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1.0 Introduction

This project is a microanalysis of a private graduate student electronic mailing list. The mailing list is private in the sense that subscribers are restricted to Master’s and Ph.D. candidates in the Division of Humanities from Maple Leaf University, a large metropolitan university in Canada. From observations I have been able to make of approximately six months of archived messages, the tone of the mailing list generally fosters collegiality and serves as a tool for disseminating information relevant to humanities graduate students; however, an ethic of camaraderie among colleagues does not always reign.\footnote{I examine one such interruption of collegiality, and how participants attend to it.} I initially gained access to the mailing list by virtue of being part of the division of Humanities. My interest in what was said on the mailing list was piqued when Jennifer, an acquaintance, began discussing with me her experience of what she believed to be silencing by male colleagues on the list. Upon my expressed interest in analyzing Jennifer’s anecdotal report of having been silenced, I secured the informed consent to make public the messages of those who participated in a series of exchanges that occurred during a five-day time frame and six-hundred and eleven lines of text. I selected these particular dates and text for analysis because the discourse that occurred during this span is rife with conflict and negotiation as participants attempt to communicate and interpret messages without the paralinguistic cues they have otherwise come to know one another by in their face-to-face interactions.

2.0 Details about the Medium

At the time of my analysis a total of thirty students subscribe to the humanities mailing list, ten of whom are women and twenty of whom are men. Of those subscribed, one third are ‘lurkers’ (in other words, have never posted a message to the list). The mailing list is unmoderated, therefore messages may be sent by anyone who is subscribed to it. Not only are messages are not filtered by a moderator, but also any humanities graduate student can subscribe to the list by sending a message to one of two list owners. The mailing list operates on a Maple Leaf University (hereafter, MLU) mail server.

3.0 Silence, Negotiation and Context

I analyze the text of the messages in question with the goal of examining how Jennifer’s silence enables her to resist ideological frames that aim to render her incapable of accurately reconstructing her own personal experience. Thus far I do not have a full-bodied account of the ideological frame through which Jennifer’s initial message to the mailing list is understood and dismissed. Tentatively, the ideological frame can be loosely characterized as one that reinforces women’s silence in spaces where male dominance is challenged.
In my analysis of the mailing list data, I borrow from Emanuel Schegloff’s (2001) analysis of how silence functions in conversation. Of particular interest is the idea that when an utterance does not receive the uptake one may have expected, she or he has to fill in the space to conceal the fact that the intended respondent’s talk is relevantly missing. A situation arises on the humanities mailing list when Stanislav sends a message to the list that is not taken up as a conversational topic by those to whom it is addressed (namely, Jennifer and Wes). Stanislav recognizes that uptake is essential to give his message force and when his message does not get taken up as a topic of discussion he flames those to whom the ignored message was directed in an attempt to conceal the relevant silence that renders his message conversationally impotent.

In lines 191-219, it can be seen that Stanislav’s mockery of Jennifer and Wes fails to incite humour because he demeans a serious issue for the members of the community who orient to it as such; his flame is poorly crafted and unoriginal, as he uses Jennifer’s and Wes’s exact words against them to demonstrate that they are just as wrong as the doctor they take issue with; and Stanislav’s flame comes after over 48 hours of having posted a message which receives no uptake, thus demonstrating he has noticed the relevant silence and must insert himself back into the conversation as someone who demands attention, albeit negative, from the rest of the group.

The discourse that comes before the flame Stanislav directs at Jennifer and Wes is particularly relevant because the previous style of response is explicitly pro-social, supportive, and even coded as feminine. I describe the style of Kalvin and Wes’s messages, in response to Jennifer’s initial post about her experience of being made to feel uncomfortable during a visit to an on-campus doctor, as symbolically coded as feminine and in stark contrast to those produced by Stanislav, because Kalvin and Wes perform the emotional labour of being empathetic to Jennifer’s feelings and anticipating her need for support. In return, Jennifer explicitly shows positive politeness to Wes and Kalvin by expressing gratitude and orienting to the tone of their respective messages (in Kalvin’s case the tone is humourous, whereas in Wes’s the tone is serious).

It is interesting to note that Jennifer responds to Stanislav’s initial request, in lines 23-37 of the appendix, for further explanation of the “relevance” of her initial message to the mailing list about what occurred at the doctor’s office. However, when Stanislav’s tone becomes more patently adversarial and he not only challenges Jennifer’s reconstruction of her personal experience, but goes so far as to state that it is not accurate, she does not give his message uptake. When Jennifer does not respond to Stanislav’s second and more verbally aggressive message, the consequence is that the sort of identity he can perform is circumscribed and his positive face wants are left unfulfilled. Jennifer’s lack of response to Stanislav’s claim (that her reconstruction of the events occurring in the doctor’s office were inaccurate) is an indication that she is not obligated to give his message uptake because he disregards her positive face wants and is more generally impolite. After all, since Stanislav was not present with Jennifer at the doctor’s appointment, Jennifer seems to be in a far better position to recount the events that occurred. Again, in an effort to insert himself back into the conversation, after his message goes without uptake for two days, Stanislav resorts to inventing for himself a speaking position as the doctor in the examination room with Jennifer. This move demonstrates an attempt, on the part of Stanislav, to elevate himself to a position of power and authority over Jennifer in a manner similar to that of the medical doctor in question.
4.0 Herring and CMC Research

I am indebted to Susan Herring for many of my ideas about silencing and CMC. Herring began researching gender and CMC in the early 1990s with the goal of assessing whether CMC lived up to the laudable goal of being a democratic medium. Herring (1994) found that the ideological frame behind patterns of male dominance and interactional styles in CMC is resident in the valorization of antagonistic debate and freedom from censorship, both of which give rise to verbally abusive attacks known as ‘flames.’ Herring (1999) goes on to argue that flaming has nothing to do with the ‘anonymity’ or the ‘impersonality’ of the medium, given that “If the medium makes men more likely to flame, it should have a similar effect on women, yet if anything the opposite appears to be the case” (Politeness 291). It seems to me that flaming is about male privilege and dominance to the extent men flame almost exclusively, in addition to producing more lines of text than women on any given topic. Herring’s research demonstrates that so long as women limit their participation to less than 30 percent of the total discussion and avoid introducing topics, they will neither arouse the hostility of men nor invoke pleas that “This thing has gotten blow out of proportion.” (appendix lines 429-430). Once female presence exceeds 30 percent, males employ the following discursive strategies for silencing them: ignoring, patronizing, dismissing, threatening, harassing, attacking and co-opting. Co-optation is “disguised in the form of agreement with feminist views” which makes it so that women themselves cannot make discursive gains (Herring 1999, 91). For Herring (1999) resistance to silencing takes the form of continued participation, being that the ultimate goal of men in CMC is to render female participants compliant to male control. I argue that resistance can also take to form of silence so that men “bury themselves” as they continue to communicate messages that ultimately result in their own loss of positive face within the group.

At its heart, this project is an affirmation of the necessity of voicing women’s concerns about being ‘flamed’ or harassed when they raise or participate in topics that challenge male control of public discourse in computer-mediated environments. Flaming “is a performative game where winning and silencing seems to be determined by thrusting the opponent into a visceral and emotional reality” (Vrooman 2002, 61). The desire to flame another person cannot be pared down to a single cause, nor does it always produce the effect that the flamer may have in mind (Vrooman 2002, 65). A discussion of the flamer’s intentions brings to the fore the problem of the indeterminacy of meaning or the intended or unintended effect of some communicative act upon the recipient. In the case of a semi-public mailing list, the audience of those who “get off” on the spectacle are important to consider because at any time an audience member can assume a speaking position and reject another’s performance.

Flaming is also “one of the prominent ways in which questions of social versus individual identity are negotiated” (Vrooman 2002, 64). It seems to me though that reducing the conflict on the Division of Humanities mailing list to simply a problem of negotiating individual identity versus group identity is too simplistic, as it leaves out a lot of the ‘context’ that is behind a participant’s identification with other participants or with the community as a whole. By ‘context’ I mean to communicate something resembling Celia Kitzinger’s (2000) definition that “For feminists, ‘context’ means the social, cultural and historical setting within which talk takes place, the institutional or hierarchical relationship of the people talking, and their location in the social order” (173). A broad conception of context is valuable in the sense that it affords one the understanding that categories of analysis such as ‘the individual’ and ‘the community’ are inadequate tools for getting a thick sense of the bonds and the history of relations that exist between participants. A discussion of the social locations of the participants on the list cannot go
much beyond disclosing that the participants are relative equals in the Division of Humanities for reasons relating to the ethical constraints of encroaching on the anonymity of participants by giving too thick a description.

5.0 Contextualizing the Exchange

Throughout this project, which is “microanalysis” of one series of discursive encounters that occurred on a Division of Humanities mailing list, I avail myself to wider social categories of analysis such as ‘gender’ because such categories are relevant to understanding how the data is socially organized. I contend that by posting a public message about her personal experience, Jennifer’s discursive construction of her experience is open to strategic misunderstanding by those who are not sympathetic to her explicit orientation as both pro-union and a feminist. It is relevant to note: although Jennifer does not explicitly state her feminist and pro-union orientation on the mailing list, her colleagues know how she situates herself politically.

Lines 264-273 of the data (see appendix) make obvious that Daniel’s misappropriation of Jennifer’s name and identity in a message he sends to Stanislav and his partner (Lidija), from an account he created for the sole purpose of pretending to be “an angry and sarcastic Jennifer,” relies upon a characterization of Jennifer as a radical feminist who problematizes the word ‘history’ by pointing out that history reflects the accomplishments of men or ‘his’ story and not ‘her’ story.

Extract 1: Daniel’s pretends to be Jennifer
270 George Bush is not just the greatest leeder of our time, he's the greatest
271 leeder in the (his)story of the world. W = winner!

272 luv u 2,
273 Jenn.

In addition to playing upon Jennifer’s feminism and the fact that she is American, Daniel misspells various words to add to his characterization of her as someone not to be taken seriously. The colloquial and friendly closing “luv u 2,” on line 272, signals that Jennifer is easily caricatured as someone who uses ‘teen-talk’ or otherwise employs the kind of slang associated with adolescent girls. The category ‘girl’ is of lower status than the category ‘woman’. What is significant is that although Daniel does not explicitly use the category ‘girl’ in reference to Jennifer, the discourse he uses in his imitation of her references or is mediated by cultural scripts, which construct how Jennifer is situated in regard to both gender and social status. My point is that Jennifer’s gender and status within the group are constructed in the interaction itself and thus it is not necessary that Daniel explicitly use the category ‘girl’ in his attempt to belittle her.

6.0 Concluding Remarks

Although one could take the position that Jennifer’s silence signals that she has been intimidated into leaving public discourse on the mailing list to the men in the Division of Humanities, I think that Jennifer’s silence is her power. Throughout the series of exchanges I’ve called attention to so far, the absence of relevant responses from Jennifer signal a refusal to interact, negotiate, or to otherwise give uptake to those who discursively position themselves as unwilling to affirm her positive face wants. In light of accusations that Jennifer’s reconstruction
of her personal experience was either irrelevant, untrue or both and that she was sending harassing e-mails to Stanislav and his partner (Lidija), it seems that to not give an account of her own positioning on their terms has the effect of making it so that those who wish to get a response from her are left to fill in the relevant silence by manufacturing a response of their choosing. The problem of the indeterminacy of meaning leaves unanswered the question of whether Jennifer’s intentions are relevant in regard to how her silence gets taken up. Regardless of her intentions, there is a sense in which Daniel “buries himself” by resorting to opening a hotmail account in Jennifer’s name to give Stanislav the “soap opera” he is after. An “angry, and sarcastic Jennifer” (see appendix line 359-362) never appears on the scene except by way of fraud on Daniel’s part.

What is interesting to note is that other men in the department rally around Daniel after he apologizes for impersonating and demeaning Jennifer. Farooq states: “Daniel it takes a great person to admit error!” (see appendix line 391-392). Donald takes a similar approach by echoing Farooq’s statement and minimizing the incident with the comment that Daniel’s “humour was a little dry anyway” (see appendix lines 434-435). It is as though Farooq and Donald are propping Daniel up after he is reduced to conceding that he treated Jennifer with inexcusable meanness.

Moreover, Stanislav ultimately suffers nearly as much face loss as Daniel does, given that Stanislav seems to want to see Jennifer’s message as “irrelevant,” whereas in his public apology Daniel positions the issue Jennifer raises in her initial post as something not only important in its own right, but significant enough of a threat to male control of the list to merit going to the trouble to open and send mail from a bogus e-mail account in her name (see appendix line 366-369)

Additionally, Perry’s claim (see appendix lines 304-345) that he is committed to reason and neutrality in opposition to Jennifer’s “skewed picture” can be analyzed alongside of his label of Jennifer’s initial warning, that an anti-union doctor might make women going for gynecological exams uncomfortable, a “sheer political response” that was not worked out morally or with reason.

Of course there is sense in which the discursive encounter I analyze throughout serves as a warning to women on the mailing list that minimal participation is the ideal. However, separatist political strategies and political mobilization is open to those women on the list who refuse to be silenced, constrained, or to otherwise refuse to assume anything less than their full entitlement to equal speaking rights.

Appendix: The Division of Humanities Mailing List
01 Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 13:29:00 -0500 (EST)
02 From: Jennifer Schweiter <Schweiter@MapleU.ca>
03 Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
04 To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
05 Subject: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre
06 I'm not sure whether or not this information will be useful to anyone, but I have a
07 story to share about my experience at the Maple Leaf health centre this morning. I had
08 an appointment with Dr. Renold (it was my first time seeing her). She entered the
09 examination room and introduced herself. I introduced myself to her and she retorted:
10 "I know who you are -- you stopped me from going into the university during the
11 strike last year. I was pregnant at the time!" She then said something about hoping she
12 would have a chance to meet me on her terms. This interaction with Dr. Renold made
13 me very uncomfortable and I would encourage those who took part in the strike to
14 avoid her. She is not sympathetic to our situation as workers and students and seemed
15 to want to render our resistance during the strike as an issue of being rude and
16 discourteous instead of it being an act of resistance.
17 Thanks for alerting others who might find themselves on the receiving end of Dr.
18 Renold's anti-union attitude -- I certainly will do my best to get the word out. This is
19 especially pertinent to women who might see her for a yearly gynecological
20 examination. I can assure you that she is still very bitter about having to have waited
21 in line "to get to work" during our labour strike.
22 Jennifer
23 Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 14:13:54 -0500
24 From: Stanislav Popovic <Popovic@MapleU.CA>
25 Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
26 To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
27 Subject: Re: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre
28 Jennifer, can you please clarify the following line:
29 >She then said something about hoping she would have a chance to meet me on her
30 >terms.
31 Without a reasonably convincing clarification of this line, I think that everything else
32 you told us in your previous e-mail seems quite irrelevant to everyone else but you.
33 Dr.Renold can be a very good professional irrespective of everything you said, and her
34 unsympathies with our causes have nothing to do with her doing a good job as a
35 doctor.
36 cheers!
37 s.
38 Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 13:52:42 -0500
39 From: Kalvin Berlowski <Berlowski@MapleU.CA>
40 Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
41 To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
42 Subject: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre
43 Ouch!
44 Next thing you know you're going to run into our old buddy Chief Wiggum! Let that
45 be a lesson to everyone who goes on strike--always wear a full face mask and carry a
46 big pipe!
47 Seriously though, that doctor sounds ridiculous. That behaviour sounds like some kind
48 of medical ethics violation, but good luck proving it happened. I think that alerting
49 everyone in the community is probably the most effective approach.
50 I'll certainly stay away from Dr. Grudge.
51 Sincerely,
52 Name withheld by request
53 Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 15:15:14 -0500 (EST)
54 From: Jennifer Schweiter <Schweiter@MapleU.ca>
55 To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
56 Subject: Re: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre
57 Stanislav,
"On her terms" meaning in the examination room and not in a line of cars waiting to be let into the university. When she was in her car waiting to be let into the university she was, I suppose, subject to the terms of the striking workers. Whenever anyone enters her place of business, that person enters under her terms in the sense that they're on her "turf." That's my best interpretation -- I took the comment as meaning something like: I had hoped I would be in a position where one of you needed something from me so that I could throw that in your face that you made me wait in a line of cars when I was pregnant.

Jennifer

Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 16:08:17 -0500 (EST)
From: Jennifer Schweiter <Schweiter@MapleU.ca>
To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
Subject: Re: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre

It might also be relevant to mention that, if my memory serves me correctly, Dr. Renold was three months pregnant at the time and claimed to be in need of a washroom. She was still working at the health centre and was late to work on the day that she encountered the Maple Lane fort.

The date of the encounter was October 31st (Halloween), as today during my visit to her examination room Dr. Renold made a remark about my wearing a clown wig on the day of the incident. Can I get Ms. Groucho Marx to back me up on this? See Groucho and I were working together on this particular morning and had several incidents with people screaming at us and trying to run us over. Groucho even lost an eyebrow over the whole thing, but Kalvin recovered the eyebrow when he broke out his pipe (the last sentence is an admitted embellishment, but it makes for a chuckle which I hope does not detract significantly from the serious tone of my first e-mail).

Thanks for the support, Kalvin! I haven't seen Chief Wiggum -- I assume he is busy elsewhere taking it *you know where*! He did so love that phrase...

Jennifer

Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 13:14:31 -0500
From: Wesley Wilde <wlwilde@PLATINUM.NET>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Re: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre

Jennifer: You should definitely contact the union about this and have them initiate a formal complaint through the university. After that I think you should contact the Canadian Medical Association, the Metropolitan Paper, The University Weekly, etc., etc. You might even think about contacting a lawyer, since the doctor's comments could be interpreted as a threat. Were there any witnesses?

Wes.

Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 13:20:00 -0500
From: Wesley Wilde <wlwilde@PLATINUM.NET>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Re: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre

Hi Jennifer: Is this a health clinic run by the university, or is it Dr. Renold's private practice? In either case, this doctor is under contract to Maple Leaf University and
104 should be bound by the rules and ethics code of the university. I believe this is
105 something you should action.
106 There must be a complaint process for something like this.
107 Wes.
108 Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 21:07:56 -0500
109 From: Stanislav Popovic <Popovic@MapleU.CA>
110 Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
111 To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
112 Subject: On Dr Renold
113 Dr Renold's comment might have been inapropriate even if Jennifer might not be
114 able to accurately reconstruct the actual sentence spelled out by the doctor. But
115 before anyone contacts either the union or media, or Helsinki Watch, I'd like to make
116 one point.
117 Medical doctors are expected to treat the patients regardless of their religious,
118 political etc beliefs and regardless of their race, gender, etc. but this expectation is
119 not one sided. Medical doctors, even in wars are treated as neutral parties, and from
120 the early stages of their medical education they feel entitlement to this kind of
121 treatment. They should be treated in the same way in which they are supposed to
122 treat their patients. That's the reason why the Union decided to treat the doctors from
123 Mapleleaf in a specific way after all as I recall it. Picketers might have crossed the
124 line in this respect and hurt the professional and even moral feelings of Dr Renold.
125 Not that this justifies her behavior at the examination room but it certainly does not
126 help the case that Jennifer or anyone on her behalf would make.
127 cheers.
128 Stanislav
129 From: Sherry Hardy <shardy@HOTMAIL.COM>
130 Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
131 To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
132 Subject: will the real Farooq please stand up
133 ok. theses are not my speculations, but a list of the Farooq rumours I have heard to
134 date.
135 1. he is under house arrest
136 2. he has a cold
137 3. he had a brian aneurism
138 4. he has a blood clot
139 5. he is just fine
140 could someone (maybe the great Farooq himself) please clear up this mess?
141 Whenever some one askes me and I present them with these possibilities,
142 people look at me as if I'm the freak.
143 Hey, man.
144 Don't shoot the messenger.
145 -Sherry
146 Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 13:51:13 -0500
147 From: Kalvin Berlowski <Berlowski@MapleU.CA>
148 Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
149 To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Meat-ring with Farooq

Gather round, young’uns and listen to my tale . . .

Well the story of Farooq is a long and convoluted one. You see what happened was, he first had a cold, but he went to see Jennifer’s doctor who recognized him from the strike. But Dr. Grudge didn’t say anything to Farooq about that, she just told him he had a brain aneurysm. He said, "What!?" and she said "Aneurysm" and he said "What?!" and she said "Aneurysm!" and he said "What?!?!" and she said "Blood clot!!! In your brain!!". Now you would think that would bother him, but it didn’t because after reading all that Konrad Lorenz last term he had sworn he would never use his brain again. So in a last ditch effort to wreak revenge for incidents that occurred during the strike, Dr. Grudge told Farooq that he had the ebola virus and the only cure was to move to the prairies. This being too much pain for anyone to endure, Farooq ran screaming from the office. In his blind mad dash to freedom he ran into a wedding ceremony between Abigail Rest and Fred Devonovich. Fred is 6’ 10” and weighs 457 lbs. His nickname on the construction site is "House" (which is weird because he's an insurance claims adjuster and works in an office). So when Farooq came crashing into the back of their knees just as they were pronounced married, he was literally under House-A. Rest.

When the couple finally saw who had fly-tackled them, they asked him why he had done it. He gasped out "I have ebola and now I've been condemned to the prairies". The preacher conducting the ceremony was part of the Suppertime Religion and being a man of the tablecloth could not abide by such a horrible sentence on such a beautiful, virile, young man. So he prayed in tongues and faith-healed Farooq of ebola. He couldn't do anything about the aneurysm though, because that really existed, and let's face it, faith is a lie. Fortunately, he is the irrepressible Farooq the magnificent ("Farooq the Great" to the press), so despite having an aneurysm and being crushed by newlyweds, he is just fine. Or as fine as he gets.***

*** Some or all of the facts of the previous story were made up for absolutely no reason.

Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 00:57:16 -0500 (EST)
From: Jennifer Schweiter <Schweiter@MapleU.ca>
To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
Subject: Alert: Dr. Renold in Maple Leaf health centre

Hi Wes. Thanks for your support and advice! I have written someone in the union via e-mail, though I've gotten no reply as of yet. I do plan to follow up on this matter and you've given me some good ideas. Thanks alot. :-)  

Dr. Renold works for the Maple Leaf health centre. I agree that her behaviour was totally uncalled for -- I could hardly believe the way she treated me -- she made me feel very uncomfortable, which is hardly the role of a medical doctor. Again, I appreciate your support on this matter.

Jennifer

Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 01:36:47 -0500
From: Stanislav Popovic <Popovic@MapleU.CA>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Alert: Schweiter in Graduate Housing asylum
Quoting Dr Renold:

On Wed, 6 Mar 2002, Dr Wilde wrote:

Dr Renold: You should definitely contact the Canadian Union of Public Employees about this and have them initiate a formal complaint through the university. After that I think you should contact the Canadian Medical Association, the Metropolitan Paper, The University Weekly, etc., etc. You might even think about contacting a lawyer, since Dr Schweiter's acts could be interpreted as a threat. Were there any witnesses?

Dr Wilde

On Wed, 6 Mar 2002, Dr Wilde wrote:

Hi Dr Renold: Is this an Graduate Housing asylum run by the university, or is it Dr.Schweiter's private practice? In either case, this doctor is under contract to CUPE and should be bound by the rules and ethics code of the CUPE. I believe this is something you should action. There must be a complaint process for something like this.

Dr Wilde

Hi Dr Wilde. Thanks for your support and advice! I have written someone in the union via e-mail, though I've gotten no reply as of yet. I do plan to follow up on this matter and you've given me some good ideas. Thanks a lot. :-)

Dr Wilde

Hi Dr Wilde. Thanks for your support and advice! I have written someone in the union via e-mail, though I've gotten no reply as of yet. I do plan to follow up on this matter and you've given me some good ideas. Thanks a lot. :-)

Dr Wilde

Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 07:12:20 -0800
From: Mar'yska Sofiyko <msofiyko@YAHOO.COM>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Stanislav and the science of psychiatry

Hi, Stan,
We have this commercial in Ukraine which says: "sometimes it's better to chew", if you understand what I mean.

Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 12:37:49 -0500
From: Stanislav Popovic <Popovic@MapleU.CA>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Dr Renold soap opera continued...

Mariska, it seems to me that you did not understand my joke that well. As far as I know Dr Popovic is a prominent member of the world renown Graduate Housing Asylum as well.

That's why he is so interested in Dr Renold case.

If you are interested in following this outstanding series here are some keywords that might help:

witch-hunt: a rigorous campaign to round up or expose dissenters on the pretext of safeguarding the public welfare
blacklist: a list of persons or organizations under suspicion, or considered
Date: Sat, 9 Mar 2002 12:13:03 -0500
From: Stanislav Popovic <Popovic@MapleU.CA>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Jennifer 's misdirected e-mail messages: Fwd: just had to share.

Jennifer Schweiter,

my understanding is that you misdirected the following message to LIDIJA and to me instead of to the list. I hope that you did it by mistake, since Lidija is not implicated in any way in our latest discussion. As a matter of fact, this is the second message that you misdirected, the previous one was sent yesterday. I must mention that Lidija finds the content of the following message pretty disturbing.

Stanislav Popovic

----- Forwarded message from Jennifer Schweiter

Date: Sat, 09 Mar 2002 02:43:00 -0500
From: Jennifer Schweiter <Jennifer_Schweiter@hotmail.com>
Reply-To: Jennifer Schweiter <Jennifer_Schweiter@hotmail.com>
Subject: just had to share.

George Bush is not just the greatest leader of our time, he's the greatest leader in the (his)story of the world. W = winner!

luv u 2,
Jenn.

----- End forwarded message -----
forwarded to others without the permission of the author. Since I can't make much
sense of Jennifer's note forwarded by Stan, it appears to me that it was not intended
for anyone other than the people it was sent to--I can't see how it was intended to be
read by *me*, anyway--and so there was no implicit permission for it to be
forwarded. People tend to get upset—justifiably so—when personal communications
are forwarded to others. So, please, be very careful about this.
Along the same lines: everything posted to this list is posted under the assumption
that no one will see it but this list's subscribers. Nothing that is posted to this list
should be forwarded elsewhere, except with the explicit permission of the author.

Along the same lines: everything posted to this list is posted under the assumption
that no one will see it but this list's subscribers. Nothing that is posted to this list
should be forwarded elsewhere, except with the explicit permission of the author.

Martin
Date: Sat, 9 Mar 2002 19:46:19 +0000
From: pKirk <pKirk@HOTMAIL.COM>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Square table?
Re: The Dr. Renold Debacle:
So folks, I am thinking we have here before us a great opportunity for a humanities
graduate conference/discussion, after all it deals with moral and political aspects both
theoretical and applied, as well as aspects about some sort of moral due process,
rights and responsibilities of various parties involved in a conflict, how such things
are determined, etc. I think many of the e-mails about the issue of Dr. Renold have
clearly pointed these out and so let's put our money where our mouths are and see
whether we through reason are capable of resolving or merely exacerbating
problems. There are many level to this issue, the first of which is the
distinction between morally appropriate behaviour of ALL parties involved on the
one hand, and a sheer political response (which could, but far from obviously,
includes a moral ground) on the other. To look at just some of these issue in isolation
will likely do little more than skew the picture, and our commitment to continue in
this fashion betrays our desire to cathart, rather than work out through reasoning or
morally.

In the event that nobody wants to put reason to the test here, I offer my own take on
the issue (for those who care). First, I think it is obvious that Jennifer clearly has
reason to be concerned, but what I think is far from obvious is whether how she
handled it was good, or even neutral (I don’t think this issue has been raised).
Conflict resolution provides for people who are involved and or accused (in this case
Dr. Renold) to be able to defend or explain themselves. I am not sure about what
beyond the e-mail 'warning' Jennifer has done, and in fact she may have started the
process that will bring an appropriate inquiry to this concern, but without such
appropriate inquiry, the claims border on liable. (Furthermore, having pursued an
appropriate inquiry to this issue in addition to the e-mail 'warning' does not
necessarily neutralize the question about whether it was appropriate to
address it in this way on this list serve, but nor does it suggest it was inappropriate to
these subtleties need to be worked out.) Also, suggesting that newspapers should
be notified, etc., seems to be a political move, that although is within one’s
prerogative, does seem to jettison the moral ground by taking it to the quasi mob
attitude of "I'll show you." Moral ground should not be assumed here on any side
and I think to a large degree it has been, at least to the extent that it is
assumed that Jennifer’s take on this is complete and accurate and that Dr. Renold is
without any reasonable explanation. Merely moving these two issues from the realm
of 'assumptions' to that of 'questions' changes all kinds of things irrespective of what
the answers actually hold. Finally, those who are committed to pursuing this issue
within a moral framework need to do more than merely direct it to a crude political
battle. Anyway, I think we have a really interesting and meaningful topic that would
put reason and our commitment to it to the test. Many may think this is undesirable
because it is too personal, but to limit reasoning to merely impersonal issues is to
relegate it to the level of bureaucracy. It is in these difficult and complex areas that
reasoning is most needed, at least as far as I am concerned.

Comments? Questions? Queries? Concerns?

perry k.

Dear all,
I would like to apologize for a terrible misjudgement on my part, one which has
resulted in the hurt feelings of at least one member of our graduate group.
Early yesterday I had a phone conversation with Lidija in which we talked about
some of the recent messages. We discussed how certain posts might have come
across as hurtful, and of how we felt that none were intended at all in this way.
In particular, Lidija expressed her hope that Jennifer would not be offended by some
of the response to her post about Dr. Renold. After our conversation I thought I
would lighten the air about this and make a sort of joke, so I pretended to be an angry
and sarcastic Jennifer, and sent emails to Stanislav and Lidija in her name, from a
fake address. I meant these to be obvious frauds, since each was just a line of
nonsense. Instead of humour, however, what I produced was injury, as my lame
attempt at a joke managed only to horribly insult Jennifer.
Of course, this was an _absolutely_ and _incredibly_ stupid thing for me to have
done, and it couldn't have been in poorer taste. I do not have words strong enough to
express my regret, but at very least I apologize to all of you for demeaning what was
an important issue raised by Jennifer, and I apologize especially to Jennifer for the
thoughtlessness and insensitivity of my act.

Sincerely,

Daniel

As I am under house arrest, I was not able to speak my mind on many occasions
which required my participation. For those who give a damn, not that I expect many
to do so, I am just fine. As of today, I can say I am 95% and ready to put some more
Garbage-in in order to Garbage-out. On a more serious note, I will be at Maple Leaf U. from now on till the day I die. ha ha for those who thought I would leave. Back to the resious note, on Thursday the 14th of this March, at 1:00 pm Wes Wilde will be giving a talk as part of our Graduate Teaching series. The talk will be general tips for TA's and possibly a discussion of the serious matters that face us now as Maple Grad. students. I strongly encourage everyone to come not because of the Indian food, but because we could take this opportunity as a means of having some of our serious concerns (as both educators and students) addressed. Another reason, you could all come to see how I am doing, since I am the product of too much stress and no results.

As for Kalvin, thank you.

As for Sandy, Sorry I am in Fairfax, and Daniel, it takes a great person to admit error! Take it easy.

regards to all,

farooq

Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 02:41:41 -0500
From: Farooq Bassami <farooq@MapleU.CA>
Reply-To: Humanities Graduate Student Forum <HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Re: On Dr Renold

Quoting Stanislav Popovic <Popovic@MapleU.CA>:

My friend Stan,

I used to think the same. But after watching the news the last few days, it seems Palestinian support People do not get the same privelage.

So much for civilization,

I'll see you soon.

farooq

>Dr Renold's comment might have been inapropriate even if Jennifer might not be able to accurately reconstruct the actual sentence spelled out by the doctor. But before anyone contacts either the union or media, or Helsinki Watch, I'd like to make one point.

>Medical doctors are expected to treat the patients regardless of their religious, political etc beliefs and regardless of their race, gender, etc. but this expectation is not one sided. Medical doctors, even in wars are treated as neutral parties, and from the early stages of their medical education they feel entitlement to this kind of treatment. They should be treated in the same way in which they are supposed to treat their patients. That's the reason why the Union decided to treat the doctors from Mapleleaf in a specific way after all as I recall it.

>Picketers might have crossed the line in this respect and hurt the professional and seven moral feelings of Dr Renold. Not that this justifies her behavior at the examination room but it certainly does not help the case that Jennifer or anyone on her behalf would make.

>cheers.

Stanislav

Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 09:47:46 -0500
From: Donald Booker <donaldbooker@HOTMAIL.COM>
I'm sorry if this is offensive to anyone but I honestly think the Dr. Renold thing has gotten blown out of proportion. The Dr. was a little frustrated and couldn't resist the chance to send a little of that frustration back Jennifer's way. It happens to the best of us! I think we need to just look at the whole episode with a little bit of humour and not let it get under any of our obviously very thin skins.

Daniel, Faroq is right, it takes courage to admit error. But hey, the humour was a little dry anyway. I honestly think that the Dr. would be incredibly amused to know that her remark has caused such a stir. Her mission is accomplished wouldn't you say?

Don

Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 13:54:46 -0500
From: Martin Kang <makang@MapleU.CA>
To: HUMANITIES@MapleU.CA
Subject: Responses to Donald and Perry (On Dr. Renold)

On Mon, 11 Mar 2002, Donald Booker wrote:
> I honestly think that the Dr. would be incredibly amused to know that her remark
> has caused such a stir.
> I think we may find out--the controversy is not confined to this list, and it's looking likely that it's going to come to her attention, somehow or other, sooner or later. It will be interesting to see.
> Look at it this way: what if one of us, who had been on the picket lines, had a student who had done something we considered rude in crossing the line--and we were to say to that student in a tutorial, "I know who you are ... now I've got you on my terms."
> That would be grossly unethical, don't you think?

Of course, it would also be grossly unethical to hold the picket-line incident against the student, even if you didn't say anything--maybe it would be even more unethical. There have been occasions in my life when I've gotten myself into trouble with people by revealing negative assumptions that I have about them. They get insulted, but I figure it's better for everything to be out in the open and for them to be insulted than it would be for me to treat them negatively without them knowing why. And, sometimes, my assumptions turn out to be wrong--and bringing them into the open gives us an opportunity for reconciliation. Once, I got into a heated online debate with someone who had a name that was gender-neutral but usually male. I had the feeling that this person was a man playing at holding feminist positions for their "radical chic" value, and it annoyed me. So I told the person this--and it turned out the person was a woman. She was, of course, very insulted, for the short term. But we got along better for the long term, with an improved understanding where each other was coming from (mostly my improved understanding of where she was coming from).

On Sat, 9 Mar 2002, pKirk wrote:
> So folks, I am thinking we have here before us a great opportunity for a graduate conference/discussion
> Want to present a paper on it at the (mythical) symposium? ;)

Want to present a paper on it at the (mythical) symposium? ;)

>
There are many level to this issue, the first of which is the distinction between morally appropriate behaviour of ALL parties involved on the one had, and a sheer political response (which could, but far from obviously, includes a moral ground) on the other.

In the manner of a true academic, let me begin with a terminological quibble (insisting, likewise in the manner of a true academic, that the quibble is actually very important): I would rather say "ideological" where you have said "political". What we are talking about here is, one way or another, a matter of politics (that is, of how we get along together in the polis). The question is whether, or in what measure, we want to approach political matters academically or ideologically. It's an important quibble since opposing politics to academic matters may have the effect of removing the academic from political matters, from participation in the polis (as Nietzsche does: "'to live alone,' says Aristotle, 'one must be either a beast or a god'--leaving out the third case: one must be a philosopher").

In the event that nobody wants to put reason to the test here, I offer my own take on the issue (for those who care). First, I think it is obvious that Jennifer clearly has reason to be concerned, but what I think is far from obvious is whether how she handled it was good, or even neutral (I don't think this issue has been raised).

What interests me particularly is the effect of her putting the story of her encounter with Dr. Renold into writing, on a listserv, as opposed to, say, orally telling each of us, or some of us, about it. I don't think the ethical issue of whether Jennifer has unfairly maligned the reputation of Dr. Renold could possible come up if she had just told each of us, orally, what had happened.

So why is the issue raised now, when Jennifer puts the story on this listserv? Here are three possibilities: putting it on the listserv makes the story more public, more permanent, and more monological. Whether it's actually more public is debatable; Jennifer could have told the story in person to just about everyone on this list. On the other hand, I'm fairly sure she wouldn't have wanted to. Some people here could be expected not to be all that interested or sympathetic. So there's another point: it generally takes less courage to say things in writing than it does to say things in person. The story being more permanent and more monological go together. As Perry notes, Dr. Renold is not given the opportunity for rebuttal; but what may be more important is that *we* aren't given the same kind of opportunity for rebuttal, or at least for investigation, that we would have if the story were related personally. The story stands--in our inboxes, in the archives, and wherever else it has passed on to--as it is. The story is less permanent than if it were written on paper, less permanent still than if it were published in a book, but it is more permanent than if it were spoken. Spoken words can be *replaced*, more or less (not entirely, because their effects may linger), in conversation, when the speaker modifies something s/he has said. Of course, something *like* a conversation can take place on a listserv. We can just read the original message and move on with the conversation, and we can ask for clarification. But there is not so much of an obligation to accommodate one's interlocutors in this sort of medium as there is in personal dialogue. If one makes a claim to someone in person, one is expected to be able to explain it and/or defend it, if desired by one's interlocutors. That isn't the case on a listserv--because, for one thing, saying things on a listserv takes longer, and so people can't be expected to
devote as much time as it might take to explain and defend anything they might say. (For that same reason, i.e. the time and deliberation it takes to say things on a listserv, saying things on a listserv may be held to be less "forgiveable" than saying them out loud, off the cuff.)

>Also, suggesting that newspapers should be notified, etc., seems to be a political move, that although is within one's prerogative, does seem to jettison the moral ground by taking it to the quasi mob attitude of "I'll show you."

I assume that Wes said what he did from a basically moral stance rather than an ideological one. I assume he said it out of the belief that one ought to take reasonable measures to ensure that people don't behave immorally toward others, and that if Dr. Renold is inclined to act immorally toward other, then any measures that could reasonably be pursued to ensure that she doesn't behave that way ought to be pursued. In Wes's estimation (I assume), Dr. Renold's behaviour indicates an inclination to act immorally toward others, and notifying newspapers is a reasonable measure to ensure that she doesn't actually behave immorally toward others in the future. Personally, I'm not convinced that contacting newspapers is a reasonable measure, but neither am I convinced that it isn't. The reason I didn't respond to Jennifer's original post is that I think she is in a far better position than anyone else to decide what might be a reasonable response; I don't think I'm in any such position at all. As Stanislav indicated in his first response, it's important to know exactly what Dr. Renold said. It's also important to know exactly how she said it--what her tone was, what her facial expression was, what her general bodily comportment was. These sorts of things can hardly be captured in writing; they can't even be captured very well in speech. Of course, Jennifer may have misinterpreted them, at least as far as Dr. Renold might be concerned; Dr. Renold may have intended what she said in a light-hearted sort of way (which would make it less inappropriate, but still inappropriate, in my view). But Jennifer is certainly in a far better position than anyone else to make that kind of judgment.

Of course, Jennifer's story came with its own judgments, in the form of her editorial comments about Dr. Renold regarding the strikers' "act of resistance" as merely discourteous and rude, etc. I tend to suspect that it was those editorial comments that generated the current controversy, and specifically Stanislav's "blacklist" remarks. With those editorial comments the ideological element was introduced, and the door was opened for debate as to whether Dr. Renold's attitude toward the behaviour of the strikers is justified--and the confusion between Dr. Renold's *attitude* and her *behaviour* as the objects of ethical debate. Incidentally, I think her attitude *is* justified, to a large extent (and, as Stanislav pointed out, the union acknowledged as much by agreeing to expedite the passage of doctors through the lines), but Dr. Renold's *behaviour* was inappropriate regardless of whether it was understandable or the attitude it manifested was justified. Once again, I think it's interesting to note that people are generally less inclined in speaking face to face than they are in writing to make the kind of editorial comments Jennifer made: in person, one is more directly confronted with the fact that either one's interlocutors will be sympathetic with such comments, and they'd be unnecessary, or one's interlocutors will not be sympathetic, and they'd be imprudent. It also goes to show how statements (apparently) motivated by ideology can tend to backfire, at least when the motivation
564 is transparent to the receivers of such statements. It should also be noted that Jennifer
565 did not advise any particular action--she didn't call for a general boycott of Dr.
566 Renold or anything like that. She did make comments to the effect that people might
567 be made uncomfortable by Dr. Renold, and that this might be of particular
568 concern to women going for gynecological exams. These seem to me like reasonable
569 inferences from her own experience, and they don't seem necessarily related to any
570 particular ideological stance. Everyone, I presume, has an interest in not being made
571 uncomfortable by their doctors while they're being examined; patients undergoing
572 particularly invasive, "personal", or otherwise uncomfortable procedures would,
573 naturally, be particularly interested in not having their doctors add to their
574 discomfort.
575 >Moral ground should not be assumed here on any side and I think to a large degree
576 >it has been, at least to the extent that it is assumed that Jennifer's take on this is
577 >complete and accurate and that Dr. Renold is without any reasonable explanation.
578 >Merely moving these two issues from the realm of 'assumptions' to that of
579 >'questions' changes all kinds of things irrespective of what the answers actually
580 >hold.
581 As I've said, I think Jennifer 's take on this as presented in her original post is
582 necessarily incomplete, as any written account would be. As for whether it's
583 accurate--what can you say? You can take into account her (apparent) ideological
584 motivations and suppose that she might have exaggerated ... but, notwithstanding the
585 hermeneutic diceyness of doing that, the story (as opposed to the editorial comments)
586 was very brief and not particularly sensational. If she had wanted to exaggerate, I
587 would think she could have given the story some more colour. (By the way,
588 Jennifer's story would only be libellous if it were untrue, right? So if it's true,
589 she presumably needn't worry about it being libellous.)
590 >Anyway, I think we have a really interesting and meaningful topic that would put
591 >reason and our commitment to it to the test. Many may think this is undesirable
592 >because it is too personal, but to limit reason to merely impersonal issues is to
593 >relegate it to the level of bureaucracy.
594 One "application" of "reason"--one thoughtful approach--here might be to understand
595 that treating "personal" matters in such an abstract and analytical manner as you and
596 I are doing may do some sort of violence to the person involved. Not merely that it
597 may be *imprudent* to do this because the person may be offended and you may
598 incur her disfavour, but that it may also be unethical. So I think one should be
599 cautious about labelling responses which one perceives to be unreflectively
600 supportive or accepting as "unreasonable". As I said to you/Perry (it's hard to know
601 who you're addressing in this medium sometimes) before, my first thought on your
602 post was: "This is why they killed Socrates, you know." Is it justifiable to place the
603 interests of reasonable investigation above all other interests--above, for instance,
604 ethical interests such as respecting the dignity of people one might wish to
605 make the subjects of investigation? Maybe, sometimes, it is, and maybe, sometimes,
606 it isn't.
607 Of course, I'm posting this now, so evidently my (uneasy) judgment is that here,
608 now, it is.
609 We're all scholars here, after all. ;)

18
The archival messages I observed span from October 12, 2001 to May 30, 2002.

It is significant to mention that a group called Women in the Division of Humanities at Maple Leaf University (WHAM) was envisioned after women on the list got together to talk about the need for a safe space where women can discuss their experiences without fear of being verbally attacked or otherwise subjected to the vocal expression of a lack of sympathy to women’s issues.

Spelling and punctuation have not been corrected.
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