

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship NEWSLETTER

Number 4

October 1993

PURPOSES of the SAFS

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

(Note that the statement of purposes of the SAFS has been reformulated.)

Changes to the BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Philip Sullivan, Institute of Aerospace Studies, University of Toronto and Ian Hunter, Law Faculty, University of Western Ontario, were elected to the Board of Directors of the SAFS by acclamation, since only two had been nominated for three available seats. Douglas Jackson has resigned as Secretary-Treasurer and from the Board. John Furedy was elected the new president by the Board, in accordance with the Bylaws.

Most matters except membership should be referred to John Furedy, Department of Psychology, Room 4024, Sidney Smith Hall, 100 St. George St., University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont. M5S 1A1; FAX (416) 978-4811; email: furedy@psych.utoronto.ca.

Local Chapters

A meeting to form a Greater Toronto Region chapter will be held on Tuesday, November 16, 1993, in the Combination Room, Trinity College, University of Toronto, Hoskin Ave., 6 p.m. - 8 p.m. Wine and snacks will be served. Enquiries: Chris Furedy, 924-2484 or email: furedy@psych.utoronto.ca.

Several places are beginning to organize local chapters. This is a great idea, since it is much easier to speak out on local issues when there is more than one voice, people give each other moral support, etc. If you don't have a local chapter and want to know who other members in the area are, get in touch with **Doreen Kimura**, who is now in charge of membership affairs, either by writing to her at the Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London N6A 5C2, by e-mail to kimura@uwo.ca or by

sending questions to the SAFS office. Remember that all members of local chapters **MUST** be members of SAFS, so if they are not, they must join.

Bill 79, the Ontario Employment Equity Act

Bill 79, Ontario's "Employment Equity" legislation, was given Second Reading approval in the Ontario Legislature on July 19, by a vote of 65 to 23 and has been sent to the Standing Committee on the Administration of Justice for further consideration and public hearings. If you are interested in appearing before this committee, contact the Clerk: **Ms. Lisa Freedman, Clerk, Standing Committee on the Administration of Justice, Room 1405, Whitney Block, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ont. M7A 1A2; tel. (416) 325-3528; FAX (416) 325-3505.**

The past and current presidents of the SAFS have corresponded with the Ontario Government and Opposition parties about Bill 79. In brief, the Government is forging ahead. Job-related qualifications are not even mentioned in the bill. The Opposition appears to accept the bill as inevitable legislation although they express unease at its implications. The MPP from Waterloo North, Mrs. Elizabeth Witmer (PC), criticized the bill extensively July 13 and sent Judy Wubnig excerpts from her remarks. Readers of the newsletter are invited to send pithy comments, as well as to send OpEd articles and letters to newspapers. (See Allan Nelson, "Bill 79: 'Employment Equity' Comes to Ontario," SAFS Newsletter, No. 2, October 1992.)

A quota is a quota is a quota

(Editorial, Globe and Mail, June 18, 1993, Bill 79)

"We are told, on the basis of a pile of government bumb and the sighs of a few contented consultants, that the long-awaited regulations accompanying Bill 79, the Employment Equity Act, show the government of Ontario is not preparing to impose a system of racial and sexual hiring quotas on the province. Sorry to spoil the party, but it is.

"Let us be clear. We have no quarrel with the 'qualitative measures' the government wants employers to undertake to ensure the pool of applicants

for a job is not unduly narrow: reviewing hiring criteria for items that might needlessly serve as barriers to certain groups, recruiting by more inclusive means than mere word of mouth, and so on. Such extra efforts would be a truer definition of 'affirmative action,' or for that matter 'employment equity,' than what those terms have come to mean in practice. And there should not be any doubt about what the rest of the regulations mean: when they talk of 'numerical goals,' they are talking of quotas.

"Until now, our objections to the legislation have largely been confined to broad questions of principle: fundamentally, the immorality of establishing legal preferences in employment for those of the right race, sex or disability: what the government calls the 'designated groups.' But there were also questions of implementation: how to define membership in each group, for example, or what population base would be used to determine whether each group's representation in each occupation at each level reflected its representation 'in the community.' We are happy to report the regulations answer these in full. In doing so, they make abundantly clear, in glorious technicolour, just how daft this legislation really is.

". . . [D]ishonesty is found throughout the argument for quotas. Is there no hard statistical evidence of discrimination in pay or barriers to employment by race or sex? Merely assert that it is so. Are such disparities as exist impossible to ascribe to discrimination, which is in any case already outlawed? Invent something called 'systematic discrimination,' for which disparity alone is all the proof required. Is the prescribed remedy for this imaginary ill, a comprehensive mandatory system of officially-sanctioned discrimination, utterly repugnant to Canadians? Rename it 'employment equity.' Are quotas the very definition of such a regime, turning the market for labour into a racial and sexual spoils system? Call them 'numerical goals and timetables.'

"But whatever words you use, the truth is that henceforth decisions on hiring and promotion throughout Ontario will be driven by the employer's need to meet the quota, and not by the merits of the individuals concerned. In the name of fighting discrimination, this bill institutionalizes it. In the guise of eliminating race and sex as factor in social and economic advancement, it portends a society wholly obsessed with such distinctions. What a terrible, monstrous mistake."

Employment Inequity
by Kathy Covell

Earlier this year, the University of Manitoba advertised

in University Affairs a tenure-stream position in a subfield of the Social Sciences. The requirements were:

- 1) a completed doctorate;
- 2) demonstrated teaching competence; and
- 3) demonstrated competence in research.

Three candidates were short-listed and subsequently interviewed: two were men and one a woman.

The men had completed Ph.D.s (in 1989 and 1990). The woman had not, indeed still has not, completed her doctorate, and has not even scheduled orals.

One of the men has four years of teaching at the assistant professor level, with consistently outstanding student evaluations. The other has somewhat less. However, he has had sufficient experience to demonstrate his teaching competence clearly. The woman has minimal experience - as a graduate student teaching assistant.

Both men have demonstrated research competence as evidence in excellent publication records: both have a number of articles in leading refereed journals in the discipline and in the subfield required. Extensive computer and library searches fail to show any publications at all in academic, refereed journals by the woman.

Can the latter be considered to have the qualifications specified in the advertisement? Can she, in any academic sense, be considered at the same level as the men?

But guess who got the job? She did.

~~~~~  
*"Academic members of the community are entitled . . . to freedom in carrying out research and in publishing the results thereof, . . . of teaching and of discussion, . . . to criticize the university and the faculty association, and . . . from institutional censorship."* CAUT Handbook

\*\*\*\*\*  
**Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship**  
152 Albert St., Unit 12, London, Ont. N6A 1M1  
(519) 661-2061; FAX (519) 661-3029

Board of Directors  
John J. Furedy, Ph.D., President  
Ian Hunter, LL.D.  
Doreen Kimura, Past President, Ph. D., F.R.S.C.  
Philip Sullivan, Ph.D.  
Judy Wubnig, Ph. D., Editor, Newsletter

\*\*\*\*\*t

## FEAR OF OFFENDING STIFLES INTELLECTUAL DEBATE

by Doreen Kimura

Doreen Kimura, Past President of the SAFS, gave the following Convocation Address at Simon Fraser University, 3 June 1993, on the occasion of being awarded the degree of honorary Doctor of Laws. (Edited versions were printed in the London Free Press and the Toronto Globe & Mail.)

Madam Chancellor, Mr. President, distinguished guests and graduands. I am pleased and honoured to be here today, and to be able to speak to you.

When I was about your age (many years ago), I went to McGill University in Montreal as an undergraduate, from my small home town in Saskatchewan. Up to that point, it was the most exciting event of my life. McGill was at that time an intellectually active and stimulating place to be, with, I am proud to say, a very bad football team. I warmed to the fire of new ideas, lively discussion with fellow students and professors, and the sense of striving for excellence which was everywhere apparent. Within the limits of common courtesy, there was no bar to what anyone might say in the heat of discussion, and even the *beginning* courses in Philosophy, English, Political Science, and so on were rich in argument and controversy.

I don't recall anything sexist about that era, there was no demeaning concern about a "woman-friendly" atmosphere, no one patronized me or other women in my classes, or made any special concessions to us as women. I was never insulted by an avoidance of topics which nowadays might be considered sensitive.

There was no Women's Studies Programme, and no perceived need for any, since it was assumed that women, like men, had an interest in studying human beings of both sexes. I had the same opportunity and means for gaining respect from my colleagues as men had, and nothing less was expected of me. I was, in other words, an equal.

I hope that you will later look back with similar pleasure on your years at Simon Fraser, but I am also frankly concerned that the quality of university education is now being seriously threatened by considerations which should be alien to an academic institution. I have therefore chosen today to say a few words on a topic dear to me, and, I think important to the basic mission of every university. This topic is academic freedom. I choose this occasion, which of course is a happy one for all of you, because the torch is now being passed on to you, and the future of the university is in your hands. By alerting you to the

problem, I hope you will be enabled to do something about it.

Most universities have in their mission statements, a defence of the right to academic freedom, usually a statement from the Handbook of the Canadian Association of University Teachers.

"Academic members of the community are entitled, regardless of prescribed doctrine, (this is very important, it means regardless of what the prevailing or popular opinion may be), to freedom in carrying out research and in publishing the results thereof, freedom of teaching and of discussion, freedom to criticize the university and the faculty association, and freedom from institutional censorship."

Why is it felt necessary to explicitly ensure academic freedom in a university? (And note that students are included in this academic community.) Again, the Handbook makes a reasonable case: Academic freedom and tenure exist in order that society will have the benefit of honest judgment and independent criticism which might (otherwise) be withheld because of fear of offending a dominant social group or transient social attitude."

Parents here today who have been to university many years ago may not be aware of the measures taken in recent years at most universities, which could significantly undermine this most essential principle. There has been an increasing tendency to become concerned with whether persons, as members of certain groups, might be "offended". I don't mean offended by a personally insulting remark, which of course we all agree is objectionable. I mean offended by ideas, or even by the airing of indisputable facts. Policies and tribunals aimed, for example, at eliminating sexual or racial discrimination, have been put in place, usually with the best of intentions. Very quickly, however, they have gone beyond questions of harassment or discrimination and have extended their mandate to the content of courses, the content of professors' research, and have even attempted to dictate how adults in the academic community should converse with each other. Clearly, then, they impinge on areas where academic freedom is absolutely essential if we are to maintain the ability to search for the truth, untrammelled by prevailing social conventions.

Now I have taught at a university for over 25 years, and I hope that in that time I have offended many students; in the sense that I have suggested ideas to them that they had not entertained before, and which they therefore found disturbing. George Bernard

Shaw once suggested that all great truths begin as blasphemies. As a biological scientist, I elaborate in my classes, ideas founded in evolutionary biology, but which to certain religious fundamentalists might be disturbing. I do research on brain and behaviour, and the prevailing assumption here is that all behaviour is a function of the nervous system, not of an immaterial soul. Some people might find that disturbing. I also do research on how individuals differ from each other in their special intellectual talents, and in the way their brains are organized. One of the contributing factors to both of those things is the sex of the person, that is, whether male or female. Some people do find that disturbing.

The capacity to disturb and offend is by no means exclusive to science. Professors of almost any discipline will, in the course of their legitimate research and teaching functions, potentially offend. Philosophers may question the very nature of our basis of knowledge and belief, for example: a professor in Political Science might dispute assumptions we make about the advantages of democracy. Yet both would be dealing with the abstract truths and emerging ideas of their disciplines. Students may certainly argue with these ideas, they are generally encouraged to do so, but arguments must be based on reason or evidence.

I see the offending of students in an intellectual sense as a positive sign that coming to university has made a difference to them. In my own classes, students may argue the issues, and they are permitted to have their say. Whether they end up agreeing with my position or not, they have at least understood it by the time they are finished the course. I consider that I am doing my job best as a professor when I have opened the door to a point of view which has not been considered before. In the process, there may initially be some confusion and distress but I hope also, in many cases, excitement about ideas which are controversial. This is the only way to fulfil the mission of the university, which is to pursue and create knowledge, as well as to disseminate old wisdom.

It surely would be a tragedy and a paradox if controversial or unpopular ideas could become censored by policies, which originally were intended only to protect individuals from unfair treatment or harassment; if a potential source of justice for some became a means of injustice to all. In fact if I were not a woman, and a senior professor, I might myself in these politically correct times have suffered from *institutional* harassment. I unfortunately know of colleagues both within and outside my own university, who have had their courses invaded by members of special interest tribunals, merely because they were socially controversial. A professor at York University

has had "observers" stationed in his class on a day in which he discusses the evolution of behavioural differences between men and women. A watchdog committee has been set up at the University of Toronto to ensure that no reference is made in textbooks which *could be construed* as unfavourable to any minority, no matter how factual or well established such references are. These are not isolated events, but are commonplace now, at least in eastern Canada.

The graduands of today will be too young to recall the reports of invasion of university classes by fascist partisans in Europe in the 30's, but some of the parents here today may recall such tactics. In fact, totalitarian regimes typically begin with the suppression of free speech. Can we honestly claim that there is any fundamental difference between the Communist or Fascist control of academia in the past, and the suppression of ideas which is spreading throughout our campuses today? Intimidation against speaking freely is reprehensible, whatever label we give it, and wherever it occurs. Alan Borovoy, head of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, has warned, "One of the most critical dangers to freedom of speech is the existence of laws that impel us to look over our shoulders for engaging in normal democratic discourse." Thought police have no place in a free society, much less in a university.

Infringements of free speech, of which academic freedom is a special case, generally operate out of fear. But the basic assumption of a rational society is that we can hear and discuss opposing points of view, and ultimately make intelligent choices. Surely then, we have nothing to fear from the truth? But to ensure that the truth can be told, we have to allow a wide margin of error, sometimes suffering the expression of ridiculous or even repugnant ideas, in the certainty that if thoroughly discussed, bad ideas will fall by the wayside, and good ones remain. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes of the United States perhaps phrased it best many years ago when he said that freedom of speech means freedom not only to speak the things we agree with, but "freedom for the thought we hate." Remember that we are never called upon to defend freedom of expression for popular ideas. It is always for the right to utter unpopular ideas that we must be on guard.

My depiction of what has been happening in universities recently may sound rather negative, but I have taken the trouble to do this because I believe that the situation, although critical, can be reversed. And I believe that you can play an important part in doing so, because today you become alumni of this university, as well as citizens of the broader intellectual community. As alumni, *you will be asked to contribute financially*

*and in other ways to the maintenance of excellence at your alma mater.* This gives you the opportunity to influence university policy for the better. Either as an individual, or through your alumni or other associations, you can express your concerns about the maintenance of impartial standards of excellence, and of academic freedom. University administrations do listen when money talks.

Today as you look back on the courses and professors you encountered over the past few years, I am sure there will be some that come to mind that initially outraged you, because of ideas that were new or even unacceptable to you at the time. If not now, then in the future, you may find that these were the courses that had the greatest impact on you, because you were forced to seriously rethink your values or beliefs. Whatever your ultimate conclusions, the intellectual and emotional challenge as you worked your way through should have been invigorating and instructive. This is the kind of educational experience you would want the next generation to enjoy, that you would want your children to have, and you can, and I hope you will, do something to ensure it.

(The author is grateful to Clive Seligman and Charlotte Vanderwolf for useful comments prior to presentation.)

### **Students Question Quotas: Alberta** by Ferrel Christensen

Chosen to be reviewed by the powers that be in the Federal 'Employment Equity' Program [Employment Equity Act] the University of Alberta last year developed an official 'Employment Equity' plan. Following the now-standard pattern at Canadian universities, the committee produced an ideologically 'correct' document called "Opening Doors: A Plan for Employment Equity." Though sensible and fairminded in many ways, it contains unfounded assumptions such as those relating to whether the designated categories (women, aboriginal peoples, visible minorities and persons with disability) are under-represented in the workforce.

In spite of representations by the Association of Concerned Academics, the Dean of Science, and various individuals -- representations covering methodology, process, quotas, discrimination, costs, and justice -- last March the General Faculties Council overwhelmingly approved the report as it stands. In the recent past, the University of Alberta's Board of Governors has routinely approved the decisions of the General Faculties Council and hence was expected to approve the document at its June meeting.

In the meantime, however, a group of undergraduate

students formed the *Students Against Employment Quotas* to express their objections, students generally not having even heard of the proposed "Opening Doors" policy until after it was approved of by the General Faculties Council. On short notice they gathered three hundred signatures opposing the report and presented them to a committee of the Board of Governors. On June 3 they wrote to Mr. Stan Milner, Chairman of the Board of Governors, requesting that references to "Numerical targets" be deleted or at least that consideration of the issue be postponed until the fall. [See below.]

At the meeting on June 4, 1993, the Board of Governors decided to postpone consideration of the issue until the meeting of December 3. In the meantime, the student group has renamed itself "*Students for Equality*" and is collecting signatures on a second petition opposing the proposed "Opening Doors" policy. On Tuesday, September 28, they convened a forum entitled "University in Peril: Affirmative Action and Hiring Quotas at the University of Alberta," which was cosponsored by the National Association of Scholars and the Fraser Institute. Speakers were Dr. Michael Walker, Director of the Fraser Institute, Grant Brown, Faculty of Management, University of Lethbridge, Ruth Gruhn, President, Society of Concerned Academics, University of Alberta, Anthropology, Tom Flanagan, University of Calgary, Political Science, and Karen Desgagne, a graduate student at the University of Alberta in Political Science.

Whatever may have been the effect of the submission of the students and those of others, the opportunity has been given for the University to take a second look at the issue - a more thoughtful one this time. And whatever the final outcome may be, perhaps there is in this incident a sign of hope for opposing the forces of ideological conformity in academe in Canada.

### **Letter of June 3: Students Against Employment Quotas**

Stan Milner, Chairman  
Board of Governors, University of Alberta

Dear Mr. Milner,

I am writing on behalf of the group Students Against Employment Quotas to express our concerns about the "Opening Doors" employment equity policy that will be considered by the Board of Governors on Friday, June 4.

We are concerned that the implementation of "numerical targets" as called for in the report will

certainly lead to reverse discrimination and could jeopardize the merit principle when hiring teaching staff. We believe further that the document is ill-thought out, based on faulty data and a lot of assumptions.

We had submitted a student petition with 300 signatures to the Board Academic Affairs and Human Resources Committee on April 22. The points raised on the petition were thus: students are opposed to "Opening Doors" because of a) the introduction of quotas b) potential cost c) it is unfair and discriminatory and unnecessary. The policy will almost certainly lead to judging applicants on the basis of gender or race, and not on the basis of merit.

Because none of us were aware of "Doors" until after it had passed the GFC [General Faculties Council] at the end of March, we were able to collect only 300 signatures, but we do not believe that this is insignificant - as it was done during the final exam period. Had we found out about the proposed policy during classes, we could have obtained thousands of signatures. For the most part, students at the U of A are opposed to the implementation of quotas (which are synonymous with numerical targets. For those who believe otherwise, I suggest studying a dictionary.)

The students who are opposed to "Opening Doors" are not a bunch of student radicals, as we have been portrayed. Rather, we are ordinary, mainstream students from various faculties who have serious concerns about a discriminatory and unfair document.

We ask that the BOG revise the "Doors" policy to remove any mention of numerical targets - or, at the very least, postpone any decisions regarding "Doors" until October or November, when more students can be made aware of this document. We believe that is not too much to ask - it is only fair that students should know about this policy and its implications.

Furthermore, we question why the university should be bound by the Federal Contractor's Program - a policy with clear political goals that do not reflect the best interests of an institution such as the U of A. Besides, the actual dollar value of contracts that would be affected by non-compliance of the U of A with the FCP is very small - two or three contracts of \$200,000 over the next few years. Does this merit the implementation of a costly, unnecessary affirmative action policy with negative consequences? (Incidentally, according to some sources, "Opening Doors" could cost the U of A some 1.2 million dollars over the next ten years).

Please pass our concerns on to the full Board of

Governors. We ask that you remove the references to "Numerical targets", or, in the very least, postpone this issue until the fall session.

Yours truly,  
Patrick Donnelly

### **Federal Elections, October 25, 1993**

Suggestion (Ed.): With the Federal Elections coming up, now is a good opportunity to contact all the candidates in your riding and ask them to get the Employment Equity Act of 1986 repealed. It requires employment policies of those with Federal contracts of over \$100,000 to be based on race, sex, ancestry, appearance or disability, the numbers depending on the percentages of the traits in the population:

(Sec. 4) "An employer shall ... implement employment equity by a) identifying and eliminating each of the employer's employment practices, not otherwise authorized by law, that results in employment barriers against persons in designated groups; and b) instituting positive policies and practices and making such reasonable accommodation as will ensure that persons in designated groups [women, aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and persons who are, because of their race or colour, in visible minority in Canada, Sec 3] achieve a degree of representation in the various positions of employment with the employer that is at least proportionate to their representation i) in the work force, or ii) in those segments of the work force that are identifiable by qualification, eligibility or geography and from which the employer may be reasonably expected to draw or promote employees."

### **Canadian Philosophical Association Rejects Mail Ballots** by Judy Wubnig

At the 1992 annual business meeting of the Canadian Philosophical Association Business Meeting, May 26, 1992, a motion was passed to support preferential hiring of women in philosophy departments (G. A. Brown and J. Wubnig, "Canadian Philosophic Association Becomes PC," SAFS Newsletter, No. 2, November 1992). Since only a small number of the members of the CPA had attended the business meeting (although many more than usual), another motion was passed directing the executive to formulate an amendment to the Constitution of the CPA to allow for mail ballots.

At the 1993 annual business meeting, June 4, 1993,

the executive proposed two alternative amendments to the Constitution to permit mail ballots, one allowing for a mail ballot on a particular issue if at least 33% of those present at the business meeting voted in favour of a mail ballot, and one allowing for a mail ballot if more than 50% voted in favour. Both amendments, which required a two-thirds majority, were defeated.

The arguments were about the principle of mail ballots and about the CPA's support of preferential hiring of women. The argument against the principle of the mail ballot was that only those present at the discussion of a motion at the business meeting should vote (even though both amendments provided that a mail ballot could only take place if those present at the business meeting voted to have one). The arguments about the CPA's support of preferential hiring of women were not really relevant to the issue of mail ballots, though it was the reason for the 1992 motion for the executive to formulate an amendment to allow mail ballots. Some of the most vigorous opponents of mail ballots were those who support preferential hiring of women.

One of the amendments might, perhaps, have been passed if the issue had been brought up at the beginning of the meeting, which started at 6:30 p.m., but it was well past 9 p.m. when it was taken up, and many had left the meeting. A practical reminder: Be sure to know what is on the agenda of business meetings of your societies and be prepared to stay to the end.

### Membership Renewal

Some members have still not renewed for 1993. Please do so as soon as possible, or we will have to stop sending you the Newsletter.

### Membership Directory

We are preparing a membership directory, which will help those who want to get together with local colleagues. It will be a simple computerized printout, and if you'd like a copy, send \$5.00 to the SAFS address. If you have not specifically requested that your name not be mentioned, you will be listed. Two people have so far asked not to be listed.

### "Wars over PC on Campuses"

Manifold Productions Inc. has a videotape report on selected cases relevant to "political correctness" in U.S. universities. Five cases are examined, the events depicted by reenactments, e.g., black students at the University of Pennsylvania accuse a professor of law of racial slurs. (800-231-0003; U.S. \$34.94 + \$5.00 shipping.)

\*\*\*\*\*

### CORRECTION

In the SAFS Newsletter, No. 3, April 1993, "The University in Jeopardy Conference in Toronto, March 12, 1993," credit was inadvertently omitted to stories in the Western News, March 18, 1993.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Further Reading

"A quota is a quota is a quota" Editorial, Globe & Mail, June 18, 1993.

Peter Brimelow and Leslie Spencer, "When Quotas Replace Merit, Everybody Suffers," Forbes, February 15, 1993.

Stanley Coren, "When Teaching Is Evaluated on Political Grounds," Academic Questions, Summer 1993. (About the University of British Columbia).

American Philosophical Association, "Letters to the Editor," Proceedings, vols. 66-67, 1992-93, on feminism and its critics.

Peter Collier and David Horowitz, SurvivingThe PC University, from Heterodoxy

### Publications

Academic Questions (National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing St., Princeton, NJ 08540 ). Your library should get this. If it has financial troubles, you may be able sponsor a subscription.

Measure (University Centers for Rational Alternatives, 570 Seventh Ave, New York, N.Y. 10018).

Campus Report (Accuracy In Academia, 4455 Connecticut Ave., Suite 330, Washington, D.C. 20008)

Heterodoxy, 12400 Ventura Blvd., Suite 304, Studio City, Cal. 91604.

The NAS (National Association of Scholars) has **Samizdat-On-Line**: ID "NAS"

Electronic Bulletin Board: Modem: 607-797-9296

E-Mail between individuals, for private messages

E-Mail 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)

### The SAFS Newsletter

The editor welcomes case studies, comments, articles, news items, references, local chapter news, etc. Address: Judy Wubnig, Philosophy, University of Waterloo. FAX: (519) 884-8995, tel. (519) 885-1211, ext. 3548.

-----  
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: \_\_\_\_\_

EMail: \_\_\_\_\_  
-----