

**A STUDY  
IN  
RACIAL REALITIES**

*by Carleton Putnam*

**Address at the University of California at Davis  
with subsequent questions and answers**





# **A Study In Racial Realities**

*by Carleton Putnam*

## **A STUDY IN RACIAL REALITIES**

Address at the University of California at Davis  
with subsequent questions and answers

**ORDER FROM**

**THE THUNDERBOLT, INC.**

**P. O. BOX 1211**

**MARIETTA, GA. 30061**



*A Study in Racial Realities*

by Carleton Putnam

Address Before the Students' Forum  
of the University of California at Davis  
December 17, 1964

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Forums Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen.

This is the first chance I have had to talk to a California audience on the race problem and I have been told that some of you may disagree with the position I am here to defend. The explanation may lie in a feeling on your part that the concept of racial integrity, which is the opposite of racial integration, is in some way outdated, unjust and inhuman.

The reason you may have this feeling is that throughout the present century—and emphatically since 1933 and the beginning of the New Deal—we have witnessed a revolutionary change in the social climate of our Western civilization. This century has often been called the century of the common man and with it has come a commendable concern about the under-privileged—about social injustice, about everything that is cruel or unfair to our fellow human beings, whoever and wherever they may be.

In other words, compassion, humanitarianism, and love have become the watchwords of our time. This must appeal strongly to the conscience of any decent man or woman. We rightly shudder away from activities or ideas that challenge the gospel of love. Our religious heritage is one of love. We love our mothers and our families and each other. I have no quarrel with love.

But I *do* have just one little stipulation, one flag of caution—I might say of warning—here. There is a word which is more important even than love. I shall not ask you to guess what it is. The word is truth. We must face the fact that if there is a single item that is closer to the core of wisdom than love, that item is truth, in any situation where truth is vital to the issue.

We may lie to a child, or even to an adult, about an incurable





disease because there the truth can solve nothing. We may not lie about a cancer where an operation will save a life. In the case of our subject this evening the truth is basic to wise solutions of our domestic difficulties here at home and to our leadership throughout the world. In such a case, love, unless it operates in a framework of truth, can only lead to disaster.

So let us set ourselves the task tonight of searching for the truth about the Negro problem. Let us do it dispassionately, and where there may be areas of uncertainty about some of the facts let us examine the *balance* of the evidence in those areas. I shall be constantly reminding you that because every item of evidence may not be perfect is no reason for basing public policy or court decisions on the assumption that the opposite of the evidence is true.

Since the picture is large and the issues complex, it may be helpful to put the essentials before you in the form of four short questions, to each of which we will seek answers. I am going to mention all four at the start, lest any of you become alarmed that in dealing with the first I may be planning to ignore the others:

1. What is the performance record of the average American Negro?
2. To what extent is this record the result of discrimination and poor environment and to what extent does it derive from innate, biological factors?
3. Should the existence of the exceptional Negro (the fact of what the psychologists call "overlap") alter public policy as it is applied to the race as a whole?
4. What is responsible for the perversion of the concept of equality in the United States today, and for the inclusion in it of forms of equality never thought of by the Founding Fathers and totally unrelated to reality?

Starting with number one, the question as to the average Negro's performance—his behavior—the facts are uncontradicted. This is not an area where we need be concerned about weighing evidence or judging disputes. The causes may be in dispute but not the facts. The American Negro on the average produces per capita ten times as many illegitimate children,<sup>1</sup> six times as many feeble-minded adults, nine times as many robberies, seven times as many rapes and ten times as many murders as the White man.<sup>2</sup> Conversely the Negro race pro-

<sup>1</sup> National Office of Vital Statistics.

<sup>2</sup> Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reports*, 1963.

duces one-sixth as many individuals with an Intelligence Quotient over 130, that is, in the gifted person category.<sup>3</sup> These are the undisputed statistics concerning the performance and behavior of the Negro race in the United States.

Overseas, in the only completely Negro republic in the Western Hemisphere, the Republic of Haiti, where the Negro has been on his own, so to speak, since 1844—that is 120 years—we have the following situation from a self-government standpoint. After the Negroes massacred the last of the White population in 1804, Haiti remained a part of Santo Domingo until 1844 when it became a separate "republic." Between 1844 and 1915 only one Haitian President completed his term of office. Fourteen were ousted by armed uprisings, one was blown up, one was poisoned and another was hacked to pieces by a mob.

Between 1908 and 1915 the revolutions and assassinations increased so rapidly that a United States military occupation was needed to restore order. This lasted from 1915 to 1934. Thereafter followed twelve years of rule by a mulatto elite which ended in the resumption of control by the black military in 1946. Since then wholesale corruption and political murder have been the rule.

Naturally, the next question is: Why? Is this record due to the fact that so many Negroes live in slums, or have been educated in their own schools, or were slaves a hundred years ago? Or is there some antecedent cause of which these other conditions are merely the end result? In other words, is the average Negro the product of his environment and history, or are his environment and history the product of the average Negro? Are his performance and behavior the accumulated effect of mistreatment, prejudice and discrimination or are they primarily a reflection of innate, biological limitations? The correct answer makes a decisive difference to what we do about the Negro problem at home and abroad.

Here, of course, is the point at which the liberal, the well-meaning humanitarian and all those whose hypnotic devotion to love makes them careless of truth rush in with their impulsive, wish-fulfilling reply. Environment, they tell us, is the primary cause of the Negro's record. They wish that this were true because it would mean that within a few years, or at most a few generations, by giving everyone the same environment, the populations of the world could all be made equal, and could live in love and happiness forever.

These good and sincere people are aided and encouraged by others who are not so good or sincere. The professional socialists, the col-

<sup>3</sup> Audrey Shuey, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, Lynchburg, 1958.



lectivists and the politicians who seek legal ways of stealing from some to buy the support of others—all of these find in the environmentalist dogma a splendid justification. It is undoubtedly the ideal platform for the demagogue. It doubles every man's chance to blame his faults on society.

So we come at this point to the center of our problem, the task of evaluating the evidence, of separating reality from hope, in the face of powerful drives in the direction of one answer—drives motivated by the strongest influences known to mankind: by love, by compassion, and by self-interest. It is in this kind of a setting that we are forced to winnow the truth.

Each one of you must make your own decision regarding the pressures in your own case—and unfortunately also in the case of those who teach you. I regret to say that my personal observation and experience have convinced me that the educational establishment in the United States, and especially its scientific hierarchy, are dominated largely by non-scientific motivations in this area. We find all of the forces we have just been talking about acting upon them, and we also find some additional forces. Those scientists who might like to stand against the popular environmentalist fashion meet with discouraging experiences.

For example, let me take the case of a professor of my acquaintance at a Northern university who published a statistical study of the comparative mental-test scores of Negroes and Whites of similar socio-economic status. Since his findings were that the Negro averages are consistently and significantly lower, even under conditions of equalized environment, delegations from two racial pressure organizations—one Negro and one Jewish—requested his university to fire him; the doors of other universities were closed in his face, and a professional society in his field refused to admit him to membership on the grounds that his opinions might be offensive to its Negro members.

As another illustration, I have in my files a letter from the president of a certain scientific society concerning a young member who had voted in favor of one of these no-difference resolutions at a meeting of that society. I quote in part: "As for X—, he said nothing at all at the meeting but just sat there like many others; he apologized to me in advance for not voting on the [other] side on the grounds that should he do so his job would be in danger. He was probably right. I don't see what else he could have done under the circumstances."

Or I can quote from a letter from a professor of anthropology at a large Western university: "It is with regret that I must decline this opportunity to express again publicly my belief in this matter

[of genetic race differences]. Letters, telephone calls, and threats after my statement in — were not favorable nor encouraging. Further exposure in the press could destroy any value that might come from my research now in progress and that which is planned for the immediate future."

Finally let me read from a letter received last month from a professor of biology at an Eastern university who had prepared material on genetic racial differences for publication: "Within the next few days [after my decision to publish had been reached] the President [of the university] summoned me to his office, and in the presence of the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, formally forbade me to publish any of this material. This was a formal and official prohibition, with some mumbling about academic freedom. I could only submit. There have been other pressures, most of which have been subtle. For example, my retirement will occur next —, and from a more than adequate income, my monthly total will be less than —. I will squeak through somehow, but I call attention to two Federal and one state job which have died on the vine, and a hint from a competent source that I had better be quiet if I expect to get a book published [on another subject]."

I shall admit that I myself have had some interesting contacts with the scientific hierarchy. In 1961 the American Anthropological Association passed a resolution which was a thinly veiled attack upon a book which I had written. This resolution read in part: "The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites . . ."

Upon learning of this resolution I immediately called a press conference in which I publicly asked the retiring president of the Association (a Harvard man) a question which I transmitted to him privately in advance. This question was: Do you also intend to repudiate the following published statement by your recently deceased Harvard colleague, Professor Clyde Kluckhohn, a Viking Medal winner and a long-time equalitarian, who said shortly before he died: "It seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their potentialities for particular kinds of achievement."<sup>4</sup>

I also publicly asked the retiring president whether he intended to repudiate the published findings of Dr. C. J. Connolly, Professor of Physical Anthropology at Catholic University, whose comparative studies of White and Negro brains led him to write in 1950: "It would be quite erroneous . . . to conclude . . . that cerebral differences do not exist in the two races."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *The American Anthropologist*, December 1959.

<sup>5</sup> *External Morphology of the Primate Brain*, Springfield, Ill., 1950, p. 258.



And I asked the retiring president whether he intended to repudiate the published statement of Dr. Garrett Hardin, Professor of Biology at the University of California at Santa Barbara, which reads as follows: "As a result of recent findings in the fields of physiological genetics and population genetics, particularly as regards blood groups, the applicability of the inequality axiom is rapidly becoming accepted."<sup>6</sup>

I then called the attention of the retiring president to the fact that none of these scientists were Southerners and I reminded him that Professor Ruggles Gates, an Englishman who was probably the world's most experienced and distinguished physical anthropologist and human geneticist at the time of his death in 1962, had made the public statement that there were vast differences among races in mental ability and capacity for development.<sup>7</sup> I wanted to know whether the retiring president had any substantive comment on any of these statements.

At this point the retiring president had apparently had enough, because he referred my questions to the new president, who was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley. This professor wrote me a letter which I would call a classic. He confined his comments to the quotation from Professor Kluckhohn and this is what the new president said:

"Relative to the statement by Dr. Kluckhohn, this is no way contradicts the position which was taken by the Fellows of the American Anthropological Association at the business meeting in Philadelphia. For example, people certainly differ in eye color. These differences are due to genetic causes. Very dark eyes are more efficient in the tropics, but this has nothing to do with the ability of people to participate in the democratic way of life."

To this I answered:

"My quotation from Kluckhohn was as follows: 'It seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their *potentialities for particular kinds of achievement*.' [Emphasis mine.] You attempt to answer this quotation by citing differences in eye color and you make the obvious remarks that these have nothing to do with the ability of people to participate in the democratic way of life. Kluckhohn spoke of differences in *potentialities for achievement* and these *do* have something to do with the democratic way of

life. They particularly have something to do with the statement in your Philadelphia resolution which flatly equates White and Negro intelligence. Your answer is therefore completely beside the point. You cannot deceive a child of ten with that sort of nonsense, so I wonder what your motives are."

Here the new president had apparently also had enough, because I have heard nothing more from him since.

Then I had an interesting experience the following year with the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. They passed a resolution in May of 1962 attacking this same book of mine. But in this case the president of the association, before he put the resolution to a vote, asked for a show of hands as to how many had read the volume. Out of about seventy in the room, three raised their hands. At this point the president remarked that under the circumstances he would rather resign the presidency than preside further over the session. He then left the rostrum and went home.

Confusion followed. I have not seen the minutes of the meeting, but it is a matter of record that no resolution was released to the press at the time. While one seems to have been passed, it was probably felt that to release it under the circumstances would reveal too much. Later in the summer, however, it appeared in a small New-England newspaper and was thereafter "in the open literature" where it could be used ruthlessly without regard to the legitimacy of its birth.

Of course the significant part of all these maneuvers is not so much the chicanery and evasions and suppressions and persecutions, but rather the fact that they are used to cloak the absence of any substantive evidence to support the environmentalist position. In all my encounters with these people—the most recent one was in connection with a pronouncement in 1963 by a committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—I have yet to meet anything but undocumented assertions. I ask nothing of you, or of any inquiring mind, except that you read these assertions, remember the scheming that went on in connection with them and then look at the available evidence.

It is manifestly impossible in one evening to cover all of the ground in detail. The best I can do is to give you the facts and the sources

<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, the resolution of his society has been used repeatedly as if in refutation of my book. See, for example, J. W. Silver, *Mississippi: The Closed Society*, New York, 1963, p. 27.

<sup>7</sup> *Science*, Nov. 1, 1963. Answered by me in *Science*, December 13, 1963, and by Henry E. Garrett and W. C. George in *Science*, Feb. 28, 1964. The same material was printed in *The Congressional Record*, May 19, 1964, A2614-A2616, and June 23, 1964, A3427-A3429.

<sup>6</sup> *Science*, April 29, 1960.

<sup>7</sup> Signed introduction to C. Putnam, *Race and Reason: A Yankee View*, Washington, D. C., 1961.



and then let you begin your own verification and deliberation, and your own comparison of these facts and sources with the assertions of the hierarchy.

I shall not dwell on the more obvious non-scientific evidence such as the figures which show that as the Negro's environment has improved his conduct has not. For example, in Virginia in the twenty years between 1938 and 1958, the rate of Negro illegitimacy increased from 19.5 percent to 22.9 percent, while the White rate declined from 2.6 to 2.3 percent. These were years which saw large gains in Negro education, Negro housing, Negro income and Negro job opportunities. In other words, as the environment improved the performance went down. This is certainly suggestive, but I shall confine myself for the moment to science.

The first scientific fact is that the balance of the evidence today indicates that heredity exceeds environment in its influence on the human mind and character by a ratio of about 3 to 1. The chief experimental data, as you know, comes from the study of one-egg twins raised apart.<sup>10</sup> The relative influence varies somewhat with different attributes of mind and character but for all practical purposes the 3-to-1 ratio can be taken as a rule of thumb.

The second fact is that there is just as much a racial heredity as there is a family heredity. Races are in fact simply pools of genes held in common which distinguish them from the gene pools of other races. If you will consult UNESCO's "The Race Concept: Results of an Inquiry," you will find in it statements by the late Sir Ronald Fisher, Professor of Genetics at Cambridge University, England, who writes, "Available scientific knowledge provides a firm basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development, seeing that such groups do differ undoubtedly in a very large number of their genes," and Dr. A. N. Sturtevant, Professor of Biology at the California Institute of Technology, says, "On general grounds there can be little question that . . . genetic differences occur in all sorts of mental properties. There can also be little question that there are at least statistical differences between races in such genes." There are many statements from other scientists along the same lines in the UNESCO pamphlet.

The third fact is that the weight of the brain in animals and human beings is a general measure of intelligence when a sufficiently

large number of cases are taken, and when the usual allowances are made for body size and sex. A 300-400 pound alligator has a brain weight of about 15 grams—and little sense. A 300-400 pound dolphin has a brain weight in the neighborhood of 1700 grams and as you know from your visits to Marineland and your acquaintance with Flipper, the dolphin is surprisingly intelligent. On the significance of brain weight and size Carleton S. Coon says: "Among living populations, absolute brain size is generally, although not necessarily individually, related to achievement."<sup>11</sup>

Parenthetically, let me remind you here that those of us who are compelled to talk about these facts, as I am tonight, are not the ones who created the *necessity* for talking about them. It always interests me to listen to an integrationist complain how unkind it is to mention such things when they are the very people who have made it imperative.

But to continue, the fourth fact is that as a racial characteristic, taking the required broad sampling of cases, the Negro brain has been found to average, I repeat *average*, some 8-12% below that of the average White. I believe this fact is so generally accepted that it does not require citations but I shall give you a good source in a footnote.<sup>12</sup>

The fifth fact is that *on the balance of the evidence* the structure of the average Negro brain, apart from its size and weight, differs from that of the average White brain in those parts which are related to the more advanced forms of intelligence and to evolutionary grade. I am speaking of such items as the thickness of the supragranular layer, the sulcification of the frontal lobes, and the cyto-architecture of the cortex. The supragranular layer of the average Negro appears to be thinner, the frontal lobes less fissured and there seem to be fewer large pyramidal neurons in the average Negro brain.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Carleton S. Coon, *Cold Spring Harbor Symposium on Quantitative Biology*, 1960, Vol. 24, p. 156. See also G. von Bonin, *The Evolution of the Human Brain*, Chicago, 1963; also Olof Larsell in *Morris' Human Anatomy*, 10th ed., 1942, p. 901.

<sup>12</sup> An excellent recent summary of the material will be found in *The Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1962, pp. 231-245.

<sup>13</sup> See C. J. Connolly, *External Morphology of the Primate Brain*, Springfield, Ill., 1950; F. W. Vint "The Brain of the Kenya Native", *Journal of Anatomy*, 1934, Vol. 68; W. Penfield and T. Rasmussen, *The Cerebral Cortex of Man*, 1950; C. W. M. Poynter and J. J. Keegan, "A Study of the American Negro Brain", *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 1915, Vol. 25; R. Ruggles Gates, *Human Genetics*, 1946, Vol. 2, p. 1138. On the significance of the thickness of the supragranular layer as an index of evolutionary grade, see J. S. Bolton, *The Brain in Health and Disease*, London, 1914.

I do not cite Penfield and Rasmussen on race differences. I cite them solely on the importance of the frontal lobes regardless of race. To my knowledge they have conducted no race studies but their investigations suggest a connection between the frontal lobes and those elements of the civilized mind which involve planning, motivation and foresight. This is something beyond intelligence. It is the use of intelligence.

<sup>10</sup> See generally L. Erlenmeyer-Kimling and I. Jarvick, "Genetics and Intelligence: A Review," *Science*, 1963, Vol. 142, No. 3598. Also H. H. Newman, F. N. Freeman and K. J. Holzinger, *Twins: A Study of Heredity and Environment*, Chicago, 1937. Also Cyril Burt and Margaret Howard, "The Relative Influence of Heredity and Environment on Assessments of Intelligence," 1957, *The British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, Vol. 10, Part 2, pp. 99-104. For a short summary, see *The Mankind Quarterly*, 1964, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 197-204.



Now in this area, as you can imagine, there is much uproar. It is a wonderful field in which the wishful-thinker can confuse the superficial investigator. Many attacks have been made on the sufficiency of the controls, the size of the samplings and so on. For instance, in the case of Vint's measurements of the thickness of the supragranular layer of the East African Negro and his comparison of this with similar measurements of certain Europeans, the argument has been made that a difference in the mode of handling the brains after death and before measurement might have resulted in a difference in shrinkage. However, nobody has explained why this shrinkage should have affected the Negro's supragranular layer but not his lamina zonalis which in every case was found to be *thicker* in the Negro.

At Princeton last spring, after a lecture like this one, a student came up to me and remarked that if the structure of the brain was important to intelligence then the dolphin should intermarry with Caucasians because of the weight and sulcification of its brain. He even asked me if I would recommend this. (Some of these people are a little sarcastic sometimes.) I told him that I had been advised that the development of the dolphin's brain is chiefly in the auditory and muscular response mechanisms. The cerebral cortex is primitive in structure. The supragranular layers are thin and relatively undeveloped. There are no frontal associational areas. Consequently I could not recommend such marriages.

Seriously, while there has been this uproar and these confusing and I am afraid sometimes deliberately misleading arguments, the content of it is largely negation and an attempt to discredit what facts we have. There have been few attempts to supply counter facts. If anybody has any, nobody brought them into court in the *Stell* or *Evers*<sup>14</sup> cases where they could have been subjected to cross-examination under oath.

However, I am sure such attempts will be made as time passes, and I warn you to watch for the same techniques that we have observed throughout the history of this controversy. My recommendation would be from now on, whenever you hear about discoveries that seem to contradict Connolly or Vint or any of the evidence I have mentioned tonight, you simply answer, "Tell it to the judge."

But let us get back to our list of facts. The sixth fact is that in all mammalian life full mental stature develops early in direct relation to cerebral simplicity. In other words, the more advanced the mind is going to be, the longer it takes to pull it together at the start. To phrase it technically, whenever the nervous system is enlarged out

of proportion to its sensory supply and has many alternative pathways and opportunities for choice, much time is taken in growing up. Recently methods have been worked out for measuring the speed of kinesthetic learning—learning, that is, which involves the transition from uterine to infant patterns of muscular reflex and control, this speed being inversely correlated with the ultimate complexity to be attained by the brain and in particular by the cerebral cortex. Thus, neonatal kinesthetic development is more rapid among gorillas than among chimpanzees, and many times faster among chimpanzees than among human infants.

So it is logical to assume that differences in the rate of kinesthetic maturation between human races would have some bearing on the complexity, or evolutionary status, of the structure of their brains. In 1956 Dr. Marcelle Geber made studies of normal infants in Kampala, Uganda, for the World Health Organization. She discovered that developmental milestones were reached much more rapidly by Negro than by White infants.<sup>15</sup>

The seventh fact—or perhaps I should call it this time a probability hypothesis—is that the Negro race relative to the White race is about 200,000 years younger on the evolutionary scale. The citation on this is Carleton S. Coon. *The Origin of Races*, 1962, also in somewhat easier form for the layman, *The Story of Man*, 2nd Edition, 1962, by the same author. Dr. Coon, a Harvard magna cum laude graduate and a Viking Medal winner, a New Englander by birth and background, was president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists at the time he published these books.

His conclusions are based on fossil discoveries up to date which indicate that the White man made the transition from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens* in Europe about 250,000 years ago whereas the Negro made the same transition in Africa about 30,000 years ago. Dr. Coon goes on to remark: "It is a fair inference . . . that the subspecies which crossed the evolutionary threshold into the category of *Homo sapiens* the earliest have evolved the most and that the obvious correlation between the length of time a subspecies has been in the *sapiens* state and the levels of civilization attained by some of its populations may be related phenomena."

Here again we are dealing with a balance of evidence, but it is interesting how the balance always seems to fall on one side. I would not be surprised to see much of this evidence modified as time goes on. I would be greatly surprised to see the balance change. And as for

<sup>14</sup> *Stell vs. the Savannah Board of Education*, 220 F. Supp. 667 (S. D. Ga. 1963); *Evers vs. Jackson School District*, 232 Fed. Supp. 241 (S. D. Miss. 1964).

<sup>15</sup> Marcelle Geber, *The Lancet*, June 15, 1957, and *Courrier*, Vol. 6, No. 1, UNESCO, Paris, Jan. 1956. See also J. C. Carothers, *The African Mind in Health and Disease: A Study in Ethnopsychiatry*, World Health Organization, Geneva, 1953, p. 100.



our current problems, let me repeat: *The fact that every item of evidence is not perfect is no reason for basing public policy or court decisions on the assumption that the opposite of the evidence is true.*

The eighth fact is that all the data we have from intelligence tests over the past forty years confirms the first seven facts. The average Negro I.Q. is 15 to 20 points below the average White I.Q.<sup>16</sup> You will constantly hear this explained on environmental grounds, but of the five tests that have been made after equating, as far as it is possible to equate, the socio-economic backgrounds of the two races, all five indicate an insignificant change in relative position. As environment is improved the Negro does better, but so does the White. The gap is not decreased.<sup>17</sup>

A favorite maneuver in regard to intelligence tests is what I might call the Klineberg maneuver. Otto Klineberg is often quoted as having shown that claims of White-Negro differences are invalidated by certain tests made during the first World War in which "the mean scores of many Northern Negro groups were higher than those of certain groups of Southern Whites." This, of course, is simply the old ruse of comparing the best Negroes with the worst Whites, which nobody has ever denied will favor the Negro. Such comparisons can always be made where there is overlap. It is much the same line of argument as the one which points out that the differences *between* races is less than the difference *within* any given race. Obviously this is true. To have it otherwise we would need to suppose a race of geniuses on the one hand and imbeciles on the other, a supposition which does not fit either the White or the Negro.

What happened in the first World War was that Negro soldiers from New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois scored on the average about three point higher than White soldiers from Arkansas, Mississippi, Kentucky and Georgia where education fifty years ago was incomparably poorer than in the North. "What we find, then," as Dr. Garrett has expressed it, "is that small groups of better educated Negroes from the *top* of their distribution did slightly better than small groups of poorly educated Whites drawn from the *bottom* of their distribution. The results, of course, could have been predicted."

In the Klineberg maneuver you have operating both the overlap factor and the educational factor. You can improve anybody's performance by education, even an animal's, provided the test is keyed to education, as the Army Alpha was.

These eight facts complete the answer to our second question and

we come to the third: Should the existence of the exceptional Negro (this matter of overlap we have just been discussing) alter public policy as it is applied to the race as a whole?

The sponsors of the Negro "revolution," when they are driven from the positions taken in the name of perverted science, always retreat to the argument concerning the exceptional Negro, claiming that fairness to him requires that he be judged on his personal merits as an individual, not by the average of his race. In other words, they claim society should accept the burden of integrating *all* Negroes in order to be fair to the exceptional Negro.

The chaos which would result if such a theory were generally applied may be judged by the case of the minor who is not allowed to vote or drive a car or get married until he reaches the prescribed legal age. Many such minors are more intelligent than many adults. There is overlap. Yet would any reasonable person favor burdening society with the presence of the average juvenile at the ballot box or the drivers' license bureau or the marriage altar in order to satisfy the exceptional juvenile? To ask the question is to answer it.

It is true that the restriction upon the minor is temporary while in the case of the Negro it is permanent, but it is also true that the restriction upon the minor is absolute while in the case of the Negro it is only partial. The exceptional Negro has many outlets and opportunities where the barriers of segregation are few.

Or take the case of state laws which prohibit overtime work by women in factories. Some women are stronger than many men. Yet they are required to forego overtime, regardless of their ability or their financial need, because they belong to a group whose average member has certain limitations. Should these laws be repealed in fairness to the exceptional woman? Again the question is rhetorical.

We are ready now for our final inquiry: In view of all the circumstances—the overwhelming balance of the evidence and the transparent political motivation of the scientific hierarchy—how can we explain our getting into the predicament in which we find ourselves among the backward peoples abroad and in regard to our own domestic policies at home? We see the White children of the South forced at bayonet point and against the wishes of their parents into schools with a race which the balance of the evidence today indicates to be thousands of years behind them in evolutionary grade and which, *primarily for this specific reason*, produces many times the illegitimacies, the feeble-mindedness, the robberies, the rapes and the murders. This aggression is committed upon the most defenseless elements in the community, children and their teachers. Yet the majority of our people acquiesce in the procedure, satisfied by ex-

<sup>16</sup> Audrey Shuey, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, Lynchburg, 1958.

<sup>17</sup> Henry E. Garrett, "The SPSSI and Racial Differences", *The American Psychologist*, May 1962.



hortations from the churches and in particular by a Supreme Court decision which is unique in the history of American law.

The Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka* on which the entire integration movement rests has now been shown, in repeated new court trials and upon uncontradicted new evidence, to have been based upon misrepresentation and concealment. Contrary to the findings in *Brown* it now appears, on studies far more complete, exhaustive and extended than those offered in *Brown*, that the Negro child is not only not harmed by segregation but is in fact injured by integration. Let me quote you just one paragraph from the opinion of the Federal judge in the case of *Evers vs. The Jackson School District* rendered July 6, 1964:

"Here [the Negro] plaintiffs have conceded, by their unwillingness or inability to contest the issues of which they had been seasonably informed, first, that the learning traits which are characteristic of Negro children do differ to an educationally significant degree from those which are typical of white pupils; second, that separate classes with teachers of the same race are academically superior and maintain a better disciplinary status; third, that such classes substantially diminish the number of delinquents and drop-outs in the schools; fourth, that such separate classes alone can be adapted to the difference in instruction which is necessary to realize for the learning patterns of both groups the equality of educational opportunity which the Constitution requires; fifth, that differences between Caucasians and Negroes are genetically determined and cannot be changed materially by environment; and, sixth, that integration—not segregation—injures the Negro school child."

Later, in reference to the matter of misrepresentation in the *Brown* case, the *Evers* judge says: "In the opinion of this Court, the facts in this case point up a most serious situation, and, indeed, 'cry out' for a reappraisal and complete reconsideration of the findings and conclusions of the United States Supreme Court in the *Brown* decision."

Yet, just ten days ago today the Supreme Court refused certiorari in the *Stell* case. The *Stell* case is a somewhat earlier but companion case to *Evers*. I might remark, without going into legal details, that what this means is that the Supreme Court has refused even to look at the new evidence or the omissions in the old evidence. They gave no reason, but I can tell you what the reason is. They are afraid to look at this evidence. They fear the truth and what it will do to the whole fantastic structure they have built. They are afraid even to

remand *Stell* for a new trial because they fear it may awaken the public to the truth. In the long annals of Anglo-American jurisprudence there is no more alarming episode than this. We need a Paul Revere to ride from coast to coast with *this* news.

Never before has the Constitution of the United States been thought to require integration, never before has the Christian religion been supposed to condone it. Christ never once suggested the integration of slaves with masters, either in the name of God or brotherhood. The Declaration of Independence had no reference to Negroes, most of whom at the time were chattel property. Abraham Lincoln stated repeatedly that he did not favor the social or political equality of Negroes. The American ideal of freedom has never before been supposed to include social equality or any form of forced integration of differing groups to achieve such equality. So again we must ask ourselves, how did it all happen? And we have come back full circle to the point we touched on at the outset.

The truth of the matter is that the Constitution, the Christian religion, the Declaration of Independence, the views of Lincoln, the American dream and all the life sciences have been perverted in the last generation in the name of a myth. That myth is the biological equality of man—both inter- and intraracially. No such equality has ever in fact existed, nor is it likely that it ever will exist, yet those who believe in it will sacrifice anything for it, including, as I think you have seen, honor itself.

And for a simple reason. The myth lies at the heart of the whole gamut of left-wing philosophies which obsess mankind today. It has no relation to reality, any more than do the ideologies that have sprung from it. It is created and worshipped in the name of love without relation to truth and therefore carries in it the seeds of disaster.

The whole business is all the more surprising since most of us recognize privately that the principle of inequality is universal. Most of us individually will concede the genetic superiority of many men to ourselves. We attempt to emulate such men, and their existence inspires us to better ourselves, in spite of the impossibility of equaling them. Unless we are fools, the inequality does not fill us with rancor. We act on the realization that life consists in making the most of the gifts we possess, and that the man who accomplishes much with little is entitled to more respect and "human dignity" than the man who accomplishes little with much. And if this be the case between individuals, why is it not also the case between groups?

Frankly it seems to me the time has come when we have got to get this situation straightened out. Either we follow the rule of all life, the rule of development, of growth, of the evolution of our per-



sonal selves as individual characters, and of our races as biological groups, through effort and stress and self-improvement, or we abandon the rule of life and dedicate ourselves to the lowest common denominator—to stagnation and mediocrity.

What we do has a direct bearing on the Negro problem. We cannot lift up the bottom by pulling down the top. Nor will we get anywhere by lying to the Negro about himself. The White man does *not* owe the Negro a debt. If there is any debt it is on the other side. The Negro owes the White man hospitals, medicines, food, education, opportunity, and a standard of living he could not possibly have acquired for himself. Most of the Negroes in America today would not even exist if their ancestors had not been brought here from Africa. The majority of these ancestors would have been wiped out by savagery and disease. If the Negro is ever going to progress he is going to have to do it by his own racial evolution and through his own personal character.

Next it seems to me the time has come to reverse those public policies which are based on the false dogma of biological identity. There would appear to be no risk in voluntary association of the races in non-social situations (those having no genetic implications) and action along these lines ought to be encouraged, but compulsory social integration of any kind, such as in primary and high schools, should be discontinued. While we are providing every feasible outlet for the exceptional Negro, we should let the average Negro find his own level without trying to force him into places where he is not qualified to be.

On the world scene the proper course seems to me just as obvious. Never in history has the Negro by himself been able to manage a stable, free society, even for a few years—not in Africa, nor in Haiti, nor anywhere else. Granting "freedom" to African tribes under these circumstances is simply granting a passport to chaos—worse, it means a return to the kind of thing that has been going on in the Congo. Let liberals ponder the kind of "love" that sanctions this.

I do not think I exaggerate when I say that the effort to find a substitute for colonialism is approaching bankruptcy—at least in Africa. A policy of controlled colonialism under the supervision of United Nations' mandates to various civilized powers is the only sensible solution for centuries to come—provided the United Nations is so reorganized that civilized peoples are not outvoted by backward peoples. As far as the United States is concerned, having in mind outlets for the exceptional Negro, can you imagine a better way of spending foreign aid than in the administration of a mandate which will combine economic benefit to ourselves with opportunity for enter-

prising American Negroes to return to their racial homeland and apply for the benefit of their own kind the civilizing knowledge they have acquired in America?

Taking such foreign and domestic policies together, can we not picture in the years ahead a Negro population in the United States in which the average Negro is adjusted to work within the range of his capabilities minus the frustrations, tensions and hostilities involved in following false stars? Can we not visualize such Negroes developing their own culture in their own communities served by the exceptional Negro in all the professions, while the exceptional and adventurous Negro returns to Africa to join in a disciplined plan of development under White protection? It seems to me that along that road lies the evolution of a higher civilization for us all.

Now in conclusion I have a suggestion to make which—though you forget everything else I have said tonight—I would like to hope you will remember. From now on, when you think about our public policies, our ideologies, and our attitudes in the humanitarian field at home and abroad, ask yourselves, each time, is this a case of love in a framework of truth, or is this the kind of love that is dedicated to a fantasy?

And if it is the kind of love that is dedicated to a fantasy, you can be sure that the motivation back of it is not the welfare of mankind. As William Massey has said recently, speaking of the whole equalitarian ideology, "We do not have here a movement by men who love humanity, but by men obsessed with a vision . . . It is the stylized, inhuman vision they love, not man. They do not look at man dispassionately, or even with affection, to heed his condition and help him. Instead they preach a mystic brotherhood, [but it is not a brotherhood] reached by good will, understanding and tolerance. It is a fanatic's dream . . . that gives them the self-righteousness to vent their hatreds with a clear conscience."

So when you listen to a teacher, or politician, or a fellow-student preaching brotherhood and love and equality, ask yourselves: Is the motivation genuine or is it a self-righteous illusion? Is it dedicated to truth, or is it dedicated to conformity—to doing the easy, popular thing? Or is it simply self-serving? Remember that it is quite as possible to steal a culture from a nation as it is to steal money from an individual—the only difference is that the thief can keep the money, but he cannot really keep the culture. It rapidly deteriorates in his hands.

You see you have to decide whether or not the motivation, in a sense, is theft masquerading as love—whether it is covetousness and envy in sheep's clothing. I am afraid some of it is. And a lot more of



it is timid conformity and ignorance rather than genuine compassion.

Because in time even love is warped by a framework of illusion. All things deteriorate and there is no redemption except in a new framework, and its name is truth.

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

*Note to UCD Students: If you do not find in the following list the question you asked in the exact words in which you asked it, it will probably be for the reason that several questions were so much alike it was a waste of space to repeat them. A few, but only a few, have been omitted because of unintelligibility, irrelevance, or triviality. The over-all standard is high. I draw certain conclusions at the end of the section.*

1. If the Negro is so different genetically, why is it that most Negroes raised in our segregated system cannot qualify for our colleges while many foreign Negroes can qualify to compete in our colleges?

Foreign-born Negroes are skimmed off the top of their intelligence distribution. They are the cream of Negro Africa. When we consider a race we are obliged to speak in averages, not exceptions. Nevertheless you may be interested in looking at the *National Review Bulletin* for February 2, 1965, p. 3, commenting upon a report of a study commission on education and world affairs endowed in 1962 by the Ford and Carnegie Foundations. This report was based upon a survey of 75,000 foreign students on American campuses—55,000 of them from Africa and Asia. The *Bulletin* finds the report "overwhelmingly negative" and goes on to say that too many of the students "are (1) ill prepared scholastically and linguistically for American college courses, (2) intellectually below college level (3) unwilling to work, and (4) a headache, in the aggregate, to host colleges."

Incidentally, Clark and Plotkin (1963) reported that, on the basis of a study of about 1200 Northern college students, those Negroes from Southern segregated schools did better than Negroes from Northern integrated schools.

2. a. It is an established fact that in World War II the over-all average I.Q. score was higher for the Northern Negro than the Southern White. Since this average was based on all those drafted (rather than the top and bottom), how do you explain this in terms other than environment? If



environment is accepted, does this not also apply to the Negro situation?

- b. Don't you believe that motivation has much to do with the achievement of the Negro? i.e., that the Negro does not see the reason for education since he does not have the opportunity to practice his skills. Also in this line how would you explain the fact (I'll be happy to cite) that Negro children have a higher aspirational level than White children?
  - a. There was no such thing as an "I.Q. score" in World War II. If you are talking about the Army General Classification Test, you have your facts reversed. The Southern White excelled the Northern Negro on this test. Five times as many Southern Whites as Northern Negroes were in Grade I. (See *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, op. cit., p. 218.) For a discussion of the meaning of an "I.Q. score" see my answer to Question 10.
  - b. Motivation comes from within, not from the environment unless the native soil is fertile. The term "aspirational level" is an inferred state. It is highly subjective and often ambiguous. The Jews, and many others, have found added motivation in hardship and persecution. Lack of motivation is more often an excuse than a reason for failure.
3. You cited the UNESCO study to substantiate that Negroes mature earlier than Whites. Please re-study the finding of this work. The reasons for early maturation of the Negro were due to climatic differences of their environment and not for biological reasons. Negroes in the same climate as the Whites mature at the same rate.

This question confuses the age of sexual maturation with a *kinesthetic* maturation process during the first months of life. The difference between White and Negro *kinesthetic* maturation is not due to climate since (1) Kampala, Uganda, where the tests were made is 2500 feet above sea level and (2) in their 1957 paper Geber and Dean (*Lancet* 272: 1216-1219) studied 15 European babies and 60 Indian babies in the same environment as the African babies. The European and Indian babies gave the same results as had been found in Europe.

4. Psychological tests of a child's "I.Q." at an early age measure

motor ability and advanced motor ability is not considered indicative of low I.Q. In fact, the correlation between motor ability at an early age and mental I.Q. at a late one is so low as to be considered not significant. Which facts—yours or mine—are right?

I have stated my sources; you do not state yours. Geber found a significantly faster kinesthetic maturation rate in Negro infants than in White infants.<sup>1</sup> Almost all investigators (see Audrey Shuey, *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, 1958) have found a significantly lower I.Q. on the average among older Negroes than among older Whites. It is likewise well known that rapid maturation of the neuromuscular system is characteristic of the lower animals. What kind of correlation does this suggest to you?

The subject may be worth a brief background examination. We have in man and the higher mammals two neural pathways that control our coordinated motor functions. These two systems are the *pyramidal* and the *extrapyramidal* systems. They have a considerable degree of independence structurally and functionally but they have interconnections and they collaborate in executing our mature complex motor functions.

The extrapyramidal system is the old motor system. It is composed largely of cells located in deep gray matter of the cerebral hemispheres. They have some connections with the cortex. This deep gray matter of the *corpus striatum* (unusually highly developed in birds) presides over production and control of instinctive and some other automatic movements.

The pyramidal system is our new motor system. The cells of origin of its transmission fibers are located in the cortex, and impulses pass directly to effector nerve cells that stimulate muscle fibers. The function of the pyramidal system is to originate and transmit impulses that arise in the realm of awareness and effect precise voluntary movements. Not only is this the last motor system to arise in the evolutionary process, it is the last to mature and come into function in individual life.

In lower forms the extrapyramidal motor system is dominant and quite effective. As it has evolved in the evolutionary series of vertebrates the extrapyramidal system has lost some of its independent efficiency.

<sup>1</sup> For example, the uterine Moro reflex was found to disappear in White children on the average between the 8th and 12th weeks of life, but with all the 107 Negro children it disappeared before the 5th day of life.



In man the pyramidal system is dominant, but coordination with the old extrapyramidal system seems necessary for effective action. In the human newborn the pyramidal system is immature and has not yet come into effective function; at the same time the extrapyramidal system has become subordinate in some degree to the pyramidal system. Hence, the perfection of many motor functions must await the maturation of the pyramidal system.

The facts presented by Geber and Dean suggest a greater retention in African babies of the primitive independence of the extrapyramidal system. This could account for the motor precocity of Negro babies. There is evidence for the hypothesis that the more primitive, greater independence of the extrapyramidal system of Africans is associated with a more primitive condition of the cortex. In addition to the now widely known observations of Vint on the supragranular layers, van Noort found the cellular structure of some regions of the cortex to present a different appearance in the Caucasian and Negro races. (See Kappers, Huber, and Crosby, p. 1632.) I stated in my lecture that this is one of the areas where the *balance* of the evidence has to be considered. I do not say in this case the data is conclusive. I say it is suggestive.

As to early intelligence tests, Dr. Geber, using Gesell Development Quotients, found distinct superiority among Negro children until the third year, thereafter distinct inferiority. These tests measure more complex muscular performance and probably combine simple reflexes with much more complex, cerebrally learned behavior. A 1955 study by Scott of comparative Negro and White development pace, where the two groups were of similar socio-economic status, showed the Negroes developing faster until the 30th week, then lagging behind.

5. Do you have some evidence for other areas besides Virginia that shows that as environment improves, performance doesn't improve? Have you read some contrary evidence and, if so, how do you refute it?

It depends whether you are speaking of character or intelligence. In my lecture I was referring to character. Any environment improves performance when it allows for a better expression of one's abilities—it does not create abilities. Practice improves a man's golf but only so far as his innate capacity permits. Practice alone will never make an Arnold Palmer.

Crime and immorality are in a somewhat different category. I have not attempted a detailed study of the national figures, but it is common knowledge that the Negro is receiving more attention today than ever before and more efforts are being made to encourage him, yet his relative crime rate is increasing. The FBI will confirm this to you.

6. Assuming for the moment that you are correct re: the racial inferiority of the Negro, why is it necessary to believe that intermarriage would necessarily lower the quality of human beings produced and thus the quality of American civilization? That is, why assume that Negro inferior traits are dominant? Why not assume, as the human evolutionary process suggests, that superior traits are dominant, and thus intermarriage would have the effect of raising the total quality of American civilization?

It is not necessary to believe *every* mixed mating would lower the quality of human being produced. If a Negro of superior genetic quality were to interbreed with a genetically poor White their offspring might be superior to the poor White parent. However, we are not confronted with exceptional individuals only. We are confronted with twenty million Negroes. Scientific evidence and practical experience regarding the intelligence of large unselected groups, and their creative achievements, show that Negroes as a group, in this country and across the world, have appreciably lower average intelligence scores and a vastly lower creative record throughout history. If we absorb twenty million uncreative Negroes into our White gene pool, the mixed product may be expected to lack the combination of qualities (insight, foresight, intelligence and drive) necessary to maintain and advance American civilization.

Traits may be desirable or undesirable; also they may be dominant or recessive, but there is no correlation that I ever heard of between desirable or undesirable traits on the one hand and dominance or recessiveness on the other. Achondroplastic dwarfism is undesirable and dominant. Undesirable traits are frequently dominant.

It is of course true that natural selection tends to eliminate those traits which are biologically disadvantageous in a particular environment. This, however, is a factor which has little chance to operate in a society granting poor-relief.

7. How can you assume any validity in I.Q. tests when those tests



have been standardized exclusively from White populations?

The American Negro speaks English, has grown up in an American culture and should experience no handicap in taking "White tests." The Japanese in California don't. Moreover, the Negro must live in our White society. What we are trying to measure is his ability to adapt to our society and to contribute to it. To the extent that the Negro does experience difficulty in taking White tests to just that extent will the nature of his mind be alien to the White mind. We have a culture based on abstract thought. The Negro is poor at abstract thinking. If this shows up in a test it does not invalidate the test. It confirms its validity. See further my answer to Question 10.

8. **In reference to results on I.Q. tests: You said equation of socioeconomic differences. What about educational differences and background?**

Educational differences and background *were* equated as nearly as possible in the studies discussed by Dr. Garrett and cited in my lecture. When you equate for background, your Negro sample comes from a higher level of its population than does the White.

9. **As a scientist, don't you feel that a scientific study of group differences can only apply to differences between means of large groups and not to single, randomly selected individuals? But even supposing the unlikely possibility that tests can be devised which determine only genetic I.Q., genetic ambition, genetic morality, genetic creativity, etc., and suppose even further that it can be established that the average Negro is inferior in all respects to the average White, then aren't you left with the obvious result that some Negroes will be superior to some Whites in every respect? Don't you think that the principle or question of racial equality is not the issue in segregation, since one can't judge an individual on the basis of some average? Don't you think that the question of civil rights is essentially a question of individual rights and not group rights or average rights? In my opinion, you confuse the question of "science and race" and the dubious question of "science and segregation."**

Apparently you arrived after my lecture was more than half over. I dealt with your question as a major point in my discussion. Please read the paragraphs concerning exceptional minors and exceptional women—also my answer to Question 17.

10. **Are you aware of the conclusions published by a University of Chicago team of M.D.'s, psychologists and educators (e.g., *Atlantic Monthly*, 1963) which clearly demonstrate the fact that the I.Q. shifts upward over 40 points in most cases when the poor climate for education is changed to a better one?**

You apparently are referring to Murray Friedman's article in the January, 1963, *Atlantic*. While I find nothing in it about 40 I.Q. points, it does speak of "dramatic success achieved in raising I.Q.'s" and thus presents a question I would like to clarify.

There is considerable discussion today about just what an I.Q. test is intended to measure, and how far it accomplishes its purpose. I believe I state the classical view correctly when I say that ideally an I.Q. test is intended to measure the intellectual potential of the mind—the raw or virgin brain power—divorced as much as possible from environmental factors. But no test can be given in a vacuum, some words and symbols have to be used, and the moment these are introduced environmental factors do creep in. All we can say is that the test is intended as far as possible to reduce their influence.

Theoretically, and in the ideal sense, an I.Q. score should change only to the extent that exercise of a capacity increases that capacity within the limits of innate potential. Actually an I.Q. score is made up of innate potential, plus practice, plus past experience in varying degrees. I would say that a test which showed a shift of 40 points was either not intended as a genuine I.Q. test or was poorly administered in the first instance.

If an individual is ill or scared to death or given a test completely alien to his experience, large changes might occur. However, the Negro child gets around quite a bit these days, more in some respects than the White child, and the terms and symbols used in Negro testing should not significantly handicap him in a properly administered test. What you have in the case you mention is probably less an improvement in I.Q. than in the tools with which the individual expressed his I.Q. Education is such a tool.

To my mind there is a point here of greater importance than an exact definition of I.Q., namely the fact that when you give two groups of different potential the same education you do not decrease the gap between them. You increase it, because the group with the higher potential will derive more from the education. Since no one has yet proposed that White environment be held constant while Negro environment is advanced,



environmental improvement will only intensify the problem of race differences.

11. a. Haitian dictators get chopped up. So do Italian and German ones (and even ancient Roman ones). Comment?
- b. The exceptional White is given advantages. Why should the exceptional Negro not be given the same advantages?
- c. A sociologist who makes a study in which he declares he compared Whites and Negroes who had environmental equality is not worth his Ph.D. Negroes are not allowed to have environment equality in this country, anywhere. They are always subject to discrimination. Comment?
- a. The difference is in the frequency and regularity.
- b. See my answer to Question 9. The exceptional Negro has the same advantages relative to his race as the White has relative to his race.
- c. The phrase used is "as far as possible." You are correct that we cannot completely "equate" without turning the Negro into a White man which is biologically impossible. The point is that as you *approach* equality of environment the gap does not decrease. Note also, as I said in answering Question 8, that when you equate for background your Negro comes from a higher level of his population than does the White.

12. You say Negro illegitimacy has a rate of 19-22. Most South American countries have rates higher than this. Venezuela has a rate of almost 70. You may ascribe this to mongrelization of the races. How about Mexico, which has few Negroes and has a rate 22.5? And Argentina, which has a still higher rate, and has a pure white population?
- Why is it that Whites in the South are the ones who are allowed to decide on segregation?
- Why can't Negroes vote?

In many Latin American countries high illegitimacy rates exist, but this simply means that stable families have omitted the marriage ceremony. Reasons may include geographical isolation, ignorance, local custom, scarcity of priests or high cost of the marriage service. Illegitimacy *per se* is often determined by social and economic factors and is not too meaningful.

American Negro illegitimacy occurs in a society in which the Latin American factors mentioned are largely non-operative. Far more significant is the fact that it generally reflects a broken family, in which the man plays a sexual, but not a responsibly paternal, role, in which the mother is the head of the household and the children lack necessary discipline. For more on this, see Nathaniel Weyl, *The Negro in American Civilization*, 1960, pp. 232-234.

As for decisions on segregation and voting, see my answer to Question 35.

13. Would you comment on the superiority of the Jewish Race (via your I.Q. reasoning)?

Jews, who are not a race but a sub-stock of the Caucasian race, test as well or better than American non-Jews on "verbal" tests, somewhat below on manipulative tests. The traits which have led to the persecution of Jews have had nothing to do with their intelligence.

14. How could the Negro have evolved from *Homo erectus* 30,000 years ago, when no fossils of this type younger than 200,000 years old are known?

Your facts are incorrect. A Negroid *Homo erectus* specimen dated about 30,000 years ago was found at Broken Hill, Northern Rhodesia, in 1921. (See Carleton S. Coon, *The Story of Man*, 1962, pp. 34-35.) There is a fairly good continuity of *erectus* and *sapiens* skeletons in Africa. The oldest *sapiens* skulls found there appear to be a set of four which Leakey excavated in Kenya in 1932; their exact age is controversial but they are probably in the general range of the Broken Hill specimen.

15. Isn't it a fact that I.Q. tests are not a significant or valid test for comparing the intelligent potentials of Negroes and Caucasians since they are primarily designed with the Caucazoid individual in mind, and are thus relevant only to the educational experiences of the Caucazoids?

See my answers to Questions 7 and 10. The original Benet was not designed with *any* specific child in mind.

16. You stated that the differences between individuals are greater than the differences between races. Would you then deny



Whites and Negroes of equal intellectual and social background the right to mix socially if they wish to do so?

And if intellect is genetically determined, would it not be beneficial for a White of low intelligence to marry a Negro of high intelligence to gain for her children the benefit of his superior genes?

See my answer to Question 6. If we had only the relatively few high quality Negroes confronting us our situation would not be serious. But once we make race mixing acceptable for the few, we lose power to control the many. Remember that the Supreme Court's integration decision, the Civil Rights Act and the Negro movement all aim at total, not selective, integration.

17. **Even accepting your assertion of racial differences, if there is a significant overlap should not divisions in classes in schools be made on the basis of individual ability instead of race, putting the superior Negro with the superior Whites?**

The Court in the *Stell* case answers this question as follows:

"Throughout the trial, counsel for plaintiffs emphasized the conceded ability of certain superior Negro children to meet the progress norms of the white classes and implied that at least selective transfers of such students to white schools would not cause injury similar to the effects of group integration. The Court finds that such selective integration would cause even greater psychological harm to the individual Negro children involved and to the balance of their group.

"Negro children so transferred would not only lose their right of achievement in their own group but would move to a class where they would be inescapably conscious of total social rejection by the dominant group. Such children must try to identify themselves with the white children while unable to free themselves from continuing identification with other Negro children. Additionally, the children involved, while able to maintain the rate of the White class at first, would, according to all of the test results, thereafter tend to fall further back in each succeeding term.

"The effects on the remaining Negro children would be even more injurious. The loss of the better group members would greatly increase any existing sense of inferiority. The competitive drive to educational accomplishment for those not transferred would be taken away. The Court finds that

selective integration would cause substantial and irremovable psychological injury both to the individual transferee and to other Negro children."

In *Evers* the Court says:

"The differences so measured [between White and Negro children] were not limited to the change of learning rate and ultimate difference in relative mental age or I.Q. which the Court has previously noted, but included as well an even more fundamental distinction in educational patterns, that of subject interest and problem approach. The witnesses were unanimous that these differences were not only substantial in themselves but were of major importance in determining the method of teaching, the selection and content of courses and fixing the progress norms. This was true even though an individual of one group would overlap the other in one or more of the measured factors since these did not show a change in the over-all pattern."

In other words, educability is a matter of more than I.Q., and overlap in I.Q. does not necessarily mean overlap in other important factors.

18. **An American with one-fourth Negro blood is considered by American social standards 100 per cent Negro. Any White blood would increase the Negro's potential for intellectual development. Does it not follow, then, that interracial marriage could help the Negro? Any offspring would be considered Negro and therefore not damage the integrity of the White race.**

See my answer to Questions 6 and 16. The fact that "any offspring would be considered Negro" would be no protection to a White society which accepted the Negro genetically.

19. **Why is the educational system consistently poorer in the South (you yourself referred to this fact) when this is the area where racial segregation of the schools is most fully implemented? Segregation supposedly benefits the Negro and, I presume, the White child.**

I said that education in the South 50 years ago was poorer than in the North. This was chiefly due to the economic handicaps of the post-Civil War era, not to segregation. Since the first World War, economic conditions have greatly improved in the South and so has education.

I have pointed out that recent surveys have shown that



Negro graduates of Southern segregated schools do better in Northern colleges than do Negro graduates of Northern integrated schools. See my answer to Question 1

20. If it is "true" that the Negro is mentally inferior to the White person (and I do not believe it is) what has this got to do with not allowing Negroes in certain restaurants or making Negroes stand on buses while Whites sit?

In my lecture I tried to make clear that I oppose social, not non-social, integration with the proviso that the local area must decide what a social situation is. A restaurant might be a social situation in Tupelo, Mississippi, but not in Chicago. For this reason it is essential that the race problem be left to the individual states.

21. If we assume your facts to be correct, what does a democratic society care about intermarriage, etc., of different I.Q. groups, etc.?

A democratic society ought to care about the qualities in its population which have made it capable of becoming and maintaining a stable, free civilization. No Negro population has ever been able to do this, for reasons which I examined in my lecture; therefore, to the extent that a successful democratic society absorbs a Negro population, to that same extent will its success decline.

22. How is the Government of Liberia so stable?

Because it is essentially a political dictatorship, supported economically by Firestone and the Bona Hills Iron mines. Although Liberia was founded by supposedly freedom-loving Negroes from America, the League of Nations was obliged to intervene in 1930 to stop the slave trade. It was found that the President and some of his highest officials were implicated. The President had to resign.

John Gunther in his *Inside Africa* (1953) makes some pertinent observations: The people are "mercilessly exploited." A country the size of Ohio, Liberia has 10 miles of paved roads. "Only two native Liberians have ever become doctors." More than 90 per cent of the population is illiterate. Infant mortality in some areas runs as high as 75 per cent. Flagrant corruption exists on all levels.

Gunther found that prisoners in the jails were either fed by

their friends and relatives or starved to death; the budget provision for their keep was devoured by grafting officials. About 15,000 Americo-Liberians rule 1,500,000 Negro natives. The True Whig Party has held power since the 1870's. People who criticize the President are arrested "on any charge."

23. Are you suggesting that the Constitution of the United States cannot apply to the Negro because he is not the "man" referred to therein?

I have never said that the Constitution does not apply to the Negro. My position is that the Constitution has been misinterpreted by a Supreme Court which has been misled by false evidence and which now refuses to review this evidence.

24. According to anthropological evidence, an African race, the Bushmen, evolved from an ancient man known as "Fish Hoek." The cranial capacity of this specimen is estimated at 1500 cc. Modern Supreme White Man is 1350 cc. Was this ancient man superior to the present day Supreme White?

One swallow does not make a summer, and one skull proves nothing about a racial average, ancient or modern. Individual cases of large brains are known even among the Bushmen today. Moreover nothing can be deduced from the size of a brain alone. The important questions which have to be answered first are: What was the sex and body size; what was the total cortex area; what was the thickness of the supragranular layer; what was the relative size of the frontal lobes, and so on. These are more important than brain size in determining the evolutionary status of a brain.

25. Is it true that I.Q. tests favor White, Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASPS) and as such therefore discriminate against not only "average" Negroes but socially deprived Whites and Orientals as well? Dizzy Gillespie for President.

See my answer to Question 7.

26. How about references on Abe Lincoln? Could you tell us your qualifications for the statement that Christ never recommended integration? Are you a Christian?

The most often cited reference on Lincoln is from his speech at Charleston, Illinois, in September of 1858 when he was debating with Douglas. (See any collection of these debates). In



this speech he said "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor qualifying them to hold office."

The most advanced position that Lincoln ever took as to the rights of Negroes was in a letter of March 13, 1864, in which he wrote to the Union governor of Louisiana to "barely suggest for your private consideration" that those Negroes who were "very intelligent" or who had fought in the Union Army be allowed to vote in state elections; but this was, Lincoln concluded, "only a suggestion."

Such views are a far cry from the present social integration demanded by the Supreme Court.

I am a Christian. My qualifications for saying that Christ never recommended integration are a reading of the Bible.

27. **Being in Mississippi I noticed many children born of White father and Negro mother. How can you speak of illegitimacy among Negroes?**

Since the end of slavery, sexual relations between native Whites and Negroes have been rare in Mississippi. Possibly the children you noticed were fathered by Northerners. But see also my answer to Question 38.

28. **What is the source of the statistics given for the crime rate, illegitimate birth rate, etc., for the American Negro?**

Are these figures in proportion to the amount of Negroes in U. S. population relative to amount of "Whites"?

Please give just one example each of "social" and "non-social" situation in your home town.

What possible pertinency to the question under discussion (that of the American Negro in American society) may be inferred from the Congo situation?

For the crime rate my source is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. For the illegitimacy rate, it is the National Office of Vital Statistics.

The figures *are* in proportion to the Negro's relative part in the total population. They are adjusted for the difference.

Any area where mates are normally chosen is a social situation. One example would be the secondary school. An example of a non-social situation would be a bus or theater.

As to the Congo situation, if one wants to study the properties of a certain substance one seeks as undiluted a sample as possible. The Congo Negro is a fair sample of the West African Negro stocks from which our Negroes are derived.

29. **What do you say about the Negro of the Moslem countries who brought civilization and light to White people of the West 1300 years ago when the West was living in its dark ages? Are they 250,000 years behind the White at that time or vice versa?**

The Negro of the Moslem countries did not bring civilization anywhere. If we take Timbuktu as an example of a Moslem city with a substantial Negro population we find that its university was Arabic in inspiration. The people of the city were ruled by an Arab nobility and a slightly colored Tuareg upper class. Full-blood Negroes were at the bottom of the social scale. This was true throughout the Moslem world wherever Negroes were present. Incidentally, it may be advisable to remind you that the Moors were not Negroes.

30. **If Negroes are innately inferior, why must they be so carefully segregated by law and custom? In any competition, they would lose. If the "inferior" Negro can drag down the "superior" Caucasian race, then perhaps the latter wants to be dragged down.**

The informed White man is not concerned with Negro "competition." He is concerned with the difference in average evolutionary grade and the ultimate effect of genetic infusion. As for the inferior dragging down the superior, let me quote you William Harvey's lines: "Far more and abler operations are required to the fabric and erection of living creatures than to their dissolution, and plucking of them down. For those things that easily and nimbly perish are slow and difficult in their rise and complement."

I am often puzzled by the attitude of churchmen nowadays who seem to think the Christian religion demands they support policies which are certain to lead to the aforesaid plucking down. They appear to care little for the heritage bequeathed them by their forebears, or for the millenniums of self-denial and self-discipline that have been a part of the growth of Western civilization and its codes of honor and decency.

They nimbly forget the effort and sacrifice—and the handing on of a torch—through countless generations. This is the trust which they now propose to abandon. But before they



dissipate so many of those values which their ancestors committed to their keeping, let such as these remember the words of Paul to the Corinthians: "It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful."

31. You stated that the lack of perfect evidence of the Negroes' inequality (inferiority) is no reason to assume that he is equal. Is it not equally true that imperfect evidence of his equality is no reason to assume he is inferior. Particularly since, contrary to your assertion, the balance of evidence does indicate that the Negro is potentially equal, but lacking the social and cultural advantages.

Your facts are wrong. You assume that the evidence is equal, in amount and in imperfection, on each side. The only way I can explain this assumption is that you were asleep during the greater part of my lecture. The truth of the matter is that the evidence is overwhelming on the side of inequality—indeed, I know of no evidence at all on the side of equality. What I said was that because *every item* of the evidence for inequality was not perfect was no reason for assuming that the opposite of the evidence was true.

There are some areas, such as fossil remains, where the evidence of evolutionary retardation is suggestive but cannot yet be considered conclusive. There are other areas, such as average brain weight, where it is already conclusive.

32. a. Do you have ratios (Negro vs. White) for such sophisticated crimes as embezzlement, income tax evasion and stock market manipulation?
- b. Concerning the murdering Negroes; how will we explain Hitler? If the average Negro is inferior, i.e., scientifically and socially, and if the Negro does not improve as his living standard is raised, i.e., "crime" statistics, would you say that segregation can in any way improve his life on this earth?
- a. I do not have ratios for the type of crimes you mention because relatively few Negroes move in the areas where such crimes are committed.
- b. Regarding Hitler, nobody claims that the White race does not produce criminals. The point is that the Negro produces ten times as many.

Regarding segregation and improvement, I have already said that all the evidence we have shows that the Negro pupil does better under segregation than integration. See the last sentence in my answer to Question 1 and all of my answer to Question 17.

33. If environment plays virtually no role in aiding the intelligence of a person, then why were the Negroes from Northern states able to score better than Whites from the South during World War I? Didn't you admit education was a factor in this case?

I did not say environment played "virtually no role." I said it played a minor role—about one-quarter, to be specific. I also explained in my lecture the reason for the World War I results, namely, first, the best of the Negroes were compared with the worst of the Whites and, second, the test used was not for I.Q. but was one which reflected educational experience.

Certainly education is a factor. Even an animal's performance can be improved by education, up to the limits of its innate capacity.

34. If it were true that the races are unequal, would that justify the oppression and hate that is aimed at the Negroes?

The oppression and hate which is aimed at the Negro is largely the result of pressure by left-wing Whites to push the Negro into places where he does not belong. This pressure has involved outright deceit, distortion and the persecution of White scientists. Such tactics are enough to arouse anger in any White man who sees his civilization threatened as is the case in the South today. To the extent that certain Negroes cooperate with the White leftists, they are naturally included in the resentment.

35. You feel that segregation might be left up to the local community, that maybe Californians would choose integration, but that Mississippians would choose segregation. The question is which Mississippians, Negro or White?

When the day comes that the average Mississippi Negro controls the state, the White population will leave. The reason for this will be that no Negro-dominated society has ever produced a responsible, free government or culture on a level acceptable to White Americans.

Consequently, when I speak of Mississippi I refer to the White man's society and government. Let me add concerning



the voting problem which naturally arises here, that I favor voting requirements and restrictions which are uniformly applied within each state to White and Negro alike, but which are not necessarily the same from state to state. In other words the educational requirements for voting in Mississippi might well be higher than in North Dakota. I can visualize requirements which, when uniformly applied to White and Negro in Mississippi, would eliminate 80 per cent of the Negroes and 20 per cent of the Whites. Such a law might be a solution to the voting impasse in Mississippi.

36. **Are you related to Carleton Coon? If so, what is your relationship to him?**

To the best of my knowledge I am not related to Coon except in the sense that all Smiths may be related. I never heard of him before I became involved in the race controversy in 1959. But what is the relevancy of the question?

37. **If you have evidence in writing of the cases of academic suppression, why do you not expose these universities by naming names? If you are shielding the individual involved—are they all lacking the courage of their convictions—this seems curious to say the least.**

There is nothing curious about it. When a man's livelihood and social standing are at stake, he naturally shrinks from jeopardizing both. You are naive if you think otherwise. On the other hand there are a number of scientists, several of whom I have cited in my lecture who, because of exceptional courage, or retirement status, or both, have consistently spoken out.

38. **If White standards are so much higher than Negro standards, why are there so many mulattoes?**

Although I have said it over and over again, let me remark once more that when we speak of race we must speak of averages. The average White man is not responsible for the mulatto.

39. **Do you feel that Caucasians of lower I.Q. should be denied the rights of higher I.Q. Caucasians? (i.e., the right to eat in cafes.)**

I have never suggested denying rights to anyone. The question is only, has the right of a Negro to be integrated been established? And I have shown that no such right exists except on the

basis of a court decision which was obtained by misrepresentation. There is no right to integration as such. Am I denied a right when I am refused admission to a ladies' rest room? See also my answer to Question 20.

40. **For the sake of this question, I will grant you the validity of your "facts." If you can show the average brain capacity of a group of black, green, purple, or white people less than that of a group of black, green, purple or white group—I say "good for you." It seems that you go on to assert that one should enter into social interaction only with those people of at least equal mental capacity. How, I ask, does one determine an individual's mental capacity, briefly, when meeting him on the street and faced with the momentous decision of whether to accept him as a social equal, or not? I claim that this would be an absurd undertaking, and your assertions are a mere facade for self-righteousness.**

Your question involves voluntary social acceptance which is not at issue in this controversy. The avowed purpose of the Negro movement and the practical result of the Supreme Court's decision on schools is to force social acceptance, either directly or by erosion through an ideological fraud equivalent to compulsion. You can do what you please on the street, but there are many people who are going to resent your telling them that they must put their children in schools with Negroes.

41. **Should Caucasians with inferior I.Q. be deprived of citizenship rights and be sent to segregated schools?**

See my answer to Question 17 and 39. Remember that more is involved in the Negro problem than just I.Q.

42. **The brain of Cro-Magnon man is believed to have about 100 cc. larger than the average modern Homo sapiens. Would you state that the Cro-Magnon man was more intelligent than you are?**

See the last part of my answer to Question 24. It is well to keep in mind, in addition, that some breeds of prehistoric man may have had great intelligence, lacking only the accumulated experience which the passage of time produced. I like to offer the analogy of the susceptibility of various kinds of tinder to fire to explain the reaction of various races and sub-stocks to the flame of civilization as it developed. Caucasian sub-stocks, such as the European barbarians, responded rapidly to contact



with the civilization of Rome because the tinder was highly flammable. Granted, there are a number of situations in which Caucasian and Mongoloid sub-stocks have not responded. The point about the Negro race is that it has *never* responded.

43. **Are the Jews intellectually and socially as superior to the White Protestants as the White Protestants are to the Negroes?**  
By your argument, this is true, and the Whites are second rate.

See my answer to Question 13. The differences between the average Jew and the average non-Jew are significantly less than between the average gentile or Jew and the average Negro. Jews and gentiles (using the term in the sense of White non-Jew) are both members of the Caucasian race.

44. **According to the genetic evidence you provided on the difference between the average Negro and the average White, similar differences should exist between intra-marrying populations within the white race. Do you believe that such differences exist between white populations in the civilized world? And if you do, who are the superior and who are the inferior?**

As I pointed out, in my answer to Question 43, the differences between averages among the sub-stocks of the Whites race are *not* similar to the differences between the White race and the Negro.

I will not attempt to rank populations within the Caucasian race as to specific traits except to say that when it comes to the faculty for maintaining stable, free societies I believe that the sub-stock amalgam which is usually referred to as the English-speaking peoples holds the championship.

45. **Jesus Christ was a Semite, of a race certainly different from yours. Would you consider him, for that reason, inferior to yourself?**

Once again, races are a matter of averages, not exceptions. Secondly, Semites are Caucasians.

46. **"Civilized peoples should not be outvoted by backward peoples"—would you define your word "civilized"?**

Civilization is a matter of degree. A voting system for the United Nations based on common sense instead of insanity would need to be hammered out on the anvil of debate and

after detailed consideration of many factors such as population, productivity, and quality and stability of government. There has never before been any problem among the great powers as to who belonged in their group, and there would be none today were it not for the cleavage between the free and communist worlds.

In my personal opinion, the free nations of Western civilization are throttling themselves in their attempts to accommodate communism. A separate organization of free countries may prove to be the only practical solution, keeping the United Nations as a debating society for the free and communist countries combined. When I speak of a mandated colonial system I refer to one which would be set up under an organization of free powers—these are the powers which previously administered most of the colonies which are now falling apart.

I do not hesitate to express my belief that the scientists who, over the last 30 years, have misled the British and American public and their governments on the capacity of backward races for self-government are basically responsible for the dissolution of the colonial system. In this sense they are as guilty of the horrors in the Congo as if they had put the gun to the head of Carlson or the knife to the throat of the nuns.

I will go further and suggest that, had it not been for these scientists and their equalitarian, socialist-motivated propaganda, the ideological and political entering wedge which communism is achieving in Africa and elsewhere would not be a menace today. For this very reason many people are coming to feel that there is a perceptible communist influence in our educational establishment. (See, for example, *The Great Deceit: Social Pseudo Sciences*, a publication of the Veritas Foundation, West Sayville, New York, 1964). Perhaps it was not entirely a coincidence that the FBI recently arrested a research associate in "social" anthropology at Harvard, a man named Zborowski, on a charge of perjury growing out of the Bureau's investigation of a Soviet spy ring.

47. **Do you have any socio-economic corrected crime statistics for Negro and White?**

No.

48. **Why have Negroes proved to be in many cases the superior athletes?**



Because athletic ability has nothing to do with evolutionary grade. Every year a horse wins the Kentucky Derby.

49. You quote Coon as stating, "Brain size is related to achievement." Is it not well documented that achievement (economic, academic, artistic, and managerial) is dependent on much more than innate intelligence?

I spoke in my lecture of the probability that the development of the frontal lobes has a relation to planning, foresight and motivation—the *use* of intelligence. If this be true, then the brain is still involved in many attributes which might not be called intelligence in the narrowest sense. Beyond this we may say that a man's character is the product not only of his brain and entire nervous system but also of his glands and internal secretions, which interact with his nervous system. Negroes differ from Whites in these secretions. Finally, there is that one-quarter contribution by environment. But with full allowance for these things, it still remains true that brain size is *related* to achievement. There is no contradiction.

50. a. How do you account for the fact that every American President was killed by a white man?
- b. More than 87 per cent of the Negroes have "so called white blood" in them—why are they inferior if Whites are better?
- c. If Whites developed before Negroes, why do Whites have more hair than Negroes, and most animals have a lot of hair.
- a. Because there have been more than ten times as many Whites as Negroes in the country, and because until recently Negroes have not had much interest in politics.
- b. Perhaps 87 per cent of American Negroes have *some* White blood. I don't know where you get this figure, but in any case it does not mean that 87 per cent of all American Negro blood is White. Recent blood group studies have shown that this latter figure is closer to 30 per cent. And observation confirms the fact that most of this is in the North.
- c. There seems no doubt that the best criteria of evolutionary grade are in the brain, not in the quantity of hair. The salamander has no hair.

51. It is a validated fact that you would not be here if you didn't have a mother. This is the same as the Negro's position—he wouldn't be here if they weren't the ancestors of slaves brought to America. What difference does this make on White supremacy? Are you inferior to your mother because she was here first?

I am here because my mother lived in a civilization which made it possible for her to survive. Had the ancestors of our American Negroes been left in Africa, it is certain that many of them would not have survived and consequently their descendants would not be here. I did not say that this had anything to do with what you call "White supremacy." I made the point in connection with the debt the Negro owes to the White man.

52. All facts you have presented seem to be based on majority standards. Wouldn't these facts be treated differently if the Negro was a majority race? Decisions therefore are not absolute, but relative to a majority's point of view. An example: if 60 per cent of the people on the earth call a certain fruit an orange and the other 40 per cent call the same fruit an apple, who is right?

See my answer to Question 35. If the Negro were a majority race—we would be living under conditions similar to the Congo or Haiti. Do you recommend this? Or I might put the matter another way: Who envies the other's civilization the most, the White man or the Negro?

53. a. Would you consider President Johnson a Communist or Socialist because of his stand on civil rights?
- b. Are Jews and Orientals mentally inferior to Whites?
- c. Do you consider college students working in Mississippi Communists or Socialists?
- a. No. In my opinion his stand on civil rights is due partly to ignorance (which in turn results from a lack of the intellectual initiative to investigate the matters discussed in my lecture) and in part to political expediency.
- b. Chinese and Japanese school children test about the same as White children in Hawaii and California. I have already said that Jews (who are not a race) test as well as or better than American non-Jews on "verbal" tests; somewhat below on manipulative tests.



c. I would guess that their motives vary.

54. Can you refute that Ancient Africa was the home of well developed civilizations, working with metals, harboring the arts, etc.? At this time White Europeans were still living in caves.

This question discloses that you have been duped by one of the rankest deceptions in this field. There are no great ancient African *Negro* civilizations. I have already discussed Timbuktu in Question 29. The Zimbabwe complex in Southern Rhodesia is causing some argument today as to whether the culture which built the ruins was native or intrusive, but to me the matter is academic because all one needs to do is to compare pictures of these ruins with the Parthenon in Athens to get a fair measure of the difference in the cultures which built them. As to Egypt, the Nubian dynasty, 742-633 B.C., was a period of retrogression.

Please let me refer you to the last part of my answer to Question 42 as regards White men living in caves. I will also cite my book *Race and Reason: A Yankee View*, 1961, pp. 42-45.

55. You refer to Abraham Lincoln's segregationist attitudes: in his day, these attitudes were liberal beyond belief. Should our society remain so static that what was a valid idea a hundred years ago remains unchanged today? Would Lincoln express these same beliefs today?

In his day Lincoln was *not* liberal beyond belief. It was the Northern abolitionists who were the fanatical liberals of the time. To Lincoln not slavery but secession was the issue in the Civil War.

Apparently you assume that in order not to remain static a society must continuously move in the direction of equalitarian socialism, which is first cousin to communism. I do not agree with you. I believe such movement is deterioration, not progress.

56. Does your concept of Equality suggest that the murderers of Evers, Herbert Lee, Louis Allen, Channey, Schwerner and Goodman not be brought to justice? Is it because Negroes being inferior must get inferior justice?

Obviously not. Justice should be universal and should prevail in Mississippi. But I will point out that when you force upon 30 million people laws which they know to be destructive of their

civilization you are going to increase crime among the more violent elements of the population. The same thing would happen in the North if something equally destructive were forced upon them against *their* convictions.

57. Your whole speech appears to be more an apology for segregation than a scientific dissertation. You know that segregation has been the cause of lynching, bombing, shooting, beating, unjust jailing in Mississippi. How do you justify this? If we accept segregation on your thesis, we must also justify these things.

Your facts are wrong and your conclusion is a non-sequitur. Segregation has not been the cause of the crimes you mention; the cause has been the attempt at forced integration. To the extent that crimes against the Negro were previously committed by Whites in the South, these were few in comparison to those committed by the Negro against other Negroes. Thousands of Southern communities lived at peace with the Negro before 1954 and some still do.

58. Since "lower" races have a common origin and common gene pool from "superior" races, what selective factors have inhibited their (inferior) culture? If you think there are some genetic factors for culture, are these acquired traits? If they are not acquired characteristics they cannot be individual racial traits, since all *Homo sapiens* have their genes from a common ancestor.

You are hopelessly confused. Genetic factors obviously cannot be acquired. If you want to find out how species and/or races evolve in plants, animals or man, read a good book on evolution such as Ernst Mayr's *Animal Species and Evolution*, 1963.

It seems doubtful that all races of *Homo sapiens* had a common *Homo erectus* ancestor. According to Coon and Gates the five major races of man branched off from their *Homo erectus* ancestors at different periods and places.

59. a. You made reference to a survey in which Negroes and Caucasians coming from similar social and economic backgrounds took an I.Q. test in which the Negro made consistently lower scores than the Whites. Is it your opinion, then, that Negroes possessing lower I.Q.'s can produce the same social and economic level of living as that of the Whites who have higher I.Q.'s?



b. You compared the Negro's situation to that of a minor whose adult rights are curtailed because the average minor is not capable of using these rights properly. However, society has taken it upon itself to compensate the minor economically because of his inferior status—that is, the legal guardian or the state is legally required to support the minor until he reaches majority. Do you feel that if the Negroes' status is inferior, the government should compensate it economically?

a. Let me repeat, the effort was made to equate as nearly as possible, and when you do this the Negro comes from a higher level of his population than does the White. Equal socio-economic backgrounds are not necessarily the result of, nor do they produce, equal I.Q.'s. They do, however, remove the argument that environment is suppressing the I.Q.

b. Because an analogy is used to illustrate one facet of a situation does not mean that it applies to all other facets of the situation, nor do I believe it to be the duty of intelligent people (through the "State") to provide unintelligent people with the same standard of living as themselves. Exceptionally strong women who, because of the limitations of the average woman, are forbidden to work overtime in factories, are not compensated by the state. Neither is the average woman.

60. Where did you obtain your erroneous material relating to the cerebral area of the dolphin's brain—advise that you refer to the work being conducted by the University of Calif. School of Veterinary Medicine—Neurological Anatomy, DAVIS CAMPUS. What Society? What University? What Publisher? Is it, or is it not true that the Dolphin has both a larger cerebral area and a more complex convolution pattern than the White man—why not legislate integrity in their field too?

While it is apparently true that dolphins have a more complex convolutional pattern than man and a larger area of cerebral cortex, I have repeatedly pointed out that such facts by themselves do not determine relative intelligence nor evolutionary grade. In the case of the dolphin, other facts are more significant: specifically, the cortex of these animals is primitive in cellular architecture, the supragranular layer is thin, and the frontal associational areas are absent. (See G. R. Langworthy "A

description of the central nervous system of the porpoises," *J. Comp. Neurol.*, Vol. 54, 1932. Also Kappers, Huber and Crosby, *The Comparative Anatomy of the Nervous Systems of Vertebrates*, Vol. 2, 1936.)

61. a. 100 years ago how many Negroes could top White men in I.Q. tests and how many Negroes can now? That is: has not the Negro improved slightly under segregation and greatly under integration, and none in slavery?

b. Why can't a culture be adopted?

a. The Negro has improved greatly under segregation; it is not apparent that he has done any better under the limited integration he has experienced. See the last sentence in my answer to Question 1.

b. Because a culture is the product of the innate capacity of the race which created it. It can to some extent be parasitically enjoyed by races of less capacity, but it can neither be advanced nor independently sustained by such races.

62. Provided the environment of the Negro and White were completely reversed, what would be the end result in crime, etc.?

Within a generation the White and Negro would be back where they are now. Let it be repeated: The Negro's nature and behavior are the primary cause of his environment, not vice versa.

63. You seem to recognize a certain value in Love. How do you explain in biological and racial terms the White man's apparently inbred or innate propensity to hate Negroes—to lynch and to throw bombs?

The average White man has no innate propensity to hate Negroes or throw bombs. Every race has criminal elements and neurotics, including the White race, and these are often inflamed by agitators and destructive legal decisions based on deceit.

64. Assuming the intelligence and performance overlap which you refer to, why not partition or segregate on these bases rather than that of race, thus integrating Negroes at the top into White society or the overlapping Whites into Negro society?

Why not integrate intelligent minors into adult society and



stupid adults into juvenile society as regards marriage, voting and driving cars? Why not integrate strong women into male society and weak men into female society as regards over-time work in factories? See also my answer to Question 17.

65. In which way do your theories differ from those of the German "scientific" writers who prepared the way for Hitler's gas chambers? What would your position have been to these racist policies had you then lived in Germany?

Because truth is perverted by evil men to vicious ends is no reason for abandoning truth. Would you condemn Christianity because of the evils of the Spanish Inquisition?

66. In what state did the Evers' trial take place? Are the actions of Black Congolese Rebels to be considered any more condemnable than the actions of White Germans under Hitler?

The *Evers* trial took place in Mississippi. If it had taken place in North Dakota and the decision had been different, would a Southerner be correct in accusing the Northern court of prejudice?

The difference between the Congo and Germany under Hitler is that the behavior of the rebels in the Congo is standard procedure when the Negro is left to his own devices under similar circumstances, whereas the behavior of the Germans under Hitler was an exception to the rule among White men.

Moreover, the civilized free world combined against Hitler. The civilized free world today, befuddled by a socialist-motivated scientific fraud, is not only not combining against the atrocities in the Congo, but, by withdrawing its controls, is actually encouraging them.

67. Aside from genetic considerations, how much do you think segregation has to do with causing the Negro to have such low moral standards, low I.Q., and high rate of illegitimate births and disease?

If a patient has a contagious disease and is segregated from the public, for the public's protection, how much does this have to do with the patient's having the disease?

68. How do you justify segregation when you know that it is the means of enforcing poverty? 46 per cent of the Negro families

in Sunflower County are forced to live on less than \$1,000 a year.

Segregation does not enforce poverty. The Jews have frequently been segregated throughout history, but they have not been made poor.

69. Mr. Putnam, have you noticed a positive correlation between size of the brain and the thickness of the skull?

No.

70. Ralph Linton in *The Tree of Culture* makes reference to the fact that certain Negro tribes in Africa were in the iron age long before Caucasians in Europe had reached a similar stage of development, being still on a level of stone age civilization.

I have not read Mr. Linton's book but I am advised that while he does say that some African tribes engaged early in simple operations with iron, he does not know whether this occurred before similar activities in Europe. The facts as I understand them are as follows:

We know that iron smelting was discovered in the general area of Caucasus-Anatolia around 1500 B.C., quickly was adopted by the Hittites and Assyrians, and spread thence to Egypt and the trade ports of the Mediterranean, both African and European.

Iron smelting developed in the interior of Northern Africa near Meroe around 400 B.C. The question, therefore, is whether those responsible can fairly be described as "Negro tribes." Meroe is on the Nile about 100 miles north of Khartoum in what is now the Sudan. It was part of the viceroy of Kush, ruled by Egypt until the breakdown of New Kingdom power circa 1000 B.C. Kush and Meroe were next occupied and governed by an Assyrian military force, equipped with iron armor and weapons. Then in 591 B.C., a force of Greek mercenaries, with iron weapons, appeared in the area and seized part of the region. Apparently, Meroe was the most important iron-producing area of North Africa between about 400 B.C. and 350 A.D.

The reasons to believe Meroe was not Negro are: (a) it is described as "the main southern bastion of Egyptian influence" and as "the southern capital of the kingdom of the Ethiopian kings of Napata from 700 to 300 B.C." (Leonard Cottrell, *The Concise Encyclopedia of Archaeology*, article on Meroe.) Obviously, the Ethiopians at the time were not Negroes; they were



Hamites ruled by Semitic immigrants from southern Arabia. (b) We find at Meroe baths, temples to Isis, Apiremak and the sun, pyramids, stelae of Queen Candace and Akiniras and a head of Octavius. The inscriptions are in Egyptian hieroglyphics and in Meroitic (a debased form of Egyptian), also some fragmentary Greek. All of which shows fairly conclusively that the Meroites were not Negro, but culturally and linguistically Egyptian, Greek and Roman.

On the subject of African cultures in general, see my answer to Question 54.

71. How can you justify discrimination in voting and transportation, for example, on differences in intelligence capacity as the Constitution has no intelligence requirements? Seating in buses is, similarly, not based on I.Q.

The Constitution leaves to the several states the determination of the qualifications for voters, providing only that they be uniformly applied to all races. I have already suggested (Question 35) how this might be applied in Mississippi.

I may remind you here, first, that when the Constitution was originally adopted Negroes were chattel property and consequently received no rights thereunder and, second, that when the 14th Amendment was adopted after the Civil War, it was forced upon the South without any pretense of legality. All but one of the Southern States rejected it and it was only ratified by them when, under a law passed by a Congress from which the South had been excluded, they were given no choice save to accept it or submit to military rule. The President vetoed this law, saying that its whole character, scope and object were in palpable conflict with the plainest provisions of the Constitution. The rump Congress over-rode the veto.

However, I am still of the opinion that the Negro can now be held to have many rights under the Constitution and 14th Amendment without the disastrous interpretation placed upon it by the Supreme Court in 1954.

As to transportation, see my answer to Question 20. Transportation is not normally a social situation.

72. How do you explain the fact that not one member of the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers has endorsed your belief that integration is bad (in the classroom situation) and that the NEA has stated positive-

ly that integration has no bad effect? (Fact citation can be found in NEA Journal.)

The NEA is part of the educational establishment whose motivations I have sufficiently examined in my lecture. Nothing could be more biased or committed by its leadership to the leftist line. You are indeed naive. The record in *Stell* and *Evers*, and other companion cases, is replete with study after study on the adverse effect of integration. See the statement by the Court in *Evers* quoted in my lecture and the material in the record on which it is based.

73. Is it not true that because of the great amount of unexplored territory, evidence will be found of an earlier conversion from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens*? Is it also not true that the climatic differences between Europe and Africa make the possibility of remains being preserved in Africa much less likely than in Europe?

New evidence may modify our conclusions, not only with respect to the date of the *sapiens-erectus* threshold among Negroes, but in all areas of science. Meanwhile we cannot and should not refuse to judge probabilities from the evidence at hand.

More specifically, it is improbable, to my mind, that the date of the emergence of *Homo sapiens* among Negroids in Africa will be pushed back very far for this reason: As a rule, *Homo sapiens* eliminated the earlier *erectus* types. We have a quite recent *erectus* type in Africa, namely Broken Hill man (Rhodesia) dating from 30,000 B.C. It seems probable that *sapiens* types in Africa, had they emerged at about the date of *sapiens* emergence in Europe or Asia, would have spread over the more habitable portions of the continent and eliminated the *erectus* type tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of years earlier.

The fact that fire was discovered in Negro Africa only 40,000 years ago as against 250,000 years ago in western Europe and 360,000 years ago in China, based on evidence now available, tends further to support the hypothesis of a much later *erectus-sapiens* transition among Negroids than among Caucasoids and Mongoloids.

Your belief that the climate of Africa makes skeleton preservation more difficult may be valid in some areas. Of 312 fossil man sites enumerated by Coon, 49 per cent are in western Europe, 11 per cent in eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R., 4.5 per



cent in East Asia, 7.1 per cent in North Africa and 7.1 per cent in Africa south of the Sahara. But the extent of digging in densely populated areas for building and industrial purposes also has a bearing on the matter. Sometimes it results in finding fossils, sometimes in the fossils being destroyed. Likewise it must be remembered that Africa is a large continent and has a great variety of climate. Finally there have been vast changes in climate in both Europe and Africa in the last 300,000 years.

74. You argued with a decision of our Supreme Court. Is not any decision of this Court "The Law of the Land" and not for you to dispute?

Your education has scarcely begun. It is the right of any citizen to disagree with, and lawfully seek to change, any decision of any court. Has it not occurred to you that when the NAACP obtained the decision in *Brown vs. Topeka* (the case on which the integration movements rests) it overthrew the decisions of ninety years on the subject? The only difference is that the NAACP obtained their decision by misrepresenting and omitting evidence, while I am trying to restore the original law by telling the truth.

75. Although there are differences in weight, relative sizes of fissures, numbers of neurons found in the supragranular layers, and "statistical average" differences in the weight of brains between the races, have these differences, by scientific experiments, been shown to be directly related to an individual's capacity to learn?

They have been shown to be related to evolutionary status and evolutionary status is certainly related to capacity to learn. That is the best general answer I can give you. For specific relations of parts to functions, look at Penfield and Rasmussen, cited in my lecture.

76. Do you happen to know the figures on the performance record comparing a Northern Negro and a Southern Caucasian? Rather than showing that the Northern White is intelligent and the Southern White is not, it shows definitely that educational environment is the predominant factor.

Your question is unintelligible. How can figures comparing a Northern Negro and a Southern White show anything about

a Northern White? If you are referring to the Klineberg figures, I have already dealt with them in my lecture. See also my answer to Question 33. Educational environment undoubtedly is a factor. Even an animal's performance can be improved by education. What does this prove regarding innate racial differences?

77. Please comment on the conflict between your views and the views of Christ<sup>1</sup> and the founding fathers of this country,<sup>2</sup> that is, if there is a conflict?

<sup>1</sup>All men are brothers; <sup>2</sup>all men are created equal.

1. I can answer this point in the words of Nathaniel Weyl in his *Geography of Intellect*, 1963: "If my brother is a cripple, do I treat him as if he were physically sound? If he is mentally retarded, does a brotherly attitude consist in pretending that he is normal?"
2. The phrase you quote is taken from the Declaration of Independence which was written by Thomas Jefferson at a time when most Negroes were chattel property. Here is what Jefferson thought about the Negro race: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live under the same government."

Abraham Lincoln also used the words "all men are created equal" in the Gettysburg Address. See my answer to Question 26 for Lincoln's views on the Negro.

78. The essence of your argument seems to be that integration in "genetic" situations would tend to decrease the standard deviation of potentialities, i.e., sacrifice exceptional individuals to decrease the percentage of substandard individuals, whereas the accumulated evidence supports the view that marital selection through social channels has tended to increase the standard deviation, i.e., increase the variability of potentials. Would you comment on this?

I have seen no evidence, accumulated or isolated, that random marriage (which is what you end up with after total integration has operated for a few generations under the pressures of an equalitarian ideology) increases the deviation at the upper end of the scale. In fact, all the evidence is to the contrary. This is what a civilization must be most concerned about. Any



culture depends for its advance on a thin top layer of its population, and Sir Julian Huxley has shown that a decrease of one and one-half per cent in the average I.Q. of large groups decreases by fifty per cent the number of those in the group with an I.Q. of 160 or higher.

Do you for one moment contend that the amalgamation of two groups, one with an I.Q. 15 or 20 points below the other, is not going to result in a mean I.Q. below that of the higher group?

79. **If the Christian religion is not for integration, why did Christ say: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Matthew 28:18-20.**

Perhaps you find in this message some reference to integrated schools. I do not.

80. **Concerning the origin of man, do the findings of Leakey in the Rift Valley (East Africa) in any way contradict your postulate concerning the duration of development of RACES?**

No. Leakey's 1961 find is about 14 million years old; his *Australopithecines* date from about 300,000 to 1,500,000 years ago. Thus they overlapped *Homo erectus* somewhat but vanished from the earth long before the *erectus-sapiens* transition.

81. **Do you feel that tests evaluating Negro intelligence are scientifically justifiable even though contemporary society has impressed upon the Negro his innate inferiority? How can you free the Negro from the stigma of inferiority so that an honest evaluation of his intelligence can be made?**

Contemporary society has impressed upon me the fact that I am not a fit bridge partner for Charles Goren. Does this lower my playing performance within my own capacity?

82. **How does Haiti's history compare with many non-Negro South American countries?**

It is the poorest of all, with the possible exception of Bolivia. I refer not only to political stability but to such indices as life-expectancy, illiteracy, per capita consumption of newsprint, and per capita gross national product.

But the fact that some other South American countries may approach Haiti only proves this: that neither the Negro nor

some Andean Indian substocks of the Mongolian race are capable of maintaining stable, free societies. It does not qualify the Negro.

83. **You stated that the Negro's inferiority is not due to social or environmental causes, yet your examples of their inferiority (rape, murder, etc.) are considered social crimes. There seems to be a lack of agreement.**

**You stated that the individual community should decide on the issue of segregation. Who decides—Negroes or Whites?**

Are you suggesting that because a crime occurs in a certain environment it is therefore due to that environment? I confess I cannot follow this. As to your second point, I have answered it under Question 35.

84. **Martin Luther King recently received the Nobel Peace Prize; undoubtedly he is an "exceptional" Negro. The White race clearly won more Nobel Prizes than have Negroes. Isn't this because there is an overwhelming majority of White races?**

The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Martin Luther King, and the viewpoint of the hierarchy which gave it to him, are things with which many people disagree. Gunnar Myrdal also came out of Sweden, where they know about as much about the Negro problem and the real effect of King's activities as they do on Mars. I may add that socialist pressures to idolize this race have developed a sickening Negromania in our society which must turn even the stomach of the Negro.

85. **Should we take a test of all minorities and segregate all those below the highest or even the average?**

Nature has segregated many of these minorities, such as the Australian aborigine, and we have segregated others with their consent, such as the Navajo Indian. Both the desirability and the feasibility of such segregation is a matter of the degree of innate difference between the groups involved.

86. **You have compared Negroes and Whites of the same socio-economic level. How is it possible for a Negro to have the same socio-economic level as a White when he is placed in a separate society by Whites, southerner and northerner alike, because he is a Negro?**

Your question assumes that the Negro is dragged down by his



own company. Why, then, should he be allowed to drag down the White man? I have already pointed out that when Negroes and Whites are equated for socio-economic factors the Negro comes from a higher level of his population than does the White.

87. Can you honestly say that segregated facilities in the South are equal? Here is a working example of segregation. Let us look at this.

Segregated schools for Negroes in the South were rapidly being made equal to those of the Whites in physical facilities. This was true long before 1954. Segregated eating places, hotels and stores run by Negroes are usually of low quality. Whose fault is this? Take a long look.

88. The Stanford-Binet is culture based. How can it be used as an absolute measure of intelligence?

All tests involving language are culture based. The Negro's language is English and his culture is that of the White American. He has nothing of his own to offer. See my answer to Question 7. The Stanford-Binet is never taken to be an *absolute* measure of intelligence.

89. I respect your faith in the many authors quoted. Perhaps the majority or even all are correct. However, should these differences, if they exist, mean that we treat an individual of this different race other than as an equal. I may be idealistic and no doubt prejudiced, but treating the Negro race as unequal can in no way help them and will only help us Whites in dislike for the colored person. On the other hand, treating the Negro as an equal may indeed help his race and ours by giving him a chance to show his worth. Thank you for an intelligent and relatively unemotional talk. It will make many of us weigh our beliefs again, which cannot hurt any individual.

Thank you for your comments. But do you really think that forcing the White children of the South, at the point of a bayonet and against the wishes of their parents, into schools with a race which the balance of the evidence today indicates to be 200,000 years behind them in evolutionary grade, is idealistic? Do you really think turning the Negro loose in the Congo to rape, murder and torture nuns is idealistic? Is this what you mean by giving him a chance to show his worth?

90. a. You said that Dr. Kluckhohn stated that there was a difference among races for potentiality for certain forms of achievement. Where were Negroes mentioned and where were mental achievements mentioned? Isn't it likely that Dr. Kluckhohn was referring to physical achievements, such as the unusual muscular development and superior coordination often observed in Negroes? Thank you.
- b. Should we be corrupt and wrong to an individual just for advancement? Should the Negro individual be sacrificed for the White man to avoid "stagnation"? Thank you again.
- a. Negroes were not specifically mentioned, but Negroes are a race. There is no indication that Kluckhohn was referring solely to physical achievements.
- b. I have never suggested that we be "corrupt and wrong" to the Negro, or "sacrifice" the Negro. Do we "sacrifice" the individual strong woman when she is not allowed to work overtime in factories, or the individual smart minor when he is not allowed to vote? On the other hand, I see no reason to sacrifice the White race to give the Negro what he has not earned and does not deserve.

91. On conditions in Haiti—is it not true that most South American countries have similar records?

On cerebral differences—is it proven that cerebral differences are indicative of mental ability or inability? May I point out that Franz Boas says that they are not. If "anyone's position can be improved by education," why not simply educate Negroes—it seems you have invalidated your own argument. About Brown vs. Board of Education—state your sources on "new evidence"—were these from Southern courts?

On Haiti, see my answer to Question 82; on cerebral differences, see Question 75. Franz Boas was a minority group immigrant with a conceded socialist background. His parents were both radical socialists. One of his aunts married Dr. Abraham Jacobi, a member of the Communist League headed by Karl Marx. He was the founder of the anthropological hoax which has warped the thinking of an entire generation of American students. Therefore, when you quote him I marvel at your gullibility. For a good summary of his life and teachings, see *The Biology of the Race Problem*, W. C. George, 1962, Section X. A copy of this can be obtained from the address given two paragraphs below.



I have never suggested that Negroes not be educated. I suggest Whites be educated, too, and when both groups are educated the gap between them is simply increased, for the reason that the capacity of the White to receive education is greater than the Negro's.

As to *Brown vs. Board of Education*, evidence never comes from "courts"; it comes from witnesses. The chief witness in the *Brown* case was a Negro. The witnesses in *Stell* and *Evers* were from both North and South. If you want to read the evidence you can do so by ordering the transcript in any of these cases (at considerable cost) from George Leonard, Steadman, Leonard and Hennessey, 1730 K St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006, or you can write for the opinions and findings of fact of the judges (at modest cost) also from Mr. Leonard.

92. Since the Orientals in our society have a much lower crime rate and illegitimacy rate than the average White in our society, and since difference between peoples are genetic in origin by a 3 to 1 ratio—can it not therefore be inferred that the Oriental is indeed not only the Caucasian's equal, but his superior?

In some respects quite possibly. I cannot verify your figures as I have not studied them. I have stated previously that the English-speaking stocks of the Caucasian race probably hold the championship in maintaining stable, free societies.

93. Assuming that the basis of segregation is intelligence, why not segregate according to an I.Q. test scale; for under this system there would be no "overlap." In other words, why was race used as a basis for segregation?

Because not only differences in I.Q. but also differences in subject interest, problem approach, group identification and other factors are taken into account when the segregation is by race. See my answer to Question 17.

94. Why do Negro children score higher on I.Q. tests when test is administered by Negro testers? This holds true especially on Achievements Tests.

Your facts have been disputed, but even if they are correct, what difference does it make? White children still do better than Negroes even when the latter are tested by Negroes. All that your point seems to prove is that Negroes are more re-

laxed and accomplish more in the presence of other Negroes, which is a good reason for Negro teachers and classmates.

95. T. Dabzansky, foremost authority on genetics (*Genetics & Origin of Species*, *Mankind Evolving*, etc.) states burden of proof is on racists to prove their superiority. There is none. Do you dispute authorities with your biased statements and expect intelligent people to take your word over theirs?

Speaking of bias, I confess to a certain bias against Dobzhansky, a specialist in fruit flies and a man whom I have found dedicated to the political use of science for equalitarian ends. Dobzhansky, a Russian immigrant, belongs to the Columbia University equalitarian coterie of proteges and followers of Boas discussed under Question 91, a group which includes Margaret Mead, Gene Weltfish, who accused the United States of using germ warfare in Korea, and Ashley Montagu, who has been frequently connected as speaker or sponsor with organizations later cited as Communist.

While none of these circumstances reflect on Dobzhansky's scientific ability, or on that of the other persons named, they suggest a chance of bias on *their* part. In fact, Dobzhansky's attacks on Coon's *Origin of Races* are singularly unconvincing. Therefore, when he says that the burden of proof is on "racists" to prove "their" superiority, I find the assertion pathetic. The burden of proof is upon those who would contradict all previously accepted fact and experience, and who would alter all previously established custom.

As for the evidence itself, there is no evidence for equality. See my answer to Question 31.

96. What are your biological qualifications for the biological interpretations of this rather biased presentation? It has to be a biological (genetic) interpretation to be a racial characteristic. Biased literature = biased reasoning.

I have a science degree, as well as law degree, but I have never pretended to be a professional scientist or a specialist in racial matters. What I have done is to listen to both sides and read materials presented by both sides—at the same time noting the efforts by the scientific hierarchy to suppress and distort evidence and to persecute other scientists who offer material exploding the equalitarian dogma. Then I have tried to call the attention of the public to what is going on.



97. Your books express your affection and respect for the Negro and your desire for fairness to the Negro. You have not gotten this point over in your speech. Please speak briefly to show your fairness, and that you are speaking only of social integration and that you demand legal and moral rights for the Negro.

It is difficult to discuss all aspects of large questions on every occasion. I hoped I had made it clear that the case I make is against the White perpetrators of what amounts to a socialist-motivated scientific fraud, not against the Negro. The Negro is being ruthlessly used by the leftist underworld in its fight for socialism and communism.

98. How do you account for the so-called "exceptional" Negro? Is he the result of a genetic mutation; or perhaps the result of being fortunate enough to realize his actual potential despite people like you?

Variability will account for the exceptional Negro, a factor which is supplemented in the United States by some White ancestry. In the study of bright Negroes done in Chicago, 80 per cent reported some White ancestry.

99. If you were to take two 400-lb. alligators—one with a brain weight of 17 g. and the other with a brain weight of 13 g.—and the latter were transported to a zoo and conditioned to certain responses, would you then assume that alligators with a brain weight of 13 g.—as an average, of course—have a greater intelligence? Thus, are you saying that brain weight is proportionate to intelligence? Is the size of the brain relative to intelligence?

You are mixing several factors in this question. First, I have already explained that an I.Q., properly determined, is not significantly changed by education. Second, I have said that education will always improve performance up to the limits of innate capacity. Third, I have emphasized that brain weight or size is only part of the story concerning intelligence in any individual case—cortex area, proportion of parts and cyto-architecture are also involved. I leave you to apply these variables to your alligators, after consulting my answer to Questions 7 and 10.

100. If you use inferior brain potential as justification for segrega-

tion would this apply to Caucasians with damaged or slightly retarded brains as well?

By definition, damaged or slightly retarded brains are not a group characteristic of Caucasians, whereas a lower I.Q. and other differences *are* group characteristics of Negroes. Obviously if brain damage or retardation is significant such individual Caucasians are segregated.

101. You admit in your speeches that the difficulty with integration is that it leads inevitably to intermarriage and this in turn would lead to abasement of the genetic stock and a degeneration of the general level of intelligence. This would occur because the frequency of high intelligence in Negroes is significantly less than in Whites. You also admit that in some cases Negroes equal or excel some Whites in intelligence. Interbreeding of these Negroes with Whites would not necessarily debase the genetic stock and in some cases might even raise the level. If we may ignore the practical difficulties a moment, should you not in consistency be advocating segregation of the intelligent from the less gifted regardless of race—since intelligence is the issue you find important?

I have already answered the question from several angles but I will summarize: First, educability is not solely a matter of intelligence. It involves subject interest and problem approach which have been found to differ between Whites and Negroes among the exceptional as well as the average. See my answer to Question 17. Second, we cannot ignore the practical difficulties—organizing a society is a practical matter. See the references in my lecture to exceptional minors and women. Third, once the doors of White society are thrown open to exceptional Negroes in those areas where mates are chosen it would be virtually impossible to close them in the face of other Negroes because of the ideological pressures of the equalitarian movement. Fourth, your suggestion is academic because the Supreme Court's 1954 decision and the Civil Rights Act require indiscriminate integration.

102. Are not ideas like yours responsible for the terrible way Negroes are treated in South Africa?

Let me answer this question with two of my own: (1) If you had to pick one country in which to live out of the entire African continent, which one would you choose? (2) If Negroes are



treated so terribly in South Africa, why is it that 25,000 Negroes manage to enter that country illegally each year and only a few leave?

103. **Today all of the peoples you refer to as backward are demanding their rights and their freedom. The world is in a ferment. It is part of progress. How can you expect to stop it?**

Just tell a naive and unsophisticated person often enough that you owe him a living, that he is entitled to share all your earnings, that you have cheated him for years, that he has a "right" to your savings and achievements, and watch how quickly he will start to ferment.

The world situation you mention is the product of White socialist indoctrination—of what Churchill called the "gospel of envy." It has no relation to truth or reality. Modern means of transportation and communication have spread this gospel broadcast like a virus. How to stop it except by starting to tell the truth I cannot say. But you may be sure it is no part of "progress."

104. **When your group of scientists say one thing, and we are taught that a much larger group of scientists say something else, how are we to decide which is correct except by the preponderance of opinion?**

By learning to think for yourselves, which is one of the chief objects of education. In this case it is not a difficult task. All you need to do is to stop taking unsupported assertions as final and demand to look at the evidence. There will soon be no question left in your mind.

## Commentary by the Speaker

*As I have said at the outset, the over-all standard of these questions is high. There are, however, certain disquieting aspects to their general tenor.*

*First may be mentioned the repeated tendency to ask a question which has already been answered, as in the discussion of the exceptional Negro. I can understand questioning the answer, but hardly the original point. It suggests a listener so saturated in a fixed attitude that he simply cannot hear what is being said. This characteristic is not confined to UCD. I have found it widespread among university students.*

*Second, there is a strong inclination to rationalize. Repeatedly arguments are put forward which, in their total context, must be seen to be invalid, simply because, in a narrow context, they may be strained into plausibility. This suggests a rather desperate determination to avoid the truth at any cost.*

*Third, there is reflected here a high incidence of gullibility. There is an avoidance of independent thought and an apparent habituation to the study of an issue from only one side. I recall a professor of mine at college years ago saying that a man's education began when he could read a newspaper and not believe the advertisements, and that it was completed when he could read the whole paper and not believe any of it. The point may be exaggerated but it contains more than a kernel of wisdom. In this sense the education of these questioners has not advanced very far.*

*Lastly, the impact of a concerted plan of equalitarian indoctrination is obvious. Identical rationalizations and other arguments occur, I find, at UCD and at Princeton. This is not the place to discuss in detail the merits of the plan. That it holds our educational system in a vise is, however, worth emphasizing. When an establishment presses the hypnosis of a whole generation of a nation's youth to the extent apparent here, it assumes a fearful responsibility.*

*Since what is being taught is, in my opinion, totally false, the procedure is bound to result in the long run in disastrous consequences to our foreign policy as well as to the health of our society at home. No amount of humanitarian zeal can excuse a blind disregard of self-evident realities or redeem a fanatical dedication to programs which are producing a continuing fever throughout the world.*

*One does not cure the disease of communism by catching it one's self, either in its final or its earlier stages.*



*Order Extra Copies Of This Booklet*

Published by:

**THE THUNDERBOLT INC.**

"A Christian American Newspaper"

P. O. Box 1211

Marietta, Georgia 30061

Dr. Edward R. Fields, Editor

**1 Copy \$1.50**

**5 Copies \$6.00**