

## **Professor Robert A. Gordon's analysis of the Peter Jennings broadcast about Pioneer.**

---

On November 22, 1994 **World News Tonight with Peter Jennings**, an ABC News broadcast, devoted two four-minute segments on its "American Agenda," feature to human intelligence research. One segment concerned the recently published book **The Bell Curve** and its surviving co-author, Charles Murray. The other segment concerned the nonprofit Pioneer Fund, which had supported via grants to universities the work of researchers whose publications were cited in **The Bell Curve**. The ABC News broadcast concluded with the message that the Pioneer Fund supported, and **The Bell Curve** depended on, researchers whose work was "not good science."

There is set out below an open letter dated June 17, 1997 from Professor Robert A. Gordon of John Hopkins University, who was among the scientists interviewed, to Roone Arledge (the then president of ABC News), David Westin (the present president), Peter Jennings (anchor of **World News Tonight**) and others responsible for the broadcast segments. After conducting what he regards as "quite possibly the most comprehensive critique per minute of news broadcast time ever offered," Professor Gordon concludes that the ABC News "broadcast was ... slick political propaganda tricked up as news."

This letter is reproduced here by permission from Professor Gordon, who also has granted permission for reproduction for purposes of classroom or group discussion. Professor Gordon may be contacted for permission for any other reproduction beyond fair use.

---



### **HOW SMART WE ARE ABOUT WHAT WE BROADCAST: AN OPEN LETTER TO ABC NEWS**

COPYRIGHT 1997 ROBERT A. GORDON

Department of Sociology  
Johns Hopkins University  
Baltimore, MD 21218

June 17, 1997

Mr. Rooney Arledge, Then President of ABC News, Now Chairman of the News Division,  
Ms. Diane Mendez,  
Ms. Elizabeth Nissen,  
Mr. Bill Blakemore,  
Mr. Albert Oetgen,  
Mr. Peter Jennings,  
and Mr. David Westin, New President of ABC News  
World News Tonight With Peter Jennings, ABC  
47 West 66th Street  
New York, NY 10023

Dear Mr. Arledge, Mss. Mendez and Nissen, and Messrs. Blakemore, Oetgen, Jennings, and Westin:

The news team of a major broadcast network is assumed to represent journalism at its professional best. Nevertheless, the televised reports on **The Bell Curve**, a book by Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray about the effects of human intelligence, and on the Pioneer Fund and intelligence researchers whose work it has supported by ABC's **World News Tonight with Peter Jennings**, on November 22nd, 1994, left much to be desired concerning your organization's journalistic integrity. The full truth of this unhappy conclusion I shall develop in the course of this letter, but the conclusion's general outline should be evident since the publication in the **Wall Street Journal** on December 13th, 1994, less than one month after that broadcast, of a statement signed by over fifty intelligence experts, "Mainstream Science on Intelligence." That very day I sent a copy of the experts' statement on to three of you by fax, pointing out that it would also appear as an editorial in the leading relevant journal, **Intelligence** (just now being published, with accompanying articles, in Volume 24, No. 1). At an appropriate point, I shall refer to the text of the "Mainstream" statement in more detail.

Even publication of the "Mainstream Science" document by a major newspaper failed to give certain opponents of IQ research pause. Some of them continue to circulate on the Internet a transcript of your ABC News broadcast of November 22nd, 1994, for example, which is well suited for lending seeming authority to their purposes, although the broadcast is seen to be, when compared with the testimony of the 52 experts, a clearly false report concerning what is well-accepted about intelligence by experts. The utility of your broadcast to such parties is not at all surprising. In content, it was a sleeker than usual specimen of the unfair criticism aimed repeatedly by media at scientists who conduct politically incorrect research on intelligence, and at the Pioneer Fund for its support of research on human heredity and on individual and group differences in important hereditary traits, such as intelligence. My comments on the broadcast can serve, therefore, as a provisional response to such attacks from various quarters until a more comprehensive treatment becomes

available in a book I have been writing.

Professor Stanley Rothman, who studies the media's handling of science relating to public policy, argued in a 1990 **Minerva** article that "if reporting on scientific issues is to be accurate reporting, it should by and large be assessed in accordance with the consensus of experts" (p. 119) [*This and other quotations from "Journalists, Broadcasters, Scientific Experts and Public Opinion," by Stanley Rothman, **Minerva**, 28, 1990, pp. 117-133, are used with kind permission from Kluwer Academic Publishers.*]. As the experts' statement in the **Wall Street Journal** makes clear, the scientific views ABC News attributed narrowly and with rather malevolent accompanying insinuations to certain recipients of Pioneer Fund support who are cited in **The Bell Curve** are actually either quite mainstream ones or simply variations around the psychometric mainstream typical of any scientific effort to resolve outstanding issues.

You were provided good evidence by me and others that such was the case prior to your broadcast. But you chose to ignore that evidence in favor of your own preconceptions, motivated apparently by the media's identification of the book as a potential source of inspiration for conservative policy-makers (about which more later), by strong precedents in your field governing how intelligence-related research should be reported to the American public, and by what, I have since learned, are known among media critics as "infotainment values," which, driven as they are by revenue considerations, seldom lead in directions parallel to truth and fairness in journalism.

The many intelligence experts who signed the "Mainstream Science" statement felt compelled to do so out of concern with the widespread attempt in media to mischaracterize as discredited certain key propositions from psychometric research crucial to **The Bell Curve**. Evident for all to see, consequently, was that, with a few outstanding exceptions, journalists practically everywhere were striving to substitute their personal judgments and preferences concerning the state of scientific knowledge for the more disciplined judgments of scientists, while editors were welcoming commentary from a biased selection of persons whose qualifications were often noticeably lacking. The most elementary qualification of all for commentators, that they actually had read the book they were condemning, was often, judging from their own words about it, left in doubt. Perhaps no other episode in recent memory has been so revealing of the full extent to which self-righteousness and political biases rule the journalistic profession as when, in overnight reaction to publication of **The Bell Curve**, a small army of self-appointed psychometricians leapt from the ranks of that essentially literary-intellectual occupation to pass uninformed judgment on quantitative studies of human mental ability and on the competence and integrity of those who conduct them.

The described outpouring of inexpertise would not be nearly as inimical to the public's understanding of intelligence research and of social problems related to intelligence if there were not also a media and academic embargo on certain

intelligence findings that largely prevents mainstream scientists from informing the American public effectively. Although **The Bell Curve** itself represented a successful but rare penetration of the embargo (helped by a responsible review from science editor Malcolm W. Browne in the October 16th, 1994, **New York Times Book Review** ), reaction to the book's publication showed a redoubled effort being made to reinstate the embargo and to isolate from any expert support the authors and their book. Indeed, Charles Murray, a political scientist, is often isolated by hostile commentators even from the expertise of his own psychologist co-author, Harvard professor Richard Herrnstein, to achieve the same effect, as when they refer to the work as "Murray's book." The only other time I have seen a co-author scholar slighted in this manner was when a reviewer was being deliberately catty.

The 52 signers of "Mainstream Science" agreed on the following propositions of special relevance here (the numerals correspond to certain numbered propositions in their published statement): Intelligence as usually defined can be measured well (2); intelligence tests as usually used are not culturally biased against minorities in the U.S. (5); the brain processes underlying intelligence are still little understood (6); groups often differ in average intelligence, but their members can be found at all IQ levels (7); the average difference in the case of blacks and whites is about one standard deviation or 15 IQ points (8); IQ is strongly related to many important human outcomes (9); variation in intelligence is more influenced by heritable than environmental causes (14); raising intelligence by environmental manipulations is still largely beyond our control (17); differing intelligence averages for various groups show little sign of converging over time (19); schooling has no discernible effect on such group differences (20); most experts believe that genetic differences as well as environmental differences could account for group differences in IQ, such as the sizable average one between blacks and whites (22); blacks reared in prosperous families score no higher on average than whites reared in poor families (23); racial identity in some essentialist sense, as opposed to race as a mainly self-designated identification, is not an issue when classifying persons for research purposes (24); and research findings neither dictate nor preclude any particular social policy (25), which would include, I might add, eugenics policies, whichever of the many possible forms those might take.

I have noticed no reference on ABC News to these newsworthy claims of mainstream status for important propositions concerning human intelligence, although many of the propositions have appeared as themes in the Pioneer-funded research that you held up to scorn. Are the propositions deemed "controversial" only when stated by Pioneer recipients or by the authors of **The Bell Curve** ? To my knowledge, "Mainstream Science" has been mentioned by journalists only in **Science** , **The Chronicle of Higher Education** , and **APA Monitor** , none of them a mass circulation publication reaching the public at large.

A network news organization ranks high, most would agree, in the informal leadership hierarchy of professional journalism (a description I imagine you will find hard to reject). Not only does a network news team enjoy the cachet of being one of

just a few such major organizations, but it depends on special access to public airways and has special responsibilities as a main source of information for a mass audience, which obtains its news from television more than from any other source. According to established principles of leadership, it is reasonable to expect, therefore, that network news journalists command respect, such as that enjoyed by Walter Cronkite, because they best personify the fundamental norms of their profession concerning such critical matters as accuracy, balance, fairness, and objectivity. Proof that such norms are not being upheld at the top can be especially diagnostic, a fortiori, of the probable state of affairs throughout the ranks. If a poor example is set by most of those at the pinnacle, how much better can matters be at ground level?

In this letter, I analyze the example set by your eight minute news broadcast in the manner of sociological studies of mass communication and persuasion, and from my observations of media treatment of issues in areas where I possess competence. The product is quite possibly the most comprehensive critique per minute of news broadcast time ever offered. We shall see that media handling of human intelligence differences has not improved since Richard Herrnstein, now deceased, complained about media coverage in his "IQ Testing and the Media," published by **Atlantic Monthly** in August 1982, or even since Dan Rather reported on intelligence in a misleading manner for the CBS News Special, **The IQ Myth**, on April 22nd, 1975. Indeed, media coverage seems to have become less responsible and more vicious.

In its more public manifestations, the controversy over intelligence, supposedly a scientific one, has long been mainly a battle between mainstream experts, on the one hand, and the media and academics favored by media as spokespersons, on the other hand. This conclusion will never be more evident than in the following analysis of your broadcast, conducted against the background of the "Mainstream Science" statement. My analysis confirms the conviction of many intelligence researchers that the battle for truth in scientific matters must be joined, therefore, not only in academe, but with media as well, as otherwise one is mounting a one-front defense against two front foes.

#### SOME STANDARDS WORTH CONSIDERING

It may be helpful to set the stage for my analysis by noting first three violations of journalistic conventions that Northwest Airlines complained were present in an investigative news series that was broadcast in three parts over WCCO-TV in Minnesota early in 1996 (as reported in the **Wall Street Journal** on November 20, 1996, by G. Bruce Knecht): relying on questionable sources, failing to provide context (about Northwest's good safety record relative to other airlines), and using sensationalism. These three infractions, questionable sources, inadequate context, and reliance on sensationalism, can be employed as useful touchstones for assessing the ABC News broadcast on intelligence. To them might be added what Professor Rothman termed "melodramatic" forms of presentation (p. 129).

Northwest's head of corporate relations protested, "They put forward a sensational

thesis that Northwest Airlines knowingly and willfully puts unairworthy aircraft into service and that we will harass, drive out of the company, and even murder anyone who bucks the system." The complaint was heard publicly by the Minnesota News Council, one of only two such media oversight bodies that remain active in the nation. After an adversarial hearing, that quasi-judicial body voted overwhelmingly in favor of the plaintiff on each of the three counts. For example, by a vote of 19 to 2, with one abstention, the Minnesota News Council determined that the WCCO-TV report had created a "distorted, untruthful" picture of Northwest's safety procedures. On the day after the hearing, nonetheless, in an action revealing of industry standards for television news, a regional Emmy was awarded to persons responsible for the WCCO-TV broadcast.

#### THE ABC NEWS BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 22nd, 1994

On November 22nd, 1994, ABC News's American Agenda devoted two four-minute segments to human intelligence. Anchor Peter Jennings introduced this featured part of the broadcast as follows: "On the American Agenda tonight: How smart we are about how smart we are. Tonight we're going to take a closer look at a **furious** debate that has been raging in the country for several weeks now, ever since a new book, **The Bell Curve**, argued the proposition that intelligence is very much determined by an individual's race, that some races are simply smarter than others. Our Agenda reporter is Beth [Elizabeth] Nissen." (Italics in recorded speech represent audible emphases, unless titles are involved.)

Before scrutinizing Ms. Nissen's segment and its supposedly closer look at the debate, attention must be given to Mr. Jennings' incorrect assertion that **The Bell Curve** argues that "intelligence is very much determined by an individual's race . . . ." The book, along with all psychologists who recognize average differences among at least some races, argues that race is an inadequate and even improper basis for estimating the intelligence of an individual (particularly as much better and fairer ways are available), and that genes for intelligence, not race, largely determine an individual's IQ. Race may be a correlate of IQ, but it is not a determinant in any useful sense of an individual's IQ. Substantial IQ variation among persons within every race is explicitly acknowledged in **The Bell Curve** and by every researcher I know (see, for example, proposition 7 in "Mainstream Science," above). No proposition in "Mainstream Science" or **The Bell Curve** corresponds to Mr. Jennings' broadcast assertion. This sloppy assertion echoes a statement previously used by Dan Rather during his televised CBS News Special, **The IQ Myth**, two decades earlier. Mr. Rather took issue with "the idea that intelligence is basically a matter of race," without introducing any evidence that such an idea was actually entertained by any expert.

Why did ABC News and CBS News reduce positions to foolish canards before undertaking to criticize them? Surely, an accurate account of the facts would not be so much more complicated than the version you presented that it could not be communicated easily to a mass audience. Perhaps science by canard makes criticism

easier and more entertaining, and lets journalists display themselves as knowing and noble. Mr. Rather predicted confidently that "the . . . myth that race is the determining factor in a person's capacity for intelligence . . . will eventually be discredited." Just who entertained this myth to make discrediting it so worthwhile was not stated. By dismissing an idea that no expert would uphold, Mr. Rather appeared to be safely positioning himself as an authority.

In formulating the proposition about black-white IQ differences in the inept manner that Mr. Jennings did, rather than as a problem involving differences between group averages, he may have needlessly added to unwelcome confusions that blacks will encounter. Among the many persons who learn about **The Bell Curve** only from media, some may be inclined, for whatever reason, not least among which is growing distrust of media, to accept ABC's misrepresentation of **The Bell Curve** concerning race as a determinant of an individual's intelligence as true, and hence regard it as being backed by the book's authority. Unexpectedly, they might thus reserve their skepticism for your broadcast rather than for the book it targeted. According to polls conducted by The Pew Research Center for The People & The Press, for example, favorable ratings of network TV news have been dropping for the last 12 years (News Release, March 21, 1997, p. 3), and the public increasingly regards news media as "inaccurate, unfair and pushy" (p. 1).

ABC News could have consulted an expert on intelligence to help guard against Mr. Jennings' maladroit handling of a sensitive issue. Instead, you have relied heavily, apparently, on your own predispositions and some rather tendentious treatments by politically correct (PC) academics. The tactics of this group often include placing inappropriate word-choices in the mouths of their opponents so as to raise the hackles, predictably, of readers or listeners. What Mr. Jennings and, earlier, Mr. Rather said fits that pattern.

In contrast to Mr. Jennings, for example, Professor Raymond Cattell, a firm believer in the existence of group differences, has emphasized explicitly, and in terms simple enough to have been understood by anyone in your audience, "Since the differences in mean are small compared to the within race differences it is a fallacious racism to perceive an individual in terms of his race." Similarly, **The Bell Curve** states, "The first thing to remember is that the differences among individuals are far greater than the differences between groups" (pp. 270-271). The difference between Professor Cattell, authors Herrnstein and Murray, on the one hand, and Peter Jennings on the other is the difference between thoughtful morality and mindless sanctimony.

#### American Agenda: First Segment

Under the title, "The IQ Debate," the voice of Ms. Nissen, often dramatically freighted with emotion, holds forth on IQ in a manner that constitutes anything but the closer look at that debate promised by Mr. Jennings. Ms. Nissen is not seen on camera; one reasonably surmises that her position at ABC News rests disproportionately on her vocal virtuosity. She possesses a rich voice that could

launch a thousand expectations--and then, with just a turn of intonation, sink them. By turns sounding anxious or alarmed, and then matter-of-fact or soothingly reassuring, she skillfully orchestrates her vocal manipulations to influence the audience's affect toward the contents of her broadcast.

Ms. Nissen also employs other presentational tricks. She uses her vocal coloring skills, for example, to shift emphasis away from the literal meaning of her text when that suits her purpose, and we shall see that she places statements from neuroscientist Eric Kandel about how little is known about what goes on **inside** the brain in false opposition to **The Bell Curve's** claims that a great deal is known about the role of intelligence **outside** the cranium, as though both sources were referring to one and the same domain. This inside-out reporting causes the statements from the two sources to appear to be not only in sharp disagreement, but in the one case, that of the book's claims, insufficiently humble to boot. Waxing humble on behalf of a rival scientific position, as Ms. Nissen does, especially when one has little counter-evidence, is a common ploy. The false issue of the supposed dependence of the external domain on knowledge of the inner one for research purposes was dispatched in 1981, when Arthur Jensen explained, "One can measure intelligence without knowing what goes on in the brain, just as one can measure the horsepower of a car without knowing what's under the hood" ( **Straight Talk About Mental Tests** , p. 71).

Once exposed, such reporting can be seen plainly as a dishonest manipulation of context by Ms. Nissen. Authors Herrnstein and Murray would certainly have agreed with the neuroscientists about how much there is yet to learn about the inner workings of the brain (see "Mainstream Science" proposition 6, for example) irrespective of whether the brain specialists, with their probably limited psychometric expertise, would agree, and for public consumption, with Herrnstein and Murray and the 52 signers of the "Mainstream Science" statement. Agreement with both sets of ideas from just one of the two camps suffices to demonstrate that the ideas are by no means in opposition. One wonders to what extent Dr. Kandel would approve the use that ABC News has made of his statements in Ms. Nissen's broadcast. My inquiry to Dr. Kandel on this and other matters following the broadcast was, unfortunately, not answered.

In the passage in question, Ms. Nissen concedes a key psychometric point about individual differences that she does her best to undermine subsequently: "We know that the complex set of abilities we call intelligence varies between individuals. We are not all equally intelligent. Yet, most scientists who study the electrical and chemical marvels of the brain say little is truly known about the origin or character of intelligence."

Dr. Eric Kandel: "Even though we've made a lot of progress, we are at the foothills of an enormous intellectual mountain range."

Ms. Nissen (now distracting with a sarcastic tone from her key initial concession):

"The much discussed new book **The Bell Curve** claims to **know** a great deal. Its fundamental claim: that intelligence can be measured accurately."

Co-author Charles Murray is spliced in, casually lecturing with evident assurance: "The mental ability is captured reasonably well, as these things go in the social sciences, by IQ tests." A skeptical attitude towards author Murray is induced at the outset, therefore, without resort either to relevant data or to a direct counterargument. Ms. Nissen plays up what we do not know about the physiological basis of intelligence, often in operationally vague terms, such as "the origin or character of intelligence," without acknowledging that enough is known about other aspects of intelligence to fill entire books if not library shelves. This is like saying that because we lack understanding of the origin of the universe, we are unable to find our way to the moon.

Proposition 2 of "Mainstream Science" states that intelligence, as the word is generally understood, can be measured both well and accurately. This widely-accepted conclusion of experts is hardly cause to write a new book, but **The Bell Curve** is made to seem audacious if not irresponsible for merely reporting as "beyond significant technical dispute" what most psychometricians would consider a truism, as though the idea were suddenly open to serious question now that it has been applied in a politically incorrect context. Having singled out "accuracy of measurement" as **The Bell Curve's** "fundamental claim," one that the book's authors good-naturedly acknowledged may appear to media-dependent readers as a "blithe" assumption (p. 1), Ms. Nissen devotes herself to undermining that claim, on the theory, clearly, that if measurement of intelligence is impossible further argument is hardly necessary. She might as well be reading one of the items from **The Bell Curve's** list of false claims often made in media (p. 12): **intelligence is so ephemeral that no one can measure it accurately ."**

Sophistry about unmeasurability and unknowability is a common strategy employed by literary intellectuals and deconstructionist academics when polemicizing against scientific findings that require technical competence to evaluate. One can almost hear a plaintive chorus intoning the Nihilist's Creed: Reality cannot be measured if one must assume the reality of the measuring instrument. Conveniently, such too-clever twattle leaves undisciplined arm-chair intellectuals free to say whatever they wish about reality. Ms. Nissen, for example, proceeds without reference to any of the standard conceptual tools concerning reliability and validity of a proposed measure that would contravene her extreme position if considered. Once again, therefore, we are reminded that no item of knowledge, no matter how rock solid its foundation, commands sufficient respect to be spared from discreditation by the PC Media-PC Academe axis if it stands in the way of their political agenda. We ought to give thanks, I suppose, that measurements in physics have not yet run afoul of the PC line.

ABC's Nissen: "IQ tests. Millions of children and adults have taken them since the 1940s, answering questions like this one, designed to test logic. In this sequence of numbers, which two come next? [A number series problem is displayed.] And there

are questions like this: define the word 'taut'; questions that measure language skills. Leading education researchers now say standard IQ tests are far too narrow. That logic and language are only two kinds of intelligence. There are others, including spatial intelligence--and interpersonal intelligence." Note that it is Ms. Nissen who casts the measurement task in terms that are far too specific, as though each test were intended to measure merely what its face content would suggest instead of the broad underlying mental ability found to be common to all such tests. Ms. Nissen does not confront the fact that persons who do well on one such test tend to do well on the others.

Operating on the "out-of-the-mouths-of-babes" principle, apparently, Ms. Nissen next displays an elementary school teacher quizzing a young girl on the meaning of "interpersonal intelligence." The little girl, who is apparently being indoctrinated at an early age with Professor Howard Gardner's scientifically unsupported theory of seven (now possibly eight) multiple intelligences, replies, "They like working with groups and they're good at being leaders." According to a recent article ("I'm Smart, You're Smart") in the February 1997 **Washingtonian**, Gardnerian instructional activities of this sort are now found in many schools that have fallen, like Ms. Nissen, under his sway.

Blaming IQ tests for being "too narrow" stops just short of invoking the deconstructionist epithet **logocentric**, but it is nevertheless a common tactic used for distracting others from attending to just how well such tests accomplish the important tasks for which they are intended (and many surprising ones for which they had not been intended). Everything is too narrow from some perspective or other, not always the most meaningful one. Ms. Nissen should note that proposition 3 of "Mainstream Science" states: "While there are different types of intelligence tests, they all measure the same intelligence. Some use words or numbers and require specific cultural knowledge . . . . Others do not . . . ."

What Ms. Nissen represented as examples of tests for "two kinds of intelligence," language and logic, are recognized now as testing virtually entirely but one major kind, general abstract reasoning ability. Standard tests measure that single dimension well despite face differences in their contents. Hence, it is possible to achieve a high degree of prediction of an outcome such as, say, scholastic performance, which depends on abstract reasoning ability, by any one of a number of tests all differing from one another in the kinds of items they employ. This is considered the most fundamental fact of all about mental ability tests.

Any of the 52 experts could have explained that fundamental discovery, if asked by Ms. Nissen. But instead of consulting the consensus view, she adhered precisely to the pattern of journalistic reporting that Professor Rothman identified in his 1990 article. Professor Rothman saw then that television coverage of intelligence between 1969 and 1983, in contrast to expert opinion as determined through a broad-based survey, had been "almost uniformly negative" and had portrayed intelligence as "not measurable" and tests of intelligence as too "narrow." Ms. Nissen and other TV

narrators such as Dan Rather in 1975 all seem to be reading from the same unchanging script. How does it come about that so many purportedly independent voices persist in singing a single false tune over network news? An inquiry into media bias might profitably begin with the treatment given hard scientific fact in a single revealing area rather than with the murkier forms of political spin. The result could be definitively diagnostic.

ABC's broadcast lesson on intelligence, the transcript of which is now ricocheting around the Internet, continued the journalistic tradition begun decades ago by being disinformative, outdated, and based entirely on subjective appearances and deep-seated media biases rather than on realities that have emerged from empirical research. Spatial ability has been identified and measured for 50 years at least, although Ms. Nissen suggests that its recognition is a new development. Interpersonal or social "intelligence," as distinct from trainable social skills, interests, and the advantages that IQ might bestow on social judgments, remains an elusive idea still awaiting supporting evidence, as a recent textbook, quoted further on, makes clear.

Although Professor Arthur Jensen and many of the 52 signers of "Mainstream Science" are certainly "leading education researchers" by any normal standard, Ms. Nissen prefers the message of Professor Gardner, whose claims are remarkable chiefly for their absence of relevant data supporting the manifold independences of the numerous skills, some not even clearly cognitive, to each of which he applies the term "intelligence." One is tempted to suspect that it is this absence of quantitative data and elevation of numerous diverse skills to equal status as separate "intelligences" regardless of their predictive importance to society that make Professor Gardner's work so attractive to educators and many other nonspecialists.

As proposition 13 of "Mainstream Science" states: "Certain personality traits, special talents, aptitudes, physical capabilities, experience, and the like are important . . . , but they have narrower (or unknown) applicability or 'transferability' across tasks and settings compared with general intelligence. Some scholars choose to refer to these other human traits as other 'intelligences.'" Howard Gardner is certainly one such scholar, if not the most extreme example, as **The Bell Curve** itself noted (pp. 17-19). Calling somewhat different things by a single catchy name can sometimes be more confusing than helpful to the general public if the one name obscures distinctions widely regarded as important by experts. We would not, for example, want to see everyone called "doctor" who offers to heal the sick, however appealing their bedside manner.

Howard Gardner was one of the many scholars invited to a prepublication seminar on **The Bell Curve**, where he could have pressed his case for "multiple intelligences" before a roomful of experts. However, he, like invitees Stephen Jay Gould and Robert J. Sternberg, did not attend. Media venues such as ABC News and, not coincidentally, **Rolling Stone**, in which he can have his say without direct challenge, may be more to Professor Gardner's and the others' liking. Paleontologist Gould later surfaced in **The New Yorker** with an ill-informed attack on **The Bell Curve**

reminiscent in style and substance of his disinformative May 1st, 1980, review in **The New York Review of Books** of Arthur Jensen's **Bias in Mental Testing** ; Professor Sternberg later submitted a broadside of his own to **The New Republic** that some psychologists who have read it regard as irresponsible (it was not published there); and Professor Gardner himself produced a glib review of Herrnstein and Murray's book, "Cracking Open the IQ Box," for **The American Prospect** (Winter, 1994), a magazine with close ties to liberal Democrats.

In **The American Prospect** , Professor Gardner contrarily asserts of **The Bell Curve** that "the science in the book was questionable when it was proposed a century ago, and it has now been completely supplanted by the development of the cognitive sciences and neurosciences." Supplanted? When is the last time someone faced with a personnel hiring decision thought it worthwhile to consult a cognitive scientist or a neuroscientist? Or, for that matter, to consult Professor Gardner? Employers do, however, find standard mental ability tests useful for selecting better workers.

On Professor Gardner's own work, the leading textbook that I mentioned, **Intelligence** , by Nathan Brody, states, "It is difficult to evaluate Gardner's theory because his book does not present specific studies in support of his claims" (p. 36), and "I find his taxonomy to be arbitrary and without empirical foundation. Neither his rejection of a superordinate general factor nor the specific subset of intelligences that he postulates appears to have a firm theoretical or empirical basis" (p. 40). Similarly, authors Herrnstein and Murray note that "Gardner's approach is . . . radical in that he does not defend his theory with quantitative data . . . Gardner's work is uniquely devoid of psychometric or other quantitative evidence" (p. 18). Even his fellow critic of **The Bell Curve**, Robert Sternberg, commented in 1994 on Professor Gardner's work: "To my knowledge, there is not even one empirical test of the theory. . . . What is clear is that the anticipated program of research has not been forthcoming, and may never be" ( **Teachers College Record** , **95** , p. 561). Professor Gardner apparently finds it easier to declare victory over his scientific rivals in the media than to achieve it through scholarly research.

According to the **Washingtonian** article on Gardnerian pedagogy, by Diane Granat, "there are no tests widely available to measure other dimensions of being smart" and "Gardner has opposed fill-in-the-blank computerized tests to evaluate multiple intelligences," favoring instead "portfolio assessments." Portfolios usually render rigorous measurement difficult and costly, if not impossible. This does not represent progress. In Vermont, a RAND study of the Education Department's attempt to grade portfolios reported, "The reliability of portfolio scoring was so low that most of the planned uses of performance data had to be abandoned" (Natalie and Gerald Sirkin, "The Portfolio Edufab," **Measure** , No. 132, December, 1995, p. 10). "What better way to camouflage failure and limited achievement than to craft an assessment system that doesn't recognize it?" asked Peter N. Berger, a quoted Vermont teacher. Perhaps one reason tests for Professor Gardner's various intelligences are not widely available is that such tests would have to meet certain evidential standards for reliability and validity set forth by the American Psychological Association and other

professional organizations in their **Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing** .

The uncritical media-celebrity of Professors Gardner, Gould, and Sternberg bears out Professor Rothman's conclusions in his 1990 **Minerva** article:

Despite the high prestige of scientists and scientific knowledge in most circles of American society, the views of scientists . . . are not presented in the press and on television in a way which reports the state of opinion prevailing in the scientific community. Because of the high prestige of scientists and scientific knowledge, journalists and broadcasters do invoke the names and opinions of scientists, but usually these are not representative of the main direction of scientific knowledge about the topics in question and are selected for the support they provide for the journalists' own political views. (pp. 132-133)

Howard Gardner, on ABC News: "We know a lot more about intelligence than we did even 30 years ago. That's not reflected in the intelligence tests. They haven't changed materially at all in 50 to 100 years." Neither has the common yardstick. Professor Gardner is not pressed to explain why, then, he has not marketed a superior product. Professor Gardner's criticism of current intelligence tests sounds authoritative as a result of Ms. Nissen's backing, which she does not trouble to justify despite his odd position in the field. The fact that she allowed his ideas, in contrast to ideas that actually are mainstream ones, to go out unchallenged over the air demands an accounting. Most viewers probably assume that network newscasters know what they are talking about, or else they would not be in their jobs, but here, as we can see, this is not a safe assumption. Researchers have found that "Proficiency at recognizing expertise has important implications for group performance" (Littlepage, Schmidt, Whisler, & Frost, "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology", "69", 1995, p. 887). The group most affected by your inability or refusal to recognize relevant expertise even when it reflects the mainstream opinion would be America's citizens.

As authors Herrnstein and Murray noted, alleging the supposed ephemerality of intelligence measurements is one way of casting doubt on the conclusion that intelligence can be measured. In "The IQ Myth", Dan Rather had emphasized the changeability of intelligence in a misleading manner, by not informing his TV audience that substantial lasting changes rarely occur after the age of 10. He claimed, "certainly over the span of a lifetime, an individual's IQ can change dramatically." Perhaps extensive changeability was the myth Mr. Rather had in mind. The most detailed study of IQ change in the period of rapid development from childhood through adolescence--exactly when such change might be most expected (tests at ages 7, 9, 11, and 13)--concluded, ""there is very little measurable naturalistic change in IQ"" (Moffitt, Caspi, Harkness, and Silva, "Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry", "34", 1993, p. 499). Now, two decades after Mr. Rather's broadcast, we find Ms. Nissen working the unmeasurability and changeability themes hard once again, following Professor Gardner's empty complaint that intelligence tests have not changed much over the years. Ms. Nissen: "But science has [changed]. Using high

tech scanners and imagers, neuroscientists like Dr. Eric Kandel can see why intelligence is almost "impossible" to measure. It is constantly changing. The brain, the factory that produces intelligence, is always learning, retooling."

Dr. Eric Kandel: "You can actually show an anatomical change. An actual increase in the number of synaptic connections."

It is not Dr. Kandel who states that intelligence is "almost impossible to measure" and "is constantly changing," only ABC's Ms. Nissen. This important gap in intended meaning may elude trusting viewers of a television broadcast built around images and voice-overs carefully sequenced to induce a sense of narrative continuity. Ms. Nissen appears to be making the common mistake of confusing learning and experience, which can alter synaptic connections between nerve cells (just as Dr. Kandel states), with intelligence, which influences how readily learning occurs, especially the learning of complex, abstract material. The fact that we know of no learning experiences that, if made widely available, would materially reduce intelligence differences between persons and groups may not be known to Ms. Nissen. She has failed to master Professor Herrnstein's basic axiom that as relevant environments become more equal for all, performance differences more totally reflect genetic differences in intelligence.

One cannot help wondering how Ms. Nissen would reconcile her statement that intelligence is "almost impossible to measure" with her earlier concession, "We are not all equally intelligent." How could she know this if intelligence were almost impossible to measure? Indeed, how could she claim to know that intelligence "is constantly changing" if she believes intelligence is impossible to measure? It seems that Ms. Nissen is so intent on dismissing **The Bell Curve** that she has lost track of the internal consistency of her own report. With so little care shown for her own coherence, it is difficult to believe that she would be much impressed by the consistency of extensive research evidence nowadays considered politically incorrect. Ms. Nissen, obviously, is entirely dependent on authority, and then only on those authorities who tell her what she prefers to tell the American public or from whose statements she can snip, as we shall see repeatedly, seemingly supportive quotations to plug into her broadcast without regard to their original intellectual contexts.

Ms. Nissen: "Brain surgeons, like Dr. Benjamin Carson [of Johns Hopkins Hospital] say the brain responds to everything it experiences from its first formation in utero." One could say much the same of muscle tissue, of course, but that would obviously have no implication for intelligence differences and would expose the irrelevance of Ms. Nissen's hardly newsworthy point. In fact, the research of Dr. Kandel, whose appearance preceded that of Dr. Carson on the broadcast, has been strongly focused on structural changes in synaptic connections in "Aplysia", the sea snail, that are entirely neuromuscular. Virtually all living cells, whether found in single-celled organisms or organisms higher in the scale of complexity, respond to everything they experience.

As Wade Roush described research like that of Dr. Kandel in "Science" (November 15, 1996, "The Supple Synapse: An Affair That Remembers"), "the link between a muscle fiber and its controlling nerve endings is perpetually in flux, alternately gaining and giving up strength in the face of shifting demands." When changes in connections are strengthening ones, they are considered "a crude form of learning and memory." In the "New York Times Magazine", George Johnson characterized this research as follows: "Kandel and other scientists hope that by studying simple invertebrate nervous systems, they can uncover basic learning processes also used by the human brain" ("Memory: Learning How It Works," August 9, 1987, p. 21). It may well have been the perpetual flux of such changes in crude learning, as exhibited in sea snails, that Ms. Nissen misreported as constant changes in intelligence following her interview of Dr. Kandel. Dr. Kandel's interest in the molecular basis of synapse formation as a basis for learning and memory in all members of a species does not address the question of differences in intelligence between members of the species any more than the molecular basis of muscle formation would account for those major differences in physique that cannot be eliminated by exercise.

Even the plasticity of synaptic responses to environmental stimuli, contrary to the impression Ms. Nissen next conveys, have been found, in the fruit fly, to reflect (mutational) genetic variation. Dr. Kandel's remark that "we are at the foothills of an enormous intellectual mountain range" was exactly the kind of statement a modest scientist would make if, following more than two decades of respected work on the peripheral neurons of sea snails, and some cautious theorizing about the possible relevance of that work to the formation of synaptic connections in the central nervous system of humans, he was asked by a journalist about the relation of his work to human intelligence. Certainly, such a response could not legitimately be construed as a commentary on the limitations of the work of other scientists, such as authors Herrnstein and Murray, who labor in a discipline dealing with entirely different problems.

Ms. Nissen's effective broadcast use of Dr. Kandel notwithstanding, I have been unable to find any evidence that Dr. Kandel presents himself as an expert on intelligence. In his massive 1135-page, 1991 work with two co-authors, "Principles of Neural Science", 3rd ed., there are found only two sentences on intelligence (p. 993). Both sentences, interestingly enough in view of what comes next in Ms. Nissen's broadcast, acknowledge a role for hereditary factors in producing intelligence. Dr. Kandel's 1995 book, "Essentials of Neural Science and Behavior", does not list intelligence or IQ in its index. One would think that someone presented as an expert by ABC News would have published more than two sentences on the topic in question. Dr. Kandel's eminence in neuroscience is confined to a field that presently bears at best only superficial resemblance to the study of human intelligence.

As we consider next the segment featuring Dr. Carson, we are forced to wonder how it was decided at ABC News that brain surgery, an applied science concerned mainly with removing diseased portions of the brain, is suddenly another discipline to be

consulted on intelligence. Surely, Ms. Nissen would not have interviewed **The Bell Curve's** authors on brain surgery. Again, this raises the question concerning her peculiar choice of disciplines that I posed for Dr. Kandel's neural science work, which was remote, at best, from intelligence. Neurons and brains are all it takes, apparently, to persuade Ms. Nissen that eminent scientists in irrelevant fields can safely be passed off as experts for a program on intelligence. Certainly, such interviewees pose little risk of contradicting her own view of **The Bell Curve**, which she has not even verified for her audience that these experts have read. An additional determining factor in the case of brain surgery, one surmises, was that Dr. Carson happens to be a highly-respected black neurosurgeon at a distinguished medical institution. Dr. Carson's eminence is cast as a not so subtle rebuke to a book that discusses black-white mean differences in intelligence and their significance to society.

Judging from his response on camera, Dr. Carson has apparently been asked, off camera, some general question, such as, "What kinds of things might affect brain development?" He states on camera: "I would have to say that hydration, nutrition, and stimulation, environmentally, play very large roles in the development of the human brain." We are not told whether or not he mentioned genes, but his answer, if examined carefully, suggests that he probably reserved a category for nonenvironmental influences.

Discarding the very logic she earlier dismissed as "far too narrow" a form of intelligence in favor now of a further non sequitur, Ms. Nissen announces: "That challenges the most critical and criticized claim in the new book, that while environment may have an effect, intelligence is largely genetic and largely fixed in a person by the age of 16 or 17." Dr. Carson's response challenged nothing of the sort, of course, and one would have to possess the nerve of a carnival concessionaire, a supreme confidence in the power of the Crookes tube, and perhaps a spellbinding, even self-hypnotizing, voice, to state before an audience of adults that it did. What we have here is a foreordained conclusion by ABC News in desperate search of material over which it can be draped to achieve a fleeting plausibility and thus earn the admiration of other overpoliticized and underscientific intellectuals.

Busy though he must be, Dr. Carson graciously responded to my inquiry, one Johns Hopkins colleague to another, answering, "No," when I queried him whether his broadcast statement meant he would exclude genetic influences on intelligence. I thank him for his patience and kindness in responding to what must have seemed a silly question from me. Dr. Carson did believe, he informed me, that environment is much more important than genetics, but he also stated that he did not view his words as challenging the claim that intelligence is largely fixed by the age of 16 or 17.

The hapless Charles Murray, who wisely refused to be interviewed for this program once he sized up its second segment as what he called "an intellectual witch hunt," is involuntarily spliced in once again from a prior videotaping, so as to exploit Ms. Nissen's non sequitur by showing him accepting as fact what the viewer has just seen

supposedly repudiated by Dr. Carson according to Ms. Nissen, but not, we now know, according to Dr. Carson himself. Dr. Murray: "For whatever reasons, whether it's nature or nurture doesn't make any difference anymore. At 17, that SAT score or an IQ score is hardwired." This little triumph over an author of **The Bell Curve** must have been accompanied by loud backslapping in the ABC cutting room.

Although I find the metaphor "hardwired" imprecise and misleading, Dr. Murray, like others who use the term, is referring to the established fact that by age 17, if not before, IQ correlates highly with scores obtained from that age on. The fact that such a correlation exists does not depend, as Dr. Murray indicated, on knowing its source in genetics or environment. Environmental is not a synonym for "changeable" or "controllable," although it is often misrepresented to the public as though it were.

Ms. Nissen has clearly misused Dr. Carson's response to a question, whatever form it took, that was altogether separate from one concerning the relative contributions of nature and nurture to existing variations in intelligence. The importance of what is "essential in order for intelligence and the brain to develop at all" in any single person can be entirely unrelated, and often is, to what is "important in accounting for variation in intelligence" among persons. Dr. Carson's perfectly sound textbook answer, which he explicitly directed at development of the brain, was, judging from its content, addressed to the former of the two questions, the one most naturally of concern to a physician. His reply did not attempt to address the relative influences in existing populations of "differences" in nature or nurture on "differences" in intelligence, and it certainly held no implication that genes do not play a role in intelligence and that differences in genetic make-up do not play a major role in differences in intelligence.

More than likely, therefore, the belief Dr. Carson reported to me that environment is more important than genes bore on the first of the two quite different questions I have distinguished from each other rather than on the second, as most genotypes contain sufficient information for a normal brain to develop, if only the environment remains adequate. That first question is the one that most persons seem to have in mind when asked about nature and nurture, as it is mainly nurture that is problematic for a developing organism, the matter of its genetic blueprint having already been settled. Dr. Carson did, after all, address himself specifically to development, which does not commence until fertilization has occurred. Infant mortality rates are high among many species, and were for humans until quite recently, because of the variable quality of the environment. Everyone is aware of the vicissitudes of development but few are familiar with behavior genetic research on the sources of differences between persons. In any case, ABC News does Dr. Carson a disservice even to suggest that a Johns Hopkins physician might discount genes and human variation.

To illustrate clearly the difference between the two kinds of nature-nurture question, we have only to ask: Just how large a factor is hydration (chemical combination with water) in accounting for differences in intelligence either between groups or between most members of a single population? True, the intelligence test performance even of

Charles Murray's 17-year-old could, in principle, be lowered drastically, conceivably to zero irreversibly, by force-feeding salted peanuts and withholding water, but is this really the kind of issue with which our society and **The Bell Curve** need be concerned? How many 17-year-olds are suffering from dehydration? ABC News furnishes no data.

As we shall see, each of the two American Agenda segments holds within its stacked deck a trump card to be played with a flourish toward the end of the hand. The point in the broadcast has been reached for Ms. Nissen to produce her version of that card, which will return us to the issue of IQ changeability. Ms. Nissen: "And the book goes on to conclude that blacks as a group are hardwired, are permanently set at a lower level of intelligence than whites. Blacks score an average of 15 points lower than whites on those standard IQ tests. Therefore, suggests the book, welfare and job training programs should reconsider spending money to change people who cannot "be" changed [background footage shows black clients lined up in what appears to be the office-quarters of a welfare bureaucracy]. Yet there is "compelling" evidence that people can be changed, even evidence based on IQ tests."

I interrupt Ms. Nissen's denouement to point out that "The Bell Curve"'s policy ideas are never based solely on the black-white IQ difference, as she would have listeners believe, but also, even mainly, on the fact that many whites, perhaps greater in absolute numbers although far fewer proportionally, fall in the lower IQ range associated with behaviors that current programs too often fail to remediate. The stubbornness of the general black-white IQ difference has long been well-documented. "Most social scientists know--though few publicly discuss it--that there has been a puzzling gap of about 15 points in I.Q. test scores, on average, between blacks and whites in America ever since the tests were first widely used more than 70 years ago," Daniel Goleman wrote in the "New York Times" in 1988 ("An Emerging Theory on Blacks' I.Q. Scores," April 10, 1988, Education Section, pp. 22-23). Ms. Nissen leaves her audience with the impression that the onus for this observation rests entirely on the new book by Professor Herrnstein and Dr. Murray.

Media tend to portray references to the black-white IQ difference either as "old" and hence passe, or as novel, as though isolated from any prior consensus. Ms. Nissen characterizes Herrnstein and Murray's version of the observation in terms so extreme that they reflect badly on them as the supposed sources, whose argument need not depend on clairvoyance about the "permanence" of the race difference to be taken seriously. What authors Herrnstein and Murray did state was that we know of no way to raise IQ in the foreseeable future, a period that falls well short of eternity, but which is far more relevant than eternity to current policy. Ms. Nissen's tactic here is to overinflate, as though it were a party balloon, the position of "The Bell Curve" until it seems likely to pop of its own accord.

Ms. Nissen's trump card, the "compelling evidence" of environmentally caused change, is now displayed: "The U.S. Army gave IQ tests to several hundred thousand recruits in 1917. Blacks as a group scored "higher" than whites when they came from

states with good education systems. Evidence that education matters more than race. Evidence that brains can and do "grow" intelligent," she announces triumphantly, her voice overbrimming with conviction, sweeping us all toward the possibility of relief that she holds before us.

Dr. Eric Kandel is usefully inserted once again, and made to seem to second Ms. Nissen's euphoric conclusion about growing more intelligent by saying, as though he were participating in an actual rather than contrived dialogue with her: "This is true for you and me at our respective stages of intellectual development. It's even more true for the unborn child and the newborn child."

One can only wonder what the antecedent of Dr. Kandel's pronominal "this" really was. What exactly was it, in his mind, that was true? That learning occurs throughout the life cycle? Probably so. Had Dr. Kandel answered my inquiry, we might know. The fact is, differences in IQ scores of groups from different backgrounds show little or no systematic change as those groups progress through educational systems, although learning occurs all along the way. This exploitation of a statement by Dr. Kandel is one of the more embarrassing moments of a shamefully manipulative broadcast.

Following Dr. Kandel's ambiguous "This is true" statement, Ms. Nissen delivers a vocally intense closing instruction to her television audience, inviting them to flatter themselves by uncritically accepting her message about growing more intelligent. Ms. Nissen: "That is something that we, as "intelligent" beings, can "learn", can "remember", can "know"." The implication seems to be that anyone who resists her four-minute disparagement of a provocative book that reports decades of research by numerous experts just might not, along with the book's authors, qualify as an intelligent being.

#### End of First Segment

"Further comment on Ms. Nissen's trump card: The Klineberg study"

To advance a claim that there was "compelling" evidence that IQ can be changed (and through quite routine interventions, no less), ABC News appears to have revived, without bothering to identify the source, the soundly criticized 1944 thesis of social psychologist Otto Klineberg concerning World War I Army Alpha test score comparisons between blacks in four Northern and whites in four Southern states. In 1975, Dan Rather did the same for CBS: "blacks in some Northern states scored higher than whites in parts of the South." Professor Klineberg's chosen comparison revealed slightly higher average scores for the blacks. ABC News failed to mention, however, that it was only whites in low-scoring Southern states with whom the Northern blacks had been compared, leaving its audience with the false impression that the blacks scored higher than whites in the same states with good educational

systems and perhaps higher even than whites from any state. Mr. Rather was clearer on these points in 1975.

From Professor Klineberg's more circumscribed comparison, he had inferred that higher educational levels then found in Northern states accounted for the difference in favor of the blacks, but his interpretation failed to consider likely sources of sample bias. The blacks were relatively few and thus potentially far more selected than whites for ability within-race, and they were also atypical by virtue of having been found in Northern states as a result of selective migration. They were also somewhat more selected among blacks, by having taken the Alpha test rather than the Beta test, than the whites tested on Alpha were within their Southern population. Proportionally more blacks than whites had been shunted off to take the Beta test intended for illiterates. Conceivably, assignment to the Beta test could have siphoned off lower IQ individuals relatively more completely among blacks than among whites, leaving only the brightest Northern blacks to take the Alpha test.

Worse yet, comparisons between the blacks and whites from the same Northern states, where the education level was higher for both groups, revealed a black-white score difference every bit as large as was usually observed in nationwide data. More education, therefore, even under the Klineberg interpretation, did not close the gap when the whites too were better educated. Such additional relevant comparisons, supplied by Professor Klineberg's critics long ago, were not considered by ABC News. Many critics have wrongly accused **The Bell Curve** of confusing correlation with causality, but, as this hoary example shows, when precisely that kind of confusion is exploited in a politically correct manner we find that a double standard lasting over many decades prevails. Professor Klineberg made no claim to have demonstrated possible change in actual individuals, by measuring their intelligence before schooling and then, following a move North, their intelligence after schooling. The measurements he relied on to demonstrate "change" were taken at just one point in time, not two, and thus his conclusions rest on questionable assumptions about the representativeness of the groups he chose to compare.

It is hard to believe that the Klineberg study would have been commended to ABC's attention by any reputable psychometrician willing to have his name attached (see "Mainstream Science" proposition 20, above, for example, on the unresponsiveness of IQ to schooling). Had I, when interviewed by Bill Blakemore later in the broadcast, been asked about the Klineberg study, I would have further informed you that between 1920 and 1980, the difference between black and white young adult males in median years of schooling completed shrank from 3.3 years to only .6 years, and the amount of schooling received by both groups increased greatly, yet the IQ difference between the two groups failed to decrease at all. This is not exactly the outcome one would anticipate from the Klineberg study. But why let facts spoil a good story such as Professor Klineberg's, particularly when so much ABC money had been invested in pursuing an expose that was transparently a hoax if only because many experts **do** recognize and are concerned about a persisting phenotypic difference in intelligence between blacks and whites (cf. "Mainstream Science")--

Pioneer Fund or no Pioneer Fund?

### The Relation Between the Two Segments

The videotape of "World News Tonight with Peter Jennings" on November 22nd, 1994, reveals that ABC's first American Agenda segment, like most media outlets, did not introduce a single scientist who might have supported any of **The Bell Curve's** contentions about mental ability and its societal effects, although many were available, as the long list of signers of "Mainstream Science" proves. Instead, ABC News drew on commentaries by individuals who were, at best, marginal to psychometric science, eminent though they might be in their own fields, and then proceeded to string together highly-selected remarks of theirs with the uninformed but supremely confident remarks of Beth Nissen so as to bias the program consistently against Charles Murray, portrayed as an isolated and apparently oft-contradicted voice.

ABC's reliance on the unidentified and inadequately presented Klineberg study indicates that ABC News harkened credulously to someone who stands far out of the mainstream of today's mental ability experts. I have noticed that Ms. Nissen's segment parallels Professor Howard Gardner's "Cracking Open the IQ Box" in many respects, even when Gardner himself is not the immediately visible source in her broadcast. Both direct their audiences to the neurosciences with a show of knowingness, as though some great breakthrough relevant to intelligence were to be found there; downplay the causal prominence of genes; promote multiple intelligences, particularly social intelligence, in specific contrast to supposedly narrow "linguistic and logical skills"; discuss prenatal and postnatal development as though environment were the chief influence on human variation in IQ; and, interestingly, overemphasize the effect of schooling on IQ and, although only tacitly in Ms. Nissen's case through her use of the unidentified Klineberg study, overemphasize too the benefits to the intelligence of blacks that migration from the rural South to the urban North might confer.

ABC News's unerring political correctness in choosing and evaluating key mental ability issues in the first segment of American Agenda was joined, as we shall see next, with an obliquely slanderous presentation of scientists on whose work part of **The Bell Curve** rests in the second segment, so as to maintain an uninterrupted slant straight throughout the news broadcast. Your coverage first inflated the value of spurious or irrelevant commentary on intelligence and then it deflated genuine expertise without ever permitting an opportunity for informed reply to ostensible research criticism. Calling such disregard for fair play "American Agenda" only serves to aggravate the mischief, by misappropriating a respected symbol. The one Pioneer-funded scientist who was permitted to speak on screen, I was confined to a carefully selected comment about Pioneer in the second segment. (Professor Michael Levin, who appeared on camera too, is a philosopher of science, although one

knowledgeable about intelligence issues.) The two American Agenda segments on intelligence, using different reporters, thus cannily excluded from the discussion of scientific issues scientists who were interviewed at length by ABC News, such as Professors Gordon, Linda Gottfredson, and Philippe Rushton, who could have addressed scientific criticisms knowledgeably if afforded an opportunity to do so. Their responses, however, might well have been at cross-purposes to the impression ABC News was obviously determined to leave with those who rely on its broadcasts for information. Long interviews recorded with two of these individuals were not included at all in either segment. Charles Murray, when he appeared on screen, was always shown after the substantive point he was about to make had already been called into question. This orchestration of the order of presentation held throughout the program, and culminated in written responses from Harry Weyher, president of the Pioneer Fund, and then Charles Murray at the program's very end, where both were quoted in tangential defense of what amounted by then, on camera, to a hopelessly lost cause.

#### American Agenda: Second Segment

At the beginning of the second segment of American Agenda, this one bearing the title, "ABC News Investigation," Peter Jennings announces: "There is more to this controversy about intelligence and race. Some of the ideas found in **The Bell Curve** are not new. Our Agenda reporter, Bill Blakemore, has been looking into a fairly obscure research fund that has drawn attention because of this book, "The Bell Curve", a fund with a history."

Most scientific reports contain some ideas that are not new, of course, but only in politically correct discourse is this cliché elevated to prominence as an epistemological principle, one using the existence of a controversial past against the truth-value of present data. In ABC's unattributed use of Professor Klineberg's 1944 ideas, for example, which were not only not new but methodologically naive, their age and encounters with controversy were not considered worthy of comment as threats to their credibility. Even older were the 1917 data on which Professor Klineberg's work was based.

Mr. Blakemore opens the "ABC News Investigation" with the revelation that the Pioneer Fund does not, unlike many wealthier foundations, spend money on office space, and uses a mailbox service. Mr. Blakemore: "This mailbox service in Manhattan is the official address for the Pioneer Fund. There is no office." We are shown mailboxes. The supposed lack of an office is left as a sinister back-alley portent concerning a foundation and its four directors and president, Mr. Harry Weyher, who "avoid publicity" and "rarely talk to journalists." One discerns an effort to implant conspiratorial notions about Pioneer in the minds of viewers from the outset. Only shady operators, presumably, use mailbox services and fail to oblige media with on-camera interviews. Dan Rather raised similar prejudicial insinuations

in "The IQ Myth", which he opened by characterizing testing organizations as "a secretive industry guarding its products against imitation and even against publicity." What would one expect publishers of secure, copyrighted tests who must defend against knockoffs and protect validity against enterprising cheaters to do, one wonders, print the correct answers upside down?

In raising questions about Pioneer's supposed lack of office, Mr. Blakemore makes no mention of the many hundreds of millions of dollars spent by wealthier and more lavishly accoutered foundations on promoting well-publicized educational innovations that have come to less-publicized naught, while their presidents and staffs draw huge salaries. Recent reports, for example, reveal that the president of the Kellogg Foundation receives in annual salary and in supplements upwards of \$500,000, which corresponds to what one article stated Pioneer distributes in grants in a current year and exceeds what it has averaged in the past. The harm through petty corruption and power struggles wrought by the wealthy Ford Foundation's promotion of community school board control in New York City is still being undone three decades later. As early as 1972, it was observed by a former president of the New York City Board of Education that in the drive to decentralize control of schools, "Communities were led to believe that bigness was responsible for failure to bring the educational achievements of children from impoverished homes and communities up to a par with children of the middle class" ("Why decentralization hasn't worked," by Rose Shapiro, Letter to the Editor, "New York Times", May 20, 1972, p. 32). Decentralization failed to work because its backers had pinned their hopes on the wrong variable, yet ABC News is clearly unfriendly to open investigation aimed at discovering right explanations.

The standards recognized as most important for assessing a foundation's performance are low overhead and high impact in its chosen area, except, apparently, in the case of Pioneer, where office-space and mailboxes count more heavily. Although Mr. Blakemore seems to be suggesting that he would have been more impressed by Pioneer had office stage props been in evidence and Pioneer's overhead been higher, there is no reason to suppose that granting ABC News an interview in posh quarters would have weighed in favor of the small foundation.

Judging from earlier preoccupations of journalists with the sumptuary habits of both the Pioneer president and Charles Murray, I am confident that any hint of self-indulgence would also have been turned to petty advantage against Pioneer. Mr. Weyher's luncheon, at his personal expense, with "GQ" magazine author John Sedgwick ("The Mentality Bunker," November 1994) at New York's Racquet & Tennis Club drew a snide remark from Mr. Sedgwick about the "toniness" of the setting, and Dr. Murray was gleefully ousted for drinking champagne and then switching to a Bordeaux in the first class cabin of their flight together by "New York Times Magazine"'s Jason DeParle ("The Most Dangerous Conservative," October 9, 1994), a journalist whose lips, presumably, like Count Dracula's, have never touched wine.

Spartan accommodations appear not to be an issue for mainstream media, however, when politically correct messages emanate therefrom. Take, for example, The Sentencing Project, whose numerous research reports generally stress two questionable points: Locking up criminals does not reduce crime, and the criminal justice system is rigged against racial minorities. According to an April 1996 report in "Organization Trends", The Sentencing Project (TSP), "a little known . . . think tank," is "a press darling," whose "name has appeared in 219 stories, 71 of them since the start of [1995]." Much of this attention, I know from my own reading, follows from the fact that The Sentencing Project does publish eye-catching statistics on race differences in criminal justice system involvement, but the data are typically used to promote the two messages indicated, and to attack "the political motivations of those who favor penalizing criminal behavior." Thus, according to The Sentencing Project, there seems to be no other reason to penalize criminality than a political one, and political responsiveness to reasonable fear of crime in a democracy is necessarily suspect.

"Organization Trends" observed, "What is remarkable about TSP's success is that it promotes its agenda [often on television newscasts] while remaining obscure as an organization." The Sentencing Project is "housed in a run-down part of Washington" in "dingy offices reached by an antique elevator." This organization has not yet descended to renting a mailbox, perhaps, but its obscurity and frugal quarters would seem to signal its ripeness for Messrs. Jennings and Blakemore's style of investigative reporting, especially in view of the fact that The Sentencing Project is reported to receive tax-payers' money from the Department of Justice to promote its soft-on-crime agenda.

Perhaps we are to infer from Mr. Blakemore's unwarranted conclusion, "there is no office," that had ABC's camera only been able to peer into Pioneer's mailbox, it would have found the officeless Mr. Weyher crouched inside. Let me assure ABC News, therefore, that Mr. Weyher does have an office, which happens to be that of his law practice. Although I have not been in the present office, I recall his prior office as a comfortable one befitting a successful attorney. Mr. Weyher, who draws no remuneration as president of Pioneer, conducts the foundation's business out of his own office space and by correspondence, as he does for clients in general. When facts as innocent as these are turned against Pioneer on "World News Tonight", it is clear what we are up against.

Pioneer's decision to rent a mailbox was a recent one and has a history too. Had Mr. Blakemore cared to ask, ABC News would have been informed of that history. But asking would have risked receiving a reasonable explanation and thus spoiling a good visual effect for ABC's investigative reporters, who, supposedly delving into a scientific controversy, evidently thought they knew a good way to tell a story when they saw one. "The Interview That Didn't Happen" ("Wall Street Journal" article by Steve Salerno on July 29, 1996) has become a staple feature of "investigative" TV reportage. Thus, in ABC's view, the rented mailbox became a key symbol as "the office that didn't exist," one that the American people needed to know about and

could understand on prime time network news. Asking about much else, Mr. Blakemore et al. were evidently careful "not" to ask about the mailbox and thus risk jeopardizing the clarification the mailbox would bring, when projected on screen, to public understanding of serious social issues and the matter of intelligence. Such care in determining both what and what not to ask represents investigative reporting of a most demanding sort.

According to Mr. Weyher's memoranda for the files, dated April 3rd and 9th, 1991, a TV crew with reporter Jeff Cole from the program "Inside Edition" arrived in the lobby of what was then Mr. Weyher's office building, and claimed, untruthfully, to have an appointment with him. They were denied entry by building security staff. Evidently hoping for a sidewalk confrontation for a story about Pioneer, the "Inside Edition" people loitered outside, accosting passersby with requests for a description of Mr. Weyher. At the close of the workday, the "Inside Edition" crew repaired to Mr. Weyher's apartment building, again claiming falsely to have an appointment with Mr. Weyher. Again denied access, they took up positions outside the building's entrances, where, for about two hours, they interviewed passing tenants on camera, asking if they knew Mr. Weyher, before departing. Mr. Weyher notes in one of his memos that following this incident residents of his building went out of their way to show friendliness and sympathy toward him, apparently a reaction against the obnoxiousness of the media harassment. As Mr. Salerno observed about TV journalism in the "Wall Street Journal", "Now it's "de rigueur" to just barge in on people unannounced, then make a stink if they're less than gracious about seeing you." In displaying the mailboxes, you were simply adhering to what Mr. Salerno called TV's "self-conscious tradition of covering its own coverage." Meanwhile, real issues were being ignored.

When Mr. Weyher moved to a new office location later that same year, Mrs. Weyher suggested he rent a convenient mailbox to forestall future attempts at ambush interviews. An ambush interview was defined by an expert witness in "Wolfson v. Lewis", a legal proceeding against "Inside Edition", as "a confrontational, surprise interview with an unwilling subject, generally a person who has previously refused to be interviewed. The TV journalist approaches the subject surreptitiously with cameras and sound rolling and asks a question calculated to embarrass the subject."

Although he is well-informed about research developments, Mr. Weyher recognizes that he is a layman and so typically refers journalists to academics who actually conduct research that Pioneer has funded and who have more credibility as experts. This is probably one reason reporters would like to interview him, and why they resort to ambush tactics when refused, figuring that whatever the result it can be edited and exploited to their advantage. Not satisfied with the Pioneer Fund president's patient written responses to numerous questions about Pioneer, questions often demanding reactions to brief passages from the past writings of long-deceased individuals with no reference information provided to enable one to determine context, the ABC News crew almost certainly was attempting an ambush when they arrived to discover they were only at Pioneer's mailbox. In contrast, busy researchers

funded by Pioneer generously granted ABC News what amounted to several days of interview time, not to mention much time devoted to fax correspondence, but we were heard on screen for a total of 31 seconds (1/16th of the total air time) to deliver just four sentences, none of them bearing on scientific matters. Why bother with such farcical "interviews"?

Indeed, in light of this analysis of your overedited broadcast, Linda Gottfredson's question, after seeing your correspondence concerning Mr. Weyher's unwillingness to grant an interview on camera to ABC News, becomes especially prescient: "The issue is not 'Why won't he?' but rather 'Why should he?'" (fax-letter from L. S. Gottfredson to Messrs. Blakemore and Oetgen, and Ms. Mendez, November 21, 1994). One could get a much fairer shake--and I intend this with no disrespect to Ms. Winfrey, a talented interviewer who listens before responding--on "Oprah". There, true dialogue can often be heard.

Lest there be any question about the rationale behind Pioneer's wish to avoid harassment from ambush interviewers, let me add that others too have found objectionable the tactics of tabloid TV shows such as "Inside Edition" and "Hard Copy". Actor George Clooney organized celebrities to withhold their personal appearances from the shows until TV tabloids agreed to issue some ethical guidelines for their news gathering techniques ("Washington Post", November 8, 1996). The Cosby family complained of stakeouts at their home following the tragic murder of their son. The president of the NBC news division, Mr. Andrew Lack, has stated, "It's not fair to stand in front of [a person's] house all day with a camera waiting for him to come out. If a person says he doesn't want to talk--leave him alone" ("New York Times", December 23, 1996). In "Wolfson v. Lewis" (1996), a federal judge found it necessary to issue an injunction against "Inside Edition" to prevent their "harassing, hounding, following, intruding, frightening, terrorizing or ambushing" the plaintiffs or their children.

Having unmasked Pioneer as a mailbox renter, which, as we have seen, was itself an iatrogenic result of media mistreatment, Mr. Blakemore now warms to his topic: "Ever since 1937, the Pioneer Fund has promoted the study of racial purity as an ideal [this against a backdrop of Ellis Island film!]. Over the past 10 years, according to public documents, the Pioneer Fund contributed \$3.3 million to scientists cited in **The Bell Curve**." All for "racial purity" studies?

I cannot imagine how one would study "racial purity as an ideal," not ever having encountered such a phrase in connection with any Pioneer-funded research, unless it were by opinion survey--not the type of investigation conducted by the many Pioneer recipients with whose work I am acquainted. I am not at all sure how the ABC phrase "racial purity" is intended, but I would certainly agree that it sounds calculated to be inflammatory to important segments of the viewing audience, especially when linked with the natural inference on the part of your audience that this was the subject that all of those scientists requested money to pursue. "" Mr. Blakemore fails to define what would constitute a "racial purity" study and provides no example to which one

can respond. Such tactics demonstrate why it was vital to ABC News to keep Pioneer-funded scientists from being able to comment about scientific matters on camera.

Mr. Blakemore, having moved on from the mailbox to further uncover that politically incorrect research costs money, just as does research in general, continues his investigation by naming Pioneer recipients and amounts of money they may have received. Such amounts are matters of public record and were published earlier, in October 1994, by "Rolling Stone" under the nasty title, "Professors of Hate," by a journalist who had dissembled an interest in our academic freedom. Monetary figures always add a semblance of rigor to an otherwise shallow investigation. No information is provided about the research of these scientists other than the "racial purity" label and a brief politically incorrect "quotation" for each, words tied together, usually, by a capacious ellipsis and stripped of scientific context when flashed on screen. It is interesting to see, despite your lead-in, that the words "racial purity" do not turn up even in these freely composed elliptical quotations.

Pioneer recipient Arthur Jensen, whose scientific publications are referenced more times than those of any other single scholar in Nathan Brody's "Intelligence" textbook, and whom many would regard as the most distinguished scientist this half century in the study of human intelligence, is shown in a photograph and described as follows: "Twenty-five years ago, he started writing that blacks may be genetically less intelligent than whites." Although sometimes severely out of fashion, this hypothesis, of course, had been a topic of discussion and research for decades prior to and following World War II, as one might well expect if a stubborn fifteen point or more average IQ difference, objectively measured or not, had persisted throughout that time. A picture of Professor Jensen is accompanied by a cryptic and seemingly ominous banner: "Genetic . . . negro-white IQ differences."

ABC News conveys a strong signal of disapproval toward Professor Jensen by omitting to note that he revived the genetic hypothesis only after first extensively reviewing relevant evidence concerning the heritability of intelligence and our inability to boost IQ and scholastic achievement by environmental methods so as to close the black-white gap, which had become increasingly salient as a public policy issue as a result of efforts at school desegregation. Such desegregation efforts themselves were originally intended to bring black students up to par with white students, and thus they themselves gave recognition to a serious performance gap. Instead, Professor Jensen is portrayed as just having "started writing" about the genetic possibility 25 years ago, as though he did so gratuitously, perhaps as an extended demonstration of automatic writing.

To justify ABC's disapproval, one must assume that Professor Jensen's idea about genetics was, and remains, so transparently absurd that only a knave or a fool would broach it. If that is indeed ABC's underlying assumption, why not stand up and state so explicitly? Or do you lack nerve for more than insinuation? Having joined with others in portraying the possibility of a genetic contribution to the black-white IQ

difference in such overly forbidding terms, ABC News has diminished the capacity of many viewers to cope rationally and reasonably with such an outcome should it ever become more securely demonstrated.

Two decades ago on CBS, Mr. Rather too focused on Professor Jensen's conclusions that blacks were less intelligent (on average) than whites, and that compensatory education was not raising IQs. According to Mr. Rather, "It isn't some natural lack of intelligence, but a cultural handicap that holds poor children back." Little has transpired since that broadcast that would bear out Mr. Rather's confident position on culture. Mr. Rather went on to add, "Jensen's arguments were welcomed in the upper reaches of the Nixon Administration. They were used to support cutbacks in Head Start and other compensatory education programs on the grounds that not enough good was being done for the money spent." One would have to be foolish or vicious to believe that the failure of compensatory education to boost IQ was welcome news to anyone, as it was only bad news all around. The disappointing results from compensatory education eliminated a comparatively economical potential remedy for a set of extremely costly social problems.

Judging from his remarks, Mr. Rather seemed convinced that tax money should be spent on social programs whether or not they work. Certainly, spending money for highly visible environmental interventions having no effect on IQ is a convenient way to show faith in the assumption that the IQ problem is one of environment. The main thrust of Mr. Rather's remarks, however, was probably to place blame for the policies of a supposedly conservative administration on Professor Jensen, and to tie the Nixon administration to controversy surrounding Professor Jensen, an effort at showing guilt by mutual association.

As anyone who had read the first few pages of Professor Jensen's Winter 1969 article in the "Harvard Educational Review" would have known, the primary evaluations of compensatory education had been performed by numerous other investigators, such as Westinghouse Learning Corporation, and not by Professor Jensen. Such studies had been reviewed with negative conclusions as early as 1967 by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, whose report Professor Jensen had cited. Here, Mr. Rather was using Professor Jensen simply as a whipping boy, and his reporting is disinformative rather than informative. The spectacle of media pundits pontificating on scientific publications they obviously could not have read and remained truthful in their reporting would be funny if the consequences were not so troubling.

The next photograph of a Pioneer recipient displayed by ABC News is of Professor Philippe Rushton, with a voice-over by Mr. Blakemore: "He says his researches show small genitalia may be a sign of superior intelligence." Mr. Blakemore omits that Professor Rushton conducted much of his research while a Guggenheim Fellow. Again, details differ crucially from what ABC claims. What Professor Rushton's book reports is that differences among the three major races in one of these two variables inversely parallel group differences in the other variable and are accompanied by similar rankings in some 58 other variables, all pointing toward

overall racial differences in reproductive strategies that have some interesting evolutionary implications. Like teeth and bones, even genitalia can provide information of potential scientific value concerning an organism's evolutionary history. Jared Diamond ("The Third Chimpanzee", New York: Harper, 1992) demonstrated this for testicle size between species prior to Professor Rushton's application of the same method within species. But many intellectuals, and apparently some networks, turn suddenly Victorian over sexual topics whenever prudery, often judged politically incorrect in other contexts, serves a larger, now politically correct purpose. Never mind that your audience will receive the bizarre impression from your statement that the two variables mentioned, out of the many considered by Professor Rushton, are operative at the individual level to any important degree. One can imagine male viewers glancing downward to check their own intelligence. An idiotic on-screen banner reads: "Size of genitalia . . . intelligence."

But for its lack of the old innocence, this ABC News Investigation of Professor Rushton might qualify as the most comical science journalism since a reporter asked Albert Einstein to define the fourth dimension in one word. Even then, given a chance to respond not afforded Rushton, Dr. Einstein could have saved the occasion merely by saying, "Time." The word "intelligence" does not appear in the two pages or so in which Professor Rushton discusses differences in genital size in his 1994 book, "Race, Evolution, and Behavior" (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction), hence the ellipsis in the banner could be long indeed. Once again, through its infidelity to the original record, ABC manages to make Dan Rather, who was not lavish with ellipses, look good. The key difference between ABC News and "Rolling Stone" magazine's "Professors of Hate" in the treatment of Professor Rushton's research, he commented to me, is that ABC News put in the three dots.

Far more pertinent to intelligence and also intuitively more understandable to your audience was Professor Rushton's concern with the relation between brain size and IQ. But brain size, which correlates with IQ around .44 in Magnetic Resonance Imaging studies, was not mentioned at all during ABC's investigative broadcast despite Ms. Nissen's supposedly knowing reference to "high tech" imagers, and Professor Rushton was not permitted to speak for himself on this issue despite his having discussed it during his long recorded interview with ABC. A newsworthy finding in its own right, I doubt that the MRI results ever will appear on network news.

Is this ever going to be a case study in how the media mangle science, and in the process scientific reputations! Gratuitously substituting a politically incorrect part of human anatomy for an anatomically correct organ will become known as one of the ABCs of sensationalistic anatomy broadcasting (part of an entertainment genre that includes exposed backsides on your unVictorian program "NYPD Blue"). Between "NYPD Blue" and ABC News, your network is perhaps well on its way to becoming known as the Anatomical Broadcasting Company, specializing in below-the-belt entertainment values. But what may pass for adult as entertainment can be infantile

when passed off as news journalism, where below-the-belt has an entirely less amusing implication.

We come next to your treatment of psychologist Richard Lynn. Here, as I shall explain, you have let yourselves be gulled by someone, very likely historian Barry Mehler of Ferris State University, despite our warnings about the methods of scholarship employed by Pioneer's critics. Counsel for Pioneer Mr. Sondericker cautioned you in a fax-letter on November 18th, 1994, "The experience of several scientists at the hands of Barry Mehler and persons deriving their information directly or indirectly from him, such as you, has been that frequently quotations such as you used [in queries to Pioneer] are not accurate, or are so out of context so as to be misleading." Before taking up the Lynn matter, however, I shall show that it does not furnish the only evidence that what you call an "ABC News Investigation" was mainly an unevaluated "rechauffe" of Mehlerisms disseminated by you to the American public.

One of the queries to which you demanded response in a fax-letter of November 15th, 1994, signed by three of you to Pioneer president Weyher, referred to a distasteful 1954 letter from perhaps the most obscure of the many persons ever funded by Pioneer, one Donald Swan. A trail from the letter leads through a reference to it from a newspaper in an article published in "The Nation" in 1960, to an anti-Pioneer article by Professor Mehler in 1989, titled "Foundation for Fascism," which cited "The Nation". Professor Mehler, whose 1996 Webpage had him listed as "a media consultant in the production of numerous documentaries," was thus a likely resource concerning the existence of the Swan letter. A fax from Professor Mehler later uncovered in a lawsuit involving one recipient of Pioneer Fund grants, dated November 9th, 1994, states, "ABC Evening News with Peter Jennings is very interested in this story. I have spend [sic] a dozen hours with them already, including a whole day of shooting and interviewing with Bill Blackmore [Bill Blakemore?]. This is a special project and scheduled for next week Thursday (although that may change)."

Long-deceased, Mr. Swan was an avid book collector if not, in one person's words, a "bibliomaniac." He now of interest only because of his personal eccentricities, such as his 1966 conviction for mail fraud for ordering three books, oranges, grapefruits, and a fruit cake by mail without intending to pay for same. These are used by Professor Mehler and others to try to embarrass Pioneer, which, after Mr. Swan's graduate training, funded him for entirely defensible scholarly purposes. A balanced presentation would have to acknowledge that Mr. Swan's professional credentials at the time showed him sufficiently qualified to merit such funding and his professional publications, as well as at least some of his personal ones, display considerable knowledge for their time. Laypersons who met Mr. Swan during his lifetime recall him as impressively learned in scientific and statistical matters, and he is known to have corresponded widely with scholars around the world. He had been introduced to Pioneer by someone who went on to a career as a respected professor at a major

university.

Mr. Swan's 1954 letter, until November 1994 unknown to all except those who maintain dossiers on such matters, expressed an intellectual infatuation with Fascism. The letter was also flashed before me ambush-style during my interview on camera (this portion not broadcast), where I was given no opportunity to examine it adequately or learn more of its context. Like me, Mr. Weyher was challenged, in your fax-letter on November 15th, 1994, to respond to brief quotations from the Swan letter, which you conveniently purported to him had been published in "the white supremacist newspaper, "Expose" [sic]" (November 15, 1994, letter from Mr. Blakemore, Ms. Mendez, and Mr. Oetgen to Mr. Weyher).

On November 16th, Mr. Weyher replied to ABC News that he was responding to various charges detailed in that letter, but some, such as Mr. Swan's letter, were new to him and so he requested documentation. On November 18th, 1994, Mr. Blakemore, Ms. Mendez, and Mr. Oetgen, after being prodded twice by fax and telephone, informed Mr. Weyher by fax, "It is not our practice to pass along documentation we have collected in the course of preparing a news report. If you have information that disproves or casts doubt upon any of our assertions, please provide that information to us." Clearly, ABC News was engaging in a one-way flow of information distinctly different from the manner in which scientific issues are customarily resolved, while purporting to deal with matters of scientific importance and the work of scientists. Without knowledge of the sources of the allegations, many of which were vaguely or tendentiously worded, one would be helpless to respond adequately. The ambushers seemed interested only ascertaining what Mr. Weyher might be able to respond to effectively on extremely short notice, in order to avoid being ambushed themselves by correct information. Under the guise of granting a target an opportunity to respond, the media reconnoiter the target without permitting themselves to be felt out in return.

Concerning these matters, Stephen E. Jenkins, pro-bono legal counsel for Linda Gottfredson, commented to you on November 21st, 1994:

Your letter of November 15th requests Mr. Weyher to respond in two days to 15 categories of questions, each with numerous subparts, raising allegations about events over the past 80 years, in the ostensible (but one would suspect, almost certainly disingenuous) belief that Mr. Weyher would have the answers to these questions at his fingertips. (Fax-letter of November 21, 1994, to Mr. Blakemore, Mr. Oetgen, and Ms. Mendez of World News Tonight, p. 2)

Mr. Jenkins went on to comment on ABC's refusal to provide documentation:

Standing alone, your November 18th [15th?] letter could merely indicate a propensity for incivility and posturing that is regrettable but not actionable. Your November 18th letter, however, would seem to constitute proof that not only do you believe that your profession gives you license to behave poorly, but it gives you the right to treat

truth with casual disdain as well. In response to your letter of November 15th, Mr. Weyher reasonably requested that you provide him with your documentation so that he could attempt to reply coherently to your charges. I say that was a reasonable request because proving a negative--which is what you repeatedly ask him to do--is, as you know, impossible. All one can do is to show that the proof of the affirmative case is wrong. (Fax-letter of November 21, 1994, to Mr. Blakemore, Mr. Oetgen, and Ms. Mendez of World News Tonight, p. 3)

Your ultimate purpose, as with several other such recent pieces, would seem to be to discredit **The Bell Curve** by smearing researchers on which it relies. (Fax-letter of November 21, 1994, to Mr. Blakemore, Mr. Oetgen, and Ms. Mendez of "World News Tonight", p. 4)

Mr. William F. Sondericker, legal counsel for Pioneer, reviewed the same correspondence between ABC News and Mr. Weyher and, noting that the planned broadcast was at that time only one more business day away, informed Mr. Blakemore, Ms. Mendez, and Mr. Oetgen:

Mr. Weyher's fax to you of November 16 and the attached list pointed out the various ways in which your questions are ambiguous or otherwise not clear. It is impossible to respond to "trick" questions of this type, which in some cases amount to charges, or the obvious innuendo which is present in these questions, without further explanation from you and/or the underlying documentation. For example, one cannot tell whether quotations are accurate, whether they are taken out of context, or if so, in what manner.

. . . Your refusal to furnish clarification or documentation and your delay in replying to his repeated requests, your unwillingness to afford Mr. Weyher the opportunity to show that it [the list] lacks substance, coupled with the implied threat to air the charges unanswered, suggests lack of confidence in your material and the lack of support and documentation for your charges.

This history shows your bias, prejudice and malevolence and further shows your reckless disregard of the principles of fair play, and indeed of those journalistic ethics aimed at insuring the discovery of the truth. It is also reminiscent of a darker period of American history when one of our senators was able to pronounce "I have a list", and get away with it for a short while. (Letter to ABC News by fax from Mr. Sondericker, November 18, 1994)

One can anticipate that ABC News would justify such questions as the one about Mr. Swan, which in relation to scientific issues was merely a side show, for a program on **The Bell Curve** by maintaining that the public had a legitimate interest in the answers, but if that is so, why must the questions be raised in such a peculiarly unfair manner? And why not extend the public's right to know to our answers to questions concerning human intelligence?

Subsequent cross-checking by Pioneer and me revealed that Mr. Swan's sophomoric letter had been written by him at age 19, precisely the usual age of a college sophomore. Continued checking since the broadcast corrects your allegation, handy in the context of your investigation of scientists who have studied black-white differences, that **Expose**, a small-circulation monthly initially unfamiliar to any of us, was a "white supremacist" publication. Quite the contrary, "Expose" was an active and courageous defender of racial justice in its time, published and edited by the well-known Lyle Stuart, a member at the time of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

The February, 1952, issue of "Expose" carried an article by the ACLU's Arthur Garfield Hays, "Guilt By Association," which I heartily commend to your attention. Who knows, perhaps a "Donald Swan" or two will turn up in the history of your organization. Certainly, you would do well to study Mr. Hays' article now that others connected with ABC News have been found guilty of fraud (like Mr. Swan) in the 1997 case, "Food Lion v. ABC". (Following your televised lead, perhaps we should all stoop to your level and get bumper stickers reading, "ABC News . . . fraud.") Never mind not having consulted the publication's masthead, as I would have thought would be natural for journalists to do. Had you read even as far beyond Mr. Swan's letter as the letter adjoining it on the same page, you might have noticed that the second letter took "Expose" to task for being "pro-Negro."

Mr. Swan's incunabular letter had been prompted by a four-part series of articles in "Expose" entitled, "I Am An American Fascist," which this free-thinking, anti-censorship newspaper ran to allow its readers to see for themselves the mentality of a self-professed American Fascist, one H. Keith Thompson. Your carelessness in assuming an ideological connection between Mr. Swan's letter and the publication in which it appeared is not dissimilar to your disposition to associate Mr. Swan's quirky and quite unpleasant personal views with Pioneer and those who have received Pioneer grants. Carried to its logical conclusion, such reasoning would have us all suspected, in view of Mr. Swan's later conviction, of mail fraud too.

One purpose behind ambush questions is to convey the impression that the journalist knows more about a person being interviewed than the person thinks the journalist knows. Understandable surprise at a totally unexpected question can register on camera as guilty knowledge. But Donald Swan's letter in **Expose** was as obscure to us as Paul de Man's early anti-Semitic writings were to his friends and literary critics of the deconstructionist school that he helped found. Unlike Mr. Swan, Professor de Man was a major figure. Nevertheless, no one has accused Professor de Man's followers of anything worse than practicing and promoting a foolish form of scholarship. Instead of confronting us with vile ambush insinuations that we are ill-prepared to answer on the spot, you ought to state openly exactly what lessons you believe that Mr. Swan's personal beliefs hold for Pioneer and the hundred or so researchers it has funded, so that, once explicit, the absurdity of those lessons, and

your complicity in politically correct slander, will be plain for all to see.

The unspoken assumption that a funding source should be held accountable for the personal politics of its recipients has embedded within it the thought that prospective grantees should be scrutinized as to their political beliefs, and funding decisions made accordingly. That no one has called attention to this not very hidden set of assumptions and loudly pronounced them objectionable is a telling comment on the probable degree to which political correctness has been allowed to infect research funding decisions of all kinds, government or private. What is taken for granted as normal practice no longer draws outraged comment. As your own broadcast demonstrates, research questions and conclusions are themselves regularly read, often in a most tendentious manner, as indications of the total political views of the researcher. Coupled with the unspoken assumption mentioned, this pernicious practice can only have a chilling effect on prudent researchers, and a career-derailing one on any of them imprudent enough to have initiated a taboo inquiry on important topics.

The other side of this intellectually counterfeit coin is that politically correct researchers, thus sheltered from the normal adversarial process in science, are being given a free ride at public expense to practice one-party science despite frequent signs of incompetence, the most common of which is showing no knowledge of rival evidence. We now have entire disciplines devoted determinedly to incompetent scholarship in areas where human intelligence needs to be considered. Ill-grounded books on intelligence pour forth from publishers constantly, to receptive media reviews, and what gets taught in the classroom is often a disgrace.

In contrast, as related in a recent article by Kevin Lamb in "National Review" (January 27, 1997), "IQ and PC," even book manuscripts backed by favorable referee reports from other scientists encounter long delays and what may amount to insuperable barriers when they deal with intelligence in other than politically correct terms. Distinguished authors of such books have difficulty finding a publisher, a situation which you have undoubtedly aggravated with your broadcast.

In a now notorious action last year that ought to supersede the myth of Sisyphus in Hades, the president of John Wiley canceled publication of one such author's book on intelligence just as bound copies were about to reach distributors (this was Chris Brand's **The g Factor** ). A spokeswoman for the major science publisher informed Mr. Lamb that Wiley does "not want to publish in this field." Evidently, the field Wiley wished to avoid was that of hard truth, as they then also returned a book manuscript on intelligence by Professor Jensen they had held for 10 months, although he had learned it had received favorable reports from all referees. Professor Jensen next submitted the manuscript, his latest **magnum opus** , to the reputable publisher Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, which advertises many books on psychology and education, after being informed they might be interested in it. Erlbaum sat on the manuscript"" for five more months. When Professor Jensen finally gave them a deadline after which he might have to consider another publisher, they waited one

more month for that deadline to arrive and returned his manuscript in its original carton, without a single word of communication (personal telephone communication from A. R. Jensen, May 19, 1997). In total, this unconscionable treatment cost the author sixteen months of delay. Other such stories are known.

Such interference with research on topics of major importance appears to stem mainly from nonscientific intellectuals in positions of authority at firms supposedly committed to publishing scientific works. Media surveys conducted by Mark Snyderman and Stanley Rothman, whose book I cite below in another connection, revealed that editors were far more politically correct on IQ matters than the reporters who cover the news and do the interviews. Judging from my personal experience with four publications, this is indeed true and it remains so even when the reporter happens to be an experienced science writer.

Politically correct disinformation about science appears to spread like wildfire among literary intellectuals and other nonspecialists, who have few disciplinary constraints on what they say about science and about particular scientists and on what they allow themselves to believe. Once the disinformation takes root, it is hard to correct, as one is working against what appears to be a majority consensus. The misinformed parties protect and excuse one another in order to preserve the credibility of the enterprise or profession to which they all belong, with most ready to turn against any defector, especially as it becomes more and more evident that the limb they have all long been inching farther out on is increasingly in danger of cracking. Thus there develop networks based on shared complicity among elites, all committed to not rocking one another's boats. The dismaying fact is that such misbehavior benefits careers, to the disadvantage of honest individuals. During your broadcast coverage of Professor Lynn, your overreadiness to draw defamatory connections, as between Mr. Swan and the admirable publication that had printed his letter, was again evident to anyone who had delved into Professor Mehler's scholarship. One would have thought, in view of Pioneer counsel's specific warning concerning Professor Mehler, whose writings and utterances repeatedly demonstrate a mastery of the self-serving misattribution, that you would have exercised at least normal care. However, the voice-over on Richard Lynn by Bill Blakemore states: "He has written that incompetent cultures should be phased out." An ellipticized banner menacingly repeats: "Incompetent cultures . . . phased out."

Not having consulted original sources, apparently, and having scorned our advice, you may be unaware that Professor Mehler and others of his stripe use the formula "so and so has written" to lead unsuspecting readers to assume that "written" is simply a variant of "stated," when the original source reveals that the author in question has simply either quoted or paraphrased someone else. They also use "written" to diminish scientific findings produced by scholarship and hard research that they cannot rebut otherwise. Thus, according to this ludicrous genre, Professor Jensen merely "writes," as you yourselves put it above, whereas researchers normally "hypothesize," "find," and "conclude."

The use to which ABC News put the "phased out" phrase can be traced easily to Professor Mehler who, in 1990, informed the Big Rapids, Michigan, "Pioneer" (February 15), as he very likely informed you, that Professor Lynn "wrote" it, after which Professor Mehler linked it to "death camps," which later appear too in your broadcast.

Had you ABC News investigators investigated to the extent of actually reading the piece by Professor Lynn, you would have discovered easily enough that he was summarizing, by paraphrase, ideas found in a 1972 book authored by the famous psychologist Raymond B. Cattell, **A New Morality from Science: Beyondism** (New York: Pergamon Press), for a November 1974 book review published in the **Bulletin of the British Psychological Society**. Professor Lynn, who was not contacted by ABC, informed me that the sentences quoted by ABC were the views of the book's author, and not an expression of his own opinion at all.

On February 16th, 1990, only one day after his appearance in the Big Rapids **Pioneer**, Professor Mehler himself gave a rambling presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), from which it was quite clear that he understood fully that Richard Lynn's words had been intended to summarize the Cattell book for a book review (there are other forms of scientific articles called "reviews").

At the AAAS meeting, Professor Mehler's exact words were: "Richard Lynn is summarizing the book. It's in a review that he wrote . . . and he says: 'See what we are talking about here is not genocide . . . .'" Three months later, however, on May 14, 1990, Professor Mehler was again informing the world, or at least the television audience of the **Donahue** show (transcript #2945), that "Richard Lynn writes a review . . . in which . . . he says--and this is almost a quote--what we're talking here about is 'phasing out incompetent societies.'" Neither Professor Cattell's name nor the name of his book was mentioned on this occasion, and the possible significance of the single word "review" was surely lost on Mr. Donahue and his audience.

Nothing could demonstrate better than the facts surrounding this matter ABC's opportunistic indifference to relevant context (in contrast to your consistent exploitation of irrelevant context) and your utter credulousness toward politically correct sources who have supplied you with ammunition against Pioneer and **The Bell Curve**, forewarnings from Pioneer and others of us who have been put through this many times before notwithstanding. ABC News's tropistic taste for politically correct consultants to employ for American Agenda produces the embarrassments you deserve, but are probably incapable of experiencing. Although you may pretend that the responsibility for publicly misrepresenting Professor Lynn's views lies with Professor Mehler, this can only be considered a dodge in view of our persistent warnings to you. Unlike the **Donahue** show, where Professor Mehler spoke the words himself, this time the words were yours.

The idea of Professor Cattell's that reviewer Lynn paraphrased concerned "thinking

realistically," as Professor Lynn put it, in terms of the phasing out of "incompetent societies," which "have to be allowed to go to the wall" (an idiom meaning allowed to fail, as in business). Exactly what was intended I shall demonstrate by recourse to Professor Cattell's text, but Professor Lynn himself made clear, where you did not, that even Professor Cattell's unsentimental view of the workings of human evolution and of ultimate long-range morality did not contemplate genocide, by saying, "What is called for here is not genocide, the killing off of the populations of incompetent cultures."

I believe I have correctly identified the relevant passage as a brief one on page 196 of Raymond Cattell's book. There, Professor Cattell stated, "morality requires that a society which shows itself obstinately unable or unwilling to change vicious habits that are killing it should be phased out, by some generations of a geometrical rate of population reduction [i.e., self-imposed via the habits], and die in peace." In a more benign case, that is exactly what became of the Shakers, who eschewed sexual relations and so died out. Other cultures might have intervened to compel the Shakers to reproduce, for example, but that was never contemplated, and so they were allowed to expire in peace. What Professor Lynn meant by "incompetent" was, obviously, simply not self-sustaining, and Professor Cattell's phrase "phasing out" meant, in this context, refusing to intervene after a certain degree of incorrigibility had been demonstrated. In the most extreme case imaginable, the appalling alternative to Professor Cattell's policy might be to sustain an incorrigibly murderous society so that its members could continue slaughtering one another indefinitely.

Professor Cattell's attempt to articulate a moral philosophy that would be consistent with evolutionary principles was written with a far higher level of moral seriousness than the snippet from it presented by ABC News, and mischievously misattributed to Professor Lynn, would lead your viewers to suspect. It contains many challenging futuristic ideas, for example, the daring suggestion that humans be allowed to branch out to form separate species so as to provide for more diversity. It deserves consideration on that same level of seriousness, if only to disagree, just as does the work of the respected bioethicist, Garrett Hardin, who argues that scarce resources should be reserved for helping needy societies that show themselves willing to put them to good use.

But even if it be assumed that the policy proposed by Professor Cattell is objectionable, why not scold him instead of the reviewer of his book, Professor Lynn? The answer is simple: Cattell was never funded by Pioneer, and Lynn was. Scolding Professor Cattell for a seemingly politically incorrect and possibly shocking idea would serve no purpose in the campaign to discredit the Pioneer Fund and disable it from supporting research that academics such as historian Mehler oppose on purely political and, I suspect from remarks of his, oftentimes careerist grounds. (Professor Mehler has been recorded reciting his various appearances in media at a press conference and then ending, "My career is soaring.")

Because he was never funded by Pioneer, Professor Cattell as source of the proposed

policy would also have proved irrelevant for the sensationalistic purposes of ABC News's version of tabloid journalism. Better to attribute the words to Professor Lynn, therefore, who, in the trivial, literal sense, had actually "written" them, a fact which perhaps renders the obviously disingenuous user of such a misleading device immune to a libel suit. The intimation here, despite the explicit disavowal on behalf of the book's author that you ignored in Professor Lynn's book review, is that genocide has been euphemistically contemplated with equanimity by a Pioneer Fund recipient; thus, you set the stage for the gratuitous references to Hitler and to the Holocaust that follow soon after in your broadcast, a la Mehler.

Genocide might also seem to have been suggested by certain words that you extracted from writings of Harry Laughlin (who, decades later, was to become first president of Pioneer) when referring to his own proposal in 1914 to sterilize the lowest 10% of the population (he seems to have had whites in mind). Had Mr. Laughlin stipulated only the 10% of whites that was lowest in intelligence, this would have amounted to those below IQ 80, a cutoff used later for defining mental retardation. Nowadays, the U.S. military is forbidden by law from accepting recruits at or below the tenth percentile in mental ability except under declaration of war. But Mr. Laughlin had included other categories in the 10% as well, such as the insane, which would have lowered any cutoff based on IQ alone to a point below 80. The two words that Mr. Laughlin used in 1914 were, according to the inner quotation marks in your fax-letter to Mr. Weyher of November 15th, 1994, "'eradicate . . . inferior' members of society." In your broadcast, these jarring words went out over the air as "quote, 'eradicate inferior people'" without, of course, the omission dots (whatever they signal), and the aired form of the words appear too in the transcript of your program now circulating on the Internet (ABC News Transcript #4232).

In my fax-letter of November 18th, 1994, I explained to you that eradicate, if indeed that was Mr. Laughlin's word, could only have been used in the same sense that persons today speak of "eradicating" poverty. Academic abstractions such as "poverty" serve now where in an earlier, and often less euphemistic, age concrete phrases such as "paupers" might be used for the purpose, as no one would ever have imagined they could be misunderstood. That was the age, after all, in which the war department was still called the War Department. Mr. Laughlin's words referred not to the elimination of living persons but to the elimination of a need for the category that contained them, a fact easily lost from sight in your program picturing Nazi concentration camps. As was learned from the Nazis, when genocide was really intended euphemism was employed routinely. We know for sure that the quotation could not have intended "eradicate" in the same sense as old gangster movies, because in 1914 Mr. Laughlin and other eugenicists explicitly rejected such an idea when clarifying their proposed eugenics policies, stating in **Eugenics Record Office Bulletin 10A** :

With euthanasia, as in the case of polygamy, an effective \_\_ eugenical agency would be purchased at altogether too dear a moral price. Any individual once born should, in the opinion of the committee, be given every opportunity and aid for developing

into a decent adulthood of maximum usefulness and happiness. Preventing the procreation of defectives rather than destroying them before birth [i.e., through abortion], or in infancy [as did the Spartans], or in the later periods of life, must be the aim of modern eugenics.

Although I provided you with the preceding explanation and the accompanying quotation from Mr. Laughlin's bulletin in my fax-letter of November 18th, 1994, you did not take heed of them in your broadcast. Indeed, you left unstated, and hence to the imaginations of viewers, what Mr. Laughlin's criteria for sterilization were, identifying them only by the ambiguous terms "inferior" or "lowest 10 percent [in what?]." This would permit all persons to feel potentially subject to sterilization. If charges are to be made against someone, they should at least be phrased properly. It is fair to object responsibly to Mr. Laughlin's 1914 sterilization proposal, as it stood, in full recognition of potential consequences to the unborn, but it is not fair to link the proposal to modern research and to Pioneer, and it is especially unfair to do so in a manner that leaves vague crucial particulars. The great variability of IQ within families and among offspring from the same family leaves no doubt that the proposal would not have approximated genocide in any other, nonmurderous, sense either.

Having prepared the ABC News audience in advance with seemingly scandalous "revelations" over genetics, genitalia, and genocide foreshadowed, by mining exploitable words from their surrounding context, as Professor Mehler does in his work, ABC's Mr. Blakemore discloses: "Close to half the footnotes citing authors to support **The Bell Curve**'s most controversial chapter that suggests that some races are naturally smarter than others refer to Pioneer Fund recipients." Your broadcast has no footnotes to count, but this novel manner of assessing quantitative IQ research, conducting investigative journalism, and reviewing books simultaneously should really be credited to Charles Lane, who wrote of **The Bell Curve**'s supposedly "tainted sources" in the December 1st, 1994, "New York Review of Books"--a publication for literary intellectuals long on its way to becoming the "Unpopular Science" of its time. Mr. Lane's article was available well before your broadcast (I have a copy fax-dated November 17th), although I recognize that you and he could well have been working off a common source. "Close to half" of Mr. Lane's footnotes, to use your own criterion, were to critics of Pioneer, but he made no attempt to question Pioneer's president or any researcher linked to Pioneer before going public with his deformed approach to scientific work--the "argumentum ad foundationem".

Your viewers were to assume, one infers, that the degree of concentration in citations to Pioneer recipients, depicted by ABC News as authors of outlandish material, is an indication of the suspect nature of **The Bell Curve**'s sources. Nothing untoward would be seen in the case had they all come from, say, Yale University and the thesis been a politically correct one. Mr. Blakemore fails to consider alternative explanations for this sharing of Pioneer support by individuals who are diverse in many other aspects of their science.

One explanation is that the need to explore perfectly viable scientific hypotheses despite their political incorrectness has led some researchers to seek support from the only remaining source in the research funding world. Another is that Pioneer has been quick to recognize and support proposals from good scientists, and good scientists get cited in important books. No funding agency bats 1000 in choosing whom to fund, but Pioneer's record is outstanding when viewed in the context of who was active in behavioral genetic research and differential psychology in any given historical period.

Rather than tackle the possibility that the concentration with respect to funding was an inevitable development under the long-standing hegemony of PC, ABC News obliges the PC camp by laying out for its viewers a long visual string of guilt by historical association with events in Nazi Germany. This stringing together of powerful emotional associations is based principally on the writings of Professor Mehler and his imitators, whose work concerning Pioneer is made to order for television, where "the small-screen world is composed largely of villains and victims," according to one media critic (Walter Goodman, "What's Bad for Politics Is Great for Television," "New York Times", November 27, 1994, p. H33).

ABC News investigators gave no consideration to the troubling possibility that the forces of political correctness in academe and the media, through intimidation abetted by dependably one-sided news coverage, are having an undue influence on research funding of the study of major race-related problems in the U.S. That would have called for real investigative reporting. ABC News instead became an enthusiastic party to the aim of discrediting **The Bell Curve** by discrediting researchers who are cited in it, whose work would not be handy to purchasers of the book. The explicitly ad hominem part of the ABC News broadcast that resulted testifies to the currently degraded state of intellectual life in the U.S., where now events of five, six, and even eight decades ago are deployed in a McCarthyist manner to influence the interpretation of scientific results highly relevant for understanding contemporary problems.

I find it interesting that Charles Lane, in his own "New York Review of Books" attack on Pioneer and **The Bell Curve**, conceded the potential importance of research on intelligence, stating, "If it can be shown that low IQ predicts social ills such as crime, poverty, and unstable families, current views of Africa and its tragic problems would have to be significantly revised" (December 1, 1994, p. 3). Mr. Lane himself appears comfortable with the assumption such relations do not hold anywhere, but that is certainly no reason for others not to investigate them in a more systematic manner than Mr. Lane employed in view of what he admits to be their potential significance. As a matter of fact, in the issue of "Intelligence" mentioned above, I demonstrate that there is often a rather precise relationship in the United States between black-white differences in each one of Mr. Lane's three outcomes and black-white differences in IQ.

Every bit as ad hominem and complacent as Mr. Lane's article, the ABC News broadcast of November 22nd, 1994, takes its rightful place as television journalism's special contribution to the pyrogenic media reaction against **The Bell Curve** and against open scientific inquiry on problems associated with race and intelligence.

Professor Mehler himself appears on the screen finally, his authority unchallenged. No foolish three-dot banners here or words twisted out of context in ABC's treatment of him. No prejudicial background footage, say, of Joseph Goebbels delivering a propaganda speech. Given Professor Mehler's sly distortions of Pioneer history in the past and his mastery of the technique of first inflaming emotions with references to the Holocaust and then channeling those feelings against Pioneer, such footage would certainly be fitting, as I have indicated elsewhere. Professor Mehler's statement links Pioneer with politically incorrect research on the black-white average difference in intelligence over the past twenty years--a fact tacitly assumed of itself to be damning, apparently. The circularity of this argument was apparently lost on you, as it amounts to claiming that research on race differences is "tainted" because it is done by persons who have done research on race differences. Professor Mehler has thus successfully enlisted you in his scientifically barren program of substituting for serious scholarship tendentious tattling about the political incorrectness of research.

As good an example as any of evidence that you share Professor Mehler's assumption that uncomfortable hypotheses are best left ignored can be found in your fax-letter of November 15th, 1994, to Mr. Weyher, where you stated, "we find Pioneer Fund recipients . . . Rushton, . . . Levin, . . . Lynn, and . . . Jensen in recent years espousing ideas of racial differences that are extremenely [sic] offensive to many people." Your broadcast, of course, shows you doing your utmost to make the ideas appear as offensive and as gratuitous as possible. You betray no awareness that poverty, crime, and underclass lifestyles are also troubling to many people, and that what might offend some of them even more than the ideas you cited is an entrenched, and often self-servingly sanctimonious, refusal to examine all potential causes of these stubborn conditions. Although your letter to Mr. Weyher highlights "a pattern of race-related questions . . . revealed in the research describe [sic] above," the conditions mentioned are also widely recognized to display a pattern of race correlations. One would think that this pattern alone would suffice to account for interest on the part of scientists. Such an interest, as in the example of **The Bell Curve** , generally has as its surrounding context an effort to understand the same phenomena within-race too, a fact often left unmentioned by commentators such as yourselves.

With the ponderous gravity typical of those whose main bid for attention is their opposition to politically incorrect conclusions, Professor Mehler states: "The Pioneer Fund has been the key source of funding for the last 20 years of scientists who have produced the material that is the foundation for the claim that African-American people on the average are intellectually inferior to whites." If ever there were any doubt, Professor Mehler's statement confirms that his real objection, and yours, is to scientific findings rather than to their source of funding. Left unmentioned by

Professor Mehler were less explicit, but equally revealing data from sources not connected with Pioneer that were available throughout the 20-year period he specified and even slightly before. Consider for example, the Coleman Report in 1966, the various National Assessment of Educational Progress reports, and the results from competency tests administered by many school systems published in local newspapers. All show black-white gaps in intellectual performance of about the same size as the IQ gap, although all avoid intelligence differences as an explanation.

Most American scientists would shun Professor Mehler's word "inferior" in such a context, as needlessly global in its connotations, although some may retain a tin-ear in this respect. Professor Rushton, for example, rejected the designation "inferior" explicitly in "Rolling Stone", and again on "Donahue" when it was used by the host, but critics like to supply the word so they can milk it for sensation regardless of the needless risks so doing may pose to blacks and to mature discussion of a difficult set of issues.

Although American Agenda insinuates mightily that research aimed at understanding persistent intelligence gaps is scientifically outre, the "Mainstream Science" article verifies that many noted scientists agree that a black-white difference in intelligence does exist, and that many would not rule out some genetic basis for that difference. A far larger number of scientists provided essentially similar responses anonymously in a survey reported by Snyderman and Rothman in their 1988 book, "The IQ Controversy: The Media and Public Policy" (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction).

Is ABC News suggesting, then, with its disapproval of our research despite its relevance, that Pioneer and its recipients should be blamed for reporting truth? Nothing so daring--the only viable implication has to be that the research is untrue. You are suggesting, leading up to a more explicit statement further on, that we are a bunch of liars or incompetents, and with good success, as most of your audience has been consistently misinformed about the meaning of IQ differences by media and PC academics for three decades or longer through efforts remarkably like yours. As Walter Goodman commented in 1994, "The media manipulators are themselves controlled by the medium's conventions, and the audience is an accomplice to its own exploitation." The book by Snyderman and Rothman helped reveal the media's bungling role in this systematic deception of the American public, and its two authors could well qualify as expert witnesses to media bias and defamatory tactics on the topic of intelligence. It will not be lost on readers of this letter that the confrontation that you have set up by the end of the broadcast, like one between two contradictory witnesses in a perjury trial, poses the following unpleasant choice: Either we are liars or incompetents or you are liars or incompetents. I am sorry to have to put this so bluntly, but the confrontation is clearly one of your own making, and I do not shrink from its eventual resolution.

Next, your audience is told that Wickliffe Draper (a name Professor Mehler often cannot spell correctly), whose money founded Pioneer in 1937, and Harry Laughlin, the latter from 1937 to 1941 the first president of Pioneer, "forged links with

researchers in Germany" who were also increasingly enthusiastic about eugenics, racial superiority and inferiority. We see no forged links between Mr. Laughlin and "researchers" in Germany, but footage is promptly displayed of a uniformed Nazi accompanying a white-coated individual who appears to be a scientist, but who may be a physician rather than a psychologist. What this has to do with Mr. Laughlin is left to viewers' imaginations.

The Nazi tableau is followed by German footage of strange physical observations being taken from an individual with his tongue, briefly, grotesquely protruded. More "research," apparently. The man's appearance suggests that he may be a Jew in the clutches of the Nazis. The juxtapositional implication is that this scene, whatever it represented, is the type of German "eugenics" in which Mr. Laughlin expressed interest.

No distinction is permitted between traditional European eugenicists (with whom the Americans had normal professional contacts), Nazi officials (some of them suddenly keen on within-group eugenics), with whom anyone interested in German developments during the 1930s had to deal if there was to be contact at all in any professional area, such as at international meetings, and later genocidal fanatics (who by no stretch of imagination could be regarded as Galtonian "eugenicists"). A moment later, in fact, Professor Mehler introduces Adolph Hitler as someone "who was serious about eugenics," although Hitler's seriousness about eugenics as that subject was understood by Mr. Laughlin and members of American eugenics societies extended no further than implementation of the 1933 German eugenic sterilization law, which was racially neutral in its application.

The racial neutrality of Mr. Laughlin's interests in German developments in eugenic legislation, understandable in view of his own long-standing commitment to such legislation and a topic distinct from "research," is further obscured in a misleading manner by an intervening reference to the mid-1930s film *Erbkrank* ("Genetically Disabled"), and footage from it showing some severely impaired inmates of a mental asylum, patients normally not encountered on the screen in the pre-medication era. The silent film footage includes next a printed passage in German that is translated as, "You find an especially high percentage of mentally ill among the Jewish population." The translation into English for the viewing audience is delivered by someone with a heavy German accent. The accent is a neat touch serving to underscore the subtext against Pioneer and intelligence researchers. It serves as an echo of many soundtracks heard since World War II, in case the audience has not yet been sufficiently manipulated by an underexplained and out-of-context idea concerning the relative frequency of mental illness among Jews. This idea can be traced for whatever factual basis it may have had to several Jewish sources in years preceding the film, as I explained to you in my fax-letter of November 18th, 1994, prior to your broadcast.

Persons unfamiliar with the film and conditioned to regard group differences as fabricated would naturally conclude from what you have shown that the film was

directed at Jews, when in fact most of the mental patients were, naturally, German Gentiles. Jewish patients play only a minor role in the film, and although their appearance in it, we now have ample reason to infer, certainly suited Nazi purposes, there was no reason for Mr. Laughlin to think, in view of the epidemiologic literature at the time, that the quoted passage did not serve ordinary scientific purposes. Had the epidemiologic literature reported a contrary fact instead, that Jews did not differ or had lower rates of mental illness, Mr. Laughlin would very likely have seen this reference in the film to Jews as a lie.

Although Mr. Laughlin lent out "Erbkrank" with English titles replacing the German a total of just 28 times, some of the borrowers being high school biology class instructors then considering issues of eugenics, he is thus portrayed as a disseminator of anti-Semitic propaganda even though he failed to see anything anti-Semitic about the film because he was probably familiar with the comparative epidemiologies of mental illness from Jewish sources, several of which had been published in eugenics outlets. There is cause to believe that Mr. Laughlin's copy of the silent film was edited along the way, which would have been easy to accomplish. At the time, high school students were a far more highly selected group than is the case nowadays, and there is no reason to think that their instructors could not have introduced and discussed the film in a manner that would have neutralized any unwanted influence that remained. It is not uncommon to see Nazi film footage used in television documentaries intended for mass audiences even today, as it is understood that thinking persons are immune to the Nazi message. Mr. Draper's role was remote, at most, and limited to having set up a small fund into which Mr. Laughlin dipped to purchase the film and a projector, but Mr. Blakemore states that he and Mr. Laughlin "distributed one of Hitler's propaganda films to American high schools [i.e., "Erbkrank"]." One would think that they had sent the film unsolicited to numerous high schools, which then screened it with no critical capacity whatever, a convenient but patronizing set of assumptions.

There are several ways of characterizing this film, the first ever on eugenics, but the one chosen for the purposes of ABC's broadcast and of critics opposed to intelligence research, "one of Hitler's propaganda films," is surely the most prejudicial of all, and especially so in light of the narrow slice of the film that you have chosen to put on screen. Had anyone been allowed to see the full film instead of the few glimpses of institutionalized mental patients, and thus the appalling nature of incurable mental retardation and of mental illness decades before the advent of anti-psychotic drugs, they too might have felt that if a genetic basis existed for these afflictions some thought ought to be given to the possibility of prevention. From his known intellectual interests, there is every reason to believe that was the aspect of the film that interested Mr. Laughlin, although his understanding of the precise genetic issues was perhaps insufficient in light of today's knowledge of behavior genetics.

At the time in question, John Marshall Harlan was one of the founding directors of Pioneer. As a later U.S. Supreme Court Justice, Mr. Harlan supported every civil rights decision that came before him, including the right to privacy in reproductive

matters. The offsetting balance to your image of Mr. Laughlin that was provided by Mr. Harlan's directorship, and that of other major figures, was brought to your attention, to no avail. The normal distinction between Pioneer as a corporate body whose actions were governed by a board of directors of differing viewpoints, a corporate body that had nothing to do with "Erbkrank", and Mr. Laughlin's activities as a private individual and simultaneously a member of other organizations is conveniently ignored in ABC's American Agenda, as it is in the PC scholarship on the matter that now dominates the academic scene.

No mention is made of the fact that Mr. Laughlin's presidency of Pioneer was not a full-time job, indeed, not a job at all. He was employed throughout the time in question by the Carnegie Institution, which Professor Mehler has described, with his usual pejorative zeal, as "the major American Foundation to support eugenics research and propaganda" ("Science for the People", May/June, 1983). Thus, the fact that Harry Laughlin's mentioned activities simply overlapped the period in which he served as president of Pioneer, and as a rather uninfluential president at that, is deftly glossed over. Although in the Winter 1994 issue of "Reform Judaism", Professor Mehler stated, "As one of the Pioneer Fund's first 'accomplishments,' it imported two copies of a Nazi propaganda film," the film ("Erbkrank") was not a Pioneer Fund project. Charles Lane, in a letter to "Commentary" (August, 1995, p. 15) has also wrongly contended, perhaps under the spell of Professor Mehler, as he misspells Mr. Draper's first name in the Mehler manner, that "funding the distribution in America of an edited version of the German eugenics propaganda film "Erbkrank"" was "the Pioneer Fund's first activity." (Despite his obvious hostility to Pioneer and the research it funded, Mr. Lane's description of the film is noticeably less inflammatory than Professor Mehler's and Mr. Blakemore's descriptions.)

Following "Erbkrank", the emotional climax of the ABC News broadcast arrives when Professor Mehler's statement, referred to above, "Go back to Adolph Hitler and take a look at what somebody who was serious about eugenics did," is followed immediately by three horror scenes from Nazi concentration camps. Two show desolate prisoners peering from behind barbed wire and the third depicts the inside of a dismal, crowded barracks. Making a deduction about the present, as this heavy-handed segment obviously tries to do, from something that happened in the past without first showing that the conditions are basically the same is known in debating circles as the "history student's error" (Neil Gunther, "Debating and Public Speaking", 1987, p. 63). Professor Mehler could have applied his simplistic Hitler formula to discredit any number of ideas: Christianity (Torquemada), Socialism (Stalin), Equality (Robespierre). Scientific research on intelligence, not eugenics, was supposedly the real topic of the ABC broadcast.

Bill Blakemore states correctly, but misleadingly, as his message capitalizes on popular misunderstandings that confounded and continue to confound Nazi genocide with any form of eugenics: "As the horror of the Nazi death camps became known, the science of eugenics became discredited." No notice is taken of great progress since in the science of behavior genetics or, as it is also known, quantitative genetics.

Mr. Blakemore continues to equate eugenics with genocide as he segues next to the Pioneer Fund in this highly charged emotional context: "Nevertheless, after the war, back in the U.S., the Pioneer Fund, bankrolled by Wickliffe Draper, continued to pay for research in race betterment." A six-dot banner reads: ". . . race betterment . . ." The dots are the only textual context provided. Perhaps we should be thankful that none of these individuals, apparently, ever used, anywhere, the word "death."

Traditional eugenicists knew full well, of course, that the Nazi genocide came from no place in their way of thinking, although they were certainly faced by a popular misconception, cultivated by media and dogmatic egalitarians, that the one was somehow an outgrowth of the other. This effort drew inspiration from certain features of Nazi ideology, of course, but I know of no serious treatment of the Holocaust, which is difficult to explain in terms of any set of prior ideas, that attributes that outcome to eugenics as broadly understood. ABC News has thus stooped to the dubious practice of misusing the Holocaust as a weapon against research that may lend support to policies perceived to be in competition with those it might favor, despite a lack of necessary or even probable connection between eugenics and genocide. I once reviewed the major genocides of this century, and found that they tended to be dysgenic as the result of targeting higher, not lower, IQ groups for extermination.

Your Holocaust footage in a program on intelligence research is as strong an example as one could ask for of the tendency of media, as described by Professor Rothman, to distort scientific opinion by placing it in "an inappropriate context" (p. 128). One would think, from Mr. Blakemore's question-begging "Nevertheless," that the Holocaust had terminated all inquiry into genetic influence on behavior, and therefore the Pioneer Fund had no business funding scientists who do research on such matters. This does not follow at all, for it is well known that topics become fashionable and unfashionable in science for reasons that sometimes have little to do with their eventual importance.

Mr. Blakemore's pointed reference to the out-of-context phrase "race betterment," taken from Pioneer's 1937 charter, which reflected the vocabulary of individuals who had been interested in eugenics since much earlier in the century, was a knowingly misleading one in full recognition of its effect via media in the present-day setting. I know this to be true, because I explained to him that the phrase was simply an archaic synonym for eugenics and "genetic betterment" that had nothing to do with "race" as most people understand that electric word today.

The word gene actually comes from the Greek word for race, and my dictionary defines "eugenic" as "improving, or relating to the improvement of, the race." "Eugenics" is defined as "the science that deals with the improvement of the races and breeds, especially the human race, through the control of hereditary factors" ("Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language", College Edition, New York: World Publishing Company, 1953). In the vernacular phrase "race betterment," which was commonly employed before the term genetics came into

popular use, "race" served simply to mean what we now use the word "genetic" to mean. Thus, to give but one of many possible examples, the Kellogg Foundation, which was once, starting in 1914, a eugenics foundation, had been named the Race Betterment Foundation. I also complained to Mr. Blakemore that journalists were simply exploiting the two words for their own purposes when commenting on Pioneer. (This exploitation may have begun with an article by Grace Lichtenstein, in the "New York Times", on December 11, 1977.) Mr. Blakemore, apparently impressed by my explanation, responded that I should realize then how the phrase would naturally be misunderstood by journalists and, by implication, the public whom they serve.

Knowing all of this, what then did ABC News do? It exploited the unfamiliar phrase and even highlighted it so as to capitalize on its current shock value. This bit of journalistic malpractice was not offset by ABC's condescending reference, at the end of the broadcast, to Pioneer president Weyher's written explanation of the full context of the phrase as it occurs in Pioneer's charter, where it can be found in a sentence referring to the entire human race. By this point in the broadcast, it would be difficult for many audience members to connect the two elements of the broadcast so as to neutralize at all the impact of the earlier reference.

It was also misleading of ABC News to extract "race betterment" (whether properly understood as a synonym for genetic betterment or not) as the main guiding principle of activities Pioneer has funded rather than "research into the problems of heredity and eugenics in the human race generally," which precedes and stands above the clause containing the "race betterment" phrase (where research funding priority is focused toward "the people of the United States"). This is particularly true of the last 27 years, when most of Pioneer's support has been given to research that addressed topics of scientific concern regardless of any immediate link to eugenic policies. Exactly the same research could be used, as could almost any research on genetics, to promote dysgenic policies, were one so inclined. If research findings can be employed equally well for two diametrically opposed purposes, is it not misleading to state that they are necessarily directed toward one of them? ABC's highlighting of the two words "race betterment" was opportunistic sensationalism of exactly the sort I had complained of to Mr. Blakemore, as he had every reason to realize by the time of the broadcast.

That someone funded by Pioneer may occasionally call attention to eugenic concerns is not the issue. Each of us is free to call attention to matters that may be proper topics of public concern in any way that we judge appropriate--and also free not to do so. Eugenic concern is not a crime and neither is such concern totally unwarranted, as witnessed by genetic counseling obtained by some possible carriers of the Tay-Sachs and other deleterious genes and by the use of amniocentesis and newer tests in connection with concern over Down syndrome. The problem recognized by past eugenicists and largely unexplored in recent decades is how to combine anticipation of long-range genetic consequences with humane and acceptable current practices. The media seem determined that such concerns should go unexplored and their basis

denied, although media are willing to show tolerance toward spokespersons for assisted suicide and abortion, both practices that would have startled many eugenicists of the 1930s. The assumption that human populations are poised precisely on the knife-edge of reproductive neutrality, and hence are experiencing neither eugenic nor dysgenic trends, is necessarily a fiction. The realistic choice, for any genetically influenced trait of major importance, is between eugenic and dysgenic trends. There is no realistic permanently stable middle ground, and so populations would be wise to consider carefully which of the two choices they would rather favor in their policies under ever-changing social conditions.

ABC News next turned its attention to immigration (accompanied by footage showing, apparently, U.S. military police guarding Haitian boat people at a detention camp). ABC complained that a study by Professor Lynn "examined the IQ of non-white immigrants." What Professor Lynn reviewed was the average IQ of groups from which immigrants came, often with little individual selectivity. Charles Lane got this correct, despite his negativism toward the research. Is it wrong-headed to be concerned about importing more low-IQ individuals? If mean IQ differences between groups are often persisting ones, and low IQ is demonstrably related to stubborn and costly social problems that we are not dealing with successfully even among native citizens, are such differences then to be of no interest when considering immigration policy? If so, then why not come right out and say so, in a frank editorial, rather than insinuate such a message when discussing current researchers? Omitted by you, but not by Charles Lane, was Professor Lynn's active role in research reporting that Asians, themselves "non-white immigrants," score higher on many IQ tests than whites.

To drive home the broadcast's devious rather than direct editorial message, ABC News followed immediately by accusing the Pioneer Fund of "funneling" (as though in an underhanded, proactive manner) its money to "anti-immigration organizations." Professor Mehler prefers the even slyer term "anti-immigrant." In fact, the three recipients of such perfectly legitimate grants have all been organizations that favor, in common with much of the voting public (72% of the public according to a December 13th, 1996, "Wall Street Journal" poll), lower limits on and reform of immigration policy as it then stood. The chief recipient of the three, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, known as FAIR, is an organization that, although opposed to illegal immigration, is not against there being any immigration, and has adopted an explicit anti-discriminatory policy with regard to race, religion, culture, and national origin. Among the luminaries on its Board of Advisors at the time were Richard D. Lamm (former Governor of Colorado), Warren E. Buffet, Paul R. Ehrlich, John V. Lindsay (former Mayor of New York), and William French Smith. Neither one of the other two organizations has voiced a discriminatory policy position. Pioneer's contribution to FAIR amounted to only a small percentage of that organization's total budget.

Would it not have been fairer and less inflammatory to state that Pioneer has made grants to immigration "reform" organizations? Or would that have made for too dull a

news broadcast? Much of the nation is currently concerned about what it regards as uncontrolled and perhaps even excessive immigration that has been occurring faster than assimilation of new arrivals. Why single out and mischaracterize unnamed Pioneer recipients who have simply addressed such popular concerns in a normal democratic manner unless there was an ulterior motive? Was it ABC's objective to discredit not only Pioneer, through exaggeration, but also the popular concern over illegal immigration, expressed at the polls by support for Proposition 187 in California, by linking that concern with Pioneer? This would add an agenda that had little to do with the public's right to be informed about the topic of intelligence.

What we are not apt to see in a news program of this sort is an attempt to link immigration and multiculturalist policies to Heinrich Himmler, who recognized their utility as divide-and-conquer devices for fractionating peoples. In a memorandum to Hitler on May 25th, 1940, Himmler urged:

Concerning the treatment of peoples of alien races in the East we have to see to it that we acknowledge and cultivate as many individual ethnic groups as possible . . . .

What I want to say is that we are not only most interested in not unifying the population of the East, but, on the contrary, in splitting them up into as many parts and fragments as possible.

Within a very few years . . . the name of the Cashubes, for instance, must be unknown, because at that time there won't be a Cashubian people any more . . . . Within a somewhat longer period, it should also be possible to make the ethnic concepts of Ukrainians, Gorals and Lemcos disappear in our area. What has been said for those fragments of peoples is also meant on a correspondingly larger scale for the Poles. ("Reflections on the Treatment of the Peoples of Alien Races in the East," pp. 74-76 in M. Berenbaum [Ed.], "Witness to the Holocaust", 1997: HarperCollins) A complex historical occasion offers many possibilities for drawing supposed lessons, but there is clearly a double standard for applying the Nazi analogy.

An involvement of Pioneer in the campaign for Proposition 187 (there was none) is certainly what some backers of existing immigration policy have alleged, without evidence, when opposing the measure prior to the California citizen's ballot that approved it on November 8th, 1994, just weeks prior to your broadcast. An editorial in the Los Angeles "Daily News" cited such a "concocted . . . accusation of guilt by association" with "the Pioneer Fund, which primarily supports research in human genetics" (September 16, 1994, p. 18). Efforts to block Proposition 187, which would have terminated certain tax-supported services for illegal aliens, began immediately after its approval, and the measure's opponents who were alleging Pioneer Fund involvement probably would have welcomed assertions from you that the Pioneer Fund was sinister. But in this respect, the Pioneer Fund is no more sinister than a majority of the nation's population, as indicated by the "Wall Street Journal" poll. Portraying certain Pioneer recipients as "anti-immigration" organizations was simply an appeal on your part to constituencies who are politically correct on the

immigration issue.

That you were clearly fishing for potentially useful wider political connections, however remote from the scientific investigation of behavior genetics and intelligence, is borne out by a follow-up letter from ABC's Mr. Oetgen to one of Pioneer's directors, Mr. John B. Trevor, Jr., on March 23rd, 1995, four months after your November 1994 broadcast on **The Bell Curve** and Pioneer. Mr. Oetgen wished to learn more about Mr. Trevor's "support for Republican candidates for public office through the years," his "thoughts on . . . the new 'Contract With America'" in light of the past November's elections, in which a Republican majority, led by Newt Gingrich, took control of Congress, and "the relationship, if any, between your Pioneer Fund directorship and your other political activities."

The uncalled for insertion, in the last passage, of the word "other" reveals your attitude toward Pioneer and toward scientific research that fails to remain subservient to political correctness. Such a characterization of research is typically heard from persons with political commitments of their own that might somehow be threatened by findings from open research. More important, the phrase containing "other" smacks of attempted entrapment, reminiscent of the "'trick' questions" that Mr. Sondericker complained of in his earlier letter to ABC News. Had the elderly Mr. Trevor carelessly overlooked the word when answering your question, a future voice-over on ABC News might well have run: "John Trevor, a director of the Pioneer Fund since 1959, admitted to ABC News that he regarded his service to Pioneer as but one of his many "political" activities." We all know that Speaker Gingrich was later charged with abusing the tax exempt status of a foundation for political purposes, and opponents of open research on intelligence have tried to challenge the tax-exempt status of Pioneer in the past.

On April 6th, 1995, Mr. Trevor, then 85 years old, replied graciously, noting with amusement that Mr. Oetgen seemed to regard him "as some sort of "eminence grise" moving the Republican Party from behind the scenes. Unfortunately this view cannot be confirmed!" Concerning Pioneer's relation to his "other political activities," Mr. Trevor pointed out that "there is a serious misunderstanding here. As a Pioneer director I am only interested in increasing human knowledge through the independent and unfettered work of scientists or by the study by competent individuals of social conditions which I believe are in serious need of better understanding." Mr. Trevor explained that his political contributions were modest, and indicated that his only thought about the current Congress was the hope that it does better than politicians have in the past.

Readers can judge for themselves, after examining the tactics employed in ABC's program on intelligence, whether or not Mr. Oetgen was probing for material that could be represented as a link between Pioneer and the new House Speaker Newt Gingrich, architect of the "Contract With America," for the purpose of alleging guilt by association.

After having laid the unfair basis that you did during ABC's program on intelligence, linkage with Pioneer, even if only tenuous, would no doubt have been welcomed by opponents of the Republican Contract, who were already using **The Bell Curve** for the same purpose. Robert Chrisman, the editor (and publisher) of "The Black Scholar", for example, was alleging by early 1995 that **The Bell Curve** serves as rationale for the assault upon all American people . . . that is presently being conducted by Newt Gingrich and his cohorts in their "Contract with America" (**The Bell Curve** and the Struggle against Racism," "The Black Scholar", 1995, Volume 25, No. 1, inside front cover). The attitude at ABC News toward the "Contract With America" was evident as early as January 5th, 1995, when weekend news anchor Carole Simpson stated on the Internet that she viewed it, if enacted, as "detrimental to the family." Ms. Simpson added that she feared Mr. Gingrich, "given his history, may increase what I see as a new mean-spiritedness in this country" (L. Brent Bozell III, "ABC News' Internet Secrets," "New York Post", April 25, 1995, p. 21).

Politicians regard the problems reflecting differences in intelligence between racial/ethnic populations as "the third rail," to be avoided at all costs, fearing the power of media to misrepresent anyone's responsible interest in such matters. Because of prejudicial treatments like yours of intelligence issues, the political process in the U.S. is circling a whirlpool of racial politics that reflects little understanding on the part of citizens of the deeper causes of social problems they are attempting to address. With its disingenuous "other," Mr. Oetgen's probe could well have led to a further effort by ABC News to frighten politicians away from intelligence issues. Certainly, I find it hard to imagine, in light of tactics employed in your November 22nd broadcast, that the merest hint of a link between Speaker Gingrich and Mr. Trevor would not have been exploited as ammunition against the Speaker and the Republican congressional program. Pioneer, apparently, was to be the start-up seed for ever-widening campaigns of guilt by association orchestrated at ABC News. No wonder a majority of Americans now believe, according to The Pew Research Center for The People & The Press, that "the news media gets in the way of society solving its problems" (News Release, March 21, 1997, p. 2).

To return to your November 22nd broadcast proper, Mr. Blakemore next states that Pioneer "officers and researchers have also fought school integration." Footage is displayed of high school students, some pointedly nonwhite, entering a school. The description concerning opposition to "school integration" is simplistic. One researcher, Ralph Scott, had merely written, under a confessed "nom de plume" for fear of academic retaliation, an empirically excellent book, "The Busing Coverup" (1975); staged symposia on "Constructive Alternatives to Forced Busing" with representatives of views on both sides (an unpardonable transgression, apparently); and given lectures, all dealing with the likely impact on public education of forced busing to achieve racial balance--an issue regarded by Professor Scott as distinct from that of school integration.

Had you consulted Professor Scott's book, you would have found that on page 8 he stated, "Forced busing and integration, although the media have made them

practically synonymous, are two entirely different concepts." Professor Scott supported his questioning of forced busing with empirical observations, with examples of media misrepresentation concerning its supposed benefits to learning, with references to attempts to censor and punish scholars whose findings failed to support claims made by busing advocates, and with quotations (p. 9) from the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which stated "desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance," and which especially disavowed "requiring the transportation of pupils from one school to another" for the purpose.

Although there was overwhelming majority support among whites for school integration by 1970 and beyond, throughout the following decade less than one-fifth of whites favored "the busing of black and white school children from one school district to another." Apparently, therefore, the public too considered the two issues to be distinct. Approximately 70% of whites who favored school integration did not favor busing. Busing was also opposed by a substantial minority among blacks, and in some years by a majority of blacks. Kenneth B. Clark himself predicted that busing "would lead to bad education and, in the end, therefore, to even more segregation." Attitudes toward busing in the North were only slightly less negative than attitudes in the South. (See G. D. Jaynes, & Williams, R. M., Jr., [Eds.], 1989, "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society", Washington, DC: National Academy Press, Tables 3-2 and 3-3, and p. 121; L. Sigelman & S. Welch, 1991, "Black Americans' Views of Racial Inequality: The Dream Deferred", New York: Cambridge University Press, Figures 7.1 and 7.2, and pp. 125-126; and Clark's "Dark Ghetto", New York: Harper & Row, p. 115.) By their very existence, the cited analyses of public opinion prove that, like Professor Scott, researchers normally are able to distinguish between busing and school integration." As such findings also demonstrate, the topic Professor Scott was interested in analyzing, explaining, and debating was an important one of broad public concern, and his conclusions, although not those favored by social science elites, were consistent with those of most Americans.

Professor Scott gave attention in his book to the plight of those black students who would be unable to keep pace with new standards if bused to produce racial parity. Because of the average difference in IQ between blacks and whites, blacks are overrepresented in lower IQ and mentally retarded ranges of intelligence by factors of about four or five when compared with whites. As a result, blacks on average seem to fall further and further behind whites in school achievement as they progress through elementary and high school, but this is a function of the constant average IQ difference, not of race.

As one recent book puts it, "blacks are more likely to end up in classes for the educable mentally retarded, to be routed into noncollege bound tracks, to be disciplined or suspended, and to suffer other kinds of discriminatory treatment in majority white schools" (Sigelman & Welch, "op. cit.", 1991, p. 126). As the quotation suggests by its reliance on "discriminatory treatment" as the explanation,

the racial disparity in such outcomes was viewed as intolerable, and it has set in motion a series of consequences designed to render it less conspicuous: the mainstreaming of retarded pupils, the abolition of tracking, the watering down of standards, and the cheapening of educational credentials. Such changes were sure to upset middle class parents.

The implied difference in scholastic performance between IQ 85 and IQ 100 at age ten, for example, amounts to one and one-half grade levels (the difference between mental ages 8.5 and 10.0), and the grade level difference increases in size as chronological age increases. Thus, a constant proportional difference between two groups in the average ratio of mental age (MA) to chronological age (CA), a ratio which constituted the original definition of IQ, produces larger and larger differences in mental age and grade-equivalent performance as children age and progress through school. By age thirteen, the difference becomes two grade levels. This is only to be expected, knowing formulas for calculating IQ. The normal variation in IQ within each race would guarantee the presence of IQ differences between individual pupils within classrooms much larger than 15 points, of course. Grouping students by ability, that is, tracking, was originally designed to help accommodate such differences so that instruction would not be too easy or too hard for too many. Once blacks and whites were combined in large numbers, however, there was great reluctance to allow blacks to become visibly overrepresented in the lower tracks, and so tracking was abolished, and with it a reasonable solution to problems caused by human variation that were now present to a far greater degree than ever before.

If one refuses to take intelligence measurements seriously, then Professor Scott's concerns in 1975 would, of course, be dismissed as irrelevant nonsense, just as both our research and IQ were dismissed by ABC News in 1994. If one understands the meaning of IQ and its resistance to change, however, one sees easily that major problems would lie in wait for those instructing youngsters who are of the same age within a single classroom setting when those youngsters vary greatly in IQ. A few years ago, for instance, Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, stated in an article on American education:

Today, especially, a heterogeneous [i.e., untracked] class \_ has such a wide range of student achievement represented within it that it resembles a one-room schoolhouse. There could easily be students from the second through tenth-grade reading or math levels present. How do we teach them? If we give them all the same lesson, surely at least two-thirds would not benefit. Should we divide the class into three groups and teach each separately? The teacher must then prepare three lessons instead of one, and each of the groups gets only one-third of the teacher's time and attention. Should we individualize instruction? This is nice rhetoric, but it is virtually impossible in classes of twenty-five or more--or even fewer--students. Occasional reports of some spectacular teacher managing heterogeneous classes well are usually unsubstantiated and offer little hope to the mere mortals who are asked to emulate her. ("Education Reform: What's Not Being Said." "Daedalus", Fall, 1995, p. 50) In the sixth grade, for example, the spread of grade levels cited would correspond to those expected

from children whose IQs range from 64 to 136. IQ, of course, is not the only cause of achievement, and so the IQ range associated with such performances need not be quite as wide as that stated; IQ does, however, provide the main scaffolding around which other causes can build. Union president Shanker also noted, "In poll after poll, parents, teachers, and the public rate violent and disruptive behavior as their number one concern with our schools" (p. 48).

Busing to achieve integration resulted in the phenomenon known as "white flight", a massive response to the predictable decline in standards that followed from the need to accommodate many more low IQ children. White flight led to the effective resegregation of many urban school systems, as Professor Scott noted in his book. Had anyone been in favor of ultimate urban-wide segregation, as distinct from racial disproportions in various schools located within an otherwise heterogeneous community, apparently they had only to back busing. By 1996, for example, Baltimore had lost 30% of its 1960 population, and the population stood at its lowest level in eight decades. Baltimore's Mayor Kurt Schmoke stated that the causes "could be summed up in two words, and that's safety and schools" (James Bock, "Baltimore Population Lowest in 8 Decades," "Sun", March 21, 1997, pp. 1A, 7A). Very likely, if the Mayor's words had been presented to ABC News as predictions made by a Southern psychologist in the 1960s, you might have quoted them as evidence of racism: "safety . . . schools."

It is now recognized that busing for racial balance is resisted by both whites and middle class blacks (e.g., Jack E. White, "Why We Need To Raise Hell," "Time", April 29, 1996, p. 46)". In June 1995, the Supreme Court stated, in "Missouri v. Jenkins", that achieving racial balance in schools was not its ultimate goal. According to "Time", mandatory busing for racial balance has become largely unachievable and hence a dead issue (James S. Kunen, "The End of Integration," "Time", April 29, 1996, pp. 38-45). Professor Scott has been flagellated for worrying about what eventually did come to pass. One can continue to flay whites as "racists" over this outcome, or one can ask for honest answers to why it came about.

The other chief individual involved in arguments over implementation of school desegregation policy, the Virginia psychometrician Henry E. Garrett, was a major figure in psychology in his day. He was a past President of the American Psychological Association, of the Eastern Psychological Association, and of the Psychometric Society; he was a former member of the National Research Council and a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; and he had been Department Chair of Psychology at Columbia University for sixteen years. Professor Garrett served briefly on the Board of Directors of Pioneer and was hence a Pioneer officer for a modest part of his distinguished career.

To understand the actions of Professor Garrett and others at the time, it is again necessary to understand the historical context in which they took place. If media continue to misrepresent IQ research now, as evidenced in ABC's broadcast, despite three decades of important new research, one can imagine how difficult it was at the

peak of the Civil Rights Movement to obtain a fair hearing for the politically incorrect information concerning intelligence that these psychologists were attempting to bring to public attention.

In view of the established black-white difference in IQ distributions, Professor Garrett and other Southern psychologists, such as Audrey M. Shuey and R. Travis Osborne, feared the consequences for education of the massive school desegregation that would occur in the Southeast, where at that time upwards of 30% of the school population was black, and so they examined black-white IQ differences and their meaning to see if their concerns could be substantiated. Professor Garrett testified dutifully in court as an expert witness, but not as an officer of Pioneer. He compiled data on IQ, integration in several cities, and crime rates and predicted in 1966 that "wholesale desegregation of public schools will lead to demoralization, next to disorganization, and eventually to ruin or complete ineffectiveness." None of these psychologists, as nearly as I can tell from their publications, opposed school integration organized according to educational principles that would take into account ability to perform in the classroom. Professor Garrett titled his prediction's, for example, "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work" (Patrick Henry Press: Richmond, 1966).

Professor Garrett leaned more heavily than was necessary, or even wise given the state of knowledge at the time, on the assumption of genetic differences between blacks and whites as the cause of the persistent mean IQ difference to make his points. He also failed, understandably enough, to anticipate explicitly how much violence would emerge eventually in the public schools. Nonetheless, his predictions, which at the time must have sounded apocalyptic to many, and those of his far more optimistic critics, can now be judged against the actuality of low standards and fear of violence in today's schools. One can certainly choose to ignore the concerns expressed by Professor Garrett, or even maintain that it was important to take social risks to try to help blacks, but it would be hard to fault his predictions, which stand as some of the more accurate ever set forth by a social scientist in the face of overwhelming professional opposition. Three decades later, Lino A. Graglia, Dalton Cross Professor of Law at the University of Texas School of Law, essentially confirmed those predictions when he described urban public school systems as "almost uniformly poor, demoralized, inefficient, and overwhelmingly nonwhite" ("The Triumph and Defeat of the Nondiscrimination Principle," "Society", March/April, 1996, p. 10). As the following examples go on to show, there is an abundance of testimony bearing out the accuracy of Professor Garrett's predictions, even though IQ is typically left unmentioned.

In a public address in Baltimore 16 months before his death in 1997, Albert Shanker warned again that good education is impossible without safe schools and high standards (Mike Bowler, "Shanker a study in contradiction," "The Sun", February 26, 1997, p. 2B). A "Washington Post" national survey conducted over the summer of 1996 found that the top worry of Americans was that "The American educational system will get worse instead of better" (62%), followed next by "Crime will

increase" (61%) (Mario A. Brossard & Richard Morin, "American Voters Focus on Worries at Home," "Washington Post", September 15, 1996, pp. A1, A18). Law professor Graglia further concluded in 1996: "Court-ordered busing in a futile attempt to create racially balanced schools is surely one of the largest and most devastating social science experiments of all time" (p. 10). An education researcher recently recalled trying unsuccessfully to convince sociologist James S. Coleman, who at first testified in support of busing, that those who objected to school busing "aren't fleeing integration, they're fleeing something else--the likelihood that their children will experience school violence and classroom indiscipline. No responsible parent wants a child in an unsafe environment" (Stephen P. Heyneman, "Jim Coleman: A Personal Story," "Educational Researcher", "26 "[1], 1997, pp. 28-30). The unwillingness of parents of any race to put their children at unnecessary risk has never been accorded the respect it deserves in academic debates over methods of implementing school desegregation.

Had other academics and activists not dismissed Professor Garrett's and other Southerners' concerns dogmatically as "racist" at the time, but responded to them in a serious and realistic way, perhaps both sides could have arrived at a sensible compromise. Much was at stake, including continuing support for public education, the survival of cities, and the future of race relations in the United States. A plan more sensitive to ability differences might have forestalled the decades of chaos in schools that caused the achievement of black students to fall below the level to be anticipated even on the basis of IQ. Instead, Professor Garrett was reviled, which only antagonized him and led him to harden his position against his critics. Your broadcast promotes a similar polarization through its creative demonizing of researchers who call attention to serious problems. Evidently, it is easier, and more rewarding, to berate people as racists than it is to find remedies for the problems that they have identified.

Henry Garrett had been one of the first psychologists to point out problems with the Klineberg study mentioned earlier. He, and then Professor Scott, among others later found it un reassuring that pro-integration arguments concerning expected benefits to schooling were often based on what they regarded, correctly, as flawed interpretations of research data such as Professor Klineberg's, and they understandably joined the debate on that empirical basis, where their methodological sophistication and knowledge were not welcomed by the other side.

It is difficult to recall now that at one time the justification for integration was couched almost entirely in pragmatic terms and was based on expected increases in black school achievement, which never materialized, not even in settings where high degrees of integration were attained. It was only in later years, as the Civil Rights Movement consolidated, that the nature of the debate was transformed such that integration came to be regarded as mainly a moral end to be desired entirely for its own sake, regardless of research outcomes concerning school achievement on standardized tests, which have failed to register the benefits that had been promised

at the outset.

The recent emphasis on "diversity" as the aim of integration rather than on improvements in tested (and testable) academic achievement is only the logical culmination of that trend. This major shift in perspectives on school integration has gone unnoticed because of the persisting dogma that evidence for group differences in average intelligence had been nonexistent all along and was nonexistent now. But at one time raising black IQ was an explicit, high-priority aim, and in fact was the central goal of compensatory early education. As reported in "Science", "most educators believed that raising children's IQs was the key" ("Head Start Enters Adulthood," by Constance Holden, 23 March, 1990, pp. 1400-1402). In "Dark Ghetto", for example, Kenneth Clark himself had presented data for blacks in Harlem showing low IQ averages, and had employed them as evidence justifying action for the purpose of raising those averages.

Reasoned criticism of flawed empirical research that has been used to justify politically correct racial policy is still apt to be misconstrued as simply opposition to integration or as racism. Such responses dissolve every statement of fact into a question of motive, a proclivity Hannah Arendt once attributed to the totalitarian elites of Europe, and they shield inadequate research, funded often with public money, that would not otherwise pass scrutiny. It is unfair to judge Professor Garrett entirely from the later perspective on integration as a moral end, according to which total school integration became valued by elites for its own sake rather than mainly as a practical means for improving black school achievement that would also be subject to empirical scrutiny. The strictly moral perspective on full integration may have merit, but its stature is not enhanced by employing that perspective as a weapon against research on problems relating to group differences.

It is also less than gracious to blackguard persons who participated with intellectual honesty on the losing side of a heated debate in a democracy, if not especially so when they spoke for a majority of the population. The enmity shown toward the losing debaters in these matters amounts to an antipathy toward debate itself and suggests a disturbing predilection for some other way of resolving differences. It also suggests deep uneasiness about the continued relevance of the criticisms and warnings that they had raised. Indeed, the enmity can be seen to serve no useful purpose other than as a ready source of antagonism that can be mobilized against present-day researchers who address related scientific issues.

In any case, researchers who were active at the peak of the school integration controversy constitute only a small minority of persons ever associated with Pioneer, and we are no more one another's wardens, retroactively, concurrently, or prospectively, than recipients of grants from other sources. Your broadcast made it appear that the challenges to school policy by these few, who played a reasonably expectable role in normal debate under democratic principles during a time of major social change, reflected not only the narrow official line of Pioneer, but are also somehow the responsibility of later grantees; those are inappropriate and obviously

self-serving inferences with all of the political overtones that accompany use of guilt by association. Pioneer, as ought to be expected of foundations, has consistently been interested in supporting searches for truth under conditions of free inquiry, and has tried to preserve opportunities for responsible debate on matters relating to intelligence and race, even though debate was considered politically incorrect. These are the real reasons Pioneer has been attacked repeatedly, often by persons who avoid debate on the science.

We can almost skip over the broadcast's rather tame allegation concerning Professor Michael Levin, who, when presented on camera, seems merely to be seconding an admission similar to one heard not long ago from the Rev. Jesse Jackson, namely, that informed persons are more apprehensive, and for good reason in light of crime data, around anonymous young black males than males of other groups. Professor Levin's appearance serves mainly to show yet another Pioneer recipient expressing concern with a race-related issue, although the only novelty here, in view of what appears in the media about race almost daily, is the small hint of political incorrectness in stating an obvious truth. Tell me that each of you does not sometimes share the same concern when going about the streets of New York, and that police, charged with crime prevention, have no reason ever to operate, as Professor Levin would defend, on similar hunches, although this may sometimes introduce additional troubling difficulties in our racially complex society. There are always two kinds of error associated with any decision procedure, such as the decision to be or not to be suspicious, and your broadcast, in typical PC fashion, unfairly highlights only one of them instead of educating listeners to recognize and ponder the true dilemma involved. Why not, once again, articulate ABC's implied racial quota policy for suspicion on the street in an explicit editorial with honesty and courage instead of smuggling it into a supposed news story by insinuation? Perhaps you fear being laughed off the air by watchers of your own "NYPD Blue". The May 1997 issue of "Emerge" contains an account by a black woman of how she discounted suspicion of two black men on the street and was robbed and raped by them. "I reminded myself that I didn't have any reason to be afraid of two men just because they were Black" (p. 43 of "I Was Raped," by Lori S. Robinson).

I appear next on screen, in person, saying: "The Pioneer Fund is the last remaining source of funding for people who might be interested in why there are race differences in crime or why there are race differences in poverty rates and who don't adopt the standard sociological line on that."

My segment is largely unobjectionable as to what is shown, although we are all defamed by ABC's manipulation of the larger context and the structured lack of opportunity to reply to both specific and broad research criticisms clothed as scientific. This particular statement of mine, like that of Professor Levin, was undoubtedly selected because it reinforces the impression that Pioneer funds only research concerning race differences, which would be far from the truth. According to Mr. Weyher, less than about 15% of Pioneer's grants have gone for the study of differences between groups. If the impression seems otherwise, it is because media

usually focus on such research questions to the exclusion of all else, as illustrated by commentary on **The Bell Curve**.

As my statement implies, disciplines such as sociology are also heavily involved in race-related issues, but in ways limited by political correctness. One of that discipline's more ambitious recent productions, "A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society", fails to list either intelligence or IQ in its index, and dismisses the issue of a real black-white difference in average intelligence as an ideological belief, founded only on the assumption of genetic causation (pp. 118, 120). This shows that well-supported arguments based entirely on phenotypic intelligence have not yet sunk in.

I am portrayed by Mr. Blakemore as arguing in my book in progress merely that the Pioneer Fund is "misunderstood"; actually, my argument is stronger than that, namely, that the Pioneer Fund, its research-grant recipients, and research on intelligence broadly are misrepresented in a manner amounting to a slanderous hoax, and misunderstood as well even when the activities are described with some accuracy. Your program exhibits both pathologies. Next comes what might be considered the intellectual turning point of your story. Immediately following my appearance as the only scientist funded by Pioneer and shown on camera, ABC's Bill Blakemore proclaims climactically what until now has been only insinuated: "But many established scientists charge that what the Pioneer Fund pays for is not good science."

Mr. Blakemore's assertion is a capital one for the purpose of defaming persons whose work has already been presented not only as politically incorrect, but even as absurdly and gratuitously so. Just as ABC's first segment described as "leading researchers" individuals whose views supposedly conflicted with **The Bell Curve**, in this segment ABC News describes our critics as "established." We, on the other hand, who collectively hold many honors and distinctions, are never so described and are, consequently, presumably anything but "established" or "leading," although the ten of us who have belonged to the American Psychological Association have published more than 100 books and over one thousand scientific articles, some of them prize-winning ones. (In an earlier time, as his listed credentials show, Professor Henry Garrett could not have been more "established.") No, we are described simply as writing and saying things deemed offensive, as though pulling discarded ideas out of the dust bin of history.

Your one-sided reference to "many established scientists" is of the same sort as those many confident pontifications in media which have stated for years that "most social scientists disagree" with Professors Jensen and Shockley, only to have it revealed by Snyderman and Rothman that 53% of a large sample of experts on mental tests from numerous subdisciplines, when polled anonymously to protect them against retaliation from the forces of PC and their media allies (recall Professor Scott's use of a "nom de plume"), thought that differences in both genetics and environment contributed to the black-white IQ difference and that a mere 17% thought the

difference to be entirely environmental in origin. The media handled the awkward discrepancy between what they were proclaiming to the nation and the findings of Snyderman and Rothman by ignoring their book. My own review of the book was sanctimoniously "killed" at a major newspaper precisely because it called attention to the contradiction.

Jonathan Beckwith, a Harvard geneticist, is the "deus ex machina" produced by Mr. Blakemore to testify on behalf of Mr. Blakemore's dramatic allegation that what we do is not considered "good science," the apparent "coup de grace" for Pioneer and its recipients. For the same reasons that Mr. Weyher referred journalists to scientists rather than allow himself to be portrayed as the source of information bearing on scientific matters, Mr. Blakemore does not rely on just his own word here, but brings in a scientist. This moment is obviously the intellectual high point of your broadcast, as distinct from the emotional climax of concentration camp scenes, which nothing can surpass. You fail to inform your audience that Professor Beckwith has long been associated with the radical political group Science for the People, whose journal of the same title has carried Professor Mehler's work on more than one occasion.

According to its statement of "Editorial Practice," submissions to "Science for the People" have been "expected to reflect the general political outlook" of the journal; from its inception, that outlook was radical Marxism, which has always been hostile to hereditarian explanations. In its March 1974 issue, "Science for the People" published articles dismissing the heritability of IQ ("Heritability: A Scientific Snow-Job," "The Case for Zero Heritability") despite the abundant evidence in favor of inheritance accumulated by that time, evidence that has continued to mount ever since and is now widely accepted. A review by Richard J. Rose in the 1995 "Annual Review of Psychology" gives the heritability of IQ in adulthood as about 80 percent (p. 628), essentially the same estimate provided by Professor Jensen in 1969. The implied dishonesty of Pioneer researchers such as Professor Jensen is thus seconded on your program by an individual who is "established" all right, but as a vigorous political activist in science as well. This dubious source, Professor Beckwith, who was nominated by science writer Albert Rosenfeld in September 1980, in "Smithsonian", as "the ultimate arch radical," apparently meets Mr. Blakemore's standard for authoritative scientific commentary on our research.

Professor Beckwith, who is indeed distinguished as a geneticist, but who is not qualified in the research specialties under discussion on ABC's program--and hence in this context is only a pseudo-expert insulated by disciplinary boundaries from the judgment of proper experts--volunteers: "I think it's important to realize that most of the people doing this work are "not" geneticists, and that if you ask people in the mainstream genetics community, you are not going to find much support for this work." Professor Beckwith is neither a psychometrician nor a behavior geneticist, considerations more relevant than the fact that we are not geneticists, which is a non sequitur for judging the quality of our research, most of which does not depend on molecular genetics, or, for that matter, on astronomy, chemistry, or physics.

Professor Beckwith's actual words fall well short of Mr. Blakemore's promise that they would charge that what we do "is not good science," and thus they fail to live up to their advance billing by your reporter. Professor Beckwith undoubtedly realizes, if Mr. Blakemore does not, what bad form it would be for a scientist to level such a charge without backing it up immediately with evidence. Yet again in this news program, therefore, an ABC News journalist claims far more from a source than is actually delivered, a gap not easy to detect during a single viewing.

Your audience, unfortunately, is unlikely to realize the inexpert speciousness of Professor Beckwith's actual criticism, which, judging from his remarks to "Boston Globe" reporter Anthony Flint before "The Bell Curve" even appeared, falls back on the fact that no one has yet identified a set of intelligence genes ("Brain Battle," "Edmonton **Journal** , August 27, 1994, p. 22). No one has identified genes for two legs either, but does anyone doubt, from observing normal variation (none) in this respect, that number of legs is genetically determined? So-called "hard DNA evidence" is not required for every conclusion about inheritance, or else agriculture and stirpiculture, as farmers and herders know, would not have developed over the centuries.

Geneticists and behavior geneticists share some of the same interests and methods, but they also differ to such an extent in those respects that the former cannot be considered the appropriate reference group of experts for evaluating the research in question, even if polled randomly and anonymously, which Professor Beckwith obviously did not contemplate doing. Professor Beckwith, perhaps artfully, failed, moreover, to distinguish lack of support based on stated scientific reasons from lack of support for unstated political reasons and for reasons of fear over one's own career; he could, therefore, turn out to be correct in the literal sense while remaining strongly misleading in a scientific sense.

You allowed Professor Beckwith to get by with offering no evidence, comparable, say, to Snyderman and Rothman's survey results, which we sent to you, to back up his testimony about the state of opinion among geneticists, yet our statements about the actual opinion of many IQ experts, now verified again in "Mainstream Science," failed to register on you at all. Professor Beckwith belonged to the Sociobiology Study Group of Science for the People that hounded Edward O. Wilson following publication of his **Sociobiology: The New Synthesis** in 1975. Professor Wilson noted that they "appear to have been alarmed by the impact a critical success of the book might have on the acceptability of their own political views," and he complained that they "furnish me with a political attitude I do not have and the book with a general conclusion that is not there." ("Academic Vigilantism and the Political Significance of Sociobiology," pp. 294 and 298. In A. L. Caplan [Ed.], "The Sociobiology Debate: Readings on Ethical and Scientific Issues" [pp. 291-303], New York: Harper & Row, 1978.) What assurance had Mr. Blakemore that Professor Beckwith has not furnished the genetics community with an attitude it does not have? I asked a colleague in biology what he knew of Jonathan Beckwith, and was told he was "a highly respected geneticist, who also has a reputation of being quite a tough

and opinionated gentleman."

Earlier, in **GQ**, Professor Beckwith had been used to prop up magazine-writer Sedgwick's sweeping pronouncement, "Of all the branches of science, the field of behavioral genetics--the area for much of the Pioneer Fund's research into race and intelligence--is generally regarded as the most dubious, in large part because it is so prone to personal prejudices about the individuals under examination." It seems not to have occurred to Mr. Sedgwick that the politically correct individuals who disregard heritability or assign it a value of zero for intelligence are implicitly doing behavior genetics too, but by the seat of their pants, oftentimes with no visible professional qualifications or support from relevant data. To substantiate his wildly irresponsible claim about behavior geneticists for **GQ**'s readers, Mr. Sedgwick had turned, once again, to the ubiquitous Professor Beckwith, whom he quoted as saying, "People always come into behavioral genetics with some bias, and it may reflect their social bias." Then again, it may not. Oddly enough, after Mr. Sedgwick's own arrogant pronouncement concerning the prejudices of an entire discipline that he knows little about, even the usually unrestrained Professor Beckwith comes across once more as distinctly more tentative than the journalist who presents him. Self-serving exaggeration of the import of others' words, whether prior to or following their actual quotation, appears to be a mainstay of the journalists' trade. Referring to Professor Rushton specifically, however, Professor Beckwith himself turned up the spite: "From everything I know, it's quite clear where his starting bias is." Mr. Sedgwick and Mr. Blakemore did not pause to consider where Professor Beckwith's starting bias might be, not to mention their own, and no one was invited by them to volunteer unflattering opinions about Jonathan Beckwith. Unlike Professor Rushton, none of the three spoke from data open to inspection by all.

According to Professor Rothman, journalists "tend to trust 'experts' who share their own outlook on society" (p. 123). Like Mr. Sedgwick, ABC News cast Professor Beckwith as a trump card--evidently the most illustrious person you could find willing to belittle the work of other scientists before a national audience without offering a single specific criticism of that work, or a shred of evidence even for his vague and irrelevant thesis about how most geneticists would actually respond. Rest easy America--there are no social problems of consequence stemming from IQ differences. "World News Tonight with Peter Jennings" has investigated, and, in two meager pages of transcript, the written record of only eight minutes of air time, has found an incriminating mailbox, but no cause for concern about prospects for the future of race relations in light of those IQ differences. Unfortunately, successfully fighting World War II and the Nazis all over again does little to prepare us for dealing with unfamiliar social problems whose general outlines are only in recent decades becoming apparent.

Geneticists whom Professor Beckwith might have had in mind are often poorly informed about psychometric research and, as scientists in unrelated fields normally do, they depend heavily on the media for what they know of that research; and we know what they find in the media, do we not? Many scientists are anxious to avoid

controversy that could jeopardize their funding. Despite such necessary considerations, ABC News presented Professor Beckwith as an objective and reliable, even "established," source, with not a single question raised about either his motivational background or the true relevance of his scholarly credentials. Although alleged associations of Pioneer going back fifty or sixty years were exhumed and paraded before the ABC News audience, that audience was left in the dark about Professor Beckwith's long-standing, but more recent, affiliation with Science for the People. The difference in historical treatment amounts to a double standard a yard wide and knee deep and, like the program as a whole, is an abuse of the access to air time and of the trust of the American people that ABC's position in the world of news journalism enables it to enjoy. The "Mainstream Science" statement demonstrates that there were many highly qualified persons you could have consulted who would affirm that Pioneer funds respected, although sometimes politically incorrect, researchers, and that our research addresses important issues and is good enough to be published and cited in respected outlets and to show cumulative progress rather than degeneration over the years. In fact, the president of Pioneer supplied you with a list of ten or so independent psychometricians whom you could have consulted on the air about the research work his foundation has supported, but you chose not to avail yourselves of the balance their views could have provided, just as you ignored numerous possible supporters of **The Bell Curve** in the first segment of American Agenda. You also omitted mention of the fact that the ten members of the American Psychological Association who had received research funds from Pioneer in the preceding ten years have all been Fellows of that organization, a distinction enjoyed by only seven percent of all APA members, lest we appear, one suspects, too "established." No notice at all, in fact, was taken of the large amount of material supplied to you by Professor Linda Gottfredson and me of the stature of many Pioneer recipients and their frequent citation in a standard work on intelligence other than **The Bell Curve**. Your broadcast was thus not balanced reporting; it was not even reporting. It was slick political propaganda tricked up as news. Talk about **Erbkrank** ! The slickness is confirmed by the incredible amount of damage to perfectly good science that you were able to inflict in astonishingly little air time and transcript space. Such concentrated impact could only be the skillful product of dedicated professionals--but dedicated to what?

As Professor Rothman concluded in his 1990 "Minerva" article:

The media of mass communication exert increasing influence on \_public opinion . . . and even on opinion . . . in the center of society. Indeed, the press and . . . television are probably the most influential institutions in the United States in the shaping of public opinion. . . . The social and political views of journalists influence how they perceive the world and how they describe it to others. . . . To a larger extent than in the past, issues in which scientific knowledge is required for the making of public policy are becoming more numerous and more important in our society. A range of issues has emerged which journalists generally are ill-equipped to handle, since most journalists are quite ignorant of scientific issues and find it very difficult to deal with them accurately. This only increases the tendency for political ideology to play a role

in determining how they cause the public to view these problems. In so far as decisions require that the public be adequately informed about the scientific aspects of issues, the media of mass communication have not [been], and are not [now], making the positive contribution which they ought to make. (pp. 132-133)

Behaving exactly as Professor Rothman described in 1990, you have succeeded in defaming Pioneer and its grant recipients with a reckless disregard of relevant truths, both general and particular, and with thoroughly slanted reporting of obviously malevolent intent, based on an incontestably biased selection and use of sources, right down to the level of single words. Your success was verified for all to see when, on the next night of ABC News, air time was set aside to announce a disclaimer from the mutual fund organization of the same name as Pioneer, namely, that it was not the Pioneer Fund mentioned on your program of the previous evening.

What other action in anticipation of normal audience reaction could one expect from your display of concentration camp film, reference to Hitler and his genocide, silly pairing of genitalia size instead of brain size with intelligence so as to make us all seem ridiculous, misleading placement of words suggestive of genocidal motives into the mouth of Professor Lynn, and reliance on a distinguished but highly politicized pseudo-expert testifying before an unaware audience, without even a pretense of objective evidence, about the supposedly negative state of anonymous and at best offhand opinion allegedly concerning the quality of our research from members of a field not really relevant to the subject matter under consideration? What, exactly, in our research approaches the dubiousness of your methods that would justify Mr. Blakemore's crowning comment, "not good science"? Was your use of supposed hearsay from a tendentiously opinionated source such as Professor Beckwith, like your use of Professor Klineberg, a scientific trump card--or just journalistic trumpery?

All such evidence of incontrovertible bias appeared in the course of an ostensible news report on what is demonstrably honest scientific research on major social problems, unpopular though that research may be with journalists and with the many politically correct symbionts in academe to which the journalists gladly play host. This bias far exceeds what A. M. Rosenthal has complained of as "editorialization in the news." The fact is, you disserved the American public by exploiting misconceptions about research on intelligence in the current climate of political correctness to provide what was actually a bullying broadcast designed to turn uninformed watchers against intelligence researchers, against their source of research funding, against **The Bell Curve** and its authors, and, ultimately, against any but the most sociologically orthodox analyses of the nation's more intractable social problems.

An experienced journalist has written that reporters and editors "learned from peers and news sources . . . whom it was safe to bully and who could fight back" (Jack Fuller, "News Values", Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, p. 179). Certainly, your mistakes were not of the innocent, random kind that are perhaps

unavoidable when nonspecialists deal with technical matters; they were totally consistent ones in disregard of correct information provided you that only a form of perverse dedication by skilled professionals could possibly achieve. Such an effort must qualify as intentional bullying. Nothing illustrates this intentionality better than your consistently misleading use of quotations out of context during both segments of your broadcast, sometimes graphically displayed, as in the case of the dotted banners. Such misuse occurred in spoken quotation too, where the token three dots would not be apparent to your audience. It has been said that all quotations are necessarily "out of context," but the proper test of fairness depends on whether meaning has been distorted in a self-serving manner by the quoter.

Many persons will understand, therefore, my confession of amusement upon reading Mr. Roone Arledge's complaint over the jury verdict that found ABC News guilty of fraud for inserting its own employees as Food Lion employees, their supermarket jobs gained with the help of falsified credentials, when their real assignment was to gather undercover evidence for ABC of allegedly unsanitary practices at the supermarket chain. The resulting 1992 ABC program "won a top award from Investigative Reporters and Editors, the leading professional organization for investigative journalists," according to William Powers in "The New Republic" (January 20, 1997). The damage to Food Lion was considerable: earnings reached 20-year lows, 84 stores were closed in 1994, with 3,500 workers laid off, and its stock price "crumbled," according to Thomas McArdle, a reporter for "Investor's Business Daily". Although research on intelligence cannot easily provide comparable indices, the reported damage to Food Lion conveys a sense of the great harm that a network news broadcast, if misleading in overall concept, can do to science and to public policy that depends for its success on knowledge of scientific facts.

Mr. Powers reported that "Food Lion claimed that 'the unedited footage provides an extraordinary look at how a network news magazine can create false impressions,' and that 'ABC producers and editors used a combination of staged events and selective editing to fit a preconceived story line and systematically fabricate a story to deceive the public.'" The unbroadcast footage was brought to light during the discovery phase of Food Lion's successful lawsuit against ABC News.

After the verdict, Mr. McArdle reviewed the now-available 45 hours of videotape and quoted key excerpts from it in "ABC's Food Lyin'," published in "National Review" (February 10, 1997). The quotations reveal a contempt for proper detachment in reporting and heavy involvement of the producers of the program in attempts to entrap real Food Lion employees in food handling violations that could secretly be caught on videotape. Media critic L. Brent Bozell III, in the "New York Post" (February 3, 1997), suggested the apt term "muckfaking" for ABC's style of reporting in the Food Lion case, which Jonathan Yardley, of the "Washington Post" (January 27, 1997) described as involving "self evidently deceptive, dishonest tactics." In the "Wall Street Journal" (February 11, 1997), Dorothy Rabinowitz, "ABC's Food Lion Mission," described the ABC team as "interested exclusively in evidence to support a story," as distinct from the more complicated truth. She

concluded, "many journalists continue to believe that they are involved in a calling so high as to entitle them to rights not given ordinary citizens, among them the right to deceive without consequence."

Mr. Arledge ("New York Times", February 1, 1997, p. 19):

". . . [this] is really a war against investigative reporting . . ."

That the severely criticized programs on Northwest Airlines and Food Lion could win top awards for investigative reporting that could itself repay investigation indicates that checking on the truth of news broadcasts is far from an overriding consideration in the higher circles of televised journalism, where applause can be tapped predictably by appealing dishonestly to emotion. Once truth is subordinated to plot, the editing and splicing skills that enter into creating a news investigation documentary become indistinguishable from those used for creating film fiction for entertainment purposes. Judging from the products, there is very little difference in the attitudes toward this work of producers and editors engaged in what ought to be two quite different pursuits.

After the jury verdict in "Food Lion v. ABC", ABC News President Arledge was quoted in the "New York Post" (January 23, 1997) as complaining: "As the lawyers have done in so many cases, instead of talking about the real story [i.e., alleged health violations] . . . they've talked about relatively minor transgressions on the part of our reporters." Mr. Arledge, until you and your reporters learn how to tell the real stories of others, with something approaching objectivity and integrity, you have no right to complain that your real story was not told. After analyzing your broadcast on human intelligence, a topic that I know something about, I find the revelations stemming from the Food Lion case against ABC News all too believable, and the presentational techniques only too familiar. Having watched a videotape of the original ABC broadcast on Food Lion, one of the jurors in the case commented, "They set out to deliberately hurt Food Lion. Deliberately, and they would have done anything to hurt 'em" (NBC News, February 5, 1997).

Writing in "Commentary" in October 1994 ("What To Do About Education; 1: The Universities"), historian Gertrude Himmelfarb regarded as "far more serious" than the more familiar manifestations of campus PC "the suppression of research on intelligence . . . on the ground that the subject itself is suspect and that the conclusions might be politically incorrect." Before presuming to pass judgment on what is or is not good science and aligning yourselves powerfully with the suppressive academic forces Professor Himmelfarb had in mind, your team would do well to consider whether ABC's own reporting qualifies as acceptable journalism. Would Walter Cronkite and Edward R. Murrow approve? Mr. Blakemore took exception when I referred to the mistreatment of **The Bell Curve** and of IQ-related matters at the hands of media in a manner that included network news organizations as media. He preferred instead to draw a saving distinction between media and

journalists such as yourselves. The distinction fails; you, my friends, are media.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT A. GORDON  
Professor

---