

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship

Number 9 ————— NEWSLETTER ————— January 1995

Purposes of SAFS

1. Maintaining freedom in teaching, research and scholarship.
2. Maintaining standards of excellence in hiring and promotion of university faculty.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Donner Canadian Foundation Funds SAFS

I am happy to report that a research grant application to the Donner Canadian Foundation has been successful.

The Donner provides support for studies of aspects of Canadian life. Following valuable advice from a number of SAFS members, I submitted an application entitled "Academic Issues in Current Canadian Higher Education: Debate, Scholarship and Advocacy" in mid-1994. The application requested a grant of \$95,000 per annum for three years, with the main budgetary components being: (a) communication and travel funds for conferences, workshops, debate, and scholarship on Canadian academic issues; (b) 50% release time from teaching duties for the president to initiate outreach; and (c) a half-time secretary for these developmental activities. The amount granted was \$70,000 per annum for three years, starting January, 1995. The grant will be administered by the University of Toronto, and they have deducted 5% (i.e., \$3,500 per annum) for overhead expenses, leaving \$66,500 for SAFS. The reduction in the amount granted will mean that some of the activities in connection with (a) conferences etc. will be scaled down.

Of course, even with the cut in the budget, the grant is

great news, mainly because it indicates that SAFS' concerns with freedom of speech and merit in evaluation in institutions of higher education are being taken seriously. It is vital, however, to recognize that the grant is not a subsidy for SAFS as an organization. The Society remains completely dependent for its well-being on an *expanding* and *paid-up* membership. Members who join and then neglect to send in their annual fees for reasons of forgetfulness cause serious financial problems for SAFS. So please, I ask all members to redouble their efforts to recruit other members, and to ensure that all pay their annual membership dues without the need for us to "chase" forgetful members. We would rather spend our time fighting the forces of velvet totalitarianism in Canadian academia.

Although there are encouraging signs that the tide may be turning, let us not make the mistake of thinking that it will continue to turn "spontaneously". There are too many vested interests such as the multi-layered equity-commissar bureaucracies that have sprung up on Canadian campuses who will take advantage of complacency on the part of individuals who wrongly think the fight is over: it has barely begun.

Who is a Racist?

"Racism is the treatment of an individual in terms of the individual's racial identity, based on average race differences", so "those with power who advocate and implement discriminatory (so-called 'affirmative action') policies – the academic apartheid administrators of the modern 'diverse' university – are racists."

John J. Furedy, Book Review entitled *Race Studies: Contentious but legitimate science*, *Toronto Star*, December 10, 1994.

Membership renewals due!! For details see back page and enclosed Membership Form.

REPORT ON THE CONFERENCE "WHEN RIGHTS COLLIDE"

UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK,
SEPTEMBER 27 & 28, 1994

David Murrell, University of New Brunswick

Readers will recall that, in November 1993, University of New Brunswick (UNB) mathematics professor Matin Yaqzan was suspended for writing an opinion article in *The Brunswickan*, the student newspaper. At the time, the Administration stated that it found evidence that the opinion piece violated the university's sexual harassment policy. Professor Yaqzan was suspended, although he was later reinstated. The SAFS' Board of Directors protested the action against Yaqzan with press releases and communications to the UNB Administration and the CAUT. SAFS' president, John Furedy, debated the issue on television programs. (See *Newsletter* no. 5, December 1993, for SAFS' Board statement and the report, "Matin Yaqzan and the UNB Administration").

After much debate, and through negotiations with the local faculty union, the University announced an agreement under which Professor Yaqzan took early retirement at full pay. At the same time, a conference to explore issues of free speech and sexual harassment at universities was planned.

This conference, entitled "When Rights Collide," took place on Wednesday evening, September 28, and Thursday, September 29, 1994, and was attended by about 300 people. This article briefly reports and comments on the proceedings.

The conference started off with an welcoming introduction by university president, Robin Armstrong. The president tried to be inoffensive and neutral -- as university presidents are wont to do when commenting on issues of controversy. But for all the blandness, he did claim that there is a legitimate trade-off between individual freedom and collective rights. He also claimed that it is acceptable to define people not only as individuals, but also in terms of collective groups. (In this he echoed the view of his vice-president academic, Tom Traves, who had been the administrative

spokesman for Yaqzan's suspension. Announcing the conference in *The Brunswickan*, Traves wrote that the university today "houses a more diverse student body defined by such categories as age, ethnicity, and gender"').

Civil libertarian Alan Borovoy, chief counsel for the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, gave the keynote address on Wednesday evening. He defended free speech in a tough, sharply articulated manner. He stated that free speech is the foundation on which other freedoms are built; it *protects* other freedoms. Free speech, for example, helped to remove barriers to allow more Jews to enter universities in the 1930s, and to break up southern-based segregation of blacks in the 1950s.

He dismissed as false arguments put forward against free speech. He criticized "anti-hate" codes; "trade-offs of free-speech and equality"; the "legitimization of trade-

SAFS Board of Directors (1994/95)

John Furedy, Ph. D. (U. Toronto) *President*
Doreen Kimura, Ph. D. FRSC (UWO) *Past President*
Philip Davis, Ph. D. (UPEI)
Jack Granatstein, Ph. D. FRSC (York U.)
Ruth Gruhn, Ph. D. (U. Alberta)
Philip Sullivan, Ph. D. (U. Toronto)
Judy Wubnig, Ph. D. (U. Waterloo)

Address

THE SOCIETY FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM &
SCHOLARSHIP
Box 581 Station 'P'
704 Spadina Ave
Toronto ON M5S 2T1

E-mail addresses (Board Members)

John Furedy	furedy@psych.utoronto.ca
Doreen Kimura	dkimura@uwovax.uwo.ca
Philip Davis	davis@upei.ca
Jack Granatstein	jgranat@vm1.yorku.ca
Ruth Gruhn	rgruhn@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca
Philip Sullivan	sullivan@utias.utoronto.ca
Judy Wubnig	jwubnig@watarts.uwaterloo.ca

offs between individual and collective rights”; and the “propensity of our culture to prohibit anything”, including offensive speech. He said the actions of those who have benefited from the vital freedom of speech, to now restrain the freedom of those whose opinions they don’t like, suggests erosion of respect for the principle. After calling Yaqzan’s article a “foolish piece,” Borovoy characterized his suspension as “repugnant”. He emphasized that Yaqzan’s article was heavily criticized at considerable length after its publication, and that in itself was enough for the anti-Yaqzan forces to “win” the debate on date rape. Going further and pressing the Administration to actually remove the professor was morally wrong.

On Thursday, the conference continued with twenty-minute speeches from three invited speakers: Professor Bernice Schrank, of Memorial University (English Dept.), former chair of the Canadian Association of University Teachers’ (CAUT’s) Academic Freedom Committee; Professor Michael Bliss, University of Toronto historian and commentator, and New Democrat MP, Svend Robinson. These speakers offered a spectrum of views.

Professor Schrank briefly outlined the struggle for academic freedom at Canadian universities, and the role the CAUT has played in defending professors with unpopular views. She criticized the Ontario government’s “framework document” for “zero tolerance” against harassment. In her view, “speech codes” are wrong. She did, however, speak against unlimited free speech. Professors who systematically promote racist or sexist ideas, such that they break criminal law, can be prosecuted, just as a university can take action against any professor for being “derelict in his/her duties”.

Professor Bliss’ theme for the free speech debate was that civility should characterize the relations of members the university community and especially professors’ dealings with their students. He described the emerging “rights culture” which has increased the rights of university students. The professor/student relationship has changed drastically from the master/servant

Annual Conference and AGM

SAFS’ second annual conference will again be at the St. George Campus of the University of Toronto, on Saturday, May 20. The format will be similar to our 1994 meeting. For paid up (hint...) members, there will be panel discussion sessions in the morning and afternoon, workshop sessions in the late afternoon, and the AGM to conclude the meeting around 6.30 pm. We shall also have a lunch-with-keynote-speaker session that is open to the public (last year Jack Granatstein gave this talk), and to media coverage. Further details will be available in the next Newsletter (scheduled for mid-April), but please keep the May 20 date clear in your calendar.

John Furedy and Laurie MacKay

relationship that had held sway up until the 1950s and early 1960s (about which there are many anecdotes of behaviour that would be unacceptable now).

What this means, Bliss said, is that university professors must have the right of academic free expression, but that they cannot abuse that right in order to be rude or derogatory. He said that a professor like Philippe Rushton has the right to do research on racial differences, but that a professor would be on dangerous ground if he treated his black students as racially inferior. In Bliss’s words, “The right to state offensive ideas is absolute; the right to act offensively can be limited by the rights of others”.

Svend Robinson started his speech by claiming that he had a strong human rights record, for opposing totalitarian regimes in the Soviet Union, South Africa, and China. But, he stated, there are other rights as fundamental as civil and political rights: economic and social rights. In terms of social rights, he strongly supports UNB’s sexual harassment policy (although he had not read it in detail). He thought that it was properly applied in the Matin Yaqzan case. Yaqzan’s article was

continued on page 10

SPREADING THE NEWS ABOUT PC, CANADIAN CAMPUS STYLE

John J. Furedy, University of Toronto

During the last 6 months of 1994, I gave talks in the Czech Republic (Charles University); Israel (Hebrew University of Jerusalem – invited by the Centre for Canadian Studies!); Germany (University of Wuppertal); New Zealand (University of Auckland and Massey University); and Australia (University of Woollongong), as well as at Simon Fraser University (where I also did a phone-in radio show which was reported on CJRT in Toronto.

Charles Crawford of SFU was particularly effective in maximising the publicity for what was a difficult time of year (December 17). The title of the talks was roughly, “Velvet totalitarianism in Canadian academia: Implications for.....?” For the NZ-Australia-Vancouver trip, a video showing segments of the W5 CTV report (see review in this issue), on the goings on at the University of Western Ontario, was a particularly effective communicational aid for the talks.

Common to all the overseas countries is the fact that their societies are democratic. With the possible exception of the Czech Republic, academics in other countries have experienced a breakdown of the merit principle in evaluating faculty and students in terms of such non-merit-related criteria as gender and “race”, although that breakdown varies from place to place, and, in general, is not as severe as that experienced in Canada.

On the other hand, the sort of breakdowns of the principle of academic freedom that have been perpetrated on Canadian campuses are completely foreign to the experiences of overseas academics. It is interesting to note that many of them have spent extended periods of research leave in North American Universities, but, perhaps not surprisingly, they have remained ignorant of what has been going on.

Perhaps the most personally disturbing trend that I notice was that although academics of my generation were horrified to hear about recent Canadian cases, there were

many younger audience members who either disbelieved my “stories”, or thought that it was worth “balancing” freedom of speech (and individual right), with the collective comfort of designated groups, even (and even especially) in institutions of higher education. To me this means that unless voices like those of SAFS are heard clearly right now, the next generation of academics may not even understand that there may be something wrong with a university that determines what may be said on the basis of what is comfortable, and that there is something fundamentally different between (higher) education and indoctrination.

SAFS' DEFENCE OF CLASSROOM ACADEMIC FREEDOM APPEARS TO HAVE HAD SOME RESULTS: THE MACKINNON CASE AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE CARIBOO

John J. Furedy, University of Toronto

After learning from Doreen Kimura about University College of the Cariboo's (in Kamloops, B.C.) July abuse of academic freedom, the Board issued the following statement on October 19, 1994:

“The Board of Directors of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship view with utmost concern the decision by University College of the Cariboo (UCC) to place a monitor in the classroom of one of its instructors, Professor A. MacKinnon, to “observe” his teaching. The basis for this decision is a charge of sexual harassment against the instructor by some students in his class. We hold no opinion on the validity of this charge, only that it has to be investigated in a way which does not abuse the academic freedom not only of the teacher, but also of the students in the class. The practice of “monitoring” represents such an abuse of academic freedom. It belongs to totalitarian regimes where institutes of higher education are viewed as servants of the State, rather than as places where issues can be examined in an academically free atmosphere.

Quite aside from the ultimate outcome of the charges against this instructor, we would urge UCC to immediately abandon its proposed monitoring activities, which will have a chilling effect on all teachers and all

students who may wish to discuss unpopular ideas. Until UCC abandons such abuses of academic freedom, we recommend censure of its administration by all groups and organisations that have a concern for academic freedom in Canadian institutes of higher education”

This press release was faxed to UCC's president, Dr. James Wright, copies to various other high-level UCC administrators, and to national and local media. In contrast to the total lack of media interest in SAFS' 1993 censure motion against the University of New Brunswick's abuse of out-of-class academic freedom in November, 1993 (The Yaqzan case; for an account, see, e.g., April, 1994 SAFS' Newsletter, "Yaqzan, Witchhunts and a Chilly Campus Climate" pp.3-4), the local press telephoned me the following evening for an interview which covered not only the UCC situation, but also the general state of velvet totalitarianism on Canadian campuses regarding the lack of freedom of speech.

By the time President Wright had received SAFS' fax, he had probably also read an October 9 letter sent to him by Doreen Kimura, writing not as Past President of SAFS, but as an eminent expert in the field of the biological bases of human sex differences. The main focus of her letter concerned the merits of the "sexual harassment" charge, which in fact referred to discipline (psychology) related assertions on group sex differences that Professor MacKinnon discussed in class, and which some students found "offensive". One of my favourite sentences of this letter is near the end, where the following question is put: "Is University College of the Cariboo prepared to state that within its walls the truth cannot be told?" One might add that in all institutions of higher education which have speech codes no matter how mild (and this probably includes all current Canadian campuses), the answer to this question is: yes, if that truth is sufficiently uncomfortable or "offensive" to some people.

The text of my letter of October 19 to President Wright, which focussed on the practice of monitoring rather than on the merits of the "harassment" charge, is reproduced below:

"As you can see from the attached censure motion, the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS)

is deeply disturbed by your administration's handling of the case of Professor A. MacKinnon. Quite aside from the merits of the sexual harassment charge (about which Dr. Doreen Kimura in her capacity as an expert eminent scientist in the area has recently written to you), your administration's decision to "monitor" this instructor represents, in itself, a gross abuse of academic freedom. It is on the level of the University of New Brunswick's immediate suspension and subsequent investigation of Professor Yaqzan; for an account of that Canadian administrative abuse of academic freedom, see pp.3-4 of the enclosed SAFS Newsletter, April, 1994.

In contrast to UNB's blunder, which could not be undone, there is a possibility for UCC to undo the damage to its reputation for abusing academic freedom by immediately and publicly dropping the "monitoring" scheme, and by ensuring that the investigation of the charge against Professor MacKinnon is fair and consistent with the principle of academic freedom. Until this is done, SAFS will continue to do all in its power to see that the present abuse of academic freedom by UCC's administration is opposed in as public a manner as possible.

Our organization now has over 350 members who come from across Canada, and from all levels of institutions of higher education. We plan to cover the events in UCC in our Newsletter, and, consistent with the principles of freedom of speech, extend an invitation to you to give an account of the MacKinnon case from your perspective. That account should reach the editor by November 15 to ensure inclusion in the next issue. Needless to say, I hope that the account will include the news that you have decided to abandon the invidious "monitoring" scheme."

In early November, I was delighted to receive a letter from President Wright, dated November 1, in which he stated that he had "attached a copy of a news release which announces that there will be no classroom monitoring of Professor MacKinnon's teaching upon his return". The press release itself stated that the UCC Administration and Faculty Association have agreed that "two different protective mechanisms already in place are adequate", because the collective agreement already

provides for Deans to initiate “summative evaluations if deemed necessary, and the updated Harassment Prevention Policy gives students the right of appeal in appropriate actions”. The text of my November 14 reply is reproduced below:

“Thanks for your November 1 letter and enclosed press release indicating that you have dropped the monitoring proposal for Professor MacKinnon.

Although SAFS remains disturbed about the sexual harassment charge and the five-month suspension penalty (see my August 20 letter and Professor Kimura’s October 9 letter), we do appreciate and thoroughly approve of your decision to drop the monitoring proposal, and thereby move UCC closer to academic values. Your decision, in our view, constitutes an important step towards academic freedom, and we hope that other Canadian institutions of higher education will take note of this decision”.

The above letter is deliberately positive in tone, because the lifting of the monitoring option is certainly a step in the right direction. It is also relevant to note that, as in the Yaqzan case, the Provincial and Federal Faculty Associations maintained a discrete silence while these gross abuses of academic freedom were being perpetrated, and SAFS was the only external academic organization to protest. And, in this case, our protest appears to have had some beneficial results.

Still, it’s only *some*. The suspension for so-called “sexual harassment” still stands, and Canadian academic administrators have been able to continue their message that, if it is “uncomfortable” to some, the “truth”, indeed, “cannot be told”. Or, to put it in my cruder terms, academic freedom in Canada has been moved back from the concentration/deathcamps to the ghetto, with the apartheid administrators (who “define” students in terms of “ethnicity and gender” in the modern “diverse” university), functioning as the Judenrat, and most individual faculty members keeping their heads down and censoring themselves for fear of being “selected”. An offensive analogy, to be sure, but an apt one to remind us that velvet totalitarianism still thrives on Canadian campuses.

Western’s Petition to Combat the Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities

Heinz Klatt, University of Western Ontario

In October, 1993, the Ontario Minister of Education and Training, David Cooke, NDP, distributed a document called *Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities*. For some reason this rather lengthy policy statement, although most intimately affecting faculty, remained hidden from them until some of us obtained a copy of it at the end of the year. I distributed copies among my colleagues in January, 1994.

To my knowledge, Professor John Fekete from Trent University was among the first to recognize the threat and danger of the policy and to organize opposition. He circulated a petition among the faculty at Trent reaffirming the university’s mandate to conduct research and to teach unhampered by any government control and currently fashionable ideology.

In February, 1994, my petition “On Free Inquiry and Expression”, and one from the Modern Languages Department, were circulated at the University of Western Ontario. The petition stated:

“We reaffirm our commitment to unrestricted academic freedom and freedom of expression and inquiry in the university... We consider the university to be a privileged place in society – privileged for the benefit of society rather than for the comfort of its members – where the unthinkable can be thought and the unspeakable can be spoken. We therefore reject any attempt of the government to impose any speech codes even if in the guise of ‘harassment policies.’ We consider censorship an unacceptable restriction in the carrying out of our academic duties even if it is intended to appease opponents or to promote harmony.

With respect to the content of research and teaching, we have to insist on the right to reach any conclusions that, in good faith, seem valid even if later they turn out to be wrong or unjustified. Academic freedom includes

the right to draw conclusions that may offend. It includes the right to express ideas and opinions which some may feel are racially, ethnically, and sexually discriminatory, just as it includes the right to expressions that suggest inequality of any kind. It includes the right to make propositions that may make others uncomfortable, that possibly injure the listeners' self-esteem and that create an atmosphere in which some may feel offended and unwelcome. We consider the university to be the place **par excellence** to challenge any and all cherished ideas, dogmas, and current trends...We cannot agree to any stifling or regulating of our diction to accommodate any political agenda. In particular, we defend the right to certain types of speech which we do not necessarily condone and in some cases even deplore. The professors' obligation is toward accuracy, appropriate restraint in judgment, respect for the opinions of others, and tact and courtesy, but not toward 'feeling good'. There is no obligation, nor is it desirable, to make everyone comfortable, nor is there a responsibility to adopt any specific sexual, racial, the 'victim's' or other 'perspective'.

From the moment that a professor is fearful of violating any of the currently fashionable constraints academic freedom is curtailed in an unacceptable manner. Fear of unintentionally violating an ill-defined code will lead to self-censorship and is an undesirable interference in research and teaching. We emphatically reject the introduction of the students' feelings as the criterion for establishing what constitutes improper behavior of the professor and what constitutes a 'hostile environment'. The latter notion must be judged so counterproductive that, in the interest of the academic freedom of faculty and students, it cannot be accepted into any document regulating classroom behavior. Finally, we vehemently deplore the imposition of any ukase by government such as the **Framework Regarding Prevention and Discrimination in Ontario Universities.**"

The two parallel petitions were rather casually circulated, but nevertheless obtained 385 signatures which were forwarded to Diane Cunningham, MPP and Education Critic for the Progressive Conservative Party,

continued on page 10

'CAMPUS CODES'...BUT CODES FOR WHAT?

Joe Katzman, student, MBA program, York University

"What are we supposed to do? In September ask our students for a list of topics that might offend, and then never, ever, cover those topics?" Dr. Marjorie Ratcliffe, UWO.

Of course not, professor.

As anyone who watched W5's episode on October 6, 1994 can attest, what you're supposed to do is ask the *politically correct and protected groups* for such a list, and to hell with the rest of 'em. Money is no object, either, despite a brutal wave of cutbacks faced by all departments except the PC Bureaucracies (PCB's?), of course.

Though less well known than its American copycat "60 Minutes", W5 has acquired a solid reputation over the years for clear-eyed, hard-hitting documentaries. In "Campus Codes", (CTV, October 6, 1994), they do not disappoint.

The show itself is divided into two parts. The first deals with the costs of these efforts, in both financial and personal terms. The second deals with a real case of harassment against UWO Professor James Miller, a gay male professor. Alone, each is compelling. Together, they are explosive.

Consider the case of UWO Psychology professor, Heinz Klatt. A former resident of East Germany, Dr. Klatt understands being investigated secretly, having no access to testimony, and being left unaware of what procedures would be followed. He just didn't expect it in Canada. The source of the complaint against him? His reference to a student during a class as "Lucky Lucy". Lucy's reaction? She wrote a letter to the Dean on his behalf. No, the complainants were two other women in the class, both of whom had averages in the D range. The charge? "Creating a negative psychological environment," or so he was told two months later. After a year involving the full-time efforts of two part-time professors and an outside investigator, Dr. Klatt was exonerated. The cost? About \$100,000.

continued next page

Similar costs were created by a case against Dr. Ratcliffe, who corrected a student in class using his own words as an example: "In Iran, they condemn everybody." A complaint was followed by mediation, with the result that the *student* apologised. Three days later, however, there was another complaint, this one written with the help of the Race-Relations Co-ordinator. Eight months later, another acquittal. Another \$100,000 gone.

With Western's tuition up 10% this year and 350 jobs recently cut, consider the costs to date: \$400,000 for the bureaucracy, plus around \$100,000 *each* for the two cases, plus the professors' time. The *only* formal cases in four years, both of which were thrown out. Despite being subject to both the Criminal Code and the Ontario 'Human Rights' Commission, this one university will have funded the PC Police to the tune of almost three-quarters of a million dollars by the end of this year. And for what?

Well, says the PC lobby, what if there really was a case of harassment? What, indeed.

James Miller is an openly-gay professor at Western who taught a Gay and Lesbian Studies course last year. Interest was high, and he noted that the students enrolled were a very diverse bunch. Diverse enough, apparently, to include a number of self-identified "S&M Radical Lesbian Feminists", who quickly had their moniker shortened to "The Politburo" by the rest of the class. Their contribution? Classes were brought to a halt by shouting, screaming and haranguing for deviations from their party line.

After 11 weeks of this, Professor Miller had had enough. The Professor called a vote to see who would run the class, him or "The Politburo". The clique's response? They "wouldn't allow a vote to take place". Chaos erupted. Unable to teach his material because of the actions of a few students, Professor Miller cancelled his course.

Interestingly, two students went to the Dean to complain. Joel Riddel and Tammy Eckenswiller both stated on camera that the rest of the class did indeed feel harassed, and that "The Politburo" were trying to silence Professor Miller.

So what did the university do about this? Why, nothing. Nothing at all.

The Vice-President, Administration, of the University of Western Ontario is Michael Gourley, who comes across in the video as the archetypal spineless, lying bureaucrat. His justification? He didn't think that the incidents involving Professor Miller fell under their policies.

If anyone wishes to see first-hand the empire-building and hypocrisy which define the whole "PC" movement on campus, this video is a must. Watching it makes a number of lessons very clear: (1) That a "PC Police" bureaucracy will work hard to find justification for itself, even if it isn't there, at the expense of others; (2) That "Anti-harassment" policies are not neutral, but tactics used by specially-exempt groups in order to prevent any questioning of their dogmas; and (3) That there will be little freedom and less justice in our universities until both the "PC Police" and bureaucrats like Mr. Gourlay are unemployed.

The question is, what are YOU planning to do about it?

One thing you might consider doing is calling W5 Producer, Ricki Katz, who will be doing a story shortly on Hiring Goals/Quotas. If you think you may have helpful information, give her a call at (416) 595-4423.

York University is coming out with a similar set of policies, and the administration is trying to implement them secretively. If we don't stand up now, it can happen here, too. More to the point, it can happen to you.

Remember: "No justice, no peace!"



Editor's note: Things like this, although perhaps not quite so spectacular, are happening on campuses across Canada. This is why everyone concerned about reversing the trend should join SAFS.

REVIEW

Judy Wubnig, University of Waterloo

Balance: the Inclusive Vision of Gender Equality. Published quarterly by the Movement for the Establishment of Real Gender Equality (MERGE), Suite 366, 9768-170 St., Edmonton, Alberta T5T 5L4. Fax: (403) 444 8880. Editor: Ferrel Christensen. (C\$ 3.50; subscription C\$ 12.50; GST and mailing included).

This new journal, published by the Movement for the Establishment of Real Gender Equality (MERGE), should make a major contribution to rethinking the relations of men and women today.

Its purpose, described in the introductory article, "Our Position," is to promote "real equality" between the sexes, which is the equality of individuals. The flier announcing *Balance* declared: "This society needs a new vision of equality between the sexes, one that rejects the old extreme of one-sex dominance and lock-step gender roles, and also rejects the contemporary extreme of gender-based hostility and separate standards for women and men...The purpose of *Balance* is to promote such a vision, through presentation of important insights and information not now being made widely available."

MERGE considers the sexes in terms of the functions of sexual differentiation and reproduction. The theme is perhaps best expressed by the title of Garth Wood's review of Christine Hoff Sommers' *Who Stole Feminism? How Women have Betrayed Women*, "Truth, the First Casualty of the Gender War." All the articles, including the humorous satire by Sean O'Connell on the "male conspiracy," aim to redress imbalance and to accurately discuss topics such as employment practices, the family, and violence. The contents of the first issue are listed below.

Contents of *Balance*, Fall, 1994: (a) Our Position: "Why Balance is Needed"; (b) Comment: Malcolm George, "The Men's Movement in the UK"; Leo Groarke, "Ontario's Bill 79: Equity or Gross Inequity?"; Cathy Young: "Gender and Violence: False Consciousness";

(c) Features: Ruth Gruhn, "Do Preferential Policies Raise the Status of Women?"; Ronald K. Henry, "Parenting – Positive Enforcement of Child Support"; Manuel Matas, "Reform in Family Law"; Gwen E. Robertson, "Fathers are Parents, Too"; Rita Simon, "Rebirth of the Women's Movement? Non-sexist groups provide an alternative to the feminist establishment"; (d) Interview: rape-trial lawyer Rikki Klieman interviewed by Jack Kammer, "The Other Kind of Rape"; (e) Humor, Sean O'Connell, "The International Male Conspiracy; A (Final) Revelation"; and (f) Book Review, Garth Wood, "Truth: First Casualty of the Gender War", review of Christina Hoff Sommers, *Who Stole Feminism? How Women have betrayed Women*.

I have a minor quibble with this excellent journal, that it uses "gender" instead of "sex" in its title. "Gender" is a grammatical term, "sex" the biological one. The issues the journal addresses are about the relations between the two sexes in the human species, which differ in biology, not in grammar. The "gender" feminists, as Christina Hoff Sommers calls them, insist that the differences between men and women are all conventional; as I heard one say, there is no difference between men and women "from the neck up". There are indeed many differences between men and women which are conventional, like clothes and legal status, which vary from place to place. But the fundamental difference is biological, and even inappropriate conventions depend on this. The biological difference is indicated in every cell of the body, from the neck up and down. The issue that *Balance* really addresses is when and how the biological differences are relevant in evaluating behavior. (See Plato's Republic on this!).

•••••

continued from page 3

clearly and persistently sexist, and had offended many people. The case demonstrated that there is a need for speech codes – to protect designated minorities on campuses.

After brief comments from the audience, the rest of the conference was devoted to a panel discussion and workshops. The panel, reacting to the speakers, was composed of professors and students from the University of New Brunswick. It was tilted towards the feminist and equity-seeking viewpoints. Most favoured limits to free expression. There is not much to report here; much of the commentary was uneven at best. But it prompted some pointed sparring between Alan Borovoy/Michael Bliss (favouring academic freedom) and Svend Robinson (favouring strict speech codes).

Reports from the discussion groups revealed that many participants were unclear about basic concepts such as the difference between individual and collective rights, or what is connoted by the much-used phrase “political correctness.”

I came away from the proceedings with mixed feelings. On the positive side, hearing Alan Borovoy speak publicly for the first time, I was impressed by the passionate advocacy, clarity of thought, and the sense of humour which he brought to the debate. His arguments were cogent and must, I think, have impressed others. Michael Bliss’s idea of “civility” was thought-provoking and encouraging to me (some SAFS’ *Newsletter* readers might disagree). During the panel sessions it was often Professor Bliss who insistently (but civilly) debated with Svend Robinson.

On the negative side, I found Mr. Robinson’s position, while not unexpected, troubling. The New Democrat MP is a forceful and articulate speaker. His arguments voiced many of the new, counter-free speech ideas offered in such recent books as *Democracy and the Problem of Free Speech* (by Cass Sunstein) and *There’s No Such Thing as Free Speech: And It’s a Good Thing, Too* (by Stanley Fish).

At one point, in a rare moment of idealism, Mr. Robinson wondered why Canada’s academic community has been so silent on major political issues. (He mentioned as an example that no professor spoke out against Canada’s closer economic links with Indonesia – a well-known human rights abuser). Then a person from the audience mentioned that one speaker from the University of New Brunswick did speak out on an issue he felt was important, and was removed from campus because of it.

It is to be hoped that the process of the debate and the discussion groups provided the faculty, staff, students and members of the public who attended with insight into why the “Yaqzan case” occurred.

Endnote

1. “When rights collide: an invitation to debate,” *University Perspectives*, vol. 21, no. 1, Sept/Oct. 1994, p. 2.



continued from page 7

with the request that she present them to Education Minister David Cooke. On March 30, 1994, Mrs. Cunningham added her name to the petition and introduced the list to the Legislature with the following words: “...Minister, universities and colleges are also concerned with issues surrounding harassment and discrimination, but had already developed policies on their own without the interference of this government. You have managed to turn what used to be a situation under control into a chaotic mess”. All readers of the *SAFS Newsletter* know what happened afterwards: The infamous *Framework* was, if not withdrawn, at least given less urgency, and it will hopefully not have another chance in a second term of this government.



FURTHER READINGS

Berman, Paul (Ed) *Debating P.C.: The Controversy over Political Correctness on College Campuses*. New York: Dell, 1992.

Dickman, Howard (Ed) *The Imperiled Academy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993.

Fekete, John, *Moral Panic: Biopolitics Rising*, Montreal, Robert Davies Publishers, 1994.

Huer, Jon. *Tenure for Socrates: A study of the betrayal of the American Professor*. New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991.

Poch, Robert K. *Academic Freedom in American Higher Education: Rights, Responsibilities, and Limitations*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, 1993. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University, 1993.

Russell, Conrad. *Academic Freedom*. London/New York: Routledge, 1993.

Soley, Lawrence C. *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia*. Boston: South End Press, 1995.

Van Alstyne, William W. (Ed) *Freedom and Tenure in the Academy*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993. (Previously published as volume 33, No. 3 of Law and Contemporary Problems Journal, Summer, 1990.)

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Haskins, William A. **Responsibility, freedom of speech and campus speech codes**. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration* (JACA) No. 1, (January, 1994): 50-53. Haskins argues the position that higher education institutions should concentrate on encouraging a climate that promotes free and responsible communication rather than implement offensive communication speech codes.

Sassower, Raphael. **On madness in the academy**. *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol.65, No.4 (July-August, 1994): 473-485. Sassower suggests that although colleges and universities should provide a climate in which social pressures and external conventions are absent and individualism and intellectual freedom flourish, that this climate no longer exists. The author urges universities and colleges to detach themselves from the culture of commercialism and to encourage "intellectual passions".

DEFINITIONS FOR A RACE RELATIONS POLICY

The York University "anti-racism policy" which was drafted by the Centre for Race and Ethnic Relations (which also calls itself The Human Rights Centre) last term, contains a "glossary" with definitions of "anti-racism," "culturally-appropriate student services," "discrimination," "equity," "harassment," "racial and ethnocultural group," and "racism." Here are the two last ones:

Racial and Ethnocultural Group

The York University Anti-Racism Policy refers to groups which, by their own definition or that imposed by others, are categorised by characteristics such as skin colour, eye shape, religion, nationality, language, and/or cultural heritage.

Racism

For the purpose of this policy, racism is defined as implicit or explicit beliefs and actions which are based on an ideology of the inherent superiority of one racial or ethnocultural group over another. Racism may be consciously or unconsciously expressed. Racism may be present within organizational and institutional structures and programs, as well as in individual thought and behaviour patterns. Operationally, for the purposes of this policy, "racism" will refer to ethnocultural groups as defined above.

Quoted from the YORK UNIVERSITY DRAFT ANTI-RACISM POLICY, October 1994.

CALL FOR 1995 MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL

It's time to renew your SAFS membership for 1995. We rely on our members for their continuing support of SAFS and its aims. The larger our membership, the more effective we can be in petitioning, lobbying and making our views known to university administrators and to government. The Donner grant will not cover the expenses of our Newsletter, mailing expenses, or the annual Conference. It is only sufficient to cover salaries for a part-time secretary and leave for the President. We don't want to lose a single member, and we want to gain as many more as we can. Enclosed with this newsletter are several membership forms - one for you to renew and some to distribute to colleagues who are interested in SAFS.

We now have office space at the University of Toronto, a telephone and a fax. Telephone: (416) 978-7062; Fax: (416) 978-4811; E-mail safs@psych.utoronto.ca Our new address is P.O. Box 581, Station 'P', Toronto, ON, M5S 2T1. Office hours will be 2-4 pm Monday through Friday.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Laurie MacKay, Secretary Treasurer.

Grant Brown's Speaking Tour

Last November, SAFS member Grant Brown, Faculty of Management, University of Lethbridge, addressed the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Rights on the topic of employment equity. Grant has done extensive statistical research on academic hiring practices, and is an outspoken opponent of current equity hiring policies.

Partly as a result of the publicity his address in Ottawa received, Grant was invited to talk/debate on the issue at three Ontario university campuses - Queen's University in Kingston on February 1, the University of Toronto on February 2, and the University of Waterloo on February 3.

SAFS is sponsoring the debate at U of T, with significant assistance from the Administration. Grant will debate Philosophy Professor James Brown (pro equity policies), and the Chair/Moderator will be Professor Joan Foley, former Provost, U of T. The 60-minute debate will be followed by comments and questions from four panelists - 2 pro, 2 anti - who are all faculty members. Audience participation will be encouraged, and CTV's W5 will cover the debate/symposium as part of their proposed program on the topic.

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 E-mail. Address: **Chris Furedy**, c/o J. Furedy, Psychology, 4024 Sidney Smith Hall, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, M5S 1A1. Fax: (416) 962-4253. E-mail: **furedy@psych.utoronto.ca**