.*”
- “*... the best university teachers are invariably the best researchers ...*”

These statements may be true, or partly true, or true sometimes, or just as true in the U.S.A. as in Canada, but they, and numerous others, are made with no serious attempt at justification. In fact, the authors seem to take a perverse joy in making not just unsubstantiated statements, but unsubstantiated overstatements. Above all, many of them are quite unnecessary: to accept some of the authors’ points about the need for change in the university, for example, it is not necessary to accept their rather opinionated and loosely argued survey of Canadian education in the 20th century. One keeps wishing that they had at least tried to take the trouble to form some basis of agreement with the reader, so that he or she might then be led by a mixture of fact and argument to accept some of the “outrageous” proposals for change. Instead, I found myself viewing with suspicion ideas put forward by the authors that, prior to reading the book, I would have been glad to accept.

To persuade myself the tomes with hundreds of notes need not be boring or irrelevant, I revisited two such books, both dealing with education and making many of the same points put forward in *Petrified Campus*. Thomas Sowell’s *Inside American Education* (The Free Press, 1993) argues persuasively that “counterproductive fads, fashions, and dogmas,” including university tenure, racial preferences, and monopolies held by academic departments of education must be eliminated. He is rather more radical than BB&G in his proposed solutions, but he argues his case. He presents facts with references to back them up, and he patiently develops arguments

based on the facts as a means of persuading the reader to listen to him.

An even more fundamental book about education in Hilda Neatby’s 1953 classic, *So Little for the Mind*, that relentlessly criticizes the Canadian educational establishment for failing in its mandate to teach children to think with precision and to use language with clarity and eloquence; and above all, for trivializing a process that should put them into contact with both the past and the present, with the great intellectual achievements of our civilization.

The deficiencies in primary and secondary education of half a century ago are now, to a large degree, the deficiencies of our university system. They are also, as Neatby points out, the faults of a civilization that seeks entertainment rather than enlightenment, that values uniformity to “equity” above excellence. What is needed at the end of the twentieth century is not yet another imprecise unconvincing *cri de coeur*, but rather a deeply analytical study of education in our society, one that avoids hyperbole, one that is at pains to argue its case, one that presents a coherent view of the objectives of education, one that at least has a chance to reshape the way we think.

I applaud the authors of *Petrified Campus* for their intuition, for their sense of what is wrong; but I do wish that they had taken more pains, thought more carefully, and written quite a different book. □

**UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII REVIEWS
SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVESTIGATION
AND ADVOCACY FUNCTION**

I. Khalil J. Spencer

The University of Hawaii at Manoa

Following a notorious case of false charges by a student against a professor of religious studies (Dr. R. Lamb) a few years ago, the University of Hawaii is discussing a proposal to separate the functions of

advocacy about sexual harassment and investigation of complaints. Investigation is to be the role of a university official with legal training. The issues at the University of Hawaii are similar to those raised by recent cases of false accusations assisted by harassment officers in Canadian universities.

The proposal for "separation of powers" at UH prompted a petition supported by some women faculty opposing the change and arguing that the university should continue to support advocacy for persons making charges of sexual harassment by giving assistance in the preparation and filing of complaints.

I put forward the counter arguments in the following letter to the dean:

Regarding the separation of responsibilities between a Sex Equity Specialist and a Title IX officer, some recent history shows why this separation is necessary.

First, in summer of 1994, after a four-month investigation, a nationally-respected labor arbitrator excoriated the Student Advocate and EEO/AA officer for administrative mishandling of a very serious set of allegations [by a student, M. Gretzinger] in the case of Religion Professor Ramdas Lamb. Then in the summer of 1996, after a very short morning of deliberations, a federal jury of four men and four women found against the plaintiff Michelle Gretzinger, and fined her heavily. By its verdict, the jury sent a clear message that it believed Dr. Lamb had been falsely and maliciously accused, although the Student Advocate apparently thought otherwise after her so-called investigation.

Meanwhile, the University of Hawaii has paid nearly \$200,000 in a settlement with Gretzinger, footed UHPA's legal expenses, and wasted the taxpayers money in the time spent by UH staff and the Attorney General's office fumbling the case. Finally, it has all but wrecked the personal and professional life of an energetic, talented faculty member. Ultimately, the university spent scarce money and looked foolish because its policies, procedures and personnel were seriously deficient.

The new idea, as I understand it, seeks to make the Student Advocate position into a faculty specialist position ("sex equity specialist") so the specialist can educate

students, lecture, publish, conduct research, etc. Investigatory and other administrative duties regarding harassment complaints, including the critical process of preparing and filing complaints, will be given to a university official with formal legal training and critical knowledge of investigation methods and procedures. This separation of powers is designed to make the system work with fewer gruesome mistakes. Past history has demonstrated that it is difficult both to advocate for alleged victims and to evaluate critically serious charges of sexual harassment if one person wears both hats: partisan advocate as well as impartial investigator.

No doubt sexual harassment occurs on campus. Furthermore, recent laws have been created to deal fairly with the accuser and the accused.

The petition is disingenuous when it states that removing administrative functions from the Sex Equity Specialist would eliminate advocacy. Rather, we must make sure that each office does its job well and does not try to do someone else's job poorly. Therefore, I would support hiring a Title IX officer for investigatory functions. Then, perhaps, the rest of us can get on with our jobs with more confidence that the system will work.

Let's not waste further hundreds of thousands in tax money, wreck people's lives, and waste newsprint in misguided attempts to pursue false allegations against innocent people. Neither should we let harassers get away or get off because UH's policies are flawed and investigators tainted. If UH is going to investigate serious matters of sexual misconduct, we must have fair-minded, competent people to do the job. □

There are some acts of justice which corrupt those who perform them.

Joubert, *Pensées*, 1842

CAUGHT IN THE NET

" Dr. Robert Haskell, professor of psychology at the University of New England has published a series of articles in the peer-reviewed electronic journal, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. This is the abstract of the final article, with urls for the previous ones and discussion of them.

Academic Freedom, Promotion, Reappointment, Tenure and The Administrative Use of Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEF): (Part IV) Analysis and Implications of Views From the Court in Relation to Academic Freedom, Standards, and Quality Instruction.
<http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n21.html>

Abstract: In three previous papers, it was noted that while a controversial history of research on the reliability and validity of student evaluation of faculty (SEF) exists, it has not been typically viewed as an infringement on academic freedom. As a consequence, legal aspects of SEF are neither readily apparent, nor available. Moreover, SEF has not been generally seen as an infringement on, and detriment to, academic standards and quality instruction. The article is a review of SEF legal rulings analyzed in terms of their implications for academic freedom and quality of instruction in higher education.

Contents: Overview of Academic Freedom; Methods of Instruction, Grading, and Academic Freedom; The Faculty Right to Select Teaching Methods; The Faculty Right to Assign Grades; The Courts, the University, the Faculty, and Setting Academic Standards; Who Is the University That Sets Academic Standards?; SEF and Administrative Pressure to Maintain Enrollment Not Academic Standards; Academic Freedom and Assumptions Underlying Student Rights to SEF; Assumption # 1: Student as Consumer and the University as Business; Assumption # 2: Higher Education as a Democracy; Assumption # 3: Students as Qualified Evaluators; Assumption # 4: Student Learning as the Responsibility of the Faculty; SEF and Conflict of Interest in Relation to Student-Instructor Interface; Curricula and Conflict of Interest; Economic Conflict of Interest; Release of SEF To Students and To the Public; SEF In a Larger Context; The Global Exporting of SEF Legal and Administrative Default-Enforcement of Faculty Allegiance; Conclusion and Discussion; References.

URLs for previous articles by Haskell and discussion:

Part I <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n6.html>

Part II <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n17.html>

Part III <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n18.html>

Michael Theall's commentary:

<http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n8c2.html>

Haskell's response to Theall:

<http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/vn8c3.html>

Stake's response: <http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n8.html>

Haskell's response to Stake:

<http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v5n8c1.html>

SCIENTISTS, PHILOSOPHERS AND HISTORIANS DEFEND THE ESSENCE OF SCIENCE

The following is a notice from the Oxford University Press for a forthcoming book to which SAFS Board member, Phil Sullivan, has contributed a chapter on feminist analyses of fluid mechanics.

A House Built on Sand: What's Wrong with the Cultural Studies Account of Science. Edited by Noretta Koertge. Oxford: Oxford University Press, March 1998, 304 pp. (511726-3 paper \$17 .95; 511725-5 cloth \$49.95)

A House Built on Sand gathers a distinguished group of historians, philosophers, and scientists to scrutinize postmodernist attacks on the aims and methods of science. Accessible and wide-ranging, this volume addresses topics such as the relativist epistemology underlying postmodernist accounts of science, the revisionist history of the experimental method and feminist "critiques" of biology and fluid dynamics. Essays also correct postmodernist accounts of cold fusion, gravity waves, neutral currents, and relativity theory. With a provocative introduction by Alan Sokal and a concluding focus on threats to education, science journalism, and public policy by postmodernist views of science, this book makes vital reading for those both within and without the academy. In addition to Sokal, contributors include Phillip Kitcher, Pual Boghossian, Alan Soble, William Newman, Noretta Koertge, historian Margaret Jacob, biologist Paul Gross, and engineer Philip Sullivan.

PC FOLLY AT TRENT UNIVERSITY

John J. Furedy

University of Toronto

In a column entitled "Campus life in the Nineties," published in the *Globe and Mail*, November 22, 1997, Margaret Wenthe commented on a charge made by Trent University's equity bureaucrat (and supported by its acting president) against students who, in a theatrical spoof, told a couple of off-colour jokes. I

sent a letter the following day pointing out that an unfortunate aspect of the Trent case of PC folly was that it could happen on any Canadian campus. The equity offices defend only the rights of the members of designated groups, who acquire the status of victims, and whose "comfort" becomes the paramount consideration. Even if many members of a designated group say that they were not offended (like the 100 women who said this at a public meeting at Trent U.), the equity officer may proceed on the assumption that s/he alone can judge when an offense has occurred.

That letter was not published. The only published comment on Wenté's column was one from Trent University's Human Rights Advisor, Patricia Strong, who defended her action in laying the charge of sexual harassment against the student jokers on the grounds of "professional responsibility." So I tried again, and the following letter was published (*Globe and Mail*, December 10, 1997).

RESPECT ERODED

In her response to Margaret Wenté's column ("Climate of mutual respect," G&M, Sat. Nov. 29) Patricia Strong, the equity bureaucrat at Trent University with the title "Human Rights Adviser," attempts to demonstrate that Ms. Wenté's account is full of crucial inaccuracies. She says her professional responsibility is to encourage respect for Trent University's Policy on Discrimination and Harassment.

Will sweeping accusations of human rights violations against participants in a predominantly good-natured student spoof event help to gain respect for the university's policy?

A deeper problem is that respect for the anti-harassment policies that have been recently set up at Canadian universities, along with "equity" offices, is being steadily eroded by cases where over-zealous equity officers have brought charges that turn out, on examination, to be preposterously unfounded. The most recent negative example was the charge against the swim coach at Simon Fraser University, but there have, in the nineties, been many

others, such as charging the entire department of political science at UBC with "pervasive sexism and racism."

The absurdities and injustices that can result from ill-judged applications of anti-harassment policies cannot be blamed solely on the equity officers, however, since the system was created and continues with the support of high-level administrators in the universities and colleges.

In the Trent case it is important to note that, at least initially, Acting President David Smith enthusiastically endorsed his Human Rights Adviser's actions.

These high-level administrators who allow their equity bureaucrats to run amuck on Canadian campuses fail to see that the real defense against discrimination in a society starts with the determination not to discriminate on ANY basis. If the rights of all members of the university community were equally respected, and one ombuds office looked after human rights, there would be fewer instances of the confusion of offensive jokes with genuine threats of violence. □

Prejudice is never easy unless it can pass itself off as reason.

Hazlitt, *On Prejudice*, p. 259

PROFESSOR HANS JURGENS EYSENCK

1916 - 1997

John J. Furedy

The freedom of speech that SAFS espouses is tested when opinions on controversial, uncomfortable topics are put forward. The eminent psychological scientist Hans Jurgens Eysenck of the University of London, who died last year aged 81, embodied this principle. He was utterly fearless in his willingness to oppose popular opinions, and to deal with issues which most other academics, protective of their reputations, avoided. His courage was not blustery, but quiet, almost introverted, whether he was dealing with a foe or a friend.

When I wrote to him last year to ask him to accept a position on SAFS Board of Advisors, he accepted (to my delight), but then apologized matter-of-factly for not being able to do a lot, as he had just had a series of operations for cancer of the brain. I was filled with sorrow at the news, but with admiration for the way he bravely carried on with scholarly work.

As for his role in the science of psychology, while perhaps he did not always get things right (I recall that in the sixties my Australian supervisor, Dick Champion, caught Hans out in the *British Journal of Psychology* on a point of Hullian learning theory), he got them clear. This was particularly evident with controversial subjects which are often fudged. Is psychotherapy useless? Is smoking related to lung cancer? What is the genetic contribution to intelligence? Are there group race differences in behavioral traits? These were the sorts of questions which Hans raised.

His life reminds us that it is the search for truth rather than truth itself that is the right and responsibility of all members of the academic community. In defence of that right and responsibility, Hans Eysenck was uncompromising.

**PASCAL'S SYNDROME IN THE ACADEMY:
KEYNOTE SPEAKER'S THEME PUBLISHED**

Prof. Barry Smith's arguments made in his keynote address at SAFS annual conference last year (that an institutionalized form of "Pascal's syndrome," a radical kind of ontological rebellion, can render mechanisms like peer review of scholarship valueless in some disciplines) has been published in *Academic Questions*, Fall 1997, under the title "Bringing the Humanities Down to Earth."□

**PRESSURE OF THE
CORPORATE MENTALITY**

Many faculty members in our colleges and universities are finding their freedom and their

positions under greater pressure from the corporate mentality than ever before. This mentality does not ask for philosophical orthodoxy so much as functional docility. The preeminent managerial ideology in higher education today seems determined to separate the theoretical from the practical realm, preserving the latter for domination by educational "professionals" rather than faculty. Faculty are admonished to be more "cooperative," to speak positively of their institutions, to practice "good citizenship," and to show a kind of "collegiality" that at times seems less a generous forbearance than a subtle form of toadying.

Mary Burgan. "Scholarly ideals and a changing reality," *Academic Questions*, vol. 10, no. 4, Fall 1997: 22-25.□

FURTHER READINGS

The first issue of the new journal *Sexuality & Culture*, edited by Barry Dank of California State University (Long Beach) is on the theme of sexual harassment and sexual consent.

Prof. Heinz Klatt, SAFS archivist, has contributed an article entitled "Sexual harassment policies as all-purpose tools to settle conflicts."

Other articles on sexual harassment in the volume include:

"Sexual harassment in organizations: A critique of current research and policy," by Christine Williams (Sociology, U. of Texas)

"Academia's dirty little secret: Deconstructing the sexual harassment hysteria," by Klaus de Albuquerque (Sociology, College of Charleston)

"Sexual harassment, sexual consent, and beyond," by Roberto Refinetti (Psychology, College of William and Mary)

"Forbidden love: Student-professor romances," by Barry M. Dank (Sociology, California State U.) and Joseph S. Fulda (Philosophy, New York City U.)

"On prohibiting relationships between professors and students," by Peg Tittle (Philosophy, Nipissing U.)

"Sexual harassment on a South African university campus: Reverberations from Apartheid," by Gillian Finchilescu (Psychology, U. of Cape)

"The making of a social problem: Sexual harassment on campus," by Daphne Patai (Spanish and Portuguese, U. of Massachusetts)

For further info: contact Barry Dank at CASE@CSULB.ED

Consider this...

After July 1998, SAFS will be totally dependent on membership donations for support of its activities. Please keep in mind that you may leave bequests to SAFS in your will, and that such contributions will be invaluable in future for our continued support of SAFS principles.

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

