

14 September 2023

Nicely done and I hope it gets published soon. I have overall three suggestions I try to explicate in my comments below. First, I'm not sure "echo chamber" is the metaphor you want to use. Second, I think you need to highlight how these scientists are embedded in far-right political networks more than you do; this is not a case of scientific research being misused "downstream" from the research itself. Third, you really need a conclusion. You do a nice job of explaining the various dilemmas scientists face with these kind of research, but I really would like to see you make a recommendation about what you think should be done.

**Line 65:** Could also cite: Nguyen, C. Thi. "Echo Chambers and Epistemic Bubbles." *Episteme* 17, no. 2 (2020): 141-61.

**Lines 71-75:** I'm not sure this is accurate summary of the position of the critics of the PF or MQ. Or, at least, it is not an accurate summary of *my* position on these folks. I think the argument is not that MQ was a closed system, but rather that it served as a friendly venue for (I'm using a shorthand here) "scientific racism." Given the citation patterns in those "mainstream scientific journals" the group tended to cite each other. Thus, if there was an "echo chamber" the chamber included journals like *Intelligence, Personality and Individual Differences*, and back in the 1960s *Perceptual and Motor Skills*. And a few others.

**Line 79 (Chart):**

I think Brunetto Chiarelli might be still alive, amazingly. My understanding is he founded the *Journal of Human Evolution* in the 1970s sometime. Then in 1985 or so, the press that owned the journal took it away from him for his racist nonsense. He went on to start this journal:

<https://pontecorbolipress.com/journals/index.php/he/about>

He is still listed as editor but he must be in his 90s. That journal, not surprisingly, has a very sketchy reputation along the lines of *PAID*.

**Line 167:** Why "instead?" Behavior genetics is within psychology. Maybe change to "other psychological subdisciplines have been the dominant...."

**Line 169-170:** Those "other disciplines (genetic and anthropology) have minimal, if any presence in behavior genetics. I think Panofsky is pretty clear that mainstream genetics fled BG after Jensen. And, I really can't think of any participation by anthropologists in BG. BG is firmly within psychology. This is clear by the very sources you cite at line 173 (28-34).

**Line 188:** I'm not sure that the idea of "echo chamber" is doing the work you want it to. I think what you have shown is that *MQ* was a less important publishing venue for race/intelligence research than those other, more mainstream, journals, at least if measured by quantity of article published.

**Lines 192-206:** I really object to the way this paragraph frames the issues. Here are my reasons:

1. It glosses over the extent that Lynn and the rest are, themselves, active participants in far-right political activity. It frames them as scientist, perhaps on the fringe, but nonetheless separate from the white nationalist and neo-Nazi networks that use their work. That is simply not the case. Most of these race/intelligence researchers actively participate in these organizations,

hence it is not a case of “downstream” effects of their research. They are in the stream.

2. The paragraph needs to frame that racist ideas are embedded into the research from the start. In other words, it is not a case of an ordinary scientific question that gets abused “downstream” by bad actors. Why is the relationship between race and intelligence a scientific question in the first place? Why ask it? It is only a question that gets asked in a racist society. There is no “scientific” reason to ask the question in the first place. Kevin Elliot has a chapter on this: Elliot, Kevin C. *A Tapestry of Values: An Introduction to Values in Science*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
3. Framing the question as solely about the responsibility of scientists to the uses of their work invites a long discussion about that very issue. The frame is the exact one Richard Haier, editor of *Intelligence*, used to defend publishing these yahoos: Haier, Richard J. “Academic Freedom and Social Responsibility: Finding a Balance.” *Intelligence* 82 (September 1, 2020): 101482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2020.101482>. It grants to Lynn and the rest the title they so desperately want: that of objective/neutral science simply trying to tell the truth, which they definitely are not.

The paper kind of just stops. It really need some kind of firmer conclusion. I’m left wondering what your view on the proper road forward is.