

Pioneer Fund Hearing Before the Faculty Senate
Research Committee:
Testimony by Linda S. Gottfredson
March 20, 1990

Dr. Nees: Thank you. Please have a seat.

Dr. Gottfredson: Down here?

Dr. Nees: That's fine. I think that is the only place at the table.

Dr. Nees: Let me introduce you. I'm Lawrence Nees. I'm the Chair of the Committee. We've talked before but have not met.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes

Dr. Nees: And Fadil Santosa from the Committee, Jack Gelb, Susan Faw, who is the Counsel for the Committee, Dee Benson, who has been working at the Research Office, not actually a member of the Committee but has attended all our meetings, and Jonathan Sharp and Rick Sylves and Bob Varrin. Robert Varrin is down in the corner.

Dr. Gottfredson: I don't see Barbara Settles.

Dr. Nees: Barbara couldn't be here today. Barbara couldn't and Michael Klein also couldn't be here and that is also one of the reasons, as you can see, why we have a tape recorder. We are making a tape recording of the session so that they'll be able to listen later and so that we will have something to refer to so that we can spend our time talking rather than taking notes.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay, fine, and George Cicala of the AAUP couldn't be here and he wanted very much to be here so I said I would record what we do.

Dr. Nees: Oh, fine, by all means. And you sir?

Mr. Jenkins: I'm Steve Jenkins. I'm Linda's lawyer.

Dr. Nees: Okay, thank you very much. I sent you a letter yesterday and I had received a message over the weekend, after our meetings, that you weren't sure that you were ready to appear today and you're not satisfied that... that's okay and you want to go ahead because we don't want to put pressure on you.

Dr. Gottfredson: No, no. I appreciated your note to that effect. I would prefer to go earlier rather than later.

Dr. Nees: I think we all would like to move ahead with this.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes.

Dr. Nees: All of the meetings that we have had with people interested and knowledgeable about this matter have followed pretty much the same format. We have offered the people who came before us an opportunity to make a statement or comment upon earlier statements which have come in. You have been in contact with all of us. I did receive and I have distributed, I hope to everyone, the letter that's dated March 18th that I just received. I have to confess that I just got it on the way over here and I haven't had a chance to read it carefully.

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh, okay. I had them delivered to everybody's offices. I don't know how many of you have gotten them or were able to read them.

Dr. Nees: I think most of us didn't get them before the meeting. Mostly we got it on the way in, so I wanted you to be aware of that, but we do have some questions, and I certainly do, that I

would like to ask of you but I certainly encourage you first if you have a statement or comments you want to make to do so.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay. The first thing I would like to clarify is that Mr. Jenkins is one of the lawyers who is representing me. But I noticed in Harry Weyher's letter to you, which he sent off on Friday, he very generously offered, implicitly, all of us legal assistance. I wanted to clarify that Mr. Jenkins is not supported via funding from Harry Weyher, but his firm is representing me pro bono.

Dr. Nees: Very good. Thank you.

Dr. Gottfredson: I appreciate the opportunity to be here and I am eager to learn what your questions are and to answer any of them that I can. I think there are probably quite a few areas in which there has been considerable misunderstanding and I would like to do anything I can to clarify that. Before we get started Mr. Jenkins would like to address you for a few minutes.

Dr. Nees: Okay, thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. Jenkins: Thank you. We have certain concerns about the proceeding here that I thought would be best brought forward and could be addressed initially - concerns about the charge of the Committee and whether the Committee is in fact implementing that charge, and concerns how the Committee might be being used in a broader context. Our understanding of the charge of this Committee is to investigate whether the Pioneer Fund - and I speak loosely - should be permitted to donate money to the University. Our understanding is that this is not, or at least

it's not been charged with, an investigation of Professor Gottfredson. We would deem any investigation of Professor Gottfredson by any committee such as this to be both completely improper, an infringement on her academic freedom, and violation of her rights under the First Amendment. Now, since we understand that the charge of this Committee is different from that normally we wouldn't have brought that subject up, but certain indications of the kinds of questions being asked and the kind of investigation being done and frankly the kind of submissions being made make us worry that in fact this Committee might be, or some members might be, more inclined to be investigating Professor Gottfredson for what she is doing with the money than what the Pioneer Fund is funding. If that's being done, we think it should stop. Now hopefully our information is just wrong or it is in some ways the people we get it from just misinterpret what is going on here. But we do wish to make it clear from the start that any such investigation would be improper.

Steve warns about investigating

Now, the second concern we have about this Committee, and it's a concern Professor Gottfredson has put in the letters, is in fact its very existence. That's something that is open to debate, but we do think that the very existence of this Committee implies that the University may terminate funding that it deems politically, socially, or whatever, wrong and we think that really is a violation of academic freedom, and we believe that the Committee's best response to its charge would be to say that

Steve objects to possibility of what they eventually did

Should use investigation

the charge is improper.

But more than that, we worry about how the Committee's deliberations are being used. I have copies, which I will pass out, of an article from the London Independent, which is reportedly a reputable paper in London, that continues the Pioneer Fund controversy - I think you'll have to give me a minute to find those copies - that contains false information about Professor Gottfredson and also does it in the context of this Committee's deliberations. Quite frankly, the very fact that this Committee exists and is investigating whatever it is investigating is being used in the broader world as an indication that there is something wrong with Professor Gottfredson, there is something wrong with her research and I think as academics you all must ask yourselves whether that's something you want to do. Whether you want to make such investigations that might be misconstrued in the broader world. Whether, in fact, you do not put everyone at risk when you do such a thing, and I'll pass this out. I've got one highlighted and several other copies. There's probably not enough there. And, in that end, I think this Committee must realize that whatever action you take will be looked at and very possibly misconstrued by a much wider world than just the University of Delaware, and therefore I would urge you to proceed with the kind of caution that you might not normally be tempted to use if you weren't under a spotlight like that. Now, with all that said and saying that we don't deem it appropriate to investigate Professor Gottfredson from what we

understand is a lot of stuff has been said about her. And what I've asked Linda to do today is to answer any questions you might have because we don't know exactly what has been said and to show you she is not what people have made her out to be, that she is not some racist, Fascist or Ku Klux Klan sitting over in the Department of Educational Studies but instead is a respected academic trying to pursue truth and trying to do so in a responsible manner.

Dr. Nees: Before Professor Gottfredson starts, I wonder if I should, if it would be appropriate for me to respond to some of Mr. Jenkin's concerns. First, this Committee exists as the Faculty Senate Committee on Research. It's a standing committee of the Faculty Senate which was charged by President Trabant to look into the questions raised by Professor Frawley. No one in the Committee, to my knowledge, has used the term investigation. I hardly think that the Committee on Research which is comprised of people interested and engaged in research needs to be told that academic freedom is important. We all think it is important. Professor Gottfredson's academic freedom is important to us.

I'm afraid we cannot be responsible, it seems to me, for how others may misconstrue what the Committee has not said. To my knowledge, none of these stories relate to Committee deliberations. To my knowledge, there have been no leaks from the Committee. I know myself and everyone else has refused requests for interim reports from the Committee or anything of

the sort, and what a newspaper in London does is hardly something we should be concerned with. We may not like it, but I can hardly control it. Other than the fact that the Committee has continued to meet in private, are you submitting that we have acted in some way improperly so as to cause these misconstruals?

Mr. Jenkins: My submission is merely that what you should have done was just reject the charge in the first place. However, we're not saying...

Dr. Nees: That's a different charge.

Mr. Jenkins: Well, exactly. I am not saying and I am not implying that in anyway the Committee has leaked any information. I have no such information.

Dr. Nees: Well you did make a statement. Perhaps I misunderstood that some submissions and some members, according to your information, wanted to investigate Professor Gottfredson in conflict with her academic freedom. I believe you used the word members. Were you referring to members of this Committee?

Mr. Jenkins: I'm referring to the members of this Committee asking what we understand are questions that relate heavily to what Professor Gottfredson's doing. Our information may be wrong on that. I'm not implying that anything has been leaked, especially to a newspaper in London, but what I am saying there Professor Nees is that indeed you are part of a wider world and whatever you do is going to be looked at and whatever you come out and say is going to be looked at and it would be very wise, I think, to do so carefully so it cannot be easily misconstrued.

Dr. Nees: We are certainly making every effort to be as careful as we can. If you have any objection to the procedure that we have so far, any claim that we have been unfair in our handling of this, I'd like to hear it right now before we go any farther.

Mr. Jenkins: Well, I have two objections and the one is your continuing. That, in fact, this procedure was ever done, but that is a point we have already addressed, and the second is to the extent that - and we weren't there, I don't know what was said - to the extent that any members have been asking questions about what Professor Gottfredson's doing, I do think that those were improper.

Ms. Faw: Mr. Jenkins, just so we're clear, Dr. Gottfredson, Professor Gottfredson has been invited to speak to the Committee. She's here on her own accord. She doesn't have to be here, and we're not at an evidentiary hearing where we have strict rules of relevance applicable, and it may be that many of the questions that the members of the Committee ask will be insignificant when it ultimately sits down at the table to discuss the issues. So I think things have to be viewed in that context as well.

Mr. Jenkins: We realize that.

Dr. Nees: Professor Gottfredson, please proceed.

Dr. Gottfredson: I am eager to answer any of your questions. And I am assuming because Professor Nees has treated me very fairly, and everything I have seen so far has, from our conversations, has indicated the utmost concern for me, so I'm going to assume that you have the very best of intentions and are

concerned about my academic freedom.

Dr. Nees: Thank you.

Dr. Gottfredson: I'm, I would second the point though -- so I'm eager to answer any questions and nothing... I'm not going to consider anything out of bounds. In this sort of area people... I've gotten every sort of question, and I would just as soon discuss anything that you have on your mind about me, why I'm in this, what I do in my research, how I think about this or that. Because I think one thing that's really at issue here is, it isn't just the Pioneer Fund and it isn't just me, it isn't just the University of Delaware, but there's a very large social process that's involved here. I'm a sociologist so I've been very interested not just in the topics that I've been working in, some of which are controversial, but the set of feelings and the reactions that attend the kind of work I do and we at the University have all been caught up in. And so anything I can do to shed a light on that too I would like to.

I actually expected some sort of controversy. One usually does in this area and, in fact, I expected it last year. This is six months late, in a way. I gave or ran a colloquium series last year that was funded entirely by the College of Education. I should note that I made an error in my first memo to Ron Whittington and I said that the colloquium was funded partly by the Pioneer Fund. I was misremembering. I had asked for money but I didn't need it, so none was ever used. But that colloquium series was an effort to explore some of the difficult issues in

this area in studying differences in intelligence and what they mean for the educational system. And what I did was to bring in some of the greatest scientists in this area, among them two of the people who have been singled out by some of the Fund's most vociferous critics as among those who provide illustration of the fact that the Fund is racist. Namely, Arthur Jensen and Hans Eysenck. There were others too who came in who were funded by the Pioneer Fund, one of whom you just met, which is Robert Gordon. So, in fact, the Dean of the College wrote to the President saying that, Dr. Jones, you should be advised that there could be some controversy but Linda's willing to talk to anybody about this who might have concerns. As it was, there were none. I should note that Professor Frawley attended those, but I didn't know who he was at the time so I didn't even know he was there. But I had expected, a lot of people had expected, there would be demonstrations outside the door and things like that. Instead people were keenly interested in what these people had to say. So, in a way, I did not expect this kind of controversy and I'm sorry it had to involve so many people because I think it's been difficult for a lot of people. But like I say, it is something that dogs people in this field and I find it an understandable reaction in some ways but a very unfortunate one, so anything I can provide in the way of information in that regard. Observations, too, for I have been a participant observer over a number of years in this area. The area is indeed a very legitimate one and - did Dr. Gordon speak

at all about this issue, because I don't want to go on about anything he talked about.

Dr. Nees: Which issue? The issue of the controversy in this area?

Dr. Gottfredson: That the field is very legitimate, respectable, mainstream psychology.

Dr. Nees: He did speak about it.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay. It's just that it doesn't get out of specialized settings and as a sociologist - and he's a sociologist too - we've been interested in taking this information further and seeing what it means for various social institutions and various groups. Where do we go from here? But that necessarily draws in other audiences in some of the controversy.

I'm sorry that I didn't get you my statement earlier. There's a number of things in here that I feel very strongly about and so I certainly hope that, well I expect that you will be reading it.

Dr. Nees: I assure you that we will.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes. Academic freedom. Just to summarize, I'd argue that the Pioneer Fund exercises no control, whatsoever, over grantees like myself. And I have been a grantee with other agencies and I can tell you that they are a lot more hands-off than any other that I've ever worked for. It's a blessing that a researcher is really privileged to experience. But they exercise no control over the projects they fund. So, therefore, the

University has neither the responsibility to investigate the Fund nor the right to deny any grantee funds from the Pioneer Fund, and I note that even investigating issue has a chilling effect. That's part of the sociology in this area. It's this sort of investigation... I should withdraw that word.

Dr. Nees: I understand. It's hard to use the right words all the time.

Dr. Gottfredson: This - what is the right word?

Dr. Nees: We've called it a consideration, which is better than President Trabant's word.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay. This sort of consideration does have a chilling effect because obviously I'm made an example. My life has been made very difficult, my reputation damaged, and other people take note of that. And so it's one way that people are made very reluctant to go into the field and people go out of the field. Many did, in fact, in the 1960s and 1970s when the controversies began.

As far as responsibility goes, I take very seriously the argument that a scientist should be responsible and I do not hide behind academic freedom by any means and I go into this work precisely because I think it's the responsible thing to do. I believe, and I've seen a lot of evidence to convince me of this, that it is not talking about these dilemmas that will prevent us from solving the problems rather than talking about them. To be sure, there is pain involved in talking about them. There are better and worse ways of doing so, and Dr. Gordon and I in our

project are trying to figure out what are the best ways of talking about these issues. But we're both firmly committed to the view that it both shows respect and concern for all parties involved to be forthright and honest. So I do believe very strongly in responsibility but my notions of responsibility may differ from others and I wouldn't deny anybody else funding on the basis of what I considered responsibility.

And as far as diversity goes, I believe that multi-cultural diversity is part of intellectual diversity, and that it has to accord with the core values of the academy and not contravene them. And, in fact, as I point out in here, I see no evidence that the Fund and its grantees repudiate the principle of diversity. In fact, I say I think the sin with regard to diversity on the part of some of us who have been funded by the Pioneer Fund is that we treat it as a dispassionate area of study. And I think, as I point out here, that a number of the people who have been funded by the Pioneer Fund believe that. Let me point out that Hans Eysenck was a refugee from Nazi Germany. Richard Lynn lives in strife-torn Northern Ireland. Arthur Jensen has many ties with India, including an Indian son-in-law, and Roger Pearson also lived in India for many years and has written explicitly about the difficult tensions between cultures living together. A number of us think it's - let's put it this way, I think that it's not only a legitimate area of inquiry to look into the dilemmas of diversity but that it's necessary for perhaps actuating our goals for living together in

a harmonious multi-cultural society.

So I believe I would have to disagree with some people who have written to you. It may be in the short run it feels like a conflict between the goals. I think in the long run, and I think we have to take a long term view, that knowing more about the sources of conflict and tension among populations - populations especially that are different, different in different ways - is important for improving prospects for getting along together.

So that's the heart of what I've said in my statement. As I end the statement I say I've always been willing and eager to talk about my work. You get me started and I might not let you go, and I still remain willing to talk to people, anybody on campus and I always have and I'm very eager to answer any of your questions. So please...

Dr. Nees: Thank you very much. But I should say at the outset that we didn't ask you to come to talk about your work. Your work is not now and never has been the focus of this Committee's consideration despite what you may have read in the press or elsewhere. This Committee was charged to look into the Pioneer Fund as a possible funding source at the University of Delaware, and the only way we can do that is by looking at the funding at the University of Delaware which is yours and how that is arranged and how the process operates and that's really the focus of our questions.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay. There may be some specific questions that you have in mind that I've sort of heard second-hand that I

can answer.

Dr. Nees: There are indeed. I have a number of them.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay.

Dr. Nees: If you'll forgive me I've written some of them down so that I can remember them. You joined the University of Delaware as an associate professor in September of 1987. Is that correct?

Dr. Gottfredson: 1986. Well, I was a visiting associate professor in 1986.

Dr. Nees: Oh, thank you for correcting me. When and how did you first hear about the Pioneer Fund?

Dr. Gottfredson: I heard about it from my husband, Robert Gordon, and now ex-husband. I think that he...I don't know how he heard about it but I had seen it acknowledged in various papers and I had spent several years looking for funds and it was one name that I hadn't heard before.

Dr. Nees: Was that before you came to the University?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes. Yes, I had several grants through the Johns Hopkins University. I think I've had six or seven and three here and the rest there.

Dr. Nees: That was my next question. When did you first work on a project receiving financial support from the Pioneer Fund? That would have been at Johns Hopkins?

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, Summer of 1986. I did projects through the Johns Hopkins University while I was here. I still had official connections there.

Dr. Nees: But your first application for a grant to the Pioneer

Fund yourself was after you came here.

Dr. Gottfredson: Summer 1988.

*I mis understood him
They think that I did not
get the grants myself.*

Dr. Nees: That's right. May of 1988 I think is the date. Have you applied to other granting agencies or organizations for financial support in connection with the projects that are also receiving or have received Pioneer Fund support?

Dr. Gottfredson: I haven't applied to any other places since I first applied to the Pioneer Fund. I had applied to a number of other places before that, NSF and whatnot. I should say I used to live on grants and contracts before I came to the University of Delaware, all of them through the National Institute of Education, now the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. And it's practically impossible to get funding for this kind of research. All you have to have is one bad rating, and you are bound to get one bad rating because a lot of groups are balanced, so it's just about impossible to get funding. So I have gone with the Pioneer Fund since then. I must say though I did apply to another organization which I will not name because they withdrew their funding. They didn't withdraw their funding because they hadn't given it to me yet but they decided ...they solicited a proposal from me and they were going to fund it, or they indicated that they were, and then when this came up they said no thank you. It was a private foundation.

Dr. Nees: The cover sheets for your three applications to the Pioneer Fund, I'm referring to these documents. I don't know if Mr. Jenkins has seen these. These are the actual proposals that

I understand went to the Pioneer Fund. Maybe you could pass them down.

Dr. Gottfredson: I have a set here. I thought we might need them.

Dr. Nees: All right. Fine. They all carry the heading "Project for the Study of Intelligence and Society." When did you first use this term to refer to your ongoing professional activity?

Dr. Gottfredson: I can't remember exactly. It was probably when we had the stationery made up and, if I may, I can pass around some of our stationery. It has our project goals on it. There are three.

Dr. Nees: I'd appreciate that. Thank you. I've never seen that. Did you talk to anyone, consult with anyone, concerning this particular term that you would use, presumably with Professor Gordon who's the Co-Director, with anyone else about what to call this ongoing activity?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh certainly. Our hope had been, and still is, to establish some sort of center but you can't call yourself a center without approval by the Trustees or somebody. But you can use the term project, and so we chose, other than that constraint, the rest was our effort to provide a descriptor that indicated what we were about. Before I got any stationery printed up, I went to the Dean.

Dr. Nees: This is Dean Frank Murray?

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, Dean Frank Murray.

Dr. Nees: in the College of Education.

Dr. Gottfredson: I also cleared it through Arno Loessner. I couldn't find my letters from him but I assumed there might be some sort of approval process so I went through that process.

Dr. Nees: But you haven't been able to find the letters. If you can find them we would very much like to see them.

Dr. Gottfredson: I know, I was looking for them the other day. I ran across them before Dean Murray said you asked some question about using the seal. And then I went back yesterday, I didn't have much time, but for the life of me I can't figure out which file I put them in.

Dr. Nees: He indicated that he had discussed this with you and did you take that discussion to be...

Dr. Gottfredson: It was written.

Dr. Nees: Oh, it was written?

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes.

Dr. Nees: Could we see copies of that?

Dr. Gottfredson: That's what I'm looking for.

Dr. Nees: Oh, oh I see. No, I was talking about that conversation with Dean Murray.

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh, I have a letter to him, which I do have, in which I say I want to get some letterhead paper and I gave him a mock-up. And at that point it wasn't clear to me how I had to go, and I think it was in informal conversations with him or probably with one of the assistants to the Dean who told me that it was Arno Loessner that I needed to talk to. So then I spoke to him on the phone and then I wrote a letter, and he got back to

me with the letter, but I can't find that response. He might have that in his file.

Dr. Nees: Well perhaps we can ask him to look for it.

Dr. Gottfredson: It's sometime during the summer of '88.

Dr. Nees: The summer of '88.

Dr. Gottfredson: Because my letter to the Dean I think was July, late July '88.

Dr. Nees: But this letter is dated May 25, 1988.

Dr. Gottfredson: '87, I'm sorry.

Dr. Nees: Okay.

Dr. Gottfredson: It must be '87 then. Yes.

Dr. Nees: We'll try to pursue that. If you can find it we'll certainly ask Mr. Loessner if he can. All three of these University of Delaware, the so called 'blue sheets' although I only have photo copies which aren't blue, but I think you know what I mean.

Dr. Gottfredson: Right.

Dr. Nees: Does Mr. Jenkins have those? Because there is a function code here - 42.

Dr. Gottfredson: I don't have one. All I have is...that must be the copy.

Dr. Nees: Let me pass that down.

Dr. Varrin: That's it, that's the blue sheet.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, but mine is before the administration has....

Dr. Nees: Oh, okay. This is the one with all the signatures and

after the signatures. After yours and after everyone else. This code, as I understand it, signifies that the project was defined as "other sponsored agreements," often mistakenly, I'm told, referred to as public service and not as research which has a different code. Were you consulted about the application of the "other sponsored agreements" code to this project and did you understand and agree with that designation?

Dr. Gottfredson: No. No one ever told me about it and I had no, I would have had no idea what it was unless you told me.

Dr. Nees: Well, we have a memo from Miss Sandra Staples, Director of Pre-award Administration at the University. She says, "determination," which is referring to of the appropriate code, "determination is made after consultation with the principal investigator." To your knowledge...

Dr. Gottfredson: But we didn't...

Dr. Nees: It is not correct in this case?

Dr. Gottfredson: Well, we did discuss one thing, that I recall, and I had many discussions with her over time, some before I even came here, so I don't know when it was, but my understanding...my memory...I really don't remember too much is that it had to do with whether there was overhead, something like that, but the Pioneer Fund doesn't have overhead so that wouldn't have made sense. But, at that time, I probably would have agreed to anything. I mean, I'm not clear what the implication...what is the implication?

Dr. Nees: You don't recall disagreeing with that or you can't...

Dr. Gottfredson: I really don't know...

Dr. Nees: arguing about that designation being applied...

Dr. Gottfredson: I'm not going to disagree with her. I just don't recall any conversation at all. There's...I...What's meant by public service?

Dr. Nees: Well, that's what everyone calls it but it's other sponsored agreements. It's something that is...something other than research. Research is the other.

*their documents
do*

Dr. Varrin: Sandra probably said public service.

Dr. Nees: No, she said other sponsored agreements. She says that you and others call it public service but...

Dr. Gottfredson: Well, I...

Dr. Nees: (laughing)

Dr. Gottfredson: You know, I might have agreed because if you look at the objectives and the proposals reflect the objectives. One is to do research, one is to disseminate information, and one is to stimulate constructive debate. And all the proposals have, as a group, involved all three.

Dr. Nees: On November 15, 1989, the Pioneer Fund mailed to President Trabant a group of documents. I think you received copies of these too, including a memorandum dated November 1 of 1989 and beginning "This memorandum is to describe the Pioneer Fund and its history since its organization in 1937 so that grantees can become fully familiar with the Fund." As a grantee of the Fund, was this memorandum mailed to you when you first applied to or received a grant from the Pioneer Fund?

Dr. Gottfredson: No, it wasn't.

Dr. Nees: On the second page of this memorandum, which is dated November 1, 1989, is a statement that "the Fund never originates any research projects and never suggests the desired result of any research. To ensure the impartiality of the research, as a matter of policy the Fund does not request reports about the research and it often does not know the results except for public information." Would you say that this statement fairly characterizes your own relationship with the Pioneer Fund?

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes. The...

Dr. Nees: That is, did the Pioneer Fund originate your project?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh heavens no!

Dr. Nees: Have you ever made a report to the Pioneer Fund?

Dr. Gottfredson: Informal reports. Yes. I always understood...I assumed it was like any other grant. You make reports.

Dr. Varrin: It was a gift.

Dr. Gottfredson: I never knew it was a gift and they always refer to them as grants, so it must be something here, the way you classify them. Because I've always called it a grant and they've always called it a grant.

Dr. Nees: If you did make reports to the Pioneer Fund in any formal way, could we see a copy of those reports?

Dr. Gottfredson: I did not make them in any formal way.

Dr. Nees: Was there conversation?

Dr. Gottfredson: There were letters to Mr. Weyher.

Dr. Nees: So you did have some contact with them prior to your next round of applications?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes. I thought it was my obligation to provide some sort of accounting for their money. I don't want to mis...I don't know what the intent of some of the questions is. The earlier one on "do they send out these materials?" I think that as a result of some of the controversy that was generated they began to do that. And they have certainly become more concerned about the grantees seeing what they've had to put up with.

Dr. Nees: The proposal that...your first proposal from the University of Delaware, on May 25 of '88, asks for support of your preparation of a special number of the Journal of Vocational Behavior which was eventually published in December of 1988, including at least some portion of your salary, xeroxing, and postage. The proposal was accepted and funded by the Pioneer Fund. Did you send a copy of the journal to the Pioneer Fund?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes.

Dr. Nees: Does this journal carry an acknowledgement that it was prepared with financial support from the Pioneer Fund?

Dr. Gottfredson: No it does not. I asked them what they would prefer and they said they didn't care, so I left it out.

Dr. Nees: You provided us with samples of materials mailed from the University of Delaware under the terms of your third Pioneer Fund grant, including the copies of the Journal of Vocational Behavior here, a review by Professor Gordon from the journal

Academic Questions, and an article also by Professor Gordon from the International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy. Is this a complete set of the publications distributed under your Pioneer Fund grants at the University? Is everything that was sent out...

Dr. Gottfredson: It depends on how you define disseminate. If you mean what I mail out when people ask, certainly not, but if you mean what I sent out in the way of large mailings.

Dr. Nees: That's what I mean.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes.

Dr. Nees: Okay. Thank you. You provided us, at my request, with three cover sheets. I asked for samples of these things. You gave me three cover sheets for these mailings which I can pass down to you.

Dr. Gottfredson: I know what they are.

Dr. Nees: You know what they look like. Do you want to see them? Okay. One pink, one yellow, one gray. Are these the only cover sheets you have used for the mailings from the University of Delaware?

Dr. Gottfredson: No, I think there is...What I do to try to get a sense of the interest in different disciplines is to send out - well, all these things are sent to, almost all are sent to, other academics or professionals. So, for example, I have a blue form when I sent out the first journal issue, a blue form for the subscribers to the journal of Personal Psychology, a yellow one for the sociologists. I had a gray one for fellows of Division

14 and 5, so I had different colors. And then with each - so there were about a half-dozen - then with each subsequent mailing it depended somewhat again on the discipline and also on whether I was going to give them an option to be on our mailing list, because we have enough people on it now - it's over a thousand - that I don't want just everybody signing up so I would only put certain disciplines in to sign up. So some have extra information at the bottom. As you see, there are two... I put one of those in, the gray one, for example. It gives them no option. It just says, "lucky you, here it is."

Dr. Nees: One has a mailing label, and one doesn't. Otherwise they are identical. I noticed that.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes. Then there are ones for our mailing list. Have you changed your address? Then it depends on what's being send out. We usually have a little blurb. The first time we sent it out we didn't say anything but then we decided we should say a little bit about what they're getting in the mail. I think...So there's a variety of them.

Dr. Nees: I wanted to come back to that but I was just looking at my notes, which are a mess here. I had a couple of questions which I wanted to ask which I've forgotten but to go back to that memorandum dated November 1 of 1989 in which the Pioneer Fund described itself. To your knowledge was this in existence prior to November 1 of 1989? Did you ever see this or a document like it prior to that time?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes, yes. Yes I did. I don't remember when

I saw it but I saw it sometime earlier. Mr. Weyher...I don't recall quite what's in it, something about the purposes of the Fund, the kinds of things it funds.

Dr. Nees: the operations.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, I had a copy of it. That's pretty much what I had already. It was...there was some things added, a few things changed. In fact, I think he sought my comments on what I thought of it.

Dr. Nees: Okay. Did you...

Dr. Gottfredson: But I don't remember when I had that first one, so I'm wrong when I say...

Dr. Nees: Was it before it was sent to President Trabant?

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes. Oh long before, so I think I'm wrong when I said I hadn't seen it before November 1 because I had a draft in my files from sometime earlier. Not a draft, but something that he had sent me.

Dr. Nees: Did you...if you were sent a draft did you make any suggestions about the content or language of that or submit any draft to him in response?

Dr. Gottfredson: I can't...No I won't say it was a draft. It was changed...between the first two were somewhat changed. They were basically the same. I think there was something different about Mehler on there. He had more information about the Ben O'Brien thing or something. But I did not provide any comments on it.

Dr. Nees: To go back to this letterhead question. The Committee

received a letter from David Kaplan of the Department of Educational Studies, your department, on January 9, 1990 in which he stated at the outset that he believed your academic freedom should be protected at all costs. He went on to suggest that "Dr. Gottfredson place a disclaimer in those works supported by the Fund in which contain the University of Delaware logo or name." That letter is here.

Dr. Gottfredson: I have the letter.

Dr. Nees: Does Mr. Jenkins have the letter?

Mr. Jenkins: I've seen a copy.

Dr. Nees: Okay. Attached to Kaplan's letter, as I received them, are two photo copies of undated cover sheets of the project for the Study of Intelligence and Society. I'll pass these down if you want to know which ones I mean. Were these sent out from the University of Delaware, to the best of your knowledge, are these some of the others that you refer to?

*One they
fucked from*

Dr. Gottfredson: They probably were. Those weren't in the files, so I haven't seen them. (Items passed to Gottfredson.)
Yes they were.

Dr. Nees: Okay. Thank you. Now we talked earlier. I wanted to ask about these cover sheets. They bear the seals of both the Johns Hopkins University and the University of Delaware. I understand from what you said you did discuss the creation of this stationery with Dean Frank Murray and the use of the University of Delaware logo...

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes.

Dr. Nees: ...not only with Dean Murray, but you wrote to Mr. Loessner.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, in fact I sent him xeroxes of mock-ups of this and there's some mailing labels. (Gottfredson shows the items.)

Dr. Nees: And it's your understanding that he authorized you to use that...are both tapes going again? Great.

Dr. Gottfredson: Right.

Dr. Nees: Has anyone, any officer, department chairman, dean or anyone else asked you not to use this stationery or to use the logo in this way?

Dr. Gottfredson: No. No one has ever complained to me about anything.

Dr. Nees: Let me return to the question of a disclaimer raised by Professor Kaplan. On November 15, Frank Dilley wrote to me suggesting that the Pioneer Fund support for the colloquium series in the College of Education ought to have been acknowledged. As you said before, on January 5 of this year, 1990, you responded to Dilley's memo by pointing out that the Pioneer Fund did not, in fact, provide support for the series in question. You go on to state "in my years of doing research on grants from the U.S. Department of Education, the operative principle for me and my colleagues was always the widely accepted one that credit should be given where credit is due." Do you stand by that statement?

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes. If the organization wants it.

Dr. Nees: If the organization wants it?

Dr. Gottfredson: I would honor their wishes, I think. I mean...

Dr. Nees: This is the explanation...What struck me is that in all of these mailing pieces, none of those we've seen is the Pioneer Fund ever mentioned and in the journal prepared in part with their support the Pioneer Fund is never mentioned. The conflict...

Dr. Gottfredson: The what prepared in support?

Dr. Nees: The Journal for Vocational Behavior...

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh.

Dr. Nees: volume of 1988 also does not mention the Pioneer Fund. Am I correct in understanding you, then, that the conflict between the lack of mention and your principle that credit should be given where credit is due is because that the Pioneer...you understood that the Pioneer Fund did not wish to be acknowledged.

Dr. Gottfredson: No, they didn't care. It was left up to me whether I wanted to do it or not, and I chose not to. It was my choice. In this area, you have to understand that my work could be used against the Fund to hurt somebody else. So, it's sort of...if you worry about guilt by association, I could hurt somebody else as a needless source of controversy.

they ignore this

Dr. Nees: Thank you. Those are all the questions I have. Anyone else on the Committee have questions they want to raise?

Dr. Varrin: I just wanted to pick up (unclear) procedural things. You didn't realize that all these "grants" to the University were actually gifts?

Dr. Gottfredson: Never.

Dr. Varrin: No one ever told you that?

Dr. Gottfredson: No, never.

Dr. Varrin: That's interesting. I'm telling you now.

Dr. Gottfredson: What's the difference?

Dr. Varrin: Well, a gift is a gift...

Dr. Gottfredson: Who makes the decision?

Dr. Varrin: The Pioneer Fund.

Dr. Gottfredson: They didn't know they were gifts.

Dr. Varrin: Oh yes they did.

Dr. Gottfredson: In what way?

Dr. Varrin: To my knowledge, I'm sorry.

Dr. Gottfredson: In what way?

Dr. Varrin: That they've acknowledged they gave them as gifts.

Dr. Gottfredson: They call them grants.

Dr. Varrin: Maybe I've been confused all along because the day they arrived, and I'm using jargon now, they were booked as gifts. Was there any cover letter? The check was transmitted to you, I understand.

Dr. Gottfredson: I have a cover letter and it just, it's one sentence. This check, they were sent to me, this check is to support work for and then it says something about the Project for Intelligence and Society. It doesn't say...

Dr. Nees: Could we see a copy of that?

Dr. Gottfredson: Sure.

Dr. Varrin: That would help.

Dr. Gottfredson: Sure.

Dr. Nees: It was booked technically as a gift.

Mr. Jenkins: Could I ask, and perhaps I could come as an outsider, the distinction between gift and grant is totally lost to me.

Dr. Varrin: A grant does have obligations, a gift does not have any obligations. As a professional courtesy you might give them a report but there is no obligation and you did feel that you had obligations.

Dr. Nees: Did you make out a report to the University's Office of Research about the activities?

Dr. Gottfredson: No.

Mr. Jenkins: I think what she was saying is kind of a professional obligation but no legal obligation.

Dr. Varrin: Then it's not a grant. A grant has legal obligations.

Mr. Jenkins: Yes, I didn't understand Linda and maybe you can clarify whether you had a legal obligation to write them a report.

Dr. Gottfredson: I guess I just assumed I did because I always had grants and I had to.

Dr. Varrin: But you said you didn't though. You said you had no formal report that you submitted.

Dr. Gottfredson: No, they turn out not to, there was no form or anything.

Dr. Varrin: What I'm telling you is that a grant requires that.

A grant requires a formal...

Dr. Nees: At least at the University...

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh right, you fill out a form.

Dr. Varrin: No, no. You send the sponsor a formal report.

Dr. Gottfredson: Right.

Dr. Varrin: A formal report.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, it even has a cover sheet too.

Dr. Varrin: Well, okay. I'm saying so you were behaving...

Dr. Gottfredson: or that the University...

Dr. Varrin: Well, no, I'm talking about any grant requires a report. You were proceeding consistently on the basis that it was a gift.

Dr. Nees: Whether you knew that or not.

Dr. Varrin: Whether you knew it or not, and it is a big distinction. There are no deliverables, as more jargon, there are no deliverables.

Dr. Gottfredson: No strings attached.

Dr. Varrin: Strings attached, thank you. There are no strings attached on a gift.

Dr. Gottfredson: So it has even fewer strings than a grant.

Dr. Varrin: There's no strings.

Dr. Gottfredson: So what's the importance of that distinction here?

Dr. Varrin: No, well it's just that you kept referring to a grant until, until today always assumed you were working under a grant and I'm telling you that by definition you were not working

*makes pt.
that no
controls.
Never mention
in report
that a
gift.*

under a grant, you were working with three gifts.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay...

Dr. Varrin: Just information.

Dr. Gottfredson: Does that distinction have any bearing on...

Dr. Nees: No, it's a very important distinction that they're handled differently. If it were a grant you would be obligated to make reports to the Office of Research. If it's a gift, you don't need to make reports or do anything of the sort.

Dr. Varrin: And you were consistent with the gift mode.

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh, okay.

Mr. Jenkins: It seems like you could have gone to the Bahamas.

Dr. Varrin: It was a gift to the University, excuse me.

Dr. Gottfredson: You're not going to the Bahamas on it.

Dr. Nees: Professor Sylves.

Dr. Sylves: I wanted to ask. You say you did work with the Pioneer Foundation at Johns Hopkins before you came here. There was another principal investigator, you were simply helping that principal investigator. Were you the PI on Pioneer foundation research at Johns Hopkins?

Dr. Gottfredson: I think we both were. I was not...we're co-directors.

Dr. Sylves: Co-directors. Did any institutional officer at Johns Hopkins ever approach you or Professor Gordon about the Pioneer Foundation? Did any official down there ever come to you and ask a question?

Dr. Gottfredson: No.

Dr. Sylves: or express reservations about that particular organization?

Dr. Gottfredson: No.

Dr. Sylves: None?

Dr. Gottfredson: None.

Dr. Sylves: In your discussions with your department chair, as you made applications, did he ever express to you any reservations about the Pioneer Foundation?

Dr. Gottfredson: No.

Dr. Sylves: Never said anything?

Dr. Gottfredson: Not that I recall.

Dr. Sylves: My next question is a hypothetical question. Do you feel that as a faculty member that you have the right to accept money for your research from any source outside the University of Delaware and in doing so involving the University in the application? Let's say the Communist Party wanted to...

Dr. Gottfredson: wanted me to have...

Dr. Sylves: support your research or the Nazi Party wanted to support your research, do you feel that as the part of your academic freedom entails you to apply for that money through the University, and to get that money the University has no right to disrupt your freedom to apply to even the Communist Party, the Nazi Party, the Ku Klux Klan. In other words...

Dr. Gottfredson: I spelled that out in my letter. I believe, yes, I believe that I have that right. I say there...

Dr. Sylves: And that the University has no rights to deny you

that privilege?

Dr. Gottfredson: That's what I say. I say that I wouldn't, but that's my decision. That is not their decision, because I wouldn't want to do that to somebody else. But I wouldn't. And if all those charges were true I wouldn't want their money, because I don't want my work used against ends that I'm for and so I'm not going to even give credibility to groups like that. But I think it's my right. It's another faculty member's right.

Dr. Varrin: I have another question, a detail question. I was just curious.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay.

Dr. Varrin: It seems like the whole sequence with the Pioneer Fund and you started in about 1986. Is that what you were saying?

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes.

Dr. Varrin: And then you...but you talked... then you arrived here in '87 but there were four grants from the start of the relationship with the Pioneer Fund until you arrived here. Four Johns Hopkins grants.

Dr. Gottfredson: It's a bit complicated.

Dr. Varrin: Sorry.

Dr. Gottfredson: You could call them continuations. I think they were classed as continuations. The first one we got was early in '86, early summer of '86 before I got here. That one was continued through Johns Hopkins even after I came here and so what I would do is submit bills from here. So it was sort of

like, it wasn't sub-contracting but I was working afar. So I just sent my bills from afar. And I cleared all that with the Dean but then I decided that it was a hassle I mean it was time to start putting them through here and the University should get the credit.

Dr. Varrin: It just seemed like the numbers didn't, I mean...so the four grants were fairly short term grants before you...It seems like the three that you've had since '88 here are fine. I mean, the timing seems right but there were four between '86 and '87 from Hopkins. I think you said you had seven grants all told or something like that.

Dr. Gottfredson: I should have brought a list of them. I think there's about seven of them. There was always one major one in the summer then there was usually some sort of continuation or some special expense. For example, we had put in to do a symposium and to solicit papers from different points of view and this-and-that for the APA convention and to do, to write a couple of papers. Then, maybe at that time, I forget, help put together the JVB, the first one.

Dr. Varrin: Listen, I think you've explained this beautifully so I don't want you to take any more time on this.

Dr. Nees: No, I think that's... We're mainly interested really in the University of Delaware,

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes.

Dr. Nees: not in your prior involvement.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay, but the involvement here is much the same

as there so I had three grants, two major ones in the summer. Major in terms of work, not necessarily money, and then one in the fall in order to pay for purchasing the second journal issue. They like them more discrete.

Dr. Varrin: They were bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. That's the point. The whole thing was a very rapid...from '86 on there were many grants.

Dr. Gottfredson: Yes, many.

Dr. Nees: Does anyone else have questions?

Mr. Jenkins: In which case perhaps I should make one additional point...

Dr. Nees: Let me, let me just make sure. Some times, I'm a teacher. Sometimes people are slow to raise their hand. Is there anyone who's just being shy?

Dr. Gottfredson: I have some questions after he speaks.

Dr. Nees: Okay, then, please go ahead Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Jenkins: The point is that on the Pioneer Fund, I don't know anything about the Pioneer Fund that I haven't read in the various articles around here. But I do know something about one of the Pioneer Fund's early trustees, John Marshall Harlan. Now, Justice Harlan was a Justice of the United States Supreme Court from 1954 to 1971. During that time he gained a reputation as perhaps the preeminent judge's judge of the 20th century. He also voted for, from 1954 until 1968, and I'm sure Miss Faw can confirm this, he voted for every single school desegregation and other desegregation case before the United States Supreme

Court. He joined the unanimous decision of that court. To me it's incredible that somebody like John Harlan would be involved with a racist trust. His actions as a justice, first on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and on the United States Supreme Court, it seems to me, to disprove any possibility that he would be so involved. I also noticed among the other trustees on the list of trustees is a number of distinguished lawyers in New York and Boston, over the years, including Mr. Weyher. I think to call any of them racists or to assume that any of them would be associated with something...with racism is, is fairly...I would want to see proof of some kind... of proof of their racism because these men are really distinguished attorneys and who have excellent, excellent reputations. Now I think again Miss Faw might be able to confirm that. A lot of this...of the stuff on the Pioneer Fund seems to me "guilt by association" in association with association on association. Well, if guilt lies with association perhaps evidence of more pure motives lie with association too. I think those trustees help demonstrate that the Pioneer Fund is not a racist organization.

Dr. Nees: Professor Gottfredson if you had something more you wanted to say or if there are questions...I have to warn you, unfortunately, we only have about ten minutes before we have to leave.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay. Fine. I sort of divide it into two questions. One is whether they're racists and one whether it's even relevant that they are racist. I don't think it should be

relevant to the University under the standard of academic freedom whether they are racists or not. That would be very unfortunate, and I would not want ties with them either. But if you reject that and you continue to, one continues to ask whether they are indeed racists, then I think that the evidence that's been put forward is really shameful. Not in indicting the Pioneer Fund but in indicting the accusers. It's false. Much of it is demonstratively false. I mean, you can bring out papers - so-and-so was not a trustee and such-and-such did not do this or do that. I mean, you can see in the Independent letter that there are now mistaken facts about me being circulated. I have never contributed to the Manland Quarterly but now I'm on record as contributing to it. Different mistakes are made about the same issue, by the same person, from letter...not from letter but from article to article. It's, for me, and I say in my letter to you, that people object to the Pioneer Fund not because of the caliber of its work, and I can show you this. Bob Gordon left it for me. There's a series put out by a British press - Falmer. They have a Falmer International Master Minds Challenged series. Five eminent living psychologists who've been provocative, you might say. Two of them are some of the Pioneer Fund recipients that have been most excoriated in some of the writings done by the Fund's chief critique, Barry Mehler: Hans Eysenck and Arthur Jensen. You might wonder who the other three are: Noam Chomsky, B. F. Skinner, and Lawrence Kohlberg. That's the company that the Pioneer Fund keeps. They are on the leading edge of a lot of

important issues. They fund Thomas Bouchard's Minnesota Twin Study and they have for ten years. It's not easy to get funding for genetic research of some types. It's one of the most important studies in psychology today. They have the guts to do that. He puts up with a lot of crap to fund this stuff, and it is very important, and these men are known for their courage and their scientific integrity and their personal integrity. And it's an affront to Harry Weyher, his organization, and to people like this that they could be judged on the basis of letters that are full of lies, guilt by association, outright fabrication that plays well because, as has been demonstrated in a recent book by Snyderman and Rothman called The I.O. Controversy, Media and Social Policy. If you do surveys of testing experts and ask them what they have concluded about certain issues, for example, whether there are black-white differences in intelligence, whether tests are biased, whether there is some genetic involvement, you find that the vast majority agree with Arthur Jensen. Now they didn't twenty years ago. That's why he was such a controversial figure, but the research in this area is so well established that it is the scientific consensus now. But what they discovered is that the media present these issues in a diametrically opposite point of view. My view is that it is the view of testing that was held at the time that some of these people started investigating those very same issues. Are tests biased? Jensen started out believing they were. But the field has come a long way. What has become entrenched publicly are the

fears and misperceptions, or the fears of the 1960s, and there is now a mythology basically that tests are biased, there are no differences, they don't matter. And you can show that science editors believe that, as this book shows, that the media systematically misrepresents the field, and that anybody who is in anyway caught up publicly, like me, is very vulnerable because everybody out there is sure, they know, because they have heard it so many times and in some of the classes on this campus, that the tests are biased, there are no differences and only a racist could say such things. They can't believe that anyone could be honestly concerned, anyone would say this, who had any human decency. I do it because I am concerned. So there is this mismatch which is...so it's easy to whip people up. There are so many misperceptions to play on. And for me...all the field has gone on for twenty years, building the evidence. It is solid...the differences are there. My work as a sociologist is to go from there. What do they mean? But when I am critized people say how can you suggest that there are even differences and so I have to go back and give Psych 101 on, well, what's - Is there test bias? Is there this, or is there that? - before I can even begin to talk about whether my work is legitimate. So there's a vast...science is cumulative, but the scientists have gone this far. The public is back here (demonstrates the gap) and so it's very difficult to present the work without someone capturing the issue and feeding on people's misperceptions.

I don't blame people. I don't attach negative motives to

people who are upset, but I'm caught and they're caught in this grinder of misunderstanding because it's taboo to talk about these things. And the Pioneer Fund has been caught up in this. Just to explain a little bit of the sociology of it and why there is...how could there be people like me and how could there be a controversy? There's just this big mismatch between what the public is given or understands and what is known in the field. And this is mainstream. This is very mainstream.

Dr. Nees: Let me ask just one last question. Very briefly. If you're correct that 53% or most people...Professor Gordon spoke to the same issue...

Dr. Gottfredson: Oh yes, he talked about it.

Dr. Nees: of this work most people believe this but they're afraid to stand up for it and that this is mainstream work. It seems to me that there's a contradiction between that statement and the statement that he made and that you made that this research cannot be funded by outside organizations because it is unpopular.

*to challenge
me*

Dr. Gottfredson: It's mainstream knowledge, and my work is very much considered mainstream. In fact, those two journal issues are considered leading edge. But if I were to go to the National Science Foundation for funding and I have gone to them. I went to them every single year and was turned down every single year. I'm not going to get it. Part of it is disciplinary. I'm a sociologist and I am looking at the sociological implications of these differences and social policy implications. What can we

do? Where's our maneuverability? For such a proposal you would submit it to the sociology section. Now I submitted one in '85 that had nothing to do with race but had to do with one of my more fundamental interests and that's the aptitude demands of jobs and how they're structured and what this means for demographic...for the future...are jobs getting more difficult and this-and-that and I spoke of ability differences, particularly the general mental factor. And the sociologists reviewing it said basically "Pooh, there's no such thing." So it's an interdisciplinary thing. My work is very interdisciplinary.

Dr. Nees: I see. I think I have to cut you off but we are keeping the people who work here late already and they've done us a favor.

Dr. Varrin: We're visitors here.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay.

Dr. Nees: Thank you very much for coming.

Dr. Gottfredson: Okay, well, thank you for the opportunity to come...and I'd like to...