Hal Markowitz
Department of Biology
San Francisco State University

The tendency to use every weapon at our disposal to attack our real or imagined enemies is an unfortunate part of our heritage. Indeed, it is one of the evils which those of us joined to work for social reform wish to expose and strive to eliminate in our own behaviors. Consequently, I am struck by the apparent paradox between the worthwhile intentions of these authors and some of the literary techniques which they have utilized. We are provided important information about apparent contradictions in Herrnstein's public 'testimony'. It is a shame that these critical data are obscured by non-sequiturs and statements quoted out of context.

With respect to the IQ controversy, and Herrnstein's role in it, there are so many methodological and philosophical inadequacies in the original work that it does not need to be attacked by indirection. As has frequently been pointed out, the basic construct "intelligence" is one of the weakest in the psychological repertoire. The impossibility of developing culture-free tests of relative ability is the heart of the problem. No mathematical techniques, no matter how sophisticated or unique, can do anything to enhance the fundamentally inadequate comparative data provided by available IQ tests. Yet, purported intelligence measures continue to have great popularity and almost magical effects upon beliefs about ourselves and beliefs about and actions toward others. At any rate, the work of Cyril Burt is hardly the weakest cornerstone of Herrnstein's position, and I am not at all sure why the IQ nonsense is of any importance for the present article which focuses on the 'war effort'.

What the careful reader must finally extract from this article is the fact that Herrnstein's 1965 *Atlantic Monthly* article clearly states the military nature of his classified research. This *does* seem to discredit his late (1971) statement quoted in the last paragraph by the present authors. One technical note of caution is necessary: the 1971 statement says that Herrnstein "never trained pigeons to hunt down Viet-Cong" and that to his knowledge the company with which he is consulted "did not so train pigeons either". It does not say that his work might not logically have been used by others for exactly that purpose, nor do these quotations deny the possibility that Herrnstein's research might have included training for some target group other than the Viet Cong.

This review is certainly not a defense of Herrnstein's efforts... an individual has moral responsibility for assessing the potential as well as intended uses of their inventions, training procedures and products. It is also important for us to evaluate one another's contributions and bring to light those efforts which are clearly contrary to minimum standards of human decency. I applaud the attempt to share important data with us. It is the significance of this data which makes me wish that the authors had not embellished it with conjecture about lies and implicit meanings. The deeds speak for themselves.

John F. Brackmann
Dept. of Psychology
California State University, Sacramento

I have read "Another True Tale from the Annals of Orthodoxy: Richard Herrnstein, The Limited War Laboratory, Pigeons, and Vietnam War" and my conclusion is that B.F.S.A. should *not* publish the article.

The article is based upon and embedded in social issues (which are, in the main, implicit) but the issues are not the issue except in the limited sense that the stance of the reader on these issues is apt to correlate highly with that reader's agreement/disagreement with the conclusions.

The character of Richard Herrnstein is at issue in the article and is the central concern of Richard Herrnstein (I would presume) and the authors of the piece. I would argue that a person's character is not a fit subject for a learned journal attempting to deal with social issues for at least three reasons.

First of all, the outcome of such an issue is of no real significance to the issues nor to society in general. The only real outcome is the agreement or disagreement with the thrust of the article and whatever feeling tone accompanies that behavior. I submit that a learned journal has more important work to do than generating ad hominem reactions and feelings.

Secondly, the article merely *uses* attitudes about issues to make its case against Herrnstein; if you are a person who is against war, against the military establishment, and for brotherhood you are apt to fault Herrnstein's character. If you are on the other side of these issues, you are apt to conclude that an airtight case against Herrnstein's character is not made. And to what result? Only that little product mentioned in the paragraph above. The pages used in this way could much better be used (as Bob Jensen did in the first issue) to evaluate the work of the man and its significance for social issues. In brief, a journal should analyze issues, not use them.

And finally, this seems a strange article for a group of *Behaviorists* to publish since the real central issue is some form of *Cognitivist* nonsense such as Herrnstein's "knowledge" or "intentions" or "motivation" or whatever, to which we can never be privy at any rate. As *Behaviorists* we don't care about that "inner cause" of Herrnstein's actions, only what he did. And there is no social issue here.