



THE UBYSSSEY

## ed not apply at universities

Mandel is also critical of the CAUT and said he believes the association shirked its mandate in his case.

"It (CAUT) was basically unwilling to go up against the McGill administration," said Mandel.

But CAUT has worked to defend professors who were denied a position or a contract renewal because of their political views.

In the fall of 1985, the CAUT Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee acted as an intermediary between Carleton professor Robin Mathews and the administration at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver. Mathews claimed that he was denied a teaching post at SFU because the university administration and faculty did not approve of his Canadian nationalist views.

The CAUT committee examined Mathews' complaint and the Canadian Studies department at SFU attempted to settle the dispute by offering Mathews the opportunity to teach at SFU. But SFU maintained, as the McGill administration did in Mandel's case,

that the professor's political views were never the issue.

But as Jerald Zaslove, chair of SFU's English department, said in a letter to Douglas Waurtele, Carleton's English department chair, "Robin Mathews' views about cultural and literary nationalism were deeply offensive to many faculty and these faculty just did not want to take the chance that he would use the department as a platform."

Gregg MacDonald, an assistant to the SFU administration president William Saywell said they offered the teaching position to Mathews to resolve the dispute but it was not an admission that SFU had hampered academic freedom by rejecting him in the first place.

While Fenichel is dubious that a CAUT censure would affect a university's hiring process, other professors say that CAUT was effective in protecting academic freedom at their university.

The CAUT imposed a censure on Memorial University of Newfoundland in May 1981 for its 1977 fir-

ing of Social Work professor Marlene Webber. Webber had been accused of using the classroom for promoting her Marxist-Leninist beliefs.

The dispute between Memorial and CAUT went on until January 1986, when the administration decided to change the agreement governing the terms and conditions of employment at Memorial. The proposed changes included an exhaustive list of anti-discrimination clauses, and for the first time provided a detailed grievance, appeal and arbitration procedure. The amendments guaranteed academic freedom for faculty by asserting "faculty have the right to teach, discuss or hold

any belief without conformity to any prescribed doctrine." As well, the CAUT proposed a settlement with Webber to cover damages.

"Webber's settlement was a fair resolution as far as we're concerned and Webber said she can accept this settlement," said Mark Graesser, president of the Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association.

"The main thing this (the Memorial administration's new policy) shows is that the influence of a censure is significant. Some people have the idea that it doesn't matter, that CAUT censure may (just) be an unpleasant label," said Graesser.

But Memorial University felt the ramifications of a CAUT censure. In May 1985, Memorial was forced to withdraw its invitation to host the prestigious 1987 Learned Societies Conference when many individual societies passed resolutions not to attend because of the censure.

While other academics have successfully contested universities who discriminated against them because of their political views, David Mandel has decided to give up his case against McGill University. He said the CAUT was not the only group who failed to support him. He calls the Human Rights Commission "something of a paper organization. It makes you think you've got somewhere to go but in reality you just have to go to court anyway. The Human Rights Commission is just another procedure to go up against."

But Mandel and Fenichel hope their book will educate people about the injustices that take place in Canadian universities, not just at McGill.

Fenichel explains the book is not meant as an attack on the Political Science Department at McGill, but rather, "an attack on the behaviour of some members of the department in (Mandel's) case, and it's a situation we don't feel is unique."

Mandel blames the university system itself, particularly at McGill, where "collegiality" is the governing principle.

Samuel Freedom, vice president academic at McGill, defines collegiality as "the attitude that the members of this community will participate in the decision-making process of the university and through their participation in its collective activities, help to fashion its attitudes."

But Fenichel and Mandel have a different interpretation.

"(Collegiality is) an authoritarian power structure, not subject to any internal or external control. Those who cooperate with the powers that be can obtain personal benefits but cannot claim academic freedom."

Mandel obviously did not fit into this system. He and Fenichel criticize the structure of the current tenure system for not protecting academic freedom at the hiring level.

"If universities are careful enough in their initial hiring, there will be no need to fire people later for non-academic reasons. 'Deviants' who make it through the graduate school selection process are left unprotected as they seek employment," write Fenichel and Mandel.

"One reason (for writing *The Academic Corporation*) is to open people's eyes to what's going on. University is surrounded by this aura, it's supposed to be the creme de la creme of society, the height of intellectual achievement. To de-mystify this would be healthy," said Mandel.

"It might also teach students to be a little more critical of what they're taught in the classrooms. If (professors) will say some of the lies that they did in the public hearings, why wouldn't they lie in the classroom?"