dent. Nixon states that our policy is simply to assure free choice; he seems to say that any government in any country is all right, so long as that government obtains power by more or less legitimate means. There may not be much difference between these statements of policy, at least not much difference that can readily be seen.

The problem is that in fact our goal in Southeast Asia is not clear. Are we out to defeat aggression, or are we not? And why is the United States paying the bill. But those legions—with a long and proud history—could not win in Indochina. The reason was not military but political. The people of France had no clear idea of why they were being taxed to death in a long and bloody war in Indochina.

And so France was defeated. The equation has not changed in all the intervening years. The means are the same. The U.S. forces in Vietnam cannot be defeated militarily. But this is a political war, and it is begging the question to say that we cannot defeat them simply by knowing that—and it is begging the question to say that all draftees will be out of combat by September. It is useless to talk of weapons seized, rice burned, and men killed, as long as the political questions remain unanswered, and those answers can be neither simple nor painless.

Cambodia is over, but it remains an open question for the United States has assumed yet another commitment.

The future remains a puzzle, and it will until we know clearly what it is we are trying to achieve in Southeast Asia, and why.

This is what Congress must address itself to. This is what the President must address himself to. It is a morally demanding leadership. It is a matter demanding honesty and courage, not shallow political maneouvring, not debating around most points. The fact is, painful as it may be, that the answers to the Vietnam riddle will be difficult, and that our painful sacrifice will not easily be ended. I do not think that Americans will shrink from the truth; all they ask is that it be stated. If we do not have the courage to face the questions, then we have no right to be dismayed over division and confusion in the country today.

Let us get on with our task.

INTEGRATION MAY HARD BLACKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Raske) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RASKE. Mr. Speaker, vast sums of taxpayers' money have been and continue to be expended to attain theoretical egalitarian goals through forced integration. Since forced integration is unnatural and the antithesis of liberty, it has created great hostility among all the people and has in reality accomplished nothing. Race relations today are far worse than before, 1964, and there has been no evidence of any improvement as the result of appropriations of larger sums of money or passage of additional social force laws.

There is no evidence whatever, that compulsory integration in education has accomplished more academic progress than free choice would have achieved. In fact, the opposite is true.

Hearings have been conducted before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Education and Labor Committee of the House. The concern is with the education of our country's leading scientific authorities on genetics and behavior have appeared and testified. I feel that the testimony of each of these men is so crucial to full understanding of the cen-
cational problems we face, that include the statements of Dr. Ernest Van Den Haag and Dr. Arthur R. Jensen following my remarks for the Information of the Members.

STATEMENT OF DR. ERNEST VAN DEN HAAG BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSING EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Ernest van den Haag. I am a Psychology Professor at the New York University, a lecturer at New York University for social research in psychology and sociology, and I have been shown in evidence, that integration will be educationally not only that academically and educationally effective, but it will be fundamentally that academically and educationally effective.

I received an M.A. degree from University of Iowa, and a Ph.D. degree from New York University. I have also studied in Europe, at the Sorbonne (the University of Paris), the University of Florence, and the University of Naples. I have lectured at Harvard and Yale Universities. I am a member of the Society of Applied Psychology, Psychoanalysis, Fellow American Sociological Association, American Sociological Society, and New York Academy of Sciences; I am a Guggenheim Fellow (1967).

My work mostly concerns the study of the relationship between the social dynamics and the educational processes, including as chapters in books, e.g., "Psychological and Sociological Research" (Philosophical Journal and Encyclopedia), and "Genuine and Spurious Integration," appearing in "Psychological and Sociological Research" (Philosophical Journal and Encyclopedia).

We have discovered that in the relationship of research, in the field of social dynamics, analyzes the causes of the formation of groups (including school groups or student groups) and how group members relate to each other. Such studies are directly applicable to predict the educational result of compulsory congregation in schools.

On the basis of those studies, I appear today to question the validity of the process in which the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, as in the case of the bill as expressed in Section 2 to improve education in the United States by increasing the degree of compulsory congregation in schools between the racial groups or student groups, and how group members relate to each other. Such studies are directly applicable to predict the educational result of compulsory congregation in schools.

On the basis of those studies, I appear today to question the validity of the process in which the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, as in the case of the bill as expressed in Section 2 to improve education in the United States by increasing the degree of compulsory congregation in schools between the racial groups or student groups, and how group members relate to each other. Such studies are directly applicable to predict the educational result of compulsory congregation in schools.

In evev corner where racial segregation is present, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others, this is necessarily based upon observable differences, among them, overt physical differences and similarities, which fom the focal point for group orientation and group identification. Professor George A. Lundberg (University of Washington; past president of the American Sociological Association) in "Some Neglected Aspects of the Minority Problem" (Modern Age, Summer, 1958, pages 285-287) says: "In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based upon some observable differences between the persons concerned. Group membership is a reaction toward a group, his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

(2) Men react selectively to their fellow men. This reaction is based upon observable differences, among them, overt physical differences and similarities, which form the focal point for group orientation and group identification. Professor George A. Lundberg (University of Washington; past president of the American Sociological Association) writes in "Some Neglected Aspects of the Minority Problem" (Modern Age, Summer, 1958, pages 285-287) says: "In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based upon some observable differences between the persons concerned. Group membership is a reaction toward a group, his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

"In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based upon some observable differences between the persons concerned. Group membership is a reaction toward a group, his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

"In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. Selective association is necessarily based upon some observable differences between the persons concerned. Group membership is a reaction toward a group, his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

(3) The social psychologists, however, (a) should start first by relating the individual to his reference and membership groups and then proceed to the finer details of personality problems. (b) In the binding in-group formation, the real identification of individual members are anchored in group. A sense of solidarity is generated in these as a natural process which manifests itself as an actual behavior. In other words, as a group is formed, or as individuals become members of the group, the social process of integration is taking place. Besides the individual members of the group, the social values and goals, the psychic characteristics, and the in-group symbols with which the individual member is identified. The social identification which evolves thus constitutes the basis of the group solidarity from which results observable, measurable behavior.

"In every society men react selectively to their fellow men, in the sense of seeking the association of some and avoiding the association of others. There are three reasons: (1) every individual needs to identify with a group; (2) every group needs a leader; and (3) every group needs an objective. Social identification implies not an individual's reaction toward a group, but his reaction as a functioning element of the group."

The amount of discriminatory action. The amount of discrimination is a problem in the sense of requiring community action. The amount of discrimination is a problem in the sense of requiring community action.

(4) At one time it was assumed that the members of the group, the social process of integration is taking place. Besides the individual members of the group, the social values and goals, the psychic characteristics, and the in-group symbols with which the individual member is identified. The social identification which evolves thus constitutes the basis of the group solidarity from which results observable, measurable behavior.

There must be a personal consciousness of 'belonging' or 'being a part' which is reflected in the opinions and behavior of the persons concerned. Group membership identifies implies not an individual's reaction toward a group, but his reaction as a functioning element of the group.

Yet our inquiry led to some other interesting facts. In this interview, 43 were unable to give any clear answer, but they found their own attitudes very natural. 18 advertisers did not accept Negro servants because of presumed lack of cleanliness; 30 thought black housekeepers were always dirty. By this measure of cleanliness and lack of assiduity, and 12 said only that they were used to white servants and therefore did not wish to engage colored servants. Seven persons believed Negroes because of the contact they would have with their young children. There were a few other reasons such as 'racial odor,' 'bad character,' 'laariness,' 'carelessness,' and other imperfections that were ascribed to Negro servants. There are many situations in social life where white people refuse to be seen with Negroes. In such public places as high-class hotels, restaurants, or casinos, fashionable clubs and dance halls, Negroes are not desired, and there are few whites who dare to introduce Negro friends or acquaintances to Negro friends or acquaintances to Negro friends or acquaintances in these places. Discrimination was strongly resisted by middle-class Negroes. On the other hand, those Negroes complained bitterly of the contemptuous attitudes that middle-class amateurs assumed toward them.

Yet our inquiry led to some other interesting facts. In this interview, 43 were unable to give any clear answer, but they found their own attitudes very natural. 18 advertisers did not accept Negro servants because of presumed lack of cleanliness; 30 thought black housekeepers were always dirty. By this measure of cleanliness and lack of assiduity, and 12 said only that they were used to white servants and therefore did not wish to engage colored servants. Seven persons believed Negroes because of the contact they would have with their young children. There were a few other reasons such as 'racial odor,' 'bad character,' 'laariness,' 'carelessness,' and other imperfections that were ascribed to Negro servants. There are many situations in social life where white people refuse to be seen with Negroes. In such public places as high-class hotels, restaurants, or casinos, fashionable clubs and dance halls, Negroes are not desired, and there are few whites who dare to introduce Negro friends or acquaintances to Negro friends or acquaintances in these places. Discrimination was strongly resisted by middle-class Negroes.
different Teachers' colleges in Sao Paulo, Brazil, that:

"Stereotypes against Negroes and mulattoes are widespread. Seventy-five per cent of the sample accept twenty-three or more stereotypes against Negroes. No one rejects all stereotypes against Negroes. . . . Mulattoes are judged to have qualities very much in conflict with the same traits as Negroes but somewhat lower percentages. The most widely accepted stereotype is lack of hygiene (accepted by 91 per cent), physical unattractiveness (87 per cent), superstition (80 per cent), lack of financial control (79 per cent) and the belief that Negroes have a lower morality (76 per cent), aggressiveness (73 per cent), laziness (72 per cent), lack of perseverance at work (62 per cent), sexuality (70 per cent), and lies (80 per cent)."

(4) Strong patterns of racial preference emerge in pre-school children—even as early as 2½ years of age. In "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," (The American Anthropologist, Vol. 46, No. 4 (1946)), Dr. Mary Ellen Goodman investigated the age at which racial attitudes become manifest. Fifteen Negro and twelve white children, ranging in age at the beginning of the study from 2-9 to 4-4 and who attended nursery schools were studied. Dr. Goodman noted that "awareness of one's racial identity may be regarded as one facet of that consciousness of self which is gradually acquired during the first three or four years of life," and "preliminary analysis leads to the belief that these children of ascriptive status are in the process of becoming aware of race differences."

The early embers of racial attitudes have been confirmed in other studies in "well-integrated" areas where there is an absence of overt racial conflict and legal racial segregation. Lts. Catherine Landreth and Barbara C. Johnson conducted such a study in the child of the equalized school system in Newark, New Jersey, and San Francisco, California, and reported in "Young Children's Responses to a Picture and Insect Test Designed to Reveal Reactions to Persons of Different Skin Color" (Child Development, Vol. 24, No. 6, (1953)). They concluded that patterns of response to persons of different skin color are present as early as three years and become accentuated during the succeeding two years.

Dr. Margaret Sutherland and Pearl Rosenburg studied the racial attitudes of children in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Sociometry, Vol. 24, (1953)). They found "the white children in all the situations and at all ages (seven to thirteen years) expressed significantly more preference for their own racial group. This partial or complete case when their choices between Negro and white children as friends are on an abstract or wish level.

(3) Some sociologists contend that Negroes would suffer far more from racial integration than from racial segregation. Thus, Prof. Ichheiser * notes that "... if the Negroes would refuse to identify themselves consciously with the Negroes as a subgroup, then they would develop a kind of collective neurosis, as do other minorities, too; for the conscious Negro would in case of such an attitude be persistently in conflict with the unconscious 'we,' and this inner split would inevitably reflect itself in different pathological distortion of personal identity."

For contrasts, Allison Davis (Racial Status and Personality Development, The Scientific Monthly, Vol. 54, No. 3 (1937)) noted where the social group of the racially subordinate individual is highly organized and integrated, as in the Little Dailies of Chinatown, or in many Southern Negro communities, its members will usually have relatively less psychological conflict over their racial status. Similarly, Mozelle Hill ('A Comparative Study of Race Attitudes in New England and the South,' Phylon, 1946) noted that Negroes raised and educated in an all-Negro community tend to have significantly more positive feelings about Negroes, and are more favorable in their expression toward their own race.

As one of the main foundations for decision in the 1954 school segregation case (Brown v. Board of Education), the Supreme Court of the United States asserted that (425 U.S. 47, 480, 494):

"To separate [children in grade and high school] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community which may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs: "Segregation of children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact of segregation is not confined to a greater or lesser measure of the gross violation of the law, for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the negro race. This ... of [unsegregated] schools in either their knowledge of racial differences or their racial identification," except that the southern children in segregated schools are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll, compared to the Negro children who, according to the Warren Court, have a definite preference for this doll. Although still a minority, a higher percentage of southern children, compared to northern, prefer to play with the colored doll, or that is to have a 'nice' doll."

The tables presented by Professor Clark bear out as much. Table 4, over, more clearly shows that a significantly higher percentage of Southern Negro children asked "give me the doll that looks like you" gave the white doll in the nonsegregated schools—29 percent as opposed to 29 percent in the segregated schools.

Thus, Professor Clark misused the court. His "previous results" are not "consistent" with those entered in the court record.

Actually, his "previous results" clearly contradict those submitted in his sworn testimony. Compared, the response of Negro children in the nonsegregated schools show that Negro children in segregated schools are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll than the nonsegregated children. Clark asseverates: "Proof that state imposed segregation inflicts injuries upon Negro children is self-evident, come from the social psychologists."

Professor Clark mentioned to the court that he had made previous experiments "consistent" with the findings in the record. However, these previous experiments were not themselves ever entered into the record. Thus, for all people for good reason as will be seen.

They had been published, however, 134 Negro children in segregated schools in Arkansas and 119 Negro children in unsegregated nursery and public schools in Springfield, Massachusetts, about evenly divided by sex, were tested.

Black and white dolls were presented, and the children were asked to indicate the "nice" and the "bad" one, as well as the one "that looks like you." Professor Clark asseverates that the "... children in the northern mixed-school situation do not differ from children in the southern segregated schools, but that in either their knowledge of racial differences or their racial identification, except that the children in segregated schools are less pronounced in their preference for the white doll, compared to the Negro children who, according to the Warren Court, have a definite preference for this doll. Although still a minority, a higher percentage of southern children, as compared to northern, prefer to play with the colored doll, or that is to have a 'nice' doll." The tables presented by Professor Clark bear out as much. Table 4, over, more clearly shows that a significantly higher percentage of Southern Negro children asked "give me the doll that looks like you" gave the white doll in the nonsegregated schools—29 percent as opposed to 29 percent in the segregated schools.

Thus, Professor Clark misused the court. His "previous results" are not "consistent" with those entered in the court record. Actually, his "previous results" clearly contradict those submitted in his sworn testimony.


The children ranged from 3 to 7 years of age. They were tested at the age of 4 years 2 months to 6 years 9 years. Professor Clark does not seem to think that the difference in average age is a blunder in his tests, as Professor Clark asserts, the Negro children in the more segregated schools would

---


3 The children ranged from 3 to 7 years of age. They were tested at the age of 4 years 2 months to 6 years 9 years. Professor Clark does not seem to think that the difference in average age is a blunder in his tests, as Professor Clark asserts, the Negro children in the more segregated schools would


5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.
have been more pronounced in their preference for the white doll. If Professor Clark's tests do demonstrate anything psychological, it will be that segregated Negro children and children in mixed schools with a far greater number of children.

IV. OBJECTIONS TO PROFESSOR CLARK'S EVIDENCE

So far I have proceeded on the assumption that Clark's general method is capable of showing something about segregation. This is doubtful.

Whatever Professor Clark demonstrated about the personality of segregated Negro children could be due to general prejudice in the community rather than to segregation, or even to circumstances not affecting Negroes specifically. Professor Clark is confounding the sources of damage, thus insisting that segregation is "fundamental.

Tests on white children, or on Jewish and Christian children in segregated Negro cultures (e.g. Africa) which might have had the same results, thus showing that it does not depend on prejudice, let alone segregation; (4) No controls with objects other than white and black dolls; (5) No evidence presented that doll tests show any correlation with personality disturbance; (6) No evidence about the type of alleged disturbance and what it means psychologically.

Professor Clark has published a book since his testimony, relied on by the Supreme Court: Prejudice and Your Child. On page 45 ff. the following is stated regarding the frequency of self-identification of Negro children in mixed schools with white dolls:

"The evidence presented in favor of racial prejudice..." This would be "superficial" and "incorrect." The fact that segregated children prefer the white doll more frequently than non-segregated ones now shows that they have suffered even deeper personality damage. The fact that segregated children prefer the white doll most often suddenly becomes an indication of comparative health.

What is the outcome of the experiment? If the outcome of the experiment shows that there is a personality damage to segregation. When Negro children identify more often with the white doll (North) it is bad and shows psychological injury. When they identify less often (segregated South) it is even worse. But wasn't the self-identification of Negro children with the white doll supposed to be the very evidence of their confusion and psychological injury? Yes, Clark writes now, except when the identification occurring less frequently among segregated Negro children would indicate that segregation makes for mental health. This would be inconvenient. Wherefore when this is the case less frequent identification with the white doll suddenly indicates more psychological damage.

Just what choice of dolls would have shown that segregation does not harm the children? None of those available. Whichver doll the children choose would, according to Clark's new interpretation, show that segregation is harmful. What can an experiment which supports the same conclusion, regardless of its methods of research. Clearly, Professor Clark's conclusions do not depend on any of his experiments. For these are inconsistent with his conclusions, if they are meaningful at all. None of the material presented by the Supreme Court accepted as probative of injury through segregation is any more cogent. No injury by segregation per se has been proved by any scientific test.

Certainly the theory of reference groups would lead us to believe so. See Feinberg's "sick role". The theory of comparative health makes for mental health. This would be inconvenient. Wherefore when this is the case less frequent identification with the white doll suddenly indicates more psychological damage.

Just what choice of dolls would have shown that segregation does not harm the children? None of those available. Whichver doll the children choose would, according to Clark's new interpretation, show that segregation is harmful. What can an experiment which supports the same conclusion, regardless of its methods of research. Clearly, Professor Clark's conclusions do not depend on any of his experiments. For these are inconsistent with his conclusions, if they are meaningful at all. None of the material presented by the Supreme Court accepted as probative of injury through segregation is any more cogent. No injury by segregation per se has been proved by any scientific test.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary groups to which an individual belongs are his family and his peer group. The latter is the group with which the individual identifies himself on the basis of a feeling of community, similar characteristics, and commonly shared emotion.
of a large part of our black population. They have been, particularly with the young people, far more successful in that aspect than the old style organizations. High school and college students, if they do not join, do certainly admire and support organizations such as the Black Panthers and the Nation of Islam. They look up to such figures as Marita Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, Malcolm X, et al. The organizations differ among themselves in their methods and to the extent one can discern them, in their purposes. But they have one thing in common: they try (and largely succeeded) to produce a prudish racial identity. They make their followers accept that "black is beautiful" from the point of view of other minorities because they are creating a black identity, and pride in it.

They do this largely by declaring their independence of and, in some cases, even hostility to whites. But the hostility here is largely a gesture necessary to support the independence and the pride.

I am not concerned with the justification of such movements. But they clearly indicate a psychological need. By gratifying this need, these organizations have succeeded to an astonishing extent in rehabilitating members who previously suffered from major symptoms of personality disorganization, such as drug addiction, criminal behavior, general irresponsibility, etc. This is not just to say the Panthers do not allow members to take drugs. It is that they make the drugs unavailable. They create for themselves a self-image of adequacy that makes the resort to drugs unnecessary. The basic ingredient in this psychological makeup is the image of an adequate, black, historical, and cultural adequacy, if not superiority.

I submit that this is what the black minority needs more than anything else. It is in this respect that its problem has diffused and transformed. The Negroes from India, Italian, Jewish—and it is this ingredient that a wise and just process of education should help provide. Integration, desirable as it may be in the end, is possible only if the elements to be integrated each feel a sense of identity and a pride in that identity rather than a testing of inadequacy. For feelings of inadequacy produce hostility to those who make one feel inadequate.

Black students know this. Their behavior itself is evidence for the need it tries to fulfill. If one looks at recent happenings in our schools, one finds that there has been a great increase in black enrollment in previously largely white schools. That increase, fostered by the colleges with the idea of giving blacks the benefits of their college life, and education, far from leading to immediate integration, has led to the very opposite. Thus, at Vassar College where I served as Visiting Professor in 1969, the one demand almost immediately made by the newly-admitted black students was a separate black dormitory. There were no complaints of inchoernty on the part of colleges. These black college students simply wanted to have a place of their own. They wanted to cultivate their own identity, lead their own life, elaborate their own traditions. They also wanted black teachers and "black courses." This development has been paralleled in almost every college in the country.

Many colleges have gone so far as to take black students less prepared or qualified than white students. Whatever the motives that led them to do so, it is relevant here to point out that the less well-prepared students felt unnecessarily belittled, and humiliated, when they could not perform as adequately in class as their more qualified white fellow students. They, therefore, were psychologically compelled to seek to achieve the prestige they had lost in their own eyes—which they could not achieve in classroom work—outside the classroom. The opportunity was readily and insistently on their own, and they would be tempted to make up for the humiliation suffered by displaying their hostility to whites and their own superiority in activities which underlined the academic and educational purposes of the school.

This is by no means to say that black and white students should forever remain separated or should be separated as a matter of administrative rule. On the contrary, what I am advocating is that they should remain free to select the school and the fellow students that in each individual case will most fulfill their academic and psychological needs.

I foresee that freedom of choice will lead ultimately to far more integration than is now extant, but it will do so slowly. The advantage of that slowness will be that blacks will be able to compete both educationally and psychologically with whites in a way that does not make the school "irrelevant" to them, nor psychologically requires them to seek compensation, through subversive or criminal activities, for the sense of inadequacy that it will generate.

Much research has been done since the Supreme Court decided (on most dubious evidence) that segregation is educationally damaging to Negro children. No evidence confirming this idea has been uncovered. Very little evidence has been offered to show that integration has been beneficial. Most pro-
grams which attempted to remedy the comparatively low performance of Negro children attributed to inferior schooling have been shown to be ineffective. Social scientists, therefore, have reached in many cases the conclusion that the inferior performance may be due to factors in very early infancy which, as yet, we have found no way of offsetting. Others have insisted that there is no evidence of a genetic difference which may explain the differences in performance, at least when the same methods of teaching are used for both groups.

I wish now to draw the attention of this Committee to an article "Early Childhood Intervention-The Social Science Base of In-tervention" by Stephen F. and Joan C. Baratz, appearing in the Harvard Educational Review (February, 1970). The authors maintain, with considerable evidence, that the two models that seek to explain the inferior performance of black children—the genetic and the subcultural background model (of which there are many varieties referring to the family, the subcultural background, nutrition, etc.)—are both unnecessary. The authors maintain that if there were a deficit not just in the actual performance of the children, so that they may not perform so well, then such models would be required. But in their opinion the low performance of negro children is due to the disinclination of teachers, and the failure of schools to perceive the linguistic and other resources of these children. This failure leads schools to insist that Negro children express themselves in a language which, in their subculture, they are not accustomed and in which they become "dummy." In short, the authors maintain that by insisting that Negro children have the same linguistic and other resources as white children and allowing them to use only these resources, schools produce the lower performance of Negro children. If on the other hand, the authors maintain, the resources actually available to Negro children were utilized—as are those actually available to white children—then Negro children might be quite as able to perform as white children. Thus the low performance of Negro children could be improved by more appropriate teaching methods and a distinctive curriculum utilizing their subcultural resources. Needless to say, this would require at least temporary separate education.

I have no personal knowledge that would indicate to me whether the contention of the authors is correct. They do, however, quote a great amount of research that certainly suggests that their thesis is worth exploring. It is quite conceivable that I wish to submit to this Committee.

A great amount of money has been spent on forced integration. A great deal of hostility has been aroused on all sides—certainly race relations are worse than they were before 1954 and there is no evidence whatever that compulsory integration has led to more academic progress than free choice would have secured. More and more evidence is accumulating that Negro schools exist and require for their utilization distinct methods if the members are to learn what the schools are trying to teach. This may indeed require separate training for teachers and separation of those pupils who wish to learn and are best able to learn by utilizing the resources of their subculture. If there is any sort of genetic difference in addition to the subcultural differences this, too, would probably lead to different learning and teaching methods.

I am not suggesting that this Committee should institute the new methods that may turn out to be useful. I am, however, suggesting that this Committee submit, instead of throwing further money into an approach that no one could possibly term successful, reserve such money (a) for thorough evaluation of the approaches so far tried, and (b) for thorough exploration and experimentation with different approaches, resting on a variety of competing teaching methods with free self selection of pupils.

I do not expect to convince this Committee that the premises on which such vast federal expenditures have been made for the integration of schools over the past ten or fifteen years is a false premise, or that the truth lies elsewhere. I do, however, most seriously recommend that alternatives be explored and all approaches scientifically evaluated before the educational system of the nation becomes so far committed to a single article of faith ("the evidence of things not seen")—that integration of the races brings better education—that the point of no return will have been passed.

Thus I appear here to recommend that in re-examination of all views on this question be come part of the evaluation directed by this bill and that we substitute objective measurement for the subjective, if praiseworthy, opinions of those who see compulsory integration a forwarding of the democratic dream of equality. If the basic purpose of schools is to be education, then we should put aside any preconceived emotional assumptions about the facts. If improvement and destruction of the educational accomplishment of any child, black or white, and use every available scientific facility to isolate the actual factors wherever we find them. To do so would be in the interest of all concerned, of all children, black and white, and contrary only to the vested interest of educational dogmatists.
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STATEMENT OF DR. ARTHUR R. JENSEN BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Arthur R. Jensen and I am Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of California at Berkeley. I hold a B.A. degree from the State University of California, an M.A. from San Diego State College, and a Ph. D. degree from Columbia University. In 1958-59, I was a United States Public Health Service Research Fellow in Psychology at the Psychiatric Institute, University of London. In 1959-60, I was Research Associate at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research and in 1964-65 a Guggenheim Fellow at the Institute of Psychiatry at the University of London. In 1965-67, I was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford. I am a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the Psychonomic Society.

I am co-editor of a text on "Social Class, Race and Psychological Development," published in 1968 and the author of the article entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and School Achievement," published in 1969 in the Harvard Educational Review. I wrote an article on the "Heterobility of Intelli-
The nature of intelligence

"I believe that the causes of observed differences in IQ tests and scholastic performance among different ethnic groups are predominantly genetic in nature, as evidenced by the fact that these differences are highly heritable. The IQ differences observed among different racial groups are likely to persist even when socioeconomic status is taken into account, making it necessary to consider the genetic basis of these differences in educational planning and policy making."
Education is one of the chief instruments for approaching this goal. Every child should receive the best education that our current knowledge and our equipment allow. This should not imply that we advocate the same methods or the same expectations for all children. There are large individual differences in children themselves, in patterns of ability, in drives and interests. These differences exist even among children of the same school and the same classroom, but also among those of different schools or the same school. The school must regard each child, and the differences among children, in much the same way as a good parent should do.

I believe we need to find out the extent to which individual differences, social class differences, and race difference in rates of cogitative development and differential patterns of relative strength and weakness in various types of ability are attributable to genetically significant biological growth factors. The answer to this question might imply differences in our approach to improving the education of all children, particularly those we call the disadvantaged, if our school is now a frustrating and unrewarding experience.

Individuals should be treated in terms of their individual characteristics and not in terms of their group membership. This is the way of a democratic society, and educationally it is the only way to make sense. Individual variations within any large socially defined group are always much greater than the differences between groups. There is overlap between groups in the distributions of all psychological characteristics that we can measure. But dealing with children as individuals, not the greatest problem. It is in our concern about the fact that when we do so, we have a substantial learning problem, and children of different socially identifiable groups may not be proportionately represented in different programs. This is the "hang-up" of many persons today, and this is where our conceptions of equal opportunity are more likely to go awry and become misconceptions.

Group racial and social class differences are first of all individual differences, but the way they may vary may not be the same as of the individual differences. This is what we must find out, because the prescription of special educational programs could depend on the answer.

Let me give one quite hypothetical example, that among middle-class white children, learning processes in the ordinary classroom instruction is related to certain psychological developmental characteristics. Educators call it "readiness." These characteristics of readiness appear at different ages for different kinds of learning, and at any given age there are considerable individual differences among children, even among siblings reared within the same family. These differences among middle-class white children, are largely conditioned by genetic factors. If we try to begin a child too early or too late, he will experience much greater difficulty than if we wait until we see more signs of "readiness." Lack of readiness, he may even become so frustrated as to "turn off" on reading, so that he will then have an emotional block toward reading later on when he should have had the opportunity to get his reading done, and can, then not be fully tapped. The child would have been better off if we had postponed reading instruction for a year and occupied him during this time with other interesting activities for which he was more ready, and then when he was a better reader at, say, 10 or 11 years of age for having started a year later, when he could catch on to reading with relative ease and avoid the unnecessary frustration. It is very doubtful in this case that some added "enrichment" to his preschool environment would have made him learn to read much earlier. This would not only be a matter of biological maturation, then the time at which a child is taught in terms of his own schedule of development becomes important, or even the matter of preschool environmental enrichment, then the thing to do is to go to work on the quality of school, could become so misguided as to work to the disadvantage of many minority children.

Should we deny differential educational treatments to children when such treatment would maximize the benefits they receive from schooling, just because differential treatment might result in disproportionate representation of different racial groups in various programs? I have seen where Negro children were denied special educational facilities common given to white children with learning difficulties simply because school authorities feared that they would only single out any Negro children, despite their obvious individual needs, to be treated any differently from the other children in the school. There was no hesitation about singling out white children who needed special attention. Many Negro children of normal and superior scholastic potential are consigned to classes in which one-fourth to one-third of their classmates have IQs below 75, which is the usual borderline of educational mental retardation. The majority of these minority children are being deprived of a benefit that little or not at all from instruction in the normal classroom, but require special attention. Indeed, it appears that a high degree of individualized and small group instruction. Their presence in regular classes creates unusual difficulties for the conscientious teacher and detracts from the optimal educational environment for children of normal ability. Yet there is reluctance to provide special classes for these educationally retarded children if they are Negro or Mexican-American. The classrooms of noncommon people are selective. If the IQ of 70 or 75 or 65 of such children, which handicaps the teacher's efforts on behalf of her other pupils, she is not likely to consider the more able minority children are thereby disadvantaged in the classroom in ways that are not obvious or obvious to the teacher when there are more diverse differences. Differentials in rates of mental development and in potentials for various types of learning will not disappear by being ignored. It is up to biologists and psychologists to discover their causes, and it is up to educators to create a diversify or instructional arrangements best suited to the full range of educational differences that we find in our population. Many environmental differences between individuals can be minimized or eliminated, given the resources and the will of society. The differences that remain are a matter of public education. The challenge will be met by making available more ways and means for children to benefit from schooling. This, I am convinced, can only come about once the particular recognition and understanding of the nature of human differences.

In closing this remarks that I call upon your Committee to set aside funds under Section 19 of H.R. 17849 to investigate methods of coping with the problem of group variability and for an impartial, in-depth study of the effects of classroom deprecation on the educational process. This came to mind that much basic research must be done as an essential part of the task of ameliorating our nation's grave educational problems.