



University of Delaware

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-2311

July 27, 1987

MEMORANDUM

TO: Muhammad Ahmed
Affirmative Action Office

FROM: Frank B. Murray, Dean *Frank*

SUBJECT: The Reception of Dr. Gottfredson's Research

I am writing to you, Muhammad, for two reasons. One, to have you read the enclosed letter from Marcus Wood in which he expresses a different view of the black community's interest in Dr. Gottfredson's research than you expressed to me the other day. Secondly, I would like to have a xerox copy of the material you mentioned that quoted Gordon's and Gottfredson's work. I would simply like to read it for myself so I can be better informed on this question.

I have spoken with Linda about the reception of her work in some quarters of our University, and she would be more than willing to present her ideas and have an open discussion with any members of the University community that wish to have an honest discussion of this topic. I think that is how it would be best to proceed with any people that come to you with concerns about the tone or implications of Dr. Gottfredson's line of work. I think we should simply schedule a seminar or discussion and have these people get to know each other a little better. I believe Vic Martuza has expressed the same view to you on another occasion and I think we should act on it.

FBM: jph

Enclosure

cc: Provost L. Leon Campbell
Linda Gottfredson *[Handwritten mark]*
Vic Martuza

May 22, 1988

On May 11 I had a meeting with Dean Frank Murray to discuss my promotion and matters concerning the colloquium series I am organizing. I mentioned that I had heard that some people on campus were disturbed by my work and my presence on campus. I thought that such sentiment could disrupt both the progress of my promotion and the conduct of the colloquium series and wanted to prepare as best possible. I had heard about the sentiment against me from both Bill Allen at the Civil Rights Commission and (upon asking) from Vic Martuza.

Bill Allen had asked me (in mid April) if I knew that some people were upset by me at Delaware. He did not reveal specifics, except to say in response to a question that "you know how these things work, people start asking if we want this sort of person on campus." Vic Martuza said that in a meeting with a black alumnus of the Department that she had said that people had commented to her that there was a racist in the department.

Dean Murray volunteered that he thought that the black faculty on campus were bothered. He mentioned [REDACTED] by name, but it was not clear why. He also said that the affirmative action officer, Mohammed, had come to him earlier in the year. Although Mohammed is aware that he cannot appear to violate academic freedom, he was concerned that Murray know that my work was cited approvingly in a klan newsletter (or some such thing). Murray told him to bring my offending statements to him, but Mohammed has not done so.

Vic and Frank seem to take much the same attitude. As long as the research is sound, the research is appropriate. Neither thinks of me as a racist. People with complaints should bring them the specifics that support their concerns (racist statements, etc.).

Murray also volunteered that at the time I was hired, someone came to him and warned him that he was hiring an "intellectual racist."

Mohammed did contact Murray one other time about me, because I have correspondence from Murray to Mohammed.



University of Delaware

#3

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

(302) 451-2954

October 31, 1989

Arthur E. Trabant, President
Hullihen Hall
University of Delaware

Dear President Trabant:

I've been told that a member of the University is likely to ask to meet with you to express his or her concern about my receiving grant support from the Pioneer Fund. It may not be coincidental that this concern is voiced at the same time that I am coming up for promotion.

The Pioneer Fund is a legitimate foundation that supports research on the genetics of intelligence and group differences in mental abilities as well as other topics. Its recipients include such distinguished scholars as Thomas Bouchard and Arthur Jensen. Because of the socially sensitive nature of much of the work that it funds, the Fund has frequently been the object of attacks, some of them quite scurrilous and McCarthy-like.

I'd be glad to meet with you to discuss my research or the Pioneer Fund, if you think that would be helpful. I'd also be happy to provide you with any materials that you might want.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Linda S. Gottfredson
Associate Professor

cc: Victor Martuza
Frank Murray

Memorandum

#4



November 14, 1989

TO: E.A. Trabant
President

FROM: Linda Gottfredson *lg*
Educational Studies

RE: The Pioneer Fund

I have just obtained a copy of William Frawley's letter to you concerning the Pioneer Fund. If the Pioneer Fund were a fascist, racist, anti-Semitic organization, I surely would have nothing to do with it. But Frawley's accusations are not only untrue; he seems to have accepted uncritically a series of lies and distortions promulgated by others.

Although I cannot answer all of Frawley's charges in so little time, I thought it was important to respond right away to set the record straight about what I do know about his allegations against the Fund. The extensive pattern of falsehoods revealed here should, however, cast serious doubt on Frawley's credibility in general.

1. The Pioneer Fund is a legitimate research foundation concerned with the study of heredity. As stated in its charter, its major purpose is:

To conduct or aid in conducting study and research into problems of heredity and eugenics in the human race generally and such research in respect to animals and plants as may throw light upon heredity in man, and research and study into problems of human race betterment with special reference to people in the United States, and for the advance of knowledge and the dissemination of information with respect to any studies so made or in general with respect to heredity and eugenics.

Its original board members include U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan, who served on the Board of Trustees from 1937 until 1954.

In recent years the Fund has supported a range of studies on heredity and health, including research on twins (the heritability of intelligence, personality traits, physical traits, and diseases and disabilities, etc.) and, more generally, on human abilities and disabilities, particularly as they bear on "head-start" type compensatory educational programs, appropriate school curricula for diverse student bodies, and the possible effects on education and employment of nationwide trends in



intelligence test results. The Fund has also supported research on improvements in testing methods and equipment which are meant to make it possible to discover innate talents in underprivileged individuals, not otherwise identifiable, for educational and other purposes. In addition, the Fund has supported the study of some genetic diseases (Sickle Cell, Tay-Sacks, and hemophilia).

Among the more than two dozen colleges and universities that have received grants from the Pioneer Fund are Stanford University, Tel Aviv University, University of Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of California (Berkeley, Santa Barbara, San Diego, and San Francisco). Foundations that have received grants include the National Hemophilia Foundation, the Sickle Cell Disease Foundation, and the Tay-Sacks Prevention Program at the Eunice Kennedy Shriver Center for Research.

My own research, carried out with support from the Fund, involves examining the implications of ability differences for education and employment policy. This work is published in prestigious mainstream academic journals and books, and is widely considered important scholarship. The Pioneer Fund has also provided partial support for a recent colloquium series at UD entitled "Ability Differences in a Democracy: Challenge to Educational Policy," and, among other things, has helped support two special issues of the Journal of Vocational Behavior, which I guest-edited.

The work of mine most recently supported by the Fund argues explicitly for racial equality ("Equality at last, or lasting inequality? Race-norming in employment testing," with Jan H. Blits; in Transaction/Society, in press).

2. The Pioneer Fund's original charter states two purposes. Frawley misrepresents both. Frawley first claims that the purpose of the Fund is "to encourage the reproduction of individuals 'descended predominantly from white persons who settled in the original thirteen states...or from related stocks'" and that to this end the Fund dedicates money to increase the number of Anglo-Saxon children (p.2). The passage that Frawley quotes here comes from the Fund's original charter, but is wrenched out of context. The charter states that one purpose of the Pioneer Fund is to provide financial aid for "the education of children of parents deemed to have such qualities and traits of character as to make such parents of unusual value as citizens." By providing such support, the Fund would "aid in improving the character of the people of the United States." The emphasis is on character, not on race. Race enters only when the charter speaks of the eligibility of children, and even then the eligibility is not unambiguously limited to whites. Consideration is to be given, the charter states, "especially" to children "who are deemed to be descended predominately from white

persons who settled in the original thirteen states...or from related stocks." What this last clause means is not perfectly clear. What is clear, though, is that racial restrictions were quite common fifty years ago. Indeed, it was only forty years ago that the University of Delaware began to admit black students into any of its programs. What is more important, though, is that no such restriction exists in the Fund's present charter (adopted in 1985), and, in fact, no scholarships were ever awarded for this purpose under either the original or the current charter. The scholarship provision was never more than a dead letter.

The Fund's principal purpose is to support the study of problems of heredity. Frawley, again quoting out of context, says that the purpose is to support research on, and dissemination of information concerning, "the problems of race betterment." The phrase, "the problems of race betterment," comes from the original charter, where it is used in the same sentence as the words "the human race":

To conduct or aid in conducting study...into problems of heredity and eugenics in the human race generally and such research in respect to animals and plants as may throw light upon heredity in man, and research and study into problems of race betterment with special reference to people in the United states....

To avoid the charge that "race" in the latter phrase did not refer to "the human race," the Fund inserted the word "human" before "race" in the second part of the sentence when it amended the charter in 1985. Frawley conveniently not only quotes out of context, but quotes a charter no longer in effect.

3. Frawley accuses the Pioneer Fund of having "a long and continuous history of supporting racism, anti-Semitism, and other discriminatory practices" (p.1), saying that its "goals are reflective of the...Nazi German program of encouraging the reproduction of 'preferred' elements of society" (p.2). He claims that the activities of its three principal founders bear this out.

Frawley, however, grossly misrepresents those activities. He implies (p. 3), for example, that Frederick Osborn, a founder and original board member, approved, or even admired, the Nazi sterilization program. Exactly the opposite is true.

Osborn, President of the American Eugenics Society, in fact turned against the racist and anti-immigrant claims that characterized much of the American eugenics movement in the 1930s. As a distinguished historian observes, Osborn (and his British counterpart Blacker), "although genuflecting at times to the hard-core conservatives in their constituencies, steadily

moved their organizations a sanitizing distance away from the right--especially the pro-Nazi right...Blacker and Osborn both sought to construct a eugenics in keeping with the known facts of heredity. To that end, both turned their societies from the propaganda promising universal social redemption to sober educational efforts concerning heredity and health" (Daniel Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics [Knopf, 1985] pp. 171-172). In contrast to Julian Huxley and other prominent eugenicists of the day, Osborn argued that eugenics should concern itself as much with environment as with heredity. And along with other reform-minded eugenicists, he "felt compelled by [scientific] evidence to break away from the identification of innate ability with race or class...and to concern [himself] instead with the biological qualities of individuals" (Kevles, p.174). Osborn's concern for "sober educational efforts concerning heredity and health" are precisely what is reflected in the purpose and activities of the Fund.

I know little about Draper or Laughlin. The following, though, may be helpful. Draper, a graduate of Harvard, volunteered for the British Army in WWI before America's entry, was severely wounded at Ypres and decorated; enlisted (over age) in the U.S. Army in WWII; was a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. Nothing is known of the so-called "Nazi" eugenics films that Frawley accuses him of seeking to distribute. A reasonable guess is that Draper was interested in the sterilization of insane mothers--a practice that was legal in most of the U.S. at the time. To label such activities as "Nazi" is gratuitous. From what I can learn, the charges that Draper was "aligned" with the House Un-American Activities Committee and that he promoted sending American blacks back to Africa are simply false. The closest connection that I can find is that Draper knew personally two persons connected with HUAC (including Congressman Walter from Pennsylvania), but he had no interest in its functions.

I know less about Laughlin, except that he was in the mainstream of American thought in the early 1930s. I have never seen his book, so I cannot comment on the inflammatory passage that Frawley quotes. I can only say that, in every instance where I have been able to locate words that Frawley has quoted, he and his sources have taken them out of context and twisted their obvious meaning. I would be very surprised if this were any different. Laughlin died in 1941. During his four years on the Board, the only grants made by the Fund were scholarships established in 1941 for the third child of all Army Air Corps pilots. They consisted of insurance trusts to be used for the college education of those children, and they began maturing around 1961. Those trusts, which were established with the assistance of General Hap Arnold (then commander of the Army Air Corps), apparently were not established under the rubric of either of the Pioneer Fund's stated purposes.

4. Frawley asks you "to consider not only the facts, which virtually speak for themselves, but also the reliability and reputation of [his] sources" (p.2). I ask you to do the same.

4a. First, as to "the reliability and reputation of [Frawley's] sources," his principal sources are not (as he suggests) Internal Revenue Service records. Rather, Frawley relies mostly on articles written by Barry Mehler (half his citations are to him). Mehler has written most frequently, not in academic journals, but for publications such as the Guardian (a self-described "Marxist-Leninist independent radical weekly") and Science for the People. The latter is a publication of the activist group of the same name, which has been described as a group of "intellectual thugs" (R.J. McShea, review of The Sociobiology Debate, ed. A.L. Caplan, in Journal of Social and Biological Structures, 1980, Vol.3; see also E.O. Wilson on "academic vigilantism" in The Sociobiology Debate, p. 291). Mehler's credibility is further called into doubt by his frequent errors of fact and unsubstantiated innuendo. For example, in an article in the Guardian (listed in Frawley's bibliography and used by him) Mehler gives an erroneous list of Fund directors while vaguely linking the Fund to "breeding farms and...Nazi death camps." Frawley's other major source of information are news stories that merely repeat vague allegations or innuendo. These reports, which are not investigative, do not give specific facts or sources, but at most cite one another.

4b. As to Frawley's specific claims:

Frawley's first piece of evidence purporting to show that the Fund consistently promotes racism ("the promotion of racism has been the mainstay of the Pioneer Fund for the past fifty years" [p.3]) is that it has supported anti-busing lectures in recent years. The Fund has supported conferences on the merits of busing, but not series of anti-busing lectures. But even if it were true, does Frawley really mean to suggest that one cannot speak against busing without being a racist? If not, there is no substance to his charge. If so, the charge would apply not only to the Pioneer Fund, but also to many Delawareans (black as well as white), including, no doubt, members of the University's administration and Board of Trustees as well as elected officials. Frawley's accusation is helpful, though, in one way. It puts his attack as a whole in clear perspective. Seen from the extreme left, everything in the middle appears to lie on the far-right.

Many of Frawley's other "facts" are harder to deal with because they are embedded in complicated knots of immaterial facts and gross fabrications. They require considerable knowledge of details even to recognize what is relevant and what is not relevant about them. At worst, however, the charges based on these "facts" amount to nothing more than guilt-by-association

at a second or third remove (e.g., the charge concerning Instauration).

For example, Frawley attacks Ralph Scott, not only for supposedly giving anti-busing lectures, but also because his publisher published the work of another author with offensive views and because some extremists praised Scott's work (p.4). He also attacks him because Scott published in a journal which was recommended by another journal--an extreme journal, Instauration, with which Scott and certainly the Pioneer Fund was not associated. As for Scott's own views, all that Frawley tells us is that he's anti-busing. As for the Fund, all that he can tell us is that it funded two of Scott's activities: 1) his conferences on the merits of busing, and 2) his research on the intelligence of white school children in Mississippi as compared with white children of the same age at a location in England where their ancestors had originated. Although Frawley seems to find the latter activity objectionable, it is hard to see what legitimate objection there could be.

Frawley also misrepresents another recipient of Pioneer Fund support, Roger Pearson. For example, he attacks Pearson not for what appeared in Mankind Quarterly while he was its publisher, beginning in 1980, but because of what is alleged to have appeared in it in 1970, ten years before Pearson took over the journal (p.5). He also strongly suggests that an organization that Pearson founded was a neo-Nazi group--a charge that the Dutch Courts have found to be false and slanderous.

Perhaps the most egregious example is the gross fabrication, which Frawley credulously repeats, that "Pearson and major American Nazi Party figure Earl Thomas organized a meeting of the 1978 World Anti-Communist League meeting in Washington, DC" (p.5). The truth is that Pearson organized the meeting with the help of a reputable Washington firm specializing in conference management, consisting mostly of Congressional wives. The meeting was a major international conference, attended by over 1,000 delegates from more than fifty Asian, African, Latin American and European countries. Afro-Asians outnumbered white delegates by more than two-to-one. Senators Garn and McClure gave the opening addresses. Thomas was merely one of 30-40 volunteers who assisted the foreign delegates. Pearson learned of his Nazi background only after reading about it in the Washington Post. Once again, Frawley's so-called "facts" amount to nothing.

Similarly, Frawley tries to smear the Fund by associating it with Howard Allen, Wilmot Robertson, Willis Carto, and Jurgen Rieger, men with whom the Fund has had absolutely no connection (pp.3,6). And, in attacking the Pioneer Fund's support for the Federation for American Immigrant Reform (FAIR), Frawley mentions not what was public knowledge at the time of the funding, but

only what became known several years later--and not knowledge of what happened in FAIR itself, but knowledge of what happened in another organization (US English) to which the Pioneer Fund gave no money (pp.6-7).

Frawley misrepresents the truth in other ways as well. For example, he misleadingly characterizes the kind of materials that the Pioneer Fund has paid to distribute. According to Frawley, the Fund provides funding for the reprinting and distribution of "discriminatory materials." "One of the documents...is John Baker's Race" (p.6). Contrary to what this mischaracterization leads you to believe, Baker's Race is a highly scholarly work in physical anthropology (nearly 600 pages long) published by the prestigious Oxford University Press. Once again, as throughout, while Frawley ostensibly aims at a political extreme, his real target is legitimate scholarship.

5. Frawley, suggesting that the Pioneer Fund is somehow a nefarious, shadowy organization, also says that "in the words of its current director, [the Fund] does not even require that its grant recipients file extensive reports, all quite unusual for a tax-exempt research foundation" (p.2). Again, Frawley is simply incorrect. As Mr. Alvin Roberson, Assistant Treasurer and Controller, will confirm, the Pioneer Fund follows perfectly ordinary reporting practices for private foundations. There is nothing "unusual" at all about what it does.

In this connection, something else should be pointed out. The Pioneer Fund never originates any research projects and never suggests a desired result of any research. To insure the impartiality of the research, as a matter of policy it does not request reports about the research, and often it does not know the results except from public information.

The Pioneer Fund is a legitimate research foundation concerned chiefly with research on problems of heredity. Because such research is controversial in some quarters (especially among the political left), the Fund has often drawn wild and false charges. Frawley's letter to you is a compendium of such charges.

Such accusations can, however, be very damaging. I have already been seriously damaged professionally by Frawley's charges and could be even more seriously hurt if they are not rejected. As much as I regret Frawley's false charges, I regret even more that he took his accusations to the Review before you had a chance to conduct an inquiry. As uncritically credulous of Frawley as Frawley is of his sources, the Review has already pronounced the University (and me) guilty of taking "dirty money."

Frawley and I agree on one point--racial equality. I, too,

would be greatly concerned if I thought the Fund was racist or anti-Semitic. The difference between him and me on this point comes down to the fact that I am a traditional liberal whereas he is a radical leftist. The greater difference, though, is that he would prefer to suppress legitimate research that he finds politically offensive, whereas I believe in the power and dignity of the truth--both speaking the truth in policy debates and seeking the truth in scientific research.

I have enclosed copies of the Pioneer Fund's present and original charters as well as a copy of the relevant pages from Kelves' In the Name of Eugenics. I am eager to cooperate with Ron Whittington and do whatever I can to aid the inquiry.

cc: R. Whittington, Assistant to the President
R. Murray, Acting Provost
F. Murray, Dean, College of Education
R. Varrin, Associate Provost for Research



Memorandum

November 22, 1989

TO: Ron Whittington
Assistant to the President

FROM: Linda Gottfredson *lg*
Educational Studies

RE: More Information on the Pioneer Fund

I provide additional information below on some of William Frawley's accusations concerning three Pioneer Fund recipients: Donald Swan, John Tanton, and Roger Pearson. Once again, fuller information reveals that Frawley has misrepresented the facts.

The following information was obtained from documents provided in the four enclosed addenda (1: the Pioneer Fund; 2: John Tanton; 3: Roger Pearson; 4: Ralph Scott). These addenda also reconfirm points I made in my November 14, 1989 letter to President Trabant.

1. Donald Swan. On page 4 of his letter, Frawley states that authorities found in Donald Swan's house various weapons along with "Nazi flags...a German helmet [and] several photographs of Swan with members of George Lincoln Rockwell's neo-Nazi organization." I have no knowledge of the photograph. No one I have been able to contact knows anything about it, let alone the identity of the people in it or Swan's relation to them. I do know, however, that Frawley's suggestion concerning the Nazi flags and helmet is utterly wrong. The flags and helmet were souvenirs that his father had collected while fighting against the Nazis in World War II, not anything that Swan collected because of an alleged sympathy with neo-Nazis. As with so many of his charges, Frawley here has turned the truth inside-out. (See Addendum 1 on the Pioneer Fund, item 1.)

2. John Tanton. On page 6, in his long attack on John Tanton and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Frawley quotes from a memorandum written by Tanton in which Tanton raised questions for discussion. While Frawley selectively quotes from (or misleadingly paraphrases) parts of Tanton's memorandum, he fails to report Tanton's own answers to those questions. One example will suffice. According to Frawley, "Tanton...wonders whether some form of Apartheid will be necessary in Southern California to maintain white dominance." In fact, in posing the question, Tanton warns of the danger of non-Hispanic whites and Asians owning the property, having the

good jobs and education, speaking one language, and being most Protestant and "other," while blacks and Hispanics will have poor jobs, will lack education, own little property, speak another language, and will be mainly Catholic. "Will there be strength in this diversity?" he asks. "Or will this prove a social and political San Andreas Fault?"

In a later commentary on his question, Tanton explains:

The term "apartheid" was chosen deliberately to jar the conferees into an awareness of just how disastrous for the country this outcome would be. The history of European countries reminds us of how divisions based on class can be as harsh and lasting as divisions based on race, religion, or ethnicity. When such divisions coincide, i.e., when one race, ethnic group or religious group systematically has less of the society's production and wealth, then serious, consuming conflict is inevitable--witness Northern Ireland, for example (p.4).

.....
Many commentators have written on the possibility of a "two-tiered" society developing in the United States, with an atrophy of the middle class. In the coming "information society" if we do not somehow improve the now lagging educational success of Blacks and Hispanics, if we do not work for assimilation and integration, but rather let separatists' influences carry the day...then we could end up with a seriously divided and weakened society....

It is hard to see what Frawley's objection to this could be. (See Addendum 2 on John Tanton, item 2.)

3. Roger Pearson and the Mankind Quarterly. Frawley also accuses Mankind Quarterly (an anthropology journal which is published by Roger Pearson, a Pioneer Fund recipient, and in which Ralph Scott, another recipient, has published) of being "an 'academic' journal with expressly racist, anti-Semitic, and pro-Apartheid concerns" (p.4). I mentioned in my initial response that no such articles have appeared in Mankind Quarterly under Pearson's leadership. I want to add now that the journal's editorial advisory board includes, among other internationally eminent scholars, Joseph Campbell (author of the 20th Century classic, The Hero with a Thousand Faces [2nd. ed Princeton University Press; Bollinger series #17]), Jacques Maquet (author of numerous anthropology books published by Yale University Press, Oxford University Press, Hachette [Paris], Cambridge University Press, and other distinguished presses), and Raymond B. Cattell (indisputably one of the most eminent and productive psychologists in the country). As in every other instance where I have been able to get at the truth, Frawley's characterization

of the journal is entirely without foundation. (See Addendum 3 on Roger Pearson, item 3.)

All four addenda have been put on two-hour reserve in the Education Resource Center of the Willard Hall Education Building so that all interested parties have access to them. I have also put on reserve the book Race, by John Baker. As I noted in my earlier letter to President Trabant, Frawley misrepresented the book in order to falsely accuse the Pioneer Fund of providing money to the Foundation for Human Understanding for the "distribution of discriminatory materials" (p.6).

Please let me know if there is anything I can do to facilitate your investigation.

encs: Addendum 1 on Pioneer Fund
Addendum 2 on John Tanton
Addendum 3 on Roger Pearson
Addendum 4 on Ralph Scott

cc: E. A.Trabant, President
Richard Murray, Acting Provost
Robert Varrin, Associate Provost for Research
Frank Murray, Dean, College of Education
Vic Martuza, Chair, Educational Studies

Linda Gottfredson
November 22, 1989

Addendum 1 to "More Information on the Pioneer Fund"

Additional Information about the Pioneer Fund

1. Reply by Pioneer Fund to the Frawley Letter
2. Description of Pioneer Fund
3. List of Directors of Pioneer Fund

All items were taken from the Pioneer Fund's November 15, 1989 memo to President Trabant. The other four items in the Fund's memo were "Reply of Professor Roger Pearson" (item 1 in Addendum 3), "Reply of Dr. John Tanton" (item 1 in Addendum 2), and the letters by Frawley and myself to President Trabant.

Linda Gottfredson
November 22, 1989

Addendum 2 to "More Information on the Pioneer Fund"

Additional Information about John Tanton

1. "Commentary on the Frawley Letter. Section 4, Entitled FAIR, Johns Tanton, and US English" (November 15, 1989 by John Tanton)
2. "Commentary on the WITAN IV Memo Dated October 10, 1986" (a December 28, 1988 memo by John Tanton which reprints the 1986 memo with clarifying commentary)
3. "The Mis- and Mal-Interpreted Tanton Memo" (an August 15, 1989 memo by John Tanton)
4. A December 7, 1988 letter by John Tanton (revised August 15, 1989)
5. Xeroxed copy of the brochure describing The Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR)
6. Xeroxed copy of the brochure describing the organization US English
7. Letter from Walter Cronkite to Linda Chavez in which he resigns from US English (October 6, 1988)
8. Letter from Walter Cronkite to Gerda Bikales of US English clarifying the reasons for his resignation from US English (November 9, 1988)
9. "An Initiative Measure." The Arizona ballot proposition to which Cronkite refers in 6 above.

Linda Gottfredson
November 22, 1989

Addendum 3 to "More Information on the Pioneer Fund"

Additional Information about Roger Pearson

1. Reply by Roger Pearson to the Frawley letter (a November 12, 1989 letter from Roger Pearson to Harry Weyher, Director of the Pioneer Fund)
2. Two book reviews of Pearson's book Eastern Interlude (in The Hindustan Times and The London Times Literary Supplement)
3. The editorial advisory boards of The Mankind Quarterly in 1985 and 1989 (the earliest and latest journal issues that I have)
4. Indexes to the volumes of The Mankind Quarterly under Pearson's direction (Volumes 21-29)

Linda Gottfredson
November 22, 1989

Addendum 4 to "More Information on the Pioneer Fund"

Additional Information about Ralph Scott

1. News clipping from the Des Moines Register, March 19, 1988. (Includes a reply by Ralph Scott to a February 28 article about him and testimonials on his behalf by colleagues and by John Eastman of the US Civil Rights Commission.)
2. DELCAT abstracts of Scott's articles on busing and the disadvantaged

Memorandum



November 30, 1989

TO: EDS Faculty, Staff, and Graduate Students

FROM: Linda Gottfredson *lg*

RE: Four More Items Concerning the Pioneer Fund

1. Five issues of the Mankind Quarterly are on reserve in the Education Resource Center of Willard Hall for your inspection. Pearson sent me these particular issues because they are the fourth issue of each of the last five volumes (the fourth issue of each volume contains the index for that year).
2. November 21, 1989 letter from Harry Weyher of the Pioneer Fund to Ron Whittington providing the following enclosures (all of which are on reserve in the ERC as well as enclosed here):
 - a November 16, 1989 column by Jack Anderson in the Washington Post concerning the Pioneer Fund and the University of Delaware
 - a November 16, 1989 letter by Weyher to Stu Harris of the Jack Anderson organization commenting on certain allegations in the column
 - June 16, 1989 letters to the editor in the American Jewish World concerning similar accusations against the Pioneer Fund in relation to Nancy Siegel's twin research at the University of Minnesota
3. November 21, 1989 letter from Harry Weyher to Ron Whittington providing a list of all Pioneer Fund grants for 1985-1989. (This item is on reserve as well as enclosed here).
4. November 19, 1989 letter from Garrett Hardin to Harry Weyher (with a November 27 cover letter from Weyher to Whittington) regarding Frawley's charges against the Pioneer Fund. Hardin is an evolutionary ecologist best known for his influential Science article "The Tragedy of the Commons" and his subsequent book Exploring New Ethics for Survival: The Voyage of the Spaceship "Beagle" (Viking Press). He is also a Pioneer Fund recipient. (The grant made last year to the University of California for "research assistance for book on demographics," as listed in item 3 above, is for work by Hardin.)

7

**An Open Letter to the
University Community from UDAAC
The University of Delaware African-American Coalition**

The statement of purpose of the *President's Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity* states: "The University of Delaware is committed to creating an educational community that is intellectually, culturally and socially diverse, and enriched by the contributions and full participation of persons from differing backgrounds." Yet in spite of such lofty goals the University refuses to divest from companies doing business in South Africa and has not adequately improved hiring, promotion and tenure practices. In addition, thanks to the efforts of Dr. William Frawley, it has come to our attention, that the University of Delaware accepted \$174,000 from the Pioneer Fund in support of research being conducted by Dr. Linda S. Gottfredson.

The Pioneer Fund's current charter reads that one of its purposes is "To provide or aid in providing for the education of children of parents deemed to have such qualities and traits of character as to make such parents of unusual value as citizens." It further states that these children "are to be deemed to be descended predominantly from persons who settled in the original thirteen states prior to the adoption of the Constitution." The charter states that the purpose of the Pioneer Fund is "To conduct or aid in conducting study and research into the problems of heredity and eugenics in the human race." The current charter differs from the original charter, drafted in 1937, in its omission of direct reference to "white persons". However, its intent remains unchanged. This direct reference to race remained in the Pioneer Fund's charter until 1985. In addition to funding Dr. Gottfredson, the Pioneer fund also funded Drs. Jensen and Shockley.

Gottfredson's current research is in the area of racial differences in intelligence and their role in employment. She states, "the large average IQ difference between blacks and whites plays a major role in explaining the disproportionately low representations of blacks for certain good outcomes—namely employment in professional jobs—and the disproportionately high representation of blacks for certain negative outcomes—namely various prevalence rates for crime and delinquency." She also states, "education and training strategies do not short circuit the impact of racial disproportions in g [Intelligence] on job performance..."

She further states, "The presumption of equal intelligence is clearly a key prop in the moral claim now levied on whites for additional social resources for blacks. Without it calls for total socioeconomic equality by race probably would lose some of their moral force."

This is the climate in which African American students, faculty and staff must function on a daily basis. If The University of Delaware is indeed interested in achieving its goal of creating, "an educational community that is intellectually, culturally and socially diverse, and enriched by the contributions and full participation of persons from differing backgrounds," it must begin to look at long term practices which work against that goal.