

I expect that the main negative reaction to the *Report* will be the objection that it is "anecdotal" and unrepresentative. In response to this I can only repeat what we say in the *Report*: as an institution we (collectively) have a problem if *anyone* feels as demoralized and excluded as did many of the women with whom we spoke. I would be delighted to learn that we had, by dint of remarkable sampling error, spoken to all the women faculty at Western who have ever had such experiences, but would still maintain that the number of problems reported to us are too many to be tolerated in an institution that has made the sort of commitment this one has to employment equity. In fact, the way we proceeded was to identify departments and faculties that represent a range of different kinds of disciplines and environments, and then interview as many women faculty in each unit as possible. In this, several of the units in which we conducted interviews were chosen precisely because they had a reputation for supporting women, so such a happy error would be quite remarkable. I was, in fact, delighted to learn that there is a great deal of variability in the experience of women faculty at Western: as indicated in the *Report*, some of the 35 we spoke to did feel that, overall, they had been treated well. But every one of them described ways in which their own effectiveness and productivity, or their ability to participate in the life of the institution had been compromised by gender-specific patterns of treatment that they felt devalued and isolated them as women. However widespread or broadly "representative" these negative experiences prove to be, for the target population as a whole or for individuals, they result in an unacceptable waste of talent and person-power in an institution whose main asset is undeniably its employees.

It is worth noting that the cost of squandering these human resources (e.g., those of the four key target groups) is quickly becoming unsupportable, not just in universities but in society as a whole. *The Toronto Star* ran a story in August under the headline, "U.S. Employers Face Boggling Demographics." These "boggling demographics" were that, while "white males . . . as few as five years ago represented 45 per cent of the U.S. work force, [they] will comprise only 15 per cent of the entering work force by 1995." *The Star* goes on to conclude that "U.S. businesses will be forced to turn to women, minorities and immigrants if they expect to compete in the global economy of the 1990s and beyond" (*The Toronto Star*, Monday, 28 August, B2; emphasis added). Whatever the peculiarities of the situation in Canada, the fact remains that we can ill afford to allow the persistence of practices that exclude, devalue, and undermine members of traditionally marginalized groups; taken together, these are rapidly emerging as the majority of the entering workforce. As a primary focus of training for members of this entering workforce, particularly managers and professionals, universities have a special responsibility to be on the cutting edge of change in this

area, and a special potential to realize the sorts of positive change that will be necessary if we are to capitalize on diversity.

I have every expectation that the new employment equity initiatives at Western will make a real difference, not just for women (or, more narrowly, for women faculty), but for all target groups. There is no question, however, that this will require the hardest kind of change: changes in attitudes and in patterns of everyday practice that are so widely taken for granted they are never even acknowledged, much less questioned. Although this necessitates an unsettling process of candid self-criticism directed not just at some amorphous "other" ("the administration," "the decision makers") but at ourselves, our own units, our immediate colleagues, it is absolutely essential if this institution (indeed, if any post-secondary institution) is to continue to play a vital role in an increasingly diverse society.

**Appendix B**  
**A Response to Some Criticisms of the *Chilly Climate Report***

*Alison Wylie*

*Drafted for circulation on 24 November 1989.*

– Eds.

---

The criticisms levelled against the *Report* we drafted on the chilly climate for women faculty at Western fall into three categories: 1) interviewees were not identified (we, and they, “hid behind anonymity”), 2) the chilly climate experiences we report are not “representative,” and 3) the *Report* was used to create a “staged media event.” I respond to each in turn.

**1. Anonymity**

It is difficult to know why protection of the identities of research subjects would be considered grounds for questioning the credibility of the reported results of interviews with them. Virtually every professional association of social scientists and most credible granting agencies enforce codes of ethics which not only allow, but in fact require, that social scientists guarantee their subjects’ anonymity. Subjects are routinely assured that research materials identifying them will be kept under lock and key and destroyed after a specified period of time; they are guaranteed that the data resulting from studies in which they participate will be published in aggregate form so they are not identifiable and, in the case of research which focuses closely on particular individuals, pseudonyms are typically used and any identifying details are carefully disguised. If researchers do plan to publish material in which their subjects are identified, they must get written permission to do this, the only exception being cases where the subjects are public figures who are being interviewed in their official capacities. If the anonymity of research subjects was, indeed, ground for dismissing the credibility of social scientific research, very little would survive scrutiny.

The reason we have been criticized for such standard research practice seems to be a worry that, in not identifying those we interviewed, we (or the subjects) could have “made it all up.” In fact, we took special care to ensure the accuracy of all claims made about the experiences women reported to us. As we completed our final draft, we contacted each woman we had interviewed whose experiences were described in the *Report*, outlined the context in which her remarks were reported, and asked her to review all the statements attributed to her, including both direct quotes and summary descriptions. Frequently interviewees requested that certain details be excised

because they were too readily identifiable, but just as frequently they added material to convey more completely and accurately the nature of the difficulties they faced. We incorporated all the revisions suggested. It is a profound insult not just to us, but to the 35 women we interviewed, that public critics of the *Report* seem to find the experiences we describe so implausible that, *in this particular case*, they take anonymity to be grounds for questioning the integrity of the accounts given, indeed, for intimating that we (and they) may have falsified the data we report.

## 2. Representativeness

Two separate issues are raised in this connection. The first has to do with the sample of women we interviewed, and the second with the kinds of incidents and experiences we reported on the basis of these interviews. The crux of both seems to be a suspicion that what we report is not representative of women's experiences at Western considered either collectively or individually, and that therefore any conclusions we have drawn are false generalizations.

It has first to be noted that we did not, in fact, undertake to establish general conclusions about the extent or degree of the problems we documented in the University as a whole. Our aim was to characterize some of the mechanisms by which a chilly climate can be created for women, following the lead of numerous studies done at other institutions in North America and nationally in the United States. To this end we were most concerned simply to describe the experiences of the women we interviewed. The conclusions we drew were that there is, in this sample, great variability in the degree to which women find the climate chilly at Western. As we indicate repeatedly, we did speak to women who felt they had been treated well overall and that their units had been relatively hospitable, but even they had encountered the same sorts of chilly climate practices which, in more extreme forms elsewhere, were described as creating an extremely hostile environment. There were consistent themes in the treatment of women, as women, which are comparable to those that have been identified in the surveys reported by the Association of American Colleges. As we said in the *Report* and elsewhere, we would be overjoyed to learn that we had interviewed the only 35 women faculty at Western who have encountered the sorts of problems that were described to us, and we congratulate those women who can claim, in good faith, never to have had such experiences or observed such practices. Our report shows, however, that Western is not an anomaly among North American universities; the problems identified elsewhere do exist here. In fact, we had assumed that the President's creation of a Standing Committee on Employment Equity was informed, at least in part, by an appreciation

that climate issues are crucial, as acknowledged in the Federal Contractors Guidelines, and that the mandate of this committee would include investigation of the extent — the distribution and seriousness — of exactly the sorts of subtle and informal, as well as formal (and now illegal), barriers to employment equity that were described by the women we interviewed.

Despite the fact that generalization was not our objective we did make a concerted effort to speak to a range of women working in a number of different sorts of academic disciplines and environments. As indicated in the *Report*, we proceeded by drawing a sample of academic units (either departments, or faculties without departmental structure) and then undertook to interview as many women within these units as possible. Where the choice of units was concerned, we felt it important to maximize variability on two dimensions: the type of discipline and the reputed warmth or chilliness of the climate for women. We chose 12 units altogether. Four can be broadly defined as “professional schools,” and the rest are distributed across the “core faculties” of Arts, Social Science, and Science. Two had a strong reputation for supporting women and two we understood to be problematic in this regard, while the rest (i.e., two-thirds of them) had no particular reputation in either direction. In all but two of the units we achieved coverage of two-thirds of all the tenured and tenurable women faculty, and in the majority of units (eight of them) we were able to interview over half the women faculty holding term appointments and ongoing part-time positions, as well as tenured and tenurable positions. None of the women we contacted declined to speak to us, although two asked that none of their experiences be included after having been interviewed. Although our assessment of the “reputation” of units was necessarily impressionistic, the fact remains that we did undertake to interview women in contexts where we believed the climate might be relatively warm and, in the end, women from such units were proportionately better represented in our sample than women from the other units. We interviewed 80% of the women in the two units we identified as supportive environments; none of them felt it necessary to withdraw their accounts and, in the end, they constituted just under a quarter of the reported sample. Insofar as our sample is skewed, then, it is definitely not skewed in the direction of a concentration on women working in what we understood to be inhospitable contexts.

In short, contrary to the allegations of our critics, we did not speak to a sample of 35 women whom we knew in advance would have negative stories to tell about their experiences at Western. We interviewed a great many women we knew hardly at all and many we believed would have had relatively good experiences at Western, given their location in units supportive of women. Given this, we were interested to learn that the climate for women varies a great deal at Western, although all of those we interviewed

report various forms of differential treatment as women that they find irksome at best, and profoundly debilitating at worst.

The second sense in which our account seems to be considered unrepresentative is that we are suspected of having included only the worst experiences reported to us or that we manipulated our subjects (using "leading questions") into reporting their bad experiences in an unrepresentative way. In fact, the way we proceeded in interviews was to ask, in as open-ended a manner as possible, whether the woman in question felt that gender had made a difference, or had affected the way she was treated in her unit, in her capacity as teacher, researcher, and administrator (the three areas covered by our contracts as faculty). More often than not we were overwhelmed by the response we got to this initial inquiry; for many women, especially those we knew least well or who were relatively isolated in their units, we presented an opportunity to talk about an enormous range of experiences that they found problematic and puzzling, but felt quite alone in addressing. In several cases what began as an hour-long interview went on for three, even four or five hours, and a number of interviewees made a point of keeping in touch with us after the interviews, calling back to add observations about the experiences they had initially described to us, or adding new incidents as they came to mind or unfolded around them in subsequent weeks and months (these include five women with whom contact through the project, as interviewees, was their primary connection with the interviewer). We certainly did not have to employ "leading" questions to elicit the enormous volume of interview material on which we based our report. All we had to do was indicate a willingness to listen and we encountered, over and over, a great desire to break the silence and isolation and to talk to others about what we quickly came to see as common problems. We can only hope the President's Employment Equity Committee will provide more women with the opportunity to discuss their experiences, concerns, and hopes for change with regard to chilly climate issues.

As this suggests, we came away from the interview process with vastly more material than we could hope to summarize in a manageable report. The selection process proved less difficult than we expected, however, because a great deal of this material proved unusable by virtue of being so specific to individual women and their situations that there was no possibility of reporting it without revealing their identities. In fact, for this reason, we left out at least as many incidents and examples of chilly climate practices as we included. Moreover, as might be expected, the experiences we did not report include the worst, most explicit cases of sexist and discriminatory behaviour we heard about, as well as many of the accounts given by women whose positions are so tenuous that they felt they could not allow us to report any but the most sanitized descriptions of their experiences. The

incidents we were able to include are, for the most part, generic enough that they could be described without specific references that would expose individuals. In short, if there is any bias in our selection of material from the accounts women gave us of their experiences at Western, it is certainly not in the direction of emphasizing the worst aspects of this work environment.

Finally, a question often raised is whether the incidents reported are representative of recent and ongoing practices, rather than relating to the environment of 15 or 20 years ago. In fact, 60% of the women we interviewed had been appointed to positions at Western in the 1980s (21 women) and well over half of these had been at Western less than five years when we contacted them in the summer of 1988. Given this, it is to be expected that the vast majority of the incidents reported are recent history. And, in fact, only a handful (specifically, six) of the incidents described were reported to us as having occurred in the 1970s. Another 10 occurred in the early 1980s but most of them (eight) were described as practices or problems that originated at that time and have continued to the present. All the rest are current either in the sense that, as discrete events, they occurred within the past five years, or they constitute features of the environment — what we referred to as “standing conditions” — that are ongoing problems. It is perhaps significant that all the incidents concerning compensation (e.g., lower starting salaries) date to within three years of the interviews, with the one exception being the case reported by a woman who had been denied summer teaching on the grounds that she had no alimony payments to meet.

I conclude, then, that the experiences we describe are not, in any of the senses identified, “unrepresentative” of the kinds of difficulties that at least 35 women currently face at Western. From the point of view of developing an effective employment equity program, it would be most interesting and useful to characterize this variability in greater detail, to establish a data base that will support generalizations about the climate at Western as a whole and, most important, to determine what factors make a difference in the environment for women. Our point has always been that our study should be treated as a contribution to this larger investigative and policy-making enterprise — it provides some preliminary information on the basis of which more extensive surveys could profitably be based. The proposal that our report be used as a point of departure for further research was, in fact, the first of the six recommendations with which we concluded the *Report*.

But whatever follow-up research is undertaken at Western, and whatever its results, we maintain that the problems reported to us by the 35 women we interviewed are too numerous, too serious, and too consistent thematically (both among themselves and with those reported in other con-

texts) to be dismissed as unproblematic because they are unrepresentative of the population as a whole.

In addition, I would argue that, whatever the results of this follow-up research, our interview data do establish a clear and present need for the sorts of response to problems of climate that we recommended in the conclusion of the *Report*. In particular, it is crucial that some kind of mechanism be established for handling complaints about the various types of discriminatory behaviour reported to us which do not fall within the mandate of the Sexual Harassment Officers. There is no individual or office empowered to handle these complaints comparable to the Sexual Harassment Officers and, as many of the stories reported indicate, women frequently find themselves in positions where those to whom they might properly report their difficulties are part of the problem. This concern was addressed by our fourth recommendation. In addition to dealing more effectively with more or less overt cases of discriminatory practice, it is crucial to sensitize the university community to the damage done by the sorts of informal, often inadvertently compromising practices that exclude and devalue women (recommendations three and five) and, most important, that every effort be made to increase the number of women on faculty and in administrative positions at Western (recommendation six with provisions for implementation in recommendation two). The President's Standing Committee for Employment Equity presumably has a mandate to take action in each of these areas and, as we indicate in our conclusion, we did see evidence that a commitment to equity has begun to change the environment for women in some quarters: we came away from the study with "some degree of optimism that such warming of the climate is spreading, and can be spread if a concerted effort is made to foster it" (p. 37).

### 3. The "Staged Media Event"

The allegation that we "staged" a "media event," evidently with the deliberate aim of discrediting the University, is one of the most puzzling features of the defensive reaction that our report has provoked. We were, from the outset, committed to making the *Report* public, in the sense that we were committed to making it available to any who might take an interest in it. It was originally distributed to the women we interviewed, to the senior administration, and to those appointed by them to address employment equity issues, and a copy was put on reserve at D.B. Weldon Library where it would be accessible to others. It is not clear what it means to say that a media event has been "staged." At the very least it would seem to imply some element of surprise—that the media were given the *Report* before those concerned or affected by it knew it was coming or had themselves received



it—and it would seem to suggest some large and well-organized press conference or systematic press release involving a range of media. In fact, many members of the administration were informed that the *Report* would be available two weeks before it was released and that the local *Free Press* reporter responsible for university news also knew that the *Report* was coming. In the event, this reporter drove over to one of our houses on the weekend after the *Report* was released to get a copy, and very quickly did interviews with the three of us who were in town at the time. The electronic media likewise made arrangements, that weekend, to interview two of us early on Monday morning. There was, then, no element of surprise and, far from “staging” a press conference or arranging a systematic, wide-ranging press release, the *Report* came to public notice in an extremely haphazard way. It is a credit to the energy and attentiveness of local London reporters, not to us, that there was news of the *Report* so soon after it was circulated.

It is a mystery to us why the President and the Provost did not simply state that they were well aware of the problems we describe, that these problems are generic to universities in North America, and that Western is actively addressing them, deferring any further questions to the highly professional staff and faculty they have appointed to positions of responsibility for these initiatives. With such a response there would have been no story, and no “media event.” The only real media event we can identify, using the criteria of surprise (or, failure to inform those involved) and deliberate solicitation of media attention, was created by the invitation of TV crews and reporters to cover the Senate meeting at which, ironically, the President issued the statement denouncing *our* report as a “staged media event.”

It has finally to be noted that this charge of having “staged a media event” is puzzling in another sense. If we had, in fact, intended publicly to discredit and embarrass the University or, more specifically, its administration, is it really plausible that we would have limited the scope of our activities to local news outlets? With the current national interest in sexism and sexual harassment on Canadian campuses it would not have been hard to draw much wider attention had that been our aim. Our concern is that in focusing on this highly questionable allegation about our motivations and objectives, the administration trivializes and obscures the real issues which require our attention and which were our primary concern: the variety of chilly climate issues raised by the 35 women to whom we spoke.

## Notes

## Notes

- 1 See, for example, Cathryn Motherwell, "Just Saying No Doesn't Always Work," *The Globe and Mail*, 6 November 1990, which discussed male students' mocking of anti-rape activists at Queen's University, sexual harassment of two female medical students by five faculty members at the University of Calgary, and violent and sexually explicit notes placed under female residence doors by male students at the University of British Columbia. See also Debora Wilson, "Brothers No More at UBC Dorms," *The Globe and Mail*, 18 October 1990, and Frances Bula, "Hostility between the Sexes: Crude Note Exchange Got Out of Hand, Male Students Ponder their Complicity," *The London Free Press*, 27 October 1990, p. E-5.  
See also accounts of "student panty raids" at Wilfrid Laurier University: Michele Landsberg, "University 'Sanctions' Student Panty Raids," *The Toronto Star*, 25 October 1989; Frances Kelly, "Panty Raids Banned at Wilfrid Laurier," *The Toronto Star*, 29 October 1989; and Michele Landsberg, "Students Learn Sexist Lesson at Universities," *The Toronto Star*, 11 November 1989.
- See also an account of death threats delivered to the female editors of a Queen's University newspaper, "Death Threat Sent to Female Editors," *The Globe and Mail*, 7 November 1991, p. A-6.
- Additional comment appears in Susan Donaldson and Will Kymlicka, "No Thaw in Chilly Campus Climate," *The Globe and Mail*, 17 November 1989; Katherine Govier, "A Time to Be Just," *Queen's Alumni Review* (March-April 1990), p. 12; and Tom Kierans, "Where Are the Guardians?" *The Globe and Mail's Report on Business* (May 1990), p. 47.
- 2 Roberta M. Hall and Bernice R. Sandler, *The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?* (Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1982); Roberta M. Hall and Bernice R. Sandler, *Out of the Classroom: A Chilly Campus Climate for Women?* (Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, AAC, 1984); Bernice R. Sandler, *The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students* (Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, AAC, 1986); Sarah Nieves-Squires, *Hispanic Women: Making their Presence on Campus Less Tenuous* (Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, AAC, 1991); and Yolanda T. Moses, *Black Women in Academe: Issues and Strategies* (Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, AAC, 1989).
- 3 Wendy McCann, "UWO Sexism Report: One Faculty Rated Brutal and Vicious," *The London Free Press*, 13 November 1989, p. B-1.
- 4 Richard Hoffman, "UWO Sexism Report: Findings Overstated, President Counters," *The London Free Press*, 14 November 1989.
- 5 Morris Dalla Costa, "UWO Sexism Report Lacks a Real Punch," *The London Free Press*, 14 November 1989.
- 6 Hoffmann, "UWO Sexism Report."
- 7 Alison Wylie, "A Response to Some Criticisms of the 'Chilly Climate' Report," 24 November 1989 (Appendix B).
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Ibid.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 President K.G. Pedersen, Statement to the Senate, 16 November 1989. Copy on file with the authors of the *Chilly Climate Report*.
- 13 For an excellent overview of this problem, see Mary P. Rowe, "Barriers to Equality: The Power of Subtle Discrimination to Maintain Unequal Opportunity," *Employee Rights and Responsibilities Journal*, 3, 2 (June 1990): 153-63.

- 14 Alan Bass and Wendy McCann, "Sexism Report, Pedersen Assails 'Anonymity,'" *The London Free Press*, 17 November 1989.
- 15 Wylie, "A Response to Some Criticisms."
- 16 Ibid.
- 17 Jane Milburn, "Alleged Harassment Disputed by Western," *UWO Gazette*, 17 November 1989.
- 18 Bass and McCann, "Sexism Report."
- 19 Geoffrey Rans, "'Fear and Loathing' on the Hill: A Male Professor Speaks," *Western News*, 7 December 1989.
- 20 Bass and McCann, "Sexism Report."
- 21 James Anderson, "'Chilly Climate' at UWO Alleged," *Western News*, 23 November 1989, p. 6.
- 22 Bass and McCann, "Sexism Report."
- 23 For reference to *The Gazette* article, see Keith Risler, "Behind the Purple Curtain," *London Magazine* (April 1990), p. 43. See also John Sloan, "Academic Racism Debated," *Western News*, 1 November 1990, p. 9; "Canadian Politics: Rise in Racism Blamed on Shift to the Right," *The London Free Press*, 14 November 1990, p. A-19; Silvia Valdman, "MP McCurdy Speaks Out against Rushton, Racism," *The Gazette*, 16 November 1990, p. 5; Lynn Marchildon, "Rushton Cancels Another Lecture," *The London Free Press*, 1 February 1991, p. B-34; "Professors Urge UWO to Fire Rushton," *The London Free Press*, 2 May 1991, p. B-7; "Motions Include Call for Dismissal Action," *Western News*, 9 May 1991, p. 7; and Greg Van Moorsel, "Human Rights: Backlog May Delay Complaint against Rushton," *The London Free Press*, 25 May 1991.
- 24 Continuing demands from members of the Western student body finally forced the administration to require Professor Rushton to provide his lectures through a televised format for a defined period of time, ostensibly to avoid risks of confrontation in the classroom. Students who protested Rushton's views publicly on campus were threatened with suspensions and trespass charges. Rushton was never prohibited from teaching. For details of the human rights complaint lodged against Western in this matter, see Van Moorsel, "Human Rights."
- 25 Risler, "Behind the Purple Curtain," p. 43.
- 26 John Sloan, "Report on Sexism Blasted by Senior Administrators," *Western News*, 23 November 1989, p. 1.
- 27 Risler, "Behind the Purple Curtain," p. 43. Freelance writer Risler's article was generally critical of Western's handling of the Chilly Climate affair, depicting its response as "on the verge of losing control of its media agenda" and "reactive self-defence . . . indicative of the chasm between Western and its sustaining society" (p. 26, 43-44). In a somewhat contradictory stance, *London Magazine's* November 1990 issue acclaimed President George Pedersen as one of "The People Who Make London," depicting him as "dealing with alleged on-campus sexual harassment that, if substantiated, must be curtailed without a McCarthyist witch hunt" (p. 38-40).
- 28 Letter from Pedersen to Wylie et al., 17 December 1990. Copy on file with the authors.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Alison Wylie, "Perspective: Everyday Attitudes, Practices Must Warm Chilly Climate," *The Gazette*, 24 November 1989 (Appendix A).
- 31 Ibid., p. 9. See also Wylie, "A Response to Some Criticisms."
- 32 Letter from W.J. McClelland to Constance Backhouse, 26 January 1990. Copy on file with the authors.
- 33 Letter from Alison Wylie to W.J. McClelland, 1 February 1990. Copy on file with the authors. In the end, the recommendation to take disciplinary action seems to have been dropped by the Vice-President (Research). Neither Wylie nor any other author of the *Report* received acknowledgement of, much less a reply to, any of the objections and responses Wylie addressed to the Review Board concerning both the inquiry and its ruling. In fact,

- when Wylie and one other member of the Review Board subsequently resigned, protesting the arbitrariness of applying guidelines retroactively before they had received public review or had even been adopted by the Review Board itself, neither received any response to their concerns, not even a formal acknowledgement that they had resigned.
- 34 Rebecca Coulter, Maryann Ayim, and 13 other signatories from the Faculty of Education, Teaching and Research Unit on Women and Education, "Report 'Opens the Door' to Look at Strategies," *Western News*, 23 November 1989.
  - 35 Karen McCaffery, "London Calling," December 14-20, 1989, p. 3.
  - 36 Jane Hegney, "Experience, Expectations Spark Law Student's 'Plea,'" *Western News*, 7 December 1989, p. 4, 6.
  - 37 Louise Forsyth, "Says Article on Canvasser Trivialized Contribution," *Western News*, 1 February 1990.
  - 38 Risler, "Behind the Purple Curtain."
  - 39 Sloan, "Report on Sexism Blasted," p. 6.
  - 40 Richard Bronaugh, "Report 'Fails as Study of Conditions at UWU,'" *Western News*, 4 January 1990.
  - 41 Lynn E. Fleming, "Young White Males Paying for Past Prejudice," *The London Free Press*, 16 May 1991, p. A-10.
  - 42 Robert Lannigan, "Methodology, Behaviour of Authors Criticized," *Western News*, 23 November 1989.
  - 43 Margaret P. Moffat, "Concerned that Report Left Wrong Impression," *Western News*, 7 December 1989.
  - 44 Sloan, "Report on Sexism Blasted."
  - 45 Bessie Borwein, "Sexism Report at University Trivializes Real Issues," *The London Free Press*, 9 December 1989.
  - 46 For an interesting discussion of the "cognitive dissonance" which may explain such reactions from women in a male institution, see Melissa Clark-Jones and Patricia Coyne, "Through the Back Door," *Atlantis*, 15, 2 (Spring 1990): 40. Having surveyed students who attended Bishop's, a small Canadian liberal arts university, during the first half of the twentieth century, they describe the contradictory and ambiguous responses of white female interviewees who deny discrimination while outlining detailed examples of unequal treatment: "Attendance at co-educational university implied the existence and experience of equality with men. Any experience of gender-based or other forms of inequality would create the occasion and the need to resolve the contradiction through ideological explanation or through denial. . . . Also, for them, discrimination implied total exclusion, usually on racial grounds. They were not attracted to direct identification with Blacks or Jews, though they shared a desire for inclusion and assimilation with these. When asked about 'discrimination' point blank, one woman spoke of the experience of the only Black of her time, instead of her own. Another praised Bishop's liberality in admitting Jews who, during the War, were being turned away at McGill [University]. To admit discrimination may have meant, at an emotive level, to admit inferiority. . . . Though many recall the facts of discrimination in both painful and humorous detail, they cannot call it by its name. Some repress the experience. Some displace it to other times or social groups. Some are aware of this curious break between their own experience and their collective meaning. . . . '[W]e didn't know we were having a hard time'; 'that (discrimination) is a modern concept'" (p. 45-46).
  - 47 Sara B. Galsworthy, "Fears We May Be Alienated from 'the Real Problems,'" *Western News*, 7 December 1989, p. 4. Similar sentiments were voiced by Western law student Kathleen M. Nolan, who announced she was "sick and tired" of the "attention and hoopla" surrounding claims of pervasive sexism in the Faculty of Law. As *The Gazette's* 14 November 1989 issue quoted her: "For Heaven's sake, there are 40,000 babies starving every day, the threat of nuclear destruction looms over our heads, thousands of people in Latin America are being

tortured each day etc. Yet it amazes me that these women have chosen as their outrage, their 'cause célèbre' gender-neutral language. Get with it" (p. 9).

- 48 See Louise Malette and Marie Chalouh, eds., *The Montreal Massacre* (Charlottetown: Gynergy Books, 1991). In the aftermath of the massacre, Alison Wylie gave a statement, as President of Western's Caucus on Women's Issues, on 12 December 1989, which was subsequently published in the Western's Caucus on Women's Issues *Newsletter* of January 1990. Some extracts follow: "Anything I might have written a week ago, by way of a President's Message, seems entirely beside the point now, in the aftermath of the Montreal massacre. I find the hostility of the 'backlash' as chilling as the tragedy itself. It is scarcely to be believed that anyone who followed the news — learning first that the fourteen 'students' killed were in fact all women, and then that they were systematically separated from the men and gunned down because they were women — could declare loudly and publicly that this was not a women's issue, that it was the isolated act of a madman which bears no relation to the attitudes and behaviours of 'real' men where women are concerned, and that feminists were therefore 'using' the event to promote their own 'narrow' political interests. In fact, as the reaction has deepened, the vehement hostility expressed toward women and, specifically, feminists, confirms and reconfirms the existence of exactly what it denies." "In my own case these recent events throw into particularly sharp relief all that I had found disappointing and, indeed, deeply unnerving, about the reaction of the senior administration to the *Chilly Climate Report* of which I am a co-author." "I am more deeply confirmed than ever in the conviction that things will not change without concerted, vocal, and uncompromising efforts on all our parts."
- 49 Alan Bass, "Grant for Video on Campus Sexism Called 'Vindication,'" *The London Free Press*, 8 May 1990.
- 50 Alison Uncles, "Colleges and Universities: 'Chilly Climate' Video Premiered in London," *The London Free Press*, 30 April 1991, p. B-7.