

August 6, 2006

Svend Hylleberg

University of Aarhus

Aarhus, Denmark

Dear Dean Hylleberg:

I have given careful consideration to the reports regarding the research of Helmuth Nyborg. Having done so, I am simply astonished that the University has temporarily relieved him of duties. I say this for a variety of reasons, but will focus here on just one. It is that *the inquiry into his work violated the very regulations used to justify it.*

As explained in my previous letter, this review owes its existence to political correctness. There is not a chance in the world that it would have been commissioned had Dr. Nyborg reported no sex differences in intelligence. Had he indicated female superiority, he would have become the darling of the very people who have sought his persecution.

Understandably, the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences does not wish to acknowledge this. In *Terms of Reference for the Expert Committee for the Evaluation of Helmuth Nyborg's Research Project*, he instead cites a government regulation implementing an official statute as the basis for the inquiry. The regulation reads:

*The Head of the Department is to ensure quality and consistency in the research and teaching carried out at the department.*

I trust it self-evident that honoring this mandate requires evaluation of more than a single paper or project. The Dean actually cites official language making this clear:

*The Head of the Department is to follow the individual researcher's publication **record** and its quality, including the observance of and adherence to the scientific ethical guidelines of the university [emphasis added].*

In contravention of this directive requiring evaluation of the full record, only a tiny fraction of Dr. Nyborg's work was examined.<sup>[1][2]</sup> This was a clear perversion of legislative intent. To relieve him of duties based on a process that violated that intent is at best tenuous, and at worst, a violation of his right to a fair evaluation.

I will not address specific points of contention between the Committee and Dr. Nyborg, as I consider his right to return to duties to be independent of them. However, I am not impressed by the Committee's statistical nitpicking.<sup>[3]</sup> Its report goes far beyond customary peer review. There is not a professor on this planet whose research would pass muster if subjected to the scrutiny of three academics assigned to look in every nook and cranny for things to quibble about. With sufficient funds and freedom to choose committee members, I guarantee that I could orchestrate reports equally, if not far more, critical of every individual on your faculty.

As noted earlier, the exclusion of most of Dr. Nyborg's record was key to orchestrating the outcome of this review. It is no mystery why this was done—in violation of regulations. A full review would have led ineluctably to truths that it was felt necessary to suppress. Among them is that Dr. Nyborg is a scientist of great vision; that his contributions to academic psychology are varied and exemplary; and that his standing in the discipline is matched by very few. I know of no academic psychologist in Denmark who is held in greater esteem. Surely the University realizes that making his release from duties permanent will result in an international furor.<sup>[4]</sup>

If the University does not realize this, it is in for a rude awakening. The simple fact is that no amount of statistical gymnastics will fool the scholarly community into believing that this inquisition is about Dr. Nyborg's competence. All concerned know that it is due to his ruffling feathers at the Church of Political Correctness, where authoritarian elders wish to make him their Galileo.

The University can only lose by dignifying this effort to deny Dr. Nyborg his academic freedom. Ultimately, the truth will out. A university that attempts to suppress the debate will succeed only in showering itself with derision.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia Hausman, Ph.D.

Cc: Lauritz B. Holm-Nielsen

---

[1] A narrow sample is not a record—particularly when the individual is as widely published as Dr. Nyborg.

[2] The Dean also biased the inquiry by making clear that the material was not expected to withstand scrutiny.

[3] The appropriate place to debate these disagreements is the scientific literature, not the personnel file of Denmark's most eminent academic psychologist.

[4] I imagine that the brouhaha over his comments on sex differences will seem minor by comparison.