

[REDACTED]
Gainesville, FL 32608
December 12, 1994

C-SPAN
400 N. Capitol St. NW, Suite 650
Washington D.C., 20001
Attn: Mr. Brian Lamb

viewer

Dear Mr. Lamb,

I just finished watching the so-called symposium on "The BellCurve" sponsored by Howard University and The National Urban League. Use of the term "symposium" stretches the definition of the word; it was more a session of preachers preaching to each other and to the converted. I have never heard a more prejudiced and biased presentation. A few of my observations follow:

For a change, it sounded like the panel all had read at least some of the book. This is a welcome change from previous TV critics I have heard.

Dr. Herrnstein held a PhD from Harvard and Dr. Murray holds a PhD from MIT, both of which are pretty darn good degrees. Except for fellow geologist Dr. S.J. Gould, I don't know where the PhD's for the others on the panel came from, but I doubt if their degrees are any more prestigious than those of the authors. Yet, the panel constantly referred to each other as "Doctor" and, just as constantly, referred to the authors as "Mister". Pretty tacky. Also down right rude. That includes Gould, who certainly knows better. I'm not so sure some of the others do know any better.

A significant point brought out in the book is that it is very difficult to separate the effects of hybridization in studies of American Negroes, as opposed to studying Nigerians in Nigeria, for example. The President of Howard looked to me to be less than full Negro and the others on the panel looked to me to be very nearly white and sure enough, they all sounded like they were pretty successful. Point being that if you tell some already successful people of mixed race that they can't be successful because they have a little Negro blood in them, they are just liable to disagree with you. And why not? I think the book did a good job of pointing out that there are a lot of successful people in the US who call themselves black without specifying just how "black" they are. The problem is that the ice is mighty thin over that subject and nobody will get out on it.

I had finished Prof. Rushton's book "Race, Evolution and Behaviour" before I got The Bell Curve and I found them both to be very supportive of the qualitative conclusions I had

reached during my three and a half years of employment in Nigeria in the early '70s. Racism, as we know it, doesn't exist in Nigeria because they are all Negroes and the percentage of white, expatriots is so small as to be measured as a tiny fraction of one percent. In a business as large as the one I worked for, where an important goal is to identify and train a regional staff to take over the company, some kind of cognitive ability testing is the only way to go. You cannot fill a pipeline of future supervisors, managers and executives any other way. Job-specific testing is useful in the short term, but is a waste of time for the longer term goal. The antagonists on the panel went on about it not being necessary to know a lot more than the job requires. I doubt if any of them ever worked in a circumstance where the "executive pipeline" had to be kept full. But they would be the first to claim foul when blacks don't get promoted out of the job they are in.

All in all, I'm getting used to the liberal, left wing media slamming away at The Bell Curve because they can't stand looking at the truth; it might put the lie to their stories. As a suggestion, why not consider a real symposium with a panel consisting of a few fully qualified persons who have STUDIED The Bell Curve and who can present opinions from both the pro and the con points of view without having the blatant, defensive, prejudiced attitude of the Howard - Urban League bunch.

Sincerely yours,

