

Negroes score higher on certain mental tests than many whites but that *on the average* Negroes score lower. This lower average performance of the underprivileged group is greatly dependent on environmental factors. Whether hereditary differences contribute to the difference in average performance is not known since it is very difficult to separate social and biological factors when one compares different ethnic groups. Our lack of knowledge is so great that it is impossible to predict whether whites will ultimately be shown to be higher in average mental endowment than Negroes, or whether the reverse is true.

5. The intent of my paper was not to single out Jensen but to show how various facets of society combined to result in the effective promotion of prejudice, even though none of the interacting agents can be accused of sole responsibility for producing such an effect.

With respect to the first amendment: I have never questioned Jensen's right to express his opinions, and I must reject his attempt to intimidate me into refraining from expressing mine.

Counter Response

Arthur R. Jensen

Dr. Alfert is grasping at straws. Her careless research methods are displayed first in the fact that even after I had refuted her claim that the *Harvard Educational Review (HER)* had not explicitly solicited my views on racial IQ differences, she still did not take the trouble to seek out the truth on this matter. A request for a copy of *HER's* letter to me is all it would have taken, or a 3 or 4 minutes' phone call to the editorial office of *HER*. Dr. Alfert would have found that the truth of the matter, including the release of my article to *U.S. News*, was given in my previous reply. I myself phoned an editor of *HER* to check out the mimeographed letter mentioned by Dr. Alfert (and sent also to others who requested an "explanation" of *HER's* publication of my article). I was told that their mimeo letter had been a "mistake," and the chief editor sent me a letter of apology, fully acknowledging their error. The erroneous statement also was set right in the *Harvard Crimson*. All this information was just as available to Dr. Alfert as it was to me, if she had been interested in ferreting out the facts.

Dr. Alfert states that four out of five discussants at the videotaped symposium "opposed" my views. The real question, however, is did they refute anything in my *HER* article with any evidence or logical reasoning based thereon? They did not, and I urge readers to procure the videotape or the sound tape to see and hear for themselves. Professor Lederberg's opinion of my position is spelled out in greater detail elsewhere (Lederberg, 1969).

Dr. Alfert gives us Webster's definition of "racist," and since she has called me a "racist" in print, she apparently has decided that this dictionary definition fits me. Anyone who tries to find anything in any of my writings or personal activities that corresponds to this definition will get some idea of Dr. Alfert's recklessness in making these accusations. I have spoken and written emphatically against racial segregation and discrimination in any form. Does Dr. Alfert wish to imply that one is a "racist" because he has not written anything about specific court cases in the South? Of course, it is obvious to me that her use of the label "racist" is merely name-calling—an easy way to avoid the substantive issues. It is in a class with Thomas F. Pettigrew's being quoted by a newspaper as labelling my *HER* article "obscene" and Martin Deutsch's calling it in a public address "abominable."

Is there any survey that substantiates Dr. Alfert's sweeping generalization that the majority of researchers in genetics, psychology, etc., do not agree with my position? Does Dr. Alfert's apparent belief that such a statement carries any weight, even if it were true, mean she believes that scientific questions are answered by a show of hands? Since when is head-counting any substitute for the analysis of existing evidence and the design of better studies?

Dr. Alfert's activities, I believe, were mainly stimulated by my contention that genetic hypotheses of racial IQ differences are reasonable and tenable and have not been discredited by evidence. I urged that genetic hypotheses be subjected to appropriate scientific study. Does this upset Dr. Alfert because she hopes that people will believe genetic hypotheses already have been scientifically disproved? If not, what is all her fuss about?

The Tulkin article referred to by Dr. Alfert is one of the 43 published studies of Negro-white IQ differences which attempted to control for socioeconomic status (SES) and/or other environmental factors. In all but three of these studies, the white mean was higher than the Negro within SES groups; the remaining mean difference, over all studies, with SES "controlled," was 11 IQ points (Shuey, 1966). Tulkin statistically "controlled" both for SES and a number of more subtle family variables. He concluded: "When family differences were also statistically controlled, there were no significant racial differences on test scores in the upper socioeconomic group, although differences remained significant in the lower socioeconomic group."

But the statistical matching of racial groups on SES and other environmental factors is an invalid method in any of these studies, since it presumes that SES, etc., are entirely *causal* variables. Since there is substantial evidence that there are genetic as

well as environmental differences between SES groups (within races), a matching procedure (statistical or actual) results in some degree of matching on the genetic as well as the environmental factors involved in mental development. Thus the independent and dependent variables in these experiments are hopelessly confounded. Paul Meehl has written cogently on this "sociologists' fallacy":

While every sophomore learns that a statistical correlation does not inform us as to the nature of the causality at work (although, except for sampling errors, it does presumably show *some* kind of causal relation latent to the covariation observed), there has arisen a widespread misconception that we can somehow, in advance, sort nuisance-variables into a class which occurs only at the input side. This is, of course, almost never the case. The usual tendency, found widely among sociologists and quite frequently among psychologists (particularly among those of strong environmentalist persuasion) is to assume *sub silentio* that there is a set of demographic-type variables, such as social class, domicile, education, and the like, that always operate as nuisance variables to obscure true relationships, and that function primarily as exclusively on the *input* side from the standpoint of causal analysis. This automatic assumption is often quite unjustified. Example: We study the relationship between some biological or social input variable, such as ethnic or religious background, upon a psychological output variable, such as IQ or *n Achievement*. We find that Protestants differ from Catholics or that Whites differ from Blacks. But we find further that the ethnic or religious groups differ in socio-economic class. We conclude, as an immediate inference and almost as a matter of course, that we have to 'control' for the socio-economic class variable, in order to find out what is the 'true' relationship between the ethnic or religious variable and the psychological output variable. But of course no such immediate inference is defensible, since on certain alternative hypotheses, such as a heavily genetic view of the determiners of social class, the result of such a 'control' is to bring about a spurious reduction of unknown magnitude in what is actually a valid difference (Meehl, 1970).

The *Los Angeles Times* (Oct. 12, 1969) printed a story to the effect that the sixth grade class in one school (Windsor Hills), with 90 percent black pupils, in Los Angeles, had a mean IQ of 115. The fact that this made headline news is interesting in itself, to say nothing of Dr. Alfert's citation of this article, since mean IQs of 115 or higher are found for some entire schools and school districts. It is a fact, for example, that prior to Fall 1968, several entire elementary schools (i.e., grades K-6) in Berkeley had mean IQs in the 120 to 125 range, and all the elementary schools of a large suburb of Berkeley had an overall mean IQ of 116. Statistics released by the Los Angeles City Schools indicate that their schools with 90% or more minority pupils have an average IQ of 88, while schools with less than 25% minority have an average IQ of 104. Given a mean IQ of 88, and assuming a normal distribu-

tion and a standard deviation of 15, we should expect approximately 3.6 percent of children in the 90% or more minority schools to obtain IQs *above* 115. Should it be so surprising, then, that in one sixth grade class in a 90% minority school a number of these high IQ pupils should come together to yield a *mean* IQ of 115? (In the two previous years the IQs in this school averaged near 100.) It is even less surprising if you consider that the pupils attending the Windsor Hills school come from homes in the \$35,000 to \$150,000 bracket. The newspaper report adds that "most Windsor Hills students come from wealthy homes with parents who are doctors, lawyers, or professional people."

In any case, a newspaper story is not a journal article or a research report and cannot be properly evaluated. Dr. Alfert's holding up this news report as if it disproves anything I said in my *HER* article is grasping at straws indeed.

Finally, does Dr. Alfert take satisfaction in the state of our ignorance that Curt Stern so nicely describes concerning the causes of the observed racial differences in intelligence and scholastic performance? I, for one, deplore the inadequacy of our scientific knowledge on this important problem. I deplore also the notion that the subject cannot or should not be studied scientifically, as we would study any other phenomenon, and I believe that ideologically-motivated doctrinaire opinions in this area have seriously hindered the scientific community from actually coming to grips with the problem. I therefore continue to advocate behavior-genetic research on human differences, including their racial aspects—not just more studies based on the false premise that genetic factors have already been ruled out as a possible source of differences, but research aimed at reducing our uncertainty about the roles of heredity and environment.

REFERENCES

- LEDERBERG, J. Racial alienation and intelligence, *Harvard Educational Review*, 1969, **39**, 611-615.
- MEEHL, P. E. Nuisance variables and the ex post facto design. In M. Radner & S. Winokur (Eds.), *Minnesota Studies in Philosophy of Science*. Vol. 4. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970.
- SHUEY, AUDREY M. *The testing of Negro intelligence* (2nd ed.). New York: Social Science Press, 1966.