

and of "intellectual harassment". Why, he might even have the penultimate indictment of our day pronounced upon him, vis., being a "reactionary", an intransigent "right-winger". Bloom, however, is not so easy to dispose of in such a clichéd manner. The man knows whereof he speaks. Even his most trenchant critics acknowledge the acuteness of the intellectual crisis in which we now find ourselves. The point that I wish to make is that, whether or not one can accept Bloom's decidedly dire analysis, the problematic that he explicates is a real think piece. And so, in my view, is Professor Rahman's book. It is demonstrably one of the few books emanating

from UPEI which can claim to be thoroughgoing critical scholarship.

Whether Professor Rahman would agree with me, I do not know; but it does seem to me that, if one can grasp what is at issue, in critical terms, for both Bloom and Rahman, then one will not find it so difficult to understand why Rahman would choose to challenge the findings in question. For there is surely more at issue for Rahman than simply his right (procured long ago by Sir Karl Popper) to reject the proping up of social science by a compromised science proper. What is at issue for Professor Rahman is the prototypical critical integrity of Socrates, the intellectual progenitor from whom Alan

Bloom also takes his bearings. Critical integrity for Rahman, as for Bloom, is a matter of uncompromised intellectual principle.

To some, all of this will smack of an acute grandiloquence and a pernicious arbitrariness. After all, why should not thinking be brought to bear upon the resolving of problems in concrete actuality? Why should it be held that critical thinking is somehow immune to the ebb and flow of practical agency? The answer, as I see it, to these objections is that the inviolability of critical thinking does indeed rest upon the arbitrary enough presupposition concerning the relationship between human agency and the mind that presumable guides it, vis; that a genial

self-determination does, in fact, hinge upon an intellectual self-accountability that refuses to compromise its critical integrity. Although some will vigorously reject it as outmoded, and perhaps downright insensitive, the late-nineteenth century philosopher, FH Bradley, in his *Critical Essays*, provides a lucid and compelling account of the traditional purview of criticism:

"... however humble the sphere of her rule, yet at least, while within that sphere, criticism is subject to no intrusion and oppressed by no authority. She moves on her path unheedful of the warning, unheedful of the clamour, of that which beyond her realm may be or may call itself religion and philosophy; her philosophy

and her religion are the realization and the fruition of herself, and her faith is this, that while true to herself, and her faith is this, that while true to herself she can find no enemy in the truth."

Lest I be accused of "obfuscating" the issue that precipitated this whole controversy, let me say that I support the implementation of a sexual harassment policy for UPEI. I recall, as a graduate student, an eminent professor at an eminent university being charged and appropriately reprimanded for a sexual harassment offense. The problem is real enough, and guidelines are needed. Nevertheless, my intellectual sympathies lie with Professor Rahman. Admittedly, his criticism of the Mazer/Percival Findings bordered on the ad hominem, but with respect to the issue at hand, Professor Rahman not only has the right, but is in the right, in attempting to critically distinguish between valid social science and an ostensible moralism. Certain of his detractors, I might add, underscore the pervasiveness of this same moralism.

—Gordon Worth

ence and fashion. The very thought of group scorn and verbal chastisement, which inevitably follow independent/critical thought, seems to reinforce the silence of the majority. It is not surprising then that many do not speak up even when they have serious concerns and reservations about such a controversial issue. Since a vocal minority gets itself heard with a passionate intensity, the illusion is created that such collectivist opinion is also collective wisdom.

Nevertheless, all research dealing with sensitive moral issues and ending up in the media must be brought under the sharpest independent public scrutiny — especially because local/national granting agencies have a tendency to fund research which is in fashion or is supported

by an interest group. Therefore, there was really nothing "unprofessional" about raising these concerns publicly about the present study — which was reported both in the student newspaper and on local television.

Specific objections to my critique may be discussed under five categories:

Cont. on page

### Reading between the lines

more shocking coming as it does from native speakers/teachers of the English language. One would have thought that such vehement denunciation of honest rational dissent was possible only in a fascist/totalitarian state. However, it would seem that in the Orwellian Newspeak, where words run helter-skelter, noise itself begins to sound like sense and substance. The "spirit of free debate" then survives only as a ghost.

Even under these cir-

cumstances, a dispassionate rational/psychological analysis is the only respectable approach. For, it is precisely the responsible kind of criticism, which is carried out of a respect for the truth of the matter, that inevitable touches on many sore points. In all rational discussion, therefore, the critical thing is what is right, not who is right — nor who is holier than the other. Name calling is as out of place as red herrings.

Paradoxically as it may sound, in the academic world, genuine respect demands honesty and even unsparing criticism from time to time. What we must really worry about is the indifference/silence which allows almost anything to gain credibility in the name of sci-

ena is profoundly important; 2. Our research is objective and neutral; and 3. Men are to be understood exclusively as exploiters of women (an assumption of doctrinaire feminism which erroneously believes in the immaculate conception of the female gender).

Prof. Rahman failed to recognize the present acceptable limits of academic freedom and hence is being severely castigated for his heresy, irreverence, and boldness.

The exchange here at UPEI among faculty over the sexual harassment survey shows that the university here, like all others, is a citadel of the diseased ego. Intellectual and moral bullying is rampant. The professors, like the students, have intellectual and moral "clay feet". There is a need and place for grace, even at that most intellectually arrogant of all modern secular institutions, the university.

—James D. Cameron.

### Critical Assessment

Dear Editor:

The anger directed toward Prof. Rahman is surprising and it certainly opens a window on the foibles and follies of academics.

Rahman's article in the *Gem*, March 10, was designed to encourage critical assessment of the sexual harassment study and to know how this could be done. The implications of what he said are two — don't take yourself or the preoccupations of the "knowledge class" too seriously and beware the possible dehumanizing effects of the social sciences. These suggestions are perfectly reasonable in an academic context.

Yet why the rage against him and the microscopic analysis of his logical errors and demonic hidden motives? Because he questioned these dimensions of prevailing academic orthodoxy; 1. What we do in our classrooms, labs, and studies by applying rationality to all human and natural phenom-

## Wile E. Coyote (Genius)

### Exactly how fast, can Wile E. run?

We've seen Wile E. chase the Roadrunner countless times at breakneck speeds, and yet no one really knows exactly how fast the coyote can travel.

### THREE VELOCITY SITUATIONS

#### 1) STANDARD COYOTE

The coyote can outrun trains, and therefore he must be travelling at speeds in excess of 50 m.p.h. The Roadrunner travels at 50 m.p.h. to tease Wile E. and then instantly accelerates to 110 m.p.h. It's just not fair when Wile E. gets left in the dust.

#### 2) ACME JET SHOES

This fine ACME product greatly helped the coyote with acceleration and top-end velocities. These rocket-powered tennis shoes enabled the coyote to reach speeds nearing the 90 m.p.h. mark. You may recall that the shoes eventually ran out of propellant and Wile E. was back at square 1. Experts are not sure what Wile E. paid for these units, but many believe that the shoes are worth well over \$6000.00 a pair.

#### 3) ACME LEG VITAMINS

I think we all remember the day that Wile E. overdosed on leg-muscle vitamins, and ended up looking like Lou Ferrigno. These vitamins were very expensive, yet very effective. Wile E. was able to attain maximum velocities well over the 100 m.p.h. barrier. The roadrunner was almost dinner for the old Anti-

Christ until his ACME steel door trap malfunctioned. The door was moulded to Wile E.'s body at an impact speed of approximately 118 m.p.h.

One might conclude that Wile E. has a set of speeds ranging from 60-120 m.p.h. If I were Wile E., I give the leg muscle vitamins one more try.

### NEXT WEEK:

Does the Anti-Christ obey the basic laws of physics?

