

THE RACE SCIENCE OF J. PHILIPPE RUSHTON:
PROFESSORS, PROTESTERS, AND THE PRESS.

by

James Philip Gray

B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1989

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology

© James Philip Gray 1991

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

December 1991

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

NAME: James Philip Gray
DEGREE: Master of Arts
TITLE OF THESIS: The Race Science of J. Philippe Rushton:
Professors, Protesters, and the Press

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Chairperson: Heribert Adam

Michael Kenny
Senior Supervisor

Noel Dyck

Bruce Alexander
External Examiner
Psychology Department
Simon Fraser University

DATE APPROVED: 12/9/91

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

The Race Science of J. Philippe Rushton: Professors,
Protesters, and the Press

Author:

(signature)

James Philip Gray

(name)

March 30, 1992

(date)

Abstract

Criticism of J. Philippe Rushton's racial theory, outrage at the implications of his work, and controversy over what needed to be done about it, became major public issues when the theory was brought to light in a number of major daily newspapers early in 1989. In London, Ontario, where Rushton is a tenured professor at the University of Western Ontario, public meetings were quickly called, letters poured into local newspapers, and demands were made on a number of public institutions. The University of Western Ontario soon came to be the central arena and focus of public demands and putative solutions.

The research for this thesis has been guided by one primary research question; what insights into the nature of the Rushton affair can be gained through utilizing the social constructionist approach to public problems? This approach is exemplified by works such as Constructing Social Problems by Malcolm Spector and John I. Kitsuse, The Culture of Public Problems by Joseph Gusfield, and "The politics of speaking in the name of society" by Bernard Beck (Social Problems 25;353-60). Guided by the methodology suggested in the social constructionist approach, the thesis research utilized publicly available original source documents gathered on two expeditions to the London area in 1989 and 1990. The thesis provides the first comprehensive account

of the controversy from its beginnings in 1988 until Rushton's return to the classroom in January 1991.

The thesis chronicles and analyzes the conflict over political responsibility for dealing with Professor Rushton as various key figures in public institutions struggle over claims of problem definition and problem ownership.

Administrators at Rushton's university attempted to redefine the problem as an internal academic affair thereby allowing for the containment of this public controversy within the pre-existing committee structure of the institution. These attempts were largely successful.

The thesis considers the strengths and weaknesses of the analytical approach adopted and poses questions for further research.

* * *

Key words

public problem, race science, scientific racism, university.

Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge the kind support and generous assistance of Elizabeth Rosenau in the preparation of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTSpage

APPROVAL	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
PREAMBLE	12
CHAPTER ONE; RACE SCIENTIST DRAWS CRITICAL FIRE MEDIA REPORTS ABOUND, COMMUNITY GROUPS DEMAND ACTION.	17
CHAPTER TWO; FROM WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY, MANY VOICES.	30
CHAPTER THREE; SENATE SPEAKS.	50
CHAPTER FOUR; UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES.	65
CHAPTER FIVE; PROTESTS, PROTESTS, AND MORE PROTESTS.	80
CLOSING REMARKS.	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100

Introduction

Criticism of Philippe Rushton's racial theories, outrage at the implications of his work, and controversy over what needed to be done about it, erupted after Rushton presented a paper at the annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on January 19, 1989 in San Francisco. News of his presentation and the critical response it provoked soon spread and ignited a furore at the University of Western Ontario, in London, where Rushton is a tenured professor.

Public meetings were quickly called by anti-racist groups in London and in other nearby communities. Faculty and students at the university began to publish a flood of letters and articles in the two campus papers. Letters to the editor also began to pour in to the local commercial newspapers. Action was demanded of many public officials and institutions. As each of these bodies, in turn, responded by rejecting responsibility for solving the Rushton controversy, the university came to be the central arena and focus of public demands and putative solutions.

This thesis provides a narrative account of the rise of this public controversy from its beginnings in 1985 until Rushton's return to the classroom in January 1991. This account is prepared and analyzed by means of the social constructionist approach to public problems.

One primary question has guided the research; namely, what insights into the nature of the Rushton affair can be gained through utilizing a social constructionist approach? In addressing this question, the thesis presents a chronological account of the Rushton affair (seen as a potential "public problem"). It also provides an examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the social constructionist approach.

Before proceeding into the substantive portion of the thesis, I provide below a brief introduction to the theoretical framework through which the research and analysis have been carried out. I then describe my fieldwork, the amount and kinds of data collected, the methodology, and briefly introduce the chapters which make up the rest of the thesis.

I should make clear at this early point that my interest and intent is not in the development or elucidation of grand theory. Instead I have used literature, primarily on the social constructionist approach to public problems, in establishing a reasoned framework of ideas for the creation and analysis of a research problem (1).

1. In choosing a framework, a number of possibilities were considered. One option would be to heed the call of Britain and Cohen for an anthropology of formal organisations. They argue for the adoption of "a holistic view of an organisation, its personnel, and the context within which it must operate." (1981;20). They seek an analysis which considers the organisation as "an entire system" (1981;20). They suggest consideration of how personnel "integrate personal, family, ethnic, professional, and political goals and ambitions in their official roles and duties. (1981;20). This thorough programme presents an ambitious challenge for anthropology and would require in its application resources

* * *

"If men define situations as real they are real in their consequences"

W.I. Thomas

"The power to influence the definition of the reality of phenomena is a facet of the politics of reality."

Joseph Gusfield

Working within a social constructionist approach, Kitsuse and Spector define social problems as "the activities of groups making assertions of grievances and claims with respect to some putative conditions" (1973;415) (2). Gusfield proposes that there is "a culture of public problems... unique to modern societies" within which such assertions and claims are made (1989). He points out that "As ideas and consciousness, public problems have a structure which involves both a cognitive and a moral dimension. The cognitive side consists in beliefs about the facticity of the situation and events comprising the problem... The moral side is that which enables the situation to be viewed as painful, ignoble, immoral. It is what makes alteration or eradication desirable or continuation valuable."

While these two dimensions may be difficult to tease apart, it is important to note that claims about public problems necessarily involve both. Competing definitions of a

in time, accessibility, and money that are beyond the scope of the present undertaking. For this reason, Britain and Cohen's admirable challenge has not be taken up directly in the present research.

2. While some authors use the term "social problems", I generally follow Gusfield's usage ie. "public problems" because it usefully distinguishes between issues of public and private concern.

problem posit that different sets of facts are relevant. These worlds of facts provide bases for different moral judgements; in support of either alteration or continuation of the putative condition(s). The shaping of public issues may thus revolve around conflict over the relevance or irrelevance of particular sets of facts and attendant moral judgements.

As well as considering facticity and morality, Gusfield proposes three other concepts as especially useful for the analysis of particular public problems - "ownership", causal responsibility, and political responsibility. Ownership "indicates the power to define and describe the problem" (1981;13).

"The concept of "ownership of public problems" is derived from the recognition that in arenas of public opinion and debate all groups do not have equal power, influence, and authority to define the reality of the problem. The ability to create and influence the public definition of a problem is what I refer to as "ownership"... Owners can make claims and assertions. They are looked at and reported to by others anxious for definitions and solutions to the problem. They possess authority in the field. Even if opposed by other groups, they are among those who can gain the public ear." (Gusfield 1981;10).

While some actors seek ownership, others "deliberately seek to resist claims that the phenomenon is their problem" (Gusfield 1981;12). The strategy of disownership is attempted by those "interested in avoiding the obligation to be involved in the problem creating or problem solving process" (Gusfield 1981;12).

While ownership or disownership tells us who the actors are in the arena of conflict, these concepts do not

necessarily tell us anything about the content of their claims. For that, we need to consider responsibility. Gusfield distinguishes between two types of responsibility; causal and political.

"The first - causal responsibility - is... an assertion about the sequence that factually accounts for the existence of the problem. The second - political responsibility -... asserts that somebody or some office is obligated to do something about the problem, to eradicate or alleviate the harmful situation." (Gusfield 1981;5-6, 13-14).

The nature of the public institutions which become obligated to act is of some importance in the shaping of problem definitions. Claimants demand action from particular public agencies. Official institutional reactions and claims to ownership may redefine the problem and thereby affect its reconstruction by those outside of the institution. As Emmerson and Messinger note, "official troubleshooters" act on behalf of public institutions and in doing so they operate within the "theory of trouble and interventional ideologies" of the institutions of which they are a part (1977). Troubleshooters and the strategy within which they may be operating are important influences on the construction of a public problem and merit close attention below.

In developing a methodology for analyzing the construction of public issues, some authors have proposed a "natural history" of social problems (eg. Fuller and Myers 1941a and 1941b, Blumer 1971, and Spector and Kitsuse 1987). It is argued that by creating chronological accounts, it would be possible to document "...the process of collective

definition (that) determines the career and fate of social problems, from the initial point of their appearance to whatever may be the terminal point in their course." (Blumer 1971;301) (3). The process thus documented in chronological sequence would highlight those structural contingencies, such as institutional strategies, which are keys to understanding the development of a particular public issue (4).

Beck argues against the uncritical adoption of a natural history approach;

"Social problems constitute an institution in American society... By institution I mean a set of commonly understood and widely shared rules for accomplishing a collective activity. The distinctive form of politics that surrounds the definition and treatment of a social problem has evolved into smooth sequences of moves by various participants. I suggest that it is the educated and orderly conduct of those participants in addressing a multitude of social problems that shows the general patterns discovered by the natural history approach. We can develop a general theory of social problems because we have established in our culture a uniform recipe for cooking one up." (Beck 1978;257).

3. The idea of a single 'terminal point' is a simplification. The development of a public issue is a complex affair which may be seen to have many endpoints since events in the conflict may lead to changing decisions in many arenas. It is not practically possible to follow all of these ramifications in constructing a history. We are left instead to paint a simpler picture and take note when problem claimants and their claims leave our arena.

4. In adopting such an approach, we must do so cautiously since a sequential presentation may tend "...to suggest that more order and coherence exist than is usually the case" (Davis in Hammersley and Atkinson 1983;218). It is therefore appropriate that our efforts here be described not as 'natural history' but rather as 'history' since our account is not a simple reflection of the natural world but rather a simplified reflection - a creation of the ethnographer.

In other words, natural history models are not only heuristic devices but are also widely-known strategies for effecting and/or containing political action (5).

* * *

In closing this brief consideration of the theoretical framework, we briefly list the analytical concerns which shaped our research.

Who attempted to own the definition of the problem(s) presented by Philippe Rushton?

Who attempted to disown responsibility for causing or for resolving the problem(s)?

What claims did the various players make regarding causal responsibility and political responsibility in this case?

What does this tell us about their power to manipulate public issues?

5. It should be noted that the selection of a series of inter-related events as constituting a unit of analysis has precedence in anthropological research on social situations;

"As it has been generally defined... a social situation is a temporally and spatially bounded series of events abstracted by the observer from the on-going flow of social life...

A situation is viewed as occurring within a field setting whose circumference expands and contracts according to the changing interests and values of the actors in the situation. The field is defined in terms of the interests and involvements of the participants in the processes being studied." (Garbett 1970).

In an insightful piece on studying one's own society, Aguilar has written a thought-provoking critique on the appropriateness of an insider-outsider model for 'local ethnographers' (1981;15). He suggests the debate rests on a false dichotomy since all insider research situations contain both insider and outsider elements; that is, since "... no one participates in all segments (or levels) of a domestic population or shares with everyone in that population all ideational components of its culture... a more realistic model of the situation would view the local ethnographer as relatively inside (or outside) with respect to a multiplicity of social and cultural characteristics of a heterogeneous population." (Aguilar 1981;25).

In my own multifaceted and ongoing involvement in Canadian universities, I am in one respect an insider in relation to the ethnography which I am undertaking. I have been an undergraduate at Trent University in Ontario and at two universities in British Columbia. During the last six years I have been involved in student politics within universities and national student organisations. I have been a member of a number of Senate committees. I have sat on the University Senate itself and on committees in my own department. These experiences give me an amount of background information not readily available to a researcher from outside of the university setting. At the same time, it should be appreciated that I am in many important respects an outsider to the Rushton affair; I have been outside of that public problem process until this writing.

Data for this research was collected on two expeditions to the London area in November 1989 and December 1990 (6). On these occasions I conducted a number of interviews, gathered written documents, audio and audio-video tapes.

I was able to meet with a number of key players in the Rushton affair. I conducted three lengthy interviews with Professor Rushton. I also interviewed Associate Professor Joseph Cummins (a vocal critic of Rushton and the university), Professor Greg Moran, (Chair of the Psychology department), Gordon Smiley, (UWO Registrar and Chair of the President's Advisory Committee on Race Relations), Jan Van Fleet, (Secretary to the UWO Senate), Geraldine Stephenson, (a leading student activist), and Stephen Strauss and Laurence Surtees, (reporters with the Toronto Globe and Mail). I also spoke with a prominent community activist (Lorna Martin), and with Todd Kassenberg, (an officer of the UWO Society of Graduate Students). (7).

The majority of the written material which I collected consists of newspaper and magazine clippings. These include 280 news stories, 25 editorials, 27 feature articles, 227

6. These excursions were conducted with the approval of the SFU University Ethics Review Committee. The first trip was funded jointly by the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Arts, and the President of SFU.

7. At the start of each interview, I told informants that the information which they provided was potential fodder for my thesis. As all informants are familiar with academic pursuits, they know that M.A. theses become publicly available. For this reason I feel comfortable using their names in this ethnography. In any case, I have no other reasonable choice. Given the widely-known nature of much of the case material, aliases would soon become transparent.

letters to the editor, 3 public opinion polls, 11 editorial cartoons, 18 opinion columns, and 7 biographical pieces. I have also obtained and examined the minutes of two meetings of the UWO Senate which dealt with the Rushton affair, a package of documents pertaining to the UWO President's Committee on Race Relations, assorted correspondence and memos, and two privately published volumes - "the blue book", (a collection of scholarly critiques of Rushton's work and policy directives published by members of the UWO), and "the green book", (a collection of letters in support of Rushton's continued tenure published by Rushton himself).

I have also collected and considered audio tapes of a UWO Senate meeting, a radio phone-in talk show, and two episodes of the CBC Radio science show "Quirks and Quarks". Two audio-video tapes pertaining to the controversy have also provided evidence of the affair - one is a copy of the live television coverage of the debate between Rushton and Dr. David Suzuki. The other is a tape of Rushton's appearance on the American television show - Geraldo!.

In researching and writing this thesis I have utilized all of this information. Given the amount of material I have had to be highly selective in compiling information for inclusion. I have selected material that is representative of the different definitions of the problems presented by actors in the affair. In this manner I hope that I have effectively captured the key developments in the shaping and management of this public issue.

The Preamble, below, sets the stage by introducing three main protagonists - a group of professors, an anti-racist organization, and a member of the press. Chapter One charts the early days of the Rushton affair as it begins to take shape outside of the university. In Chapter Two we move inside the university to observe initial reactions within the institution. Chapter Three focuses on a special meeting of the university senate called to garner formal support for the administration's position. Chapter Four details the official channels followed in investigating Rushton's research efforts after the senate meeting. Chapter Five narrates the continuing protests and sketches the changes which the strategies of the protesters underwent as they were repeatedly shut out of official channels. The Conclusion summarizes the narrative account, considers the strengths and weaknesses of the theoretical framework, and poses questions for further research and analysis which are beyond the scope of this thesis.

PREAMBLE

"Essentially, the taboo is a ban on touching or eating or speaking or seeing. Its breach will unleash dangers, while keeping the rules would amount to avoiding dangers and sickness. Since the native theory of taboo was concerned to keep certain classes of people and things apart lest misfortune befall, it was a theory about contagion.

Mary Douglas

In 1985, members of the University of Western Ontario invited Professor Arthur Jensen to speak on campus. Jensen had aroused a great deal of controversy in both the popular media and the academic literature in 1969 when he brought together the idea of racial difference and the language and techniques of science in an argument published in the Harvard Educational Review. The scientific study of race had largely been abandoned after the world learned of the horrific policies and practices which such studies had supported in Nazi Germany. Professor Jensen had been attempting to revive the scientific status of racial studies through his work. He published claims that his research showed that the cause of putative black intellectual inferiority was "10%" environmental and "90%" genetic. Therefore, he argued, affirmative action policies aimed at rectifying the low scholastic performance of blacks were doomed to failure and should be abandoned. Jensen's work was widely denounced at the time by laymen and experts alike.

The revival of interest in Jensen's work sixteen years later by members of the UWO psychology department had

sparked deep concern both in members of the university and in those outside. They mounted protests of Jensen's lecture at the university.

Members of one organization in particular, the London Urban Alliance on Race Relations (LUARR), determined to keep their eyes on the psychology department. The LUARR is a coalition of ethnic minority and multicultural groups. These member groups together claim a total of over 7,000 members in the London area (1).

According to Lorna Martin, LUARR spokesperson, her organization generally operates through "quiet diplomacy", concentrating its efforts on educating employers, police, elected officials, school children, and members of the public about human rights and the problem of racism. The organization operates a 24 hour a day telephone 'hotline' for receiving complaints about racist incidents and devotes most of its energy operating 'behind the scenes', intervening discreetly in particular racial incidents at the workplace or in schools.

When reports of Rushton's race science hit the news, the LUARR leapt into action.

1. Members of this umbrella organization include the African Association of London, B'nai Brith, the Canadian Arab Society, the Caribbean Cultural Society, the Chinese-Canadian National Council, the Ethiopian Association of London, the London Citizen's Committee for Human Rights, London Folk Arts, London Multi-cultural Youth, the London Sikh Society, N'Amerind, the Trinidad and Tobago Association, the Vietnamese Assistance Association, and the West Indian-Canadian Organization. The LUARR is, in turn, a member of a larger, province-wide association - the Ontario Alliance on Race Relations (OARR).

* * *

Steven Strauss is a science reporter for a widely-read newspaper, the Globe and Mail. He is among the dozen or so reporters who made and spread news about Rushton. The roots of his interest in this particular scientist are to be found in an earlier encounter with another researcher from the University of Western Ontario, Professor Bessie Borwein.

In May 1986, Strauss and another reporter, David Helwig, received a call from Lifeforce, a Vancouver-based animal rights organization. This group had obtained documents from the U.S. military on successful grant proposals submitted by Professor Borwein. The documents showed that the widespread use of lasers as rangefinders and weapons had led to the funding of experiments which Borwein had proposed. These experiments involved directing lasers into the eyes of monkeys. The monkeys were then killed and the damage to their eyes assessed. Lifeforce objected to this practice.

When Borwein was contacted by reporters, she denied that her research had any military applications. According to Strauss, Borwein went on to indicate to him that critical inquiries from outside the university were unwarranted and unwelcome.

As a result of this encounter, Strauss began to characterize the UWO research community in general as holding similar feelings - that university research should be allowed to carry on without challenge or inquiry. It was

within such an atmosphere, Strauss contended, that work such as Rushton's might largely go unchallenged.

Strauss had begun reading the racial theories of J. Philippe Rushton in academic publications (2). He travelled to San Francisco in January 1989 in order to interview Rushton prior to the scheduled presentation of his theory at a conference symposium (3).

* * *

In September 1987, Professor Rushton was awarded a one year leave from teaching by his university in recognition of the excellence of his research. His position as Faculty of Social Science Research Professor allowed him to devote himself full-time to his research endeavours. During the academic year beginning September 1988, Rushton was awarded a fellowship by the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial

2. Keeping up with Rushton's written work is no easy task. He has published, as author or co-author, a total of 6 books (including the best-selling textbook Introduction to Psychology) and over 111 articles or book chapters.

In 1988, along with keeping up with Rushton's tremendous output of scholarly works, Strauss read Murderous Science, Muller-Hill's captivating and horrifying account of the work of race scientists in Nazi Germany. He recommends it as providing a context for understanding the significance of Rushton and his research.

3. In his study of how journalists do their daily work, Fishman (1980) found that since journalists need to produce a constant stream of stories, they tend to rely on regularly scheduled events for material. The publication of academic articles in journals and the presentation of papers at academic conferences certainly fall into this category of predictable, reliable events. As the Rushton affair progressed, the flow of material turned into a torrent as problem claimants produced press releases, distributed correspondence and memos, called press conferences, and made speeches at well-publicized public meetings and demonstrations.

Foundation of New York. The Guggenheim Fellowship is a prestigious and substantial cash award which, by agreement with the university, freed the professor from his teaching duties in order that he could spend his time on his research. Half-way through his year as a Guggenheim Fellow public controversy erupted.

CHAPTER ONE;

RACE SCIENTIST DRAWS CRITICAL FIRE; MEDIA REPORTS ABOUND,
COMMUNITY GROUPS DEMAND ACTION.

"I have to believe after four and a half years of research that I am right... and everyone else is wrong."

J. Philippe Rushton

on his theory of racial differences

In January, 1989, at San Francisco's Hilton Hotel, almost ten thousand scientists and over seven hundred and fifty journalists registered for the annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

On Thursday January 19, Dr. J. Philippe Rushton read aloud a summary of his racial research to a session entitled "Politics, Economics, and Evolutionary Biology: An Emerging Theoretical Convergence". According to a report in the Chronicle of Higher Education, one hundred scientists and fifty journalists came to this session and heard Rushton's twenty-minute talk. Those unable to attend were able to gather the essence of Rushton's argument through a press release which he had distributed.

At the meeting, Rushton told his audience that evolution had led to the emergence of three human races - oriental, white, and black. He claimed that there were significant measurable anatomical differences between members of the races and that these differences were

heritable and caused 50% of observed differences in behaviour. Comparing measurements of 65 variables including intelligence, sexual restraint, and law abidingness, these races always fell into the same pattern. Rushton depicted the ranking as "oriental>white>black" using the mathematical symbol ">" meaning "greater than" (4). His characterisation of blacks as wild, sexually-unrestrained criminals of low intelligence with small brains and large genitalia soon drew critical fire.

Immediately following his presentation, Rushton was peppered with questions and showered with criticism. One Harvard professor said he totally disagreed with Rushton. He accused Rushton of "outrageous actions" aimed at gaining attention.

Very soon after the session, Dr. Walter Massey, President of the AAAS, called a press conference to dissociate the Association from Dr. Rushton's research. He said that the Association was not in a position to criticize Rushton's research and could not be expected to review work prior to its presentation at their conference (5). He went on to comment that he found the paper "personally disturbing" and its conclusions "highly suspect". The

4. While this paper has not been published in a peer-reviewed publication, it was printed in the London Free Press of February 8, 1989.

5. Thus the AAAS became the first organization to disown responsibility for the work of Rushton. Over the following months a number of other organizations took similar positions.

organizer of the session which Rushton addressed told reporters that the whole incident was "terribly embarrassing".

Within the next few days, news stories on Rushton's presentation and its reception were carried in a number of newspapers readily available from vendors and streetcorner boxes in London including the Toronto Star, The Globe and Mail, and the London Free Press. Stories also soon appeared in two papers published at the university - The Gazette, a student-run paper, and The Western News which is published by the university's information office. Many of these news articles supplemented the comments of those at the conference with criticisms from academics at UWO and elsewhere (6).

Under a Toronto Star headline "Scholars dismiss Canadian's racial theory", Garland Allen, a biologist at Washington University was quoted as saying that Rushton's findings are "...about the most racist stuff I've ever heard. I don't think a single one of his arguments isn't strongly questionable". In the London Free Press, Dr. Rowland Christjohn, a researcher on intelligence at the nearby University of Guelph was reported to have reviewed

6. These developments may have an parallel in the case of Sir Cyril Burt, the pre-eminent British psychologist whose research on IQ was challenged as fraudulent only after a journalist reported scholarly criticisms of his work in the Sunday Times of London (see Joynson 1989 pp. 32-5). As in the Rushton affair, the initial stories were followed by a lengthy stream of letters and articles published in newspapers by scholars critical of the researcher.

Rushton's recent work and found that it had "no validity at all". Under the Globe and Mail headline "Academics skeptical of theory associating race and intelligence", University of Delaware psychologist Marvin Zuckerman, who had a year earlier coauthored and published a scathing criticism of Rushton's work that was widely referred to during the ensuing controversy, characterized the work as "bad science serving a bad cause." (7).

These expert criticisms fell onto fertile ground in London. While the scholarly critiques continued in the newspapers, on the radio and the television, a number of organizations in London, recently formed to identify and deal with the putatively widespread problem of racism, leapt into action. Chief amongst these protagonists in the early days of the Rushton affair was the London Urban Alliance on Race Relations, the LUARR.

Within days of the AAAS meeting in San Francisco, the LUARR called for the immediate suspension of Rushton from his teaching duties in order to prevent him from "spouting his filth" in a university classroom.

Spokesperson Lorna Martin also called on the university to undertake a formal review of his work by an "academic review board" (8). The university was also called upon to

7. See Zuckerman and Brody 1988.

8. The fact that a number of the members of the LUARR are also on faculty at the UWO may have given rise to this specific demand. These members were no doubt aware that had the university administration decided to suspend Rushton, consideration of the Rushton case would have ensued under

reconsider the acceptability of Rushton's financial support from the Pioneer Fund (9).

On the evening of January 25, members of the London Urban Alliance crowded into the basement of a suburban home. There they argued and discussed a range of options including demanding action on the part of the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the government of Ontario (10). They agreed that their key target was the university. They handed out petition forms which demanded that the university's president suspend Rushton and investigate his work. Those present were to take these petitions back to their own organizations for distribution.

A number of the speakers at the meeting were widely quoted in the press. Among these was Emeka Njoku of the African Association of London (11). In the name of his constituents Njoku demanded Rushton's dismissal; "The African community is outraged and insulted by Rushton's

the Terms and Conditions of Employment in force at the UWO. In this scenario, the investigation would have to have been completed within seven days. A quick consideration of the case may have been the initial goal of the LUARR.

9. Through the news article reporting the alliance's position, Martin also announced an emergency meeting of her organization for the following week to discuss a course of action. This illustrates how this organization involved in the Rushton affair used the press as a vehicle for communicating with their supporters about upcoming events.

10. They immediately sent a letter of concern to the Ontario Human Rights Commission. The commission responded by encouraging applications for funds by groups intending to criticize Rushton.

11. The recent (1987) formation of the African Association of London stands as further evidence of the growth of the public problem of racism in the region.

racist views. Philippe Rushton is using our educational system to preach racial superiority and hatred and pollute young students' minds. We demand Rushton's immediate removal from UWO". Njoku called on the provincial government to lay criminal charges against Rushton. He also called on the government to deny funds to the university claiming that tax money should not be spent on "racist research" at public institutions; "We must not spend money on these kinds of things."

Godfrey Moses, as President of the LUARR, did not call for Rushton's dismissal but he did speak bluntly and forcefully on behalf of his membership; "We will not accept this kind of material being disseminated in any institution where young minds are being trained." Moses called for a meeting with the president of the university.

* * *

Other actors continued to enter the affair.

Representatives of some London-area churches soon made their views known. They proclaimed that the "racist inferences and insinuations" of Rushton's work are "contrary to Judeo-Christian teachings and principles". They expressed their concern that Rushton's work "caused undue suffering to all visible minorities" (12). In reference to Rushton's support by the Pioneer Fund, the group urged

12. These positions were taken at a meeting of the Convention Baptist Churches of the Middlesex-Lambton Association of Baptist Churches, an association of twenty-six London-area churches.

President Pedersen to "exercise greater caution before authorizing the acceptance of funds from any and all organizations that are known to hold or promote racist doctrines." (13).

* * *

Politicians of the municipal, federal, and provincial governments soon took the opportunity of the controversy to air their views on the state of race relations and demand action on that basis.

During the first week of February the London Advisory Committee on Race Relations met for the very first time - in order to let its members get acquainted. This committee of the London city council included among its members the city's mayor and a number of city councillors. As well it had representation from local school boards, the police, multicultural groups, and institutes of higher education, including Western. The committee's mandate was to help lessen racial tension in the city and to "foster a spirit of mutuality, trust, and respect among the city's visible

13. By this time more background on the Pioneer Fund was known. The organization had been founded in 1937 to promote the eugenics movement in the United States. It has both historic and ideological links with Nazi Germany including those of one of its founders, Harry Lachlan, who received an honorary degree from the University of Heidelberg in Germany for his contribution to the development of Nazi racial purity policies. In the last few decades it has provided funding to a number of academics including Jensen and Rushton.

After public outcry, the Universities of Delaware and London, England have investigated the organization and decided that they will no longer accept Pioneer Fund money. The university administration at Western steadfastly refused to investigate the issue.

minorities and other groups". At their first meeting, the issue of Rushton loomed large; Kizitu Serumaga made a presentation as a representative of a newly-formed student group - the Academic Coalition for Equality. Serumaga urged the committee to support the call for Rushton's suspension.

Committee member Pulivelil George told the meeting that "Rushton cannot hide behind freedom of speech and academic freedom. There is a moral and ethical dimension here."

(14). By meeting's end, the committee decided to invite university officials to speak to their next meeting (15).

A second committee of the city of London's council - the Community and Protective Services Committee soon decided to add their weight to the growing volume of demands that the university conduct an official investigation; "Since (Rushton's research) has been questioned by the public and other academics, we think it's appropriate for the university to conduct a review."

Howard McCurdy is a black member of the Canadian parliament representing the nearby city of Windsor. He is a

14. George is also a professor at Western. This committee which operates outside of the university structure and makes demands upon the university, like a number of others, contains university professors. While the division of inside/outside exists at a formal, structural, institutional level and is a useful analytical tool, crossovers in membership should be noted as they do present some anomalies in minor detail.

15. After hearing from these officials, the committee decided to call upon the university senate to take action; "the promotions and tenure committee of the senate of UWO (should) undertake a review of the tenured position of Professor Rushton on academic and scientific grounds."

former professor of biology, and an opposition-party critic for post-secondary education. McCurdy called a press conference to place responsibility for dealing with Rushton, first and foremost, within the university. If the university failed to act however, he said that the provincial government should reconsider its financial support of the university, in light of the government's own race relations policies.

McCurdy claimed that the university must

"...demonstrate that it rejects the theories of Mr. Rushton, the consequences of those theories and any practices which could be justified by those theories. The demand is clear ... Mr. Rushton cannot be allowed to become the scientific racist guru of Canada at a time in which we face considerable problems, some would say a crisis, in race relations... Failure to respond to this demand should certainly lead to a clear examination of the appropriateness of continued financial support of a university which has failed to demonstrate that it is not in adherence with the laws and policies of this province."

The premier of the province of Ontario, David Peterson, himself a native of London, a UWO graduate, and member of the provincial parliament for London, joined in the fray. He told reporters that he thought Rushton's research "highly questionable and destructive... (It's) not only academically unacceptable but morally offensive to the way Ontario thinks... It just destroys the kind of work we are trying to do to bring together a society based on equality of opportunity for everyone."

The premier claimed that it was the responsibility of the students and the faculty of the university to deal with Rushton. He called on students to "to stand up and tell him

(Rushton) what they think of him". He encouraged professors to challenge Rushton's research and conclusions. While acknowledging his own impotence to intervene directly, the premier made known his position and, perhaps, sought to pass his recommendations on to the university's administration when he said "If I had the power to fire him, I would". (16).

It was shortly after the premier made these remarks that Alexander Martin, a member of the LUARR and the President of the Ontario Alliance on Race Relations demanded that the provincial government get actively involved. Martin wrote to Ontario's Attorney General demanding that he honour the commitment of Ontario's Policy on Race Relations to "attack the overt manifestations of racism" by laying criminal charges against Rushton. Press reports on this development also printed excerpts from the provincial policy;

"Racism in any form is not tolerated in Ontario. All doctrines and practices of racial superiority are scientifically false, morally reprehensible and socially destructive, contrary to the policies of this government and unacceptable. Racially motivated offences will be met with the full force of the law to protect personal dignity and safety."

16. Many felt that the premier's remark was heavy-handed. The president of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, John Starkey, for example, said that "The premier should butt out. It's up to the academic community to police itself." In this statement this representative of university faculty members illustrates the position espoused by many academics active in the Rushton affair. Many of these stated that troublesome individuals within the academic community are best dealt with by members of that community. They maintain that when and how this is done is not the business of outsiders.

Although calls for enforcement of the policy became the focus of much public discussion, it became clear through the Rushton affair that as a policy the document does not have the force of legislation and so could not be "enforced". Rushton was instead investigated under criminal law provisions prohibiting the promotion of hatred and the spreading of false news (17).

Members of the African Association of London added to the list of demands being made on the university after their February meeting. At a news conference, spokesperson Emeka Njoku announced "The university and other agencies must take action to ensure that racism and the teaching of racial superiority are unacceptable. The University is overdue for a race relations policy." Njoku went on to claim that the time had come for the media and the public to ignore Rushton and focus on "the broader issue of racism."

Njoku continued, adding to his list of recommendations. "The university should conduct research on racism and what causes individuals to become racists... We're (also) asking for... appointment of qualified blacks to positions that are commensurate with their qualifications."

* * *

It should be noted that outside the university there was not unanimous support for demands that the university administration take action. There were many calls for the

17. This investigation was not to be launched for over a month and not concluded for another seven months. Developments are outlined below.

university to sit tight. The editors of the Free Press, for example, ran an editorial which echoed this sentiment; "In the interests of free speech and free inquiry, the University of Western Ontario should resist pressure to take disciplinary action...".

* * *

In this chapter we have seen that there are three important positions on causal responsibility at issue in the Rushton affair. First, some claim that Rushton's theory is a direct result of his racist views. Others claim that Rushton's theory is faulty because it is the result of poor scientific practice. Finally, some claim that the controversy is caused by political agitators whose influence should have no impact on a university (18).

While some non-UWO scientists and members of the press defined the problem as one caused by the incompetent practice of science, the majority of the claims about Rushton by those outside of the university were made by groups and individuals concerned not with science per se but with racism. For the most part, these players had some authority within their community for speaking on race relations issues. They claimed that the university was responsible for the problem of Rushton-the-racist-academic by supporting his tenure. They also claimed that the

18. Each of these causal positions has a corresponding set of claims regarding political responsibility. Having spelled out the causal issues, we concentrate below on the conflict over political responsibility since this conflict assumes and contains the causal positions.

university's position was likely to increase inter-racial tensions. Therefore, they argued, it was the political responsibility of the university to deal not only with this racist professor, but also with any promotion of racist views or practices at the university.

These many claims were frustrated by the response of the University Administration which moved to disown the problem of Rushton-as-a-racist. The administration instead announced ownership over two different problems. Firstly they proclaimed their intention to protect the university and all of its professors from the problem of outside interference in their work, under the rubric of academic freedom. Secondly, they announced that there were extant personnel policies and procedures which would automatically deal, through peer review, with concerns regarding the problem of Rushton-the-incompetent-scientist.

CHAPTER TWO

FROM WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY, MANY VOICES.

At the beginning of the controversy two members of the university's administration; the president and a vice-president responsible for academic affairs (who also holds the title of provost), announced and defended a position on behalf of the university community. Perhaps partly as a result of this, many of those from outside the university who made demands on "the university" focused their demands on these two officials. Thus the president and the provost were, somewhat confusedly, identified as the university. The university, in fact, is a complex social institution. Structures within this institution have mandates, rules, and procedures. These are largely unknown to those outside of the institution. Through the course of the Rushton affair, some of these structures were brought to public attention by actors in our drama. We systematically outline these channels here in order that subsequent events may be understood within this context.

The University of Western Ontario may be divided into a number of constituencies for purposes of clarification; administrators, faculty members, and students.

The President and the Provost (Vice President-Academic) are two of the chief protagonists within the administration. As heads of the university's administrative

structure, they act as the representatives of the university to the public. Within the university, members of the administration are charged with running the university. They are not, ideally, to interfere in the academic functions of the faculty members of the university which are seen as more properly being the purview of the members of faculty operating through various committees and through the university senate (19).

Western's faculty members are involved in the university through teaching, research, and service on the various university committees which oversee the running and development of the university's academic life. The contributions of individual faculty members to their particular field of scholarship, to teaching, and to university and community service are evaluated each year by a committee within their own department (20). If faculty members wish to appeal decisions made by these departmental committees, they do so to the Grievance Committee of the Faculty in which their department is located. Appeals of Faculty-level decisions are made to a committee of the university's senate.

19. At the same time, many administrators are also faculty members who have taken on administrative posts. The strain which this double-duty can create is seen in the position of the Dean of Social Sciences below.

20. There are in fact a number of members who do not operate within departments as some Faculties do not have departments. The account given here is a generalized one which highlights those structures within the institution which came to bear on the Rushton case. A more complete picture may be found in the Terms and Conditions of Employment, University of Western Ontario.

The university senate is the ruling academic body of the institution. The membership of the senate reflects the delicate balance within the institution as a whole between the administration and the faculty. Elected representatives of the faculty members hold the majority of senate seats. Administrators hold just over half as many. Students and others make up the rest. The mandate of the senate is to direct the academic affairs of the university. This it attempts to do through its meetings and those of its various committees and subcommittees.

During the Rushton controversy, members of the faculty who were not members of the departmental, Faculty, senate or other university committees responsible for ruling on the Rushton case, but who nonetheless were desirous of having their voices heard, utilized the only other structure within the institution available to them, the campus newspapers.

The students of Western have a University Student's Council which served as a channel for the participation of some. A few students became involved through service as elected representatives on the University Senate. Students do not sit on any of the other university committees which became involved in the Rushton affair. Like the faculty, many students used the campus papers to present their views. But the vehicle through which most of the students involved in the affair operated was an organization which they created outside of the formal university structure, during the early days of the Rushton affair.

* * *

Within days of the outbreak of the Rushton controversy, the president of the UWO, George K. Pedersen, announced that the university saw the issue as involving the rights of academics and universities to be free from public influence and pressure. He announced that the university would defend Rushton's right to research and teach on topics of his choosing under the rubric of "academic freedom" and tenure (21). Professor Greg Moran, chair of Western's department of psychology, defended Rushton as "a highly respected member of not only the academic community at Western, but

21. "Tenure, generally, is the holding of a secure position within an educational institution or system... The granting of tenure by the institution signifies that the individual so classified has an ongoing appointment that may be terminated only through resignation, retirement, or dismissal for good reasons as established by a proper hearing." (Canadian Encyclopedia 1988, p. 2131).

the country and internationally" (22). Provost Collins dismissed calls for Rushton's suspension as "silly".

* * *

Despite the firmness of his original position, President Pedersen agreed to meet with community representatives on February 2. At that meeting, Lorna Martin of the London Urban Alliance on Race Relations suggested that the president call a meeting of the President's Advisory Committee on Race Relations to consider the Rushton case (23). This he would not agree to do.

22. Jean Philippe Rushton distinguished himself as a member of the University of Western Ontario by having become the youngest person ever to achieve tenure in the history of that university. He is a Full Professor in the university's Department of Psychology. That department has over fifty members who teach one of the largest undergraduate enrollments at the university.

He received his academic degrees from the University of London, in England; a bachelor of science with first class honours was granted at Birbeck College in 1970 and a Ph.D. at the London School of Economics in 1973.

He has an apparently impressive list of credentials and publications. "He has served as a consultant to the Royal Commission on Violence in the Communication Industry, as a fellow of the Centre for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, as a visiting scholar at the Institute of Human Development at Berkeley, and as a fellow of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada." (Gross 1990). He has been elected a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Psychological Associations of Canada, the United States, and Britain. He is currently working on a number of articles and on a book to be published by the prestigious Cambridge University Press. He has received financial support for this research from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and, along with a departmental colleague, Tony Vernon, has been granted almost a quarter of a million dollars from the Pioneer Fund of New York.

23. This committee is another manifestation of the emergent construction and institutionalization of the problem of racism. In 1987, at the urging of the UWO chaplaincy, the

The Alliance also asked that the university reconsider its support of Rushton and the decision not to suspend him. President Pedersen said that he would take these suggestions to a meeting with senior administrators. They alone could and would make such decisions.

The next day the university administration called a press conference. Tom Collins, University Provost and Vice-President (Academic), said that there would be no reconsideration of the University's position; "Rushton will not be suspended and (Western will not) investigate his activities". Collins went on to focus on student concerns; "If students have complaints," he said "they can issue them." When asked if the university would take action on such complaints, Collins answered with an unqualified "no".

"If he is proved wrong he will be academically disgraced but nothing more. His theory will be disproved. That is all. He will be allowed to continue his work." announced Collins.

Dr. Greg Moran, chairperson of department of psychology said that "Rushton is free to pursue whatever academic topic

LUARR, and the Ministry of Labour the president established a committee to study "the incidence of racism" on campus and to recommend policy directions (like those which were being developed at York University) in line with the Ontario Policy on Race Relations.

Although the committee's mandate included the monitoring "on an ongoing basis", of "issues related to race relations within the University", no meeting of the committee was convened by the president to consider the uproar over Rushton on campus. The president did, however, later use the committee's existence to direct the focus and energy of problem claimants into the on-going policy creation process.

he chooses". According to Moran, Rushton's views and credibility would inevitably be subjected to peer criticism.

It is interesting to note that none of the university officials who spoke at the press conference offered any information on the mechanisms and procedures within the institution which might be brought into play to investigate Rushton and his work. They chose instead to imply that review of the work was an affair wholly internal to the university, automatic, and not properly the concern of those from outside.

At the press conference, UWO's president George Pedersen, distributed and read aloud a "Statement on Academic Freedom". In doing so he attempted to reinforce the definition of the problems associated with the Rushton affair in terms of academic freedom. The document begins; "The issue of academic freedom has received much attention in the media recently. The University believes that it is important to clarify this basic principle.

The principle of academic freedom is not new; it has been in force in all universities in North America for several decades. Academic freedom provides a university community with the protection that must accompany independent research and the publication of its results... It is a matter of historical record that members of the academic community, faculty and students alike, evaluate such results and interpretations. Conclusions are either sustained or refuted. The basis of this process is that the university must remain the centre of such free intellectual inquiry and interchange."

While claiming that the university was the proper forum for discussions of issues surrounding the Rushton controversy, the president went on to establish that the university as a whole was not responsible for the moral and

social implications of the research conducted by members of that community.

"Members of the academic community have responsibilities as well as rights and they are individually accountable, in both the moral and social sense, for their findings and statements. In protecting academic freedom, the University is not assuming that responsibility which is properly the responsibility of the individual concerned."

After he finished reading to the press, the president noted that "Rushton will continue to do his research, he will continue to teach... This is a final statement of the university."

While the administration was speaking to the press, students were meeting together to organize the Academic Coalition for Equality (ACE), an alliance of students and student organizations that was to be the most vocal and long-lived opposition to the university's official position on Rushton. Kizito Serumaga, who later became president of ACE and one of its most active and vocal members, asked those assembled at the meeting "When a person on the street calls you a nigger, you ignore it because he is ignorant. When a professor calls you stupid - how can you ignore that?". The aim of the coalition at the beginning of the Rushton affair was to expose the fallacies and dangers of race science. In their first press release they described the problem of Rushton's research; "what we have here is a case of manipulation of science to justify and promote racism. It is racism of this nature that has historically been used to legitimize... slavery and the holocaust".

Members of ACE began actively recruiting students to their cause - pushing the university administrators and administrative bodies to take action;

"The Academic Coalition for Equality needs the support of every student at the University of Western Ontario in order to take a firm stand against the infectious virus of scientific racism. We must with one voice and one force call upon the powers that be to prevent the teaching of scientific racism at our university. We must demand that there be found no place in the university's curriculum for such teachings. We must require of the Board of Governors, the senate and the president of U.W.O. that a committee be appointed which will field complaints concerning the existence of scientific racism within the university's curriculum. (signed) Zhivargo Laing, member of ACE".

About this time Professor Eموke Szathmary, the Dean of the Faculty of Social Science, told the student newspaper that she was "concerned with the individuals who are maligned" by Rushton's findings. The dean also told the Gazette she was considering several different courses of action including a public lecture or debate. In the end, she decided to write a letter to the editor of the Western News. In her letter she made it clear that she was not writing as the dean, but as a professor. The deanship is an administrative post and, as noted above, administrators are not supposed to meddle in the affairs of particular academics (24).

Professor Szathmary was not alone in choosing one of the campus newspapers as the forum for airing her concerns. In the months to come, the university newspapers were filled

24. Despite her caveats the dean has nonetheless been criticized for her position. See McGregor 1989 Mankind Quarterly, and Gross 1990 Academic Questions.

with letters and articles by dozens of faculty members. Szathmary's initial letter was an extensively-referenced critique of the foundations of Rushton's theory. Yet much of the argument and data which she presented is of a technical nature and therefore somewhat inaccessible to those unfamiliar with her particular scholarly discipline - physical anthropology. This attribute of inaccessibility it shared with many of the letters and articles by other faculty members that preceded, accompanied, and followed hers. These communications were clearly meant for a particular audience of Rushton's peers within the university community rather than for the general public. This approach assumed and proclaimed the exclusive value of scientific expertise in dealing with Rushton. These writers, by and large, were content with publicly rejecting and ridiculing Rushton's research (25). They did not openly support disciplinary institutional action, legal action, or public meetings or protests against Rushton.

While many members of the faculty wrote into the papers, not all of them concerned themselves solely with strictly scientific criticisms. Many defined the problem

25. It is important to note that these members of the university community did not only use the campus and local papers as a platform for attempting to discredit Rushton's findings. Many also began preparing articles for publication in peer reviewed academic journals. Through those channels they were not apparently seeking to communicate their findings to the irate public but rather to attack Rushton's thesis in this forum which, while remote from public view, was for them another appropriate forum for scholarly discourse.

instead in terms of the role of academics within an academic community. One such letter by a member of the Department of Political Science was published in the Western News on February 17;

"I am writing to comment on the "Statement on Academic Freedom" issued on Feb. 3 by the President of the University of Western Ontario and distributed to all members of faculty by the Provost (Vice-President Academic). This statement noted, rightly in my view, that "members of the academic community have responsibilities as well as rights..." Less helpfully, the statement went on to declare that faculty are "individually accountable, in both the moral and legal sense, for their findings and statements. In protecting academic freedom, the university is not assuming that responsibility which is properly the responsibility of the individual concerned." Left unanswered by the second quoted statement is the question, "Is there any academic responsibility associated with academic rights that does properly belong with the university?" I believe the answer to this question is yes; the members of faculty carry both an individual and collective obligation to hold themselves and, through appropriately constituted procedures, one another to a commonly understood notion of academic responsibility. Missing so far in the controversy here over Dr. Philippe Rushton's recent presentation of his research is any discussion of what academic responsibility actually amounts to, as though every faculty member was free to define it, if at all, in any manner he or she sees fit.

I, for one, reject completely this implicit intrusion of relativism into the morality of scholarship and teaching. If we are unable to identify and repudiate certain kinds of conduct by our colleagues as unmistakable violations of academic responsibility, then we cannot justifiably claim that we hold an operative notion of this part of the academic function. Accordingly, I call upon members of the faculty to make clear their view that Dr. Rushton has abused the privileges of academic freedom and forfeited the protection that goes with it. He has done this by violating a number of the principles of academic conduct that his colleagues may only rarely spell out but which they, as professionals, nevertheless do attempt to respect in relation to their teaching and scholarly work. Three of those principles are:

a) Scholarship - No scholar worthy of the name has a right to disregard repeatedly the representation of contrary evidence and argument that most academics would accept as sufficient reason for the abandonment or amendment of his or her observations and interpretations. At the very least, an academic is under the obligation to acknowledge particular challenges directed against his or her position, and to

provide the necessary arguments and evidence necessary to show that the challenges are themselves either answerable or inconsequential.

b) Teaching: Academics are under an obligation to do whatever is in their power to avoid manners of discourse and modes of presentation that are likely to promote a sense of alienation among students in their classes. No teacher has any business casting off, either inside or outside the classroom, casual and unfounded observations about people or groups that any person would regard as, for example, sexual or racial slurs.

c) Public statements and appearances - It is improper for academics to attempt to use their association with the University and their academic discipline to achieve sway within the public on issues that they should more suitably address simply as one citizen among many. This is especially true of issues that fall outside their own disciplinary competence. Even when speaking as an expert, an academic should show reasonable regard for the ratio between the conclusiveness, or the contestability, of their particular positions and the extent of the exposure they seek or permit for them. The less conclusive the work at a given stage, the less exposure it should be allowed to receive in the public, as opposed to professional domain.

I have met Dr. Rushton's serious violations of these principles with considerable dismay, and I am also simply angry that this disregard for them can disrupt my own classes and research and bring me, my students and my colleagues into national disrepute. Even more demoralizing, however, is the fact that so far the university's response to this irresponsible display has had no evident effect on Rushton. Thus, it is especially important that Dr. Rushton hear unmistakably that his colleagues consider him a disgrace. In particular, we should make it clear to him that his reported intention to appear on a North America-wide sensational television talk show - presumably to promote further the ideas whose supposed academic foundation has been so massively discredited over the past 10 days - is simply intolerable.

Perhaps Dr. Rushton cannot be fired. Perhaps, even, he should not be fired - there are several ways in which this could do more harm than good. But Dr Rushton should be told that, according to his colleagues' understanding of what it means to be an academic, he has been failing to live up to his professional responsibilities and should either do so, or resign. (signed) J.N. McDougall, Associate Professor"

* * *

Rushton did not resign and no official investigation through existent procedures was started at this point.

Members of the University Students' Council had earlier gathered for a regular meeting. While noting that the university's reputation was now "linked nationally and internationally with racism", they passed a motion asking university administrators to arrange a public meeting between Rushton and other faculty to discuss "academic freedom and the ethical value" of reports like Rushton's. This was one of many calls from within and without the university for a meeting where Rushton would face his detractors.

In the face of the administration's steadfast refusal to organize an event of this nature, members of ACE tried to get a number of prominent scientists including Stephen Jay Gould to come to the campus to deliver a lecture on Rushton's work. Gould declined, citing a wish to avoid lending any semblance of credibility to Rushton's work. ACE also attempted to contact Dr. David Suzuki (26). The efforts of ACE to arrange a lecture were superseded by the actions of the University Student's Council Speaker's Commissioner Michael Brown who succeeded in arranging for a public debate between Suzuki and Rushton. Interest in the event was remarkable - two thousand tickets for the event were bought within two hours of going on sale.

ACE had sought lecturers to speak about Rushton and his work. They did not support the debate format, taking the

26. Suzuki is a University of British Columbia geneticist, an officer of the Order of Canada, host of The Nature of Things, (a weekly science program broadcast nationally by the CBC), and an outspoken social critic.

position that giving Rushton a platform to air his views was wrong. They organized a picket of the event and were joined by busloads of students from the nearby universities of Toronto, York, and McMaster, as well as by supporters from Windsor (27). The protestors, numbering between 150 and 300, chanted from behind police barricades outside Alumni Hall; "Rushton out", "No debate", and "One Race, the Human Race". A dozen university police, thirty-five event staff, and four London police officers were present.

The event was carried live by a local television station and two local radio stations. It was also later aired by Channel 19, a public education station. Half a dozen campus papers were present as were many members of the local and national print and electronic media.

The debate began with Rushton reiterating his findings. Suzuki's rebuttal was simple. While Rushton's research attempted to explain differences in behaviour between races in terms of genetics, two of the world's leading experts in the field of genetics had twenty years earlier dismissed such efforts as impossible due to the confounding environmental influence of racism. Rushton, Suzuki concluded, was "either grossly ignorant or mischievous". In either case, he continued;

27. They were not joined by members of the London Urban Alliance because the alliance has a policy against participating in public demonstrations. Although these two groups had earlier worked closely, this first public demonstration by ACE marked an end to their relations.

"What has to be done is action by scientists and academics. (Rushton's) claims must be denounced, his research discredited, his grant revoked, and his position terminated at this university. This is not science."

On his way to the airport following the debate, Suzuki spoke with a reporter from the student paper;

"I am deeply concerned, as a broadcaster, with the media's frenzy that has provided Rushton a wide audience for ideas that simply do not qualify as science. I am outraged - I mean outraged - that the students on this campus could not find a single professor at Western who would debate this man here. They could find no psychologist or academic who would counter these monstrous claims. Instead they were told this is an academic matter, this is not a public matter... The public, the students can't judge the merits of esoteric scientific ideas. Yet the public is profoundly affected by the ramifications of these ideas."

* * *

It was after the debate and Suzuki's rebuke that fifteen members of the UWO Department of Anthropology published a lengthy article in the local papers. The anthropologists were critical of Rushton's work but more so of the university's position. They proposed specific concrete actions;

"We are distressed and angry about the "research" of P. Rushton, and by the way it has been handled. We have been disappointed that the University of Western Ontario has shown so little concern for the feelings of the community, and especially of visible minorities in the community. The University has been clear in its support of Rushton's rights, and we don't quarrel with that. But what about the rights of concerned people who feel that Rushton's statements degrade their/our human dignity? Where is the leadership of the University for us?

We have read Rushton's paper, and are confident that the academic community will certainly heap scorn on his assumptions, methods and conclusions, but that won't heal the wounds that have been inflicted on the public by the "scientific" support Rushton has given to ugly stereotypes.

Now that the University has spoken clearly on academic freedom, it is time to redress some of the harm that has been done. We call on the University to do so. Specifically we ask

- 1) that the University immediately undertake a survey of the courses in which the concept of race is discussed, and ensure that negative stereotypes are not being propagated.
- 2) that the University support the development of an interdisciplinary course in which the topic of racism is opened to thoughtful examination to help students reject racist dogma in all its forms, including scientific.
- 3) that the University recognize that it is inappropriate to eschew consideration of ethical issues, or to place the onus for them entirely on individual researchers. We do not operate in an ethical vacuum, nor should we. We request that the University provide a clear statement of the ethical principles that guide researchers at this institution..." .

This letter represents one of a number of attempts made both inside and outside the university to widen the scope of the university's inquiries beyond an investigation of the activities of one professor to include an examination of the entire university curriculum (28). These and other such proposals were apparently incorporated into the ongoing process of developing a race relations policy at the university (29).

28. These efforts may be seen as part of faculty and student activism on campuses throughout North America to redefine the university curriculum in non-racist non-sexist, "politically correct" terms (see D'Souza 1991 on developments in the United States and see Fennel (1991) and Jenish and Lowther (1991) on Canada).

29. Although the theoretical framework which I have adopted might seem to oblige me to follow these developments, such a route has not been followed. I decided instead to focus on problem definitions as they revolved around Rushton. The development of public issues spawn many "solutions" that form an intricate web of interconnected developments. It is not practically possible to reconstruct all of these developments in the writing of a history of a public issue.

Some members of Rushton's department had been publicly involved in claimsmaking from the beginning of the controversy. They had written lengthy scholarly critiques of Rushton's work in the campus papers. As the controversy entered its second month, they spread their criticism farther afield. A group of them published a letter in the Free Press on March 2;

"As social psychologists in the same department... as J. Philippe Rushton, we feel compelled to take a public stand in opposition to his theory of racial differences... It is important for the public to know that Rushton's views are not shared by his colleagues in the scientific community... One disturbing aspect of the Rushton episode has been his eagerness to state his views in public channels despite strong disagreement from the scientific community with his ideas... When studying sensitive social issues, researchers have a responsibility to ensure that their work meets the highest scientific standards before they publicly offer interpretations that might cause social harm... We hope that the critiques of Rushton's work that are now appearing will be able to repair some of the damage caused both to members of minority groups and to the reputation and credibility of psychology." Olson, Atkinson, Sorrentino, Vidmar.

Members of Rushton's department did not limit their public participation in the controversy to writing articles and letters. They also gave interviews to the press. There they continued to express their concerns over the impression created by the apparent support of Rushton provided by the university. Professor Atkinson, for example, told the Free Press;

"I hope this doesn't paint the picture that people in this department believe Phil's theory. Phil is quite alone, I think, in supporting his research."

* * *

Some members of the university community were not content with individually presenting critiques in the newspapers, each alone from the perspective of his or her own expertise. A group of these individuals got together and published A multi-disciplinary critique of Philippe Rushton's theory on racial differences. They explained that the report had been prepared "...in an attempt... to focus attention on what we consider the issue at the core of the Rushton affair; academic competence."

In his contribution, Chet Creider of the Department of Anthropology focused on a theme common to much of the commentary on Rushton's work - the absence of response to pre-existing criticisms;

"Perhaps the most distressing aspect of (Rushton's) research is that in its essentials it is a version of human prehistory and a purported account of the present-day human condition which was common during the nineteenth century, and was effectively refuted repeatedly during this century. The physical anthropological research of Franz Boas (1911, 1912) in the early part of this century (see also Stocking 1968), the responses of psychologists and anthropologists to the racist thinking of the 1930s and 40s (Shapiro 1952), and the response of the same communities of researchers to 'jensenism' in the late 1960s and early 70s (Brace et al 1971) should have prevented the sloppy reasoning, fancifully reconstructed prehistory, and irrelevant correlations of (Rushton) from being published. Although it does appear that (Rushton) is not often able to publish in first class journals, but must settle for those which are less well-regarded (e.g. Mankind Quarterly), the fact remains, unfortunately, that he does publish his work. However, though he is happy to ferret out and cite pseudo-facts from work published 90 years ago, he fails to consider these three generations of criticism of the kind of work he is doing." (30).

30. Creider's references are included in the bibliography.

The editors of the collection, Siddiqi and Moses, conclude that its authors found Rushton's work "absolutely untenable";

"... Numerous flaws have been documented in virtually every step of his work, from his initial assumptions to his final conclusions... Professor Rushton is not competent as a scientist, and thus does not deserve the rights and privileges afforded to scientists... At the University of Western Ontario, the Conditions of Employment lists incompetence, or specifically the 'failure to maintain a record of competent performance' as one potential cause for the dismissal of tenured faculty members..."

The report went on to list a number of recommendations. Chief among these was the request that members of the senate "carefully examine whether Professor Philippe Rushton has or has not contravened the Conditions of Employment with respect to the requirement for competence." The report was published and distributed just in time for a special meeting of senate called for March 2.

* * *

In the weeks following initial reports of Rushton's theory, many had claimed that it was the university's moral and political responsibility to launch an official investigation into Rushton's conduct. These demands were met by repeated stonewalling on the part of the university's administration. The President, the Provost, the Dean of Rushton's faculty, and the head of Rushton's department all maintained that no special investigation was warranted. This response had led to charges of racism being levelled at the university community as a whole, to renewed calls for an

investigation, and to claims that the administration's inaction was intolerable. In this situation, university administrators decided to call a "special" meeting of the University Senate, details of which are provided in the chapter which follows.

* * *

In this chapter we have seen that there were a number of conflicting constituencies within the university, each of which attempted to claim ownership of the definition of the problem. Students began to organize in an effort to press their claim that the university administration was politically responsible for dealing with the problem of Rushton-as-a-racist. Some faculty claimed that formal action on the part of the institution was called for to deal with the problem of Rushton-as-a-racist.

Some claimants proposed that the institution should act to examine and judge the problem of Rushton-the-incompetent-scientist. Yet other claimants proposed that scientific scrutiny was necessary but that official action on the part of the institution was not.

During the Senate meeting outlined below, the University Administration attempted to redefine the problem in its own particular way. In the process, it disowned the problems as defined by numerous claimants both within and outside of the university.

CHAPTER THREE;

SENATE SPEAKS.

"It is clear that some have come to speak and not to listen"
Professor T.J. Collins, Provost, Vice-President (Academic).
March 2, 1989

The Senate of the University of Western Ontario met in special session on March 2, 1989 at 2:30 pm.

The Senate is the ruling academic body in the university. It is, ideally, the mechanism through which the faculty and students of the university community maintain authority over the academic life of the institution. The Senate is composed of 26 members of the administration, (including the President who acts as chair, the Vice-Presidents, the Deans, the Registrar, and the Director of Libraries), 2 administrative staff persons, 5 representatives of the "general community", 2 from the Board of Governors, 42 elected faculty members, and 15 elected students.

The meeting was to begin at 2:30 pm. At 1:30, students began to gather at a rally organized by ACE. Just before 2:30, the protest moved to the hallway outside of the meeting room. Here sixty members of ACE demanded that Rushton "apologize for his teachings" and that the senate initiate an investigation of the professor's work. A number

of uniformed members of the university police force were outside of the meeting room.

Inside the room dozens of print, television, and radio reporters from the local and national press were considering their press releases and waiting for the meeting to begin.

In addition to the senators, over two hundred and fifty students, faculty, and interested others were present in the room. If the onlookers had hoped to participate, they were to be sorely disappointed.

* * *

President Pedersen opened "this very special meeting" of Senate with a brief history of the Rushton controversy. This preamble served as an attempt to dissociate the members of the university from Rushton's position by noting that "many, if not all, of our faculty colleagues do not agree with Professor Rushton".

Pederson went on to note the "astounding" level of media interest and to acknowledge the many reporters present at the meeting. The president then set out the parameters for the meeting. In doing so, he sought to avoid public discussion at Senate about the Rushton affair. In its place, he proposed to redefine the problem in such a way that the university could be seen to be doing something - apologizing and passing motions - thereby dispelling charges of inaction.

"The purpose of this meeting is not to discuss Professor Rushton or his work... individual personnel matters have never been, nor should they be, part of the public debate of this Senate... What we are here to do is to conduct a

discussion... on the nature of the professoriate... More specifically, you will be asked to consider two specific motions: one dealing with the fundamental issue of academic freedom and what that term means in a university; and second, to consider a motion which deals with bigotry, racism and intolerance."

The president continued, saying that

"I personally - and I am sure I speak for everyone at Western - regret very much the distress, or anxiety or embarrassment or pain which this particular incident has caused individuals or groups of individuals either inside or outside the university."

The President continued his introduction with a lengthy history of the university's race relations committee and informed the meeting that he looked forward to having the committee's recommendations within the month (31).

Before closing, the President announced that only Senators would be allowed to speak. He went on to remind those present that mention of Professor Rushton would not be tolerated.

The way in which the ensuing debate had been circumscribed by Pedersen, as chair, is of special note. The university had received requests from many groups that they be given the opportunity to speak directly to the Senate. By ruling that only senators could speak, representatives of those many community groups were prevented from making public presentations of their grievances at the meeting. Interested members of the

31. Earlier that day The Globe and Mail had reported that two members of that committee had already met with the President and recommended that he announce that the university review the Rushton case. No mention of this recommendation was made by the president at the senate meeting.

university who were not also senate members were also prevented from speaking. In addition, the Senators were themselves limited in their actions since they could only speak about the two motions before the meeting. The administration had thus contrived to dam the flood of demands which had prompted the meeting in the first place and redirect discussion in a more comfortable direction. By making arrangements to have plainclothes members of the university police force scattered throughout the crowd, administrators must have hoped to ensure that these rulings could be effectively enforced.

The first motion put before the meeting was;

"RESOLVED; that the University of Western Ontario reaffirms the principle of academic freedom with its attendant rights and responsibilities".

In speaking in support of the motion, Provost Collins spoke at length on the history of academic freedom. He used the president's press release of February 3 as the basis for his speech, and elaborated upon it. He reiterated the President's contention that "the university must remain the centre of .. free intellectual inquiry and interchange." Shortly after he had begun, he was interrupted by members of the audience. Chants of "One race, the human race" broke out, quickly rose in volume and just as quickly quieted down.

The president banged his gavel.

In a harsh tone, he reasserted his authority; "May I remind the gallery this is a regular meeting of senate.

I'll clear that gallery if we have another disruption."

Someone shouted "There's academic freedom for you!"

While that heckler was not expelled immediately, it was now clear that the audience was obliged to remain quiet. They had already been told that they could not address the meeting. Now they were told that if they were not silent they would be thrown out. They were thus denied any legitimate role except that of silent spectators.

In the quiet room, Collins continued with his speech on the nature of the peer review process and the important role played by expertise. He claimed that while individual researchers were responsible for their findings, the university was responsible for dealing with errant academics. He also proposed that procedures were already in place to monitor conduct but did not name those institutional mechanisms concerned;

"The scholar's personal responsibility is to conduct honest and thorough work with a high degree of integrity. The institution's responsibility - working through peer group evaluation, both internally and externally - is to judge the nature and the quality of the work undertaken ... and to act upon that judgement in any number of ways... If the quality of the work is judged to be poor, there are sanctions: these include peer group castigation, denial of promotion and tenure, withholding of salary increases, withholding of research and travel funds, denial of leaves, closely monitored teaching activity, and finally, perhaps, even dismissal."

At his mention of dismissal, the Provost was interrupted by applause.

He continued on the role of the institution;

"...All through this recent controversy we have stressed peer group evaluation. This involves the activity of experts working within particular discipline areas, making judgements about the nature and quality of research and teaching activity and rendering these judgements within departments and faculties. The institutional officers, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost, assist in the conduct of those investigations and examine the results, but only the scholarly community with particular expertise is qualified to make the judgements..."

As Collins concluded his remarks, the chair asked for discussion on the motion. There was a lengthy silence.

Then Howard Rosenoff, a student senator, raised the question of the responsibility of the academic profession;

"The question that has not been satisfactorily answered at this university is: What happens when an individual fails to recognize his responsibilities? Looking at other professions, for example, law. A lawyer who does not act responsibly is reprimanded by the Ontario Bar Association. In medicine, a doctor who fails to act responsibly is reprimanded by the Ontario College of Physicians and Surgeons... The administration of the University of Western Ontario has a responsibility to its students, faculty, and staff, as well as the entire university community, to investigate when a paid member of this University clearly ignores his responsibilities."

Rosenoff went on to say that the motion before senate was inadequate and that he could therefore not support it (32).

The chair asked if there was anyone else who wished to address the motion. After a lengthy silence, student senator Joe Radocchia spoke up. He explained that he was speaking

32. Some of the student senators had earlier held a public meeting. There they discussed the senate agenda in order to establish a position representative of student concerns.

on behalf of the students of Western.

"This school must repair the damage already done to its students and its reputation by taking real action against racism and spare us the embarrassment of hollow resolutions. Stand up for us. Investigate. Apologize".

No one responded to this proposal.

The chair asked if there were any more speakers.

Silence. Then Senator Kapur, again a student, moved an amendment; namely "that the motion be amended by adding at the end, the following: "The University must act in situations where individuals fail to meet their moral, social, or academic responsibilities." In support of this amendment, Kapur argued that the university has a responsibility to ensure that standards of adequate scientific methodology are maintained. Senator Sarah Shorten, President of the university's Faculty Association, asked Kapur what she meant by the term "The University" in the amendment. When told that it was meant to refer to "the University as a whole, but particularly to the administration", Shorten announced that she would vote against the amendment since it "violates the distribution of powers with the institution..." (33).

Shorten's intervention appears to have aimed at the defeat of the amendment. She could have as easily supported the amendment by specifying that she was doing so on the understanding that "the university" referred to those

33. As the Faculty Association president, she is charged with acting on behalf of the faculty and, of course, the university.

structures within the institution that are already mandated to review the work of faculty members. Instead she chose to scuttle this attempt to name the party or parties within the university responsible for policing academic work.

Thomas Lennon, Dean of Arts, added his voice in opposition to the amendment and this is recorded in the Minutes of the Meeting, as are all but one of the speeches made there that afternoon. It was the interchange immediately following Lennon's speech which was not recorded in the minutes but was captured on audio tape.

After Lennon spoke, a student senator claimed that only the president has the authority to singlehandedly launch an investigation into a faculty member's abuse of academic responsibility;

"If at present or in the future someone abuses academic freedom we have no recourse, none at all at the present time. None. Unless it is the will of the President of the University of Western Ontario. And that is not right."

The president was clearly caught off guard and responded in a mumble; "A few delusions of power I didn't know I had" (34). The president moved quickly to call the

34. The student was likely referring to Conditions of Appointment section C.3 where it states that the president is responsible for suspending faculty members "when in his/her opinion the member's conduct poses a threat to the proper functioning of the university". The speaker may also have been referring to section C.15 where it states that the president is responsible for initiating dismissal procedures when he or she is "of the opinion that cause for dismissal exists."

The president's statement that he is unaware of this authority is odd. Surely the president was also aware of past proceedings at his own institution in which the president of the day was no doubt involved. The particular proceedings to which I refer were revealed by Peter King,

vote on the amendment - which was defeated to cries of "shame".

The next senator to speak up was the only faculty senator who did not also hold an administrative post to address the meeting. Senator Semmens said that he could not support the motion on "the principle of academic freedom with its attendant rights and responsibilities" because the motion did not specify what those responsibilities are. He felt that those responsibilities should be presented unambiguously. While he spoke only very briefly at this point, the nature of his objection became clearer later in the meeting.

A vote was then taken and the first motion was carried.

At that moment many senators indicated that they wanted their opposition to the motion noted. The president attempted to carry on but many raised their hands so that they would be recognized by the chair as opponents of the motion. The president continued saying "Do we agree that you'll all come up afterwards to make sure that your name is noted". Thirteen senators silently acquiesced to this procedural nicety and thereby gave up the opportunity to

President of the Canadian Association of University Teachers; "There has already been a formal independent hearing at the University of Western Ontario which held that a tenured post was not a sinecure and that the university had the right and obligation to judge the quality of the teaching, research and service of the individual. In this case the tribunal upheld the right of the university to fire the tenured professor concerned." ("Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Unpopular Views" in CAUT Bulletin April 1989, p.4.)

make a bold statement by standing in public and declaring their opposition, one by one.

The second motion was then presented;

"...WHEREAS the University has as its aim the creation of a climate of understanding and mutual respect for the dignity and worth of each person so that each person feels a part of the University community and able to contribute fully to the development and well-being of the University and the general community

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Senate affirms that the University of Western Ontario deplores bigotry, intolerance, and racism in any form."

Again Collins spoke at length on the motion. Student Senator Rosenoff then asked how the two motions related to one another. What would happen if an individual "used academic freedom as a shield for racism?". In reply, the provost referred to mechanisms already in existence; "the procedures and policies currently in place do not make it possible to hide behind academic freedom."

At that point the meeting was interrupted by a question on another topic from another Student Senator; "Mr. President, why was the press given a copy of all of your speeches when none of the senators were?". Pedersen denied any responsibility "I'm amazed by that. I don't really know." he said. "You'll have to ask someone who's related to press releases. I'm not really related to press releases".

Student Senator Rosen spoke next and brought up issues surrounding employers legal obligation to provide a work environment "free of racial harassment". He asked how the university intends to deal with this issue. Pederson asked

the chair of the race relations committee to respond. Smiley reiterated the fact that the committee had not yet completed its report and that only after policies and procedures had been developed and adopted could an answer be given to the question as far as it related to questions of race policy. Smiley went on to note that Collins had earlier referred to extant policies and procedures that deal with academic issues. He did not take the opportunity to spell out what those procedures were.

As the meeting continued, there was no interference from the audience until Senator Szathmary, Dean of Social Science, Rushton's faculty, spoke. She began her contribution by commenting on those speakers who doubt the existence of procedures for academic review.

"I am a little bit astounded that they should be so, that their attitude seems to be, or that their awareness seems to be that there are not procedures in place within the Faculty of Social Science as within the other faculties to assure that individuals meet their responsibilities under the rubric of academic freedom. In fact, there are procedures in place and every faculty member, whether in Social Science or otherwise, knows of them."

At that point she was interrupted by the faculty senator who had spoken up earlier. Semmens declared that he did not say that he did not know of the procedures. Rather he had wanted them publicly spelled out in the motion. Dean Szathmary did not address this nuance but rather spoke on "the scientific process" as it relates to "the issue that

was the reason for this meeting";

"... A scientific argument has been made, and you either have faith in the scientific process to refute that argument, to show where it is methodologically unsound, where it is based on evidence that is not sustained because the evidence has been fabricated. The scientific process is in place, and the scientific process must be allowed to work. There is no other way in which we can proceed except by allowing that scientific process to continue. By doing so does not mean that we are supporting racism."

A heckler interjected - "You just give it a home and pay it well and give it an office and let it talk to first year students."

A student senator attempted to raise an amendment strengthening the motion. Collins spoke against it; "there is no place in this institution for a witch hunt or a hanging tree."

Edith Bramwell, an ACE member in the audience, shouted "It's only professors who get to do the witch hunt." The president banged his gavel. "Will you please come to order or leave." She continued: "The thing is I don't have a chance to talk in this school, no one will give me a platform, that's only for tenured faculty." At that point a plainclothes policeman began dragging Bramwell from the room. Other students who stood up and pulled placards from under their coats were also grabbed and shoved toward the doors. Bramwell began to cry out: "You don't want me to say what's wrong with this school in front of the TV cameras, do you? It would be too bad if the whole country..." Her voice was drowned out by other protesters chanting "One race, the human race". As Bramwell and others were forced

from the room, the mass of protesters followed out, chanting. Under the meeting's guidelines, Rushton's opponents in the audience had not had an opportunity to be heard without disrupting the meeting. When they finally did so, they were quickly escorted out by plainclothes policemen. Their protest continued in the hall outside of the meeting room.

Inside, the meeting also continued. The motion to amend was withdrawn. A new amendment was proposed. There was no discussion. There was a vote to accept the amendment. There was a vote to accept the motion. Both passed. The chair called for a motion to adjourn and was interrupted. A student senator had a question. Since certain alumni had withheld donations to the university because of the Rushton affair, and since letters have been sent to foreign embassies linking the university with racism, did the president feel that Rushton's "conduct poses a threat to the proper functioning of the university" and therefore grounds for suspension. The president said "The answer to your question is no."

The meeting adjourned. Altogether, eighty-two members of senate came to the meeting. The majority of the speakers were senators holding administrative posts. These all spoke in favour of the motions presented to the meeting, often at great length. Vocal opposition to the motions was limited to a number of student senators and to the lone faculty senator who spoke. Sixty-seven senators attended the

meeting but remained silent throughout the proceedings. While lending legitimacy to the event by their very presence, they otherwise limited their participation to raising their hands, generally voting in favour of the motions presented.

The meeting had lasted just over an hour.

* * *

Reports on the senate meeting dutifully reprinted the motions which were passed. The meeting of senate did not dam the tide of demands that the university launch an investigation into Rushton's work. Community groups, committees of the municipal government, students and faculty members all redoubled their demands that an official investigation be launched. In the months that followed, the activities of a number of internal committees charged with overseeing the ethical and professional conduct of the university's professors came to light.

* * *

In this chapter we have seen senior university administrators attempt to manipulate the public meaning of the Rushton affair by staging a public performance. Through their decision to call a special meeting of the Senate, the Administration put themselves in the position of being able to narrowly focus discussion of the Rushton affair at a public event in two ways. Firstly, this narrow focus was achieved by limiting participation in the event. A sizeable contingent of Administration's opponents were nearly

rendered mute by the ruling of the chair that non-senators would not be invited to speak at the event. Secondly, an administrative committee had the authority to set the Senate's agenda and thereby define the parameters of permissible discussion. With the stage thus set in a manner very much to their advantage, the administration took yet another opportunity to proclaim the facts that they saw as relevant - that the issue at hand was a personnel issue which could only be dealt with by the appropriate authorities within the institution, behind closed doors. In doing so, they reasserted their belief in their right to academic freedom.

The performance was interrupted. Some members of Senate attempted to widen the scope of the discussion to include the specifics of the university's political responsibility. Such inquiries were fended off. Those members of the audience who spoke up, unable or unwilling to operate within the formal rules of Senate and remain silent, were removed from the room. By creating a situation in which outside opponents of the administration were reduced to shouting from the gallery, the administration attempted to place its critics outside the tight lines of academia which the administration had drawn for themselves.

CHAPTER FOUR;

UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES.

"In my own case, all but one of the members of my department, and the dean, and the higher university administration fully supported me, right from the first blast of public controversy up to the present day. For that, I am indeed proud of my university, and grateful."

Arthur Jensen, writing to the
UWO Senate Grievance Appeals Committee in
support of J.P. Rushton, April 4, 1990.

On March 11, those outside of the university began to discover the particular "policies and procedures" to which administrators had repeatedly, mysteriously, referred. Professor Joseph Cummins, a geneticist in the Department of Plant Sciences, claimed that the university's Non-Medical Ethics Committee had a role to play in investigating Rushton's activities (35). This committee consists of an associate dean of social sciences as well as faculty members from social sciences, law, education, and philosophy. All non-medical university research projects which deal with human subjects must be approved beforehand by this committee.

Cummins told a reporter from the Free Press that he had attempted to enquire about whether Rushton had the required approval for a survey on the sexual habits of blacks,

35. Dr. Cummins himself is no stranger to controversy, university procedures, investigations, and pronouncements. According to the Globe and Mail's Steven Strauss, the professor's environmental activism has resulted in "directives from the president's office not to speak to the press, not to send letters to newspapers on university stationery and not to criticize fellow faculty members' research".

orientals, and whites at the Eaton Centre in Toronto in December 1988 (36). It is the mandate of this committee to weigh the foreseeable negative impact that research might have on research subjects in deciding whether to grant approval to research proposals that are submitted. Cummins claimed that the president's apology at the senate meeting could be taken as official acceptance that harm had been done by Rushton's work. The committee had been remiss in its duty, according to Cummins, when it approved Rushton's research and should therefore resign. Professor Bess Borwein, chair of the Medical Review Committee disagreed: "The ethics committee does not come into this at all" she told the Gazette (37).

Within days Caldwell, Vice-President (Research), confirmed to the Free Press that his staff were working to determine whether Rushton had violated university research

36. Cummins also released a memo which he had sent the previous day to the UWO Faculty Association executive; "On Friday March 10, 1989 at about 10:30 AM I spoke on the telephone with Dr. W. G. Caldwell, Vice-President (Research). The matter that I wished to discuss was a question of the ethics committee approval of experiments done by Prof. Rushton in Toronto during 1988. However, our conversation veered to the Vice-President's opinion about news media in general and the London Free Press in particular. Caldwell indicated to me that he believed some faculty were disloyal to the University of Western Ontario for expressing opinions to the press that were critical of the University and the manner in which they handled the Rushton matter... I am reporting the conversation I had with Caldwell to the Faculty Association Executive because I believe other Faculty may have been approached by the Research Office about their disloyalty to the University."

37. As we noted in the Preamble, this denial of responsibility was not the only contribution of Professor Borwein to the Rushton affair.

procedures (38). Caldwell told the press that a review of committee decisions about controversial work was "automatic". In Caldwell's action we again observe a university administrator attempting to create the impression that the university is not responding to publicly-made demands for action but rather carrying on its business as usual.

While the review was underway, Cummins worked to strengthen the basis of his objection by situating it historically within the history of Nazi Germany and institutionally within the policies of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. He did so in a public forum on Wednesday, March 29 (39).

On that day, the UWO Society of Graduate Students hosted two multi-disciplinary symposia; one entitled "Genetics, Race, Psychology and the Media"; the other on "The Social Responsibilities of Researchers". The latter meeting concerned "issues of social responsibility and academic freedom in research..." and was an attempt "...to address an issue on which the University administration has

38. It should be noted that this investigation did not and could not focus on the particular research project that stirred the public controversy. Rushton's AAAS paper was based on previously-published material. Since that kind of research does not involve living human subjects, it does not require ethical approval from any university body.

39. While the symposia were on, protests on campus continued as eight students participated in a sit-in at the administration offices to protest university inaction.

steadfastly refused to adopt a conscientious policy position."

In speaking to this gathering, Cummins delivered a paper entitled The University Administration may be ignoring "Ethical Guidelines for the Institutional Review of Research With Human Subjects" (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council). The paper begins;

" In the years following Hitler's rise to power in Germany teaching of biology degenerated to a teaching of nightmarish stereotypes. According to Grunberger (The Twelve Year Reich. A Social History of Nazi Germany 1971) "Pupils were trained to measure their skulls and to classify each other's racial types." Along with the perversion of education Nazi-influenced academics conducted experiments on humans that were vile atrocities. University administrators ignored well-established guidelines for research on human subjects thus they condoned and facilitated Nazi atrocities. According to the Medical Research Council of Canada "The need for vigilance in these matters is evident from the fact there existed in Germany ethical guidelines for experimentation issued by the German Minister of the Interior in February 1931 well before the atrocities took place." (Guidelines on Research Involving Human Subjects, 1987)...

In my opinion Ethical Guidelines for Research on Human Subjects are equal in importance and certainly not in conflict with considerations of Academic Freedom. Under Nazi Germany University Administrators lacked courage to stand up for the established guidelines for ethical research on humans and for that they bear significant responsibility for the atrocities committed by German researchers."

* * *

At a press conference on April 12, President Pedersen announced that another university committee whose very existence had not previously been widely known had been investigating Rushton's research activities. The Ethics Review Committee of the Department of Psychology had found that Rushton had not followed a departmental protocol with

regards to research ethics; Rushton had, apparently, conducted a survey without first submitting the survey questionnaire to the committee for approval. In the event he had surveyed his own students, asking them, among other things, to compare their genitals with models which he displayed. The committee decided to bar Rushton from conducting surveys on students enrolled in introductory psychology classes. These students are regarded by the department as a willing pool of research subjects and they are normally accessible to all departmental researchers. Department Chair Greg Moran told reporters that the two-year ban was a serious impediment to Rushton's future as a researcher at the university; the ban "may not seem like much to someone from the outside but for researchers the pool is the lifeblood of their research."

Two days after reports of this ban were made public, the president called another press conference, this time to announce that a "letter of reprimand" had been placed on Rushton's employment file. The university's Non-Medical Ethics Committee had found that Rushton had failed to apply for their permission to conduct a December 1988 survey at the Eaton centre in Toronto in which Rushton had paid informants \$50.00 each to answer questions about their sexual habits. President Pedersen called Rushton's actions "a serious breach of scholarly procedure."

Cummins responded in an open letter to the Vice-President (Academic);

"The University Administration's remedy for a serious breach of professional ethics took the form of a letter of reprimand placed in the Academic File.

University Administration is quoted as claiming "there is no appeal against the letter of reprimand" (Western News May 11) and "if such reprimands accumulate dismissal could follow" (Toronto Star 29 April). The Faculty Handbook Section C (XIVA) deals with Academic Files and clearly makes no accommodation in the file for administrative reprimands... It seems likely that appeals to actions based on the contents of files containing bureaucratic reprimands would easily overturn actions based on such files..."

Cummins' claims about the ineffectiveness of the committee's actions did not receive media attention. His claims on a related matter did. In a letter to the university president, Cummins had written;

"I wish to point out that the University has but one course and that course is to ensure that all of the data collected in human experiments conducted without ethical approval must be destroyed. There is no other honorable course. The President's office must oversee the destruction of sensitive personal information dealing with matters including size of genitals and other deeply personal concerns. Use of "tainted" data in scientific studies will destroy the use of ethical guidelines and lead to the disrepute of human research."

This solution was noted in the press but no reply from Pedersen was reported.

After making announcements about the ethical reviews, the administration was silent on the Rushton affair for the next ten months while protesters continued to make sporadic claims on the administration (40).

40. It was at this time that another issue on campus made clear the position of university administrators regarding the rights of students on campus.

The parents of some students had raised concerns about the goings-on at Saugeen-Maitland Hall, a campus residence building which students called "The Zoo". Parents were distressed at what this nickname might portend. University

During the early months of 1990, the Rushton controversy remained in the news through a sporadic series of letters to the editor. A number of retrospective pieces appeared on the anniversary of the AAAS conference, mostly biographical pieces on Rushton.

During the week of May 19, 1990 Rushton published an article in the American journal The Scientist which attempted to redefine the situation as one of a persecuted professor. This lengthy article detailed the "complete dislocation" of Rushton's life and revealed for the first time that his academic performance had been rated unsatisfactory by a committee within his department. The result was that he had been denied an otherwise-routine annual pay increase. Rushton also expressed concern that the failing mark on his work might provide fodder for those who wished him dismissed from his post.

The publication of this report gave new life to the issue. The story of Rushton's failed review was carried by the campus papers as well as by the London Free Press, the Star, the Globe and Mail, and in the Standard in the nearby city of St. Catherines.

As the story unfolded in that and subsequent weeks, the following particulars came to light. Every year the work of each professor in the UWO psychology department is reviewed by a Personnel, Promotion and Tenure Committee composed of

administrators responded by banning the use of the word "zoo" by students as a reference to the residence. Students who defied this order were threatened with severe punishment up to and including expulsion.

six members of their department. The work of faculty members is rated on a scale - from excellent to unsatisfactory. Both research and teaching performance are usually reviewed but since Rushton had not taught for two of the three years which the review covered, 1986-1989, the review undertaken in the summer of 1989 concentrated on Rushton's research. According to Dr. Greg Moran, chair of the department and ex officio committee chair, during the committee's work, "People look at manuscripts, look at the journals (professors) are in, and judge the quality of the work." Moran told a radio interviewer that "each member of that committee is charged with making an evaluation of the quality of the contributions that (Rushton) is making to the area of psychology". We may observe here a significant redefinition of the problem. As the departmental committee has come to own the problem, it has redefined the problem in terms of its mandate and therefore considers the case as an issue of Rushton's competence as a psychologist. Such a redefinition could have been anticipated given the prescription for dealing with the problem of Rushton suggested by the provost at the senate meeting of the previous March. There and elsewhere it was proposed that experts acting through the institutional peer review process would properly have the final say on Rushton's work.

While the outcomes of the department's review process are usually considered and treated as confidential by participants, once Rushton's case became widely known

through the article in The Scientist and subsequent reports, many of the participants were soon holding interviews, issuing press releases, and writing letters and articles for the press.

Provost Tom Collins took the opportunity to say that Rushton's work "is not good science." According to Canadian Press, "Collins said it was rare for professors to get unsatisfactory ratings. When they do, few remain long enough to be fired."

The next day Rushton announced that he had hired a lawyer, had begun an appeal of the committee decision and was confident of success. Rushton's lawyer John Judson claimed that the rating "... is intended, as far as we can tell, not to be a bona fide assessment of his research but rather an attempt to attack his right to research in the areas he's chosen and to prepare a possible case for his dismissal."

Speaking with the Globe and Mail, Moran denied the claims of Rushton and his lawyer that the committee's judgement was swayed by public opinion - "That evaluation, I'm confident, was not based on the social-political atmosphere that surrounded his work." The committee decision was, instead, based on the judgement that Rushton's scholarship "was not up to the standards of the department."

Student Michael Halkitis, a representative of the Academic Coalition for Equality was widely quoted in the press. He said: "We have maintained all along that as a

scientist and professor Rushton has been presenting shoddy research that has been dismissed by other researchers." He went on to say that the rating was an important formal recognition by the university that "Rushton's research is incompetent" and "a first step" toward ACE's ultimate goal of Rushton's dismissal (41).

* * *

In launching his appeal, Rushton began to release excerpts of letters of support which he had solicited from "some of the most distinguished psychologists, behavioral geneticists, biologists, and philosophers in the field". Some of these excerpts were printed in the newspapers. The Star, for example, printed comments by Raymond B. Cattell, an American psychologist and behavioural geneticist; "If (a true regard for academic freedom) does not clear your case, the University of Western Ontario will be remembered as a black spot in the academic world." As well as invoking the spirit of academic freedom in support of his continued tenure, Rushton attempted to use the letters to counter "the apparent public impression that no one agrees with me". Rushton ultimately published and distributed his collection of letters. It is indeed a handsome volume, well bound, with an attractive cover of heavy green paper. It bears the

41. ACE's enthusiasm was soon dampened. At a June meeting of Senate, the president explained that dismissal proceedings do not automatically follow from repeated negative performance appraisals by departmental committees. Each case would, he said, be considered on its merits. (Minutes of the Meeting of Senate, June 7, 1990. p.2.)

title "On Rushton, Race and Academic Freedom: Responses From the International Community". As he told the student paper, he wanted it to be known that "a lot of people do believe that my work is very good science".

The producers of the CBC Radio science show Quirks and Quarks apparently did not. They invited Dr. Barry Mehler to examine and comment on Rushton's collection of letters (42).

For Mehler, the 45 letters of support show that

"Phil Rushton is not an isolated case. This is part of a larger, renewed eugenics movement, part of the whole history of biological determinism. This is simply this generation's group of scientists or pseudo-scientists who are claiming that there is scientific evidence for biological inferiority of negroes."

Mehler went on to observe that 9 of the 45 authors have received millions of dollars from the Pioneer Fund - "the major source of funding for the new eugenics movement".

Mehler picked out a few of Rushton's supporters for particular comment.

"Roger Pearson is a British-born anthropologist who organized the Northern League after World War Two. The Northern League brought together former Waffen SS officers, Nazi intellectuals, and other fascists from Europe and Scandinavia into an intellectual organization to continue the ideology of the World War Two Nazi movement. He came to the United States in 1965."

Mehler quoted a pamphlet Pearson published in 1966;

"If a nation with a more advanced, more specialized or in any way superior set of genes mingles with, instead of exterminating an inferior tribe, it commits racial suicide

42. Mehler is a Professor of the history of science at Ferris State University, Big Rapids, Michigan and provided commentary on Rushton's work in many venues throughout the affair.

and destroys the work of thousands of years of biological isolation and natural selection."

Mehler also sought to indicate the nature of Rushton's peers by quoting from a review by one (Richard Lynn) of a book written by another (Raymond B. Cattell);

"What is called for here is not genocide, the killing-off of populations of incompetent cultures, but we do need to think realistically in terms of phasing out of such peoples. If the world is to evolve more better humans then obviously someone has to make way for them, otherwise we shall all be overcrowded. After all, evolutionary progress means the extinction of the less competent. To think otherwise is mere sentimentality."

* * *

Press reports subsequent to these remarks on the radio announced that some of Rushton's supporters were also coming under fire from students, faculty members, and the public for their views.

Among these is Michael Levin, a professor of philosophy at the City College of the City University of New York in Harlem. Like Rushton, Levin studies black intellectual inferiority. He has argued against affirmative action programmes. He has also claimed that blacks are inherently criminal and proposed that "black youths should be restricted to police-patrolled subway cars and subject to curfews".

While these stories described the nature of some of Rushton's supporters, it is important to remember that most newspaper reports, after they are read, are thrown out with the trash. Or perhaps they are recycled. In any event, the problem of Rushton did not long retain the focus which was

provided by these reports. Just before he was due to return to the classroom in September 1990, Rushton himself took the lead in defining the nature of the issues surrounding that return. He informed the press in August that he was protesting an "order" by his department head to teach "via videotape". He claimed that this was further evidence of "persecution".

The story emerged that Rushton and university administrators had spent the summer months engaged in lengthy negotiations aimed at arranging for Rushton to teach in a classroom while at the same time assuring his safety; apparently the public demonstrations and statements of ACE had raised the spectre of violence in the eyes of some. Provost Collins told the journal Nature that negotiations regarding classroom security had broken down over Rushton's demands; "(Rushton) said that if we had 300 demonstrators, we should provide 300 security guards. Obviously we can't do that". Arrangements were ultimately made for the professor to record his 90 minute lectures weekly on videotape. Students enrolled in his second-year introductory course in psychology were to pick the tapes up at the department office and view them privately.

"I've been ordered by my department chairman to teach this way" Rushton told the press, "and I object... My prediction is I will lose a lot of students because students don't want to be taught by videotape".

Rushton announced that he was launching a formal appeal of the videotape decision. Members of his department organized a petition proclaiming the right to teach in person. Many letters appeared in the press supporting that right.

Moran defended the administration's decision;

"We felt the focus of Dr. Rushton and his students in a classroom increased the likelihood of a peaceful demonstration reaching a flashpoint where tempers could rise and violence, which no one would want, would erupt."

And so, while the videotaping decision was under review, Rushton began recording his lectures on videotape.

At the end of September 1990, he announced that he had been vindicated by the decision of the Grievance Committee of the University Senate to uphold his appeal of the "less than satisfactory" rating of his performance between 1986 and 1989 (43).

Rushton's appeal had followed a tortuous route. He had first appealed the departmental committee's decision to the Dean of his faculty. After Dean Szathmary upheld the committee's decision, Rushton appealed to the Faculty Grievance Committee which upheld his appeal. Chair of the Psychology department Greg Moran then appealed this decision to a Senate Grievance Committee. It was this 'committee of last resort' which had denied Moran's appeal and found in

43. Rushton's performance during 1987-90 was also determined by his department's Promotion and Tenure Review Committee to be "less than satisfactory" in July 1990. He was nonetheless granted a merit pay increase.

Rushton has announced that he will appeal the rating.

Rushton's favour. Rushton told the press that the committee chair Provost Tom Collins had sent him a confidential memo rejecting the 1989 rating "on procedural grounds".

* * *

In this chapter we have seen that while actors outside of the university's committee structure made claims about the nature of the problem, it was committee members who were responsible for redefining the content of the problem, this time according to the mandates of their particular committees. In the first instance, the problem was redefined as one of non-compliance with those procedures over which the ethics committee has authority. In the second instance, the problem to be examined was Rushton-as-a-contributor-to-the-field-of-psychology. Judgements about this problem were made behind closed doors by departmental committee members exercising their specialized knowledge of the "field of psychology". Curiously, this particular problem was ultimately transformed into a problem of the departmental committee's non-compliance with an unspecified procedure.

Many members of the university and the public who would have sought to shape the definition of the problem were at this time excluded from official proceedings and reduced to the status of onlookers and commentators.

CHAPTER FIVE;

PROTESTS, PROTESTS, AND MORE PROTESTS

"The reaction of the scientific community to this kind of material will take care of Dr. Rushton. There is no merit in any of his claims and it won't take a trained eye more than a microsecond to realize that. The scientific community will not have to deal with him because they'll ignore him. It's such weak research, if you could call it research, that he is not a figure to be dealt with and I have no worries that within a couple of years maybe, within even six months, that the community will come to realize that Dr. Rushton's material is so laughable that they won't have to deal with it either and he can say all he likes, when he likes, and where he likes and the audience will take it for what it is - a scientific nonsense."

Dr Mark Feldman, a world authority on r and K theory - the theoretical foundation of Rushton's evolutionary schema.

In the weeks and months following the senate meeting of March 2, 1989, the university continued to draw criticisms of inaction. Community groups and faculty members repeated demands for an investigation. Committees of the municipal government restated their demands through the passage of official motions. Students presented the president with a petition containing over 1,000 signatures. Newspaper editors gave these developments wide coverage.

The Toronto Star ran an editorial entitled "A Weak Reaction to Academic Fraud". Calling Rushton "a charlatan" and referring to his "discredited research", the editorial

claimed that

"Western has shirked its responsibility... This isn't just a case for protracted process, but for action. A body of Rushton's academic peers should be set up at once to investigate the many charges of academic fraud against him... The real issue is whether Rushton is a scientist or a fraud." (44).

In the same week an editorial in The Gazette claimed

"It's time for Western to begin a full academic inquiry into Rushton. If the man's science is as bad as several academics claim, and he is unwilling to modify his theory (perhaps because he enjoys his notoriety?), it's the least Western can do to establish that..."

The university, it continued, should also "guarantee that no student will have to study under Rushton before the investigation finishes." (45).

Instead of appearing in front of an officially-constituted body of his peers, or in front of his accusers in London, Rushton appeared, six days after the senate meeting, on the sensational American daytime television talk show "Geraldo!". In an edition entitled "Sex, Brains, and Brawn: Is there a Master Race?", Rushton was joined by the man he calls his mentor, William Shockley (46). A host of

44. Rushton attempted, through the courts, to gain redress for the harm alleged to have been done to his character by this editorial and by a cartoon run by the Star showing Rushton in Ku Klux Klan headgear. Rushton later dropped his legal case citing a lack of funds. He submitted his complaint instead to the Ontario Press Council who found that while the paper had not abused its right to editorial comment, it should in the future ensure that they 'provide light as well as heat' when commenting on sensitive issues.

45. While the university administration continued to refuse to launch an investigation, it did agree, twelve months later, that students who did not wish to study under Rushton would be assigned to other professors.

academic critics were also present. The now-usual criticisms of bias, inadequate sample-size, and faulty reasoning were brought up as were connections between Rushton's research funding and the policies of Nazis. Rushton responded to these criticisms with his oft-heard plea that the discussion return to scientific matters. One of the show's guests, Dr. Charles King, a black and the founder of the Urban Crisis Centre in Atlanta, Georgia, refused to attribute any scientific character to Rushton's work. Rather than participate in an argument about Rushton's data, he thundered; "These people should not be met with intellectual questions. These people should be met with our indignation and our anger."

Two days after appearing on *Geraldo!*, a number of newspapers reported that Rushton was going to speak to a meeting of white supremacists in Toronto (47). At that

46. Shockley, a Nobel Prize winning physicist and electronics experts who some call "the father of silicon valley", gained notoriety in the early 1970's when he published his findings that blacks are less intelligent than whites and that this difference is based in genetic differences which are heritable. He proposed the establishment of a "voluntary sterilization bonus plan... based on payments of a thousand dollars for each point below 100 IQ". Otherwise, he said "the stupid will inherit the earth." According to his recent obituary in *Nature*, Shockley's campus lectures "caused near riots" (vol 341 p. 190).

47. While Rushton cancelled his appearance at this meeting of the Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform this did not end his association with the group. In September 1990 they published a pamphlet entitled "Race, Evolution, & AIDS: What Rushton really said". In an advertisement for this pamphlet they claimed that "What this much-harassed scholar has to say has serious implications for people interested in law enforcement and immigration and public health."

time, the government announced that the Pornography and Hate Literature Squad of the Ontario Provincial Police were launching an investigation of Rushton's work in response to complaints lodged by a number of parties including the Ontario Urban Alliance on Race Relations (48).

* * *

At about this time, some student members of ACE became discouraged. Geraldine Stephenson, an ACE organizer, told me that as it became apparent that there were no official channels through which they could present their grievances and work for change within the institution, ACE decided to

48. The six-month investigation involved questioning Rushton and other academics at UWO and at nearby universities as to the scientific status of Rushton and his theory. At the conclusion of the investigation, Ontario's Attorney-General Ian Scott called a news conference to announce that charges, which could have resulted in imprisonment for up to two years, would not be pressed. In a press release distributed at the meeting, Scott's office announced that "...as distasteful as Professor Rushton's views may be to members of the public, they do not meet the requirements for prosecution set out in the Criminal Code."

At the press conference, the attorney-general said that successful prosecution of the charges of spreading false news would have required the crown to prove that Rushton knew that his theories were false when he publicized them. This the crown could not establish. Scott dismissed the likelihood of the second charge saying that the Crown would in that case have had to establish that Rushton intended to promote hatred against an identifiable group. This also had not been established by the investigation. "None of the professors interviewed alleged that Professor Rushton's intent was to willfully promote hatred" he reported. While professing ignorance of Rushton's work, Scott nonetheless offered a careful comment; "I don't know anything about them (Rushton's theories) but I think they are looney... Looney but not criminal".

The decision of the attorney general in November 1989 to decline in pressing criminal charges against Rushton laid the responsibility for dealing with Rushton into the hands of the university alone.

press their demands through different means. The half-measures of the ethics review reinforced their decision that calling for a comprehensive review of Rushton's theory was fruitless. They decided that they should demand Rushton's dismissal from the university.

With the start of the new school year in the autumn of 1989, ACE organised a number of public demonstrations to press their demand that Rushton be fired (49). Almost one hundred demonstrators gathered on September 30 in downtown London. ACE was joined on this occasion by representatives of labour, the unemployed, native students, and the London Human Rights Committee. ACE was also joined by students from other nearby universities (50). The marchers

49. In solidarity with these protests, the Black Students' Alliance at the University of Windsor also held anti-Rushton protests on their campus in the nearby city of Windsor.

50. The ability of ACE, largely a group of students, to continue its activities into a second year is remarkable. Part of the explanation of this may be found in a consideration of the overall level of activism in the region's black community. In this context, claims about Rushton may be seen as one of a number of ongoing protests by blacks against perceived threats in southeastern Ontario at this time. Some leading members of ACE not only protested in London, they also helped organize and joined in demonstrations in Toronto organized by a group calling itself the Coalition for the Truth About Africa.

This umbrella organization of about twenty groups (mostly composed of students) was formed in the fall of 1989 and coordinated the mounting of weekly pickets to protest an exhibit at the Royal Ontario Museum. The exhibit chronicled the experiences and perspectives of Canadian missionaries and soldiers in nineteenth century Africa. "Into the Heart of Africa", the coalition claimed, was a racist, one-sided, narrow-minded display which promoted racist attitudes in the community and fostered anti-black violence. They demanded that the exhibit be closed until it could be reconstructed

congregated outside the constituency office of Premier David Peterson and proceeded through downtown streets, stopping outside offices of the provincial, federal, and municipal governments to protest inaction. The demonstration ended with a rally and speeches on the steps of the City Hall.

Only two weeks later, members of ACE were again joined in protest by trade unionists and unemployed workers in a noisy protest on campus, through the hallways of the psychology department. The official response to these demonstrations, according to a university spokesperson, was that the university "had nothing to say that hadn't already been said."

ACE regrouped the following March, when students at UWO were registering for the fall semester and making their course selections. Rushton was finally due to return to his teaching duties at that time and ACE again moved into high

in a manner more politically acceptable to the black community.

Defense of the exhibit fell to an anthropologist highly regarded by her colleagues, Jeanne Cannizzo, who was the curator of the exhibit. She argued that one of the aims of the exhibit was to help educate the public about the historical roots of racism. The pickets continued into the autumn of 1990.

In September 1990 Cannizzo, who previously taught at UWO, was hired on a one-year contract to teach an undergraduate course in anthropology at the University of Toronto. The accusations of racism stemming from the museum exhibit followed her there. Cannizzo told the university administration that she was being harrassed at the university and at home. Students and others continued to interrupt her classes with accusations of racism and on one occasion chased her from the classroom. Cannizzo felt that she could not teach under such conditions and applied for sick leave which she was granted. The course was cancelled.

The planned cross-country tour of the museum exhibit was also cancelled.

gear. It printed leaflets and organized a campaign to call on students to not register for Rushton's classes. ACE spokesperson Grace Saunders announced that one of their chief reasons for the boycott was that they questioned whether Rushton would be biased with respect to treatment of students of different races; "We want Rushton's classes to be boycotted because we don't feel that he's capable of treating everybody equally".

Under the headline "Rushton not fit to teach at Western", an editorial in The Gazette supported ACE's call for a boycott.

The next week, psychology department head Greg Moran avoided the question of equal treatment of students of different races within Rushton's classes and announced that "Students who do want to take that course, but don't want to take Rushton's section, can request a different section when classes start in the fall. Every effort will be made to accommodate those students."

Not content to allow the issue to be narrowly defined as a problem only of students who did not want to study under Rushton, ACE organised their largest demonstration. On Wednesday March 21, 1990, students came from the nearby city of Windsor, from York University, and from the Universities of Toronto and Guelph to protest Rushton's continued employment and his imminent return to the classroom. A crowd numbering between 200 and 300 gathered outside the student centre and heard a number of speeches.

Student Michael Halkitis told the cheering crowd "We will not sit here and be slapped in the face day after day. I came here to get an education. I did not come here to be spat upon". ACE organiser Geraldine Stephenson promised that there would be more rallies in the future; "Until Rushton is gone, there'll be more."

After the speeches, the crowd stormed the halls of the psychology department, pounded on doors and walls, stamped on the floor, and chanted; "Hey Western haven't you heard? This is not Johannesburg"; "Rushton out out out". Someone scrawled "Racist pig lives here!!" on the door of Rushton's office. Kizitu Serumaga, president of ACE told reporters after the rally; "This is to give the administration the flavor of what's to come... Rushton has no right to be on campus. We shall remove him".

* * *

During the first week of classes in September 1990, the Gazette captured the new character of the Rushton affair with its front page headline which read "Western fears violent protests, makes Rushton teach on video". The Gazette's editorial that week proposed that the disruption of classes was criminal. ACE responded;

"... The main problem on the UWO campus is not the anti-racist protestors. It is Philippe Rushton and his racist views, and the administration officials who protect him. The elimination of academic racism is an important step in ridding society of all forms of racism."

letter to the editor of the Gazette
K. Serumaga, President of ACE.
The letter was also signed by 19 others.

* * *

On September 20 the university senate met to finally approve a race and ethnic relations policy for the university (51). Serumaga had been told by administration officials that "the probability of Rushton being fired (under the policy) is zero". Members of ACE gathered. Some carried picket signs reading "Racists have no right to teach". The protestors moved through the halls of the psychology department and on to the Senate meeting.

Serumaga asked Senate; "What are you going to do about Rushton. We deserve to be heard". Pedersen spoke; "We will not discuss this here. This is not the appropriate time".

A few days later the Gazette reported that in an interview, Serumaga did not deny that ACE "... would resort to violence if necessary to remove Rushton from teaching." Serumaga told the paper "If a woman is being raped and she kicks the man in the balls, is that violence? No, she is defending herself. Rushton is raping our people and it is time to defend ourselves."

During the first week of October, Serumaga acknowledged the image problems of ACE and announced the intentions of an upcoming demonstration; "It's a rally to heighten awareness of the support we have off-campus. We want to wake people

51. In December 1989 the university had released a draft of its long-awaited policy on race relations. Discussion of this document likely absorbed the energies of some of those problem claimants who had earlier proposed that developing a university race relations policy was the most appropriate and expedient manner for dealing with Rushton and his work.

up to the issue and make them stop seeing ACE as a violent group". On October 12 the rally was held at the UWO. Members of ACE were joined by members of the London community, high school students, labor representatives, and students from Windsor and from the Universities of Toronto and Guelph. Ron Gibson, chairman of the Peace and Human Rights Committee of the London and District Labor Council spoke; "...the administration thinks it's just a bunch of kids, but it's not. I don't think society wants Philippe Rushton teaching their kids."

There was no movement in the administration's position except in so far as they acknowledged that a university committee had overturned Rushton's performance rating of "less than satisfactory".

In the month following the demonstration, Serumaga made preparations for printing the first black campus newspaper at UWO. The front page of the first edition featured a photo of Malcolm X holding an assault rifle, peering out a window. The new newspaper was called Sauti Ya Wajeshi - Voice of Soldiers. Serumaga told the Gazette;

"It will take a lot of struggling to unite blacks on campus and it won't happen overnight. I want to unite students to work together. Oppression unites us as a people. Our skin color makes us part of the oppressed population... Rushton's theory is very specific. We have to deal with it from a black perspective."

* * *

In December 1990, I met and talked with Professor Rushton for a third time. Over lunch, he spoke of an

orthodoxy of egalitarianism threatening academic freedom everywhere.

Back at his office, he gave me a copy of the bound collection of his supporters' letters. He showed me a stack of letters addressed "To Friends of Academic Freedom". The letters announced that he would no longer be teaching by videotape, he would be returning to the classroom in person for the next term - January 1991. He told me to keep this information under my hat, he didn't want "the wrong people" to find out about it. He gave me a copy. I thanked him for his help and returned to Hamilton.

The next morning, there was an article on Rushton in the local newspaper. In the article Dr. Rushton said that he was "delighted" to be returning to the classroom. Provost Thomas Collins announced that "We are under the impression and I hope it's not mistaken, that those who seemed intent on causing problems understand that disturbance is counter-productive." ACE president Serumaga responded; "That is absolutely wrong. We've always had the position that we'll use any means available to keep him out of the classroom."

In February 1991, after opponents attended Rushton's first few classes, the university administration announced that any student who disrupted Rushton's classes would be suspended indefinitely.

* * *

In this final chapter we have observed that student and community opponents of Rushton continued to press problem definitions which conflicted with that offered by the university administration. Students were frustrated by a lack of recognition for their claims of racism and by the complete lack of progress on the implementation of the putative solutions which they had proposed. The administration's stonewalling precipitated a radicalization of students' tactics, definitions, and demands. They regrouped in an effort to prevent Rushton from teaching and began demanding his dismissal. While they were occasionally able to make their voices heard, the authority of the administration over campus affairs largely prevented them from succeeding in the attainment of their goals.

CLOSING REMARKS

We present below a summary account of the Rushton affair. We then comment on the weaknesses and strengths of the theoretical approach which we adopted and make concluding observations about the development of public issues in this case. We then pose questions for further research and analysis.

* * *

The Rushton affair began in January 1989 when press reports of his racial theory and the critical responses it provoked were observed by anti-racist activists who began to demand that action be taken. Politicians, church groups, editorialists, and others sought to prevent Rushton from presenting his "racist" theory in the classroom. Claims were made that a number of public institutions, including Rushton's university, were morally and politically responsible for dealing with and resolving the problems which Rushton was said to present. All of the organizations called upon to respond to Rushton's opponents disowned responsibility for the problem of Rushton-the-racist.

In response to the public outcry, the administrators of Rushton's university claimed that the Rushton affair presented a different kind of danger. Professor Rushton and the university as a whole would suffer if those from outside

of the university were permitted to interfere in university affairs. Administrators proclaimed that Rushton had the right to research freely and teach what he chose. The university would defend that right. By thus positing a different set of facts as relevant, the administration redefined the putative public problem and sought thereby to frustrate the attempts of others to define the problem as racism in academia. Nevertheless, both outside and inside the university, the range of claims broadened as Rushton was identified by some as a symptom of a larger problem of institutional racism requiring university investigation and affirmative action.

Some faculty and students attacked Rushton's theory by publishing scientific criticisms of it in the campus and local newspapers. Other university members proclaimed the importance of social and collegial responsibility and organized debates, privately sponsored publications, petitions, and symposia. Many sought to have a number of existing institutional procedures brought to bear on the case. Chief among these was a claim to have "the university" investigate Rushton's performance.

Through a meeting of the University Senate, the administration attempted to manipulate the public meaning of the Rushton affair by staging a public performance. The administration set the agenda and the rules of senate prevented any divergence from that agenda. The agenda items and the discussion dealt with the ideals and aspirations of

the institution. Administrators made vague reference to extant "policies and procedures" which would deal with any errancy on the part of professors but did not elaborate. The rules of senate and the actions of the chair prevented many from participating in the discussion or the making of decisions. Critics of the administration's definition of the situation were reduced to shouting from the gallery, clearly marginalized.

Despite the administration's attempts to gather formal support for its position through the meeting of Senate, there continued to be conflicts over problem definition. Having been shut out of official channels, opponents continued to publicly voice their criticisms, objections and demands through those channels that remained available to them - chiefly the press, especially the campus newspapers.

One faculty member publicly and effectively claimed that a particular university committee should take responsibility for investigating Rushton. The ethics committee redefined the Rushton "problem" as one of non-compliance to the procedures over which that committee has authority. Faculty members sitting on a committee within Rushton's department also launched an investigation into procedural compliance. Soon the president announced that these two committees had denounced Rushton's non-compliance to institutional procedures as unprofessional and unethical. The administration reprimanded Rushton and the department denied him access to research subjects for a period of time.

Behind closed doors, members of another departmental committee examined his performance and officially branded his contribution to psychology as "less than satisfactory". In attempting to redefine the situation as one of unwarranted persecution, Rushton made this news public. He also launched a successful appeal of the departmental committee's decision (51).

During the Rushton affair, some student members of the university came to feel increasingly shut out of official channels and began to organize large public demonstrations demanding Rushton's dismissal. The administration, claiming to be concerned that Rushton's return to the classroom might spark violent protest, decided to have Rushton teach via videotape. Just before classes began, Rushton made public this news. The public issue, which once involved questions of academic racism and academic incompetence was now largely redefined as revolving around the right of the professoriate to teach in person. Rushton returned to the classroom in January 1991. The administration announced that any disruptive students in Rushton's classroom would be suspended indefinitely.

* * *

51. Given the widely-proclaimed status of expert knowledge as the ultimate basis for judgements of scientific competence, the fact that the Senate Grievance Committee overturned the decision of Rushton's peers within his department and within his faculty "on procedural grounds" is immensely curious.

We may conclude that our investigation has revealed a process through which a public institution may seek to control political activity - by containing it within the organization. In the Rushton affair, this was accomplished by university administrators and others who sought to control the shape of the discussion surrounding a public problem. In the face of public charges that incompetent and racist social science can lead to racial intolerance and racist injustice, the university administration posited that different facts were relevant. By largely ignoring considerations of racism whilst pronouncing upon academic rights and freedoms, the university sought to move the discussion away from the definition of the problem offered by numerous others toward a focus on the desirability of the continuation of the right to academic freedom. The administration thus constructed a different cognitive and moral dimension for the Rushton affair. By transforming the controversy into an academic affair, a matter more properly dealt with internally by members of the university, the administration had sought to contain the controversy.

After these key developments, the administration was left largely unfettered to let events unfold within the institution as the content of the problem was left to be determined by the mandates of the various pre-existing structures within the university which came, successively, to own the definitions of the problem. These new definitions of the problem were far removed from the

definitions offered by the original problem claimants and did little to ameliorate their deep concerns - concerns which the university administration had been unwilling or perhaps unable to address.

* * *

It should be noted that the social constructionist approach has a number of weaknesses. Chief among these is that the approach can effectively deal only with particular types of situations; ie. the management and shaping of public issues through definitional work and communicative processes. Another shortcoming of the approach is that the writing of a brief history of a public issue unfortunately necessitates the simplification of a very complex series of events. Since the researcher can only follow a limited number of the numerous strands of argument which emerge in the definitional process, the project is necessarily incomplete.

The social constructionist approach to public problems also has a number of strengths. The approach is oriented toward process and provides a method through which the researcher may track change. The method allows investigation of public issues without requiring the researcher to acquire expertise in the fields of knowledge of the various claimants. By compelling researchers to focus on claims-making activities, the approach allows them to reduce vast amounts of material to a manageable size when

documenting and analyzing political activities which are taking place within and between complex organizations.

Other strengths of the social constructionist approach also became apparent in this research. The application of the method brought into bold relief those oppositional elements of social structure which shaped the content and outcome of the debate over this particular public issue. The method also helped to highlight the significant role played by various internal structures and divisions within a complex organization such as a university.

* * *

This research has brought up a number of questions for research and analysis, which could also be approached within a social constructionist theoretical framework but which lie beyond the scope of this thesis.

Some of these questions are of a comparative nature; how does the university administration's handling of the Rushton affair compare to race science controversies at other universities; especially those in the 1970's sparked by the work of Arthur Jensen at Harvard and William Shockley at Stanford and those presently surrounding Michael Levin at the City University of New York, Richard Herrnstein at Harvard, Vince Sarich at Berkeley, and Linda Gottfredson at the University of Delaware?

Another interesting line of ethnographic research and analysis could follow further developments in the Rushton

affair. In August 1991, eighteen students and former students from the UWO filed a complaint with the Ontario Human Rights Commission. Among other things, they are complaining that President Pedersen, Provost Collins, and Professor Rushton have 'poisoned the academic learning environment' by 'permitting or causing the promotion of racism' in the guise of science. The complainants seek a number of solutions, including Rushton's dismissal (52). The Commission is currently requesting submissions from the respondents Rushton, Collins, and Pedersen. With these developments in the Rushton affair, the process of problem definition has moved outside of the university and into a new venue (53). New definitions of the problem will now likely emerge as different facts are considered relevant by a broader set of participants.

52. Recent events in New Brunswick may provide an interesting foil to these developments. In 1991 the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission investigated the anti-Semitic writings of school teacher Malcolm Ross. The Commission subsequently ordered the Moncton School Board to assign Ross to a non-teaching position or fire him. Whether the Ontario Human Rights Commission will attempt to make a similar order against a university and one of its professors remains to be seen - as does the outcome of such an attempt.

53. Analysis of events at the Commission would be more challenging since my long-term field work and research into university affairs would be of less value in seeking to understand events taking place outside of a university setting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

As well as original documents directly pertaining to the the Rushton affair, issues of the following periodicals between January 1989 and March 1991 were used;

The London Free Press,
 The Toronto Star,
 The Globe and Mail,
 The St. Catherines Standard,
 The Winnipeg Free Press,
 The New York Times,
 The Gazette,
 The Western News,
 - The Chronicle of Higher Education,

The following monographs and articles were also used;

Aguilar, John L. (1981) "Insider research: An ethnography of a debate." in Anthropologists at home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society. Messerschmidt ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 15-28.

Bailey, F.G. (1977) Morality and Expediency: The folklore of academic politics. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co.

Beck, Bernard (1978) "The politics of speaking in the name of society" in Social Problems. 25;353-60.

Blumer, Herbert (1971) "Social problems as collective behavior" in Social Problems. 18;298-306.

Boas, F. (1911) The Mind of Primitive Man. New York, The Macmillan Co.

----- (1912) Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants. New York, Columbia University Press.

Brace, C.L. and G.R. Gamble and J.T. Bond (1971) "Race and intelligence" in Anthropological Studies 8. Washington, American Anthropological Association.

Britan, Gerald M. and Ronald Cohen (1980) "Toward an anthropology of formal organizations." in Hierarchy and Society: Anthropological perspectives on bureaucracy. Britan and Cohen eds., Philadelphia, Institute for the Study of Human Issues, pp. 9-30.

Caplan, Gerald (1989) "Demonstrable truths for Professor Rushton" in Toronto Star. March 20. p. A19.

D'Souza, Danesh (1991) "Illiberal education" in Atlantic Monthly.

Emmerson, R.M. and S.I. Messinger (1977) "The micro-politics of trouble" in Social Problems. 25;121-35.

Fennel, Tom (1991) "The silencers. A new wave of repression is sweeping through the universities." in Maclean's. 104(21);40-43.

Fishman, M. (1980) Manufacturing the News. Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press.

Frank, L.K. (1925) "Social Problems" in American Journal of Sociology. 30;462-73.

Fuller and Myers (1941a) "Some aspects of a theory of social problems" in American Sociological Review. 6;24-32. February.
----- (1941b) "The natural history of a social problem" in American Sociological Review. 6;320-8. June.

Garbett, G. Kingsley (1970) "The analysis of social situations" in Man. 5(2);214-27. June.

Gross, Barry R. (1990) "The case of Philippe Rushton" in Academic Questions. 3 (4);35-46.

Gusfield, Joseph R. (1981) The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking Driving and the Symbolic Order. Chicago, University of Chicago Press

----- (1989a) "Constructing the ownership of public problems; Fun and profit in the welfare state" in Social Problems. 36(5);431-41.

----- (1989b) Introduction to Kenneth Burke On Symbols and Society. Gusfield ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp.1-52.

Hammersley, Martyn and Paul Atkinson (1983) Ethnography. Principles in Practice. New York, Tavistock Publications.

Jenish, D'arcy and William Lowther (1991) "A war of words. Academics clash over 'correctness'" in Maclean's. 104(21);44-45

Joyson, Robert B. (1989) The Burt Affair. London, Routledge.

Kitsuse, J.I. and M. Spector (1973) "Toward a sociology of social problems: Social conditions, value-judgements, and social problems." in Social Problems. 20;407-19.

Knudtson, Peter (1991) A Mirror to Nature. Reflections on Science, Scientists, and Society. Toronto, Stoddard.

Leslie, Charles (1990) "Scientific racism: Reflections on peer review, science, and ideology" in Social Science and Medicine. 31(8);891-912.

Manning, Nick (1987) "What is a social problem?" in The State or the Market: Politics and Welfare in Contemporary Britain. Martin Loney, ed., London, Sage, pp.8-23.

McGregor, James (1989) "Race, prejudice and a Guggenheim fellow" in Mankind Quarterly. 29 (Spring);267-285.

Muller-Hill, Benno (1988) Murderous Science: Elimination by scientific selection of Jews, Gypsies, and others, Germany 1933-1945. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Schneider, Joseph W. (1985) "Social problems theory; the constructionist view" in Annual Review of Sociology. 11;209-29.

Shapiro, H.. (1952) "Revised version of UNESCO statement on race" in American Journal of Physical Anthropology. n.s., 10;363-368.

Spector, Malcolm and John I. Kitsuse (1973) "Social problems: A reformulation" in Social Problems. 20;145-59. --
----- (1987) Constructing Social Problems. New York, Aldine de Gruyter.

Stocking, George W. (1968) Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology. New York, The Free Press.

----- (1988) "Bones, bodies, and behavior" in Bones, bodies, and behavior: Essays in biological anthropology. Stocking, ed., London, University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 3-17.

Waller, W. (1936) "Social problems and the mores" in American Sociological Review. 1;922-34.

Zuckerman, Marvin and Nathan Brody (1988) "Oysters, rabbits and people: A critique of "Race differences in behaviour" by J.P. Rushton" in Personality and Individual Differences. 9(6);1025-1033.