



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 82

www.safs.ca

April 2019

In This Issue

<i>Bruce Pardy</i> , Outraged Responses to Ontario Free Speech Directive Reveal the Problem the Directive is Trying to Solve . . .	3
In Memoriam: James Albert DeLater (November 2018)	5
In Memoriam: Michael Persinger (26 June 1945 – 14 August 2018)	6
<i>Philip Carl Salzman</i> , Feminists Assault Science	8
<i>Denis Rancourt</i> , Academic Freedom Case of Physics Professor Denis Rancourt at the University of Ottawa has been Amicably Resolved on All Matters in Dispute	12
<i>Stephen B. Perrott</i> , Review of Campbell and Manning, <i>The Rise of Victimhood Culture</i>	13
<i>Kris Larsen</i> , Review of Heather Mac Donald, <i>The Diversity Delusion</i>	16
<i>Tom Flanagan</i> , Review of Joan Wallach Scott, <i>Knowledge, Power, and Academic Freedom</i>	20
<i>Adèle Mercier</i> , Free Speech on Campus and (the Dangers of) Being a Woman at Queen’s University	22
<i>Philip A. Sullivan</i> , Ontario’s Mathematics Teaching Policies Discriminate Against Poorer Families	25
<i>Frances Widdowson</i> , Indigenizing Mount Royal’s Curricula: The Threat to Academic Freedom, Freedom of Inquiry and Academic Standards	27

*Adam J. Lucas with James Lees, The Dalhousie Student President
Election was no Laughing Matter* 30

Robert Price, Suffering Student Media 33

Albert Howard, The Lasting Legacy of the Trojan Horse 35

Mark Mercer, Hate-Speech and Universities 37

OUTRAGED RESPONSES TO ONTARIO FREE SPEECH DIRECTIVE REVEAL
THE PROBLEM THE DIRECTIVE IS TRYING TO SOLVE

Bruce Pardy

Doublethink, wrote George Orwell, means to hold opposing beliefs and to accept the truth of both. “To know and not to know, to hold simultaneously two opinions which (cancel) out, knowing them to be contradictory and believing in both of them.” When the Ontario government released its directive last August requiring universities to prepare policies that protect free speech, it exposed the doublethink that thrives in the halls of academia. In response to the directive, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) said that requiring universities to protect free speech would threaten free speech. So did James Turk, writing for the Centre for Free Expression. According to University of Waterloo philosopher Shannon Dea, the policy imperils academic freedom, while Nora Loreto’s piece in the *National Observer* said the directive amounts to government-compelled speech.

SUBMISSIONS TO THE SAFS NEWSLETTER

The SAFS Newsletter is published three times a year (September, January, and April) by the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship and is edited by the Society’s president, Mark Mercer.
ISSN: 1704-5436

The editor welcomes articles, case studies, news items, book reviews, and letters. Send submissions by email to president@safs.ca or by letter mail to SAFS, PO Box 33056 Quinpool Centre, Halifax, NS B3L 4T6.

Like most academics, these critics regard academic freedom as sacrosanct: expression at universities must be unrestrained. The mission of creating knowledge and educating students depends upon it, Turk wrote, and “failure to protect free expression on campus destroys the foundation of the university.” But paradoxically, speech must also be limited, the critics insisted. Universities must be able to make policies about speech, said OCUFA, so that they maintain “a safe and secure educational environment”. Such policies, said the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), should reconcile “unhindered debate with the need to ensure that all voices can be heard without facing discrimination and harassment” and, wrote Turk, allow for “community discussions about proper limits to free speech”. A policy that protects free speech, they claimed, endangers free speech because it imperils the institutional autonomy of universities to limit speech.

The well of doublethink is deep. A free speech policy will discourage members of the university community from speaking, said OCUFA, for fear of being

disciplined. (If a free speech policy prohibited criticism of the policy, then it wouldn't really be a free speech policy, would it?) Universities can't achieve free speech without more money, said CAUT (presumably because having no restrictions on speech is more expensive than having them?). Besides, there is no free speech problem to fix, wrote Turk, who claimed there is more freedom of expression on university campuses than anywhere else in Canada.

I expect Lindsay Shepherd, a teaching assistant disciplined at Wilfrid Laurier for showing a clip of a televised debate, would disagree, as would Rick Mehta, a psychology professor fired by Acadia University, ostensibly for expressing unpopular views. When I invited University of Toronto Psychology Professor Jordan Peterson to give the inaugural Liberty Lecture at Queen's University last year, many faculty and students vehemently objected. When Queen's Principal Daniel Woolf, to his credit, defended academic freedom and informed respectful debate, numerous professors signed an open letter criticizing his refusal to condemn the talk. A couple of minutes into the lecture, two protestors jumped on the stage, and for much of the evening, others banged on the windows of the hall from the outside in an attempt to shut down the event.

This March, after Professor Amy Wax of the University of Pennsylvania delivered the 2019 Liberty Lecture, Queen's law students launched a petition to denounce the Liberty Lecture series. They are adept at doublethink too. "We affirm the importance of free speech in society and at Queen's Law," the petition reads, "and we specifically denounce the attempt of the 'Liberty Lectures' to co-opt the term 'free speech' as something which is ideologically juxtaposed to promoting inclusivity and diversity." Speech is not free, they say, unless it promotes a particular political imperative. Note the logic: such speech is not merely illegitimate but *not free*. (At the time of writing, the petition had circulated for a day and a half and almost a third of the student body had signed on.)

Campus speech policies should be simple. Universities are automatically subject to the same laws that apply everywhere else. Laws about defamation, harassment, hate speech and discrimination apply in exactly the same way to speech in the classroom as they do to speech on the sidewalk. Universities need do nothing to make that so and could not change it if they wanted to. Academic speech – ideas, theories and opinions, based on reasoning or data – no matter how controversial, does not legally constitute hate speech, harassment, discrimination, defamation, assault or harm. The law does not prohibit speech that happens to offend. University policies should simply say: "Other than limits contained in the laws of the land, there are no restrictions on the content of speech on this campus."

To protect speech, universities also need "time and place" rules. You can say anything you want but you cannot yell it out in a classroom so as to disrupt the lecture; you cannot tape your posters on the chalkboard; and you cannot bang on the windows to shut down speakers with whom you disagree. These rules do not limit the content of speech. They are not about what can be said but when

and where you say it. Peaceful protests are not prohibited. Those who object to a speaker's message may parade with signs or hold a competing talk with a contrary view. However, they may not prevent the speaker from speaking, which would interfere both with the right to speak and with the audience's right to listen.

Institutions are apt to use "time and place" rules to restrict the content of speech without admitting that they are doing so. Yes, they say, you can state your views on abortion but you may only do so in a roped off zone in an isolated area. Yes, you may bring in controversial speakers but you must pay security fees to book the room. Yes, you are entitled to your own views but this classroom is a safe space where offensive speech is not appropriate. Such policies are not genuine "time and place" rules but excuses to control content. Legitimate rules protect open discussion and vigorous debate, not limit them. Freedom of speech means the freedom to say things that others may find offensive. All controversial ideas are offensive to someone. Academic freedom ceases to exist when it is "balanced" against community preferences. As Principal Woolf wrote, "protection from disagreeable ideas isn't safety; it's infantilization and robs everyone of the opportunity to reflect and grow."

Whether Ontario universities might again be places to get an actual education remains to be seen. Critics remain undaunted. Free speech, they say, yes of course but not if your views are "odious and ill-informed", as the Queen's professors' letter put it. Loreto wrote, "Ontarians will be smart to pay close attention to these attacks on free speech and free expression, and intensely organize against them." She may as well have asserted that freedom is slavery. Censors of the world unite!

Bruce Pardy (pardyb@queensu.ca) is Professor of Law at Queen's University, in Kingston.

IN MEMORIAM: JAMES ALBERT DELATER (NOVEMBER 2018)

Members of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship who regularly attend the society's Annual General Meeting will remember James DeLater for his wit, his anecdotes, his erudition, and his cigarette and hat. A royalist and a patriotic American, it was not always clear whether James was being sincere or putting one on. It might have been that putting people on about something for long enough invisibly brought James to espouse it sincerely.

At last year's meeting, after a bit of discussion of the political left and right, James reminded us that we had neglected his area of the spectrum, the reactionaries.

James died just before American Thanksgiving, at his home, in Jackson, Missouri. He was in his early 70s.

James served in the US Army from 1968 to 1970, during part of which time he was stationed in Long Binh, Republic of Vietnam. In 1997, he received his doctorate in English, Comparative Literature, and Translation from the University of Washington. He had previously earned two Master of Arts degrees, one in English, one in History. As a translator, he worked in Greek, Latin, French, Italian, and German.

James is the author of *Translation Theory in the Age of Louis XIV: "The 1683 De optimo genere interpretandi of Pierre Daniel Huet (1630-1721)"* (Routledge, 2002).

On 5 November 2003, in his third year as a visiting assistant professor at Hillsdale College, in Michigan, Dr DeLater was fired for "misconduct, including inappropriate activity with a student" and "complaints and concerns over his teaching style," according to the 20 November 2003 Hillsdale *Collegian*. One student interviewed by the paper said "I never met anyone personally offended by what he said. Everyone thought he was joking. They did think it was interesting for a professor to be joking so freely."

From the same article in *The Collegian*: "Professor of Christianity and Literature John Reist Jr. described the feeling many faculty members have had regarding DeLater. 'We've always thought Jim represented excellent top-notch scholarship, openness and freedom of debate,' he said."

The "inappropriate activity with a student" was his early relationship with his future wife, who was then a Hillsdale student though no longer in any of James's courses. James wrote about the case in the SAFS Newsletter of September 2015, "Tread Carefully in the Lives of Professors and their Former Students" (<https://www.safs.ca/newsletters/article.php?article=878>).

After his dismissal from Hillsdale, James taught on a per-course basis at various universities, travelled, translated, attended SAFS meetings, with his wife raised a child, complained about declining standards of scholarship, and wrote both academically and for a popular audience.

According to SAFS member Kirby Olson, "His best part was that he was a profound Catholic scholar in the vein of René Girard."

IN MEMORIAM: MICHAEL PERSINGER (26 JUNE 1945 – 14 AUGUST 2018)

Michael Persinger taught psychology and conducted research into the brain and behaviour at Laurentian University, in Sudbury, from 1971 until his death last August. He also practiced psychology clinically. Born in Jacksonville, Florida, Michael earned his doctorate from the University of Manitoba the same year he was hired by Laurentian.

Michael became internationally known for his research attempting to establish correlations between electromagnetic fields, plate-tectonic action, and other

physical phenomena and human and animal consciousness and behaviour, and for the theories he developed to explain these correlations.

The Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship first intervened on Michael's behalf in 2006, when Laurentian denied a film crew for the Discovery Channel permission to interview Michael on campus. The plan had been to videotape student volunteers in a demonstration of one of Michael's experiments. Although the original experiment had been approved by the university's research ethics board and the results of it published, Laurentian said the proposed demonstration also needed board approval. SAFS contended that Laurentian's actions violated Michael's academic freedom to disseminate his work. (The letter SAFS sent is available in our 2006 cases folder. <https://www.safs.ca/issuescases/case.php?case=laurentian>)

A little later, in 2007, SAFS president Clive Seligman spoke in Michael's defense both when Michael's lecture content and provocative teaching style drew complaints and in connection with a charge of clinical malpractice, of which Michael was acquitted.

Not only did Michael join SAFS at that time, but he bought memberships for ten of his students.

In January 2016, SAFS again intervened on Michael's behalf, when Laurentian removed Michael as teacher of a year-long introduction to psychology course. For a number of years when teaching this course, Michael had asked the students to sign a form indicating that they understood that Michael, in his role as teacher, would occasionally swear, shout, make an outrageous claim, or otherwise violate assumed norms of comportment. Michael explained on the form his various pedagogical reasons for violating these norms, one of which was to encourage students to think calmly even in charged situations. Readers of the SAFS Newsletter were made aware of these reasons in Michael's article defending Teresa Buchanan, a Louisiana State University professor who came to grief because of her use of profanity (<https://www.safs.ca/newsletters/article.php?article=882>). The article appeared just a few months before Michael's own troubles.

Laurentian originally claimed that it suspended Michael for requiring students to sign the form as a condition of entry into the course. Michael denied that signing was in fact a requirement and noted that he lacked the power to deny qualified students a seat. (The letter SAFS sent is available in our 2016 cases folder. <https://www.safs.ca/issuescases/case.php?case=persinger> Michael contributed to the SAFS Newsletter a short discussion of what was at stake in his case. <https://www.safs.ca/newsletters/article.php?article=926>)

Because of the importance the matter has to academic freedom in teaching, Michael's faculty association and the Canadian Association of University Teachers are continuing to pursue against Laurentian University the case of Michael's removal from his course.

FEMINISTS ASSAULT SCIENCE

Philip Carl Salzman

Feminism is a closed, partisan ideology designed to lobby for female advantage. Science is an open exploration designed to test and expand knowledge. Feminism and science are entirely incompatible.

Feminism rejects biological knowledge about the differences of males and females. To quote a university student about her feminist courses, “merely mentioning biological differences can be wrongthink. Or worse, as I learned in one of my classes, it can be upsetting to genderqueer or transgender students. Thus, some of the root causes of what makes men and women differ — hormonal, neurological, and biological differences — is left out of the discussion.” Biology is rejected on the grounds that locating gender differences in biology has been used to oppress women.

In place of biology, “social construction” of gender roles explains the differences between males and females, according to feminists. In feminist ideology, “biology doesn’t determine fate, but culture. Men are violent not because of hormones, but because of socialization into ‘toxic masculinity.’ And women, who are more nurturing, do so because of sexist conditioning, says social constructionism.”

Feminists deny the most basic facts of biology. A feminist colleague refused to accept that human males are on average physically larger and stronger than human females. She knew perfectly well that female elite athletes could not compete with male elite athletes, but even refused to concede this point. Is “social construction” the reason that there are no female players in the NFL, CFL, NBA, NHL, MLB? Or is there a biological basis to the parallel male and female sports leagues and competitions? The physical advantage of males is behind the controversy over transsexual male-to-female athletes competing in events against women.

The biological differences between human males and females are myriad, as they are in the animal kingdom among species with sexual reproduction. Both neurological and hormonal differences can impact emotions and skills. For example, cognitive skills differ, with men being stronger in spatial cognition.

Feminists deny all of this, because genetically -based biological characteristics are not amenable to change for the convenience of benefitting females. And biological characteristics that stand in the way of female equality or superiority cannot be admitted. Therefore, all differences in gender roles are attributed to “social construction,” that is, to culture and socialization. It is thus a basic precept of feminism that genetics and biology are false. This makes feminism an enemy of science.

Feminist animosity to science is seen particularly in the opposition to and sup-

pression of scientific studies that do not conform with feminist ideology. One example is the “Greater Male Variability Hypothesis.” Theodore P. Hill, Professor Emeritus of Mathematics at Georgia Tech, and currently a research scholar in residence at the California Polytechnic State University, describes the subject of his recent paper:

“In the highly controversial area of human intelligence, the ‘Greater Male Variability Hypothesis’ (GMVH) asserts that there are more idiots and more geniuses among men than among women. Darwin’s research on evolution in the nineteenth century found that, although there are many exceptions for specific traits and species, there is generally more variability in males than in females of the same species throughout the animal kingdom.

“Evidence for this hypothesis is fairly robust and has been reported in species ranging from adders and sockeye salmon to wasps and orangutans, as well as humans. Multiple studies have found that boys and men are over-represented at both the high and low ends of the distributions in categories ranging from birth weight and brain structures and 60-meter dash times to reading and mathematics test scores. There are significantly more men than women, for example, among Nobel laureates, music composers, and chess champions—and also among homeless people, suicide victims, and federal prison inmates.”

This paper was accepted in sequence by two respected journals, and then, after feminist intervention, was rejected by both journals. The feminist group, Women in Mathematics, insisted that the journals reject the article, and feminists lobbied the National Science Foundation to refuse acknowledgment as a funder, which it did. Other contributors to the paper were threatened by feminist colleagues with loss of their jobs; Women in Mathematics said “the paper might be damaging to the aspirations of impressionable young women,” and feminist professors at the university of the co-author said, to argue that “women have a lesser chance to succeed in mathematics at the very top end is bias.” The chair of the co-author’s department said, “sometimes values such as academic freedom and free speech come into conflict with other values to which Penn State was committed.” In other words, feminists are allowed to negate academic freedom, and to deny publication of scientific evidence. As we see in this case, feminist views not only conflict with scientific evidence, but throughout our governmental and educational institutions feminists are officially allowed to bully scientists and suppress scientific conclusions that they do not like.

Alessandro Strumia, a Senior Scientist at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) and Professor at Pisa University, on 28 September 2018 presented a talk designed to respond to previous presentations. According to Strumia, “This workshop was continuously telling (saying), ‘men are bad, men are sexist, they discriminate against us’ – lots of things like this. I did a check to see if this was true . . . and the result was, that was not true. There is a political group that wants women, and other people, to believe that they are victims.”

Strumia presented a series of charts, tables, and graphs to demonstrate that, far from being discriminated against, women were favoured, and men were discriminated against. He also said that “Physics [was] invented and built by men.” Whatever the historical reasons for it, this is of course true of all sciences. In Physics, the subject under discussion, women have won three Nobel Prizes, men 207.

The response was immediate: Strumia was suspended from CERN, and his university has launched an investigation. 1600 scientists signed a petition against Strumia, saying, among other things, that “Strumia’s arguments are morally reprehensible. Belittling the ability and legitimacy of scientists of colour and white women scientists using such flimsy pretexts is disgraceful, and it reveals a deep contempt for more than half of humanity that clearly comes from some source other than scientific logic.” There was much high rhetoric in the petition, and most of the counter arguments and allegedly refuting evidence are dubious at best.

It would have been difficult to provide refuting argument about “scientists of colour,” because Strumia never mentioned them. The petition also said, “Signatories to the statement agreed that they wanted to “state, in the strongest possible terms, that the humanity of any person, regardless of ascribed identities such as race, ethnicity, gender identity, religion, disability, gender presentation, or sexual identity is not up for debate”. Strumia of course said nothing about anybody’s “humanity,” nor about religion, disability, or sexual identity. What he did say was “The data about citations and hirings show that women are not discriminated (against) in fundamental physics,” he said. “We reward merit, irrespective of gender.”

The reaction to Strumia was not an impartial scientific challenge based on evidence. Rather, the reaction to Strumia was an indignant rejection of a heretic who violated the religion of progressive feminism’s most cherished commandment, that females must make up at least 50% of the people in any enterprise. Strumia received the usual treatment of a heretic: vilification and excommunication. A major part of the vilification was to condemn Strumia for saying things that he never said. The underlying view of his accusers is that if you do not accept feminist ideology and goals, then you are evil.

Where did the idea come from that “justice” is the demographic representation in every activity and enterprise of every category of humanity according to their statistical representation in the general population? And that if equal representation does not exist, it is in every case because of bigotry and discrimination? This precept ignores the differences among different categories of population, and their different suitability for different activities. For example, members of particular categories who are, on average, short in stature, are unlikely to be represented in professional basketball, not due to bigotry, but due to suitability. Why is the illustrious idea of “diversity” in physical type and ability ignored in the equal representation commandment? The equal representation precept also ignores freedom, the ability of people to choose what they prefer. If people of

certain categories prefer urban living, must a representative proportion of them be sent to the farms and forests against their wills?

Throughout North American society, in governments, scientific agencies, granting agencies, and universities, there is a determined policy, with sanctions attached, to increase the number of females in STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) fields. This has been determined from above, from progressive feminist principles. Below, among students, the enthusiasm of females to commit to STEM has been, shall we say, lukewarm. Given the free choice that females have had in universities, they have massively chosen to go into the social sciences and humanities. Females now make up 60% of university graduates across North America, males 40%, so females are already substantially overrepresented, but this does not seem to be a violation of “gender equality,” at least according to feminists. Nonetheless, feminists are frantic that females do not have a higher representation in STEM. Here are the Canadian figures:

“According to the National Household Survey (NHS), women accounted for 39% of university graduates aged 25 to 34 with a STEM degree in 2011, compared with 66% of university graduates in non-STEM programs.

“Among STEM graduates aged 25 to 34, women accounted for 59% of those in science and technology programs, but accounted for 23% of those who graduated from engineering and 30% of those who graduated from mathematics and computer science programs.

“Women are always less likely to choose a STEM program, regardless of mathematical ability. Among those who went to university, 23% women in the three highest categories of PISA [Programme for International Student Assessment] scores (out of six) chose a STEM program, compared with 39% of men in the three lowest categories of PISA scores.”

Furthermore, it appears that gender equality in the society at large is negatively correlated with females in STEM. That is, “In countries that empower women, they are less likely to choose math and science professions.” The explanation seems to be that girls, while good at math and science, are better at reading, and prefer reading. And there are more opportunities in economically advanced countries for people with literary backgrounds. “The upshot of this research is neither especially feminist nor especially sad: It’s not that gender equality discourages girls from pursuing science. It’s that it allows them not to if they’re not interested. This evidence does not support the feminist argument that females do not go into STEM because they are discriminated against. Rather, it supports what female students have shown by their free choices, that they prefer non-STEM fields.

Finally, the assault on science continues with a demand that science be transformed into “feminist science.” In other words, feminists say that science as it has been practiced during the past 500 years is no good and should be abandoned. After all, say the feminists, “objectivity is male subjectivity.”

In its place? Feminist science that “infuses social justice, inclusion and equality into science to advance progressive social change. . . . a socially just science.” In other words, feminists do not want to explore reality through the collection and assessment of evidence. Feminists already know the answers that they like, and wish to transform science to fit feminist ideology. That will allegedly “advance progressive social change,” although it is likely to end the masculine discovery of the world.

We already know that feminism is toxic to our culture and our educational system, and next it will be toxic to science. Are we smart enough and serious enough to defend science?

Read the entire version with footnotes here: <https://fcpp.org/wp-content/uploads/EF53FeministsAssaultScienceSalzman.pdf>

Philip Carl Salzman (philip.carl.salzman@mcgill.ca) is Emeritus Professor of Anthropology at McGill University, in Montréal. His article originally appeared on 23 January on the website of the Frontier Centre for Public Policy, where Dr Salzman is a Senior Fellow. It is reprinted by permission.

BEQUEST TO SAFS

Please consider remembering the Society in your will. Even small bequests can help us greatly in carrying on SAFS's work. In most cases, a bequest does not require rewriting your entire will, but can be done simply by adding a codicil.

Thank you,
Mark Mercer, SAFS president

ACADEMIC FREEDOM CASE OF PHYSICS PROFESSOR DENIS RANCOURT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA HAS BEEN AMICABLY RESOLVED ON ALL MATTERS IN DISPUTE

Denis Rancourt

As reported by me on my “Activist Teacher” blog, and by arbitrator William Kaplan on his website, all the matters in dispute between the University of Ottawa and me have been amicably resolved, through voluntary mediation that occurred on January 16, 2019.

The terms of the agreement are confidential. All outstanding matters from all litigations and arbitrations have been resolved.

The protracted conflict started before my full professorship was terminated on March 31, 2009. The most current aspects were described by me in the article “Why Did The University Of Ottawa Secretly Destroy My Large Collection Of Unique Scientific Samples?” in the January 2019 issue of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship’s *SAFS Newsletter*, and links therein.[1]

I am happy with this development of settlement. I am thankful to my union, the Association of Professors of the University of Ottawa (APUO), for its continuous support, and for the many students and friends who, over the years, signed petitions, wrote letters, attended hearings, followed the events, and publicly expressed their opinions. Thank you all very much!

I will now more fully devote myself to my volunteer work as a researcher at the Ontario Civil Liberties Association (ocla.ca), to helping folks that way; and to my social theory explorations, often published at *Dissident Voice*; plus some basic and environmental science, mostly posted to my page at Research Gate, and on my Google Scholar profile. I agitate on current issues on Facebook.

In the end, my generic conclusion is that there is sometimes justice regarding legal claims, but there is no academic freedom or professional independence in universities.

The best historical analysis of the absence of actual academic freedom, which I have found, is in the Introduction and Chapter I of Ellen W. Schrecker’s 1986 book *No Ivory Tower*.

I think the lack of freedom and independence does great harm to society, by the mechanism that I described in my 2017 article “Cause of USA Meltdown and Collapse of Civil Rights”.[2]

Denis Rancourt (denis.rancourt@alumni.utoronto.ca) is a researcher with the Ontario Civil Liberties Association. He taught physics at the University of Ottawa and is the author of Hierarchy and Free Expression in the Fight Against Racism (2013).

Endnotes

1. “Why Did The University Of Ottawa Secretly Destroy My Large Collection Of Unique Scientific Samples?”, by Denis Rancourt, *SAFS Newsletter*, January 2019. <https://www.safs.ca/newsletters/article.php?article=994>
2. “Cause of USA Meltdown and Collapse of Civil Rights”, by Denis Rancourt, *Dissident Voice*, 7 September 2017. <https://dissidentvoice.org/2017/09/cause-of-usa-meltdown-and-collapse-of-civil-rights/>

REVIEW OF CAMPBELL AND MANNING, *The Rise of Victimhood Culture*

Stephen B. Perrott

The Rise of Victimhood Culture by sociologists Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning offers little in the way of novel concepts but integrates a kitchen sink full of social justice lexicon and arguments into a holistic understanding of an emerging world view. Moreover, the gestalt that emerges from the synthesis provides a novel and lucid theoretical framework for understanding academe's current culture wars.

In expanding on their controversial 2014 *Comparative Sociology* article, "Microaggressions and Moral Culture", the authors use the first two chapters to outline their thesis within the framework of the **three moral cultures** encompassing much of humankind. If you stopped there, you would have a reasonably complete picture of the authors' core message but would lose the benefit of profiting from the greater richness that comes with reading the rest of the book. Furthermore, reading cover-to-cover is hardly a burden as the authors pull off the rare achievement of providing a well-sourced and rigorously argued scholarly treatise in a writing style that is truly page-turning.

For those not already familiar, an **honour culture** is characterised by hypersensitivity to perceived slight, an obsessive demand for respect, and a reliance on conflict resolution by self-help rather than by institutional authority (think, for example, of the Hatfields and McCoys or of duels with pistols). Honour cultures have been largely eclipsed in mainstream Western society but hang on stubbornly in certain disadvantaged groups (e.g., inner city gangs).

Dignity is at the core of today's mainstream moral culture, characterized by the valuing of personal resilience (e.g., sticks and stones . . .), by giving people the benefit of the doubt, and of a commitment to non-violent conflict resolution based in dialogue and good will. **Dignity culture** can only thrive in societies based in the rule of law yet discourages appeals to institutional authority other than for significant breaches of the social contract or when good-will dialogue fails to settle less serious matters. Over the last five years or so, dignity culture has come under increasing attack by a rapidly expanding **victimhood culture**, first emerging in our universities but now starting to spill over into mainstream society.

Like honour culture, a victimhood orientation promotes extreme sensitivity to perceived slight regardless of the intent of the offense-giver and where the reality of any offense need not be discernable in any objective sense (e.g., the microaggression). However, rather than seeking remedy via individual efforts, those in victimhood cultures are encouraged to rely on institutional authority. This has resulted in the ever-increasing number of university bureaucrats with titles related to harassment, diversity, and inclusion.

Victimhood culture encourages people to report offenses, even if trivial or experienced vicariously, by mechanisms like the bias hotlines that are increasing in frequency in the university. Whereas dignity culture discourages, or even scorns, the actions of the "tattle-tell" or informer, victimhood culture tends to reward such behaviour. Furthermore, whereas dignity culture determines moral worth

based on individual actions (e.g., Martin Luther King's famous admonition to judge by character), status in victimhood culture is accrued by demographic characteristics (e.g., sex, race) denoting the level of one's oppression.

The authors combine University of Melbourne's Nick Haslam's notion of *concept creep* with the ranking system used to determine one's level of privilege and/or oppression to explain the logic of the victimhood rulebook. That only whites can be racist, only men can be sexist, and that words can be acts of violence (and justifiably countered by actual violence) are examples of rules that adherents to dignity culture are likely to find mysterious or nonsensical. A more extreme, yet seriously defended, claim is that being white is, *de facto*, an act of violence.

Traditional scholars might wish to view certain victimhood claims as hyperbolic and directed to support a grab for political power packaged in a balloon bound to deflate if only a pin were stuck in it. Campbell and Manning argue that such a conclusion is wrong because victimhood forms the basis of a distinct moral culture where dignity principles may seem as antiquated and unreasonable as those of honour culture have come to be seen. The actions of the victimhood crowd flow normally from the foundations of their culture and they are unlikely to be persuaded by rational arguments reflecting dignity values. As such, student activists, as well as a similarly inclined and increasingly homogenous professoriate, are unreachable in terms of seeing the desirability of viewpoint diversity. The discomfiting question that arises is not how long the victimhood fad will last but rather whether there is any future at all for a dignity-oriented university.

Consider, for example, the email that Yale assistant house-master Erica Christakis sent to students encouraging the exercise of good judgement in their choice of Halloween costumes. Her comments come across as commensurate with the maturity and autonomy of young people in a dignity culture. However, to the victimhood culture, left-leaning Christakis was a villain who challenged their deeply held beliefs and who deserved, in turn, to be driven from her post. Such campus conflict, argue Campbell and Manning, is not best understood as a battle between left and right, but rather as a clash between the values of dignity and those of a rapidly expanding victimhood culture.

The Yale incident points to another seeming irony of victimhood culture. Students there, as at other elite universities where victimhood is most dominant, are very privileged and this privilege extends, relatively at least, to students identifying as members of oppressed groups. Campbell and Manning point out that victimhood culture flourishes best in societal milieus that are already generally, if not perfectly, egalitarian.

Campbell and Manning are obvious iconoclasts amongst today's advocacy-oriented sociologists, and in Chapter 6 they take aim at the current state of their discipline. They contend that social science generally, and sociology in particular, cannot advance when the primary goal is to advance a political agenda. It is for sociologists to describe and explain the social phenomena they study, not to

make judgements and proscribe how those data should be used.

Sociologists who fail to recognize this distinction compromise the integrity of their research endeavours insofar as their findings and interpretations, and even their questions, are destined to conform to the prevailing ideology. The authors do not spare my own discipline of psychology from this critique with the only difference being that psychology has not ventured quite so far down the social-justice rabbit hole. Not surprisingly, the newer identity disciplines, like Women's Studies, are even further removed from the scholarly endeavour.

The authors point out two examples of where a burgeoning victimhood culture has resulted in side-effects that threaten the movement overall. The first of these is referred to as a *purity spiral* (more commonly and derisively known as the *Oppression Olympics*) where identity groups compete to prove that they are the **most** oppressed. A current salient example of this phenomenon is seen in the remarkable hostility that has grown between certain transgender activists and those to whom they derisively refer as TERFS (Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminists). However, even if such internal conflict has resulted in cracks in solidarity within victimhood culture, there is no clear evidence that the strength of the movement overall has been compromised.

Another example involves those who were initially consigned to have no status whatsoever within victimhood culture. These are, of course, cis-gendered, straight, white males some of whom are now claiming their own victim status. These alt-right identitarians appear to be similarly motivated to their victimhood culture counterparts in their desire to censor speech and de-platform speakers with whom they disagree.

Readers of this review are encouraged to pick up a copy of the book to see just how much more the authors deliver than can be conveyed here. In endorsing this volume, New York University's Jonathan Haidt points to just how prophetic the authors' original 2014 article has proven to be. The extended treatment in this book is not, by definition, prophetic but it is bound to become these authors' enduring contribution, such that future scholars are likely to view it as being seminally relevant to describing our current times in the academy.

Stephen Perrott (Stephen.Perrott@msvu.ca) is Professor of Psychology at Mount Saint Vincent University, in Halifax.

REVIEW OF HEATHER MAC DONALD, *The Diversity Delusion*

Kris Larsen

Heather Mac Donald, *The Diversity Delusion: How Race and Gender Pandering Corrupt the University and Undermine Our Culture*, St Martin's Press, New York, 2018. (Hardcover, 278 pages.)

Heather Mac Donald, a trained lawyer and a distinguished fellow at the Manhattan Institute, enlightens us with *The Diversity Delusion*. It is a well-researched, well-argued critique of the postmodern campus and, increasingly, the broader society, where political correctness, including race/gender hustling often runs amok. The “unwoke” are frequently persecuted, while others are cowed into silence.

Unfortunately, Mac Donald recently experienced this tyranny firsthand when she was scheduled to speak at Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, California. A planned discussion of her previous book, *The War On Cops* (highly recommended, by the way) was too much for little cupcakes, who behaved like spoiled brats by throwing a tantrum. Naturally, they called her a “fascist” and a “racist”. The beat goes on.

Security concerns forced Mac Donald to live stream her speech to the audience from a vacant auditorium. Of course these intolerant radicals were entitled to express their views. But they had no right to prevent Mac Donald from speaking or to prevent an audience from hearing what she had to say. At least they didn’t succeed in cancelling the event, a travesty all too familiar to Charles Murray, Ann Coulter, Ben Shapiro, and others.

An obsession with gender and racial diversity, but, alas, not the diversity of ideas, is a big part of the problem. Instead of focusing on individuals, diversity emphasizes the individual’s larger group, with all the *perceived* baggage that goes with it, and extends outside of an individual’s control. Scabs are ripped off old wounds and we are too often reduced to a collection of warring tribes competing for spoils, each pitted against all and all pitted against whites, Western civilization, and, increasingly, Asians, who disproportionately benefit from the merit principle and *equality of opportunity* and who are oftentimes discriminated against by affirmative action student admissions policies, which stress *proportional equality of outcome* by identity group. Indeed, Asians have taken Harvard University to court over that institution’s discriminatory, dare I say racist, admissions policies, where members of their communities applying with higher SAT (Scholastic Aptitude/Assessment Test) scores are frequently rejected in favour of others less qualified.

Mac Donald speaks truth to power by setting her sights on the burgeoning campus diversity bureaucracy, which believes it advocates for the oppressed, but is actually a wasteful extravagance. Hiking university budgets to accommodate diversity bureaucrats’ six figure salaries may ultimately be offset by reductions in teaching staff and course offerings (with adverse consequences for standards), plus larger classes and higher tuition costs, which places a university education financially out of reach for more students.

Mac Donald adds that contemporary Western culture is the least patriarchal in history, a claim that is hard to dispute, although there is always room for improvement. She critiques the so-called “campus rape crisis”, a phenomenon seemingly based on an assumption that all males are dangerous sexual predators.

Accused parties are too often denied due process and deemed guilty until proven innocent. Furthermore, the bar constituting sexual assault is lowered to include groping, either unwanted or later regretted, and sexual couplings with later regret. Also, seemingly consensual sex while intoxicated may qualify as sexual assault or rape because the female “victim” *really* wasn’t rational enough to give consent. Apparently, the fact that people *choose* to get drunk and must know that it impairs their judgment is lost on the campus kangaroo courts adjudicating these claims. There are also vendettas where the spurned party is hell-bent on revenge and doesn’t mind destroying someone’s reputation in the process. Methinks it is best if a university’s responsibility is limited to referring sexual misconduct allegations to police and the justice system, where qualified people can conduct a proper investigation.

Bureaucratizing campus coupling with dating dos and don’ts has also become *de rigueur*, with Mac Donald referring to Columbia University’s mandatory “Sexual Respect and Community Citizenship Initiative” program. The late great Tom Wolfe could not have dreamed this up for one of his satires. Then again, maybe he could have.

Finally, affirmative action admissions policies at universities, while often well intentioned, mean lowering standards to accommodate minority applicants. And those admitted with lower SAT scores are ill prepared for academic rigour and more apt to fail.

Yet Mac Donald contends that the problem often stems less from racism than from minority (especially African American and Hispanic) children disproportionately falling behind in the early elementary years and never catching up. More familial and cultural emphasis must be placed on the importance of education, especially reading, writing, and math, while children are young. If gaps are not prevented or overcome in elementary grades, it may be too late by the time a child reaches high school. Forget about success at university.

Proportional representation admissions policies privileging the less qualified might also necessitate the dumbing down of curricula so that fewer fail. This is always problematic, but especially so for professional schools, who then graduate more doctors and lawyers who provide inferior service to patients and clients, and more engineers who build less structurally sound bridges.

Yet valid points emphasized by Mac Donald and others are too often ruled out of bounds. Indeed, a young computer engineer at Google was actually fired for his memo attributing male dominance in STEM fields to a tendency, not an absolute rule, for men and women to differ with respect to assertiveness, drive, and orientation towards things rather than people.

But Mac Donald is right to stress that science and technology require the best people available. Emphasis on identity group quotas, a luxury we can’t afford, undermines our ability to compete in a global marketplace. Generally higher SAT scores in math account for whatever advantages males might have in engineering and technical fields. Conversely, women dominate in more people

oriented professions, given their generally higher verbal skills.

Of course, drilling down to individuals yields exceptions to general tendencies. Some individuals from underrepresented minorities will excel, not fall behind in math in the early grades, and some individual women will be superior in STEM oriented courses. Furthermore, Mac Donald stresses that high tech companies and engineering firms successfully competing to survive understand it is wildly irrational and certainly economically counterproductive to discriminate against supremely qualified female or minority candidates because of gender or skin colour.

Condemnations from diversity cults are not limited to Western civilization and white men, but extend to white women, gays, and minority group members who refuse to fall in line with politically correct groupthink. And Mac Donald laments how such traditional values as self-discipline, hard work, education, civility, child rearing within an intact relationship, and respect for authority seemingly merit scorn.

But what is to replace our civilization? Can the diversity and multiculturalism crowd make a cogent case for some other system being superior to the West, or are they merely nihilists? Are there other civilizations which do a better job tolerating diversity of race, religion, and opinion? Why do so many from other parts of the world literally risk life and limb to come here? Unfortunately, intimidating, bullying, and cowing the politically incorrect into silence (even by violent means) is much easier than employing the time and effort to assess, formulate thoughtful counterarguments, and engage in constructive debate.

This does not end well. Students marinating in a toxic stew of critical race, gender, and LGBTQ propaganda eventually graduate into the “real world”, where they extend their pernicious influence. Schools and universities, the media, corporations, civil services, the non-profit sector, even professional athletes and sports pundits are politically correct now. And people are rightfully afraid of running afoul of this totalitarian orthodoxy because it can actually get them publically shamed, even fired from their jobs. Just ask Rick Mehta, James Damore, or Curt Schilling.

What to do? Mac Donald laments how many eighteen year olds enter university ignorant of the Western canon and remain so (albeit cloaked in victimhood) when they leave four years later. She stresses that the university’s purpose is to transmit knowledge, including the linking of great thinkers of the past with the future. More emphasis ought to be placed on the masters who influenced America’s founders and their *ideals*, including opposition to tyranny and support for representative democracy and the rule of law. Breaking our links with the past increases the potential to reject a civilization built painstakingly brick by brick over centuries. Ronald Reagan was absolutely right when he warned that we are always one generation away from replacing democracy with tyranny.

Mac Donald also mentions extension courses established by Tom Rollins under the title *Great Courses*, which include lectures in literature, philosophy, music,

history, math, and the sciences by *ideologically* diverse academics, unencumbered by identity politics. This market driven program has experienced growing pains, but might be valuable as a supplement, assuming costs for students are not prohibitive.

A possible antidote, not mentioned by Mac Donald, is student centred. With or without classroom indoctrination, it can never hurt if students are cognizant of footnotes and bibliographies in their texts and other readings and pay attention to ideas, thinkers, and worldviews discussed in class or in texts, then find supplementary writings (hopefully from differing perspectives) in the library or by using Google. When Googling, bear in mind that more conservative or libertarian perspectives might (or might not?) be buried in later pages.

Also, Jordan Peterson recommends DIE avoidance, which means staying away from courses using such words as diversity, inclusion, or equity in their descriptions. They do not educate, they indoctrinate.

Finally, the National Association of Scholars (NAS), an organization devoted to academic freedom, freedom of speech, and the Western canon, is always looking for members, including undergraduates who share its philosophy. Its quarterly publication, *Academic Questions*, is an outstanding counterweight to politically correct postmodernist dogma. And one need not be American or involved in the university or think tank scene to join. The Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS) performs a similar role in Canada.

On a concluding note, Heather Mac Donald does an excellent job highlighting the scourge of political correctness and its progeny, diversity (or is it the scourge of diversity and its progeny, political correctness?), while also championing Western civilization. She rightfully condemns the significant bullying and intolerance found on campuses and beyond, which largely targets those with views not deemed politically correct, and which leaves us all more fearful and less free. Possible antidotes including additional student research, DIE avoidance, and NAS membership might be useful supplements to Mac Donald's powerful thesis.

Kris Larsen (larsenke57@gmail.com) is a SAFS member and a retired Nova Scotia civil servant with a background in adult education and social services. He and his wife live in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

REVIEW OF JOAN WALLACH SCOTT, *Knowledge, Power, and Academic Freedom*

Tom Flanagan

Joan Wallach Scott, *Knowledge, Power, and Academic Freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.

Joan Wallach Scott is a well-known American historian, now based at Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study, the quondam home of intellectual giants such as Albert Einstein and John von Neumann. She is also a long-time member and chair of the American Association of University Professors Committee A, which deals with academic freedom. I naively thought that a book by an author with such illustrious credentials would teach me a lot about contemporary issues of academic freedom. I was wrong.

For one thing, the book is a collection of short essays published over more than 20 years. Important issues, such as the difference between academic freedom and constitutionally protected freedom of speech, or the relationship between academic freedom and civility, are mentioned but never systematically developed. But there is a more important problem related to the author's general outlook, which cannot be understood without some *ad feminam* observations.

Joan Wallach was a red-diaper baby. Her father Sam Wallach (brother of the renowned actor Eli Wallach) was president of the Communist-led New York City Teachers Union. The Teachers Union was expelled by the American Federation of Teachers at the time when American organized labour was ridding itself of Communist influences, and Sam Wallach lost his job as a high-school teacher. Like many Marxists of her generation, Joan Wallach Scott went into university life and transferred her allegiance to identity politics, reinterpreting class struggle in terms of gender and ethnic conflict.

Given that backstory, it is not surprising that she is blind in one eye. She sees threats to academic freedom coming only from the political Right. A century ago, at the height of the first American Progressive movement, pressures from university trustees, donors, and state legislators led socialist-leaning academics to organize in defence of academic freedom. In Scott's view of the world, nothing much has changed in a hundred years. The enemies of academic freedom are still state legislators, in league with big corporations and, of course, the Trump administration.

But the world has in fact changed. The academic Left enjoys a huge numerical preponderance in today's universities, and the main threats to academic freedom come from Leftist professors, student mobs, and bumptious diversity administrators. In Canada, it was not provincial politicians and big corporations who fired Rick Mehta and tried to silence Jordan Peterson and Lindsay Shepherd. But Scott hardly notices parallel events in her own country. Her comments on the disgraceful mobbing of Charles Murray at Middlebury College are typical: he never should have been invited in the first place, and the only harm done by the mobbing was to cede some temporary moral high ground to the Right. You would think that, as a *soi-disant* feminist, she might have mentioned that the mob violence sent to the hospital the liberal female professor who had invited Murray to speak, but again you would be wrong.

Scott's distinctions, even when valid, are always drawn in a way convenient to her political stance. For example, it is true that academic freedom and freedom

of speech are not identical. Academic freedom is not a fundamental constitutional right but a privilege enjoyed by university academics because it is essential to the enterprise of science and scholarship. But if you draw the distinction too narrowly, academic freedom becomes a privilege of a credentialed guild, who can use it to ignore or even abuse the free speech of others. That is what is happening today, now that academic Leftists control most disciplines. They are driving non-conformists like Rick Mehta out of their jobs, propagandizing in the classroom, and deplatforming visiting speakers who might offer contrary views.

Campus freedom of speech is so threatened that governments like those of Rob Ford and Donald Trump are stepping in—perhaps not an ideal solution, but understandable in light of the Left’s hegemony in academia. Scott’s book provides some insight about how universities got into their present degraded situation but offers no useful ideas about how to get out of it. Ironically, she and others like her have discovered a perverse philosopher’s stone that turns gold into lead, transmuting academic freedom from a defence of dissenting opinion into protection of a credentialed elite imposing their opinions on others.

Tom Flanagan (tflanaga@ucalgary.ca) is Professor Emeritus of Political Science, University of Calgary, and a member of the SAFS Board of Directors.

FREE SPEECH ON CAMPUS AND (THE DANGERS OF) BEING A WOMAN AT
QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY

Adèle Mercier

Ontario Premier Doug Ford has introduced new “free speech” policies for Ontario campuses. Queen’s University is cited (*Toronto Star*, January 9) as “among those universities approving new policies”, with its Principal (Daniel Woolf) stating that the “failure to explore or confront ideas with which we disagree through disciplined and respectful dialogue, debate, and argument, does society a disservice, weakens our intellectual integrity, and threatens the very core of the university.”

A brochure from Inclusive Queen’s! on “Harassment and Discrimination Support and Reporting” states that “Queen’s is committed to fostering a campus environment in which all students, staff, and faculty are treated with dignity and respect” and claiming that “the university encourages members of the Queen’s community who experience or witness harassment or discrimination to disclose their experience. Faculty, staff, and students can confidentially consult on their options, seek informal resolutions, and initiate a formal report, or any combination of these options.” What the brochure fails to mention is that you expose yourself to systemic defamation and demonization if you do.

Between 2008 and 2010, having “experienced or witnessed harassment or discrimination” – reliably or not, we know not, for my detailed and lengthy complaint remains to this day uninvestigated – I pursued all combinations of these

“options”. While my complaint remains uninvestigated, I have been investigated to death in demonstrably idiotic and Kafkaesque hired-gun affairs and was summarily booted out of my office of 20 years on explicit allegations of being a safety threat. It took six years for it to come out, and for anyone to tell me, that nobody ever really thought I was ever a safety threat after all, despite repeated claims to that effect by respondents to my complaints. I was still booted out of my office for 4 years. As serendipity would have it, this happened the same week that the Student Government awarded me the first “Anti-Oppression Award”, in recognition for, among others things, my contribution to “the safety [sic] of the campus, community, and society”. Ah! Poetic justice!

Well, prosaic justice is no less vindication for being less pithy. The following is lifted from Queen’s-QUFA Arbitration, Professor Mercier Award, a public document available on Canlii that establishes the record:

“From about 2008, Professor Mercier pursued allegations of gender bias in the Department of Philosophy involving both faculty and students. Professor Mercier filed a complaint under the University’s internal complaint process in 2009. In the fall of 2010, absent an investigation into her internal complaint, Professor Mercier filed a complaint with the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario (HRTO). [Subsequently] a number of her colleagues made complaints about Professor Mercier, one of whom alleged in an email that Professor Mercier posed a threat of workplace violence. This complaint was investigated and found to be without merit. In May 2013, Professor Mercier complained about the conduct of x & y. In October 2013, x & y complained that comments made by Professor Mercier constituted a threat of workplace violence. The Director of Security did not agree. There was no investigation. Professor Mercier continued to have concerns about x. The department head suggested Professor Mercier raise her concerns, which she did; x was upset by what had been said. A letter dated October 29, 2013 advised Professor Mercier that: ‘both x & y have indicated that they feel unsafe in your presence; the university is required to respond to safety concerns; you should not attend your office in Watson Hall until you are advised that you may do so; you should arrange immediately to see students for academic purposes at your new office; you should not have any verbal contact with x & y either in person or by phone; any E-mail contact required for academic purposes should be directed to the Faculty Office’. The above are described as interim arrangements. The grievance officer was ‘struck dumb’. She comments that ‘the manner of this directive smacks of punishment.’ Professor Mercier was interviewed by the investigator on three occasions and a finding was eventually made in June 2015 that she did not pose a safety threat. The difficulty here stems from the manner in which these decisions were put into effect with the resultant impact upon Professor Mercier.

“The University either knew or reasonably should have known that the effective banishment of Professor Mercier from the Department premises would have a significant reputational impact. In the further circumstance where there had been no finding of misconduct, it could reasonably have been expected that

the University would have taken steps to lessen the reputational impact of the separation upon Professor Mercier. There is no evidence that anything was done in this regard or that there was consultation for the purpose of fashioning a more flexible separation or otherwise minimizing the reputational impact of the separation upon Professor Mercier.

“The University’s failure to take all reasonable steps to minimize the reputational harm to Professor Mercier constitutes an exercise of managerial discretion that was neither fair nor equitable in its application to Professor Mercier.

“As for the extended duration of Professor Mercier’s exclusion from the Department, the University could have insisted that the alleged workplace violence component of the investigation be done immediately, especially in light of conclusion in October 2013 that Professor Mercier did not pose a threat of physical violence. Even though the University has argued here that the threat was not significant, it allowed the investigation into whether Professor Mercier posed a threat of physical violence to continue until June 2015.

“I am compelled to conclude on a holistic assessment of the University’s actions that the University did not conduct itself fairly and/or equitably in regard to its treatment of Professor Mercier. Given that there was no admission or finding of misconduct, it was incumbent upon the University to seek to minimize both the impact and the duration of the forced interim relocation. It did neither. Apart from consulting or otherwise searching for a less impactful separation, neither of which was done, at the very least the University could have taken steps to ensure that from the outset Professor Mercier would be comfortable in her relocated office. Instead, it refused...”

As you can see, and notwithstanding Inclusive Queen’s!, it is quite dangerous to disclose one’s experience of harassment and discrimination at Queen’s University. By complaining, you become a danger. Of course the transference is fallacious: the respondents and University are afraid of the complaint, not of me.

So what does it take to be taken seriously and treated fairly? If even the likes of an award-winning professor suffer such grave epistemic injustice and credibility deficit after 20 years of dedicated service to Queen’s, how can women with fewer intellectual resources and privilege hope to be heard? “Have we come such a long way, baby?” asks an article in the *Queen’s Journal* of 1975. Well, 45 years later, here’s one Dangerous Woman who’s relieved they’ve progressed beyond burning the likes of us at the stake.

I hope Doug Ford and Daniel Woolf understand that it’s not just Jordan Peterson, white nationalists, misogynists and homophobes that the “snowflakes” in universities bully into silence. At Queen’s University, it’s the likes of Me Too.

Adèle Mercier (adele.mercier@gmail.com) is an award-winning philosopher of language and logic and a dedicated logic professor many times nominated for teaching prizes. She has two PhDs and has worked at Queen’s University, in

Kingston, for 20 years.

ONTARIO'S MATHEMATICS TEACHING POLICIES DISCRIMINATE AGAINST
POORER FAMILIES

Philip A. Sullivan

Competence in math among Ontario public school students in grades 1 through 8 continues to decline and worried parents increasingly resort to private tuition, something virtually unknown 40 years ago. But such tuition is expensive. Fees can be \$300 per child per month, so that children of poorer families are disadvantaged.

Ontario's Ministry of Education literature reveals several reasons for this discrimination. These include: (1) a curriculum favoured by educators but unsuited to mathematics' hierarchical structure; (2) an obsession with discovery/problem-based learning at the expense of direct instruction; (3) deficient textbooks; and (4) the failure to train elementary math teachers for the particular challenges of teaching children. The Ministry's curriculum glossary also includes elementary errors, an example being the wrong definition of a rational number. The correct version is available in any good dictionary. These errors suggest that the officials responsible for curriculum development are ill-prepared for the task.

The structure of mathematics including algebra and calculus is based on five rules for adding and multiplying the natural numbers, these rules being the "chess-moves" of the subject. They govern subtraction and division together with operations on fractions, negative numbers, decimals and percentages. To advance learning, by grade 6 students should be able to automatically apply the five rules to all these operations. To free working memory for problem-solving, the 12 X 12 times table should also be memorized. Failure to achieve these goals strongly predicts under-performance in the higher school years and in college.

Concerned mathematicians distinguish between mastery curricular on the one hand and spiral curricula on the other. Progress in mathematics requires understanding thoroughly a particular concept before building on it. For example, division of a whole number by a fraction will be meaningless to the student if she does not understand multiplication by a fraction. Mastery curricula recognise this feature by intensely teaching each step in the hierarchy before moving up.

In contrast, in any given year spiral curricula cover many topics, which can range from basic arithmetic to probability and statistics. Each topic is treated only briefly, being revisited over several years. Although the intent is to treat concepts with increasing depth in successive grades, what tends to happen in mathematics is that students acquire only a superficial understanding of basic concepts. Ontario's spiral curriculum is a major source of our problem.

Effective mathematics teaching in grades 1 to 8 requires a three-pronged strat-

egy: (1) developing understanding of the basic principles; (2) teaching competence in using computational techniques; and (3) providing experience in applying mathematical ideas through problem-solving. As is typical of North-American educators, Ontario's ministry literature focusses almost entirely on problem-solving, together with student-based discovery techniques. A recent Ministry "expert panel" report waxes lyrical about this technique by picturing students working in groups, with minimal guidance from the teacher. But a colleague who has observed such groups found that it is usually the brightest student who solves the problem on her own, with the others merely copying. As the cognitive scientist H. A. Simon, who, in 1978, received the Nobel Prize in Economics, observed in a discussion on teaching mathematics, "there is very little positive evidence for discovery learning, and it is often inferior" to direct instruction.

It is tragic that educators ignore half-century old evidence showing that direct instruction focusing on basic skills is the most effective in developing not only those skills, but also problem-solving ability. Moreover, direct instruction promotes students' self-esteem. Australian education professor John Hattie's 2009 publication of an analysis of 52,000 investigations confirms this. The most important teaching factors are, in order: (1) feedback from student to teacher; (2) instructional quality; and (3) direct instruction. All are part of competent teacher-directed instruction.

In relation to teacher training, recent ministry policy changes are likely to be ineffective. Although class hours have been increased, advisors evidently continue to push problem-based learning. Furthermore, there appears to be no provision for the specialist training that is needed to teach children the abstract concepts of mathematics. Traditional teacher training topped up with few university level math courses is not enough.

Four years ago, in an article in the *Globe and Mail*, University of Winnipeg mathematician Anna Stokke, who wrote the authoritative C. D. Howe Report on deficiencies in math teaching in Canada, identified the above problems, and laid out an easily implemented plan for reform. This past September, lamenting the lack of progress, she asked "how can we expect a change of direction when ministries of education tend to put the very people in charge who were responsible for choosing the wrong direction in the first place, and have staked careers on promoting ineffective math programs..."

I agree. In its Throne Speech, the Ford Government included math teaching reform as one of its aims. Let us hope that it has both the fortitude and wisdom to mandate effective change.

Phil Sullivan (psullivan@utias.utoronto.ca) is Professor Emeritus, Institute for Aerospace Studies, University of Toronto.

INDIGENIZING MOUNT ROYAL'S CURRICULA: THE THREAT TO ACADEMIC
FREEDOM, FREEDOM OF INQUIRY AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS*Frances Widdowson*

In September 2018, the Office of Academic Indigenization provided Mount Royal University (MRU) faculty with a document entitled “[Indigenizing Mount Royal's Curricula: A Call For Engagement](#)”. This document affirmed MRU’s “commit[ment] to indigenizing its curricula to ensure that all students graduate with a basic understanding of Indigenous content informed by Indigenous perspectives”, and encouraged faculty to transform their courses on this basis. These arguments for “curricula indigenization”, however, have not been subjected to any critical analysis. In fact, “Indigenizing Mount Royal’s Curricula” contains serious flaws and constitutes an unprecedented threat to academic freedom, freedom of inquiry and academic standards at MRU.

“Why Indigenize?”

The ill-conceived nature of “Indigenizing Mount Royal’s Curricula” is shown in the section “Why Indigenize?”. MRU should Indigenize, we are told, because “Indigenous people remain underrepresented among postsecondary students, staff and faculty, and indigenous content remains marginalized”. Indigenization is also necessary, the document asserts, to respond to the demands for Indigenization that were made by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

These reasons are political in nature, and are a distraction from examining the academic implications of the initiative. The reference to “Indigenous underrepresentation” just assumes that there should be proportionality without considering the qualifications of applicants. It is well known that educational levels in the indigenous population are lower than the Canadian average, and so discussions about artificially increasing indigenous representation should consider this.

Furthermore, it is not clear what is meant by increasing “Indigenous content”. Does this concern subjects that include indigenous people, such as indigenous history and indigenous politics? Or is it a plea to include “indigenous perspectives” regardless of whether or not they have been shown to increase empirical knowledge and theoretical understanding?

Finally, should anything that the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the UN Declaration says be accepted? For example, the document states that the TRC asserts that universities should “ensure all Canadians have a basic understanding of. . . this country’s history of cultural genocide”, when many would question this interpretation of

the past. Should we not be analyzing the claims being made, rather than assuming that these political bodies created sacred texts that must be obeyed?

Problems for Academic Freedom

“Indigenizing Mount Royal’s Curricula” states that “[a]s part of the Indigenization Strategy, every academic department will soon be asked to Indigenize its curricula to ensure that every student who majors in a program in that department graduates, at minimum, with a basic understanding of Indigenous content informed by Indigenous perspectives. Goal 5 of the ISP [Indigenous Strategic Plan] states that this content must be the equivalent of at least 3.0 credits of coursework”. It also is asserted that there will be a “[r]equest from the Office of the Provost and Vice-President, Academic that all departments develop formal plans for Indigenizing their major programs”. These plans, according to the document, “will be asked to include core Indigenous content consistent with the TRC Calls to Action, including, ‘the history and legacy of residential schools, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Treaties and Aboriginal rights, Indigenous teachings and practices, Indigenous law, and Aboriginal–Crown relations.’”

The Indigenous Strategic Plan was never approved by MRU’s General Faculties Council. It was provided only as “information”. In spite of this, there is now an effort to use it to make significant changes to MRU curricula. Faculty members should be the ones determining the academic requirements of their departments, and it is alarming that advocacy is driving such a fundamental transformation of university programs. By presenting the Indigenous Strategic Plan as “information”, MRU administrators were able to circumvent potential faculty opposition to curricula Indigenization.

Problems for Open Inquiry

Although it could be argued that individual professors don’t have to participate in these Indigenization initiatives, and therefore it is not a threat to academic freedom, this ignores how Indigenization processes are creating a hostile climate for open inquiry. This has been a problem from the beginning, as is shown by the Indigenous Strategic Plan’s directive that the university “honour Indigenous experiences and identities.” As a result, “territorial acknowledgement” statements pretend to be factual, when their content is contested and a matter for academic investigation. It is noted in “Indigenizing Mount Royal’s Curricula”, for example, that Treaty 7 “included a commitment to crosscultural education that has not been honoured”, when there is no evidence that this is the case.

These kinds of statements, apparently handed down from the university’s “Ministry of Truth”, indicate that the Indigenous Strategic Plan is intent on building

a “culture of celebration” at MRU rather than one that encourages critical thinking and rigorous methods. Even worse, it is tacitly assumed that anyone who has reservations about Indigenization is not an “ally” of indigenous people. This has created huge difficulties for faculty who question the hype. My criticisms of Indigenization, for example, have resulted in accusations that I am a “pathetic racist” with a “hateful perspective” who is damaging Mount Royal University’s reputation.

Problems for Academic Standards

The document refers to the Indigenous Strategic Plan’s goal “to Indigenize Mount Royal University, to respect and embrace Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing, to integrate Indigenous teachings and practices. . . .” It goes on to state that “[w]e believe that the Indigenization Strategy provides a unique opportunity to propose innovative pedagogies and curricula that will benefit all students and programs on campus.”

The assertions are bold, but there has been no attempt to evaluate their veracity. There is not even any definition of what “Indigenous knowledge”, “[Indigenous] ways of knowing”, “Indigenous teachings and practices”, and “Indigenous perspectives” are, or an attempt to determine how they differ from their non-indigenous counterparts. Below are three examples, which occurred at MRU, that are an indication of some of the problems that will face curricula Indigenization.

On January 18, 2018, one of the Office of Academic Indigenization’s Co-Directors, Renae Watchman, invited Robert Curley, a Diné elder, to give a presentation on “Western Medicine vs. Traditional Healing Medicine”. This elder was asked a question from the audience as to what he recommended for the “gut problems” her child was experiencing. In response, the elder stated: “Rub corn pollen on his feet and do a sunrise ceremony”. Is this the kind of “indigenous knowledge” that should be incorporated into our nursing program?

The second example concerns an indigenized course that was developed at MRU. When a non-indigenous professor attempted to teach the course, the indigenous students enrolled said that a non-indigenous professor could not talk about indigenous spirituality, which was perceived to be an essential part of the course. As a result of student opposition, the course was transferred to an indigenous professor. Does Indigenization mean that some courses cannot be taught by non-indigenous professors?

A third example concerns the biology program. At General Faculties Council on May 17, 2018, it was noted that the biology degree would have an indigenous component. This component consisted of the department “working with numerous community Elders and Knowledge Keepers” to ensure that biology students would obtain “a diverse knowledge base that includes the traditional

Indigenous knowledge.” As Paul Johnston, an MRU professor in Earth Sciences, stated at the time:

“[t]he difficulty here is that we are asking students to accept or at least be exposed to what I suspect is largely non-peer reviewed information or ideas in the science classroom. We don’t do that with any other ideas about biology from around the globe, for example ‘scientific creationism’, an idea espoused by millions, and so I am not sure why we would do it here. It may be that the Biology Program IS incorporating peer-reviewed traditional Indigenous knowledge, and if so that needs to be clearly stated in the letter. But, the statement I read, as it now stands, sends the wrong message to students, whether indigenous or non-indigenous, that some information presented in the biology curriculum at this university is exempt from scientific rigor and scrutiny as practiced in science globally. I suggest that this can be somewhat remedied with a modification to at least the third sentence in this paragraph to read: ‘By including this course as a core requirement for the BSc Biology, all students will get an awareness of how Indigenous knowledge, as subject to systematic observational testing and/or experimental verification, helps to inform our understanding in biology.’”

Dr. Johnston’s attempt to ensure scientific rigour in the biology degree was defeated, and this was due to the fact that Indigenization has encouraged the view that faculty should unconditionally support “indigenous knowledge” and “ways of knowing”.

Conclusion

The document “Indigenizing Mount Royal’s Curricula: A Call for Engagement”, therefore, provides no logical or reasoned answer to the question “Why Indigenize?”, and its coerced support for incorporating “Indigenous knowledge” and “ways of knowing” will have negative consequences for academic freedom and open inquiry. The celebration of undefined “Indigenous perspectives” also will lead to an undermining of academic standards and inveigle the racially essentialist position that certain kinds of “knowledge” are dependent upon one’s ethnic background.

Frances Widdowson (fwiddowson@mtroyal.ca) is Associate Professor, Department of Economics, Justice, and Policy Studies, at Mount Royal University, in Calgary. She is also the Coordinator, Membership Outreach, of SAFS. Dr Widdowson’s Separate but Unequal: How Parallelist Ideology Conceals Indigenous Dependency will be published by the University of Ottawa Press in 2019.

THE DALHOUSIE STUDENT PRESIDENT ELECTION WAS NO LAUGHING
MATTER

Adam J. Lucas with James Lees

The Dalhousie Student Union (DSU) is the official independent representative body of students attending Dalhousie University. At present, students are obliged to pay over \$150 in fees to the DSU each academic year. As they have no easy means to exit the union, Dalhousie students are in effect forced to have the DSU represent them.

The DSU has been the subject of several imbroglios during my brief time as a Dalhousie student. These have included the banning of Canada Day celebrations on Student Union Building precincts during the sesquicentenary of Canada's confederation, the tacit approval of protests demanding the resignation of interim president Peter MacKinnon for his views on campus free speech, and the support of organisations participating in the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement against Israel. In 2016, 2017, and 2018, the DSU received a grade of F on the Campus Freedom Index, primarily for the undemocratic and restrictive aspects of its Elections Policy.

The DSU has expanded its range well beyond student government and has embarked on a trajectory of self-aggrandisement. That it supports controversial and divisive policies largely unrelated to its mandate while it compels students to pay fees, runs counter to the most basic assumptions we have as Canadians about freedom of speech and association.

The DSU as it presently exists deserves neither the financial support nor the respect of the students it purports to represent.

To make this point clear to my fellow students, I, Adam, decided this year to run as a satirical candidate for the presidency of the Dalhousie Student Union. My platform was tastefully absurd, including the formation of a student militia, the creation of a collective farm to offset tuition fees, and the hiring of Benedictine monks to replace the campus copy centre with a medieval scriptorium. Dressing in a costume inspired by *The Matrix*, I stood in high places around the university campus and preached my message of absurdity, distributing my "Glorious Manifesto" as I went.

Like other candidates, I had to submit my campaign materials, including my poster and handbills (which contained my manifesto), for approval by the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) of the DSU. My social media content was similarly subject to censorship by the CRO should it be deemed offensive or in contravention of the Elections Policy, whose scope was sufficiently broad to require me to remove a post about "raiding coastal fishing villages to offset rising tuition costs," because it aggravated someone sensitive to the Restigouche raid of 1981. In this case, I asked to appeal the decision. In a move indicative of the depth of the DSU's understanding of procedural fairness, I was told that I could not appeal, as I had not been levied a fine, but they could levy one if I wished for them to do so.

This sort of micromanaging and unfair treatment was applied with great force to my campaign. My poster was removed by Rights and Equity Services on an anonymous insistence that it had offended someone. Unreasonable interference

by the Elections Committee reached an apex when I was sent a set of specific instructions regarding what I could and could not say during the debate lest I face immediate expulsion, instructions not sent to other candidates.

I had not violated any election policy, and had not been made privy to any complaints against me (except the one about fishing villages). I had been cordial toward the other candidates, and, in fact, before the debate, two of them approached me and expressed support and admiration for what I was doing. I also naively thanked the CRO for what I had perceived as fair treatment considering my satirical status up until that point.

During opening statements and the two questions to which I was allowed to respond, the audience was overwhelmingly positive. As I had hoped, people were smiling and laughing. While the other candidates expressed their views, I stood in contrast as a caricature of the DSU.

The good mood didn't last. In the middle of my second response, a member of the audience, the DSU's current Vice President of Finance and Operations, interrupted me, in contravention of the debate rules. The moderator, who was the CRO, agreed with her comment, and noisily expelled me from the debate, although I had not broken any of the general rules or the rules imposed upon me specifically. Following my speedy departure, one of the candidates who has intimate DSU affiliation thanked the VPFO for her intervention, in contravention of the rules, and was not reprimanded.

The following day, I was disqualified from the campaign, in a note riddled with typos and baseless accusations. The CRO, using an extraordinary power of the elections policy, had fined me \$220. The fine was for actions of my supporters after I had left the debate and over whom I had no control, the "senselessness" of my campaign, and the fact that certain members of the university community had been "disturbed" by my statements during the debate. Disqualification is automatic for a candidate who accrues over \$100 in fines, and my name was removed from the ballot.

The following day, I wrote a detailed appeal of each fine, countering every claim made against me by the CRO. I issued a notice of libel and cease and desist to the CRO along with a request that my name be restored to the ballot pending a decision on my appeal. My name on the ballot, I said, would not harm the elections process (I could be disqualified later) while my removal would irreparably damage my campaign. My notice and request were ignored. Several days later, I received a response to my appeal, stating that it had been dismissed by the Elections Committee. They gave no argument against my appeal, simply stated that it was dismissed. I encouraged my supporters to mark an abstention on their ballots. At the end of the voting period the victorious candidate, who has expressed her deep affiliation with the DSU, was declared.

I have now appealed to the Judicial Board, which alleges itself (quite speciously) to be the highest level of recourse I can seek for my treatment. In fact, the DSU is subject to the power of provincial judges, although I doubt that in

their power-drunk state, DSU officials are aware of this. One full week after the election, the detailed results, most importantly information on abstentions, remain unreleased to the student body. The DSU is trying to put aside the flagrant miscarriage of justice and democracy in its recent election.

Adam Lucas (adam.lucas@dal.ca) and James Lees are finishing their third year at Dalhousie University, in Halifax. Adam studies mathematics and has an interest in performance art. James studies history and English and is writing his honours thesis on forest management in medieval England.

SUFFERING STUDENT MEDIA

Robert Price

I've been observing Canadian student media for a long time. I got my start as a writer at my campus newspaper—an experience that changed me—and after graduation spent a couple of years as a national sales agent for an agency that sold advertising space for Canadian student newspapers. The best part of the job was reading the news from across the country. Many papers, like the *Queen's Journal*, the *Western Gazette*, *The Ubysey*, and others, delivered engaging reporting and editorial. They were reliable papers. An easy sell.

That was fifteen years ago. Not that long ago, but long enough for the scene to upend. In reading the student press, speaking to students, and observing the market for many years, I see two factors limiting the student press as a venue for the free exchange of ideas on university campuses. The first is a move towards privileged communication. The second is a change to the business model. Some readers will add that student media has become rigidly, ideologically progressive at the expense of all other points of view. I won't discuss that issue here. Among the issues facing the student press, ideological bias is the one that needs the least comment.

Privileged communications

One factor limiting the free flow information in the student press is the privileging of information by student unions. Unions have learned from professional politicians and started to accredit media. Some are legitimate. Others they deem fake news.

On the campus where I teach, the student union (UTMSU) has limited access to reporters from the campus paper, *The Medium*. When the union does provide comment, the comment is almost always filtered. In one low moment, the union provided commentary on transit overcrowding through a nameless "media correspondent."

Through conversation I also learned that the news editor at the paper had received instruction from the paper's senior editors that any questions for the union had to be delivered to the senior editors, who would then relate these questions to the union. This policy was imposed at the request of the union. No more on-the-spot interviews. All must be arranged and managed.

Why this was happening became clear after a scandal broke at the University of Toronto Scarborough Campus. There, the student union tried to limit access to "accredited" media. At one meeting, union executives requested that journalists not live tweet or photograph student politicians out of concern that these students might become targets for online bullies. (At this meeting, the executive planned to overturn a decision made by the general membership to deny funding to a trans center—a controversial decision that would sure lead to some trolling.) Student politicians, I have heard from students, worry that statements they make as students might haunt them on Google forever. And so they want to say less publicly.

These developments—the quietening of unions and the caving of media to union demands—trouble me. The potential to speak stupidly is the risk people take when they enter the public sphere. Democratic representatives must be brave and accountable, not invisible. So must the media. Media that cave to the demands of unions misunderstand who the news media serve. Papers should be on the vanguard of free speech on university campuses, not acceding to the demands of student politicians.

Declining markets and gutted student levies

Advertising in the student press has declined precipitously. In 2006, two national advertising agencies—The Campus Network and Campus Plus—serviced the student press. These agencies brought millions of dollars in corporate advertising to student papers. Both agencies shut down and so far nobody has filled the void. Online advertising revenues do not compete with the revenues print advertising used to deliver. As a result, student newspapers increasingly rely on student levies to finance themselves.

In Ontario, these levies will soon be less stable, less bankable than in the past. The provincial government has instituted the Student Choice Initiative, an initiative that will allow students to opt-out of "non-essential" student fees, like the ones that fund student unions and media.

Proponents of the Student Choice Initiative cheer the move. Unable to win elections and unwilling to establish competing media—actions that take energy and make a positive difference—proponents want to withdraw funding from student organizations that typically lean left. One student told me that he planned on pulling back his levies on everything he could. "I don't give a shit about any of this stuff," he told me.

The people who do give a shit will have a harder time at sustaining their organizations. Newspapers will be gutted. Many will have to cut their print distribution, slash editorial salaries, and shrink their ambitions. This is a shame, since student papers do much to educate students and enrich the campus.

As I've mentioned in other places, killing funding to student unions and media will not cure the left-wing hegemony conservatives see on their campuses. While it is possible that apathetic students will forget to withdraw their funding, we're more likely to see diehard activists fund paper themselves. Since they will be the only ones providing funding, they will take greater control of the organizations, however staggered they might be by funding cuts.

Another future exists. External funding sources, like foreign governments, unions, political parties, and other interests targeting students, might offer to underwrite the campus paper since nobody else will. Will these sponsorship arrangements be conducive to free expression?

I don't mention any of what I've said out of spite or to embarrass anybody. The student press is a valuable extracurricular and a bedrock of campus life. I hope it thrives. I mention these developments to inform readers of what I've noticed. Readers who have noticed strange goings on with their student media are encouraged to write to me.

Robert Grant Price (robertgrantprice@gmail.com) is a Lecturer at the University of Toronto Mississauga.

DISCLAIMER AND COPYRIGHT

Apart from notices issued by the SAFS Board of Directors, views expressed in the Newsletter are not necessarily those of the Society.

All or portions of original articles in the Newsletter may be copied for further circulation. We request acknowledgement of the source and would appreciate receiving a copy of the publication in which the Newsletter material appears. The copyright for reprinted articles remains with the original publication.

THE LASTING LEGACY OF THE TROJAN HORSE

Albert Howard

The Greek myth of the Trojan Horse, a story of deception and subterfuge, wherein a wooden horse is presented as a gift to the Trojan goddess Athene, is embedded in our consciousness. Of course, we all know that the horse was full of Greek soldiers whose purpose was to gain entrance to Troy for the purpose of destroying it.

The myth of the Trojan Horse has endured through history, and while the concept has surely applied throughout history, it is exemplified in modern times by imperialist tactics of sending “advisors” to intervene in offshore disruptions, and to exert the imperialist agendas under the guise of aid. The use of “Trojans” in the computer world refers to misleading users of the true intent of the offerings. These malicious programs are usually simply schemes to defraud people of money, but the trick has broader applications in the area of ideology.

A glaring example is the recent appearance of “secular chaplains” at Mount Royal University. Such a blatant oxymoron should be recognized for its obvious deception and invasive intent but, like the naive, mythical Trojans, this attempt to bypass MRU’s secular status is accommodated as an amicable compromise. This secular disguise was used recently to cancel an event, organized by the Atheist Society of Calgary, featuring the atheist ex-Muslim speaker Armin Navabi who recently spoke at the University of British Columbia. Navabi’s presentation, titled “We must defeat Islam,” has no connection and makes no reference to the recent killings in New Zealand mosques, as the chaplains claimed. At the Navabi event, I was struck by the apparent contradiction of overt criticism of Islam, and support for Muslims. Surely Muslims are the representation of Islam; if it weren’t for them the *Qur’an* would be as irrelevant as *Mein Kampf*. Navabi’s severe criticism of Islam was the Trojan Horse that brought the audience into acceptance of Muslims and thus the maintenance of the religion.

A further example of this pretention is the Unitarian Church. The church, accepting members from all ideological backgrounds, even encourages atheists under the pretense of not believing in a “spiritual existence outside this world”. However, Unitarians do have faith - a contradiction of their claim to value reason. The real aim is the obstruction of the exponential momentum of rational thinking, thinking that demands evidence for beliefs, into a collective that accepts anything, except rational thought.

Mimicry of the subterfuge is in the climate-change denier movement. Industry sponsored organizations and corrupt scientists misrepresent themselves with names like “American Institute of Biological Sciences”, “Global Warming Policy Foundation”, “International Union for the Conservation of Nature,” and “World Wide Fund for Nature” – all fronts for fossil fuel and associated industries. The latter is a shameless attempt to be mistaken for the science-driven World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

A most recent Trojan Horse occurrence is the reversal of the philosopher Charles Taylor’s position on the Quebec secularism bill. The Bouchard-Taylor Commission report (2007) upheld the barring of wearing religious symbols by persons in positions of coercive authority in public institutions. Having established himself as an intrinsic authority on all questions of reason, Taylor is now upheld as the final word against the recommendations of the report he co-authored. The horse’s belly has opened, and Taylor’s deception has spilled out.

The postmodern objective, of intercepting progressive initiatives, is at the core

of the contemporary Trojan Horse phenomenon. It is through adherence to the values of The Enlightenment – reason and critical thought – that the reactionary subterfuge of the contemporary Trojan Horse will be excluded from our rational space.

Albert Howard (albehoward@hotmail.com) is a researcher and writer currently residing in Calgary. He is writing a book on the social effects of religion.

HATE-SPEECH AND UNIVERSITIES

Mark Mercer

We have in Canada laws against the expression of hate. Publicly inciting hatred against an identifiable group and promoting hatred against an identifiable group are crimes punishable by imprisonment or fine. People found to have expressed hatred can be ordered to cease and desist and their publications can be seized and destroyed.

As well, some provinces have human rights acts under which people can be fined for communicating an intention to discriminate against members of an identifiable group. Again, offending publications can be confiscated and banned.

Well-crafted laws and government policies against the expression of hate could conceivably be sound, for hate speech can cause harm. But given the centrality of expression to individual autonomy, a law or policy restricting hateful speech is unsound unless three conditions hold. 1) The law is in fact an effective means of attaining a significant good. 2) There is no other way for the government to attain that good, at least no other way that brings it about as effectively. 3) The good attained by the law or policy outweighs the costs and harms of having that law or policy.

If hate speech laws in a country fail any one of these three conditions, then they constitute an unjustified infringement on the peaceful expression of opinion and emotion. As such, they are inconsistent with both democracy and the conception of people as free and equal individuals capable of exercising their own judgement and choosing for themselves how to live.

In Canada, in my view, laws against the expression of hate fail all three criteria. First, the plight of marginalized people or people from historically oppressed groups has not been improved by these laws or by prosecuting people under them or banning their publications. Second, that plight could well be ameliorated through policies aimed at raising the living standards of marginalized people or ensuring them opportunities for education and employment.

Finally, laws against the expression of hate have done much damage to public discourse in Canada, primarily by making ordinary, non-hateful people fearful to express themselves on controversial matters, but also by creating rancor among those few who actually do wish ill toward others. Feeling that they have been

denied a say in democratic processes, such people are encouraged to take up direct action both against the targets of their ill-will and against the illegitimate political order that has excluded them.

And yet, we have these laws, and we must live under them, even as we work to increase the respect and affection Canadians have for the civil liberties, in particular for freedom of expression.

How should universities behave given the presence of laws and other government policies against the expression of hate?

My answer is that universities should simply ignore hate-speech laws and go about their business as though these laws didn't exist. Doing anything even to acknowledge hate-speech laws, let alone aiding in their enforcement, is contrary to the academic ethos and mission of the university.

Others, though, have said that universities should ensure that people on Canadian university campuses know about our hate-speech laws and that universities should indicate their willingness to see these laws used. University administrators should attempt to prevent expressions of hate and they should summon the police should they deem a hate-speech law to have been violated.

Those who enjoin universities to take the specter of hateful utterance seriously speak favourably of the letter academic vice-president François Houle sent to Ann Coulter, back in 2010, when Coulter was scheduled to speak at the University of Ottawa. "I hereby encourage you to educate yourself, if need be, as to what is acceptable in Canada and to do so before your planned visit here. Promoting hatred against any identifiable group would not only be considered inappropriate, but could in fact lead to criminal charges."

The argument for having universities embrace hate-speech laws is that their doing so tells students and professors who belong to marginalized groups that they are respected by the university and that the university is committed to maintaining a hospitable environment in which they may study and work.

This justification, though, misunderstands entirely the sort of people who are at home on university campuses. University people are intellectuals, or aspiring or apprentice intellectuals. For them, a hospitable environment is one of wide freedom of expression. If we appreciate the nature of university people, we will see that only ignoring laws against the expression of hate is consistent with the academic ethos and mission of a university.

A university is a place of open and free inquiry and discussion, inquiry and discussion aimed at creating comprehensive and true understandings of the world. University people, though, want not only to produce and to contemplate such understandings. They are moved by two other things, as well.

First, they enjoy the process of fashioning their understandings. They enjoy being in the lab or running surveys or reading articles or hearing about new (or old) theories. They enjoy thinking hard. They enjoy critical discussion. They

do not, that is, engage in all this work simply to produce more knowledge. The work itself is profoundly joyous.

Second, while they care to believe truly and to value soundly, they care also, even more, to believe and value for their own reasons. They want to believe and value on the basis of evidence and argument, evidence and argument that they accept as indicating truth; they do not want to believe and value what they do as a result of social or psychological pressures. This gives them another reason to value the process of inquiry, besides their taste for it. They value inquiry because it supplies them with reasons of their own for believing and valuing as they do.

A person who wishes to believe truly but only for reasons of evidence or argument will seek to remove or at least to minimize within her workspace the social and psychological pressures that influence what she believes and values. That is why she will be keen that expression is well protected at her university, that people be able to inquire and to speak as they wish. Sanctioning the expression or advocacy of a view, any view, is to try to impose on people reasons that are not reasons of evidence or argument to refrain from believing that view.

A university will be, then, to the extent that it takes its responsibility to its academic ethos and mission seriously, a place of wide freedom of expression. It will not itself restrict expression either in order to create a hospitable environment or to combat hate. A hospitable university environment would be an environment congenial to university people, whether other people find it congenial or not, and university people will combat hate not by silencing it but only through critique.

For a university, then, to mention hate speech in its rules and regulations or to take account of that category in its practices would be for that university to distract the members of the university community from their tasks. University people, as I said, are interested in the truth of claims or theories and the soundness of values. They are not interested in whether a claim or theory can be categorized as hateful—they are especially not interested in that matter if the result is to be used to control expression or discussion. Asking them to take an interest in the status of claims and theories as hateful or not is to divert them from their tasks of creating comprehensive understandings of things. It is at least to waste their time, but it also threatens to corrupt their academic endeavour.

Academics care only whether the impugned idea is true or false, not whether it expresses hate. The university, as an institution charged with establishing and maintaining an environment in which academics might best pursue academic endeavours, must not direct them to care whether hatred is being illegally expressed by the idea they are examining.

Now one objection to the idea that universities should simply ignore laws against the expression of hate is that we all have a duty to abide by the law. This duty extends to foolish and unjust laws, for they, too, are laws among all the others.

In a democracy, all the laws have the distinction of expressing the will of the people and they all thereby enjoy legitimacy. To fail in the duty to abide by the law is to express disdain for both democracy and the rule of law, if not indeed to put democracy or the rule of law at risk.

There are times, of course, when individuals and institutions should violate the law, even democratically enacted law. But if they are going to violate the law, they should violate it only in the spirit of civil disobedience. That is, they should violate it publicly, having given public notice that that is what they intend to do, and they should communicate a rationale for violating it. And they must accept to be prosecuted for breaking it and accept their punishment.

My argument, though, is not that universities should violate laws against the expression of hate in the spirit of civil disobedience, aiming thereby to draw attention to the injustice of such laws and to mobilize people against them. In recommending that universities ignore hate-speech laws, I am not suggesting that they or anyone violate those laws, not even in the best spirit.

Ignoring hate-speech laws is perfectly legal, not an act of civil disobedience. Ignoring them amounts simply to refraining from making complaints under them and not including reference to them in university policies. No one is under any obligation to scan what people say for hateful content or to report any incident of what appears to be hate speech. We are legally free to engage with expressions of hate by simply critiquing them or ignoring them. Not even the police have a duty to watch or report. The police will, unfortunately, investigate complaints of hate-speech, but, happily, they take no interest in what people say until they receive a complaint.

University people won't complain that someone has crossed the line into hate speech, for it won't occur to them to do so. They will react to illegal hate speech just as they react to all speech: by considering it or critiquing it, if they are interested; by ignoring it, if they are not. They won't compromise the integrity of their academic spaces by doing something that might chill discussion or bring social or psychological pressures to bear on what people believe or value.

University speech policies, codes of conduct, safe and respectful campus policies, harassment policies, gendered and sexual violence policies—none need and none should mention hate speech. Policies and codes might note that the laws of the land apply on campus just as they do off campus, though everyone knows this already. Best that universities simply affirm that the university itself puts no restrictions on the content of speech or other expression.

To sum up. In Canada, we have laws against the expression of hate. These laws have had a baleful effect on public discourse in our country and in our universities. We are not, though, bound by law to monitor discussions for expressions of hate or to complain to the police about instances of speech we think might be illegal. It is perfectly legal, then, for us to go about our business never employing the concept of hate speech.

If we are intellectuals, we won't employ the concept of hate speech in judging what people say. As intellectuals, what matters to us is the truth of the ideas or the soundness of the values that people advocate. Whether an expression is or isn't an illegal expression of hate is irrelevant to intellectuals.

Universities, to the extent that they provide caring and nurturing homes for intellectuals, will neither divert members of their communities from their scholarly tasks nor allow social or psychological pressures to condition what those members believe and value. Since a concern to prevent hate speech or to identify and punish it diverts attention from matters of truth and soundness, and since it urges people to believe or value in certain ways—or else, universities will be concerned neither to prevent hate speech nor to identify and punish instances of it.

University rules and policies, then, should make no mention of hate speech. University people should carry on as though there were no laws in Canada against the peaceful expression of opinion and emotion.

Mark Mercer (mark.mercer@smu.ca), president of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship, teaches philosophy at Saint Mary's University, in Halifax.

SAFS BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mark Mercer, PhD, Saint Mary's University
president@safs.ca

Janice Fiamengo, PhD, University of Ottawa
fiamengo@uottawa.ca

Tom Flanagan, PhD, FRSC, University of Calgary
tflanaga@ucalgary.ca

Andrew Irvine, PhD, University of British Columbia
andrew.irvine@ubc.ca

Steve Lupker, PhD, Western University
lupker@uwo.ca

John Mueller, PhD, University of Calgary
mueller@ucalgary.ca

Clive Seligman, PhD, Western University
seligman@uwo.ca

Peter Suedfeld, PhD, FRSC, University of British Columbia
psuedfeld@psych.ubc.ca

Past Presidents

Clive Seligman, PhD, Western University

John Furedy, PhD, University of Toronto

Doreen Kimura, PhD, FRSC, Simon Fraser University

SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM

To join SAFS or to renew your SAFS membership, please go to: <http://safs.ca/membership.html>

SAFS OFFICE

PO Box 33056 Quinpool Centre, Halifax, Canada NS B3L 4T6. Email:
president@safs.ca.

First Annual Chris and John Furedy Lecture

SAFE Spaces vs. **SACRED Spaces** and the Purpose of University Education



Presented by the
**Society for
Academic
Freedom
and Scholarship**

www.safs.ca/
home.uchicago.edu/~rfulton/

**Free of charge
and everybody
welcome**

Rachel Fulton Brown

Associate Professor of History,
University of Chicago



Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship

Friday, 3 May 2019

7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Stevenson & Hunt Room ∴ Central Public Library

251 Dundas Street ∴ London, Ontario