

dent Nixon states that our policy is simply to assure free choice; he seems to say that any government in any country is all right, so long as that government obtains power by more or less legitimate means. There is not much difference between these statements of policy, at least not much difference that can readily be seen.

The problem is that in fact our goal in Southeast Asia is not clear. Are we out to defeat aggression, or are we not? And why is Southeast Asia of concern to us? If Vietnam is vital, then why is not Cambodia equally vital to our interests? If our military commitment is lesser today than it was yesterday, why is it that our Air Force has greater combat assignments now than it did a month or so ago?

Americans are not ashamed to commit themselves to the cause of freedom, or to the defense of another land; history shows that indeed we welcome such a challenge, when it becomes necessary. There can be no question of the determination and courage of our people, if they are given a cause that they can truly believe in. But as a free people, Americans demand, and have a right to know, what objective it is that they fight for, and why.

Answers are required, answers that have not been given either by Congress or by the President.

These are matters that cannot be settled in the easy exchange of simple slogans, or in partisan charge and countercharge. The election of 1968 is past, and it is time that the politicians of that contest cease politicking and assume statesmanship. The decisions that must be taken now and the policies that must be explained cannot be taken, cannot be explained, in so simple a fashion as partisan politics.

We are told often enough by the President that we have three options. But there are always three options, no matter what the situation may be: do nothing, do a little, do a lot. The issue is not over what the tactics—what the options are—but why it is that the question concerns us at all.

If we had three options in Vietnam in 1965, we also had three options in 1968 and in 1970. It is not enough to say that 17 months ago one thing was done, and now we are doing another. What must be said is why.

That is not so simple, but that is what must be explained. I think that our people understand the options of life well enough, but that they—all of us—are simply puzzled about the larger issue—what, after all, is our goal? Not how do we get there, but where is it?

The fact is that Congress has never answered the question of what our goal is, and has never itself made a commitment to the war in Southeast Asia, beyond a resolution that the Senate now rebuffs, with blessings from the White House itself.

And that has led to the fundamental cause of our national malaise: the use of conscripts in a protracted, and according to the President, indecisive war.

The draft demands that a man go and fight wherever required, war or no. But this is not what can be demanded of a

man who calls himself free. A free man is not one who can be conscripted to go into combat where his elected representatives have not declared war to exist, as is required in the Constitution.

Congress once placed rigid restraints on the use of draftees. Right up until the very beginning of World War II, no conscript could be sent out of the Western Hemisphere unless Congress authorized it. But the present draft permits the President to use any number of conscripts in any place, regardless of whether Congress has declared war to exist or not.

And so we now force men into combat without so much as bothering to say answer those hard questions: what are our goals, and what are our national objectives?

It is little wonder that thousands resist the draft.

I have for several years sponsored a bill that would prohibit the use of draftees in a combat zone without a declaration of war.

Some of my friends think this to be a radical bill, and others think of it as less than serious. But in fact it is only an extension of a protection that Congress itself demanded 30 years ago.

What Congress has lost is the power to commit our country to war.

Until and unless Congress regains that power, Presidential wars will take place, and the country will again and again be plunged into crises such as we see today.

Congress does not have any authority to determine the conduct of a war, but it does have the authority and the responsibility to determine whether war is justified, and whether a commitment of this Nation to war is necessary, and to what end.

I do not ask that Congress be given the power to control the movement of forces in the field; that is for generals. But what I do ask is that we regain the power to determine whether free men are to be committed to war.

This is not radical; this is not interference with the President; it is simply the recognition of plain constitutional duty, and the exercise of freedom as it was intended to be exercised.

For if Congress forbade the use of conscripts in undeclared wars, we could be assured that protected wars would be avoided, at least until and unless the Congress determined that such wars are necessary, and this would require that we answer those questions that we have so long avoided in Southeast Asia: What are our goals, what are our interests?

Some historians have said in assessing the Korean war that the tragedy was that the American people would permit the use of draftees in a protected and indecisive Asian conflict. These observers believed that the only solution—since there would be future wars in Asia—as indeed Vietnam proved there would be—what had to be done was to provide for a professional army that would be like the Roman legions of old, fighting anywhere to protect the Empire.

But this begged the question. The fact is that in Southeast Asia, France used only professional soldiers and let an ally—the United States—pay a good part

of the bill. But those legions—with a long and proud history—could not win in Indochina. The reason was not military but political. The people of France had no clear idea of why they were being taxed to fight a long and bloody war in Indochina.

And so France was defeated.

The equation has not changed in all the intervening years. The military facts are the same. The U.S. forces in Vietnam cannot be defeated militarily. But this is a political war, and it is begging the question to say that we cannot be defeated militarily—we know that—and it is begging the question to say that all draftees will be out of combat by September. It is useless to talk of weapons seized, rice burned, and men killed, as long as the political questions remain unanswered, and those answers can be neither simple nor painless.

Cambodia is over, but it remains an open question, for the United States has assumed yet another commitment.

The future remains a puzzle, and it will until we know clearly what it is we are trying to achieve in Southeast Asia, and why.

This is what Congress must address itself to. This is what the President must address himself to. It is a matter demanding leadership. It is a matter demanding honesty and courage, not shallow political maneuverings, not debating around moot points. The fact is, painful as it may be, that the answers to the Vietnam riddle will be difficult, and that our painful sacrifice will not easily be ended. I do not think that Americans will shrink from the truth; all they ask is that it be stated. If we do not have the courage to face the questions, then we have no right to be dismayed over division and confusion in the country today.

Let us get on with our task.

INTEGRATION MAY HARM BLACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, vast sums of taxpayers' money have been and continue to be expended to attain theoretical egalitarian goals through forced integration. Since forced integration is unnatural and the antithesis of liberty, it has created great hostility among all the people and has in reality accomplished nothing. Race relations today are far worse than before 1954 and there has been no evidence of any improvement as the result of appropriations of larger sums of money or passage of additional social force laws.

There is no evidence whatever, that compulsory integration in education has accomplished more academic progress than free choice would have achieved. In fact, the opposite has been proven.

Hearings have been conducted before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee concerning integration in education. Two of our country's leading scientific authorities on genetics and behavior have appeared and testified. I feel that the testimony of each of these men is so crucial to full understanding of the edu-

national problems we face, that include the statements of Dr. Ernest Van Den Haag and Dr. Arthur R. Jensen following my remarks for the information of the Members:

STATEMENT OF DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Ernest van den Haag. I am a Professor of Social Philosophy at New York University, a lecturer at the New School for Social Research in psychology and sociology, and a psychoanalyst in private practice. I received an M.A. degree from University of Iowa, and a Ph. D. degree from New York University. I also have studied in Europe, at the Sorbonne (the University of Paris), the University of Florence, and the University of Naples. I have lectured at Harvard and Yale Universities. I am a member of the Society of Applied Psychoanalysis, Fellow American Sociological Association, Royal Economic Society and New York Academy of Sciences; I am a Guggenheim Fellow (1967).

I am the author of *Education as an Industry* and the coauthor of *The Fabric of Society*. I have published nearly 70 scientific articles in my fields, appearing in professional journals and encyclopedias as well as chapters in books, e.g., "Psychoanalysis and Discontents," appearing in *Psychoanalysis, Scientific Method and Philosophy*, and "Genuine and Spurious Integration," appearing in *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*. I have delivered the Freud Memorial Lecture to the Philadelphia Psycho-analytic Association ("Psychoanalysis and Utopia").

My work mostly concerns study of the relationship of groups. Research in the field of social dynamics analyzes the causes of the formation of groups (including classroom groups or student groups) and how group members relate to others. Such studies are directly applicable to predict the educational result of compulsory congregation in schools.

On the basis of those studies, I appear today to question the validity of the purpose which the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, H.R. 17846, is intended to serve. Essentially the bill seeks to end what is called racial isolation—defined as more than 50% minority attendance in a single classroom. It is the purpose of the bill as expressed in Section 2 to improve the quality of education in the United States by increasing the degree of compulsory classroom integration between the races. But it is simply assumed, without actual evidence, that integration will be educationally and psychologically beneficial.

This legislation before the Committee assumes fundamentally that academically and socially effective classroom groups can be formed by putting black and white students together in larger numbers in a single classroom regardless of their wishes and that this will improve their education and decrease the differences as well as hostilities which now exist between them. Yet such an enforced congregation of two identifiable racial groups, one deprived in relation to the other, does not diminish, but rather increases the divisive forces which now exist between these students and the consequent increase in classroom tension leads to a substantial decrease in the educational accomplishment of both groups and multiplies the disciplinary problems which detract from the essential student attention required for effective study.

If such integration is compelled, as this bill proposes to do, it will injure rather than assist the future educational accomplishment of the nation's schools.

The blacks who will feel humiliated by their low performance relative to white children—be it owed to genetic, economic,

subcultural or family conditions—are likely to react with redoubled hostility to white pupils, teachers and institutions—to schooling as a whole. It will be labeled "irrelevant."

II. GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY

(1) Every individual needs to identify with a particular group. Such an identification is essential for the development of personality. This is clearly expressed by Dr. Glatster A. Elmer (Michigan State College) in "Identification as a Social Concept" (*Sociology and Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2 (1954), pp. 103-109).

"The social psychologists, however, . . . should start first by relating the individual to his reference and membership groups and then proceed to the finer details of personality problems. . . . In the binding in-group formation, the real identification of individual members are anchored in the group. A sense of solidarity is generated in them as a natural process which manifests itself in actual behavior. In other words, as a group is formed, or as individuals become members of the group, the social process of integration is taking place. Besides the individual members of the group, the integration binds the social values and goals, the psychic characteristics, and the in-group symbols with which the individual members become identified. The social identification which evolves thus constitutes the basis of the group solidarity from which results observable, measurable behavior.

"There must be a personal consciousness of 'belonging' or 'being a part' which is reflected in the opinions and behavior of the persons concerned. Group membership identification implies not an individual's reaction toward a group, but his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

(2) Men react selectively to their fellow men. This preferential association is based upon observable differences, among them overt physical differences and similarities, which form the focal point for group orientation and group identification. Professor George A. Lundberg (University of Washington; past president of the American Sociological Association) writes in "Some Neglected Aspects of the 'Minorities' Problem" (*Modern Age*, Summer, 1958, pp. 285-297):

"In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based on some observable differences between those whose association we seek and those whose association we avoid. The differences which are the basis of selective association are of an indefinitely large variety, of all degrees of visibility and subtlety, and vastly different in social consequences. Sex, age, marital condition, religion, socioeconomic status, color, size, shape, health, morals, birth, breeding, and B.O.—the list of differences is endless and varied, but all the items have this in common: (1) they are observable; and (2) they are significant differences to those who react selectively to people with the characteristics in question. It is, therefore, wholly absurd to try to ignore, deny or talk out of existence these differences just because we do not approve of some of their social results . . ."

Professor Lundberg with an associate also studied high school students in Seattle, Washington, to find out the determinants of their preferential associations in leadership, work, dating, and friendship. Lundberg reported in "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population" (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1952)). He found:

" . . . every ethnic group showed a preference for its own members in each of the four relationships covered by the question. . . . ethnocentrism or prejudice is not con-

fining to the majority of the dominant group . . .

" . . . A certain amount of ethnocentrism is a normal and necessary ingredient of all group life, i.e., it is the basic characteristic that differentiates one group from another and thus is fundamental to social structure. Ethnocentrism ('discrimination,' 'prejudice') is, therefore, not in itself necessarily to be regarded as a problem. It is rather a question of determining *what degree* of it (a) is functional for social survival and satisfaction under given conditions, or at least (b) is not regarded by a society as a problem in the sense of requiring community action. The amount of discrimination that has been shown to exist in the present study, for example, is not incompatible with the peaceful and efficient functioning of the institution in question . . ."

There are a substantial number of studies reported in social science literature which indicate that the attitudes reported in Lundberg's study of Seattle, Washington, are not confined to that particular city. Indeed, social scientists find in all areas where groups of diverse origin and appearance come into contact, some degree of race preference and selective association is manifested by the various groups.

(3) At one time it was assumed that certain areas of the world were free from race prejudice. Hawaii and Brazil were often cited as examples of interracial "alohas" where all race prejudice had disappeared. More careful students of these areas have found that despite a superficial interracial harmony, racial preferences and prejudices are manifested in both these areas. In "Racial Attitudes in Brazil" (*American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949), pp. 402-408), Dr. Emilio Willems described color prejudice in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil, as manifested in a series of interviews carried out among middle and upper-class whites. Dr. Willems found:

"Of the 245 advertisers, 194 were interviewed about the reasons for their unfavorable attitude toward Negro servants. In this interview, 48 were unable to give any clear answer, but they found their own attitude 'very natural.' 18 advertisers did not accept Negro servants because of presumed lack of cleanliness; 30 thought black housemaids were always thieves; 14 alleged instability and lack of assiduity; and 12 said only that they were used to white servants and therefore did not wish to engage colored ones. Seven persons precluded Negroes because of the contact they would have with their young children. There were a few other reasons, such as 'race odor,' 'bad character,' 'laziness,' 'carelessness,' and other imperfections that were ascribed to Negro servants.

"There are many situations in social life where white people refuse to be seen with Negroes. In such public places as high-class hotels, restaurants, or casinos, fashionable clubs and dances, Negroes are not desired, and there are few whites who dare to introduce Negro friends or relatives into such places. This discrimination was strongly resented by middle-class Negroes. On the other hand, those Negroes complained bitterly of the contemptuous attitudes that middle-class mulattoes assumed toward them.

"Yet our inquiry led to some other interesting results. In 23 out of 36 cases the questionnaires contained references to formal associations of all kinds from which Negroes were excluded. Usually these associations are clubs maintained by the upper-class families of the city. Though there does not exist any reference to Negro members in club statutes, these are rarely admitted . . ."

In "Stereotypes, Norms and Interracial Behavior in Sao Paulo, Brazil" (*American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6 (1957)), Professors Roger Bastide and Pierre van den Bergh found on the basis of a questionnaire given to 580 white students from five

different Teachers' colleges in Sao Paulo, Brazil, that:

"Stereotypes against Negroes and mulattoes are widespread. Seventy-five per cent of the sample accept twenty-three or more stereotypes against Negroes. No one rejects all stereotypes against Negroes. . . . Mulattoes are judged inferior or superior to whites on the same traits as Negroes but somewhat lower percentages. The most widely accepted stereotypes are lack of hygiene (accepted by 91 per cent), physical unattractiveness (87 per cent), superstition (80 per cent), lack of financial foresight (77 per cent), lack of a morality (76 per cent), aggressiveness (73 per cent), laziness (72 per cent), lack of persistence at work (62 per cent), sexual 'perversity' (57 per cent), and exhibitionism (50 per cent)."

(4) Strong patterns of racial preference emerge in pre-school children—even as early as 2½ years of age. In "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes" (*The American Anthropologist*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (1946)), Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman investigated the age at which racial attitudes become manifest. Fifteen Negro and twelve white children, ranging in age at the beginning of the study from 2-9 to 4-4 and who attended a bi-racial nursery school were studied. Dr. Goodman noted that "awareness of one's racial identity may be regarded as one facet of that consciousness of self which is gradually achieved during the first three or four years of life," and "preliminary analysis leads to the belief that these children of approximately 3 to 4½ years were in the process of becoming aware of race differences."

The early genesis of racial attitudes has been confirmed in other studies in "well-integrated" areas where there is an absence of overt racial hostility and legal racial segregation. Drs. Catherine Landreth and Barbara C. Johnson conducted such a study in the child care centers of Berkeley, Oakland, and San Francisco, California, and reported in "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color" (*Child Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1, (1953)). They concluded that "patterns of response to persons of different skin color are present as early as three years and become accentuated during the succeeding two years."

Drs. Marlon Radke, Gene Sutherland and Pearl Rosenberg studied the racial attitudes of children in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (*Sociometry*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1953).

They found "the white children in all the situations and at all ages (seven to thirteen years) expressed strong preference for their own racial group. This is particularly the case when their choices between Negro and white children as friends are on an abstract or wish level."

(5) Some sociologists contend that Negroes would suffer far more from racial integration than from racial segregation. Thus Professor Ichhelsler* notes that ". . . if the Negroes would refuse to identify themselves consciously with the Negroes as a subgroup, then they would develop a kind of collective neurosis, as do other minorities, too; for the conscious 'we' would in case of such an attitude be persistently in conflict with the unconscious 'we,' and this inner split would inevitably reflect itself in different pathological distortions of the Negro personality."

For contrast, Allison Davis (*Racial Status and Personality Development, The Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 57, Oct. 1943) noted ". . . where the social group of the racially subordinate individual is highly organized and integrated, as in the Little Italies or Chinatowns, or in many Southern Negro com-

munities, its members will usually have relatively less psychological conflict over their racial status." Similarly, Mozelle Hill ("A Comparative Study of Race Attitudes in the All-Negro Community in Oklahoma," *Phylon*, 1946) noted that Negroes raised and educated in an all-Negro community tend to have "a much higher regard for Negroes," and are more favorable in their expression toward their own race.

III. "PSYCHOLOGICAL INJURY" ARGUMENT IN SUPREME COURT

As one of the main grounds for decision in the 1954 school desegregation case (*Brown v. Board of Education*), the Supreme Court of the United States asserted that (347 U.S. 483, 494):

"To separate [children in grade and high schools] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system."

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority." (emphasis added).

In footnote 11 of *Brown v. Board of Education*, *supra*, the Supreme Court quoted a number of social science materials alleged to demonstrate the psychological injury basic to its reversal of *Plessy vs. Ferguson*. Similar materials were quoted in an appendix to Appellant's Brief signed by a number of prominent social scientists.

Professor Kenneth B. Clark has testified in three of the actions that led to the *Brown* decision. His testimony is part of the record in *Brown* and also contributed importantly to the assertions of the social scientists in the appendix to Appellant's Brief and to those mentioned in footnote 11 of *Brown*. Clark maintained that he as well as others have shown the existence of psychological injury owing to segregation.

In the South Carolina case *Briggs vs. Elliot* (Professor Clark employed the same method and reached the same conclusions in the Delaware and Virginia cases which are also part of the *Brown* record). Professor Clark explained that he had shown Negro and white dolls (or drawings thereof) to Negro children in a segregated public school and, having ascertained that they distinguished white from Negro people, asked them, in effect, which doll they preferred, and which one "looks like you." Ten (later in the testimony, nine) out of sixteen Negro children picked the white doll as the one that "looked like you." Professor Clark concluded that "these children . . . have been definitely harmed in the development of their personalities." He knew, of course, that the question before the court was whether school segregation had harmed the children and testified: "My opinion is that a fundamental effect of segregation is basic confusion in the individuals and their concepts about themselves conflicting in their self images. That seemed to be supported by the results of these sixteen children. . . ." The syntax is

obscure, but the sense is not. Professor Clark testified (1) that segregation caused the harm he found (or at least played a "fundamental role"); (2) later on that this is "consistent with previous results which we have obtained in testing over 300 children"; (3) finally, "and this result was confirmed in Clarendon County." Elsewhere Professor Clark asseverates: "Proof that state imposed segregation inflicts injuries upon the Negro had to come from the social psychologists. . . ."

Professor Clark mentioned to the court that he had made previous experiments "consistent" with those he entered into the record. However, these previous experiments were not themselves ever entered into the record—for good reason as will be seen.

They had been published, however.² 134 Negro children in segregated schools in Arkansas and 119 Negro children in unsegregated nursery and public schools in Springfield, Massachusetts, about evenly divided by sex, were tested.³

Black and white dolls were presented, and the children were asked to indicate the "nice" and the "bad" one, as well as the one "that looks like you." Professor Clark concluded that ". . . the children in the northern mixed-school situation do not differ from children in the southern segregated schools in either their knowledge of racial differences or their racial identification,"⁴ except that ". . . the southern children in segregated schools are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll, compared to the northern [unsegregated] children's definite preference for this doll. Although still in a minority, a higher percentage of southern children, compared to northern, prefer to play with the colored doll or think that it is a 'nice' doll."⁵ The tables presented by Professor Clark bear out as much. Table 4,⁶ moreover, shows that a significantly higher percentage of Negro children when asked "give me the doll that looks like you" gave the white doll in the nonsegregated schools—39 percent as opposed to 29 percent in the segregated schools.

Thus, Professor Clark misled the courts. His "previous results" are not "consistent" with those entered in the court record, though he assured the court that they are. Actually, his "previous results" clearly contradict those submitted in his sworn testimony. Compared, the response of Negro children in segregated and in non-segregated schools show that Negro children in segregated schools "are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll" and more often think of the colored dolls as "nice" or identify with them—whereas if segregation were harmful and the harm were shown by his tests, as Professor Clark asserts, the Negro children in the more segregated schools would

¹ Clark, "Desegregation, an Appraisal of the Evidence," *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 4, p. 3 (1953).

² Clark "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," Readings in Social Psychology (Newcomb & Hartley eds., 1947).

³ The children ranged from 3 to 7 years of age; those tested in Clarendon County were between 6 to 9 years old. Professor Clark does not seem to think that the difference in average age affects the results, and I have no reason for disagreeing. But, both in view of the difference in average age, and the small size of the Clarendon group, I follow Professor Clark in comparing the two groups described in his previous tests with each other, rather than with the Clarendon group. However, since it is possible after all that the effects of segregation vary with age, and particularly with length of schooling, competent studies should take this into account.

⁴ *Op. Cit. supra*, note 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

* Ichhelsler, "Socio-psychological and Cultural Factors in Race Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949).

have been more pronounced in their preference for the white doll. If Professor Clark's tests do demonstrate any psychological injury in connection with segregation, they demonstrate that there is more injury to unsegregated Negro children and less to segregated Negro children. Yet Professor Clark told the court that his tests had shown that "segregation inflicts injuries upon the Negro." He did so by presenting only the tests with the segregated Negro children and ignoring the tests he had himself undertaken previously in desegregated and segregated schools with a far greater number of children.

IV. OBJECTIONS TO PROFESSOR CLARK'S EXPERIMENT

So far I have proceeded on the assumption that Clark's general method is capable of showing something about segregation. This is doubtful.

Whatever Professor Clark demonstrated about the personality of segregated Negro children could be due to general prejudice in the community rather than to segregation, or even to circumstances not affecting Negroes specifically. Professor Clark is confusing on the sources of damage, though insisting that segregation is "fundamental." Tests on white children, or on Jewish and Christian children, were not presented. Such tests would be needed to indicate whether the damage was general (there may be a general confusion of self-images in our culture, a "crisis of identity"); or restricted to minorities; or restricted to Negro children. (That whatever damage can be demonstrated by his methods is not restricted to segregated Negro children Professor Clark proved, if he proved anything; indeed although he misled the court on this matter, Professor Clark's tests show that segregation decreases and congregation, even when not compulsory, increases the damage to Negro children.)

However, no proof whatever was presented to indicate that preference for, or identification with, a doll different in color from one-self indicates personality disturbance. I wrote on this point:

"Suppose dark-haired white children were to identify blonde dolls as nice; or suppose, having the choice, they identified teddy bears as nice rather than any dolls. Would this prove injury owing to (nonexistent) segregation from blondes? Or communal prejudice against humans? Professor Clark's logic suggests that it would.

"Control tests—which unfortunately were not presented—might have established an alternative explanation for the identification of white with nice, and black with bad: in our own culture and in many others, including cultures where white people are unknown, black has traditionally been the color of evil, death, sorrow, and fear. People are called blackguards or blackhearted when considered evil; and children fear darkness. In these same cultures, white is the color of happiness, joy, and innocence. We need not speculate on why this is so to assert that it is a fact and that it seems utterly unlikely

that it originated with segregation (though it may have contributed to it). Professor Clark's findings then can be explained without any reference to injury by segregation or by prejudice. The 'scientific' evidence for this injury is no more 'scientific' than the evidence presented in favor of racial prejudice."

I can only list some of the many other objections that could be raised against the Clark experiment. (1) The subjects were neither randomized nor stratified properly by age, sex, economic, religious, residential and other criteria; (2) No controls with white children in segregated and unsegregated environments; (3) No controls with Negro children in Negro cultures (e.g. Africa) which might have had the same results, thus showing that it does not depend on prejudice, let alone segregation; (4) No controls with objects other than white and black dolls; (5) No evidence presented that doll tests show any correlation with personality disturbance; (6) No evidence about the type of alleged disturbance and what it means psychiatrically.

Professor Clark has published a book since his testimony, relied on by the Supreme Court: *Prejudice and Your Child*. On page 45 ff. the following is stated with reference to the more frequent self-identification of Negro children in mixed schools with white dolls:

"On the surface, these findings might suggest that northern Negro children suffer more personality damage from racial prejudice and discrimination than southern Negro children. However, this interpretation would seem to be not only superficial but incorrect. The apparent emotional stability of the southern Negro child may be indicative only of the fact that through rigid racial segregation and isolation he has accepted as normal the fact of his inferior social status. Such an acceptance is not symptomatic of a healthy personality. The emotional turmoil revealed by some of the northern children may be interpreted as an attempt on their part to assert some positive aspect of the self."

Here Professor Clark starts by speaking of "personality damage" and ends by speaking of "emotional turmoil." Clark notwithstanding, it seems more likely that "rigid racial segregation and isolation" would make the segregated least aware of their status in the eyes of the group from which they are "isolated" and most likely to identify with each other.⁸ Further, "acceptance" of an "inferior social status" by any group may be morally or politically disturbing, but there is no reason to consider it *per se* a symptom of either "healthy personality" or sickness. Not all members of castes below brahmins in India are sick, nor even all "untouchables." Clark here confuses his moral views with clinical evidence. There is no evidence to show that acceptance of inferior, superior or equal status is a symptom of emotional disturbance.

In his testimony, Professor Clark asserted categorically that when Negro children iden-

tify with, and prefer, white to colored dolls it means that personality damage, owing to segregation has occurred. Now that his previous experiments, not entered into the court records, have been brought to public attention, Professor Clark would have to conclude that segregation decreases, and congregation increases, the personality damage that is detected by the doll tests. For the tests not entered into the court record detect such personality damage more often where there is congregation than where there is segregation.

To avoid this embarrassing result Professor Clark now explains that if segregated Negro children prefer white dolls it indeed shows personality damage suffered because of segregation. And if nonsegregated children prefer white dolls even more frequently it does not show that they suffer more "personality damage." This would be "superficial" and "incorrect." The fact that segregated children prefer the white dolls less often than nonsegregated ones now shows that they have suffered even deeper personality damage. The fact that congregated children prefer the white doll more often suddenly becomes an indication of comparative health.

Which is to say that whatever the outcome of the experiment, it shows that there is personality damage to segregation. When Negro children identify more often with the white doll (North) it is bad and shows psychological injury. When they identify less often (segregated South) it is even worse. But wasn't the self-identification of Negro children with the white doll supposed to be the very evidence of their confusion and psychological injury? Yes, Clark writes now, except when the identification occurring less frequently among segregated Negro children would indicate that segregation makes for mental health. This would be inconvenient. Wherefore when this is the case less frequent identification with the white doll suddenly indicates more psychological damage.

Just what choice of dolls would have shown that segregation does not harm the children? None of those available. Whichever doll the children choose would, according to Clark's new interpretation, show that segregation is harmful. What can an experiment which supports the same conclusion, regardless of its outcome, possibly show? Only the experimenter's prejudices and his failure to grasp the purpose and nature of experimental methods of research. Clearly, Professor Clark's conclusions do not depend on any of his experiments. For these are inconsistent with his conclusions, if they are meaningful at all. None of the material which the Supreme Court accepted as probative of injury through segregation is any more cogent. No injury by segregation *per se* has been proved by any scientific test.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary groups to which an individual belongs are his family and his peer group. The latter is the group with which the individual identifies himself on the basis of a feeling of community, observable physical characteristics, and commonly shared emotion. Later the individual will also become

⁸Ross and van den Haag, *The Fabric of Society* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1957), pp. 165-66.

⁸Certainly the theory of reference groups would lead us to believe so. See Robert K. Merton, *Social Structure and Social Theory*, p. 225 ff.

a member of such groups as are based on material matters such as membership in a profession or persons of a given income level.

Such group membership is a main factor constituting the individual's identity or personality. It is essential to the normal individual to have a firm feeling of belonging to a group. Failure to identify with a group prevents the individual from functioning normally. An individual identifies with persons in his own environment whom he takes as models accepting some characteristics, developing others of the individual's own, and in this way building up the essential personality of the individual.

Without such a sense of identity, the mental health of the individual will be seriously impaired. Unrealistic identification is a form of insanity. An identity once acquired cannot be lost.

Groups are formed from individuals having common self-identification. In the small child the factors involved will be almost exclusively visual, such as skin color; but as the child grows, other factors of intelligence and achievement will play a part, as in joining a football team. In different aspects of activity, the individual belongs not to one, but to a series of groups.

Group identification must be voluntary. Involuntary placement in a group with which the individual does not identify creates hostility. The group approval or disapproval is extremely important to identity, and the disapproval destroys the individual's image of himself.

Where ethnic identity is clearly visible, it becomes a matter of considerable importance in group relations. The variation in attitude created by differences in skin color exists in all countries.

Group members tend to adhere to group norms, which, if they are within the potential of the individual, is of advantage. On the other hand, if the norm of the group exceeds the maximum potential of the individual, then this gives rise to feelings of humiliation, incapacity, and inadequacy which impair his motivation.

Contrary to the "psychological evidence" which apparently was accorded great weight by the Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education*, scientific tests have not proved any injury by segregation *per se*. In fact, some sociologists contend that Negroes would suffer far more from racial integration than from segregation.

Under a freedom of choice system for school attendance, as the individual increases in age, his willingness and ability successfully to associate himself with other groups would increase, provided there was a generally favorable atmosphere and favorable attitude on the part of the superintendent, principals, and teachers, as well as parents. Voluntary mingling would have beneficial effects on personality and education. Immediate, total, enforced integration would lead to even greater demoralization of Negro pupils than is already taking place, and would also lead to lower educational achievement.

Whatever one may think of the more radical Negro organizations, they have captured the emotions and the imagination

of a large part of our black population. They have been, particularly with the young people, far more successful in that aspect than the old style organizations. High school and college students, if they do not join, do certainly admire and support organizations such as the Black Panthers and the Nation of Islam. They look up to such figures as Rap Brown, Stokeley Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, Malcolm X, et al. The organizations differ among themselves in their methods and to the extent one can discern them, in their purposes. But they have one thing in common. They try (and largely succeed) to produce a prideful racial identity. They make their followers accept that "black is beautiful" and they attract support because they are creating a black identity, and pride in it.

They do this largely by declaring their independence of and, in some cases, even hostility to whites. But the hostility here is largely a gesture necessary to support the independence and the pride.

I am not concerned with the justification of such movements. But they clearly indicate a psychological need. By gratifying this need, these organizations have succeeded to an astonishing extent in rehabilitating members who previously suffered from major symptoms of personality disorganization, such as drug addiction, criminal behavior, general irresponsibility, etc. This is not just to say the Panthers do not allow members to take drugs. It is that they make the drugs unnecessary; they offer their members a self-image of adequacy that makes the resort to drugs unnecessary. The basic ingredient in that self-image is the identification with an image of historical, racial and cultural adequacy, if not superiority.

I submit that this is what the black minority needs more than anything else. It is in this respect that its problem has differed from that of other minorities—Irish, Italian, Jewish—and it is this ingredient that a wise and just process of education should help provide. Integration, desirable as it may be in the end, is possible only if the elements to be integrated each feel a sense of identity and a pride in that identity rather than a feeling of inadequacy. For feelings of inadequacy produce hostility to those who make one feel inadequate.

Black students know this. Their behavior itself is evidence for the need it tries to fulfill. If one looks at recent happenings in our colleges, one finds that there has been a great increase in black enrollment in previously largely white schools. That increase, fostered by the colleges with the idea of giving blacks the benefits of their college life, and education, far from leading to immediate integration, has led to the very opposite. Thus, at Vassar College where I served as Visiting Professor in 1969, the one demand almost immediately made by the newly-admitted black students was a separate black dormitory. There were no complaints of inhospitality on the part of the white college students. The black college students simply wanted to have a place of their own. They wanted to cultivate their own identity, lead their own life, elaborate their own traditions. They also wanted black

teachers and "black courses." This development has been paralleled in almost every college in the country.

Many colleges have gone so far as to take black students less prepared or qualified than white students. Whatever the motives that led them to do so, it is relevant here to point out that the less well prepared students felt necessarily left out, and humiliated, when they could not perform as adequately in class as their more qualified white fellow students did. They, therefore, were psychologically compelled to seek to achieve the prestige they had lost in their own eyes—which they could not achieve in classroom work—outside the classroom. The opportunity was readily at hand.

They could, and did, achieve status as revolutionary leaders against the "irrelevant" college curriculum in which they were unable to excel. In some cases (with the help of disaffected and masochistic whites) they came near destroying the institutions which had recruited them.

I am fully aware that we are dealing not with colleges but with primary and secondary schools. But I am mentioning this history because it is about to be repeated in secondary schools. "Those who do not know history are condemned to repeat it." In our high schools we already have a similar development. When well prepared white students and inadequately prepared black students, in many cases coming from underprivileged backgrounds, are compelled to go to school together, those who cannot perform well by the standards of the school, necessarily become hostile to the school which humiliates them, and to the whites who outperform them. They also become discouraged. They are likely to seek outside the prestige they lost in school work; and they will be tempted to make up for the humiliation suffered by displaying their hostility to whites and insisting on their own superiority in activities which undermine the academic and educational purposes of the school.

This is by no means to say that black and white students should forever remain separated or should be separated as a matter of administrative rule. On the contrary, what I am advocating is that they should remain free to select the school and the fellow students that in each individual case most fulfill their academic and psychological needs.

I foresee that freedom of choice will lead ultimately to far more integration than is now extant, but it will do so slowly. The advantage of that slowness will be that blacks will be able to compete both academically and psychologically with whites in a way that does not make the school "irrelevant" to them, nor psychologically requires them to seek compensation, through subversive or criminal activities, for the sense of inadequacy that it will generate.

Much research has been done since the Supreme Court decided (on most dubious evidence) that separation is educationally damaging to Negro children. No evidence confirming this idea has been uncovered. Very little evidence has been offered to show that integration has been beneficial. Most pro-

grams which attempted to remedy the comparatively low performance of Negro children attributed to inferior schooling have been shown to be ineffective.

Social scientists, therefore, have reached in many cases the conclusion that the inferior performance may be due to factors in very early infancy which, as yet, we have found no way of offsetting. Others have insisted that there is no evidence of a genetic difference which may explain the differences in performance, at least when the same methods of teaching are used for both groups.

I wish now to draw the attention of this Committee to an article "Early Childhood Intervention—The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism" by Stephen F. and Joan C. Baratz, appearing in the *Harvard Educational Review* (February, 1970). The authors maintain, with considerable evidence, that the two models that seek to explain the inferior performance of black children—the genetic model and the social pathology model (of which there are many varieties referring to the family, the subcultural background, nutrition, etc.)—are both unnecessary. The authors maintain that if there were a deficit not just in the actual performance of the children, but in their ability to perform, then such models would be required. But in their opinion the low performance of Negro children is due to the disinclination of teachers, and the failure of schools to perceive the linguistic and other resources of these children. This failure leads schools to insist that Negro children express themselves in a language to which, in their subculture, they are not accustomed and in which they become "dumb." In short, the authors maintain that by insisting that Negro children have the same linguistic and other resources as white children and allowing them to use only these resources, schools produce the lower performance of Negro children. If on the other hand, the authors maintain, the resources actually available to Negro children were utilized—as are those actually available to white children—then Negro children might be quite as able to perform as white children. Thus the low performance of Negro children could be improved only by distinct teaching methods and a distinctive curriculum utilizing their subcultural resources. Needless to say, this would require at least temporary separate education.

I have no personal knowledge that would indicate to me whether the contention of the authors is correct. They do, however, quote a great amount of research that certainly suggests that their thesis is worth exploration. And this is the conclusion that I wish to submit to this Committee.

A great amount of money has been spent on forced integration. A great deal of hostility has been aroused on all sides—certainly race relations are worse than they were before 1954 and there is no evidence whatever that compulsory integration has led to more academic progress than free choice would have achieved. More and more evidence is accumulating that a different Negro subculture exists and requires for its utilization distinct methods if the members are to learn what the schools are trying to teach. This may indeed

require separate training for teachers and separation of those pupils who wish to learn and are best able to learn by utilizing the resources of their subculture. If there is any sort of genetic difference in addition to the subcultural differences this, too, would probably lead to different learning and teaching methods.

I am not suggesting that this Committee should institute the new methods that may turn out to be useful. I am, however, suggesting that this Committee should, instead of throwing further money into an approach that no one could possibly term successful, reserve such money (a) for thorough evaluation of the approaches so far tried, and (b) for thorough exploration and experimentation with different approaches resting on a variety of competing teaching methods with free self selection of pupils.

I do not expect to convince this Committee that the premise on which such vast federal expenditures have been made for the integration of schools over the past ten or fifteen years is a false premise, or that the truth lies elsewhere. I do, however, most seriously recommend that alternatives be explored and all approaches scientifically evaluated before the educational system of the nation becomes so far committed to a single article of faith ("the evidence of things not seen")—that integration of the races brings better education—that the point of no return will have been passed.

Thus I appear here to recommend that investigation of all views on this question become part of the evaluation directed by this bill and that we substitute objective measurement for the subjective, if praiseworthy, opinions of those who see compulsory integration a forwarding of the democratic dream of equality. If the basic purpose of schools is to be education, then we should put aside any preconceived emotional assumptions about the factors which improve or destroy the educational accomplishment of any child, black or white, and use every available scientific facility to isolate the actual factors wherever we find them. To do so would be in the interest of all concerned, of all children, black and white, and contrary only to the vested interest of educational dogmatists.

SOURCES

Stell Tr., 218–256.
Hinds County Tr., 271–369 (vol. 1)
Testimony before Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1731 (1964).

EXHIBITS

Bastide, Roger, & van den Berghe, Pierre, "Stereotypes, Norms & Interracial Behavior in Sao Paulo, Brazil," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 22, No. 6 (1957).

Clark, Kenneth B., "Desegregation, an Appraisal of the Evidence," *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 4, p. 3 (1953).

Clark, Kenneth B., *Prejudice and Your Child*.

Clark, Kenneth B. and Mamie, "Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," reprinted in *Readings in Social Psychology* (1st ed., 1947).

Davis, Allison, "Racial Status and Personality Development," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 57 (October, 1943).

Elmer, Glaister A., "Identification as a Social Concept," *Sociology & Social Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 103–109 (1954).

Goodman, A. M. E. (Mae), "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," *The American Anthropologist*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (October–December, 1946).

Hill, Mozelle, "A Comparative Study of Race Attitudes in the All Negro Community in Oklahoma," *Phylon* (Third Quarterly Issue, 1946).

Ichheiser, Gustav, "Socio-psychological and Cultural Factors in Race Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (1949).

Landreth, Catherine, & Johnson, Barbara C., "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Inset Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color," *Child Development*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1953).

Lundberg, George A., "Some Neglected Aspects of the 'Minorities' Problem," *Modern Age*, pp. 285–297 (Summer, 1958).

Lundberg, George A., "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population."

Merton, Robert K., *Social Structure and Social Theory*, pp. 225 ff.

Radke, Marion; Sutherland, Gene; and Rosenberg, Pearl, *Sociometry*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (1953) (racial attitudes of children in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania).

van den Haag, Roes & *The Fabric of Society* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1957) (specifically chapter on prejudice).

van den Haag, "Genuine and Spurious Integration," *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences* (New York).

Willems, "Racial Attitudes in Brazil," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, No. 5 pp. 402–408 (1949).

STATEMENT OF DR. ARTHUR R. JENSEN BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Arthur R. Jensen and I am Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of California at Berkeley. I hold a B.A. degree from the University of California, an M.A. from San Diego State College, and a Ph. D. degree from Columbia University. In 1956–58, I was a United States Public Health Service Research Fellow in Psychology at the Psychiatric Institute, University of London. In 1961–62, I was a Research Associate at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research and in 1964–65 a Guggenheim Fellow at the Institute of Psychiatry at the University of London. In 1966–67, I was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science at Stanford. I am a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the Psychonomics Society.

I am co-editor of a text on "Social Class, Race and Psychological Development," published in 1968 and the author of the article entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?," published in 1969 in the *Harvard Educational Review*. I wrote an article on the "Heritability of Intelli-

gence," published in *Engineering and Science* in April, 1970, and have more recently prepared a research resume entitled "Parent and Teacher Attitudes Toward Integration and Busing" for the California Advisory Council on Education and Research of the California Teachers Association.

I am currently in the course of publishing a comprehensive review on the subject of "Can We and Should We Study Race Differences?"

I appear before you today for the purpose of raising what appears to me to be an essential preliminary inquiry to the Committee's approval of the present form of H.R. 17846, the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. That inquiry relates to the truth or falsity as a scientific matter of the basic factual assumption underlying this bill.

On May 21, President Nixon submitted to the Congress a special message on aid to schools and recommended this legislation. There he stated: "It is clear that racial isolation ordinarily has an adverse effect on education."

That premise supports the present declaration of purpose in Section 2 of H.R. 17846—to prevent racial isolation in schools so as to improve the quality of education. I do not believe that this premise alone can be regarded as adequate justification for this bill. Recent comprehensive reviews of research on the effects of the racial composition of schools and classes in public schools come to conclusions which are highly ambiguous and inconclusive regarding the causal relationship between racial composition of the student body and scholastic performance. Most of the research on this subject to date has been too inadequate statistically and methodologically to allow any firm conclusion one way or the other regarding the effects of a school's racial composition on achievement. I refer you to a thorough review of this research by Nancy H. St. John of Harvard University; it appears in the February, 1970, issue of the *Review of Educational Research*, a publication of the American Educational Research Association. Her review supports my conclusion, which is that we have no scientifically or statistically substantial conclusions at this time.

I personally favor racial integration and I hopefully believe it is coming about. As an educator, I am concerned that it come about in such a way as to be of benefit to the schooling of all children. Achieving racial balance, while viewed by many of us as desirable for moral, ethical, and social reasons, will not solve existing educational problems; it will create new ones, and I am anxious that we provide the means for fully and objectively assessing them and for discovering the means of solving them. I am quite convinced on the basis of massive research evidence that the educational abilities and needs of the majority of white and Negro children are sufficiently different at this present time in our history that both groups—and particularly the more disadvantaged group—can be cheated out of the best education we now know how to provide in our schools if uniformity rather than diversity of instructional approaches becomes the rule. Diversity and desegregation need not be incompatible goals. I think both are necessary. But achieving racial balance and at the same time ignoring individual differences in children's special educational needs could be most destructive to those who are already the most disadvantaged educationally. The allocation of a school's resources for children with special educational problems cannot be influenced by race; it must be governed by individual needs.

To insure the developments of integrated education that could make it just and valid for all children, therefore, I urge that this Committee seriously consider the addition

to the bill of a directive in Section 10 that a major proportion of the research funds provided for evaluation shall be used for a scientifically valid, objective examination of the educational effects of compulsory school desegregation. I further suggest that the technical requirements of the needed research are probably beyond the personnel and facilities of most school systems, and that major studies should be conducted by or in consultation with properly equipped research institutions under Federal support.

In my opinion, based upon my studies for the past 20 years and more in the field of educational psychology, I am convinced that the study of racial differences and their applicability to variations in learning and organization of the educational process are essential to any true understanding of the problems which America's schools face today in determining the future course of school integration.

II. THE EXISTING CONTROVERSY OVER IQ AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

I can best explain the basis of my views in this area by summarizing for the Committee some of the main points I made in the *Harvard Educational Review* article to which I have referred:

"In my article, I first reviewed the conclusion of a nationwide survey and evaluation of the large, Federally funded compensatory education programs done by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which concluded that these special programs had produced no significant improvement in the measured intelligence or scholastic performance of the disadvantaged children whose educational achievements they were specifically intended to raise. The evidence presented by the Civil Rights Commission suggests to me that merely applying more of the same approach to compensatory education on a larger scale is not likely to lead to the desired results, namely increasing the benefits of public education to the disadvantaged. The well-documented fruitlessness of these well-intentioned compensatory programs indicates the importance of now questioning the assumptions, theories, and practices on which they were based. I point out, also, that some small-scale experimental intervention programs have shown more promise of beneficial results.

"I do not advocate abandoning efforts to improve the education of the disadvantaged. I urge increased emphasis on these efforts, in the spirit of experimentation, expanding the diversity of approaches and improving the rigor of evaluation in order to boost our chances of discovering the methods that will work best.

"The nature of intelligence

"In my article, I pointed out that IQ tests evolved to predict scholastic performance in largely European and North American middle-class populations around the turn of the century. They evolved to measure those abilities most relevant to the curriculum and type of instruction, which in turn were shaped by the pattern of abilities of the children the schools were then intended to serve.

"IQ or abstract reasoning ability is thus a selection of just one portion of the total spectrum of human mental abilities. This aspect of mental abilities measured by IQ tests is important to our society, but is obviously not the only set of educationally or occupationally relevant abilities. Other mental abilities have not yet been adequately measured; their distributions in various segments of the population have not been adequately determined; and their educational relevance has not been fully explored.

"I believe a much broader assessment of the spectrum of abilities and potentials, and the investigation of their utilization for edu-

cational achievement, will be an essential aspect of improving the education of children regarded as disadvantaged.

"Inheritance of intelligence

"Much of my paper was a review of the methods and evidence that lead me to the conclusion that individual differences in intelligence, that is, IQ, are predominantly attributable to genetic differences, with environmental factors contributing a minor portion of the variance among individuals. The heritability of the IQ—that is, the percentage of individual differences variance attributable to genetic factors—comes out to about 80 per cent, the average value obtained from all relevant studies now reported.

"These estimates of heritability are based on tests administered to European and North American populations and cannot properly be generalized to other populations. I believe we need similar heritability studies in minority populations if we are to increase our understanding of what our tests measure in these populations and how these abilities can be most effectively used in the educational process.

"Social class differences

"Although the full range of IQ and other abilities is found among children in every socioeconomic stratum in our population, it is well established that IQ differs on the average among children from different social class backgrounds. The evidence, some of which I referred to in my article, indicates to me that some of this IQ difference is attributable to environmental differences and some of it is attributable to genetic differences between social classes—largely as a result of differential selection of the parent generations for different patterns of ability.

"I have not yet met or read a modern geneticist who disputes this interpretation of the evidence. In the view of geneticist C. O. Carter: 'Sociologists who doubt this show more ingenuity than judgment.' At least three prominent sociologists who are students of this problem—Sorokin, Bruce Eckland, and Otis Dudley Duncan—all agree that selective factors in social mobility and assortative mating have resulted in a genetic component in social class intelligence differences. As Eckland points out, this conclusion holds *within* socially defined racial groups but cannot properly be generalized *between* racial groups, since barriers to upward mobility have undoubtedly been quite different for various racial groups.

"Race differences

"I have always advocated dealing with persons as individuals, each in terms of his own merits and characteristics and am opposed to according treatment to persons solely on the basis of their race, color, national origin, or social class background. But I am also opposed to ignoring or refusing to investigate the causes of the well-established differences among racial groups in the distribution of educationally relevant traits, particularly IQ.

"I believe that the causes of observed differences in IQ and scholastic performance among different ethnic groups is, scientifically, still an open question, an important question, and a researchable one. I believe that official statements, such as 'It is a demonstrable fact that the talent pool in any one ethnic group is substantially the same as in any other ethnic groups' (U.S. Office of Education, 1966), and 'Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese, or any other group' (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1965), are without scientific merit. They lack any factual basis and must be regarded only as hypotheses.

"It would require more space than I am allotted to describe the personal and professional consequences of challenging this prevailing hypothesis of genetic equality by sug-

gesting alternative hypotheses that invoke genetic as well as environmental factors as being among the causes of the observed differences in patterns of mental ability among racial groups.

"The fact that different racial groups in this country have widely separated geographic origins and have had quite different histories which have subjected them to different selective social and economic pressures make it highly likely that their gene pools differ for some genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, including intelligence, or abstract reasoning ability. Nearly every anatomical, physiological and biochemical system investigated shows racial differences. Why should the brain be any exception? The reasonableness of the hypothesis that there are racial differences in genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, including mental abilities, is not confined to the poorly informed, but has been expressed in writings and public statements by such eminent geneticists as K. Mather, C. D. Darlington, R. A. Fisher, and Francis Crick, to name a few.

"In my article, I indicated several lines of evidence which support my assertion that a genetic hypothesis is not unwarranted. The fact that we still have only inconclusive conclusions with respect to this hypothesis does not mean that the opposite of the hypothesis is true. Yet some social scientists speak as if this were the case and have even publicly censured me for suggesting an alternative to purely environmental hypotheses of intelligence differences. Scientific investigation proceeds most effectively by means of what Platt has called "strong inference," pitting alternative hypotheses that lead to different predictions against one another and then putting the predictions to an empirical test.

"Learning Ability and IQ

"The article also dealt with my theory of two broad categories of mental abilities, which I call intelligence (or abstract reasoning ability) and associative learning ability. These types of ability appear to be distributed differently in various social classes and racial groups. While large racial and social class differences are found for intelligence, there are practically negligible differences among these groups in associative learning abilities, such as memory span and serial and paired-associate rote learning.

"Research should be directed at delineating still other types of abilities and at discovering how the particular strengths in each individual's pattern of abilities can be most effectively brought to bear on school learning and on the attainment of occupational skills. By pursuing this path, I believe we can discover the means by which the reality of individual differences need not mean educational rewards for some children and utter frustration and defeat for others."

III. THE IMPLICATIONS OF RACE DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATION

Since educators have at least officially assumed that race and social class differences in scholastic performance are not associated with any genetic differences in growth rates or patterns of mental abilities but are due entirely to discrimination, prejudice, inequality of educational opportunity, and factors in the child's home environment and peer culture, we have collectively given little if any serious thought to whether we would do anything differently if we knew in fact that all educational differences were not due solely to these environmental factors.

There have been and still are obvious environmental inequities and injustices which have disfavored certain minorities, particularly Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians. Progress has been made and is continuing to be made to improve these conditions. But there is no doubt still a long way to go, and the drive toward further progress in this direction should be given top priority in our national effort.

Education is one of the chief instruments for approaching this goal. Every child should receive the best education that our current knowledge and technology can provide. This should not imply that we advocate the same methods or the same expectations for all children. There are large individual differences in rates of mental development, in patterns of ability, in drives and interests. These differences exist even among children of the same family. The good parent does his best to make the most of each child's strong points and to help him on his weak points but not make these the crux of success or failure. The school must regard each child, and the differences among children, in much the same way as a good parent should do.

I believe we need to find out the extent to which individual differences, social class differences, and race difference in rates of cognitive development and differential patterns of relative strength and weakness in various types of ability are attributable to genetically conditioned biological growth factors. The answer to this question might imply differences in our approach to improving the education of all children, particularly those we call the disadvantaged, for many of whom school is now a frustrating and unrewarding experience.

Individuals should be treated in terms of their individual characteristics and not in terms of their group membership. This is the way of a democratic society, and educationally it is the only procedure that makes any sense. Individual variations within any large socially defined group are always much greater than the average differences between groups. There is overlap between groups in the distributions of all psychological characteristics that we know anything about. But dealing with children as individuals is not the greatest problem. It is in our concern about the fact that when we do so, we have a differentiated educational program, and children of different socially identifiable groups may not be proportionately represented in different programs. This is the "hang-up" of many persons today and this is where our conceptions of equal opportunity are most likely to go awry and become misconceptions.

Group racial and social class differences are first of all individual differences, but the causes of the group differences may not be the same as of the individual differences. This is what we must find out, because the prescription of remedies for our educational ills could depend on the answer.

Let me give one quite hypothetical example. We know that among middle-class white children, learning to read by ordinary classroom instruction is related to certain psychological developmental characteristics. Educators call it "readiness." These characteristics of readiness appear at different ages for different kinds of learning, and at any given age there are considerable individual differences among children, even among siblings reared within the same family. These developmental differences, in middle-class white children, are largely conditioned by genetic factors. If we try to begin a child too early in reading instruction, he will experience much greater difficulty than if we waited until we saw more signs of "readiness." Lacking readiness, he may even become so frustrated as to "turn off" on reading, so that he will then have an emotional block toward reading later on when he should have the optimal readiness. The readiness can then not be fully tapped. The child would have been better off had we postponed reading instruction for six months or a year and occupied him during this time with other interesting activities for which he was ready. Chances are he would be a better reader at, say, 10 or 11 years of age for having started a year later, when he could catch on to reading with relative ease and avoid the unnecessary frustration. It is very

doubtful in this case that some added "enrichment" to his preschool environment would have made him learn to read much more easily a year earlier. If this is largely a matter of biological maturation, then the time at which a child is taught in terms of his own schedule of development becomes important. If, on the other hand, it is largely a matter of preschool environmental enrichment, then the thing to do is to go to work on the preschool environment so as to make all children equally ready for reading in the first grade. If a child's difficulty is the result of both factors, then a combination of both enrichment and optimal developmental sequencing should be recommended.

There is a danger that some educators' fear of being accused of racial discrimination could become so misguided as to work to the disadvantage of many minority children. Should we deny differential educational treatments to children when such treatment will maximize the benefits they receive from schooling, just because differential treatment might result in disproportionate representation of different racial groups in various programs? I have seen instances where Negro children were denied special educational facilities commonly given to white children with learning difficulties simply because school authorities were reluctant to single out any Negro children, despite their obvious individual needs, to be treated any differently from the majority of youngsters in the school. There was no hesitation about singling out white children who needed special attention. Many Negro children of normal and superior scholastic potential are consigned to classes in which one-fourth to one-third of their classmates have IQs below 75, which is the usual borderline of educational mental retardation. The majority of these educationally retarded children benefit little or not at all from instruction in the normal classroom, but require special attention in smaller classes that permit a high degree of individualized and small group instruction. Their presence in regular classes creates unusual difficulties for the conscientious teacher and detracts from the optimal educational environment for children of normal ability. Yet there is reluctance to provide special classes for these educationally retarded children if they are Negro or Mexican-American. The classrooms of predominantly minority schools often have 20 to 30 percent of such children, which handicaps the teacher's efforts on behalf of her other pupils in the normal range of IQ. The more able minority children are thereby disadvantaged in the classroom in ways that are rarely imposed on white children for whom there are more diverse facilities. Differences in rates of mental development and in potentials for various types of learning will not disappear by being ignored. It is up to biologists and psychologists to discover their causes, and it is up to educators to create a diversity of instructional arrangements best suited to the full range of educational differences that we find in our population. Many environmentally caused differences can be minimized or eliminated, given the resources and the will of society. The differences that remain are a challenge for public education. The challenge will be met by making available more ways and means for children to benefit from schooling. This, I am convinced, can come about only through a greater recognition and understanding of the nature of human differences.

It is for this reason that I call upon your Committee to set aside funds under Section 10 of H.R. 17846 to investigate methods of coping educationally with individual and group variability and for an impartial, in-depth study of the effects of classroom desegregation on the educational process. I feel strongly that such basic cause-and-effect research must be done as an essential part of the task of ameliorating our nation's grave educational problems.