SOCIETY, (1997), 34, 78-82.

Review Essay

The Bell Curve Debate: History, Documents, Opinions
By Russell Jacoby and Naomi Glauberman, eds. New York: Random House, 720 pages

The Bell Curve Wars: Race, Intelligence, and the Future of America
By Steven Fraser, ed. New York: Basic Books, 216 pages

Final Solutions: Biology, Prejudice, and Genocide
By Richard M. Lerner. College Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 238 pages

The Mismeasure of Man: Revised and Expanded Edition
By Stephen Jay Gould. New York: Norton, 444 pages

The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism
By Stefan Kühl. New York: Oxford University Press, 166 pages

The Race Gallery: The Return of Racial Science
By Marek Kohn. London: Jonathan Cape, 322 pages

The Science and Politics of Racial Research
By William H. Tucker. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 371 pages

Reviewed by J. Philippe Rushton

Most of those engaged in the serious study of race today do so from either the "hermeneutical" or the "race-realist" perspective. At one extreme, those I have termed "hermeneuticists" approach race as an epiphenomenon, a mere social construction, with political and economic forces as the real causal agents worthy of study. Rather than research race, hermeneuticists research those who do. At the other end of the forum, those I term the "race-realists" view race as a natural phenomenon to be observed, studied, and explained. (Alternative and intermediate positions certainly exist, but the most heated debate currently takes place between advocates of the two polar positions).

The hermeneutical approach relies on textual, historical, and political analysis; the race-realist approach is empirical and employs a panoply of scientific methodologies, including surveys, psychometrics, and genetics. Because the hermeneutical viewpoint sees inexorable links between theory and practice, its writings are often prescriptive and assume an advocacy position. The race-realist viewpoint is descriptive and typically avoids prescribing policy. To their opposite numbers, hermeneuticists come across as muddled, heated, and politically committed to "antiracism"; the race-realists come across to their opponents as cold, detached, and suspect of hiding a "racist" agenda.

All seven books reviewed here are written primarily from the hermeneutical viewpoint, and I am a race-realist. Having said that, let me then also say that I learned a lot from each of these books. Much of what I learned was history rather than science. I found Jacoby and Glauberman's *The Bell Curve Debate* the most valuable because it allows some of the early writers to speak for themselves. For example, Francis Galton's 1865 essay "Hereditary, Talent, and Character" contrasts the taciturn reserve of American Indians with the talkative impulsivity of Africans. Galton described how these temperamental differences persisted irrespective of climate (from the frozen north through the equator), religion, language, or political system (whether self-ruled or governed by the Spanish, Portuguese, English, or French). Anticipating later work on transracial adoption, Galton noted that the majority of individuals adhered to racial type even after being raised by white settlers. Other essays include one by Galton's protégé, Karl Pearson, favoring eugenics, and an essay by the founder and first president of the American Sociological Society, Charles Cooley, which contains the original use of the analogy about "same seeds in different soils" to favor environmentalism. A curiosity is the 1911 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* entry that identifies a smaller brain and lower intelligence as characteristic of "the Negro." Later debates on IQ from the 1920s between Lewis Terman and Walter Lippmann also appear along with the views of such "Nordicists" as Carl Brigham and Lothrop Stoddard. This collection is also especially useful for providing in one place so many of the responses to *The Bell Curve*.

Unlike the balanced *The Bell Curve Debate*, Steven Fraser's edited volume *The Bell Curve Wars* comes across as rather partisan. It includes expanded versions of anti–*Bell Curve* articles that appeared in *The New Republic* of October 31, 1994, by editors of that magazine, yet curiously it replaces the essay by Charles Murray that appeared in that same issue with additional anti–*Bell Curve* reviews by Stephen Jay Gould and Howard Gardner. The most sober of the anti–*Bell Curve* essays is that by Thomas Sowell. He argues that if Jews, Italians, and Poles could rise up from their (allegedly) low scores in Brigham's World War I study then so

might blacks. Sowell also discusses the "Flynn Effect," named after Professor James Flynn, who found IQ scores rising by about 3 points a decade over the last fifty years. The Flynn Effect might in fact be better named the Lynn-Flynn Effect, since Professor Richard Lynn's 1982 article in *Nature* was actually the first to document the phenomenon of rising IQ scores among the Japanese, which he attributed to improved nutrition. But because Lynn is both a "race-realist" and a "hereditarian," while Flynn is an "environmentalist" (though certainly not a hermeneuticist), the credit will most likely remain the latter's.

Richard M. Lerner's *Final Solutions* is not really about IQ. Rather, the author attempts to show how the German interpretations of Darwin's theory by Ernst Haeckel (1835–1919) and Konrad Lorenz (1973 Nobel laureate for helping to found the discipline of ethology), among others, mixed with eugenic thinking and the notion of a struggle for survival between ethnic groups to culminate in the genocidal Armageddon of Hitler and the Nazis. Lerner argues that the actions of the Nazis would never have occurred if their underlying ideology of genetic determinism and "survival of the fittest" had not been widely accepted. The latter half of the book documents Lerner's concern that E. O. Wilson's 1975 landmark tome, *Sociobiology,* constitutes a rebirth of biological determinism.

Gould's reissue of his 1981 *The Mismeasure of Man* merits special attention. It is the only one of these books to have "star quality" and Gould is the only author discussed here with an international reputation. But so numerous and serious are the errors and omissions and so well-publicized their source that I have devoted an entire separate review just to them (forthcoming in *Personality and Individual Differences*). Here I can only summarize that review and refer the interested reader to it for topic-by-topic refutation.

Rather than revising the original edition of *The Mismeasure of Man* in light of new evidence, including evidence from magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of brains (reviewed below), Gould merely expanded it to include a thirty-page preface on why he wrote the original and why he has reissued it after fifteen years. Gould also adds five end chapters including essays on J. F. Blumenbach, the nineteenth-century German anthropologist who developed the first scientific system of racial hierarchy, and his own previously published reviews of Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray's *The Bell Curve.* Gould tells us that the book did not need to be updated because any new work on race, brain size, and IQ carried out since 1981 is plagued by the same "philosophical errors" he identified in his original edition. And so all the chapters of the initial edition have now been unapologetically repeated.

Gould prefers to deal with scientifically very old history. He argues that such nineteenth-century luminaries as Paul Broca, Sir Francis Galton, Samuel George Morton, and Cesare Lombroso *all* "juggled" and "finagled" their brain size data in the *same* direction and by *similar* magnitudes in order to place Northern Europeans at the apex of civilization, lower orders trailing behind in a great chain of being. Implausibly, Gould asks us to believe that Paul Broca "leaned" on his autopsy scales when measuring wet brains by just enough to produce the same differences that Morton caused by "over-packing" empty skulls using filler, as did Galton's "extra loose" grip on calipers while measuring heads! Later in the book, Gould claims that such twentieth-century scientists as H. H. Goddard, Lewis Terman, R. M. Yerkes, Charles Spearman, Sir Cyril Burt, Hans Eysenck, and Arthur Jensen all played fast and loose with IQ and heritability data to invidiously rank individuals, classes, and races.

Stefan Kühl's *The Nazi Connection* attempts to link the American eugenics movement to the extermination policies of the Third Reich. Because eugenics was more developed in the United States than in Germany, the German "racial hygienists" referred favorably to the sterilization laws enacted in several states and to the U.S. Supreme Court decisions that upheld compulsory sterilization in 1916 and again in 1927 (when Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote in *Buck v. Bell* that "three generations of imbeciles are enough"). The American eugenicists returned the courtesy, at least initially, being pleased to see some of their ideas taking hold in Germany. After World War II eugenics was brought into disrepute—the University of London's Department of Eugenics changed its name to the Department of Genetics, the *Annals of Eugenics* was renamed the *Annals of Human Genetics,* and *Eugenics Quarterly* became *Social Biology.* Kühl suggests that contemporary race-realists and the Pioneer Fund, which supported some of their research, are perpetuating the dangerous Nazi-tainted eugenic connection.

Marek Kohn's *The Race Gallery* covers much more contemporary and largely untrod ground—genocide in Bosnia, evolutionary theorizing about the Gypsies in post-Communist Hungary, and the Human Genome Project's plan to map the entire DNA code for our species. Kohn also goes beyond the usual contemporary discussion of IQ differences between blacks and whites and early twentieth-century debates over immigration to consider the question "Can white men jump?" and the implications of the "out-of-Africa" model of human origins. Although decidedly "antiracist" in orientation, Kohn is in favor of research that seeks to determine how various illnesses are linked to genetic factors among certain ethnic groups and looks forward to an enlightened science of human diversity that takes ethnicity into account.

William H. Tucker's *The Science and Politics of Racial Research* is the most intemperate of the books. Tracing the history of scientific views on race from Carolus Linnaeus in 1735 Sweden to the present, Tucker's book is very one-sided. Whereas Gould painted his villains as self-deceiving fools, victims of the prevailing prejudice of their times, Tucker too often portrays his as ranting bigots, diehard segregationists, and genocidal Nazis. I could only read this book a few pages at a time and found it a shame that a university press could not have

copy edited out the anger because this history is worth reading. Tucker's account of the 1924 U.S. immigration controversy that imposed quotas on Eastern Europeans is the most detailed. He also includes information not found elsewhere on the scientific controversy over court-enforced desegregation and the Supreme Court decision in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. The important figures and controversies are all described—Franz Boas's enduring legacy, Gunnar Myrdal's massive *An American Dilemma*, Kenneth Clark's studies of racial identity, Carleton Putnam's counterattack in *Race and Reason*, Carleton Coon's 1962 book *The Origin of Races*, and finally the failed attempt to overturn the *Brown* decision in *Stell v. The Savannah Board of Education*. Tucker's book ends with a long chapter on "Jensenism," the still ongoing battle in the race–IQ war set off by Arthur Jensen's famous 1969 *Harvard Educational Review* article and the belligerents pro and contra.

Despite their outward claims that they are participating in a scientific debate, these hermeneuticist books are neither empirical in orientation nor dispassionate in tone. Rather than examining evidence in a search for the truth, their authors repeatedly misrepresent or withhold evidence and instead resort to character assassination and guilt by (often remote or simply wrong) association. By an in-depth examination of two major topics—(1) the role of early IQ tests on U.S. immigration policy and its relationship to the Holocaust and (2) the consistent international pattern of human variation in brain size and intelligence—I shall demonstrate that these books are neither honest history nor good science but agitprop.

Jacoby and Glauberman, Kühl, Kohn, and Tucker all brand eugenicist Harry H. Laughlin, the first president of the Pioneer Fund, as a "Nazi sympathizer." Laughlin, the longtime superintendent of the Eugenics Records Office (founded and supported by the Carnegie Foundation) did in fact receive an honorary degree from the University of Heidelberg in 1936 (in the same year as the antifascist, Nobel Prize–winning physicist Enrico Fermi). But whatever Laughlin's sympathies may or may not have been (he died in 1943), it is important to note that while eugenics, as such, is politically incorrect today, it was not at that time. As described by historian Daniel Kevles in his 1985 book *In the Name of Eugenics*, a number of mainstream and even left-of-center thinkers publicly supported eugenic policies—H. G. Wells, Margaret Sanger, Havelock Ellis, Harold Laski, George Bernard Shaw, and J. B. S. Haldane, as well as Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1927 when upholding state-mandated sterilization of the mentally retarded in *Buck v. Bell*.

Waved like a red flag before the readers in almost all these "antiracist" books are allegations that IQ tests showed that a large proportion of Jewish immigrants were "feebleminded." Utterly false in this regard is Adam Miller's claim, in the tabloid *Rolling Stone*, which unfortunately Jacoby and Glauberman choose to repeat (p. 172), that Harry Laughlin testified before Congress that Jews were a threat to the nation's economy and genetic makeup because IQ data showed "that 83% of Jewish immigrants were born feebleminded." In fact, these statements are not only falsely attributed to Laughlin, they are not attributable to anyone! They constitute one of those masterpieces of misinformation that takes on a life of its own. Most likely the falsely attributed statement is a bastardization of research done many years earlier by Henry H. Goddard (in 1917) and Carl C. Brigham (in 1923), scientists not connected to Pioneer. The canard that Goddard and Brigham allegedly labeled four-fifths of immigrant Jews as "feebleminded...morons" seems to have originated in Leon Kamin's 1974 book *The Science and Politics of IQ* and has since made the rounds—Jacoby and Glauberman (p. 488), Gould (pp. 195–98, 255–58), and Tucker (pp. 3–4, 79–80).

The true story of the early IQ testing of immigrants is very different. Goddard wanted to find out if the Binet IQ test was as effective at identifying "high-grade defectives" (the term then used for those with mental ages between eight and twelve) among immigrants as it was among native-born Americans. The first to translate the Binet test into English, Goddard was very aware that it had not yet been appropriately standardized. In 1913, over a period of two and a half months, he arranged for the Binet test to be given to a group of thirty-five Jewish, twenty-two Hungarian, fifty Italian, and forty-five Russian immigrants preselected as being neither "feebleminded" nor "obviously normal." Among these obviously unrepresentative groups, the tests successfully categorized 83 percent of the Jews, 80 percent of the Hungarians, 79 percent of the Italians, and 80 percent of the Russians. Goddard explicitly did *not* assert that 80 percent of Russians, Jews, or any immigrant group in general were "feebleminded," *nor* that the figures were representative of all immigrants from those nations. *Nor* did he claim that the feeblemindedness he was measuring was due to heredity. Brigham made only made passing reference to Jewish IQ (see pp. 187–90 of his 1923 book *A Study of American Intelligence*).

In fact, IQ tests typically find that the mean IQ for Jews is *above* that of the general white population (see more below). If one thinks about it, the story about "feebleminded Jews" is absurd. Not even real Nazis claimed stupidity was one of the vices supposedly inherent among the Jews—just the opposite. Rather, Nazi race theorists (and some Nordicists) argued that Jews were intelligent and used their intelligence in a self-serving, venal, and clannish manner. Hence, anti-Semites advocated restricting the admission of Jews, regardless of their qualifications, to prestigious universities and professions. This shows that racism is not the product of any objective study of human diversity and abilities but, rather, an emotional reaction against perceived competition for scarce resources and an antipathy to those who are seen as "the other." It also suggests that these Na-

zis and Nordicists were, in fact, among the first to argue the need for affirmative action quotas!

That these books are agitprop is apparent in the way they perpetuate the disinformation about the allegedly low Jewish IQ scores despite widely disseminated authoritative refutations. Historian of psychology Franz Samelson began setting the record straight on this subject in his 1975 review in the journal *Social Research* of Kamin's book. In the 1983 issue of the *American Psychologist,* Mark Snyderman and the late Richard Herrnstein fully corroborated Samelson's conclusions pointing out that the testing community in general did not view its findings as favoring restrictive immigration policies like those in the 1924 Act and that Congress took virtually no notice of intelligence testing, as far as Snyderman and Herrnstein could ascertain from the records and publications of the time. The noted columnist Daniel Seligman provided a more recent debunking of this antitesting propaganda in his 1992 book, *A Question of Intelligence.*

While preparing this review, Tucker was good enough to send me his annotated copies of Laughlin's testimony before Congress in 1924 and 1939, which he had cited in his book. I found that they were not always exactly as he claimed. For example, Tucker (p. 95) alleged that Laughlin testified before Congress in 1924 that there was an "American race" made up "of white people from northern and western Europe." What Laughlin actually turns out to have said was that the "American race...is a race of white people...(themselves mosaics)...[of]...[p]rimarily, British, Irish, German, Scandinavian, French, and Dutch; secondarily, American Indian, Jewish, Spanish, Swiss, Italian, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian." If Tucker had provided the full quote he would not have been able to put the spin on it that he did. Similarly, Tucker alleged (p. 127) that in 1939, when attempts were being made to waive quota restrictions for Jewish refugees, Laughlin singled out Jews and reiterated biological warnings about "human dross." Thus, Tucker concluded: "For the eugenicists, Nordic purity was as important in the United States as it was in Germany." But what Laughlin actually said was that "the Jew ranks high in scholarship, in the learned professions, in music and in business, but he has been slow to assimilate to the American pattern of life." Again, if Tucker had provided the full quote, his readers would have taken away a different meaning.

Certainly ethnocentrism and xenophobia have resulted in hideous acts of genocide. But historical tragedy should not be invoked to deliberately obscure important scientific data. By focusing so heavily on nineteenth-century anthropologists and early-twentieth-century eugenicists (Gould), the commonalities between German and American eugenicists in the 1930s (Kühl, Lerner), the post-1940s battles over court-enforced integration (Tucker), current European and American politics (Kohn), and the social opinions of pundits (Fraser, Jacoby and Glauberman), these books avoid the massive, and decisive, accumulated evidence. Even the two books explicitly devoted to *The Bell Curve* neglect to inform their readers that Herrnstein and Murray's book is mainly an empirical work about the causes of social stratification and that it reached its conclusions only after analyzing a twelve-year longitudinal study of 12,486 youths (3,022 of whom were African American) that showed that most seventeen-year-olds with high IQs (black as well as white) went on to occupational success by their late twenties and early thirties, whereas many of those with low IQs (both black and white) went on to welfare dependency. The average IQ for "African" Americans was found to be lower than those for "Latino," "white," "Asian," and "Jewish" Americans (pp. 85, 89, 103, 106, and 115, respectively, pp. 273–78). Failure to mention these data gives false credibility to those who believe that IQ tests are not predictive and that they are biased in favor of those of Northern European origins.

Instead of being discussed (and critiqued) as a major empirical investigation confirming relationships long known to those interested in individual differences, *The Bell Curve* is demeaned by placing it in a historical context that likens it to "the eugenics craze of the 1920s" (Fraser, p. 3). Perhaps it was naive of me to expect otherwise. As Irving Louis Horowitz wrote in an essay in Jacoby and Glauberman's volume (p. 180): "Scandals over specific scholars or books become public issues because in some special way...they mirror larger themes and concerns of the century." Thus the index to the Jacoby and Glauberman volume, in which Horowitz's statement appears, shows, in total, more entries to "eugenics" (forty-seven lines), "racism" (thirty-three), and "Nazis" (twelve) than to "Herrnstein" (thirty-three), "Murray" (seventeen), and "brain size" (two).

Such perseverating on "Nazis" while withholding the most recent evidence from behavior genetics, psychometrics, neuroscience, and evolutionary biology further establishes the agitprop nature of the books. None of these books even mentions the remarkable new discoveries made using MRI, which constructs three-dimensional models of the brain *in vivo*. MRI studies show a correlation of about 0.40 between brain size and IQ, as replicable a set of results as can be found in the social and behavioral sciences. This research confirms many of the relationships described by the nineteenth-century visionaries defamed by Gould. Further, the nineteenth-century findings on race differences in brain size have largely been corroborated by numerous modern studies using wet brain weight at autopsy, volume of empty skulls using filler, and volume estimated from head sizes. The preponderance of evidence from studies using different techniques, conducted by different researchers, on different samples, confirms the conclusion that brains of Orientals and their descendants average about 17 cubic centimeters (1 cubic inch) larger than those of Europeans and their descendants, whose brains average about 80 cubic centimeters (5 cubic inches) larger than those of Africans and their descendants.

Contrary to what would be predicted by most purely environmental theories, racial differences in brain size show up early in life. Data from the U.S. National Collaborative Perinatal Project on 19,000 black children and 17,000 white children showed that black children had a smaller head perimeter at birth and that although black children were born shorter in stature and lighter in weight than white children, by age seven "catch-up growth" led black children to be larger in body size than white children. However, blacks remained smaller in head perimeter. Further, head perimeter at birth, one year, four years, and seven years correlated with IQ scores at age seven in both black and white children ($r = 0.13$ to 0.24).

When discussing heritability, these books invoke obscurantist arguments rather than describe empirical research. Lerner argues that because development is so complicated and the interactions between heredity and environment are so ubiquitous, it is impossible to disentangle causality and apportion variance separately to genes and environment. Richard Lewontin (in Lerner) even invokes Karl Marx to lend his authority to the debate by calling for a reconceptualization of the "dialectical relation" in which organism and environment are somehow "fused" as subject and object. Using data from his famous Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart, Tom Bouchard sliced through this methodological knot. "If context and interaction effects are so ubiquitous and genetic effects so complicated," Bouchard asked, "how can it be that monozygotic twins reared apart grow to be so similar in so many ways?" Siblings raised away from each other grow to be significantly similar to each other, with their degree of similarity being predicted by the number of genes they share.

Only Kohn's book and the edited volumes by Fraser and by Jacoby and Glauberman address the most recent international literature on IQ. These data show that Orientals score higher on tests of mental ability than do whites, both within the United States and in Asia, whereas Africans and Caribbeans score lower. Richard Lynn, in a well-publicized article in the 1991 issue of *Mankind Quarterly* (cited by *The Bell Curve*), showed that Oriental populations in East Asia and North America typically have mean IQs falling between 101 and 111. White populations in Europe, South Africa, Australasia, and North America have mean IQs of from 85 to 115, with an overall mean of 100. Black populations living south of the Sahara, in the Caribbean, in Britain, and in North America have average IQs of from 70 to 90. Many reviewers have expressed skepticism that, by European standards, 50 percent of Black Africa is "mentally retarded." But a mean African IQ of 70 has been confirmed in three studies since Lynn's review—Kenneth Owen in a sample of over 1,000 South African thirteen-year-olds; Fred Zindi, a Black Zimbabwean, in a study of Zimbabwean twelve- to fourteen-year olds; and Richard Lynn in a study of Ethiopian immigrants to Israel. Each of these studies used Raven's Progressive Matrices, a test regarded as an excellent measure of the nonverbal component of general intelligence and one not bound by culturally specific information. In a reply to Leon Kamin about these data in the August 1995 issue of *Commentary*, Charles Murray wrote: "When data are as carefully collected and analyzed as these, attention must be paid" (p. 22).

The rhetoric of all these books attempts to whipsaw readers into dismissing all this new evidence as inadmissible on the grounds that any empirical work on race is morally equivalent to Nazi research. The argument is put forth that the Nazis would not have achieved power if their general ideology of genetic determinism had not been widely accepted. Consequently, their program to murder Jews, Gypsies, and the insane would not have occurred. But of course, the underlying logic of this political critique is grievously flawed. It is totalitarianism in the service of fanaticism that causes people to be murdered, not theories about human nature. All ideas can be used to justify hatred—religious and egalitarian ideas have just as bad a history. The Reign of Terror following the French Revolution and the seventy years of Communist dictatorship following the Russian Revolution show how readily idealism can be perverted.

While I found these seven books disappointing, I also found them ironically vindicating. If I may dare to venture into the field of the sociology of knowledge, I believe all of these books were largely written in reaction to the publication of the new research favorably reviewed in *The Bell Curve*. For the past thirty years an increasing number of world-class scholars, including those without the remotest taint of segregationism or Nordicist anti-Semitism, have been publishing empirical research in the most prestigious academic journals (*Nature, Science, Psychological Science, Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Behavior Genetics*, and *Intelligence*) that demonstrably challenges each and every article of the egalitarian dogma. But it was only with publication of *The Bell Curve* as a trade book by a major U.S. publisher that this information has made its way to the general reading public. With egalitarianism under siege, hermeneuticism represents an attempt to put the genie back in the bottle, to squeeze the previously tabooed toothpaste back in the tube.

Contrary to the hermeneuticists, ethnic rivalry and inequality have been with us since the dawn of human evolutionary history. As the world enters the next millennium, not just as a global village but as a global high-tech economy, competition and inequality among individuals and between groups might well increase rather than decrease. Solving the problems of the next millennium will require knowledge from biological sciences as much as from the social and physical sciences. The authors of these books would forbid society's even daring to look through the genetic analog of Galileo's telescope. I believe our best hope is to look and to learn.

J. Philippe Rushton is John Simon Guggenheim Fellow and professor of psychology at the University of Western Ontario in London, Ontario, Canada. His latest book, Race, Evolution, and Behavior, *was published by Transaction (1995).*