



PROJECT MUSE®

Letters to the Editor

Jerome F. Fredrick, Ralph Mason Dreger, Rodney C. Bryant, Nathaniel Weyl

Perspectives in Biology and Medicine, Volume 13, Number 1, Autumn 1969,
pp. 117-124 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.1969.0056>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/408195/summary>

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

DEAR SIR:

It was with a great deal of commensurate sympathy that I read Dr. Pomeranze's essay, "Sic Transit Gloria"[1]. But it is not in the spirit of "me-too" that I offer him the following thought. It is always so much the case that hindsight is better than foresight. Even though our discoveries may seem all important in the light of someone's later publications, they represent only the first crude observations which others refine.

In support of this, two preliminary reports of mine [2, 3] published in the early 1950s could have indeed been construed by me, in the light of Leloir's later work, to have rightly heralded my group as discoverer of the UDP/ADP-glucosyltransferases. But, in a careful reading of the contributions of Leloir and his group [4], I realize too well that although I did have the "bird in hand," I was woefully lacking in the abilities to delineate and describe in detail the nucleotide-glucosyltransferases at that time.

I sincerely believe that we should be altruistic enough to realize that our publications are not (unfortunately, as many segments of the scientific community think today) for the purposes of publicizing ourselves, but rather to contribute to the sum-total of human knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. JULIUS POMERANZE. *Perspect. Biol. Med.*, 12:457, 1969.
2. JEROME F. FREDRICK. *Fed. Proc.*, 9:170, 1950.
3. ———. *Ibid.*, 10:182, 1951.
4. D. LELOIR. *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 79:6340, 1957.

JEROME F. FREDRICK, Ph.D.

The Dodge Chemical Company
Research Division
3425 Boston Post Road
Bronx, New York 10469

DEAR SIR:

Professor Noble has invited me to comment on his article "Race, Reality, and Experimental Psychology" (p. 10, this issue). There are so many areas of agreement between his material and my own published writings and views that at first I thought it might not be necessary to provide any additional statement. However, there are a number of places that do need commentary in Noble's introduction and section 1.

Noble makes the following points which need commentary: 1. An experimental approach to psychological problems of race and ethnic groups is preferable to a correlational approach. 2. Dreger espouses a "uniformity doctrine." 3. Dreger appears to be selectively indignant about totalitarianism. 4. There is innuendo in Dreger's review of Putnam's book to the effect that Putnam and his *Stell* associates are anti-Semitic. 5. Dreger should have brought readers of his Putnam review up to date on clinical evidence pertinent to the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision. 6. Evidence should have been presented in Dreger's review on the effects of segregated versus desegregated classrooms. 7. Dreger's statement of Putnam's thesis is in error in several ways.

My comments are: 1. An experimental approach is to be preferred. As I have said many times, "Our most assured knowledge comes from experiment." 2. I do not espouse a "uniformity doctrine" in contradistinction to Williams' views. Admitting an environmental bias is not the same as maintaining any "uniformity doctrine" [1, 2].

3. Professor Noble's fairly direct allegation that Professor Dreger is selectively indignant about the murdering of Nazi victims as compared with Communist victims suggests a contrary-to-fact situation. How many Americans who were adults during World War II were opposed to our alliance with Communist Russia before and during that period? Very few indeed—but I was one of the few, because as a Christian minister before and during and for a while after, I felt Marxist and Leninist communism to be basically antithetical to the Christian gospel as were Stalinist excesses committed in the name of communism. I still believe this way. I earned opprobrium then, and have since, for insisting that though I see theoretical differences I can see no practical differences between a Nazi Germany which liquidated millions of Jews and a Communist Russia which liquidated millions of kulaks and others. Labeling me, by direct implication, as part of the Left is strictly inaccurate.

4. I have read and reread my own review statements relating to *Stell* and I cannot find, as Professor Noble appears to, any innuendo imputing anti-Semitism or anti-socialism (or both) to witnesses in that case. The only place I mention "Jewish" or "Socialist" in the entire review is in the second paragraph where I faithfully reflect Putnam's intent in his section on "Motivations" in chapter 2 of his *Race and Reality* [3]. It is evident Putnam intended to emphasize the Jewish and radical socialist (Marxist) background of Boas and the Jewishness and/or Marxist motivations of Boas's followers. I do not, by imputation or otherwise, in my review suggest that witnesses in the *Stell* case were anything but naïve. These witnesses, a high-powered array of intellectual talent, were outsmarted by a pair of NAACP lawyers. I frankly do not think Putnam or his colleagues are anti-Semitic, even though I am fairly certain some sensitive Jews would take Putnam's coupling of Jewishness and communism as closely as he does as anti-Semitic. Of course, Putnam clearly opposes communism.

5. Frankly, I hold no brief for what Noble calls the "primitive science" offered as social, psychological and sociological evidence in *Brown vs. Board of Education*. Some of it seems rather flimsy to me too. It was not appropriate to review earlier or later evidence in a review of a single book. But I wonder if this is not a parallel to Kendall's homely observation that one "will sometimes find elaborate analyses applied to data in order

to prove something which was almost obvious from careful inspection right from the start" [4, p. 245]. If one is not convinced of the degradation of human dignity required by segregation by the evidence openly at hand ("No colored man dare look a white woman in the face," "Yas suh yas suh, boss," "When do I begin teaching my child he is to act inferior to every white person?" "Listen, boy, you don't talk like that to a white man!" et cetera, et cetera, ad infinitum, ad nauseam acerbam), no amount of either clinical or experimental evidence will suffice. And no amount of up-to-date clinical or experimental evidence can overcome the mountains of sociological and high-level journalistic evidence, accumulated both before and after 1954, on the evil effects of segregation on both whites and blacks. However, I agree with Noble that the 1954 decision does not and ought not depend on such evidence. Then, why I should bring readers up to date on it is not clear to me. As for "sophomoric law" and the Tenth Amendment, "it may be helpful to remember that neither psychologists nor airline executives have any special competence to pontificate on this matter."

6. Miller and I plan to present evidence on the effects of segregated versus desegregated classrooms in our next review of the literature. It was not appropriate in this case, either, to detail such evidence in a single book review.

7. As Noble points out, my primary concern was with Putnam's both expressed and implied solution to the "race problem," that is, a modified segregation system. A careful reading of Putnam's *Race and Reason: A Yankee Viewpoint* [5] and the book I reviewed for *Perspectives* [3] reveals to me at any rate that in both books Putnam regrets (if that is a strong enough word) the 1954 Supreme Court school desegregation decision and the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That he *would* like to repeal the latter I gather from his remarks in his second book (e.g., "The Passage of the Civil Rights Act [among other things] had only resulted in increasing racial tension throughout the country" [3, p. 1]). The modified segregation Putnam espouses is, I think, expressed in the phrase quoted by Noble, "voluntary non-social integration" supplemented by the expression, "forced social integration [is] undesirable."

Two things must be said about either "voluntary" or "forced" integration. First, no one can compel integration. It is a matter of the heart and mind. All that can be compelled is desegregation—the admission of all persons to schools, public transportation, public accommodations, or whatever else is protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. In his first book Putnam makes this distinction, but appears to forget it later on. Putnam would accept "voluntary, *not federally compelled* integration of public accommodations" when the Negro percentage is small. But there is no such thing as voluntary integration or desegregation where state or locally compelled segregation is the law. And the actual fact is that no matter what the percentage of Negroes in any of the Southern states, the same or similar laws *required* segregation.

Just a word should be added about "compulsory integration" or "forced integration." I have heard none of the defenders of the so-called freedom of association implied by the opposite of these terms even hint at the compulsion involved in forced segregation. Take bussing, for example, to which Noble objects as a form of compulsion. Are persons like Noble who have lived in the South for many years not aware that ever since buses have

been used in the South children have been bussed across whole counties in order to preserve segregation, a forced segregation, if you will? Not that I defend bussing, only that I object to the use of the pejorative term compulsory integration when the whole system of segregation has been a compulsory one. Natural geographic units have been forcibly disregarded. Individuals who would otherwise naturally associate together have been forcibly restrained from doing so. If it were not that they would naturally do so, why the need for laws to force segregation? (To protect the young who have no wisdom, someone says—why not then laws applying only to the young, like minimum age laws for liquor and smoking?) If anyone thinks that “forcibly restrained” is a figurative expression, he does not indeed know his South.

No, my linking of Putnam’s ideas with Nazi Germany is in connection with what I regard as Putnam’s thesis of racial superiority of whites and what Noble regards as an absolutism in my use of a nondistributed middle. My assertion was based on the following evidence: The background in *Race and Reason* appears to imply inherent superiority to all other races of the white race, especially the Anglo-Saxon component [5, pp. 41, 47, 76, 77 ff., 85, 102, 104, 107]. So, too, in *Race and Reality* the immediate bases of my assertion appear to be implied [3, pp. 115, 127, 151, 153, 159, 161, 171, 174]. If I have erred in supposing Putnam’s thesis is that “white people are inherently superior to other races” (which statement by the rules of syntax does indeed imply *all not some*), I believe I have not erred in my later restatement of Putnam’s thesis: “On the average some races are inherently inferior to others.” Putnam might, and rightly, object to my not specifying the areas of comparison, but I think he would accept the statement for most if not all areas important to civilization. If I identify what I regard as Putnam’s main thesis, in either its more absolute or its less absolute form, I cannot see that in itself I am impugning his motives. As for calling him prejudiced, long ago I learned that prejudice is a *prejudicial* term (rejected by most everyone for himself, “now, I’m not prejudiced, but . . .”) and have virtually eliminated it from my vocabulary.

Now, as to the parallel I allege between nazism and the philosophy Putnam appears to espouse, I must say that I deliberately chose the Nazi model rather than the Communist model because the little totalitarian regimes which developed in the South, and still exist to a greater degree than even most Southerners are aware, have been on the former model, proleptically in most cases. I say, “It can happen here,” because it has happened here.

The aspects of Hitler’s Germany most applicable are not genocide or concentration camps but notions of the inequality of men and races, the right of the strong to rule the weak, of intense nationalism, of a single enemy of the state, of antiliberalism (in *both* the modern and original senses), and of fanatic anticommunism as well as the single party system. Genocide and concentration camps and similar excesses were not of the essence of National Socialism, but direct outgrowths of the “enemy of the state” idea which concentrated on Jews (though in spite of Hitler’s ideal expressed in *Mein Kampf*, of trying to limit “the enemy” to one object, some non-Jews insisted also on being enemies of the state). Reading my review of Putnam’s book, however, will reveal that I do not allege Putnam to be a “genocidal maniac.” I refer instead to *Putnam’s position* which, if for whatever reasons it should become dominant, I believe would lead to a Nazi-type totalitarian

state. This conviction is based in part on the tendencies toward Nazi-type totalitarian government in many parts of the South, using the Negro as the counterforce in somewhat (though not exactly) the same manner nazism used the Jew. (As an examiner of seven boys apprehended as desecrators of a Jewish synagogue, I found that every one of the boys defended his anti-Jewish acts because somehow they would down the Negro in this manner.) It is a conviction I hold in the same manner Putnam holds his conviction that the egalitarian doctrine will lead to a Communist-type takeover which he saw in tendencies of the country under the liberal policies of the Democratic party.

So much then for my commentary. Section 2 of Noble's article is mostly reporting of others' and his own research bearing on psychomotor behaviors. In the next review of comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States, Miller and I shall take account of these studies.

After going back over my remarks above, I realize some of them appear to constitute a rejoinder more than a commentary. Despite appearances, however, I have not felt indignant over any of the points, so I think the term "commentary" still holds.

REFERENCES

1. R. M. DREGER and K. S. MILLER. *Psychol. Bull.*, 57:361, 1960.
2. ———. *Psychol. Bull. Monogr. Suppl.*, 70:1, 1968.
3. C. PUTNAM. *Race and reality*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1968.
4. M. G. KENDALL. *The advanced theory of statistics*, vol. 2. 2d ed. London: Charles Griffin, 1948.
5. C. PUTNAM. *Race and reason: A Yankee view*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961.

RALPH MASON DREGER

*Louisiana State University
Department of Psychology
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803*

DEAR SIR:

While the possible historical parallel you seek to indicate in the Editorial "History Repeats" (Spring 1969) is interesting, an even more interesting aspect is your evident willingness to accept without thorough verification (even documentary) material which supports your general orientation. The quote you reprint is not from the "memoirs" of Emperor Julian in "Vidal's version," as you state. The material is from the novel *Julian*, by Gore Vidal. "Vidal's version" of the "memoirs" is a well researched but highly fictionalized story. Other novels by Mr. Vidal include *The Pillar and the City* and *Myra Breckinridge*.

RODNEY C. BRYANT

*Dalton Junior College
Department of Psychology
Dalton, Georgia 30720*

DEAR SIR:

On the basis of 1960 Census data, Jensen [1] has suggested the hypothesis of a decline in Negro mental capacity and a widening of the intelligence gap between blacks and whites. He observed that Negro women aged thirty-five to forty-four and married to unskilled laborers averaged 4.7 children as against 3.8 children for their white counterparts, whereas Negro women in this age bracket married to professionals averaged only 1.9 children as compared with 2.4 children for whites similarly situated. The apparently much larger inverse correlation between socioeconomic status and fertility among Negroes than among whites led Jensen to ask: "Is there a danger that the current welfare policies, unaided by eugenic foresight, could lead to the genetic enslavement of a substantial segment of our population?"

The secular trend in the comparative mental test scores of whites and Negroes examined for admission into the armed services casts interesting light on the Jensen hypothesis.

A comparison between World War II and contemporary mental test scores is not feasible because the only comprehensive published data which compare Negro and white scores are for the nine Service Command Areas. These cannot be averaged without knowing the comparative numbers of admissions from each race in each of these Command Areas. Stouffer's well-known analysis of the white and Negro scores of a 2 percent sample of the Army as of March 1945 cannot be used because the Negro sample is not representative [2, chap. 10]. Thus, Stouffer finds that 1 percent of his Negro sample scored in Group I, whereas Davenport's tabulation of the mental test scores of 3 million inductees during June 1943 to May 1945 showed that the percentage of Negroes in the top group varied from 0.1 percent in Service Command Areas IV and VIII to a maximum of 0.8 percent in Service Command Area VI [3].

Comparison will be made accordingly of Korean War data (December 1951) with Vietnam war data (1967). The mental tests used in the two periods—Army General Classification Test (AGCT) and Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT)—are similar and the AFQT test is standardized on World War II AGCT scores.

The December 1951 figures are from the adjutant general's office and give the percentages of white and Negro men examined who fell into each of the five mental groups [4, p. 103]. These cannot be compared directly with the published data on the 1967 percentages of "male chargeable accessions"—that is to say, both draftees and enlistees—in each of the mental groups. Adjustment must first be made for rejections. All men rejected because they failed the mental tests belong in Group V and are usually in the lowest decile. Men rejected because of "limited trainability" belong in Group IV. "Administrative acceptances" are persons who failed the mental test but were inducted after interview. These men are assumed to belong in Group V. With these adjustments, the comparative figures are as shown in table 1.

It will be noted that a significant decline has occurred in the percentage of Negroes in the top group, but that Negro representation in the second and third groups has increased and the proportion of blacks in the fourth and fifth groups (low and bottom) has fallen. The decline in Negro representation in Group V is probably attributable to

four successive lowerings of the qualifications for admission into Group IV, due to the heavy manpower demands of the Vietnam war. It seems reasonable to attribute the upward shift in Negro mental test scores in the three middle groups to improvements in education and relevant environmental factors between 1951 and 1967, improvements which have been more accentuated in the case of Negroes than in that of whites.

To compare the relative position of the two races, the percentage of white representation which Negro representation constitutes in each of the five mental categories is shown in table 2.

Table 2 shows a widening gap between Negroes and whites in the first two mental groups. There were proportionately one-third fewer Group I Negroes in 1967 than in 1951 and 8 percent fewer Group II Negroes. There were proportionately 28 percent more Negroes in the low and bottom categories combined (Groups IV and V) in 1967 than in 1951. An increase of 38 percent in the middle category (Group III) relative to whites took place during the period.

These figures suggest the possibility that improvements in environment and education have upgraded both races during the sixteen-year period but that the whites have been the main beneficiaries. The absolute decline in the proportion of Group I Negroes and

TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MEN EXAMINED AT ARMED
SERVICE INDUCTION CENTERS BY MENTAL GROUP AND
BY RACE IN TWO DIFFERENT PERIODS

MENTAL GROUP	1951		1967*	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
I.....	6.3	0.4	6.6	0.28+
II.....	24.0	3.5	33.5	4.1
III.....	34.3	14.1	34.1	19.3
IV.....	31.3	52.3	19.4	49.6
V.....	4.1	29.7	6.4	26.7
Totals.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*[5, pp. 18-20, 25, 29-30, 81].

TABLE 2
NEGRO PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN AS PERCENT-
AGE OF WHITE PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN
IN FIVE MENTAL TEST GROUPS

Mental Group	1951	1967
I.....	6.3	4.2
II.....	14.6	12.2
III.....	41.1	56.6
IV.....	167.1	255.7
V.....	232.2	417.2

the widening of the mental test score gap between the races seems to be consistent with the dysgenic reproductive pattern noted by Jensen.

The statistics on the proportion of Negroes examined for military service who failed the mental tests are also illuminating. There has been a decline in the percentage failing from 47.3 percent in July 1950 to December 1962 to 43.5 percent in 1967, but this decline is probably due to changes in the classification system by which inductees and enlistees who formerly would have been rejected were classified as acceptable. When a comparison is made of the ratio of the white to the Negro rejection rate, it appears again that the gap is widening. In the July 1950 to December 1962 period, the white-black ratio was 4.08. In the next five years, the ratio, based on an unweighted average, was 5.17, and in 1967 it was 7.25. Thus, the rejection data are consistent with the hypothesis of a widening gap between the mental abilities of the two ethnic groups as measured by armed service tests.

REFERENCES

1. A. R. JENSEN. *Harvard Educ. Rev.*, 39:1, 1968.
2. S. A. STOFFER, E. A. SUCHMAN, L. C. DEVINNEY, S. A. STAR, and R. M. WILLIAMS, JR. *The American soldiers: adjustment during army life*, vol. 1, chap. 10. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1949.
3. R. K. DAVENPORT. *J. Negro Educ.*, 15:585, 1946.
4. E. GINZBERG. *The Negro potential*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1956.
5. Medical Statistics Agency Office of the Surgeon General U.S. Army. *Supplement to Health of the Army: Results of the Examination of Youths for Military Service*, 1967.

NATHANIEL WEYL

*4201 South Ocean Boulevard
Delray Beach, Florida 33444*