

Society for Academic Freedom & Scholarship

Number 21

NEWSLETTER

March 1999

www.safs.niagara.com

PURPOSES of SAFS

- 1. Maintaining freedom in teaching, research and scholarship;**
- 2. Maintaining standards of excellence in decisions about students and faculty.**

SAFS NEWS IN BRIEF

Doreen Kimura, President

SAFS ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING AT SFU, BURNABY, BC

For the first time since our inception, the AGM will be held outside of Ontario. We will meet on the Simon Fraser Campus in Burnaby, BC on Saturday, May 8, 1999. I hope many people will come, but I particularly urge those nearby to come out and meet your fellow SAFS members and exchange views. Our BC membership is much smaller than that of Ontario, but I hope we can have a viable meeting despite that.

The program is included as an insert in this newsletter, which also contains the nomination for new board members...

TELL US YOUR NEW ADDRESS!

Please send changes in postal or email addresses promptly, to the SAFS office. (See back page.)

Every mailing results in a number of returned messages or envelopes due to out of date addresses. The office does not have a regular secretary which makes keeping track of addresses time-consuming. It would be greatly appreciated if SAFS members themselves initiated changes of address.

SAFS President

1999 DUES

Membership fees (\$20 regular; \$10 students/retired) are due at the beginning of the calendar year. To gain the maximum benefit, early payment is advised. Paid up membership is necessary to vote at the AGM and to receive newsletters, mailings and e-mails from SAFS.

Subscription form on back page

REGISTER NOW!

**SIXTH ANNUAL
SAFS CONFERENCE AND
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1999
BURNABY, BC**

Program details enclosed.

KIMURA...continued from column 1

SAFS ACTIONS ON CURRENT ISSUES

Anti-hate proposed legislation: I wrote to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa on behalf of, and with the critical assistance of, the Board. We outlined our concerns with the probable impact of proposed changes to the "anti-hate" laws. The box on page 3 urges you to write to the minister of justice and others.

Role of Medical Research Council: We wrote to MRC about the Olivieri case at Sick Children's Hospital in Toronto, which has been covered extensively in the press.

Continued on page 2...

KIMURA...continued from page 1

In addition, Murray Miles, our Board member from Brock University, sent a letter on our behalf to the hospital administration, outlining our concerns for the academic freedom of researchers like Dr. Olivieri. Although MRC agreed with us that there should be no restriction on publication of research supported by MRC, they are still evading responsibility for providing matching funds in such cases. Their last reply to me indicated that there would be an ethics committee formed to look into this! Some of us find it astonishing that a body which has been so coercive in outlining rules of ethical conduct for individual researchers has shown such a lamentable lapse. As most of you will have read, a satisfactory settlement has now been reached between Dr. Olivieri and both the hospital and university.

APEC Inquiry: In September last year we wrote to Prime Minister Chrétien, expressing our concerns about events during the APEC demonstrations. The letter is reprinted on page 6. This yielded the usual type of reply -- wait for the report of the RCMP public complaints commission.

NSERC awards to women: On the question of the NSERC women's faculty awards, I received a polite reply from NSERC's president, enclosing a report that claims to show that none of the adverse consequences predicted from such restricted access appears to have occurred (based on the last round of awards which ended in 1995). The report, however, is based primarily on responses from awardees or applicants. I will be writing a response some time soon, and in the interim a letter from me (related to this issue) will appear in the April CAUT bulletin.

Published by the **Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship**, a society open to all (whether in a university or not) who accept the principles of freedom in teaching, research and scholarship and maintaining standards of excellence in decisions about students and faculty.

ISSN 1203-3197

Editor: Dr. Chris Furedy

E-mail: SAFSN@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA

Fax for newsletter submissions: (416) 962-4253

Mail for newsletter submissions: c/o J. Furedy, Dept. of Psychology, University of Toronto, M5S 3G3

Individual subscriptions: \$10 p.a.; institutional: \$15

Monitoring implementation of the Tri-Council Statement: John Furedy continues to monitor the new ethics code for researchers, both nationally and at his home university. Obviously this will be an ongoing struggle in Canada, and your co-operation in communicating concerns and developments to John would be appreciated. See page 5 for his first report.

DONATION TO SAFS

The Society is delighted to receive a donation from John and Chris Furedy in memory of John's parents. The Board is considering devoting part of the fund to a small prize to be given for an outstanding contribution to academic freedom in Canada. This will be discussed at the AGM. See back page.

CHAPTER ACTION

I would like to congratulate and encourage the University of Western Ontario's SAFS chapter on their courageous and tenacious fight to mitigate the stringent employment equity policies being pushed by the newly formed faculty union. Steve Lupker, the local coordinator, and Clive Seligman, have been especially active. A report on the chapter's progress will appear in the next *Newsletter*.

If any members out there have some local news you'd like relayed, please let me know and if it seems appropriate, I can send it out to the e-mail members, and we will also include it in a forthcoming newsletter. 9

SAFS Board of Directors (1998/99)

Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC, (UWO) *President*
 John J. Furedy, Ph.D., (U. Toronto) *Past President*
 Kenneth Hilborn, Ph.D., (UWO)
 Paul Marantz, Ph.D., (UBC)
 Murray Miles, Dr. Phil., (Brock U.)
 Harvey Shulman, M.A., (Concordia U.)
 Peter Suedfeld, Ph.D., FRSC, (UBC)
 Philip Sullivan, Ph.D., (U. Toronto)

E-mail Addresses

Doreen Kimura DKIMURA@SFU.CA
 John Furedy FUREDY@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA
 Kenneth Hilborn HILBORN@SSCL.UWO.CA
 Paul Marantz PMARANTZ@UNIXG.UBC.CA
 Murray Miles MILES@SPARTAN.AC.BROCKU.CA
 Harvey Shulman HSHULMAN@VIDEOTRON.CA
 Peter Suedfeld PSUEDFELD@NEURON3.PSYCH.UBC.CA
 Philip Sullivan SULLIVAN@UTIAS.UTORONTO.CA

EXPRESS YOUR VIEWS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO ANTI-HATE LEGISLATION

The Board has written to the federal justice minister (copy to the BC attorney general, since he has been instrumental in formulating the proposals), outlining our concerns that the changes, if adopted, would pose a serious threat to freedom of enquiry and discussion in academic institutions.

Some of these proposed changes:

- Allowing seizure of computer hard drives storing hate literature (apparently regardless of the purpose of storage)
- Expanding identifiable groups to include race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability and sexual orientation
- In principle, that the defense [sic] of truth should not be based on a denial of the holocaust (or?) of any other historically recognized act of genocide
- That an offence of 'institutionalized vandalism' be created
- That consideration be given to amending Human Rights legislation to prohibit slurs and harassment based on membership in groups defined in the Charter.

These provisions could put severe constraints on the kinds of issues that could be discussed anywhere, including universities.

Please express your concerns to:

The Minister of Justice
 Hon. Anne McLellan
 East Memorial Bldg
 284 Wellington St., 4th flr
 Ottawa, K1A 0H8

Note: mail to federal government representatives requires no postage stamp.

It would also be advisable write to your provincial premier and attorney general, since these issues were apparently discussed (with approval) at a provincial premiers' meeting last fall. You should be able to find their addresses in the telephone directory under government listings.

If you want advice, e-mail Ken Hilborn, a Board member, at: HILBORN@JULIAN.UWO.CA

KEEPING AN EYE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRI-COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

*John J. Furedy
 University of Toronto*

Now that the Statement on Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans has been accepted and is being implemented, in view of the many objections that SAFS expressed to details of the document (see *Newsletters* 17, 18, 20), it is important that we monitor the implementation, as best we can.

I have agreed to keep a watch for SAFS in this matter. Obviously, I am limited to my own university, and I will depend upon SAFS members to supply me with information about the implementation at their universities and institutions. Any comments, if reported on the SAFS list or in the *Newsletter*, will be kept anonymous, since I realize this issue bears upon many members' research and teaching in their institutions. We will therefore only identify the discipline of critics, but not their names or institutions.

I have circulated on the SAFS list some correspondence I initiated with representatives of the Medical Research Council (MRC). (An account of this correspondence is available from me by e-mail -- please request triced1 and triced2 files; my email is FUREDY@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA). These files are based on the two-day visit in January of a delegation from MRC to the University of Toronto.

At that time, there was a meeting attended by those who had answered a survey about implementation. I was the only researcher who had held NSERC or SSHRC funding.

It emerged from the MRC representatives that they took the "Statement" to be a code: they did not dispute sections which stated that non-compliance with the "mandated" principles would imply lack of funding. I interpreted the discussion as indicating that MRC was basically running the show, and that final implementation of the Statement's principles was being worked out by MRC, with NSERC and SSHRC basically going along.

A long time was spent on the "principle" that face-to-face meetings of research ethics boards (REBs) for *all* research proposals would be the norm. When it was pointed out

Continued on page 5...

SULLIVAN OPINION PIECE PUBLISHED IN

TORONTO STAR FOLLOWING PRESS COUNCIL RULING

In October 1997, Board member Philip Sullivan submitted a letter to the Toronto Star responding to an article by Thomas Walkom ("Right-wing causes find a rich and ready paymaster," Toronto Star Oct. 25) that contained errors, confusions and innuendoes about SAFS activities and funding for research from the Donner Canadian Foundation. The editors did not publish the letter and provided no clear reasons for their decision. Later, the Star ombudsman held that the rejection was because of "a legal matter" and suggested that Sullivan rewrite the letter avoiding accusations of inaccuracies and misquotations by Walkom. Prof. Sullivan submitted a complaint to the Ontario Press Council, on the grounds that the Star's rule of showing its writers critical letters meant that letters would not be published unless changed to suit the writer. After reviewing the exchange of memos between Sullivan and the Star ombudsman, the OPC although it does not usually consider cases concerning letters to editors, decided, in January 1998, to hear this complaint.

Phil Sullivan, backed by John Furedy, presented SAFS case, and Chris Furedy attended as observer on behalf of the Newsletter at the hearing in May last year. Prof. Sullivan argued that the Star, having said that two letters submitted by him were unacceptable because of unspecified "legal matters," implied that the writer of an article had the right to vet critical letters, and failed to provide clear guidance as to what would constitute an acceptable letter.

In June 1998 the OPC gave its decision dismissing the complaint. The OPC ruled that a newspaper has an unfettered right to decide what to publish and what not to publish, and that it is understandable that a writer be given the right to read and comment on a letter critical of what he has written. The OPC, noted, however, the reservation that the Star editors should have been more forthright in explaining what they considered to be a "legal matter," and could have been more helpful in outlining to Sullivan the ground rules for an acceptable letter.

At the hearing, the letters editor said he would welcome an opinion piece from Prof. Sullivan on the subject of SAFS. The following piece was published in the newspaper on October 26, 1998. The Star made some small editorial deletions from the original, and some of these are noted in parentheses.

ACADEMIC FREE SPEECH NEEDS CONTINUAL DEFENCE

P. A. Sullivan

In an increasingly complex civilization, universities play a vital role in promoting scholarship: the preservation, dissemination and expansion of knowledge. Crucial to that role is academic freedom. This is the right of unfettered debate on contentious issues according to the principles of responsible scholarship: rational argument applied to factual evidence. But this right is both hard-won and continually attacked by individuals, groups and governments taking offense for religious, political, or commercial reasons.

In Western democracies these attacks usually come from conservative forces external to the university; current examples are attempts by corporations to suppress information discovered by university researchers on harmful side effects of drugs. Such threats are well understood, but the last 30 years have witnessed attacks from other, more subtle, sources. Activists assert that, being dominated by white heterosexual males, universities need reform to eliminate racism and sexism.

The incident initiating this development occurred at Cornell University a generation ago. In 1963, Black students rioted and held several hostages, claiming that a professor's evaluation of the economic performance of several African countries was "racist." Setting terrible precedents, Cornell met the students' demands for an academic program having an explicit political mission, and forced the professor to apologize.

There have since been many similar assaults on academic freedom, with administrations routinely botching their resolution. In Canada, one of the worst occurred at McGill in 1993 when feminists disrupted a lecture by a U.S. psychologist arguing that recovered memories of sexual abuse are implanted by the therapists. McGill failed to discipline the offenders or to provide redress to the speaker.

These failures reflect widespread acceptance of the doctrine of postmodernism, which displaces the idea that facts and evidence count with the idea that everything reduces to subjective interests and perspectives. Postmodernism politicizes scholarship and legitimizes tactics such as discrediting an argument by pointing to the proponent's race or sex. Typically, "chilly climate" investigations of the political science departments at the Universities of Victoria and British Columbia portrayed critiques of feminist scholarship as sexual harassment.

Postmodernism has also fostered the adoption of speech codes and racial and sexual harassment criteria having subjective definitions of 'offence'. Furthermore, in

academic appointment and promotion practices, when an individual's excellence -- however imperfectly evaluated -- should be the predominant criterion, postmodernism accentuates [inappropriate] group membership criteria.

The Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship was formed in 1992 following both attacks on controversial professors and the ensnarement of others in absurd harassment proceedings. The Society does not deny the problems that speech codes and harassment policies address. It argues that experience has confirmed early critics' predictions: the codes and policies have created secretive, self-justifying bureaucracies, and unfair investigative practices prone to abuse by individuals bearing grudges. Furthermore, by creating a climate of uncertainty, they assault academic freedom.

Speech codes have been especially troublesome; indeed, political scientist Abigail Thernstrom depicts U.S. universities as "islands of repression in a sea of freedom." In Canada, Ontario's NDP government introduced a draconian code which civil liberties lawyer Alan Borovoy described as "making one person's free speech contingent on another person's thin skin." This code is still in force.

As the recent swimming coach case at Simon Fraser University illustrates, harassment policies have also been problem-ridden, with administrations repeatedly bungling their implementation. Although few in number, such debacles have serious legal consequences, lead to agonized policy revisions, and polarize campus communities.

The Society believes that speech codes and harassment policies have proved to be unnecessary, costly, divisive failures. For example, the harassment uppermost in the public mind, "sex for grades," was a serious academic offense long before harassment codes were introduced, so that these codes focus on trivial cases such as leering or the ideologically offended.

Typically, this February, in granting the appeal of a Waterloo sociology professor against his conviction for offending a student by savagely criticizing employment equity, the adjudicator commented on the flawed nature of the university's policy, and on the absurdity of forcing insincere written public apologies. [Also, this May, when a few students in a University of Massachusetts biology class objected to a professor's factual description of an abortion drug, a bureaucrat declared it harassment warranting replacement of the professor with someone more "sensitive."] Given evidence such as this, it is time for detached and open reappraisal of these policies.

Critics such as the Star's Thomas Walkom portray the

Society as defending only certain views. But it speaks out on all attacks on academic free speech, regardless of the ideological content. In the recent past we have defended a conservative Muslim, a feminist scholar, a leftist homosexual, as well as academics who discussed sex and race differences in human groups in ways that may have been uncomfortable for some but which were consistent with the academic mission of the university, which is the search for truth through reasoned argument.⁹

Philip Sullivan teaches at the Institute for Aerospace Studies, University of Toronto, and is a member of the Board of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship.

FUREDY...continued from page 2

that at my university this would mean meetings for about 1100 proposals per year (in contrast to our previous system where such meetings occurred about 1% of the time), the MRC members argued that it was necessary to have the meetings to solve various ethical problems. When challenged to provide evidence that our system had such problems, they shrugged. They contested the suggestion (made initially by Bernard Dickens, a U of T professor, who was a member of the original Tri-Council drafting committee) that the physical meeting requirement would actually detract from the quality of the reviews.

In the end, though, it was clear that the degree to which the Statement would be implemented in every detail would depend on the strength of resistance in each institution. I'm still optimistic about the will to resist at my university. There seems to be an increased awareness of the probable detrimental effects of a number of the provisions, especially on younger faculty researchers and their students.

The implementation wagon train is rolling on. On March 13 there is to be a one-day workshop at York University, to which future REB members are especially invited. The program suggests merely "how to" sessions for budding applied "bio ethicists" who will be taught how to apply a "Statement" which is really a code.⁹

APEC: AN APOLOGY AND AN ASSURANCE NEEDED

To: Prime Minister Jean Chrétien
From: Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC, LLD (Hon)
President, SAFS

September 28, 1998

Dear Mr. Chrétien,

Our society is a nation wide organization, composed of individuals dedicated to the maintenance of academic freedom and the merit principle in all academic pursuits. Most of the membership are faculty at universities throughout Canada.

We have become very concerned about the events occurring during the APEC demonstration on the UBC campus last year. By all accounts, the RCMP pepper sprayed and arrested students who were attempting a peaceful demonstration against the presence on campus of a foreign dictator. Such police actions in a democratic country are inexcusable, and are the more reprehensible when taking place on a university campus where the mission is to search for and speak the truth. We consider it a basic right of individuals to express their opinions, by whatever forum, including public placards.

The excuse of protection for the demonstrators is simply unacceptable. It is those who would suppress freedom of speech who are culpable. If there were any anticipated danger to the students from foreign security guards, the latter should not have been admitted to the country. Our democratic rights should not be bartered for the good will of states that do not honour those rights.

As a country, we had an opportunity to show totalitarian states that we allow public dissent. Instead, we behaved as Suharto himself would have behaved. Moreover, you, Mr. Prime Minister, made sneering remarks about the pepper spraying incident, sending a clear message to Canadians that you have contempt for their right to speak up in disagreement with their government.

You owe the student demonstrators an apology, and you owe the Canadian public an unequivocal assurance that you understand and will in future support the right of every citizen to carry on peaceful protests. 9

cc: Mr. P. Manning, Reform Party Leader,
Ms. A. McDonagh, NDP Leader

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY VS. MERIT

To: Premier Michael Harris
From: Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC, LLD (Hon)
President, SAFS

June 16, 1998

Dear Mr. Harris,

I am writing as president of the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship (SAFS). We are a nation wide organization dedicated to the maintenance of academic

freedom, and of the merit principle in post-secondary education.

We have in the past congratulated you and your government for rescinding the infamous Employment Equity law passed by the previous NDP government. Unfortunately, during the NDP's term of office this law became the basis for establishing equity offices in most Ontario universities. These offices continue to exist in nearly all Ontario universities, and in many they continue to promote the old employment equity policy, that is, that representation of designated groups in all occupations should reflect their representation in the population.

The application of employment equity in many post-secondary institutions has taken the form of advertising wordings such as "Women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply," rather than the more neutral "All qualified persons are encouraged to apply." Worse still, administrators have used the still-implicit EE principle to actively discourage men who apply. In one case that I know of, a qualified man chosen by a department was not allowed to be offered a position, on grounds that *a woman must be hired*, even though the department had exhausted its supply of qualified women candidates.

Unfortunately, these decisions often go on *sub rosa*, with administrators denying that they are favouring women. In the case I just mentioned, the Vice-President Academic responded to my enquiry about a "women only" hiring policy by saying that their policy was dictated by their Employment Equity office; thus using the office as an excuse for what I regard as a violation of the Ontario Human Rights Code. In other words, he did not admit that he personally had made such a decision.

I think it would be very useful for your office, and that of the appropriate education ministry, to remind colleges and universities that the EE law was in fact rescinded, and to encourage the hiring of faculty on the basis of merit alone. This could have a very positive effect in encouraging the maintenance of standards in our institutions of higher learning. Taxpayers pay the salaries of university faculty, and they have the right to the best that money can buy. At present, they are being shortchanged. 9

cc: David Johnson, Diane Cunningham, MPP

GRADUATE STUDENTS' ACADEMIC FREEDOM PROTECTED AT SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

The Dean of Graduate Studies at SFU, Bruce Clayton,

circulated last November the policy below, designed to support SFU graduate students whose academic freedom, in the course of their approved research, is challenged or compromised by an external body.

Where an SFU graduate student who is a candidate for a degree undertakes in good faith research which is: (a) approved by the University, including ethics approval where necessary; and, (b) under faculty supervision, and where that individual's academic freedom is challenged or compromised by an external body, the University has an obligation to provide legal advice, representation, and/or indemnification to him/her in defending against those actions. This protection does not apply to legal action initiated by the graduate student.

Where there is a dispute between a graduate student and the University regarding the application of this policy it will be referred to a three-person ad hoc sub-committee of the Senate Graduate Studies Committee which includes at least one student. The decision of this sub-committee will be final. 9

HISTORY CURRICULUM IN CANADA

It is not really the ministers [of education] who make the policy but the bureaucrats. The professional educators who dominate the education ministries in the provinces remain fixated on the theory of progressive education, on remedying societal ills such as sexism and racism, and on making students feel good about themselves. Whatever the criticisms of those who believe otherwise, content remains second to process -- a distant second.

J. L. Granatstein, *Who Killed Canadian History?* Harper-Collins Publishers, 1998, p. 33.

Former SAFS Board Member and Professor Emeritus of History, now director of the Canadian War Museum, tracks the decline of the teaching of history in Canadian public and high schools, identifying preoccupation with multiculturalism as an important factor.

Larson, Ruth. "Advocacy groups are putting science on defensive, shutting research down." *Washington Times*, January 15, 1999.

McMurtry, J. "Education and the market model," *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 25, 1991: 209-217.

Patai, Daphne. *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998.

The outcome of some years of research into complaints about sexual harassment on campuses and the study of attitudes of feminists, this book presents the aim of dismantling heterosexuality as a force behind campus speech codes and regulations of sexual relations. The agenda is abetted, Patai contends, "by the frequent overreactions of college administrators fearful of lawsuits from alleged victims but not from alleged harassers. Thus it is that the former are given assistance, counseling and support while the latter are often suspended or otherwise punished at the mere threat of a sexual harassment charge and well in advance of any investigation." Patai argues that this situation is "neither intellectually productive nor morally tolerable."

Pear, Joseph J., Alexander A. Berezin, Geoffrey Hunter, and Chary Rangacharyulu. "Why Canadian research funding councils need fundamental revision," *OCUFA Forum*, Fall 1998: 8-13. See also: www.ocufa.on.ca.

Sokal, Alan and Jean Bricmont. *Fashionable Nonsense: Post-modern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science*. Picador, 1998.

Continued on page 12...

FURTHER READINGS

Bertonneau, Thomas F. "Epistemological correctness in English 101," *Academic Questions*, vol. 10, no. 1, Winter 1996-97: 66-78.

Campbell, John Angus. "John Stuart Mill, Charles Darwin, and the culture wars: resolving a crisis in education." *The Intercollegiate Review*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1996: 44-51.

Granatstein, J. L. *Who Killed Canadian History?* Toronto: Harper-Collins, 1998. ISBN 0-00-255759-2.

HOWL 1998
Henry H. Bauer

For Academe¹

I

I saw the best minds of my generation demoralized by
 the madness around them, starving hysterical unbelieving,
 dragging themselves through the classes, meetings, hallways
 looking for an honest academic fix,
 angelhearted scholars burning for the ancient heavenly
 connection to the starry dynamo in the machinery of night...

With self-interested ignoramuses selfishly making self-serving curriculums,
 with neophytes rendering judgment on their mentors and
 novices on their tutors
 with education professors professing empty nothings

with feminoid sexists calling men sexist
 with racist black fanatics calling others racist,
 demanding sensitivity, and illustrating it
 by honoring Hymie-calling Jackson and Jew-baiting Farrakhan,
 teaching that black Egyptians could fly and read minds
 (who never were black and never could)
 demanding for themselves the right to speak and to slander
 while shouting down any contrary opinion
 as the sanctimonious guardians of academe watch and approve
 demanding for themselves separate this and separate that
 "What's mine is mine, and what's yours is also mine"...

With faculties aye-saying standard-less mindless spin-doctored crap
 With administrators unaccountable - lawless, gutless wonders
 self-serving spineless conviction-less lackeys
 With professors bedding students - M/F, F/F, M/M, any number can play
 and writing it up as scholarly work
 hiring their lovers, their children, their wives, promoting their friends
 hiring by race, by sexual orientation, by sexual performance,
 by political activity, by anything but scholarly merit
 all approved by Dean Pontius Pilate: "They all do it";
 and by Provost Pontius, and by President Pilate...

With professors preaching not teaching, indoctrinating not educating and
 proud of it!
 giving grades to please and to get praised in return

All selling out, everything for sale, degrees expensive enough but
 often worth nothing

II

What sphinx of cement and silicon bashed open
 their skulls and ate up their brains and imagination?
 Moloch! Filth! Ugliness...
 Moloch whose mind is pure machinery! Moloch whose
 blood is running money...
 Moloch whose skyscrapers stand in the long
 streets like endless Jehovahs! Moloch whose factories
 dream and croak in the fog! Moloch whose
 smokestacks and antennae crown their cities!
 Moloch whose love is endless oil and stone! Moloch
 whose soul is electricity and banks!...

III

Christopher Brand! I'm with you in Edinburgh
 where the spirits of countless generations of
 distinguished scholars and graduates gape unbelieving
 at the spectacle of a Provost investigating whether students might
 have been *discomforted* as they learned to think about the world
 Joe Conlin! I'm with you at Chico State
 insisting that academic qualifications be the hiring criterion
 with administrators - who else? calling that - what else?
 - "racial harassment"
 Craig Cobane! I'm with you at Cincinnati,
 where graduate assistants must have their brains washed
 with multi-culti sensitivity training
 John Doe! I'm with you at Valparaiso
 Adam Lack! I'm with you at Brown
 - and with countless others, from sea to shining sea -
 where no due process stops the lynching, if you're white
 and male charged with rape because some girl willingly had sex with you
 but later regretted it and now absolves her guilt by blaming you,
 becoming as a bonus a feminoid heroine
 a paler Anita Hill
 Murray Dolfman! I'm with you at Penn
 you said... "ex-slave"!!!
 for which no apology could be enough
 it called for sensitivity brain-training
 and still they wanted you to be fired
 Elizabeth Fox-Genovese! I'm with you at Emory
 where Women's Studies mustn't be intellectual, only ideological
 Linda Gottfredson! I'm with you at Delaware
 where research sponsors must always be politically correct
 Alan Gribben! I'm with you at Texas
 and with all the others at all the other places

who still think that professors in faculty meetings ought to vote their
 professional opinion without reprisals from the ranting fanatics
 who will brook no deviation from the PC party-line
 Louis Jacobs! I'm with you at Ohio State
 and with all the other flaming liberals who learned - re-learned,
 learned over and over again, shades of Stalin - that the Left
 eats its own, who dare think for themselves, and spits them out
 and pisses on them
 and tears out their hearts as reward for lifelong loyalty
 Heinz-Joachim Klatt! Marjorie Ratcliffe! I'm with you at Western Ontario
 Graydon Snyder! I'm with you at Chicago Theological Seminary
 innocent of sexual harassment
 but reputation besmirched as though you had been guilty
 Judith Kleinfeld! I'm with you at Alaska-Fairbanks
 Lino Graglia! I'm with you at Texas Law
 daring to speak what everyone knows but mustn't say;
 Don't you know that the truth creates a hostile environment?
 Marlin Lask! I'm with you at Sarah Lawrence
 persecuted for breaking into laughter
 "We know you're not guilty but you tried to make an environment
 that was uncomfortable and demeaning.
 Your actions can be interpreted as hostile"
 Julius Lester! I'm with you at Massachusetts-Amherst
 where everyone is free to believe the same things, not anything else
 Jim Maas! I'm with you at Cornell
 in the Star Chamber of feminoid radicals where rules are made up as
 they go along, no due process, without shame, without decency
 and the dean washes his hands until he can become a Provost with
 a fancier washroom
 Al Mandelstamm! I'm with you at Virginia Tech
 master teacher of tens of thousands, applauded for decades, honored
 alike by colleagues and students
 then lynched by one Women's Affairs Officer
 who refused to look at the evidence because even one single
 complaint from a woman should be enough to end anyone's career
 whether or not the complaint has any basis in fact
 And ten years later, who cares that your Department has still not
 found anyone to fill your shoes?

Pete Schaub! I'm with you at Washington
 where no questions are permitted when it's a class in
 Women's Studies
 where the Truth is being revealed, not ideas discussed
 where it's OK to teach female masturbation
 but not to offer a different opinion
 Phoebe Spinrad! I'm with you at Ohio State
 where diversity doesn't include veterans

Shelby Steele! I'm with you and all the other self-thinking ones
 Thomas Sowell! Glenn Loury! Kenny Williams! Stephen Carter!
 the list is long; Julius Lester! Walter Williams! on and on
 excommunicated from "your" group in the name
 of freedom for not toeing the color-line
 Stephan Thernstrom! I'm with you at Harvard,
 whose official language is double-speak
 No professional opinions, please, just agree with
 the hallowed slogans of officially designated victimhood
 Phi Kappa Sigma at Riverside! I'm with you
 for the right to advertise with normal sophomoric humor
 a Spring Break in Mexico
 Students (who want to study)! I'm with you at Penn
 amidst stampeding noisy water-buffaloes
 non-studying students stealing newspapers
 applauded by administrators
 Political Science at British Columbia! I'm with you
 suspended for political incorrectness
 Scandinavian Studies at Minnesota! I'm with you
 not guilty, but harassed for months and reputations smeared by
 Sexual Harassment Officers and administrative lackeys

Oh Academe! I'm with you in Asylum-land
 where machines are prized more than brains
 I'm with you in Asylum-Wonderland
 where professors assert that there's nothing to profess
 where administrators hold faculty accountable but no one else not
 themselves and certainly not the students
 I'm with you in Wonderland
 where Enlightenment is a dirty word but
 everything else can be said (if you're the right sort of person)
 I'm with you all in Asylum-land
 in tears...
 in the Western night.

The perpetrator of this appropriation of Ginsberg's work, Henry Bauer, begs that stridency and infelicity therein will be excused: he did it while victim of a hostile intellectual environment, having just heard of three separate instance of hires for reasons of nepotism rather than merit, in two of them even contrary to programmatic need, A would-be whistle-blower reporting illegalities in a search was shrugged off by the dean - "They all do it"- and by the EO/AA officer because, said she, only unsuccessful candidates lodging such a complaint need be attended to by her.

Endnote: 1. *Pace* Allen Ginsberg "Howl--For Carl Solomon," San Francisco 1995-96, often cited as an icon of the "Beat Generation" that was willfully estranged from a society it could not believe in. Collier's (1969) Encyclopaedia signified "beat" as "ruined," "spent," as in "I'm beat." But the term "beat" has a second meaning: "beatific" or sacred or holy. Kerouac, a devout Catholic, explained many times that by describing his generation as "beat", he was trying to capture the secret holiness of the downtrodden. (Levi Asher, 1998, on the web). Academics today are certainly "beat" in the first sense, and some are in the second as well.

DONATION TO SAFS IN MEMORY OF PARENTS

John and Chris Furedy have made a donation to SAFS in memory of John's parents, Dusi (1910-1990) and Bela (1906-1999). The Board has received a suggestion that a small amount be devoted to a prize for an outstanding contribution to academic freedom in Canada. This will be discussed at the AGM.

The Board thanks the Furedys for their generous gesture, and remind members that bequests can strengthen our organization.
SAFS Board

FURTHER READINGS...continued from page 8

Sullivan, Philip A. "An engineer dissects two case studies: Hayles on fluid mechanics, and Mackenzie on statistics." In *A House Built on Sand: Flaws in the Cultural Studies of Science*. Edited by Noretta Koertge. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998: 71-98.

One of the authors discussed in this chapter corresponded with Phil Sullivan, and the letters will be published in the forthcoming edition of Social Studies of Science (vol. 29, no. 2, April 1999).

Westhues, Kenneth. *Eliminating Professors: A Guide to the Dismissal Process*. Queenstown, ON: Edwin Mellen Press, 1998. ISBN 0-7734-8210-5.

SAFS member, professor of sociology at University of Waterloo, who battled two accusations at "Censorship U," one being of racism (see Newsletter 19, pp. 6-7), uses his own and other cases to cast light on "the five-stage process by which a university comes to define a professor as undesirable and the gets rid of him or her."

Zuriff, Gerald E. "Learning disabilities in the academy," *Academic Questions*, vol. 10, no. 1, Winter 1996-97: 53-65.9

THANKS...to Lianne Carley, former SAFS secretary, for the typing and layout. -- Ed.

Disclaimer

The SAFS *Newsletter* publishes authoritative notices from the Board of Directors. Apart from these, the views expressed are not necessarily those of the Society.

All or portions of the *Newsletter* may be copied for further circulation. We request acknowledgement of the source and would appreciate a copy of any further publication of *Newsletter* material.

SAFS NEW OFFICE

Doreen Kimura will deal with all SAFS business (except the *Newsletter*) from the new office at Simon Fraser University.

The new SAFS address is: Box 235, 6540 Hastings Street, Burnaby, BC, V5B 4Z5.
E-mail: SAFS@SFU.CA
Website: www.safs.niagara.com

SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM

To join SAFS or to renew your membership, please complete this form and return to: SAFS, Box 235, 6540 Hastings St., Burnaby, BC, V5B 4Z5

Please make your cheque payable to SAFS for \$20 (regular) or \$10 (students and retirees).

I support the Society's aims:

Renewal New Member

Name: _____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

Other Address: _____

Ph (work): _____ Ph (home): _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Submissions to the SAFS Newsletter

The editor welcomes short articles, case studies, news items, comments, readings, local chapter news, etc. Longer items are preferred on a 3.5" (MS-DOS) disk in Word Perfect or Word, or by e-mail attachment. Address: **Chris Furedy**, c/o John Furedy, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 3G3. Fax: (416) 962-4253; E-mail: SAFSN@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA