

SAFS Newsletter

Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship

Maintaining freedom in teaching, research and scholarship
Maintaining standards of excellence in academic decisions about students and faculty

Number 45

www.safs.ca

January 2007

DOREEN KIMURA WINS KISTLER PRIZE


The *Foundation for the Future* has selected Dr. Doreen Kimura, a world expert on sex differences in the brain, as the 2006 winner of the Kistler Prize.

The Prize is awarded annually for original work that significantly increases knowledge and understanding of the relationship between the human genome and society.

Doreen Kimura is being honoured for her research on biological influences on human cognitive and motor skills most notably the relationship between sex and cognition. A leading researcher for over 30 years in neuropsychology and sex differences, she studies the relationship of levels of sex hormones to cognitive patterns in men and women. Her book *Sex and Cognition* (1999) discusses known sex differences in cognitive and motor skills, a possible evolutionary framework, and the probable hormonal bases of some of the differences. Other emphases of Dr. Kimura's work have included studies of people with pathology to the brain, to see which abilities are affected after different parts of the brain are damaged, and research in the normal functioning of the cerebral hemispheres.

"An element of the Kistler Prize that makes it unique among major scholarly prizes is that it is was created to honor significant dedication to scientific research, with courage and conviction in the face of criticism and opposition," said Sesh Velamoor, Deputy Director, Programs, for the Foundation. "Dr. Kimura has steadfastly continued her research into the differences in male and female brain processing despite often-loud offence taken in a society that prefers to claim equality and deny the actuality of difference."

continued on page 2...



Walter Kistler congratulates Dr. Doreen Kimura, researcher in neuropsychology, for winning the 2006 Kistler Prize.

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Diversity Outpolls freedom
- 3 Racial Discrimination at U. of Michigan
- 5 Michigan Votes Down Affirmative Action
- 6 Elusive Benefits of Diversity
- 8 Sacrificing Truth on Altar of Diversity
- 9 Pay Equity at Western
- 11 Enrollment and CRC Stats
- 12 Censorship Debate at Saint Mary's University
- 14 Censorship Rampant in US
- 15 ANNUAL MEETING – MAY 12, 2007 at UWO
- 15 Balancing Views on Campus
- 16 Academic Bill of Rights
- 19 Scope of Research Ethics Boards

...continued from page 1

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 concerning students and faculty.

ISSN 1704-5436

Acting Editor: Dr. CLIVE SELIGMAN

E-mail: safs@safs.ca

Fax for newsletter submissions: (519) 661-3961

Mail for newsletter submissions:

Dr. Clive Seligman

Psychology Department
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, N6A 5C2

The Kistler Prize consists of a US\$100,000 cash award and a specially designed 200 gram gold medallion seated in a leaded glass sculpture. The award was presented on October 22, 2006 in Seattle, Washington. Previous award recipients include E.O. Wilson and Richard Dawkins.

Doreen Kimura, is currently a visiting professor at Simon Fraser University. Previously she was a professor of psychology at the University of Western Ontario for over 30 years. She holds honorary degrees from Queen's University and Simon Fraser University. Doreen was founding president of SAFS.

On behalf of SAFS, I offer Doreen our heartfelt congratulations. I am also very happy to announce that Doreen has made a substantial contribution to SAFS. We thank her for her generosity and continuing commitment to SAFS. □

NAS PRESS RELEASE

DIVERSITY OUTPOLLS FREEDOM ON UNIVERSITY WEBSITES

Stephen H. Balch

A study of university websites released today by the National Association of Scholars reveals an obsession with diversity unparalleled in any other sector of American opinion leadership. Only on university websites do the overall references to diversity exceed in number references to traditional American ideals like freedom, democracy, and liberty. In striking contrast, the websites of the major media (both print

and broadcasting), national business associations, leading churches, labor unions, "the new media," and the major political parties, typically referred to freedom far more often than diversity. Both Republican and Democratic National committees, for instance, refer to freedom about eight times as often as diversity, "the blogs" about seven times as often, television about five times as often, print media and religious denominations about four times as often, and even unions twice as often. References to freedom exceed those to diversity on the websites of the major business associations by a ratio of three to two.

By contrast, the references to diversity on the websites of the top 100 *U.S. News & World Report* Universities and Colleges exceeded those to freedom by a ratio of four to three, even though "academic freedom" is an issue higher education presumably holds dear. Other traditional liberal/democratic watchwords fared even worse. For the same group of academic institutions diversity references exceeded liberty by a ratio of five to one, equality four to one, and democracy three to one. No other opinion leadership sector in the nation has such a pattern of preference.

"In current intellectual usage, the word 'diversity', has acquired a meaning largely antithetical to the ideals that have given America its distinctive character," observed Stephen H. Balch, president of the NAS. "In 'diversityspeak,' America is a collection of ethnicities and lifestyles rather than a common cultural identity, and group membership trumps individuality. Given the caste mentality associated with the term, and its emphasis on grievance and victimhood, it is especially alarming that university references to diversity exceed those to freedom and liberty, words emblematic of individual autonomy and national pride."

"The endless reiterations in academe of this corporatist term," continued Dr. Balch, "indicate the great gulf that has opened between our universities and the rest of the country. And interestingly, it is in contrast with those sectors closest to the people that the chasm yawns widest. It is the media and both of our major political parties, relying as they do on the American people for patronage and votes, that most stress freedom, liberty, and democracy over diversity -- as, in great measure, do our labor unions, as well. The separation is smallest, although still substantial, between the universities, on the one hand, and

Washington business lobbies and mainline churches, on the other."

"Unfortunately," concluded Dr. Balch, "our universities are educators, and hence leading indicators of cultural change. During the 1980s, diversity was little more than an ideological term-of-art confined to the discourse of assorted humanities faculties. Today it has extensively penetrated into the national psyche, even recognized by the government -- albeit by the judiciary, the least popular branch - as a 'compelling state interest.' If diversity is not now central to the American people's vision of itself, it may eventually become so. Accomplishing this, alas, is a mission to which our universities appear resolutely pledged."

The National Association of Scholars is America's foremost higher education reform group. Located in Princeton, it has forty-six state affiliates and more than four thousand professors, graduate students, administrators, and trustees as members.

Stephen Balch is president of NAS. Contact: 609-683-7878.

National Association of Scholars, June 29, 2006. □

SAFS Board of Directors

(2006-2007)

Clive Seligman, PhD (UWO) President
safs@safs.ca
 Grant Brown, D. Phil, LLB (Edmonton)
grant.brown@shaw.com
 Andrew Irvine, PhD (UBC)
andrew.irvine@ubc.ca
 Tom Flanagan, PhD, FRSC (Calgary)
tflanaga@ucalgary.ca
 Steve Lupker, PhD (UWO)
lupker@uwo.ca
 John Mueller, PhD (U. Calgary)
mueller@ucalgary.ca
 Peter Suedfeld, PhD FRSC (UBC)
psuedfeld@psych.ubc.ca
 Marty Wall, PhD (U. Toronto)
wall@psych.utoronto.ca

Past Presidents

Doreen Kimura, PhD FRSC (SFU)
 John J. Furedy, PhD (U. Toronto)

CEO PRESS RELEASE

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Three studies released today by the Center for Equal Opportunity document evidence of severe discrimination based on race and ethnicity in undergraduate, law, and medical school admissions at the University of Michigan.

The studies are based on data supplied by the University itself, pursuant to freedom-of-information requests filed by CEO and the Michigan Association of Scholars. The studies were prepared by Dr. Althea Nagai, a research fellow at CEO, and can be viewed on the organization's website, www.ceousa.org. Highlights of the studies are:

Severe discrimination favoring African American applicants over white and Asian applicants was found at all three schools in all four years for which data were received (1999, 2003, 2004, and 2005, the most recent year for which data were available). Hispanics were also favored, but by less; frequently whites were given preferences over Asians, although to a still smaller extent. In all three studies, the data received from the university were analyzed to calculate: (1) the gaps in academic qualifications among admitted students; (2) the number of nonblack students who were rejected even though they had better academic qualifications than the median black admittee; (3) the odds ratios for the three minority groups relative to whites; and (4) the probabilities of admission for students of different races but with the same academic credentials (test scores and grades) and background (in particular, in-state applicants with no parental alumni/ae). For the undergraduate and medical school students, the subsequent academic performance of students after admission to UM was analyzed (the law school did not provide the data needed for such an analysis).

Undergraduate Admissions

In the most recent year (2005), the median black admittee's SAT score was 1160, versus 1260 for Hispanics, 1350 for whites, and 1400 for Asians. High school GPAs were 3.4 for the median black, 3.6 for Hispanics, 3.8 for Asians, and 3.9 for whites. In the four years analyzed, UM rejected over 8000 Hispanics,

Asians, and whites who had higher SAT or ACT scores and GPAs than the median black admittee—including nearly 2700 students in 2005 alone.

The black-to-white odds ratio for 2005 was 70 to 1 among students taking the SAT, and 63 to 1 for students taking the ACT.

(To put this in perspective, the odds ratio for nonsmokers versus smokers dying from lung cancer is only 14 to 1.)

In terms of probability of admissions in 2005, black and Hispanic students with a 1240 SAT and a 3.2 high school GPA, for instance, had a 9 out of 10 chance of admissions, while whites and Asians in this group had only a 1 out of 10 chance.

These disparities are reflected in subsequent academic performance at the University of Michigan, where blacks and Hispanics earn lower grades, and are less likely to be in the honors program and more likely to be on academic probation, than whites and Asians.

It is noteworthy that race and ethnicity are apparently more heavily weighted in admissions now than in the system declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court

Law School Admissions

Black admittees had lower LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs than the other three ethnic groups. Whites and Asians had the highest LSATs and grades (whites' grades were slightly higher than Asians'); Hispanics' were higher than blacks but lower than whites' and Asians'.

During the four years for which we received data, 4415 Hispanic, Asian, and white students who earned higher undergraduate GPAs and scored higher on their LSATs than the median black admittee were nonetheless rejected.

The odds ratio favoring black applicants over whites was 18 to 1 in 2005, the most recent year for which data were available.

In terms of the probabilities of admission that year, an in-state male candidate, with no parents having attended the law school and with an LSAT score and

GPA equal to the black admittee median of that year, would have had a 7 out of 10 chance of admission if black, but only a 3 out of 10 chance if Hispanic, and a 1 out of 10 chance if white or Asian.

Medical School Admissions

Black admittees had substantially lower MCAT scores and undergraduate science GPAs compared to other groups; Hispanic admittees' scores and grades were higher; and whites' and Asians' the highest (with Asian GPAs slightly higher than whites').

During the four years for which we received data, 11,647 Hispanic, Asian, and white students (or nearly 3000 students each year) who earned higher undergraduate grades and scored higher on the MCAT than the median black admittee were nonetheless rejected.

The odds ratio favoring black applicants over whites was 21 to 1 in 2005.

Likewise, differences in probabilities of admission in 2005 were dramatic. For instance, students with an MCAT total of 41 and an undergraduate science GPA of 3.6 have these probabilities of admission: 74 percent if black and 43 percent if Hispanic, but only 12 percent if white and 6 percent if Asian. For those with a 42 MCAT and 3.7 GPA: 85 percent if black and 59 percent if Hispanic, but only 21 percent if white and 11 percent if Asian. Finally, for those with a 43 MCAT and at 3.8 GPA, black applicants have a 9 out of 10 chance of admission (91 percent) and Hispanics a 3 out of 4 chance (73 percent), but whites have only a 1 out of 3 chance (33 percent) and Asians only a 1 out of 5 chance (19 percent).

Gaps in USMLE Step 1 scores--this is a licensing exam taken after the first two years of medical school--parallel racial/ethnic differences in entering qualifications. White and Asian median scores are substantially higher than 75th percentile black scores.

The Center for Equal Opportunity is a nonprofit research and educational organization that studies issues related to civil rights, bilingual education, and immigration and assimilation nationwide.

Center for Equal Opportunity, October 17, 2006. □

MICHIGAN VOTES DOWN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Scott Jaschik

Michigan voters on Tuesday approved a ban on affirmative action at the state's public colleges and in government contracting. The vote came despite opposition to the ban from most academic and business leaders in the state — and the history in which the University of Michigan played a key role in preserving the right of colleges to consider race as a factor in admissions.

Defenders of affirmative action had been encouraged in the campaign's closing days by polls suggesting growing skepticism for the ban. But in the end, the ban won support from more than 58 percent of voters, according to unofficial results. Michigan thus followed a pattern in which some voters appear reluctant to tell pollsters of their opposition to affirmative action.

A CNN exit poll of Michigan voters suggested that the ban passed because of support from men. Sixty percent of men, but only 47 percent of women said that they backed the ban. By educational status, support for the ban was strongest among those who were college graduates, and opposition was strongest among those with postgraduate education. Among white voters, CNN found that 59 percent backed the ban, while only 14 percent of black voters did so.

The impact of the ban — known as the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative — is expected to be greatest at the University of Michigan, which has the most competitive admissions in the state. It is unclear how Michigan will respond to the change, which would take effect in the middle of an admissions cycle.

Mary Sue Coleman, president of the university issued the following statement Tuesday night — before final results were in: “We defended affirmative action all the way to the Supreme Court because diversity is essential to our mission as educators. We must keep the doors of opportunity open to all. Regardless of what happens with Proposal 2, the University of Michigan will remain fully and completely committed to diversity. I am determined to do whatever it takes to sustain our excellence by recruiting and retaining a diverse community of students, faculty and staff.” Coleman plans to meet with students today to discuss the vote.

Donn M. Fresard, editor in chief of *The Michigan Daily*, which opposed the ban, said he didn't expect major student unrest over the vote. “You are not going to see rioting on the Diag,” he said. “The average students isn't overly upset about this, and you'd be surprised how many students support it. Especially among white students, support was pretty high.”

The Michigan Civil Rights Initiative was the brainchild of Ward Connerly, who as a regent of the University of California led that system and then the state to bar affirmative action, with statewide action coming in 1996 vote. A similar vote two years later banned affirmative action in Washington State, but efforts by affirmative action foes then shifted largely to the courts, leading to the landmark 2003 Supreme Court decisions in two cases involving the University of Michigan.

Those decisions — one about the system used by Michigan to admit undergraduates and one about the system used by its law school — effectively said that colleges could continue to use affirmative action, but couldn't have separate systems in which extra points were awarded across the board specifically for race and ethnicity. Many critics of affirmative action had high hopes that the Michigan cases would be used by the Supreme Court to roll back its 1978 ruling in the *Bakke* case, which upheld the right of colleges to consider race in admissions. When *Bakke* largely survived, Connerly and others shifted back to the referendum approach, with a focus on Michigan.

The effort in Michigan was controversial throughout the process. Defenders of affirmative action said that those who gathered petitions on behalf of the measure deceived citizens, leading many to sign the petitions without realizing what they were supporting. When Michigan courts said that the petitions were valid, the stage was set for the campaign that ended on Tuesday.

In that campaign, critics of affirmative action consistently talked about admissions — in black and white terms — at the University of Michigan. Defenders of affirmative action stressed the potential impact of the measure on the education of female students in schools and colleges, many of which have created special programs for them, especially in math and science. The emphasis on such programs was seen in the last week as eroding support for a ban — particularly among female voters.

Inside Higher Ed, November 8, 2006. □



I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

Martin Luther King, I Have a Dream, August 28, 1963. □

NOMINATION FOR SAFS BOARD OF DIRECTORS

2007-2008

The Nominations Committee consisted of Clive Seligman (President), Doreen Kimura (Past-President), Albert Katz (UWO) and Phil Sullivan (U of T) as two SAFS members not currently on the Board.

The current board is being re-nominated. The Directors are: **Grant Brown, Andrew Irvine, Tom Flanagan, Steve Lukper, John Mueller, Clive Seligman, Peter Suedfeld, and Martin Wall.**

Any member of SAFS may nominate individuals for election as Director. These nominations must be received at the SAFS Office by April 16, 2007. Each member nomination shall contain the following information: (i) the signature of the person nominating and the signatures of two (2) seconders; (ii) the full name and address of the person nominated; (iii) a statement of the status and attributes of the person nominated, showing each person's qualifications to be a director; (iv) a written consent signed by the person nominated agreeing to be nominated for election and serve, if elected. □

FAILURE OF PROOF: THE ELUSIVE BENEFITS OF DIVERSITY

Peter Kirsanow

The Supreme Court will be considering two cases in the coming term that will determine whether the benefits that flow from racially diverse K-12 classrooms constitute a compelling state interest. The Supreme Court held in the 2003 University of Michigan affirmative action case, *Grutter V. Bollinger*, that the benefits that flow from a racially diverse elite college campus constitute a compelling state interest permitting the use of racial classifications. The alleged benefits in *Grutter* were: 1) breaking down racial stereotypes, 2) promoting cross-cultural understanding, 3) preparing students for a global marketplace, and 4) promoting spirited classroom discussions.

The Seattle School District, a party in one of the two cases pending before the Court, asserts that its race-based student-assignment policy serves two compelling state interests: 1) securing the educational and societal benefits that flow from racial diversity and 2) avoiding the harms that result from racially concentrated schools. (Note that the race-based assignments in the two cases weren't made to remedy segregated schools; the schools weren't segregated. Rather, the assignments were made to diversify the racial composition of the schools in order to obtain the foregoing benefits).

In support of its allegedly compelling state interests, the district cited the testimony of social scientists who claimed that racially diverse schools promote, among other things, critical-thinking skills. The district also cited research that students in racially isolated schools have lower test scores and achievement levels.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recently held a hearing to consider whether, as the District contends, racially diverse K-12 schools do, in fact, promote critical-thinking skills and whether students in racially isolated schools have lower test scores and achievement levels. Most of the testimony at the hearing showed that the evidence in support of the District's contentions is scant, and, to the extent it does exist, highly dubious.

Professor David Armor of George Mason University compared reading achievement scores of black 8th

graders from predominantly black schools versus comparatives from predominantly white schools. The scores came from the National Assessment of Educational Progress ("the nation's report card"). The comparison showed that after adjusting for socioeconomic differences (i.e., parent's educational level, number of computers and books in the home, eligibility for free-lunch program, limited language proficiency, etc.) black students in predominantly white schools scored only two points higher than blacks in predominantly black schools - a mere one-percent difference. (As a frame of reference, the reading-achievement gap between black students and white students is 24 points).

Interestingly, Hispanic students in predominantly Hispanic schools scored nearly ten-points higher than Hispanic students in predominantly white schools. Prof. Armor points out that this may be because the states in which Hispanic students are more heavily concentrated (e.g., Texas, California) do a better job educating their students. But even after adjusting for such differences, Hispanics in predominantly Hispanic schools outperformed Hispanics in predominantly white schools by 3 or 4 points.

Witnesses at the hearing cited a number of studies that concluded that the median reading- and math-achievement gains for minority students due to classroom diversity were zero. Still, advocates for race-based student assignments could reasonably argue that this doesn't necessarily disprove the contention that racially diverse schools promote critical-thinking skills or that those students in racially isolated schools have lower test scores. After all, reading and math comprise only part of a well-rounded education. Proponents argue that the benefits of diversity cited by the University of Michigan in Grutter - e.g., breaking down racial stereotypes, promoting spirited classroom discussions - are components of a good education as well.

The problem is that the purported benefits cited by supporters of affirmative action elude precise measurement. Students aren't tested or graded on things such as "breaking down racial stereotypes". The alleged benefits are so nebulous that even obtaining consensus on the appropriate metrics is difficult. Whether students are "better prepared for a global marketplace" as a result of attending a racially diverse school is a proposition difficult to prove or disprove.

There is, however, a very straightforward way of measuring whether racially diverse schools, as such, improve critical-thinking skills. The method is inelegant and painfully devoid of nuance. Quite simply, the experts at the hearing were asked whether there are any studies showing that racial/ethnic diversity improves student performance, as demonstrated by grades or standardized test scores, in any of the following subjects: Arithmetic, Reading, Spelling, Writing, Phonics, English, Penmanship, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Calculus, Biology, Physics, Anatomy, Geology, Economics, Geography, Speech, History, Archaeology, Anthropology, Religion, Health, Physical education, Home economics, Shop.

These are subjects that may be found in a K-12 curriculum. Admittedly, the relevance of some of these categories may seem absurd; penmanship, shop, and physical education generally aren't associated with critical-thinking skills.

But they're not much more absurd than "promoting spirited classroom discussions" - a goal achievable without much critical thinking by virtually any 3rd-grade class, regardless of how diverse it may be. Nonetheless, the majority of the above categories inarguably measure critical-thinking skills. And such skills can be measured using generally accepted standards.

So, what was the response to the questions? The witnesses at the hearing, each an expert in the area and familiar with the extant literature on the subject, could cite only one study that suggests that racially diverse schools improved student performance as defined above. And that improvement pertains to just one of the 26 subjects listed above - spelling. But even that study is disputed. (There's also some evidence of improvements, however negligible, in writing and geography.) This isn't to suggest that there might not be some literature of which the witnesses were unaware or couldn't readily recall - but rather, that the existence of unequivocal data widely acknowledged to support a finding of improved student performance is, at best, underwhelming.

A contention that something is a compelling state interest - on a par with national security - must be supported by more than disputed data or utopian presumptions. As one of the circuit-court judges in the

Seattle case observed, "One would think that to be 'compelling' there would be no room for doubt of the need [for race-based student assignments]."

Exactly. Mere good intentions are insufficient to make mincemeat of the 14th Amendment.

Peter Kirsanow is a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He also is a member of the National Labor Relations Board. These comments do not necessarily represent the positions of either organization.

National Review Online, September 7, 2006. □

SACRIFICING TRUTH ON THE ALTAR OF DIVERSITY

Jeff Jacoby

You're a publisher of children's textbooks, and you have a problem. Your diversity guidelines -- quotas in all but name -- require you to include pictures of disabled children in your elementary and high school texts, but it isn't easy to find handicapped children who are willing and able to pose for a photographer. Kids confined to wheelchairs often suffer from afflictions that affect their appearance, such as cerebral palsy or muscular dystrophy. How can you meet your quota of disability images if you don't have disabled models who are suitably photogenic?

Well, you can always do what Houghton Mifflin does. The well-known textbook publisher keeps a wheelchair on hand as a prop and hires able-bodied children from a modeling agency to pose in it. It keeps colorful pairs of crutches on hand, too -- in case a child model turns out to be the wrong size for the wheelchair.

Houghton Mifflin's ploy was recently described by reporter Daniel Golden in a Wall Street Journal story on the lengths to which publishers go to get images of minorities and the disabled into grade-school textbooks. A Houghton Mifflin spokesman claimed that able-bodied models are presented as handicapped only as a last resort. But according to one of the company's regular photographers, the deception is the norm. At least three-fourths of the children portrayed as disabled in Houghton Mifflin textbooks actually aren't, she told Golden. In fact, publishers have to keep

track of all the models they use for such pictures, so that a child posing as disabled in one chapter isn't shown running or climbing a tree in another.

Faked photos of handicapped kids are just one of the ways in which truth is sacrificed on the altar of diversity. The cofounder of PhotoEdit Inc., a commercial archive that specializes in pictures of what it calls "ethnic and minority people in all walks of life," advises publishers that images of Chicanos can be passed off as American Indians from the Southwest, because they "look very similar." Similarly, Golden notes, a textbook photographer tells clients that since the "facial features" of some Asians resemble Indians from Mexico, "there are some times where you can flip-flop."

Yet pictures of authentic Hispanics who happen to have blond hair or blue eyes don't count toward the Hispanic quota "because their background would not be apparent to readers." In other words, rather than expose schoolchildren to the fact that "Hispanic" is an artificial classification that encompasses people of every color, publishers promote the fiction that all Hispanics look the same -- and that looks, not language or lineage, are the essence of Hispanic identity.

Some images are banned from textbooks because they are deemed stereotypical or offensive. For example, McGraw-Hill's guidelines specify that Asians not be portrayed wearing glasses or as intellectuals and that publishers avoid showing Mexican men in ponchos or sombreros. "One major publisher vetoed a photo of a barefoot child in an African village," Golden writes, "on the grounds that the lack of footwear reinforced the stereotype of poverty on that continent." Grinding poverty is in fact a daily reality for hundreds of millions of Africans. But when reality conflicts with political correctness, reality gets the boot.

So, on occasion, does historical perspective, as for example when a McGraw-Hill US history text devoted a profile and photograph to Bessie Coleman, the first African-American woman pilot -- but neglected even to mention Wilbur and Orville Wright. "A company spokesman," the Journal reports dryly, "said the brothers had been left out inadvertently."

It isn't only when it comes to texts that diversity has led to dishonesty, or even to the manipulation of photos. In 2000, the University of Wisconsin at

Madison featured a group of students cheering at a football game on the cover of its admissions brochure. One of those students was Diallo Shabazz, a black senior who hadn't been at the game. University officials, desperately wanting the new publication to reflect a diverse student body, had lifted Diallo's image from somewhere else and digitally inserted it into the football shot. "Our intentions were good," Madison's director of university publications said when the deception was exposed, "but our methods were bad."

But the "good" intentions of the diversity crusaders cannot be separated from bad methods they resort to, whether those methods involve racial quotas in admissions and hiring, the assignment of schoolchildren on the basis of color, or photographic fakery that puts healthy kids in wheelchairs. By reducing "diversity" to something as shallow and meaningless as appearance, they reinforce the most dehumanizing stereotypes of all -- those that treat people first and foremost as members of racial, ethnic, or social groups. Far from acknowledging the genuine complexity and variety of human life, the diversity dogmatists deny it. Is it any wonder that their methods so often lead to unhappy and unhealthy results?

*Jeff Jacoby's e-mail address is jacoby@globe.com.
Boston Globe, August 30, 2006. □*

PAY EQUITY AT WESTERN: A CRITICAL LOOK

Steve Lupker and Clive Seligman

This past May, 78 per cent of female faculty received increments to their annual salary, ranging from \$50 to over \$10,000. These raises followed from the Faculty Pay Equity Committee Report (August, 2005) and from the Implementation Committee Report (March, 2006) that examined gender-based differences in salary at Western.

The widespread presumption underlying these reports is that Western has been discriminating against women in terms of compensation. Neither committee was mandated to examine unfairness in men's salaries.

To examine the question of gender-based differences, the committees carried out a multiple regression

analysis in an attempt to determine what factors explain individuals' actual salaries.

Factors like number of years at Western, faculty membership, years since highest degree, gender, and so on were used in the analysis and the result was an equation that tried to explain why different people make different salaries (e.g., people in Faculty X make more than people in Faculty Y which partially explains why Chris, who is a member of X, makes more than Pat, who is a member of Y). Both committees concluded that gender is a factor in Western salaries; even when the other factors were taken into account, men earned, on average, about \$2,200 more than women.

We would like to comment on some interesting aspects of these reports.

One is that the committees concluded that assistant professors and, more specifically, those most recently hired were suffering the most from gender-based pay inequity. This is a rather surprising, and disturbing, conclusion. However, it also seems implausible for a couple of reasons.

1) if the presumption about Western discriminating against women is correct, it would be senior female faculty who would show the strongest impact; over time, their salaries would have fallen increasingly further behind their male counterparts.

2) the committees' conclusion implies that the main source of male-female salary discrepancies is due to starting salary differences. That is, those women who have been hired very recently must have received much smaller salaries than their male counterparts. Could this possibly be true? Interestingly, starting salary was not included as a factor in the analysis and, thus, it was not investigated as an explanation. However, there are at least two arguments suggesting that starting salaries is not the reason for the male-female differences.

First, there has been a public commitment by this university for over 10 years to ensure that women are paid equitably compared to men. Is it likely that during this time Western's deans have been allowing women faculty to be shortchanged in starting salaries?

Indeed, in our faculty, starting salaries are negotiated

by the dean himself.

According to the multiple regression analyses, the estimated male-female starting salary difference in Social Science for a new PhD is \$5,535. If this estimated discrepancy reflects bias, rather than a flaw in the regression analyses, then our dean must be a misogynist. We don't believe that. Nor does it seem likely that the deans in the two faculties in which the estimate of the discrepancy was more than \$10,000 (Law and Dentistry) could have acted so egregiously.

Second, and equally importantly, the data in Figure 3 of the August, 2005 report suggest that there is virtually no male-female salary difference among faculty making up to about \$80,000, which presumably includes the assistant professors who were hired recently.

There is, of course, a straightforward way to determine whether a male-female salary difference exists among newer faculty. Analyze those data directly, including doing multiple regression analyses only on assistant professors. We have been told that these analyses have not been done.

Another noteworthy aspect of the reports is that there are about a dozen or more male faculty members making more than the highest paid female faculty member. More importantly, according to the multiple regression analysis, they are all making substantially more than predicted by the equation (see Figure 3 in the August, 2005 report). Why? Merit was included as a factor in the analysis, although the only merit indicator used was the most recently available PAI rating (used for yearly pay raises), rather than any career-based measure. (Male and female faculty received virtually identical PAI ratings, relative to others in their departments.)

Could these large salaries be explained by merit factors that weren't included in the regression analyses, for example, career achievement, competitive market adjustments used to retain these individuals or CRC status? Or, are the salaries a result of having served in a high administrative office (e.g., dean or above). Or, are they due to genuine sex-based discrimination? It's impossible to know from the reported analyses.

However, if these salaries are due to legitimate merit

factors omitted from the regression analyses, both those analyses and any conclusions about the effect of gender would be seriously compromised.

Importantly, inclusion of these very highly paid individuals in the analysis may be the reason that the committees came to the conclusion that men make significantly more than women. That is, these highly paid male faculty (and not the other 700 male faculty) may be the source of the significant gender effect found in the analyses. This hypothesis could also be addressed. We could include some of the missing variables, e.g., market adjustment, in another analysis. We could also remove any salaries over some large value (e.g., \$150,000) and redo the analyses. We have been told that none of these analyses have been done.

In conclusion, we have suggested that improbable results and the omission of important variables make the regression analyses and the subsequent pay raises suspect. We have pointed out that data either exist in the current data base or could be gathered without too much trouble to test some of the hypotheses we outlined. Unfortunately there is no will in the university administration to do so.

One of us was told directly by a senior official who is ultimately responsible for pay equity that no further analyses would be done on the data reported in the two equity reports. A private appeal to the university administration's publicly stated commitment to transparent and accountable decision-making was not persuasive in changing this official's mind.

We now make public our appeal for further data analyses.

The writers Steve Lupker and Clive Seligman are faculty members in the Department of Psychology, and members of SAFS Board of Directors.

Western News, October 26, 2006. p. 5. □

DISCLAIMER

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

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.

UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT HITS ONE MILLION

Sarah Schmidt

OTTAWA - Canadian universities now serve more than one million students after seven consecutive years of record-high enrolment.

Enrolment surpassed the million mark for the first time in the 2004-05 academic year, according to data released yesterday by Statistics Canada. The rising number of foreign students and young people known as the Echo Boom generation pushed total enrolment to 1.01 million.

Women continue to outnumber men at universities (585,200, or 58%, compared with 429,000), even though their enrolment increased at a slightly slower pace.

Enrolment in doctoral programs experienced the biggest one-year jump among degree programs -- 7.9% -- to 34,500 students. This is the only area where men still outnumber women, but their dominance is also at risk in this prestigious club. In 2004-05, men made up 54% of students pursuing a PhD, compared with 61% a decade earlier.

Still, there are persistent gender patterns in traditionally male-dominated fields. Of the 86,500 students enrolled in architecture, engineering and related technologies, 67,300 were men -- 78% of the students in these programs. And men made up 73% of students enrolled in mathematics and computer and information sciences.

Women, meanwhile, dominate education; of the 72,600 students in the field, 55,100, or 76%, were women.

These are "very stereotypical roles," said Monique Frize, a biomedical engineering professor at Ottawa's Carleton University and a long-time advocate of encouraging girls to enter engineering programs and consider careers in science and technology. "When my career began in 1989, I really thought that in 20 years [women] would be at 35 or 40%."

Enrolment of students aged 18 to 24 increased by 2.9% from the previous year to more than 654,000. They accounted for 64% of all students in 2004-05, up from

59% 10 years earlier.

The other contributing factor is the number of foreign students. They represented about a quarter of the growth in total enrolment from the previous year and made up 7.4% of all students, nearly double the proportion in 1994-95.

CanWest News Service, Wednesday, November 8, 2006. □

PROGRAM STATISTICS: CANADA RESEARCH CHAIRS

Number of Canada Research Chairs allocated: **1,689**

Tier 1 chair holders: **785**

Tier 2 chair holders: **904**

Recruits from outside of Canada: **539**
(32%)

Expatriates: **243**

International recruits: **296**

Female chair holders: **364** (22%)

Male chair holders: **1,325** (78%)

Chair holders renewed for a second term: **108**

Data as of July 2006. A new round of chair appointments was expected to be announced by the end of November.

University Affairs, December 2006, p. 24 □

**CENSORSHIP DEBATE:
SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY**

Letter to the Editor (*The Journal*)

October 18, 2006

In Response to Mark Mercer's Letters to the Editor (Sept. 20 and Oct. 11) re: Peter March Controversy.

In reading Mark Mercer's comments in his letters to the editor on September 20 and on October 11, it's clear that he does not have a genuine understanding of the scope of the issues surrounding the publications of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him).

Dr. Mercer holds that Dr. March has the right as an academic to say whatever he wants to whomever he wants, no matter who he insults, because that is what the so called "life of the mind" is about, open discussion and dialogue. But, the issue at hand runs far deeper than a simple insult to the Muslim community. If this is a simple matter of offence then all who actually value real academia, scholarly criticism, true insight, and "the life of the mind" should have been offended by March's continual display of ignorance, misunderstanding, and thoughtlessness, not just Muslims. No this issue runs much deeper.

Although the depictions of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) are indeed offensive to the Muslim community, their repercussions to society are much more grave. These images are part of a system of images that perpetuate a stereotype of Muslims and Arabs that has permeated Western academia, politics, and culture since the middle of the seventeenth century. These sorts of depictions, whether they are in editorial cartoons or in history books, are birthed from and have helped cultivate a sense of superiority in the west, and have allowed for the justification of centuries of colonization, occupation, and oppression. The issues at hand are not about simply insulting, they are about dehumanization or other human beings, racism, segregation, and power. Mercer asserts that by silencing March's madness, we are indeed suppressing his expression of ideas, but what Dr. Mercer doesn't seem to realize is that March's actions and the images of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him) that have been published across the world are part of a system that is suppressing others socially and politically on a global scale.

And this has nothing to do with free speech in Canada. Freedom of speech in this country is not granted so that our citizens and raving lunatics can go around saying whatever they want. Freedom of speech in Canada is a means to criticize those in power without suffering from political consequences; it is not a means to further disenfranchise an already segregated and suppressed group. If academic freedom, however, does entail the ability to do this, then it is part of the problem and must be re-defined. For it should never be the role of an academic to uphold social constructions, misrepresentations, misconceptions, and stereotypes, but to help their students and society see beyond these things; to employ a higher level of critical thought and a higher level of analysis so we can move beyond these sort of intellectual constraints, so our thoughts are framed by our collective cultural understanding, and so we can actually live the "life of the mind" where we are actually free to think for ourselves.

Zach Churchill
President
Saint Mary's University Students Association

Letter To The Editor (*The Journal*)

October 20, 2006

Zach Churchill makes a mistake opponents of freedom often make (Letter to the Editor, 18 October). Mr. Churchill supposes that freedom of expression is *for* something. (According to Mr. Churchill, freedom of expression is "a means to criticize those in power...") Should freedom of expression not pay its way in securing some social goal he favours, Mr. Churchill would straightaway kick it off the bus.

But those of us passionate about freedom of expression want it for its own sake, not (only) for the sake of something else. We simply like that we and others will say what we want to say without fear of being silenced or punished by an authority. We love freedom of expression for itself as we love many other things for themselves: our friends, political equality, knowledge and understanding, that our students become competent and committed intellectuals, the happiness and well being of our fellow citizens or of people generally, the music of Serge Gainsbourg, beauty, our children, our pets, tennis, whatever. Sometimes, of

course, we have to make compromises among those things that matter to us for their own sakes. One deep commitment can conflict with another in a particular case, and then we have to choose against one of them. We will not find it easy to forsake something that matters to us and we will regret having to do so.

So I can imagine agreeing with Mr. Churchill that this or that restriction on expression is justified in the context of either threats to equality or the plight of members of a beleaguered and vulnerable minority. Unlike Mr. Churchill, though, I would be terribly sad to have to advocate restrictions on expression—but, were the situation dire and the means crucial, advocate restrictions I would. One practical question for Mr. Churchill and me, then, in cases like that of the *Jyllands-Posten* cartoons, is whether official suppression of expressions involving racist or other offensive materials is a necessary, or even effective, way of promoting the social goals we share.

Mr. Churchill thinks suppressing displays of the cartoons *is* an effective way to promote peace among nations and equality of opportunity for Muslims in Canada. The cartoons, Mr. Churchill charges, embody racist stereotypes. Displays of the cartoons, then, will or very well might work to reinforce or even to engender prejudice against Muslims. Individuals prejudiced against Muslims will act badly toward those whom they think are Muslim, and Muslims will suffer.

Let us suppose that one or another of the cartoons does indeed embody racist stereotypes. What reason do we have to think that displaying that cartoon actually *promotes* racist attitudes? What reason do we have to think that Dr. March's displaying the cartoons might well have brought someone to the side of racism? I'd like to see studies. Perhaps Dr March's displaying the cartoons had the salutary effect of causing people prejudiced against Muslims to notice and criticise their bias. We don't know either way. Before we can judge the effectiveness of censorship in realizing some social goal, we need to evaluate whatever relevant research we can get. Mr. Churchill cites no relevant research. We ought not just assume that censorship will be an effective tool in our work.

Let us suppose that people prejudiced against Muslims will try to act badly toward those they think are Muslim. How will they try to act badly toward Muslims? By denying them equality of opportunity,

jobs, education, health care, a spot at the lunch counter, a seat on the airplane, freedom of dress, effective policing? Let them try!—and then fine the bastards heavily or cart them off to jail.

While we are supposing these things, do keep in mind that even if suppressing expressions of racism has some good effect, our energies in the fight against racism and for social justice could well be better spent in ways that don't include suppressing any ideas or images. Our energies would be well used criticizing bad ideas and images and making our own good ones. Our energies would be well used in at least twenty-seven other ways, including, of course, doing what we can politically to ensure that Muslims in Canada enjoy equality of opportunity and all the rest. I wonder: Are there adequate channels through which Muslims in Canada can speak to other Canadians to make their concerns and aspirations known? Are there adequate channels for Muslims here at Saint Mary's? If not, let's get to work.

Mr. Churchill contends that the *Jyllands-Posten* cartoons embody false and pernicious stereotypes of Muslims and Islam. He might be right. Let's find out. But wait—finding out would require that we examine the cartoons. But we are not to view the cartoons. After all, they embody false and pernicious stereotypes. Viewing them might confirm us in our prejudices or, worse, instill prejudice in us. We will just have to trust the censors who have viewed the cartoons that indeed they embody false and pernicious stereotypes and that it is right that we not see them.

That's the final point I wish to make. Employing censorship and suppression in our endeavour to create a peaceful, egalitarian, just, and decent society means handing to our politicians, bureaucrats, police, and courts an awful lot of power and then turning our backs and trusting them to use it wisely. Even those who, with Zach Churchill, have no particular liking for freedom of expression might fear going this route.

Let me list the points I have made. 1) Zach Churchill thinks of freedom of expression as a tool that has been granted to us by our nation for a purpose or a set of purposes. I, on the other hand, love freedom of expression and love it for its own sake. I would no more that you and I be without it than that you or I be without music or our friends or our children or whatever it is we love for its own sake (no matter how

bad your music, how no-account your friends, how rotten your children). 2) Despite this fundamental difference, Mr. Churchill and I are concerned that Saint Mary's, and Halifax, and Canada, and perhaps the world itself be peaceful, egalitarian, just, and decent. We agree that we would have a strong, though for me perhaps not compelling, reason to advocate and accept restrictions on expression were those restrictions effective in promoting peace, equality, justice, or decency. 3) Mr. Churchill gave us in his letter no reason to think restrictions on expression do or could promote peace, equality, justice, or decency. (I would note on the other side that at least one great contemporary liberation movement, that of lesbians and gays, did extremely well entirely without the aid of laws against homophobic expression.) 4) We have in Canada, or should insist on having, strong protections against discrimination in hiring, housing, education, and the rest. Let the school teacher say whatever he wants to say about Jews (talk back to him, of course); fire him should he fail to teach his Jewish charges (or any of his charges) well. 5) Whether the weight of evidence, once we see the evidence, tips the scales in favour of Mr. Churchill or not, much can be done to bring about peace, equality, justice, and decency without suppressing anyone's expression. 6) Trust officials to use the power of censorship to suppress only racist expression? Might as well trust the puma roaming your house to eat only the mice.

Mark Mercer, Department of Philosophy, Saint Mary's University. □

FIRE PRESS RELEASE

REPORT FINDS RAMPANT CENSORSHIP AT AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

PHILADELPHIA, December 6, 2006 — A report released today by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) reveals that burdensome restrictions on speech are commonplace at America's colleges and universities. The report, entitled *Spotlight on Speech Codes 2006: The State of Free Speech on Our Nation's Campuses*, surveyed more than 330 schools and found that an overwhelming majority of them explicitly prohibit speech that, outside the borders of campus, is protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

“There is a common misconception that ‘speech codes’ are a thing of the past—a relic of the heyday of political correctness of the 1980s and 90s—but the public needs to know that speech codes are perhaps more pervasive and restrictive than ever,” FIRE President Greg Lukianoff said.

FIRE's report is the most comprehensive effort to date to quantify both the number of colleges and universities that restrict free speech and the severity of those restrictions. The report surveyed publicly available policies at the 100 “Best National Universities” and at the 50 “Best Liberal Arts Colleges,” as rated in the August 29, 2005 “America's Best Colleges” issue of *U.S. News & World Report*, as well as at an additional 184 major public universities. The research was conducted between September 2005 and September 2006. All of the policies cited in the report are available on FIRE's searchable speech codes database, Spotlight: The Campus Freedom Resource.

The report's findings include:

- Public colleges and universities are disregarding their constitutional obligations. More than 73% of public universities surveyed maintain unconstitutional speech codes, despite numerous federal court decisions striking down similar or identical policies.
- Most private colleges and universities promise free speech, but usually do not deliver. Unlike public universities, private universities are not legally bound by the First Amendment. However, most of them explicitly promise free speech rights to their students and faculty. For example, Boston University promises “the right to teach and to learn in an atmosphere of unfettered free inquiry and exposition.” Unfortunately, it also prohibits speech that would be constitutionally protected in society at large, such as “annoying” electronic communications and expressions of opinion that do not “show respect for the aesthetic, social, moral, and religious feelings of others.”

Overall, the report reveals that more than 68% of the colleges and universities surveyed maintain policies that “both clearly and substantially restrict freedom of speech.” Overbroad and vague speech codes from the 2005-2006 academic year include:

- Macalester College bans “speech that makes use of inappropriate words or non-verbals.”
- Furman University bans any “offensive communication not in keeping with community standards.”
- At the University of Mississippi, “offensive language is not to be used” over the telephone.
- The University of North Carolina–Greensboro prohibits “disrespect for persons.”

At the report’s conclusion, FIRE suggests several potential solutions to the problem of speech codes. As the report notes, many of the speech codes cited at public universities would likely not survive a legal challenge. FIRE’s Speech Codes Litigation Project has already led to the demise of similar codes at Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, Texas Tech University, Citrus College, and the State University of New York at Brockport. The report also suggests that public exposure is a highly effective weapon against speech codes, since “neither our nation’s courts nor its people look favorably upon speech codes or other restrictions on basic freedoms.”

“Speech codes have lost in the courts whenever they have been challenged, and they are a failure with the public who rightfully believe that colleges and universities rely on free speech in order to function. Speech codes should be relegated to the dustbin of history, and FIRE will keep fighting until they are gone,” Lukianoff said.

FIRE is a nonprofit educational foundation that unites civil rights and civil liberties leaders, scholars, journalists, and public intellectuals from across the political and ideological spectrum on behalf of individual rights, due process, freedom of expression, academic freedom, and rights of conscience at our nation’s colleges and universities. FIRE’s efforts to preserve liberty on campuses across America can be viewed at thefire.org.

Greg Lukianoff, President, FIRE: 215-717-3473; greg_lukianoff@thefire.org, December 6, 2006. □

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

May 12, 2007

Advance Notice

SAFS Annual General Meeting will be held at the University of Western Ontario on May 12, 2007. Further program details will be provided later. Suggestions for presentations, panel discussion, symposia, and the like are encouraged. Members wishing to participate as speakers at the AGM should contact the President.

Please mark this date on your calendar, and we hope to see you at the meeting in May. □

BALANCING VIEWS ON CAMPUS

Cathy Young

DIVERSITY in higher education was a major topic of discussion at a recent conference in Cambridge. The focus, however, was not on the familiar concept of diversity as a desirable mix of races, genders, and ethnic groups. Rather, participants deplored the lack of intellectual and political diversity on college campuses. The National Organization of Scholars, which held the conference Nov. 17-19, emerged in the late 1980s in response to "political correctness" in the academy. The group is widely perceived as conservative, much to the consternation of some members who are liberal Democrats but are put off by the prevailing orthodoxy in the universities. One star speaker at the event was Boston-based lawyer Harvey Silverglate, a liberal champion of civil liberties, who noted that many statements that would be considered normal, if debatable, expressions of opinion anywhere else are regarded as discriminatory on college campuses.

Numerous studies confirm that most college faculty lean left, especially in the more prestigious institutions. At a time when political discourse in American society in general has shifted noticeably to the right, some people wonder why an academy that tilts left is a problem: The universities, they argue, are islands in a

sea of conservatism. But no academic institution can thrive on uniformity; liberalism itself can turn illiberal when isolated from different ideas. What's more, the marginalization of right-of-center ideas in the academy may have a lot to do with modern conservatism's transformation into a caricature of itself.

That marginalization is evident. Some academic programs, particularly in such areas as women's studies, education, and social work, explicitly push for left-leaning social change. On one panel, Brooklyn College historian Robert Johnson offered a striking example of intellectual uniformity. He noted that, according to its website, the University of Michigan history department has 26 full-time professors teaching American history. Eleven of them focus on race and ethnicity in America, while another nine specialize in women's history. There are no military or diplomatic historians.

To what extent this imbalance penalizes alternative viewpoints is hard to establish. In a recent survey by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni at 50 top colleges and universities, nearly half of students said the presentation of contemporary political issues and controversies in classes, campus panels, and lecture series was too one-sided, and nearly a third felt they had to agree with a professor's political views in order to get good grades. On many campuses, there is a general sense that you have to be a liberal to fit in. In a post-conference interview, Johnson said that the problem was not so much retaliation against students with dissenting opinions as "one-sided instruction to students that don't have the educational or intellectual background to detect the bias and challenge a professor's viewpoint."

Some conservatives advocate legislative interference as a solution. Activist David Horowitz has been pushing for an "Academic Bill of Rights" that would not only protect dissenting students from classroom retaliation but also guarantee the inclusion of balanced viewpoints in the curriculum. This effort has gone nowhere.

In his talk at the conference, Johnson took a dim view of such efforts. Given conservative support for including "intelligent design" in the biology curriculum, he noted, a mandate of "balance" in teaching could be used to smuggle creationism into science classrooms at public universities. Yet he also outlined legislative remedies that could work:

Fund programs that would expose students to ideas currently neglected or marginalized in the academy; conduct oversight hearings on the lack of intellectual diversity on campuses; abolish speech codes that often result in suppressing politically incorrect opinions on race, gender, and sexuality within college courses.

When stifled on campuses, right-of-center ideas don't just go away. These days, they are expressed -- in pungent manner -- on talk radio, and in overtly political journalism and publishing. Such outlets have increased in prominence, and universities have lost influence over American politics. When intellectual life is seen as a bastion of the left, conservatism devolves from intellectual giants like the late Milton Friedman to intellectual thugs like Ann Coulter -- with dangerous consequences for the political climate.

Cathy Young is a contributing editor at Reason magazine. Her column appears regularly in the Globe.

Boston Globe, November 27, 2006. □

AFTER THE ACADEMIC BILL OF RIGHTS

David Horowitz

In September 2003, I began a national campaign to persuade universities to adopt an academic bill of rights, aimed at extending traditional academic-freedom protections to students and restoring objectivity and fairness to classrooms. Mounting such an effort is not easy. Getting the issue of campaign finance reform on the national radar, for example, reportedly required some \$120-million and the work of several major public-interest organizations. My campaign consisted of two staff members and myself, and a budget to match.

Yet three years later, the issues that I raised the lack of intellectual diversity on campuses and the intrusion of political agendas into the curriculum have become topics of discussion at colleges throughout the country. This July, moreover, Temple University became the first institution to adopt a student bill of rights as a response to my challenge.

How did this happen? Oddly enough, no small part of

my success can be attributed to my opponents' tactics.

The American Historical Association and other organizations passed resolutions condemning my bill as an attempt to impose political controls over academic hiring and the curriculum. Representatives and members of the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers denied any problem existed and described my campaign as "Orwellian," a "grave threat to the fundamental principles of academic freedom" and "worse than McCarthy." Joan Wallach Scott, former chairwoman of the AAUP's Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, compared my proposals to the educational policies of Communist Russia, fascist Japan, and the Third Reich. Although unintended, the extravagance of such claims ensured that my campaign would get national attention.

Suppose my opponents had focused the argument instead on modifying points in my bill to suit the distinct needs of academic institutions. If universities had stepped forward to accept those modified reforms, what legislator would have been willing to propose redundant legislation? Who would have cared about my campaign?

The second problem that my opponents created for themselves lay in the extreme nature of their claims. My assertion, hardly mine alone, that the university environment is heavily skewed to the political left should have been uncontroversial. If it had been received as such by my opponents, the discussion would then have focused on whether the disparity mattered, and what, if anything, should be done.

Instead, my opponents forced me to prove the obvious. My study which I admitted was a crude survey of the party registration of faculty members at 32 elite universities was challenged. The challenge inspired more studies, this time conducted by social scientists like Daniel B. Klein, associate professor of economics at Santa Clara University, that were methodologically sophisticated and took in much larger samples. The result? We now have an empirically sound picture of just how one-sided university faculties have become.

My opponents' third problem has been the absurdity of their charges. I have never called for the firing of liberal professors; I am not seeking political control over personnel decisions or the curriculum; I am not

concerned about protecting students from exposure to the liberal biases of professors; and I have not invented faculty abuses of students so as to make a nonexistent case. (There is a difference, need I point out, between repeating a student's claim, which when challenged could not be substantiated, as happened in one incident in Pennsylvania, and attempting to deliberately deceive people that such problems exist.)

In short, my critics' attacks, instead of killing my campaign, have lent it credibility at least among those serious enough to weigh the facts and arguments for themselves.

My opponents have also consistently aimed their intellectual arrows at the wrong targets, allowing me to proceed with my agenda without any substantive opposition. In a September 17 article in *The New York Times*, for example, Michael Brub, a professor of literature at Pennsylvania State University, expressed concern about a legislative committee that I inspired, the Pennsylvania Committee on Academic Freedom, which held hearings in the state. He noted that during the hearings Penn State "revealed that it had received all of 13 student complaints about political 'bias' over the past five years on a campus with a student population of 40,000."

My response to that point? If there are just 13 abuses per campus at the top 100 universities, that would add up to 1,300 over five years. A study by the historian Lionel Lewis of academic persecutions during the McCarthy era (which, according to Lewis, lasted nine years) found only 126 faculty members involved in academic-freedom cases at 58 institutions nationally. Those cases led to an estimated 69 terminations, of which 31 were resignations at a single institution after it established a loyalty oath. Yet small as that number may appear among the thousands of universities and hundreds of thousands of professors, the author concluded, "It is apparent that their chilling effect on the expression of all ideas by both faculty and students was significant, although in fact there is no way to measure adequately their full impact."

I think most people would concur: The chilling effect is the issue, not the absolute number, although each case is cause for concern. The real question is whether universities are set up to deal with such problems through established and well-publicized procedures. Brub did not discuss whether a policy and a grievance

system to handle such abuses exists at universities such as Penn State. In point of fact, Penn State has an admirable academic-freedom policy, but it can be found only in the Human Resources Policy Manual, which pertains to employees. The 40,000 Penn State students at University Park are probably not only unaware of the manual's existence, but if they were to consult it, they would find that the policy does not apply to them.

So while Brub and his colleagues have been covering for administrators who do not want to deal with such problems, I and the Pennsylvania committee have focused on the lack of university policies to protect students from abuses. From that point of view, the result of the hearings was an unqualified victory for the academic-freedom campaign. In the aftermath, Temple adopted its new policy, "Student and Faculty Academic Rights and Responsibilities". That provided the missing protections for students, along with a grievance process specific to academic-freedom violations something no other university that I know has. It also established a reporting system that goes directly to the administration, precluding faculty members from closing ranks at the expense of student petitioners.

National awareness of the academic-freedom issue and the adoption by one university of a worthy student bill of rights bring to a close the first phase of my campaign. I have achieved what I set out to accomplish. The legislative measures that I proposed were a means of urging universities to do the right thing and were never intended to impose standards on them. The purpose of the measures was to put the issue of student rights on the public agenda, and they did just that.

The second phase of my campaign will be a national effort to persuade other universities to follow Temple's example and adopt academic-freedom policies that protect students as well as faculty members. Putting in place a reasonable code of behavior, along with an adequate grievance process to handle complaints, will strengthen universities in these fractious times. If universities are seen to be encouraging intellectual diversity and protecting political and cultural minority groups from attack, they will receive public support. That is in the interest of everyone, liberal people as well as conservative ones, faculty members as well as students.

My new campaign will also focus on the collapse of academic standards in fields where political agendas instead of scholarly values have come to shape curricula. I do not claim to be infallible in conducting research about the issue, but I caution my critics against repeating previous mistakes. Politically corrupted academic standards are an issue, and everybody knows it. How else, for example, could Ward Churchill be elevated to a position of prominence as a full professor and chairman of the ethnic-studies department at a major research university like the University of Colorado at Boulder?

This is no small problem. At the University of Wisconsin at Madison, a lecturer whose expertise is African languages and literature is teaching conspiracy theories in an introductory course on Islam about September 11, when a scientific understanding of what happened that day must rely on expertise in metals and fuels. Public outcry in Wisconsin over the appointment, which administrators are defending on the grounds of free speech, has already damaged the university. What about professional speech? What about the scholarly expertise that is supposed to underlie academic privilege and tenure? If the university does not support its own professional standards, the public's elected representatives will set standards for it. Such legislative interventions are undesirable but will be an inevitable result of persistent university irresponsibility in those matters.

I therefore invite the AAUP and others to join me in forestalling such steps by pressing universities to enforce professional standards on rogue elements in their faculties. Instead of claiming that no abuses exist, they should try to help remedy them. They should focus any criticisms of me on how I describe particular abuses and the solutions that I propose to correct them. If that should happen, a lot of wind would be taken out of my sails. But then a lot of good would be accomplished, and for me that would be satisfaction enough.

David Horowitz is the president of the David Horowitz Freedom Center.

The Chronicle Review, Volume 53, Issue 12, Page B20. □

AAUP QUESTIONS SCOPE OF RESEARCH ETHICS BOARDS

Research ethics boards were never designed for oversight of journalism programs or surveys by sociology majors and have gone well beyond their mandates and purpose, and in the process harming scholarly work, a recent report from the American Association of University Professors warns.

David Hyman, one of the authors of the report and a professor of law and medicine at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, said ethics boards (known as Institutional Review Boards or IRBs in the U.S.) serve an important purpose when people who are the subjects of research can face real harm but that “what is deeply troublesome is the fact that research on human subjects must obtain IRB approval whether or not it imposes a serious risk of harm on its subjects”.

The report recommends that research methodologies that consist entirely in collecting data by survey, through interviews, or by observing behavior in public places be exempt from review by campus IRBs, and that there be no requirement of IRB approval for the exemption.

It also recommends that all universities and colleges at which, or under whose auspices, federally funded research on human subjects is to be conducted provide assurance they will protect the rights and welfare of the human subjects of all their research on human subjects, whatever their source of funding.

The report lists a number of “more or less familiar horror stories” that leave no ambiguity that the process has gotten out of hand. In one case, a linguist seeking to study language development in a preliterate tribe was instructed by the IRB to have the subjects read and sign a consent form before the study could proceed. In another, a white graduate student was told he could not interview African-American students on career expectations because the interview might cause trauma.

Jonathan Knight, director of AAUP’s department of academic freedom, tenure and governance, said there is no systematic analysis of IRBs to see how commonly such examples occur but that the stories pop up regularly.

Yet, the report notes there is a danger that the requirement of advance IRB approval of research will come to be imposed more broadly than it currently is. And it says that “complaints published here and there over the years have accomplished little beyond generating an angry and deeply dismaying literature.”

The AAUP report on institutional review boards is available online at:

www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsrres/academe/2006/SO/Rep/ResearchonHumanSubjects.htm.

CAUT Bulletin, November 2006, p.A5 □

SUBMISSIONS TO THE SAFS NEWSLETTER

The acting editor welcomes articles, case studies, news items, comments, readings, local chapter news, etc. Please send your submission by e-mail attachment.

Mailing Address:

Dr. Clive Seligman
Psychology Department
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, N6A 5C2
Fax: (519) 661-3961
E-mail: safs@safs.ca
Web: www.safs.ca

BEQUEST TO SAFS

Please consider remembering the Society in your will. Even small bequests can help us greatly in carrying on SAFS’ work. In most cases, a bequest does not require rewriting your entire will, but can be done simply by adding a codicil. So please do give this some thought.

Thank you

Clive Seligman, President.

SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM

To join **SAFS** or to renew your **SAFS** membership, please sign and complete this form and return to:

SAFS
1673 Richmond Street, #344
London, Ontario, Canada
N6G 2N3

Please make your cheque payable to **SAFS**

- ◆ Annual regular - \$25.00
- ◆ Annual retirees/students - \$15.00
- ◆ Lifetime - \$150 (available to those 60 years or older or retired)
- ◆ Sustaining - \$100 - \$299
- ◆ Benefactor - \$300.00

"I support the Society's goals"

signature

Renewal	Sustaining
New Member	Benefactor

Name: _____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

Other Address: _____

Please specify preferred address for the Newsletter

Ph (W): _____

Ph (H): _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

*(Because **SAFS** is not a registered charity, memberships cannot be considered charitable contributions for income tax purposes.)*

WWW.SAFS.CA
VISIT THE SAFS WEBSITE AT

SAFS OFFICE

1673 Richmond Street, #344, London, Ontario, Canada, N6G 2N3, e-mail: safs@safs.ca
Secretary: Daniella Chirila, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, e-mail: secretary@safs.ca