

## The Bootblack Stand



Dr. George Washington Plunkitt, our prize-winning political analyst, has just completed a penetrating study of the last Congolese election. Published in August, it focuses on the unique position of minority groups in the Congolese electoral process; it can be purchased in all bookstores. It is titled *Escape! A New Demand Response System*. Now, through this column, the distinguished Dr. Plunkitt has agreed to advise American statesmen in this time of troubles. Address all correspondence to The Bootblack Stand, The Establishment, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, Continental U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

Why does no one remember that I stormed through the Illinois Primary with a landslide 63 per cent?

E. Muskie

Dear Mr. Muskie:

You were running against an unemployed about-to-be divorced Catholic poet.

—GWP

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

!&?\*!(\$, you should be able to help me out. Those \$\*?&!?! senators run me over the coals and its impossible to get a word out edgewise with all those \$f\*&?!\$\* newsmen around. How can I re-establish my reputation as a dignified, honest lady lobbyist.

Dita Beard

Dear Mrs. Beard:

Some time ago, I pointed out the difference between honest graft and dishonest graft and as I said, "I seen my chances and I took 'em." Frankly this whole ITT thing sounds silly to me. Who would throw an antitrust suit for money that didn't even go into their own personal bank account?

—GWP

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

It has come to my attention, quite by happenstance, that a letter allegedly signed by me and written on Senate stationery was published in your May column. I say by happenstance because I never read, for I realize that so much more can be learned by just talking to folks and that printed matter is elitist and the work of fat cats who lack compassion and understanding for the people.

Now I never wrote that letter, and, in fact, I rarely write at all, having

only recently learned how to spell my name. As that letter made me sound stupid and unsympathetic to the problems of the people I demand an immediate retraction from your column. I realize that your publication of this letter was an attempt at political assassination of me by conveying to the people the fallacious notion that I write letters to fat cat elitists and running dogs.

Senator Name Withheld  
Evansville, Indiana

Dear Senator Name Withheld:

You have me wrong. I never would do anything to hinder your gorgeous career, for it has provided vast amusement to me throughout the years. Indeed, I was surprised to see that you actually wrote a letter, but then I thought you might have put one of your enlightened aides on the project. I should have known that the letter was not your work. And, certainly, I would have caught on to the real source had I but read the newspaper at the time your letter arrived in our offices. You see, at that time there was an escape by several patients from the Indiana State Insane Asylum. Had I been aware of it I would have been more attentive to their mischief. Incidentally, one of the patients is still at large. I expect he will be nabbed when he enters the governor's race this fall.

—GWP

Professor of Psychology at Harvard University. Mr. Herrnstein came under attack following the publication of his article "I.Q." in the September 1971 issue of *The Atlantic*.

In his article, Mr. Herrnstein recounts the development of intelligence tests and reviews some of the literature on the concept of intelligence, the relations between intelligence, education and socio-economic status and the effect of environment and heredity on intelligence. When he considers the extent to which intelligence is a product of environment or heredity, he takes up two articles by Arthur R. Jensen, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley and another object of the SDS campaign. Mr. Herrnstein agrees with Mr. Jensen and others that about eighty per cent of the variation in intelligence is attributable to heredity. Mr. Herrnstein states that Jensen's two papers leave little doubt about the heritability of I.Q. among North American and Western European whites, whom most data on the subject describe," and he notes that there has been little controversy over this finding. On the other hand, there has been much controversy over the extent to which racial differences in I.Q. can be attributed to genetic differences between blacks and whites. Mr. Herrnstein argues that, given the current state of knowledge about the matter,

nothing conclusive can be said right now but he maintains that, given "sufficient ingenuity and hard work," knowledge about this matter can be substantially improved.

Mr. Herrnstein advances an argument about the role of inherited intelligence in a society in which success is based on merit. At one point, he puts his argument in the form of a "syllogism":

1. If differences in mental abilities are inherited, and
2. If success requires those abilities, and
3. If earnings and prestige depend on success,
4. Then social standing (which reflects earnings and prestige) will be based to some extent on inherited differences among people.

Mr. Herrnstein lists five "corollaries" to this "syllogism" and he then concludes that "the syllogism and its corollaries point to a future in which social classes not only continue but become ever more solidly built on in-born differences." Mr. Herrnstein believes "classlessness is elusive because people vary and compete for gain — economic and otherwise." He notes the efforts of reformers who hope to achieve classlessness by improving social conditions and making the environments in which people live similar or even identical. But, as he points out, reducing the effect of environment on variations in intelligence necessarily

increases that of heredity. The paradox is that, in a meritocratic society, efforts to eliminate classes based at least partially on non-genetic differences help to produce or reinforce classes based largely on genetic differences. Since the publication of his article, Mr. Herrnstein has been given the works. At Harvard, radicals involved in the anti-Herrnstein campaign have held meetings, passed out leaflets, and put up posters. One poster, many copies of which appeared on the Harvard campus during the first semester of this past academic year, was a "Wanted" poster produced by the Harvard chapter of SDS and Harvard's radical University Action Group (UAG). Besides characterizing Mr. Herrnstein as "Pigeonman" — most of his laboratory research has been on pigeons — the poster misrepresented what he says in his article. For example, the poster said that, in his article, Mr. Herrnstein offers this definition: "Blacks: A low-capacity residue unable to master even the common occupations." What Mr. Herrnstein really says in his article is: "As the wealth and complexity of human society grow, there will be precipitated out of the mass of humanity a low-capacity (intellectual and otherwise) residue that may be unable to master the common occupations, cannot compete for success and achievement, and are most likely to be born

to parents who have similarly failed." When Alan J. Garfinkel, a member of Harvard's UAG and a fourth-year graduate student in — of all things — philosophy, was asked by a reporter for *The Phoenix*, a Boston weekly newspaper, to account for the discrepancy, Garfinkel said: "It was a dumb thing. I had to finish up the poster and I didn't have the article in front of me. The question was, was I going to haul ass for two miles at 2 a.m. or was I going to rely on my usually good memory. I don't think I betrayed the sense of what he was saying, though." (Paul Solman, "The Herrnstein IQ Controversy," *The Phoenix*, April 18 1972.)

Some radicals at Harvard have not only criticized Mr. Herrnstein's article but harassed Mr. Herrnstein himself. They have attended some of his classes, where they have distributed anti-Herrnstein literature to the students, taped anti-Herrnstein posters to the walls and attempted to turn discussion or question-and-answer sessions into debates over the article.

At Harvard, some students and teachers who do not belong to radical groups or favor extreme tactics have become critics of Mr. Herrnstein. Much of their criticism has been directed not at any deficiencies or errors in Mr. Herrnstein's article but at what they suppose to be his political motivations or his article's political implications. It has been argued that Mr. Herrnstein published his article in *The Atlantic* instead of a "scholarly" journal and wrote about intelligence in the first place not because he wanted to bring his scholarly work to other people's attention but because he is "racist," "sexist" or "anti-working class." It also has been argued that, even if Mr. Herrnstein himself were not "racist," "sexist" or "anti-working class," he should not have published his article because of its political, that is "racist," "sexist" or "anti-working class" implications. In addition to being slanderous, these arguments are weak and most of the people who advance them are disingenuous. These people constantly have rejected the distinction between scholarship and politics and even reviled those who have attempted to uphold the distinction in principle and practice. Now they present themselves as steadfast defenders of the distinction, outraged by Mr. Herrnstein's alleged failure to observe it.

The campaign against Mr. Herrnstein has not been limited to Harvard, for the current academic mentality that acquiesces to this sort of totalitarian activity now can be found on most colleges. On February 28, Professor Herrnstein was at the University of Iowa. He was scheduled to deliver a speech there, but he had to cancel when he learned SDS had gathered a hostile crowd of about 400 students to confront him. On March 3, Mr. Herrnstein informed the Princeton Psychology Colloquium Committee that he was

cancelling the talk he had been scheduled to give at one of its weekly meetings for advanced psychology students. He cancelled the talk after the chairman of the Colloquium Committee told him that Princeton's University Action Group planned to attend the meeting and question Mr. Herrnstein about his views on I.Q., which was not the scheduled topic of the meeting. Furthermore, the group intended to use force if necessary to prevent Mr. Herrnstein from leaving the room were he to refuse to answer their questions. Commenting on his decision not to go to Princeton, Mr. Herrnstein said: "I just won't speak at all under these conditions because I see no reason to subject myself to physical violence." (By the way, the nefarious topic on which he had planned to speak at Princeton was "The Visual World of the Pigeon.")

What may prove to be the most extraordinary event of the anti-Herrnstein campaign occurred at Harvard just three days after Mr. Herrnstein cancelled his appearance at Princeton. On the morning of March 6, Mr. Herrnstein went to the Allston Burr building's lecture hall B, where he delivered a lecture to about 250 students in his "Introduction to Psychology" course. He finished his lecture at 11 a.m. As the students were leaving the lecture hall, about twenty-five members of Harvard SDS and Harvard's University Action Group (UAG) rushed through two sets of doors near the rostrum, gathered around Mr. Herrnstein and shouted questions at him.

Mr. Herrnstein did not answer their questions but, accompanied by a plain-clothes Harvard police officer, he made his way through the crowd. As he left the building, he had to scuffle with an SDS member who tried to block his way.

He and the Harvard police officer walked from the Allston Burr building up Quincy Street to William James Hall, where Mr. Herrnstein has his office. On the way, they were surrounded by the SDS-UAG group, whose members continued to shout at Mr. Herrnstein.

At William James Hall, Mr. Herrnstein and the officer entered an elevator, and members of the SDS-UAG group tried to enter it too. The officer complained that there were too many people in the elevator and he and Mr. Herrnstein quickly switched to another elevator, where there was scuffling when the officer tried to close the doors. According to Daniel Swanson, a reporter for *The Harvard Crimson*, "Herrnstein said nothing throughout the confrontation but appeared shaken." On the elevator ride to the sixth floor, about ten members of the group accompanied the officer and Mr. Herrnstein, who continued not to respond to what members of the group were saying to him. On the sixth floor, Mr. Herrnstein, followed by the people who had accompanied him on the elevator ride, walked up and down the

(continued on page 24)

## LATIN MASS

### "Missa Ave Verum"

A Record to Treasure

The beauty of the traditional Catholic High Mass, sung entirely in the Latin you remember from your own Parish Church, will be yours when you have this album in your library.

Intended to preserve the simple majesty and beauty of the traditional Tridentine Latin High Mass as celebrated in the past, this album serves also as a consolation to elderly and shut-in Catholics.

"Missa Ave Verum" was chosen because of its frequent selection by choirmasters throughout the world. It will truly be a treasured keepsake for Catholic children, many of whom may never experience in person the celebration of a High Mass in Latin.

This album is a live recording of the Mass celebrated in Saint Joan of Arc Church, Indianapolis, Ind., by the Pastor, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Clement M. Bosler. The choir, "The Columbians" famous chorus of the Mater Dei Council, Knights of Columbus, was directed by the organist, Edward F. Krieger.

Finest quality 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  rpm LP mono (compatible with stereo). Forty minutes in length.

Price: \$4.95 each (\$4.50 each for 5 or more). Please make check payable to "LATIN MASS."

— clip and mail this coupon —

The Alternative  
Dept. M9  
R.R. 11, Box 360  
Bloomington, Ind. 47401

Please send \_\_\_\_\_ Mass albums  
at \$4.95 each (\$4.50 each for  
5 or more) Check or M.O.  
payable to LATIN MASS en-  
closed.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

(For Canadian delivery, sorry,  
but please add 90¢ for  
Canadian postage)





To the Editor:

Poor Michael Clurman (March) has "not seen a single modern cogent, moral argument for accepting the distribution of income which a free market presents us with." Perhaps he hasn't really looked.

My income in a free market represents what other people are perfectly willing to give up in order to acquire my services, or the goods to which my labor contributes (in this case, NATIONAL REVIEW). Except for monopoly or theft, income is a measure of one's exchange value to others.

Now, Why does Mr. Clurman feel morally justified in forcing me, with the help of however large a majority, to share that which has been freely given to me for my considerable efforts? Contrary to the opening quote, I do not have an unnatural monopoly over libertarian economics, nor have I stolen anything from NATIONAL REVIEW's beloved subscribers. True, I did "inherit" a vocabulary and some tuition money from my parents (though I lived, rent-free, in a dog hospital), but that was their right since their incomes were also obtained without force or fraud.

The dollars I have symbolize what I have created, just as surely as a pot belongs to the potter who made it. If Clurman wishes to take my little pot of wealth, the burden of moral justification would seem to lie on his modern shoulders. Otherwise, we should brand and prosecute him as the thief he aspires to be.

Alan Reynolds  
Associate Editor  
National Review

To the Editor:

I just read your editorial in the May issue of *The Alternative* and I didn't like the part about the "noble red men." You say, "look what we have done for the American Indian." I know that time changes lots of things - but I believe there is one fact in history which remains the same WHO WAS HERE FIRST? Us or the "noble red man?" If memory serves me right I believe he was. Probably tied up the boat when our ancestors stepped off the Mayflower.

But the great white man fought them and took the land away from them and put them on a little patch of land, gave them a few blankets and food and ordered them not to stray out of bounds. That's Americanism and Christianity? (Sic) Well, I'm not too proud of it. You also say "our government" is it not "their" government, too? Don't they have a right to go to Senate hearings if they so choose? And you say "no civilized man" times have changed, Mr. Tyrrell, they're civilized maybe more than you. In my opinion, you sound like an "I" man. What makes you think you are any better than they are? They're just not our kind, right?

And while we're at it I suppose you believe the American Negroes should also be put on a reservation. And how did they get here? Did not the great white man bring them here for slaves? Naturally, they multiplied as most species

of human life does (Sic). And I say HURRAH for Abraham Lincoln - he was a great and wise man. In my opinion, the greatest President this nation has ever had or ever will have. Let's also put Catholics and Jews on reservations. They're not our kind, either. Have we left anyone out? Personally, I do believe that all men (and women) are created equal and should be treated as equals. I have never known any full-blooded Indians - but I did work with a girl that was part Indian - I believe her grandmother was a "half-breed" as you would probably say. I liked her and we got along just fine. I didn't feel I was better than she was. One of my best friends is a Catholic - I don't believe in her religion, but I respect her right to her own beliefs no matter how odd. I have worked with some very wonderful Negroes - men and women. Some of my favorite entertainers are Negroes.

I'm proud to say I'm not prejudiced against Indians, Negroes, Catholics, Jews or whatever I'm just prejudiced against people who are prejudiced!!

Penelope Penberth  
Bloomington, Indiana

To the Editor:

I admire John R. Coyne, Jr., and thus I was greatly disappointed in his *Centrist Nixon, Centrist Nation* piece in your May *Alternative*.

First, for reasons articulately offered by George McCarter in the same issue and by Evans and Novak in their book, Richard Nixon is not a "centrist." That is, he is not a product of nor conscious espouser for the broad, middle base of non-ideological citizens which make up our country. He has always been an introvert by nature, we are told by his intimates, and his few associates were men of non-descript though hyperambitious character with equal desires to achieve success. The President is a card-carrying Pragmatist.

Secondly, by asking if we, as conservatives, "really (would) enjoy living in a completely conservative society?", John Coyne perhaps unconsciously assumes that conservatism is an ideology. Though some people by the rigor of their "conservative demonstration" may facilitate such appearances, I join the late Willmoore Kendall in his nearly universally held view. That is, that there is a reason no one has ever written or attempted to write a book entitled, *Conservatism, A to Z*. As philosophical and-or political conservatives, our views are "in continuing approximation." Dr. Jeffrey Hart offers proofs in his, *The American Dissent* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), and one only has to read a single issue of *National Review* to realize that there is no party line amongst us. In his heart, I know that John Coyne agrees with me, because the day American conservatism loses its basically eclectic and - fusionist character (i.e., the day we deny American pluralism) is the day we join the fate of moribund Liberalism.

Thirdly, assuming the President is a pragmatic fellow, I also assume he acknowledges a momentary truth, though a truth no less: One can get away with moves to the left (e.g., FAP, wage-price, China, low profile on defense, etc.) that one cannot effect with impunity to the right. (e.g. attempt in 1969 to decrease size of state department). By pulling off a China reverse and pleasing at least most editors of the *New Republic* with FAP, the President gains marginal political support in certain communities not accessible to a normal Republican. The Silent Majority, which increasingly describes itself as conservative as time evolves, is satisfied with Nixon stands and-or moves on busing, abortion and areas of material interest. The Silent Majority has never been an avid follower of foreign affairs, nor will it unless it directly involves American boys or an attack on American soil. The Silent Majority, the visceral base of

"grassroots conservatism" sociologists are discussing more frequently these days, depends on the Barry Goldwaters, the Ronald Reagans and the identified public office holders to describe the "conservative's position" on China, Vietnam, etc.

The danger in Conservative support of Nixon and the danger of not articulating a position to the right of this antiprincipled administration would not have been real had our political leaders, Governor Reagan and Senator Goldwater, offered a spirited to at least luke-warm opposition during those days of the week Nixon is Liberal. However, by omission, established senior conservative leaders in effect confirmed the media's portrait of Nixon as the Conservative Alternative. And so it is that a pragmatic president, described today as a "centrist," can tomorrow move thirty degrees to the left and still be called a "centrist." Or so it will be unless a few more established conservative leaders offer the nation a little more choice and a bit less echo on behalf of Nixon's right flank in the years ahead.

Ronald F. Docksai  
national chairman,  
Young Americans for Freedom

To the Editor:

Why exactly David Brudnoy takes upon himself the task of reviewing a book, the contents of which and subject whereof he confesses some ignorance, is a question which I should think at least a few other readers may have asked. Several of his open-ended sentences and paragraphs could stand reply and clarification. First, he is wrong to judge today's theatre on the basis of flying genitalia. "Dionysus in 69," and "Fortune and Men's Eyes," the implicit suggestion in his review-article being that such like are representative of all modern theatre productions. They may be representative of a theatrical sexual preoccupation, but probably not much more. Sure, "Hair" was highly profitable in Boston (and elsewhere) while it ran, but "Jacques Brel" and "The Proposition" too, have been just as profitable and popular in their own ways. And for each college production of "Fortune and Men's Eyes" he points to, I'll bet he can also point to a traditional play in a seasonal program, for my guess is that a collegiate company cannot hope to attract a sizeable audience throughout its season if it insists on toasting the *avant-garde* is bound to be artificial. People just can't be homogenized like that, especially as concerns the theatre. I've seen some Shakespearean productions which Mr. Brudnoy would have found just as dismaying as anything done by the Living Theater. On the other hand, Robert Bolt's "Vivat, Regina" is, by all standards, theatrically conservative. Anyone who frequents the theatre is bound to be sophisticated in his own way, and educated, even if superficially, to the kinds of changes the twentieth century has wrought in drama. Those who were weaned on Pirandello in the thirties can hardly be called "new theatre-goers" today.

And, third, if I may be forgiven for suggesting the matter, it does seem to me as if Mr. Brudnoy may be confusing the *avant-garde* with modern drama. Though it is true that one arises from the other, the two aren't always the same. To use an example from a form of entertainment he knows well, Robbe-Grillet's "L'Eden et apres" is *avant-garde* and would have been impossible without the Dali-Bunuel "Un Chien Andalou," but there's little point in calling the latter *avant-garde*. It's now part of the classical cinematic repertory.

Your humble servant,  
Steve Finer  
Boston, Massachusetts