

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship NEWSLETTER

Number 3

April 1993

This is the third 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.

Call for NOMINATIONS: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

We have five directors at present, but Dave Ankney will be stepping down, and we can have as many as seven directors. Dave was one of the founding members, and we will miss him on the Board, but he will continue to support the Society as a regular member. The Board of Directors, in accordance with our bylaws, will choose the new President when Doreen Kimura's resignation becomes effective at the beginning of May. Please send suggestions for added Board members, along with your renewal cheque and with any specifications concerning the inclusion of your name in the proposed directory of members. (See p. 7 for important information.)

The University in Jeopardy Toronto Conference, March 12, 1993 by Judy Wubnig

The SAFS and the Fraser Institute sponsored a conference on *The University In Jeopardy* March 12, 1993 at the Royal York Hotel in Toronto, the National Association of Scholars co-sponsoring Dinesh D'Souza. About 175 people attended, including those from the media. After opening remarks by Michael A. Walker of the Fraser Institute, Doreen Kimura, President of the SAFS, University of Western Ontario (UWO), said that the conference had been organized to consider the threats to academic freedom and scholarship from non-academic policies and referred to

two cases at Western (see pp. 3-6). Whatever their original intent, they can and have been abused. "If we achieve these goals at the expense of freedom of speech, then the cost will have been too high."

Constraints on Academic Freedom from Non-Academic Policies

John Furedy, University of Toronto, talked about how an Iron Curtain of Political Correctness is falling in North American Universities. He described what he called the "Purity Platoon" at the U of T (Presidential Advisory Committee on Race Relations and Anti-Racism Initiatives) which is moving towards imposing restrictions on behavior and speech going beyond criminal and civil laws. At the time when universities are suffering from financial problems, \$100,000 has been allocated to this committee with increases planned.¹ He warned, "Unless senior faculty stir from their apathy, within a generation the new Iron Curtain will be firmly in place, and the notion that universities pursue free inquiry will be as empty as the notion that the former German Democratic Republic had anything to do with democracy."

Michael Walker gave a talk on the media prepared by Lydia Miljan, based on data from National Media Archive. He described the Archive, which collects information about coverage in all the media. He said that 75 per cent of Canadians get their news from television. What is newsworthy for journalists is the unusual so that, from 1988 to 1992, every tv show about universities dealt with sexual deviance, not with academic achievement and scholarship, which one expects at universities.

Jan Narveson, University of Waterloo, stressed that the university is an institution to promote human knowledge. The pursuit of truth, he pointed out, can sometimes be contrary to political agendas of the

¹ See John Furedy, "Academic Freedom At Risk At U.T." SAFS Newsletter, May 1992. At the University of Waterloo in the fall of 1992, the new position of Coordinator Ethical Behavior/Human Relations was established, at a salary of \$45,000 - 50,000 plus supporting services. (This is in addition to a Sexual Harassment Officer, an Advisor on Academic Human Resources, and an Ombudsperson.) At the same time, for financial reasons, the library is cutting back on purchases and letting staff go, and the Department of Dance has been abolished.

greater community. "The academic subordinates himself completely to the goal of truth." He criticized "equity" policies, which interfere directly with academic criteria and indirectly by taking scarce university resources for non-academic purposes of maintaining offices of equity. He said that universities should oppose government initiated policies designed to "maximize secure jobs for bureaucrats."

Fred Wilson, Past President CAUT (Canadian Association of Teachers), U of T, in the question period said that university Faculty Associations, the Ontario Confederation of University Teachers (OCUFA), and CAUT are more than adequate to defend the academic freedom. Heinz-Joachim Klatt, King's College, UWO, replied that he had had no help at all from these organizations when accused of sexual harassment.²

Dinesh D'Souza

The American Experience: Bogus Multiculturalism

Judy Wubnig chaired the session with Dinesh D'Souza, John M. Olin Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, author of *Illiberal Education*, on "The American Experience." She took the opportunity to plug for free speech against the Newspeak and announced that she was chairman of the session, proud to be a member of the family of man, since man is a rational animal!

D'Souza spoke about "bogus multiculturalism" being taught at many American universities. He said that although many universities now emphasize non-western cultures, what is taught is frequently inaccurate. D'Souza, originally from India, said that he has heard American professors describe an India that

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

² The Faculty Association of King's College (not the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association) forwarded Klatt's files on to the CAUT requesting advice. The CAUT replied that there was not much it could do to help except to advise him to go to court if he wanted money. Klatt received no reply from OCUFA for his request for help.

he does not recognize. Those pushing for what they call "multiculturalism" do so in the context of attacking western civilization as racist and sexist. This conflicts with the fact that many non-western cultures have poor traditions of racial equality and treatment of women, so that the "multicultural" courses are inaccurate, selecting atypical individuals whose political views are those of the "multiculturalists."

The courses tend to be based on the politics of the race and sex of professors rather than on finding out about non-western cultures. This is antithetical to liberal education, which is to learn to navigate around boundaries of race and culture, learning from each other as Martin Luther King did from Mahatma Gandhi.⁴ D'Souza argued that colleges and universities cannot abolish discrimination on the basis of race, sex, etc., by institutionalizing new forms of it. He concluded that although these issues need to be discussed seriously, it has become very difficult to do so because those who disagree about "multiculturalism," "diversity," and the like are called "racist" and similar epithets. He pleaded for civility in discourse with those with whom one disagrees.

Erosion of Standards by Employment Equity Policies

Grant Brown, University of Lethbridge gave a statistical analysis of hiring trends at Canadian universities since 1986, based on publicly available sources. He held that there is systematic discrimination against men. Women were twice as likely to be hired as men. At the University of Western Ontario, for example, in 1991-92, 37 of 333 female applicants for academic appointments were hired (11.1 % success rate) compared to 56 of 953 male applicants (5.9 %); at the University of Alberta, from 1988-90, 53 of 464 female applicants were hired (11.4%), while 117 of 2019 male applicants were hired (5.8 %). Some institutions, the University of Victoria, Ontario College of Art, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, and St. Lawrence College, recently began to exclude male candidates totally from consideration. Brown concluded that Canadian universities are "a bastion of sexism - anti-male sexism."

Ruth Gruhn, President, Association of Concerned Academics, University of Alberta, argued that

³ See D'Souza's account of L. Rigoberta Menchu, a text in a new requirement at Stanford University called "Cultures, Ideas, and Values", replacing the Western civilization core curriculum. It is the life story of a Mayan Indian woman from Guatamala supposed to be speaking for all Indians of the Americas, as told to Elizabeth Burgos-Debray. They met in Paris at a socialist conference - hardly a place where a traditional Indian peasant would be found!

⁴ Gandhi himself learned from the American Henry David Thoreau and the Russian Leo Tolstoy, among others. JW

preferential policies of hiring women on the basis of their sex, far from raising their status, lower it by placing all women academics under the cloud of not really being good enough to be hired on merit. The status of male academics will increase, because if a man is hired, he will have to be very much better than any woman applicant. She said that the real barrier to higher education and academic careers is economic. The expense of a university education and the absence of adequate scholarship and bursaries make it impossible for many of both sexes to pursue graduate studies. University money used for government-imposed Employment Equity programs could be better used for supporting students.

Concluding Roundtable and Floor Discussion

Doreen Kimura commented on the fallacy of equity policies not taking into account the pool of qualified applicants. Fred Wilson argued that the equity policies are only intended to give women a fair shake; Scott Bradley, President of the University Students' council at Western said that "we're not providing opportunities for people who need them."

A female student from Brock University said that sexual harassment policies discriminate against men. Brock's sexual harassment officer, Ann Bowen, replied that all allegations of sexual harassment against men and women are investigated with equal vigor, and most are dealt with confidentially. Judy Wubnig commented that the very position of "Sexual harassment Officer", to police the behavior of adult men and women, was presumptuous and tyrannical. No such office had ever been necessary in the colleges and universities she had attended nor, until very recently, had any been deemed necessary.

John Crispo, U of T, on the CBC Board of directors, commenting on Lydia Miljan's paper on the media, urged people to file complaints about unfairness or unbalanced coverage with the CBC Ombudsman. Michael Walker said that the CBC Ombudsman has used the resources of the National Media Archive, the only one of its kind in Canada.

Two Case Studies of Attacks on Academic Freedom from Non-Academic Policies by Judy Wubnig

The morning session of the conference in Toronto was devoted to the issue of Constraints on Academic Freedom from Non-Academic Policies. Doreen Kimura referred to two cases at the University of Western Ontario, those of Professors Heinz-Joachim Klatt and of Marjorie Ratcliffe. Professor Klatt was accused of sexual harassment of students and Professor Ratcliffe of racism, both on the basis of what they had said in

class. In both cases, the students who brought the complaints were doing poorly in the course. Both cases have taken about two years to resolve, with both professors completely exonerated. That either case was taken seriously seems like a routine from the Marx Brothers; instead, alas, they formed the occasion for persecutions like those of twentieth century tyrannies following the views of the other Marx, Karl. The presumption that judgments about effective methods of teaching are to be made in quasi-judicial criminal proceedings, by Race Relations, Sexual Harassment, or other officials, reveals how anti-rational, how contrary to the pursuit of knowledge and education such policies are. Instead, like all attempts at thought-control by intimidation, they encourage vices like malice, dishonesty, and opportunism, and they discourage the pursuit of knowledge.

(1) On April 16, 1991, Professor Heinz-Joachim Klatt, professor of psychology, King's College, UWO, was accused of sexual harassment by some students under the *Policies and Procedures Concerning Sexual Harassment*. They wrote a letter to the Chairperson of Psychology complaining that in his course in Child Psychology,

Professor Klatt used the example of women's breast size as an analogy [for learning disabilities]. He used words such as 'perky,' 'exuberant,' 'bodacious,' This example falls squarely into the definition of sexual harassment . . . 'sexually oriented remarks including sexist remarks, and/or behavior which might reasonably be perceived to **create a negative psychological environment for work or study.** . . .' [Emphasis Ed.] It is common knowledge that Professor Klatt has been getting away with these violations for years. . . . Another example of Professor Klatt's sexist remarks in the classroom was illustrated in the first two weeks of class when he gave a student the pet name of 'Lucky ---- . . . gross lack of professional conduct.

The letter was written by two women students **after** twelve signatures had been obtained on an empty sheet of paper immediately after the final examination. One signature was that of a student who had never taken any of Professor Klatt's courses. The average course grade of the students was 54.9 per cent.

Professor Klatt first learned in a letter from Principal Philip Mueller of June 18, 1991, that he had been accused of sexual harassment and that he had been indicted by Harassment Officers Drs. Camiletti and Jaco on June 4, 1991, who judged the accusations to be so serious that they recommended that they be "thoroughly investigated" by "formal administrative

action" instead of mediation.⁵ Principal Mueller said that formal administrative action was being taken, and that he was delegating his authority in this case to an *ad hoc* committee which would have the power to decide on "complete exoneration of the respondent to severe disciplinary action, including dismissal and/or expulsion."

Dr. Douglas R. Letson, President of St. Jerome's College, University of Waterloo, was then appointed the sole arbitrator.⁶ Letson based his report on, among other things, taped confidential interviews with a number of persons. Klatt, in other words, had to defend himself against secret testimony from witnesses, among whom were the dean, the current and former chairpersons of psychology at King's, two secretaries, and the registrar!⁷ Klatt was never confronted by his accusers nor by the testimony. On October 22, 1991, the College lawyer, Mr. Nash, sent the Chairman of the Board, Mr. S. Stefanko (in effect the second sole arbitrator) and Klatt's lawyer a copy of Letson's report, which recommended that Klatt be exonerated. Not until eight months later, however, in a letter of June 24, 1992, did Principal Mueller inform Klatt that the College had decided that he had not engaged in sexual harassment in his Child Psychology course in 1990-91.

Typical of this investigation into the very words a professor used was the charge that his calling a student named "Lucretia" "Lucky-Lucy" was "sexual harassment." The student herself, in a letter of June 28, 1991, denied this and found it "humorous and almost privileged [sic] to have a professor taking an interest in my name and character." She was particularly angry that her name had been used in the petition despite her having told the authors of her total disagreement with it. She praised Dr. Klatt as a professor and found the allegations against him "totally ludicrous." King's College, however, trapped in the quicksands of "Sexual Harassment" policies, took fourteen months (the policy allows for five weeks) to discover what Lucky-Lucy (and twenty three other students who were witnesses on behalf of Professor

⁵ The minutes of a meeting of Drs. Camiletti and Jaco with four female students included the following judgment: "We [Camiletti and Jaco] found that while no incident in itself would likely be considered serious sexual harassment, an accumulation of such incidents over the year in the classroom and in the office amounted to sexual harassment in which a **negative psychological environment for study was created for the students of Psychology 140.**" [Emphasis Ed.]

⁶ There seem to have been three later "sole arbitrators"

⁷ See Michael Platt, "Will Academe Teach America, or America Teach Academe?" on the curious institutions that have been developed in universities contrary to all common sense and principles of American justice. *Measure*, January 1993.

Klatt) knew and what anyone with common sense would have known, that the allegations were ludicrous. (In any case, serious students of Child Psychology dissatisfied with a course would try to learn about it by taking other courses, reading, and the like, not by making criminal charges against the professor.)

In March 1993 Professor Klatt settled with the College for a year of leave with pay and reimbursement of legal expenses with interest, in return for which Klatt would not pursue legal proceedings against the college or the accusing students. He also refused to agree to being muzzled.

(2) Professor Marjorie Ratcliffe, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, University of Western Ontario, was accused by a student in her Spanish course of racial harassment under the University's Race Relations Policy. The student complained to the Race Relations Office on December 6, 1991, the day he had received a midterm grade of 62% and he lodged a formal complaint in late January 1992, after he had learned that he could not be assigned to a new professor. The case was eventually brought before an *ad hoc* Human Relations Tribunal, described as "Re *Madhavarau v. Ratcliffe*" by Professor David Mullan, Faculty of Law, Queen's University, hired by President Pedersen October 2, 1992, to investigate the proceedings. The Race Relations Officer, Ms. Leela MadhavaRau, made four charges against Professor Ratcliffe. The relief sought by the complainant was: "(1) A letter of apology directed to the comp.; (2) The respondent (Professor Ratcliffe) receive a directive from the Tribunal to attend a workshop on cross-cultural communication. . . ." (*UWOFA Review*, January 1993, p. 5.) The student was allowed to withdraw from the University after the date for dropping courses without academic penalty and was helped to recover some of his tuition fee.

The UWO Faculty Association has been involved since January 1992. The case was brought to a Human Relations Tribunal consisting of one external adjudicator, Professor Emily Carasco of the Faculty of Law, University of Windsor, since there was no standing Human Relations Tribunal. On June 19, 1992, six months after the original complaint had been lodged, K. George Pedersen, President of the University of Western Ontario, sent the report of the adjudicator to Professor Ratcliffe, which exonerated her, and on July 27, 1992 sent her a letter saying that the case was dismissed. On July 31, 1992 Professor Ratcliffe wrote President Pedersen requesting redress, including a review of the Race Relations Policy, an apology, legal fees and damages. September 28, 1992 the UWOFA wrote President Pedersen supporting

Professor Ratcliffe's request, and on October 13, 1992, a General Meeting of the UWOFA passed a resolution to "rescind and review the Race Relations Policy." On March 5, 1993 President Pedersen wrote that the University would reimburse her for legal costs and the airfare for flying a witness to the Race Relations hearing held in April 1992, that a Committee had been struck to review the Race Relations Policy, and that the letter itself was an expression of regret; however, these three points would hold only if Professor Ratcliffe would execute a full and final release in a form satisfactory to the University Counsel. Professor Ratcliffe was not satisfied; she wanted redress for the pain and suffering she had undergone, and since the affair had deprived her of research time, she wanted an equal amount of leave with pay to restore her to the position she had been in January 1992. At the April 1993 UWOFA meeting, President E.L. Medzon reported that the Executive was still discussing the matter with President Pedersen to resolve outstanding issues. Two issues of the *UWOFA Review*, January and March 1993, vol. 25, nos. 2-3, have covered the case in some detail.

The allegation of "racism" was based on one statement, according to Professor Ratcliffe. In her words: "I corrected his repeated misuse of the verb condenar (to condemn) to translate each of the words convert, consisting, conversion and consider in a translation class. Rather than provide the direct English equivalent, I proceeded by analogy and example, saying (in Spanish), "As you said [student's name]: In [student's country of origin] they condemn everyone." This referred to an earlier statement he had volunteered in class concerning his country of origin when we were discussing problems arising when translating for refugees who have suffered persecution in their countries. The phrase was his, not mine. I was merely repeating his words to make the correction more relevant. There was no intentional or 'inadvertent' racism or 'insensitivity' on my part." (*UWOFA Review*, January 1993, p. 20.)

There were numerous violations of procedure, in part resulting from the fact that the Race Relations Officer served as mediator, complainant's advocate, and judge for deciding whether there was a *prima facie* case for a formal hearing. The President requested Professor Mullan to review the evidence presented to the Tribunal (1) to determine whether the University's policy on Race Relations and Human Relations Tribunal procedures had been followed, (2) to advise whether the proceedings met the standard of fairness and, if not, to assess the source of flaws, (3) to examine the charges set out in Professor Ratcliffe's letter of July 31, 1992, and (4) to provide any observations related to Professor Ratcliffe's complaint to assist in

responding to her. Professor Mullan was not a mutually-agreed-on referee, but chosen by the President over Professor Ratcliffe's objections. He agreed to his report's being made public only if the terms of reference were published with it. The report said, in part:

In my judgment, the conduct of the actual hearing into the allegations made by The Complainant against Professor Ratcliffe, not only observed the procedures laid down in the relevant rules but also was more than adequate to meet the standards of procedural fairness required by Canadian common law. . . . I do, however, have serious concerns with the way in which this particular matter reached the hearing stage. . . . the multiplicity of functions fulfilled under the present policy by the Race Relations Officer compromises that person's ability to act as a mediator of complaints particularly when, at the same time, she is the person charged with deciding whether there is a *prima facie* case against a respondent as to justify a formal hearing into a complaint. . . . (Mullan Report, Nov. 16, 1992, *Ibid.*, p. 13)

Professor Ratcliffe, on receipt of the report and an accompanying letter by President Pedersen, replied in some detail. She objected to Professor Mullan's having been hired, since his terms of reference were "confined to narrow legalistic and procedural matters and did not include wider issues such as academic freedom. It was for this reason that I recommended that an eminent scholar, not a lawyer, review the case." She said that she did not know what written or oral instructions had been given to Mullan, what documents he saw, or if he provided any interim reports. He had not interviewed her. "The unfortunate title of his report 'MadhavaRau v. Ratcliffe,' could be construed as an example of the attitude he brought to his task." (Letter to President Pedersen, Jan. 28, 1993, *Ibid.*, p. 19.)

This case, like the Klatt case, shows the foolishness of Race Relations policies which deal with racial relations by quasi-judicial criminal procedures, making thoughts, words and other undefined behavior crimes. The complainant demanded that a professor of Spanish "attend a workshop on cross-cultural communication," although it was he who was having difficulty learning a foreign language - Spanish! Who are the putative experts to run such a workshop? What are their qualifications supposed to be? In fact, university education is "cross-cultural communication," based on the view that man is a rational animal with the capacity to reason "trans-culturally." The natural sciences, mathematics, psychology, social sciences, history, the humanities, including languages, are all "cross-

cultural.” The presumption of Race Relations policies, Sexual Harassment policies, and similar ones, is that it is impossible to learn by reasoning, that instead ideas must be imposed on people by laws - intimidation.

Professor Ratcliffe is courageous to have fought her accusers. Apparently, many have been accused by the Race Relations Officer at UWO of “racism” and “racial harassment,” but Professor Ratcliffe was the only one who had to appear before a Human Relations Tribunal. How many who were equally innocent (whatever that means in this context) acquiesced and wrote an “apology” rather than suffer the horrors of a tribunal?⁸

The Ontario Women’s Directorate: Dictating How to Speak the Queen’s English by Judy Wubnig

George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, written in nineteen forty-eight, was a satire of tendencies among British socialists sympathetic to Soviet Communism. A feature of this nightmare utopia was the control of language, invented in order to control thought. Orwell coined such useful terms as “newspeak” and “history rewrite.”

Orwell knew what he was talking about. The ever-increasing attacks on free speech in the United States and Canada since the nineteen sixties have extended even to the very words we use. They are attempts to control thought by controlling language, waged by those with the Marxist view that our ideas are solely a reflection of physical states and never the result of reasoning.⁹ Marx and Engels themselves thought that ideas reflect only the physical state of labour, economic classes being determined by the conditions of labour and always occurring as pairs of opponents, the exploiters and exploited. (In Communist regimes ideas are those of the “capitalist” or “bourgeois” and the “proletariat” classes.) According to the recent versions of this view, the physical states reflected in ideas are those of race (“Aryan and Non-Aryan,” “White and Non-White,”), ancestry (“European and Non-European”), appearance (“Visible Majority and Visible Minority”) and sex (“Male and Female”). Language, according to this view, only reflects these ideas. The formula is that of Good versus Evil, in the modern

⁸ See Henry H., Bauer, “Lessons from the Mandelstamm Case,” *Academic Questions*, Spring 1992, on the case of Allan Mandelstamm at Virginia Polytechnic Institute who was the only one of twenty professors who refused to accept a reprimand from the VPI Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EO/AA) office on the charge of “sexual harassment.”

⁹ See, for example, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The German Ideology.

dress of Oppressed versus Oppressor; all who disagree with the politically correct Robespierres are Evil and must be forced to be Good, “re-educated” even about their native language. The attacks on language by these varieties of Marxists are an attempt to control thought although that contradicts their theory of ideas.

The Ontario government agency named the “Ontario Women’s Directorate” could have come right out of Orwell’s satire, name and all. It has recently published a pamphlet - at the taxpayers’ expense - telling us benighted ones how we are to speak English, native language speakers though we be, the language of Shakespeare, John Locke, Abraham Lincoln, John Stuart Mill, Jane Austen, Virginia Woolf, Agatha Christie, Queen Elizabeth I, Queen Victoria, et al. C. F. MacRae, retired professor of English at the University of Waterloo, comments.

Jack Was Every Inch A Sailor
[Newfoundland Folk Song]
(But Jill, Who Crewed For Him, Was A Sailoress)
by C. F. MacRae

Words that Count Women Out In. [Manager, Speeches and Information, Ontario Women’s Directorate, 12th Fl., 2 Carleton St., Toronto, Ont., M5B 2M9: Tel. (416) 314 - 0300]

Words that Count Women Out In begins by quoting the beginning of “O Canada,” down to the words “in all thy sons command,” and comments:

Picture two children singing these lyrics - a girl and a boy. . . . The boy sees countless males like himself, all standing on guard for their country. . . . The girl is not so lucky. Since our national anthem says nothing about daughters, she can’t help wondering whether it applies to her.

Since I am a man, I have no direct knowledge about all this; but I have been a child, and therefore I am not convinced that such images take a very prominent place in either of these two minds.

That is on the assumption that the hypothetical girl has not been indoctrinated. Years ago I was talking with a sociologist about a socio-ethnic problem about which we were both concerned. I put the question: “Do these people feel downtrodden and oppressed because they feel downtrodden and oppressed or because other people keep telling them that they feel downtrodden and oppressed?” His answer - which was, I believe, admittedly off-the-cuff and not the result of careful thought - was that the second factor certainly did exist and ought to be taken into consideration.

On page 12 *Words*. . . quotes an Andre Dubus: "a male nurse and a doctor had saved my life. . . ." and follows the quotation with this comment: "Female nurses save lives too. But this sentence by identifying the nurse's sex, portrays heroism as a male trait." Is it true that this form of words makes "heroism" solely a male trait? Some males, of course, do display heroism. So do some women. Ever hear of Florence Nightingale or Grace Darling? Indeed, Gilbert Chesterton once wrote to this effect: "Every man alive on this earth is a walking testimonial to the valour of a woman."

In any case, what is the relevance of the word "heroism" to this incident, whatever it may have been? If a soldier, or a sailor, or a fireman saves a life, heroism may well be needed; but when a doctor, with the help of a nurse, saves a life, heroism does not ordinarily come into it. The qualities needed would include knowledge, skill, experience, and perseverance.

On page 11 there is this passage:

At a high school commencement ceremony, a teacher hands a male graduate his award. "This fine young man is an inspiration to his classmates," she declares. Then the teacher honours his female classmate. She is called "a spunky little lady, a joy to us all."

Which prizewinner sounds more impressive? The male graduate - no contest. "Inspiration" connotes action and leadership, while "joy to us all" connotes the supposedly feminine virtues of kindness and good humour.

Questions arise. Where and when did this happen, and in what context? Or is it a fictional reconstruction of what is supposed to happen? More important, does "inspiration" necessarily connote action and leadership, or does it connote a tired cliché and a boring stereotype? It is arguable that the young woman has got the better deal.

References

- Henry H. Bauer, "Lessons from the Mandelstamm Case," *Academic Questions*, Spring 1992.
 G. A. Brown, Author, Fac.of Management, Univ.of Lethbridge, "The Employment Equity Empress Has No Clothes."

 (OED: 'Man' (Old English) - generic term for homo sapiens, probably originally meant 'one who thinks' from the Indo-European base *men 'to think', whence also OI 'mathi', 'máthi' - thought

- Dinesh D'Souza, Illiberal Education
 Michael Platt, "Will Academe Teach America, or America Teach Academe?" *Measure*, January 1993.
 Christine Sommers, "A Sisterhood of Scholars?" *Measure*, January, 1993.
 Thomas Sowell, Inside American Education. *UWOFA Review*, University of Western Ontario Faculty Association, January 1993 and March 1993, vol 25, nos. 2 and 3.
Academic Questions (National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing St., Princeton, NJ 08540)
Measure (University Centers for Rational Alternatives, 570 Seventh Ave, New York, N.Y. 10018).

NAS Samizdat-On-Line:

Electronic Bulletin Board: Modem: 607-797-9296
 EMail for private messages, user networks, Public Forum for general information and commentary.
 NAS: Bulletin Board, ID "NAS": John Schepp, Box 2562, Binghamton, NY 13902 (607-797-3225 (voice) or 797-9296 (modem))

Membership Renewal

Our membership is now well over 200, but we need your continuing support if we are to fund the Newsletter, and the occasional advertising and campaign costs of the Society, as well as special events like the recent University in Jeopardy conference. Please send your renewal cheque to the Society's address without further individual solicitation to save time, clerical costs and stamps. If you joined in Nov/Dec 1992 or in 1993, you are recorded as having paid dues for 1993. We apologise for not having sent receipts for 1992, but we have such limited resources that this became a low priority. However, receipts will be sent for 1993, and for those who belonged in 1992, the amount will reflect the dues for two years combined. Please be sure to update your membership record when you renew, including work and home address and telephone numbers, fax number, e - mail address, etc. We urge you to do what you can to recruit new members.

Directory of SAFS Members:

Many members would like to know who their fellow-members are. At the beginning, some were sensitive about making their membership public, but probably most have gotten over this stage. It is now essential that members have some information about other members in order to form local chapters, decide on directors, etc. We are preparing a membership directory which will include all members' names, unless you specifically ask us not to include yours.

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 (general) or \$10
(students).

Name: _____

Address: _____

Institution: _____

Department: _____

Tel.: _____

FAX: _____

E-Mail: _____
