

The pseudo in scholarship/academia/institutions: know your warning signs

- intolerance of alternate theories and refusal to weigh new evidence
- misuse of institutional/professional power and networks to silence critics
- exercises of power for the sake of retaining power
- cliques masquerading as scholarly consensus. Gatekeeping (journals, grants/awards, symposiums)
- “identification with institutional power” (Edmund Carpenter, 1961). Toxic loyalty. More important to defend “reputation” of institution and colleagues than to engage scholarly evidence.
- contrary views are considered an attack on colleagues or an institution rather than a normal part of scholarly debate
- institutions advancing or tolerating historical interpretations because they are “popular,” “marketable,” or “politically useful” rather than scholarly.
- Abandonment of scholarly rigour in hope of reaching a broader audience. “We welcome all interpretations.”

—Douglas Hunter, author of *The Place of Stone* (UNC Press) and *Beardmore* (McGill-Queen’s University Press)