

and considers many important methodological problems. Amir also agrees with me and not Pettigrew when he writes:

The studies reported earlier in this section considered the direction (i.e., positive or negative) of the initial attitude as a determinant and the intensity as an outcome. Specifically, it was found that initial positive attitudes tend to become more positive as a result of contact situations, and initial negative attitudes will tend to become more negative (Amir, 1969, p. 337).

Amir considers both equal-status contacts and non-equal-status contacts. His review is recommended to all interested in this important area.

REFERENCES

- ALLPORT, G. W. *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
 AMIR, Y. Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, **71**, 319-342.

Comment on: *The Promotion of Prejudice*

Elizabeth Alfert

University of California, Berkeley

Studies of prejudice have often been concerned with demonstrating the relationship of prejudice to personality factors, to child rearing, or to social conditions. Social scientific journals have described expressions of prejudice, as well as ways to decrease it. It might be of interest, however, to follow a case in which the publicized views held by an educational psychologist would appear to increase prejudice and to examine the various factors that interacted and contributed to such an effect.

The Originator. Arthur Jensen, a Professor of Education at the University of California in Berkeley, had been asked by the *Harvard Educational Review* to write an article on the nature of intelligence and the extent to which it can be modified by experience. The editors of that journal sent Jensen an outline of the topics they wanted him to treat and, according to the editors, this outline made no mention of racial differences in intelligence. In a mimeographed statement dated March 5, 1969, the editors of the *Harvard Educational Review*, apparently trying to satisfy the many inquiries about the Jensen review, state: "The outline sent to Dr. Jensen made no specific mention of a discussion of racial differences in intelligence. However, it is our policy with respect to such outlines that they are only a general indication of the areas we want the author to cover and that he is free to carry out our general charge to him in the way he thinks most appropriate."

Jensen submitted to the *Harvard Educational Review* (Vol. 39, No. 1, Winter 1969) the longest article ever published in that journal. Essentially a review of the literature, it included a section on racial differences in intelligence in which the author expounded his by now well-known theories on the genetic inferiority of Negroes in intelligence and learning ability. While Jensen's views on racial differences did not seem germane to his discussion of the importance of heredity in intelligence or to his discussion of different teaching methods for pupils of various abilities, the inclusion of this section seemed justified by the principle of freedom of expression.

The Originator of the theory as disseminator. The editors of the *Harvard Educational Review* also say in the mimeographed statement mentioned above that Jensen released the text of his article to *U.S. News and World Report* several weeks before his review article was to be published. The March 10, 1969 issue of *U.S. News and World Report* published an article on it entitled "Can Negroes learn the way whites do?" While the *Harvard Educational Review* is read by relatively few people and mainly by scholars, *U.S. News and World Report* is a national popular magazine.

Jensen is currently vice-president of the American Educational Research Association. This association held a convention in Los Angeles during the first week of February 1969, prior to publication of the *Harvard Educational Review* article. It included a symposium on "Race and Intelligence," in which Jensen expounded his views on the genetic inferiority of Negroes in intellectual ability and the advantage of rote learning methods for people inferior in intelligence. His speech was widely quoted by the press.

Support for dissemination of the originator's viewpoint by his academic discipline. While Jensen may or may not have suggested the symposium on race and intelligence, the Educational Research Association accepted it as a meaningful scientific topic for a symposium.

No heed was paid to the fact that there is no pure race, that "race" popularly used mainly refers to skin color, and that a symposium on "Race and Intelligence" is no more justified than a symposium on "Eye Color and Intelligence." While somebody might do research on such an esoteric topic, it can hardly be considered a worthwhile topic for a symposium. No attention was paid to the fact that when the environment cannot be controlled, the topic of "Race and Intelligence" becomes one of polemics and that such a symposium is pseudoscientific in character.

No care was taken to have scholars present at the symposium to oppose Jensen's polemics, so that different views could simultaneously be heard and then quoted by the press. Similarly, the

Harvard Educational Review had no simultaneous serious rebuttal of Jensen's racial views. Opposing views were published by the journal in two subsequent issues, but did not receive the publicity given to Jensen's views.

The news media. Jensen's statements on race at the symposium were picked up by an Associated Press dispatch and widely circulated throughout the newspapers of this nation. *Newsweek Magazine* (March 31, 1969) published an article on it entitled "Born Dumb." Of all the articles available in popular magazines only *Time Magazine* (April 11, 1969) conveyed some doubt about Jensen's views to its readers.

The San Francisco Bay area may serve as an illustration of the dissemination of this story: All major Bay area newspapers carried accounts of Jensen's views. It was rather topical for this area since at that time people attending a school board meeting to discuss integration of schools in San Francisco had reportedly been beaten up by goons, and in nearby Richmond the three liberal members of a five-man school board had resigned because of claimed threats to their lives and those of their families. The *Oakland Tribune*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Richmond Independent*, and the *Berkeley Gazette* all had extensive accounts of Jensen's views on race. *The Berkeley Gazette*, the only local daily of a liberal university town, topped all accounts by having two front-page articles—the first one in a special frame, the second one several days later—giving a more extensive account.

Control of the press. While the Jensen story was well covered by the press, it was impossible to get opposing views published. Psychologists and anthropologists at Berkeley wrote to newspapers and to *Newsweek*, but no accounts appeared. Even letters were not accepted.

My personal experience may serve as an illustration: I had written a short statement citing a number of studies that could be used to contradict Jensen's views and included a statement by the geneticist Curt Stern. Neither *Newsweek* nor *U.S. News and World Report* accepted it. It was also rejected as a letter to the editor by the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Oakland Tribune*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *New York Times*. When the *Berkeley Gazette* came out with its second front page article on Jensen's racial views, I went to talk to the editors, stating that there was another side to this issue and demanding that my statement be published with the same prominence as Jensen's. The *Gazette* executive editor, backed by the city editor, told me that Jensen's views were news, while the other side was not, and that, after all, Jensen was the author of the longest article ever published by the *Harvard Educational Review*. After further arguments the editor eventually agreed

to publish my statement as a "Letter to the Editor" and promised that the reporter who wrote the extensive review of Jensen's views on race would collect a number of views representing the other side, which would be published soon. My letter to the editor was then published March 7, 1969. The promised article presenting other viewpoints never appeared. Instead of it, the executive editor wrote several columns, one eulogizing Jensen, one eulogizing William Shockley (a physicist who dabbles in genetics and has views similar to Jensen's), and a couple of columns commending Shockley's vain attempts to get the National Academy of Sciences involved in this type of issue.

The publicity office of the university, contacted for help in publicizing a statement in opposition to Jensen's, reported that they were unable to do so. They explained that a written statement was not considered news and that a large public conference was necessary to attain publicity for viewpoints opposing Jensen's. The statement by the Council of the Society for the Psychological study of Social Issues (see JSI, Summer 1969) which was issued in response to Jensen's article was published in this region only in the student newspaper.

The readers of the Jensen article. One might well ask at whom all this publicity was directed. A local sample of black and white people not connected with the university showed that it was mainly white people who read the statement in the newspapers. White teachers, school administrators, educational policy makers, and the general white population not connected with the university would be particularly likely to be exposed to the Jensen viewpoint without any counter-information. It seems clear that this may have an adverse effect on teacher expectation (with its counterpart of a decrement in student performance), on parents who are dubious about integration of schools, and on policy makers and taxpayers wondering about the usefulness of continuing compensatory education or the enforcement of integration. Lee Edson in an article on Jensen in the *New York Times Magazine* (August 31, 1969) states that "a Congressman put all 123 pages of the article into the Congressional Record and segregationists took to citing the article in court as the word of science. Since then word has filtered down that the article was distributed as must reading by Daniel Patrick Moynihan to members of the Nixon Cabinet."

Response of the university community. For several weeks letters appeared in the Berkeley student newspaper commenting on the Jensen story. On the whole, letters centered on scientific aspects of his views. There were students who contradicted some of Jensen's statements, and there were some faculty members, including University of California anthropology Professor Sherwood L.

Washburn, who published brief letters opposing Jensen's views. A few letters referred to Jensen as a racist. Jensen, himself, answered some of the criticism; and some students and some Ph.D. researchers defended his views.

Response of the radical community (SDS). Letters submitted under the auspices of the "Students for a Democratic Society" openly accused Jensen of racism and included statements on the racist nature of our society. Their statements culminated in asking for Jensen's dismissal. This demand was not supported by other groups or individuals opposing Jensen's views.

Response to SDS. In response to SDS a number of university people, both faculty and students rallied to Jensen's defense. In the upholding of free expression of opinion, Jensen himself was supported and defended. As on other issues, SDS offered some valid criticism but put it in such crass terms that it brought forth a reaction, in which the validity of the criticism, if not the issue itself, was lost.

The people so concerned with academic freedom and the freedom to express a variety of views seemed oddly not equally ready to fight for the freedom of the public to receive a variety of opinions. Freedom of expression increases in value if people are allowed to listen. A person's freedom to voice his opinion by himself in a locked room is limited in value. Academicians concerned with freedom of expression sometimes do not consider that the freedom for all sides to be heard may actually be restricted to a few universities, like Berkeley, and be totally denied to the public at large.

Reaction of the administration. On February 7, 1969 the first report of the Jensen story had appeared in the *Berkeley Gazette*. A conference to discuss Jensen's views was set for May 27th. The chancellor of U.C., Berkeley, had been approached and had agreed to sponsor and fund this conference, which was to be co-sponsored by the Departments of Sociology and Education. Several speakers including Jensen were invited; presentations of the speakers were to be followed by a debate. It was felt that even if Jensen would refuse to attend, the conference would draw some publicity.

After speakers to such an open conference had been invited, Jensen insisted at a meeting of the symposium organizers and administrative personnel handling the symposium that conditions for his participation in the symposium include that it be closed to the general public and that only a panel of experts be admitted to attend. The organizers of the conference were willing to go ahead with the conference as planned whether or not Jensen participated, but the chancellor was hesitant about sponsorship of a

symposium on Jensen without Jensen's participation. The personnel in the administrative unit sided with the view that Jensen's conditions be met.

Consequently a closed panel meeting was held and video-taped. A press conference was held later in the afternoon with Jensen and most of the panel participants present. A replay of the video-taped conference was announced in the student newspaper and shown in the evening to a student audience. Following the presentation of the video-tape some of the participants present took part in a discussion; Jensen had refused to attend. While the consensus of opinions at the meeting did not support Jensen's views, the fact that it was a closed meeting, with merely a video-taped replay later, defeated the aim of getting good press coverage. Only the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported on the proceedings. No report appeared in the *Berkeley Gazette*, the *Oakland Tribune*, the Richmond paper, or other local newspapers; neither AP, *Time*, *Newsweek*, or *U.S. News and World Report* carried the story, although they had extensively publicized Jensen's views.

Conclusions. In this case a number of factors contributed to the promotion of prejudice.

1. The author of a theory that supposedly shows inferiority of a race.
2. The author's interest and efforts to disseminate his theory through the news media.
3. The support of the author's discipline in giving his theory scientific prestige and aiding in its dissemination.
4. The eagerness of the press to give widespread exposure to such a theory.
5. The unwillingness of the press to print material opposing the theory.
6. The author's success in suppressing a public conference with the university administration's connivance.
7. The ineptness of the opposition which went ahead with a conference under conditions that precluded the generation of any significant publicity.
8. Extreme verbal attacks on the author by leftist organizations generating sympathy and support for the author (rubbing off on his theory).

This case illustrates the great importance of the news media in promoting or fighting prejudice. What is news and who decides what is taken to be news? Evidently what is considered to be "news" and presented to the public as "scientific" and "factual" is decided by a white society in which black people—or white people who consider blacks equally human and able—have little control.

Rejoinder: *The Promotion of Dogmatism*

Arthur R. Jensen

University of California, Berkeley

Alfert's article begins with a falsehood. It is a fatuous falsehood which I conclusively refuted many months ago, and yet Alfert persists in it. For some reason she apparently wants to spread the notion that the editors of the *Harvard Educational Review* (*HER*) solicited my article ("How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?") and at the same time sent me a suggested outline of topics to be covered, an outline which, Alfert claims, "made no mention of racial differences in intelligence." Alfert originally made this assertion in a letter to the *Daily Californian* (April 30, 1969). Assuming that Alfert has read the references cited in her own article, she must have known that this statement was untrue before she wrote the article for this journal (see Edson, 1969). Yet she continues to perpetuate a falsehood. The simple fact of the matter is that the outline*¹ sent to me by the co-chairman of the editorial board of *HER* on April 26, 1968 includes the following statement: "A. 1. b. A clear statement of your position on social class and racial differences in intelligence." In the context of the entire outline of the article, a failure to include a discussion of racial differences in intelligence would have been a glaring omission. It is actually to the credit of *HER*'s editors that they did not assert an ostrich-like denial of this issue by deliberately omitting it in their outline.

Alfert's recent activities thus merely add further documentation to the already ample evidence of an entrenched dogmatism among some persons in the social sciences concerning the causes of the observed average difference of about one standard deviation in intelligence test scores between American Negroes and other groups in our population, mainly whites and Orientals. Those, including myself, who question the unproved hypothesis that all races and population groups are identical with respect to the genetic factors involved in the development of mental abilities are reviled and vilified by many of those who promulgate this doctrine and who, like Alfert, are apparently extremely intolerant of any open-minded and scientific approach to the study of this question. A recent flagrant example of such intolerance is the SPSSI Council's press release of May 2, 1969 (JSI, 1969) censuring my *HER* article (Jensen, 1969a). I have commented on the SPSSI statement in detail elsewhere (Jensen, 1969c)*.

¹Items followed by an asterisk (*) can be obtained from the author on request.

And now we have SPSSI's official Journal publishing Alfert's piece, which, like the statement of the SPSSI Council, is not intellectually responsible criticism or genuine research, but mere propaganda. Judging from Alfert's letters to the *Berkeley Gazette* (March 7, 1969)* and to the *Daily Californian* (April 30, 1969)*, it is clear that her interest in my *HER* article is not addressed to its actual content or to making a careful analysis or critique thereof. It appears that she is simply angered because I do not condone her dogmatism concerning the causes of racial differences in intelligence. I hold to no doctrinaire position on this subject, nor do most scientists who have studied the matter. But I fear that it might be hard for Alfert to believe that scientists do not have the kind of religious fervor about their opinions which she has exhibited about hers.

Since Alfert has gone so far as to call me a "racist" (*Daily Californian*, April 30, 1969, p. 9)*, the reader should be allowed to know just what my position actually is on the subject of race differences. First of all, I have always advocated dealing with persons as individuals, each in terms of his own merits, characteristics, and needs. I am opposed to according any treatment to persons solely on the basis of their race, color, national origin, or social class background. 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, occupationally, and socially relevant traits, particularly IQ. I believe that the cause of the observed differences in IQ and scholastic performance among different racial groups is scientifically still an open question, an important question, and a researchable one. I believe that official statements, apparently accepted without question by some social scientists—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 group (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 (Department of Labor, 1965)"—are without scientific merit. They lack any factual basis and must be regarded only as hypotheses. 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 makes 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 an exception?

The reasonableness of the hypothesis that there are racial differences in genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, including mental abilities, has been expressed in writings and public statements by such eminent geneticists as Kenneth Mather, Cyril D. Darlington, Sir Ronald A. Fisher, and Sir Francis Crick, to name but a few. In my articles in *HER* (Jensen, 1969a, 1969b) I indicated several lines of evidence which support my assertion that a genetic hypothesis is not unwarranted and can be scientifically researched. 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. Alternatives to a purely environmental hypothesis of intelligence differences are essential if we are to advance our understanding. Scientific investigation proceeds most effectively by means of what Platt has called "strong inference," which means pitting against one another alternative hypotheses that lead to different predictions and then submitting these predictions to an empirical test.

Contrary to the misleading impression that Alfert's paper tries to give, it was *HER* itself, not I, who sent prepublication copies of my article to numerous major news media. As was reported in the *New York Times Magazine* (Edson, 1969)*, *U.S. News and World Report* interviewed me on the topic after learning about the article, and they requested a prepublication copy which I later provided with the consent of *HER*. The editors of *HER* further cooperated by providing *U.S. News* with prepublication copies of seven other articles dealing with this topic from their Spring 1969 issue. The article that appeared in *U.S. News* (March 10, 1969) came out almost a month after *HER*'s publication of my article (February 15, 1969). *U.S. News* actually gave one of the more accurate accounts of my views in the popular press. Would Alfert suggest that we should repeal the First Amendment, at least when it comes to the expression of ideas that conflict with her own beliefs?

The symposium on "Race and Intelligence" at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, February 6, 1969) was excellent, but I cannot take credit for organizing it or for inviting the several participants. (This was done by Dr. David Feldman.) I was asked to serve as chairman and as one of the symposium's two discussants. The panel consisted of three psychologists of differing viewpoints and a geneticist (Dr. Cavalli-Sforza) who was suggested for the panel by one of my better critics, Professor Joshua Lederberg, a Nobel Laureate in genetics and head of Stanford's Department of Genetics (see Lederberg, 1969). Plans are being made to publish the entire symposium. My own discussion of the several papers ("Can

We and Should We Study Race Differences?")* has been expanded for publication; it includes all the points I made in the 15 minutes allotted for my discussion at the convention. Readers will be able to judge for themselves the accuracy of Alfert's assertion that in this symposium I "expounded . . . on the genetic inferiority of Negroes." This is another blatant falsehood. Alfert also misrepresents my views on other matters. The above named paper fully answers all these misconceptions as well as Alfert's incredible statement that the subject of race differences "can hardly be considered a worthwhile topic for a symposium."

Alfert seems to believe that she and her likes are the only ones whose letters-to-the-editor do not get published. Neither do mine, in many cases. It seems to me that Alfert should have less to complain about than I have on this score. Although the *Daily Californian* (Apr. 30, 1969) published Alfert's defamatory letter about me, impugning my integrity, calling me a "racist," and suggesting that students should boycott my classes, they never published my reply to Alfert's letter. Furthermore, a number of eminent scientists (two Nobel Laureates and several members of the National Academy of Sciences) have written letters-to-the-editors on all sides of this topic but have never seen them published (they have sent me their carbon copies). Thus the impression Alfert tries to create—that the press has treated only her and her side badly—is without any basis in fact.

In the spring, 1969, Alfert was one of the instigators of what, hopefully from her standpoint, was to have been a confrontation between a group of prestigious critics of my *HER* article and me before a mass audience of students and the general public, to be held in the largest auditorium on the Berkeley campus. I disapproved of the plan because of the circus atmosphere that I felt was liable to be generated by such a highly publicized event open to the general public, especially after I was alerted by a reliable source that the SDS was planning a general disturbance at this hoped-for public auto-da-fé. I insisted, and the chancellor supported me, that the entire symposium be videotaped under studio conditions in order to preserve a permanent record, and that it be attended by an invited audience consisting only of professors and researchers in relevant fields who would be qualified to take part in the discussions that followed the formal presentations by the panelists. (The invited audience was composed of faculty from anthropology, education, genetics, law, political science, psychology, and sociology.) I was also encouraged in this method of conducting the symposium because University Extension was eager to obtain a videotape for wide distribution to other colleges through its rental audio-visual library and for use in classes on the Berke-

ley campus. The symposium was actually held under these conditions, which insured freedom from outside disturbances and also guaranteed the widest possible audience through the making of a permanent record on videotape. As one could have expected, knowing the participants, it was a dignified meeting. Curt Stern (genetics) was chairman, and papers were given by Aaron Cicourel (sociology), Lee Cronbach (psychology), Joshua Lederberg (genetics), William Libby (genetics), and Arthur Stinchcombe (sociology). I responded, on the average for about five minutes, to each paper; this was followed by interchanges among the panelists and then the discussion was opened to the audience for about forty-five minutes of questions and reactions. In all, it lasted nearly three hours. From my standpoint it was a success. The videotape has since been shown four times on the Berkeley campus. Unfortunately, it has not been sufficiently publicized by University Extension, so there have been few requests for it from other colleges. In addition to the costly videotape, a complete sound tape can be purchased at cost (\$20) from University Extension. I hope that by means of either video or audio the symposium will reach an even wider audience than it has so far. Viewers and listeners may then see why the final outcome of this project, which Alfert originally helped to set in motion, has apparently made her so unhappy.

Alfert claims that "extreme verbal attacks on the author {Jensen} by leftist organizations" have generated sympathy and support for me. If this is true, I can surely thank Alfert for much of the sympathetic support I have received, because her letter to the *Daily Californian* (Apr. 30, 1969) was easily the most crudely abusive I have yet seen in print and, of those that have come to my attention, it is the only one that is—so a lawyer friend informs me—clearly defamatory and actionable.

But Alfert's wish that only one viewpoint be tolerated—the antithesis of scientific inquiry—has already gone down in defeat. My article in the *HER* has undoubtedly given much renewed impetus to searching thought, discussion, and new research by leaders in education, genetics, psychology, and sociology, who are concerned with the important fundamental questions of individual and group differences and their implications for public education. I expect that my work will stimulate further relevant research as well as efforts to apply the knowledge gained thereby to educationally and socially beneficial purposes. The whole society will benefit most if scientists and educators treat these problems in the spirit of scientific inquiry rather than as a battlefield upon which one or another preordained ideology may seemingly triumph. With respect to the study of racial differences, as in the study of all

other natural phenomena, I advocate that we try to follow the general course proposed by John Stuart Mill: "If there are some subjects on which the results obtained have finally received the unanimous assent of all who have attended to the proof, and others on which mankind have not yet been equally successful; on which the most sagacious minds have occupied themselves from the earliest date, and have never succeeded in establishing any considerable body of truths, so as to be beyond denial or doubt; it is by generalizing the methods successfully followed in the former enquiries, and adapting them to the latter, that we may hope to remove this blot on the face of science."

REFERENCES

- EDSON, L. jensenism, *n*. The theory that IQ is largely determined by the genes. *New York Times Magazine*, August 31, 1969.
- JENSEN, A. R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 1969, **39**, 1-123. (a)
- JENSEN, A. R. Reducing the heredity-environment uncertainty. In *Environment, Heredity, and Intelligence*, *Harvard Educational Review*, Reprint Series No. 2, 1969, pp. 209-243. (b)
- JENSEN, A. R. Criticism or propaganda? *American Psychologist*, 1969, **24**, 1040-1041. (c)
- JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES. SPSSI Council statement on race and intelligence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1969, **25**(3), 1-3.
- LEDERBERG, J. Racial alienation and intelligence. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1969, **39**, 611-615.

Response to Jensen's Rejoinder

Elizabeth Alfert

1. The Editors of the *Harvard Educational Review* have sent me a mimeographed letter stating that it was Jensen who released the text of his article to the *U.S. News and World Report* several weeks before the review article was to be published, and that their outline for Jensen had not included racial differences. If Jensen claims this to be untrue, he should ask these editors to retract their statement which was sent out to many people.

2. Unequal treatment by the news media of opposing opinions on the genetic basis of racial differences is illustrated in my paper. Jensen concurs that at his insistence the public was excluded from the University of California symposium, held in an attempt to publicize various viewpoints. While the U.C. Information Office had promised substantial publicity for a large public conference, the adopted format of the conference made it impossible to get any significant news coverage. At that conference Jensen's views were opposed by four out of five discussants, es-