

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship NEWSLETTER

Number 2

November 1992

This is the second issue of the Newsletter of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship.

The **PURPOSES** of the **SAFS** are:

1. To resist the ideological misuse of teaching and scholarship.
2. To support rigorous standards in research and teaching in university hiring practices.
3. To preserve academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas, regardless of popular doctrine.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The annual general meeting of the SAFS will take place on Wednesday, December 9, 1992, 5:00 P.M. at the University of Waterloo, University Avenue, Waterloo, Ontario, Hagey Hall 334. Please send suggestions for the agenda to any one of the directors or to the office of the SAFS. [From Hwy 401: Exit 278 to Hwy 8W, Hwy 7E to Conestoga Pkwy, Exit University Ave.W.]

CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

The University in Jeopardy
Toronto, March 12, 1993

The President of the SAFS, Doreen Kimura, has negotiated the joint sponsoring, with the Fraser Institute, for a one-day conference on the topic of *The University In Jeopardy*. The focus will be on the potential effect of policies about race relations, sexual harassment, and employment equity on the quality of university education. The tentative meeting place and time is Toronto, March 12, 1993. Members will be sent details at the beginning of the new year. There will be a nominal registration fee. Please plan to attend.

CALL FOR ARTICLES

The *Fraser Forum* is requesting articles about the university in jeopardy for the January 1993 Critical Issues Bulletin. The articles should be brief, five pages or so, on one specific issue. Please send submissions to the SAFS office on IBM-compatible disks, WordPerfect 5.1 or Microsoft Word, by early December, 1992.

BILL 79: "EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" COMES TO ONTARIO

Allan Nelson

The Government of Ontario, under the leadership of the New Democratic Party, has introduced into the Legislative Assembly, where it currently controls a majority of the seats, "An Act to Provide for Employment Equity for Aboriginal People, People with Disabilities, Members of Racial Minorities and Women" (Bill 79). This well-meaning but misguided measure promises to ease the plight of the members of the named groups as subjects of "both systemic and intentional discrimination" in the workplace. Its preamble justifies the bill on the grounds that members of these groups "experience higher rates of unemployment than other people in Ontario," that they "experience more discrimination . . . in finding employment, in retaining employment and in being promoted." The authors of the bill conclude that the members of these groups are consequently "underrepresented in most areas of employment, especially in senior and management positions, and they are overrepresented in those areas of employment that provide low pay and little chance for advancement." The authors of the bill, therefore, intend not only to regulate the hiring (and firing) practices of employers, but also to regulate their promotion practices as well.

"Constructive Discrimination"

While the bill is purportedly aimed at the elimination of "barriers, including systemic and deliberate practices and policies, that discriminate against them as an Aboriginal person, as a person with a disability, as a member of a racial minority or as a woman," the means which it employs are not narrowly geared to such cases of unjustified discrimination. As we have come to expect of such measures, the ultimate reliance is upon the establishment and enforcement of numerical quotas. While the hated "q"-word is studiously avoided, the bill speaks of "representation" of the stipulated groups. It declares that: "Every employer's workforce, in all occupational categories and at all levels of employment, shall reflect the representation of Aboriginal people, people with disabilities, members of racial minorities and women in the community." (Part I:2)

Two New Government Agencies

Thus, the bill does not merely provide a mechanism for remedying cases of manifest unfair discrimination, where the burden is upon the accuser to prove that he or she has been unfairly treated - that is, presumably, by being deprived of the proper rewards of his or her merit. It goes beyond such reasonable protection to members of the preferred groups and thereby denies the same protection all others. The primary thrust of the legislation is to establish a presumption of guilt of wrongful discrimination against favoured groups on the basis of statistical demographic analysis. The burden of proof is thus shifted to the accused: "Every employer shall ensure that its recruitment, employment and promotion practices and policies are free of barriers, both systemic and deliberate, that discriminate against" members of the named groups.(Part I:3)

Two new administrative organizations will subsequently see to it that proposed plans are acceptable and are subsequently pursued by the employers. An *Employment Equity Commission* is to be established, to be "composed of one or more members to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council," to administer the program, along with an *Employment Equity Tribunal*, "composed of such members as are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council," which will hear and decide disputed cases. Employers deemed to be guilty of non-compliance with the act are subject to penalties ranging from providing employment to rejected applicants or providing them with monetary compensation, to fines up to \$50,000. and the cancellation of any government contracts.

On the other hand, the bill does not require that members of groups not favoured by the bill be rewarded in the workplace in accordance with their merit as employees or be awarded a proportionate share of the available jobs. It provides that preferential hiring which is not otherwise justified by the quota system is permitted "if the preference or denial is one that is permitted under the Human Rights Code" as "constructive discrimination" or "handicap" or "special employment."

12 to 36 Months to Develop "Equity" Plans

Government Control of Most Employment

Employers subject to the Act will have from twelve to thirty-six months to develop and submit their employment equity plans, depending upon the number of employees, the smaller employers being allowed the greater lengths of time. And the Commission is authorized to "work with employers and bargaining agents to ensure that existing seniority systems will not be a barrier to employment equity." It is evident that the creators of this bill anticipate that the transition to the brave new world which they seek to create will not be without pain and hardship for individuals who are not fortunate enough to be favoured by these social engineers. It remains to be seen what the longer run economic costs will be in reduced productivity, efficiency and competitiveness, as considerations of merit and skill are subordinated to calculations of demographic proportionality. There will, of course, also be a great cost in other than economic terms. There will be innumerable mischiefs unique to particular fields of endeavour, as well as the more general ones most easily foreseen.

Consequently, all private employers of fifty or more employees, and all public sector employers of ten or more employees, are required to collect relevant information and to formulate and to submit an "employment equity plan" for the recruitment, employment and promotion of members of the legislatively favoured groups, "according to employment equity principles." Each such plan must include specific goals and timetables for the elimination of any barriers to the objectives of the bill and for the meeting of the quotas. And employers are expected to do whatever is necessary "to accommodate members of the designated groups." This would presumably entail the provision of whatever new physical facilities might be necessary to meet the special needs of any of the groups. One can only guess about other possible interpretations of the possible meaning of the term "accommodation" in this context. And, while every employer is required to "conduct employment equity workforce surveys and collect other information to determine the extent to which members of the designated groups are employed in the employer's workforce," the bill affirms the right of the employee to refuse to answer any questions asked by the employer pursuant to that requirement. Any such lack of cooperation does not apparently reduce the employer's liability under this law.

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship

152 Albert St., Unit 12, London, Ont. N6A 1M1
(519) 661-2061; FAX (519) 661-3029

Board of Directors

- Doreen Kimura, Ph. D., F.R.S.C., President
- Douglas N. Jackson, Ph. D., F.R.S.C., Secretary-Treasurer
- C. Davison Ankney, Ph.D.
- John J. Furedy, Ph.D.
- Judy Wubnig, Ph. D., Editor, Newsletter

Consequences for Universities

Some of the probably adverse consequences of this legislation for the schools and universities and those whom they serve are rather easily predictable. Reassurances to the contrary notwithstanding, the quality of education is bound to be seriously eroded as considerations of merit - i.e., qualifications and competency - are subordinated to the simplistic demographic requirements. Academic departments will be forced to compromise not only the quality of what they have to offer their students, but also the substance they will be able to offer. A department which is hard-pressed to increase the number of women, disabled, "visible minority" group members or aboriginals will have to take what it can get when it cannot find any such persons qualified to teach the particular courses which it regards as most urgently needed. Since the individual academic positions to be filled tend to entail highly specific specialized competencies, the pool of available qualified candidates is, in most cases, fairly small - too small to accommodate the requirements of the "equity" legislation and the real academic needs of the department as well. It requires considerable naivete to believe that the administrators of the legislation will be tolerant of reasonable departures from their quota system.

The search for perfect social justice goes on.

LEWIS REPORT on Racism in Ontario

Judy Wubnig

Premier Bob Rae, after riots in Toronto, asked Stephen Lewis to become his Advisor on Race Relation and to make a report to him. Lewis submitted his report on June 9, 1992 and made a number of recommendations, about the police, public schools, trades and professions, and the following about colleges and universities and new government agencies:

- "(1) The Employment Equity legislation [Bill 79] . . . should be passed by December 31, 1992, to take effect as early as possible in 1993. Furthermore, the most senior levels of the OPP should be mobilized to ensure rigorous implementation.
- (2) The Minister of Colleges and Universities examine carefully the representative nature of Boards which govern both Colleges and Universities so that they reflect the changed society of Ontario.
- (3) The Minister of Colleges and Universities determine that Employment Equity be incorporated into the policy of every institution for which he is responsible.
- (4) The Minister of Colleges and Universities give serious consideration to the harassment and discrimination policy proposed by the Council of Regents

of the Community College system, with a view to using it, with whatever appropriate amendment, as a model for post-secondary institutions.

(5) By November 1, 1992, legislation be introduced to convert the Ontario Anti-Racism Secretariat into an enhanced Ontario Anti-Racism Directorate reporting directly to the Minister of Citizenship. . . .

(6) By August 1, 1992, a Cabinet Committee on Race Relations be formed, to be chaired by the Minister of Citizenship, with a core of requisite members. The composition of the Committee would accommodate the issues to be addressed. The Committee would meet four times a year with a Consultative Group representative of the visible minority communities. The proposed enhanced Anti-Racism Directorate would act as a secretariat to the meetings, and provide research and consultative back-up to the preparation for the meetings. . . ."

Lewis nowhere explains what he means by "racism." Is it judging the deeds of individuals according to their race, so that they are unequal under the law? No, not according to Lewis because he thinks it "anti-racist" to treat individuals of different races unequally under the law, members of "visible minorities" (but not the individual, the "visible minority of one") being treated preferentially, superior in law to the "visible majority."

Is it racism to judge ideas on the basis of the race of those who have them, as did the National Socialists in Germany the ideas of "Aryans" and "non-Aryans" (Jews)? No, not according to Lewis, who thinks it "anti-racist" to have texts in the school curriculum chosen on the basis of the race of the authors.

According to Lewis, the fundamental problem in race relations is anti-Black racism. The evidence is twofold: (1) representatives of the Black community say so, and (2) "It is Blacks who are being shot at, it is Black youth that is unemployed in excessive numbers, it is Black students who are inappropriately streamed in schools, it is Black kids who are disproportionately dropping-out, it is housing communities with large concentrations of Black residents where the sense of vulnerability and disadvantage are most acute, it is Black employees, professional and non-professional, on whom the doors of upward equity slam." Lewis can think of no other interpretation of this evidence, nor does he explain what he means by "excessive numbers" of the unemployed, "inappropriate streaming" in schools, "disproportionate" dropping-out of schools, etc.

Lewis thinks that Black students should have Black teachers and is appalled that Black students do not read books by Black authors in their school curriculum. In his well-intentioned confusion, Lewis seems to be reinventing the rationale for racially segregated

schools, (abolished in 1954 in the United States and recently in South Africa with the end of apartheid) where students are sent to different schools on the basis of their "race" (whatever that means legally) and taught by teachers of their own race.

Lewis is concerned with ill-will that is generated when individuals believe that they are treated differently because of their race. Blacks, he reports, expressed strong feelings about being mistreated on the basis of their race. He seems not to consider, however, that policies of legally enforced preferential treatment of "visible minorities" might mistreat and generate ill-will in the "visible majority." Such policies in South Africa did not generate the good will of the "visible majority" (Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds) towards the "visible minority" (Whites). (Thomas Sowell in Preferential Policies: An International Perspective discusses the effects of such policies in different countries.)

SAFS Letter to Stephen Lewis

John Furedy sent the following letter to Mr. Lewis on the behalf of the Board of Directors of the SAFS.

Mr. Stephen Lewis, Special Advisor to Premier of Ontario
Room 374, Legislative Building
Toronto, M7A 1A2

May 19, 1992

Dear Mr. Lewis:

The purpose of this note is to provide some input for your enquiry in your role as Special Advisor to the Premier from the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS). Our organization is devoted to preserving academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas, and supporting rigorous standards in university hiring practices (see attached March 19 press release). It is our position that free enquiry, research and discussion regarding social problems should be encouraged, without censorship.

More specifically for your enquiry, we advise that if Canadians are to understand race relations, it is imperative to avoid legislation or guidelines that would restrict enquiry and discussion. For example, the use of certain data sources and the airing of alternative interpretations of data should not be debarred because the data or the interpretations are thought to be offensive to some people.

To give a specific example: currently, the Metro police are not allowed to indicate the race of arrested suspects, yet the figures on the race of the people shot by the police during arrests are given out. Both sorts of statistics (and additional ones) need to be collected before one can come to a sound interpretation of what

is going on. We should not shrink from gathering basic information because we fear that the results may be unsettling. If information cannot be collected, supposition and innuendo will be resorted to not only by extremists but also by moderates, since no genuine knowledge will be available to anyone.

There is already a climate of intimidation in Ontario universities (which should be leaders of open enquiry) unconducive to open enquiry. One small example comes from a discussion of the recently formed Presidential Advisory Committee on Race Relations at my University. As indicated in the enclosed letter, the co-chair of PACRR, a professor of sociology, suggested that statistics referring to socio-economic differences between Black and White households should not be used in teaching. Yet this is the sort of information we may well need if we are to provide informed rather than simply ideological answers to the important question of what are the origins of racial tensions.

The sociological, economic, and psychological problems of race relations, crime, and the causes and effects of the recession in Canada are complex. If your advice to the Premier of Ontario can foster an environment of openness and rationality in research and discussion, and support the resolution to examine issues against evidence, it will make an extremely important contribution to Canadian society in general.

Because of the short time before you have to present your report, we have not prepared a joint letter, but the statement below has been seen and agreed to by all members of the Board of Directors of SAFS.

Yours sincerely,
John J. Furedy, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology,
University of Toronto

Prof. Furedy comments on the Lewis Report.

INFORMATIONAL versus IDEOLOGICAL STRATEGIES

John Furedy

I detest racism in all its forms. In Budapest during the twenties, my father was a victim of racism when he was barred from entering university because of the Numerous Clausus law. This was a form of Affirmative Action legislated by the government, which noted that Christian Hungarians who formed 95% of the population were under-represented at universities, where they formed only 85% of the students. In order to achieve the representation of 95%, Jewish applicants had to obtain higher marks than did Christian ones, and my father was one of

those who did not meet this "affirmative-action" criterion. And so he never became an architect, as was his wish.

But, of course, that was a mild case of racism compared to what happened to the Hungarian Jews in the forties, who were subjected to the Holocaust. About a third of my relatives survived this somewhat stronger form of racial discrimination, and most survivors have understandably retained an extreme sensitivity to and dislike of racism.

Somewhere between these lie current events like the riot in Los Angeles last spring and the paler Toronto version. All the motives for the rioting must be condemned, including racist ones, but two mistakes should be avoided. The first is to assume that racism can only occur among the "oppressors" and not the "oppressed." Because, in this strong form, the assumption is clearly false, a weaker version is that racial discrimination by the "oppressed" or "disadvantaged" or "visible minorities" is less serious than that by the "oppressor" or "privileged" or "visible majority." A recent instance of this weaker version is the reported assertion of a representative of the University of Toronto's United Coalition Against Racism (UCAR) "that discrimination against Jews does not rate with that experienced by other minorities." (*U of T Bulletin*, September 21, 1992, p. 20).

I reject this weaker version as well. Racism can be more or less serious, but the seriousness has to be judged only in terms of what is done (as in the two examples I gave at the outset), not who is doing it. Similarly, the only way to stop racial discrimination is not to discriminate on the basis of race, not to have any laws which discriminate on the basis of race. There is no distinction between "reverse" racial discrimination and racial discrimination; there is only racial discrimination, in different degrees.

The second mistake, related to the first, is to adopt an ideological rather than an informational approach to matters of race. For example, the Toronto police have, for some years, been forbidden to keep statistics on the race of criminal suspects, on the grounds that such statistics might promote the stereotype of the black criminal. This is an ideological approach to the problem of prejudice against blacks, and its effect is simply to reinforce that prejudice, because prejudice thrives on the absence of information. When systematic information is not available, people go on impressions, which are themselves fueled by prejudice. It is far easier to maintain the strong prejudice that all criminals are black in an environment where racial statistics are not available but isolated pictures of suspects on TV are, than in an environment where statistics are available. An ideological approach

suppresses information that is contrary to basic tenets of the ideology, and thereby actually promotes stereotypes it is supposed to destroy.

It was with these considerations in mind that, on behalf of the SAFS board, I wrote a letter on May 19, 1992, to Stephen Lewis. I received a warmly worded reply on May 27 which stated that "I want to assure you that your letter will be taken seriously as I prepare my report," that "systematic racism in our society cannot be tolerated," and that "I hope that my report will be useful in helping find solutions."

My optimism following this reply dissipated rapidly when I saw the June 9 report. Although the report acknowledged "more than seventy meetings" and innumerable phone conversations," there was no reference at all to any written submissions. As to the actual content of the report, there is no need for detailed comment, since the report is widely available. Suffice it to say that there is great emphasis on "visceral impact," "deep affect," and "palpable fear," but little or none on obtaining relevant information on a very complex issue. It is a thoroughly ideological approach.

In the wake of the Lewis Report, the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship has recently released an undated letter of some three pages under the signature of the Minister (Elaine Ziemba) and the Attorney General (Howard Hampton). It is available upon request, and I suggest that SAFS members obtain it. Among the recommendations is one for "developing an anti-racist curriculum for Ontario schools." Neither this letter nor the Lewis report give a clear definition of what they consider racism to be, and whether, in particular, they agree with the apparent position of the UCAR that racial discrimination depends on who is doing it rather than what is being done. It is also not clear whether the "anti-racist curriculum" will have an informational component, or will be thoroughly ideological. From what I have seen going on recently in Ontario, I am not optimistic.

CANADIAN PHILOSOPHERS

The first SAFS newsletter reported on a motion to be voted on at the annual meeting of the Canadian Philosophical Association to the effect that philosophy departments hire women preferentially so that "If the proposed guidelines are adopted tomorrow by every Canadian department, then fifty percent of permanent or probationary faculty should be female in forty years." It was taken up at the annual meeting of the CPA May 26, 1992, in Charlottetown, P.E.I. What occurred is perhaps of general interest since similar issues may arise in other professional societies.

CANADIAN PHILOSOPHIC ASSOCIATION BECOMES PC

Grant A. Brown and Judy Wubnig

At the Executive meeting of the Canadian Philosophical Association in November 1990, an *ad hoc* committee was established with the mandate "to study hiring policies affecting women" (with no reference to effects on men). Many procedural issues warrant discussion, including the composition of the committee, but we consider only two: the authority of the CPA to make recommendations about employment and the debate on the issue.

Dubious Procedures

To begin with, the establishment of the committee was inconsistent with the Constitution of the Canadian Philosophical Association. According to Article 1.02d, the four objectives of the organization of the organization are:

- (a) To promote philosophical scholarship and education in Canada by discussion, research and the dissemination of information.
- (b) To issue such publications as shall from time to time be considered desirable.
- (c) To represent the interests of Canadian philosophers and the profession at large before governmental and other organizations.
- (d) To administer and use for the purposes set forth in this article all monies received or acquired by the Association.

None of these objectives authorizes the CPA to produce, promulgate, and ratify recommendations concerning hiring policies. Moreover, the hiring policy proposed by the Committee is not only in contravention of the Constitution of the CPA but is also legally *ultra vires*. Hiring policies are formed in each institution according to its own charter. Individual academic departments are not autonomous in hiring decisions, and are not subject to the dictates of voluntary academic associations.

The Committee published a report recommending preferential hiring of women. It was publicized in the CPA Newsletter of November, 1991, the vote on its recommendations set for the annual meeting of 1992.

I [GB] asked the CPA President Michael McDonald if someone from the other side of the debate might be allowed an opportunity to respond to the report in the CPA Newsletter of March, 1992. Saying that "procedures that are fair and encourage informed debate" had been followed, he rejected this request. He apparently thought that having a panel discussion

at the annual meeting a day before the vote and making available a single copy of the correspondence to the committee, to be read at the registration desk, was sufficient for fair and informed debate.

The CPA Meeting

The panel discussion took place on Monday, May 25, 1992, followed by a question period. Several noted that there seemed to be an unusual number of female graduate students, particularly from the University of Toronto, considering the remote location. An example of how some of them viewed the issue is this: "I think of my friend Glen and my friend Mike, and I wonder what is going to happen to them if this policy is adopted. But then I consider that men have been in a dominant position for the past 2000 years, and I realize that they will just have to stand aside now." (Such is the philosophical insight from some to be hired under the recommendations of the Report.) Some commented by hissing and booing (especially at women who opposed the recommendations) or cheering, as some also did at the Annual General Meeting.

Motion For Preferential Hiring of Women

The Annual General Meeting was held the next day, with a separate session for the vote. Prof. Kathryn Okruhlik clarified the motion and summarized the written responses to the Report as being evenly divided between Pro and Con. (She counted only the number of letters received, not the number of signatories. For example, twenty-one graduate students from the University of Waterloo signed a letter opposing the recommendations, while eight from the University of Alberta signed one supporting them, but she counted each letter as only one response.)

Prof. Okruhlik moved a version of the recommendations of the Report, seconded by S. Sherwin. Prof. Jan Narveson's motion to table it on the ground that it violated the mandate of the CPA was defeated. A call for a mail ballot was rejected, the Chair reporting that the CPA lawyer had advised the Executive that the assembly could not choose a mail ballot. (No one challenged this ruling, although Article 5.02(f) of the CPA Constitution clearly allows for this: "Voting shall be by show of hands unless the Meeting decides otherwise.") The final motion was:

- 1) That by the year 2000, at least one-quarter of permanent or probationary faculty in any unit be female, and by the year 2010 at least three-eighths be female.
- 2) That in any decade in any Department, at least fifty percent of permanent or probationary positions be filled by women over the next twenty-five years.
- 3) That the CPA urge Departments to give priority

to #1 as a target and to increase the fifty percent hiring ratio where required and possible.

Hiring by Merit Openly Rejected

I [JW] argued that the only rationale for the motion seemed to be that in the past women had not been judged solely on their merits, so that the motion should be amended to read simply that all hiring is to be done by merit, deleting the clauses of the original motion. I moved this, seconded by Prof. Narveson, but the amendment was ruled out of order. When I then asked if this amendment was considered as contrary to the intent of the main motion and whether the main motion was to be interpreted to mean that philosophy departments were not to hire solely on the basis of merit, Prof. Okruhlik agreed with my interpretation of the motion.

Secret Ballot Not Politically Correct

Prof. Christopher Gray, seconded by Prof. D. Ross, moved for a secret ballot. After the Chair ruled that debate on this secondary motion was not permitted by the rules of Code Morin, the motion was defeated by show of hands 56 for, 66 against. To repeat: a plurality of those at the 1992 Annual General Meeting of the CPA, including specialists in moral philosophy, rejected a secret ballot.

The Chair's ruling was successfully challenged, so the vote was set aside and debate ensued. The opposition voiced to a secret ballot (mainly, it seemed, by some female graduate students) was that people should be held to account for how they vote. "If your conscience won't allow you to vote openly against the motion, then perhaps your conscience is telling you something." Someone noted that the principle of the secret ballot is a cornerstone of democracy and that the only place where public voting is appropriately required is in representative legislative assemblies, where the public has the right to know how their representatives vote. The motion was eventually carried by the new vote, 85 for, 18 against, 14 abstentions.

Motion Passes: Is It Reversible by Mail Ballot?

The main motion was voted on by secret ballot, 91 for, 45 against, with 4 abstentions, so the motion carried. Note that those attending and voting were a small percentage of the membership of the CPA, and an even smaller percentage of philosophers in Canada. In fact, many who opposed the policy told me [GB] that they were not going to go to the annual conference because of the antagonistic atmosphere expected there. This itself indicates the growing climate of fear and intimidation.

Prof. Jan Narveson then moved that the executive formulate an amendment to the Constitution of the CPA to allow mail ballots. This motion was approved and the amendment will be voted on at the next Annual General Meeting. It is hoped that a motion to rescind the hiring policy can be placed on the agenda for the meeting in 1993. [A longer version of this article is available from G. A. Brown, Univ. Lethbridge. Ed.]

References

G. A. Brown, Author, Fac. of Management, Univ. of Lethbridge, "A Critique of the Report to the C.P.A. from the Committee to Study Hiring Policies Affecting Women."

Graeme Hunter, Author, Dept. Philosophy, Univ. of Ottawa, "The Feminist Hijacking of Public Space: Canadian Case Study."

Paul R. Gross, "On the 'Gendering' of Science," Academic Questions, Spring, 1992

Joan Harrison, "The New Feminism: Harbinger of Totalitarianism?" Measure, September 1991.

Irvine, A. D., Dept. Philosophy, Univ. British Columbia: "Jack & Jill and employment equity."

Jan Narveson, Author, Dept. Philosophy, Univ. of Waterloo, "Forced Affirmative Action."

Ryten, E., Assoc. Can. Med. Colleges, Ottawa: "Women in academic medicine in Canada: Are women subject to discrimination?"

Joseph S. Salemi, "Political Correctness at Dallas Baptist University: The Firing of David Ayers and John Jeffrey," Measure, Aug.-Sept. 1992

Thomas Sowell, Preferential Policies: An International Perspective.

Judy Wubnig, "The Rule of Ignorance in the United States & Canada," Measure, March, 1991.

Two informative publications: *Academic Questions* (National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing St., Princeton, NJ 08540 Princeton, New Jersey), and *Measure* (University Centers for Rational Alternatives, 570 Seventh Ave, New York, N.Y. 10018).

The NAS has Samizdat-On-Line:

Electronic Bulletin Board: Modem: 607-797-9296

EMail between individuals, for private messages

EMail for user networks, e.g. NAS Affiliates,

Campus Chapters, Disciplinary Subsections

Bulletins posted in a Public Forum, for general

information and user commentary.

To NAS: Bulletin Board, ID "NAS"

John Schepp, Box 2562, Binghamton, NY 13902 (607-797-3225 (voice) or 797-9296 (modem))

Members: Let SAFS know if you are willing to let your name be public.

If you would like to join the SAFS, please detach and return this coupon to:

**Society for Academic Freedom &
Scholarship**
**152 Albert St., Unit 12, London,
Ont. N6A 1M1**

Please enclose a check for \$20 (faculty) or \$10 (students).

Name: _____

Address: _____

Institution: _____

Department: _____

Tel.: _____

FAX: _____

E-Mail: _____
