
SOCIETY FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND SCHOLARSHIP

Number 25

NEWSLETTER

April 2000

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.

Conference Issue

IMPOSED DIVERSITY: ANTITHESIS OF A UNIVERSITY

Leo Zakuta

Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto

Despite the imperiousness of president-designate Dr. Robert Birgeneau's proclamation that the University of Toronto will be "committed to diversity," i.e., affirmative action, his remarks betray considerable ambivalence or perhaps confusion. ("An Ivy League Brouhaha," *National Post*, Feb. 26). The trouble began when the dean of Science at MIT tried to support affirmative action by comparing the position of women and Jews.

"Dr. Birgeneau likened the position of women academics to that of Jews after the Second World War, adding that 'when many academic institutions, both in Canada and the United States, were reluctant to hire Jewish scholars, MIT practised absolute merit-based hiring, which meant that we brought to MIT people like Paul Samuelson and Noam Chomsky'." His message: they were hired not because they were Jews but solely because of their academic qualifications

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 3 | SAFS Board on Birgeneau |
| 4 | BC Tribunal Unbalanced |
| 5 | Conference Programme |
| 7 | VT in British Academia |
| 8 | UWO Course on Political Correctness |
| 9 | Kimura Replies to Frize |
| 10 | Controversy Award for Kimura |

and look how well it turned out. Sure, but where did affirmative action come in?

"So: Does he believe in quota-based affirmative action? 'I believe very firmly in merit-based hiring,' he replied. 'We attained the top scientists

Continued on page 2...

ZAKUTA...continued from page 1

in the world at MIT under my leadership by an unrelenting commitment to merit-based hiring, and in the current climate, in the current world we live in, merit-based hiring automatically produces a diverse faculty.” Could he be any clearer? It turned out splendidly, but a ringing endorsement of affirmative action, it's not.

“That said, he also says he believes it's critical to ‘aggressively search’ for outstanding women faculty, and that he welcomes affirmative action and quotas as a ‘temporary measure where it's necessary to correct egregiously bad historical behaviour and to help ameliorate the effects of the environment for non-majority people’.”

So, Dr. Birgeneau tells us, “absolute and unrelenting merit-based hiring” did wonders for MIT. It recruited the best people; it “automatically produces a diverse faculty” and it overcame discrimination against Jews. (Could it not do the same for women, blacks and any other groups?). One might have thought, after all that, that he would be an ardent champion of the merit principle. But, it seems it's not really that good, after all. Something different is needed, something like “merit-hiring if necessary, but not necessarily merit-hiring”. Mackenzie King's original phrase

was designed to reassure both sides in an irreconcilable conflict of his support.¹

Imposed diversity is as antithetical to the idea of a university as was the imposed uniformity of an earlier age. Both restrict access to talent.

Nevertheless, even if it's only confusion, Dr. Birgeneau's views are not mere harmless muddle. They can have dark consequences. “Dr. Birgeneau told the Post he was misquoted in the original article (*Toronto Star*, Feb. 8) when he allegedly said those in leadership positions (at the U of T) who disagree with his views about affirmative action “should find something else to do”. He tried to clarify matters by saying “I just do not want in my administration people who discriminate, that is, people who consistently favour one sociological sub-group over others.” (Actually, there has been so little evidence of such discrimination in our universities in recent times that this sounds like a phantom foe or perhaps a straw man.)

Continued on page 3...

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, 4024 Sidney Smith Hall
100 St. George Street

University of Toronto, M5S 3G3

Subscription: \$25 p.a.

SAFS Board of Directors (1999/2000)

Doreen Kimura, Ph.D., FRSC, (UWO) President
John J. Furedy, Ph.D., (U. Toronto) Past President
Dale Beyerstein, M.A., (Langara, BC)
Kenneth Hilborn, D. Phil., (UWO)
Paul Marantz, Ph.D., (UBC)
Clive Seligman, Ph.D., (UWO)
Harvey Shulman, M.A., (Concordia U)
Peter Suedfeld, Ph.D., FRSC, (UBC)

E-mail Addresses

Doreen Kimura DKIMURA@SFU.CA
John Furedy FUREDY@PSYCH.UTORONTO.CA
Dale Beyerstein DBEYERST@LANGARA.BC.CA
Kenneth Hilborn HILBORN@JULIAN.UWO.CA
Paul Marantz PMARANTZ@UNIXG.UBC.CA
Clive Seligman SELIGMAN@JULIAN.UWO.CA
Harvey Shulman HSHULMAN@VIDEOTRON.CA
Peter Suedfeld SUEDFELD@PSYCH.UBC.CA

ZAKUTA...continued from page 2

But there it is: if you disagree with his views about affirmative action, you favour discrimination. That is, you're a racist or sexist or whatever. To say that openly would be too patently absurd or maybe even libelous so it's turned into an insinuation or a smear. The universities - and they're not alone - are full of people so petrified by that smear that, sheep-like, they fall silently into line behind affirmative action policies. The media report the pathetic efforts of beleaguered department heads to prove the "diversity" of their staffs. As if it matters. A generation ago, another smear terrified the academic world into a similar sheep-like syndrome - the fear of being labeled a "reactionary". The faculty fell all over themselves to prove how democratic they were and how they believed in complete equality between teachers and students. That was a crock of course and it passed away but not without leaving much damage in its wake. What threat will trigger the next outbreak?

¹The original phrase, familiar to older Canadians, was "Conscription if necessary but not necessarily conscription". Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, sometimes known as Wily Willie, faced a nation sharply divided by the conscription issue during the last world war. Most French Canadians were strongly opposed to it while the rest of the country was just as staunchly in favour. So King devised a policy embodied in that deathless phrase. □

THE MEANING OF SYSTEMIC DISCRIMINATION

What is the meaning of "systemic discrimination" and how does it apply, or not apply to universities and colleges in Canada? Readers are invited to send comments or examples of the use of this concept to the Newsletter.

Editor

PRESS RELEASE RE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

The Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship is gravely concerned about the threat to academic freedom and the merit principle that is implied by some recent remarks by Dean Robert Birgeneau of MIT. Dr. Birgeneau is president-designate of the University of Toronto and is due to take up office on July 1 of this year. The two remarks occurred on two separate visits by president-designate Birgeneau to Toronto when he met with U. of T. administrators.

One remark, reported in the *Toronto Star*, January 9, was that he told U. of T. administrators that "if they did not share his views on diversity, they may as well step down." The other remark, reported in the *Star*, February 8, not only appeared to repeat the threat, but extended its scope to include "anyone in a leadership position" who, Birgeneau was reported to have said, "can find something else to do." President-designate Birgeneau was reported to have stated in a later interview (*National Post*, February 26) that he had been "misrepresented," but has not specifically stated in what respects these misrepresentations occurred.

Especially as there is a wide range of legitimate views on "diversity" and "equity," without further clarification on his part, Dr. Birgeneau's remarks are deeply disturbing. They at least suggest an intention on his part to run one of Canada's leading universities with a degree of imposed conformity that is incompatible with a genuine institution of higher education, as well as being inconsistent with the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) principles on academic freedom. Those CAUT principles explicitly include "freedom to criticize the university" and "freedom from institutional censorship." SAFS therefore protests the serious threat to academic freedom implied by his remarks, and urges him either to withdraw them or

Continued on page 4...

PRESS RELEASE...continued from page 3

to clarify how they are compatible with freedom from institutional censorship, a cornerstone of Canadian academic life.

*SAFS Board of Directors
March 7, 2000* □

OUT OF BALANCE: BC HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL

*James Steiger
University of British Columbia*

In a decision that prompted outraged responses from many private citizens and media figures, the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal ruled in favor of complainant Fariba Mahmoodi in her sexual harassment case against Professor Don Dutton.

Dutton, a full professor in UBC's (University of British Columbia) Department of Psychology, is an internationally-known expert on domestic violence.

The basic facts of the case are these. In the late fall of 1994, Mahmoodi approached Dutton about enrolling in a directed studies course. On December 30, she went to his apartment in the evening to discuss research. Subsequently, she sent him a letter threatening to destroy his career if he did not get her into graduate school. Dutton took the letter to UBC's Equity Office and complained that he was being blackmailed. They did nothing.

Mahmoodi filed a complaint that Dutton had tried to seduce her while she was in his apartment. Upon receiving Mahmoodi's complaint, the Equity Office immediately launched an extensive investigation of Dutton.

Mahmoodi produced a murky tape recording that included sounds of music being played and snippets of conversation between her and Dutton. Exactly how this recording was made was never

determined, although the method of production would seem to be of central importance in assessing the motivation of Mahmoodi. Dutton claimed he never made the recording. Mahmoodi claimed the voice recording accidentally occurred while Dutton was recording music for her. Yet the ability of the tape recorder to actually perform this feat without a microphone was never proven. A definite possibility is that Mahmoodi produced the recording herself.

Ultimately, the B. C. Human Rights Tribunal decided that there was no evidence Dutton had physically seduced Mahmoodi, but found him guilty anyway of "creating a sexualized environment." He was fined \$13,000. His legal expenses are already in six figures.

Numerous aspects of the BC Human Rights Tribunals procedures give grave cause for concern. The most serious problems are the following:

- 1) Vague, ill-defined procedures controlled by a single individual (the tribunal chair, a political appointee) who serves as judge and jury.
- 2) Incredibly slow processing of cases, resulting in unnecessary stress and financial hardship to all involved, especially the defendant. The claimant's legal bills are paid for by the Tribunal, while the defendant has to pay for legal expenses.
- 3) Selective filtering of information at several stages of the hearing process. The tribunal "chair" can rule evidence inadmissible, and the evidence then disappears permanently from the record. For example, the Tribunal took several years to process the case, and yet ruled some key testimony as "inadmissible."

Professor James Steiger testified that Mahmoodi approached him about a failing mark around the same time she visited Dutton's apartment, and threatened (in the presence of a witness) to charge

Continued on page 6...

SAFS Annual General Meeting 2000

University of Western Ontario, Somerville House
London Ontario

Saturday, May 13, 9-3:30

Location: Somerville 3317

- 9:00-10:00 a.m. Registration, coffee and rolls, meet other members.
- 10:00-10:30 a.m. President's introductory remarks (D. Kimura)
Academic Freedom Award (presented by J. Furedy)
- 10:30-12:00 noon "*Combating Preferential Hiring*" (Jim Ryan, Huron College, UWO, Chair)
Clive Seligman, UWO, "Faculty job discrimination at Wilfrid Laurier University"
Steve Lupker, UWO, "The excellence-versus-equity debate at UWO"
- 12:00 noon Buffet lunch (In Somerville 3320)
- 12:45 p.m. Special invited presentation (Nancy Innis, UWO, Chair)
Karen Selick, lawyer and writer: "Anti-hate laws: the good news and the bad"
- 2:00 p.m. Annual Business Meeting (members only) (Somerville 3317)

[Agenda will be sent via e-mail]

Registration Fees: \$30 per person, pay at the door. Members must have paid their dues. Non-members may attend all but the business meeting. (Registration includes coffee and lunch, but not parking.)

Getting there: **From the 401**, take Wellington Road N to end, then jog one block west to Richmond Street north to University gates (on your left), just above Huron Street. On campus, follow this road over the bridge, turn left at the next light and continue to traffic circle. **Visitor parking** is on your right next to Alumni Hall once you are almost around the circle. **From Highway 7**, take Highway 4 south (it becomes Richmond). At the fork after Fanshawe, you can either stay left on Richmond to University gates (now on R) as above, or stay right and go down Western Road, turn left at 3rd light (Lambton Drive). Visitor parking is on your right as you enter traffic circle. **Somerville House** is across the traffic circle, 2nd building on Oxford Drive. [On Saturday there is usually no one at the Information booths, but check SAFS website for a campus map.]

Accommodation: On-campus rooms at Alumni House are \$33 per night including breakfast. Four rooms share a bath, kitchen, etc. Tel: (519) 661-3545. The Station Park Inn on Richmond north at Pall Mall and has UWO rates at under \$100 per night. Tel: (800) 561-4574: www.stationparkinn.ca

For further information, and to announce attendance: E- mail: safs@sfu.ca or write to SAFS, #235, 6540 Hastings St E, Burnaby BC, V5B 4Z5. For urgent matters only, call (604) 291-3356.
After May 10, contact Dr. Nancy Innis, ninnis@julian.uwo.ca, or (519) 661-3686.

PLEASE GIVE NOTIFICATION OF ATTENDANCE BY MAY 1, SO THAT WE CAN ARRANGE APPROPRIATE CATERING. ADDRESSES GIVEN IN NOTICE. THANKS!

STEIGER... Continued from page 4

Steiger with racial discrimination if he failed to pass her. The court ruled this testimony "inadmissible," on the grounds that the probative value of the testimony was inadequate to compensate for its potential damage to the reputation of the complainant.

The probative value of the testimony was considered limited because of many alleged differences between the circumstances under which Mahmoodi approached Steiger and Dutton. The fact that she approached two professors, in the same department, in the same time frame, and allegedly threatened each in order to achieve an academic objective seemed lost on Frances Gordon, the Tribunal chair.

All record of this testimony has now disappeared. There is no mention of it in the extensive notice of decision (available at the HRT's website, <http://www.bchrt.gov.bc.ca/mahmoodi3.htm>) with one notable exception. A letter from Dutton to Steiger was entered into the record, because the tribunal chair felt that it reflected negatively on Dutton's credibility.

A careful reading of the decision reveals just how selective Frances Gordon was in processing and compiling information. For example, in a key section of the her report, Gordon intersperses actual elements from the tape recording with Mahmoodi's allegations, creating a seamless narrative strictly from Mahmoodi's point of view. It is very easy for a casual reader to lose sight of the fact that much of this material is uncorroborated conjecture, and almost all damaging "facts" in the narrative are unproven allegations by Mahmoodi.

On the other hand, Gordon presents only a small snippet of the blackmail letter Mahmoodi sent to Don Dutton, blunting the impact of the very negative piece of evidence.

4) Failure to control the tribunal proceedings. Numerous times during the proceedings,

Mahmoodi disrupted testimony with a hysterical emotional outbursts. Each time, the hearings were delayed. Frances Gordon not only failed to control Mahmoodi's outbursts, each of which caused substantial delays and which frightened and disturbed the witnesses, but she also continued to allow her to return to the proceedings and perform the same acts over and over again.

One must recall that the complainant in these cases has legal bills paid by the government, while the defendant is paying by the minute for legal advice. Under these conditions, failure to establish expeditious procedures and failure to control outbursts from the complainant are both prejudicial to the interests of the defendant, and can contribute to financial hardship.

During the tribunal proceedings, numerous facts were presented that reflected very negatively on the complainant's credibility. Besides the matter of the forged letters of recommendation and Mahmoodi's initial blackmail letter to Dutton, there were discussions of falsified immigration records, falsified educational transcripts, recordings of obscene phone calls Mahmoodi made to staff members working in Dutton's lab, and details of Mahmoodi's physical harassment of Dutton and other UBC staff members. Ultimately, Frances Gordon found Dutton to be less credible than Mahmoodi! [In an interesting postscript to these matters, Mahmoodi was recently arrested at Vancouver International Airport and charged with a criminal offense.]

What emerged from the Mahmoodi-Dutton tribunal hearing was a disturbing truth. *The British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal is a parallel court system out of control.* Originally, the system was weighted heavily on the side of the complainant because it was designed to aid individuals whose rights were compromised by large organizations with overwhelming financial and legal resources to maintain violations of a complainant's rights. The quixotic notion was that the system would provide balance for righting

Continued on page 7...

STEIGER ...continued from page 6

serious wrongs in the society.

What exists in fact is something else: a system which places immense power in the hands of a political bureaucracy, with an obvious agenda-- to use selected complainants to establish new legal precedents. Say the wrong thing, be charged with a Human Rights violation, and you may end up spending several years defending yourself under indeterminate conditions. The court will decide what evidence to admit, how the tribunal will proceed, and answers to no one after deciding your fate. The power of such a system to repress freedom of speech is disturbing, and similarities to certain totalitarian societies are frightening.

John Furedy has described the Human Rights Tribunal system as "velvet totalitarianism." This is entirely accurate. □

LETTER TO EDITOR

"Diversity" in University Hiring and Admissions

Members of SAFS should take a keen look at the arguments diversity in hiring and admissions in George Sher's article: "Diversity," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 28(1999): 85-104. The value placed on diversity is often supposed to be wholly unrelated to affirmative action but Sher shows that there is little difference between the two. He surveys the arguments clearly. Of particular interest is the last section in which he argues that it is far from obvious that a university that hires using "diversity" as one of its criteria will graduate better educated students than one that admits and hires using only intelligence, imagination, and desire for knowledge as criteria.

James A. Ryan
Huron College, University of Western Ontario □

VELVET TOTALITARIANISM IN BRITISH ACADEMIA: THE CASE OF CHRIS BRAND AND EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY

John Furedy
University of Toronto

After publishing a book on intelligence that argued there are race-based differences in intelligence, Chris Brand, a tenured psychology lecturer at the University of Edinburgh, was "investigated," and suspended for nine months. He was subsequently fired for "disgraceful behaviour" and "gross misconduct" after he supported an American academic accused of paedophilia in an Internet newsletter. [See *SAFS Newsletters* 14 (Sept. 1996), 16 (March 1997), 17 (August 1997), 18 (Feb. 1998).

The final act of this drama came at the end of October last year, when the University settled out of court just before an employment tribunal was to hear the case. The University agreed to pay Mr. Brand the maximum that he could have been awarded by the tribunal.

"What happened to me is a total suppression of academic opinion and evidence, which is comparable only to the kind of thing that used to go on in the Soviet Union," Brand said in an interview with John O'Leary, Education Editor of *The Times* (London) (October 29, 1999).

I tend to agree, while recognizing that the punishments metered out by the Soviet totalitarian regime were far more severe than the one from this distinguished British university.

The Edinburgh University approach fits what I have called 'velvet totalitarianism.' One of the indicators of subtle but insidious repression is the freezing fear exhibited by faculty and their organizations when one of their colleagues is treated unfairly. In the Brand case, no British academic organization came to his aid or spoke

Continued on page 8...

FUREDY...continued from page 7

out on the issues involved. This includes the British Council for Academic Freedom, whose president (at the time) was Lord Russell, grandson of the great philosopher and the author of a fine book on academic freedom.

As far as I know, SAFS and our sister organization, the National Association of Scholars in the USA, were the only groups to speak out on the issues of academic freedom in the treatment of Chris Brand. (See *SAFS Newsletter* 18, Feb. 1998, p. 2, for our joint press release).

The decision of Edinburgh University to fire Brand was given legal rationale by a Commissioner's Ordinance passed by parliament. The ordinance allows that "disgraceful behaviour" is sufficient cause for dismissal from a workplace. The law was passed in 1988 during the Thatcher government, but it is my understanding (from a conversation with Dr. Malcolm Lowe, the Secretary of Edinburgh University, August 15, 1999) that this is the first time that a university has used the ordinance to justify a dismissal.

Dr. Lowe, like many other British university administrators, is uneasy about the ordinance's application to universities, as against other workplaces. Behaviour that some would consider "disgraceful" has often been tolerated as allowable and even as facilitating the mission of institutions of higher education. The fact that British universities so meekly accepted the ordinance, that one university has applied it and others did not challenge this, seems to me to suggest that an inhibiting fear pervades academia there. □

BEQUESTS TO SAFS

Please consider remembering the Society in your will. Even small bequests can help us greatly in carrying on SAFS' work. In most cases, a bequest does not require rewriting your entire will, but can be done simply by adding a codicil. So please do give this some thought. Thank you.

Doreen Kimura, President.

A CURRICULAR FIRST: PSYCHOLOGY COURSE ON POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

Professor Heinz-Joachim Klatt, Department of Psychology, Kings College, University of Western Ontario, has designed a course (to be offered in the 2000-2001 academic year) that considers the relation of psychology to social activism, in particular, statements and prohibitions that can be classified as 'politically correct.' The media have shown much interest in this course.

A shortened version of the course description is given here. -Ed.

PSYCHOLOGY 383E (2000-2001): Psychology and Ideology: The Study of Political Correctness

This course examines a wide variety of issues in which psychology is in conflict with ideology, and in which psychological theory and methodology are used to justify socio-political agendas. The seminar investigates the role of psychology in promoting and legitimizing social activism.

Political Correctness is a canon of orthodoxies and prohibitions, a set of claims that society today does not readily allow to be questioned. Examples are statements such as:

- All cultures are equal and equally meritorious; there are no universal values;
- If women do not constitute at least 50% of the workforce (e.g., engineering departments), then it is a sign of discrimination justifying preferential hiring;
- If men constitute less than 50% of the workforce (e. g., nursing), then it is self-selection without consequences;
- The diversity that is considered desirable at universities is racial rather than one of intellectual perspectives;

Continued on page 9...

-Nothing must be said in the academic classroom that may make a student 'uncomfortable.'

Anyone who becomes politically incorrect by daring to challenge a prohibition of this unwritten code is accused of insensitivity or hate, of being sexist, racist, and a right-winger or even something worse. There is very little debate in North American universities on these and countless related issues because deviation from political correctness is sanctioned by harassment codes (that function as speech codes), by 'hate' legislation, and, above all, the Human Rights Commissions.

There is no taboo subject in this course. Every student is urged to use his or her academic freedom to the fullest. Every student who enrolls must understand that this class is a forum for intellectual diversity. No viewpoint or use of vocabulary, no matter how unconventional or distasteful, will be considered legitimate reason to accuse someone of harassment. No effort will be made to make everyone feel 'comfortable'. No respect will be paid to written or unwritten speech codes, merely to rules of etiquette and civility. Students who want a censored classroom should not sign up!

Prerequisite: 3rd year in psychology or instructor's permission. □

STUDENTS

"It's important that students bring a certain ragamuffin barefoot irreverence to their studies; they are not here to worship what is known, but to question it."

Jacob Bronowski, *The Ascent of Man*, 1975.

Quoted in: Jonathon Green (compiler): *The Macmillan Dictionary of Contemporary Quotations*. Pan Books, 1996. □

UNDER-REPRESENTATION: A TIRED REFRAIN

Doreen Kimura
Simon Fraser University

[*Monique Frize, who holds the NSERC/Nortel Joint Chair for Women in Science and Engineering (Ontario), University of Ottawa and Carleton University, wrote a response to Doreen Kimura's criticisms of the NSERC Faculty Awards being restricted to women. (Dr. Frize did not state where she read Kimura's views. It may have been Kimura's letter to NSERC committees.) Kimura has submitted this reply to the magazine. – Ed.]*

It is disappointing when someone holding a chair in science and engineering puts more reliance on personal anecdotes than on objective evidence ("Women role models do make a difference" *University Affairs*, April 2000). Though I don't doubt there are individual instances of sexual harassment in some universities, this has not prevented women from increasingly entering fields of science other than the physical sciences. If Dr. Frize wishes to enlighten herself on some of the reasons women tend not to enter engineering and physical sciences, I will be happy to provide her with references to published studies (not my own). Neither she nor anyone else has satisfactorily explained why women need exclusive access to awards (University Faculty Awards) which ought to go to the best qualified candidates, NOT just to the best qualified women. NSERC's tired refrain that women are "under-represented" in these sciences is simply an ill-informed description of a situation, it is not an explanation. When these awards were open to both men and women, women received at least their proportional share. Why then would bright qualified women object to a fair competition? □

FURTHER READINGS

Balch, Stephen. (1999). "Rational discourse and free speech." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 26. (Letter on National Association of Scholars and treatment of Linda Gottfredson by the University of Delaware's AAUP president).

Carens, Joseph. (2000). "Creating a pool of opportunity." *University of Toronto Bulletin*, March 27, p. 16. (Proposal to hire more star minority faculty without stigmatization or lessening of excellence).

Url: www.newsandevents.utoronto.ca

Cohen, Patricia (2000). "Oops, sorry: seems that my pie chart is half-baked." *New York Times*, April 8. (On issues of peer-review of research).

Furedy, John. (2000). "A price too high?" *University of Toronto Bulletin*, March 27, p. 11. (Hospitals, universities and research councils are negligent re contracts with companies).

Hunter, Ian. (1999). "Universities must nurture free inquiry: semi-literate graduates result from low academic standards, affirmative-action hiring." *Montreal Gazette*, July 17, p. B5.

Grewal, S. (1999). "Plagiarism, cheating plague universities but online resources are helping professors nab the offenders." *Toronto Star*, December 28.

Kimura, Doreen (1999). "Women's faculty awards called discriminatory" (Letter) *University Affairs* (CAUT Bulletin), vol. 46, no. 4, April.

Kors, Alan C. (2000). "Thought Reform 101: The Orwellian implications of today's college orientation." *Reason* (March).

Leo, John. (1999). "Claim it loud enough and it's news." *New York Daily News*, December 11. (Re: claim that women scientists are discriminated against at MIT).

Levine, Arthur, and Jeannette S. Cureton. (1999). *When Hope and Fear Collide: a Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (For Paul Trout's review, see *The Montana Professor*, vol. 10, no. 1, Winter 2000: 18-20.

Url: <http://mtprof.msun.edu>

Wall Street Journal [Interactive Edition]. "A speech code dies." Review & Outlook section, July 16, 1999. (On abolition of the speech code at U. Wisconsin). □

IN SUPPORT OF CONTROVERSY: RECOGNITION OF PROF. DOREEN KIMURA

SAFS' president, Professor Doreen Kimura will be awarded *The Nora and Ted Sterling Prize in Support of Controversy* at a ceremony at Simon Fraser University on April 13.

The award is given annually "to honour those who question conventional wisdom and challenge entrenched authorities or prejudices with reason and evidence."

The selection committee based the award on: 1) Prof. Kimura's research on biological contributions to differences between men and women, a subject often side-stepped because of its contentious nature, and 2) her work for the Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship in preserving freedom of inquiry at universities and in maintaining the principles of real equality for everyone, regardless of special group interests.

At the award ceremony, Professor Kimura will give a talk entitled "Biological constraints on parity between the sexes".

SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM

To join SAFS or to renew your SAFS membership, please complete this form and return to:

SAFS
 Box 235, 6540 Hastings Street
 Burnaby, BC, V5B 4Z5

Please make your cheque payable to SAFS.
 Regular member: \$25; students and retirees: \$15; sustaining member: \$100-299; benefactor: \$300 or more annually.

I support the Society's aims:

Renewal	Sustaining Member
New Member	Benefactor

Name: _____
 Department: _____
 Institution: _____
 Address: _____

Other
 Address: _____

Ph (W): _____
 Ph (H) _____
 Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

SPECIAL MEMBERSHIPS

Sustaining Member: \$100-\$299 annually
Benefactor: \$300 or more annually

Special memberships are inclusive of the current annual dues, but payment of back dues cannot count towards them. Names of members in these special categories will be circulated at the AGM.

EQUALITY: TEMPORARY MEASURES AND PERMANENT DIFFERENCES

Affirmative action, i.e. giving a group preferential treatment into some social resource or activity, is consistent with equality only on the assumption that it is a temporary measure, to be phased out when equal access has been achieved on its own merits; i.e. on the assumption that preferential treatment is merely the removal of an unfair handicap on entrants to the same race. This is obviously sometimes the case. But where we deal with permanent differences it cannot be to the point. It is absurd, even at first sight, to give men priority in entering courses on coloratura singing or to insist that it is theoretically desirable, on demographic grounds, that 50 percent of army generals should be women. On the other hand it is entirely legitimate to give every man with the wish and potential qualification to sing Norma, and every woman with the wish and potential to lead an army, the chance to do so.

From the E. Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes, Abacus*: 1994, p.318.

Dues Reminder

RECEIVING MEMBERSHIP PAYMENTS ON TIME IS IMPORTANT FOR THE SOCIETY.

The costs of producing and mailing the newsletter are high and we are unable to continue sending copies to past members beyond a courtesy mailing. The president is trying to contact those who will be dropped from the mailing list. Unlike some charities that can chase neglectful members several times a year, we cannot do multiple reminder mailings. Please check your status and send in your dues if you have forgotten!

SAFS OFFICE ADDRESS

Box 235
6540 Hastings Street
Burnaby, BC, V5B 4Z5
E-mail: safsn@sfu.ca

COLLEGE ATMOSPHERE

"An atmosphere in which the dominant ideas are treated as the only true ideas encourages an arrogant triumphalism."

From Alan Wolfe, "The Hillsdale Tragedy Holds Lessons for Colleges Everywhere", Point of View, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 3, 1999, p. 72.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in the *SAFS Newsletter* are not necessarily those of the Society, apart from the authoritative notices of the Board of Governors

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

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 95, or by email 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