

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY, SOCIAL SCIENCE, AND *BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION* 1954–1964

RAYMOND WOLTERS

PART II: THE CONTINUING CONTROVERSY

The segregationists' counterattack on the *Brown* ruling and its historical and social science underpinnings was not limited to courtroom battles. Ever since *Brown* they had also challenged the prevailing public opinion about school desegregation. After *Stell v. Savannah* they redoubled these efforts. Henry E. Garrett and Wesley Critz George often wrote for general audiences, and two especially gifted writers, James J. Kilpatrick and Carleton Putnam, also came to the defense of segregation.

From the moment of the *Brown* decision, Kilpatrick regarded desegregation as "jurisprudence gone mad." He thought the Supreme Court had ignored eight decades of legal precedents and willfully disregarded the original understanding of the Fourteenth Amendment. Since the justices had interpreted the Constitution "to suit their own gauzy concepts of sociology," Kilpatrick recommended that the South use every possible legal means to circumvent desegregation. "Let us pledge ourselves to litigate this thing for fifty years," he wrote. "If one remedial law is ruled invalid, then let us try another; and if the second is ruled invalid, then let us enact a third... If it be said now that the South is flouting the law, let it be said to the high court, *You taught us how.*"¹

In an extraordinary series of editorials published in the *Richmond News Leader* in 1955, Kilpatrick resurrected the Jeffersonian idea of interposition as a way to stop abuses of federal power. When a Federalist Congress passed the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, in apparent disregard of states' rights and of the First Amendment's prohibition of laws that abridged freedom of speech, James Madison and Thomas Jefferson prepared protests known as the Virginia and Kentucky Resolves. If the federal government acted unconstitutionally, Madison and Jefferson asserted, a state had the right to interpose its authority between the federal government and its own citizens. Yet Madison and Jefferson did not have to specify the precise meaning of interposition, for the Alien and Sedition Acts expired on March 3, 1801, the day before Jefferson succeeded John Adams as president of the United States.

It was John C. Calhoun, writing in the 1820s and 1830s, who prescribed how states might resist unconstitutional federal encroachments without withdrawing from the Union. They could "interpose," or suspend, the operation of

a federal law considered unconstitutional, pending resolution of the dispute according to the manner prescribed in Article V of the Constitution. In joining the Union, each state had conceded that the Constitution might be amended by three-fourths of the states. Thus interposition by one state could prevail only if it was sustained by at least one-fourth of the sister states. Individual states possessed the right to set aside laws they considered unconstitutional, Calhoun asserted, but this right was to be checked by the power of three-fourths of the states acting in concert.

Kilpatrick thought the right to interpose could be inferred from the nature of the Constitution and its system of checks and balances. In his view the *Brown* Court, while purporting to interpret the Constitution, had actually amended the charter and in the process had arrogated powers that were reserved to not fewer than three-fourths of the states. According to the logic of Madison, Jefferson, and Calhoun, however, usurpations such as *Brown* could be checked and suspended pending appeal to the people of the states that had joined to form the federal Union.²

In February 1956, Virginia's state legislature adopted an interposition resolution which asserted that, in the absence of an amendment to the Constitution, states retained the authority to operate racially segregated schools, provided such schools were substantially equal. By mid-1957, eight states had formally approved measures of interposition, and three others had protested officially against the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown*.³

Meanwhile, 19 southern senators and 81 members of the House of Representatives challenged the legitimacy of *Brown* with a formal Declaration of Constitutional Principles (popularly known as "the Southern Manifesto"). It described "the unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court" as the substitution of "naked power for established law." It praised states that had "declared the intention to resist forced integration by any lawful means." And it asked people outside the South "to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they too, on issues vital to them, may be the victims of judicial encroachment."⁴

Endorsed by many southern luminaries (including Harry Byrd of Virginia, James F. Byrnes of South Carolina, J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, and Richard B. Russell of Georgia), the Southern Manifesto was "a calculated declaration of political war against [*Brown*]."⁵ It shouted defiance while declaring for law and order. It became a battle cry for massive resistance.⁶

Since Kilpatrick was a journalist steeped in American history, his arguments emphasized states' rights and constitutionalism. He mentioned differences in brain size and IQ, but with touches of uncertainty that befit a writer who did not pretend to be a scientist. He acknowledged that "the question of the Negro's innate inferiority has not been proved and hence is still open." Personally, Kilpatrick "incline[d]" toward the view that Negroes, on average, were innately inferior in intellectual ability, but he refused to assert that he knew

this to be true. He insisted instead that, in terms of the problem immediately at hand, the question of whether the Negro's shortcomings were innate was "irrelevant." If the condition was intrinsic, Kilpatrick saw "nothing but disaster...in risking an accelerated intermingling of blood lines." If it was acquired, blacks still lagged so far behind that most whites were determined not to let their children be "guinea pigs for any man's social experiment." Kilpatrick pointed in particular to practical problems that he thought would beset the schools if integration were implemented at a time when one race, on average, trailed far behind the other in academic achievement.⁷

This did not satisfy the segregationists' most popular writer, Carleton Putnam. Putnam thought that Kilpatrick and some other southerners were mistaken to think "that the Constitution could save [the South] — that states' rights was its best defense." Instead of emphasizing constitutional principles, segregationists should stress the importance of differences in brain size and IQ; and they should warn that interracial mating would increase if students were sent to desegregated schools where they would be taught that racial differences were of no great significance. Putnam said that "instinctive human kindness" had prevented many southern leaders from emphasizing the importance of IQ and the size and structure of the brain, but the NAACP and its allies had left segregationists with "no choice." However much they might regret the necessity of discussing the shortcomings of the Negro, there was "a point at which kindness...ceases to be a virtue."⁸

Putnam was an unlikely recruit to the segregationist cause. He was born in New York, educated at Princeton and Columbia, and descended from the Revolutionary War general Israel Putnam. After making a fortune as a founder and executive of Delta Airlines, he had written a well-regarded biography of Theodore Roosevelt. When the Supreme Court handed down its opinion in *Brown*, Putnam was absorbed with other matters and did not pay much attention to school desegregation. But he kept abreast of the news and over the course of the next few years found the arguments for segregation more cogent than those for integration. After the school desegregation crisis in Little Rock (1957-58) Putnam wrote to President Eisenhower saying that "the law must be obeyed," but *Brown* was wrong, "that it ought to be reversed, and that meanwhile every legal means should be found, not to disobey it, but to avoid it."⁹

President Eisenhower did not respond to Putnam's letter, but Putnam had made the case for segregation with such style and force that, after the letter was published in southern newspapers, a group called the "Putnam Letters Committee" received \$37,000 in contributions to reprint the letter as a paid advertisement in newspapers outside the South.¹⁰ When eight northern newspapers refused the ads, Putnam became convinced that the national press had closed its mind and had established a "paper curtain" to prevent the American people from hearing the truth about race and race relations. To combat this, Putnam published two books, *Race and Reason: A Yankee View* (1961), which sold more

than a hundred thousand copies, and *Race and Reality* (1967). A Northerner by birth and inheritance, Putnam won acclaim in the South. In Mississippi, Governor Ross Barnett designated October 26, 1961, "*Race and Reason Day*," and in Louisiana and Virginia the state boards of education made *Race and Reason* required reading for high school students.¹¹

Putnam argued that there were substantial biological differences between the races and that differences in anatomy, especially brain structure, were "the crux" of America's racial problems.¹² He feared that school integration would lead to "an ever increasing rate of interbreeding" and that this eventually would degrade American civilization. This was hardly a new idea, and one critic dismissed Putnam's work as simply another "pernicious" addition to "the rubbish pile of racist tracts." But it was an especially "dangerous contribution" because, as other critics observed, Putnam was "an effective writer with a fluid style and beguiling presentation"; he was making "tiresome" arguments with such "verve and literacy" that he was "enchancing a number of southern newspaper editors and even a few scientists."¹³

Putnam put a Yankee gloss on an argument that southerners had been making for years. As James T. Patterson has noted in his history, *Brown v. Board of Education* (2001), segregationists not only "raised the specter of sexually aggressive black males" but also "worried that their own children might come to enjoy the company, even sexual relationships, with blacks."¹⁴ This was true of elite whites as well members of the rank and file. In 1956 South Carolina's Governor James F. Byrnes, himself a former justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, insisted

one cannot discuss [*Brown*] without admitting that, in the South, there is a fundamental objection to integration. White Southerners fear that the purpose of many of those advocating integration is to break down social barriers in the period of adolescence and ultimately bring about intermarriage of the races. Because they are opposed to this, they are opposed to abolishing segregation.

Segregation was not based on "petty prejudice," Byrnes insisted, but on "an instinctive desire for the preservation of our race." He contended that "pride of race has been responsible for the grouping of people along ethnic lines throughout the world." He endorsed Benjamin Disraeli's assertion that no one should "treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key to history." Although Byrnes did not dwell on racial statistics pertaining to crime, illegitimacy, and venereal disease, he said parents should try to rear their children in an atmosphere reasonably free from moral dangers. When they were forced to give their children to school authorities for several hours each day, parents had the duty as well as the right to "control the schools their children attend." "The lives of our children must not be fashioned by some bureaucrat in Washington," Byrnes declared.¹⁵

Herbert Ravenal Sass, a well-known author from Charleston, South Carolina, also worried that "integration of white and Negro children in the South's

primary schools would open the gates to miscegenation and widespread racial amalgamation." In an article in the *Atlantic*, Sass maintained that integration rested on the premise that blacks and whites were essentially alike except for skin color. Integrated schools consequently would turn out "successive generations in whom, because they are imbued with this philosophy, the instinct of race preference would have been suppressed." Some people thought this would be a good thing, the happy solution to the race problem in America. But Sass maintained that one need look no farther than Latin America to see that the fusion of racial bloodlines led to second-class societies.¹⁶

Not all segregationists feared miscegenation. Sociologist A. James Gregor, for one, said that because people possessed an instinctive "consciousness of kind" there was little chance of widespread interracial mating. According to Gregor, "social creatures throughout the animal kingdom" manifested a "disposition to identify with only select members of [their] species." Hence, in the past "anything more than a casual or temporary contact between widely diverse races" had led, at the least, to "prejudice and discrimination and a subsequent rationalization for felt preferences." On some occasions, mixing had led either to subordination or extermination.¹⁷

Nevertheless, Carleton Putnam warned that one could not break down educational barriers "without eventually breaking them down heterosexually." As an example, he mentioned the comment of an eighteen-year-old white girl who attended an integrated high school in the North:

I remember reading somewhere that a famous sociologist said that about the last person that the average white kid would be interested in is a Negro. I have news for him. Integration is a gradual process. At first it is difficult to see anything but that they are Negroes. Later you think of them as just people and then as friends. As one girl I know put it, from there it is just a hop, skip and a jump before you think of them as more than friends. Almost every white girl I knew had a secret crush on one of the colored boys. The crushes varied from warm friendship to wild infatuation...One of the girls felt guilty about it but she kept on dating the colored boy...She once told me that if people were going to object they shouldn't expose us to the temptation. As she put it, we're not all saints.¹⁸

In his private correspondence Putnam acknowledged that the available evidence had not conclusively proved or disproved the theory of innate Negro inferiority. He knew that anthropology was "not an exact science." He agreed with the judgment of the NAACP's John A. Morsell "no [scholar] has ever been able (or is ever likely to be able) to control enough of the conditioning factors to make genuinely scientific comparison possible." Putnam considered Morsell's comment "the best critique...of any I received...in style and tone, as well as in content." Nevertheless, Putnam insisted that "in the management of human affairs all law and practical judgments are based on a balance of probabilities."¹⁹

While James J. Kilpatrick and Carleton Putnam were the leading popularizers of the case for segregation, like-minded scientists and social scientists joined together in 1959 to establish the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics (IAAEE). It was an imposing title for an organization whose purpose was to oversee and coordinate the efforts of scientific racists. Chartered in 1959, the IAAEE's first president was Robert Kuttner, the Creighton University biologist who had given testimony in *Stell v. Savannah*. The membership included most of those who had testified in *Stell* and many others: British geneticist R. Ruggles Gates, Italian sociologist Corrado Gini, and several American professors, among them George Lundberg of the University of Washington, Frank McGurk of Villanova, Audrey M. Shuey of Randolph-Macon Womens College, and Charles Callan Tansill of Georgetown. With funds provided by Wickliffe Draper of the Pioneer Fund, the IAAEE set up a scholarly journal, *Mankind Quarterly*, and distributed pamphlets and other literature to a mailing list of sixteen thousand people.²⁰

The revival of scientific racism surprised many observers, who thought that the Second World War and the destruction of fascism had brought an end to such thinking. Because the Nazis had perverted racial science, many scholars avoided the field of racial studies. In his book of 1942, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, Ashley Montagu had noted

In our time the problem of *race* has assumed an alarmingly exaggerated importance. Alarming, because racial dogmas have been made the basis for an inhumanely brutal political philosophy which has already resulted in the death or social disfranchisement of millions of innocent individuals."²¹ In 1961 the members of the American Anthropological Association approved a resolution which asserted that "for the good of mankind in general the myth [of racial inferiority] ought to be recognized for what it is—a pretext for bigotry and discrimination."²²

The organization of the IAAEE and publication of *Mankind Quarterly*, however, signaled that at least some authorities no longer felt "that because the study of race once gave ammunition to racial fascists, who misused it," researchers should avoid the study of racial differences.²³ Instead, several racial scientists had decided, as one critic noted, "to re-open Pandora's box." According to this critic, "the fact that scientist[s] of [the] calibre of [R. Ruggles] Gates [were] participating in the undertaking render[ed] the initiative nothing less than tragical."²⁴

THE BOASIAN COUNTERATTACK

The pro-segregation testimony in *Stell*, the IAAEE, and *Mankind Quarterly* eventually provoked a counterreaction among mainstream social scientists. Many conventional scholars initially seemed to sputter, as if they did not wish to pay the compliment of a rational response to arguments they considered unworthy. They feared that discussion might dignify the proposition that

blacks were inherently inferior in intellectual aptitude. They hardly knew what to say when told that black students, even gifted black students, would be better off in all-black schools. Charles L. Black of the Yale Law School confessed that it was hard for him to keep "a straight face" when he heard such statements.²⁵ Others responded with abusive reproach. Writing in *Man*, the journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of London, G. Ainsworth Harrison dismissed the first three issues of *Mankind Quarterly* as "no more than incompetent attempts to rationalize irrational opinions."²⁶ In *Science*, the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Santiago Genoves criticized *Mankind Quarterly* for "using science, or rather pseudoscience, to try to establish postulates of racial superiority or inferiority based on biological differences."²⁷ And in *Current Anthropology*, Juan Comas described *Mankind Quarterly* as "a supposedly scientific journal whose contents are the cause of profound concern to those interested in racial questions..."²⁸

Critics of the IAAEE and of *Mankind Quarterly* began by noting that the great majority of anthropologists rejected scientific racism. In simplified form, racists said that races could be identified by physical appearance and measurements; that some races possessed more intelligence than others; and that races which were deficient in intelligence lacked the ability to develop or even to maintain a high civilization. In response, critics said there was a "nearly overwhelming rejection of scientific claims of white superiority by a consensus of scientific opinion."²⁹

Yet appeals to authority did not settle the matter, for scientific racists insisted that truth was not established by majority vote. They knew that anti-racist views had become predominant in the academic world, and they recognized that "the favorable opinion of [a scholar's] fellow intellectuals is vital since he depends on them for a livelihood and companionship."³⁰ Yet, despite an inhospitable climate of opinion at most universities and foundations, racist scholars felt the need to publish, even if it meant that they would suffer professionally. They said it would never do if scholars, for reasons of expediency, lied to the world about what they considered the truth. "Not since the days of Galileo has science seen anything like [this]," the editor of *Mankind Quarterly* declared.³¹

Scientific racists thought their views had been rejected because of recent political developments. *Mankind Quarterly* acknowledged that Nazi Germany had committed "terrible crimes and gross abuses," "allegedly in the name of 'race.'" In the opinion of the journal, however, "the tragedy of Nazism and the reaction to its bestialities," unfortunately, had also instigated a counter reaction that "had come to bedevil our field of studies."³² Contributors to the quarterly affirmed that, in reaction against the Nazis' perverse use of doctrines of racial superiority and inferiority, many well-intentioned scholars went to the other extreme and denied the existence of any significant racial differences. One contributor said that "as a result of the German excesses most intellectuals...took a stand at the other extreme on the question of...the existence of

racial differences."³³ Another complained that fellow scholars would not have "a frank and realistic discussion of the minority problem" because they feared that "a more realistic view would merely be seized upon by the prejudiced as vindication of their hostility."³⁴

Meanwhile, an important transition had occurred within the field of anthropology. At one time physical anthropologists had been dominant at Harvard, Pennsylvania, and other leading universities. In the nineteenth century physical anthropologists had been preoccupied with classifying and measuring distinctive populations. In the early years of the twentieth century they continued to measure variations in the shape of heads and the color of hair, eyes, and skin. They were especially concerned with fossils and with documenting the sequence whereby *Homo sapiens* had evolved from early primate ancestors and had adapted to different environments.

Yet physical anthropology came under a cloud in the 1930s. One leader of the discipline, Earnest Hooton of Harvard, felt it necessary to state explicitly that his findings "should not be interpreted as a substantiation of any of the ridiculous and pernicious doctrines of racial inequality which have become a menace to the peace of the world and which have brought tragedy upon millions of blameless and worthy individuals."³⁵ Nevertheless, Hooton also insisted that anthropologists had a responsibility to report the truth on racial differences. So did Carleton Coon of the University of Pennsylvania, who "relished the diverse personalities and physical traits of all he met." Coon "cared genuinely and deeply about some of the tribal peoples he lived with. But he was always classifying, noting features, slotting people into pigeonholes, whether he was meeting Kurdish herders in Iraq or Celtic academics in Boston. And he had names for these pigeonholes – scientific ones, not racial epithets – and an ineradicable habit of referring casually to people as he thought of them, as members of a particular group or subgroup."³⁶

After Hitler, the tendency to classify people became unfashionable and even offensive to some. The vogue then shifted to cultural anthropology, a field that had been germinating for decades in the seminars of Columbia University professor Franz Boas. At one time Boas had reported that "the average size of the Negro brain is slightly smaller than the average size of the brain of the white race," and he therefore thought it likely "that differences in mental characteristics of the two races exist." Even before Hitler's rise to power, however, Boas had come to emphasize that a people's cultural heritage – their ideas and values – shaped the way they lived. Boas acknowledged that Caucasians had developed a high civilization "which is sweeping the whole world"; that Asians had developed impressive but less technical civilizations; and that Negroes lagged behind. But he insisted that "the reason for this fact" did "not necessarily lie in a greater ability of the races of Europe and Asia." He thought "the variations in cultural development" could be explained "by a consideration

of the general course of historical events" and without recourse to any innate differences.³⁷

Boas also trained a number of influential anthropologists (among them Ruth Benedict, Melville Herskovits, Alfred Kroeber, Margaret Mead, Ashley Montagu), and the "Boasians" (as they were sometimes called) proceeded to detach "civilization" from "race." They not only stressed the importance of culture and history in shaping human behavior; they also repudiated the significance of race as a way to account for human differences. Previously, many educated people had considered racial inheritance responsible for at least some differences in civilizational standards. The Boasians, on the other hand, attributed the differences to history and environment. They emphasized "patterns of culture" as an explanation of social behavior. They minimized the significance of physical differences. And by emphasizing that the range of differences within the black racial grouping greatly overlapped that among whites, they called into question the very concept of race. Some Boasians regarded "the Negro race" not as a biological reality but a sociological concept.³⁸

After World War II, the predominance of cultural anthropology was manifest in several official resolutions. In a 1951 statement that Ashley Montagu edited for UNESCO, fourteen well-regarded geneticists and anthropologists asserted: "[T]he differences in physical structure which distinguish one major group from another give no support to popular notions of any general 'superiority' or 'inferiority' ... The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups... Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development."³⁹

Ten years later the governing board of the American Anthropological Association expressed its "concern" over what it described as the "false and misrepresentative" use of "anthropological science" by persons who were "not recognized by the American Anthropological Association as professional anthropologists." By a vote of 192-0, the Association asserted that "scientific evidence indicates that the range of mental capacities in all ethnic groups is much the same," and it specifically "repudiate[d] statements... that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites ..."⁴⁰ In 1963 the American Association of Physical Anthropologists "deplore[d] the misuse of science to advocate racism" and specifically condemned "such writings as [Carleton Putnam's book] *Race and Reason*."⁴¹

These statements were further evidence of the shift in opinion that had accelerated in the years since 1942, when, at the height of Nazism, Ashley Montagu had called attention to the harm that could be done in the name of "race." As fellow anthropologist C. Loring Brace noted, Montagu's book, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, "rode a wave of public reaction fueled by a

growing awareness of the pervasive evil manifest in the Nazi uses of 'race.'" Indeed, "the social message concerning the misapplication of the concept of 'race'...was so compelling that the book went through three editions before biologists began to make the first tentative steps toward catching up with" Montagu.⁴²

Eventually, there was a counterreaction among some physical anthropologists. In 1954, for example, Carleton Coon complained about "certain writers, who are mostly social anthropologists." According to Coon, these writers considered it "immoral to study race" and produced "book after book exposing [race] as a 'myth.' Their argument is that because the study of race once gave ammunition to racial fascists, who misused it, we should pretend that races do not exist."⁴³

Some biologists, geneticists, and zoologists also refused to abandon the concept of race. One such was geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky, who was a personal friend and sometimes co-author with Ashley Montagu. Nevertheless, Dobzhansky continued to maintain that "Race *differences* are facts of nature which can, given sufficient study, be ascertained objectively." Dobzhansky believed that, over the long course of history, many of the differences probably had been adaptations to different climates and environments. Darker skins, for example, were resistant to sunburn and skin cancer, lighter skins less susceptible to frostbite, and other differences may well have influenced the ability to thrive in high altitudes and susceptibility or resistance to certain diseases.⁴⁴ The need for effective medical treatments would later stimulate further study of human genetic variability.

While noting the persistence of races, Dobzhansky also recognized that, because of migrations and racial crossings, physically intermediate populations had existed for thousands of years. The gene flow had been so pervasive that there were no "pure" races. It was possible, perhaps likely, that there had been enough hybridization to create intellectual equality among the subgroups of mankind. Dobzhansky also insisted that there was no warrant for believing that differences in physical characteristics were related to a group's ability to develop or maintain a civilization. "Nobody can discover the cultural capacities of...races until they have been given something like an equal opportunity to demonstrate these capacities."⁴⁵

Some egalitarians went further, in part, perhaps, out of fear that the concept of race inevitably would serve as a pretext for bigotry and discrimination. In 1980 the *Academic American Encyclopedia* reported that "many scientists today reject the concept of race." In 1993 the "many" was changed to "probably most."⁴⁶ In 1995, researchers at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science announced that "the concept of race...has no basis in fundamental human biology."⁴⁷ And in 2004 biologist Paul R. Gross noted an extraordinary paradox. Many American intellectuals, when asked to identify their society's most serious problem, answered, "Race." But many (most?) of

these intellectuals also insisted that the concept of "race" was meaningless: "that there are no biologically significant human group differences, hence no human races."⁴⁸

To explain their rejection of race, some scholars pointed to genetics. Melville Herskovits wrote in 1961 that physical anthropologists no longer "went about the world measuring heads in order to classify people..." They had shifted their focus to studying genetics and in the process had discovered that many genes were distributed without regard to skin color. In fact, Herskovits said that among the groupings of mankind there was so much overlapping of so many genes as to call into question the idea that there were distinct races.⁴⁹ Again and again, egalitarians emphasized the significance of the overlapping. They insisted that any differences between racial averages were small when compared to the differences among individual members of each race. Even those who conceded that "on the average, the brain of the [N]egro is slightly smaller than the brain of the European" also emphasized the great "variability which is found within each race."⁵⁰ Julian Huxley summed up this point of view when he asserted:

[T]he genetic variability of the human species is so well distributed that the average genetic difference between different classes or social groups and different nations or ethnic groups is negligible or small in its effects compared with the improvements which can be effected through better living conditions and education.⁵¹

Others said that popular conceptions of race were constructed socially rather than scientifically. To illustrate this point, Pierre L. van den Berghe noted that a light-skinned person of partial African ancestry would be considered a Negro in the United States but not in Brazil.⁵²

Eventually, for many scholars it became almost an article of faith, one that was repeated regularly, with feeling if not conviction, that race was a social construct. All human groups were basically the same, they insisted, and any differences were culturally determined products of differences in upbringing, lifestyle, and social environment. This point of view seemed implicit in the titles of two influential books: *Race: A Study in Superstition*, by Jacques Barzun, and *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, by Ashley Montagu. It was also the thesis of a much-admired 2003 documentary for the Public Broadcasting System, *The Power of an Illusion*.

Was race a reality or merely a social construct? It may be presumptuous for an historian to offer an opinion when anthropologists and geneticists have different claims. Yet most authorities acknowledged that different populations differed in the frequency of some genes, and that these differences were the result of evolution in geographically distinct regions. They conceded that differences existed. But they differed when it came to whether the differences should be called "racial." Many anthropologists decided to minimize the importance of difference for fear that acknowledging the reality of "race"

might again conduce to disastrous consequences. Frank B. Livingstone, for example, admitted that “genetic variability among human population[s]” was “a central problem of physical anthropology.” But Livingstone described the differences in terms of “cline” and “morphism” rather than “race.”⁵³

The trend toward de-emphasizing the importance of race was reinforced by a recognition that racial studies had been politicized in the aftermath of *Brown v. Board of Education*. Egalitarians knew that the question of school segregation was lurking in the background (if not at the fore), and they suspected that those who challenged the basic intellectual equality of the Negro did not do so for scientific reasons. However much racists might clothe their arguments in the garb of science, one professor at the University of Missouri noted, they could not “obscure the fact that the[ir] position... would have no particular interest... were it not for the current controversy over the integration of education.”⁵⁴

Nevertheless, some observers thought egalitarians were going too far when they said that races were merely “social constructs” and not biological realities. The physical anthropologist Carleton Coon scoffed that the “soft pedaling” and “prudery” of some cultural anthropologists with respect to race was “equaled only by their horror of Victorian prudery about sex.”⁵⁵ The geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky warned that denying the existence of biological phenomena might do worse than breed confusion. “To say that mankind has no races” was so counterintuitive that it would play “into the hands of race bigots” by discrediting science.⁵⁶

The work of Carleton Putnam served as an illustration of Dobzhansky’s point. From the outset Putnam recognized that “social construction” was a concept that racists could also use. When anthropologists said that “race” had no biological significance but was employed to justify the subordination of unpopular minorities, Putnam answered that the “deconstruction” of race had been devised to protect and promote the interests of Jews. According to Putnam, much of modern anthropology was “clever and insidious propaganda posing in the name of science.” He emphasized that Franz Boas, “the founder of the modern vogue,” was a Jew, as were Boas’s influential students Melville Herskovits, Ralph Klineberg, and Ashley Montagu (whose given name, Putnam noted, was Israel Ehrenberg). Even before Hitler, Putnam wrote, these men were “smarting under what they considered unjustified discrimination.” Therefore, “they set purposefully to the task of showing they were just as good as the native stocks (as, indeed, in many ways they were), and they tried to do this by proving that *all* races were equal in their adaptability to our white civilization.” They secured professorships at leading universities, cliquishly cultivated like-minded colleagues, and marginalized and ostracized those who did not share their views. Soon they dominated the field of anthropology. According to Putnam, Jewish anthropologists were on “a self-serving mission” and their “objectivity” should be “judged accordingly.”⁵⁷ Other critics later

asserted that Boas's influential gentile protégées Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead similarly reified the importance of "culture" as a way to undermine established mores and justify their own deviant sexual practices.⁵⁸

Some later scholars have endorsed Putnam's argument, but with qualifications. Historian Carl N. Degler conceded that "Boas's influence upon American social scientists in matters of race can hardly be exaggerated," since Boas "developed in America the concept of culture, which, like a powerful solvent, would in time expunge race from the literature of social science." Degler further concluded that "Boas did not arrive at that position from a disinterested, scientific inquiry." "Instead, [Boas's] idea derived from an ideological commitment that began early in his life," when he observed and suffered from anti-Semitism in his native Germany. "Throughout his adult life," Degler noted, "Boas's face bore the scars from a duel entered into during his university days to punish an anti-Semitic slur."⁵⁹ Hasia R. Diner has also noted that Boas "felt profoundly conscious of his religious background and his minority status in German society."⁶⁰ Degler and Diner concluded that Boas stressed the importance of culture (and de-emphasized race) in part because he thought racial explanations were being used to deny opportunities and acceptance to members of minority groups.⁶¹

Other scholars have suggested yet another motive: that Boas and especially his disciple Alfred Kroeber had a "professional interest in providing a secure intellectual base for [the] newly emerging field of anthropology." By denying the influence of biology and by emphasizing the significance of culture, they promoted the discipline of anthropology in its competition with established biological sciences.⁶²

Nevertheless, Putnam probably "exaggerate[d] the role of Boas in American anthropology," as Sherwood Washburn of Berkeley insisted in a personal letter.⁶³ There was not enough evidence to prove that anthropologists had conspired to mislead the public about the scientific evidence regarding racial differences. Egalitarians recognized, however, that they would need more than "social construction" to discredit scientific racism. It was necessary to challenge the physical evidence that Negroes, as a race, had smaller brains than Asians and Caucasians.

One possibility was to assert that there was little or no correlation between intelligence and the size of human brains. Autopsies have revealed, for example, that some noted intellectuals possessed brains of less than average size, while the brains of many criminals were larger than average⁶⁴ – which led paleoanthropologist Pat Shipman to conclude that "neither brain nor skull size has any relationship to the intelligence of the individual."⁶⁵ Yet what was true for individuals might not apply to groups. Egalitarians therefore felt the need to question whether Negroes, as a race, really did have smaller than average brains, with some of the deficit occurring in the prefrontal areas that were considered especially important for abstract thinking.

Two of the most persuasive critiques of racist science came from unlikely sources: Robert E. Kuttner of the Creighton University Medical School, and Dwight J. Ingle, the chairman of the Department of Physiology at the University of Chicago. This was unexpected, for Kuttner and Ingle had been associated with scientific racism. Both wrote for *Mankind Quarterly*. Kuttner had given testimony for segregation in *Stell v. Savannah* and had served as president of the IAAEE. Ingle had publicly opposed “the random mixing of races in schools” and later expressed alarm about “the very high birth rate among indolent incompetent Negroes.”⁶⁶ Yet neither was blind to the canons of scientific proof.

During the preparation for the *Stell* litigation, Kuttner had warned segregationist lawyers about the paucity of evidence for Wesley Critz George’s assertions about the size and structure of Negro brains. To establish morphologic differences, George relied especially on previous research done by Bennet Bean, C. J. Connolly, and F. W. Vint, but Bean and Vint had published their work in 1906 and 1934, before “modern methods of electrophysiology and experimental neurophysiology became standard,” and Connolly’s statements were so full of qualifications that he could easily be quoted to the opposite effect. Kuttner especially doubted that Vint, who had measured skulls in Kenya, had the equipment needed to make “such delicate measurements.”⁶⁷

Ingle similarly concluded that George’s assertions were “without scientific value.” To prove the existence of “significant average differences” between the brains of Asians, Caucasians, and Negroes, it would be necessary to gather representative samples after ensuring that the environment, “including prenatal and postnatal nutrition,” had been equivalent. Researchers would have to take into consideration the age, stature, and bulk of the individuals concerned. And “the brains would have to be removed from skulls at the same time after death, fixed, processed and measured by identical methods.” To guard against bias, the brains would also have to be studied by several experts as “unknowns” – that is, without being told that the sample was of one race or another.⁶⁸ None of the extant studies had done this.

Ingle hastened to add, “The fact that the presently existing evidence for inferiority of the Negro brain is without value does not mean that the brains of Whites and Negroes are identical.” Indeed, the evidence, “unsatisfactory as it is,” led Ingle to consider it “probable that genetic endowment plays an important role in determining racial differences.” Ingle was opposed to intermarriage “until it can be proven that [it] involves no risk to the future of mankind.” But he nevertheless thought that Carleton Putnam and Wesley Critz George had based their conclusions on “worthless evidence.”⁶⁹

Ingle’s approach riled Putnam. “You are a timid little academician,” Putnam wrote in one letter to Ingle. “You know full well that the overwhelming weight of evidence is enough to sink the American and British navies, yet you talk about waiting for more. You don’t want more evidence, Ingle. You just want to hide behind a tree....”⁷⁰ Putnam also was testy with William F.

Buckley of the *National Review*, who sometimes featured essays by the antiegalitarian writers Ernest van den Haag and Nathaniel Weyl but generally steered mainstream conservatism away from an alliance with scientific racists (as Buckley also avoided the John Birch Society and the "objectivism" of Ayn Rand). Putnam considered it folly not to tell readers that Negroes probably were inferior to Caucasians in intelligence. He thought it irresponsible not to warn that desegregation would lead to more mixed mating and, eventually, a decline in standards of civilization. "To say that Carleton's letters [to Buckley] were overaggressive would be putting the matter mildly," Weyl confided in one letter.⁷¹

In public Putnam continued to affirm "*the overwhelming balance of probability* that racial differences exist in the morphology of the human brain." He continued to say that this accounted for "differences in the capacity to adapt to Western civilization." He insisted, "because the evidence is not *perfect* is no reason for basing a social revolution on the assumption that the opposite of the evidence is true." He challenged egalitarian scientists to "conduct tests of their own." He sputtered, "With the hundreds of millions of dollars available to them through leftist American foundations, these scientists could easily finance a project controlled to the most exacting taste. However, they have not conducted such tests and will not conduct any. For obvious reasons, they do not dare."⁷²

Putnam's rhetoric betrayed a recognition that doubt had been cast on the anthropological arguments for segregation. The evidence with respect to the size and structure of the brain was not conclusive.

Nor, it turned out, was the evidence from intelligence tests.

The evidence from several decades of psychological testing admittedly showed that whites, on average, did better than blacks, and the deficiency among blacks appeared to be especially great on tests that were intended to measure abstract intelligence. These tests included symbols (numbers, diagrams, formulas) and required the test taker to draw inferences and to assemble and reassemble information. The racist psychologist Henry E. Garrett characterized these aptitudes as "the sort of ability that creates a modern technical society."⁷³ According to Garrett, "the lag of the Negro in abstract ability" was responsible for his having "not produced any of the so-called great civilizations of the past," the reason why "the black African over most of his history has been a miserable creature, beset by disease, tormented by animal and human enemies."⁷⁴

Journalist James J. Kilpatrick seemed to concur. "For thousands of years," Kilpatrick wrote, black Africans had lived "in effective possession of one of the richest continents on earth." Yet, although they had "lived by the sea," they had "never conceived the sail." They had "dwelled in the midst of fantastic mineral deposits, and contrived no more than the crudest smelting of iron and copper. The Negro developed no written language, not even the poorest hieroglyphics; no poetry; no numerals; not even a calendar that has survived." Kilpatrick conceded

“that certain African arts and crafts reached a tolerably interesting stage of development.” “But south of the Sahara there was no literate civilization, no intellects at work to comprehend and solve the abstract problems.”⁷⁵

This sort of talk warmed the heart of Carleton Putnam. Like Garrett and Kilpatrick, Putnam thought history had rendered a definitive verdict. “Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pure-blooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization.”⁷⁶

Nevertheless, the historical evidence was problematic. One could attribute the underdevelopment of sub-Saharan Africa, as Franz Boas did, to the difficulty of traversing the vast desert that separated black Africa from the civilization that gradually extended from Egypt and Babylon over the Mediterranean area, and from there later into Northern Europe.⁷⁷ Or one could point, as Thomas Sowell would, to the stunting of human interaction in black Africa that stemmed from a scarcity of navigable inland waterways and other geographic factors.⁷⁸ In addition, ascribing backwardness to racial inferiority could also be used against Caucasians, since many whites had been “uncouth barbarians at a time when the Egyptians and the Babylonians had a flourishing civilization.”⁷⁹

Thus the evidence from history was suggestive, at best. And the evidence from psychology was not conclusive, either. There was no doubt that, on average, blacks scored below whites on intelligence tests. But the reasons for the difference were hotly disputed.

Intelligence tests were useful for identifying youngsters with special problems and for classifying students or employees who were ready for different levels of study or work. But many Americans doubted that the tests explained why the test scores were such as they were. They also thought psychologists overstepped when they said their tests measured innate mental capacity, as distinguished from knowledge and acquired skills. Puzzles and questions might reveal something about memory, ingenuity, and other mental faculties, but many people scoffed when the testers said they could measure a general “intelligence” that was fixed by heredity. The journalist and social philosopher Walter Lippmann characterized such claims as a sort of predestination, one that would condemn those who were socially disadvantaged to inferior positions in society. He warned against intelligence testers who yearned to “occupy a position of power which no intellectual has held since the collapse of theocracy.”⁸⁰ Lippmann hated “the impudence of a claim that in fifty minutes you can judge and classify a human being’s predestined fitness in life...I hate the abuse of scientific method which it involves. I hate the sense of superiority which it creates, and the sense of inferiority which it imposes.”⁸¹

Some psychologists also presented evidence to challenge the notion of innate differences in intelligence. Otto Klineberg reported that northern Negroes consistently outperformed southern blacks on intelligence tests. Some racists attributed this to selective migration, saying that “the most intelligent and energetic of southern African Americans [had] migrated north.” But Klineberg warned against accepting an hereditarian interpretation when the results could be explained equally well on the basis of environment. Klineberg accordingly concluded that northern blacks did better because of superior educational opportunities in the North.⁸²

Meanwhile, an African-American scholar devised a caustic method for debunking the alleged link between intelligence and race. Writing in *The Crisis* and in *Opportunity*, the official magazines of the NAACP and the Urban League, Horace Mann Bond reported that whites in the South, who hailed from states with “the purest racial stock of the so-called Nordic branch,” made lower scores than whites in the North and West, where there had been a larger infusion of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. If the difference in these scores could not be attributed to environment and educational opportunities, then it seemed to follow “that the white population of [the South] is inherently and racially inferior to the whites of another section of the country.”⁸³

Even those who specialized in administering intelligence tests noted that the correlation coefficient (that is, the correlation between test scores and performance in school) was about 0.5. This was enough to satisfy statisticians that the tests were relevant — that, in fact, they were better at predicting performance than interviews, experience, or letters of recommendation. But a correlation of 0.5 meant that sometimes there was no correlation between performance on the test and later. Whatever the statistics and correlations, many Americans distrusted inflated claims about the value of intelligence tests, especially when the tests had a disproportionate impact on a minority group that had been subjected to systematic discrimination.

In addition, by the 1950s, if not earlier, there was general agreement that nature and nurture both played important roles in shaping “intelligence.” Practically everyone conceded that IQ scores were influenced by environment as well as heredity, with most estimates attributing between 40 and 60 percent of “intelligence” to the influence of environment.⁸⁴ Even Carleton Putnam conceded the “possibility” that “the finding of intelligence tests” might be “the result of environment.”⁸⁵

This point was underscored by the responses to a 1961 article that Henry Garrett published in the scholarly journal, *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*. Garrett had repeated his standard refrain: that “on the various tests of abstract intelligence, the American Negro regularly and persistently scores below the mean of comparable American Whites”; that “the lag of the Negro in abstract ability plus his long history of non-intellectual achievement forces us to infer that his inferiority...vis-à-vis the White is in part innate and of genetic origin.”⁸⁶

In response, several readers noted that there was general agreement that IQ was influenced by *both* heredity and environment. Thus the question at issue was whether and how much allowance should be made for the history of Negroes — their experience with slavery, segregation, and discrimination. And how much allowance should be made for the continuing isolation and relative economic deprivation, and for the persistent assertions that blacks were, by nature, intellectually inferior? For many, these factors of history, background, and opportunity easily explained the 15 point difference in the mean IQ scores of American blacks and whites.

Anthropologist Melville Herskovits insisted that cultural factors were “critical.”⁸⁷ Psychiatrist Morton H. Frank noted that, because of the complexity of history, culture, and society, “socioeconomic factors cannot...be equated.”⁸⁸ Psychologist Nathaniel Eisen similarly wrote that “the influence of socioeconomic conditions on the intelligence of Negroes” was “well known.”⁸⁹ Ashley Montagu also maintained that differences in test scores “could be explained on socio-cultural grounds.” In fact, Montagu asserted, “the major factors in producing the differences in mental ability...are demonstrably of a cultural nature.”⁹⁰

The arguments of egalitarian social scientists, in psychology as in anthropology, were not conclusive. But they were sufficient to call into question the assertions of scientific racists. The hypothesis that IQ differences could be accounted for by nurture was tenable. Egalitarian social scientists had rebutted the contentions of scientific racists.

A FRAGILE CONSENSUS

The difficulty of doing research on racial differences partook of a double-edged sword, one that wounded scientific egalitarians as well as scientific racists. Because the major races were so heterogeneous, because the interaction of nature and nurture was so complex, because of problems with sampling and measurement, and because it was hard to develop tests of intelligence that were truly culture-free, it had not been possible to prove that Caucasians and Negroes differed with respect to innate intelligence. For the same reasons, however, it was also impossible to prove that the different races were equally endowed with intelligence.

Consequently, in the 1960s scholars in the field arrived at a consensus. Racists and egalitarians agreed that cultural *and* hereditary factors combined to influence intelligence, and further agreed that there was no definitive proof with respect to the relative importance of the two factors or their manner of interaction. Thus Dwight J. Ingle, while refusing to embrace the idea of racial equality, acknowledged that it had “not been possible to control or equate the culture factor in comparing the intelligence of Whites and Negroes.”⁹¹ Ingle continued to believe that genetic endowment “probabl[y] played an important role in determining racial differences in drives, aptitudes, and achievements,”

but he conceded that the evidence was not conclusive. According to Ingle, “the concept that White and Negro races are approximately equally endowed with intelligence remains a plausible hypothesis for which there is faulty evidence. The concept that the average Negro is significantly less intelligent than the average White is also a plausible hypothesis for which there is faulty but, in my opinion, somewhat stronger evidence.”⁹²

Meanwhile, Ashley Montagu also acknowledged that there was no proof as to the equal distribution of innate intelligence. This was quite a concession for Montagu, who had written in 1944 “with some degree of assurance that in all probability the range of inherited capacities in two different ethnic groups is just about identical.”⁹³ In 1961, however, Montagu asserted that he had been misunderstood; that he had never maintained that the races were equal in mental abilities; that he had contended only “that studies claiming to have proven that genetic differences were the responsible causes [for differences in test scores and standards of civilization] have not upon critical examination been found to prove anything of the sort.”⁹⁴

Technically there was no inconsistency in Montagu’s statements, since the “range” of intelligence differs from the “distribution.” The former term refers to individuals—where each race possesses a great range, from the retarded to the genius. The latter refers to averages. A great deal of controversy might have been avoided if Montagu had clarified the difference when *Man’s Most Dangerous Myth* was published in 1942; or in 1950–1951 when he edited the UNESCO statement on race. In 1961, however, Montagu asserted that “during more than thirty-five years of reading on the subject I have *not more than once or twice* encountered a writer who claimed that ‘the races were equal in mental abilities.’” Montagu said that he himself did not subscribe “to the view that all races are equal in mental ability”; that he simply believed that, “whatever the differences in mental ability may be between the races, the only practical and decent way to behave toward the members of every group is to give them every opportunity to realize whatever is in them to fulfill themselves.”⁹⁵

While many social scientists were becoming skeptical, even agnostic, about the relative importance of nurture and nature, other people were coming to think (or at least say) that the races were equally endowed with intelligence. Thus the Harvard historian Oscar Handlin declared, “There is no evidence of any inborn differences of temperament, personality, character, or intelligence among races.”⁹⁶ And the Berkeley historian Kenneth M. Stampp asserted, in memorable language, “Negroes *are*, after all, only white men with black skins, nothing more, nothing less.”⁹⁷ In the 1950s and 1960s many well-educated people, perhaps most of them, embraced what historian Walter Jackson has called a “liberal orthodoxy.”⁹⁸ They assumed that the races did not differ in intelligence, aptitudes, or character. This view became increasingly popular as the civil rights movement gained momentum in the 1960s.

In accounting for the success of the civil rights movement many historians have embraced the “backlash thesis” of University of Virginia law professor Michael J. Klarman. According to this thesis, the combination of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Brown* and rank-and-file civil rights demonstrations gave rise to “a southern political climate in which racial extremism flourished.”⁹⁹ Believing that *Brown* was unjustified, white southerners refused to desegregate their public schools and also organized “massive resistance” to racial boycotts, sit-ins, and freedom rides – a resistance that often lapsed into violent assaults on civil rights activists. Then, when the brutal repression was televised to the rest of the nation, there was a backlash as whites outside the South demanded that the federal government protect the activists, desegregate the schools, and enact new laws to guarantee the right to vote and to end discrimination in public accommodations.

According to Professor Klarman, Martin Luther King and other civil rights leaders were well aware of this chain of causation. King may have begun with the hope that he could convince southern whites that racial discrimination was wrong. Eventually, however, he modified his approach. In 1963 King chose Birmingham, Alabama, as the site for massive demonstrations because he calculated that the police chief, Eugene “Bull” Connor, would deal roughly with demonstrators. When Connor complied with attack dogs and fire hoses, the nation was repulsed and Congress responded with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The next year King focused a voting rights campaign on Selma, Alabama, because he expected that the local sheriff there, Jim Clark, would behave as Bull Connor had in Birmingham. When this happened, the American public was again outraged and Congress responded with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. “It was the brutality of southern whites resisting desegregation that ultimately rallied national opinion behind the enforcement of *Brown* and the enactment of civil rights legislation.”¹⁰⁰

Klarman conceded that *Brown* had no warrant either in constitutional history or in the precedents of the Supreme Court. He acknowledged that the justices simply thought that segregation was wrong, “and they were determined to forbid it, regardless of whether conventional legal sources sanctioned that result.” Klarman, however, considered it “pointless” to bewail judicial activism because, he wrote, “the Court’s constitutional interpretations have always been influenced by the social and political contexts of the times in which they were rendered.”¹⁰¹

Klarman did not mention the anthropological and educational arguments of the southern resistance, and he admitted that the legal points of the Southern Manifesto were well taken. He conceded, in addition, that the leading critics of desegregation did not endorse violence. Mississippi’s Senator James Eastland, for example, cautioned, “Acts of violence and lawlessness have no place. The fight we wage must be a just and legal fight.” Georgia’s congressman James Davis similarly insisted: “There is no place for violence or lawless acts,” just

after he had called *Brown* “a monumental fraud” and a “brazen usurpation of power.”¹⁰²

Klarman severely censured the critics of desegregation, saying that racist intellectuals and southern politicians “either knew that [their] rhetoric was likely to incite violence, or they were criminally negligent for not knowing it.” In making this argument, Klarman reiterated views that civil rights activists and their supporters often expressed in the 1960s. Roy Wilkins of the NAACP had insisted that southern vigilantes “were made bold by groups of so-called respectable people which have urged publicly that the courts be defied.” After a bombing in Atlanta, Georgia, the city’s mayor declared, “Whether they like it or not, every rabble-rousing politician is the godfather of the cross-burners and dynamiters who are giving the South a bad name.” And in Tennessee one lawyer blamed school desegregation violence on the senators and representatives who signed the Southern Manifesto: “What the hell do you expect these people to do when they have 90 some odd congressmen from the South signing a piece of paper that says you’re a southern hero if you defy the Supreme Court.”¹⁰³

The civil rights movement also gained popularity because prior to the late 1960s the demands of the movement were for policies that most white people, at least most whites outside the South, considered reasonable. Blacks were demanding an end to the humiliation of segregated public facilities; they were demanding the right to vote; and they were demanding the desegregation but not the massive integration of the public schools. At the time *desegregation* was not understood to mean that black and white students must mix in proportionally balanced schools. In *Brown II* (the implementation order of May 31, 1955) the Supreme Court ordered school districts to “make a prompt and reasonable start” and then to proceed “with all deliberate speed” toward admitting students to public schools “on a racially nondiscriminatory basis.” The Court also mentioned two nondiscriminatory methods for achieving desegregation — either freedom of choice for individual students or assignment according to “the limits set by normal geographic school districting.”¹⁰⁴ It was understood that neither method would lead to a great deal of racial mixing — because most students, blacks as well as whites, would not freely choose to attend a school in which their race was in the minority, and because the races often were disproportionately concentrated in different residential neighborhoods.

Until the late 1960s most whites outside the South thought the demands of the civil rights movement were unambiguously legitimate. And, because of the violence associated with massive resistance, most of these whites also considered the opponents of desegregation not only mistaken but also intellectually ignorant and morally benighted. These impressions were reinforced when civil rights leaders insisted that their demonstrators should be nonviolent and dignified. For tactical reasons, the civil rights leaders sought to portray a contrast “between well-dressed, polite, studious blacks peacefully protesting”

and, wherever possible, a violent mob of whites, "a ragtail rabble, slackjawed, black jacketed, grinning fit to kill." The freedom riders "count[ed] upon the racists of the South to create a crisis," and black leaders in Birmingham "calculated for the stupidity of a Bull Connor."¹⁰⁵

Several background trends also contributed to the success of the civil rights movement. Hitler's extremism had discredited racism during World War II, and during the Cold War desegregation at home was of benefit to American foreign policy. Meanwhile, because of the Great Migration of blacks away from the rural South and toward urban areas, more blacks were voting – and politicians were seeking their support. At the same time, the growth of the national economy had led to a larger black middle class, whose purchasing power mattered more than ever before. With economic integration throughout the nation, and especially with the increasing influence of chain stores, corporate leaders pressed the white South to accept the national norms. The "nationalizing" of television and radio also had a similar effect. In addition, the New South developed patterns of settlement that resembled the situation in the North more than that of the Old South. In Dixie relatively few whites continued to live as a minority in predominantly black areas. Instead, they followed the example of their northern cousins and moved to predominantly white suburbs. Thus the arguments for segregation, arguments that had been developed to protect whites in predominantly black agrarian societies, increasingly seemed beside the point.¹⁰⁶ By the 1960s the legal, anthropological, and educational arguments of the white South seemed obsolete, out-of-date, of another era.

These trends provided the context in which many rank-and-file whites began to say that all races were equally endowed with intelligence. Politicians did not wish to alienate a growing segment of the electorate. Business leaders did not want to lose black customers. With the growing spatial segmentation of the American population, there was less reason to give offense. Most of all, whites outside the South did not wish to be associated with massive resistance to what they considered the sane and sensible demands of the civil rights movement.

Racists nevertheless developed a different explanation for the popularity of what they called the "equalitarian dogma" – the belief "that all races are potentially equal in ability and differ only in their opportunity to achieve."¹⁰⁷ They charged that scholars who sympathized with the civil rights movement had engaged in a duplicitous form of double dealing. In the professional journals, the civil rights scholars were careful and precise in their statements. They admitted that, because of the difficulty of controlling the relevant variables, "it is just as unscientific to support an equalitarian dogma as it is to maintain that the actual cultural superiority or inferiority of a certain human group is due to morphological ... differences."¹⁰⁸ Racist writers alleged, however, that when the civil rights scholars were not writing for professional journals, when they were hiring, firing, and promoting fellow scholars within their academic departments and professional associations, they established egalitarianism "as a major premise

not to be questioned."¹⁰⁹ They said that "budding young scientists of independent mind jeopardize[d] their careers by challenging the dogma and may be silenced by strong disapproval." They said that through control of universities and foundations, egalitarians made it almost impossible for dissenters to hold jobs. Where outside the South, one psychiatrist asked, "could a psychologist, sociologist or anthropologist find employment if he openly and unreservedly espoused the theory of...racial inequality?"¹¹⁰

Racist writers also alleged that "many college students have been indoctrinated and parrot the equalitarian arguments without competent familiarity with the evidence."¹¹¹ They said in addition that heterodox books of good quality, after being repeatedly rejected by established academic presses, had to be published with the imprimatur of little-known publishers. They lamented that Carleton Coon, an eminent scholar who was the president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists in 1962, was first denounced and later ostracized because he would not toe the liberal line on racial matters. This, they said, sent an unmistakable message to other scholars.

Racists were not alone in lamenting the treatment accorded to Professor Coon. Writing in 1994, the liberal science writer Pat Shipman also expressed regret that "the tenor of the times" was such that Coon, a "scientific purist," was "disgraced and, to some extent, driven out of his profession" for two reasons. First, Coon refused to comment one way or the other when racist writers made use of Coon's studies of fossils and skulls. He said it was "the duty of a scientist to do his work conscientiously and...to reject publicly only the writings of those persons who...have misquoted him." Egalitarian critics insisted, however, that Coon should criticize the racists, that he "cannot disclaim all responsibility" in this regard.¹¹² In addition, egalitarians found fault because Coon persisted in "defending the unpopular position that the relative intelligence of the human races was a matter about which there were insufficient data."¹¹³ Coon's "crime" was not heresy. His position was the same as that expressed by Ashley Montagu and other egalitarians, when they were writing for *Science* or *Perspectives in Medicine and Biology*. But Coon wrote for the general public and continued to assert that "whether or not the average mental capacity of one race exceeds that of another is...beside the point because even if such differences exist – and we do not know yet whether they do or do not – each race includes bright, average, and dull people."¹¹⁴

Coon's statement was defensible. There are so many possible explanations for racial differences that it behooves cautious scholars to be skeptical, even agnostic, about the relations between nature and nurture, civilization and race. But by the 1960s the backlash against the white South had reached full force. By then a liberal orthodoxy held that, whatever scientists might think about the inadequacy of the evidence, they were not to get in the way of the struggle for social and civil rights. In 1962 the members of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists insisted on voting on a resolution that

all races were of equal intelligence, even though Coon insisted that the proof of this proposition (or of its antithesis) was still lacking. Coon then resigned as president of the Association, took early retirement from the University of Pennsylvania, and “died in 1981, unredeemed in the eyes of the anthropological community.”¹¹⁵

There is a saying that truth crushed to earth will rise again. The same is often true of nagging questions. Concerns about the relative influence of nature and nurture were stifled for a while, but they would persist as the course of school desegregation and integration proceeded through the 1960s and beyond.

*Raymond Wolters is Thomas Muney Keith professor of history at the University of Delaware. He received the American Bar Association's Silver Gavel Award for his earlier study of desegregation, **The Burden of Brown**. The article above is adapted from his forthcoming book.*

ENDNOTES

1. James Jackson Kilpatrick, *The Southern Case for School Segregation* (Crowell-Collier Press, 1962), 105; *Richmond News Leader*, June 1, 1955; Raymond Wolters, *The Burden of Brown: Thirty Years of School Desegregation* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984), 88–90.
2. *Richmond News Leader*, November 21, 22, and 23, 1955; James J. Kilpatrick, *The Sovereign States: Notes of a Citizen of Virginia* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1957).
3. Numan V. Bartley, *The Rise of Massive Resistance: Race and Politics in the South During the 1950s* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969), 131.
4. *Congressional Record*, 84th Congress, 2nd Session (March 12, 1956), 3948, 4004; Numan Bartley, *The Rise of Massive Resistance*, 116.
5. Alexander M. Bickel, *The Least Dangerous Branch: The Supreme Court at the Bar of Politics* (New York: 1962), 256.
6. Harry S. Ashmore, *An Epitaph for Dixie* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1957), 32.
7. Kilpatrick, *The Southern Case*, 43, 71, 70, 72, 72–93.
8. Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason: A Yankee View* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1961), 20, 35, 109. Putnam was sensitive to the charge that his work was “ungentlemanly” in that it gave offense to Negroes, a weak minority group that had suffered much from unfair discrimination. In response, Putnam shifted blame to egalitarians, especially Jewish egalitarians, who allegedly had selfish ulterior motives. “I indict the men who have fooled and goaded the Negro – the men who have made it necessary for the rest of us to point out truths which the Negro might otherwise have been spared the telling.”
9. Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 6.
10. I. A. Newby, *Challenge to the Court: Social Scientists and the Defense of Segregation, 1954–1966* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967), 152. The eight newspapers were the *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Examiner*, *Los Angeles Times*,

Pittsburgh Press, *Indianapolis Star-News*, *Newark News*, *Newark Star-Ledger*, and *Buffalo News*.

11. Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 13; Newby, *Challenge to the Court*, 165–167; John J. Jackson, Jr., *The Scientific Defense of Segregation*, 202–204 (MS); Corey T. Lessig, "Roast Beef and Racial Integrity: Mississippi's 'Race and Reason Day,'" *October 26, 1962*," *Journal of Mississippi History* 56 (1994): 1–15.

12. Putnam, *Race and Reality*, 81.

13. Barton Bernstein, review of *Race and Reason*, *Journal of Negro History* 48 (January 1963): 58–60; I. A. Newby, *Challenge to the Court*, 158; Louis Schneider, "Race, Reason and Rubbish Again," *Phylon* 23 (1962): 149.

14. Patterson, *Brown v. Board of Education*, 88.

15. James F. Byrnes, "Guns and Bayonets Cannot Promote Education," *U. S. News and World Report*, October 5, 1956, 104; Byrnes, "The Supreme Court Must Be Curbed," *U. S. News and World Report*, May 18, 1956, 50, 58; Byrnes, speech at dedication of Municipal Auditorium, Spartanburg, December 1, 1951; Howard H. Quint, *Profile in Black and White: A Frank Portrait of South Carolina* (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1958), 25.

16. Herbert Ravenall Sass, "Mixed Schools and Mixed Blood," *Atlantic Monthly* 198 (November 1956): 45–49.

17. A. James Gregor, "On the Nature of Prejudice," 217–224. Gregor, who was then employed at the University of Hawaii, did not give testimony in *Stell v. Savannah*. Some of his published articles were entered into the records of the case, however, and Gregor exchanged letters with the lawyers and other segregationists who were involved in the case.

18. Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 65.

19. Putnam-Morsell correspondence, quoted in Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (MS, Chapter 5, pp. 163–64); Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 30–31.

20. See Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation*, chapter 5; Newby, *Challenge to the Court*, chapter 6; and William H. Tucker, *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002) 65–130.

21. Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York: Oxford University Press, Fifth Edition Revised and Enlarged, 1974), ix.

22. *Science* 135 (March 16, 1962): 988.

23. Henry E. Garrett, reply to Juan Comas, *Current Anthropology* 2 (October 1961): 320.

24. A. Thomas, reply to Juan Comas, *Current Anthropology* 2 (October 1961): 330.

25. Charles L. Black, "The Lawfulness of the Segregation Decisions," 425.

26. G. Ainsworth Harrison, "The Mankind Quarterly," *Man* 61 (September 1961): 163–164.

27. Santiago Genoves, "Racism and 'The Mankind Quarterly,'" *Science*, December 8, 1961, 1928–1932.

28. Juan Comas, "'Scientific' Racism Again," *Current Anthropology* 2 (October 1961): 306.

29. Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (ms), 119.

30. William A. Massey, "The New Fanatics," *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (October–December, 1963): 76.

31. Robert Gayre, paraphrased by Carleton Putnam, "These Are the Guilty," *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (July–September, 1963): 22.
32. "The Mankind Quarterly Under Attack," *Mankind Quarterly* 2 (October–December, 1961): 79.
33. William Massey, "The New Fanatics," *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (October–December 1963): 75.
34. George A. Lundberg, "Some Neglected Aspects of the 'Minorities' Problem," *Mankind Quarterly* 3 (April–June 1963): 211–212.
35. Earnest A. Hooton, *Apes, Men and Morons* (New York: Putnam, 1937), 210.
36. Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 175.
37. Franz Boas, "The Real Race Problem," *Crisis* 1 (November 1910): 2, 23; Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man* (New York: McMillan, 1911), 5, 11, 22, 29.
38. Dinesh D'Souza, *The End of Racism* (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 153 and passim; Carl Degler, *In Search of Human Nature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 81 and passim; Hasia R. Diner, *In the Almost Promised Land* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1977), 147 and passim.
39. "Statement on the Nature of Race and Race Differences," *Current Anthropology* 2 (October 1961): 304–306.
40. *Science* 136 (March 16, 1962): 988; Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (ms), 263.
41. *American Association of Physical Anthropologists* 21 (1963): 402. Thirty years later, the 1993 business meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists entertained a motion that declared: "As scientists who study human evolution and variation, we believe that we have an obligation to share with other scientists and the general public our current understanding of the structure of human variation... Nineteenth and early twentieth century categories of race have often been used to support racist doctrines. The race concept currently is understood to have little scientific merit..." Yet this motion did not pass, perhaps because, as Pat Shipman has written, "the number of opinions in a room full of anthropologists is roughly equivalent to the number of anthropologists." Shipman, *The Evolution of Race*, 220–221.
42. C. Loring Brace, "Foreword to the Sixth Edition," *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, by Ashley Montagu (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1997), 14, 16.
43. Carleton S. Coon, *The Story of Man* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954), 187–188.
44. Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), 267 and passim.
45. *Ibid.*, 286.
46. *Academic American Encyclopedia* (Princeton: Arete Publishing Company, Inc., 1980), 33; *Academic American Encyclopedia* (Danbury: Grolier Incorporated, 1993), vol. 16, 33.
47. *Los Angeles Times*, February 20, 1995, A1.
48. Paul R. Gross, "Race: No Such Thing," *The New Criterion* 22 (April 2004), 86–90. Gross was reviewing *Race: The Reality of Human Differences* (Boulder: Westview, 2004), by Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele, which maintains that "race" is a sound biological classification and not just a social construct.
49. Melville J. Herskovits, "Rear-Guard Action," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 124–126. Herskovits also stated, however, that his opposition to

"the concept 'race'" was not entirely scientific – that he also felt the need to oppose a dubious idea that not only was being used "to preserve inequalities" but also caused such "tensions in world relations" as to constitute a "threat to world peace." *Ibid.*, 126, 129.

50. Franz Boas, "The Problem of the American Negro," *Yale Review* 10 (1920): 386.

51. Julian S. Huxley, *Heredity East and West* (New York: Schuman, 1949), 185.

52. Pierre L. van den Berghe, "Racism," *Academic American Encyclopedia* (1993): vol. 16, 37–38.

53. "On the Non-Existence of Human Races," *Current Anthropology* 3 (June 1962): 279–81. The matter of definition could become heated because it touched on the question of whether Jews constituted a distinct race. Some geneticists and physical anthropologists classified Jews as a race because of inbreeding and possession of specific heritable traits. See A. James Gregor's comments and citations in *Mankind Quarterly* 2 (1961): 3, and 3 (1962): 42–43. But Earnest Hooton of Harvard would not classify the Jews as a separate race even though he acknowledged the existence of inbreeding and "the dominance of certain anatomical features." *Ibid.*, 42. Juan Comas regarded any treatment of Jews as a biological race as dangerous myth-mongering, but A. James Gregor thought otherwise: "Since there is no universally accepted taxonomy, all that can legitimately be required of a scientist is that he use the term 'race' with a carefully stipulated denotation." *Ibid.*, 44. See also Carleton Coon, "Have the Jews a Racial Identity?" in Isaque Graebner, ed., *Jews in a Gentile World: The Problem of Anti-Semitism* (New York: McMillan, 1942), 20–37.

54. Solomon Garb to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 135–136.

55. Carleton Coon, *The Story of Man* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), 188.

56. Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Comment on Frank B. Livingston, 'On the Non-Existence of Human Races,'" *Current Anthropology* 3 (June 1962): 280.

57. Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 18, 47.

58. Derek Freeman was one of the first and probably the most influential of Mead's critics. See his book, *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983). Also see E. Michael Jones, *Degenerate Moderns: Modernity As Rationalized Sexual Misbehavior* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993).

59. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature*, 61, 71, 73. George W. Stocking has written that Boas was "the most important single force shaping American anthropology in the first half of the twentieth century." *Delimiting Anthropology* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001), 26.

For an especially pointed interpretation of Boas, see Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique* (Westport: Praeger, 1998), *passim*. Also see Marshall Hyatt, *Franz Boas: Social Activist* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), chapter 5 and *passim*; and a forthcoming article by Glen Anthony Harris, "Franz Boas and Black-Jewish Relations at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century." According to Harris, Boas thought that Negroes and Caucasians differed in their physical makeup. He thought the brain of the average Negro was smaller than that of the average Caucasian; that the differences in anatomy made it plausible to assume that there were corresponding mental differences. Boas even wrote that because of "fundamental differences between whites and blacks," "the first question to be answered by scientific investigation is.... How far [blacks] may be considered the inferior [and] whites...superior." According to Harris, Boas was a

racial liberal only in the sense that Boas thought that despite differences in racial averages there was also considerable overlap among individual members of the different races – and that consequently most blacks “when given the facility and opportunity will be perfectly able to fill the duties of citizenship,” and that some outstanding individual blacks “will be able to outrun their white competitors.” Harris based some of his comments on a book that Vernon J. Williams published in 1989 (*From a Caste a Minority: Changing Attitudes of American Sociologists toward Afro-Americans*) and on an article that Williams published in volume 92 of *The American Philosophical Association Newsletters on Philosophy and the Black Experience*.

60. Diner, *In the Almost Promised Land*, 143.

61. Long before Putnam, Degler, and Diner, Boas conceded the point. In 1924 he wrote: “It is easily recognized that the majority of defenders of the superiority of this Northwest European type are swayed, not by scientific arguments but by prejudice, but it is equally true that the defenders of race equality who have risen to combat their views are no less influenced by a desire to defend the position of those races that have been designated inferior.” *American Mercury* 3 (1926): 124. In 1925 Boas acknowledged that much of the literature that was “intended to maintain the irrelevancy of racial affiliation[s]” had been penned in “an effort to combat the anti-Semitic drift of our times.” *Nation* 120 (January 28, 1925): 89.

62. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature*, 82–83.

63. Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (ms, chapter 7, 264).

64. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: W. E. Norton and Company, 1981), 92–95.

65. Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Race*, 213. Franz Boas was more circumspect in his conclusions. As mentioned above (see note 59), Boas had reported that the races differed slightly in the structure of the brain, and that therefore it was likely that there were also differences in mental characteristics. However, Boas also reported “that the relation between mental ability and brain-weight is rather remote, and that we are not by any means justified in concluding that the larger brain is always the more efficient tool for mental achievement. There is presumably a slight increase of average ability corresponding to a considerable increase in average brain-weight; but this increase is so slight that in a comparison of the mental ability of the Negro race and the white race, the difference in size of the brain seems quite insignificant.” “The Real Race Problem,” 22, 23.

For yet another opinion, see the statement of Donald A. Swan in *Mankind Quarterly* 2 (1962): 237. “[S]tudies of large numbers of brains have established a positive relationship – statistical in nature – between brain weight and mental capabilities, and as Professor Carleton Coon notes ‘among living populations, absolute brain size is generally, although not necessarily individually, related to achievement.’ Furthermore, the brains of intellectually distinguished men are generally larger and more complex and those of mental defectives are generally smaller....”

Surprisingly, Henry E. Garrett, one of the most emphatic of the psychologists who insisted that Negroes were inferior to Caucasians in intelligence, and that some of that inferiority was due to heredity, once wrote that “discussion of brain size and intelligence is tedious and irrelevant. I doubt that anyone thinks that mere brain size has any marked relationship to intelligence. One of the largest brains on record is that of an idiot.” *Current Anthropology* 2 (October 1961): 319.

66. Dwight J. Ingle, letter to the editor, *Science* 133 (1961): 960; Ingle, "Racial Differences and the Future," *Science* 146 (1964): 378; Tucker, *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*, 155, 182.
67. Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (MS, chapter 6, 224).
68. Dwight J. Ingle, "Comments on the Teachings of Carleton Putnam," *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (1963): 30; Dwight J. Ingle, "Racial Differences in the Future," 375-379.
69. Dwight J. Ingle, "Comments on the Teachings of Carleton Putnam," 40, 41-42.
70. Carleton Putnam to Dwight Ingle, December 26, 1962, quoted in Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (ms chapter 7, page 288)
71. *Ibid.*, 302.
72. Carleton Putnam, "A Reply to Dwight Ingle," *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (July-September, 1963): 44.
73. Henry E. Garrett, "Racial Mixing Could Be Catastrophic," *U. S. News and World Report*, November 18, 1963, 92-93.
74. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Winter 1961): 262, 264.
75. Kilpatrick, *The Southern Case*, 50, 54.
76. Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 7.
77. Franz Boas, "The Real Race Problem," *Crisis* 1 (November 1910): 23.
78. Thomas Sowell, *Migrations and Cultures: A World View* (New York: Basic Books, 1996); Sowell, *Conquests and Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1998).
79. Franz Boas, "The Problem of the American Negro," *Yale Review* 10 (1920): 390.
80. Walter Lippmann, "A Future for the Tests," *New Republic* (November 29, 1922): 10.
81. Lippmann, quoted in Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* (New York: Free Press, 1994), 6.
82. Otto Klineberg, *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935), 59-60 and passim; John P. Jackson, Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), 22. Klineberg also noted that on World War I army tests the average score of black soldiers in four northern states was higher than the average score of whites from four southern states. Some critics took exception to comparing the best of one group with the worst of another, but the comparison reinforced the argument that educational, social and economic factors (that is, "culture") were key to understanding racial differences on intelligence tests.
83. Horace Mann Bond, "Intelligence Tests and Propaganda," *Crisis* 28 (1924): 63; Bond, "What Army 'Intelligence' Tests Measured," *Opportunity* 2 (1924): 198, 200; Bond, "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," *Journal of Negro Education* 27 (1958): 519, 529, 523.
84. Studies of identical twins who have been reared apart have led some researchers to estimate the influence of heredity as high as 70%.
85. Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation* (ms), 221.
86. Henry E. Garrett to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Winter 1962): 262.
87. Melville J. Herskovits, "Rear-Guard Action," 127.
88. Morton H. Frank to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 139.
89. Nathaniel H. Eisen to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 141.
90. Ashley Montagu to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 132, 133.

91. Dwight J. Ingle, "Comments on the Teachings of Carleton Putnam," 29.
92. *Ibid.*, 40, 41, 29, 28; *Science* 133 (1961): 960. However, Carleton Putnam remained unreconstructed and unrepentant: "No amount of talk about environment," he wrote, "can change the fundamental facts." "[A]nybody who can believe that the Negro's limitations are solely environmental in the face of African history and of Haitian history...and of forty years of intelligence tests, and of the microscopic studies of Vint, and of the morphology of Bean...and of the other evidence in [Wesley Critz George's book, *The Biology of the Race Problem*] ...any person, I say, who can believe the Negro is the product of his history and environment (instead of vice versa) in the face of all those facts may not belong in a mental institution, but I dread the thought of his teaching any child of mine." Putnam to *The New Republic* 148 (February 23, 1963): 29-30; Putnam, "These Are the Guilty," *Mankind Quarterly* 4 (July-September 1963): 25.
93. *Science* 100 (October 20, 1944): 383-384.
94. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 5 (Autumn 1961): 132, 133.
95. *Ibid.*, 132, 134. Montagu's statements were consistent with views expressed by his mentor, Franz Boas, who had written in 1924: "I grant willingly that proof of mental equality has not been adduced...But I insist that nobody has ever given satisfactory proof of an inherent inequality of races, and that the final solution of this problem still has to be found." *American Mercury* 3 (1924): 169.
96. Oscar Handlin, quoted by Carleton Putnam, "These Are the Guilty," 13.
97. Kenneth M. Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), vii.
98. Walter Jackson, *Gunnar Myrdal and America's Conscience: Social Engineering and Racial Liberalism, 1938-1987* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990). Also see John P. Jackson, Jr., "The Scientific Attack on *Brown v. Board of Education, 1954-1964*," *American Psychologist* 59 (September 2004): 531.
99. Michael J. Klarman, "How *Brown* Changed Race Relations: The Backlash Thesis," *Journal of American History* 81 (June 1994): 103.
100. Michael J. Klarman, *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights: The Supreme Court and the Struggle for Racial Equality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 385.
101. *Ibid.*, 447, 449, 298, 303, 296.
102. Quoted by Klarman, *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights*, 428.
103. *Ibid.*
104. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955), 298 n. 2, 300, 301.
105. Klarman, *From Jim Crow to Civil Rights*, 429.
106. For a good summary of the social and economic trends, see Michael J. Klarman, "Brown, Racial Change, and the Civil Rights Movement," *Virginia Law Review* 80 (February 1994): 7-150. In *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York: Knopf, 1949), V. O. Key stressed that southern race relations had been greatly influenced by the concerns of whites who lived in predominantly black areas.
107. Henry E. Garrett, "One Psychologist's View of 'Equality of the Races,'" *U. S. News and World Report*, August 14, 1961, 72.
108. Santiago Genoves, "Letter to the Editor," *Science* 135 (March 16, 1962): 988.
109. Garrett, "One Psychologist's View of 'Equality of the Races,'" 73.
110. Putnam, *Race and Reason*, 49.
111. Garrett, "One Psychologist's View of 'Equality of the Races,'" 73.

112. Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism*, 209, 207. For more on this point, see Jackson, *The Scientific Defense of Segregation*, chapter 7.

113. Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism*, 209, 206.

114. Carleton Coon, *The Story of Man*, 182.

115. Pat Shipman, *The Evolution of Racism*, 217, 198–200.