

#13

E14M

**To:** Larry Nees Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Research  
**From:** University of Delaware African-American Coalition  
**Re:** Pioneer Fund  
**Date:** January 30, 1990

Thank you for inviting our comments regarding the University's acceptance of monies from the Pioneer Fund. We appreciate the seriousness of the matter facing your committee, and we applaud your efforts to obtain broad-based opinion from within the University community.

We have studied the information collected thus far by your Committee and have concluded that it is not in the best interest of the University to be associated with the Pioneer Fund. We call on the University to return all research money to the Pioneer Fund.

We believe that the Pioneer Fund's history, as well as its current practices, run counter to the University's goal of fostering an appreciation of multicultural diversity. It also runs counter to the University's goal of educating individuals to their fullest potential with no regard to the individual's race, religion, national origin, or date of naturalization. Further, it is our opinion that the Pioneer Fund has established a clear pattern of giving that promotes activities intended to denigrate, inhibit, and otherwise proscribe the activities of those groups of people whom they deem undesirable, e.g. blacks, Jews, Latinos, immigrants, and leftists, to name but a few.

We also believe that there is a concerted effort on the part of some researchers funded by the Pioneer Fund to circumvent the process of scholarly peer review and distribute prematurely their half-baked research. We believe this is a dishonest and reckless process that also runs counter to the University's goal of developing and disseminating 'scholarship', in the best sense of the word.

Also, we strongly recommend that the University administration develop a procedure by which grants and other outside funding can be appropriately monitored. Attached you will find a full outline of our views on this subject, which we hope you will give careful consideration.

Thank you.

Before the  
Faculty Senate Committee on Research  
University of Delaware

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Acceptance of Funding )  
from the Pioneer Fund )  
in Support of Research )  
by Dr. Linda S. Gottfredson )

STATEMENT FILED BY UDAAC  
THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE AFRICAN-AMERICAN COALITION  
; January 30, 1990.

Introduction

The charter of the Pioneer Fund, many of the foundations it supports and much of the research it funds, including the work of Professor Gottfredson here at the University of Delaware, stand in direct opposition to University of Delaware goals as mandated by The President's Commission To Promote Racial And Cultural Diversity. Specifically, Professor Gottfredson's research in racially based differences in intelligence and her recommendation that the way to deal with difference is to continue to deny access to those who are different, stands in direct opposition to University of Delaware stated goals.

Gottfredson's and The Pioneer Fund's arguments are based on the naive assumption that we seek to ignore and minimize differences between groups. Quite the contrary, we recognize that differences exist and have always existed. The University of Delaware in adopting the goals of the Commission has taken the position that difference is to be accepted, respected and indeed celebrated. As Dr. Trabant said, "One of the things we must do is to recognize that diversity is a strength and to find the means by which this University can be a finer place with greater diversity than it had been in the past (News Journal, Jan. 9, 1990 )."

Gottfredson and the Pioneer Fund on the other hand see difference from a hierarchical perspective. People are ranked according to these differences, with rewards going to individuals possessing "desirable traits" (in-group), as defined by those in power. Those possessing "shortcomings" (out-group), are to be denied access. (Jones, 1986).

The power to define which instrumentalities (inputs) will be useful in realizing the meritocratic opportunities in this society rests with people who often believe that blacks are not only different but also deficient and that those differences constitute a legitimate basis for differential outcomes (Jones, 1986. pp. 307-308).

Gottfredson expresses her true feelings best in, "Breaching Taboos: A Personal Perspective" when she writes, "Group differences, like individual differences to some extent, are an embarrassment and unwelcome complication to a society in which equality is such a central philosophical tenet." What she fails to grasp is the true meaning of equality. "Democracy does not require belief in the moral equality of those who are the same or alike

but, rather, belief in the moral equality of the *different*-whether they are physically different, racially different, or intellectually different" (Hook, 1971, p. 116).

By adopting the mandates of the President's Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity, the University of Delaware has chosen to take an enlightened approach with respect to dealing with the issue of difference.

The Commission seeks not only to help open the doors of the University of Delaware to populations which have hitherto been under-represented in proportion to populations in the larger community, but attempts to deal with factors which prevented equal treatment in the past.

It is most important to note that sheer increase in numbers and in equitable treatment of those perceived as minority is not the only goal; a more fundamental issue is the acceptance of diversity itself. As human beings we are already diverse; what needs to be achieved is an increased acceptance of...indeed, a celebration of...that diversity.

We take this as a University commitment to challenge unsound positions that seek to prevent individuals and groups from receiving a fair and just hearing. The views of difference as espoused by the Pioneer Fund and Gottfredson are reactionary, and at best, outdated. They run counter to the expressed goals and aims of the University of Delaware.

In this brief we will review: the Pioneer Fund's Charter, its funding methods and organizations receiving Pioneer Fund Money. We will highlight areas where these methods or organizations are in direct conflict with University of Delaware goals. In addition we will examine the question of academic freedom and review Professor Gottfredson's work, and the work of major Pioneer Fund researcher, J. Philippe Rushton.

UDAAC will show where acceptance of Pioneer Fund money will extract a greater cost from the University and strongly recommend that the Faculty Senate Committee on Research advise the Faculty Senate to resolve that the University of Delaware will:

1. Return all research money to the Pioneer Fund.
2. Have no further dealings with the Pioneer Fund.
3. Establish a review process to examine those philanthropic organizations whose objectives stand in opposition to University of Delaware aims and goals.

### Pioneer Fund

#### Charter

An examination of the Pioneer Fund's charter reveals it to be in direct opposition to University goals as expressed by the mandate of the President's Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity.

The Pioneer Fund's current charter reads that one of its purposes is, "To provide or aid in providing for the education of children of parents deemed to have such qualities and traits of character as to make such parents of unusual value as citizens (Pioneer Fund, 1985, p. 2)." It further states that these children "are to be deemed to be descended predominantly from persons who settled in the original thirteen states prior to the adoption of the Constitution (Pioneer Fund, 1985, p. 3)." The charter states that the purpose of the

Pioneer Fund is "To conduct or aid in conducting study and research into the problems of heredity and eugenics in the human race." The current charter differs from the original charter drafted in 1937 in its omission of direct reference to "white persons". However, our review of the organization's funding patterns will show that the intent remains unchanged.

Letters from the Pioneer Fund and Dr. Gottfredson argue that 40 years ago the University of Delaware did not accept African-American students. We contend that there is a major difference between a change made 40 years ago and one made in 1985. In addition the Pioneer Fund attempts to hide discriminatory practices with ambiguous wording in its charter. For example, Africans were not considered persons "prior to the adoption of the Constitution."

Funded Research Agencies  
Based on tax records 1982 - 1987  
and Pioneer Fund Statement

This section of the brief will examine research funded by the Pioneer Fund. Organizations will be listed in descending order of dollar amount received. Where possible additional information on the organizations was obtained from the Encyclopedia of Associations and the Research Centers Directory. It is interesting to note that in letters submitted by the Pioneer Fund and Professor Gottfredson, mention is made of donations to sickle cell anemia (a disease which affects people of African origin) and Tay-Sachs Disease (which affects people of Jewish origin). Our research revealed that during the period 1982 - 1987, \$1,000 was contributed to Tay-Sachs research. No grants were made to study Sickle Cell during that time period.

The Pioneer Fund provided a list of diseases studied under its grants: AIDS, heart disease, hemophilia, nutritional deficiencies impact on intelligence, periodontal disease, identical twin transfusion syndrome, psychoses, schizophrenia, sickle cell anemia, Tay-Sachs disease, Tourette's syndrome.

University recipients from 1937 - 1989 include: Calgary, California: (Berkeley, Santa Barbara, San Diego, San Francisco), Connecticut, Delaware, Hampden-Sydney College, Hawaii, Johns Hopkins, London, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, Montevallo, NYU, Northern Iowa, Pennsylvania, Randolph - Macon College, Smith, Southern Mississippi, Stanford, Tel-Aviv, Texas at Austin, Western Ontario, Ulster at Coleraine.

Foundation recipients from 1937 - 1989 include: American Eugenics Society, American Immigration Control Foundation, American Policy Institute, Atlas Economics Research Foundation, Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, Coalition for Freedom, Foundation for American Immigration Reform, Foundation for Human Understanding, Foundation for Research and Education on Eugenics and Dysgenics, Institute for the Study of Educational Differences, Institute for the Study of Man, Institute for Western Values, International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, National Defense Council, New York Hospital (Cornell Medical Center) Pioneer Scholarships for Army Aircorp Children, Sickle Cell Foundation, Tay-Sachs Prevention Program of the Shriver Center for Mental Retardation, Testing Research Fund.

An interesting pattern of Pioneer-funded research is the amount of money spent on distribution of literature. While this is a common practice, it has interesting consequences.

In the physical sciences, it aids in the process of replication by allowing scientists to distribute important formulas and research methods. In the social sciences it often has the effect of bypassing the important step of scholarly peer review. It allows researchers to pass their work off as fact without any challenges.

University of Minnesota  
Dept of Psychology Elliot Hall  
75 East River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

\$495,274

Grants received in 1982, \$68,274; 1984, \$95,000; 1985, \$100,000; 1986, \$132,000; 1987, \$100,000. Funds were for research on twins.

Institute for the Study of Educational Differences  
(ISED)

\$477,500

61 Moraga Way Suite 6  
Orinda, California 94563

Grants received in 1982, \$50,000 for operating budget (Nov. 1982 - Oct. 1983); 1984, \$90,000 for research; 1985, \$96,000 for research; 1986 grants on Feb. 24, June 10, and Dec. 17 totalling \$134,500 for research; 1987, grants on Feb. 25 and August 28, totalling \$107,000.

Foundation for American Immigration Reform  
(FAIR)

\$420,000

2028 P. Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20002

Grants received in 1982, \$60,000 for general operating costs; 1984, \$30,000 for studies on immigration problems; additional \$35,000 in 1984 for research study; 1985 grants on Jan. 2, June 11, and Oct. 4, totalling \$105,000 for study of immigration problems; 1986 grants on March 20, and July 28 totalling \$80,000 for study of immigration problems; 1987 grants on Jan. 6, May 6, Sept. 26, totalling \$110,000 for study of immigration problems.

Institute for the Study of Man

Institute for the Study of Man

\$264,500

1133 13th Street NW Suite C-2  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 789-0231  
Roger Pearson, PhD, Director

Founded 1975. Purpose is to publish books and Journals in areas related to anthropology and the human sciences. Conducts seminars; maintains 11,000 volume library. Publications Journal of Indo-European Studies: quarterly. Also publishes books and monograph series. Grants received in 1982, \$91,200 for construction of a building to house a library and general operating costs; 1984, \$9,000 for distribution of articles, additional \$32,000 for library maintenance; 1985, \$57,300 for printing of educational materials and literary activities; 1986, grants received on Feb 3, Oct 20 and Dec. 18 totalling \$44,500 for literary activities; 1987, \$30,500 for literary activities.

University of Western Ontario  
Department of Psychology  
London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2

\$206,550.99

Received grants from the Pioneer fund in 1984, \$54,861.32; 1985, \$73,152.67; 1986, \$17,934; 1987, 60,603. Grants supported the work of J. Philippe Rushton. Rushton's work will be examined later in this brief.

Coalition for Freedom  
P.O. Box 19458  
Raleigh, NC 27619  
Phone (919) 781-0489  
Ann May, Executive Officer

\$150,000

Founded 1979. Nonmembership. Sponsors television programs designed to inform the public of the fundamentals of the free enterprise system. Programs also emphasize the importance of a strong national defense in the face of "communist threats" and urge a reduction in "wasteful" spending by the government. Is currently establishing the Jesse Helms Institute for Foreign Policy and American Studies. Grants received in 1984, \$20,000. for distribution of educational films; 1985, \$30,000 for distribution of educational films; 1987, grants on Jan. 6, and April 24 totalling \$100,000 for the production of films on immigration.

University of Pennsylvania  
Population Studies Center  
3718 Locust Walk  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6298  
Dr. Samuel H. Preston, Director.  
(215) 898-6441

\$137,000

Organizational Notes: Integral unit of Faculty of Arts and Sciences at University of Pennsylvania. Founded 1961. Sources of Support: Parent institution, U. S. government and foundations. Staff 12 research professionals, 3 others. Research Activities and Fields: Demography and ecology, including interrelation of migration and economic and social factors, statistical correlates of fertility, labor force, comparative urbanization, historical demography, population and development. Publications and Services: Research results published in books and professional journals. Publications: Technical Reports. Meetings/Educational Activities: Provides doctoral training at the University through research and academic courses in demography, sociology, and economics. Holds seminar led by visiting scholars or staff members, several times per year. Library: 15,000 volumes on demography and population-related subjects for use of staff and trainees: Lisa Newman, Librarian.

Grants received in 1982, \$27,000 for study of dysgenic trends in U.S. and Japanese populations; 1984, \$45,000 for study of German/Danish positive eugenics; 1987, \$65,000 for studies in the decline of infertility in European, North American and East Asian populations.

Johns Hopkins University  
Center for Social Organization of Schools  
Baltimore, MD 21218.

\$124,000

Grants received in 1986, \$51,000 for symposium on crime and unemployment in support of work by Drs. Gordon and Gottfredson; 1987, \$73,000 for support of a new computer system.

American Immigration Control Reform  
Box 525  
Three Water Street  
Monterey, VA 24465  
Phone: (703) 468-2022  
Susan Stacy, Executive Director  
Founded 1983, Members 80,000, Staff 4.

\$102,000

American citizens concerned about what the AICF views as uncontrolled immigration in the U.S. Objective is to educate Americans and their leaders on problems the AICF believes are caused by illegal immigration, and on the need for immigration control. Seeks to resolve what the AICF claims is the current crisis caused by illegal immigration practices. Commission research projects on immigration policies and related issues. Maintains speakers' bureau and 800 volume library. Conducts seminars.

Publications: AICF Report, bimonthly. Newsletter. Price: included in membership dues. Circulation 80,000, advertising not accepted. Also publishes Immigration time bomb (book) research findings, and monographs.

Convention/Meeting: periodic conference.

Grants received in 1984, Feb 2, June 7, and August 29, totalling \$22,000 for study of immigration problems and distribution of literature; 1985, \$30,000 for printing of educational material; 1986, \$30,000 for the purchase of computer equipment; 1987, \$20,000 for operating expenses.

University of London

\$ 94,905

Grants received in 1986, \$45,975 for study of cross-cultural reaction times; 1987, \$48,930 for study of cross-cultural reaction times.

Foundation for Human Understanding  
206 North Washington St. Suite 238  
Alexandria, VA 20314  
Box 5712  
Athens, GA 30604.

\$ 81,000

Grants received in 1982, \$51,000 for operating costs and for distribution of: Prof. R.J. Herrnstein's, IQ testing and the media, and Dr. P. Herndon's, The abilities and achievements of Orientals in North America; 1984, \$5,000 for distribution of materials on evolution; 1987, June 26, August 22, and November 26, totalling \$25,000 for book on origins and achievements.

American Policy Institute \$ 59,500  
227 Massachusetts Avenue, NE Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20002

Grant received in 1982, \$59,500 for general operating costs, for an opinion survey on immigration and for a project entitled "Center for Immigration Research and Education."

Smith College \$ 36,000  
Department of Education and Child Study  
Morgan Hall-37 Prospect Street  
Northampton, MA 01063

Grant received in 1985, \$12,000 to publish educational books; 1986, \$24,000 awarded in two \$12,000 installments approved in 1985 to publish educational books.

East-West Center \$ 17,000  
East-West Population Institute  
17717 East-West Road  
Honolulu, HI 96848

Grant received in 1984, \$17,000 for research into evolution and demographics.

Institute for Western Value \$ 12,000  
4413 Braddock Road  
Alexandria, VA 22312

Grant received in 1982, \$12,000 for publication of the book, Southern horizons.

The New University of Ulster \$ 5,000

Grant received in 1986, \$5,000 for the study of changes in intelligence scores of British children.

Testing Research Fund \$ 2,000  
6207 Tallyho Lane  
Alexandria, VA 22307

Grant received in 1984, \$2,000 for research.

Tay-Sachs Center \$ 1,000  
c/o Shriver Center for Mental Retardation, Inc.  
200 Trapelo Road  
Waltham, MA 02254

Grant received in 1984, \$1,000 for research expenses.

National Defense Council  
L'Enfant Plaza Box 23397  
Washington, DC 20026

\$ 1,000

Grant received in 1984, \$1,000 for food and supplies for Central American Refugees.

New York Hospital  
(Cornell Medical Center)  
525 East 68th Street  
New York, NY 10021

\$ 1,000

Grant received in 1984, \$1,000 for research on cancer patients' ocular tumors.

The Pioneer Fund clearly states its objectives by the allocation of its dollars. A disproportionate amount of money is spent in support of organizations which advocate a view of difference clearly in opposition to that stated by the University of Delaware. The goals of many of these groups is to scientifically prove the inferiority of African-Americans and other minority groups. In addition much of the funding is for the dissemination of materials. Grants made during the period 1985-1989 follow the same pattern. No additional grants were made for either Tay-Sachs research or to study sickle cell anemia.

Our objection is based not only on the organization's past history but also on its current practices. Many philanthropic organizations have questionable origins. To suggest that the University not accept funds from the Rhodes Foundation or the Guggenheim Foundation because of their origins or because they have funded controversial research is an attempt to trivialize legitimate concerns regarding the practices of the Pioneer Fund.

#### Dr. J. Philippe Rushton

J. P. Rushton is one of the Pioneer Fund's primary researchers. He received \$206,550.99 for research in the area of racial differences in Behavior. His work is theoretical consisting of secondary analysis of data and literature reviews. It can be assumed that much of the financial support was for the purpose of distribution of literature.

Acknowledgements read: "This research was supported by a grant from the Pioneer Fund. Requests for reprints should be sent to J. P. Rushton at the Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2 (Rushton and Bogaert, 1988, p. 259)." "I am grateful to A. F. Bogaert, L. Ellis, H. J. Eysenck, D. Freedman, A. R. Jensen, R. Lynn, H. Nyborg, K. P. Ossenkopp and P. A. Vernon for comments, B. Mills for preparing the typescript, and The Pioneer Fund for financial support (Rushton, 1988a, p. 1021)." and "The author is indebted to A. R. Jensen for useful discussion and The Pioneer Fund for financial support (1988b, p. 1039)."

Rushton (1988a) develops a theory of racial hierarchy "discussed in the context of evolutionary based r/K reproductive strategies (p. 1009)." The r/K reproductive strategy balances the production of eggs (the potential for life) with parental care after birth. On the r end of the spectrum, species produce large numbers of eggs but provide no parental care. On the K end a species produces few eggs but assures the survival of its offspring through nurturing. Humans are the most K species. Rushton takes the r/K strategy develops scales for intelligence, maturation rate, personality and temperament, and social organization. He then places the three races: "Mongoloid, Caucasoid and Negroid" on this continuum and

provides statistics to prove his point. It is preposterous to assume that all that we are as human beings can be assigned to a scale. Rushton takes the preposterous a step further by postulating that the "true" measure of human beings is below the belt.

For example the rate of dizygotic twinning among Mongoloids is <4 per thousand; among Caucasoids 8; and among Negroids >16 (Bulmer, 1970). Similarly, in sexual restraint, on both genetically based variables (size of penis, vagina, clitoris, breasts and buttocks), and those more culturally influenceable (attitudes, intercourse frequencies), the Japanese are similar to the Chinese and Koreans, whether assessed in their home countries, Hawaii, or the U.S. mainland, but are different from Australians, Israelis and white Americans, who are similar to each other but are different from Kenyans, Nigerians, and black Americans (Rushton and Bogaert, 1987).

Paralleling differences in gamete production and sexual restraint are those in intelligence (cranial capacity, brain weight, test scores), maturation rate (age to hold head erect, age to walk alone, age of death), personality (activity level, anxiety, sociability), and social organization (marital stability, mental disorder, law abidingness), all of which show whites between Orientals and blacks. The efficient unit of analysis, therefore, is the higher order concept of race, within which cluster the different ethnic groups and, ultimately, individuals. Following common usage three main racial categories are considered: Mongoloid, Caucasoid and Negroid (Rushton, 1988a, p. 1009).

According to Rushton,

The more K a person, the longer the period of gestation, the higher the birthweight, the more delayed the onset of sexual activity, the older the age at first reproduction, the longer the life, the lower the sex drive, the higher the intelligence, the more efficient the use of energy, the lower the dispersal tendency, the more social rule following the behavior, and the greater the altruism (Rushton, 1988a, p. 1019).

Rushton makes value judgements such that restraint is superior to expressiveness, introversion to extroversion and exploitation of the environment superior to living in harmony with it. It should also be noted that his study did not analyze Africans that had not been exposed to the contamination of European enslavement or colonization. For statistics on crime, family stability, and mental health, U.S. blacks were the model with some support provided by British figures.

Rushton's (1988a) work would lead one to believe that African culture has contributed nothing of value to the world community.

Thus in China and Japan, numerous monastic centers of enlightenment have existed historically and today universities and research institutes begin to outnumber those in the West whereas the same populations have often adopted clothing styles to flatten the breasts and buttocks in an explicit attempt to "deanimalize" (Freedman, 1979, p. 107). On the African

continent dances have often been invented to emphasize undulating rhythms (A French Army Surgeon 1898/1972; Freedman, 1979), although there are fewer centers of educational excellence (Rushton, 1988a, p. 1020).

Rushton goes on to quote Freud's theory of the psychodynamics of repression and sublimation which posit a positive correlation between restrained sexuality and the production of culture: "Rushton's analysis of African dance and art appears to reflect an ethnocentric bias and a puritanical esthetic sensibility (Zuckerman and Brody, 1988 p. 1031)."

Data from standardized tests such as Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory are used to operationalize personality traits such as altruism, thrill and adventure seeking, aggressiveness, dominance, and impulsivity. Rushton concludes:

The evidence consistently favored the hypothesis that on average, Asians were both more introverted and more anxious than Euro-Americans and less dominant and aggressive. While fewer systematic studies have been carried out on Africans and black Americans, many imply greater aggressiveness, dominance, impulsivity, and displays of masculinity compared to whites (Dreger and Miller, 1960; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985). (Rushton, 1988a, p. 1014).

Again, conclusions are made on the basis of inconclusive operationalized definitions. Rushton has insufficient evidence to make these claims.

Pioneer disseminated studies quickly find their way into the hands of white supremacists who use them to further fuel hatred. These groups will even refute sections of the studies to further their belief in white supremacy. The Instauration a Florida based anti-Jewish/anti-black publication of Howard Allen Enterprises [Allen uses the pen name Wilmot Robertson (ADL, Jan. 25, 1990)] writes:

If any social scientist, including Rushton, is truly interested in studying racial differences, he must first subdivide the white race. If he measures the intelligence of Nordics against Mongoloids or against any specific Mongoloid subrace, such as the Japanese, he might get results that would sharply contradict the theories obtained by throwing all whites (including many Hispanics) in the same pot and letting their average 100 IQ be the standard against which the higher scoring Mongoloids are compared (Instauration, 1989, May, p. 34).

These studies are used by such groups to spew hatred in a variety of directions. The same issue of Instauration writes,

Four Jewish mediators, Michael Ziegler, David Wiesenthal, Neil Wiener and Fredric Weizman, were recruited by the Toronto Globe and Mail (Feb. 4, 1989) to cut Rushton down to size. He was accordingly damned as a reactionary

racist and the liberal Jewish quadrumvirate passionately demanded that all future funding for Rushton's research be withheld (Instauration, 1989, May, p. 34).

In the eyes of the Instauration, Rushton is a hero known for "rugged forthright speech."

Rushton admits, "I would much rather everyone agree with me...but there comes a point when you have to tell the truth." He further states that Nazis did not persecute Jews because they were "an inferior people," but because of their dominance and ascendancy in German public life. He comes right out and says, "I'm not going to give (a Negro) a higher grade just because he complains." As for the Negro habit of asking for special treatment, Rushton says, "Let's face it. That's what he wants (Instauration, 1989, May, p. 34).

Quoting from an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, the Instauration writes, "Walter Massey, president of the AAAS, who just happens to be black (a goal or a quota?) called the whole affair 'personally disturbing' and 'highly suspect'". Ironically the same Chronicle (Feb 1, 1989) article provides further evidence of the shoddiness of Rushton's work,

Allan C. Wilson, a professor of biochemistry at the University of California at Berkeley whose research Mr. Rushton quoted in determining which race had evolved most recently, said that Mr. Rushton had misinterpreted his research. "I'm pretty upset," Mr. Wilson said. No conclusions could be drawn from his research about which race had evolved most recently. Mr. Wilson said, and no evidence suggests the Orientals are any more distantly related to Africans than Caucasians are. "Races are not like species," he said. "They don't have a divergence time from each other. They are still exchanging genes (p. A6)."

It should also be noted that Rushton cites Gottfredson.

Fortunately a more enlightened research climate for the study of racial variation may be occurring, at least as indicated by the increasing popular interest in human racial beginnings (Newsweek, January, 1988), and the willingness of front rank journals to consider their differences (Gottfredson, 1986; Steen, 1987). (Rushton 1988b, p. 1038).

While Rushton is perhaps the most dangerous of Pioneer's major researchers, he is part of a pattern that is almost conspiratorial in nature. Pioneer funded twin studies support genetic studies which in turn support population studies, which support racial difference studies. Pioneer funds the dissemination of the racial difference studies, which bypass the scientific process of scholarly peer review. These studies find their way to white supremacists who amplify the message. They are also sent to decision makers and picked up by the general public, where lacking critical review, they run the risk of being accepted as gospel.

## Professor Linda S. Gottfredson

Professor Gottfredson clearly has not embraced the University of Delaware's goal of "creating a climate that expects and encourages all members of the University community to respect and appreciate individual and cultural differences." Her research indicates that she believes that differences are to be used to provide opportunity for some and deny access to others. It is accepted that there are differences among people. Gottfredson recommends developing a hierarchy based on intelligence levels.

*Current differences between the black and white IQ distributions are large enough to produce enormous adverse impact when tests are used in a race-neutral manner to hire workers. A fuller appreciation of the predicament facing personnel workers, and the nation itself, can be obtained by looking at black-white disproportions in IQ scores and arraying them along the same g dimension that runs through occupations (Gottfredson, 1988, p. 301).*

Gottfredson's aim is to restrict African-American advancement on the basis of test scores. By placing IQ scores on the same continuum with "the same g dimension that runs through occupations", she produces the argument that there simply are not enough qualified black people.

I estimate that if both blacks and whites were recruited to jobs from the same IQ range as workers in general have been in the past, the proportion of all blacks who would be eligible compared to the proportion of all whites who would be eligible would be progressively smaller for higher level jobs. Specifically, the ratio of proportions would be only 1 to 20 for physicians, 1 to 10 for secondary teachers, and 1 to 2 for police officers (Gottfredson, 1987 p. 8).

Gottfredson's beliefs are based on the central tendency approach which operates on three basic premises:

1. One can and does assign value to dimensions of human character and ability, based on the norms or values of society.
2. One can assess the standing of every citizen along these dimensions.
3. One can evaluate the merit of citizens on the basis of the value assigned to the behavior and the standing one attains in its expression. This merit then becomes the basis for the allocation of rewards (Jones, 1988, p. 120).

In adopting the statement of the President's Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity, the University of Delaware has chosen to take a more enlightened approach with regard to "promoting equity for people of differing backgrounds throughout all areas of University life." Gottfredson seeks to use IQ differences as a barrier to that equity.

Even more disturbing is Gottfredson's belief that racial friction is the result of people being exposed to racial differences in IQ. "Ironically, integration, more equal opportunity, and affirmative action may be exacerbating this process by exposing more blacks and whites to their average differences with each other (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 11). Such a statement sounds like a call for a return to segregation.

Finally, Professor Gottfredson states, "The large average IQ difference between blacks and whites plays a major role in explaining the disproportionately low representation of blacks for certain good outcomes--namely, employment in professional jobs--and the disproportionately high representation of blacks for certain negative outcomes--namely, various prevalence rates for crime and delinquency (Gottfredson, 1987, p.4)." She also claims, "Education and training strategies do not short-circuit the impact of racial disproportions in [intelligence] (Gottfredson, 1987, p. 5)."

It is dangerous, irresponsible and unethical for a social scientist to postulate a causal relationship between the IQ of African-Americans and crime, at a time in our nation, when the "Willie Horton campaign strategy" turns a 19-point opinion poll deficit into a 10-point lead and when merely accusing a black person of a crime, sends police on a search and round-up in the black community! UDAAC sincerely hopes that the faculty of the University of Delaware will not allow this type of research to represent them in the larger academic community.

#### Academic Freedom

We at UDAAC realize that this case presents a challenge for the theory of academic freedom. The University of Delaware, in the end, must decide whether its own goals should be subverted by the research aims of its employees. In the open letter to the University of Delaware community, Larry Nees, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Research raises the question of academic freedom by quoting President Trabant, " Our efforts to resolve this question must, of course, recognize the fundamental right of a faculty member to pursue research in a field of the faculty member's choice, even if that research is unpopular." The question of academic freedom is indeed important. It is that freedom which provides for the existence of UDAAC. We salute the President's decision to resolve this sensitive matter through the Faculty Senate. It is through the Senate that academic freedom can best be protected.

Gottfredson's use of academic freedom in defense of her acceptance of Pioneer Fund money rests on a very narrow interpretation of academic freedom. Academic freedom as a concept balances the rights of the individual with the goals and aims of the institution. While it prevents the institution from usurping the rights of the individual it also prevents the individual from undermining the institution. The Pioneer Fund's objectives and Professor Gottfredson's research are not just "unpopular", they demonstrate a flagrant disregard for the goals of the University of Delaware.

There is little consensus regarding the meaning of academic freedom although there is agreement that it is something worth protecting. The concept has been invoked in support of many contrary causes and positions. It, for example, was used to justify student activism and to repress it, to defend radical faculty and to defend their suppression, to support inquiry into admissions of promotions or tenure decisions and to deny such inquiry (Kaplan, 1983, p. 6).

Academic freedom is often viewed narrowly from the perspective that a professor has the freedom to pursue any field of research. In fact this is but one of three levels of academic freedom. According to Schrecker (1983) academic freedom exists on three levels.

1. The individual work level. This level relates to the research interests of the academic professional.
2. General freedom level. This level allows academic professionals to exercise their rights as members of the larger society without endangering their academic status.
3. The corporate level. This level is a collective right. It is at this level that institutions determine who shall teach and what shall be taught without outside interference.

The first two are individual freedoms and easily understood by most people. It is the third level which causes institutions difficulty.

It becomes clear that the academic profession has defended its collective freedom by making concessions with regard to that of its individual members. In other words, in order to make sure that outsiders do not meddle with matters like hiring, promotion, and curriculum development, the academic profession took upon itself the task of policing itself and making sure that none of its members would do anything that would bring about such intervention. This means that the profession essentially acts as a transmission belt for political pressures from the outside. Ironically, the more coherently organized the academy is, the more sensitive it becomes to those pressures and the more quickly it responds to or even anticipates them. Thus, the more effectively the academic profession defends itself, the more likely it is to sacrifice those of its members who cause it trouble (Schrecker, 1983, p. 26).

Should a professor's research interests be exercised in violation of the University's goals?

Just as individual academic freedom has come under fire, or has been defended in ways that erode its legitimate *raison d'etre*, so the freedom of autonomy of academic departments has been questioned. That is the right of academics, constituted as departments, to make decisions concerning their own has come under fire as just another way individuals perform the police function of their repressive social order (Elshtain, 1983, p. 164).

The Faculty Senate is certainly within its rights to resolve that the University of Delaware return Pioneer Fund money and refuse to accept research grants from the organization in the future, without being in violation of Professor Gottfredson's rights.

## Academic Financing

We also realize that universities very rarely return money or cut themselves off from funding sources.

Repudiating the giver while keeping the gift would seem the ideal solution. But some schools, adopting a fairly classic morning-after attitude can't seem to admit that they have become entangled with an unwholesome gift giver. For them, a scandal involving a major donor provides an opportunity for some exciting ethical gymnastics and fancy public-relations gimmickry (Grosman, 1990, Jan., p. 82).

However, a decision to return Pioneer Fund money and refuse to accept future grants from the organization would prove in the best interest of the University of Delaware. Universities must strive to achieve higher moral ends. In this particular case the goal of making the University of Delaware "an educational community that is intellectually, culturally and socially diverse, and enriched by the contributions and full participation of persons from differing backgrounds" is the greater goal.

## Conclusion

UDAAC feels it important to point out that Gottfredson's knowledge of and defense of the Pioneer Fund and its recipients is above and beyond the normal relationship which exists between researcher and funding source. The relationship points to a certain collusion. In a January 12, letter to the Review, she comes to the defense of J. P. Rushton who cited her in his work.

The Fund has supported some research by J. P. Rushton, but so has the Guggenheim Foundation. In fact, the Foundation last year supported Rushton to continue the very research that he was conducting with support from the Pioneer Fund and that Frawley finds so objectionable.

Whereas:

1. The Pioneer Fund clearly states its objectives through the allocation of funds;
2. The best exercise of academic freedom in this case is at the corporate level;
3. The cost of accepting Pioneer Fund money is far greater than returning it;
4. Acceptance of Pioneer Fund money is clearly in opposition to University of Delaware stated goals;
5. Pioneer researchers, including Professor Linda S. Gottfredson, show a disregard for respecting difference as encouraged by The President's Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity;

UDAAC strongly recommends that the Faculty Senate Committee on Research advise the Faculty Senate to resolve that the University of Delaware will:

1. Return all research money to the Pioneer Fund.
2. Have no further dealings with the Pioneer Fund.
3. Establish a review process to examine those philanthropic organizations whose objectives stand in opposition to University of Delaware aims and goals.

This position is consistent with The University's stated aim of "creating an educational community that is intellectually, culturally and socially diverse, and enriched by the contributions and full participation of persons from differing backgrounds."

## References

- Anti-Defamation League, of B'nai B'rith, (Jan. 25, 1990). Telephone conversation with director.
- Burek, D. M., Koek, K. E., & Novallo, A. (Eds.). (1990). Encyclopedia of associations: National organizations of the U.S. Detroit: Gale Research Inc.
- Dresser, P. D., & Hill, K. (Eds.). (1990). Research centers directory (19th ed.). Detroit: Gale Research Inc.
- Elshtain, J. B. (1983). Reflections on academic freedom, equality, and excellence. In C. Kaplan & E. Schrecker (Eds.), Regulating the intellectuals: Perspectives on academic freedom in the 1980s. (pp. 161-180). New York: Praeger.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1987, August). Breaching taboos: A personal perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1988). Reconsidering fairness: A matter of social and ethical priorities. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 33, (pp. 293-312).
- Gottfredson, L. S. (Jan. 12, 1990). Letter to the Review.
- Grosman, R. (1990, January). Embarrassment of riches: Certain riches anyway. Spy. pp. 80-87.
- Hook, S. (1971). Conflict and change in the academic community. In S. Hook (Ed.), In defense of academic freedom. (pp. 106-119). New York: Pegasus.
- Jones, J. M. (1986). Racism: A cultural analysis of the problem. In J. Dovidio and S. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination and racism. (pp. 279-313). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Jones, J. M. (1988). Racism in black and white: A bicultural model of reaction and evolution. In P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating Racism. (pp. 117-132). New York: Plenum.
- Kaplan, C. (1983). Introduction. In C. Kaplan & E. Schrecker (Eds.), Regulating the intellectuals: Perspectives on academic freedom in the 1980s. (pp. 1-13). New York: Praeger.
- McCormick, A. (Jan. 9, 1990). Trabant bowing out. Wilmington News Journal. pp. A1, A4.
- Nes, L. (Dec. 14, 1989). Open letter to the University of Delaware community. Correspondence.
- Pioneer Fund. (1937). Original Charter.
- Pioneer Fund. (1985). Current Charter.
- Pioneer Fund. (1982-1987). Tax Returns.

Pioneer Fund. (Nov. 21, 1989). Letter listing grants made between 1985-1989.

President's Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity. Purpose.

Rushton, J. P. (1988a). Race differences in behavior: A review and evolutionary analysis. Personality and Individual Differences. 9, (pp. 1009-1024).

Rushton, J. P. (1988b). The reality of racial differences: A rejoinder with new evidence. Personality and Individual Differences. 9, (pp. 1035-1040).

Rushton, J. P. & Bogaert, A. F. (1988). Race versus social class in sexual behavior: A follow-up test of the r/K dimension. Journal of Research in Personality. 22, 259-272.

Rushton on the rack. (1989, May). Instauration. p. 34.

Schrecker, E. (1983). Academic freedom: The historical view. In C. Kaplan & E. Schrecker (Eds.), Regulating the intellectuals: Perspectives on academic freedom in the 1980s. (pp. 25-43). New York: Praeger.

Wheeler, D. L. (1, 1989, February). Psychologist's view on race differences stirs controversy at meeting. The Chronicle of Higher Education. p. A6.

Zuckerman, M. & Brody, N. (1988). Oysters, rabbits and people: A critique of "Race differences in behavior" by J. P. Rushton. Personality and Individual Differences. 9, (pp. 1025-1033.)