

MEETING OF FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH  
March 16, 1990

Dean Frank Murray's Testimony

NEES: This is a meeting of the Faculty Senate Committee on Research, which has really been caused by the President's charge to the Committee to look into the questions raised by Professor Frawley about the Pioneer Fund and its relationship with the University as a funding source and we've asked a number of people to come who either were involved in the process of the grant or might have something to say about it or might have strong views about it and I want to thank you very much for coming. As the Dean of the College of Education you have been involved and have communicated to us through a number of letters, which have been very helpful, and obviously you can see in front of you the tape machine. We are making tapes of these proceedings, for a couple of reasons. One, so that we don't have to be constantly taking notes to remember what was said, because we are hoping to learn a lot from this, so we'll have something to refer to, and in part also because two of the members of the Committee were unable to be here at all today and two others have not yet arrived -- three others -- so we have a small group right now. And, we want to have them be able to hear the discussion and statements.. I think you know almost everyone here perhaps, but perhaps not Jack Gelb, from Animal Science and a member of the Committee, Bob Varrin, Dee Benson you know, and I don't know if we've ever met. Have we ever actually met?

MURRAY: Maybe not. \_\_\_\_\_. I have seen you in the Senate.

NEES: And you probably don't know Susan Faw, who has been retained as the Committee's counsel to give us legal advice. And what we've done with most of these meetings so far is ask people if they wanted to make any initial statement about material that's been introduced in the record since they had an opportunity to make written comments or to react to anything else and ...

MURRAY: I don't, I wrote out pretty much what I thought needed to be followed up [or thought of?]

NEES: Okay, then we have some questions. We have many, many questions and we have many more questions than we have minutes, and if you don't have any initial -- anything

you want us to ...?

MURRAY: No, no.

NEES: Well, fine.

MURRAY: I presume you looked at and read what I wrote ...

NEES: Indeed

MURRAY: and I think those are my \_\_\_\_\_.

NEES: Let me just get out a copy of one of your letters in particular and some of the other material. And I'd like to start by clarifying some things in my own mind. I'm a historian. I like to get histories of things. Professor Gottfredson came to the University, is it 3 years ago, in the fall of '88? Is that correct?

MURRAY: Sounds right. It's recent. [background discussion: 3 years? Seems to be it's before that] This is her third year.

NEES: And at the time she came to the University, you obviously as the Dean of the College knew she was coming to the University, had you ever heard of the Pioneer Fund?

MURRAY: No...

NEES: When did you first hear of the Pioneer Fund? There's probably a better way to put that.

MURRAY: I was aware of the Fund as a fund, you know, when she applied for grants, but it was just a fund ...

NEES: When she applied for grants after she had arrived?

MURRAY: I had not heard of the thing before.

NEES: The first time that one of these proposals, which I think the earliest one is May of 1989 (? - year drowned out by Murray) ...

MURRAY: And I wouldn't say even then that I would have been aware of the Fund as much as what the project was and what I was committed to do -- you know, I read it as a

Dean reads it. Is there a matching fund requirement?

MURRAY: You know, because it comes to me approved by others, and I would look for what's our commitment, and is it acceptable.

NEES: Let me just introduce Rick Sylves, I don't know if you know him. [Introduction Sylves & Murray].

MURRAY: So that's how it would have gone. And in terms of anything unusual about the fund, such as we are now talking about, that would have come much later, before Frawley, but later in the sense that people would say "what do we know about this fund?" You know, "I've heard funny things about it," you know, then we would have taken, I would've taken a view, well, you know, it's not actually my issue, the issue is that is the work she's doing any good? Do we want to do this sort of thing? and, let it kind of go at that.

NEES: When you signed -- received three -- there are three different grants that we're talking about, three different proposals from May of '88, November of '88 and November of '89. We have cover sheets, they're called blue sheets, from all three of those proposals and which contain, as you know, a budget and an abstract at the end. When you received the grant application, do you get just that sheet or do you see the whole proposal?

MURRAY: I usually, it varies, but usually I get the whole proposal. It usually goes I get the first part and then I ask for the second part. You know, people are always in a rush, you know, would I sign it ...

NEES: Yeah.

MURRAY: I would have to look at those to see if in fact I did sign them, my office has a way of -- we handle some of these things over the phone ...

NEES: That's not really a question ...

MURRAY: No, no, but the point is that there would be no issue from my end. Up until now I would have just checked on the technical matters, from my end of it and I actually have somebody do that.

NEES: In fact, unless it's someone signing for you, I mean, your name is certainly on all three of them, that's certainly not the point ...

MURRAY: I understand ...

NEES: We don't expect that that ... when you would look at them, you mentioned earlier that you considered them as a dean considers them, which has to do with priorities and budgets, and other kinds of things, all three of these very clearly state the Pioneer Fund is not paying indirect costs, and that those involuntary costs are picked up by the University. In the case of this, or in applications generally, is that something that you pay attention to, does it make a difference?

MURRAY: Some, it makes a difference because the indirect costs portion come back. But, on the hold it's now where our energies are. My message to the faculty is get everything you need in direct costs. The indirect costs are fine, because they are quite discretionary later on. But you want people to be sure they get everything they can in direct costs. And some groups simply don't pay them. That's particularly the case with foundations. The federal government understands the need for these things, but on the whole we have any number of grants in the college where we either waive them or the group doesn't give it in the first place.

NEES: I'm just curious. I don't know what granting agencies in your college, would you say 50% or more are ...

MURRAY: No, on the whole the only people you get these things from are the federal government. We have a very large grant now from General Foods just on the condition that there's no, it's \$380,000 [?], they will not pay any indirect costs. You know, that's the point. And it's not actually my issue. My issue is get every penny for everything you need in direct costs. And actually, I have people do both. I press for all the direct costs and I hope again I get indirect costs. If I can get heat and light out of direct costs, I let them do it.

NEES: I'm sorry to interrupt, I just wanted to introduce Barbara Settles...

- MURRAY: We have seen each other fairly regularly for some years ...
- NEES: One of the things you ask in your letter of the first of February is for guidance about how administrators should deal with these things, and that has many different aspects to it. This particular series of three grants, I'll call them, these blue sheets, we've already, I think, learned that this is a standard form for research grants ...
- MURRAY: Right.
- NEES: and the contracts that go out, but in this particular case the money came in as in the form of a restricted gift rather than a ...
- MURRAY: But not to me that way.
- NEES: No, not to you, but for Professor Gottfredson's use and as an administrator in the college of education, do you think that is a situation which is uncomfortable? Should we make changes about that?
- MURRAY: Do you mean how it actually it comes? How it's booked, you mean?
- NEES: Well, presumably when you signed on all three of these on a contract and grant proposal you were expecting the money that was applied for to come in the form of a contract or a grant, rather than a gift.
- MURRAY: Yeah, it really wouldn't matter much.
- NEES: It wouldn't matter much?
- MURRAY: I would mostly be concerned with whether the money came and was available for the person's use, and how it's booked -- I never really cared how it's booked essentially.
- VARRIN: And this happens all the time -- Bob Varrin here-- because many proposals leave this campus as research proposal requests and come back as gifts.
- ?FEMALE: The reason we keep coming back and asking the question, is there does appear to be this one piece of

policy about gifts that's not symmetrical exactly with research grants. [Background talk re gift policy]. The gift policy has these words about coherent with University goals and objectives and so forth.

NEES: Well, let me read...

MURRAY: But that would be true for me anyway.

NEES: What this reads is the President is authorized to accept certain gifts, the policy reads from a foundation or other donor: "provided the terms of the gift do not require commitments by the University which are contrary to the general purposes for which the University was established and for which it exists and that such gifts represent assets which to the best of his knowledge directly or indirectly meet the highest legal and ethical standards of the University." We currently do not have a policy like that for research grants.

MURRAY: Also the endowment.

NEES: Do you think we should or shouldn't? Does it make a difference?

MURRAY: It depends on how that's going to be interpreted. It might make no difference. I find very little in that that I could object to as a policy. In fact I can't think of anything particularly wrong about it. It's how you would figure it out that's the problem. Surely, in my attempt to get my own thinking straight in what are the relevant factors, in the end, is it supporting the kind of work we want people to do, and is it consistent with our mission within the College, and that's about it. Now, when you start talking about whether the work fulfills some high ethical thing, I don't know, actually I don't know what practical difference that's going to make in a research project that isn't already covered with human subjects clearances or other with other kinds of things, so I've never really tried to weigh the moral value of a faculty member's research.

SYLVES: Can I just -- since he mentioned it in passing -- just for clarification -- are you telling us that the Gottfredson proposal in your opinion when you passed

judgment on it and signed it was consistent with the mission of the University in your opinion?

MURRAY: Oh sure. You mean was she proposing to do something that we as a university ought not to do?

SYLVES: Yeah. Or that is inimical to the missions of the college that you're dean of.

MURRAY: What would you think it was?

SYLVES: I'm asking --

MURRAY: Oh, no, no ...

SYLVES: Did you think it was contrary to the mission -- the subject matter of what she was proposing to do?

MURRAY: No. Not the subject matter, no --

NEES: I have a couple of other -- oh, I'm sorry, go ahead ...

MURRAY: I mean we're talking about a funny subject matter-- The subject matter is the implications of IQ test results, right?

NEES: Basically, or vocational placement.

MURRAY: Yeah.

Sylves:  
NEES:

And the use of g theory. Do you know what g theory's about?

MURRAY: Oh, yeah, actually I know quite a bit about it.  
[laughter from group]

?MALE: And you're saying all that is consistent with the mission of the College.

MURRAY: I mean, you're asking as though you think it possibly could be inconsistent.

?FEMALE: We have had people suggest that to us.

SYLVES: Yes, UDAAC for example.

MURRAY: Who?

SYLVES: University of Delaware African American Coalition.

MURRAY: Oh, I see. That that would be inconsistent with the University?

SYLVES: Most particularly the mission of the College of Education because of its sensitivity to teacher training and of the need to provide multi-cultural diversity ...

MURRAY: That's actually why you have to do it. Just for that reason. Because you have to understand what you are talking about. So you'd have to do it -- all the more so for those very reasons. Say that I -- I don't know if you want to talk about it in this way, but for me the question on the substantive side is whether or not IQ test results are to be taken seriously. I mean, does this, are these results that could conceivably matter? Now, it matters a lot on how you come out on that. If you argue that, and as you can argue, that these, this is an important achievement in psychology, the invention of these tests, that they in fact can tell you a great deal about a person and about a group ...

SYLVES: How about a racial group?

MURRAY: About any kind of group. I mean, it tells you a lot about -- I can compute the IQ of Ph.D students, the IQ of BA students, and in fact it turns out that one's higher than the other. Which I probably would predict. You know, that might be the case. But in any event, it is, if you think that's important, then her research is entirely predictable and legitimate from that perspective, and there is a body of opinion that says these tests, (1) they are reliable, that's clear, so they are really a marvelous achievement from that perspective because it's hard to build a reliable test. Now whether or not they're valid is arguable. They are certainly connected to other measures and to have certain validities established, construct validity to be sure, predictive validity is somewhat more doubtful, but nevertheless you can make a reasonable case for the validity of these instruments.

NEES: I think we need to get off that now. Our concern here



is the Pioneer Fund and these tests. I think ...

SYLVES: I'm sorry. He opened the door when he asked ...

NEES: I understand that.

SYLVES: the mission of the College, and I just wanted to see what his definition is of the mission of the College.

MURRAY: It is well within the mission of a college of education to worry about the people's intelligence and to worry about the measuring of that intelligence, to worry about the validity of those measures, and to worry about the reliability of them.

SYLVES: Thank you.

?FEMALE: And the policies recommended on the basis of whatever your understanding of that mission is.

MURRAY: Absolutely. A lot in education, in particular, depends on how these tests are used, and you got to understand a lot about them to deal with a lot of school policy. Because there are schools that use these tests.

?FEMALE: Do you have some people in your college who have addressed this issue in a somewhat different way?

MURRAY: Absolutely. In that sense we are fortunate. Because I wish it were actually by design, because you couldn't have predicted what everybody's research would have ended up being. But as a Dean, I am actually more comfortable than I'm entitled to be over the fact that there's a balance of opinion within the college on this topic, so we have a group that takes just the opposite view, which is that these tests are relatively trivial, misleading, unimportant, and shouldn't be relied upon at all and Crouse has a book ....

VARRIN: Have they ever sought Pioneer Fund funding?

MURRAY: No, not that I'm aware of.

VARRIN: I'm just curious ...

NEES: Is that other side represented within the faculty of the College of Education?

- MURRAY: Oh yeah.
- NEES: Is it as well represented?
- MURRAY: Very well represented.
- NEES: No, as well represented in the public eye?
- MURRAY: Oh, sure.
- NEES: Do those people also have grants to disseminate that view?
- MURRAY: They actually write books. I'm referring in particular to Jim Crouse's work, which you know, is quite as provocative, and as controversial as Gottfredson's, but on the other side of the fence. I mean, Crouse is ...
- NEES: The College Board scores.
- MURRAY: Yeah, it's a book called "The Case Against the SAT", which is a very provocative title, and argues that the SAT provides very little of value in the admissions decision, the very thing it's designed to do, so, yeah, you would have within our faculty a wide range of opinion.
- NEES: Oh, I understand that. My question is, do members of the faculty who take opposite sides, do they also distribute their material, reprints of that material, in thousands of copies to policy ...
- MURRAY: No, no
- NEES: policy making people? Under the University of Delaware imprint?
- MURRAY: Not particularly. I mean, Crouse will, Crouse is more likely to seek a popular audience, you know for his work, so his stuff gets into the Wall Street Journal and in other places and he would send it on University letterhead. But it's not the same thing at all. I mean, Gottfredson has a different thing going.
- NEES: While speaking of that letterhead question, I wanted to

ask you about this. This is a couple of copies that we had. Professor Gottfredson provided us with sample listing with three different cover sheets ...

MURRAY: Right. I've seen them.

NEES: With the seal of the University of Delaware and the Johns Hopkins University and this project for the study of intelligence and society. Did you discuss her use of this particular letterhead?

MURRAY: With her?

NEES: With her, yes.

MURRAY: I don't remember the exact conversation in that way. What I, but I've seen it, but I can't recall what kind of approval route for it, but had that happened, I mean for your purposes, I would have seen nothing wrong with it. I mean, I would have approved it if it had come to me for approval. And I don't recall that it did come to me for approval.

VARRIN: There was an applied [or implied?] approval but you were aware of it?

MURRAY: Yeah, I don't see any problem with it. Insofar as we would have at the time said we wanted credit, we wouldn't want this to be a Hopkins project. You know, and another reason is that the two of them, one's at one institution and one's at another. So if you're going to send out stuff from your work, on a whole we want people to ...

NEES: But the grant is to the University of Delaware. None of these have Hopkins on it in any place. These projects and all of the activities that are under all of the sponsoring ...

MURRAY: But the co-director of the project is at Hopkins.

NEES: But it seems to me very anomalous that we have both universities as the project and their seals on this information but all of this is done with exclusively direct money from the Pioneer Fund and exclusively at the University of Delaware.

MURRAY: I don't know if that's true ...

NEES: Well, the conference is to be held at the University of Delaware ...

MURRAY: But I don't know that Hopkins doesn't have funds for this... What you say is not ... I don't know how you know that either...

VARRIN: Frank, what ...

NEES: Just on the basis of what I do know...

MURRAY: Yeah, but what do we know, what kind of money does Gordon have?

NEES: I have no idea -- but the proposal to do this is

MURRAY: Is ours.

NEES: Is ours.

?FEMALE: ... doesn't mention this connection.

NEES: Yes, it was routed through our university and it calls for the activities being done here

MURRAY: Sure

NEES: And says nothing about how the ... the only implication of the

MURRAY: Gotcha.

NEES: joint work with Hopkins is the letterhead.

MURRAY: Gotcha, gotcha. It wouldn't matter to me. If you're working with someone at another university, you know, it's very standard to credit both universities. When you do bylines on an article you list both people.

NEES: When you're working with a grant of some \$175,000 over some years, would you consider it standard practice to credit the granting agency?

MURRAY: Yeah, I would. I mean some funders want you to do it. Certainly the federal funds require you to do that. ...

I think it's ordinary, I would say its fairly ordinary, it depends on the kind of publication, I'm trying to think of my own thing with Carnegie, whether in each case I mentioned it, I think I mentioned it when it was to my advantage to mention it.

- NEES: I mean on the letterhead on these things that goes out the first thing everyone sees in the upper left hand corner, whether you read left to right or top to bottom, is the seal of the Johns Hopkins University, which is the only thing anywhere in here about costs, activity, anything else, and ...
- MURRAY: Is your point that it would be, is inappropriate to have the Johns Hopkins seal on there?
- NEES: Well, it strikes me as very odd.
- MURRAY: Why?
- NEES: Well, because Hopkins, to the best of my knowledge has nothing to do with this project, this mailing.
- MURRAY: The co-director is from Hopkins.
- VARRIN: Can I ask a question.
- MURRAY: I think that's the reason why its on there.
- VARRIN: What's the status of that project, Frank. Can you tell us anything about that?
- MURRAY: It's their work, it's what they do.
- VARRIN: So in other words ...
- MURRAY: It's not a project in any other sense.
- NEES: It's not a project of the College of Education?
- MURRAY: Only by virtue of the fact that they, one of them works here. It's not a project that was kind of charted out, it wasn't the case that the faculty decided let's have a project on this and let's see who can do it and then, you know, you go get, you initiate a project and then go find someone. It's just the opposite. I mean if someone who wants to do as part of their work, they

want to call it a project, that's fine with me.

NEES: But there are, as we now know, we didn't know before, Professor Gottfredson is in fact not the only person from the College of Education who has worked with support from the Pioneer Fund.

MURRAY: That's right.

NEES: Professor Jan Blits of the same department I guess also has received salary stipend from that. It is my understanding that you did not know that.

MURRAY: No, I really wasn't aware of it.

NEES: And, I was surprised by that, normally I haven't looked up PAF forms or anything like that but ... Don't you normally see that people are

MURRAY: I don't do PAF's -- I mean that's the Department Chair. The general workload assignments and the source of funding are department chair functions.

NEES: I know that every year I have to make out an evaluation form that I discuss with my chairman that goes to the dean that lists my various involvements in research and other kinds of things. You don't do that in the College of Education?

MURRAY: No I don't. I mean I don't do the faculty appraisals and I don't sign off on them.

NEW MALE  
VOICE:

How do you feel about receiving funds from an organization that many consider is controversial in nature? As far as, do you feel that funds are funds and you really don't care where they come from or what sort of organization they may be associated with?

MURRAY: No, I mean that's actually the point of my letter.

VARRIN: I think your first paragraph speaks to that.

MURRAY: My problem is to figure out in fact what's tainted and what's not and you know, what would be a principle by which you'd figure this out. The fact that it's controversial wouldn't be of interest to me because

most interesting things are controversial so, you know, money funding the Department of Education, in some people's minds, is controversial, you know, I know people who think that its unethical to take money from the Department of Education. You know, if I believed them we wouldn't do it. I don't believe them and so... So the controversiality of it is not terribly interesting. I don't think its all that relevant

NEES: Let me ask you another question as to specifically designated on the forms, that Code 42, which I now know but didn't know before indicates, not public service as its usually called, but other sponsored activities as opposed to research, which has a different code. One issue that we've been asked by the president to consider, and we've given a lot of thought to, is the question of academic freedom, and you have raised that as well. It's a body of precedents, and a lot of body of opinion, that academic freedom clearly refers to the right of a faculty member to say unpopular and outrageous things in the classroom and to say them in writing. Would you ...

MURRAY: Not just because that, but anyway...

NEES: Would you extend that right which some have asserted in writing to us that as a collary of academic freedom is a faculty member's right to receive through the University, not independently, but through the University, funding from whatever source.

MURRAY: No, I don't see those exactly, and my memo is, I mean I'm quite sure, as I said there are certain funds that are unacceptable. Now, but you know, how to figure those out is actually a difficult problem.

VARRIN: Although, Frank I think you also said - I don't want to misquote your letter - that you understand, if I'm correct, to conclude, I hope I'm not taking anything out of context here, "I think it would be very difficult for your committee not to conclude that the acceptance of monies from the Pioneer Fund has compromised the University's stated position of supporting a multi-cultural...

MURRAY: What I mean by that is it is clear to me, and you alluded to it, that commission on multi-cultural

diversity, their work is going to be harder by virtue of this fund and we've made their job a little harder and I think that's undeniable. And then you have other groups. I mean I have a minority recruitment committee in the College. I have made my work harder with them. You know, we have long discussions about this, I've raised with them, how do they feel about it and so on. It's clear that they're very annoyed at this. So our work with them will be harder. But it's also the case that our work was harder because we picked Roselle as president over one of the other candidates and we did it in a public way, but we did pick Roselle I hope for a good reason and you know one of the consequences of picking that guy rather than somebody else is that it makes it a little harder to convince people to know that we are what we say we are with respect to the commission. So, life is tough. You know, it's harder to do your work. Well, my own work as dean of the college is made very difficult by people around here. You know, when Russ Jones put his kid in private schools, and did it in a visible way, my job was harder. Now he had a right to do it; I thought he was wrong, particularly for the reasons he gave publicly, which was if they were going to ride a bus they might as well go to good schools. [laughter]. You know, thanks a lot, now I've got to explain that one away to every damn group in the state. So I think the fact that some people's work is made harder by other people's pursuing their agenda that's undeniably the case and I just take that as part of the problems of a big university, and that's what I have to deal with. And I think that's right. But we've made it -- it's complicated because this thing has become a public event. And the irony is in my view that Frawley made it a public event and frustrated the very goals that he is espousing and that's just one of life's ironies, that by making it a media event you've created a climate in which it is going to be hard, and you've created other problems as well.

VARRIN: Are you ...

NEES: I think we're going to have to end ...

VARRIN: I think if I could go step outside Mr. Chairman, and ask that the other group give us another 13 minutes, would that be reasonable? [everyone agrees].



NEES: One issue is the nature of what the grant is for, and it's not classified as research, and very little of it seems to have to do primarily with research work-- it's mainly preparation of a conference, but the one common denominator to all three proposals is in fact the dissemination of large amounts of material which have already been prepared and which were already a matter of public record. I assume that the reason for doing this at all is part of the University's mission for public service as it were, to disseminate the results of research

MURRAY: Well, yeah, yeah.

NEES: Something like that.

MURRAY: It wouldn't just be how I would see it, but you could say that. I'm not ecstatic over the fact that the primary use of these funds is just dissemination. I think but that if a person wants to get money to disseminate their own work I would have no way to object.

NEES: Why not?

VARRIN: This is not their own work though.

MURRAY: No, actually most of it is their own work, isn't it?

VARIOUS: The last batch ... Everything but ... mostly ... that's all I know ...

NEES: Her work is involved in it, and her work is involved in editing the journal obviously.

MURRAY: But, as I face the issue is, the person says I want to disseminate my work on a wide scale and I need several thousand dollars, I would probably say, get a grant, we're not in the mail order business. And if they did get a grant, you know to disseminate their work, we'd say fine. It's part of our mission in the sense that we expect faculty to do good work and to have other people know about it and that's part of how the place works. So there's nothing from that perspective unusual about it. There probably is a balance problem, that if a person was only doing that we would get a

little nervous and not, but as long as it didn't take away from other things they were doing, the balance is preserved.

NEES: There is in the faculty handbook, however, a clear statement about political activity ...

MURRAY: Ha ha ha, yeah.

NEES: that faculty members are advised, not to not engage in political activity but to make clear that in so doing they are not in any way representing the University. They may identify themselves as members of the University but not to give the impression that they are that.

MURRAY: This would be hard.

NEES: Now, is this a political issue and is the nature of the process at least might be considered political.

MURRAY: Well, when you say it the latter way then everything comes under that.

NEES: Pardon?

MURRAY: Everything comes under the latter phrase -- it might be a political thing.

NEES: Well, it might be considered by a dean in deciding whether or not to seek the funds to support the project.

MURRAY: No. See, if what she's sending out are, as far as I know, refereed general articles, and these are scholarly pieces of work, defined by the way we define scholarly work, I may not and do not agree with the conclusions of this work and I may find the work not to my liking in many ways, and I may find it overlooks literature I think is important, and it may not in fact be my own view of the matter, and in fact it's not my own view of the matter of how important these tests are, as I have written about myself in other places, but it is her view and I don't know of a principled way by which to say to a faculty member you can't send out your work.

- NEES: We're not talking about sending out her work. We're talking about sending out -- I mean we all send out our works -- I write an article and I send out 50 offprints to scholars in the field. We're talking about here \$175,000 mostly to disseminate work to lists of thousands of people. I mean let's be specific, in this particular case to send 1,000 of these to every dean of medical schools in the country, which is my understanding of what was involved.
- MURRAY: It's not mine, it's not mine.
- VARRIN: Oh yeah, it is.
- NEES: For one of these projects, there
- MURRAY: I've inquired about that but only after the fact, because I've never looked at the mailing list and I really can't tell you who they actually go to, but nor would I ever look at anybody's mailing list to find out who they send to ...
- NEES: I think it says in here. It says category.
- MURRAY: Oh I see, there it is, category. They sent one of Gordon's articles. There was one mailing when I've asked about it. But you know, this is just a matter of record. ... yeah, that went to medical school deans, but on the whole, that's not part of the regular pattern, but even if it were, even if it were ...
- NEES: Is that scholarly dissemination? Medical school deans are not normally scholars in the field of genetic components of intelligence, in fact, the cover letter directs people's attention to the implications of the g factor for admissions, essentially ...
- MURRAY: Yeah, yeah.
- NEES: and clearly affirmative action, whether or not we should have it is a political matter, it's all legal of course ...
- MURRAY: Right, but we have it ...
- NEES: It ...

MURRAY: I would say that sending those things to medical school deans or others is not, would not be considered ordinary scholarly dissemination, you know, where you're sending your work to your peers, to your colleagues, to your co-workers, so it's not that kind of an activity. And it's clearly a kind of activity meant to influence people's opinions and to kind of make them, bring them into a larger debate. You know, on the other hand, it's not atypical for colleges, for people in college's of education, to send their work to school board members, to all kinds of people, you know, Crouse would quite naturally send his book, if he had the money to do it, to admissions directors, because he wants them to know that the SAT use is more complicated than they might think. We would think nothing wrong in that, although he's not going to get from admissions directors any scholarly benefit by way of having a new colleague or someone else to cite his work, or to send him similar work ...

NEES: I understand that, but my question is in part how you would react to -- the issue is not must one restrict this sort of activity, but must one be prevented from restricting it -- is there ..

MURRAY: On what basis?

NEES: Does Professor Gottfredson have a right to have you sign on this grant and send it out? Is it abusing her academic freedom for you to say I really don't think that this is, I think this may be political, this is not normally the way we want to run things, it's not in the interest of the College of Education nor the University of Delaware to be engaging in this ...

MURRAY: That could happen and that's actually the point of my letter. It can't happen using the four criteria I use unless I find a way to say this is inconsistent with our mission, but I actually can't at the moment find a principled way to say it is, because we allow all kinds of people to send stuff out. I could conclude if we, and basically, it depends on what you conclude, that the Pioneer Fund is just an unacceptable group of people for some reason. At the moment I don't see a strong way to do that. I would see that for the American Nazi Party or some other group that was so far away from our beliefs, but the Pioneer Fund ...

NEES: So academic freedom doesn't extend to the American Nazi Party?

MURRAY: Academic freedom actually doesn't even extend to the Pioneer Fund. Academic freedom in my view, I mean, it's not, the question, it's not an academic freedom issue to me and I thought I made that clear. We don't want to take money from this group, it's not a academic freedom issue. What makes it an academic freedom issue is, then you have to then provide her with support for her work, or find a way to make that transition. That is, we can't censor her work indirectly by taking her money away and pretending it wasn't an academic freedom issue ...

ANOTHER

MALE VOICE: But couldn't she just compete in the same arena that everyone else is competing in for funds?

MURRAY: She certainly could and I would like her to. Her response will be, when I raised this, is (1) you know, I got a good thing going with this fund, you know, so I say I got a good thing going with a Carnegie. I was there yesterday preparing the way for my next proposal. For you guys tell me go to Ford, I'll say you know, that is a big pain, I've got a lot of work now to do to cultivate Ford. So why are you doing this to me? Cause I got a good thing going. And they like it. I've got a track record. And that's actually a reasonable position. That's one argument I think would apply to anyone. You wouldn't just say give up on the National Science Foundation, it's not worth it [unclear] some other group... The other is, she says, and this is problematical, but nevertheless its her claim, that many groups will not support this work because of the highly controversial nature and the kind of opinions you are expressing from, say the Coalition. It's become politically very difficult. Now, in that \_\_\_\_\_ it makes it much more difficult.

THE OTHER

MALE VOICE: You said earlier, though, because of her activities that it's made life difficult for the rest of us.

MURRAY: No, it's her activities are ...

THE OTHER

MALE VOICE: So we make life a little more difficult for her?

MURRAY: Oh sure, I think it's whether you ...

THE OTHER

MALE VOICE: Is there any problem with that?

MURRAY: Making life difficult for people? It's not generally a role [background comments and laughter] of a dean. I mean it's perceived maybe that way but I have to look at it differently. I'm supposed to make people's life better, you know, and try to help them out.

NEES: But in fact these activities, you've spoken that there is another side within the college on this issue of testing ... but in fact

MURRAY: Of course! Of course! Sure, I'd worry if there wasn't.

NEES: But in fact the other side does not in fact engage in this kind of dissemination of their materials so widely. It may be possible that in fact there aren't outside funds that will support that type of dissemination.

MURRAY: Well, the irony in this case, as we're talking now is, we allowed her to run a seminar that was highly one-sided, and this was debated at great length within the College.

FEMALE: Yes, we have that program.

MURRAY: Yeah, and she argued, look, I'm want to make a coherent thing. So the general agreement was, okay Linda, you can do this. One, she had to give a preamble lecture herself that actually was balanced and she did a wonderful job of kind a pointing out why she was only presenting one side of the story in this case because she had to make it coherent and clear and you might as well get it out. This was to then be followed by this conference that is now in jeopardy that was to be, all the critics of the original review, and that's kind of the other shoe dropping, if you know what I mean. That was the plan. That there was to be a follow-up conference, for which she got funds.

NEES: All from the Pioneer Fund?

MURRAY: Well, she had two sources of funds, actually. The one source, she tells me, has dropped out, over this controversy. You know, they don't want to be connected with this whole business, given the way its gone. Now that's, if you talk to her you can ask her more about that. I don't know that that fund, in fact, she didn't ...

SYLVES: You're saying the other fund was going to pay for the critics?

MURRAY: She had two sources of funds for the follow-up conference. The Pioneer Fund and then she was cultivating another group. The other group she tells me has withdrawn their offer to support because of this controversy...

SYLVES: ... the Pioneer Fund? ...

MURRAY: which only supports the view that she's completely dependent on the Pioneer Fund. Cause I've raised this question, your question, get out and get money the way everyone does. It's not healthy to be tied to one group ...

NEES: I'm afraid we've really kept other people being waiting for 20 minutes now, and we could go on for a long time. Thank you very much for coming.

MURRAY: I don't mind staying on.

FEMALE: We may have to invite you back.

MURRAY: I'm quite happy to come back.

END OF TAPE