

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship

Number 14

NEWSLETTER

September 1996

ISSN 1203-3197

PURPOSES of SAFS

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

REVISING THE ETHICS CODE FOR HUMAN RESEARCH -- RESPONSE OF SAFS

John Furedy (On behalf of SAFS' Board)

In the Spring of 1996, a "working group" of members from Canada's three federal research councils (NSERC, MRC, and SSHRC), dubbed the "Tri-Council", circulated to a limited audience the draft of a new ethical code for human research. This code will, among other things, provide the criteria to be used by university and college research ethics committees to evaluate grant applications to the major funding councils.

In early May, our past president, Doreen Kimura, drew my attention to some of the more absurd proposals in the draft, and we are indebted to her for preparing a response for discussion by the SAFS board. We made some modifications and sent the comments (reproduced here) to the Tri-Council.

Professor Peter Suedfeld of the University of British Columbia, a member of the board, had earlier sent in his comments to the Council. The British Columbia chapter of SAFS also sent a response (prepared by Dale Beyerstein). If you would like to see either of these, please write to the SAFS office, and ask Wendy to either email or mail to you the file called "*tricouncil*".

BOOK DE-PUBLICATION: JOINT NAS-SAFS STATEMENT

Princeton, New Jersey, 20 May 1996.

The National Association of Scholars (in the United States) and the Society for Academic Freedom (in Canada) released the following statement on the John Wiley & Sons' suspension of publication, and withdrawal from circulation, of Christopher Brand's *The g Factor*.

We view with deep concern the decision of the American publishing house, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., to suspend British publication of, and withdraw from circulation, Christopher Brand's *The g Factor*. We recognize the editorial freedom of publishing houses to decide what and what not to publish, but the withdrawal of a book following an agreement to publish--and after the processes of scholarly review, approval, and production have been completed--seriously impedes the free flow of ideas, chills the intellectual climate, and encourages efforts to suppress opinions of every stripe. While we understand and sympathize with Wiley's discomfort over some of the statements made to the British press by *The g Factor's* author, we believe that its actions constitute a dangerous precedent, and fall far short of the level of professional responsibility expected of a leading academic publisher.

NAS president Stephen H. Balch, noting that Wiley's action had, at the very least, delayed the publication of the book for some months, urged the publishing house to reconsider its decision and proceed with its original commitment to publish.

.... continued from page 1.

Published by the **Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship**, a society open to all (whether in a university or not) who accept the principles of freedom in teaching, research and scholarship and maintaining standards of excellence in decisions about students and faculty; **Editor:** Dr. Chris Furedy, **Readings editor:** Judy Wubnig, **Layout:** Wendy Nolan

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

Finally, the Canadian Psychological Association's Scientific Affairs Committee (of which I am a member) was provided with emailed copies of the three submissions. The CPA's subsequent letter to the Tri-Council was less critical in tone, but echoed many of the concerns expressed by the SAFS' letters.

The Tri-Council's draft can be obtained by writing to: Secretariat, Tri-Council Working Group on Ethics, c/o Jean Joly, Chair, Pavillon de l'Est, Universite Laval, Quebec City, PQ, G1K 7P4.

Response of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship to the document "Code of Conduct For Research Involving Humans" by the Tri-Council Working Group, March 1996.

Prepared by Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC (past president, and member, Board of Directors) July 1996.

The Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS) is an association dedicated to the maintenance of freedom and excellence in all academic pursuits. It consists of approximately 400 members, most of whom are faculty in universities throughout Canada, many of them distinguished scholars. Although as individuals we may have additional comments or concerns about this document, this response is directed primarily toward ensuring the broadest freedom for all in the pursuit of

knowledge.

Introduction

We appreciate the importance of general guidelines regarding the conduct of research with human subjects. This document is useful, in particular, in pointing out the necessity for avoidance of coercive measures for soliciting and/or keeping subjects in a project (p. 2-8). Coercive offers of benefits, which are essential to the well-being of the subject, are especially likely to occur in health research settings, and researchers in such fields may need stronger reminders than others that research participation is voluntary.

We also see as very positive the suggestion that local Research Ethics Boards (REBs) coordinate with others, so that the researcher does not have to deal with several REBs (such as a hospital board and a separate university board) on the same research project.

Nonetheless, we find some serious flaws in the draft document which we are hopeful can be corrected. They arise from five major concerns:

Continued on page 5 ...

SAFS Board of Directors (1996/97)

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

Email Addresses

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

**IMPLICIT APPLICATION OF THE
“COMFORT CRITERION”?
THE “INQUIRY” INTO THE TEACHING OF
CHRIS BRAND, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH**

John Furedy

Following the decision of the publishers John Wiley to withdraw Chris Brand's book *The g Factor* (see joint NAS/SAFS reaction on page 1 of this newsletter), *Nature* reported (issue of May 9) that Edinburgh University was launching an “inquiry” into Brand's teaching methods to determine whether what he taught made students “uncomfortable”.

This reference to “comfort” naturally caught my attention, so I wrote to the head of the inquiry, the Provost of the University, Law Professor, Neil MacCormick. His initial response to my fax was prompt and reassuring, suggesting that some Scottish universities, at least, are clear on what academic freedom entails.

The recommendations made by the committee of inquiry, however, suggest that, in fact, there does appear to be an implicit use of the “culture of comfort” criterion in the way in which the University of Edinburgh has dealt with Mr. Brand.

Here are: my original fax, Provost MacCormick's response, and my reply to it in May, as well as a summary of my more recent emailed comments (Sept. 3) on the inquiry, its timing, its terms of reference, and its “directives”. As of Sept. 14, I have had no reply to my last email.

Quite independently of Wiley's actions, and certainly of Brand's views, which I need not stress are not part of SAFS' concern, our society should be alert to the implications of inquiries into the teaching of instructors who hold or publish unpopular ideas.

Fax to Prof. Neil MacCormick, Dean of Social Sciences, University of Edinburgh, May 10, 1996. Re: Your Inquiry into the Teaching Conduct of Mr. Chris Brand

On the basis of the May 9 article in *Nature*, it appears that your inquiry will be based on whether students were made to feel “uncomfortable” during classroom d

discussions. This appears to be an acceptance of what I

have called the “culture of comfort” criterion for higher education, and it would be disturbing to learn that this sort of thinking has spread to one of Scotland's finest universities.

Email message from Provost Neil MacCormick, May 13, 1996. Subject: Academic Freedom

Dear colleague: Whatever *Nature* may have said, my remit in relation to Mr. Brand's case contains neither the term “uncomfortable” nor the concept, and I would not have accepted to carry out any inquiry couched in such terms, nor do I suppose Principal Sutherland to be a person who would issue such a mandate. Mr. Brand's freedom of speech and opinion is, and so far as concerns me will remain, unimpaired. Complaints by students about the quality of his teaching and of his treatment of them in the teaching relationship are a different matter and merit careful inquiry, and, if necessary, action. Since I am now in the process of such inquiry, it would be improper for me to comment further in response to your fax message.

*J. Furedy's email to MacCormick, May 13, 1996.
Re: Academic Freedom*

Thanks for your prompt and very clear reply. I am in full agreement with you that an inquiry into teaching performance is entirely appropriate, provided it does not involve the comfort criterion, as the *Nature* article, apparently mistakenly, suggested. If only administrators this side of the Atlantic were as clear on these issues as you are!

I also agree that, given that the inquiry is proceeding, further comments from you on this specific issue would be inappropriate. However, as promised, I am attaching the culture-of-comfort paper, and also one on the distinction between acts and opinions, not so much for you, but for some other colleagues (perhaps including the *Nature* article writer) who are not as clear on these issues as you are.

Summary of Furedy's email to MacCormick, Sept. 3, '96.

[These comments are based on the April 24 and May 31 press releases of Edinburgh University, which were entitled “Academic Freedom, Teaching Responsibilities And Mr. Chris Brand”. The releases were attributed to the Principal of the University, Professor Sir Stewart

Sutherland. The subtitles described the press releases as, respectively, a “statement”, and a “report of an enquiry established,” by the Principal. Full copies of both press releases can be obtained by contacting Ray Footman, Director, or Ann McKelvie, Deputy Director, Information & PR Services. To obtain my copies, I emailed a request to R.FOOTMAN@ED.AC.UK.

Continued on page 4 ...

In my September 3 letter I argued that there were aspects of the university's actions that suggested that, perhaps unwittingly, weaker and more muted forms of the comfort criterion influenced both the timing of the inquiry and the report.

I referred to the first requirement in assessing an instructor's teaching put forward by the inquiry committee -- that there be a “a relationship between teacher and taught of mutual respect”-- as vague, especially when used in a potentially punitive situation, where the punishment might not be the ultimate one of being fired, but a diminution of academic reputation. “Mutual respect”, if meaning that the instructor has to respect student views as much as they would respect his, might lead to culture-of-comfort behaviour.

The second requirement (“that the presentation, exposition and critical evaluation of what is taught, should be balanced and competent”) was also vague. “Balanced” might be taken to mean that the instructor should give equal weight to *all* opinions on the subject. If the instructor, however, mentions only his own views (no “balance”), or does not properly cite relevant evidence (lack of competence), then s/he is open to reprimand.

I expressed concern that the evidence in the inquiry was gathered by inviting students to give information and express views “in confidence”. The balance and competence of an instructor should be judged primarily by experts who are familiar with the discipline, and who are presented with systematic evidence to evaluate.

While it appeared that Mr. Brand had passed such expert evaluation in the past, the inquiry committee did not contain any experts in the field that Mr. Brand was teaching, and did not systematically examine the evidence.

The third criterion in the inquiry was that “that there should be fairness and impartiality in assessing students'

work”. Mr. Brand was unequivocally cleared on this point.

Given that there was apparently no earlier evidence in terms of the judgment of internal and external experts that there was anything amiss in Brand's teaching, the timing of this inquiry suggested that it was conducted because Brand's opinions make some people uncomfortable.

The inquiry committee's decision not to reprimand the instructor, but to issue “directives” to him, to “modify his teaching”, with the threat of disciplinary action if he did not comply, appeared unjustified. These recommendations would surely smear the academic reputation of Mr. Brand.

The University's actions in this case will inhibit faculty from raising controversial issues. The professional cost of even vaguely worded “directives” is considerable. Mr. Brand has responded quite aggressively to defend his academic reputation. He may not represent the typical academic; other faculty, however, observing how he has been treated, may bow to the pressure of the culture of comfort.

I concluded by suggesting that the University should withdraw the “directives” it has issued to Brand, and reiterate that the inquiry showed that Mr. Brand's teaching is unimpeachable in terms of “fairness and impartiality in assessing students' work”. I stressed that SAFS does not take any position concerning the validity of Brand's opinions, or the way in which he has chosen to defend those opinions.

[The full text of the above letter was sent out to SAFS members with email addresses. Those who are interested can get a copy by contacting the SAFS office by email or mail.]

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND UNION CONTRACTS

There have been a number of occasions when the conditions under particular union contracts of university instructors have impinged on the generally-accepted (and even codified) rights to academic freedom of university teachers.

Recently, at York University, the Administration interpreted a clause designed to protect the confidentiality of the grievance process as meaning that faculty could not discuss the general principles arising from any particular grievance, *during or after* the grievance process, with any degree of specificity. The reason given was that even discussion of principles (without any names) might allow people to identify persons involved in the grievance.

The editor is interested in hearing from members about tensions between faculty and instructor contracts and academic freedom.

... continued from page 2.

- 1) The approach of weighing harm versus benefits arises from a medical model, and is largely irrelevant to most non-health research. We foresee the endorsement of such an artificial model by the Tri-Council as likely to encourage its use as a means of disallowing research deemed unpopular.
- 2) Many of the proposed regulations imply that the outcome of the research may be determined by the subjects, a situation which could lead to research being dictated by transient ideological fashions or by sheer ignorance, rather than by testable hypotheses and objective methods of investigation.
- 3) The requirement that local REBs make decisions on the scientific value of the research has MAJOR potential for abuse. Of the many functions that REBs may serve in future, this one needs to be severely curtailed.
- 4) We see the emphasis on the rights of "collectivities" as overstated relative to the rights of the individual.

5) We find the attempts to delineate an "ideal" researcher to be futile and irrelevant; futile because we don't at present know the characteristics of good researchers, which is, after all, an empirical question; and irrelevant because the guidelines should be concerned with outlining desirable behaviors strictly within the research framework.

Detailed comments and suggestions for improvement are given below.

Harm Versus Benefits

If this is to be maintained as a Tri-Council document, the general principles should be enunciated in ways which could apply to all Councils equally, rather than by taking one model and forcing an artificial application to others. This is particularly important because local REBs will be guided by, and (experience tells us) are likely to interpret literally, the final wording of the Code of Conduct. For most non-medical research on humans, all that should be required is that no foreseeable direct harm will come to the subject. In behavioral research, for example, the greatest harm that typically could be done, and the possibility is remote, is making a subject feel that s/he has not met some standard set by the experimenter. This is nearly always offset, however, by the assurance from the research description that it is not the individual's performance which is the focus of investigation, but the operation of a general principle (for example, whether learning a list of words is affected by learning a previous list).

There is not enough recognition in this document (e.g., p. 2-7, para 4) of the importance of research which yields no obvious immediate personal or societal benefit (for example, the discovery that the level of sex hormones significantly predicts the tendency to aggression in certain social situations), but which may radically alter how we think about a particular question or field--in this case, the biological contribution to aggressive behavior. Such research might be among the most valuable we could promote in terms of ultimate contribution to knowledge about humans, yet might fall prey to the

narrow view espoused here of what is ethically acceptable.

Recommendation: the sections on harm vs. benefits be rewritten to reflect the lesser pertinence of such a model for most non-medical research; or, that different guidelines be written for medical and non-medical research.

Subjects' Determination Of Results

The emphasis on a subject-centered perspective (p. 2-7, bottom) is generally incompatible with the aim of scientific validity. This is particularly likely if the intent is that the subject is entered in a study only if s/he is in agreement with the theoretical framework of the research. On p. 2-10 it is suggested that if, after debriefing about a study, S does not want to participate, the data from such Ss should not be

Continued on page 6 ...

... continued from page 5.

used. While this stricture is made within the specific context of research requiring deception on the part of the experimenter, it could be seen to apply to nearly all behavioral research, since one hardly ever reveals the exact hypothesis to Ss in the quite reasonable belief that they will be influenced by it.

Allowing subjects to determine whether their data should be in the study after they have served as willing subjects, would make it impossible to get an unbiased sample of subjects in most research projects. For example, in doing research on the effects of age on memory function, one might compare 40 year-olds and 70 year-olds. Among other things, one would inform the older subject that s/he would be doing a variety of tests of intellectual function, with brief descriptions, and probably also that the experimenter is interested in seeing how older people do on such tests. However, if after the study is finished, the 70 year-old subjects understand that they were being compared to 40 year-olds, and had the option of removing their data, the comparability of the two age groups might well be undermined. Suppose that subjects who are most

likely to want their data withdrawn would be those who thought that they did not do well. If such data were removed, we would have an invalid study of intellectual changes with age, i.e., the scientific criterion of validity could not be met. With more controversial fields of research, this problem would be exaggerated.

The objection does not even touch upon the impossibility of enforcing such removal of data. This suggested standard with respect to the collection of anonymous impersonal data is in puzzling contrast to the wider latitude given to biographical and historical data, despite the fact that in the latter, individual identity is a given. Thus on p. 5-8, it is (quite appropriately) stated with respect to biographical research that "the subject...has no right to censor the researcher's work or to be guaranteed that any objection [from S] will be cited in the document". The ethics document admits the importance of subjects not being allowed to determine the outcome of biographical or historical research, yet would proscribe the inclusion of behavioral data from anonymous subjects who, after the study, express a negative view of the project. Surely there is a gross inconsistency here?

Recommendation: Article 5.13.d (p. 5-6) "if the subject decides not to participate following debriefing, the subject's data must be removed from the study" should be deleted.

Research Ethics Boards' Evaluation Of Scientific Validity

Page 2-4: We are aware that there is a tradition in some institutions for REBs to evaluate the validity of research proposals. We believe that this is an unfortunate tradition, since the ethical question of treatment of subjects can in most instances be separated from the question of quality of the research. Given the difficulty that Grants Selection Committees have had in all three granting councils in the past in deciding which grant proposals are most deserving of support, it is clear that judging scientific validity is not an easy task. The three councils quite rightly commit major time and resources to resolving this

question, but despite the considered expertise available from scholars throughout the country, questionable decisions are nevertheless made.

It is much more likely, therefore, that a local REB, without the resources available to the granting agencies, will make bad decisions, particularly given the makeup of the committees as outlined on p. 3-3 and 3-4. Moreover, local REBs are more likely to be influenced by the history of a particular researcher, and probably more likely to be susceptible to the local political milieu in making decisions about the quality of a research proposal. The research endeavor in this country, particularly in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, is already seriously threatened by strong pressures from special interest groups, and it must become independent of current political ideologies if it is to survive and maintain integrity. As an example

Continued on page 7 ...

... continued from page 6.

of the potential for a stifling effect of ideology on research, a valid research proposal on AIDS which relates its incidence in a specified ethnic group to multiple partners (regarded as promiscuity by some and therefore potentially "stigmatizing", see p. 13-4), could well run into difficulty solely on the basis of an REB's evaluating this as an unsympathetic view of the group's sexuality (yet this might be the very community to benefit from the research).

Recommendations: 1) That local REBs make no judgments about scientific validity except in special cases where palpable direct harm might occur to Ss by not doing so; 2) that this document explicitly exhort local REBs to go beyond objections from special interest groups and political ideologies, and judge the proposals solely on the basis of ethical acceptability; 3) that to the Appeal Procedures (p. 3-6) be added the provision of an external appeal, that is, to a committee outside the local REB's domain, which will usually be outside the institution.

"Collectivities" Versus Individuals

Section 13: While we appreciate that doing research on a cohesive group qua group is different from research on a number of individuals, we feel that the

emphasis on a hierarchical process of permission is inimical to our cultural tradition of individual self-determination, as well as to the objective unbiased collection of data. Therefore, once group access has been granted, the researcher must finally determine who shall be interviewed, assessed, etc.

"Morality" of Individual Researchers

In several places, the document refers to the characteristics a good researcher should possess (p. 2-3, bottom; 10-1). While it is reasonable to attempt to specify some of the behaviors which are appropriate to the interaction between researcher and subject, difficult as this may be, it is not appropriate (nor possible) for this committee to delineate the personal qualities of a good researcher. The value of any research is and should be judged by its contribution to knowledge, not be the degree of altruism (10-1), empathy or compassion (2-3) of the researcher. Otherwise, instead of requiring research proposals, we should be giving personality tests! Empathy and compassion might conceivably be drawbacks in doing certain kinds of research well.

Moreover, most people are responsive to economic gain, indeed much of our societal interaction is based on its effectiveness, hence for the Working Group to make negative pronouncements about it as a motivator either for researchers or subjects is to show an insensitivity to cultural norms which the Code itself deplores (as in Section 13).

Recommendation: That commentary about the research endeavor be strictly restricted to minimally acceptable behaviors within which researchers and subjects operate, and all reference to desirable or undesirable personality characteristics of a good researcher be deleted, in deference to our ignorance on this subject.

Submitted by the Board of Directors, Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS), July 23, 1996.

SAFS WELCOMES NEW BOARD MEMBERS

There are two new members of the Board:

Dr. Peter Suedfeld, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia and **Dr. Murray Miles**, Department of Philosophy, Brock University.

Dr. Judy Wubnig, one of founding members of SAFS, who has served on the Board since it was formed has rotated off the Board. The Society gave a vote of thanks to Judy for her sterling work on behalf of the Society at the Annual Meeting. Judy started the newsletter and edited and produced the first seven issues, almost single-handedly. She continues to contribute items for the Further Readings column.

PATAI ON HETEROPHOBIA: THE FEMINIST TURN AGAINST MEN

Heinz Klatt

It was a real treat to listen to Professor Daphne Patai from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst speak about *Heterophobia: The Feminist Turn Against Men*, at the SAFS annual meeting in May. Her remarks were an intimation of what is coming up in her forthcoming book called *Heterophobia*, as well as a look back to the critique of Women's Studies programs which she published in collaboration with Noretta Koertge under the title *Professing Feminism*.

Dr. Patai started by introducing the notion of heterophobia, the fear of difference, and by explaining that the term refers to the "feminist turn against men and heterosexuality." She deplored the fact that, although heterophobia existed even a century ago when Mona Caird agitated against marriage, it has never before reached such a point of excess as to indict heterosexuality as devious. If heterophobia in the past was part of the struggle for equality, it did not advocate any sort of double standard, use inflated scare statistics or consider "feminist" and "heterosexual" as antithetical.

The examples Patai gave to illustrate her contentions were precious: a Women's Studies teacher consistently referred to her "partner" without ever using any pronoun in order to conceal that she was married to a man; a couple established a women's centre on campus and the wife

insisted that her husband not show up for the centre's anniversary because she did not "want to flaunt [her] heterosexuality."

Patai conceded as much as she could to the notorious heterophobes MacKinnon, Dworkin and Daly, who, according to her, "manifest a pathological aversion to men," by admitting that their extremist assertions like "all intercourse is rape" or that "all men are potential rapists" are "useful as catalysts for social change." She was, however, unequivocal in her rejection of generalizations that crudely denigrate and indict all men with a characterization that would be impugned if it would target any one of the legally protected social groups.

Some prominence was given in the talk to Valerie Solanas who in the late 1960s published the SCUM Manifesto, SCUM being an acronym for Society For Cutting Up Men. Solanas' agenda of overthrowing the government, eliminating the money system, destroying the male sex, and, in fact, of "kill[ing] all men who are not in the Men's Auxiliary of SCUM," certainly went beyond the programs of most ladies' supper clubs and girl scouts' organizations. Solanas surely meant what she proclaimed. She proved her sincerity in 1968 by trying to kill Andy Warhol with three bullets into his chest for not agreeing to accept a film script of hers. How did the women's movement use these events for its purposes? As so often, organizations that see some value in gaining or preserving respectability, distance themselves from such members among them by admitting that they constitute the lunatic fringe. Such distancing is often quite legitimate because extremists rarely represent larger groups. What therefore has to be examined is in what way the feminist movement has absorbed such terrorist proposals into its platform.

Professor Sally Gearhart salvaged Solanas' "good" ideas by formulating them in more moderate language. In her essay "The Future--If There Is One--Is Female" (ironically published in a volume called *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Nonviolence* by Pam McAllister, 1982) she argued that women alone must control the reproduction of the species... and that only 10% of the population be allowed to be male. Gearhart, however, in contrast to Solanas, assured her readers that she wanted men's cooperation for their own demise and that she did not envision mass murder of males but rather the non-violent, kind form of diminution of their numbers through slow attrition. Women who would not submit to such reproductive discipline she considered "enslaved by male-identification", and what she thought about uncooperative men was probably not fit for print.

Interestingly, Patai indicated she has been willing to go along with some of the above proposals when she was younger and had not yet worked in a Women's Studies program. She herself "used to believe that women should run the world" since they could possibly not do it worse than men did. Today, she appears to say, women could do just as bad a job.

Patai was refreshingly unambiguous about the idea that patriarchy would lead to peace and order; she called such proposals "nonsense" and "childish dreams". Further, she dismissed any notion that women are natural socialists as many feminist utopian fiction writers assume. She criticised the lack of realism in feminist fiction that presumes lack of conflict in societies run by women, and she was critical of the hypocrisy among feminist extremists who exempt themselves from the norms they impose on all other women. Her examples were Andrea Dworkin who, despite her notoriously hateful writings about men and patriarchy, wrote lovingly about her father, and Catharine MacKinnon who believes that no woman but herself can give informed consent to intercourse.

Everyone who predicts the self-destruction of feminism must take encouragement when hearing that feminists like Deborah Stearns get prominent exposure in the *National Women's Studies Association Journal* (Spring 1995). This feminist theorist urges that men and women and every other sex should disregard their partner's sex when they date, mate or marry, or, at least, should not give it greater significance than any other personality characteristic like patience or stubbornness.

Patai urged her listeners not to underestimate the impact of the heterophobes' language of hate. She appeared confident that the universal patriarchy will not materialize, but she pointed out some of the scary feminist achievements, in particular sexual harassment policies and the acceptance of "recovered memories" of presumed sexual abuse. Women are given "if not automatic credence, at least the benefit of the doubt"; men's testimony is always suspect and no match for the weight of a woman's word. Due process, like freedom of speech, is considered a power tool of the patriarchy and therefore despised and rejected. The climate is chilly for men, particularly at universities, and men have lost their jobs on the basis of the flimsiest allegations of sexual harassment. Innocent men, as well as women, currently sit in prison on evidence that a decent and sane society would have laughed out of the courtroom. It is even claimed that "massive sexual harassment is going on in school yards" and that preschoolers have to be trained in feminist theory of sexual harassment. Patai rightly compared our society

that unleashes "against its own citizens codes of speech and behavior that can ensnare just about anyone" with the dystopias of Zamiatin and Orwell, and she urged her listeners not to misinterpret heterophobia as an innocent or well-intentioned return to purist victorianism. Her views were greeted with warm applause.

I would like to make some comments on the presentation. Everyone familiar with *Professing Feminism* by Patai and Koertge (1994) expected and received a strong and well-informed message about how to view the contemporary *déravage* of feminism. The lecture was so persuasive and well-delivered that it solicited a question from the audience about how it is possible for her to have all these insights and still proclaim herself to be a feminist. Daphne did not give a convincing answer to this question.

I question the use of the term "heterophobia," coined by Patai to refer to the fact that "heterosexuality... went from being the norm to being on the defensive" and to the feminist antagonism to men. Should these phenomena of hostility be called a phobia and explained by fear? The term "heterophobia" is non-descriptive, makes unwarranted assumptions, and limits reasoning to one particular explanation. It is simply not obvious that the "feminist turn against men" at the end of this century is based on the **fear** of heterosexuality. Despite these objections, however, I hope to hear Professor Patai at another SAFS meeting.

[A longer version of this item, with some discussion of Patai's views on Simone de Beauvoir and Jean Paul Satre is available from the author. Write to Prof. H. Klatt at Dept. Psychology, King's College, U. Western Ontario, 266 Epworth Avenue, London, ON, N6A 2M3]

RESEARCHING THE EQUITY INDUSTRY

Part Two: Academe's Diversity Disciples

Martin Loney

Employment equity activists have made particularly forceful inroads into the universities. The initial impetus came from those who argued that women faced singular barriers in seeking appointment and promotion, although evidence suggests that women's representation levels are primarily a function of the relatively small size of the female qualified pool at historical recruitment points. In recent years qualified women candidates appear to have enjoyed a significant advantage over their male counterparts. The fashion has now shifted with aboriginal and visible minority candidates the current beneficiaries

of preferential hiring policies. Those able to claim both gender and racial disadvantage are the most eagerly sought.

Dalhousie University caused some controversy in 1994, when it announced a chair of Black history reserved for members of only one racial group. The university held its ground and Dalhousie's President, Howard Clark, promised a series of additional, racially exclusive appointments, as funds become available, in such areas as science, law and medicine. Dalhousie attracted attention only because the university explicitly barred non-black applicants, a parallel to the Ontario government's mistake when the Management Board announced that white males would be excluded from a particular job competition. Universities which exercise more subtle discrimination escape attention.

Carleton University has made a number of appointments where the racial characteristics of an applicant have ensured that normal qualification requirements were waived. Sometimes such practices are informal, but in December 1990, the School of Social Work brought the issue into the open. The School advertised four full-time positions, three at the assistant professor level, one at the instructor level. The School's advert declared:

.... [W]e are anxious to increase our understanding of the way in which race and ethnicity affect the lives of people in Canada. We want to develop a culturally sensitive program and an active anti-racist practice.

It is unclear what caused the School's faculty suddenly to notice the fact that Canada included people with different cultural backgrounds. The fact that a culturally sensitive approach still required developing might be thought to reflect a degree of myopic lassitude which raises questions as to what competence previous graduates acquired. More baffling was the concept of an active "anti-racist" practice. Was this to exist in contrast to the racist practice being carried out by other social workers?

The advert noted:

Normally, appointment to professor positions requires a doctoral degree, but under affirmative hiring practices, visible minority and aboriginal candidates without a doctorate will be considered.

The School was as good as its word. Seven candidates were short-listed for the three assistant professor

positions. Four were visible minority candidates who lacked a Ph.D. Two of the three appointed were visible minority candidates who lacked a Ph.D. No qualified, able-bodied, white male made the short-list. Had Carleton previously discriminated against those who were now entitled to such privileged treatment? At the time the advert was placed, the School's small faculty already included two aboriginal Canadians. The University's own figures indicated that racial minorities were well represented in academic employment.

Carleton is not unique. At the beginning of the 1995/96 academic year, the University of Windsor proudly announced a number of academic appointments favouring those perceived to have been subject to some historic disadvantage. All the appointees were members of a visible minority. The social work appointee lacked a Ph.D., others appeared to have been recruited through a process which excluded those who failed to share the desired ethnic characteristics. Those benefitting from this attempt to rectify "historic disadvantage", through the provision of tenure track appointments, included a mainland Chinese Ph.D. student, in Canada on a CIDA scholarship, and a recent graduate of the University of Calcutta, also in receipt of Canadian tax funded support for her graduate studies.

Employment equity is explicitly linked to the wider diversity cult, incisively analysed in Richard Bernstein's, *Dictatorship of Virtue*. A recent book, *Diversity at Work*, by Trevor Wilson, head of one of the more successful diversity training companies, Omnibus Consulting, spells out the case for attacking the perceived homogeneous legacy of a society dominated by the values of white, heterosexual, Christian males. This is history as caricature, supported by an array of statistical misinformation, including a 50 percent understatement of Canada's visible minority population, gross distortions of the evidence of labour market discrimination and the claim that 10 percent of the Canadian workforce is "predominantly (sic) gay". These are obviously minor quibbles. Introduced by Loblaw's President, David Williams, the book receives a glowing endorsement from one of U of T's many vice-presidents. Michael Finlayson, who, alarmingly, is in charge of the university's human resources, assures readers that Wilson, "presents a balanced and up-to-date account of the economics of equity."

The politics of diversity are not simply manifested in hiring decisions; they also increasingly invade the

curriculum and the admissions policy. Dalhousie is currently hiring a new Director for the Maritime School of Social Work. The announcement leaves no doubt as to the ideological perspective which will be required of a successful candidate:

The School is interested in advancing the development of theory/practice that accounts for systemic inequities based on social factors such as gender, sexual orientation, race, class, disability, is rooted in knowledge of political economy, and is useful in community development and social action.

Candidates who think scholarship is more than a shopping list of putative victims, which should not be confused with advocacy, are unlikely to find this encouraging.

Continued on page 11 ...

... continued from page 10.

Carleton, which is already some way further down this road, has amended its social work admission's policy accordingly. Under the heading "How Do I Qualify?" the School's prospectus identifies a cast of underdogs who will find particular welcome:

Admissions to Social Work are governed by the following policy:

The Carleton School of Social Work is committed to educational equity. The society in which we live and of which social work is a constituent part is composed of groups with differential access to power - economic, political and social. The School affirms that all these groups should have the opportunity to learn in a supportive environment. Specific groups include, but are not limited to, persons of Aboriginal and racial, cultural, and/or ethnic minority origin, persons with disabilities, lesbian, gay, and bisexual persons, and persons disadvantaged by their gender or economic position.

The only group omitted from the School's equity admissions program is able-bodied, white males, without culture, not poor and whose horizons are so limited that they eschew same-sex coupling.

In order to be eligible for enrolment, students require only a 65 percent average, allowing considerable discretion in the admission of those blessed with one (or better still three or four) of the numerous disadvantages helpfully

itemised in the prospectus. Whether such characteristics as bisexuality are not only relevant to, but should be criteria for interview, and selection is no doubt a matter which has received careful consideration. Nevertheless, verification must be problematic.

These are early days. Academics at Canadian Universities, particularly in the arts and social sciences, have shown a singular willingness to embrace the latest politically correct ideas. There has been no shortage of tenured male professors eager to demonstrate their progressive credentials by endorsing hiring policies which discriminate against those burdened with similar racial and gender characteristics. Where the diversity cult has moved into a frontal offensive, as at UBC, the response of university administrators has been cringing capitulation.

The emergence of a growing group of academics who are prepared to confront the tyranny of the righteous is an encouraging sign, but far more forceful action will be required to reverse the legacy of the last twenty years.

References

Bernstein, R. *Dictatorship of Virtue: Multiculturalism and the Battle for America's Future*. New York: Knopf, 1994.

Brown, G. *The Employment Equity Empress Has No Clothes: An Inquiry into Preferential Hiring In Canadian Universities*. Edmonton: Gender Issues Education Foundation, 1994.

Carleton University, *This is Carleton University School of Social Work*, Ottawa: Carleton University Office of Admissions and Academic Records, 1993.

Canadian Association of University Teachers, University Affairs, "Social Work" positions, Ottawa: CAUT, January 1996.

Wilson, T. *Diversity at Work: The Business Case for Equity*. Toronto: Wiley and Sons, 1996.

Martin Loney is a social policy consultant, based in Manotick, Ontario. The author and editor of a number of books on race relations and social policy, Martin is currently researching employment equity with grant support from the Donner Canadian Foundation, administered by SAFS. He would like to hear from SAFS members about developments in their universities. Contact him at: (613) 692-2565, fax: (613) 692-1447, Box 45, RR3, Manotick, ON, K4M 1B4.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESEARCH

Academic freedom does not entail that a scholar be absolutely unconstrained. This is not only impossible but morally undesirable. What it does require is that the ethical constraints imposed on the scholar be ones that can be rationally defended. When this condition is not met, research projects can be unnecessarily delayed or thwarted, and result in a violation of academic freedom.

Dr. Dale Beyerstein, Coordinator SAFS (BC) chapter, in a letter commenting on the Tri-Council draft code of research ethics, July 23, 1996.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR**The Left and Employment Equity**

9 I believe that Deborah Cook (*Newsletter*, April 1996) is, in essence, correct in her response to Gordon Chong's article "The terrible twins: EE and AA," in *Newsletter* No. 12 (January 1996). It wasn't "Marxists" or "socialists" who got us into the affirmative action mess, it was people like JFK and LBJ, i.e., self-proclaimed "liberals", who did so.

As most of my Marxist friends would be only too quick to point out, the stress in Marxism falls mainly on the "productive" rather than "distributive" process, and employment equity policies concern distribution rather than production. If anything, such policies are regarded as diversionary as they act to divide rather than unite the working class. They can, therefore, do nothing to affect in any important way the dominant players in the Marxist analysis, viz., the system of production (productive forces, productive relations, etc.), and can only divide the revolutionary segment to be united, viz., the proletariat.

Prof. Cook also seems to be arguing that those who pressed these programs on us were (and are) not "really leftists". While I am also inclined to agree with her on this point, I do not think anything very substantial turns on it. It requires us to establish some objective criteria for determining a "true" from a "false" leftist, and the categories are much too fluid and subjective to enable us to do so. Pursuing this line of argument is essentially divisive.

Intelligent people on both the "left" and the "right" can oppose claims made for preferential treatment on the basis

of race, ethnicity, etc. As someone who still thinks of himself as being on the "left", I only wish more of those who think this way would stand up and oppose the foolishness of employment equity practices as vigorously as many of those on the "right" have. Perhaps they will. Who knows? Sometimes, though, the silence is "truly" deafening.

Terry Heinrichs
York University

Decidedly Leftist

9 Deborah Cook's contention (*SAFS Newsletter*, April 1996) that affirmative action is not a policy of the Left is astounding, and must be rooted in a systematic disregard of patent empirical fact. Affirmative action is decidedly a Leftist policy. It entails an expansion of the power of the state, and is therefore inherently attractive to the Left. As Peter Brimelow has argued, Leftism has evolved into a sort of racial spoils system, of which affirmative action is an integral element.

If Cook is a Leftist while simultaneously opposing affirmative action, that is admirable, but it should not blind her to the Left's overwhelming support for and imposition of so-called employment equity.

Graeme Voyer
Winnipeg

Misinformed on Employment Equity

9 Jennifer Lewington, the "Learning Beat" columnist for the *Globe and Mail*, is at it again with her misinformed propaganda on employment equity. On Sept. 2 (*Globe and Mail*, page A3), she reported on a dubious study by "post-secondary education consultant" Edward Renner, "research professor at Carleton University."

Here's the argument: Between 1961 and 1992, the proportion of women students doubled (from 27% to 54%), and so did the proportion of women faculty (from 11% to 22%). "The net result is that after three decades of affirmative action there are [sic] exactly the same proportion of women faculty members per female student as there was in 1961."

Three decades of affirmative action? And here I thought that employment equity was first enacted in 1986. Apparently, Professor Renner tacitly agrees with the conclusion of Andrew Irvine's study (published recently in the philosophy journal *Dialogue*) that women have been enjoying preferential hiring for nearly a generation.

Despite the fact that women have for decades been hired in proportions greatly in excess of their availability in the qualified applicant pool, Renner assures us that “The squeeze that [academic] men feel is from lack of jobs, not from an unfair advantage being given to women,” adding (without an iota of empirical evidence in support) that “the hiring advantage long enjoyed by men has not yet been reversed by women.”

What sheer ignorance, or dishonesty, or both! Nobody, after reading Irvine's careful study, can plausibly assert any such thing!

Next, Lewington drags in philosophy professor James Robert Brown, a “specialist in university equity issues”. He points out that in 1995, of 11 tenure-track jobs in

Continued on page 13 ...

... continued from page 12.

philosophy across Canada, only one was filled by a woman. Did he also point out that probably only one woman graduated with a Ph.D. in philosophy in Canada in 1994-95? Or that women who graduated with a Ph.D. in philosophy over the past decade or two have nearly a 100% success rate getting a university job? Or that after three decades of affirmative action there are now dozens more unemployed or under-employed male Ph.D.s in the philosophy job pool than qualified women to draw from? Some “specialist”!

I'd be interested to see if Lewington is willing to give the other side of the issue equal consideration.

Grant A. Brown
University of Lethbridge

JOHN ROBSON, FRSC

Long-time SAFS member, John Robson died in July 1995. Emeritus University Professor of English (a rank attained by very few academics) at the University of Toronto, John was an eminently distinguished academic with excellent administrative skills, the latter shown, for example, by his service as principal of University College from 1971-1976.

I first met John in the late sixties, when he joined me in our unsuccessful opposition to our university's abolition of the distinction between honours and pass courses. (It was held, by the majority, that this distinction was “elitist” and “undemocratic”). He was also one of the first U of T senior academics to join SAFS. He saw the organization as consistent with his principles of maintaining freedom of speech and excellence in higher education. Perhaps the fact that one of his major scholarly contributions was the edition (33 volumes) of the *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill* had something to do with his commitment to basic principles such as freedom of speech.

John was unfailingly pleasant in his personal relationships, and enjoyed the confidence of different “camps” in university education. His non-academic talents were many, including championship-level yo-yo skills, which he was always willing to exhibit. SAFS is just one of the many organizations that is made poorer by the loss of this fine and principled scholar and courteous colleague.

John J. Furedy

Dodging the “Fix” of the Tri-Council

9 If I am right in reading between some lines, with respect to the Tri-Council's code of ethics for human research, “the fix is in” to use underworld jargon. I suspect that the Tri-Council writers not only come from a hyper-politically correct background but also that they may have planned in advance for *some* revision to the initial draft (thereby apparently responding to protests) while retaining the great majority of this awful text.

There may be some concessions to the historians' concerns about, for instance, having to get permission from the likes of the Mafia before writing about them. But the parts obnoxious to other social sciences (such as absurd rules on experimentation) that the public does not understand so well, will be protected and retained.

What leads me to expect the above? I have become a member of the Committee on Professional Ethics (COPE) of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (CSAA). I have discussed on email with the other members of the committee, the Tri-council abomination. One of them intimated to me that she has information to indicate that the Tri-Council's revisions will still stick pretty close to the original, ignoring the more outspoken criticisms.

What this means, I fear, is that many well-thought-out and articulate criticisms that have been sent to the Tri-Council have been wastes of time.

I think that the only effective way to combat this is go outside the Tri-Council altogether, to the relevant federal government ministry. A flood of strong messages to the ministry might bring some sanity to this exercise; appeals to the drafters of the document will be futile.

Some SAFS members have already written, and Doreen Kimura has sent these addresses:

For SSHRC & NSERC: Hon. John Manley, Minister of Industry, Confederation Bldg., Room 356, Ottawa, K1A 0A6.

For MRC: Hon. David Dingwall, Minister of Health, Confederation Bldg., Room 607, Ottawa, K1A 0A6.

Remember that you do not need to affix postage.

Dick Henshel
University of London

REVIEW

Sid Knowles

“Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History” Mary Lefkowitz, New York: A New Republic Book, 1996, 222 pages.

Mary Lefkowitz is a classicist and the Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. Her book *Not Out of Africa* is a scholarly examination of some of the Afrocentric assertions being made in American schools and universities.

Lefkowitz examines and explains the historical evidence which is required to understand and evaluate the claims of the Afrocentrists. She first discusses the Greek historian Herodotus (4th century BC) who claimed that Egyptian culture had a direct influence on the Greeks, and concludes that Herodotus “despite his best efforts to get at the truth, offers his audience misleading information about origins” (page 66). That Herodotus over-emphasized the connection of the two cultures became apparent when scholarship based on deciphering of Egyptian documents allowed scholars to compare Herodotus' writings with the source materials. Lefkowitz similarly casts doubt on the work of the eighteenth century French priest and professor of Greek, Abbe Jean Terrasson, whose writings influenced Freemasons of the time. She traces ideas about ancient Egyptian rites through Freemasons to the rituals of the black Masons of the West Indies and of the United States.

She then discusses the ideas of Prof. G. M. James, a professor of Greek and mathematics at several colleges in Arkansas, who argues in *Stolen Legacy* that there is no such thing as Greek philosophy but only Black Egyptian philosophy stolen by the Greeks. The Greeks, according to James “did not possess the native ability essential to the development of philosophy.” This is a major theme of Afrocentrism, which Prof. James argues is justified as a legitimate educational discipline because it serves a political cause. Professor Lefkowitz characterizes this as an example of the “identity politics”.

Lefkowitz argues that extreme Afrocentrism substitutes myth for history while at the same time ignoring the real history of Ancient Egypt. It is political indoctrination and not education. “When it comes to deciding what one can or cannot say in class, the question of ethnicity or of motivations, whether personal or cultural, is, or ought to be, irrelevant. What matters is whether what one says is supported by facts and evidence, texts or formulae”, Lefkowitz declares (page 162).

She points out that there is a difference between freedom of speech and academic freedom. “Freedom of speech gives me the right to say that Aristotle stole his philosophy from Egypt, provided that it is clear that what I am expressing is my opinion, and that I do not pretend or assert that it is factually accurate and true in every respect.” (page 165) Competence within a field is an implicit restriction in universities upon the freedom of speech of professors. “We will not be serving our students well if we insist on teaching them what is

factually incorrect, even if we imagine that it would be better for them if we did so." (page 167)

Although Afrocentrism is not an issue in Canadian universities and colleges, all teachers and students can benefit from reading the general discussion of the differences between freedom of speech and academic freedom, indoctrination and education, and social goals and genuine scholarship.

**INCREASING IMPACT:
NOTES FROM PRESIDENT'S REMARKS
AT SAFS ANNUAL MEETING, MAY 11, 1996**
John Furedy

Since last year, I think SAFS has increased its impact, although this is not necessarily reflected in an increase in the number of our members. The difference from last year is that we are now starting to be treated with some respect by the media and institutions. Our rapid speaking out in the UBC case was important in this.

The suspension case at Ryerson was essentially a test of our belief in the principle of academic freedom aside from the ideas held by the person we may have to defend (see *Newsletter No.12*). There were a few resignations of members who thought we acted improperly or injudiciously in defending the academic freedom of this professor and his students. The encouraging response was that several other academic organisations--CAUT and the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Assns.--took the same stand and sent us copies of their letters regarding the case.

That, I think, was significant. I think it indicates that we are starting to have an impact.

We started off strictly as a scholarly organisation supported by membership funds; in 1995, we became a hybridly-funded organisation. I've received research grants for work on academic issues, advocacy, debate and scholarship and although those research grants are not meant to directly support SAFS' activities, they have greatly helped in enabling us to be active.

Perhaps most importantly, the Newsletter could not continue at its present quality and frequency without the grant from the Donner Foundation; and the Newsletter has helped us to better collect fees.

In terms of our mission, I think *advocacy* has been relatively successful. The *debate* aspect has, in a sense, been quite significant, especially at the University of Toronto, where we've sponsored two debates on contentious issues this year (Daphne

Patai's talk yesterday being one of them).

The *scholarship* aspect of our mission is much harder to accomplish. Several members have written conceptual papers, but empirical scholarship is still very much ahead of us and it's going to be much more expensive and difficult to do.

SETTLEMENT AT RYERSON

Mr. Gerald Hannon made the following statement at a press conference on Friday, Sept. 13th:

Ryerson University, CUPE and I have reached a settlement in the grievances filed over the past year. The settlement includes the following provisions:

1. That I will not return to teaching at Ryerson this year. 2. That I will never again apply for teaching work at Ryerson, though that restriction may be lifted by order of the president. 3. At our request, Ryerson has agreed that there will be no repercussions for students or staff who supported me over the past year. 4. At our request, Ryerson has agreed to hold a competition for the position I will not be taking, so that those who, for reasons of probity refused to accept a position they saw as rightfully mine, can reapply. 5. I have accepted a cash settlement, the amount of which I have agreed not to reveal.

Hannon announced at the press conference that he intended to donate \$5000-\$10000 of the settlement "to create a fund at Ryerson to keep alive the issues raised by this case." He included in these issues: academic freedom and freedom of speech. Hannon commented: "*The administration's handling of this affair struck me as cowardly, visionless, moralizing, and deeply irresponsible, given the financial difficulties faced by academic institutions these days.*" He spoke highly of the Ryerson students and the Journalism Department, saying he would miss working with both.

EFFECTS OF PC ON NEUROSCIENCES TO BE DISCUSSED IN SYMPOSIUM

SAFS and the **National Association of Scholars** are sponsoring a symposium at the 26th Annual Meeting of the Society for Neuroscience, to be held in Washington in November. Here is an abstract of the session.

*THE EFFECTS OF NORTH AMERICAN
POLITICAL CORRECTNESS ON
NEUROSCIENTIFIC PROGRESS: EMERGING
PRINCIPLES, PROBLEMS AND PRIORITIES*

Although the effects of political correctness (PC) are more obvious in social sciences and humanities, PC has had some influence on harder sciences in general, and on neuroscientific research and teaching in particular. The purpose of this symposium is to discuss PC in a context that provides full audience participation following presentations that will deal with: a) The critical importance of total academic freedom in neuroscientific teaching and research (**John Furedy, University of Toronto, Canada**); b) Neuroscientific research in the PC related topic of gender differences (**Sakire Pogun, Ege University, Turkey**); c) Ethics codes as impediments to valid research (**Doreen Kimura, University of Western Ontario, Canada**); d) Ideology and high fashion in anti-science (**Paul Gross, University of Virginia, USA**).

The general thesis to which speakers will subscribe is: *In science, knowledge must come first and comfort second.*

FURTHER READINGS

Carroll, Joseph. "Pluralism, poststructuralism and evolutionary theory," *Academic Questions*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1996: 43-57.

Grayson, J. Paul. "Value Added in Generic Skills Between First and Final Year: A Pilot Project". *ISR Working Paper*. Toronto: Institute for Social Research, York University, 1996.

Gottfried, Paul. "Postmodernism and academic discontents," *Academic Questions*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1996: 58-67.

Haack, Susan and Barry Smith. (Eds.). "Feminist epistemology: for and against." Special issue of *The Monist*, Vol. 77, No. 4, October 1994. (Includes an essay by Barry Gross).

Hilborn, Kenneth H. W. *The Quest for "Equality: From Robespierre to Rae and Beyond: How an Unattainable Ideal Has Threatened Freedom"*. Toronto: C-FAR, 1996.

Martin, Robert. "Guesswork," *The Literary Review of Canada*, Feb. 1995. (Review of four reports: (i) Task Force on Gender Equality in the Legal Profession, The Canadian Bar Association, "Touchstones for Change: Equality, Diversity and Accountability;" (ii) David Pomerant, "Multiculturalism Representation and the Jury Selection Process in Canadian Criminal Cases," Department of Justice, Canada; (iii) Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women, "Changing the Landscape: Ending Violence - Achieving Equality, Final Report" and "Executive Summary/National Action Plan," Department of Supply and Services; (iv) Walter Dekeserdy and Katherine Kelly, "The Incidence and Prevalence of Woman Abuse in Canadian University and College Dating Relationships: Results from a National Survey.")

Measure, Number 130, Special Issue, Aug/Sept 1995.

Murray, David. W. "Racial and sexual politics in testing," *Academic Questions*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1996: 10-17.

NAS Science Newslist. "That 'repellant' book," *Newslist*, Vol. III, Issue 3-S, May 1996. (A summary of some items about Christopher Brand's book *The g Factor* that were posted on the list up to May).

National Association of Scholars. *NAS Science Newslist*. (Some of the items posted on the list serve NASSNL).

Resnick, Philip. "No discrimination means no reverse discrimination." Commentary, *Globe and Mail*, Sept. 12, A17, 1996.

Smith, Barry. (Ed.). *European Philosophy and the American Academy*. LaSalle: The Hegeler Institute, 1994. (Includes a series of essays on the French nihilist roots of deconstructionism and other North American fancies).

Disclaimer

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

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

The SAFS Newsletter

The editor welcomes short articles, case studies, news items, comments, readings, local chapter news, etc. Longer items are preferred on disk 3.5" (MS-DOS) in Word Perfect, or by

email. Address: **Chris Furedy**, c/o J. Furedy, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON. M5S 3G3. Fax: (416) 962-4253. Email: **SAFSN@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA**

SAFS OFFICE HOURS

Wendy Nolan, our secretary, is in the office Tuesdays and Thursdays, 9:00 - 4:00 and Wednesdays, 1:00 - 4:00
Phone: (416)978-7062, Fax: (416)978-4811
Email: **SAFS@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA**

Members can contact Wendy by phone or email for extra copies of our new brochure to distribute to those who may be interested in joining SAFS.

1996 DUES

Membership fees (\$20 regular; \$10 students and retired) are due at the beginning of the calendar year. SAFS dues cover a calendar year (January-December) so to gain the maximum benefit, early payment of dues is advised. Paid up membership is necessary to vote at the AGM, to receive newsletters, mailings and email messages from the SAFS office. For those on email, we are developing an electronic discussion group which also requires members to be paid up.

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

CAUGHT IN THE NET

SAFS now has an e-mail discussion group--**Safs-talk--** which is open to members who are paid up. All those already on e-mail have been sent a message about how to subscribe to the group. New e-mailers should enquire at **SAFS@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA**.

Home page for National Association of Scholars: the URL is <http://tigger.jvnc.net/~nas/index.htm>. SAFS is a sister organization and has a link at: <http://tigger.jvnc.net/~nas/affiliates/safs.htm>.

THINK-L is a "self-archiving listserv" for information on critical thinking, and the economic, political and ethical aspects of teaching and learning, maintained at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. To subscribe, send your request to: **LISTSERV@YMSLVMA.EDU**. Leave the "subject" line blank. In the body of the message type: **SUBSCRIBE THINK-L**.

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

Gene Burns, president, US National Public Radio Association interviewed on CBC's *As It Happens*,