

Appendix 32: email from Monahan on securing Glendon Campus, May 10, 2009

From: Law Dean/osgoode  
To: Susan Drummond/osgoode@Osgoode/CA  
cc: Bruce Ryder@Osgoode/CA, Law Dean/osgoode@Osgoode/CA

---

Date: Sunday, May 10, 2009 07:14AM  
Subject: Conference update

History:

Dear Susan and Bruce

Susan I am copying Bruce because he has been part of our discussions in the past, and I wanted to make sure he is included in this exchange. I would also encourage you to circulate this note to the other two members of your committee.

I must say that I was very discouraged to receive this email, as well as the email you sent to the President asking to meet with him. Whether intentional or not, the underlying message that I take from both of your emails is that, for some reason, you do not seem to appreciate that I have been attempting to assist you in your efforts to improve the conference. On the contrary, you seem to regard me as somehow threatening or undermining your efforts.

When we met in my office a couple of weeks ago I thought we had agreed that it was important to add another significant speaker to the program as a keynote speaker. The reason is that, given the current lineup of speakers, there is a perceived lack of balance in the approaches being taken. I hasten to add that this is not for lack of trying, as you have invited a significant number of speakers who would allow for the desired balance and have been unsuccessful in getting them to sign on (or in some cases, speakers who had signed on have since declined to participate.) But I thought we had agreed that, regardless of the reasons, there is a problem with the overall balance in the speakers and it was therefore important to add at least one other speaker who would be a strong advocate of a two-state solution.

As you know, offering someone a keynote slot is an important way to attract senior scholars. For a number of reasons I think it unlikely, although not impossible, that you will be able to attract significant scholars to participate in this conference at this stage. So adding a new speaker as a keynote was a very important and constructive decision on your part. I was encouraged by your agreement with this and, based on that, (as well as on the idea of plenary sessions to highlight the strongest scholars), I facilitated the securing of the space in Glendon for the conference.

What your email now indicates is that you are not in fact going to add another speaker but, instead, have decided to elevate one of your existing speakers to be a keynote. This is not what we agreed in my office. More importantly, from my perspective, by using up

the additional keynote slot on an existing speaker, you now have made it virtually impossible to attract any additional major scholars to the conference.

Even more troubling is the fact that you have already gone ahead and invited Lustick as a keynote, without any further consultation or discussion with me. So from my perspective this is presented as *fait accompli*.

I would have thought it appropriate and necessary to at least discuss this revised plan with me before acting on it, particularly since it was inconsistent with what we had agreed. So I have to ask, why would you do that, without consulting or discussing it with me? I have to conclude that you don't see meeting with me or discussing these issues in advance as helping you.

This is reinforced by the second email you sent to the President asking to meet with him. Rather than proposing to meet with me, which in fact you have never done as a committee, you are seeking a meeting with the President which does not include me. I can see a number of reasons why you might want to have such a meeting with him. But none of those reasons will help you in the work that you need to do – to achieve the balance that is necessary, and which you have not succeeded in achieving on your own.

I have said throughout that I want to be able to continue to support you in this endeavour, both within the university and publicly. But this is premised on my being comfortable that the necessary balance had been achieved. I have to tell you that at this point I very much doubt that I will be able to personally support the conference. (This does not mean that the university will withdraw its sponsorship – although, to be candid, had I know in the beginning that it would develop in this way, I would not have agreed to have the university or the law school associated as a sponsor of this event. But that has been done and I do not think it would be worthwhile to revisit that decision at this stage.)

I remain open to discussing this further with you, and working with you on improving the conference. But you have to want to work me. That involves more than just meeting or sending emails. It requires actual cooperation on your part, where you want to work with me in a positive and constructive way, seeing me as a collaborator rather than as a threat. Can I also suggest, gently, that you need some help at this stage – and that you would benefit from my involvement?

This is really why I am discouraged. What I see is that, rather than making progress, you are just retracing ground you have already covered, working within your committee and not looking outside, and that nothing is really going to change.

Despite all this, I remain open to working with you and attempting to assist you. Can I even suggest that it would be worthwhile for your entire committee to meet with me to discuss the conference? Another suggestion I would make is that you to seek some other form of outside participation on your committee, someone who could bring a fresh perspective to your work and help you get to where I think you need to be. Otherwise,

to be frank, I don't see you making a whole lot of progress.

Yours very truly,  
Patrick

---

Patrick J. Monahan, Dean  
Osgoode Hall Law School  
York University, 4700 Keele Street  
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3  
Telephone: (416) 736-5199 / Fax: (416) 736-5251  
Email: lawdean@osgoode.yorku.ca

▼ Susan Drummond/osgoode

**Susan  
Drummond/osgoode**

To Law Dean/osgoode@Osgoode/CA

cc

05/08/2009  
07:53 PM

Subject

Hi Patrick,

I'm writing to give you a brief update from our organizing committee meeting today.

We have decided to showcase, in a keynote speaker role, one of the several strong Zionist two-state advocates from amongst our list of high profile academic presenters already secured for the conference. We do this with an aim to stimulating, as much as possible, a lively dialogue on the complex themes driving the conference.

To this end, we sent an invitation at our meeting today to Ian Lustick to serve in this capacity on the second day of the conference. Beyond our current offer of travel and accommodation we have offered him a \$2,000 honorarium for this role. Professor's Lustick's academic profile in this area is beyond reproach. He has replied this afternoon saying that he would love to take on this role, and that he will be in a position to confirm next week. In the event that he is not available in this capacity, it is our intention to turn next to Chaim Gans, a similarly renowned scholar with a similar philosophical position.

After a four hour meeting dedicated to the conference structure, we are almost finished putting the provisional program in place. We are planning - in addition to the keynote addresses by Jeremy Webber and Ian Lustick (or Chaim Gans) - to highlight our best scholars in three plenary sessions. We should be finished with this exercise early next week and have another meeting scheduled on Tuesday for this purpose.

Can we please ask something of you:

When Bruce and I met with Irving Abella last week, he was already aware that we had invited Michael Bell as a keynote speaker. He initiated a conversation about where we were at in that process. In fact, it had been the intention of Bruce and me not to bring up Bell's potential role in the conference as we are aware that there is fairly intense pressure being brought upon Jewish scholars in particular not to participate in the conference in any way. We were unsettled to know that Irving Abella already knew about the invitation to Bell. Similarly, when we were scheduling the meeting with Irving the previous week, he also made it clear to us the day before Bruce and I were scheduled to meet with you and David Dewitt that he was aware that that meeting was taking place. He appeared to be awaiting its outcome before arranging to meet with Bruce and I.

As we communicate with you about the details of the conference - details such as keynote speakers and the provisional program - can we please get an assurance from you that all of our communications with you are in confidence and that you will seek from us permission in advance to share information with third parties? This would be very much appreciated. We also feel that this discretion will shore up the integrity of the academic process in which we are engaged.

Susan Drummond  
Associate Professor  
Osgoode Hall Law School,  
York University,  
4700 Keele Street,  
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3  
Canada  
email: [sdrummond@osgoode.yorku.ca](mailto:sdrummond@osgoode.yorku.ca)

---