

Grievor's Response to the University of Waterloo's "Written Decision With Reasons"

In what follows, I shall address particular paragraphs of the "Written Decision With Reasons" (henceforth "Decision"), referring to them by their numbers as employed in the Decision, e.g., "Paragraph 20".

Let us now travel through the Decision.

Paragraph 13: The phrase, "aside from being compelled by the Regulations and Instructions to adopt the Requirement", is inaccurate and misleading. The University was **never** compelled to adopt "the Requirement". It was compelled to adopt a **policy**, as I have written several times in both grievances. In fact, the University acknowledges this in the next paragraph.

Paragraph 14: I note, with appreciation, the phrase, "to adopt a vaccination policy", in the first sentence. This was, in fact, the first time that I saw this statement by the university in print. As I discussed in my second grievance, letters to UW employees from the UW administration (including Deans' letters of disciplinary action) contained the false statement, "The University was required by statute to adopt a COVID-19 vaccination mandate." I also note that the correct statement, "to adopt a vaccination policy", now appears on the University's coronavirus website. This statement was **not** present on the website during the time over which the University's vaccination mandate was enforced.

I question the statement, "the University's actions cannot be challenged through the grievance process under the MOA." I also challenge the statement, "it is not open to Vrscaj to challenge statutory requirements in a grievance/arbitration process." (By "statutory requirement", I assume that the University is referring to its "Requirement".) Firstly, my two grievances have been primarily concerned with the **implementation** of the University's vaccination mandate, including the ways in which disciplinary processes were performed and the refusal of administrators to answer important questions regarding the possible implications of these disciplinary actions (e.g., "Who will supervise and financially support my graduate students?") These **actions** of the University can most certainly be challenged.

Secondly, with regard to challenging "statutory requirements," let me once again point out (as was done in my grievances) that (i) the University **falsely** stated that it was required to adopt a COVID-19 vaccination **mandate** (as opposed to **policy**) – see Page 2 of my second grievance – and (ii) it posted two separate vaccination "Requirements" – see Page 3 of my second grievance. This was the basis, at least in part, of grievances filed by most, if not all other, faculty members in response to the "Requirement". In our minds, such behaviour by the University was reckless and irresponsible, hence unprofessional. Moreover, since this behaviour contributed to workplace anxiety and insecurity, it must be discussed – and challenged – in these grievances.

Paragraph 15: Much of this paragraph is devoted to a discussion of how the University was entitled to remove the "alternative option" of "proof of completing an educational session alongside regular antigen testing". Then why was this "alternative option" included in the definition of the "Requirement" on UW's coronavirus website during the mandate? (See Page 3 of my grievance. Interestingly, this definition has since been removed.) For a possible explanation, please see the post by Prof. J. Turri (Philosophy, UW) entitled, "The University of Waterloo keeps changing what its 'vaccination requirement' requires. A hallmark of arbitrary and authoritarian governance." Dated March 26, 2022 at

<https://mandates.substack.com/p/the-university-of-waterloo-keeps>

The final sentence of Paragraph 15, “Again, the grievance and arbitration process is not an appropriate venue to challenge OMCOH’s Instructions and the content of those Instructions”, is example of “sleight-of-hand”. The Tribunal should easily see that in my grievances, I have most definitely **not** challenged OMCOH’s Instructions and the content of those Instructions.

Paragraph 16: My comments regarding Paragraph 15 also apply here.

Paragraph 18: The first sentence is misleading. Why does the Respondent write that the University was “required and/or entitled ...”? Which was it? “Required”? Or “Entitled”? Both? Answer: It depends on which of the two “Requirements” is considered. Once again, for clarity, the University was **required** to adopt a vaccination **policy**, such as the one listed on its website. It was **legally entitled**, but not required, to adopt its other “Requirement” – the vaccination **mandate** that was imposed on all UW employees and students. We shall return to this point.

The final sentence regarding the FAUW is irrelevant to this case. That being said, what does “generally supported” mean?

Paragraph 19: With regard to the first sentence, a challenge of the Requirement is warranted when the Requirement itself is not well-defined, i.e., when two different definitions exist, one for public viewing and the other for internal enforcement.

The Grievor understands that this grievance process should not include an “academic debate on the dangers of the vaccination”. Nevertheless, since the University has chosen to write the following in its Decision, “the safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccination is so well-established at this point” – a classic “proof by authority” mantra that it continues to proclaim and which it now employs to “respectfully request that the Tribunal take judicial notice of these facts” – it is not only the Grievor’s right, but also his duty, as an academic, to challenge this mantra. That the COVID-19 mRNA vaccines are safe and effective has been established to be untrue, which has also been acknowledged by the CEOs of some of their manufacturers, e.g., Pfizer. In order to provide a glimpse of the rapidly increasing amount of peer-reviewed, published research literature dealing with the inefficacy and toxicity of mRNA vaccines along with the effectiveness of other therapies (see side note below), I have attached copies of six sample research papers which have appeared in medical journals of extremely high repute. I have also attached a reference list of some research papers that deal with some specific negative effects of the vaccines, i.e., stroke, myocardial infarction, thrombosis.

Once again, I do not expect any academic debate of this subject to take place in this grievance process. But that being said, I consider it to be my duty **not** to allow the University’s statements on “safety” and “efficacy” of the COVID-19 vaccines to be unchallenged when they are presented in the course of this process. Furthermore, any response to the effect that I am not an expert will be answered with, “Let the peer-reviewed papers in journals of high repute speak for themselves!”

A side note on the sixth research paper, *Ivermectin for Prevention ...* , Amer. J. Ther. 28 , e434-e460 (2021), included in this document: I have included this paper because of some unfortunate comments made by a “leading Waterloo expert” in the Friday, September 10, 2021 UW Daily Bulletin headline story and video interview, “The facts about vaccines and COVID-19.” In the interview, the “expert” dismissed

Ivermectin as simply a “dewormer” which then led to a rather theatric “Eeeeeewwwww” reaction from the interviewer. I wrote to the administration about this unfortunate incident, proposing that Dr. Michael Palmer be “invited to engage in a panel discussion with some – or even all – of the medical experts consulted in the September 10 Bulletin feature”. A copy of my letter dated September 15, 2021 was attached to my first grievance – please see Page 56. I never received a reply to my letter – from anyone.

Paragraph 20: I well understand that my “Grievances are individual grievances”, and that I “and the University are the only parties to the Grievances”. That being said, it is important for the Tribunal to know that I was not the only person to be confused/concerned/affected by the letters sent to “noncompliant” faculty members regarding the disciplinary procedures that were being imposed on them. In such an abnormal workplace setting, it was also important for **me** to know that I was not the only person who felt and thought this way. The enforcement of the University’s Requirement contributed to a tremendous amount of workplace anxiety and confusion.

Paragraphs 21 and 22: These two paragraphs are, unfortunately, “smoke screens”. Each of my first and second grievances was filed in response to a number of actions taken by my Dean in his effort to enforce, respectively, the first and second disciplinary processes (3-day paid and 8-day unpaid suspensions) associated with the University’s internal “Requirement”. The filing of each of these grievances was done immediately after each of these actions by the Dean. In each case, a more general discussion of the “Requirement” and its inconsistencies and falsehoods was in order, if only to show that at many stages, the University was moving in a quite uncertain manner. Consider, for example, my letter dated November 15, 2021 and entitled, “Attention required: What do we do with a non-compliant faculty member?” (see Page 41 of my first grievance). In this letter, I pointed out that the original “Employee Disciplinary Process” (EDP) announced by the President and VPAP of UW in their October 8, 2021 memo on “Consequences of noncompliance” violated the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between UW and the FAUW. Most interestingly, the 40-day unpaid suspension that had just been imposed on a “noncompliant” faculty member was quickly withdrawn along with apologies, a reimbursement of all salary withheld and a written acknowledgement that the MOA had been violated. After these incidents, the University, having realized that it would have to proceed according to the MOA, changed its course with regard to disciplinary procedures and how they would be enforced in early 2022.

Paragraph 29: Unfortunately, this paragraph suffers from the omission of some important facts - facts that I took great care to point out in my communications with Dean Giesbrecht. It also, however, contains some “misinformation”.

Important fact: As I reminded the Dean, months earlier and well before the imposition of the “Requirement”, I submitted my desire to teach my two Fall 2021 undergraduate courses online. (Many faculty members chose in advance to teach their Fall 2021 courses online.) I could also have specified online tutorials as well for these courses but thought that I would try an “in person” component for the tutorial hours of each course. In any event, the sentence including the phrase, “because of Vrscay’s choice not to be vaccinated” is **false**. My not being vaccinated had **nothing** to do with the **teaching** of my Fall 2021 courses online. The online teaching of these courses was decided well before the “Requirement” was imposed. This is why I considered the Dean’s statement to be a “cheap shot”.

Furthermore, at the beginning of the Fall 2021 term, I had informed my students that the “in-person” component of each course, a one-hour tutorial session - originally proposed by myself voluntarily to be “in person” - was now going to be online. (Yes, I did this because I was not vaccinated, and therefore not allowed to be on campus, but there were absolutely no complaints during the course – student reviews of the courses were extremely positive.) As such, **there was absolutely no need for me to be on campus during the Fall 2021 term to deliver these two courses.** Why then, would Dean Giesbrecht even suggest that I might not be permitted continue teaching beyond October 17 because of “noncompliance”? From the viewpoints of course delivery and avoidance of disruption to both students and faculty, **there was no rational reason for this statement to be made**, which is why I considered Dean Giesbrecht's written comments to be threats, and therefore comprising “harassment”, according to UW Policy 33 (“Ethical Behaviour”):

Harassment is defined as engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known, or ought reasonably to be known, to be unwelcome. (from Section 2, “Specific principles”)

Aside: I ask for the Tribunal’s patience with regard to my repetition of facts. If the University persists in repeating inaccuracies, it is my duty to persistently correct them.

Paragraph 30: Once again, this paragraph is plagued with misinformation. My two Fall 2021 courses had no in-person components. As such, the inability of “completing the in-person aspects of his fall courses” was not an issue at all, as discussed in my comments regarding Paragraph 29. When a “manager” deliberately conveys false – or at least “questionable” – information to a “subordinate”, it may be interpreted as “workplace harassment”.

Paragraph 31: What is written in this paragraph is inconsistent with what appears in Paragraph No. 29. Dean Giesbrecht’s “premature” comment referred to the undergraduate students in my Fall 2021 and not to my graduate students, as suggested in Paragraph No. 31.

It is not clear whether the Respondent’s phrase, “and Vrscay was not entitled to any further response,” refers to undergraduate or graduate students. In any case, this phrase, along with the later sentence, “Neither Vrscay, nor any other University, has a right to demand a particular response from his/her supervisor in this manner”, is extremely troubling, especially when the welfare of other members of the UW community – in this case, students – is concerned. Furthermore, is unclear what the Respondent means by “particular response”. I was asking for a response, not a “particular response”.

Paragraph 32: The statement, “In any event, Article 8.8 of the MOA specifically states that the Dean is responsible for disciplinary investigations” demonstrates a “we’re above the law” mentality. In my first grievance (Point No. 1, Page 2), I presented a case to show that the Dean was unsuitable because of his actions. Such a case can certainly be the basis for a grievance.

Paragraph 33: With regard to the statement, “and it seems his actual dispute is that the University failed to implement his suggestions”, my dispute is that the University failed to engage in any communication whatsoever, with either myself or anyone else who disagreed with the “Requirement” and how it was being enforced.

On a more general note, I was under the impression – one that I have held for 36 years at UW – that the university is a place where truth and knowledge are sought, in line with healthy academic discourse and debate. After all, UW’s motto is *Concordia cum Veritate*. The Respondent states that the “University

was under no obligation to respond to Vrscaj's (or any other employee's) various letters and suggested approaches to the pandemic." Such a statement would be expected from the Manager or CEO of a corporation but **not** from a senior administrator of a university. The arrogance of this statement and the neglect of academic ethics are astounding. (I wonder if such a statement would have been written in the case of a Grievor who is not a male Caucasian.)

I would like to ask the members of the Tribunal to read my letter to the Provost, dated December 2, 2021 (Page 53 of my first grievance), in which I propose an alternative disciplinary process for "noncompliant" faculty members which, at that time, was being considered at the University of Guelph and which eventually was implemented. I believe that this "modest proposal", in which "noncompliant" faculty members' salaries would be reduced in proportion to their time away from the classroom, would have been agreeable to said faculty members. Moreover, I believe that the implementation of this proposal could have prevented the unnecessary dismissal of Dr. Michael Palmer, MD from the Department of Chemistry, UW. Dr. Palmer is the **only** full-time and tenured faculty member to be fired by a Canadian university because of "noncompliance" to a mandatory vaccination policy.

Paragraph 34: The statement "allegations relating to time periods more than two months prior to him filing the First Grievance" is false. The grievances were filed immediately after particular actions taken by the Dean in his effort to impose disciplinary actions associated with the "Requirement".

Paragraph 36: For the record, I agree entirely with the statement, "No faculty member 'owns' a course or can demand to teach it in any given term." I would simply like to repeat that I was asked by the Chair of the Pure Mathematics Department to teach PMATH 370 during Winter 2022 because I had taught it quite successfully over its previous three offerings. (It was a "beautiful friendship," if I may be allowed to quote Humphrey Bogart's character, "Rick Blaine", from the movie *Casablanca*.) I was hoping that the University would be less interested in achieving total control over its employees in the form of a mandate and more interested in allowing some creative options to be employed which would have allowed me to teach PMATH 370, even if it were to be done online. **In fact, were not ALL Winter 2022 courses delivered online for at least the first half of the term, many of which continued to be taught online for the remainder of the term?** Would my course have suffered irreparable damage if I had to teach it online for the remainder of the term – as was the case for many other courses? (I invite the members of the Tribunal to seek the opinion of students whom I taught online during the Fall 2021 term. I was going to suggest some of these students as potential interviewees for the Dean's "investigation", the subject of the next few Paragraphs.)

Paragraph 41: In none of the letters of Deans to their respective "noncompliant" faculty members (or at least the letters that I saw – most of us compared letters) was there any mention of what such an "investigation" would entail. As such, "noncompliant" faculty members had no idea of what to expect. (Once again, I know this on the basis of interactions with others.) The only thing that I/we could do was to consult Sections 8.8, 8.9 and 8.10 of the Memorandum of Agreement ("Discipline") over and over again. As such, the statement, "The circumstances did not require, nor could Vrscaj reasonably expect, a more comprehensive investigation" is without merit. How can one know what to "reasonably expect" when one has not been adequately informed of the rules and procedures from one's "superiors"?

Paragraph 42: The Respondent states that "such 'interviews' are not required by the MOA", which is true. However, its subsequent statement, "failing to 'interview' others as part of a discipline investigation cannot, in and of itself, be considered a breach of the MOA" would also be correct but **only**

if the University **did not** originally issue an invitation to “noncompliant” faculty members in its letters. But it **did issue** an invitation – more on this in the comments regarding Paragraph 43 below.

The Respondent then writes, “Given the nature of the allegations and the investigation being conducted, this language could probably have been removed from the letter.” **The fact is that “this language” appeared in the letter and the University has a responsibility to act accordingly** – see the next point.

Paragraph 43: Here is the relevant paragraph from the January 5 letter regarding the invitation to submit names of interviewees:

If there are individuals you wish to be interviewed as part of this investigation, please notify me as soon as possible following your receipt of this letter. Each individual who participates in the investigation will be specifically informed that the investigation and their participation must be kept strictly confidential.

The first sentence of the Respondent’s Paragraph 43 in the Decision is remarkable. If “the language in the January 5 letter was not an invitation”, then what was it? Why then, according to the selected quote above, would I be asked to provide names of interviewees to the Dean as soon as possible?

The final sentence of the Respondent’s Paragraph 43 is without merit. Why should the names of potential interviewees have been provided in my first grievance? If the Tribunal wishes, I can provide some names, although it seems that such information is unnecessary at this time.

Let us please stop here for a moment. Paragraph 43 in its entirety is another “sleight-of-hand” designed to divert attention away from the major point – one of the reasons that I filed my first grievance! I draw the Tribunal’s attention to Point No. 2, Pages 2 and 3, of my first grievance which I summarize as follows: **I am invited by the Dean to submit a list of names for the “investigation” that he has just announced to me. On the very next day, he informs me that the “investigation” has been concluded and that he has made a decision!** Does this not sound like something from *The Trial* by Franz Kafka? In any event, it demonstrates a profound lack of respect shown by the UW administration towards its faculty members – a lack of respect which is indefensible.

We now arrive at another important point – one which I did not mention in my original grievance: If the Dean, or the Provost for that matter, was not at all interested in conducting a proper investigation with interviews, then why would he write the following in his January 5 letter:

As a matter of course, I must instruct you not to interfere with this investigation or to engage in any form of reprisal action against any individual for their actual or perceived role in this investigation. Such conduct is prohibited and will result in the taking of disciplinary action by the University.

Firstly, these are very strong words, indeed. In fact, they can be viewed as being quite uncollegial by one who is being disciplined – as if the Dean suspected that I would actually think of interfering in the investigation or in seeking retaliation. Why would the Dean not write something a little more collegial – for example, “I trust that you will not interfere ...”? Once again, we see a lack of respect towards “subordinates”.

Secondly, if the Dean’s “investigation” would consist only in checking with Human Resources on whether or not I was “jabbed”, then how could I possibly interfere with the “investigation”? Furthermore, how could I possibly “engage in any form of reprisal action” against the relevant

employee(s) from Human Resources? To the best of my knowledge, the only people with whom I could possibly “engage in any form of reprisal action” would be fellow faculty members, students and possibly some staff members, perhaps from my own Department. Note that such “reprisal action” would be difficult – or at least difficult to keep secret – since I had not been on campus for several months. In any case, students – in particular, my own graduate students or students whom I had recently taught – would probably be perceived as the most likely victims of interference or retaliation on my part.

The Dean, however, clearly knew that his “investigation” consisted only in checking with Human Resources on whether or not I was “jabbed”. Therefore, he knew that I could not possibly interfere with the “investigation” or “engage in any form of reprisal action” since there would be no one with whom I could be engaged! Nevertheless, he sent me a very strong message, warning me to “Stay away from people involved in the investigation!” Why would he do this? At best, it is an error in judgement. At worst, it is an act of **dishonesty**. Which is it?

Dear members of the Tribunal, **how could I NOT conclude that people other than Human Resources staff might be involved in the “investigation”, i.e., people who would be interviewed by the Dean?** In other words, the Dean’s message naturally made me think that other people could/would be involved in the “investigation”. (What else would someone being disciplined think? This is why I began to prepare a list of potential interviewees immediately after receiving his January 5 letter.) But the Dean must have known that nobody else would be involved in the “investigation” since he sent me his “investigation is completed” letter on the next day. One must therefore conclude that the Dean’s message represents an act of **dishonesty**. (In *film noir* parlance, “He set me up.”)

The word “dishonesty” does not appear in Policy 33 on Ethical Behaviour. So how would it be classified? One possibility is to consider it as “harassment”, defined earlier (in Paragraph 29). Another is “poisoned environment”:

A ‘poisoned environment’ (or one that is intimidating, hostile or offensive) can be created based on any of the prohibited grounds under the Ontario Human Rights Code, and can be described as comment or conduct that is contrary to the aims of maintaining a supportive, respectful and tolerant environment. (from Section 2, “Specific principles”)

I shall leave it to the Tribunal to decide the more appropriate “specific principle” of the two. (Or perhaps they both apply.) Hopefully you will now understand why I consider the Dean’s “investigation”, and therefore the entire disciplinary procedure, to be invalid.

Finally, I should mention that I used the term “poisoned environment” in my first grievance (Page 6) but in another context.

Paragraphs 44 and 45: With all due respect, when an employee is treated with such lack of respect – especially in a university setting – what do you expect the employee to do except to conclude that something like *The Trial* is going on? I brought some “information” to the meeting but it was deemed by the Dean to be irrelevant.

With regard to the final sentence in Paragraph 45, i.e., that my claim that I was deprived of “due process” is “simply untenable”, I shall simply invite the reader to re-read the “sleight-of-hand” paragraph found immediately before the previous paragraph. This “jerking of the strings”, to use the

vernacular, is a classic example of “lack of due process”, to be expected in a concentration camp or a Gulag but not in a university.

Paragraph 48: The University is once again resorting to “sleight-of-hand” or “deflection”. I refer the members of the Tribunal to my second grievance. The University consistently claimed, in various letters to all UW employees, and then in disciplinary letters to all those deemed “noncompliant”, that it was required to adopt a **mandate**, not a policy. I chose to call this a “falsehood” in my grievance. In this document, the Respondent is now trying to hide/deflect the existence of these many falsehoods by stating the truth, i.e., that “University was required to adopt a COVID-19 vaccination policy.”

I refer the members of the Tribunal to the excellent and incisive post by Prof. J. Turri (Philosophy, UW) entitled, “The University of Waterloo’s ‘vaccination requirement’ was not legally required. But the university lied by saying it was.” Dated March 25, 2022 at

<https://mandates.substack.com/p/requirement-lie>

Paragraph 49: This is an exercise in basic logic which I thought was clearly explained in my grievance. The reader is referred once again to the following post by Prof. Turri,

<https://mandates.substack.com/p/the-university-of-waterloo-keeps>

Paragraph 50: The second sentence is at best misleading and, at worst, a very subtle attempt at “sleight-of-hand.” As such, it should be ignored by the Tribunal. Originally, the University posted its “Requirement” on the following webpage,

<https://uwaterloo.ca/coronavirus.return/vaccination-requirement>

solely in terms of “Non-compliance” as copied exactly on Page 3 of my second grievance. **There was absolutely no mention of this being a list of “four non-exhaustive examples of employee ‘non-compliance’”**. From basic logic, a reader would conclude that if one was not “non-compliant”, i.e., if none of the four points applied, then one was compliant. This was the logic employed in my second grievance and in Prof. Turri’s post,

<https://mandates.substack.com/p/the-university-of-waterloo-keeps>

Paragraph 54: Firstly, the Respondent should clearly indicate the precise source of “his statements” since they (i.e., my statements) do not appear in my grievances. My “statements” are to be found in my letter to my Dean and Chair, and copied to a number of members of the UW senior administration, entitled, “Notice of my refusal to submit to the UW mandatory vaccination and testing policy,” dated September 27, 2021. Secondly, the statement, “he did so based on his personal beliefs” is incomplete and misleading: My refusal was based on several reasons – not all personal – which include (i) my religious beliefs as a Roman Catholic (the mRNA vaccines were made with the use of aborted fetal tissue), (ii) legal/ethical principles (which include the fact that Nuremburg Code was being violated) and (iii) scientific considerations (which include the fact that the mRNA vaccines were poorly tested and already conjectured to be potentially toxic).

Paragraph 55: Once again, I refer the reader to Prof. Turri’s post,

<https://mandates.substack.com/p/the-university-of-waterloo-keeps>

Paragraph 63: The sentence, “If all employees ...” is not only weak but, in fact, without merit. A statement to the effect, “If a significant fraction of employees ...”, would have been more acceptable although, as it turns out, the COVID-19 mRNA vaccines were shown to be ineffective during the pandemic. Indeed, Prof. J. Turri (Philosophy, UW) showed this to be true on the UW campus – please see his post entitled, “The University of Waterloo’s own data show that its ‘vaccination requirement’ failed to make campus safer. But its president now says that compliance, not safety, was the true goal.” Dated March 28, 2022 at

<https://mandates.substack.com/p/the-university-of-waterloos-own-data>

Paragraph No. 67: Let me beg the reader’s patience and remind her/him that were it not for my letter dated November 15, 2021, the University would have proceeded with disciplinary actions that violated the Memorandum of Agreement. The fact that it even tried to impose its original “Employee Discipline Process” (EDP) outlined in its October 8, 2021 memo without consulting the MOA is most disturbing. (And the fact that the FAUW was “sleeping at the wheel”, completely unaware that the EDP was violating the MOA, is even more disturbing.) These actions reveal UW administration’s desire to control its employees, as revealed in Robert Williams’ (Torstar) interview of UW President Vivek Goel – see the post by J. Turri cited immediately above.

Concluding Remarks

The motives of my two grievances lie not in the University of Waterloo’s “Requirement” itself but in the ways in which the “Requirement” was enforced. Firstly, as pointed out in these grievances, the University unnecessarily resorted to falsehoods (i.e., that it was compelled to adopt a vaccination mandate) and deception (two “Requirements”) to justify its mandate.

Secondly, my grievances are concerned about how those deemed “noncompliant” with respect to the “Requirement” were treated by UW’s administration, both at the local level, i.e., Deans, as well as the higher level, i.e., President and Vice President Academic and Provost. Indeed, I conclude this document with an expression of sympathy and greatest respect for the fifty (to my knowledge) UW employees who were fired because of “noncompliance”. Why these fifty people were fired, while no people were fired at our sister institution, Wilfrid Laurier University, remains a mystery. One can only pray that the truth will someday be revealed. The authoritarian behaviour of the UW administration in its imposition and enforcement of the “Requirement” suggests a new and more appropriate motto for the University of Waterloo, namely,

Concordia cum falsitate per coercionem (In harmony with falsehood by coercion)

A tragic stain on an institution which I used to consider, with pride, as my “home”.

Edward R. Vrscay
Department of Applied Mathematics

Dated December 10, 2022