

SAFS Newsletter

Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship

Maintaining freedom in teaching, research and scholarship
Maintaining standards of excellence in academic decisions about students and faculty

Number 28

www.safs.niagara.com

April 2001

FUREDY ACADEMIC FREEDOM AWARD

The Board of Directors of SAFS is pleased to announce that Ms. **Julie Bosman**, a journalism major and the Editor - in - Chief of the *Badger Herald*, the student newspaper of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, is the recipient of the 2001 Furedy Academic Freedom Award. Her article, reprinted below, demonstrates her courage and integrity in supporting the free exchange of ideas. The award will be presented on May 19, 2001 at the Annual General Meeting of SAFS in London, Ontario. □

THE (NO) FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT

Julie Bosman

One hundred screaming protesters outside the doors of a small newspaper office can be intimidating, especially for the editor who is the main target of their abuse.

The protesters swarmed outside the office of my paper, the *Badger Herald*, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, after first marching across campus brandishing placards that read "Badger Herald Racist." They demonstrated for more than an hour, demanding my resignation as editor, because the Herald had run a paid advertisement entitled "Ten Reasons Why Reparations for Slavery Is a Bad Idea -- and Racist Too." The ad was written and placed by David Horowitz, a conservative author, and had appeared on the last

SAFS 2001 Conference Issue

IN THIS ISSUE

- 3 More on (No) Free Speech
- 3 Michigan's Thin Line
- 5 NAS Hails Michigan Discrimination Ruling
- 6 SAFS Letter to Provost Owram, U of Alberta: Academic Freedom
- 7 Provost Owram's Response to SAFS
- 7 SAFS Response to Provost Owram
- 9 Annual General Meeting 2001
- 10 Academic Freedom
- 10 Protest U
- 11 Women Who Whine Too Much
- 12 Study Methods Sound
- 13 Free Speech Controversy at U of Alaska
- 14 UWO Recruitment Data

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 concerning students and faculty.

ISSN 1203-3197

Editor: Dr. Nancy K. Innis

Assistant Editor: Dr. Chris Furedy

E-mail: SAFSNEWS@NIAGARA.COM

Fax for newsletter submissions : (519) 661-3961

Mail for newsletter submissions :

Dr. Nancy K. Innis,
Psychology Department
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, N6A 5C2

day of Black History Month, a full six days before the demonstration, which took place March 6.

The 10 anti-reparations reasons listed ranged from the commonplace ("There is no single group clearly responsible for the crime of slavery," or "Only a tiny minority of white Americans ever owned slaves") to the very controversial ("What about the debt blacks owe to America?"). But our decision to publish was based on the straightforward view that our paper believes in free speech.

The Horowitz ad was published elsewhere too, and the hostile response to it was as disturbing as the mobbing of our offices. Angry protesters confronted staffers of the Daily Californian at the University of California, Berkeley, after the ad had run. The Daily Cal's editor, Daniel Hernandez, printed a front-page apology for running the ad, calling his paper "an inadvertent vehicle for bigotry" and acknowledging, in a mea culpa wrung from him by the protesters, that the ad had not passed through the proper channels.

We were also under pressure to abase ourselves. But the Herald editorial board refused to run an apology. Instead, we published an editorial saying that "at the *Badger Herald*, we only regret that the editors of the Daily Californian allowed

themselves to give in to pressure in the manner that unfortunately violated their professional integrity and journalistic duty to protect speech with which they disagree."

The issues raised here go to the heart of a critical question: Are American university campuses free and open to a spirit of inquiry, or closed places where activist cohorts can determine what is, or isn't, acceptable? Signs of rot can be detected in the fact that at least 15 college newspapers -- including those at Harvard, Columbia, Notre Dame, the University of Washington, Georgia Tech and the University of Virginia -- have rejected the Horowitz ad on grounds that it was politically unacceptable.

This is not to say that newspapers must print all advertisements submitted. The Herald does not print ads that are completely false. The ad submitted (and rejected) last weekend by the Multicultural Student Coalition calling the Herald a "racist propaganda machine" would fall into this category. But the Horowitz ad is well within the bounds of political discourse. One student (and student-government representative) at the Badger Herald rally shouted, "This isn't free speech, it's hate speech." Really? Most people outside of college campuses no doubt would be amazed to find that reparations for slavery has become, for some, a nondebatabable subject.

On a traditionally liberal campus like ours, any opinions originating from the right tend to be stomped out with a vengeance. Rather than rebut Mr. Horowitz's arguments, the protesters simply tried to drown out his message with name-calling directed at the Herald. It's woefully apparent that the same campuses that once stood for idealistic causes in the '60s and '70s now tolerate only political hyper-correctness and unchallenged "progressive" thought. Though the students who protested at the doors of the Herald say they demand "diversity" -- UW-Madison's latest buzzword -- they appear not to accept that principle when it comes to expression or beliefs. The most consistent criticism of the Herald's action in printing the Horowitz ad has been our

alleged lack of sensitivity to students of color on campus. While I do not deny the passionate reaction by many students to the advertisement, this is one of the painful and inescapable by-products of the free-speech principle by which ethical journalists must abide.

Shamefully for the culprits, the most recent maneuver in the speech wars at UW-Madison is an illegal and cowardly one. Several students have witnessed others throwing away stacks of *Heralds* from their racks in university buildings, while several *Herald* staff members have retrieved heaps of bundled papers from garbage cans in the same buildings. How ironic it is that the diversity of viewpoints the activists are demanding is trashed along with the open forum in which it can be represented.

Previously published in the Wall Street Journal, March 14, 2001.

Printed with permission of the author. □

MORE ON (NO) FREE SPEECH

From Best of the Web Today

March 23, 2001

Two Pulitzer Prize-winning former managing editors of the Harvard *Crimson*, *New York Times* columnist Anthony Lewis (Class of 1948) and author David Halberstam (Class of '55) rebuke the newspaper for refusing to run the advertisement from David Horowitz opposing slavery reparations:

"We noted with surprise that you rejected the ad: surprise because we thought The *Crimson* stood for freedom of the press and courage in exercising that right. We understand that a newspaper is not compelled to print all advertising submitted. It is entitled to its own judgement on the suitability of the ad for its audience. But in this case the judgement appears to have been that the audience was too tender to deal with what to many would have been an offensive political argument. We

think that notion is false to the ideals of The *Crimson* and of free speech. If Harvard students cannot stand hearing an unpopular political argument, we are in a bad way. But we are utterly confident that they are capable of doing so. You missed an opportunity--an easy opportunity--to show what freedom of speech is all about." □

MICHIGAN'S THIN LINE

Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them. — George Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four

We have often had occasion to dilate on the Orwellian nature of the phrase "affirmative action" in this space. We are going to do so again. Memories are short; ideological pressure is unremitting; in short, some things cannot be repeated too often. *Rhetorically*, as we all know, "affirmative action" is redolent of high principle and the struggle for equality. One can almost hear strains of the Marseillaise echoing behind its syllables—or maybe that sound is only the thump of a judge's gavel ordering some new social experiment. In any event, "affirmative action" suggests, . . . well, something *good*: something positive, something *affirmative*. (Also, of course, something pragmatic: we're talking about *action* here, not theorizing: *results*, not starry-eyed speculation.) And the opponents of affirmative action, what do *they* want? Something beginning with "N" at any rate: something involving the word "no," something *negative*, and no doubt impractical to boot.

In actuality, of course, affirmative action is first and foremost a powerful engine for perpetuating preferential treatment and discrimination based on race, sex, ethnic origin, or some other approved badge of victim status. It is not about assuring equality of opportunity but artificially—that is, judicially—enforcing equality of outcome. It sounds quite different when put like that, doesn't it? But liberals never do put it like that. They love the phrase "affirmative action" precisely because

it allows them to avoid acknowledging—perhaps even recognizing—the unpleasant actuality at the heart of affirmative action. This is one reason that connoisseurs of Orwellian obfuscation cannot admire the phrase “affirmative action” too greatly. It is a gift that just keeps on giving. It is vague enough to cover nearly any contingency, pompous enough always to garner partisan support. Talk of “affirmative action” automatically catapults one onto the moral high ground, at least rhetorically, even if it allows one to pursue inequitable programs of social engineering and racial or sexual redress. (Some liberals acknowledge the inequity involved in enforcing the diktats of affirmative-action programs; those who do will generally point out—usually *sotto voce* and with a rueful smile—that one cannot make an omelet without breaking a few eggs.) Perhaps the greatest boon conferred by embracing affirmative action is an insensibility to contradiction. It nudges one blissfully over the “hard place” one faces when simultaneously affirming X and not-X. It is an invitation to what Orwell called Doublethink. College admissions are a laboratory case. We all know about the many colleges whose applications begin by declaring that admission will be granted without consideration of race, sex, creed, or national origin—and then go on a few pages later to inform applicants that it is to *their advantage* if they are black, Hispanic, American Indian, etc., etc. (We have been told, but have not verified, that at least one distinguished university even has a category for “current gender.”) “Check here,” they say, “and we’ll see what we can do for you.”

It turns out, of course, that many universities are prepared to do quite a lot for applicants who meet the correct racial/ sexual/ethnic profile. Consider the University of Michigan. Just last month, a federal judge ruled that the two-tiered admission system employed by the university from 1995 to 1998 was unconstitutional because it employed different admission criteria for whites and minorities. It was, plain and simple, a matter of separate but unequal. Well and good, you say: at last a victory in the war against quotas. Not so fast. For in the same ruling, Judge Patrick J.

Duggan said that the university’s current policy, which automatically awards twenty points (out of a possible 150) to black and Hispanic applicants is just fine. So it is “No” to what Judge Duggan called “fixed racial quotas” but “full steam ahead” when it comes to “consideration of an applicant’s race during the admissions process.” No wonder he went on to observe that “in situations such as this, it is often a thin line that divides the permissible from the impermissible.” So thin, we fear, that one would have to be an affirmative-action activist to be sure of discerning it.

Let’s put Michigan’s twenty-point bonus into perspective. As *The New York Times* reported on December 14, applicants can get up to eighty points for their grades. They can get another twelve points for stellar performance on so-called standardized tests (“so-called” because affirmative action has come to the Scholastic Aptitude Tests as well: see our note “Boycott the SAT” in the October 1999 issue of *The New Criterion*). Being a Michigan resident gets them ten points, being the child of an alumnus four. According to the *Times*, “an outstanding essay, leadership, or personal achievement are each worth 3 points,” that is, a mere nine points total for factors that one might have thought should count—that once upon a time in fact did count—a great deal in the admission process. But then what is a terrific essay, outstanding leadership, or superior “personal achievement” in comparison with skin color or (the right) ethnic origin? Not much in Michigan, apparently, for that is all it takes to qualify for the university’s twenty-point gift.

You see the vertiginous land of Oz one enters by embracing affirmative action. But what is a poor judge to do? Back in the late 1970s in the infamous Bakke case, the U.S. Supreme Court institutionalized confusion by simultaneously forbidding explicit quotas while upholding the unofficial quotas mandated by the demand for “diversity”—another Orwellian mantra. The Michigan ruling dramatizes that confusion. What it amounts to is a species of racial profiling, though of course we must not call it that. At bottom, affirmative action is the application of

welfare mentality to academia and the business world. It is a hand out, not a hand up, and its ultimate effect is to harden the very prejudice it claims to be battling. It creates a two-track system in which some people succeed by dint of hard work, talent, and accomplishment, while others succeed at least partly by dint of racially- or sexually-mandated preferential treatment. Everyone recognizes this, the beneficiaries as well as the victims of affirmative action. The result is an increase in cynicism, resentment, and, not least, the selfish spirit of litigiousness.

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the Michigan decision is the suggestion that the policies it endorses will have to go on indefinitely. According to Judge Duggan, the University of Michigan's points-for-minorities system is not a temporary expedient but one attempt to address a permanent inequality. "[T]he need for diversity lives on perpetually," he was quoted in the *Times* as saying, and programs to enforce it could therefore continue until the "day when universities are able to achieve the desired diversity without resort to racial preferences." "Perpetually" is a very long time. Today Michigan gives minorities twenty points; maybe it will have to be fifty next year to achieve the same result. George Orwell encapsulated the contradiction inherent in such procedures perfectly when he wrote, in *Animal Farm*, that "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." There, too, the rhetoric of fairness was employed to institutionalize the reality of inequality.

We observed above that embracing affirmative action tended to impart an insensibility to contradiction. Insensibility, it is worth noting, is not the same as immunity, as those unfortunate people who lack feeling in some part of their body know well. Just because you are without pain does not mean your hand has not been burned.

Reprinted from the New Criterion online, Notes and Comments, January 2001. New Criterion website: www.newcriterion.com □

NAS HAILS MICHIGAN RACE DISCRIMINATION RULING

Princeton, NJ--The National Association of Scholars today applauded a ruling by federal district court Judge Bernard A. Friedman, who held that the University of Michigan's law school admissions policies were unconstitutional. Finding in favor of plaintiff Barbara Grutter, Judge Friedman ruled that she had been denied admission to the University's law school on the basis of race, thus violating both her equal protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution and Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits racial discrimination by any institution receiving federal funds. Whatever the realities of past discrimination or the putative value of a racially diverse student body, Judge Friedman noted, a race-conscious admissions program such as Michigan's was fundamentally incompatible with the Constitution: "Whatever solution the law school elects to pursue, it must be race neutral. The focus must be upon the merit of *individual applicants*, not upon assumed characteristics of racial groups. An admissions policy that treats any applicants differently from others on account of their race is unfair and unconstitutional."

NAS executive director Bradford Wilson extolled the decision and noted that the organization had filed an *amicus* brief supporting Grutter's suit: "This was exactly the right decision, and we're grateful to Judge Friedman for sticking to the Constitution, rather than being distracted by the dubious social science hypotheses often proffered in support of race-based admissions policies. One has to admire Barbara Grutter's courage and perseverance in what must at times have seemed like overwhelming odds. It's certainly disheartening to note the lineup of prestigious academic institutions, professional organizations and giant corporations, such as General Motors, which weighed in on the side of Michigan's law school. Still, justice has ringingly prevailed, and we're proud to have supported Ms. Grutter in this eminently worthy cause. No doubt, the battle over quotas in academic hiring and admissions is far

from concluded. But this outcome is certainly a major victory for anyone who believes that individual achievement, not group membership, should be the academy's guiding light."

NAS Press Release, March 23, 2001. □

SAFS LETTER TO PROVOST OWRAM, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

November 28, 2000

Dear Provost Owram:

I am writing to you as President of the Society for Academic Freedom. Our society is committed to the preservation of academic freedom and the merit principle in decisions about faculty and students. A description of our organization is provided on our website: www.safs.niagara.com. It is our policy to solicit clarifying information from all parties whenever we are informed of a possible abuse of academic freedom. It is in that spirit I am writing to you.

One of your faculty members, Professor Louis Pagliaro, has sent us a number of documents regarding charges the University of Alberta has made against him. The documents include correspondence between yourself and Professor Pagliaro, Professor Dixon, Professor Smith, and Mr. Beresh, newspaper reports of comments Professor Pagliaro has made, a copy of Article 16 of the current Faculty Agreement, a copy of Section 96 of the Policy and Procedure Manual adopted by the General Faculties Council, Professor Pagliaro's vita, and Professor Dixon's report of his initial investigation into the charges.

As I understand it, Professor Smith, Vice-President (Research), made two complaints against Professor Pagliaro. The first charged that Professor Pagliaro did not have ethics approval for research he was conducting, and the second charged that Professor Pagliaro failed to meet "stringent standards of honesty and scholarly and scientific practice in the collection, recording, and analysis of data in the dissemination of

information, findings, and discoveries." Your appointed investigator, Professor Dixon, recommended to you that both charges be dismissed. You agreed to drop the first, but asked Professor Dixon to continue the investigation into the second.

My evaluation of the material that I have in hand tends to support Professor Dixon's conclusions. As Professor Pagliaro's statements to the media were not based on current research, but were instead based on his experience as a drug researcher for many years and his informal contacts, he does not appear to be guilty of violating ethical guidelines regarding the conduct of research or of the reporting of research. It seems that he was merely offering his expert opinion on drug use in the schools. Of course, we take no stand on the validity of Professor Pagliaro's claims; that is an issue for those with expertise in the matter to decide.

It is understandable that those who disagree with Professor Pagliaro's opinions on the extent of drug use in the schools would want to dispute his conclusions or to engage him in debate. It is less clear why the University of Alberta took formal steps to charge him with research misconduct, and to request that he stop talking to the media. It may appear to some that the actions of the University of Alberta are attempts to intimidate, censor, or otherwise abridge Professor Pagliaro's academic freedom.

We recognize, of course, that we have received information on this issue from only Professor Pagliaro. There may be other information that would alter the interpretation of Professor Pagliaro's case. Whenever feasible, but particularly when all the facts are not known, it is our practice to contact the parties directly involved before commenting publicly on the academic freedom aspects of a case of this nature. Accordingly, we invite you to give us your side of the case.

We are particularly interested in your answers to three questions:

1. Why the University of Alberta felt justified in trying to silence Professor Pagliaro, i.e., keeping him from talking to the media?
2. Why the university felt it needed to charge Professor Pagliaro with research conduct violations for giving his expert opinion?
3. Why the recommendation from Professor Dixon to dismiss the second charge against Professor Pagliaro relating to stringent standards of reporting research was not accepted?

Thank you for your attention in this matter, and we look forward to receiving your prompt reply.

Sincerely,
Clive Seligman, President ☐

PROVOST OWRAM'S RESPONSE TO SAFS

January 25, 2001

Dear Dr. Seligman:

Thank you for your letter of January 18 and your patience while we fulfilled our obligations under Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

I will answer your questions in the order in which they were put.

The University of Alberta has not attempted to silence Dr. Pagliaro. We have asked him, in the name of scholarship integrity, to be clear with the media as to whether he is offering opinion or presenting the results of replicable research.

The University did not charge Professor Pagliaro with research conduct violations. The University received a complaint, actually several complaints, about Professor Pagliaro's behaviours. The University is attempting, through the investigation, to determine the veracity of the

complaints. At the heart of the investigation is the question of whether Dr. Pagliaro presented his opinions as expert opinion or as the results of this research.

Professor Dixon's report presented no evidence on the question of Dr. Pagliaro's clarity respecting the basis of his comments....expert opinion or research findings. Dr. Dixon has been asked to determine the evidence on this point.

I trust these answers will be satisfactory to you.

Yours truly,
Doug Owrām
Vice-President (Academic) and Provost ☐

SAFS RESPONSE TO PROVOST OWRAM

February 14, 2001

Dear Professor Owrām:

Thank you for your letter of January 25. Its three main contentions were transmitted to Professor Pagliaro for comment, and we are now in receipt of his replies.

In our judgment, your first contention that the University of Alberta did not attempt to silence Dr. Pagliaro does not square with the facts as widely reported in the public press and never expressly denied (in fact, confirmed) by the University. We quote from the *Edmonton Journal* (page B7) of March 23, 2000: "Sandra Halme, university media-relations manager, confirmed Wednesday that Louis Pagliaro has been asked to stop giving interviews. 'Yes, this is what we asked, until we are able to find out more about the situation.' But Pagliaro is ignoring the request."

Had the University merely asked Professor Pagliaro, as you state in your letter to me, "in the name of scholarship integrity, to be clear with the media as to whether he is offering opinion or presenting the results of replicable research," there would be no objection. Perhaps what you have

described in your January 25 letter is the course of action that the university now recognizes as appropriate in the circumstances. We concur. It appears, however, that an attempt was made in the first instance to prevent Professor Pagliaro from expressing his views in media interviews at all. We regard this with the utmost seriousness. On the second and third points, it is of no great consequence, in our opinion, whether the University has charged Professor Pagliaro with research conduct violations and instituted formal disciplinary proceedings, or whether it is investigating a complaint.

The appointment of Professor Dixon to conduct an investigation, the partial rejection of his initial findings exculpating Professor Pagliaro, and the initiation of a further inquiry lasting several months by the same investigator appear to be both extraordinary measures under the circumstances and an abuse of process that is apt to have a severely chilling effect on campus free speech. Under the circumstances, the suggestion that

Professor Dixon has only been asked to fill a lacuna in his initial report does not ring true. Professor Dixon was quite clear in his initial report: "I am inclined to believe that in his interactions with the media, Dr. Pagliaro was reasonably forthcoming about the (informal and anecdotal) basis of his conclusions and intended to convey a distinction between his evidence and the kind of evidence that would be obtained from a research project. As a consequence, I think that it would be difficult to maintain that Dr. Pagliaro intentionally and dishonestly described his conclusions as based on scientific research ... Consequently, given that Dr. Pagliaro's communications did not pertain to research and research results, I do not believe that they can be construed as inconsistent with GFC96, and there would be no basis for the specific complaint as outlined in Dr. Smith's memo."

On the strength of the evidence now before us, we shall issue a news release dealing with the due process and academic freedom aspects of this case as soon as possible after the contents of Dr. Dixon's impending report become known, when we expect the matter to be once again before the general public and the Canadian university community. It is not our intention to comment on the substance of Professor Pagliaro's public statements. While the latter raise important issues for discussion and debate in the wider university community, our concern is solely with the University of Alberta's actions in attempting to prevent Professor Pagliaro from granting further media interviews and in investigating his activities in an excessively zealous manner.

Sincerely,
Clive Seligman
President, and on behalf of the
Board of Directors

Note: As of March 30, 2001, Provost Owram has not decided whether he will accept Professor Dixon's final report to dismiss the complaints against Professor Pagliaro. □

SAFS BOARD OF DIRECTORS (2000-2001)

Clive Seligman, Ph.D., (UWO) President
Doreen Kimura, Ph.D, FRSC, (SFU), Past President
Dale Beyerstin, M.A. (Langara, BC)
John J. Furedy, Ph.D., (U. Toronto)
Paul Marantz, Ph.D., (UBC)
Murray Miles, Dr.phil., (Brock University)
Harvey Shulman, M.A., (Concordia U.)
Peter Suedfeld, Ph.D., FRSC, (UBC)

E-mail addresses

Clive Seligman: safs@niagara.com
Dorren Kimura: dkimura@sfu.ca
Dale Beyerstin: dbeyerst@langara.bc.ca
John J. Furedy: furedy@psych.utoronto.ca
Paul Marantz: pmarantz@unixg.ubc.ca
Murray Miles: mmiles@spartan.ac.brocku.ca
Harvey Shulman: hshulman@videotron.ca
Peter Suedfeld: psuedfeld@psych.ubc.ca

SAFS Annual General Meeting 2001

University of Western Ontario, Somerville House
London, Ontario

Saturday, May 19, 2001, from 9:00am - 3:30pm

Location: Somerville House, Room 3317

- 9:00-10:00 am Registration and refreshments, meet other members
- 10:00-10:30 am President's introductory remarks (*Clive Seligman*)
Furedy Academic Freedom Award (*Presented to **Julie Bosman** by Chris Furedy*)
- 10:30-12:00 noon SAFS Role in Defending Academic Freedom, *Panel Discussion*
Panel Members: *Chris Furedy, Murray Miles, Clive Seligman*
- 12:00 noon Buffet lunch (In Somerville House 3320)
- Keynote Speaker (*Nancy Innis, Chair*)
Margaret Wente, Columnist, Globe and Mail
Moral Panics And The Media
- 2:30 pm Annual Business Meeting (*members only*) (Somerville 3317)
[*Agenda will be sent via e-mail*]

REGISTRATION FEES: \$30.00 per person, pay at the door. Members must have paid their dues. (Registration includes coffee and lunch, but not parking).

GETTING THERE: From the 401, take Wellington Road north to end, then jog one block west to Richmond Street, go north to University gates (on your left), just north of Huron Street. On campus, follow this road over the bridge, turn left at the light and continue to traffic circle. **Visitor parking** is on your right next to Alumni Hall once you are almost around the circle. Rate: \$4.00 flat rate. **From Highway 7**, take Highway 4 south (it becomes Richmond Street). At the fork after Fanshawe, you can either stay left on Richmond to University gates (now on Richmond St.) 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: www.safs.niagara.com/activities for a campus map.]

ACCOMODATION: On-campus rooms at Alumni House are \$33.00 per night including breakfast. Four rooms share a bath, kitchen, etc. (1-519-661-3545). The Station Park Inn on Richmond north at Pall Mall (1-800-561-4574) and Windermere Manor (1-519-858-1414) have UWO rates at under \$100.00 per night.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, AND TO ANNOUNCE ATTENDANCE: E-mail: safs@niagara.com, or write to SAFS, 1673 Richmond Street, #344, London, ON, N6G 2N3. For further info. contact Daniella Chirila, e-mail: dchirila@uwo.ca, or (519-661-2111, ext. 84690).

PLEASE GIVE NOTIFICATION OF ATTENDANCE BY MAY 7th, SO THAT WE CAN ARRANGE APPROPRIATE CATERING. ADDRESSES GIVEN ABOVE. THANK YOU!

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Letter to Editor, National Post

It is precisely to safeguard academic freedom that universities must not succumb to granting students particular privileges to attend specific political event.

Once a university decides that one or other such events warrants the granting of such privileges, independence has already been tainted. This is because the vetting of political initiatives taken by students involves value judgments about the importance of each event. If the university were to allow students privileges to attend any political event, an option clearly unworkable, there would be no such compromise. Would the university allow students of conscience privileges to protest at, say, an abortion colloquium? A world conference on feminist issues? A forum on Third World health issues? No way.

My father was a Holocaust survivor and it has been edifying to me, in recently reading the social history of Germany in the Thirties, to see how insidiously and almost unconsciously the universities contributed, by just such small capitulations as this, to the rise of Nazism. University students and professors were encouraged to, and did, as the rot spread, show their allegiance to the Reich by a certain kind of heinous activism.

*Marianne Bluger Neily, Ottawa.
Published, March 22, 2001. □*

PROTEST U

Editorial, National Post

Once upon a time, university administrators were the target of student protests. These days, however, they are more likely to be *facilitating* student protests. In January, the senate at Concordia University in Montreal voted to make special accommodation for students who wish to

defer their final exams so they can attend demonstrations against the upcoming Summit of the Americans in Quebec City. This week, the University of New Brunswick made a similar dispensation. Typically, permission to write a make-up exam is granted only in cases of medical or family emergencies; but given the Concordia and UNB precedents, students at several other universities are pushing for their own protest exemptions.

To be very clear: This paper strongly supports freedom of speech and the right to protest peacefully, and it is proper that universities should incubate a wide range of debate and opinion. That said, the primary function of a university or college is to educate students. Something so basic to education as course examinations should not take a back seat to extracurricular political activities. Of equal concern is the fact that school administrators appear to be turning students into proxies for their own political beliefs. Frederick Lowy, the Vice-Chancellor of Concordia, claims his school's new exam policy is not an indication that the university is taking a position on the Quebec City summit. Rather, he says, the school has a duty to "permit the clash of ideas ... and to facilitate constructive engagement in the important events of the day." Fine words, but the veracity of Mr. Lowy's statement will be put to the test when another group, less inclined to leftist politics, appears before him to make a similar request. If opponents of globalization are permitted to skip exams, then a pro-life group whose members wish to attend a high-profile abortion clinic protest on exam day must also be accommodated.

School administrations at Concordia and UNB have acted on one of two principles. Either (a) the dates of all final exams are negotiable for politically active students; or (b) special treatment should be accorded to proponents of fashionable political views. Either position is inappropriate for an institution whose main goal is higher learning.

Published March 23, 2001. □

WOMEN WHO WHINE TOO MUCH: CONFESSING TO A NONEXISTENT CRIME

Patricia Hausman

Nine members of the patriarchy met last week at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to ink the latest concession to feminism's Under-representation Industry. The high-ranking representatives of the nation's most elite universities pledged their commitment to "equity for, and full participation by, women faculty." Their institutions, they said, "recognize that barriers still exist to the full participation of women in science and engineering." What those barriers are remains a mystery - the statement cites not one obstacle that is causing women to become doctors and lawyers despite secret longings to be particle physicists.

All of this was nothing if not predictable: The latest chapter in a saga of sex, lies, and science that began two years ago, when MIT released a report confessing to discrimination against senior female faculty. The kvetch-filled document, penned largely by the same females whose complaint of discriminatory treatment had spurred appointment of a committee to study the "status of women," was greeted with near-universal acclaim. Press coverage was remarkably uncritical - often crediting the report with characteristics (such as evidence) that it did not have. Its principal author, biology professor Nancy Hopkins, was even feted at the White House by the President and First Lady. The Ford Foundation promptly kicked a million bucks into MIT's coffers, making possible last week's conference and other initiatives to "improve opportunities for women faculty" at MIT and elsewhere.

Not a bad track record when you consider that this is a report for which "hatchet job" may be too charitable a description. And not a particularly artful example of the genre either. With its collective intelligence, one might expect MIT to find it fishy that the report declared female faculty to be underpaid despite admitting that its authors lacked access to "primary salary data." Or that it would consider it in bad form for the same women

who filed a complaint alleging discrimination to be charged with interviewing others to see if they, too, felt "marginalized." Or that its scientific literati would see a certain hypocrisy in MIT requiring students to include not only conclusions, but also supporting evidence in their work, while refusing to provide any documentation for the report's claims that women were denied their fair share of compensation and resources. Intentionally or not, MIT seems to have put itself above the kind of full disclosure and open debate universally understood to be the price that scientists pay for the esteem accorded them.

And now for the really hard part. Last year, a colleague posed a hypothetical question. What if MIT actually released evidence showing that the claimed disparities between males and females truly exist? I conceded that this might indicate discrimination, but that first, one would have to consider other factors that often account for differences in salaries and working conditions. In one form or another, the question kept coming up.

Eventually, I enlisted the expert assistance of James Steiger, a statistician and professor of psychology at the University of British Columbia. Together we produced a report, "Confession Without Guilt?" [see www.iwf.org], that examines the productivity of two groups of MIT biologists. One is comprised of younger professors, the other of their more senior colleagues.

The results for the younger group were actually rather heartening. One of its men had a truly extraordinary output. But otherwise, the males and females were generally competitive with each other.

But in the more senior group, the results were - How do I say this politely? - noticeably different. Not that anyone had an unimpressive record. All had published a respectable number of research papers. Their work was cited in the scientific literature many times. But though all were impressive, some were far more so than others.

Three of six males in the group had published more than 100 papers in the last 12 years - a

distinction held by only one of the five females. By contrast, four of the females, but only one male had published fewer than 50 papers.

Even more dramatic were differences in the number of citations to these publications, a common way to measure a scientist's influence. The most cited female scientist had fewer than 3000 citations. Three of the males had more than 10,000. One of the three was also principal researcher for 23 million dollars in federal grant funds that he raised for MIT during an 11-year period. (Not that the rest of his colleagues - male or female-were losers in the money game. All but one raised three to nine million from federal sources during the same time.) We made several statistical adjustments to account for factors that might enhance or detract from productivity, but these had little effect on the basic pattern of the results.

So, what do I conclude about sex discrimination at MIT? I don't have the information to venture an opinion as to whether the salaries and lab space allocated to these biologists is commensurate with their performance. But I can say this: If the guy in the next office had greatly bested me in publications, influence, and grant money, he could have a bigger lab and higher salary without me filing a sex-bias complaint. Especially one explaining that my beef was not discrimination in the usual sense of the word, but "a pattern of powerful, but unrecognized assumptions that work systematically against women faculty even in the light of obvious goodwill."

And if I were running Feminism, Incorporated, I'd reread the rhetoric of the MIT report in the context of these results and ask, "Are we embarrassed yet"?

Patricia Hausman is a consulting behavioral scientist & member of the National Advisory Board of the Independent Women's Forum.

Reprinted from National Review online, February 5, 2001. □

STUDY METHODS SOUND

Letter to Editor, The Harvard Crimson

As co-author with Patricia Hausman of the Independent Women's Forum analysis of the productivity of male and female biologists at MIT, I would appreciate an opportunity to comment on The Crimson's report on our work (News, "MIT Study on Faculty Gender Bias Criticized," Feb. 8).

The article quotes MIT professor Nancy Hopkins, who dismisses our findings of greater male productivity by claiming that scientists who work outside an institution cannot judge the performance of its faculty. Yet this is precisely what committees that award research grants and Nobel Prizes do all the time.

Relevant to her allegation of deliberate bias, I point out that in choosing the senior males to include in the study, we considered only those who received their doctorates in the same time frame (1970-76) as the senior women. This resulted in the exclusion of some of the most distinguished males, specifically two Nobel laureates who graduated in 1968 and 1969. We also presented data for junior scientists. These data showed very encouraging performance trends for junior women faculty. Contrary to Hopkins' claims, we did not tailor our methodology to a particular result; we simply followed standards commonly used in universities throughout the U.S. and Canada.

If Hopkins believes our conclusions about the relative performance of senior men and women biologists at MIT are wrong, I challenge her to present (publicly) a superior methodology and the resulting data. This is precisely the way a scientist who challenges the work of others is expected to proceed.

James H. Steiger

Professor of Psychology, University of British Columbia (and also a SAFS member).

Published February 20, 2001. □

CONTROVERSY OVER A PROFESSOR'S POEM PROMPTS DEBATE ON FREE SPEECH AT U. OF ALASKA

Scott Smallwood

The president of the University of Alaska has issued a strongly worded memorandum defending free speech and urging administrators to be unambiguous when protecting that right for faculty members and students.

His actions countered statements by officials at the university's Anchorage campus, who responded to protests over a professor's poem by saying they were investigating the matter.

In the memorandum written last month to the university's three chancellors, President Mark R. Hamilton specifically mentioned the case of Linda McCarriston, a creative-writing professor at the Anchorage campus, who has been at the center of a controversy since late last year.

Her poem "Indian Girls" is about the sexual abuse of children. Some at the university characterized the poem as racist hate speech.

Protesters, mostly Native Alaskans and students, wrote to Ms. McCarriston's chairman, Ronald Spatz, demanding an apology for what they viewed as stereotypes of Native Alaskan men in the poem. Mr. Spatz responded by telling them that he had forwarded the messages to Kerry Feldman, an associate dean and "the person in charge of resolving such matters."

And Chancellor Edward Lee Gorsuch wrote an e-mail message to the leader of the protest saying that Mr. Feldman "is now actively dealing with the issues and events involved and is working toward a positive and appropriate result." Mr. Gorsuch also wrote, "It is the university's obligation to protect the rights of free speech and artistic license of both faculty and students, while at the same time fostering respect for the effects exercising such speech and license may have upon the values and rights of others."

But Mr. Hamilton said administrators needed to defend free speech more clearly: "Attempts to assuage anger or to demonstrate concern by qualifying our support for free speech serve to cloud what must be a clear message," he wrote in his memorandum. "Noting that, for example, 'The University supports the right to free speech, but we intend to check into this matter,' or 'The university supports the right of free speech, but I have asked Dean X or Provost Y to investigate the circumstances,' is unacceptable. There is nothing to 'check into,' nothing 'to investigate.'

In a telephone interview last week, Mr. Hamilton was even more direct about protecting free speech: "As soon as you place a caveat on it, you curtail it. And then you're going straight to hell." Coincidentally, Mr. Hamilton, who is also a poet, had a poem in the same issue of the journal, *Ice-Floe*, that carried Ms. McCarriston's controversial work.

Ms. McCarriston, who described the protests outside her classroom over recent months as "harrowing," said she was relieved by the president's forceful defense.

Continued on page 15...

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 e-mail attachment.

Mailing Address:

Dr. Nancy K. Innis

Psychology Department
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario
N6A 5C2

Fax: (519) 661-3961

E-mail: safsnews@niagara.com

SUMMARY OF RECRUITMENT ACTIVITY FOR ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO BY SEX AND YEAR

Clive Seligman, SAFS President

Last year the University of Western Ontario released a detailed report of faculty recruitment for the academic years 1991-1992 to 1998-1999, categorized by sex. The Tables reported below were taken from the report entitled, *Full-time Faculty Distribution, Appointments, and Recruitment - - by Gender* (January, 2000). The full report is available from the UWO Office of the Provost.

In **Table 1**, data are reported for the number of applications, interviews held, and appointments made. By looking at the last line of Table 1, summarizing the data for all 8 years, one can see that, on average women represented 23.2% of the applicant pool, 30.4% of those interviewed, and 36.2% of those hired. Thus women were both interviewed and hired in numbers greater than their representation in the applicant pool. In each of the years surveyed, women were interviewed at a higher rate than their presence in the applicant pool, and in six of the eight years the percentage of those hired who were women was greater than the percentage of those interviewed who were women.

Recruitment Activity for All Full-time Initial Limited - Term, Probationary, and Tenured Appointments 1991-1992 to 1998-1999										
	Applications				Interviews Held			Appointments		
Year	Men	Women	Unknown	% Women	Men	Women	% Women	Men	Women	% Women
1991-92	938	319	21	25.4	155	78	33.5	44	22	33.3
1992-93	1341	416	52	23.7	169	77	31.3	39	21	35.0
1993-94	1158	378	6	24.6	196	82	29.5	38	28	42.4
1994-95	1590	443	38	21.8	218	82	27.3	38	22	36.7
1995-96	1217	311	99	20.4	197	86	30.4	29	20	40.8
1996-97	2005	619	31	23.6	206	126	38.0	47	27	36.5
1997-98	1496	472	4	24.0	239	98	29.1	43	22	33.8
1998-99	1449	429	38	22.8	302	105	25.8	45	21	31.8
8 Years	11194	3387	289	23.2	1682	734	30.4	323	183	36.2

Table 2 shows separately the number of women and men appointed and interviewed as a percentage of applicants, and appointed as a percentage of those interviewed. Looked at this way, the data reveal the same pattern as described in Table 1. Over the 8 years, on average: 5.4% of female applicants were appointed compared to 2.9% of male applicants; 21.7% of female applicants were interviewed compared to 15% of male applicants; and 24.9% of female applicants who were interviewed were hired whereas 19.2% of men who were interviewed were appointed. Again, the results in each of the years are remarkably consistent. Women had almost twice the chance of being hired as did men.

Likelihood of Being Interviewed and Appointed to Regular Faculty Positions at Western, 1991-1992 to 1998-1999						
	Women			Men		
Year	Appointed as % W Applicants	Interviewed as % W Applicants	Appointed as % W Interviewed	Appointed as % M Applicants	Interviewed as % M Applicants	Appointed as % M Interviewed
1991-92	6.9	24.5	28.2	4.7	16.5	28.4
1992-93	5.0	18.5	27.3	2.9	12.6	23.1
1993-94	7.4	21.7	34.1	3.3	16.9	19.4
1994-95	5.0	18.5	26.8	2.4	13.7	17.4
1995-96	6.4	27.7	23.3	2.4	16.2	14.7
1996-97	4.4	20.4	21.4	2.3	10.3	22.8
1997-98	4.7	20.8	22.4	2.9	16.0	18.0
1998-99	4.9	24.5	20.0	3.1	20.8	14.9
8 Years	5.4	21.7	24.9	2.9	15.0	19.2

Controversy... continued from page 13

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, a group that opposes what it calls political correctness, had championed Ms. McCarriston's cause in a letter to the university's president, urging him to publicly acknowledge her right to free speech. The group noted that the case was "especially indecent" in a creative-writing program. "Basically, they started an investigation into a professor because of a poem," said Thor L. Halvorseen, the group's executive director.

Mr. Feldman acknowledged that Mr. Spatz's response to the complaints "could have been written less ambiguously," but he said no one had ever asked him to investigate the poem. "And if it was requested of me, I would have refused," he said.

Many of the complaints, Mr. Feldman said, came from Native Alaskans who said they didn't feel the campus was a hospitable place for them. That issue, not the poem, was what he had been asked to deal with, Mr. Feldman said.

Attempts to reach Mr. Gorsuch and Mr. Spatz were unsuccessful.

Reprinted from the Chronicle of Higher Education online, April 6, 2001 issue. □

SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM

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

SAFS
1673 Richmond Street, #344
London, Ontario, Canada
N6G 2N3

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 goals:

- Renewal Sustaining Member
 New Member Benefactor

Name: _____

Department: _____

Institution: _____

Address: _____

Other Address: _____

Please specify preferred address for the Newsletter

Ph (W): _____

Ph (H): _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Visit the SAFS website at www.safs.niagara.com

Bequest 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.

Clive Seligman, President

DUES REMINDER

RECEIVING MEMBERSHIPS ON TIME IS IMPORTANT FOR THE SOCIETY

For those of you who still have not paid your 2001 year dues, please do so as soon as possible. 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. Please check your status and send in your dues if you have forgotten! Thank you!

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.

(Because SAFS is not a registered charity, memberships cannot be considered charitable contributions for income tax purposes.)

SAFS OFFICE

Mailing Address: 1673 Richmond Street, #344, London, Ontario, Canada, N6G 2N3, e-mail: safs@niagara.com

Secretary: Daniella Chirila, Dept. of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, e-mail: dchirila@uwo.ca

