

Freedom of research, political bias, and academic lies.

This is a freely translated and extended paper from:

Nyborg, H. (2018). Forskningsfrihed – Political bias og akademiske løgne. Aarhus: Critique: Idédebat og kulturkamp.

**Link:** [http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Kronik\\_Akademiske-loegne\\_Nyborg\\_AU\\_Critique.pdf](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Kronik_Akademiske-loegne_Nyborg_AU_Critique.pdf)

Let me begin by trying to convince you that academically speaking I am in good standing. Recently I was invited as a keynote speaker and workshop leader at a Mexican Congress for 300+ extremely gifted Children. On the occasion I was awarded the Mexican National Award of Giftedness - Medal in front of 800+ notabilities. I regularly organize or talk at major international Events. I have over a life-time written 8 books, many chapter, and 100+ papers in professional journals, most of them well received and quoted. Although left-oriented colleagues from time to time viciously attack my sex and race research, I each time win the related lawsuits, because the research is data-based (Nyborg, 2003a).

Seen in this light one may wonder why Aarhus University (AU) still consider my research unworthy of a professor. So controversial is it seen that the higher university ranks recently had to lie in several steps to explain away why a student organization (Conservative Student Aarhus, 2017) could not book a room for a public discussion with me on freedom of research.

The explanation is simple. AU has become a parking place for politically correct lies, like so many other left-leaning universities (Nyborg, 2003b).

At first a highly placed administrative staff member told the Conservative Students Aarhus, that due to your choice of lecturer the matter drags, as he is “somewhat controversial”. *It is the management of BSS faculty that has to take decision* [My emphasis], and I can't speed it up, but I can assure you that in case of the choice of a less controversial presenter, you won't have to wait so long every time for a vacant lecture room .... Perhaps professor Nyborg might better talk somewhere else - like DOKK1, she suggested!

Then the AU press officer, Anders Correll, guaranteed publicly that: "The faculty management has not been in on this issue. We speak here just about a simple communication error".

But then Berit Kornbæk Boisen, head of the buildings Secretariat, revealed that the university has tightened up its procedures at the request of then Education and Research Minister Ulla Toernæs: "There have recently been several examples of events ... which ... had been met with criticism for not being consistent with Danish democratic values. " This made Berit Boisen issue a note that "Since Helmuth Nyborg has been widely reported in the press, we estimated that this event could give press coverage, and we therefore sent the case to press officer Anders Correll."

If not the press officer, then is it the BSS faculty which finds that my international anonymously peer review'ed published research is inconsistent with Danish democratic values? Moreover, does the BSS faculty – which, by the way, insist on the importance of press coverage of its research – support only research it consider "Democratic"?

The University's confusion reflects, as I see it, an attempt to censor incorrect research.

However, this is nothing new. The above minor case just replicates a decade-long series of lies, deliberate misrepresentations, and civil misconduct directed against my sex- and race difference research at AU.

It began in 2002-5 when I observed at sex difference in intelligence that went the wrong way, at a time when AU actively and vocally spend good money endeavoring to create sex equality in the Academy. Then candidate-stipendiate Pia Ankersen lied to the local committee for research practice that I had flatly refused to supply the data for the observed sex difference. Moreover, she forgot to tell that I had sent her ample material and asked her four times what more she wanted to know. She never replied, the committee knowingly disregarded all this, and sent a complaint to the dean. The then head of my department, Prof. Dr. Phil. Jens Mammen informed dean Svend Hylleberg that he could not accept my research. An "Independent" commission was set up, handcuffed by a detailed prescription over several pages, asking for the implementation of unusual and unrealistic standards for what counts as scientific quality in accordance with common international norms for the field.

Then AU called me to a meeting at the faculty - without first informing me about the agenda for the meeting or advising me to bring a legal counselor considering the serious nature of the meeting. The basic message was clear: The university will raise a disciplinary civil service case against you for bad research. I mentioned this at an international Congress for IQ specialists shortly after the faculty meeting. It then appeared that AU had systematically scanned several IQ specialist websites and followed my internet correspondence about the case closely. I was then, on my return to DK called to another meeting with the dean, lawyers, and others: The university intend to raise one more disciplinary civil case against you, this time because our "Internet Searches" indicates that you have brought AU into a disadvantageous light (Decorum). However, the lawyers soon found out that I was too old for two long-term Civil Service cases to be terminated in time, so the university shifted strategy: You will receive a severe warning, will be liberated from all professorial duties, will leave your office immediately, will give us the keys to the institute, will close your research center, and will send your research assistant away now. You may use the trolley at the fifth floor, though. My full university research profile was simultaneously removed from the AU home page, even if this must have taken some time to be initiated in connection with the meeting. It was legally wrong, and later excused, but illustrates quite well the carefully directed sortie after almost 40 years of service. During that period the criticized sex difference part of my research took up only a microscopic space.

What is really the substance of the university's critique?

The actions of AU forced me to send the case to the *Committee on Scientific Malpractice* (UVVU), which acquitted me for fraud. The AU was then enforced to re-hire me, but only for 6 months until I was 70 and had to leave due to age. A request for the obligatory emeritus status was rejected on the ground, that I entertained Values (perhaps un-democratic?) which the department

neither shared nor wanted projected out to the public as theirs'. Again, AU prioritizes values over data and freedom of research and honors the muggers with emeritus status.

Subsequently the AU kept posted a public notice over many years, assuring the public of the poor quality of my research ([www.AU.dk/Nyborg](http://www.AU.dk/Nyborg)), without ever mentioning that 30-40 of the world's leading researchers had protested in writing over their handling of the case. It made no impression on the university that several world specialists recalculated the data also used by the "independent" commission's work, down to the third decimal, and then raised a devastating critique of the work of the committee (see [www.helmuthnyborg.dk/Letters](http://www.helmuthnyborg.dk/Letters) of Support/Rushton or Gottfredson, or the leading intelligence researcher Arthur Jensen from Berkeley University). These specialists independently confirmed my original results, as I myself also have done in a subsequent study representing 17 + million subjects, and other independent researchers obtain similar results.

No reaction from AU when told that much. In other words, not even the combined forces of the world's best and most authoritative researchers and external cold data can make AU consider retracting their critique but, interestingly, after the case was brought out in the open by the local TV2Østjylland channel, AU swiftly removed its year-long criticism.

But still worse.

Then dean Svend Hylleberg and then head of my department, professor, Dr. Phil. Jens Mammen have long been competing in presenting the most obvious misrepresentations and lies. An excerpt of dean-lies can be found in a grossly misinforming official report from dean Hylleberg (Hylleberg, 2006) to rector. The dean also told the public that I had measured penis length, which was not the case. Professor Mammen wrote an equally misinforming paper in the newspaper Jyllandsposten (Mammen; JP, 2007). This official Research Guardian at the institute first underlines that he has privileged insight into my research, then criticizes that I had forced children to be photographed naked as an obligatory admission condition of attending my long-term study of normal children's development; this gives my study such a devastating but unmeasurable sex bias, that nobody can have any faith in the observed sex difference in intelligence. This is simply bad and unworthy research, must be reported to the university, and must have consequences. What the special Research Guardian missed to tell rector, the dean, and the public was, that participation was entirely voluntary, about half of the children did not want to be photographed, and they displayed virtually the same IQ and gender profile as those photographed (Nyborg; JP, 2007). Even when confronted with these – and many other - cold facts, AU sees no wrongdoing.

Another attempt to discredit my developmental research took place when professor Mammen was interviewed by the weekly magazine "Se og Hør" [See and Hear]. He told the magazine that he did not know what use I had made of the nude pictures of children, but he could not see that I had made any scientific use of them! Some professors have no shame in life. AU remains as usual inaudible.

Such stories raise a more general question of why the management of behavioral science at Aarhus University has gone awry?

In its own self-understanding AU strives towards the highest in the deepest, but at the same time the university does not hesitate to grossly misrepresents research areas they don't like, lie squarely, readily establishing uncommon high standards for sex difference research declared unusual and unrealistic by internationally recognized specialists in the area, and then unfairly apply

these standards retrospectively on already published anonymous peer-reviewed empirical research work? A university that repeatedly try to disguise its attempts to censure controversial lectures, believed to represent "Undemocratic Values" without any proof.

The level of science at the Aarhus University BBS Faculty has apparently sunken so deeply, that it accepts that the previous long-time official guardian of scientific quality at the psychology Institute – who anyway over a life-long career attained only a microscopic International Science Citation Index – now manages to have his partial critical newspaper-posting accepted as relevant research reported by the University of Aarhus to the National Danish Research Database? Where did science go?

Part of the explanation may be found in the fact that AU has since the 1960s hired a majority (60-80%) researchers and managers, who uncritically united abstract ideas about progressive human development with the introduction of narrow bureaucratic power structures. This majority combine a particularly high morality with a critical, progressive Self-understanding, and political correctness, the product of which entitles them to read immorality into what they a priori see as controversial value-based, undemocratic, conservative sex and race analyses. As fish do not know they are wet, these administrators, employees, and colleagues do not even see what is wrong with them (Gottfredson, 1994; Nyborg 2003, 2011).

The self-righteousness feelings at the systemic level gives rectors, deans, department managers, research guardians, and other high-ranking administrators a free hand to sanction "non-progressive", "non-democratic", "morally suspect", "controversial", or even "Very much discussed" researchers through establishing scientific standards manifestly out of sync with common research traditions. Ironically, much of the left-oriented social constructivist's own research fail even by common scientific standards, as reflected in the so-called replication crisis.

Obviously, when the ethical compass fails in a system, then the administration and guardians may license small and large lies, exorcise researchers, and may even not shy away from insinuating pedophilia. Whatever the reason, the consequence has been that the management at Aarhus University have replaced the Humboldtian ideal of a Free University with a political production machine dominated by a majority of left-oriented (60-80%) workers who effectively censor and repress unwanted research and publicly name and shame controversialized researchers (Wodley, Dutton, Figueredo, Carl, et al., 2018).

As if it could not be worse, such a university may systematically supply a reform-hungry government and educational sector with unrealistic progressive opportunities in sex- race, and immigration-related matters, and at the same time keep inconvenient non-progressive research proving it wrong in the dark.

But reality cannot be cheated for long. Academic institutions and others who try should be held liable.

## References

- Gottfredson, L. (1994), Egalitarian fiction and collective fraud. *Society*, 31(3), 53-59.  
[Http://www.udel.edu/educ/gottfredson/reprints/1994egalitarianfiction.pdf](http://www.udel.edu/educ/gottfredson/reprints/1994egalitarianfiction.pdf).
- Hylleberg, S. (2006) extracts of Dean Hyllebergs official reporting of professor Helmuth Nyborg;  
[Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Uddrag-af-dekan-Svend-Hyllebergs-tjenstlige-indberetning-af-professor-Helmuth-Nyborg-2006.doc](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Uddrag-af-dekan-Svend-Hyllebergs-tjenstlige-indberetning-af-professor-Helmuth-Nyborg-2006.doc)
- Conservative Students Aarhus, 2017); <http://omnibus.au.dk/arkiv/vis/artikel/ks-formand-koerber-ikke-aus-forklaring-om-kommunikationsfejl/>this is linked to the.
- Mammen, J. (2007). Misrepresentation in the Helmuth Nyborg case. (JP 9.7.07);  
[Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Kronik\\_Jens-Mammen-1\\_JP-9.7.07.doc](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Kronik_Jens-Mammen-1_JP-9.7.07.doc)
- Nyborg, H. (2003a). Sex difference in *g*. In Nyborg H. (Ed.), *The Scientific Study of general Intelligence: Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen* (pp. 187-222). Amsterdam: Pergamon/Elsevier Science;  
[Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Sex-differences-in-g\\_AJ-book-chapter.pdf](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Sex-differences-in-g_AJ-book-chapter.pdf)
- Nyborg H. (2003b). The sociology of psychometric and bio-behavioral sciences: A case study of destructive social reductionism and collective fraud in 20th century academia. In Nyborg H. (Ed.), *The scientific study of general intelligence: Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen* (pp. 441-501). Amsterdam: Pergamon/Elsevier Science.
- Nyborg, H. (2005). Sex-related differences in general intelligence, *g*, brain size, and social status. *Person. Indiv. Diff.* 39, 497-509; [Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Publ\\_2005\\_Sex-related-differences-in-general-intelligence.pdf](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Publ_2005_Sex-related-differences-in-general-intelligence.pdf).
- Nyborg, H. (2007). Deception in the Jens Mammen case; (JP 10.7.07s);  
[Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Kronik\\_Vildledning-i-Jens-Mammen-sagen\\_JP.doc](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Kronik_Vildledning-i-Jens-Mammen-sagen_JP.doc).
- Nyborg, H. (2015). Sex differences across different racial ability levels: Theories of origin and societal consequences. *Intelligence*, 52, 44-62; [Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Publ\\_2015\\_Sex-differences-across-different-racial-ability-levels.pdf](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Publ_2015_Sex-differences-across-different-racial-ability-levels.pdf)
- Wodley, M. of Menie, Dutton, E., Figueredo, A-J., Carl, N., et al. (2018). Communicating intelligence research: Media misrepresentation, the Gould effect and unexpected forces. *Intelligence*, in press.
- [www.helmuthnyborg.dk](http://www.helmuthnyborg.dk) For further details.
- [www.AU.dk/Helmuth Nyborg](http://www.AU.dk/Helmuth%20Nyborg) (2012) Facts about Helmuth Nyborg case;  
[Http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/AU\\_Fakta-i-Helmuth-Nyborg.docx](http://helmuthnyborg.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/AU_Fakta-i-Helmuth-Nyborg.docx).