Measuring Minds: Henry Herbert Goddard and the Origins of American Intelligence Testing
by Leila Zenderland
Review by: Patrick J. Ryan
Published by: Organization of American Historians
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2674833
Accessed: 22/01/2015 14:03

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of
content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms
of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Organization of American Historians is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to

Measuring Minds provides a detailed treatment of the life and work of Henry Herbert Goddard, the infamous eugenicist who prior to World War I blazed a trail for clinical psychology and helped establish intelligence testing in American social policy. The book is thoroughly documented and well written. It focuses on Goddard’s accomplishments when he headed the research laboratories at Vineland Training School from 1906 to 1918, but it also offers interesting passages on G. Stanley Hall, Alfred Binet, Lewis M. Terman, and Robert Yerkes. Leila Zenderland provides an excellent analysis of the professional contests between physicians and psychologists throughout the text and fashions a particularly helpful discussion of army intelligence testing during World War I. The book argues that Goddard has been misunderstood and unfairly maligned by present-minded historians who failed to examine the full context of his life. Goddard emerges as a humanitarian scientist trying to solve social problems. Zenderland explains Goddard’s work (much as he himself saw it) as an honest search for “the facts,” complete with human errors that are part of scientific progress but grounded in missionary service to the less fortunate and governed by “luck” or unintended consequences.

Zenderland states that her purpose is to “expand the paradigm” that has been used to simplify the politics of intelligence testing. Given this objective, it is unfortunate that she focused her critique of the literature upon Nicholas Pastore’s 1949 The Nature-Nurture Controversy rather than presenting a broader and more current perspective on the sociology of knowledge. She limited her attack on the thesis that hereditarians are conservative and environmentalists are liberal, and too often she worked to exonerate Goddard’s intentions instead of rigorously interpreting the meanings and consequences of his work. Evidence of this appears in more ways than can be noted here, but these are some examples. Zenderland portrays Goddard as an astute politician who wins the medical acceptance of Binet tests in 1910, but he is characterized as being passively seduced by Charles Davenport’s eugenics during the same year. A long section documents the cheery atmosphere that visitors reported finding at Vineland, yet Zenderland does not explore resistance offered by those incarcerated in the name of eugenics. To show Goddard as a humanitarian, Zenderland emphasized how he repeatedly testified in courts to defend the feeble-minded from the death penalty. She fails to add that his testimony was part of a larger attack on the liberal tenet of “due process of law,” which he hoped could be supplanted by the authority of psychological experts. As an aside at the end of the book, Zenderland aptly characterizes Goddard as a technocratic utopian eugenicist. Unfortunately, this crucial observation was not integrated into her overall interpretation of Goddard’s work and is quickly dismissed because he was...
unconscious of the full nature of his own politics and was unable to control what more brutal technocrats would do in Nazi Germany. Again, defending his character took priority over a deeper interpretation of his ideas. The book's internalist biographical approach limits its ability to "expand the paradigm" and lessens its contribution to debates about knowledge, culture, power, and the state.
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Germ theory, or the idea that microorganisms could cause disease, rose to prominence in the late nineteenth century. Robert Koch's 1882 proof that a germ caused tuberculosis is often cited as a key event in that process. Vaccinations and antitoxins were the immediate result; antibiotics came along by the 1940s. Mortality from infectious diseases declined, and medical practitioners congratulated themselves on their success.

Spoiling the perfection of that view, Thomas McKeown demonstrated in the late 1970s that mortality owing to some infectious diseases, especially tuberculosis, was already on the wane before germ theory had been espoused. He suggested that increased wealth and improved nutrition and living standards were more important than the medical advances. More recently, several scholars, Nancy Tomes among them, have shown that the picture is more subtle than either McKeown or the medics might have imagined. They demonstrate the powerful impact of an earlier sanitary movement on social and personal behaviors. The medical discoveries can be seen as stemming from and contributing to the wider social movement.

In this engaging and beautifully written book, Tomes explains how germs came to capture the American psyche and insert themselves as veritable actors in turn-of-the-century culture. More than a medical perspective, germ theory was a religion, promulgated evangelically in a fertile terrain. Many advocates were Protestants who linked their vision of cleanliness with that of godliness, even when it entailed dispensing with long-standing liturgical rituals such as the common communion cup.

Four sections trace the rise, triumph, practices, and decline of the gospel of germs from 1870 to 1930. Each chapter opens with a riveting vignette of an event that captured the public imagination: the deaths of the mother and the wife of Theodore Roosevelt in 1884; the filthy "cesspools" of the White House plumbing system, exposed after the fatal shooting of President James A. Garfield; the antics of the hygienic dress reform movement. Tomes explains the origin of several familiar icons, such as "the white china toilet," and the demise of others, such as the habits of spitting and kissing babies. She shows how the gospel was shaped by the pervasiveness of tuberculosis and how its demands played out in terms of gender, race, and class. Because women bore the onus of meeting impossible standards for cleaning the home, they also bore the guilt of failure and disease. Poor immigrants and sweatshop laborers were identified with filth and contagion; yet, this oppressive act of identification demonstrated the additional need to alleviate their conditions.

Tomes has sifted through an intriguing array of primary sources and refers to a wide variety of secondary sources in a manner that enhances their accessibility. In the epilogue, she suggests that the cruel responses to those suffering from AIDS (acquired immune deficiency syndrome) were behaviors dictated by the entrenched gospel of germs. Ironically, to combat this learned ignorance, public health officials now attempt to de-demonsize the former vehicles of contagion: touching and sharing of utensils. It is difficult because they are obliged to combat a century-old religion.

A must for medical historians, this book will also interest cultural historians, students, and the general reader.
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