

# 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 31

www.safs.niagara.com

April 2002

## FUREDY ACADEMIC FREEDOM AWARD

The Board of Directors of SAFS is pleased to announce that the recipient of the 2002 Furedy Academic Freedom Award is Doreen Kimura. Doreen is founding president of SAFS and a tireless soldier in the fight for academic freedom and scholarship in Canada. Her many activities on behalf of the goals of SAFS have been documented numerous times in the pages of the *SAFS Newsletter* since the beginning of SAFS in 1992. In 2000, Doreen received Simon Fraser University's Sterling Prize in Support of Controversy, in part because of her work with SAFS.

Doreen is internationally known for her research on brain organization, the biology of sex differences, and clinical neuropsychology. She is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and holds honorary degrees from Queen's and Simon Fraser Universities, in addition to her McGill PhD. Currently, she is enjoying a post-retirement appointment at Simon Fraser University, after a long, distinguished career at the University of Western Ontario. □

## HAPPY 10TH BIRTHDAY TO US!

*Clive Seligman*  
*SAFS President*

As part of our celebration of SAFS 10th Anniversary, we are happy to include in this Newsletter several items that comment on SAFS value through the years. In our first reflective piece, Nancy Innis, Editor of *SAFS Newsletter*, interviews Doreen Kimura, our founding president, about the origins of SAFS, the issues we've addressed, and how we are doing today. Ken Hilborn follows with his recollections of the political successes of the local SAFS chapter at the University of Western

*Conference Issue*  
**SAFS 2002**  
*10th Anniversary*

### IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Interview with Doreen Kimura
- 4 SAFS and Campus Politics
- 5 Speech Codes on Campus
- 5 Preferential Hiring of Women
- 6 Attitudes Toward Equity
- 8 Diversity of People and Ideas
- 9 Faculty/Student Diversity Mismatch
- 10 Science as Politics
- 11 Ethics Regulations
- 12 Ethics and Epistemology
- 12 Over-Concern with Ethics
- 13 Update on Osgoode Hall
- 14 Sexism Rampant in Nature
- 15 Bonehead Award

**INSERT - CONFERENCE INFORMATION**

*Happy 10<sup>th</sup> Birthday... continued from page 1*

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](mailto: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

Ontario. Finally, Bill Smyth reminds us that our actions, as an organization that fights for academic freedom and scholarship, do not go unnoticed and, in the best of circumstances, motivate others to join us in promoting our goals. □

## **NANCY INNIS INTERVIEWS DOREEN KIMURA**

*Could you give us your recollection of the factors that led to the decision to establish SAFS?*

A number of us at the University of Western Ontario had become concerned at the intimidation of professors by both students and the administration in several Ontario universities. Besides myself, I recall Professors Ian Hunter from Law, Kenneth Hilborn from History, Douglas Jackson from Psychology, and from outside Western there were Professor John Furedy from Toronto, and Professor Judy Wubnig from Waterloo, to name only a few.

Examples of such intimidation included a professor at University of Toronto who had been hounded out of the university after an exhibit she had done on life in colonial Africa. The exhibit was deemed to be offensive to black students, though she intended it simply as an accurate pictorial portrayal of the times.

Another professor at York University had an official observer stationed in a class he was teaching on behavioural differences between men and women - the aim presumably being to ensure that women were not being offended.

At the University of Western Ontario, a professor who studied race differences was harassed by students, was not allowed to teach his classes live, and was singled out for proposed "firing" by then Ontario Premier Peterson.

These and other examples were clearly incompatible with the values of academic freedom. Other worrisome developments were the establishment at many universities of extra-legal tribunals concerned ostensibly with curbing sexual and racial harassment. However, the policies guiding these tribunals were so broadly worded that if taken literally, many traditional academic courses could not have been taught. As it happened, these policies were precursors to the infamous "Frameworks" document later promulgated by the NDP government, originating from Stephen Lewis' 1992 recommendations. The latter urged "zero tolerance" of many activities in the academy, including the creation of a nebulous "negative environment", which could be done by "comments" or "remarks", largely unspecified. Almost any controversial statement could have been so interpreted according to that document.

*Did the NAS play a role in getting SAFS going? What is the relationship between the two organizations?*

Yes, the US-based National Association of Scholars was very helpful to SAFS in its fledgling stages, giving both useful advice, and financial help. Many of the original organizers of SAFS were already members of NAS. NAS, along with the Fraser Institute, helped us sponsor the 1993 "University in Jeopardy" conference in Toronto, which gave us the needed publicity to enlarge our membership and further our aims. There were no ties attached to this help by either organization. NAS has also helped organize sessions on academic freedom and the merit principle at other meetings, such as the Society for Neuroscience. SAFS and NAS are independent organizations with similar goals. SAFS, unlike NAS, has followed John Furedy's advice and welcomed non-academics to our organization.

*How easy – or difficult – was it to attract members to the society?*

At the beginning, while the academic freedom issues were foremost, it was relatively easy to recruit members. There were, nevertheless, many faculty who told us they sympathized with our views, but were uneasy about joining because they felt there might be negative repercussions for them. Most of these were

tenured faculty! We initially had a surprising number of non-university members, who seemed to understand the importance of these issues somewhat better than many faculty did. Over the years our membership has waxed and waned. Whenever there is a critical issue, we get some new members, but between crises, people tend to become complacent. An added factor may be that some faculty are willing to endorse our goal of supporting academic freedom but, although again secretly agreeing with the merit principle, are uncomfortable about taking a stand on it. Unfortunately, I think too many university faculty have become part of what Furedy called "the culture of comfort" and fail to see the long-term consequences of academic decisions based on group identity.

*How do you think the issues facing SAFS have changed over the past 10 years? What was its initial major focus?*

Although the importance of academic freedom is no less than it was originally, some of the most flagrant threats have been defeated, in part I do believe because SAFS was often the first, and sometimes the only, organization to raise the alarm. In recent years, we have focussed on maintaining the merit principle, in the face of employment equity or affirmative action campaigns. However, recent world events have again underlined the necessity for defence of free discussion in universities. We now hear of instances in classrooms and in campus writings, where criticism of repressive Islamic fundamentalism is effectively not allowed, in case it offend some people. In the early years of SAFS, I gave a talk on the occasion of receiving an honorary degree, in which I emphasized that offending students in an academic sense was part of the learning experience at a university. We need to be constantly reminded of that.

*What do you think is the most important area of concern today?*

I think that our two goals are of equal importance, but their salience will vary with the occasion. We cannot have excellence in the academy without academic freedom, nor can we have it without excellence being the primary goal.

*In what areas do you feel that SAFS has been most effective?*

It is very difficult to judge one's own performance. Some members may become discouraged by the size of the mountain we have to climb, but we should not judge

our impact by the immediate results. It takes time for ideas to circulate and become openly discussed, and I believe SAFS has been instrumental in initiating many of those discussions in this country. We simply must be willing to engage in the rational critique of objectionable practices, in the hope that a seed will be sown that ultimately will bear fruit. But there will never be an end to the battle - eternal vigilance is indeed the price we must pay.

*How was the name for the society determined?*

Originally, we called ourselves the Ontario Association of Scholars, but when in 1992 we incorporated as a non-profit organization, the term "association" could not be used because it had certain legal connotations. So we chose Society. Since at that point we thought we should indicate the aims of the organization, and our purpose went beyond the boundaries of Ontario, we finally came up with the name Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship, naming both our major goals.

*Do you have any suggestions for the future development of SAFS?*

I don't have any specific suggestions, but I think that the Society is in good hands, judging by the present Board.□

#### SAFS BOARD OF DIRECTORS (2001-2002)

Clive Seligman, Ph.D. (UWO) President  
[safs@niagara.com](mailto:safs@niagara.com)  
 Dale Beyerstein, M.A. (Langara College)  
[dbeyerst@langara.bc.ca](mailto:dbeyerst@langara.bc.ca)  
 Steve Lupker, Ph.D. (UWO)  
[lupker@uwo.ca](mailto:lupker@uwo.ca)  
 Murray Miles, Dr.phil. (Brock U.)  
[mmiles@spartan.ac.brocku.ca](mailto:mmiles@spartan.ac.brocku.ca)  
 Philip Resnick, Ph.D. (UBC)  
[resnick@interchange.ubc.ca](mailto:resnick@interchange.ubc.ca)  
 Harvey Shulman, M.A. (Concordia U.)  
[hshulman@videotron.ca](mailto:hshulman@videotron.ca)  
 Peter Suedfeld, Ph.D. FRSC (UBC)  
[psuedfeld@psych.ubc.ca](mailto:psuedfeld@psych.ubc.ca)

#### Past Presidents

Doreen Kimura, Ph.D. FRSC (SFU)  
 John J. Furedy, Ph.D. (U. Toronto)

## SAFS AND CAMPUS POLITICS AT WESTERN

*Kenneth H.W. Hilborn  
University of Western Ontario*

My most vivid recollections of SAFS in its early years relate to the successes of the chapter at Western in campus politics. In September 1993, through accident or oversight, I failed to receive notification of a chapter meeting, with the result that I was not present when plans were made for the impending elections to the University Senate. On the following morning a colleague telephoned to tell me that, if I agreed, I was to be nominated as a SAFS candidate for Senate in the Social Science constituency.

My first inclination was to resist the idea on the ground that I would almost certainly be defeated, not having a wide circle of friends and acquaintances outside my own Department. My colleague argued, however, that I did have an unusually high level of name recognition, thanks to my habit of expressing controversial opinions in the letters column of the weekly *Western News*. Among other things, I had been vehement in my condemnation of the University's repressive Race Relations Policy and the seemingly fanatical "political correctness" of its Race Relations Officer - both of them posing threats to academic freedom that SAFS' influence later helped to eliminate, through the drastic revision of the first and the resignation (under fire) of the second.

Eventually I permitted myself to be persuaded, thinking that my candidacy would be an interesting experiment; precisely because I could not rely on personal popularity, the election would be more a referendum on my well-known political views than is usually the case in Senate contests. The result was that I spent nearly four years as a member of that body, from November 1993 until I took early retirement from the University in 1997.

One thing led to another; having won a Senate seat, I was asked in 1994 to run for the Faculty Association executive. Again SAFS demonstrated its political effectiveness, for I was elected along with two other SAFS nominees. For a time we held five of the executive's thirteen seats, as well as gaining a significant Senate representation. In 1995, when I was up for re-election to Senate, SAFS achieved what I remember as its greatest electoral victory. Out of nine candidates who won seats against opposition in faculty

constituencies, no fewer than five ran with the local chapter's endorsement, and all but one of these were SAFS members. In a two-person race for a single seat, our former and future national president Doreen Kimura carried the Biosciences Division of Graduate Studies with more than 70 per cent of the vote. David Munoz, former coordinator of the local chapter, headed the poll in the Faculty of Medicine by a comfortable margin. Nowhere did a SAFS-supported candidate suffer defeat.

The value of holding seats in Senate was apparent in the spring of 1997, when the forces of "political correctness" in the Department of Sociology tried to bring about adoption of a departmental code of "ethics" severely restricting freedom of expression. After Doreen Kimura and I drew attention to the issue on the Senate floor, the senior administration gave assurances regarding the equal right to academic freedom enjoyed by all members of faculty, regardless of departmental affiliation. The forces of repression in Sociology failed to get their way.

In later years the UWO chapter's political activity declined, but presumably it could be revived if a situation arose that placed SAFS' principles in renewed jeopardy. What was accomplished earlier is evidence of what could be accomplished in future, and of what perhaps could be accomplished in other universities, if the "politically correct" were to offer sufficient provocation.

*SAFS' member Ken Hilborn is Professor Emeritus in the History Department at UWO. □*

### 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](mailto:safsnews@niagara.com)

## SPEECH CODES ON CAMPUS

*Bill Smyth  
McMaster University*

In 1994 Bob Rae's NDP government in Ontario wanted to impose a speech code on colleges and universities, to ensure that everyone in the university, especially students, always felt "comfortable" and were never challenged in their beliefs. There was not a single protest from any university or university president. In fact, the only two organizations that protested were SAFS and the McMaster University Faculty Association that I had never joined because I find it inappropriate for university professors to engage in collective bargaining. I immediately joined both.

*SAFS' member Bill Smyth is in the Computing and Software Department at McMaster. □*

## PREFERENTIAL HIRING OF WOMEN

*Doreen Kimura  
Simon Fraser University*

I would like to thank the many chairs and chairs' assistants who responded to my recent survey on the hiring rates of men and women faculty at Simon Fraser University and the University of British Columbia. The survey asked how many applicants of each sex had applied to the last 3 positions filled, as well as the sex of the successful applicants. I received responses from over half of the departments/schools polled, 17 from SFU and 19 from UBC. The respondents represented all of the disciplines recognized by Statistics Canada, but we did not poll Nursing.

From the respondent departments, the total number of men applying to both institutions was 3,219, the number of women, 1,306. Thus 71.1% of applicants was male, while 28.9% was female. This ratio was identical for the two institutions, and is similar to that reported for a 10-year period at the University of Western Ontario (Seligman, *SAFS Newsletter*, April, 2001). Overall, this suggests that currently, at least 70% of faculty job applicants to Canadian academic institutions are male. The situation varies somewhat across disciplines. For example, the proportion of male applicants is significantly higher in the Natural Sciences than in the Humanities. However, across both BC institutions, only one of the disciplines responding reported substantially

more female applicants. In the vast majority of departments, more men than women applied. Of the 105 people from the survey actually hired, 43 (41%) were women, and 62 (59%) were men. This discrepancy between the ratio of applicants to the ratio of hires is statistically significant, using a Chi-square analysis in which the expected hiring rate is based on the applicant pool. Again, this confirms findings from the UWO study, where women were hired in proportions significantly higher than would be predicted from the number of women applicants. An earlier Canada-wide report, estimating the applicant pool from the number of PhD graduates, similarly found an over-representation of women among new faculty, in the preceding two decades (Irvine, *Dialogue*, 1996).

Assuming equivalent quality ranges in men and women applicants, that is, the same proportion of "excellent" to "average" candidates, it must follow that, when preferences are severe, some women will be hired over better-qualified men. For example, in one case all 3 hires were female though the ratio of men to women applicants was 2:1. It is clear that women are not being discriminated against in hiring in any Canadian university to date on which we have information. This holds true for Science disciplines: in both biological and physical sciences, women were over-hired, though the sample size being smaller than in the case of total applicants, the effect is not statistically significant. However, one can state with certainty that there is no evidence of a bias against hiring women in the sciences, subjective impressions notwithstanding.

Of course, some questions remain. The findings do not rule out idiosyncratic cases of negative bias against women at either a departmental or individual level. However, men may suffer identical idiosyncratic bias, and the data show that they suffer generalized negative bias as well. Some might contend that women are hired preferentially because they are better qualified. This seems unlikely given the generally lower productivity of women academics (e.g., Schneider, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1998, Sept 11), but only access to vitae can answer that question. It also seems unlikely that respondent bias was a significant factor, since our data are consistent with previous studies cited, in which no respondent bias could operate.

*A letter to the editor published in UBC Reports, January 10, 2002. □*

## ATTITUDES TOWARD EQUITY ISSUES: A GRADUATE STUDENT SAMPLE

Stewart Page  
University of Windsor

Over the course of SAFS' ten years, many equity-related issues in the academic workplace have been prominent at one time or other, several of these having been identified by Professor Sandra Acker and other writers in the spring, 2001 issue of the *OCUFA Forum*. Many such issues, of course, have been identified by previous writers in this Newsletter.

One perspective, often overlooked, concerns the general orientations held by students toward equity-related matters, including the issue of gender-based or gender-restricted hiring. Student orientations are relevant, since these must coexist amid other, sometimes conflicting, perspectives about these matters, as advocated by professors and other authorities. We have been interested in the question of to what extent the student constituency supports various equity perspectives and endorses attitudes supporting them.

In late 2001, with support from a President's Fund SSHRC grant, we thus administered a survey (complete version and data available upon request), composed of 34 statements about equity issues, to 48 female and 9 male graduate students in psychology, average age = 26.84 yrs. (range = 22 to 47), at the University of Windsor. Each item was answered using a 7-point Likert scale assessing strength of endorsement (where 1 = most agreement and 7 = least agreement). Each student was instructed not to respond in terms of experience with a particular university, but only according to his or her view toward universities in general. Most had attended at least two different universities.

Results showed generally modest and rather inconsistent support for many positions popular with equity programs, for example, that women would be better taught by or more comfortable with female faculty, or are not treated with civility by male professors, and so on. Female respondents only mildly supported, and males were relatively indifferent to the general proposition that a university position could justifiably be advertised for female applicants only. Table 1 presents mean item scores, in ascending order for females, with item content shown in abbreviated form.

The women students generally agreed with "equity" positions - that is, those perceived as favouring and advancing the academic situation of women particularly - somewhat more than did the men or disagreed with them somewhat less. T-tests showed significant sex differences ( $p < .05$ ) in responses to 8 items (24%) (Table 1). Women were thus much more likely to believe: that universities would benefit from having more female faculty with the goal of a 50-50 ratio, that there should be at least one female and as many as possible on every departmental and university committee, that there should be different standards for evaluating the academic performance of female faculty (t significant on one of four items assessing this issue), and that there should be more scholarships and grant opportunities available only to female applicants; also that hiring in universities should not be gender-blind as in hiring musicians for a symphony orchestra; that it is good for universities to advertise positions specifically for female faculty since there are already enough men, and that it is critical for universities to have strong equity-based organizations to oversee all aspects of hiring procedures. The basic notion that universities would benefit from having more female faculty was found to be the strongest discriminating variable between male and female participants, again with women being more likely to support this position.

For both the total and female-only subsamples, the significant ( $p < .05$ ) Pearson  $r$  correlations concerning participants' age showed that older students, perhaps surprisingly, were generally less likely to support "non-equity" positions, for example, the "symphony orchestra" approach to hiring, as well as the position that if females were to be deliberately given preference over male professors in hiring, this would be an insult to many female applicants and might cause them to lose respect from colleagues as a result. They were also less likely to agree that females are under-represented in sciences and engineering not through discrimination but due to factors such as having other talents or interests. It may be that older students have become more familiar with the nature and advancement of equity causes, are more familiar with past inequities and issues within the women's movement, and/or that they better realize or perceive that female students still face areas of actual or possible discrimination within academic environments. For the total sample, the above correlations were .334 ( $p < .014$ ), .275 ( $p < .042$ ), and .284 ( $p < .036$ ) respectively.

Women thus supported some equity positions at higher levels relative to men, although on most items (76%)

**Table 1**

Means of Responses to Equity Survey Items; (N = 57 graduate students; n = 48 female; 9 male )  
 (ne = “non-equity” item; n = “neutral” item, excluded from present analysis)  
 Lower values (range = 1 to 7) indicate stronger endorsement of position  
 \* Indicates a statistically significant difference

<u>Survey Item</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>
If hiring only women, should say so in job advertisement (n)	1.79	1.11
Should have more female faculty, already enough men; goal is 50/50 ratio	2.10	3.44*
Should have females on every committee in university	2.42	4.00*
Must have strong equity committees re language, terms, documents	2.60	3.25
Good to have academic credit for feminist activities in community	2.96	3.78
Equity offices should be heavily involved, oversee all aspects of hiring	2.96	4.11*
There is gender-based discrimination now in hard sciences	3.04	4.11
Right for OHRC to advertise female-only university position	3.17	4.00
Preference for female faculty an insult to them; might lose respect from colleagues (ne)	3.26	2.78
Hire only on basis of merit; sex of applicant irrelevant (ne)	3.27	2.33
Ok to advertise for females with feminist orientation in their work	3.28	4.22
Hiring should be gender-blind, as in a symphony orchestra (ne)	3.58	2.22*
Use different or more lenient methods for evaluating female faculty	3.75	4.78
Discrimination in sciences due to factors other than gender (ne)	3.79	3.56
Female faculty are a minority group, victims of discrimination	4.02	4.56
More scholarships available to women only	4.12	5.89*
Female students more comfortable with female faculty	4.17	3.78
AA programs are discrimination against men (ne)	4.25	3.22
Female professors expected to care more/be more empathic than men	4.32	5.44
Good to advertise for females only; already enough men	4.38	5.89*
Females in science/engineering suffer intentional discrimination	4.38	4.89
Should be more grants open to women applicants only	4.42	5.78*
University presidents should be women	4.60	5.00
More demands made on female professors	4.73	5.22
Female students prefer to work with female professors	4.83	4.11
Females on all committees an unfair burden to female professors	5.06	4.56
Can advertise higher academic rank as possible for female applicants	5.30	5.56
Evaluate academic records of females differently, due to hardships	5.33	6.00
Evaluate records differently due to child/family pressures	5.38	6.33
Publications should refuse advertisements for females only (ne)	5.44	5.25
Evaluate CV/publication/grant record differently for female faculty	5.44	6.56*
Females better taught by female faculty	5.52	5.67
Female students not treated with civility/understanding by male faculty	5.69	5.89
Should be different standards for overall evaluation of female faculty	5.73	6.44

there were no significant gender differences. Also, on most items there were no differences in terms of one gender strongly accepting and the other strongly rejecting a position. Inspection of the means with strict reference to the scales' mid-point (4) shows that on only 11 items did the women endorse equity positions, as these were defined previously, or disagree (4 instances) with non-equity positions, and most of the former showed relatively mild endorsement and/or relative indifference. Moreover, many of the mean differences with respect to gender (Table 1), even some for which significant gender differences emerged, reflected differing levels of non-support and/or indifference more than support for equity positions. On 4 items, concerning hiring issues, women mildly supported "non-equity" positions, such as the symphony orchestra approach, though males supported them more. On 22 items (66%), inspection of the means, as above, showed that women participants were actually indifferent or negative toward pro-equity or positive toward non-equity positions.

Of course, the present exercise cannot adequately reflect the complexities and issues of which the present items were sound-bites. While the present sample will not totally reflect all student populations, we believe it was nevertheless a relevant, if not totally representative, sample. Indeed the proportion of men was small, though again this difference reflects a general demographic trend in university populations and apparently many graduate programs. In each individual program therefore, a similar situation will obtain in terms of gender representation and "dynamics."

In many ways, the data show that both men and women within student populations may be assumed to hold personal orientations toward equity matters which, in fact, they do not hold, or do not strongly or consistently hold. Pitfalls therefore exist in generalizing about "typically" male or female points of view, and certainly further data are needed from additional studies of student orientations. In any event, one may wonder whether official equity offices and organizations in universities hold and advocate their positions much more intensely than do those who provide the matrix and forum for this advocacy and for whom universities exist, that is, the student population.

*SAFS' member Stewart Page is a professor in the Department of Psychology at Windsor. Data collection*

*for the present study was coordinated by Ms. Larissa Goertzen; data entry and coding were performed by Ms. Reena Chopra. □*

### **LINKING THE DIVERSITY OF PEOPLES' SEX, RACE, ETC. WITH THE DIVERSIFICATION OF IDEAS : WHO'S BEING RACIST AND SEXIST HERE?**

*From University of Toronto Job Ad  
for Vice President and Provost*

The University of Toronto is strongly committed to diversity within its community and especially welcomes applications from visible minority group members, women, Aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities, members of sexual minority groups, and others who may contribute to the further diversification of ideas.

*CAUT Bulletin, February, 2002*

### **Diversity or Conformity?**

*John Furedy  
University of Toronto*

Does Jude Tate, co-ordinator, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, queer resources and programs, who has applauded the recent inclusion of "sexual minority groups" in U of T's employment equity statement" have any systematic evidence to show that preferential hiring on the basis of sex, race, and sexual orientation actually "contribute[s] to the further diversification of ideas" (Employment equity statement updated to include sexual minorities, Sept. 13)?.

Or does this sort of politically-correct hiring policy actually *increase* conformity and hence reduce the diversity of opinions, by placing the emphasis on what designated group (or groups) an academic is a member of rather than on the ideas themselves contributed by that appointee?

*Letter to Editor, published in The Bulletin, University of Toronto, September 24, 2001. □*

## SATIRE ADDRESSING THE FACULTY: STUDENT DIVERSITY MISMATCH

*Peter Herman  
University of Toronto*

University of Toronto has been struggling for a while now to arrange things so that the faculty complement more closely resembles the student body in terms of diversity. We haven't yet got to the point of advertising for "lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and queer" professors, but that's only a matter of time. For the moment, we are focusing on sex and race, endeavouring with only limited success to bring our faculty complement into synchrony with our student body. Because the student body is so dramatically diverse, however - according to some counts both women and visible minorities now comprise over 50% of the student body, making these minorities majorities - faculty recruitment efforts continue to fall short. Is there any hope of recruiting enough Asian women faculty to mentor all the Asian women students? We fear not. Our concern about matching faculty and student demographics, however, must not breed despair. Rather, we propose a simple plan to rectify the situation, by bringing faculty and student race and sex characteristics quickly into harmony.

The basic problem is that hiring suitable faculty is difficult. There are only so many desirable faculty to go around, and U of T is not particularly well-positioned to hire scholars with just the right genetic make-up. Our salaries aren't particularly competitive, even within Canada. The weather sucks. The facilities are run down. Classes are overcrowded. And things are likely to just keep getting worse. Realistically, there's no way that we can change the faculty make-up to correspond to the student make-up within the foreseeable future. Unless....

Unlike faculty, students are easy to come by. There are thousands and thousands of them clamouring to get in, and every year we get a new batch of applicants. In fact, we can pretty much pick and choose which students get in. So far, we have been pretty much oblivious to student genetics when making admission decisions, but in the interests of fairness, this policy must change. If we are to achieve an appropriate and equitable faculty: student diversity ratio, we must start applying the same criteria to student applicants as we do to faculty applicants. In fact, if we implement a

more diligent "diversity screening" among our student applicants, we can eliminate the "diversity gap" within 4 years.

We begin with a faculty survey. God knows there must be some data somewhere on the sex and racial composition of the faculty; in fact, we know there are, because people are always complaining about the figures. So, starting with the faculty complement, we then proceed to establish student recruitment guidelines so as to bring the students and faculty into greater congruence. If the faculty is, say, 70% male and 80% white, then starting this Spring, we must admit student applicants in corresponding percentages. Before you know it, the faculty will offer a perfect mirror of the student body. Because of the speed with which student admissions can be adjusted, from one year to the next, any changes in the faculty composition can be rapidly reflected in the student body. If - as a result of the vicissitudes of faculty hiring, retirement, defection, and death - the sex or ethnic make-up of the faculty changes, it's a simple enough matter to admit students accordingly, so as to maintain a perfect balance. Some may object that basing student admissions on characteristics such as sex and race is unfair (especially to those saddled with the "wrong" characteristics). But no - one will argue with the need to have the faculty fully represent the characteristics of the student body. In fact, U of T is publically committed to achieving this form of equity, even if it means adopting "affirmative" recruitment standards. The only novelty in our proposal is that we apply the standards to the students rather than to the faculty, in the interests of simplicity and speed.<sup>1</sup> If you have an easier and quicker way to establish a proportionate faculty: student diversity ratio, we'd like to hear it.

*Reprinted from Psychops, February 2002, edited by P. Herman who is a professor in Psychology Department, at the University of Toronto.*

---

<sup>1</sup> This scheme has the additional advantage of preventing the stigma of affirmative - action hiring from undermining the self-esteem of the hired individual. Faculty will be spared the ignominy of having been chosen for the "wrong" reasons. Students, on the other hand, couldn't care less why they're chosen, as long as they're chosen (as was made clear when our law students knowingly submitted inflated grade reports when applying for summer jobs - only one of the myriad instances nowadays of student cheating at the university level). □

## SCIENCE AS POLITICS BY OTHER MEANS<sup>1</sup>: FACT AND ANALYSIS IN AN ETHICAL WORLD

John Staddon, Editor  
*Behavior and Philosophy*

*An Editorial on the relation between objective and subjective, fact and value, belief and reality, in contemporary psychology.*

"We are all engaged in writing a kind of propaganda...Rather than believe in the absolute truth of what we are writing, we must believe in the moral or political positions we are taking with it." So wrote a couple of University of Pennsylvania instructors in the *Journal of Social History*, quoted by columnist John Leo. I recall my sometime colleague Stanley Fish saying (with the air of reciting the obvious) "all teaching is seduction." While many scientists might quarrel with these two statements, relatively few would dispute this recent comment in *Science*: "[In 1976] biomedical science — indeed science in general — labored under a belief that scientific activity was value-free and ethics free. The view that science does not make ethical judgments was so pervasive that it essentially served as an ideological basis for scientific activity..." (Rollin<sup>2</sup> & Loew, 2001, p. 1831). The implication, presumably, is that science *does*, or perhaps *should*, make ethical judgments; that it is not, or *cannot be*, value-free.

Contrast this position with "Nature consists of facts and regularities, and is in itself neither moral nor immoral", which is Karl Popper in 1950 stating what to him and his contemporaries was obvious. But now, in the social sciences, and perhaps also in some so-called "hard" sciences like biomedicine, understanding nature is taking a back seat to ideology. Moreover, this is regarded by many as both laudable and inevitable.

Even the psychological establishment seem to be aware that there is some sort of problem. The March 2001 issue of the *American Psychologist* contained an article by Richard Redding that looked at the political/ideological affiliation of psychologists. He found considerable uniformity: Liberals rule. Redding's solution was to call for greater political diversity in the field. Such a call will certainly go un-

heeded - and so it should, for what business does the APA or any other scientific (not to mention tax-exempt!) organization have seeking to influence the politics of its members?

But Redding is right that there is a problem, albeit not one of expressed political affiliations. It also can be illustrated from the pages of the *American Psychologist*. The lead article in the February 2001 issue is entitled: "An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications" by Glick and Fiske. The theme of the article is that "The equation of prejudice with antipathy is challenged by recent research on sexism" (p. 109). Of course both "prejudice" and "sexism" are terms that depend for their pejorative force on an ideology, a set of *values* - values that are almost entirely unstated in the article. Not that the authors are unaware of the power of ideology. They are very critical of what they call "legitimizing ideologies" - Rudyard Kipling's "white man's burden" takes quite a licking, for example. But their own ideology is to them as water to the fish: invisible.

Here is a partial list of the values that seem to be taken for granted by these authors:

1. Equality is the most important value and trumps all others. "Equality" (between the sexes, for example) is not defined but seems to amount to "identity." Only if men and women are treated in exactly the same way in every situation can they be regarded as truly equal: "gender differentiation create[s] and reinforces[s] hostile sexism" (p. 112).
2. "Power" is important, but there is good power and bad power. "Good power" is the power associated with professional status and money. "Bad power" is the power associated with good looks, charm and sexual attractiveness. "Simply put, men typically rule, dominating the highest status roles" (p. 110) but "Benevolent sexism is disarming" (p. 111) and "men often resent women's perceived ability to use sexual attractiveness to gain power over them" (p. 112).
3. Stereotyping (not defined) is bad.
4. A professional career is better than being a housewife: "women who implicitly associated male romantic partners with chivalrous images...had less ambitious career goals, presumably because they were counting on a future husband for economic support" (p. 111).
5. Sexual reproduction is problematic: "male-female relations are conditioned by sexual reproduction, a

<sup>1</sup> The allusion is to Karl von Clausewitz's famous comment in *On War* that "War is only a continuation of state policy by other means."

<sup>2</sup> University Bioethicist for Colorado State University.

biological constant that creates dependencies and intimacy between the sexes...patriarchy, gender differentiation and sexual reproduction...create both hostile and benevolent attitudes toward the other sex" (pp. 111-112).

6. Patriarchy (not defined) is bad.
7. Intellectual elitism: Some beliefs (mine) should be respected, others (yours) are "false consciousness," cf. "The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false-consciousness," a paper by Jost and Banaji cited with approval by the authors.

Some readers may be puzzled by this list, since these so-called "values" are surely self-evident. Who could be against equality, for gender roles, against lofty career goals, and so on? But that is not the point. The point is that these claims are not scientific facts, nor will they seem self-evident to many cultures other than our own - or indeed to many subcultures within the United States.

What then is the solution? Well, it has long been a convention in experimental work to separate factual matter, the data, from analysis. Data appear in the *Results* section, all else is reserved to the *Discussion*. And value judgements are usually excluded altogether. I see no reason why these rules should not be universally required in science. Thus, value-laden statements should either be excluded from the research entirely or (lest we abolish much of social psychology) stated in a responsible way. For example, "If you believe that women should have exactly the same social role as men, then our research shows that following things favor that objective and these other things hinder it"...and so on. First the value-dependent premises, then the data - or the reverse. The point is to separate facts and assumptions. It seems pretty obvious that a conscientious effort to differentiate what is fact from what is value is essential if social-science psychology is to rise above the level of "politics by other means."

#### References

- Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 109-118.
- Popper, K. (1950). *The open society and its enemies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Redding, R.E. (2001) Sociopolitical diversity in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 205-215.
- Rollin, B.E., & Loew, F.M. (2001) Assessing the reviewers of animal research. *Science*, *294*, 1831. *Editorial in Behavior and Philosophy*, Vol. 29, 2001. □

## REGULATIONS—A THREAT TO SCHOLARSHIP

Nancy Innis  
SAFS Newsletter Editor

Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs) were established to protect research participants. In recent years, however, they have expanded in ways that seem unrelated to their original mandates. As a recent editorial article, "Time to cut regulations that protect only regulators," in the journal *Nature* (2001, *414*, 379) states "much of the research that falls under the purview of [these committees] does not warrant such close scrutiny, as it causes little real risk for the study subject or, in the case of animals, involves generally accepted procedures..." Moreover, IACUC reviews typically must be completed before a grant application to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) can be considered and, since the majority of proposals are not funded, much of the research will never be conducted. Nevertheless vast amounts of researchers' time is taken up with completing research protocols and serving on committees to vet the proposals of others. The article goes on to state that the "climate under which even routine protocols are reviewed by IACUCs and IRBs is now one of fear – fear by the institution that it will be 'out of compliance' with one or more aspects of the paperwork, and so subject to penalty upon audit." Indeed, the "fear factor" results in absolute absurdities. The article states that in "some institutions, scientists who never work with organisms more complex than yeast and bacteria are now being forced to attend lectures on how to conduct experiments on humans, 'just in case.'" This is yet another example of the way in which university administrations have turned away from promoting and protecting the interests of their faculty by buckling under government pressure. □

### 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.

## IRBS: ETHICS, YES - EPISTEMOLOGY, NO

*John J. Furedy*  
*University of Toronto*

Christine Hansen's paean to the increased current role of institutional review boards (IRBs) ["Regulatory Changes Affecting IRBs and Researchers," September 2001] contains a number of questionable assertions, but what struck me as particularly unsound was the view that, as long as they were "diverse" enough, IRBs could validly determine what constitutes "poorly designed research." This view may have some plausibility for medical drug-evaluation research on humans, which is not really basic research at all, but rather applied evaluations of treatments that have been discovered through basic scientific research. However, it does not apply to most studies conducted by members of APS, studies that deal with scientific, psychological basic research issues. For such psychological research, IRBs are capable only of evaluating the ethical issues of how the subjects are treated, and not epistemological issues such as how well designed the study is. To take my own MA and PhD research as an example, during the period of 1963-4 at Sydney University, I administered electric shocks to several hundred human subjects. Had an IRB existed at that time and place, it would have been competent to decide whether the strongest shock I used (2.5 mA) met ethical requirements. Indeed, I would go further and say that these sorts of ethical checks are continuously required, because otherwise researchers like me may be tempted to go beyond ethical limits to increase the statistical power of what are usually frustratingly weak experimental manipulations in human experimental psychology.

But I assert with considerable confidence that no IRB would have been competent to assess the adequacy of my experimental design, which was intended to determine the locus of reinforcement in human autonomic classical aversive and appetitive conditioning. The only individuals who had the slightest chance of epistemologically evaluating my experimental design were the referees of my papers on this subject, the titles of which were: "Reinforcement Through UCS Offset in Classical Conditioning," "Aspects of Reinforcement Through UCS Offset in Classical Aversive Conditioning," And "Classical Appetitive Conditioning of the GSR with Cool Air as UCS, and the Roles of UCS Onset and Offset as Reinforcers of the CR" (1965, 1967, and 1967, res-

pectively; see my cv on my web-site, [www.psych.utoronto.ca/~furedy](http://www.psych.utoronto.ca/~furedy)). Even some of those knowledgeable and expert referees, in my view, totally misunderstood what I was investigating and hence were wrong about the soundness of my experimental design. For example, a number of them could not understand how I could talk about reinforcement in an experimental preparation that involved classical rather than instrumental or operant conditioning.

At least for the typical psychological basic research studies conducted by members of APS, let us not follow inapplicable analogies based on medical treatment-evaluation research, but rather let us restrict the ethical issues of treatment to IRBs, and leave the epistemological task of evaluating the soundness of a psychological study's design to grant proposal-evaluating committees and to editors of our high-quality journals. They are not infallible, but at least they have in principle the requisite background for what is an epistemological rather than ethical evaluative task.

*Letter in American Psychological Society Observer, February 2002 issue.* □

## OVER-CONCERN WITH RESEARCH ETHICS

*Ed Diener, President*  
*Society for Personality and Social Psychology*

In 1978 I co-authored a book on research ethics, believing that investigators needed to be more sensitive to ethical issues. Since that time, I have become concerned that ethics review boards have become overly sensitive, sometimes to the point of craziness. One recent example: An investigator moves to a new institution and brings old data with him. The new university requires that he must have all the old studies reviewed, even though they were reviewed at the institution where the data were collected and even though the studies are all completed, if he is going to do any more analyses on the data.

The problem is not just with the federal government guidelines - it is with institutions that go far beyond the guidelines in worrying about possible problems that have a remote chance of arising. We are in the strange situation where many ethics review committees are adding on increasing hurdles, paperwork, and rules, at

the same time that participation in research has become one of the safest activities in which our subjects participate. Think of it - dating, driving, playing sports, working, watching movies, eating, and sex are all much more harmful on average than participation in the vast majority of behavioral science studies. What can be done to make the review procedures and level of scrutiny equivalent to the very, very low risks in most psychological studies? Our ethics review panels need to be reminded of several things:

1. The rules of NIH (National Institutes of Health) provide large exemptions from review of many of the methods used in psychological research. These exemptions were provided because the types of research which are exempted were considered ethically trivial by those who wrote the laws. Exemption from review for research without true risk of harm needs to be granted much more often.

2. Prototypes of certain types of research protocols can be given approval, and research thereafter that fits into these prototypes can be granted expedited review. This modular approach to ethics approval could be used much more to save investigators from lengthy paper chases.

3. Review panels need to be reminded that they have an ethical obligation not only to protect research participants, but also to foster good research. It is unethical to block or slow research that can benefit society and science, unless there is good cause in a particular instance. Thus, to the extent that a board imposes lengthy delays, extensive applications that take away researchers' time, and will not exempt research that fits certain broad categories, the review panels are obligated ethically to provide compensatory assistance to researchers to offset these costs. The review panels cannot simply impose delays, moral qualms, and demands without also giving offsetting aid to researchers (e.g., help in completing the forms, advice on getting the research approved, funding to comply with the requirements, and so forth). Ethics review boards need to understand that society profits greatly from research, and they have an obligation both to protect subjects and to foster research. One suggestion is that review committees grant expedited review (very quick and easy check-off forms) for all research that does not contain risk of harm beyond everyday life, is not deceptive, and which does not contain highly sensitive information.

We have come to the point where ethics review committees are starting to impede research in many cases. Overly-nervous people are sometimes drawn to these committees, and universities are increasingly fearful of the federal government. In this climate, active researchers must work to keep ethics reviews in proportion to the actual risks that are involved in behavioral research. Judging from the virtual nonexistence of documented harm in our studies, the risks are almost always close to zero.

*Reprinted from Dialogue: The Official Newsletter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology Newsletter, Fall 2001.* □

### UPDATE ON OSGOODE HALL LAW SCHOOL'S INVESTIGATION OF HATEMONGERING

*Clive Seligman*  
SAFS President

Readers may recall that last Spring the *National Post* (May 1, 2001) reported that Osgoode Hall Law School of York University was investigating one of its students for allegedly engaging in hatemongering. The student in question had written an article in *Obiter Dicta* (March 12, 2001), an Osgoode Hall publication, that was critical of aspects of life in an Islamic state. Another student had complained about the article.

According to the *National Post* story, York University apologized for the article and President Marsden wrote to the Council on American-Islamic Relations, a lobby group based in Washington, D.C., to "inform them proceedings against the student have begun."

SAFS immediately wrote to Dean Peter Hogg and President Lorna Marsden to protest that their actions violated the student's academic freedom and asked them to stop the investigation. In his response to SAFS, Dean Hogg said that Osgoode Hall was obligated to investigate the complaint.

I'm happy to report that Dean Peter Hogg has informed me that the complaint against the student has been withdrawn and that the student is still enrolled in the Law School.

The complete correspondence between SAFS and Osgoode Hall was printed in the *SAFS Newsletter*

(September, 2001) and is on our webpage. A slightly shortened version of our letter to President Marsden and Dean Hogg was published in the *National Post* on May 3, 2001. □

## **SATIRE**

### **STUDY FINDS SEXISM RAMPANT IN NATURE**

SAN DIEGO—According to a University of California–San Diego study released Monday, sexism is rampant throughout the natural world, particularly among the highest classes of vertebrates.

"When we first decided to examine attitudes and behaviors toward gender roles among non-humans, we were wholly unprepared for what we would find," said Jennifer Tannen, leader of the UCSD research team, a joint venture between the school's zoology and women's studies departments. "Females living in the wild routinely fall victim to everything from stereotyping to exclusion from pack activities to sexual harassment."

Nowhere is the natural world's gender inequity more transparent, Tannen said, than in the unfair burden females assume for the rearing of offspring.

"Take the behavior of the ring-neck pheasant," Tannen said. "After mating, the male immediately abandons the hen, leaving her responsible for the total care for the chicks. For the single mother-to-be, there is no assistance, either in the form of a partner or child support. Nor is there any legal recourse. It's despicable."

Tannen said pheasants are typical of the natural world, where a mere 5 percent of animal species mate for life. Among species that do form lasting pairs, the situation barely improves: Females must remain close to the nest to incubate eggs, nurse, and keep watch over the burrow while males are free to go off hunting and fishing with their friends.

"The sexist attitude that child-rearing is 'women's work' is prevalent throughout nature and has been for generations, probably since reptiles first developed mammalian characteristics in the Triassic period," Tannen said. "Sadly, most creatures never pause to challenge these woefully outdated gender roles."

Tannen stressed the need to hold high those rare examples of species that do form caring, mutually supportive relationships.

"Wolves, beavers, gibbons, and a small African antelope known as a dik-dik all live in stable, monogamous pairs," Tannen said. "Other animals need to look to them as positive models if we are to have any hope of one day creating an ecosystem of understanding and respect."

More seriously, in addition to an unfair division of labor, nature is rife with sexual abuse and harassment. The UCSD study estimates that in 2001 alone, more than 170 trillion cases of abuse occurred in the world's forests, grasslands, and oceans - all of them unreported.

"During the act of mating, the female moose is subject to excessive biting, nipping, and herding," Tannen said. "The male has no qualms about using sheer, brute force to overpower his sex partner, and the female, accustomed to this sort of rough treatment after millions of years of it, doesn't even realize there's something wrong."

"Then, when it's time for the bull moose to complete the sexual act," Tannen continued, "it's over in about five seconds, with no regard to female pleasure whatsoever. Typical."

Adding insult to injury, Tannen said, the bull moose then heads off to mate with dozens more females over a period of two to three weeks, justifying his behavior as "part of the Mardi Gras-like atmosphere of 'mating season.'"

With other species, darker situations unfold. "To mate, the male Galapagos tortoise simply immobilizes the female with his weight, which, as far as I'm concerned, qualifies as non-consensual sex," Tannen says. "Female southern elephant seals gather in large groups during mating season, and each group has a small handful of males who control them like a harem. It's sick."

When female animals refuse to play along with prescribed gender roles, Tannen said, they are demonized. For example, female foxes, known throughout the animal kingdom for their aggressiveness, are labeled "vixen."

"We've all heard the lurid tales about the female black-widow spider, who kills and eats her mate," Tannen said. "The truth is, male spiders encourage their partners to kill them because it increases the time spent mating and, thus, the number of eggs fertilized by his sperm. But no one condemns the male for his part in this destructive relationship."

UCSD researchers identified 24 distinct male behaviors designed to perpetuate gender inequity and preserve the prevailing power structure. Among these dominance-asserting behaviors are chest-puffing, plumage-spreading, and antler growth.

The UCSD study is not without its detractors. Glen Otis Brown, author of *Forced To Strut: Reverse Sexism In The Animal World*, countered that male animals are victims of "the beauty myth" as much as females.

"When given a choice, female green tree frogs gravitate toward males that call the loudest and most often," Brown said. "Female *Poecilia reticulata* [guppies] go straight to the most brightly colored males. But when males evolve exaggerated secondary sexual traits to attract the opposite sex, suddenly *they're* the bad guys."

Tannen conceded that both genders have suffered as a result of sexism.

"Other than sexual size dimorphism due to same-sex competition, males benefit little from the gender inequity that so strongly favors them," Tannen said. "In a world where interactions are rooted in competition, not cooperation, both females *and* males are being denied the right to form meaningful relationships."

Annie Secunda, a Boston-based females'-rights advocate, said swift action must be taken to address the problem of sexism within the animal kingdom.

"We need to provide tigresses, hens, and all other females in nature with outreach programs and support networks," Secunda said. "We also need to impose standards through intervention. The males of all species need to hear loud and clear the message that this kind of animal behavior is not acceptable."

Secunda conducts numerous workshops aimed at creating female-friendly biomes and promoting the health and positive self-image of females on both land

and in the sea. She also strongly advocates the legalization of infanticide, which would enable females to devour their newborn offspring when resources are limited.

Secunda spent much of 2001 in the Amazon rainforest, working to create safe spaces for female animals. These efforts, however, yielded mixed results: Females have avoided the lighted walkways she built in several dangerously dense areas, and leaflets encouraging females to learn how their own bodies work were ultimately used to line dens for the rainy season.

Far from discouraged, Secunda said she plans to embark on an intensive study of the sexuality of flora.

"Multicellular plants alternate sexually reproducing and asexually reproducing generations, with each plant producing both male and female gametes," Secunda said. "It seems many plants have moved past conventional notions of male-female gender altogether. It's so liberating, I can't help but have hope for all those so-called 'higher' species of animals."

*Reprinted from The Onion, March 13, 2002.* □

---

### **Bonehead award three goes to a 5 ft 1 inch firefighter in the UK who, being so short:**

Cannot reach equipment on the fire truck,  
 Cannot pull the hoses from the fire truck,  
 Cannot lift ladders because they are too long  
 Cannot clean the fire engine because she cannot reach all areas,  
 Cannot use cutting equipment on large commercial vehicles and,  
 Cannot reach the emergency keys in an elevator and so cannot handle emergencies involving elevators.

### **And who now says that she has become embarrassed and depressed and so has decided to SUE the fire brigade for:**

Not making shorter fire trucks so she can reach equipment, pull hoses and clean all areas,  
 Not using shorter ladders,  
 Not making smaller cutting equipment and smaller commercial vehicles  
 Not making sure all elevators have keys can reach  
 She is claiming sexual discrimination. Huh???  
 As we make her the poster woman for the "it's everyone else's fault" generation.

*From UK Telegraph, January 30, 2002.* □

---

**SAFS MEMBERSHIP FORM**

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

**SAFS**

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

Please make your cheque payable to **SAFS**

- ◆ Annual regular - \$25
- ◆ Annual retirees/students - \$15
- ◆ Lifetime - \$150 (available to those 60 years or older or retired)
- ◆ Sustaining - \$100 - \$299
- ◆ Benefactor - \$300

**"I support the Society's goals"**

\_\_\_\_\_ *signature*

- |                                     |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal    | <input type="checkbox"/> Sustaining |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Member | <input type="checkbox"/> 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](http://www.safs.niagara.com)



**RECEIVING MEMBERSHIPS ON TIME  
IS IMPORTANT FOR THE SOCIETY**

For those of you who still have not paid your 2002 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**

**Lifetime:** \$150 (available to those 60 years or older or retired)

**Sustaining:** \$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**

1673 Richmond Street, #344, London, Ontario, Canada, N6G 2N3, e-mail: [safs@niagara.com](mailto:safs@niagara.com)

Secretary: Daniella Chirila, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, e-mail: [dchirila@uwo.ca](mailto:dchirila@uwo.ca)