

Mississippi State University Libraries
Special Collections Department, Manuscripts Division

Citizen's Council Radio Forums
Acc. No. 597
Stephanie Rolph Transcripts Addition

Audiotape ID number: 597-6219

Date: 1962

Guest (s): Carleton Putnam

Title: Race and Reason: A Yankee View

Note: Questions were paraphrased and/or shortened by the transcriber. For the exact question, please consult the audiotapes.

Guest: Morphew: Introduction...distinguished author of the best-selling new book, Race and Reason, Carleton Putnam, author of the well-known letters to the president and attorney general, native of New England, graduate of Princeton and a law graduate of Columbia, founder of Chicago and Southern Airlines, later board chairman of Delta...as a result of your letters, you heard from thousands of people from all over the country and this inspired you to collect additional information and present it in book form...it has been a runaway best seller in the South and it's rapidly gaining notoriety in the North recently...what has been the reaction?

Putnam: Well, it's been extremely favorable throughout the South. It's been mixed in the North. I think that sums it up.

Morphew: The fact that it's getting any reception at all in the north is somewhat of an accomplishment itself, is it not?

Putnam: Perhaps. I think that many northerners, once they're informed on this subject, will be inclined to agree with the South and I hope that that trend will continue.

Morphew: In your book you put on a very scholarly basis the refutation of the equalitarian racial philosophy...how did this philosophy get started in this country?

Putnam: It goes, the racial equality philosophy, goes back, is to my mind, simply a facet of the much broader equalitarian ideology which is characteristic of the entire, what I call, left-wing overdraft of our era. I would say that its roots go back perhaps 50 years. Now, sometimes, people ask me, what do you mean by this left-wing overdraft? And perhaps if you'll permit me, I will explain what I do mean by it.

Morphew: Please do.

Putnam: To my mind, the expression 'left-wing' connotes, and I think this is true of most of us, the philosophy which justifies taking the money out of the pocket of the man who

earned it and putting it into the pocket of a man who didn't. Now you'll say, may that not sometimes be justified? Actually, of course, if it were done by a private individual, it would be a matter of highway robbery. The government does it, so everything's alright. It's alright up to a point, and it's the point that I'd like to stress just for a second. If you are going to take the money out of the pocket of a man who earned and put it into the pocket of a man who didn't, you must be awfully sure that you do it to promote social justice and not beyond. If you take this money for the purpose of leveling it becomes not only, in my judgment, unconstitutional, but certainly immoral. For example, where you go the point of punitive taxation, where you go to the point of assisting and siding, as a government, on the side of a labor union, beyond the point where productivity of the union justifies the increase in salaries which the strike brings about, when you go to the point of having relief beneficiaries simply loafing on the relief roles and you are supporting the improvident at the expense of the provident, there I say, you have gone over the line where you take the money justifiably and become really, the government in a sense becomes a highwayman, in that case. Now, if you were going to promote this kind of a philosophy across the years, if you were one of those who wished to continue to go over this line, what would be the first thing that you would do? The first thing, I think, that you would do would be to develop a justification and the justification that you would probably think of first would be, let's assume that we're all equal, we all should have an even distribution of this world's goods, that we should all be leveled down. And then the next thing that would occur to you would be, we must have some scientific justification for this procedure. You would get your scientists together and you would say, now, gentlemen, those of you who agree with this political view, come up with some scientific justification for it. You would perhaps do what one president of the United States did. He sent certain anthropologists to Africa, then he said, now go to Africa and come back with equalitarian findings. Two or three anthropologists that I know of went through that experience and they were quite disgruntled. On their return they said the findings that they made were quite the contrary. I don't know what they told the president, but you can see how a left-wing movement which drifts over the line more and more will be inclined to press in the direction of proving equalitarianism, proving the equality of individuals and also, mind you, of races, in order to justify this even distribution of all this world's goods, regardless of whether the foundation is sound scientifically. Now, my study of the matter, my discussions with scientists have convinced me that the truth does not lie on the side of the equalitarian scientific philosophy. My studies have convinced me that this is a deliberately cultivated, politically motivated, misleading, and distorting interpretation of racial science.

Morphew: Surely these facts are known to the faculty members of some of our leading institutions...why haven't they been more vocal in bringing them to the attention to the American people?

Putnam: Many of them have been. Now, you can take Dr. Garrett, you can those who signed the introduction to *Race and Reason*, for example. Dr. Gates has no superior in the field of human genetics. He has written the definitive book on the subject, and that is the most important field in this matter, human genetics. He has made the flat statement that what I say in *Race and Reason* is sound. He is supported by Dr. George, he is supported

by Dr. Garrett, he is supported by Dr. Gayre. We have Dr. McGirk (sp?), we have other scientists who have joined, I cite several of them in my book, they have joined in agreement on this issue, pointing out that why you don't have still more has been due to a very, I would say, sinister suppression of scientific research and scientific declarations in this field because as I have pointed out in a speech I made, I believe it was in Jackson, I pointed out that one non-equalitarian scientist who made a statement on this subject, on the side of the non-equalitarian point of view, went back to ??? University and he was told, we won't fire you. That would be too obvious, but you will never get a raise in pay and you will never get a promotion.

Morphew: In other words, the scientific and academic community is coming up and telling you, we agree with you and we wish we could say so?

Putnam: That puts it very well. I have been through that experience now for three years.

Morphew: In the public addresses that you have made...you have said that the South needs to use a new approach in phrasing its arguments and its story to convince the rest of the nation of the South's views...could you give us a brief recap of that?

Putnam: Well, I think the South has been restrained and constrained to use the states' rights argument in this fight because it wished to avoid hurting the feelings of the Negro, and there are many estimable Negroes and I have the utmost sympathy for the Negro whose got large amounts of white blood. It's a very unfortunate and unhappy state of affairs. But I don't think, to begin with, that it's necessary to be as blunt, nor do I think it's correct to be as blunt, as many today would be in connection with interpreting my point of view. For instance, they say, Putnam believes that the Negro race is inferior to the white. I don't put it that way. What I say is that the Negro has certain limitations in regard to, vis a vis, as the French would say, our white culture. They're not inferior when it comes to their capacity to live according to their own civilization in the Congo. I'm not saying that God regards them as inferior. I'm saying that as far as our white civilization is concerned, they do have certain genetic limitations. Now that's a tactful way of putting the subject. It cannot be contradicted. I think the South has unfortunately felt that in order to avoid hurting the Negro's feelings, it had to drop the whole subject, and I have consistently taken the position that the South must now recognize that the time has come where kindness of that kind, being imposed upon as it has been, ceases to be a virtue and becomes a vice.