

#14

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE INTER-DEPARTMENTAL

Memorandum



February 16, 1990

TO: Lawrence Nees, Chair
Faculty Senate Research Committee

FROM: Linda S. Gottfredson

RE: Your Request for Materials

Thank you for your call yesterday bringing me up-to-date about the Committee's plans. You asked at that time if I could send you some materials regarding my grants with the Pioneer Fund. I would appreciate some clarification of your request.

Specifically, could you please list exactly what information you would like to receive and the specific reasons for requesting it.



University of Delaware

#15

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-8415

February 20, 1990

Professor Linda Gottfredson
Department of Educational Studies
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19716

Dear Professor Gottfredson,

During our telephone conversation last week I asked for several items of information concerning your grants from the Pioneer Fund, items which the Research Committee does not have available for its consideration. We do have the cover sheets for all three of your proposals to the fund, dated (at your signature) May 25, 1988, November 24, 1988, and May 24, 1989 respectively. We also have your detailed letter applying to the Pioneer Fund in connection with the third proposal, dated May 24, 1989. I thank you again for your previous agreement to allow us to include all of these documents in the public dossier kept in the Research Office. At this time, so that we may have the fullest possible record of the relationship between the Pioneer Fund and the University of Delaware, and of the activities carried out as a result of that relationship, we would also like to see some additional documents. Specifically, we would like to have copies of the detailed application letters to the Fund in connection with the first two proposals, in May and June of 1988. At the same time, we would like to see some samples of the material actually distributed under the various Pioneer Fund grants, all of which appear to entail substantial numbers of mailings, including the cover letters if any attached by you as well as the texts distributed. We do have a series of photocopies of material that you planned to distribute under the May 24, 1989 proposal, attached to the proposal itself, but would also like to see what actually went out from the University of Delaware in connect with your project. When we spoke on the telephone, you indicated that you wanted some time to think about these requests, and I hope that by this time you have decided to provide the material. Please know that if you wish to provide the material but would prefer that it not be added to the public open dossier, you may arrange for its availability only to the Research Committee by sending it directly to me rather than to the President's Office, and by clearly so stating in a cover letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lawrence Nees".

Lawrence Nees
Professor



University of Delaware

16

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-8415

February 26, 1990

Professor Jan Blits
Department of Educational Studies
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716

Dear Professor Blits,

In your letter to me dated January 12, 1990 you stated on the third page, just under your heading "III" that "I have received support from the Pioneer Fund (summer salary for work on a paper, with Linda Gottfredson . . .)" Although I may have overlooked some mention elsewhere in the very large dossier concerning the Pioneer Fund already made available to the Research Committee and to the university community, until I received your letter I had believed that Professor Gottfredson was the only faculty member at the University of Delaware who was a recipient of Pioneer Fund support. Because President Trabant charged the Research Committee to consider the relationship between the University of Delaware and the Pioneer Fund, your involvement with the Fund is clearly something with which we need to be as fully and accurately informed as possible. Would you please send to me a full description of your Pioneer Fund support. Did you receive this support as a direct grantee, or indirectly? May we please see the application for support that you submitted to the Fund? Although I hope and urge that you will be willing to submit copies of these materials to the President's office, for inclusion in the open public dossier, if you wish to have the material reserved for the use of the Research Committee and other persons specifically designated by the Committee, I will endeavor to the best of my ability to honor your request. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lawrence Nees".

Lawrence Nees
Professor
Chair, Committee on Research

cc: Linda Gottfredson
Victor Martuza
Frank Murray
Robert Varrin
Ron Whittington (for President Trabant)

Memorandum



DATE:

February 26, 1990

TO: Lawrence Nees, Chair
Faculty Senate Research Committee

FROM: Linda S. Gottfredson *lg*
Educational Studies

RE: Your Request for Information about my Pioneer-Funded Work

I have enclosed the proposals and publications you requested in your memo of February 20. Specifically, I have enclosed the two grant proposals in question (5/25/88 and 11/24/88) and the four publications (with sample cover letters) that I have disseminated with Pioneer monies. The latter, listed below, are a matter of public record and you are free to put them in the public file.

Gottfredson, L. S. (Ed.) (1986). The g factor in employment [Special issue]. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 29 (3).

Gottfredson, L. S., & Sharf, J. C. (Eds.) (1988). Fairness in employment testing [Special issue], Journal of Vocational Behavior, 33 (3).

Gordon, R. A. (1987). SES versus IQ in the race-IQ-delinquency model. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 7 (3), 30-96.

Gordon, R. A. (1988). Thunder from the left. [Book review of Storm over biology: Essays on science, sentiment, and public policy, by Bernard Davis] Academic Questions, 1 (3), 74-92.

Morris Library subscribes to all three journals, but the fourth item is not in the library because the library's subscription for Academic Questions began with Volume 2.

Although I have complied with your request, I am disturbed by the possible shift in focus that it implies. The charge to your committee, as I understand it, is to investigate the Pioneer Fund and to assess its acceptability as a donor. It is not to investigate me or my work. However, any examination of my "activities carried out as a result of [the] relationship" between the Pioneer Fund and the University would seem to constitute an investigation of me and thus a threat to my academic freedom.



The University approved my grant proposals through the normal administrative process, and the Pioneer Fund exercises absolutely no control over my activities. Thus, it is not clear how examining the contents of my proposals and publications would help the Committee learn more than it already knows about the relation between the University and the Fund.

I am providing the enclosed documents under the assumption that your request for them does not signal any inappropriate shift in the focus of your deliberations.

cc: Frank Murray, Dean, College of Education
Committee on Research
Jack Gelb, Animal Science
Michael Klein, Chemical Engineering
Fadil Santosa, Mathematical Sciences
Barbara Settles, Individual and Family Studies
Jonathan Sharp, Marine Studies
Richard Sylves, Political Science
Robert Varrin, Research Office



University of Delaware

#18

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
WILLARD HALL EDUCATION BUILDING, ROOM 219
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-2954

February 27, 1990

Lawrence Nees, Chair
University Committee on Research

Dear Prof. Nees,

I think you already have the information you asked me for. It's contained on page 3 of Linda Gottfredson's May 25, 1988 proposal to the Pioneer Fund (in the section titled "Paper on Race-Norming and Rights").

While I'm uneasy about the apparent shift in your committee's focus from the source of research funding to the content of the research itself, I don't mind telling you that the paper in question ("Equality or Lasting Inequality?") will soon be published in Transaction/SOCIETY, a journal that Helen Gouldner (among other UD faculty) has published in.

I hope this answers your questions. I'd be glad to provide whatever appropriate help I can.

Yours,

Jan Blits
Jan H. Blits

cc: Linda Gottfredson
Victor Martuza
Frank Murray
Robert Varrin
Ron Whittington (for President Trabant)

Memorandum



March 18, 1990

TO: Lawrence Nees, Chair
Faculty Senate Committee on Research

FROM: Linda S. Gottfredson *lg*
Educational Studies

RE: The Pioneer Fund

I appreciate the Research Committee's willingness to solicit and share information and commentary about the Pioneer Fund and related issues. You already have in hand four memoranda (11/14/89, 11/22/89, 11/30/90, 12/15/90) in which I comment on specific allegations against the Pioneer Fund. As is evident from those memos, I see no evidence to support the charge that the Pioneer Fund pursues a racist, anti-Semitic, or fascist agenda. The only systematic pattern of prejudice and intolerance revealed is that of the Fund's accusers.

In this letter I provide more general reflections about Professor Frawley's (10/31/89) charges and the larger issues they raise about academic freedom, responsibility, and diversity.

Academic Freedom

I agree with Dean Frank Murray (2/1/90) that external funding should be (1) legal and (2) free from any influence over the outcomes of the inquiry, and that the research projects supported be (3) subject to free and open inquiry and (4) consistent with the unit's mission and standards, broadly construed.

The fourth criterion applies in principle to all University-related scholarship, whether externally sponsored or not. It is irrelevant for evaluating the grantor, however, because the grantor receives only proposals that have already been approved by the University through its grant proposal review process. Legality can probably be presumed for non-profit charitable organizations (such as the Pioneer Fund) and for governmental units, because the finances of both are subject to government scrutiny.

The second and third criteria can be classified under



the more general rubric of "no strings attached." If the grantor meets this criterion, there is no need to investigate the grantor further. The organization's mission, past or present, is irrelevant, as are the activities of any persons associated with the grantor, for they exert no influence over the funded project when no strings are attached to the funds. The imposition of any ideological litmus test for funding organizations (or grant applicants) would violate the spirit of the third criterion (free and open inquiry) and the very idea of a university.

I personally would not accept funds from organizations that I considered reprehensible, but, like Professor Kleinman (1/10/90), I would not restrict the right of anyone else to do so. And consistent with Professor Boorse's (1/21/90) analysis, I believe that denying another scholar the means available to pursue his or her work is tantamount to proscribing the work itself, which violates academic freedom.

There are broader issues of academic freedom that must be considered too, and which help to explain my persistence in defending the Fund. I have frequently been advised that it is neither prudent nor my responsibility to defend the Pioneer Fund. Although well-intentioned and perhaps true in a narrow sense, this advice is short-sighted.

The Fund has come under attack, not because of the caliber of the projects it has funded, but because of their content. As Mr. Weyher (3/16/90) has noted, the Fund's critics do not dispute the truth or importance of the conclusions reached by its recipients; rather, the critics object to the subjects being investigated. This is clear, for example, in the African-American Coalition's (1/30/90) complaints about my own research. It is also clear in the writings of Barry Mehler, who is the Pioneer Fund's most dogged critic. Both these critics also reveal that the real target is not the Pioneer Fund itself, but the fields of research that it supports. They would abolish certain kinds of inquiry by impugning the motives of all who pursue it or support it. They illustrate Professor Wolter's (1/10/90) observation that "[n]owhere is the pressure for censorship greater than in the study of racial questions."

Just as the Pioneer Fund's critics attack it in order to kill the types of research that it funds, I defend the Fund in order to protect the right and ability of scholars, myself included, to pursue such research. The mere fact that the University's Research Committee is investigating the Fund is now being used outside the University as further evidence against the Fund (The [London] Independent, 3/4/90), and it will no doubt be used against Pioneer recipients elsewhere.

And as Professor Boorse (1/21/90) points out, the loss of academic freedom in any field is a threat to academic freedom in all fields.

Like Professor Wolters (1/10/90), I also believe that the manner in which the Pioneer Fund has been attacked violates the most fundamental values of the academy, and thereby constitutes an additional threat to it. The accusations against the Fund show an unfortunate disregard for ascertaining the truth. As Professor Blits (1/12/90) describes, "the accusers stand the truth on its head," suppress vital facts, and "deliberately obscure important--even profound--distinctions."

Moreover, the luridness of these allegations, which consist of innuendo, half-truths, guilt-by-association, and outright fabrication, serves to stifle or prejudice discourse, not to inform it. It is a most pernicious form of intimidation. Thus, while the accusations against the Fund have been intended to discredit it, my evidence in response to them is intended partly to expose the unacceptable modes of argument by which the allegations are constituted. I do this also with the hope of encouraging more reasoned and honest discourse.

In summary, the Pioneer Fund exercises no control over the projects it funds, so the University has neither the responsibility to investigate the Fund nor the right to refuse its grants for University-approved projects. Even to investigate the mission of a grantor has a chilling effect, whatever the University may eventually conclude. I agree with Professor Boorse (1/21/90) that your committee should "drop its whole investigation immediately as inconsistent with basic principles of academic freedom, and to announce that it will accept no further assignments of this kind."

Responsibility

As some in this debate have noted, with freedom should come responsibility. I believe that the exercise of academic freedom should not be merely an act of self-indulgence carried out with disregard for the consequences to others. But I would not restrict another scholar's freedom of inquiry on the basis that he or she does not satisfy my definition of responsibility.

Because I hold this standard for myself as a scholar, I take seriously (and have organized, with Pioneer monies) debates about what constitutes responsibility and irresponsibility in my own areas of inquiry. While many people assume that responsibility requires silence about

group differences and their practical implications (topics I have addressed in some recent work), I have become convinced that the reverse is true. Although obviously personally expedient, silence and self-censorship are irresponsible because, among other reasons, they impede the search for ways to ameliorate social inequalities.

Thus, while notions of responsibility merit more discussion, they are not a basis for restricting another scholar's inquiry. Nor should they give license for critics themselves to behave irresponsibly.

Diversity

I agree with Professor Blits (1/12/90) that multicultural diversity should represent an expansion, not a contraction, of intellectual diversity within academe. Multiculturalism must not be misused to enforce ideological uniformity. As Professors Blits and Marler (1/8/90) both argue, a commitment to multiculturalism must be firmly grounded in, and not contravene, the core values of the academy.

I see no evidence that the Fund and its grantees repudiate the principle of diversity. In fact, Professor Blits has noted that it is ironic that the Pioneer Fund is attacked for supporting the journal Mankind Quarterly under Roger Pearson, because, as he points out, it "is precisely a multicultural journal...with an emphasis on the variety of cultures (past and present) around the world." Their sin with regard to diversity, it would seem, is that they treat it as an object of dispassionate study rather than simply as a moral imperative.

My three years as a Peace Corps volunteer in a troubled multi-ethnic country (Malaysia) deeply impressed upon me both the virtues and difficulties of multicultural societies. More than a glib glorification of diversity or a rigidly enforced tact is essential for the cohesion of ethnically diverse populations. The personal experiences of other Fund grantees who have come under attack lead me to suspect that many of them share these sentiments. Hans Eysenck entered England as a refugee from Nazi Germany, Richard Lynn lives in strife-torn Northern Ireland, Arthur Jensen has many ties with multi-ethnic India (including an Indian son-in-law), and Roger Pearson worked for many years in India and has written specifically about the sometimes uneasy interface between cultures.

A common thread through many of the accusations against the Fund is a distaste for activities that address or expose

in some way the complications of diversity. Does a multi-ethnic society require a common language to cohere? What rates of increase in racial-ethnic diversity (through immigration) can societies realistically accommodate? What kinds and levels of forced association across racial-ethnic lines are constructive? To what extent is heterogeneity vs. homogeneity of human societies (for example, in intelligence or ethnicity) related to their evolution, differentiation, cohesion, inter-group relations, and cultural achievements? I have no opinion about most of these matters, but they are legitimate scholarly questions. Moreover, some of them must be confronted if we are to actuate our own goals for a harmonious multicultural society.

One might ask which is the more destructive of lasting diversity--an honest examination of the nature and dilemmas of diversity, or the refusal to entertain such examination.

I have always been willing and eager to discuss my work with others, especially critics. Dean Murray made this known to the Affirmative Action Officer several years ago when he approached the Dean to discuss my presence in the College. However, with a few notable exceptions (and none of them being the principles in this case), no critic at the University has ever approached me to discuss either the Pioneer Fund or my work.

I remain interested in engaging in open, respectful dialogue, for it is the only way I see for us to find effective and fair solutions to vexing social problems such as those I analyze in my work. If we in academe cannot engage in such discourse, who can?

cc: Arthur Trabant, President
Gordon DiRenzo, Faculty Welfare and Privileges
George Cicala, AAUP
Richard Murray, Acting Provost
Robert Varrin, Associate Provost for Research
Ronald Whittington, Assistant to the President
Frank Murray, Dean, College of Education
Victor Martuza, Chair, Educational Studies