

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship NEWSLETTER

Number 6

April 1994

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.)

SAFS Directory

Members of the SAFS can purchase a Directory of SAFS Members, as of October 1993, by sending \$5 to the SAFS address, **Doreen Kimura**, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London N6A 5C2.

First Annual SAFS Conference and Annual General Meeting: May 7, 1994 "University in Jeopardy: Canadian Concerns"

The first annual SAFS Conference, "University in Jeopardy: Canadian Concerns," and annual General Meeting will be held May 7, 1994, 10:00 A.M. to 6:15 P.M., St. George Campus, University of Toronto. Registration in the Foyer of the Sidney Smith Building, 100 George Street.

Except for the lunch and the postlunch talk by **Jack Granatstein**, sessions will be open only to SAFS members. (**Be sure you have paid your membership dues!**) Lunch-session-only registration, \$20, and full registration, \$25, if received by April 15; registration fees received after April 15 will be \$35 and \$30 respectively. The **Registration Form** is on the last page of this Newsletter.

PROGRAM

10:15-11:45 A.M. *Professors and the University*
Chaired by Doreen Kimura, UWO, Panelists Chris Essex, UWO, John Furedy, UT, David Smith, PEI, Paul Wong, Trent, "General principles for dealing with 'political correctness'" based on their experiences.

12 Noon - 1:45 P.M. Lunch, Speaker Jack Granatstein, Professor of History, York University, "*Academic Freefall: Whatever Happened to Free Speech?*"

2:15-3:45 P.M. *Department Chairs and the University*, Chaired by John Furedy, UT. Panelists Tom Adamowski (English, UT), Clive Seligman (Psychology, UWO), Martin Wall (Psychology, UT) believe in the principles of the SAFS but have to operate within the real world of current Canadian universities.

4:00-5:00 P.M. *Workshops*

5:15-6:15 P.M. *Annual General Meeting*

Reports by SAFS Chapter Coordinators, Discussion of Principles of SAFS Operations, Election of officers

Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty

The following comments were made by the American commentator Elmer Davis during the period when Wisconsin Senator Joe McCarthy was trying to intimidate individuals for their political views. (From *But We Were Born Free*, 1954)

With a great price our ancestors obtained this freedom, but we were born free. . . . But that freedom can be retained only by the eternal vigilance which has always been its price.

The first and great commandment is, Don't let them scare you.

This will remain the land of the free only so long as it is the home of the brave.

What makes Western civilization worth saving is the freedom of the mind, now under heavy attack from the primitives . . . who have persisted among us. If we have not the courage to defend that faith, it won't matter much whether we are saved or not.

University of Alberta: "Opening Doors: A Plan for Employment Equity"

The University of Alberta has developed a plan to conform to the Federal Employment Equity Act entitled "Opening Doors: A Plan for Employment Equity." [See *SAFS Newsletter*, October, 1993, No. 4, articles by Ferrel Christensen and Patrick Donnelly.]

This act 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."

Mr. Ezra Levant, a third-year law student at the University of Alberta reports.

**The University of Alberta: "Anti-Racism"
Racism
by Ezra Levant**

(I wrote this article for the student newspaper of the law school [U of A], *The Cannon of Construction*, and was subsequently called before the assistant dean. The newspaper was leaned on tremendously. I was told that my article was offensive and hurtful; I was cautioned against writing more of the same. The paper had other threats made against it.)¹

Scientists can do some funny things.

For example, I'm told that if you throw a frog into boiling water, it will jump out immediately because of the pain.

But if you put a frog into tap water, and heat it up slowly, the frog will boil alive without moving.

We humans are the same. Let's take taxes: if the government today decided to increase the tax burden on each Canadian by 40%, there would be mass demonstrations in the streets.

¹ The article was reprinted in the *Fraser Forum*, Dec. 1993. The CBC program *Prime Time* broadcast a documentary in January about "Political Correctness" which covered his case.

But if the government slowly, steadily, almost imperceptibly increased taxes by that amount over a decade, Canadians would not resist. How do I know? Because that is exactly what has happened in Canada.

Or how about traffic lights? Doesn't it always seem to take a terrible accident before city officials put in pedestrian crossing lights?

But taxes and traffic lights are small issues compared to race and sex equality. Unfortunately, the same rule of thumb applies.

If outrageous racist policies were ever implemented in a single move, no nation would accept them. However, if a racist system were to evolve slowly, irresistibly, bureaucratically, many nations would succumb.

Again, how do I know? Because it happened in the period leading up to racism in Nazi Germany and Apartheid South Africa. The desensitizing, legalistic approaches to racism were so innocuous, that the good people of these lands slept.

The Nazis campaigned for a decade before seizing power, and Apartheid evolved from a series of labor laws over the years. They were not overnight revolutions.

What would we have done in pre-war Germany? Would we have opposed the early stages of South African Apartheid? We'd like to think we would have; but I'm not so sure.

Because most people are too busy doing more important things than to fight every infringement on their freedoms.

Most people leave the rights battles to others.

Most people, like the frog, will only react when there is a crisis.

Again, how do I know? Well, it is happening today, here at the University of Alberta. A legalistic, bureau-

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
Doreen Kimura, Past President, Ph. D., F.R.S.C.
Philip Sullivan, Ph.D.
Judy Wubnig, Ph. D., Editor, Newsletter

cratic document called "Opening Doors" is going before the Board of Governors for final approval in December. This document, among other things, calls for racially-based hiring policies and campus speech codes.

How do you feel about U of A choosing students based on race? Well, on page xii of the document, there are plans to "ensure that designated groups are reasonably represented in the student body." Those assurances are racial quotas.

How about a racist/sexist hiring policy for professors? Check out page 58, where each race is guaranteed a certain number of positions. Take the category, "University Teachers." In the next five years, six aboriginals and eighty-eight women must be hired to reach the quotas. How utterly condescending. How humiliating to women and aboriginals. How racist.

So, if you are interested in teaching at U of A after you get your degree, you'd better get in your proper line. There is one line up if you are aboriginal. If you are a woman, there is another line up - both of these are fast tracks.

But if you were unfortunate enough to be born Ukrainian, Jewish, Italian, Polish, Greek . . . well, your race is not one of the "designated groups."

Should we be worried about this racist, sexist plan? Well, again on page 58, we read "it is important to note that neither numerical nor proportional targets should be considered as anything more than a first step . . ."

I knew that already, for I have studied the implementation of racist laws in Germany and South Africa.

There always has to be a first step, and it is always the mildest. In Germany, the Jews went first, then the Gypsies. Then came the trade unionists and the Catholics.

In "Opening Doors," the racial hiring quotas are first. Then the racial student quotas. Then the speech codes.

So will we allow ourselves to be slowly, irresistibly enslaved by these new merchants of racism? Will we boil alive like the frog?

Or will we stop this cancer while we still can?

Freedom is not something that can be handed down from one generation to the next. It cannot be bequeathed from father to son or mother to daughter.

It must be fought for and preserved every day by every generation.

So what will you do? Will you sit idle as many did in Germany?

Or will you take your turn defending freedom and racial equality?

I thank God that we still have the choice.

Yaqzan, Witchhunts and a Chilly Campus Climate²

by Christine Furedy

The issue of academic freedom raised by the actions of the administration of the University of New Brunswick (UNB) against Prof. Matin Yaqzan in November has been well aired in Canada. As far as most media are concerned, the case closed with the lifting by the UNB administration of their hasty and ill-judged suspension of him (Nov. 19). But for concerned academics and professionals, this case has a number of issues which still warrant comment and watchfulness: besides freedom of speech, there is the nature and scope of enquiries into a professor's behavior, and the factors affecting intolerance on campuses.

The predominant opinion of academics and faculty associations who have spoken out is that, by its immediate suspension of Prof. Yaqzan on Nov. 11, the UNB administration clearly contravened the principles of academic freedom, both as it is generally understood and as it is explicitly stated in article 14 of the collective bargaining agreement (1991-95) of the UNB.

Two weeks after the suspension, the president of UNB (Robin Armstrong) and vice-president, academic (Tom Traves) conditionally lifted the suspension (although Prof. Yaqzan was required not to meet his regular classes and not to discuss the matter). They issued a statement that the suspension had been merely to create a "cooling off" period so that public safety and order could be maintained on campus. It is hardly credible, however, that this was the original intent, given the administration's silence at the time on its reasons for the suspension.

It is also disturbing to note that the only publicized official condemnations of the UNB administration's action came from the UNB's faculty association and the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship. Groups supposedly concerned with academic freedom such as the Canadian Association of University Teachers, the Ontario Confederation of Faculty Associations, and other faculty association groups have not spoken out, nor encouraged further analysis, as far as I am aware (see December's *University Affairs*, which makes no mention of the matter).

²Letter to the *York University Gazette*, Jan. 12, 1994, p.2.

While attention has focused on the suspension as the most glaring action contravening the right to free speech without harassment, another dubious decision was the announcement that an enquiry would be undertaken into Prof. Yaqzan's 'total' employment record and performance. Open-ended enquiries, in circumstances such as these, look like witch hunts and all-too-easily become witch hunts. This is not to say that enquiries into a professor's behavior may not be appropriate under certain circumstances (not, I must stress, because teachers express their ideas about morality outside the classroom and completely divorced from any context of academic duties). If an incident occurs in the course of academic duties which constitutes discriminatory or prejudicial behavior or the promotion of unscholarly views in an academic setting, an enquiry might be appropriate. But the enquirers need to be very transparent about the questions raised and information sought: specific charges should be stated, the faculty member should be informed of them, and the enquiry should even-handedly seek supporting or contradictory evidence.

I stress this issue because it is currently relevant at the University of Toronto, it has come up at several universities in the past, and could appear at any of our universities and colleges. At the U of T, an enquiry has been mounted into a professor's behavior, but he has not been told what he is supposed to have done that was not "conducive to learning" and "free of discriminations," and the letter seeking the opinion of his colleagues and non-academic staff is vaguely and ambiguously worded.

A question that is being much discussed about the UNB case is how could the senior administrators of the university make such a wrong-headed decision? Although I have no first-hand knowledge of what happened, I suspect that a large factor was the near-hysterical atmosphere created on the campus by groups of mainly women students. Tom Traves came as vice-president academic to UNB from York with a reputation for proactive support of affirmative action. Did this, perhaps, incline him to pay more attention to the demands (strongly presented by women's groups and units for women's security) that Yaqzan be suspended and less to the voices of fairness? The main argument of many who recommended immediate suspension was that the safety of women students was threatened by Prof. Yaqzan expressing views on date rape. An indication of the extreme perceptions at UNB came to us here in Ontario when the Student Safety Officer of UNB spoke on television and radio about the suspension. (Following the suspension, the UNB administration declined to send a senior representative to debate the issue publicly, but rather deputized the Student Safety Officer to carry the can.)

Although few people in the audiences had read Prof. Yaqzan's article, the Student Safety Officer did not quote from it or attempt to summarize his full argument; rather, she mischaracterized the argument as an "incitement to violence against women." This could only inflame emotions and obscure the issues.

The blurring of concepts, such as that of 'violent acts,' is one of the forces tending to undermine rational understanding and resolution of conflicts or misunderstandings on university campuses. The inflation of the concept of inciting violence seems, at least, to have been very important in the UNB case.

The extraordinary actions of the UNB administration, occurring as they did on the same day as a visiting professor at McGill University was prevented from speaking by people opposed to his views, should be a reminder to all of us that the basic principle of university life and a free society have to be carefully guarded and constantly affirmed in democratic societies.

**Parkinson's Law and Employment Equity
Officers: Brock University and the McKeen
Memorandum
by Murray Miles**

Recently a chapter of the SAFS was formed at Brock. The background may be of interest to faculty at other institutions contemplating a similar step.

In March of 1993 I received a telephone call from the Acting Dean of Humanities. He said that he and the other Deans had been asked by the Vice-President, Academic, to gather information about the teaching evaluations currently in use in the various faculties and departments. Thus far he had obtained the necessary information from departmental secretaries, but since the Philosophy secretary was away sick and I was the only department member who seemed to be at his extension, would I mind, he asked, answering a few questions. They were:

Does the department now, or is it proposing, to include on its questionnaires questions such as:

1. Does the instructor use gender inclusive/neutral language in the classroom?
2. Does the instructor use gender and racially inclusive textbooks and/or other teaching materials?
3. Is the classroom free from racist, sexist, or other biased jokes and/or comments - from students? from the professor?

I managed to find out that this information had been requested by Carol A. McKeen, Faculty Advisor on

Employment Equity, Queen's University, in a memorandum to Employment Equity Offices at other member institutions of the Canadian University Employment Equity Network. It had been sent to Brock's Employment Equity Officer, who had sent it on to the Vice-President Academic, who had requested the help of the deans. In her memorandum, Ms. McKeen indicated that some faculties and departments at Queen's were undertaking reviews of the questionnaires used in student teaching evaluations. She added a fourth question:

4. We [the referent of the pronoun is unclear in the memorandum] are also considering asking the students who complete the questionnaires to indicate their sex so that we can compare responses by sex. Do you do this or are you considering doing so?

Alarmed by what I had learned, I sent a memorandum to the Employment Equity Officer (with a copy to the V.P., Academic) outlining my concerns and urging her not to participate in this information-gathering exercise. I also requested a copy of the McKeen memorandum (which I had seen, but wanted to obtain through the proper channels). Neither request was heeded. I then wrote to the Vice-President, Academic. The Employment Equity Officer was instructed to send me a copy of the memorandum. I made copies and sent it to all Brock faculty, together with a covering letter setting out the purposes of the SAFS and proposing the founding of a local chapter. A number of colleagues responded, and so discussions began which have led to the founding of a SAFS chapter at Brock. The McKeen memorandum proved particularly effective in alerting faculty to what may be in store for them unless steps are taken to safeguard academic freedom. (Copies of the memorandum are available from Prof. Miles, Department of Philosophy, Brock University, St. Catherine's, Ontario, L2S 3A1, E-mail: mmiles@spartan.ac.brocku.ca)

Does OCUFA Represent You? by Judy Wubnig

According to the *OCUFA Forum*, January/February 1994, Volume 9, number 3, p. 1, President Saul Ross welcomed the passage of Bill 79, the Employment Equity Legislation. OCUFA will be advising and assisting faculty associations in negotiating employment equity plans with their administrations. Public sector employers with more than ten employees are required by the legislation to determine how many members of the designated groups (aboriginal people, people with disabilities, members of racial minorities, and women) are in their workforce. They will then have to initiate an Employment Systems Review (ESR) to identify

barriers to hiring, retaining, treatment and promotion of members of the designated groups. Once the barriers have been identified, employers will have to create an employment equity plan to remove them, with "goals and timetables" for achieving a "more representative workforce." President Ross says that the government must now turn its attention to "educational equity."

"It has been OCUFA's position that there will be no employment equity in Ontario if members of designated groups are not adequately represented in the student populations of universities.

"An OCUFA brief to Justice Committee hearings on Bill 79 pointed out that while the proportion of women among undergraduate students has increased dramatically in recent years, women remain only a small fraction of the undergraduates in engineering programs (16%) and in math and physical science programs (30%). Aboriginal women, women with disabilities and women from some visible minorities are barely represented in the undergraduate student programs."

And more: Prof. Emily Carasco, Vice-President of OCUFA, at a conference on Academic Freedom, March 21, at the University of Guelph where we were both panelists, attacked me for "silencing" those speaking from the floor because I asked questions or disagreed!

OCUFA is supported by fees from local faculty associations. If you are a member of your local faculty association, you might try to persuade it to object to positions of OCUFA or to opt out of it.

"Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario"

The Ontario Ministry of Education and Training issued a *Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities* in the fall of 1993. Although the faculty associations seem to have received the document in October, the faculty of most universities in Ontario, except at Trent, only learned about it in February 1994 through the newspapers. Apparently, most faculty associations and the OCUFA did not think it important but as only spelling out Human Rights Legislation already on the books.

SAFS Letter to Minister of Education and Training David Cooke

March 8, 1994
Dear Mr. Cooke:

I am writing on behalf of the *Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship* (SAFS) regarding the Zero

Tolerance **Framework** that your Government has promulgated for the Universities in the Province of Ontario. The aims of the SAFS are indicated in the attached pamphlet. Our membership (now over 300) consists of people from all Ontario universities, as well as people from other Canadian universities from coast to coast.

By now you have received criticisms (some of them quite harshly worded) of this document from almost all University organizations, but it may appear to you that many of the organizations' objections have been assuaged by "clarifications" that the document is a **framework** rather than a code, or that the March 1 deadline is not "absolute."

No such "clarifications" can remove SAFS's basic objections to any such attempts to impose a speech code on institutions of higher education. A central purpose of these institutions is to allow not only faculty but also students the intellectual freedom to propose and debate doctrines that are, by their nature, uncomfortable for some individuals and groups, and therefore are potentially "verbally harassing."

As indicated in the attached pamphlet, one of SAFS's two principles is that of academic freedom, and that freedom has to be present not only for individual faculty but also for individual students. Young undergraduate students are particularly vulnerable to the velvet totalitarianism implied by any speech code, according to which the **comfort** of people with whom one disagrees is to be the criterion of whether one will suffer from the airing of one's opinions. Acceptance of speech codes which go beyond the normal civil laws of society outside the University, no matter how well-intended those speech codes or "frameworks" may be, means that universities will become institutions of indoctrination and not education. For this reason SAFS is against the **spirit** of the document you have issued, quite aside from whatever changes in the **wording** that may be made.

Yours sincerely,
John Furedy, President

Trent University

The *Framework* was distributed to all faculty of Trent University in the fall of 1993. On December 2, 1993, the Cultural Studies Program adopted a statement "On Free Inquiry and Expression," which was a petition opposing the position of the framework circulated to all faculty. It was signed by 80 (out of 200) members of the faculty (40%). On February 4, 1994, the Faculty Council passed a resolution including the following:

The Faculty Council resolves, and wishes to advise

the University and the appropriate legislative and administrative bodies and officers of the University, that:

2. The "Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities," issued by the Ministry in October to reflect "the Ministry's minimum expectation of the elements that should form both the process and product of institutional policy," is not acceptable as a basis for Trent University's own review and reform of its policies and regulations. The University cannot commit itself to "zero tolerance" as its objective, nor accept the framework of definitions, example, and application, in as much as these pose a threat to the established rights of expression, association, and privacy. The Ministry should be so advised. . . .

3. The University and its officers are not to make or enforce any rule subjecting any member of the university to disciplinary action solely on the basis of conduct that is speech or other communication which, outside the University, is protected by governmental restrictions by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. . . .

After the Faculty Council meeting, faculty learned that the Faculty Association at Trent had made a contract in the summer of 1993 with substantially the same provisions as the *Framework*. Faculty were unable to get the Faculty Association to change the contract.

University of Waterloo

The Senate of the University of Waterloo at its meeting of February 22 approved of a letter sent to Minister Cooke by the President of the University which was critical of the *Framework*. The Arts Faculty Council, at the meeting of March 8, 1994, passed a much stronger motion which may be of interest. (The Council had been unable to consider it before the meeting of the University Senate and before the Ministry deadline of March 1, 1994.)

The Arts Faculty Council of the University of Waterloo condemns the NDP Government of Ontario for the issuance of a document entitled *Framework Regarding Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination in Ontario Universities* which endorses guidelines destructive of academic freedom and an open society.

Some comments of the mover, Prof. Joseph Novak:

". . . Many faculty are astonished at the scope of this document. Although their astonishment arises from a quite accurate intuitive sense of its scope, they should reflectively consider how really expansive it is. In

considering just some of the various factors mentioned in the guidelines (coverage types, grounds, examples, coverage who), I drew up [an] outline of what I will call type cases (as opposed to token cases) which would fall under the *Framework*. I made a diagram using a branching schema. By multiplying its columns in connection with the factors, I arrived at a total of 398,416 type cases. . . . Were I to factor in the location elements, the number rises to 2,788,912. . . . If the ministry budget for this program remains at \$1.5 million, the above estimated number of cases would mean that there would be less than one dollar merely for the elaboration of each case type

[Later he noted examples of what might be prohibited.] "A recently published book entitled *Men and Other Reptiles* contains the following passages: "Don't accept rides from strange men -- and remember that all men are as strange as hell"; "Men are speedbumps on the highway of life"; "Men are idiots and I married their king"; "I married beneath me, all women do." "Q: How do you get an ex-boyfriend out of a tree?" A: "Cut the rope." Since the book is just a series of these aphorisms, I can assure you that I am not removing these from any context that would guarantee their artistic merit. This book is displayed with some prominence in the UW Bookstore. If the government guidelines were to pass, it seems that I or any male or even any female might claim that this book should be removed from sale on campus because it contributes to a negative environment on campus. . . .

"In the Sura of the *Koran* entitled "Women" (par. 38) we read the following: "Men are the managers of the affairs of women. . . Righteous women are therefore obedient. . . And those you fear may be rebellious admonish; banish them to their couches, and beat them." The *Koran* is read and discussed on campus. This passage may well be offensive to some women on campus; but then again, any criticism of this section of the *Koran* could be taken as offensive to Muslims. . . .

"Consider the case of some famous operatic pieces that could be considered offensive or sexist. *La donna e mobile, qual fium al vento* - "Woman is fickle as a feather in the breeze." Should Pavarotti come to campus to sing this, would he, as a visitor, be considered as violating the guidelines? . . . Now the magnitude of the improbability of Pavarotti coming to campus is only surpassed by the magnitude of the probability that were he to come and sing as described, some idiot would come forward to launch just such a complaint. . . ."

Zero Tolerance In The Year 1933 by Manfred Kuxdorf

The year was 1933, when on the 11th of June, the

newspaper, *Das Evangelische Deutschland* (10th year, Nr. 24), issued the following announcement of "zero tolerance" in regard to offensive literature. (Translation mine)

The *Reichsschundkampfstelle* (Central Defence League Against Smut) of the *Evangelical Young Men's Associations* writes us among other things:

Our members cleansed in Berlin in one day ten city-owned libraries, and approximately 70 other libraries. Loaded on to two trucks, 1212 books -- among them some of the worst kind -- were driven to the pyre. In Schneidemühl our co-workers withdrew 500 books from circulation. In Stargard the work commenced with the cooperation of the police. In a number of other German cities our friends have been consulted by the police to help them in their fight against filth-and-smut literature. In Stettin, schools organized a voluntary collection of trashy books. Not only is the symbolic action of burning significant, a thorough cleansing of publications is of importance too. Who would not support such actions, who would not personally get involved in this task? The *Defence League Against Smut* branch of the Evangelical Young Men's Associations in Germany, Berlin N 54, Sophienstraße 19, will send you material in support of the fight against smut and filth. Free information is available and support in any form is requested.³

Note: None of those well-meaning people anticipated that the suppression of books always leads to the oppression of people and that the burning of books would lead to the burning of people. Shortly after Hitler's rise to power in 1933, the evangelical newspaper for the entire realm of the *Federation of German Evangelical Churches* had thus lent a helping hand to forces which, once unleashed, could not be stopped. This happened a long, long time ago and similarities to present-day events are not coincidental.

"If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind." John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*

³ Nikolaus von Prederadovich and Joseph Stingl: *Gott Segne den Führer! Die Kirchen im Dritten Reich--Eine Dokumentation von Bekenntnissen und Selbstzeugnissen*. Starnbergersee: Druffel Verlag Leoni, 1985, p.35.

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

Further Reading

Richard Epstein, *Forbidden Grounds: The Case Against Employment Discrimination Laws*.

Michael A. Walker, ed., "In Defence of Academic Freedom and Scholarship," *Critical Issues Bulletin III, Fraser Forum*. Articles by Doreen Kimura, Ruth Gruehn, Dinesh D'Souza, Christopher Hodgkinson, Grant Brown, John Furedy, and Lydia Miljan. For copies, write or call: The *Fraser Institute*, 626 Bute St., Vancouver, B.C. V6E 3M1, Tel. (604) 688-0221, FAX (604) 688-8539 or Suite 2550-55 King St. W., Toronto, Ont., M5K 1E7, Tel. (416) 363-6575, FAX (416) 601-7322.

Nikolaus von Prederadovich and Joseph Stigl, *Gott Segne den Führer! Die Kirchen im Dritten Reich--Eine Dokumentation von Bekenntnissen und Selbstzeugnissen*.

Richard Bernstein, "Guilty If Charged," *NY Review of Books*, January 13, 1994.

Publications

Academic Questions (National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing St., Princeton, NJ 08540)

Measure (University Centers for Rational Alternatives, 570 Seventh Ave, New York, NY 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)

Samizdat-On-Line: ID "NAS" Electronic Bulletin Board: (607)-797-3225 (voice) or 797-9296 (modem)

NAS Princeton office E-mail: nas@nas.org. For suggestions and adding your E-mail address, contact rita@nas.org.

The SAFS Newsletter

The editor welcomes case studies, comments, articles, news items, references, local chapter news, etc. Address: **Chris Furedy**, c/o J. Furedy, Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont. M5S 1A1. FAX: (416) 962-4253.

Send registration form and cheque to **Laurie MacKay**, Secretary-Treasurer, c/o Furedy, Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont. M5S 1A1

E-mail: furedy@psych.utoronto.ca

REGISTRATION

First Annual SAFS Conference and Annual General Meeting: May 7, 1994

Name: _____

Address: _____

\$25, Full Registration, SAFS Member
(Be sure to be paid up!) _____

\$20, Lunch-session-only registration _____

(Registration fees received after April 15 will be \$35 and \$30 respectively.)

To join the SAFS, return this coupon to:
Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship, 152 Albert St., Unit 12, London, Ont. N6A 1M1

SAFS MEMBERSHIP

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

Name: _____

Address (home or office): _____

Institution: _____

Department: _____

Tel.: _____

FAX, E-Mail: _____