Dear Fellow Member of the National Academy of Sciences:

"Poor women have babies because, in their bleak world, babies are the only dependable source of happiness", observes Negro author Kristin Hunter. To look aside from the probably dysgenie effects and the potential agony to all concerned if this observation is valid is an irresponsibility on the part of our nation's intellectual community quite comparable, in my opinion, to the disregard by German intellectuals of the mysterious disappearance of Jews in their country during the Nazi era.

The above quotation is taken from page 4 of PRAY FOR BARBARA'S BABY, a reprint of an article from the January 1969 Reader's Digest. This reprint is the first of a rather extensive collection of enclosures that are transmitted herewith in an attempt to enlist your participation in altering the "unsearch" posture of the National Academy of Sciences as it has been for the last three years to one that endeavors to promote vigorous inquiry directed towards establishing relevant objective realities about our national human quality problems including their racial aspects. In particular this letter is intended to furnish background in evaluating Professor Jensen's Harvard Educational Review article that I now hope I shall be able to send to you about one week before the meeting. The reasons for this delay are interesting.

On March 24, I wrote to Miss Margaret K. O'Hara of the Harvard Educational Review asking how to order for distribution to the Engineering, Physiology, Psychology and Anthropology sections of the National Academy about 150 copies of the article, HOW MUCH CAN WE BOOST IQ AND SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT?, by Arthur R. Jensen, which occupied most of the Winter Quarter issue of the Harvard Educational Review. The reply did not grant me permission to place an order, but I was given permission to reproduce portions of Jensen's article for this purpose. These two letters are Enclosures (2) and (3).

Professor Jensen was also denied permission to order reprints from Harvard but was granted permission to reproduce the article. Professor Jensen prefers that I do not reproduce portions and is prepared to honor my request for reprints so that I may distribute them prior to the Spring meeting of the Academy.

I intend to obtain copies of this article and to send it to a
number of members of several sections. In the meantime, I am sending copies
of this letter. My position in respect to Jensen's article has been
expressed in a criticism that I made of two columns written by
Joseph Alsop. Possibly these columns have come to the attention of many
members of the Academy and some impressions that they give should be
corrected. Accordingly, I am furnishing reproductions of Alsop's columns
together with his letter to the Washington Post that evaluates comments
by other psychologists on Jensen's article. These comments are now in

In Mr. Alsop's columns, certain major points were inaccurately
reported. My comments on Alsop's article and his acknowledgment are
Enclosures (7) and (8). I also prepared a statement criticizing in
general the press reports about Jensen's article and in addition emphasizing
those aspects of Jensen's article that support my objections to the
National Academy of Science's statement on HUMAN GENETICS AND URBAN SLUMS.
This statement of mine was reported by Associated Press and printed in at
least one newspaper of which I enclose a copy as Enclosure (9).

Public attention to the problem areas that in my opinion the
Academy has irresponsibly refused to face have recently appeared in a
number of other journals. I enclose several examples. I direct your
attention specifically in Enclosure (11) to Holmes Alexander's quotation
of Jensen's fear of "genetic enslavement" and "greatest injustice to
Negro Americans." These are precisely the points that I emphasized in my

The Level I and Level II Learning abilities defined by Jensen
to me to be exactly the type of "new method" that the N.A.S. Council state-
ment discounts. Jensen's use of this method of analysis and particularly
its relationship to racial differences is discussed clearly in an
Associated Press news story, Enclosure (12). (Jensen has objected to the
phrase "obvious differences in inborn mental ability" as an inaccurate
quotation in this report but has not criticized the description of his
research.)

My attempts to provoke objective explorations and discussions
on the part of the president and the council of the Academy over a period
of years have proved unsuccessful. My correspondence with the Academy
organization on these attempts is extensive and, for safe keeping,
recorded on microfilm. A sample of the correspondence is enclosed start-
ing with a letter of May 4, 1966 from Harvey Brooks, then Chairman of
COSPUP, expressing doubt that the N.A.S. should study possible dysgenic
effects of welfare programs, and above all, not consider racial questions,
no matter how scientific the methods! [I also enclose as Enclosure (14)
the exchange of correspondence with the Faculty of the Department of
Genetics to which Brooks refers and as Enclosure (15) a recent appraisal by
Walter Alvarez of the Jukes studies. In October 1967, the Academy issued a statement on HUMAN GENETICS AND URBAN SLUMS provoked, according to SCIENCE, by my urging. It was my appraisal that this statement could properly be described, to quote correspondence to me from an eminent N.A.S. psychologist, as a "disgrace".

Several key items are enclosed selected from my correspondence with the Academy subsequent to the publication of the Council's statement: Enclosure (16) 1 Feb 68, Seitz to Shockley; (17) 3 Mar 68, Shockley to Seitz, (including a postscript stipulating that all the exchanges of correspondence be regarded as public); (18) 7 Mar 68, Seitz to Shockley; (For perspective on Dr. Seitz's phrase "exacerbate existing tensions", I insert as Enclosure (19) a 1966 letter from Dr. J. B. deC.M. Saunders quoting Curt Stern, one of the authors of the Academy statement, as anticipating "within a year when the environment has cooled off a little."); (20) 15 Mar 68, Shockley to Seitz; (21) 21 Mar 68, Seitz to Shockley. I responded to President Seitz's 21 March letter at the Spring meeting by criticizing the Academy's position, opposing W. D. McElroy's electon to the Council on the basis of his support of the Academy endorsed statement [see Enclosure (17), Shockley to Seitz for 3 Mar 68], "The high birth rate of the impoverished does not constitute a major threat to overall national prosperity..."], offering myself as a write-in candidate for the Council in his place (I believe I obtained about six votes), and arranging for several relevant contributed papers.

My experience with the Academy is strongly supportive of The Wall Street Journal appraisal by its editor, Vermont Royster, Enclosure (22). In brief, I believe that in our democracy some of the wisest words are in the First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of speech and of the press. I appraise the views of Brooks [4 May 66, Enclosure (13)], Seitz [7 Mar 68, Enclosure (18)] and the Faculty of the Department of Genetics at Stanford [Enclosure (14)] as meaning that the public should not be trusted and thus as being more in keeping with totalitarian politics than with our own. The view that controversial research results should be obscured is in conflict with the wisdom of the First Amendment for which I have acquired profound respect during my experiences with the press over the last three years.

It is my hope that at the Spring meeting a resolution will be adopted that will properly disavow the Council's "unsearch" position about HUMAN GENETICS AND URBAN SLUMS. I hope that the public will thereby learn that objective study of possible dysgenic trends in our population is both possible and urgent. If this occurs at the Spring meeting then I believe that the current Lysenko-like record will be left on the history of our Academy for significantly less years than occurred in Russia.

Sincerely,

W. Shockley

WS:els

Enclosures listed on separate page.
P.S. While this letter was in process, Professor Jensen sent me Enclosure (23), a letter from the University of Buffalo documenting the "research taboo" attitude of the Harvard Educational Review.

An additional item of information is that Jensen has two contributions in the Proc., N.A.S.: 1967, 58, 149-157; 1968, 60, 1330-1337.

Enclosures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enclosure</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Jan 69</td>
<td>I-163 Kristin Hunter, PRAY FOR BARBARA'S BABY, Reader's Digest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>31 Mar</td>
<td>69 I-168.1 Alsop on Dr. Jensen, response to Brazziel's letter, Washington Post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>18 Mar</td>
<td>69 I-169 Shockley re Alsop (Criticism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>30 Mar</td>
<td>69 I-172 Joseph Alsop to W. Shockley letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>24 Mar</td>
<td>69 I-172 (AP) Dr. Shockley Again Urges Racial Intelligence Probe, Daily Advance, Lynchburg, p. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>10 Mar</td>
<td>69 I-162 Mike Culbert, RUNNING THE RISK OF RUFFLING ENVIRONMENTALIST FEATHERS and SHOCKLEY, TOO, RISKS WRATH OF THE DOMINANT 'INVERTED LIBERALS', Berkeley Daily Gazette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Mar</td>
<td>(Rev. Side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>7 Apr</td>
<td>69 I-173 Holmes Alexander, HOW TO REDUCE HARDSHIP AND HANDICAPS, McNaught Syndicate, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>6 Feb</td>
<td>69 I-149 (AP) Study claims Negro, white kids differ in inborn mental ability, Palo Alto Times, p. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>4 May</td>
<td>66 I-6 Harvey Brooks to W. Shockley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>Oct 66</td>
<td>6 I-6 Exchange of correspondence with the Faculty of the Department of Genetics, Stanford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>27 Jan</td>
<td>69 I-158 Walter C. Alvarez, M.D., MORE TRIBES OF PAUPERS, Modern Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>25 Mar</td>
<td>68 F. Seitz to W. Shockley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>3 Mar</td>
<td>68 W. Shockley to F. Seitz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>7 Mar</td>
<td>68 F. Seitz to W. Shockley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>29 Sep</td>
<td>66 J. B. deC.M. Saunders, M.D. letter to W. Shockley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>15 Mar</td>
<td>68 W. Shockley to F. Seitz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>21 Mar</td>
<td>68 F. Seitz to W. Shockley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P.S. Enclosure (23) Letter from the University of Buffalo to Professor Jensen.