

THE LEGACY OF BROWN: RACIAL ISSUES, ACADEMIC INCIVILITY, AND UNPRODUCTIVE EDUCATIONAL REFORMS

RALPH SCOTT

During recent years a sequence of failed school reforms designed to close the racial achievement gap of African-American and white students has progressively laid bare one of the nation's dirtiest and best kept little secrets: Something is seriously amiss within American social science, the institution which presumably provides "eyes" to policymakers charged with formulating viable interventions. History records the virtually inevitable consequences when institutions fall short of societal expectations: When academics deobjectify events in which they are acknowledged authorities, when governmental agencies review proposals for social change not on the basis of credibility but of political perspective, when courts issue orders based on misleading and fabricated information, when universities fund texts which vilify scholars of empirically supportive views, and when the media seek not to report facts but to mislead and obfuscate.¹

This paper evaluates scientific standards employed in formulating and implementing educational reforms which focus on contemporary American racial issues. Given historical developments, primary attention is given to school desegregatory practices which primarily impact African Americans and whites, although the conditions described frequently affect non-black minorities. The assessment begins by appraising the objectivity and authenticity of social science testimony presented in *Brown* (1954)², the landmark Supreme Court desegregation decision, and moves chronologically to educational innovations of the current Bush administration. Consistent failures of federal and state initiatives, designed to close the racial achievement gap, are invariably linked to prevailing intolerance within academia and codification of questionable sociological theses.

During the early stages of school desegregation, University of London professor of psychology Philip Vernon expressed bewilderment over the reluctance of American researchers to deal objectively with socially sensitive topics.³ More recently Joseph Masling remarked "[W]hen American psychologists have data that conflict with their theories, they retain the theories and discard

the data..."⁴ Not immediately apparent is the potential cost of such an attitude. Exactly why the majority of contemporary scholars have complied with sanitized and conventionalized views on racial issues is best comprehended by examining the lives of individual researchers.⁵ Therefore a case vignette is presented which illustrates incivility within academia which exceeds that employed by roughhousing and ambitious politicians,⁶ and which forces many scholars to avoid thoroughly dissecting complex and potentially explosive ethnic issues. Finally, evidence is presented that poor and minority children, and their families, have paid and continue to pay an inordinately high price for the moralization and politicization of ethnic issues.

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION:

WHEN LAW AND SOCIAL SCIENCE WENT AMISS

The origins of forced busing, or transporting children from their neighborhood schools presumably to enhance academic attainments of African-American children, lie in *Brown* (1954), the landmark Supreme Court ruling. With virtually no overt dissent within academia, social scientists persuaded the high court that racially balanced schools were essential if African-American students were to receive equitable educational opportunities.⁷ Legal precedence was established which subsequently bound lower courts to issuing orders which by destroying neighborhoods diluted the historic bonds of home, school, and community.

Even devout school desegregation advocates acknowledge that in *Brown* social scientists failed to provide the Supreme Court with objective information concerning the impact of mandated school desegregation on minority and majority Americans. Archibald Robertson, representing Virginia in one of the four cases which the Supreme Court combined in *Brown*, talked to more than one hundred prospective witnesses. Most said their views would conflict with NAACP testimony and prove so unpopular among their colleagues that it might ruin their careers.⁸ Some researchers shared with NAACP attorneys one particularly unwelcome fact: Pronounced black-white learning differences existed *before* children entered school. Eventually Kenneth Clark agreed to testify that school integration would compensate for all the psychological and intellectual damage imposed on black children by the crushing burdens of Southern racial ideology; NAACP attorneys readily embraced this concept, although Clark admitted that his views were empirically unsupportable.⁹

Among Supreme Court justices before whom expert testimony was presented, Justice Frankfurter was especially incredulous. A voracious reader, and aware of ecological and biophysical correlates of human growth and development, Frankfurter asked chief NAACP attorney Thurgood Marshall why no witnesses questioned the benefits of remedies restricted to within-school conditions. Marshall replied that no social scientist in the country would contest the NAACP position.¹⁰ In fact, some of the nation's most influential

scholars had previously informed Marshall there was no empirical evidence to support the NAACP position. In declining, Elsa E. Robinson of New York University said she had no evidence of harmful desegregation effects. William H. Kilpatrick of Columbia University informed NAACP attorneys that what they had in mind “would put back the long run cause.”

Relying on expert opinions expressed in the now famous Footnote Eleven, the high court cited social science claims that the black-white achievement gap was essentially a product of separate schools and that the gap would significantly diminish, if not disappear, once schools were racially balanced. Leaving little doubt concerning expectations of school desegregation, the Court stated “...to separate them (black students) from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely to be undone.” In issuing this ruling the justices failed to distinguish *de jure* and *de facto* desegregation. *De jure* desegregation assured African-American students their constitutional right to attend neighborhood schools. Conversely, *de facto* school desegregation, designed to racially balance schools, denied both black and white children their constitutional right to attend neighborhood schools.

Following *Brown*, lower courts issued rulings based on the assumption that racial separation adversely affected self-esteem, which reduced motivation and consequently retarded the “educational and mental development of Negro children.” Sometimes facts intervened, however temporarily. Judge Mize, presiding in *Evers v. Jackson Municipal School District* (1964), permitted evidence to be introduced to show that segregation was not injurious but instead advantageous to pupils of all races. “This evidence,” said Mize, “cries out for a reappraisal and complete reconsideration of the findings and conclusions of the United States Supreme Court in the *Brown* decision.” Nonetheless, Mize felt bound by the prior Fifth Circuit determination and upheld racial balancing of schools irrespective of housing patterns.

As court-ordered desegregatory rulings proliferated, it became increasingly apparent that predictions of the high court were profoundly flawed. Prompted by evidence that busing did not enable African-American children to more effectively learn, judicial equivocation confused the public. A Grand Rapids, Michigan judge mandated school desegregation remedies which, in nearby Kalamazoo, another judge declared unconstitutional; the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed both judgments (*Oliver v. Kalamazoo Board of Education*).¹¹ Acting without supportive statistics in 1982, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals overturned a district court judge who ruled that desegregation only marginally enhanced black learning profiles and declared that desegregation does much more and “raises the level of black achievements.” Elsewhere, a Virginia district court heard conflicting expert testimony concerning desegregatory effects and elected not to “balance the experts.”

Humiliated by errant rulings predicated on non-demonstrable achievement benefits, some judges blamed the messenger, not their own gullibility. Early in the desegregation controversy and in *Hobson v. Hansen* (1967), Judge J. Skelly Wright declared, "...Racially and socially homogenous schools damage the minds and spirits of all children...the Scholastic achievement of the disadvantaged Negro and white is strongly related to the racial and socioeconomic customs of the student body...a racially and socially integrated school environment increases the scholastic achievement of the disadvantaged student of whatever race..."¹² Approximately a decade later, a wiser Judge Wright did a turnaround and declared "a plague on the house of social science." Other judges have sought refuge in disputing the high court's *Brown* determination. Judge William E. Doyle dismissed the value of social science evidence presented at *Brown*. Desegregatory rulings, he said, "...are founded not on social science evidence but on much more fundamental precepts—moral, organizational, positive law and reason."¹³

Troubled by mounting public doubts concerning desegregatory rulings, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court Warren Burger declared "[T]he American people are nearing an end of the patience with the American machinery of justice."¹⁴ Subsequently other Supreme Court justices wrestled with the embarrassing precedent established in *Brown*. On January 21, 1980, the Supreme Court returned a Dallas school desegregation case to a lower federal court. Three justices—William Rehnquist, Potter Stewart, and Lewis Powell—cited evidence that busing caused white flight, resegregated schools, hurt the quality of education, and declared "...the case presents a long needed opportunity to examine the considerations relevant to framing a remedy in a desegregation suit."

Sensitive to rising public discontent over counterproductive desegregation mandates as reflected in voter refusal to pay increased taxes for schools, some judges have cited illusionary desegregatory gains as the basis for discontinuing school desegregation. Thus in Kansas City, Missouri, U.S. District Judge Dean Whipple ended twenty-six years of *de facto* busing by declaring that the school district had reduced the black-white achievement gap sufficiently, but not entirely, and thus had "complied with the Constitution."¹⁵ However, analysis of available Kansas City school data fails to reveal evidence of desegregatory academic benefits.¹⁶

DESEGREGATORY EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS: EFFORTS TO SUSTAIN THE MYTH

In the decades after *Brown*, pillars of the educational establishment researchers, professional journals, school authorities, and state and federal agencies—deluged the public with reports of desegregatory academic gains. Leaders within academia issued overt and covert threats to those who questioned the value of busing children from their homes and destroying neighborhood schools.¹⁷ But parents and teachers, the presumed beneficiaries

of forced busing, saw things differently. Many reported that, regardless of race, school desegregation harmfully impacted students, families, schools, and communities.

In the mid-1960s, realizing public disenchantment with mandated school desegregation, U.S. Commissioner of Education Frank Keppel authorized a nationwide survey under the direction of James Coleman.¹⁸ The Coleman Report's initial summary struck Washington like a thunderbolt. Student learning, Coleman concluded, was more dependent on family than on race or schooling issues. Federal officials "reinterpreted" the report, which soon went out of print. Under pressure from critics, Coleman recanted and declared that desegregation enhanced minority achievement. Then, responding to irrefutable data-based assessments, Coleman admitted that busing does not work, and averred that social science data are simply tools that can be used for whatever political purposes one wishes.¹⁹

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION (NIE) STUDY

Following the election of Ronald Reagan, which mirrored deep public concern over disruptive desegregatory initiatives, appointees of the NIE, research arm of the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), asked the author (Ralph Scott) to organize and monitor an investigation to determine "once and for all" whether black children academically benefited from desegregation.²⁰ Assisted by NIE staff, primarily by Dr. Jeff Schneider, Scott selected as panel members seven of the nation's most prestigious researchers in the domain of school integration. To avoid charges of bias, panelists of different persuasions were selected. Initially the panel selected one hundred fifty-seven of the most influential studies on desegregatory achievement effects. Following several sessions, the panel concurred that only nineteen of the studies met even minimal validity standards.

Researcher bias was apparent throughout panel discussions. Agreement on the nineteen case studies was reached only because Scott and Schneider insisted on focusing *exclusively* on data. Significantly, Cooper's post-study appraisal revealed that NIE panelists were less cognitively malleable than graduate students.²¹ He interpreted this as evidence that cognitive schemas of academia are well established and resistive to integration of contradictory new information. After intensive assessment of the "best studies," the panel concluded that not one of the nineteen demonstrated long-term desegregatory achievement benefits. Several panelists long committed to forced busing introduced their own studies, which most panelists considered seriously flawed.

Charged with presenting NIE findings before the National Press Club, Scott encountered protests by USDE and NIE officials. Such information, they averred, would reduce public confidence in school desegregation. Scott replied that if desegregation failed to produce benefits, disrupted schools and family

life, and was opposed by parents of all ethnic groups, then perhaps it should be jettisoned and more promising interventions formulated. Soon thereafter Scott was terminated and funds for his authorship of the study were “reassigned to the NIE Director.”²² Eventually the NIE reported that academic performance of African -American students rises in desegregated schools. Within six months the USDE launched a fresh undertaking: assessing the academic benefits of school desegregation.²³

NATIONAL INITIATIVES

Following revisions of NIE findings, federal officials formulated President Reagan’s *A Nation at Risk*.²⁴ Consistent with the desegregation rationale, this educational reform increased within-school resources: A central objective was to close the ethnic achievement gap. Results proved discouraging. When *A Nation at Risk* was initiated, international comparisons of student achievement showed that on nineteen academic tests, American students were last on seven measures and never first or second in comparison with other nations. By 1998 international comparisons revealed that Americans fared still worse: American twelfth graders ranked nineteenth out of twenty-one nations in math and seventeenth out of twenty-one in science. Further, the literacy level of young adults ages fifteen to twenty-one dropped more than eleven points from 1984 to 1992. Following acknowledgement that *A Nation at Risk* had failed, USOE, the predecessor of the U.S. Department of Education, officials launched another initiative, Title I. Again the focus was on within-school variables. Title I provided \$7.5 billion each year to help twenty percent of the pupils in the nation’s public schools; over the decades, as of 1999, the federal government expended \$118 billion on Title I efforts to narrow the black-white achievement gap. Achievement levels of poor and minority students failed to close.²⁵ Maris A. Vinovskis, a University of Michigan education expert who reviewed independent studies assessing the effectiveness of Title I, commented, “The real losers in this are not just taxpayers but the kids... We haven’t been able to deliver.” Results of subsequent federal initiatives demonstrate that interventions focusing on what transpires within schools consistently fail to close the achievement gap.²⁶

Guided by President Bush’s program “No Child Left Behind,” American schools continue to ignore biophysical and ecological influences on student growth and development. As with other federal undertakings, harsh and unpleasant truths are sometimes cleverly concealed, and the foundations of “No Child Left Behind” have already begun to crumble. After having been awarded “exemplary” status, the progress achieved at Houston’s Austin High School, the touted exemplar of “the Texas educational miracle” used by the Bush administration as a national model, is a proven sham.²⁷ A Houston school board member has called the Bush administration’s dropout statistics “baloney.” Statistical analysis revealed that the black-white differential failed

to narrow, despite generous fiscal and human-resources allocations. Referring to alleged benefits of reforms at Austin High School, Linda McNeil, a professor of education at Houston's Rice University, comments, "[I]t's all phony; it's just like Enron [the defunct Texas centered energy services company that raised its stock price by covering up losses: Enron was concerned about appearances, not real economic results]. That pretty much describes what we [educational policy makers] have been doing to our children in Houston."

SPLIT VISION: BUSING AS PERCEIVED BY SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND PARENTS

As busing progressed, perceptual differences of academicians and parents have increasingly bifurcated. On the one hand civil rights organizations urge increased funding for desegregatory efforts.²⁸ In this they are supported by scholars who claim de facto school desegregatory academic benefits.²⁹ Currently, parents and an increasing proportion of black scholars see things differently.

After several decades of de facto desegregation, Tony Brown, executive producer of *The Black Journal*, concluded "[T]here is a significant but silent black majority view of busing that is virtually never heard. Because black leaders are the only members of the black community who get media exposure, the public hears only their perceptions of busing for integration purposes, and black leaders are overwhelmingly in favor of busing."³⁰ Columnist William Raspberry and others have also contrasted desegregatory support of scholars and civil rights groups with parental opposition.³¹ In his best selling-book *Losing the Race: Self Sabotage in Black America*, John McWhorter, a black professor of linguistics at Berkeley, identifies forced busing as the most damaging intervention ever foisted upon African Americans.³² On a broader level, a 2003 poll by the nonprofit organization, Public Agenda, found that eighty-two percent of African-American parents favored efforts to promote quality education: Only eight percent wanted an educational focus on diversity and integration.³³ In some quarters within minority communities, emphasis has shifted from a virtually exclusive focus on education to examination of self-abusive lifestyles which occur disproportionately in black families.³⁴

POST-BROWN RULINGS: IGNORING FACTS, PERPETUATING EDUCATION UNPRODUCTIVITY

Despite virtually five decades of discouraging research on desegregatory achievement effects, and constrained by the *Brown* conclusion that schools alone explain ethnic differences, courts continue (as recently as 2000) to order forcible busing of children from neighborhood schools in districts as diverse as Duvall County, Florida; St. Lucie County, Florida; Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina; East Baton Rouge, Louisiana; South Bend, Indiana; Seattle,

Washington; Cherry Hill Township, New Jersey; Chicago, Illinois; and Rock Hill, South Carolina. It should be noted that some desegregation plans have been lifted in some areas.

INCIVILITY AND THE INCREASING IRRELEVANCE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Given evidence that researchers have failed to provide courts with authentic information on desegregatory effects, that federal and state agencies continue to finance reforms for which there is no realistic expectation of significant success, and that parents have become progressively disillusioned with desegregation, it is fair to ask: Why does the practice continue? The most credible answer lies in the failure of academia to deal with emotionally charged racial issues. As early as the mid-1970s, Edward Thorne, editor of *The Journal of Clinical Psychology*, noted: "...an increasing number of students are being brainwashed by extremist psychologists who go far beyond anything scientific in their advocacy of political activities."³⁵ In the three decades that have followed Thorne's observations, American academia has become still more politicized. To understand why, it is useful to examine the professional and personal costs individual researchers can anticipate for honestly reporting research findings on ethnic questions.

WILLIAM TUCKER AND THE POLITICS OF RACIAL RESEARCH: ALLEGATIONS AND RESPONSES

Perhaps as much as any one academician, William Tucker has discouraged open dialogue by demonizing those with whom he disagrees. A professor at Rutgers University, Tucker has authored two books dealing with racial topics, under the aegis of the University of Illinois Press.^{36, 37} Tucker primarily targets the tax-exempt Pioneer Fund, whose president has replied to Tucker's charges.³⁸ Additionally, Tucker has lodged ad hominem charges against awardees of the Fund. In so doing, he includes Scott among a number of "obscure [Pioneer Fund] academics lacking any major scientific achievements and notable primarily for their contributions to a string of racist and neo-Nazi causes."³⁹ Given the prevailing climate of academic intimidation, and the societal cost of that intimidation, it is instructive to examine Tucker's allegations and Scott's responses.

ALLEGATION 1: Scott "is a former vice president of the German American National Congress (GANC), an organization that extolled the virtues of the Third Reich."⁴⁰

RESPONSE: First a clarification: Although Tucker has frequently sought to link Pioneer Fund grantees with "neo Nazism," a "German" is not necessarily a "neo-Nazi." Some Germans were and are neo-Nazis and others are not. Moreover, as a former GANC vice president, Scott is unaware of any evidence that GANC "extolled the virtues of the Third Reich." In making this charge

Tucker relies on Bellant,⁴¹ who cites a tertiary source, Wymar.⁴² But Wymar simply describes social and cultural activities conducted within GANC. Moreover, Bellant's co-publishers, Political Research Associates (PRA) and South End Press (SEP), advertise Bellant's writings as "presenting some of the best new research on the seamy side of the Reagan Revolution." Bellant's publishers also claim to meet "...the needs of readers who are exploring or are already committed to the politics of radical social change and aim to discredit 'right wing efforts to limit justice and equality.'" Perhaps recognizing his (1994) mischaracterization of German-Americans, which falls under the rubric of "hate and ethnic propaganda," Tucker makes no mention of GANC in his 2002 text.

ALLEGATION 2: Scott "was once a gubernatorial candidate of the American Party, another 'Far Right' group supported by Willis Carto."⁴³

RESPONSE: The 1970 Iowa gubernatorial candidate of the American Party, Scott has never met or corresponded with Willis Carto, whatever that might mean. Further, the record shows that throughout the (Iowa) campaign no ethnic topics were raised. Focus was placed on four issues: (1) the counterproductivity of forced busing, (2) questions concerning quotas in implementing affirmative action, (3) threats to democracy when political candidates are "bought" through contributions of the very wealthy, and (4) the value of restricting tobacco advertisements aimed at adolescents.

ALLEGATION 3: Scott "scored the professional bias and ideological imbalance of expert witnesses for the plaintiffs in the *Brown* (1954) case, now some thirty years old, and claimed that desegregation had been harmful to blacks"⁴⁴

RESPONSE: Tucker fails to distinguish de jure and de facto desegregation; as noted previously, the former is constitutional, whereas the latter is not. Quite surprisingly, although Tucker praises Kenneth Clark, the key NAACP witness in *Brown*, he describes Clark's research as "of questionable validity" and the social science evidence presented at *Brown* as "flimsy" and presented by social scientists "who desired to align their professions with the forces of freedom."⁴⁵ Tucker also acknowledges that of the various NAACP witnesses offering opinions in *Brown*, only Clark presented any empirical data and, further, that Clark withheld data from which, in Tucker's words "...one could legitimately conclude that integration had produced more damage than segregation had."⁴⁶ Additionally, Tucker characterizes as irrelevant the expert testimony presented in *Brown* since it had nothing to do with the constitutional basis for the decision. Here Tucker is correct: In *Brown*, the Supreme Court should have adhered to constitutional issues. If so, the high court would have enshrined de jure but not de facto desegregation, and neighborhood schools would have remained intact.

Within academia, errors in the *Brown* decision have been sanctified and closed to questioning or the introduction of new research findings. Contrary to the most central premise of academia, Tucker praises Clark's call for

“professional organizations to establish machinery which will prevent social scientists from...offering with equal certainty contradictory testimony.”⁴⁷ Translated, this means that once courts and public institutions have been deliberately misled, expert witnesses should not be held accountable: Unproductive and harmful practices are codified, dissension should be silenced.⁴⁸ The NAACP has taken a similar stance, preferring to leave untouched the transparent flimsiness of expert testimony presented in *Brown*. Urging continued legal precedence based on presumed desegregatory academic benefits, NAACP attorneys avoided a rehearing of scientific evidence in *Stell v. Savannah Chatham City Board of Education*. Here NAACP strategy was clear: Regardless of the effects on children, families, and communities, “let sleeping dogs lie.”

ALLEGATION 4: Scott “received Pioneer Fund grants to hold ‘anti-school integration seminars’ around the country, an activity he conducted under a pseudonym.”⁴⁹ Here Tucker relies on Grace Lichtenstein, *New York Times* journalist. In several articles, Lichtenstein sensationalized the Pioneer Fund-sponsored seminars Scott organized under the themes “constructive alternatives to forced busing.”⁵⁰

RESPONSE: The four public seminars were held in Boston, Denver, Louisville, and Wilmington; indicative of media collusion, the major newspapers of all four cities assigned reporters to convey the impression that the seminars were “anti-integration” and “racist.” However, no reporter provided evidence that they were “anti-school integration.” Symposia participants included representatives of all ethnic groups, school board members, religious and civic leaders, educators, social scientists, attorneys, and elected officials. During her investigation, Lichtenstein never contacted Scott but instead telephoned officials of his employer, the University of Northern Iowa (UNI). Lichtenstein was referred to UNI grant administrator Harold Burris, an NAACP member and forced busing advocate. Burris knew but apparently did not inform Lichtenstein that his office had approved all four symposia. For Burris, each application had spelled out the objectives, named all participants, and discussed how the symposia converged on examining productive alternatives to forced busing.

Lichtenstein’s articles emphasized that the seminars were intended to propagandize and influence legislation. Seeking to expand her story, Lichtenstein interviewed an IRS official and inquired whether the Pioneer Fund’s tax-exempt status was not therefore endangered.⁵¹ Upon learning of this not through Lichtenstein but through local “community leaders,” Scott telephoned IRS officials who had informed Lichtenstein that her concerns were unfounded. Responding to Scott’s questions, the IRS investigator agreed that tax-exempt questions could be raised concerning (1) the University of Illinois, which funded Tucker’s books; (2) The National Institute of Mental Health Program for Training in Research on Institutional Racism at the University of

Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, as directed by Jerry Hirsch; (3) the Institute for the Study of Academic Racism, funded by Ferris State (Michigan) University, directed by Barry Mehler; and (4) foundations underwriting Bellant's attacks on the Reagan administration and "extremists" seeking to promote "right wing" policies.

Tucker and Lichtenstein refer to Scott's use of a pen name in a book, *The Busing Coverup*,⁵² which claimed busing is counterproductive. In this book, Scott used a pen name for one simple reason: In 1975, as now, educators and researchers were punished for questioning the merits of forced busing. Had the book included evidence of racism, Lichtenstein's claim would have carried weight. However, neither Tucker nor Lichtenstein ever faulted the book's contents, which accurately predicted the high societal costs of forced busing or de facto desegregation.

ALLEGATION 5: "Barry Mehler 'discussed the neo-Nazi associations' of some Pioneer Fund grantees and revealed that, ironically, Scott '...had been appointed by the Reagan administration to a state Advisory Commission on Civil Rights of the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights (USCCR).'"⁵³

RESPONSE: Tucker's reliance on Mehler for information reveals a curious linkage of collaborative distortion which has been translated into seemingly responsible social science.⁵⁴ Scott's appointment as Iowa Chair of the USCCR stemmed from President Reagan's commitment to "color blind" USCCR policies. There was a secondary issue: widespread public and administrative concern over faulty USCCR assessments on such issues as affirmative action, racial quotas, and forced busing. The Reagan administration replaced USCCR administrators in an effort to raise credibility of USCCR reports. Following orchestrated media attacks on "conservatives" and white males who had been appointed state chairs, Scott and other state chairs resigned, despite high praise and commendation from the (Reagan appointed) director.⁵⁵

ALLEGATION 6: "Scott threatened a Delaware newspaper with 'legal action' if revelation of his identity jeopardized his \$2 million of federal grants; it turned out he did not have any..."⁵⁶

RESPONSE: Tucker's claim here rests on a series of articles by Peter Leo, a *Wilmington Daily News* reporter, who, like Lichtenstein, made no effort to clarify issues by talking directly with Scott. Scott did ask Leo to clarify facts for his readers, but no "legal action" was contemplated. Moreover, seeking to discredit Wilmington seminar participants, Leo informed his readers that Scott falsely claimed having personally received \$2 million in federal grants for the federal project Home Start.^{57, 58} Finding no evidence that Scott claimed to have personally received any Home Start funds, and assuming that Scott's employer was the recipient, Leo called UNI administrators and, like Lichtenstein, was referred to Harold Burris. Burris informed Leo that Scott "had not received a dime." Leo conveyed this colorful phrase to his readers, adding that university officials were "aghast" at Scott's claims. After reading Leo's report, Scott

unsuccessfully attempted to talk with Burris. However, James Martin, UNI provost, disavowed any claim that he was “aghast” at Scott’s references to his role in the Home Start project.

Eventually Leo learned that the USDE had awarded Home Start funding not to UNI but to the Waterloo Community Schools. Leo telephoned Steven Holbrook, who headed the school district’s research projects. Allied with “community leaders” who favored busing, Holbrook informed Leo that Scott’s involvement in Home Start was “minimal.” Nonetheless, Waterloo School Superintendent George Diestelmeier and members of the Waterloo School Board affirmed that Scott had initiated Home Start, was primarily responsible for preparing grant proposals, served as primary project investigator and trainer of project personnel, and as Home Start representative traveled to over a dozen states to share information concerning the program with other educators, under the auspices of the Home Start Project and the USDE Diffusion Network.

Continuing his investigation, Leo contacted other UNI officials and reported that “Dr. Len Froyen, head of the writer’s university department, said that Scott had frequently claimed credit for grants received by other departments and individuals....” Upon learning of Leo’s published statements, Froyen informed Scott as well as UNI Provost James Martin, Dean Howard Knutson, and Harold Burris. “I emphatically deny having made this statement...his [Leo’s] remarks are a generous bit of conjecture. I made no such statement.”⁵⁹

ALLEGATION 7: Almost all of Scott’s articles pursued the argument that blacks fail to improve under school integration “...because of their genetic shortcomings.”⁶⁰

RESPONSE: Contrary to Tucker’s statement, Scott has published in numerous journals and on a variety of educational and psychological issues. A psychologist, Scott acknowledges little formal training in genetics, and therefore has never attributed the black-white achievement gap to genetic factors. However, he has studied the incidence of adverse prenatal and perinatal influences experienced by children of various races and social classes and concluded that prenatal and perinatal issues, as well as other biophysical factors, explain ethnic academic differentials.

ALLEGATION 8: “With or without busing he [Scott] did not seem to find the thought of Blacks and Whites attending the same school to be a pleasant prospect.”⁶¹

RESPONSE: This statement, sufficiently inflammatory to fan a riot on some campuses, deserves no response.

ALLEGATION 9: “Scott also reviewed Wilmot Robertson’s *The Dispossessed Majority* for the Liberty Lobby newspaper, recommending the book as a ‘family must’ for its ‘bright clear light’ and ‘richly documented argument,’ especially the author’s description of the ‘noble...attempt to restrain the forces of hate...after World War II’: the *prosecution* (Tucker’s italics) in the trials of Nazi war criminals,” and “defended the rights of George Lincoln Rockwell, American Nazi Party founder.”⁶²

RESPONSE: As Tucker surely knows, no review endorses all ideas expressed in either a controversial or noncontroversial book. The purpose is to highlight main ideas, synthesize, and summarize. Further, Tucker either did not read the review in question or ignored the content.⁶³ Published sometime during the 1970s, the review includes the statement "...the aim [of the book] is not to build a case for any super race but to appreciate that from which we came." Throughout, the review focused on two central issues: the value of individuals of all races of appreciating their heritage, and the divisive impact of quotas and affirmative action.

Tucker's reference to Scott's objection to the Nuremberg trials is perplexing. Others who opposed those trials include President John F. Kennedy, U.S. Senator Robert Taft, Harlan Fiske Stone, and U.S. Supreme Justice William O. Douglas.⁶⁴ Further, and separately, Scott did not *defend* Rockwell's position but argued that it was academically feasible for Rockwell to speak at a student forum as part of the "Controversial Speakers Program." Of the numerous speakers who presented papers on a wide variety of topics, some would have drawn Tucker's high praise.

ALLEGATION 10: Scott has made "...the absurd charge that Kenneth B. Clark, the respected psychologist who had testified for plaintiffs in *Brown*, had urged the use of 'drugs and the electrical stimulation of certain brain areas' to alter the thinking of any researchers opposed to his social objectives and that the American Psychological Association (APA) supported this proposal..."⁶⁵

RESPONSE: First, an observation: Although Tucker acknowledges that Clark knowingly provided the Supreme Court with false information, he describes Clark as "respected." Further, Scott did not claim that APA formally and as an organization approved Clark's proposal. Rather, he stated that "APA publications approvingly published letters supporting implementation of psychotechnology for erring educational researchers." In fact, the *American Psychologist*, official publication of the APA, not only published such letters but featured Clark's entire proposal.⁶⁶

In his 1971 APA presidential address, Clark refers to his role in *Brown* (1954) as "...motivated by a desire to influence the decisions of those with power to facilitate, block or determine the rate of desired social change." Clark describes his efforts to advance "remedies for the persistent social insensitivities and resulting pathologies which robbed human beings of self-esteem, reinforced negative self-images and destroyed the changes of personal and social effectiveness..." Subsequently, Clark refers to "the controlling and inhibiting fact that those human beings with power are deeply unwilling or unable to share even a modicum of real power with those who have been powerless" [and]..."reflect the inability of the decision makers and the society as a whole to change the set of perceiving and treating the poor and dark skin minorities as justifiably rejected inferior human beings."

Moving into treatment, Clark asserts that "...man can no longer afford the luxuries of a leisurely trial and error, trivia dominated approach to the behavioral sciences...the redirecting of power away from the absurd, the self-defeating can be and now must be seen as a responsibility and goal of science and psychotechnology... Already there are many provocative and suggestive findings from neurophysiological, biochemical, psychopharmacological and psychological research. The work on the effect of direct stimulation on certain areas of the brain suggest that we might be on the threshold of that type of scientific biochemical intervention which could stabilize and make dominant the moral and ethical propensities of man and subordinates, if not eliminate, his negative and primitive behavioral tendencies."

Continuing, Clark states, "It is a fact that a few men in leadership positions in the industrialized nations of the world now have the power to determine among themselves...the survival or extinction of human civilization...such controlling leaders should be willing to...accept and use the earliest forms of psychotechnological, biochemical interventions which would assure their positive use of power and reduce or block the possibility of their using power destructively." Clark also charges social scientists who disagree with him on racial issues as "...indistinguishable from active agents of injustice and with infecting children with hostility." The work of such scientists, Clark avers, "...must be monitored scrupulously" in matters involving social policies. Such statements, coming from the president of the APA, cast a chilling effect on any researcher aspiring to gain tenure and promotion within contemporary academia.⁶⁷

ALLEGATION 11: "In 1998, ...Scott was still attempting to organize a debate at professional conferences over the validity of the *Brown* evidence."⁶⁸

RESPONSE: In 1998, given the damaging societal effects of mandated school desegregation, Scott once invited Tucker to debate, at a professional conference of his choice, whether Scott's research is characterized by prevarication, racism, neo-Nazism, white supremacism, and indifference to the poor and minority. Tucker declined. Instead of openly defending allegations, and again supported by a tax-supported university press, Tucker preferred to write a second treatise on "racism" and "racists" within academia.

BROWN: THE CONTINUING LEGACY

Virtually five decades after *Brown*, those who control the educational establishment continue to formulate and implement schooling interventions designed to narrow or even close the black-white achievement gap. Those efforts remain fixated on environmental and within-school variables; ecological and biophysical variables are ignored. Along a wide educational spectrum and at whatever cost, racial balance is to be maintained between and within schools. Federal officials threaten school districts with discontinuance of funds if proportions of student suspensions are not "at parity."⁶⁹

Mainstreaming or inclusion, requiring the placement of students in classrooms regardless of experiences or academic competencies to assure racial balance, has become prioritized and a measure of assuring within-school racial balance, as in special classes for mentally retarded and gifted students. Disregarding decades of research findings, scholars argue that black high school graduates, typically three grade levels below their white counterparts academically, can succeed if preferentially placed in colleges and universities.⁷⁰ All this is done without regard to diversity of students' intellectual and academic skills and needs. Troublingly, intimidation within academia virtually prohibits forthright dialogue: Fear has transplanted reason as the primary propellant in the formulation of educational planning for many of the nation's most vulnerable students and their families.

CIVILITY AND RATIONAL DISCOURSE: QUO VADIS, CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCE?

In an age when the public expects objectivity and civil debate within colleges and universities, Tucker's writings testify to the spirit which prevailed in academia at the time of *Brown* and progressively intensifies. Researchers fear "saying it as it is," and, as Jencks and Phillips declare, "have chosen safer topics and hoped this problem [the black-white achievement gap] would go away. It didn't."⁷¹

How then to formulate and implement authentically productive educational reforms? Derek Bok, professor and president emeritus of Harvard University, has advanced a proposal: "To begin with, universities can encourage more research to discover the causes of the minority achievement gap."⁷² Now, virtually fifty years after *Brown*, can such research truly *begin*?

*Ralph Scott is the author of **Education and Ethnicity: The U.S. Experiment in School Integration** (1987) and **The Busing Coverup** (1976).*

ENDNOTES

1. Toynbee, A. (1972). *A Study of History* (New York: Oxford University Press); Kennedy, P. (1987). *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (New York: Random House); Frum, D. (1999). *How We Got There* (New York: Basic Books).
2. *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
3. Vernon, P. (1969). *Intelligence and Cultural Environment* (London: Methuen).
4. Masling, J. (2002). Speak, memory or goodbye Columbus. *Journal of Personality* 78(1), 7.

5. Mitchell, J.V. (1970). On the perils of conducting socially and significant research. *Phi Delta Kappan* 52(3), 182–184; Green, P. (1971). *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 395, 13–27; Stroufe, G.E. (1997). Improving the ‘awful’ reputation of educational research. *Educational Research*, 26(7) (October), 26–28; Pollock, M. (2001). How the questions we ask about race in education are the very questions we most repress. *Educational Researcher* 30(9), 2–12; Begley, S. (2002). Now, science panelists are picked for ideology rather than expertise. *Wall Street Journal*, December 6, B1.

6. Paradoxically, greater civility prevails in the political arena than in presumably reasoned academia. Thus while scholars commonly employ inflammatory and mean-spirited terms such as “racist,” “neo-Nazi,” and “oppressors of the poor and minority,” such characterizations rarely occur in even heated political campaigns; when they do occur, repercussions follow. In 2003 the European Union formally rebuked Italian Premier Silvio Berlusconi for insulting a German deputy of the European parliament by suggesting he should star as a Nazi concentration camp guard in a movie. Subsequently, German Chancellor Schröder refused to travel to Venice for his vacation. Separately, House Majority Leader Tom DeLay termed Senator Edward Kennedy’s criticism of President Bush and the Iraq War “a form of hate speech.” Such instances of politicians paying a price for ad hominem attacks are relatively common. While stopping in Iowa, Democratic presidential candidate Howard Dean claimed to be “the only white politician who ever talks about race in front of white audiences.” Charged with racism and fueling racial discussion, he apologized. In California a high political price was paid by those who, in 2003, dubbed California gubernatorial candidate Arnold Schwarzenegger a “neo-Nazi.”

7. Simplifying complex issues and embracing testimony of NAACP witnesses, the high court ruled that segregated schooling generated a feeling of inferiority with subsequent academic and social harm. This finding, said the Court, was amply supported by “modern authority.” Kluger, R. (1976). *Simple Justice* (New York: Knopf), 704.

8. *Ibid.*, 320, 353.

9. *Ibid.*, 353.

10. *Ibid.*, 575.

11. Wilkin, J. Harvie III. (1979). *From Brown to Bakke: The Supreme Court and Integration: 1954-1978* (New York: Oxford University Press). Also, U.S. District Judge Carr initially ordered a four-year delay in implementing literacy tests in Florida. In so doing, Carr concurred with an NAACP complaint that literacy tests would deny a disproportionate number of minority students their high school certificates and this would be unfair since, to a significant extent, blacks’ lower achievement was attributable to segregated learning (*Wall Street Journal*, December 23, 1980, 14; *Time*, July 30, 1979). After blacks had attended desegregated schools for four years, the ban on literacy tests was lifted: There were no pre- and post-segregation differences in ethnic failure rates. Nationwide, twenty-three years after Carr’s decision, the black-white achievement gap remains at approximately a standard deviation.

Current Supreme Court decisions continue to be based on unrealistic expectations. Thus when casting her decisive vote on affirmative action in the 2003 University of Michigan case, U.S. Supreme Court Justice O’Connor concluded her opinion in terms ominously similar to those of Judge Carr: “We expected that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest approved today.”

12. *Hobson vs. Hansen*, 269 F. Supp 401 (1967) at 406, 407.

13. Doyle, W.E. (1977). Social science evidence in court cases. *Educational Forum* 41 (March), 263–270. See also Doyle, W. D. in Ray C. Rist and R. J. Anton (eds). (1977). *Education, social science and the judicial process* (New York: Columbia Teachers College Press), 11–17. The unconstitutionality of forced busing is comprehensively examined in Roberts, P. C. & Stratton, L. (1997). *The New Color Line: How Quotas and Privilege Destroy Democracy* (Washington, DC: Regnery).

14. Stein, D. (1974). *Judging the Judges: The Cause, Control and Cure of Judicial Jaundice* (Hicksville, NY: Exposition Press).

15. Hollingsworth, H. (2003). Judge closes Missouri school desegregation case. *Kansas City Star*, September 6.

16. Judge Whipple's 2003 ruling was largely based on presumed desegregatory achievement benefits. A 1997 order of U.S. District Judge Russell G. Clark, who supervised the Kansas City (KC) case before it was transferred to Judge Whipple, required the district to reduce the test score differential of black and white students by thirteen percent in reading and math. Presenting dubious statistics, the court was informed that race explains from four to nine percent of the variation in KC student test scores. Low teacher expectations *presumably* (author's italics) added an additional two to four percent of the explained variation (Michael Podgursky. [2003]. Black-White Achievement Gaps in Kansas City, Missouri School District). Using the combined high-end estimates of thirteen percent (rather than low-end estimates of six percent), thirteen percent of the racial variation was attributed to the initial gap and thirteen percent of the increase was seen as due to prior discrimination. Even those questionable estimates reveal that the variance in ethnic learning profiles is predominantly linked to factors *beyond* the reach of schools and teachers.

There are other problems in the court's ruling, which claimed that black children entered the KC school district ten Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) behind their white cohorts and that by tenth grade the ethnic gap had widened to twenty NCEs. These figures are inconsistent with national trends. A differential of ten NCEs indicates that the average standard score of KC entering black students was ninety-three, which is at the 32nd percentile. However the court noted that in tenth grade the KC black mean standard score was eighty-five, which is at the 16th percentile. Allowing for national interschool differences, comparable figures for black students entering schools are eighty-five and 16th percentile, far below figures stated for entering KC students.

If scores of entering KC students are unusually high, and if their scores later settle into a national pattern of one standard deviation in black-white differences, then there indeed is reason to believe that schools may adversely affect African-American learning. But were the scores of entering KC blacks unusually elevated? In an effort to answer that question, Scott contacted the KC district legal consultant, Kathy Walter-Mack, the defendant's attorney Arthur Benson, and the Riverside Publishing Company, which publishes the tests employed by KC schools. Not one of the three could explain the apparent discrepancies or supply raw data. Further, the Riverside Publishing Company representative volunteered that only KC school officials could provide the requested information. Other questions persist: Judge Whipple's assumptions failed to consider the impact of the demise from the KC district of low-performing blacks and loss to the KC district of high performing whites to charter schools, which to an undeterminable extent reduced the ethnic differential.

17. Blankenburg, R. (1969). A racist proposal. *Phi Delta Kappan* 50(5), January, cover. Separately and representative of the mood within the educational establishment during the early years of school desegregation, an article in an influential educational journal

declared that “Federal judges are not impulsive or uninformed men as some publications are implying these days. All of their rulings in school integration have come about only after long and thoughtful deliberation, consultation with experts and review of all relevant evidence. And the overwhelming weight of evidence and expert advice points to the permanently damaging effects of segregated schooling on minority children” [Cooper, Charles R. (1971). An educator looks at busing. *National Elementary Principal* 95 (April 29). During this era, official publications of all major professional organizations—the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the National Association of Social Workers—published a plethora of now discredited research studies proclaiming desegregatory achievement benefits. Further, and literally speaking in one voice, officials of these organizations issued financial threats and demanded from city leaders evidence of aggressive school desegregation before selecting convention sites.

18. Coleman, J.S. et al. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office); Rainwater, L. and Yancy, C.W. (1967). *The Coleman Report and the Politics of Controversy* (Cambridge: MIT Press).

19. Arnold, M.R. (1975). Scholar who inspired it says “Busing backfired.” *National Observer*, June 7.

20. Scott, R. “Synopsis of the 1982-83 *National Institute of Education Study into the Relationship between Desegregation and Black Learning*.” Unpublished manuscript: Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa.

21. Cooper, H.M. (1990). On the social psychology of using research reviews. In K.W. Wachter and M.I. Staf (eds.). *The Future of Meta-Analysis* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation), 75–87.

22. Scott, Ralph (2003). Five decades of Federal initiatives concerning school desegregatory effects: What have we learned? *Mankind Quarterly* 28(2) (Summer), 177–215.

23. Lindsay, R. (1983). *Announcement of the National Institute of Education Commissioned Paper*. Washington, DC, September.

24. Fifteen years after “A Nation at Risk”: Then and now. Center for Educational Reform, <http://edreform.com/pubs/then&now.htm>. September 7, 2003.

25. Frammolino, R. (1997). U.S. Project fails to close education gap between rich and poor, studies show. *Arkansas Democratic Gazette*, January 17.

26. Recently the College Board reported that over the past decade, a period marked by extensive mandated desegregation, the black mean SAT scores fell from 153 to 187 below the national average in reading and from 163 to 206 points in math (*Wall Street Journal*, August 29, 2003, A8). Similar international trends have been reported by the Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In an assessment of academic profiles of students in thirty-two nations, conducted by the OECD’s subsidiary, the Program of International Student Assessment, American students ranked 15th in reading, 19th in math, and 14th in science. Moreover, a breakdown of American statistics produced the following ethnic differences. Reading: White students 2nd, Black students, 29th, and Hispanic students 29th. Math: White students 7th, Black and Hispanic students 30th. Science: White students fourth and Black and Hispanics students 30th. Bracey reports other disconcerting international achievement trends [(2002. Another nation at risk? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(3) [November], 245–247).] Separately, editors of *The*

Journal of Blacks in Higher Education have expressed concern about “the large and growing gap between Black and White students’ scores on the *Scholastic Assessment Test* (SAT) and also on the *American College Testing Programs* (ACT) test for college admission” (*News and Views*, 2003).

27. “Critics say Houston’s educational ‘miracle’ doesn’t add up: System touted by Bush as model for nation may be built on fuzzy math” (*Washington Post* as reported in the *Waterloo/Cedar Falls Courier*, November 9, 2003). Separately, Illinois school officials tossed out 80,000 tests used to determine if schools had met academic standards as enunciated in “No Child Left Behind.” Some school administrators also noted that the new law excludes “mobile” students of whom a high proportion are homeless, immigrant, or poor (Rado, D. “Thousands of exams tossed out by state,” *Chicago Tribune*, December 28, 2002, 1). Ironically, the primary architect of “No Child Left Behind,” Katie Haycock, who directs the Washington-based Education Trust, was partly motivated by her Hispanic background to create the “No Child Left Behind” rationale, which emphasizes closing the achievement gap of poor, mobile, and minority children (Boser, U. “No Child Left Behind.” *U.S. News and World Reports*, December 29, 2003, 62).

28. In early 2003 the Children’s Defense Fund issued a “Call for Action,” asserting that the persistent failure of schools to provide equality of opportunity for all students is having a devastating effect on communities of color and the future of our nation (ERIC – ED41909, 1998-04-00; Leadership Conference on Civil Rights 2003). Moreover, the Civil Rights Coalition for the 21st century has issued a similar petition (<http://civilrights.org.research/civilrights101index.html>). Here again the central theme is that schools alone, with heavy cash outlays and ignoring biophysical and ecological forces, can significantly reduce if not eliminate racial achievement differentials.

29. Scott (2003), op cit.

30. Brown, T. (1977). Does busing work? WNET-TV, New York, March 13.

31. Scott (2003), op. cit.; Raspberry, W. “Involving black parents: Affirmative action is insufficient.” *Springfield (Illinois) Register*, January 4, 2004.

32. McWhorter, J. (2000). *Losing the Race: Self Sabotage in Black America* (New York: Free Press).

33. Henninger, D. (2003). Doing the numbers on public schools adds up to zero. *Wall Street Journal*, A14.

34. Raspberry (2004), op. cit. Furthermore, Jonathan Narcisse, director of the State Black Iowa Initiative, has outlined ten central findings from statewide hearings focusing on the health of black Iowans. Among his conclusions: Although racism remains a major contributor to the poor health conditions of African Americans, lifestyle is the primary enemy of the health of African Americans. Narcisse emphasized that black Iowans must help themselves and accept responsibility for disparities in such dimensions as mental health, spiritual health, and promiscuity (*Waterloo/Cedar Falls Courier*, November 26, 2003, B1). Self-examination among African Americans, and more generally within minority communities, offers authentic hope for many minority children. Thus, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services data reported sharp declines nationally from 1970 to 1996 in the proportion of two parent families and significant increases in percentages of unwed mothers and abused children. The changes and conditions were more dramatic in African-American, Hispanic, and Native American populations.

35. Thorne, F.C. (1974). The conflicting missions of psychology. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* XXX (3), July, 428.

36. Tucker, William H. (1994). *The Science and Politics of Racial Research* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press). In his writings, Tucker relies heavily on works of Jerry Hirsch and Barry Mehler. Hirsch formerly co-directed of the National Institute of Mental Health Program for Training in Research on Institutional Racism at the University of Illinois; Mehler is founder and Executive Director of the Institute for the Study of Academic Racism at Michigan's Ferris State University. Both scholars have issued ad hominem critiques of Pioneer Fund awardees.

37. Tucker, William H. (2002). *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press).

38. Weyher, Harry F. (1998). Contributions to the history of psychology, intelligence, behavior genetics and the Pioneer Fund. *Psychological Reports* 82, 1347–1374. Dubbed a “neo-Nazi” by Tucker, Weyher parachuted behind Axis lines in World War II and provided military logistics to Eisenhower's invading forces.

39. Tucker (2002), op. cit., 210.

40. Tucker (1994), op. cit., 260.

41. Bellant, R. (1986, revised 1988). *Old Nazis, the New Right and the Reagan Administration*. In books published by Political Research Associates (PRA) and South End Press (SEP), Bellant acknowledges the assistance of Barry Mehler. Founded in 1981 as Midwest Research, officials of PRA describe their press as “a widely respected leader in research and publications on right wing efforts to limit justice and equality.” Director Kate Cloud (2002, PR web.<http://www.prweb.com/releases/2001/10/prweb28960.php>, October 11) emphasizes PRA's “...history of alerting the progressive movement to dangerous right wing initiatives” and “as a resource for activists, journalists, educators, policy makers, and the general public.” Separately and on September 5, 2002, the PRA website referred to the organization's emphasis on providing policy makers and the general public with information concerning “oppressive movements, institutions and trends.” PRA publications also note that the organization is a political organization and therefore need not disclose names of its contributors. Working within the context of PRA goals, and without evidence, Bellant first describes a book Scott reviewed as “a white-supremacist discourse” (1988, p.46). In a largely duplicative and revised book, and without evidence, Bellant calls Scott a “white supremacist” and avers that members of GANC are “Nazi apologists” (Bellant, 1991).

42. Wymar, Lubomyr. (1975). *Encyclopedic Directory of Ethnic Organizations in the United States* (Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited), 150. In claiming that GANC is a “neo-nazi” organization, Tucker relies on Wymar, who simply states “...GANC is an organization which aims to unite all German Americans to maintain German culture and customs, to educate members in American citizenship and nonpartisan politics and to foster friendship between the United States and Germany. The local branches have many sports centers and youth groups as well as German language and culture classes for children from kindergarten through high school age.”

43. Tucker (1994), op. cit., 260.

44. Ibid.

45. Tucker (1994), op. cit., 144.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid, 147.

48. Unrepentant for deliberately providing misinformation to the courts, Clark continues to be held in high regard within American academia. In his 1998 presidential address before the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Banks averred that Clark "...epitomizes the role of the socially responsible scholar in a democratic pluralistic society...he consistently opposed institutionalized structures that promote racism and inequity and constructed scholarship that challenged existing knowledge systems and paradigms...because education is a moral endeavor, educational researchers should be scientists as well as citizens committed to democratic ideals" [Banks, J.A., 1998. Presidential Address: American Educational Research Association. The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher* 7 (October), 4–17]. See also Ludy, Benjamin, and Crouse (2002). The American Psychological Association's response to *Brown v. Board of Education: The case of Kenneth B. Clark*. *The American Psychologist* 57(1), 37–50. Also, Keppel, Ben (2002). Kenneth B. Clark in the patterns of America culture. *The American Psychologist* 57(1), 29–37.

49. Tucker (1994), op. cit., 260; Tucker (2002), op. cit., 2.

50. Lichtenstein, G. (1977). Fund backs controversial study of racial betterment. *New York Times*, December 11, 1976. Articles such as those by Lichtenstein create sensations on contemporary university campuses, discourage research on racial issues, and are frequently designed not to inform but to indoctrinate. Addressing what he terms this "problem," Poniewozik (2003) acknowledges that "many big-media journalists...are distant from their audiences and more responsive to urban elites, powerful people, and mega corporations—especially the ones they work for" (*Time*, June 1, 90).

Shortly after publication of Lichtenstein's article, Scott received a threatening telephone call which he relayed to campus police. At the same time, several students expressed apprehension about attending Scott's classes inasmuch as a lecturer had declared that Scott "believed that Blacks are biologically inferior." To clarify the matter, Scott arranged a conference with himself, the professor who had given the lecture, a professor representing the university's faculty union, and his (Scott's) department head. The alleging professor volunteered that he had received a call from a national NAACP official, requesting that Scott's classes be monitored. Further, the professor warned of a possible lawsuit inasmuch as Scott was "infringing" on his academic freedom.

51. Tucker (2002), op. cit., 2–3.

52. Scott, Ralph, and Edward P. Langerton (1975). *The Busing Coverup*. Rio, WI: Martin Quam Press.

53. Tucker (1994), op. cit., 260; Tucker, 2002, 3.

54. In his writings Tucker relies heavily on Mehler, some of whose activities have been clandestine, if not illegal. In 1987 and 1988 Scott received several calls from "Ben O'Brien," who claimed to be investigating Pioneer Fund grantees for the *Baltimore Sun*. Scott telephoned *Baltimore Sun* officials who denied ever employing "Ben O'Brien," whom they unsuccessfully sought to identify. Despite O'Brien's mysterious role, Mehler singled out Ben O'Brien "for his assistance in conducting research" (Mehler, op. cit., 1988). About the time "Ben O'Brien" was gathering research for Mehler, *The Northern Iowan*, UNI's flagstaff paper, received an anonymous set of materials, including several of Mehler's articles claiming that Scott was a "racist" and "neo Nazi." Urged by the paper's activist advisor, college reporters searched for spectacular news, but found none. For some of Mehler's other productions, see Mehler, B. (1988). Rightists on the Rights Panel. *Nation*, May 7. 55. Following several sensational articles concerning Scott's research and

activities as USCCR state chair for Iowa, which USCCR officials termed “scurrilous,” editorial staff of the *Des Moines Register* (DMS) refused to print Scott’s response inasmuch as he is “a public figure and is therefore unentitled to have a published defense.” Subsequently, the USCCR dispatched two attorneys to confer with the *DMR*’s chief executive officer; ultimately an entire editorial page consisted of support. In one letter, a USCCR director wrote, “Dr. Scott’s greatest ‘sin’ appears to be that he stands against much of what the civil rights movement stands for. In this case, it means that Dr. Scott vigorously opposed race based forced busing and has therefore earned the ire of those who favor race conscious remedies and who consider themselves monopoly landlords of civil rights policy... what I find most disturbing is that your reporter knew (these various facts) and excluded them from the story. He also admitted to me that nowhere in any of Scott’s writings had he seen anything which would lead one to believe Scott was racist. Unfortunately it is the norm rather than the exception among today’s civil rights lobbyists to discount as racists all who dare even to document the detrimental effect of twenty years of race based remedies. The future of civil rights and therefore of our country, requires debate on the serious questions Scott has raised in his career, not vitriolic attack and innuendo...”

56. Tucker (2002), op. cit., 176.

57. Leo, P. (1976). Author calls busing idea blatant error. *Wilmington Morning News*, June 8; Busing opponent spreads the word. *Wilmington Evening Journal*, June 8; Name revealed, cover blown for ‘Busing Coverup’ author. *Wilmington Evening Journal*, June 14; Antibusing author returns to defend claim on grants. *Wilmington Morning News*, June 15.

58. Home Start, the program for which Leo questioned funding, was based on very different theories than Head Start of the 1960s and 1970s, which provided enrichment in learning centers and then returned children to their homes. Home Start reversed the process: educators came into the homes of socioeconomically disadvantaged minority and majority children and sought to enable parents to become more effective teachers of their own children. Attention was given to biophysical and home-based issues. For nearly a decade and with Scott as primary investigator, Home Start was funded at the local, state, and federal levels and received various awards. Total project expenditures exceeded \$2 million. Supported by Title III ESEA for six years (1968–1974), Home Start was selected as the Iowa Project in 1970 by President Nixon’s National Advisory Council on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services and was also cited as the ESEA 1971 model for accountability for the State of Iowa. In 1972, Home Start was designated by the President’s Council as one of eleven national projects of the Center for Educational Communication and served as a model for school districts seeking to implement innovative activities. Honored as one of the two national models in 1972, Home Start was affiliated with the USOE’s National Diffusion Network; representing Home Start, Scott directed miniworkshops in over twenty states. Publicity associated with Leo’s newspaper articles angered pro-busing “community activists” who lodged protests with the Waterloo School Board. Scott was terminated and the school district discontinued Home Start, refusing to accept further state and federal funding.

59. Froyen, L. (1976). Personal communication, June 25.

60. Tucker (2002), op. cit., 176.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid.

63. Scott, R. (1976). It’s so controversial, newspapers refuse ads. *National Spotlight*, March 8.

64. Tucker's reference to Scott's opposition to the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials is comprehensible only when cast in the perspective of Tucker's race-based efforts to discredit Pioneer Fund grantees. President John F. Kennedy was among those who considered the Nuremberg trials inconsistent with American principles. In praising the late Senator Robert A. Taft, President Kennedy (1956. *Profiles in Courage* [New York: McMillan], 211–234) averred that Taft's "greatest tragedy was his failure to become president but therein was Taft's national greatness." Kennedy notes that for Taft to speak out in opposition to the Nuremberg trials "would prove politically costly and clearly futile. But Bob Taft spoke out, after which his prospects for ascending to the Presidency of the United States precipitously declined." On October 6, 1946, at Ohio's Kenyon College, Taft deplored the death sentences of Nazi leaders which he claimed "violate the fundamental principles of American law that a man cannot be tried under an *ex post facto* statute." Taft concluded "...the handling of the eleven men convicted will be a blot on the American record which we shall long regret...We cannot teach them (Germans) government by suppressing liberty and justice. As I see it, the English speaking peoples have one great responsibility—that is to retake to the minds of men a devotion to equal justice under law." In a similar vein, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas wrote "...by our standards...Goering et al. deserved severe punishment. But their guilt did not justify substituting power for principle" (Kennedy, 1956, op. cit. 216). Mason [1953, Extra judicial work for judges: Chief Justice Stone. *Harvard Law Review* 67(2), 193-214] notes that following President Truman's 1945 designation of Robert H. Jackson as American prosecutor at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials, Harlan F. Stone, chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, went out of his way to express his dislike of the entire (Nuremberg) proceedings by refusing to swear Jackson in. "I did not wish," Stone explained, "to appear, in that remote way to give my blessing or that of the court on the proposed Nuremberg trials." Mason concluded that to Stone the proceedings "in which the victors act as prosecutor, judge and jury seemed more a Carthaginian vengeance than appeal to the processes of the law." "I hold no brief for the Nazis," said Stone, "but I am deeply concerned lest we become Nazified" (Stone, H.F., 1945, personal correspondence to Sir Arthur and Lady Salter, June 23). On December 4, 1945, Stone remarked, "Jackson is always conducting his high grade lynching party in Nuremberg. I don't mind what he [Jackson] does to the Nazis, but I hate to see the pretense that he is running a court and proceedings according to Common Law. This is a little too sanctimonious, a fad to meet my old fashioned ideas" (Stone, personal communication to Charles Fairman, March 13, 1946).

65. Tucker (2002), op. cit., 176–177.

66. (a) Clark, K.B. (1971). The pathos of power. *The American Psychologist* 26(12), 1047–1057; Clark's peace pill proposal one year later (1971), *American Psychological Association Monitor* 3(9-10), September, 1–6; (b) Clark, K.B. (1973). Social policy, power and social science research. *Harvard Educational Reviews* 43(19), 113–121; (c) Clark, K.B. (1992). Infecting our children with hostility. In G.W. Albee (ed.). *Improving Children's Lives: Global Perspectives on Prevention*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 330–333.

67. Begley, S. (2002). Now, science panelists are picked for ideology rather than expertise. *Wall Street Journal*, December 6, B1; Begley, S. (2003). White House seeks peer review standard for range of students. *Wall Street Journal*, December 5, B1. Scott (2003) discusses how review processes within academia discourage unfettered research on racial questions.

68. Tucker (2002), op. cit., 176.

69. In the fall of 2000, Safiyyah Muhammad, representing the U.S. Office of Civil Rights, assessed racial issues in Waterloo Community Schools. Identifying a significant disparity between the proportion of African Americans in the school district and of African-American students suspended, Muhammad warned school officials that federal funds would be curtailed unless the numbers are brought into “parity.”

70. Bok, Derek (2003). Closing the nagging gap in minority achievement. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 24, B20.

71. Jencks, C., & Phillips, M. (1998). *The Black White Test Score Gap* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press); Bok (2003), op. cit.

72. Bok, op. cit.

Footnote: A professor at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI), Diplomate of the American Board of Professional Psychology, Fellow of the Society for Personality Assessment, and Medical Consultant for the U.S. Social Service Administration, Ralph Scott was the primary investigator and project director of Home Start, one of two national programs for the U.S. Department of Education during the 1970s. Unlike Head Start, which at the time provided minority and majority children with enrichment activities *outside* the home, Home Start focused on parents as children’s primary teachers. Intervention included consideration of biophysical factors and ecological forces in shaping children’s development. Presenting evidence concerning the complexity of human learning and development, Scott testified on desegregatory issues in local, state, and federal courts, and twice before subcommittees of the United States Senate. Under the Reagan administration, he also served as chair of the desegregation team of the National Institute of Education (NIE), research arm of the U.S. Department of Education (USDE).