



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 17, 2024

Black Prof Needed Armed Security After Releasing Study Showing Possible Anti-WHITE Bias in Police Shootings

It's called "the narrative" — which is usually just a polite name for a fashionable lie. A black Ivy League academic has learned the price of contradicting cherished narratives, too: threat to life and limb.

In fact, after releasing a credible study finding "no evidence of racial bias" in police shootings, Harvard economics professor Roland Fryer said that not only did he become a pariah in many circles, but he actually needed police protection.

As striking as this is, however, there's another big story within this story: Fryer's study possibly *did* find a racial bias — against *whites*. Yet this is so accepted today that media don't even notice.

BizPac Review [reports](#) on the story:



400tmax/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Recently, journalist Bari Weiss sat down for a live Q&A with Harvard Economics professor Roland Fryer at the fledgling University of Austin where she is a founding trustee. As they engaged in a discussion before prospective students, the award-winning academic addressed a 2016 controversy that involved his findings that determined no "racial bias in police shooting."

Explaining that he himself "expected to see it [the bias]," Fryer's analysis showed that while non-fatal physical force from police officers was twice as likely to be used against blacks and Hispanics, the same could not be said for shootings. His research found officers were 23.8% less likely to shoot at blacks and 8.5% less likely to shoot at Hispanics than white perpetrators.

"When I found this surprising result, I hired 8 fresh [resident advisor[s]] and redid it to make sure they came up with the same exact answer and I thought it was robust," he explained to Weiss. "And I went to go give it and ... all hell broke loose."

"It was in this moment, 2016, that I realized people lose their minds if they don't like the result," detailed Fryer[,] who said peers who liked the first half of his findings were encouraging him not to publish the second half.

In point of fact, Fryer got reamed before his study even got read. As Fox News [adds](#):

Fryer received the first of many complaints and threats four minutes after publication.

"You're full of s—t," the sender said.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 17, 2024

Fryer said people quickly “lost their minds” and some of his colleagues refused to believe the results after months of asking him not to print the data.

“I had colleagues take me to the side and say, ‘Don’t publish this. You’ll ruin your career,’” Fryer revealed.

It turned out, however, that his career would be the least of his worries. For after “the report was published, Fryer lived under police protection for over a month,” Fox also informs. “He had a seven-day-old daughter at the time and went shopping for diapers.”

“‘I was going to the grocery store to get diapers with the armed guard. It was crazy. It was really, truly crazy,’ he said.”

But Fryer’s torments weren’t over. In 2019, he “was suspended from Harvard for alleged misconduct related to ‘unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature,’” [relates](#) Red Voice Media (RVM), in [what appears to have been a witch hunt](#). “Fryer has continuously denied these allegations, asserting his innocence,” RVM continues.

Ironically, during that time, it was the disgraced Claudine Gay, then-Harvard dean, who “claimed that Fryer’s research and conduct exhibited a pattern that violated institutional norms and betrayed the trust within the community,” RVM further informs. Of course, since those norms appear to involve promoting incompetents to the institution’s upper echelons and encouraging obscurantism, Gay’s accusation may in part be true.

“Interestingly enough, Gay herself stepped down as Harvard president in January amid allegations of widespread plagiarism and criticisms of her flawed testimony to Congress,” RVM reminds us.

As for Fryer’s woes, they’re just another lamentable example of how, “The further a society drifts from Truth, the more it will hate those who speak it,” as my now-famous saying goes. Apropos to this, there’s a truth here that no media, as far as I’ve seen, has even mentioned while reporting on Fryer’s story. To wit:

How could police being *more likely to shoot whites* be a complete lack of “evidence of racial bias”? Are whites no longer a race?

I asked Professor Fryer about this via email, and he was kind enough to respond promptly. He replied that while in “some specifications” the data showed racial bias against whites, “in others it didn’t” — “so the anti-white bias was not robust.” I absolutely take him at his word.

Yet robust or not, this accords with other research I’ve cited over the years, which [found](#) that police are actually more likely to shoot whites relative to the races’ different homicide rates and the rates at which they feloniously shoot police. Moreover, [a 2014 study showed](#) that cops are, in reality, more *willing* to shoot white suspects than black ones.

Is this surprising? As with ex-officer Darren Wilson of Ferguson, Missouri, shooting a black criminal can mean media demonization, pariah status, career destruction, and perhaps threats to personal safety. Yet as with 46-year-old white man John Geer (who? *Exactly*), who was posing no threat but [was nonetheless murdered in 2013](#) by a Hispanic cop with “anger issues,” the shooting of a white person will almost certainly get memory-holed.

In other words, police would have to not be human but RoboCop to be unaffected by the extreme societal pressure militating against firing upon black suspects. As University of Missouri-St. Louis



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 17, 2024

criminology professor David Klinger [put it](#) after interviewing more than 300 cops:

“When it comes to the issue of race, I’ve never had a single officer tell me, ‘I didn’t shoot a guy because he was white.’ I’ve had multiple officers tell me, ‘I didn’t shoot a guy because he was black.’”

Now, I don’t know if that’s what they call “white privilege,” but it’s certainly a “narrative” we won’t be hearing anytime soon.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.