

BACKTALK

Gage Misleading?

N.L. Gage (January *Kappan*) does a service in calling attention to what environment may hopefully accomplish in improving I.Q. and school attainment. In the current controversy, however, which concerns the relative importance of environment *versus* heredity, the article is largely beside the point, since it centers around identical twins reared apart. If we hold to a deterministic view of human behavior, we have only the influences of heredity and environment (and their interactions) to explain such behavior. If we hold heredity constant — as we do in the study of identical-twin pairs — then *of course* we shall expect to find a relation between I.Q. *differences* (within pair) and environment *differences* (within pair). The statistical equivalent would be to partial out genetic contributions: The residual variance would be difficult to explain in any way which was *not* environment or error.

The usual reader of Gage's article will be thus misled (though surely without Gage's intention) by his emphasis on such *residual* correlations (especially on pp. 309-10). Such a reader might get the impression that Gage's emphasis contradicts the Jensen-Shockley-Herrnstein-Eysenck thesis of the greater importance of heredity. To the contrary, there would be little argument over the general notion that what isn't explained by heredity is, by default, explained by environment or by error. It leaves untouched the question of whether nature or nurture has more influence on I.Q.

For educators, however, a more serious misconception which might be drawn from Gage's article concerns the social or legislative implications of the controversy. "The most important way to disprove Jensen's hypothesis," writes Gage, "is to reduce race differences through education and other kinds of environmental influence" (p. 308). There is an ambiguity about reducing "race differences" which can lead to biased practices in admissions, employment, promotion, pay policies, and other treatments of individuals. If we mean "reduce race differences in *opportunity*," then there is little argument about the worthiness of such a general goal. On the other hand, if we mean "reduce race differences in *achievement*," then as believers in an open society, a meritocracy of talent, we must reject such forced egalitarianism, unless it comes as a result of equalizing opportunity. But we cannot reason

from differences in achievement *to* alleged differences in opportunity — unless we have already proved that Jensen and Shockley are mistaken. And that we have surely not yet done. — *Ellis B. Page*, professor of educational psychology, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Congratulations to Gage

My congratulations to Professor Gage on his January *Kappan* article, "I.Q. Heritability, Race Differences, and Educational Research." It is the best article on the subject that I've seen. It combines brilliant scholarship, humaneness, common sense, educational statesmanship, and clear writing. I'm sending copies to several colleagues to be sure they don't miss it. — *Sidney Dorros*, communications program consultant, National Education Association.

Raceology or Racism?

In the December *Kappan* Backtalk department, I noted that William Shockley's conclusion that blacks are innately inferior to whites in intelligence is blatantly racist and expressed my disappointment that Shockley had been invited to write for the *Kappan*.

The quality of Shockley's convoluted statement, combined with a sloppy analysis of insufficient data, renders it unfitting for refutation. Nonetheless, refutation of Shockley's statement must occur because, as a "brilliant statistical analyst" (the *Kappan's* phrase) and Nobel Prize winner, Shockley treacherously exploits the genetic fallacy for an insidious genocidal operation on black people.

Norman Dixon wrote in an unpublished manuscript, "Historically, those who have ruled or oppressed others have sought to justify their behavior on whatever grounds possible. They have used religious, social, psychological, and physical data to 'prove' that the oppressed deserved and needed the oppressor's messianic oppression. It is not surprising, then, to learn that some members of the dominant racial majority have sought and used 'standard tests' to document the 'inferior' intellectual capabilities and achievement of blacks. Whatever differences test results reveal are said to be due to 'race'."

Any valid exploration of race and intelligence should lead to the discussion of several critical questions. What is a "race"? What is "intelligence"? What concept of intelligence is being measured? What are the limita-

tions of pencil-and-paper tests used to measure "intelligent performances"? Shockley's article gives no adequate response to these questions. Any attempt to measure the intelligence of black people must concern itself with the destructive influence that racism has had on its development. Shockley and Jensen have definitely ignored the overt and covert role of racism in the development of a black person's intelligence. Shockley should substitute racism for raceology in the title of his *Kappan* article.

It is common knowledge that all conceptions of intelligence reflect the values of the society they were conceived to serve, as well as the forces which shaped the behavior of the individuals formulating that conception of intelligence. Several analyses (e.g., the Kerner Commission's report on civil disorders) of American society reveal a pugnacious saturation of racism!

"Surreptitious, subliminal racist notions — as well as deliberate racist intent — surround and permeate the white construct 'intelligence' and white 'testing' devices," says Dixon. Jerome Kagan writes, "... given the insufficient and controversial quality of the information relevant to the causes of these differences, it is likely that deep personal attitudes rather than logical or sound empirical data dictate one's interpretations of the documented variability in I.Q." (*Saturday Review*, December 4, 1971, pp. 92-93).

Kagan also writes, "... the widely publicized announcement that 80% of intelligence is inherited and 20% environmentally determined is based on information from two similarly constructed standardized I.Q. tests invented by Caucasian middle-class Western man to rank order everyone."

The following comments and criticisms refer to points raised in Shockley's paper. Lack of a meaningful definition of intelligence should not be compared with a lack of a valid answer to the question, What is gravity?, although both are natural phenomena. Shockley ignores the significance of the fact that I.Q. is socially-culturally determined.

One weakness in the twin data is that none of it was collected on black twins. Also a great proportion of the data was produced in England. It is fallacious to construct such broad generalizations from such incomplete data. Furthermore, it shows a complete ignorance of the potentially destructive effect of racism in a black person's I.Q. development.

Shockley says, "Professor Rick Heber has given an intensive educational enrichment program to slum children whose mothers have I.Q.'s below 75. At three and a half years of age, the undersecretary of Health, Education,

and Welfare has recently reported, these experimental children are averaging 33 I.Q. points above comparable controls." One would believe this data non-supportive of Shockley's hypothesis. Nevertheless, Shockley attempts through sloppy "probably" statements to show how this data may support 80% geneticity. "The undisturbed home environments were *probably* in the lowest 1 or 2% of all home environments for intellectual stimulation. On the other hand, Heber's intensive program is *probably* in the top fraction of 1% for developing performance on I.Q. tests. This is equivalent to an improvement of perhaps six standard deviations . . . a value quite compatible with 80% geneticity" (italics mine).

Shockley has twisted the data to support his own particular idea. To further promote his "statistical" legerdemain, Shockley criticizes the cost (\$10,000 per child per year) of the aforementioned HEW program.

One must wonder if he is aware of how much the Vietnam war is costing us. Is he aware of what the space program is and what it has cost? Undoubtedly not.

Shockley's myopic view of the origin of intelligence, coupled with his sadistic use of statistics, has led him to make such a teleological statement as: "*Nature has color-coded groups of individuals so that statistically reliable predictions of their adaptability, to intellectually rewarding and effective lives can easily be made and profitably be used by the pragmatic man in the street*" (italics mine). Again, black people find themselves confronted with a paternalistic white man presenting himself as the messiah.

Paternalistic behavior by Shockley is further evident in the following quote: "If . . . our welfare programs are unwittingly . . . selectively down-breeding the poor of our slums by encouraging their least foresighted to be most prolific, the consequences will be tragic for both blacks and whites – but proportionately so much worse for our black minority that . . . the consequence may be a form of *genetic enslavement* that will provoke extremes of racism . . ." (italics mine). Any valid American history would reveal to Shockley that this country was actually re-started by poor people. People from "welfare" programs. European countries coerce their poor, downcast, and thieves to leave before they genetically downgrade the elite population. Consequently inferior white stock populates this country as compared with the present stock populating those European countries their ancestors unceremoniously left. Is that true?

Articles similar to Shockley's will only serve to further dichotomize this

society along racial lines. As soon as articles of this kind appear, black people find themselves confronted with revitalized racist political and social forces to oppress them. I submit that the very survival of black people is dependent upon discerning whites and blacks categorically rejecting racist concepts of intelligence. – *H. P. Baptiste, Jr.*, assistant professor of education, Indiana University at South Bend.

'At Least You Printed It'

As with most administrators and researchers in education, I belong to many organizations, all of which have publications. When these arrive, I leaf through them, read the table of contents, glance at the articles of most interest. For once, I found one that I read thoroughly, not just once but twice!

The January Shockley-Gage supplement will long stand as a tribute to the *Kappan*. Oh, I know the slings and arrows will fall upon you, but perhaps not so heavily what with all the qualifying editorial remarks you preface it with – "We do not ourselves endorse his conclusions. . . , etc."

Despite your apparent lack of courage to stand beside research and meaningful statistics as evidence worthy of serious consideration, at least you did print the article. This in itself speaks well for the publication. Congratulations! – *John C. Pearson*, director, University Laboratory School, Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point.

Jensen on Friedrichs Survey

May I comment on the "survey" by Robert W. Friedrichs which received double mention in the January *Kappan* (p. 287 and p. 333)? Friedrichs claims to have made a "representative survey" of the agreement of the American Psychological Association's membership with my views regarding Negro-white differences in intelligence, as put forth in my well-known article in the *Harvard Educational Review* (Winter, 1969). Friedrichs states that 68% of his respondents disagreed with the following statement quoted from my article: ". . . it [is] a not unreasonable hypothesis that genetic factors are strongly implicated in the average Negro-white intelligence difference. The preponderance of the evidence is, in my opinion, less consistent with a strictly environmental hypothesis than with a genetic hypothesis" (p. 82).

This is precisely the statement used in Friedrichs's survey questionnaire. Although he concluded the statement with a full stop and inverted commas, it is actually only *half* of my sentence, which continues after the word *hypothesis*:

esis: ". . . which, of course, does not exclude the influence of environment or its interaction with genetic factors." Friedrichs's incomplete version of my statement could only produce a strong bias in his respondents' replies in the negative direction that he so obviously wished to obtain.

Since a "strictly environmental hypothesis" completely excludes any genetic factor, the reader of Friedrichs's questionnaire could easily assume that the contrasting genetic hypothesis completely excluded the role of environmental factors. And that is why it is so important to include the final half of my sentence. The genetic hypothesis does not ignore environment.

A number of psychologists who received Friedrichs's questionnaire wrote to me saying that although they had agreed with me when they read my article, they found themselves unable to agree when they were called upon to answer Friedrichs's questionnaire. They then reread the passage in the original and, of course, immediately detected the reason for their puzzlement.

I therefore judge the results of Friedrichs's survey to be biased and invalid. Unfortunately, such a survey does nothing to promote rational discussion and scientific research on this socially important issue. As I stated in my article, "The possible consequences of our failure to seriously study these questions may well be viewed by future generations as our society's greatest injustice to Negro Americans." – *Arthur R. Jensen*, professor of educational psychology, University of California, Berkeley.

Blacks Have More To Teach

There is no humor in the Bible nor in the Nobel Prize winner who, could he escape for a moment from his statistics, would realize that the black has more to teach Mr. Whitey about permanent values than the reverse. . . . He has a HEART. – *Louis Henrich*, Odin's Wood, Boulder Creek, Calif.

Agreement with Lieberman

I could not agree more with Myron Lieberman's crystal ball on "The Future of Collective Negotiations," December *Kappan*. He has sketched it very well from the teacher's side of the table. I am interested in knowing what he sees on the school board side of the table other than the gain in the power of administrators and corresponding decline in the power of school boards, necessitated by the negotiators' having the authority to make a deal at an appropriate time. – *Gordon Nelson*, executive secretary, Associated School Boards of South Dakota, Huron, S.D.

Survivalship or Scholarship?

I read with interest Terry Whealon's "Thoughts of a Disillusioned Educator" in the October *Kappan*. Mr. Whealon's decision to enter a doctoral program two years ago was shared by many, including me. His obsession with higher education, his financial difficulties, and the disruption of his domestic tranquility were certainly not unique, nor was his disappointment with the employment situation. I too have engaged in letter writing and door pounding.

For the benefit of *Kappan* readers anticipating the pursuit of a doctorate, however, I would offer words of encouragement, not lamentation. The encouragement is based, not on a view of the doctorate as a ticket to a university position, but as an intellectual and social expansion of one's self.

While gaining these objectives may result in securing a university position, the emphasis on personal growth makes academic achievement self-rewarding. Thus it is impossible to educate oneself into a "state of limbo." Rather than become a disillusioned scholar, you become an ardent learner. . . .

To become an involved learner, to experience personal growth, to widen one's parameters of thought, makes doctoral studies an exciting undertaking. At least I found it exciting. Thus I advocate the experience for anyone who has the capacity. If, however, you are only looking for a union card, you may be very disappointed. —*Charles F. Cook*, assistant professor, University of Michigan-Flint.

Pity or Envy Mr. Whealon?

Maybe Terry Whealon would be happy if Phi Delta Kappans would pity him. He has suffered a great disappointment. However, I sooner would envy than pity him. Many Kappans must be less fortunate than Mr. Whealon. After all, he was lucky enough to be born with adequate academic ability to pursue a doctorate.

When I completed the Ed.S. degree, I was 51 years old. Had I been blessed with Mr. Whealon's ability, I would not have stopped with the Ed.S. I would have worked for the Ed.D.

Thank you for your interesting and thought-provoking magazine. — (*Name withheld by request.*)

Objectivity Impossible, Undesirable?

Although Rolland Dewing tried hard to make his point ("Is Ecological Brinkmanship Compromising Scientific Integrity?," December *Kappan*), rather than deal with the very real dangers of a deteriorating environment he gave us that old one-note symphony of "objectivity," which is not only impossible to

achieve but probably a somewhat dubious virtue when one's house is burning down. The problem seems to be that so many aspiring social scientists, or scientists-*manque*, accept the possibility of "objectivity," besides making it the criterion by which everything else in the world must be judged. They are wrong on both counts. First, the value-free human being has not yet been born; second, many social scientists are poorly grounded in the philosophy of their craft. (This is especially true of statisticians.) The fact is this: In social science research, isomorphism is impossible; there are no Newtonian worlds for us.

At the risk of sounding sardonic, I note that Mr. Dewing lives in Nebraska. He should try New York for a couple of weeks, after which we will "measure" his "objectivity" about environment matters. — *Michael T. Hinkemeyer*, Queens College, Flushing, N.Y.

Plague Ships, Swimming Coffins

As a third-generation German-American, I am currently doing research for a family history. I was amazed to see that with 35,000,000 German-Americans, we are the largest minority group despite being the least noticeable. I also read with interest the January *Kappan* — in particular the article by Krug on white ethnic studies.

Indeed, I must strongly support the notion of white ethnic studies for at least two reasons: 1) to help the German-Americans reestablish their own identities . . . and 2) to help later immigrants and other minorities indicate the full extent of their paranoid feelings. How else would these minorities know of the false promises and outright lies which lured German immigrants to America in "damned plague ships and swimming coffins" — often as redemptioners to be sold into outright slavery? . . . — *Raymond A. Ehrle*, New Carrollton, Md.

Racism Not Sole Motivation

I read Walden and Cleveland's article, "The South's New Segregation Academies" (December *Kappan*), with great interest, since I have been conducting a somewhat parallel study of these schools in the state of Florida. While I found most of their observations familiar, I was greatly surprised by their statements about the motives behind such schools. They say, "The motives which account for the new private academies are relatively well understood" and "the racism which motivated the founding of these academies is invariably played down by the whites who support them." While racial integration has served as a catalyst in the formation of most of these institutions, it is a gross oversimplification to state that all those who support them do so

because of racism.

In my study of the motivations and expectations of the parents of children attending such schools, some 200 sets of parents representing 25 new private schools throughout the state of Florida were questioned. While about 20% of those responding could be called "hard-core racists," the other 80% were simply convinced that integration had signaled a lower academic standard, overcrowding, a sometimes disrupted campus, and the introduction of some unqualified teachers. There is, I feel, a significant difference between the motives of the parents who support these schools on general principle and those who support them out of genuine conviction. There is a difference between escaping racial integration and escaping the effects of integration. . . . — *Jon Wiles*, doctoral candidate, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Miller Made His Point

I enjoyed William C. Miller's "letter" from "Edsel Memorial High School," December *Kappan* ("Recalled for Revision"). It served as a reminder of what the educational process is all about. It also reminded me to take stock of my own work in helping to produce "future models."

Even though we are getting used to the idea of call-backs, can we really afford them? As Mr. Miller points out, "it would have been more effective and less costly in time and money to have produced the product correctly in the first place."

Mr. Miller's message is clear and to the point, especially if we want the support and respect of the consumers of our products. — *Gerard G. Vernot*, Archbishop John Carroll High School for Boys, Radnor, Pa.

Indians Must Run Their Schools

My son, who is a teacher, let me take his copy of the January *Kappan*. Among the articles was one by Theodore Kaltsounis titled "The Need To Indianize Indian Schools." I read it very carefully. I want to congratulate Mr. Kaltsounis on a very fine article and I agree with his suggestions 100%. I am a retired teacher myself and I taught in Indian schools for 24 years. The article expressed my feelings, for I have seen this need to have Indians run their own schools in every way. . . . — *Ray Fadden*, Akwesasne, Six Nations Indian Museum, Onchiota, N.Y.

William Van Til's "One Way of Looking at It" (January *Kappan*) is . . . the most insightful one page that I have ever seen. — *Roy Isacksen*, Hazel Park Junior High, St. Paul, Minn.