

RACE AND SCIENCE

*A Review Essay Assessing the Debates of the 1950s
and 1960s in the Light of Subsequent Research*

Social Scientists for Social Justice

Making the Case against Segregation

John P. Jackson, Jr.

New York: New York University Press, 2001

\$45

289 pp.

Science for Segregation

Race, Law, and the Case against *Brown v. Board of Education*

John P. Jackson, Jr.

New York: New York University Press, 2005

\$45

290 pp.

Reviewed by Raymond Wolters

In these two volumes Professor John P. Jackson, Jr., of the University of Colorado, provides a well-researched account of scientific arguments that were used for and against segregation during the years before and shortly after the Supreme Court's landmark school desegregation decision, *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). He has mined the archives for quotations that give the flavor of disputes and infighting that occurred among both proponents and opponents of *Brown*, and his footnotes provide a useful guide to the relevant correspondence, articles, and books.

Despite their virtues, however, these volumes are impaired because Professor Jackson's sympathy for the positions of the NAACP leads him to neglect the larger historical context. He does not discuss the social science research that in the years since *Brown* has led many informed observers to reject the arguments of the scholars who aided the NAACP; nor does he discuss the evidence that has led modern authorities in genetics and biology to challenge the premise of racial equality. Readers of these volumes are not told that fifty

years after *Brown* much of the social and biological science of the NAACP has either been discredited or is facing stiff criticism. Instead, they are given to understand that a liberal orthodoxy prevails and that a belief in biodiversity persists only in what Professor Jackson calls "the underground."

I

In *Social Scientists for Social Justice*, Professor Jackson correctly notes that scientific thinking about race shifted during the years between the two world wars. Social and natural scientists became less certain about the importance of race and the need to discourage marriages between Negroes and Caucasians. Professor Jackson is mistaken, however, to equate skepticism with a belief in racial equality. Far from believing, as Professor Jackson asserts, "that the races were, scientifically speaking, equal,"¹ at the time of *Brown* most social scientists were agnostics. They had come to question the craniology and intelligence tests that previously had been adduced to prove racial inequality. But demonstrating the weakness of evidence that had been used to establish inequality was quite different from establishing equality. As Vernon J. Williams, Jr. has noted in another review of Professor Jackson's book, "the paradigm of white racial superiority was undermined not by some assertion of African American equality, but rather by the demolition of the evidence on which that claim was made. What social scientists argued during the interwar years...was not that the races were equal but rather that there was no scientific basis for the claim of white intellectual racial superiority."² The failure to make this crucial distinction is a major shortcoming of *Social Scientists for Social Justice*. But it is not the only problem with the book.

Social Scientists for Social Justice does not discuss the role that historians played in shaping the arguments of the NAACP. This omission is surprising, since Professor Jackson's work itself is a history. As has been noted in a previous issue of TOQ,³ when *Brown* was before the Supreme Court in 1953 the justices asked whether the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment had contemplated and understood that their handiwork would render segregated schools unconstitutional. Or had the framers, as a possible alternative, intended that either Congress or the Supreme Court could abolish segregation in light of future conditions? The questions suggested that the Court wanted to rule against segregation but feared that doing so could be justified only by the sort of judicial activism that several of the justices had denounced during the years of the New Deal. The justices therefore asked the NAACP to provide historical evidence to protect the Court against the charge that it would be legislating if, without regard to historical intent, the Court discovered a new meaning in the amendment.

The NAACP then employed several historians, but when these historians delved into the record they discovered that, as one put it, "unhappily, from the NAACP's point of view, most of what appeared there at first blush looked rather decidedly bad."⁴ To begin with, there was the fact that the Congress

that submitted the Fourteenth Amendment to the states also established segregated schools in the District of Columbia. It hardly seemed likely that Congress intended to destroy the states' right to maintain segregated schools when that very same Congress provided a system of segregated schools in the federal district. In addition, although a few states discontinued segregation after endorsing the amendment, most continued with segregation and some introduced segregation contemporaneously with passage of the amendment. They did not think there was any conflict between the two actions. All things considered, it seemed clear that neither the Congress nor the ratifying states understood that the Fourteenth Amendment would destroy the states' right to maintain segregated schools. The Supreme Court had not been mistaken when it decided, in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), that segregated schools were not at odds with the Fourteenth Amendment, if the facilities provided for black students were equal to those provided for whites.

At first the historians' role was to alert the NAACP to the difficulties posed by the historical record. Only then could the NAACP formulate "an adequate gloss on the fateful events of 1866 sufficient to convince the Court that we had something of a historical case." "It was not that we were engaged in formulating lies," historian Alfred H. Kelly wrote. "There was nothing as crude and naïve as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts, and above all interpreting facts in a way to do what [NAACP lawyer Thurgood] Marshall said we had to do."⁵

In 1965 Kelly admitted that he had "manipulated history in the best tradition of American advocacy, carefully marshaling every possible scrap of evidence in support of the desired interpretation and just as carefully doctoring all the evidence to the contrary either by suppressing it when that seemed plausible, or by distorting it when suppression was not possible." Kelly acknowledged that his work for the NAACP contributed to "a piece of highly selective and carefully prepared law-office history."⁶

Thinking back, Kelly recalled that he had been "facing for the first time in my own career the deadly opposition between my professional integrity as a historian and my wishes and hopes with respect to a contemporary question...I suppose if a man is without scruple this matter will not bother him, but I am frank to say that it bothered me terribly."⁷ John Hope Franklin, another historian who worked for the NAACP in *Brown*, did not experience the same *angst*. Although Franklin acknowledged "the temptation to pollute...scholarship with polemics," he was "flattered" when Thurgood Marshall praised him for "deliberately transform[ing] the objective data provided by historical research into an urgent plea for justice."⁸

Generally, it is not fair to criticize an author for what he has *not* done. In this instance, however, Professor Jackson's failure to discuss the historians who worked for the NAACP obscures an aspect that is crucial for a proper understanding of *Brown*. Because Thurgood Marshall and other NAACP lawyers

recognized that their case rested on shaky historical evidence, they supplemented their argument with new evidence drawn from the social sciences.

In his introduction, Professor Jackson noted that “it is hinted in various quarters and said openly in others” that the social science testimony that psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists presented on behalf of the NAACP was “tendentious and ungrounded.” Indeed, Professor Jackson conceded, by the turn of the twenty-first century “the idea that social scientists’ testimony in *Brown* was unfounded has become the dominant understanding of the case.”⁹ Professor Jackson’s main purpose is to show the contrary. He maintains that the NAACP’s social scientists did not compromise the standard of scientific objectivity. On the contrary, Professor Jackson maintains that the social science testimony against segregation was consistent with the best scientific information that was available.¹⁰

To support his theme, Professor Jackson discusses the general state of social science research at the time of *Brown* and the work of psychologist Kenneth B. Clark in particular. He acknowledges that Clark’s research and testimony before the courts was dubious and contradictory. In South Carolina, Clark showed black and white dolls to a small group of black children selected at random from segregated schools. When a majority of the children identified the white doll as the “nice one,” Clark inferred that segregation had a detrimental effect on the personalities of the Negro children. But in another case from Delaware, where most of the children did not identify the black doll as “bad,” Clark said that the children who refused to pronounce a negative judgment were “seeking to avoid coming to grips with the personally disturbing problem of racial status.” Professor Jackson concedes, “no matter what choice a child made, Clark would interpret it as indicating psychological damage.”¹¹ There were many other problems with Clark’s doll tests and with his courtroom testimony — problems that have been noted by several scholars.¹² Professor Jackson acknowledges the problems. He concedes, “if there was a place where objective science began to appear as advocacy, it was in the testimony of Kenneth B. Clark.”¹³

Professor Jackson nevertheless maintains that the bulk of the social science testimony presented on behalf of the NAACP was “justified by...standards of scientific objectivity.”¹⁴ This conclusion is mistaken. Clark was not alone in saying that segregation damaged the self-esteem of black students. This was the consensus of a statement that the NAACP submitted to the Supreme Court over the signatures of thirty-two prominent anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists. The statement said that black children were psychologically injured if they attended segregated schools. Regardless of the condition of the separate facilities, the NAACP’s social science statement said, segregation had a belittling effect upon the self-esteem of African-American students. According to the statement, segregated black students reacted with “feelings of inferiority” which led to “a generally defeatist attitude and a lowering of

personal ambitions." The statement further said that desegregation could be implemented without undue difficulty and implied that the schoolwork of black children would improve if they attended desegregated schools.¹⁵

These assertions turned out to be wrong. Since *Brown*, the matter of self-esteem has been investigated extensively, and in 1979 one review of the literature concluded: "research is nearly unanimous in reporting either no racial differences in self-esteem or differences favoring blacks over whites."¹⁶ This might seem surprising, since blacks have trailed whites in average academic achievement. But most black youths apparently considered schoolwork less important than street smarts, athletic prowess, and success with the opposite sex.

It did not require hindsight to establish that the NAACP's assertions about self-esteem were incorrect. In 1944 Gunnar Myrdal had noted that blacks tended to attribute any problems not to personal failings but to racism and the American system.¹⁷ And when Kenneth Clark, in research conducted before *Brown*, had shown black and white dolls to Negro students who were attending desegregated schools in the North, he discovered that the desegregated black students were *more* likely to view the black dolls negatively than were their segregated Southern counterparts. Thus if the doll test was a valid means of indicating what sort of schooling enhanced black self-esteem, the data tended to favor segregated schools.¹⁸

The results of other tests were even more damaging to the NAACP's case. When Clark asked children to color the drawing of a boy or girl, "nearly 80 per cent of the Southern Negro children [who had been educated in all-black, segregated schools] colored their preferences brown, whereas only 36 per cent of the northern Negro children did. Furthermore, over 20 per cent of the northern [black] children colored their preferences in a bizarre color, while only five per cent of the Southern [black] children did."¹⁹ These results also suggested that desegregation created more psychological problems than it solved.

Research such as this led one psychiatrist, Ernest van den Haag, to conclude in 1960 that most African-American children would be happier if they were educated in all-black schools. Van den Haag granted that there was something to "the commonsense view that Negroes are humiliated...by segregation," but he predicted that it would be even worse to send black students to schools with hostile whites who would "resent ...the imposition." Van den Haag said that "being resented and shunned personally and concretely by their white schoolmates throughout every day would [not] be less humiliating to Negro children than a general abstract knowledge that they are separately educated because of white prejudice."²⁰ In 1975 another scholar, Edgar G. Epps, concluded that, contrary to the prediction of the NAACP's social science statement, "segregation *protects* self-esteem [of blacks], while the impact of desegregation is to lower self-esteem."²¹ In 1995 yet another scholar, David Armor, noted that research had established, first, that the self-esteem of black students is as high

as that of whites; and second, that “segregated” black students are more likely to have a positive self-image than “desegregated” black students. According to Armor, “The research on black self-esteem...not only fails to support the harm...thesis...but indeed seems to turn the thesis on its head.” Attending predominantly black schools did not harm the self-esteem of black students. Instead, attending predominantly white schools led to lower self-esteem—either because blacks were experiencing racial prejudice, or because they found themselves at a disadvantage in comparison with white students.²²

In the statement they submitted to the *Brown* Court, the NAACP’s social scientists predicted that “under certain circumstances” (among them an absence of competition and special efforts to ensure that the academic status of the black and white students would be equal) desegregation would proceed “without major difficulties... [and] lead to the emergence of more favorable attitudes and friendlier relations between races.”²³ This was consistent with the “contact thesis,” a view that Harvard psychologist Gordon W. Allport propounded in the 1950s and one that has stood the test of time. Allport said that if interracial contact was to reduce prejudice, the contact should involve persons of equal status and similar interests.²⁴

The NAACP’s social scientists were mistaken, however, when they told the Court that the conditions for successful desegregation could “generally be satisfied in...public schools.”²⁵ Given the racial gap in average academic achievement, there was no likelihood that black and white students, on average, would be of equivalent academic status. Moreover, because competitiveness is embedded in the American culture and because teachers are expected to give higher grades to better students, competition could not be eliminated from the classroom. There was no way to create the circumstances that Professor Allport had identified as essential for the success of desegregation.

Far from being the panacea that the NAACP’s social scientists envisioned, desegregation and integration have proved to be problematic for both blacks and whites.

With school desegregation (and with concomitant “open housing” legislation), many middle-class blacks moved to the suburbs. As a result, the black scholar John Ogbu has noted, many inner-city schools were deprived of their successful students and role models. After observing the situation in inner-city schools, Ogbu further reported that rank-and-file blacks responded by regarding middle-class blacks as racial turncoats of a sort. They accused the middle class blacks of “acting white.” And they developed a sort of peer pressure that encouraged lower-class blacks to regard desegregation, assimilation, and success in school as forms of disloyalty to fellow students of their own class.²⁶

With the passage of time it became apparent that “acting white” was not limited to the predominantly black, inner-city schools that the black middle class had abandoned. In many suburbs the children of successful African-American professional people also lagged behind their white classmates on

almost every measure of academic success. In fact, in suburban schools the children of black professionals often trailed their white classmates by greater margins than those that separated urban black students from their white classmates. This became a matter of grave concern to the black doctors, lawyers, judges, and other professional people who had moved to the suburbs because of their supposedly outstanding school systems.

Some observers wondered if integration was not responsible for the underachievement of black students in the suburbs. One was a black economist at Harvard, Roland Fryer, who reported that the phenomenon of blacks disparaging academic work as “acting white” was more prevalent in racially mixed schools than in schools that were predominantly black. Because black students lagged behind whites in average academic performance, Fryer reported, the attitudes of blacks who attended predominantly white schools became even more anti-academic than the attitudes of those who attended predominantly black schools.²⁷

“Acting white” has given rise to an academic debate, the final resolution of which is far from clear. It is apparent, however, that the social scientists who testified for the NAACP in *Brown* were naively optimistic when they assured the Supreme Court that desegregation could be achieved without difficulty and when they implied that racial mixing would lead to better education for blacks. In the years since *Brown* there have been scores of studies of the relation of school racial composition and the achievement of students. After reviewing 120 of these studies, one sober scholar, Nancy St. John, reported that there was no reliable evidence that racial mixing led to significantly better performance by black students.²⁸ A more outspoken observer, the black public intellectual Thomas Sowell, concluded that the “benefits of ‘diversity’ ... are as invisible as the proverbial emperor’s new clothes... There is no hard evidence that mixing and matching black and white kids in school produces either educational or social benefits.”²⁹

Some informed observers continue to support integration for reasons similar to those put forward in the statement that the NAACP’s social scientists submitted in *Brown*. Gary Orfield and Jonathan Kozol are two cases in point.³⁰ But there is no longer a consensus on this point. The division of opinion among blacks has been especially notable. One Gallup poll reported that by 1981 half the black population in the United States believed that busing to achieve school integration had “caused more difficulties than it is worth.”³¹ In another poll, 75 percent of African Americans reportedly agreed with the assertion that “the schools work so hard to achieve integration that they end up neglecting their most important goal – teaching kids.”³²

There were many reasons for an increase in black criticism of, or disillusionment with, integration. Some African Americans pointed to a problem created by demography, saying it was impossible to achieve integration when black youngsters made up the great majority of students in many urban areas.

Benjamin Mays, a former president of Morehouse College, mentioned this in 1974 when he explained his support for a compromise in which civil rights groups in Atlanta gave up their demands for city-suburban busing in return for assurances that more blacks would be hired as teachers and administrators in Atlanta. "It is the most viable plan for Atlanta—a city school system that is 82 percent Black and 18 percent white and is continuing to lose whites every year to five counties that are more than 90 percent white." In addition, Mays said, "Black people must not resign themselves to the pessimistic view that a non-integrated school cannot provide Black children with an excellent educational setting. Instead, Black people should recognize that integration alone does not provide a quality education, and that much of the substance of quality education can be provided to Black children in [predominantly black schools]." ³³

Thomas Sowell agreed with Mays. In an article that celebrated the excellence of Dunbar High School, a segregated school in Washington, D. C., Sowell reported that over a span of eighty-five years most of Dunbar's graduates went on to college and, although financial limitations required most to attend low-cost colleges nearby, an impressive minority achieved academic honors at prestigious schools like Harvard, Amherst, and Oberlin. According to Sowell, the graduates of Dunbar excelled "in their careers, as in their academic work." "The first black general (Benjamin O. Davis), the first black federal judge (William H. Hastie), the first black Cabinet member (Robert C. Weaver), the discoverer of blood plasma (Charles Drew), and the first black Senator since Reconstruction (Edward W. Brooke) were all Dunbar graduates. During World War II, Dunbar graduates in the Army included... a substantial percentage of the total number of high-ranking black officers at that time." ³⁴

Of course Dunbar was only one school. But in 1976, Ron Edmonds, an influential black educator and school administrator in New York, identified several other successful black schools. In a letter that was placed on file with the *Yale Law Journal*, Edmonds listed 71 public schools in the Northeast that he said were effective in teaching basic skills to poor children. Thirty-four of these schools had student enrollments that were 50 percent or more black, and blacks made up more than 75 percent of the students in 16 of the schools. Rather than continue to emphasize the need for racially balanced integration, Edmonds recommended that emphasis be shifted to educating black children where they were, in the inner cities. ³⁵

This message resonated in many black communities. It did so in part because many blacks took exception to what they considered the condescending and misleading implications of seeking racially balanced integration. To assume that African Americans could not learn unless white students were present in the classrooms seemed to suggest that there was something wrong with blacks. William Raspberry of the *Washington Post* said it was "damaging" to tell black children "that what is wrong with their predominantly black school

is that it has too many kids who look like them." Raspberry also criticized black leaders for giving the false impression that learning was "a passive enterprise...something that happens to children." He said these leaders were using racial imbalance as an excuse, when they should have stressed that black youths could learn, even in mostly black schools, if they had good teachers and worked conscientiously.³⁶

Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas expressed similar views in one of his concurring opinions. "It never ceases to amaze me that the courts are so willing to assume that anything that is predominantly black must be inferior," Thomas wrote. According to Thomas, some integrationists assumed "that blacks cannot succeed without the benefit of the company of whites"; that "blacks, when left on their own, cannot achieve."³⁷ The black economist Glenn Loury made the same point in pithy language: "We need better schools, not racial condescension."³⁸

The message resonated because most African-American parents were practical people who thought it made more sense to devote scarce resources to addressing their children's educational needs directly. These parents sensed that integration had not improved the quality of their children's basic education. Instead of hoping for long-term benefits that might accrue from gaining greater familiarity with the ways of the white world, they stressed the importance of improving their neighborhood schools. They also recognized that there was an important difference between schools that were black because the neighborhood was black and the dual school systems that had existed in many states before *Brown*. Beloine Whiting Young and Grade Billings Bress, two black teachers who wrote about education, insisted that it was inappropriate to extend the word *segregation* "beyond the specific Southern *de jure* meaning to include this Northern *de facto* imbalance." They said the semantic conflation was misleading, because it "conveyed the assumption that the problem in the North was identical to the Southern situation"; and "dangerously simplistic," because it suggested "that if the correct racial mix can be provided in a classroom, problems of low achievement and racial tensions will disappear."³⁹

Many blacks also complained that integration deprived the black community of schools that had previously served as centers for community and social life. Jea P. Street, a community activist in Delaware, recalled that when he attended the predominantly black Wilmington High School in the 1960s, "I didn't have any talent for basketball, but I went to all the games because the social life was the best I've known." After Wilmington's black students were bused to the suburbs to achieve integration, there was less participation in school activities, and Street maintained that the youngsters had been "systematically deprived of fun."⁴⁰ Street's friend Theo Gregory, a councilman in Wilmington, also noted the disadvantages of what he called "forced integration" in the suburbs. While conceding that some black students did well in

"diverse schools," Gregory said that others thrived "in an environment free of racial conflict, surrounded by those of similar background."⁴¹

The growing defection of blacks alarmed traditional integrationists, who were especially startled when Ruby Martin joined "the opposition." Martin had headed the Office of Civil Rights in 1965–1966, when the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson had rejected freedom-of-choice plans and demanded racially balanced integration as proof that schools were truly desegregated. In 1975, however, Martin told old friends in the civil rights movement that she "no longer consider[ed] integration a high priority." She said she preferred to concentrate her efforts "on black children where they are, in the slums."⁴²

Derrick Bell experienced a similar change of mind. At one time Bell had supervised three hundred school integration lawsuits for the NAACP. Nevertheless, he eventually concluded that he had been "more committed than wise." "The belief that I was doing the Lord's work did not relieve me of the obligation to consider...what I was doing." "Why was I trying to get [black] children admitted to schools where they were not wanted?" Bell concluded that he had been "blinded" by a "zealous faith in integration." In the 1970s he came to the conclusion that "a singular focus on racial balance" was counterproductive, because it distracted attention away from efforts to improve education "and led us to pursue integration without regard to, and often despite, its ultimate impact on the well-being of students."⁴³

In explaining his turnabout, Bell reiterated some of the explanations that others had offered. He noted that the rationale for racial balance perpetuated "the demeaning and unproven assumption that blacks must have a majority-white presence in order either to teach or to learn effectively."⁴⁴ He recognized that "few...desegregated districts show black scholastic achievement scores equal to those of whites," a result that Bell considered "the most distressing aspect of school desegregation."⁴⁵

Bell, however, emphasized *legal* points, as befitted an attorney who, after leaving the NAACP, became a law professor at Oregon, Stanford, Harvard, and NYU. In an article entitled "Serving Two Masters," Bell challenged the propriety of using class-action lawsuits to obtain court orders for racially balanced school integration. When civil rights lawyers petitioned courts for such orders, they claimed to be acting on behalf of the entire class of African Americans. In point of fact, Bell wrote in 1976, these lawyers answered only to the people who financed the NAACP—"middle class blacks and whites who believe fervently in integration."⁴⁶

According to Bell, the civil rights lawyers ignored the fact that substantial numbers of African Americans (50 percent, according to the pollster Samuel Lubell)⁴⁷ did not favor the racial balance that was being sought in their behalf. In the case of the NAACP's school integration lawsuits, the fee-paying minority was "impos[ing] its will on the majority of the class on whose behalf [the] suit

[was] presumably brought." As Bell saw it, the civil rights lawyers failed to reflect the significant changes that had occurred in black thinking. In the 1950s and early 1960s the great majority of blacks had assumed "that integration was the best means of achieving a quality education for black children." Yet the NAACP continued to seek the same remedy decades later, "when many black parents are disenchanted with the educational results of integration." Bell urged the courts to "develop greater sensitivity to the growing disagreement in black communities over the nature of school relief."⁴⁸

Meanwhile, many white liberals also had second thoughts about integration. This phenomenon is so well known that it hardly needs elaboration. During the 1960s white liberals had pushed for integration, and for one generation – from about 1968 to 1991 – they succeeded in enlisting the Supreme Court in their campaign. They emphasized the importance of peer groups in affecting attitudes toward academic work. Taking their cue from sociologist James S. Coleman, they said that black children would become better students if they attended predominantly white, middle-class schools. As Coleman explained the rationale for integration, as long as middle-class whites remained in the majority, middle-class values would govern the integrated classrooms and "in that situation both white and black children would learn."⁴⁹

In the mid-1970s, however, Coleman conceded that it was mistaken to assume that integration would improve the schoolwork of black children. What happened all too frequently, Coleman said, was that "characteristics of the lower-class black classroom, namely a high degree of disorder, came to take over and constitute the values and characteristics of the classroom in the integrated school." Many middle-class parents then fled to the refuge of private schools or to public schools in predominantly white areas – a phenomenon that Coleman considered "quite understandable" because so many integrated schools had "failed to control lower-class black children" and had to spend "90 percent of the time)not on instruction but on discipline."⁵⁰

After analyzing data from twenty large school districts, Coleman reported that court-ordered busing fostered "resegregation" by stimulating "white flight." The more blacks enrolled in a school's system, the more whites left. Specifically, Coleman found that an increase of 5 per cent in the average child's black classmates caused an additional 10 percent of white families to leave. Thus integrationists faced what Coleman called "an insoluble dilemma." The push for integration was offset by the actions of white families who moved from areas where there was a large enrollment of black students to areas in which there was less racial mixing.⁵¹

More could be said about social science and the retreat from integration, but this much was clear. By the 1980s, criticism of integration was increasing – and it was criticism from blacks as well as whites. A growing body of evidence indicated that: (1) far from increasing the self-esteem of black students, integration often had the opposite effect; (2) the anticipated academic gains from

integration had not materialized; and (3) integration had led to a number of problems, among them “white flight” and a tendency for blacks to disparage academic work as “acting white.”

In a changed climate of opinion, the Supreme Court shifted its jurisprudence. In three cases of the 1990s, the Court reinterpreted the Constitution once again – this time to require desegregation but not court-ordered busing for integration.⁵² In doing so, the Court belatedly acknowledged that it no longer regarded the social science statement that the NAACP had submitted in *Brown* as a proper guide for interpreting the U. S. Constitution. Professor Jackson’s first volume would have been better if he had admitted that the NAACP’s social science had been dubious even at the time of *Brown* and had become widely discredited by the time he published *Social Scientists for Social Justice*.

II

History is usually written by the victors and, as Jared Taylor once noted, this has led to the neglect of scientists and intellectuals who opposed *Brown*, “leaving ‘Bull’ Connor and his snarling police dogs as the only recognizable symbols of resistance.”⁵³ Believing that bigotry was enough to explain why people fought to preserve segregation, many historians have ignored the ideas of segregationists. Some have even argued that the segregationist cause failed because it lacked a coherent intellectual rationale. However, in his second volume, *Science for Segregation*, Professor Jackson acknowledges that there was a scientific and intellectual case for segregation, even as he makes it clear that he does not agree with those who made this argument. He does so by looking carefully at the work of Henry E. Garrett, Wesley Critz George, Carleton Putnam, and others who wrote for *Mankind Quarterly* and were associated with the IAAEE – the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics.

Unfortunately, when describing mainstream views of race and science at the time of *Brown*, Professor Jackson again confuses skepticism about racial inequality with a belief in racial equality. He mistakenly asserts that, by the middle of the twentieth century, “most American social scientists believed) there were no fundamental differences in intelligence between the races.”⁵⁴ This obscures a crucial distinction. It is correct to say that mainstream scholars questioned the evidence that had been presented to show that Caucasians were superior to Negroes intellectually. It does not follow that most scholars believed that the earlier claims of racial superiority and inferiority had been disproved. Among well-informed scholars and scientists, the prevailing view was not that races were equal but that the evidence of Negro inferiority was not *conclusive*.

This distinction is important for understanding many of the matters that Professor Jackson discusses. Consider the two UNESCO statements on race, one written in 1950 and the other in 1951. The first statement, written by cultural anthropologists and other social scientists, displayed egalitarianism at its peak.

It asserted that racial characteristics were limited to physical traits like hair, eyes, head shape, and physique and did not extend to intelligence, character, or personality. "For all practical purposes," the statement declared, "'race' is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth...Biological differences between ethnic groups should be disregarded...The unity of mankind is the main thing."⁵⁵ According to Ashley Montagu, the principal author of the statement, "Whatever classification the anthropologist makes of man, he never includes mental characteristics as part of those classifications."⁵⁶

This first UNESCO statement eventually became an article of faith for many egalitarians, one that was repeated regularly, with feeling if not conviction. All human groups were basically the same, they insisted, and any differences were culturally determined products of differences in upbringing, lifestyle, and social environment. This point of view was implicit in the title of Ashley Montagu's influential book, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (1942). It was also the thesis of a much admired 2003 documentary for the Public Broadcasting System, *The Power of an Illusion*. In 2004 the biologist Paul R. Gross noted an extraordinary paradox: When asked to identify their society's most serious problem, many Americans answered, "Race." But many of these people also insisted that the concept of "race" was meaningless.⁵⁷

Nevertheless, most geneticists and physical anthropologists rejected the argument that "race" was merely a social construct. The prominent population geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky was one of those who found fault with the first UNESCO statement. Dobzhansky was a friend of Ashley Montagu, with whom he coauthored articles. But Dobzhansky nevertheless insisted that "Race differences are facts of nature which can, given sufficient study, be ascertained objectively."⁵⁸ The prominent physical anthropologist Carleton Coon agreed, saying that the "soft pedaling" and "prudery" of some cultural anthropologists with respect to race was "equaled only by their horror of Victorian prudery about sex."⁵⁹ Others chimed in. Henri Vallois, the director of the Musée de l'Homme in Paris, considered it ridiculous to regard race as a myth.⁶⁰ And W. C. Osman Hill, the prosector at the Zoological Society of London, discussed the question with remarkable candor, saying,

That range of mental capabilities is "much the same" in all races is scarcely a scientifically accurate statement. It is at most a vague generalization. It is, however, scarcely true, for temperamental and other mental differences are well known to be correlated with physical differences...Even if it were true that there is "no proof that the groups of mankind differ in intelligence, temperament or other innate characteristics," it is certainly the case that there is no proof to the contrary.⁶¹

In response to these criticisms, UNESCO convened another committee of racial experts, one that was composed entirely of physical anthropologists and geneticists. The resulting Second UNESCO Statement on Race differed from the first statement in important respects. While admitting that within a given race "capacities vary as much as, if not more than, they do between

different groups," the second statement rejected the earlier assertion that the races did not differ in mental traits. "It is possible, though not proved," the second statement said, "that some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner in one human group than another."⁶² As Jenny Reardon has noted, the second statement "accommodated both those who wanted to de-emphasize the importance of group-level differences in intellectual and emotional traits (by pointing to the importance of differences among individuals *within* a group) and those who wanted to hold onto a belief not uncommon among geneticists and physical anthropologists that group differences in mental and psychological traits did exist."⁶³

At mid-century most population geneticists and physical anthropologists accepted the possibility (but not the certainty) that the races differed intrinsically in important respects. This view was so widespread that even Ashley Montagu acknowledged that there was no proof as to the equal distribution of innate intelligence. This was quite a concession, but one that Montagu had to make in order to retain the respect of his professional peers. In 1944 Montagu had written "with some degree of assurance that in all probability the range of inherited capacities in two different ethnic groups is just about identical."⁶⁴ In 1961, however, he asserted that he had been misunderstood;⁶⁵ that he had never maintained that the races were equal in mental abilities; that he had contended only "that studies claiming to have proven that genetic differences were the responsible causes [for differences in test scores and standards of civilization] have not upon critical examination been found to prove anything of the sort."⁶⁶ Montagu went on to say that "during thirty-five years of reading on the subject I have *not more than once or twice* encountered a writer who claimed that 'the races were equal in mental abilities.'"⁶⁷

As the civil rights movement gained momentum in the 1950s and 1960s, the opinion that prevailed in the mainstream of generally educated Americans began to diverge from the views that prevailed among geneticists and physical anthropologists. While most knowledgeable scientists remained skeptical, even agnostic, about racial differences, and about the relative importance of nature and nurture, many well-educated generalists embraced what one historian has called a "liberal orthodoxy."⁶⁸ This view held that the races did not differ in intelligence, aptitudes, or character. The Berkeley historian Kenneth M. Stampf summed it up in memorable language, "Negroes *are*, after all, only white men with black skins, nothing more, nothing less."⁶⁹

A discussion of this paradox is beyond the scope of this review. Suffice to say that strong historical currents swept popular opinion toward convictions that were at odds with the skepticism that prevailed among knowledgeable experts. Unfortunately, Professor Jackson obscures this key point. Instead of emphasizing the distance that separated the orthodoxy of egalitarian liberals from the accepted wisdom of experts, Professor Jackson magnifies the points at issue between "racist" and "non racist" experts.

The scientists for segregation pointed especially to two bodies of evidence: differences in brain structure and differences in IQ scores. As summarized by Wesley Critz George, a professor of anatomy at the University of North Carolina, the average weight of the brains of Caucasians was about 1,380 grams and that of Negroes about 1,240 grams, with the difference especially pronounced in the prefrontal area, where abstract thought occurred. According to Professor George, these differences might be modified by changes in diet, but only "to a minimal degree."⁷⁰ As summarized by Henry E. Garrett, a professor of psychology at the University of Virginia, African Americans regularly scored from 15 to 20 points below the average for American whites on IQ tests, with the difference especially pronounced on questions that involved reasoning, deduction, and comprehension. According to Garrett, the gap in test scores did not disappear when black and white subjects were paired in terms of fourteen social and economic factors. As Garrett assessed the situation, "the differences between the two racial groups in a variety of mental tests are so large, so regular and so persistent under all sorts of conditions that it is almost unthinkable to conclude that they are entirely a matter of environment."⁷¹

The scientists against segregation pointed to problems with the evidence that the scientists for segregation had presented. With respect to craniology, critics said the studies Professor George had summarized were dated and problematical. Some had been conducted in Africa without the modern equipment required for reliable measurements. Others did not control for prenatal and postnatal nutrition. Still others did not use identical methods for fixing and processing the brains that were analyzed. As for the IQ tests, critics said that allowance should be made for the African Americans' experience with slavery, segregation, and discrimination—and that this consideration could account for the 15 point difference in mean IQ scores.

The point at issue was not whether the intellectual potential of Negroes as a race was equal to the potential of Caucasians as a race. Rather, the question concerned the evidence that had been presented. Was it sufficient to prove that blacks were inherently inferior in matters pertaining to intellect? Most geneticists and physical anthropologists maintained that the evidence was not sufficient to decide the question *definitively*. But the scientists for segregation believed the evidence was sufficient to warrant the continuation of segregated schooling.

The scientists and intellectuals for segregation recognized that there were problems with both IQ testing and craniology. In his private correspondence, Carleton Putnam acknowledged that psychology and anthropology were not exact sciences. "The best critique...of any I received," Putnam wrote, came from John Morsell of the NAACP, who had noted that "no student has ever been able (or is ever likely to be able) to control enough of the conditioning factors to make genuinely scientific comparison possible."⁷² Putnam nevertheless insisted that "in the management of human affairs...all practical judgments

are based on a balance of probabilities."⁷³ Although the scientific evidence of Negro inferiority was not conclusive, it was sufficient for Putnam to plump for segregation. As Putnam saw it, intelligence tests and brain studies reinforced the lessons of history. "In all history," he wrote, there was not one stable republic that had been "predominantly, or even substantially, Negro."⁷⁴ "Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pure-blooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization."⁷⁵

Other segregationists concurred. Dwight Ingle, the chairman of the physiology department at the University of Chicago, believed that genetic endowment "probabl[y] played an important role in determining racial differences in drives, aptitudes and achievements," although Ingle conceded that the evidence was not conclusive. According to Ingle, "the concept that White and Negro races are approximately equally endowed with intelligence remains a plausible hypothesis for which there is faulty evidence. The concept that the average Negro is significantly less intelligent than the average White is also a plausible hypothesis for which there is faulty but in my opinion, somewhat stronger evidence."⁷⁶

The Southern writer James J. Kilpatrick similarly conceded that modern science had not developed methods to determine with precision the relative importance of heredity and environment. Yet the origin of the Negro's backwardness seemed "largely irrelevant." If the condition were acquired, blacks still lagged far behind, and Kilpatrick feared that the academic achievement gap would make it difficult, if not impossible, to have effective integrated schools. If the condition were intrinsic, Kilpatrick saw "nothing but disaster... in risking an accelerated intermingling of blood lines."⁷⁷

In mentioning the "intermingling of blood lines," Kilpatrick touched on a topic that was central to the thinking of segregationist scientists and writers. Northern writers sometimes implied that the specter of racial amalgamation was a hobgoblin that demagogic politicians used to bamboozle their most ignorant followers but one that enlightened whites recognized as a trumped-up thing having no real substance. Yet this was not the case. Southern whites of every degree of prominence feared that school desegregation would open the gates to racial amalgamation. Writing in *The Atlantic Monthly*, the Charleston author Herbert Ravenel Sass said that integration rested on the premise that blacks and whites were essentially alike except for skin color. Therefore, Sass predicted, integrated schools would turn out "successive generations in whom, because they are imbued with this philosophy, the instinct of race preference would have been suppressed." Some people thought this would be a good thing, the happy solution to America's racial problem. But Sass maintained

that one need look no farther than Latin America to see that the fusion of racial bloodlines led to second-class societies.⁷⁸

The dispute over amalgamation had been brewing for years. Egalitarians said there was no danger, because the range of aptitudes within one race overlapped that of the other. Some assumed that Caucasians would mix only with superior Negroes, in which case the results of racial crossings would be positive. Franz Boas, the most influential egalitarian anthropologist, once maintained that racial mixing posed no problem because of the great variety of individuals within any race. Boas insisted that nothing justified branding an individual inferior or superior because he happened to belong to one race or another.⁷⁹

Yet segregationists were not convinced. James J. Kilpatrick admitted that egalitarianism could be argued plausibly and "provided a fine topic for a sophomore's term paper." But Kilpatrick and most other Southern whites thought it imprudent to facilitate racial mixing when the evidence was not conclusive. They were determined not to let their children become "guinea pigs for any man's social experiment."⁸⁰ Some were horrified by the prospect that America's population would become increasingly beige. Others simply liked the way their race looked and wanted grandchildren to look like their grandparents. Still others were more theoretical, saying that "race informs culture" and that a decline in the white population would undermine standards of civilization and thus impoverish not just white people but the world in general.

In the end, the civil rights campaign for school desegregation prevailed (although desegregation fell short of the racially balanced integration that many liberals sought). In accounting for the triumph of desegregation, many segregationist scholars and writers developed a conspiracy thesis. Carleton Putnam, in particular, complained that Jewish anthropologists produced book after book that argued, essentially, that because Nazi Germany had misused racial studies modern scholars should insist that racial differences were either inconsequential or nonexistent. Beginning with Franz Boas and extending to Ashley Montagu (whom Putnam sometimes identified by his birth name, Israel Ehrenberg), Jewish scholars were "smarting under what they considered unjustified discrimination." Therefore, "they set purposely to the task of showing they were just as good as the native stocks (as, indeed, in many ways they were), and they tried to do this by proving that *all* races were equal in their adaptability to our white civilization." They secured professorships at leading universities, cliquishly cultivated like-minded colleagues, and marginalized and ostracized those who did not share their views. Soon they dominated the field of anthropology but, according to Putnam, they were on "a self-serving mission" and their objectivity should be "judged accordingly."⁸¹

In insisting that much of modern anthropology was "clever and insidious propaganda posing in the name of science,"⁸² Putnam was tactless, if not mistaken.⁸³ If Jewish influence over the major newspapers and television

networks was as extensive as Putnam claimed, it was not good strategy to bait the media elite. Nevertheless, as Professor Jackson has emphasized, Putnam and others insisted that their views had not been disproved but, rather, had been obscured by "a scientific conspiracy."⁸⁴

Some scholars have continued to sound this theme. Thus Glayde Whitney, in his 1995 presidential address to the Behavioral Genetics Association, said that the scientific investigation of racial differences was not only being smothered; it was being suppressed by "organized Jewry," which "dogmatically attempts to keep the general population from awareness of the findings of modern science."⁸⁵ Other observers have avoided statements that are overtly anti-Semitic, but nevertheless insist that much criticism of racial research has been motivated by ideological, rather than scientific, considerations. In 1984 David Zarefsky asserted that "a secret cabal is afoot," one in which "clever conspirators" had "conceal[ed] their true intentions."⁸⁶ In 1997, J. Philippe Rushton lamented that pressures were such as to discourage contemporary scientists from "even daring to look through the genetic analog of Galileo's telescope."⁸⁷

Professor Jackson properly stresses that "for the past five decades, scientists who claim there are racial differences...consistently have held that scientific truth was and is being muzzled by a conspiracy of powerful, shadowy figures who control the public airings of academic discourse."⁸⁸ Professor Jackson then slants his account to give the impression that this concern is without foundation. In doing so he passes over instances that show how heterodox racial research has been discouraged, if not suppressed.

Consider the case of the eminent sociologist James S. Coleman. Coleman first came to wide public attention in 1966 as the principal author of an influential report, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. This "Coleman Report" analyzed the results of tests given to some 570,000 students and was written in a matter-of-fact style that befitted a scholarly work. In newspaper interviews and later courtroom testimony, however, Coleman stressed a particular correlation, one that indicated that black children who attended majority-white schools scored higher on standard tests than other blacks. This eventually became the most widely reported finding of the report. When Coleman died in 1995, the *New York Times* recalled, "Dr. Coleman concluded that disadvantaged black children learned better in integrated classes, and his findings became a manual for political and court actions and were widely used to support busing to achieve racial balance in public schools."⁸⁹ In a feature story, the *National Observer* once identified Coleman as "the Scholar Who Inspired Busing."⁹⁰

In the early 1970s, however, Coleman changed his mind. After examining the results of still more tests, he acknowledged that he had been mistaken to assume that integration would improve the schoolwork of black children. Most of the blacks who integrated schools in the early 1960s and who had provided the basis for Coleman's earlier conclusions were well-motivated volunteers

who enrolled under freedom-of-choice plans. They were superior students from families who considered education important. It was simply "wishful thinking," Coleman admitted, to believe that similar academic improvement would result from the massive integration of blacks under mandatory court orders.⁹¹ Then, in 1975, Coleman prepared a second report that documented the prevalence of "white flight" from court-ordered integration.⁹²

Civil rights leaders were shocked. In his report of 1966 and in several legal depositions, Coleman had supplied a scholarly rationale for busing for racial balance. Now, it seemed, he had switched sides and joined with those who opposed integration. "In 1966 we cited you as proof that [integration] worked," NAACP attorney Charles Morgan told Coleman. "We don't cite you as proof any more."⁹³ Some critics went further. When Coleman's second report was published in 1976, Arthur McClung Lee, the president of the American Sociological Association, denounced Coleman at a press conference and then asked the Ethics Committee of the association to censure him.⁹⁴ Still later, Lee asked the general membership of the organization to condemn Coleman. Cooler heads ultimately prevailed, and Coleman eventually confronted his critics at a plenary session of the association. The walls at that session were plastered with posters bearing Coleman's name, Nazi swastikas, and various epithets. For some time thereafter, Coleman suffered through what he later recalled as "a tortured period of intellectual isolation." "We should not forget," Coleman wrote, "how strong the consensus was at that time among social scientists that bussing was an unalloyed benefit, and a policy not to be questioned."⁹⁵

Coleman survived the criticism. His standing as a sociologist remained high, and he himself later became the president of the American Sociological Association. Accepting an award in 1988, Coleman acknowledged that "recognition by one's fellow researchers is one of the highest honors that can be bestowed." Yet he also remembered that it had been difficult to withstand the criticism of peers, and he lamented that others, including "some of the most original and brilliant sociologists," had been "driven to the periphery or to adjacent disciplines because the implication of their work runs counter to the current intellectual fashion." In the academic world, Coleman noted, "the threat posed by fellow faculty members is probably greater than that posed by the usual villains." In sociology, academic freedom had been constricted, not by external pressures from either the right or the left, but by fellow scholars who were predisposed against research that challenged the conventional wisdom of the liberal mainstream.⁹⁶

When Coleman spoke of sociologists who were driven from academe, he might have been thinking about David Armor, the author of an influential 1972 article, "The Evidence on Busing." In the late 1950s and early 1960s Armor had been a leader of SLATE, a radical student party at the University of California, Berkeley. In the mid-1960s he had joined the team of researchers that produced the first Coleman report. Like Coleman and other members of the

team, at that time Armor had been a liberal integrationist. Yet after considering additional research, Armor also criticized court-ordered busing. His 1972 article summarized research that had been done on integration in six Northern cities, focusing especially on METCO, a voluntary program that Armor had helped to design and which bused approximately 1,500 black students from Boston to its suburbs. In terms of academic achievement, Armor reported, "None of the studies were able to demonstrate conclusively that integration has had an effect...as measured by standardized tests." "The bused students did not gain significantly more than the black control group, nor did their gains diminish the black/white gap in the integrated schools." The results with respect to self-confidence were also discouraging. When questions were posed about the students' occupational aspirations and when students were asked to rate "how bright they were in comparison to their classmates," the bused blacks were less positive than the control students who remained in inner-city schools.⁹⁷

Armor's article was a blow to the pro-busing movement. Joseph Alsop publicized the article in one of his op-ed essays in the *Washington Post*, and Lawrence Feinberg, the education reporter for the *Post*, discussed Armor's work in two widely read news stories. As a result, Armor later recalled, "my telephone rang constantly for the next several weeks, and I believe I heard from virtually every school system in the nation that was involved in school desegregation litigation."⁹⁸

When he published "The Evidence on Busing" in 1972, Armor was a junior professor at Harvard, with an office two doors away from that of a tenured senior scholar, Thomas Pettigrew. Pettigrew had been one of Armor's professors when Armor was a graduate student, and in the past Pettigrew had recommended Armor for several research positions. Nevertheless, after Armor published "The Evidence on Busing," Pettigrew became determined to oust Armor from Harvard. According to Pettigrew, a careful examination of Armor's work was "like cleaning out the Augean stable, an incredible job. We kept shoveling away and there just turns out to be more of it yet."⁹⁹ Some Harvard professors defended Armor's integrity and competence, but others, while praising Armor's work privately, refused to be quoted by name. "Only a damn fool would talk," one said. "I don't want to pay the price."¹⁰⁰

Later in 1972, after leaving Harvard to take a teaching position at UCLA, some of Armor's colleagues in California boycotted and demonstrated against Armor's course on race relations. In the meantime, Armor received a job offer from the Rand Corporation, and because of the controversy his research had caused at both Harvard and UCLA, he decided that a research institute might be a better place to do his work. He did not return to an academic position until 1989, when he accepted a visiting professorship at Rutgers University. In 1992 he became a regular member of the faculty at

George Mason University.

Having retaliated in this fashion against erstwhile allies, it was hardly a surprise when civil rights activists also tried to discredit and discourage heterodox scholars who had not been associated with the civil rights movement.

- One case concerned the Berkeley psychologist Arthur Jensen, a man who was generally recognized as the leading exponent of the view that heredity plays a large role in determining intelligence. Jensen's findings have been accepted by most of his colleagues. A 1988 survey of 661 psychologists reported that most of the experts believed that IQ tests measure the ability to reason abstractly; that most experts believe that heredity accounts for much of the variation within racial groups; and most believe that the IQ gap between blacks and whites is due in part to genetic inheritance.¹⁰¹ It should be noted, however, that the psychologists who replied to this survey were allowed to do so anonymously. Because of the danger of reprisals, some of the responding psychologists might have been reluctant to express their views openly. Such concern would be understandable. After Jensen published an influential article in the *Harvard Educational Review* in 1969, there were calls for his expulsion from the American Psychological Association, and the American Anthropological Association passed a resolution condemning his position on racial differences. Meanwhile, student groups at Berkeley demanded that Jensen be fired and urged students to boycott his classes. Jensen conducted some seminars secretly, but his lecture classes were filled with hecklers whose shouting sometimes prevented him from being heard. When Jensen attempted to speak to fellow scholars at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, a spokesman for the Progressive Labor Party went to the dais, seized Jensen's notes, and tore them up. When Jensen tried to hand out copies of his talk, demonstrators stormed the stage and Jensen was rushed to safety by a police squad that took him to a back exit and a freight elevator. On another occasion, Jensen was spat upon when he attempted to speak at the University of Minnesota. When he proceeded to speak, "he was drowned out by catcalls and shouts, fist-fights broke out in the audience, and the campus police, fearing a full-scale riot, hurried him out the back way and down a fire escape."¹⁰²
- J. Philippe Rushton experienced similar treatment at the University of Western Ontario, where he is a professor of psychology. In 1988 Rushton received a Guggenheim fellowship, but he became the subject of controversy when he used the Guggenheim to gather a mass of data on racial differences in various physical and behavioral characteristics. After presenting this information at the 1989 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, forty-five members of the

Western Ontario faculty signed a petition asking the University to fire Rushton. Even more ominously, the Ontario Provincial Police began an investigation to determine if Rushton had violated a Canadian law that made it a criminal offense to “willfully promote hatred against any identifiable group.” In the end, Rushton kept his job and the legal charges were dropped. In the meantime, though, there were efforts to silence him. In 1990 a contingent of students “stormed through the psychology department building, banging on walls and doors, bellowing slogans through bull horns, spray-painting swastikas on walls.” Fearful that the demonstrators might become violent, the university administration “ordered Rushton to cease teaching his classes in person and to videotape his lectures; students who wished to take his courses would have to view the videotapes.” After winning an appeal, Rushton was allowed to resume teaching in person, but “demonstrators promptly met this challenge by massing outside his classroom and shouting slogans so loudly and continuously that the first scheduled class had to be canceled and on three subsequent occasions jammed the doorway to the classroom, preventing Rushton’s students from entering.”¹⁰³

- Because some groups were so strongly opposed to heterodox studies of racial matters, government agencies and major foundations were reluctant to support such research. There were occasional exceptions, to be sure, but even the exceptions proved to be problematical. Consider the case of the Human Genome Diversity Project, which received funding from the National Institute for Health (NIH) in 1991. The purpose of the research, as explained by one of the originators of the project, was to study race and genetics in order to “enable us to better understand and treat a variety of diseases.” Yet there were objections to the project even before the work got underway. Some of the complaints were parochial, as with anthropologists who were annoyed at their exclusion from the study. Other concerns focused on whether certain tribes and peoples were capable of giving informed consent for the study of their DNA. The crucial objections came from groups that were troubled by the conceptual orientation of the project. Because the researchers proposed to deal with race and heredity, some observers feared that the results might promote bigotry and prejudice. These sentiments were so strongly felt that the funding was curtailed and the Diversity Project died a slow death. This happened despite the fact that the project’s leaders included “some of biology’s most respected, socially conscious scientists—scientists who had devoted significant energy over many decades to fighting racism.” In debates with his Stanford colleague William Shockley, geneticist Luca Cavalli-Sforza had made the case for intrinsic racial equality in intelligence. Robert Cook-Deegan had worked for Physicians for Human Rights. Mary-Claire King had used genetic techniques in an effort to identify grandchildren that had been

kidnapped in Argentina. "These were not self-seeking researchers who sought to extract the blood of indigenous peoples for the sake of financial and political gain. They were scientists who sincerely hoped to create a project that would deepen the stores of human knowledge" – and in the process facilitate the treatment of numerous diseases.¹⁰⁴

Because it was difficult to obtain major funding for projects that might be at odds with egalitarian preconceptions, some researchers turned to the Pioneer Fund. This organization had been established in the 1930s with two purposes. One was to provide scholarships, with a preference given "to children who are deemed to be descended predominantly from white persons who settled in the original thirteen states." Yet such scholarships were awarded only once, and most Pioneer funds have been used for the second purpose: to support research and teaching on racial matters.¹⁰⁵

- The best known of Pioneer's projects was probably the "twins studies" that Professor Thomas J. Bouchard and his colleagues conducted at the University of Minnesota. These studies came in for criticism, however, because the Bouchard group concluded that human nature was not a *tabula rasa*, a blank slate on which environment, experience, and upbringing shaped the quality of personality and intellect. On the contrary, the twins studies pointed to the enduring importance of heredity. Most identical twins who were separated at or soon after birth not only looked alike as adults but also were quite similar in terms of IQ, personality, and tastes – even if they had been reared in quite different circumstances. In fact, such identical twins were far more alike than fraternal twins who had been reared together.¹⁰⁶

Additional adoption studies followed, including investigations of black children adopted into white families, and the research again pointed to the importance of heredity as well as environment. In one study of 101 middle class white Minnesota families into which 130 black children had been adopted, the researchers reported that the average IQ of the adopted children was "distinctly lower than that of their adoptive parents...and the biological children of those parents" but 15 points higher than the national average for black children reared in their own homes in the region, and higher than the IQs of their biological parents.¹⁰⁷

Bouchard's research is generally well regarded, but he and others who conduct twin studies have come under repeated and severe attacks from egalitarians. As Morton Hunt has noted, students at the University of Minnesota have called Bouchard "a racist in their handouts, linked his name with 'German fascism,' spray-painted slogans calling him a Nazi...and demanded that he be fired."

Meanwhile, at professional meetings some scholars have assailed Bouchard's work, with Barry Mehler of Ferris State University setting the tone by mentioning that Dr. Josef Mengele conducted experiments with twins at

Auschwitz before proceeding to say that Bouchard “rehabilitated this line of research.”¹⁰⁸

- Because Pioneer funds were so important for research on heredity, Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate concluded that “no case is more instructive about the assault on academic freedom...than the attempt to silence and punish Professor Linda Gottfredson at the University of Delaware.”¹⁰⁹ Gottfredson’s research was not especially contentious. One of her studies calculated the IQ scores that seemed to be prerequisites for success in graduate programs or high-level jobs (and also mentioned the relatively small pool of blacks who had such scores). Her most provocative article dealt with the practice of race-norming, “whereby tested individuals are admitted to educational or employment positions by their rank within a racial group rather than within the overall applicant pool.”¹¹⁰ Gottfredson’s work implicitly challenged the egalitarian premise that there were no important racial differences in capabilities (and that consequently any differences in test scores or employment had to be due to bias in the tests, to cultural variations, or to societal discrimination against blacks). But her work was within the mainstream of American opinion, as was attested when the Civil Rights Act of 1991 prohibited employers and government agencies from continuing to adjust the results of tests on the basis of race.

Gottfredson also accepted grants from the Pioneer Fund, and critics sensed that this gave them a chance to squelch a foundation that had been a thorn in their side. In 1989 a professor of English and linguistics wrote to the president of the University of Delaware, saying that the institution should not allow the receipt of grants from the Pioneer Fund. After investigating the matter, the university’s Faculty Senate Committee on Research concurred, saying that “a substantial...portion of the activities supported by the Pioneer Fund either seek to demonstrate or start from the assumption that there are fundamental hereditary differences among people of different racial and cultural backgrounds.” Because such beliefs were at odds with the university’s professed “commitment to racial and cultural diversity,” the committee said, Delaware should discourage its professors from engaging in Pioneer-funded research. The university’s associate provost for research then telephoned Gottfredson and said “that if she somehow found any independent way to receive support from the Pioneer Fund, the university would have to decide whether her outside research interfered with her academic duties.” Nor should Gottfredson use spare time to work on research sponsored by the Pioneer Fund. “It is important that the university be connected only with work it supports,” the associate provost explained. Therefore, if Gottfredson published any paper or book “based on work supported by Pioneer,” she should list only her “home or business, not [her] university address.” The associate provost

further said that such research “would not count toward fulfilling research requirements, nor toward yearly evaluations, merit raises, ... [or] promotion.” In addition, the dean of Gottfredson’s college asked to see the papers written by students in Gottfredson’s classes. All he wanted, the dean said, was for himself, or, perhaps, “your new department chair, to read over the papers to see what beliefs, if any, about race superiority your students express.” The dean explained that he was “concerned...about the incidental and unintended lessons you may be teaching.”¹¹¹

Gottfredson appealed on the basis of her faculty’s collective bargaining agreement, which stated that “the teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of results.” The federal arbitrator eventually decided in her favor, saying, “Academic freedom is a contractually conferred right” – one that could not be abridged even if the university’s administrators or faculty thought the freedom was being used to oppose the university’s policy with respect to racial and cultural diversity. In addition, the executive committee of the campus AAUP rebuked the dean, saying, “it is an infringement of... academic freedom for you to request or demand that [Gottfredson] provide her student papers for the purpose to which you wish to put them. The university may not conduct ideologically – or politically – motivated investigations of the content of faculty research or teaching.”¹¹²

Gottfredson’s victory was significant. Had the outcome been different, critics would have taken yet another step toward silencing heterodox teachers and toward suppressing a foundation that, in the words of VDARE.com, was “like an Irish monastery [that] has kept the study of human differences alive during the long egalitarian Dark Age.”¹¹³

Accounting for the assault on hereditarian research necessarily involves some speculation. Arthur Jensen may well have been correct when he once said, “those who have most strongly opposed me on essentially non-scientific grounds have done so out of noble but mistaken sentiments.”¹¹⁴ As Morton Hunt has explained, “During World War II...racism became increasingly identified with Nazism, and after the war, when the world learned in detail of the horror of the death camps, the notion that people of any race were biologically and hereditarily inferior to any other was so loathsome to most social scientists and intelligentsia that it became unacceptable to suggest that any differences among races...were of innate origin.”¹¹⁵ The fear that racial difference might be used as a justification for bigotry and discrimination led many well-meaning people to deny the obvious. Thus in 1995 researchers at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science announced that “the concept of race...has no basis in fundamental human biology.”¹¹⁶ By way of contrast, many of those who questioned integration or were associated with the Pioneer Fund essentially rejected the contention that, as Henry E. Garrett once put it, “because the study of race once gave ammunition to racial fascists, who misused it, researchers should avoid the study of racial differences.”¹¹⁷

Race-conscious writers predicted that, despite the reprisals, an emphasis on heredity eventually would come back into style. In 1961 Carleton Putnam said this would happen “not primarily through anthropologists but through the zoologists...It will take time, but the pendulum will swing.”¹¹⁸ So it has, although it is geneticists, not zoologists, who have been most important in stimulating the trend. Although the Human Genome Diversity Project was curtailed for reasons already mentioned, the larger Human Genome Project continued throughout the 1990s, funded in part by commercial enterprise and in part by government agencies in the United States and Britain. The purpose was to decode the human genome with the expectation that this would lead to advances in medical treatment. When the project was completed in 2000, President Bill Clinton declared, “with this profound new knowledge, humankind is on the verge of gaining immense, new power to heal. Genome science will have a real impact on all our lives – and even more, on the lives of our children. It will revolutionize the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of most, if not all, human diseases.”¹¹⁹

In the course of mapping the distribution of genes, the human genome researchers discovered that if they looked at enough genetic markers they could identify the geographic region of a person’s ancestors. They concluded further that all of mankind arose out of Africa but began to disperse into different regions some 50,000 years ago. As a result of the common origin, 95 percent of the genetic variation in the human genome was found in people all over the world. But as human populations started reproducing independently from one another, each group began to develop its own genetic configuration.¹²⁰ Since so much of the genetic make-up was held in common, some egalitarians said the new knowledge pointed to the insignificance of race. Others, however, said the importance of race should not be discounted, even if 99 percent of human genes were shared among all people. According to Dr. Alan Bernstein, the president of the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, small genetic differences were far from insignificant. After mentioning that there was not much genetic distance between humans and gorillas, Bernstein said, “It’s silly to try and be politically correct ...” Even when the same genes were shared, the frequencies of distribution often varied.¹²¹

Several science writers have developed this theme. Steve Sailer, a writer who has frequently commented on human biodiversity, noted that humans shared “98 percent of our genes with chimpanzees (and, supposedly, 70 percent with yeast).” But that did not mean that genetic differences between humans and chimps (or yeast) were insignificant.¹²² *Occidental Quarterly* editor Kevin Lamb also concluded that it is a “sham” to say that because almost all human genes are racially shared, there are no important racial differences. According to Lamb, “the genetic similarities between mice and men are chemically nearly exact, but a few selected genetic switches that turn certain genes on within human and mouse genomes yield the difference between a Beethoven and

a rodent...Race differences by their very nature stem from minor biological distinctions."¹²³

Scanning the human genome has forced scientists to confront a problematic situation. They recognized that there were five main human population groups, corresponding to the major geographical regions of the world: Africa, Europe, Asia, Melanania, and the Americas.¹²⁴ But they feared that the evidence of genetic difference, even though useful for medical purposes, might be used invidiously to damage one population or another. Nevertheless, the immediate benefits were such that many doctors began to practice racial profiling. They recognized that some diseases were much more common among some ethnic groups and that there were group differences in the way people responded to medical treatments.

Thus sickle cell anemia was more common in parts of Africa than in most other places. Hemochromatosis (an iron metabolism disorder) was especially prevalent among Swedes, and Tay-Sachs disease afflicted a disproportionate number of East European Jews. As knowledge of genetics increased, doctors also discovered that enalapril, a standard treatment for chronic heart failure, was less helpful to blacks than to whites; that blacks should be given lower doses of Prozac because they metabolized antidepressants more slowly than Caucasians and Asians; that whites responded better than blacks to the standard treatment for active hepatitis C; and that blacks and whites tended to respond differently to treatments for hypertension and high blood pressure.¹²⁵

Meanwhile, in 2004 the U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved the world's first "ethnic medication," a heart-failure drug for African Americans known as BiDil, and in 2005 Astra Zeneca began marketing a lung-cancer drug that had failed with Caucasians but seemed to work for Asians. Genaisance Pharmaceuticals, a biotechnology company, similarly developed a genetic test that enabled doctors to forego trial and error when deciding which asthma or cholesterol drug was best for a patient. Another company, DNA Print Genomics, developed a test that measured customers' racial ancestry and their ancestral proportions if they were of mixed race. This was relevant not only for medical reasons but also in determining eligibility for some government benefits and set-asides.¹²⁶

In addition, America's premier black university, Howard University, established a Human Genome Center to investigate the genetic and environmental contributions to the causes of complex diseases that afflicted African Americans disproportionately. African-American men were three times more likely than white men to die of prostate cancer and five times more likely than Asian men, researchers reported; and the codirector of the center, microbiologist Rick Kittles, thought this was due to both genetics and environment. Kittles also established a firm that gave African Americans the chance to trace their ancestral roots. Kittles's fellow researcher Mark Shriver reported that about 90 percent of those who identified themselves as African Americans were at least

half black genetically and, on average, about 83 percent of the genes found in African Americans were from Africa.¹²⁷

The new knowledge challenged the premises of those who had maintained either that race did not exist or was insignificant. Genetic research continued nevertheless, driven by a belief that lack of knowledge would harm sick people. As the research proceeded to deal with genes that might be involved in mental diseases that can be inherited, such as schizophrenia, autism, and Alzheimer's, scientists once again were plunged into the debate over human intelligence and its heritability. Thus one group of researchers, headed by Dr. Paul M. Thompson of UCLA, began with a type of brain scanning called magnetic resonance imaging, which showed the difference between gray and white matter in a living brain. Then they reported that there were "some brain areas in which there are very significant genetic influences on structure." Finally, they "gave their subjects intelligence tests and found that intelligence was significantly linked with the amount of gray matter in the subjects' frontal lobes."¹²⁸

Meanwhile, at the University of Chicago a professor of human genetics, Bruce Lahn, presented evidence to show that mutations that affected the brain had occurred in Asia and Europe but not in Africa. Dr. Lahn, an immigrant from China, did not understand political correctness and reportedly considered it "a triumphant moment" when he published two articles in the highly regarded journal, *Science*, maintaining that DNA changes had taken hold and spread widely in Europe and Asia but were not common in sub-Saharan Africa. One magazine described Lahn's research as "the moment the antiracists and egalitarians have dreaded," and the media department at the Chicago medical school feared that the work would be too controversial for the university. As one story in the *Wall Street Journal* noted, by 2006 scientists were accustomed to dealing with many physical differences, but they "tense up when it comes to doing the same sort of research on the brain."¹²⁹

At first Lahn stood by his research, saying, "society will have to grapple with some very difficult facts." But Lahn had second thoughts after he learned more about the extent to which his research had touched a raw nerve. The University of Chicago abandoned a patent application it had filed to develop a test that would draw on Lahn's work in developing a correlation between DNA and intelligence. And some of Lahn's coauthors were uncomfortable with the publicity their work was receiving. Lahn then turned to other projects, saying that he had second thoughts about "whether some knowledge might not be worth having."¹³⁰ This statement predictably led to much criticism on the World Wide Web. "Welcome to the new Dark Ages," one writer scoffed. Another wrote that Lahn had been made "to stand before the altar of equality and recant. The sun moves about the earth."¹³¹

The full extent of the nature and significance of racial differences is not yet a settled question. But there is little doubt about which way the wind is

blowing. Research in genetics has established that race is a reality. Police in Florida admitted as much when they identified “the man they sought in the murders of at least five women [as] 85 percent African and 15 percent Indian.” Authorities in Louisiana did the same when they concentrated their search for a serial killer on white men between the ages of 25 and 35.¹³² So did courts when they ruled that convictions must be overturned because DNA evidence established that the crimes had been committed by people who were not members of the convicts’ race.¹³³

The Pulitzer Prize-winning historian Carl N. Degler has written a perceptive account of the revived emphasis on DNA, race, and sex as explanations for differences in human behavior.¹³⁴ Summing up the thesis of the book in his review for the *New York Times*, Richard A. Schweder, a professor at the University of Chicago and president of the Society for Psychological Anthropology, put it this way: “Anyone who has lived long enough in the social sciences has seen the nature-nurture pendulum swing: from nature in the first decades of the century, to nurture in the 1930’s, 40’s, 50’s, and 60’s, to nature once again in the 70’s, 80’s and 90’s.”¹³⁵ In this instance, the movement may be more than just another swing of the pendulum. It seems, at least to this writer, that truth crushed to ground is rising once again.

Raymond Wolters is the Thomas Muncy Keith Professor of History at the University of Delaware.

ENDNOTES

1. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), 43.
2. *American Historical Review* 107 (December 2002): 1597-1598.
3. Volume 5 (Spring 2005): 8-12.
4. Alfred H. Kelly, “An Insider’s View of *Brown v. Board*,” paper delivered to the American Historical Association, December 28, 1961, reprinted at the request of J. Strom Thurmond in *Congressional Record*, 87th Congress, 2nd Session, September 11, 1962: 19023.
5. *Ibid.*, 19025.
6. Alfred H. Kelly, “Clio and the Court: An Illicit Love Affair,” *Supreme Court Review*, 1965, 144.
7. Alfred H. Kelly, “An Insider’s View of *Brown v. Board*,” 19024.
8. John Hope Franklin, “The Dilemma of the American Negro Scholar,” in Herbert Hill, ed., *Soon One Morning* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), 74, 73.
9. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice*, 1, 2.
10. *Ibid.*, 5 and *passim*.
11. *Ibid.*, 142.

12. See Bruno Bettelheim, "Discrimination and Science," *Commentary* 21 (April 1956): 384–386; Ernest van den Haag, "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases – A Reply to Professor Kenneth Clark," *Villanova Law Review* 6 (Fall 1960): 69–79; A. James Gregor, "The Law, Social Science, and School Segregation," *Western Reserve Law Review* 14. (1963): 621–636; Hadley Arkes, "The Problem of Kenneth Clark," *Commentary* 58 (November 1974): 37–46.
13. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice*, 135.
14. *Ibid.*, 5.
15. "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement," in Philip B. Kurland and Gerhard Casper, eds., *Landmark Briefs and Arguments of the Supreme Court* (Arlington, VA: University Publications of America, 1975), vol. 49, 43–66.
16. Marylee C. Taylor and Edward J. Walsh, "Explanations of Black Self-Esteem," *Social Psychology Quarterly* 42 (1979): 242.
17. Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1944).
18. Argument of John W. Davis, in Philip B. Kurland and Gerhard Casper, eds., *Landmark Briefs and Arguments of the Supreme Court of the United States*, vol. 49, 336; Ernest van den Haag, "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases," 69, 71, 77, 79.
19. Bruno Bettelheim, "Discrimination and Science," 384.
20. Ernest van den Haag, "Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases," 69, 71.
21. Edgar G. Epps, "The Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts, and Other Aspects of Personality," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 39 (Spring 1975): 307.
22. David Armor, *Forced Justice: School Segregation and the Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 99–101.
23. "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation," 4–5, 15–17.
24. Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1954).
25. *Ibid.*, 59.
26. John Ogbu and Signithia Fordham, "Black Students' School Success: Coping with the Burden of 'Acting White,'" *Urban Review* 18 (1986): 176–206.
27. Roland G. Fryer, "Acting White," *Education Next* (Winter 2005): 53–59.
28. Nancy St. John, *School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children* (New York: Wiley, 1975).
29. Thomas Sowell, "Supreme Farce," *Townhall.com*, 12 December 2006.
30. See Jonathan Kozol, *The Shame of the Nation* (New York: Crown Publishers), 2005; and Gary Orfield, *Schools More Separate* (Cambridge: Harvard Civil Rights Project, 2001). In 1992, when another case was pending before the federal courts, Orfield organized an updated social science statement for the NAACP: "School Desegregation: A Social Science Statement," in brief of the NAACP as amicus curiae in support of respondents, *Freeman v. Pitts*, 503 U.S. 467 (1992).
31. *New York Times*, March 2, 1981, B4.
32. *Ibid.*, May 16, 2004, 27.

33. Benjamin E. Mays, "Comment: Atlanta—Living with *Brown* Twenty Years Later," *Black Law Journal* 3 (1974): 190–192.
34. Thomas Sowell, "Black Excellence—The Case of Dunbar High School," *Public Interest* (Spring 1974): 13, 2–4, 5–6.
35. Derrick Bell, "Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation," *Yale Law Journal* 85 (March 1976): 479.
36. *Washington Post*, December 19, 1987, A25; September 16, 1985, A17.
37. *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 63USLW 4486 (1995), 4498–4500.
38. Glenn Loury, "Integration Has Had Its Day," *New York Times*, April 23, 1996, A23.
39. Beloine Whiting Young and Grace Billings Bress, "A New Educational Decision," *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1975): 516, 519.
40. Interview with Jea P. Street, March 7, 1982.
41. *Wilmington News Journal*, October 28, 2005, A2.
42. *New York Times*, June 22, 1975, 19.
43. Derrick Bell, *Silent Covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the Unfulfilled Hopes for Racial Reform* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 106, 113.
44. Derrick A. Bell, Jr., "A Reassessment of Racial Balance Remedies," *Phi Delta Kappan* (November 1980): 177.
45. Derrick A. Bell, Jr., "Learning from Our Losses," *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1983): 575.
46. Derrick Bell, "Serving Two Masters," 489, 491, 492, 507.
47. Ben J. Wattenberg, *The Real America* (New York: Doubleday, 1974), 252.
48. Derrick Bell, "Serving Two Masters," 489, 491, 492, 507.
49. *National Observer*, June 7, 1975.
50. *Ibid.*
51. James S. Coleman, "Recent Trends in School Integration," report to the American Educational Research Association, April 2, 1975.
52. This shift occurred in three cases: *Oklahoma City v. Dowell*, 111 S.Ct. 630 (1991); *Freeman v. Pitts*, 60 USLW 4286 (1992); and *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 63 USLW 4486 (1995).
53. *American Renaissance*, (March 2006): 7.
54. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Science for Segregation* (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 910.
55. Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 163.
56. Jenny Reardon, *Race to the Finish: Identity and Governance in an Age of Genomics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 28.
57. Paul R. Gross, "Race: No Such Thing," *The New Criterion* 22 (April 2004): 8690.
58. Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), 267.
59. Carleton Coon, *The Story of Man* (New York: Knopf, 1954), 188.
60. Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism*, 164.
61. *Ibid.*, 164–165.
62. *The Race Concept* (Paris: UNESCO, 1952), 13.
63. Jenny Reardon, *Race to the Finish*, 30.

64. *Science* 100 (October 20, 1944): 383–384.
65. Technically, Montagu was correct, since the “range” of intelligence differs from the “distribution.” The former term refers to individuals – where each race possesses a great range, from the retarded to the genius.
66. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 132–134.
67. *Ibid.*
68. Walter Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America’s Conscience* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).
69. Kenneth M. Stampf, *The Peculiar Institution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), vii.
70. *Stell v. Savannah-Chatham*, 229 F. Supp 667 (1963), 673; Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reality* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1967), 82–84; Wesley Critz George, *The Biology of the Race Problem* (New York: National Putnam Letters Committee, 1962).
71. Henry E. Garrett, “Negro-White Differences in Mental Ability in the United States,” *Scientific Monthly* 65 (October 1947): 333; Garrett, “Racial Mixing Could Be Catastrophic,” *U.S. News & World Report*, November 18, 1963, 93.
72. Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1961), 30–31; John P. Jackson, Jr., *Science for Segregation*, 97.
73. Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 40.
74. *Ibid.*, 41.
75. *Ibid.*, 7. In response to this argument from history, Theodosius Dobzhansky wrote; “Race bigots contend that the cultural achievements of different races being so obviously unlike, it follows that their genetic capacities for achievement must be just as different...The decisive point is, however, that nobody can discover the cultural capacities of human individuals, populations or races until they have been given something like an equality of opportunity to demonstrate these capacities.” *Mankind Evolving*, 299–300.
76. Dwight J. Ingle, “Comments on the Teachings of Carleton Putnam,” *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (1963): 40–41, 28–29.
77. James J. Kilpatrick, *The Southern Case for School Segregation* (New York: Crowell-Collier, 1962), 70–72.
78. Herbert Ravenal Sass, “Mixed Schools and Mixed Blood,” *Atlantic Monthly* 198 (November 1956): 45–49.
79. Carl N. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 79, 81–82; Franz Boas, “The Problem of the American Negro,” *Yale Review* 10 (1920–1921): 384–395.
80. James J. Kilpatrick, *The Southern Case for School Segregation*, 52, 72.
81. Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 18, 47.
82. *Ibid.*, 18.
83. Elsewhere I have written that “Putnam probably ‘exaggerate[d] the role of Boas in American anthropology,’ as Sherwood Washburn of Berkeley insisted in a personal letter. There was not enough evidence to prove that anthropologists had conspired to mislead the public about the scientific evidence regarding racial differences.” *The Occidental Quarterly* 5 (Summer 2005): 17.
84. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Science for Segregation*, 1.

85. *Ibid.*, 3.
86. *Ibid.*, 13; David Zarefsky, "Conspiracy Arguments in the Lincoln-Douglas Debates," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 21 (1984): 72, 73.
87. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Science for Segregation*, 10; J. Philippe Rushton, "Review Essay," *Society* 34 (March/April 1997): 82.
88. John P. Jackson, Jr., *Science for Segregation*, 10.
89. *New York Times*, March 28, 1995, B11.
90. *National Observer*, June 7, 1975.
91. *National Observer*, June 7, 1975.
92. James S. Coleman, "Recent Trends in School Integration."
93. *New York Times*, December 12, 1975, 31.
94. In the 1950s, when the *Brown* litigation was before the Supreme Court, Lee had worked with Kenneth Clark in preparing the NAACP's social science statement.
95. James S. Coleman to American Sociological Association, *ASA Footnotes*, November 1976, 4; and January 1989, 4-5.
96. *ASA Footnotes*, January 1989, 4-5; James S. Coleman, "Sins of Sensitivity," *National Review* 43 (18 March 1991): 28-32.
97. David J. Armor, "The Evidence on Busing," *The Public Interest* (1972): 90-126.
98. David J. Armor, "Reflections of an Expert Witness," in Stephen J. Caldas and Carl L. Bangston III, eds., *The End of Desegregation?* (New York: Nova Science Publishing, 2003), 4-5.
99. *Washington Post*, June 11, 1972, A1.
100. *Ibid.*
101. Mark Snyderman and Stanley Rothman, *The IQ Controversy* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1988), 128 and *passim*; Morton Hunt, *The New Know Nothings* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1999), 66.
102. Morton Hunt, *The New Know Nothings*, 77, 65-81.
103. *Ibid.*, 88, 81-93.
104. David J. Rothman and Sheila M. Rothman, "Race without Racism?" *New Republic*, November 14, 2005, 27; Jenny Reardon, *Race to the Finish*, 2.
105. Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate, *The Shadow University* (New York: The Free Press, 1998), 137.
106. See Thomas J. Bouchard, et al., "Sources of Human Differences: The Minnesota Twins Study of Twins Reared Apart," *Science* 250 (1990): 223-228.
107. Sandra Scarr and Richard A. Weinberg, "IQ Test Performance of Black Children Adopted by White Families," *American Psychologist* 31 (1976): 726-739; Morton Hunt, *The New Know Nothings*, 51-52.
108. Morton Hunt, *The New Know Nothings*, 50.
109. Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate, *The Shadow University*, 136.
110. *Ibid.*; Linda Gottfredson, "The Science and Politics of Race Norming," *American Psychologist* (November 1994): 955ff.
111. Alan Charles Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate, *The Shadow University*, 137-144.
112. *Ibid.*, 141-145.
113. Edith Hakola, "In Memoriam Harry F. Weyher," VDARE.com, April 4, 2002.
114. Morton Hunt, *The New Know Nothings*, 78.

115. *Ibid.*, 42.
116. *Los Angeles Times*, February 20, 1995, A1.
117. Henry E. Garrett, reply to Juan Comas, *Current Anthropology* 2 (October 1961): 320.
118. Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 50.
119. Nicholas Wade, *Life Script: How the Human Genome Discoveries Will Transform Medicine and Enhance Your Health* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001), 14–15.
120. Nicholas Wade, “For Genome Mappers, the Tricky Terrain of Race Requires Some Careful Navigating,” *New York Times*, July 20, 2001, A17; Wade, “Gene Study Identifies 5 Main Human Populations, Linking them to Geography,” *New York Times*, December 20, 2002, A37; Wade, “The Palette of Humankind,” *New York Times*, December 24, 2002, F3.
121. *Toronto Globe and Mail*, June 18, 2005, F1.
122. Steve Sailer, “It’s All Relative: Putting Race in Its Proper Perspective,” VDARE.com, August 2, 2002.
123. Kevin Lamb, “The Reality of Race,” in Samuel Francis, ed., *Race and the American Prospect* (Mt. Airy, MD: The Occidental Press, 2006), 43.
124. *New York Times*, December 20, 2002, A37.
125. *Ibid.*; Sally L. Satel, “I Am a Racially Profiling Doctor,” *New York Times*, May 5, 2002, E56.
126. *Toronto Globe and Mail*, June 18, 2005, F1; *New York Times*, July 13, 2001, A14; October 1, 2002, F4.
127. Steve Sailer, “African Ancestry Inc. Traces DNA Roots,” UPI, April 28, 2003. .
128. *New York Times*, November 5, 2001, A15.
129. *Wall Street Journal*, June 16, 2006, 1.
130. *Ibid.*
131. See AmRen.com for these comments and an additional 46 pages of related remarks.
132. Kevin Lamb, “The Reality of Race,” 48, 45.
133. William Saleton, “The Race Gene,” *Slate Magazine*, December 12, 2005.
134. Carl N. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature*.
135. *New York Times*, March 17, 1991, BR1.