

---

# FAUW FORUM

FACULTY ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO NEWSLETTER

HTTP://WATSERV1.UWATERLOO.CA:80/ FACASSOC/

Number 99, March/April 2000

---

## FAUW ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Wednesday, April 5, 2000  
2:30 p.m., Physics 145

## FAUW ELECTION BALLOTS

due noon, Wednesday, April  
4, 2000

## RATIFICATION VOTE FOR ARTICLES 13 & 14 OF THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

closes noon, April 14, 2000

## FAUW STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS

### Academic Freedom & Tenure

Ray McLenaghan

### Compensation

Mohamed Elmasry

### Membership

John Wilson

### Pension & Benefits

Sandra Burt

### Political Relations

Len Guelke

### Status of Women & Inclusivity

Alicja Muszynski

---

## Inside:

New articles for M of A . . . . .	4
Looking back over three years . . . .	6
Book review . . . . .	8
Interview: Kieran Bonner . . . . .	9
New U of T president . . . . .	12

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE – THE TIME HAS INDEED COME

BY FRED MCCOURT

It's hard for me to realize that as of the upcoming Annual General Meeting (April 5) I shall have completed three years as President of the FAUW. Time has gone by very rapidly, and this message to you will thus be my last one, as I have decided not to run for a fourth term of office. There are several reasons why it is time for me to go. Perhaps the most compelling one from where I stand is that with all that has been happening at UW the past few years, the amount of time required for carrying out the duties of FAUW President properly has grown so considerably over the past three years that it has been taking up an increasing fraction of my time each and every week, despite the teaching relief that accompanies the position. Indeed, so much of my time has been seconded by this position that I have finally had to admit to myself that the continuation of my research program would be severely jeopardized if I continued to serve in this capacity for a fourth year. On top of that, of course, it's important that a person should be able to sense when the time is ripe to depart the scene.

Fortunately, my job as FAUW President was otherwise made relatively easy by all the help that I've enjoyed from past and present colleagues on the Board of Directors, and the particularly important role played by our sole staff member, Pat Moore. It has been largely due to the unselfishness of these individuals that I found myself serving for three years, rather than the one year that I had originally intended to serve when I first agreed to let my name stand.

Naturally, it's tempting to look back over my tenure in office and to review what the FAUW has achieved since May, 1997, when I took office. Unfortunately, I couldn't resist the temptation and, as a result, a brief review of what I consider to be the main accomplishments of the FAUW during my tenure as President also appears in this issue of the *Forum* (see p. 6).

The third round of Memorandum of Agreement negotiations

have been completed successfully during the past three weeks. The final form for Article 13, on "Faculty Salaries, Annual Selective Increases and Member Evaluation Procedures", was agreed upon last week. John Wilson (Political Science), Bill Power (Chemistry) and Lynne Taylor (History) were the members of the FAUW negotiating team, while Sujeet Chaudhuri (Dean of Engineering), Geoff McBoyle (Dean of Environmental Studies) and Harry Panjer (Statistics and Actuarial Science) made up the Board of Governors negotiating team. Agreement upon the final form for Article 14, on "Integrity in Scholarly Research", was achieved two weeks earlier. The FAUW team was the same, but the Board of Governors team in this case consisted of Alan George (Dean of Mathematics), Carolyn Hansson (Vice President, University Research), Mike Ross (Psychology), with Susan Sykes (ORA) substituting for Carolyn Hansson when she was unable to attend because of her heavy travel schedule. Both articles now require a ratification vote by all those whom FAUW represents and by the UW Board of Governors. Accordingly, as well as time allotted for discussion of these articles at the Annual General Meeting on April 5, we have scheduled two additional information sessions, one for March 29 and one for April 10 (the times and places are posted in the box on p.5) prior to the closing date of April 14, 2000. Ballots will be sent out from the Secretariat on or about April 3, for return to the Secretariat no later than 12:00 noon on April 14.

These two Articles are very important for all faculty members. In particular, Article 13 replaces and expands UW Policy 11 (Faculty Salaries). The texts of these Articles have been mounted on the FAUW Website, and can be found at:

<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca:80/~facassoc/>

If you can bear with me I would like to comment rather briefly on one or two highlights of each of these Articles. The most obvious, and very important, change introduced in Article 13 has been an opening up of the top end of the faculty salary scale, so that senior faculty members will now be able to reach salaries that are competitive with those attained by their peers at comparable Ontario universities. A second change is that the entire structure is no longer driven by the value of the floor salary for the Assistant Professor rank. This has allowed the Assistant Professor floor salary to be set at

\$45,000 in the new structure, which represents an increase of nearly \$5,000 over the present floor value. The entire structure still moves annually according to scale changes determined through salary negotiations. Clearly, the new salary structure has implications for all faculty members, and I therefore strongly urge everyone to find the time to read this document carefully. Article 14, while it has no fiscal implications for faculty members, does provide a good deal of protection for research activities. In particular, it carefully defines what constitutes misconduct in scholarly research, and what procedures are to be followed to deal with allegations of research misconduct by faculty members. It is thus also a document that deserves careful scrutiny. A more detailed description of what has been accomplished in these Articles that you are being asked to ratify in the upcoming vote can be found in this issue of the *Forum* (see p.4).

At the same time the Faculty Relations Committee has completed its deliberations on draft Policies 76 (Faculty Appointments) and 77 (Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members) that had their first readings at the January Senate meeting. FRC has received a number of comments and suggestions regarding these draft policies, and has taken a number of them into account in preparing them for second reading at the upcoming April meeting of Senate. Jim Kalbfleisch and I, as Co-Chairs of FRC, have sent a memorandum to Senators outlining the specific modifications that have been introduced into the draft policy documents by FRC. A copy of this memorandum, together with the revised draft policies, has been mounted on the Secretariat Website:

<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/draft/dpols.html>

If you have comments on these documents, I suggest that you contact one of the Senators with them, or plan to attend the Senate meeting itself, as Senate meetings are open to all members of the university community.

Two weeks ago I sent an e-mail message to all faculty members asking that serious consideration be given to supporting a letter to Prime Minister Chrétien requesting that he reject the report of the "Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research" and undertake to commission a new, more

balanced panel to bring in a new report. I want now to thank those of you who did send in your names to the CAUT to be added to that letter. Over 1400 individuals from across Canada have signed the letter to the Prime Minister, including 98 signatories from the University of Waterloo. The response from Waterloo was one of the strongest in the country. The Executive Director of CAUT, Jim Turk, has written to me to express the special thanks of the CAUT to all of us for the strong participation of Waterloo faculty. I want especially to thank the Federation of Students President, Christine Cheng, and Vice President, Education, Veronica Chau, who also signed the letter. They were the only student leaders in Canada who did so. It is truly gratifying to find student leaders who have such an appreciation of the concerns of researchers in general.

I would also like to comment briefly on a recent newspaper article, purportedly on the issue of academic freedom, that appeared in the *National Post* on Saturday, March 11. The article, with the title "Professors Meet Their Waterloo", made some statements with which I personally take issue. One particular reference is to a "palpable chill" to be found here, and talks of professors who "eat lunch at their desks, rather than venture forth into the faculty common rooms". These colleagues of ours are supposed to do this because they are afraid to speak their minds freely, and not because many of them are simply so busy with teaching, research and service tasks that they just cannot find the time that would be required to meet with their colleagues over lunch and participate in discussion or debate. One of my colleagues in the Chemistry Department, who could be considered to be one of its more outspoken individuals, is such an individual. He eats his lunch in his office most days of the week because it allows him to edit a manuscript, work on a lecture, or carry out some service task while he is eating; he has done this as long as I have known him, some twenty-eight years. He often gets his mixing time in after seminars or at the Grad Club on a Friday evening. Many of my colleagues are like that. This does not make them fearful.

Professor Len Guelke (Geography) is quoted in the *National Post* article as saying that "a lot of professors [at Waterloo] are very unhappy" and that they "don't want to

be targetted as troublemakers". Of course, no one wants to be targetted as a troublemaker, including me. But that doesn't mean that I won't speak out when I think that something is wrong. It seems that Professor Guelke and I differ in our opinions on just how fettered we are at Waterloo. Indeed, he has spoken out a number of times over the past several years, both through the *Forum* and at Senate, about what he has considered to be flawed processes at UW. In some cases he has been able to effect changes, and in other cases he has not been successful in motivating change, not because people were fearful, but rather, I believe, because he was not able to convince enough people that he was right. Indeed, the very fact that Professor Guelke and others have been able to speak out again and again about those processes with which they disagree, without being "punished" for their views either by the administration or by colleagues seems to me to speak volumes for the actual climate at UW.

I have to agree with Professor Guelke that some of our processes at Waterloo were flawed, in that clear and fully-defined procedures were not always in place. In my opinion many, but likely not all, of those flaws have been addressed, and to the best of my knowledge corrected, over the past few years through bilateral agreements between the FAUW and the University, both via Memorandum of Agreement negotiations with representatives of the UW Board of Governors and by meeting on a regular basis with senior members of the UW Administration at the Faculty Relations Committee. As examples of changes that have been introduced over the past three years by these processes, I cite the opening of access to external professional arbitrators through Article 9 (Grievance and Arbitration) of the Memorandum of Agreement, the provision of careful definitions of what is grievable, what can be considered to be research misconduct, which actions by faculty members are disciplinable, and the determination of what disciplinary actions can be taken by University officers. The University has adopted a Policy on Official Employment Files of Regular Faculty Members (UW Policy 75), and it has eliminated the infamous ad hoc "Ethics Committees" that in some cases only obfuscated the issues that they were supposed to resolve.

I cannot claim that there are no problems

remaining to be resolved at UW. Rather, I can and do claim that when new problems that need to be dealt with are identified, both the FAUW and the UW Administration have shown that they are willing to work together to resolve those issues in a fair and equitable manner. That to me is ultimately what being an active member of a faculty association is all about.

Let me finish this message by encouraging each FAUW member to vote for one of the candidates for FAUW President and to choose from the candidates for the five vacancies on the FAUW Board of Directors. Remember that we don't always manage to have enough candidates to hold a full election! I would also urge all faculty members to cast their ratification ballots for the new Articles for the Memorandum of Agreement.

*The FAUW Forum is a service for the UW faculty sponsored by the Association. It seeks to promote exchange of ideas, foster open debate on issues, publish a wide and balanced spectrum of views, and inform members about current Association matters. Opinions expressed in the Forum are those of the authors, and ought not to be perceived as representing the views of the Association, its Board of Directors, or of the Editorial Board of the Forum, unless so specified. Members are invited to submit letters, news items and brief articles. If you do not wish to receive the Forum, please contact the Faculty Association Office and your name will be removed from the mailing list.*

## New Memorandum of Agreement Articles

Over the past six months two new articles for the Memorandum of Agreement – on various aspects of faculty salary adjustment and on what we now call integrity in scholarly research – have been negotiated between the Association and the University, as promised by Article 12 of the original Agreement approved two years ago.

It will be necessary to hold an approval vote for these new components of the Agreement at some point before the end of April. The texts which have been agreed upon are now up on the Association's web page, and we hope everyone will take the time to examine that site to see what has been done. The comments provided here are intended only to describe very generally some of the more important aspects of the two new articles.

### **Article 13: Faculty Salaries, Annual Selective Increases and Member Evaluation Procedures**

The aim of the first part of this new article is to eliminate Policy 11 altogether, to amend its current provisions in a major way, and to move all of these into the Memorandum of Agreement. What has been agreed makes some very major changes in the faculty salary structure but we are certain that the new provisions will benefit everyone.

The old structure – based on F (the floor for Assistant Professors) – is abolished and is to be replaced by a different system which serves the same purpose of guaranteeing the orderly movement of faculty members through the salary structure over a period of years. This part of the new arrangements will come into force a year from now.

The text contains a table which sets out the basic components of the new system. Each of the ranks is to have a nominal floor and two points (thresholds)

at which the rules for awarding selective increases change. The floor for Assistant Professors is set at \$45,000 (nearly \$5,000 higher than at the moment) and the other floors bear a relation to this roughly the same as the present structure dictates. But this is less important than the fact that from now on all of these values – the floors and the thresholds – will be adjusted annually by the percentage value of the scale increase negotiated by the Association.

There is as well a flat sum of \$2,500 which is designated as the Selective Increase Unit (it can be compared roughly to a figure of approximately \$2,400 which is now in place) whose value will also be adjusted upward each year by the change in the negotiated scale increase. This number is to be used – in a manner specified in the article – to calculate the amount of money which will be put into the merit pool in each Faculty.

The thresholds for each rank stipulate the points in salary growth at which any faculty member's selective increase is calculated in a different way and in this sense are similar to the role now played by the measures 2.2F and 2.5F in determining the actual size of one's merit increment. What is new in this article is that the precise manner in which this adjustment – as well as the "feathering" which occurs as one moves across the threshold – is to take place is set out clearly in the text, as are the "rules" which are to be used for determining the actual size of the merit pool – bearing in mind that it must be able to accommodate **all** of the merit increments which have been awarded in a Faculty. Although these "rules" have been in use for many years they have never been explicitly stated before.

The second part of the new article sets out rules of procedure in annual evalua-

tions which will be new to several parts of the University. Here there are many new provisions which we believe will open up the process and result in more equitable decisions (to the extent that may not now be the case). This part of the new arrangements will apply to evaluations of performance in the current calendar year.

Each Faculty will now be required to have guidelines for evaluation which are known to all faculty members at the beginning of the evaluation year and which are consistent with the Memorandum of Agreement and with the new Policy 77.

The article makes a strong pitch for the existence in all departments and schools of performance evaluation committees which are elected by faculty members, and while it permits evaluations conducted only by chairs or directors there is a powerful implication intended by the language that the department as a whole must decide by majority vote to follow that route.

The numerical values of ratings for each of the three traditional forms of performance are now specified across the whole University (and will be different than the current practice in some Faculties) and labels for each value are in some cases new.

A new innovation (which has apparently always been available but has never been spelled out) has been added – the option of altering the traditional 40/40/20 weighting of the three performance areas, but not permitting any one of them to be less than 20 percent.

Rules have also been added for dealing with the situations presented by various kinds of absences – such as sabbatical leave, leave without pay, pregnancy, adoption, or parental leave, and new appointments who have not served the full calendar year.

Finally, Deans are now required to deal

at their level with salary adjustment disputes which cannot be solved in the department – there is, in short, a right of appeal which has not been explicitly set out in the past.

As part of these changes it will be necessary to make minor amendments to Article 10 of the Memorandum of Agreement, and the text for these is also posted on the Association web page.

#### **Article 14: Integrity in Scholarly Research**

This article is perhaps not as grand and sweeping in its application as Article 13 but it is no less important.

Its purpose is to define what constitutes misconduct in scholarly research, to deal with some of the more difficult aspects of this problem when it arises (such as the requirements for record-keeping), and most importantly to set out the procedures which are to be followed when an allegation of misconduct in research is made against a faculty member.

The definition may not satisfy everyone but we have tried to make it as broad and inclusive as possible, and in particular to identify those things which ought not to be regarded as misconduct in research.

We had some difficulty with the second part but we have achieved a reasonable balance where the University accepts some degree of financial responsibility for the cost involved in record-keeping where that is required because of allegations which have been made.

The part on procedures re-iterates much of what already exists in Articles 8 and 9 but introduces a concept which we need to put in Article 8 as well – the destruction of all documents pertaining to an investigation where it has been determined that the allegations are without foundation.

The new article also uses language

which imposes on the University an obligation to protect the reputations of faculty members who are wrongfully accused of misconduct in research and to discipline members of the University community who make unfounded allegations of research misconduct against faculty members.

## ON THE NEW ARTICLES FOR THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Wednesday, March 29 3:30 p.m. Physics 145  
Monday, April 10 3:30 p.m. Physics 145

The ratification vote on these articles will close on  
Friday, April 14, at noon.

---

---

## INFORMATION SESSIONS

### A personal view of FAUW activities during the past three years

*by Fred McCourt, President, FAUW*

At the time that I took office as FAUW President, the Association had recently come through what I would term a particularly difficult period, during which an initial attempt at negotiating a memorandum of agreement between the FAUW and the Board of Governors had foundered, with the consequence that relations with our senior administration appeared to have reached an all-time low. The lack of confidence in the UW senior administration then felt by the FAUW leadership had led them in turn to organize a certification drive. Unfortunately, the issue of certification itself was then, and likely still is, a somewhat controversial topic at UW, so that the certification drive generated a fair amount of heated discussion amongst and between supporters and opponents. The outcome was that the certification vote fell just short (by about 4%) of the required Bouchard majority.

At the urging of Ian Macdonald, who was then the FAUW President, I had become involved once again with the FAUW Board of Directors (after nearly seven years' absence), serving as Chief Salary Negotiator and Chair of the FAUW Compensation Committee from late 1996. By the beginning of 1997 the Board of Directors, of which I was by then a member, decided that the message to be derived from the outcome of the certification vote was that the FAUW had to start negotiations anew for a Memorandum of Agreement. Consequently, Ian Macdonald wrote to President Downey to propose that negotiations with representatives of the Board of Governors on the Memorandum of Agreement be re-opened. President Downey re-

sponded that the University would be prepared to try again, but for a number of reasons not until perhaps May of 1997. Because I felt that I could contribute constructively to the renegotiation process, I decided to allow my name to stand for FAUW President in February, 1997, when I was approached by the FAUW Elections Committee.

One of the first things that I had said that I would do as FAUW President was to attempt to re-establish a working relationship with the senior University Administration, and to that end I wrote early in May to President Downey to propose that we proceed with the appointment of our negotiating teams as soon as possible. He responded a short time later to welcome a restart of the negotiations, but for much the same reasons as before, he now felt that it would not be possible to do so until the upcoming Fall term. I accepted his arguments, and agreed to start them in September, 1997. During the summer I asked Professor John Wilson, who had already agreed to serve as FAUW Vice President, to take on the job of FAUW Chief Negotiator. He agreed to do so, and the rest is history. The negotiating teams were able to complete twelve of the nearly twenty articles in time for ratification (with a 94% approval rate!) by faculty in late April of 1998, and by the Board of Governors shortly thereafter.

In October, 1998 we held a separate ratification vote on the payment to the Association of an amount equivalent to FAUW dues by all those who are represented by the FAUW under the

Memorandum of Agreement. It was ratified with essentially a two-thirds majority of those voting (and representing a greater than 50% majority of the total faculty complement). Indeed, only two faculty members out of the 720 that the FAUW then represented applied to deflect their payments under the "bona fide religious objection" clause that had been included in the Memorandum of Agreement. One application was ultimately approved, while the other was not.

The twelfth article in the Memorandum of Agreement called for three additional stages of negotiation, namely a first such stage dealing with the FAUW proposal to represent Waterloo's professional librarians (Fall, 1998), a second stage dealing with articles on what was then termed "Fraud and Misconduct in Academic Research" and on "Member Evaluation and Selective Increments" (Spring, 1999), and finally, a third stage dealing with three economic articles on "Financial Exigency", "Program Redundancy", and "Layoffs" (Winter, 2000).

Thus, in the Fall of 1998 we began negotiations on the representation of UW professional librarians. These negotiations were stymied within a very few meetings, when the Board of Governors' negotiating team told our team that the FAUW "had not convinced them" of its case. While the VPA&P considered that these negotiations had been completed, I took the position that they had simply moved into limbo due to recalcitrance on the part of the Board of Governors negotiating team. I still believe that the position that the other side took was unreasonable. Our lack of success in "convincing" the UW senior administration that UW professional librarians should be represented by the FAUW remains my only regret.

Following the collapse of the Fall 1998 negotiations, some members of the Board of Directors feared that a response similar to that given in the librarian representation negotiations would be made to the remaining Memorandum of Agreement negotiations that were to follow in April 1999 and January 2000. Fortunately, those worries have proven to be unfounded since, as I have indicated in my January/February *Forum* message, the two negotiating teams have now successfully completed negotiations on Articles 13 and 14, "Faculty Salaries, Annual Selective Increases and Member Evaluation Procedures" and "Integrity in Scholarly Research", respectively. The Board of Governors team even broadened the negotiations on Article 13 by bringing in the issue of salary structure, thereby proposing to move a revision of UW Policy 11 over into the

Memorandum of Agreement. They did this partly because of their concern over the effect of the second breakpoint in the current salary structure, which tends to place too strong a damper on the salaries of senior faculty members, making them uncompetitive with those at other Ontario universities. I believe that the teams have found a resolution that will be of benefit to all faculty members, both junior and senior, new and long-term. These two articles will be coming forward within the next few weeks for ratification both by all those whom FAUW represents and by the UW Board of Governors.

Because the negotiations on Articles 13 and 14 took somewhat longer than was initially anticipated, I had agreed with VPA&P Kalbfleisch to postpone the final set of negotiations until those on Articles 13 and 14 were completed. Thus, we should be starting these negotiations in the coming Spring term (possibly in May). I have agreed to serve as the FAUW Chief Negotiator for these economic articles, and Professors Jim Brox (Economics) and Metin Renksizbulut (Mechanical Engineering) have agreed to serve as the other two members of the FAUW negotiating team. We do not yet know who will be representing the UW Board of Governors.

As I hope you can already see from what I've written above, your Association has been quite active in negotiating a comprehensive and fair-minded set of articles protecting the rights of faculty members at the University of Waterloo. We should all be grateful to the negotiating teams for being able to locate the common ground that is required in order to arrive at a just, fair and functional agreement.

There was, however, another front on which members of the Board of Directors were active, and that was at the Faculty Relations Committee (FRC). FRC meets every two weeks during the Fall and Winter terms, and roughly until the end of June. Alternate meetings of the FRC are chaired by the VPA&P and by the FAUW President, who serve as Co-Chairs. This is perhaps the most important committee at the University level so far as faculty members are concerned. It has responsibility for the development and approval of all new and the revision of all existing class F and class A Policies at UW, and has shared responsibility with the Staff Relations Committee for the development and approval of new and revision of existing class FS Policies. It is defined through UW Policy 1 (see also Article 4 of the Memorandum of Agreement). In particular, while both Senate and the Board of Governors must approve such Policies, if either of them wishes to cause an amendment to such a Policy, it must return the Policy to FRC with



reasons given for wishing the amendment to be made. It is the role of FRC to decide whether to make the amendment before returning the Policy to Senate or the Board of Governors. If Senate or the Board of Governors and FRC cannot reach agreement, then the Policy will ultimately have to be shelved. Finally, FRC is also the forum in which issues that affect faculty members can be brought forward for discussion and resolution either by the FAUW, by the Administration, or by request of individual members of the professoriate directly to FRC.

During the past three years FRC has introduced Policy 75 ("Official Employment Files of Regular Faculty Members") and converted Policy 63 ("Grievances") into Article 9 of the MofA, and has revised Policies 33 ("Ethical Behaviour"), 4 ("Benefits to Faculty and Staff Undertaking Part-Time Educational Programs"), 24 ("Tuition Benefits for Children of Faculty and Staff"), 38 ("Paid Holidays"), 10 (which became #66 "Use of University Resources and Affiliation"), and 14 ("Leaves Related to Pregnancy or Adoption"). In addition, at the request of the Staff Relations Committee, FRC agreed to revise Policies 40, 44, 45, 48, 50, and 68, applying to the selection of Department Chairs, the Dean of Graduate Studies, Faculty Deans, the Vice President Academic, and Provost, the President, and the Vice President, University Research, respectively, to in order to provide increased levels of staff representation on the selection commit-

tees.

Finally, during the past twelve months Policies 46 ("Promotion") and 53 ("Tenure") have been completely revised, and are being replaced by new Policies 76 ("Faculty Appointments") and 77 ("Promotion and Tenure of Faculty Members"). These two Policies have been in circulation in draft form for commentary and feedback since the beginning of January, and based upon feedback received by the end of January, FRC has been working on revisions to these Policies. It is intended that they will be sent to Senate for a second reading at the April meeting of Senate.

When I look back on all of this, it appears to me that we have had a busy and productive period of faculty-administration cooperation. Indeed, the Vice President Academic, and Provost, Jim Kalbfleisch, has taken great care to keep me abreast of happenings at UW, and has shown a willingness to work with the FAUW to resolve various issues that have been raised from time to time. He and I have not always agreed on all issues, but we have always been able to sit down together, have a productive discussion of them, and in many cases be able to arrive at meaningful solutions. From my own perspective, it has been a productive and useful three years, and in this sense it has been a pleasurable experience to have served as FAUW President during this very active period.

# *BOOK REVIEW*

## **The Real World of Technology**

**Ursula M. Franklin**

**Anansi, 1999, \$16.95**

In this revised edition of her previously-published CBC Massey Lectures of 1989, Ursula M. Franklin marks the ten years since their delivery by adding four additional chapters to the original six lectures, thus bringing up to date her observations on technology and its effect on our daily lives.

The original series of lectures sketched out how the division of labour inherent in moving historically from one-person holistic technical processes to conveyor-belt team production processes threatens to produce a culture of "conformity and compliance," breaking down the reciprocity of human relationships and leading to isolation of the individual. At the same time, the modern media, by purveying "pseudorealities" that substitute images for direct experiences, produce "pseudocommunities" that discuss common (mediated)

perceptions — while only rarely motivating individuals to form communities capable of taking political action based on these perceptions. Moreover, the funnelling of public monies into corporate infrastructure increasingly relegates indivisible benefits (in other words, the public good) to a secondary position, emphasizing instead divisible benefits, in the form of private profits, and therefore competition rather than cooperation. To keep this process going, technological innovations are constantly introduced into society, initially trumpeted as liberating but ultimately producing only a new form of dependence. The only conceivable response, in Franklin's original summation, was to keep alive grassroots forms of protest.

Franklin's new chapters add a more detailed analysis of the electronic communications technologies which have developed so rapidly since the lectures first appeared. Computers, "today's scribes," have allowed forms of communication to develop that, despite their apparently liberating convenience and speed, exacerbate the breakdown of reciprocity in human relationships by adding the further disruptive element of asynchronicity. The possibility of asynchronous communication via e-mail promotes the spread of globalization, and with it, corporatization, on the fertile, timeless and borderless field of cyberspace. What Franklin calls the "bitsphere" threatens to supplant the "biosphere" — which is, in fact, the "real world" in which we must live, and in which we interact with technology. At the same time, however, the potential of these communication technologies to aid democratization and protest demonstrates that the bitsphere can also supplement the biosphere. The decision, finally, is up to us.

A German-trained physicist who specializes in the metallurgy of ancient Chinese bronzes, and a Quaker with strong ties to feminism, Franklin expertly juggles facts from ancient history and modern anthropology with references to Kant, Camus and Herbert Marcuse without ever becoming obscure. The breadth of knowledge and experience in this book is expressed both accessibly and with impressive eloquence, style and wit; as a result, not only Franklin's interdisciplinary interests but also her intelligence and her compassion come through on every page. Readers who embrace the corporatization and globalization of society (and many people have compelling reasons to do so) will undoubtedly find this book lightweight, dewy-eyed and naive; for anyone who regards these processes with skepticism or dismay, however, *The Real World of Technology* will likely prove lively and uplifting both in its graceful form and in its optimistic content.

*Paul M. Malone*  
*Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures*

# ***Waterloo, A Complex Reality: A Newcomer's View***

*As guest Interview Editor of the Forum, Vera Golini met in late January with Dr. Kieran Bonner, newly appointed Dean and Vice-President of St. Jerome's University, which has been federated with the University of Waterloo since 1959. Unfortunately, publication of the interview was delayed from the January/February issue to the March/April issue. Dr. Bonner has looked over this interview to make sure it accurately reflects his views. The title was suggested by Dr. Bonner.*

*Dr. Kieran Bonner*

---

VG: Thank you very much, Kieran, for agreeing to this interview. This is a rather unique occasion not only because you are the very first person from St. Jerome's to be interviewed for the *FAUW Forum*, but also because you are the first St. Jerome's Dean ever to come from outside. Perhaps this interview is our way of welcoming you and introducing you to our broader university community.

KB: Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity of being able to do this. There's a celebration of many firsts here and I appreciate the opportunity you're giving me to talk to you and to the *Forum* readers.

VG: You just took on your new post in July, and now that the six months' "honeymoon" is over, how does it feel to be working at St. Jerome's as Academic Dean and Vice-President? Have you and your family "settled in" yet?

KB: Okay. Let me take the latter part of that first, the family situation. The decision to move here was major, so it's been very unsettling family-wise. When you have three kids who at that time were 19, 17 and 15, that's a big disruption. We gave up the home we'd lived in for the longest

time ever as a family and the many friends we had in Camrose, Alberta. That makes it a huge jump. We're still realizing the dramatic nature of that move and we're in the process of getting settled. The kids are in school; Roisin is here in Drama and English. She's registered here at St. Jerome's. Of everyone, she has adjusted easily and the best; it's been a very good move for her. For Maeve and Devin it's been a little more difficult because they've gone into high school. There are very few teenage groups that go around with "vacancies" in the group where they could welcome strangers.

VG: In fact the opposite may be true.

KB: The opposite is true, so that's been difficult for them, you know, especially having left some very close knit friends. And then there's Margaret just dealing with the whole challenge of trying to help support the family side of things as I've been trying to get used to the job situation here. It's been challenging. But we've just bought a house, just bought it last Monday evening, in fact. We'll be moving down to Lydia and Pandora in Kitchener. Once we get settled into our own place we'll almost have gone through a year. The kids have now settled in

a bit more, and it's less difficult for them now than it was when they first came here. That side is starting to settle down; it is taking time and it's taking a lot longer than I expected. But, as the Irish say, I was expecting that.

VG: Well, it may take at least a year.

KB: Yes, that part of it. On the other hand I've been immersing myself in the workings of St. Jerome's and the University of Waterloo, trying to get to know the situation here, talking to lots of people and again feeling a little more comfortable with the rhythm of the job now than I was in the beginning. All in all actually, it's been an interesting challenge, but very demanding.

VG: Time wise, and the intensity of the work, I guess.

KB: The intensity of the work and the number and the range of areas I have to get involved in, how you can, in any one day, have to deal with six different areas and get to the depths in all of them. So that means keeping a lot of balls in the air – all at the same time.

VG: Seems you have quite a lot in your hands.

KB: Yes, very much so.

VG: How are you finding the working and administrative arrangement with the three Colleges affiliated and St. Jerome's federated with the University of Waterloo? There is also Laurier just a mile away. And we live in what we call the "twin-cities." Are you getting things sorted out gradually?

KB: It's very, very complex and that's been quite different from what I was used to working at a small university in Alberta.

VG: At Augustana?

KB: At Augustana, where it's autonomous and discrete – both physically and in terms of its own governance – and also the fact that it's in a smaller town means that there is also lots of interaction with the community on and off work. Then I come here and have to understand the federated relation between the University of Waterloo and St. Jerome's University – which has its own demands, because you have two autonomous institutions that have entered into a fully co-operative relation, which means that

the students who register at St. Jerome's get a University of Waterloo degree. This requires a lot of co-operation and involvement. But I think it is a great thing, you know, and I was trying to think of a model for this. It's similar to how things are evolving in the European Union, as you know, because you have countries that are independent and are now trying to collaborate more closely in terms of working out the monetary system and individual country passports, which can also be European passports.

VG: And access to jobs.

KB: Yes, the ability to be able to work in different areas. It's analogically similar to what's happening here. So, I do think that this is a very interesting arrangement that Waterloo has; it's kind of contemporary with what's developing in other areas of the world.

VG: Like universities without borders.

KB: Yes, in some ways, our two universities are highly fluid and porous in borders and identity. And then there are the other affiliated Colleges across the creek who are all collaborating and working together as well. So there are many, many different complexities in relation to independent institutions trying to work together. Problems will naturally come up because it isn't just one large streamlined organization. It seems quite decentralized here, which I think is a good thing.

VG: Waterloo has a great reputation for that. So, we seem to have features of the global village here already?

KB: Yes, that's right. And for me that makes for a lot to catch up on, you know, because it's catching up with St. Jerome's, the other affiliates and Waterloo – all in their own right – then there's the relation between all of them. I'm looking forward to getting to know Wilfrid Laurier a bit more. I have a sense of what it's like. I'm going to give a talk there, so that will be another opportunity for me to be physically around there and see what that's like.

VG: You spoke of the European Union before. You are essentially a European,

being of Irish background and Irish roots. And myself being of Italian roots, I was just wondering what brought you to Canada initially.

KB: What brought me to Canada initially was to do graduate work at York University. It's connected with the kind of sociology I do, which integrates contemporary developments in philosophy, especially in continental philosophy, these being phenomenology and hermeneutics. A sociology was being constructed out of those developments called Analysis, centered at York University, and led by Professors Alan Blum and Peter McHugh. They had published some books that I had studied in my undergraduate days at Trinity College in Dublin. I was in my last year and I thought, gee, if I was ever going to do graduate work I'd like to do it in this kind of area. First, I took a three-year hiatus where I was working in construction in San Francisco one year and Alaska for two years, just paying off student debts, being adventurous, you know, and combinations of things like that. Then – at this stage Margaret and I were together and married – we agreed to come to York for me to do a Master's in Analytic Sociology. We then had intended to go back to Ireland. Then I got involved in Analysis and I got really excited about it and I thought this is the kind of work I want to do, because it combined my interests of studying people with—how can I put it – asking bigger questions, bigger theoretic questions, you know. I was here initially as a foreign student, and then Margaret and I had our three children. They were born in Toronto as I was starting to pursue a Ph.D. Then we decided maybe we should think of Canada as a place where we were going to live. And so, after a time, we applied to become landed immigrants. Then I got my Ph.D. I taught at York for a short while, and then a job came up at Augustana, so I went to Augustana and stayed there for 12 years before coming here.

VG: I find your thoughts on your work very engaging. Would you mind elaborating on your field of study?

KB: Sure. It's a kind of applied social theory that looks at and emphasizes human action and human interpretations. It

looks at the assumptions that undergird all understanding – every understanding is grounded in assumptions – all kinds of assumptions, be they scientific, philosophical, or everyday. What phenomenological sociology does is look at these assumptions underlying everyday knowledge/action and see how everyday society is held together. This is done by examining what everyone is expected to know as they go about doing the tasks that they do. When these taken-for-granted are uncovered, it can be seen that some are claims to reality, but some are normative claims about what should be. So this is a way of doing inquiry that teases out the ethical component built into knowledge. The kind of work I do tries to bring out this ethical component built into the assumptions that sustain all knowledge-seeking and knowledge-building kind of work – whether it's everyday knowledge, scientific knowledge, philosophical knowledge, sociological knowledge. That would be the broad approach. I've applied that in my work, and I've published in the area of sociological theory. For example, I will be doing a presentation at WLU on Hannah Arendt. She's one of the contemporary writers who has influenced me quite a lot in my own writing, in my own thinking, and in my own research. I've taken some of those contemporary developments, and have examined two particular areas. One is parent-child relations, and the other, the urban-rural debate. What would parent-child relations look like when I apply this kind of way of looking at things? How do they appear? How does the literature appear? I will be speaking to some of these issues at my St. Jerome's Centre talk on March 3rd. In regards to the other research area, when we moved out to Alberta many people said to us – because we had three young kids at the time – that Camrose will be a great place to raise kids. So over the course of five or six years – and with a small research grant – I took that up as a research question. What would it mean to turn that statement, "This is a great place to raise kids," into a research question? What goes into that question? Is it true; is it not true? What would it mean to count this true? What does it mean when we say we are raising children well? What

is the conception of a well-raised person? In what way does that conception carry some cultural assumptions and implications, and how can these be critically examined? So that became another work examining the urban-rural debate around that issue of raising children.

VG: And did that give rise to a publication?

KB: Yes, with McGill-Queen's University Press, a book called *A Great Place to Raise Kids: Interpretation, Science and the Urban-Rural Debate*. Part of the book is about how you would examine that question. What methods would help, and what methods would be limiting? So, as well, methodology is subject to examination throughout the book.

VG: If we now return to St. Jerome's, I was

curious about what inspired you to come here to take up this position, and perhaps your past administrative experiences.

KB: Well, one of the advantages of working at a smaller place is that you have opportunities to take on different kinds of administrative and teaching situations. I was the senior member of the Sociology Department from the third year on – by virtue of people leaving and coming. I got involved with a very interesting group of new faculty who were hired around the same time and we founded a journal there called *Dianoia: An Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts Journal*. I was co-editor of that for five years, and then editor for

(continued on p. 13)

## New U of T president known as supporter of social equity

by Paul Malone

*Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures*

The incoming president of the University of Toronto, Robert Birgeneau, is an award-winning physicist; but he may be better-known for the results of his tenure as Dean of Science at MIT, according to a *Toronto Star* article of Jan. 3. It was during his term that 15 senior women faculty — the only tenured women out of over 200 in the prestigious institute's school of science — complained of systemic discrimination on the basis of their gender. Birgeneau, to their surprise, not only heard them out but also set up a committee which examined the situation and concluded that the women's complaints had merit, initiating a series of reforms which included adding to the number of tenured women faculty and increasing both the salaries and the laboratory space of women on staff. MIT reported these results of the committee's work in an edition of its faculty newsletter.

Critics, particularly psychologist Judith S. Kleinfeld's report published by the conservative *Independent Women's Forum*, have protested that the MIT committee, which included the complainants, kept the data that led to these reforms confidential; but everyone has agreed that, for better or worse, morale and job satisfaction among senior women faculty have generally

improved. Moreover, an article in the 3 December issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* claims that as a result of the actions Birgeneau took at MIT, other top-ranking American universities, such as Harvard and UCLA, have likewise been driven to a rigorous self-examination of their treatment of women faculty. Even U of T, which went through a review process in 1991 which adjusted women faculty's salaries, is apparently ready to celebrate Birgeneau's accession with a further review of laboratory space allotment, according to Bill Graham, head of the U of T faculty association, who is quoted in the *Star* as saying, "[Birgeneau's] example is one people will want to see carried out here." Graham added that ethnic diversity among faculty should also be addressed; as Kristin Rushowy, author of the *Star* article, points out, such a review may indeed occur, since Birgeneau also has a long history of activism in this regard — going back to his days as a Yale doctoral student. Birgeneau himself has recently suggested that U of T administrators who do not share his concern for equity "may as well step down."

Whether Birgeneau, as head of Ontario's flagship university, will actively pursue this concern at the provincial level, or whether

the mere fact that such a review at U of T, should it occur, will exert pressure on other Ontario universities to follow suit, remains to be seen.

Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT. Vol. IX, No. 4 (Mar. 1999). Available on the Web at <http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/Fnlwomen.htm>.

## References

Kleinfeld, Judith S. "MIT Tarnishes Its Reputation with Gender Junk Science." Dec. 1999. Available on the Web at <http://www.uaf.edu/northern/mitstudy/>.

Miller, D.W. "In Candid Language, MIT Report Concludes That Female Professors Face Bias." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 2 Apr. 1999: A18.

*The MIT Faculty Newsletter*. Special Edition: A

Rushowy, Kristin. "The Science of Listening." *Toronto Star* 3 Jan. 2000. Available on the Web at [http://www.thestar.com/back\\_issues/ED20000103/news/999000103NEW07-CI-PREZ3.html](http://www.thestar.com/back_issues/ED20000103/news/999000103NEW07-CI-PREZ3.html).

Wilson, Robin. "An MIT Professor's Suspicion of Bias Leads to a New Movement for Academic Women." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 3 Dec. 1999: A16.

\*\*\*\*\*

## REMINDER

**Cast your vote in the FAUW election by noon Tuesday, April 4.  
A new president and five directors will be elected.**

\*\*\*\*\*

(Continued from p. 11)

another three years. Then when Augustana went through its first presidential search in 28 years, I was one of the two faculty members on that presidential search committee. I was also Chair of the division of History, Sociology and Political Studies – Augustana has Divisions rather than departments. At that time, Augustana started up a new Division of Interdisciplinary Studies and International Programs, and I was its first Chair. My task was to set up the administrative procedures to accommodate this new division within the existing collegial structure of Augustana, to monitor existing programs and also to facilitate the review and development of new international and interdisciplinary programs. By the time I left, we had six interdisciplinary degrees at Augustana. Our international programs in Mexico and Cuba were the main ones, plus, we had exchanges with France, Germany, and Norway. And it was a lot to try and bring all of that under one umbrella so that it would facilitate things for people who were involved in these programs and also for the administration of them.

VG: Quite a lot to manage!

KB: That's what I was doing before I came here. Now, what inspired me to consider this post? Many things. I've always had an interest in getting involved in graduate programs. Augustana is an undergraduate university. As well, I had thought that I would, at some point in my career, give a deaconal position a try because various people at Augustana had encouraged me to think along those lines. However, I thought it would be much later in my career. Another thing, too–this may sound quirky, following on the five quirky moments, I was interested in being a little closer to Ireland, my home, because...

VG: Oh, that's right, here you're only eight hours away.

KB: Yes, and a direct flight. I mean, there's no direct flight from Edmonton. Here you can go Toronto-Dublin.

VG: That's important when you have a family.

KB: Because there are five of us, being so far away is quite inconvenient. My wife and I are both from Ireland and all our relatives are back there. We don't have any family in Canada at all. The

opportunity to be a little closer facilitates the back and forth not only for me, but also for Margaret and the children.

VG: Easier connections.

KB: Yes, for all of us. When this job came up I thought I would I just send in an application and see what would happen. I wasn't edging to get out of Augustana. There were certain positive things that were pulling me away from Augustana but there was also a very good work situation there. It had been great. I started a journal, sustained it for eight issues, a great interdisciplinary collaboration, interdisciplinary context, and I'm very steeped in and dedicated to the liberal arts. But there were a lot of things that made St. Jerome's particularly interesting. It's a smaller place. I can bring some of the benefits that I had at Augustana, and also have access to other things that I wouldn't have had there. That made the St. Jerome's situation particularly attractive to me: the smaller community, the collegiality, the opportunity to talk to people from other disciplines, and at the same time involvement in the larger Waterloo context.

VG: Talking about people, I just wondered if you had a few words to say about students at Waterloo, how you find them compared to other students that you have known in other countries or provinces?

KB: Interesting. I have been teaching for only five weeks, and a sociologist is always hesitant to make generalizations; but I can make some anecdotal observations. I find the students quite willing to participate and they seem less reserved, though they also focus on the technicalities (exams, assignments, etc.) of the course more. But it is very early to comment on this.

VG: The thought of students naturally brings to mind the question of fees and funding for postsecondary education. I was wondering whether you could comment on funding in Alberta universities and Ontario universities. As an administrator, are you experiencing the narrowness of funding and how is that affecting your work?

KB: You remember Ralph Klein was elected in Alberta in 1993, I believe. He was the

first, I think, among the premiers to move toward getting rid of the deficit, cutting back on the social services, in health and education. So, in some ways, Alberta went through this already. Now it's coming out of it and they're putting more money back into the system. But for over three years in a row there was a 7% cut from the university budgets, a 21% total, which was a huge cut in funding. It's come now to Ontario. Both are also obsessed with targeted technological training as against education. The difficulty with Ontario is that the universities are under tremendous pressures and what seems to me to be particular about the Harris situation is that they're so reluctant to let people know what they're doing. We don't even know what the funding is going to be for the increase in student population, which means it's very difficult to project plans for budgets. The interest seems to be pushing it to the wire instead of letting us know so that we can make a long term plan. The echo boom has already started this year, with the increase in enrolment here at Waterloo and at St. Jerome's, and still now we're unsure as to what the government is going to do.

VG: So this kind of predicament affects everyone, the big universities, the smaller universities, the colleges. . . .

KB: Yes it's felt everywhere. Clearly, it's felt in a larger way at the larger university. With our equity agreement, we are teaching more at St. Jerome's. And in fact we are teaching many more University of Waterloo students than we are St. Jerome's students. It's an important factor, you know, when the student population goes up in the University of Waterloo and in Arts, that has implications for our teaching, and what we're going to be doing here, just as much as when the student population at St. Jerome's goes up.

VG: Well, in light of all this unpredictability, is there room for real growth? Do you have a "vision" for St. Jerome's in terms of spiritual and academic enhancement?

KB: I took a lot of initiatives when I was at Augustana. They're all initiatives in the context of the opportunities that Augustana offered like the interdisciplinary teaching, the start of the



journal, working on the curriculum, etc. I said to myself, when I was going to come here that I wanted a better sense both of what the St. Jerome's and the University of Waterloo's situation is. I needed first to be clear on what initiative I could best develop out of that context – I mean, of my encounter with the experience I bring to St. Jerome's, and University of Waterloo culture. Given that I've quite a bit of experience in Interdisciplinary Studies and Interdisciplinary Programs: I'm interested in those areas. I have a few ideas about developing an interdisciplinary studies program in particular in relation to how St. Jerome's can contribute to that. Right now we're exploring the Sexuality, Marriage and the Family Program and bringing that forward to a degree-granting stage. I have other ideas for other interdisciplinary studies initiatives; I would like them to be based on true interdisciplinarity, as I am interested in their having an integrative component in them, so that students get a chance to pull things together as against taking a collection of courses. I've had some very good conversations with Dr. Bruce Mitchell about the difference between multidisciplinary and interdisciplinarity, on how interdisciplinarity involves some integration, some sense of a core which pulls themes and concepts together as well as taking courses from different disciplines. But, also, I've a strong interest in the liberal arts, in the revived and revitalized liberal arts – the concept of the liberal arts, that is, when it's true to its own spirit. It can connect with contemporary culture and connect with contemporary issues. Basically, the idea of a liberal arts education is an education for life. Now, a job is one part of our life. So, you do need to be educated for a job, and liberal arts does this. But we also have our communities, the relations we have with others, the involvement with civic life, the involvement in social justice issues. No matter what kind of person you're going to be, and what kind of job you're going to have, presumably you're going to have some family life. You're going to have some connection with neighbours and community. Then a liberal arts education should connect you with that, and connect you with what is the best

that the tradition can offer us when we encounter difficult dilemmas. Not that a liberal arts education gives us an answer to life; but it can at least help us by showing how different dilemmas were responded to in the past. Now we have to look at it anew, and see what new kinds of answers we can develop.

VG: Something that can sensitize us to all the various alternatives that can be open to us?

KB: That's right. And so, for that reason, I would like to help St. Jerome's develop its curricular uniqueness while still fully collaborating with the University of Waterloo.

VG: And also with Renison, perhaps, in the future, if the projected plans for sharing a common or joint building will be realized?

KB: Yes. An application has gone forward about the Learning Centre, the collaborative project with Renison, equipped with classrooms, a library facility, and various other options. Right now that's with the SuperBuild program. It's an example of the kind of collaboration that can happen here. It continues to be developed on the ecumenical level and at an inter-university level. And presumably, whether this building gets funded or not, that collaboration will still be built on. Now the issue of whether the Learning Centre gets funded or not is with the government, and we have to wait and see. *[Editor's note: Since this interview, we now know that the St. Jerome's/Renison Learning Centre was not successful with the SuperBuild Program.]*

VG: It's all part of the overall philosophy of collaboration, inclusion and sharing . . .

KB: A particularly good opportunity for different denominations sharing the Christian faith and for the two different denominations to show that they work together – literally side by side. We have a similar interest also with the focus on teaching and on the liberal arts. The collaborative experiences and culture had already been well established with Renison even before the idea of this building came forward. So now, even if the government decides not to fund it, it's just a demonstration of

the further kinds of initiatives that can and will happen, at least at the local level of collaboration.

VG: Well, as we come near the end of our interview, I was just wondering if you could say a few words on what research projects you might be involved with.

KB: The one that's coming up is the Multi-Collaborative Research Initiative funded by SSHRC. Last year I think there were six projects funded across Canada. They involve faculty from many disciplines and from many universities coming together to collaborate on a common project. I'm part of a team that's involved in researching the culture of cities. The project director is at York. But it's made up of people from York, McGill, Concordia, the University of Calgary, UQAM in Quebec, and so on, and now St. Jerome's University, Waterloo. We've just received word that our application has been successful. The Minister of Industry, Manley, should be making a public announcement of this project any day now. It will examine how cities retain a culture in light of all the many changes they are going through right now. We will study four cities.

VG: Which are they?

KB: Toronto, Montreal, Dublin and Berlin. Over five years we will look at the ways they manage to sustain identity through a variety of practices like architecture, neighbourhoods, the circulation of artefacts, citizenship, and so on. I'm one of 23 researchers and I'm on the executive team as well. That will probably be my major research focus for the next five years.

VG: That will give you plenty to do. Do you have any free time in your life now?

KB: Well, I find that most of my time is now devoted to this job, obviously, particularly coming in brand new to a very demanding task. Then family life is also very important in terms of adjusting to this new experience. So, right now, family and work dominate my time.

VG: Do you enjoy sports?

KB: Because of my son, I've taken up golf and I enjoy it. My son just bought his own clubs with his first few pay checks from a part-time job he has here.

Actually, I come from a family of sports people. My brothers are nationally known in Ireland in the game called hurling. It's supposedly one of the oldest games in the world. Somebody has claimed to have traced a reference to this game being played in 1200 B.C. It goes way back and it's a very, very competitive national sport in Ireland. I had three brothers who played on a championship team in Ireland. My sister has also played the women's version of that game. She was captain of the Tipperary team and has an all-Ireland medal and cup. My family is very athletic. I'm the exception.

VG: A fascinating exception, I'd say. Well then, to conclude, what are your general impressions of the place where you are working now and its people. Are you liking it?

KB: Oh, yes. I would say St. Jerome's is a caring community, very caring, very friendly. They're very interested in each other, in the health of each other, and it's very collegial; it all makes for an interesting situation. When you're working in a smaller place where people care for each other, that means they're also more involved with each other. It makes for an interesting, different kind of dynamic than you would have at a larger place where people come and go and they're a little more detached. There's a different kind of effervescence that happens in a smaller place in terms of personality than would happen at a larger place. And that's always interesting to come across that effervescence. The people have been very, very welcoming here and concerned. As we go through our tribulations of trying to find a home and a school for the kids, I very much see that people are caring and concerned. At UW too, everyone from the president on down has been very sympathetic to our predicament. People are friendly here, though in a more reserved way – as compared to out west where they take a few more risks interpersonally. But apart from that difference between east and west, we have been very pleased with the many offers of help we have received.

VG: I would like to thank you very, very much, Kieran, on behalf of the FAUW

*Forum* readers, and especially all the staff at St. Jerome's. I hadn't as yet had the chance to talk with you at length, so I really appreciate your time and your openness.

KB: Thank you, Vera, and my thanks to your

editorial board for the invitation. This is a great opportunity. I enjoy reading the *Forum* and look forward to it when it comes out.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ***ANNOUNCEMENT***

***THE FAUW FORUM IS PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE THAT EDWARD VRSCAY OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS WILL BECOME EDITOR EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000. HE SUCCEEDS VERA GOLINI WHO HAS SERVED AS EDITOR SINCE 1996. THE EDITOR OF THE FORUM IS APPOINTED BY THE FAUW BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A ONE-YEAR RENEWABLE TERM.***

### ***EDITORIAL BOARD***

***VERA GOLINI (WOMEN'S STUDIES/ST. JEROME'S UNIVERSITY, VGOLINI WATARTS), EDITOR***

*Anu Banerji ( (Architecture/Planning, abanerji@fes)*

*Andrew Hunt (History, aehunt@watarts)*

*Paul Malone (Germanic & Slavic Languages & Literatures, pmalone@artsmail)*

*Jeffrey Shallit (Computer Science, SHALLIT GRACELAND)*

*Lynne Taylor (History, ltaylor@watarts)*

*David Williams (Optometry, williams@sciborg)*

*Fred McCourt (Chemistry, mccourt@theochem), ex officio*

*Pat Moore (Faculty Association Office, facassoc@watserv1), Production*