

round up all the loonies and kept them away from those who might be contaminated. Arguing does no good since all is a matter of faith and therapeutic self-flattery. Nothing, absolutely nothing, can convince these relativists, including demonstrating the immense damage they do to the less fortunate believing that their debilitating "life-styles" are now commendable. In short, a public health model of resistance.

Mr. Chynoweth zeros in on my celebration of discrimination as the hallmark of authentic tolerance. He argues that my point should be made more concrete by challenging our empty-headed infatuation with "equality" across racial and sexual lines. I concur that this modern infatuation daily moves closer to fantasy, as in strict government gender guidelines regarding college sports teams. Yet, university and government stupidity aside, I suspect that nearly everybody privately accepts the awkward truth: not all people or groups of people are equal in everything. Only a handful of academics and perhaps a few zealots in officialdom sincerely swallow the dogma of encompassing equality. In daily conduct, from choosing a doctor to finding a marriage partner, reality is victorious. Those in denial will surely receive their punishment via poor health care or wedding night frustration.

*Professor Robert Weissberg
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois*

STUTTERING Help prevent it!

For information, write or call toll-free:

1-800-992-9392

www.stuttersfa.org



**STUTTERING
FOUNDATION
OF AMERICA**

A Nonprofit Organization—Since 1947

P O Box 11749 • Memphis, TN 38111-0749

Exchange

Editor's Note: After publication of J. Philippe Rushton's piece in *Society* (Volume 34, Number 3, March/April 1997) titled "Racial Research and Final Solutions, the author and I entered into a lengthy correspondence on issues therein raised. This is the distilled exchange summarized in mid-1998. Given the continuing controversies about the issue of race and intelligence, our feeling is that differences herein expressed continue to warrant public attention.

From J. Philippe Rushton:

I have been meaning to write for some time about the issues you are kind enough to raise because your opinion of my work is of great importance to me. In particular, citing Needham's *Science and Civilization in China*, you ask how there could be a thousand-year hiatus in scientific creativity if the Chinese have higher average intelligence than Europeans? You also wonder whether I have surrendered my scientific shield by entering the world of policy and ideology by providing a chapter for Jared Taylor's edited book, *The Real American Dilemma*.

On the main scientific point regarding, in effect, how the Europeans leapfrogged over the Chinese in scientific achievement over the last few hundred years, there is no easy answer. Few even dare raise such issues because it implies some cultures may be more "advanced" than others do and especially raise questions of why other cultures so clearly lag behind.

One hypothesis I have always intended to try and explore is that the Black Death, which occurred prior to Europe's Renaissance, had long term demographic effects on the IQ distribution. If this plague, which killed half or more of the population of Western Europe behaved like most plagues and

decimated the peasant and working classes more than the middle and upper classes and if, even in those days the IQ distribution was substantially correlated with social position, then the "bottom-half" of the European IQ distribution would have been severely thinned out. With the mobility to towns that occurred following the population loss, and the added assortative mating for IQ that might be expected to have occurred (which spreads the genetic distribution upwards), there would have been a sudden expansion in the number of high IQ people in the population. If this speculation is correct, then the White and Oriental populations are now finally returning to their historical level.

Another possible hypothesis for why the Chinese scuppered their sailing ships and scientific knowledge is that although the Chinese have a small IQ advantage relative to Whites, they are not as wont to capitalize on it due to very cautious temperaments. At other times, however, the quiet temperament works to Oriental advantage. We know, for example, that IQ scores "under-predict" the school achievement of Orientals relative to whites, just as IQ scores "over-predict" the achievements of Blacks. Orientals with IQs of 100 do better in school than Whites with IQs of 100, whereas Blacks with IQs of 100 do poorer than their white counterparts. Clearly something else is going on. Perhaps it is a matter of restrained versus impulsive temperaments.

Not for a moment am I attempting to deny economic, social, and political factors. Who can deny the economic productivity comparisons of Hong Kong and Taiwan versus the PRC then versus the PRC now? Or, East and West Germany? Possibly even Kenya and Tanzania? Same or similar gene pools but vastly different economic growth

rates. Communism has a lot to answer for in holding back the power and initiative of even high IQ peoples!

In any case, perhaps my whole thesis of Oriental-White differences is wrong. One who tells me so is Michael Hart, professor of astronomy and the history of science at Anne Arundel Community College in Maryland, author of *The 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Persons in History*, and of a chapter in Jared Taylor's *The Real American Dilemma*. He disputes my claim that the Chinese even had an intellectual advantage before the Renaissance and challenges me to find the Chinese equivalents of the Bible, or Greek Philosophy, and so on. I need to think through my reply to him. All these topics need more thought. I only wish there were not so many taboos on thinking so more people would begin to test alternative hypotheses to the ones mentioned above.

This brings me to your apprehensions, which I much appreciate, you raising. I often recall to myself (and actually to others as well) our conversations about the advisability of not stepping into the public policy arena. Many others counsel me likewise. Nor have I changed my own opinion on the issue. I am really *not* interested in advocating policy. Nor am I sure what I would say if I was forced to do so.

Unfortunately, however, because "egalitarians" shout down anyone who does not agree with them completely and engender fear in otherwise reasonable people, half the data cannot even be put on the table. The result is only a soliloquy rather than a dialogue on race. This bothers me immensely. It offends my sense of right and wrong and of duty to tell the truth. It really bothers me when I see President Clinton shouting down Abigail Thernstrom at one of the so-called "town-hall meetings," especially when she herself is quite moderate in both style and orientation. Later, when appearing on Jesse Jackson's CNN program, *The Other Side*, he repeatedly interrupted her. Jackson thus demanded, and extracted from her, several reassurances that the race problem was "systemic" and not "biological."

Thernstrom "confessed" not only that Black underachievement was purely a matter of schooling and family structures but that all IQ type tests could be banned as far as she was concerned; they only reflected school learning. She went on to say (correctly) that the President's Commission on Race had no proper "social scientists" on it and that because it was they who were needed because they were used to collecting "facts," and "control variables," and "testing hypotheses about causal relationships," she was assembling just such a panel. So, there we have it: Bill Clinton versus Abigail Thernstrom in what is billed as the Great American Dialogue About Race, but in fact revolves around only the question of whether or what kind of affirmative action there should be. No mention whatsoever of genetics, hormones, physiology, or evolution. Even typing the words seems sacrilegious. Yet, I predict that many Americans suspect there *are* biological-physiological differences between Blacks and Whites. Blacks *can* run and jump better than Whites, as most schoolchildren at racially mixed schools know. The whole "discussion" is an absolute sham. And most people know that too!

I am saying these (to me) obvious things to try and convey my sense of (I hope sensible, not over-the-top) purpose in trying to open the debate to include known facts. I try to be an "equal-opportunity" speaker and will talk to anyone who has what seems to be a scholarly agenda, even if there is a political agenda too. I'd be happy to speak with Jesse Jackson, Bill Clinton, and Abigail Thernstrom if they would listen, and also appear with them on platforms and next to them in the pages of books devoted to the race issue. This doesn't in any way, shape, or form mean that I advocate any public policy (for or against affirmative action, for example).

So, yes, I do want the scientific debate to enter public policy forums. I would like some of the "biological" aspects to be put on the table. Until it is acknowledged openly we can never expect the National Science Foundation to give money for this kind of research.

How will the United Nations even begin to get to grips with the fact that some countries of the world average IQs of about 110 and others only about 70? Surely it is worth trying to get some of this discussed.

My focus remains entirely scholarly in scope. Most effort is in academic journals and libraries. Yet I also feel it is my scholarly duty to raise issues (in a quiet and responsible way) in occasional letters-to-the-editor, opinion pieces, and "advertisements" for the book too. So, what is the correct position for an academic to take when there is a national debate on a vital topic that studiously avoids any mention of the most important and recent social science data and analyses?

With always highest regard,
Professor J. Philippe Rushton
Department of Psychology
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario N6A 5C2
CANADA

From Irving Louis Horowitz:

Thank you for your letter of May 20th. I found it intriguing and fair-minded, but woefully inadequate. On the plus side, not too many of your new-found "policy" friends would be willing to state for the record that "Perhaps my [your] whole thesis of Oriental-White differences is wrong." This also holds open the prospect of serious modification of your views of Black-White differences as well. It is incumbent on all of us to hold open channels of communication, especially on subjects that are volatile because they are important. On the minus side, is the troubling and disturbing imputation that so-called intelligence differentials have innate, unilinear public policy consequences; and these can be best summed up in the phrase "malign neglect." In short, you continue to use testing and measuring devices as an anti-policy.

Particularly disturbing in your post-*Race, Evolution and Behavior* period is the deployment of victimology to fend off critics. You steadily inform us that you and your associates have been denied a full and fair hearing in the journal literature. Absent from this litany

of complaints are the publications dedicated to issuing materials that assert a genetic differential in intelligence such as *Mankind*, or foundations of various sorts that support your efforts. The actual balance of intellectual forces strikes me as hardly one-sided. Indeed, even in main line sociological journals, we find a critical response to a hatchet job anthology such as *Inequality by Design: Cracking the Bell Curve Myth*. Writing in the December 1997 issue of *Social Forces*, Francois Nielsen of the University of North Carolina writes that sociologists like Claude S. Fisher, Ann Swidler, Michael Hout et al, "represents the rear-guard struggle of an outdated ideology against the accumulating findings of psychology, human resources, behavioral genetics, and other fields that have revealed the central role of cognitive ability in determining the fate of individuals in the stratification systems of industrial societies." This hardly confirms your assumption of unfair treatment or neglect.

It is not simply that people arguing the existence and extent of genetically inherited factors in intelligence have the same biases, it is that such biases are no more subject to modification than the environmentalists. Nearly all of these cohorts are drawn from the field of experimental psychology. You seem impervious to arguments derived from the full panoply of disciplines extending from social history to moral philosophy. As a result, criticisms of the genetic differential hypothesis are most often met with stony silence. Indeed, I have raised with you the serious problem of the assumption of superior intelligence of the Asian "race" by pointing to the Needham Problem. Specifically, how is it that a people so skilled and versed in technological invention as the Chinese, were stymied for 500 years, or why the Japanese needed an opening to the West before their seeming inventiveness became manifest. It took three letters over a two-year time period for you to come to terms with the problem of Asian superiority as a flimsy canard circumscribed by real history.

The ultimate rub, the final problem, is self-created. Unlike psychologists

and behavioral theorists who share your perspective, for a long time you claimed exemption from the culture wars or even the racial wars, on the grounds that you were doing science, not making policy. In your earlier incarnation you took a rather Olympian view of problems of African-American life, or for that matter, African affairs per se, by claiming that you are a genetics scientist and not a policy analyst. Behold, you have now adopted the mantle of policy analyst, and written for compendia with a strong statement indicating that intelligence is not simply a biological or racial category, but a touchstone for distributing goods and services.

I am concerned with you entering the policy arena in the recent anthology on the subject. This becomes particularly troublesome since you frankly and honestly claimed in the past that, "I am really *not* interested in advocating policy, nor am I sure what I would say if I was forced to do so." Granted that intolerance, bigotry, the lack of academic balance exists. How does it help your cause to move over from the scientific to the policy-oriented end of this spectrum? This fuels the belief not in biological explanation abstractly, but racial differentiation concretely.

The irony in your position is that you have been driven into a cul-de-sac. If there is a percentile differential between the races, one logical possibility is an inquiry into the amount of capital required minimizing this differential. But this type of analysis has not been forthcoming. Conservative doctrine intervenes. One has the disquieting feeling that your notion of policy is not much more than a neo-Darwinian acceptance of natural selection as the struggle for survival. Surely, one can just as well argue the case for affirmative action, for bootstrap support to create a sufficiently level playing field so as to prevent an excessive amount of racial or social friction. Such notions of stimulating racial parity simply do not enter into your behavioral calculations. Quite the reverse, your vision of policy is not much more than a recitation of crime figures, illegitimate births, and a greater incidence of disease and death at every

age. Clearly, whatever the accuracy or worth of such data, it is just as compatible with strong environmentalist biases as belief in genetic inheritance. Thus, your newly found interest in policy is little more than a recitation of well known data that does little to prove or disprove any particular bio-genetic view.

The problem of assigning causation to black-white differences in intelligence is elusive—even for those desperately searching for genetic explanations. Thus, Richard Lynn in the current issue of *Personality and Individual Differences* (Volume 25, 1998, pp. 999–1002) concludes by admitting that "the data on the absence of any narrowing of black-white differences in either intelligence or earnings are consistent." Unless economy and biology have somehow merged behind our backs, this hardly represents evidence for either policy indifference or statistical support to any racial basis for intelligence.

The average intelligence quotients in every industrialized nation have been rising for most of the century, yet the mean IQ gap between American whites and blacks is the same as it was a half century ago. How can genetic theory explain such constancy over time between the races? Further, it must finally be acknowledged that intelligence may or may not be correlated with moral traits or work habits. The self-importance attached to genetic traits has very little evidence to support claims for a special group of geniuses. Or at least, there is little to indicate more than a random association between intelligence and real world achievements. I suggest that it is time to move beyond this sterile notion that the sheer study of genetic factors somehow established anything more than one of several ways of settling modest ascriptive issues of intelligence. Everything from specific characteristics in the biology of childbirth and child rearing to the sharply different nature of animal intelligence and human ethics requires careful consideration. The great virtue of your work is drawing attention with dedication and fearless courage to differences of intelligence that are grounded in bio-

genetic structures rather than environmental conditioning. The great vice of your work is its a priori and dogmatic claims that such differences are more than a tiny part of the world of chance, love and logic, and an even more minuscule world of race, gender and national origin. It is perfectly reasonable to mine this area of research. It is perfectly unreasonable to consider such work as by definition the most important explanation for human behavior since the invention of the science of society.

Let me address some specific issues raised by your letter: The difficulty with your Black Plague hypothesis, in addition to being introduced on an *ad hoc* basis, is that: (a) you assume that the distribution of deaths affected the peasantry and proletariat more than the middle and upper classes, the problem is the implicit assumption that; (b) the "bottom half" of the demographic distribution is less intelligent than the upper half; and this lead you onto the slippery slope; (c) that intelligence is related to social class as well as racial type. But I fail to see how the dominance of intelligence in any one class or race can be verified by such broad theorizing outside of history.

The second problem is with your notion that Chinese by their nature have "very cautious temperaments." Here your dilemma is that intelligence would have to be divorced from culture or temperament, and be presumed to have a uniquely daring component. But nowhere in your work do I find IQ correlated with an adventurous spirit or even a sense of discovery. In any event, one might argue that caution is in the eye of the beholder. Was the development of Maoist military "adventures" lasting three decades and two generations not a daring assault on the more cautious followers of the KMT? This seems to be little else than a form of ex post facto reasoning introduced to explain what your basic theorems fail to explain.

I most certainly do not have in mind a pop culture book by a community college teacher to argue my case. Rather it is the extraordinary work of Nobel Laureate Joseph Needham in his monu-

mental work on *Science and Civilization in China* that compels us to deal with this issue, since the Chinese were world leaders in science prior to their long night of atrophy. The huge differences in temperament between Chinese, Koreans and Japanese (noted in many works on national character) again argue against genetic explanations of intelligence variations.

Abigail Thernstrom is a friend. President Clinton treated her in a cavalier manner. But then again, in answer to his absurd remarks that racial integration in the armed forces disproves any but administrative, affirmative action causes for differences, all she had to say is what Charles Moskos has noted: the military are a unique agency, one in which the administrative bureaucratic rules are essentially fair and worked out on a level playing field. It is an example of an institution that does not require affirmative action, just fairness in law and application of law. Abby failed to do that, so she lost the debate! But that is hardly a reason for going off the cliff in a policy-dominated volume with strange buzzards who care not a whit for science and evidence.

The denial of advertising space for your book *Race, Evolution, and Behavior* by *The New Republic* and now *The American Anthropologist* is self-righteous rubbish. The issue at the professional level is not race, but the freedom to read. In this all democratic people, especially scholars, have a high stake in keeping open the lines of public discourse. That said, differences are real on matters of substance and must be expressed with candor. Transaction does pay a price for publishing your book (and others of a similar outlook). But it also pays the same price for publishing a powerful series on Black Nationalism by my friend and colleague Ivan Van Sertima. It is one thing to *argue* the case for the freedom to read and the Bill of Rights in general (something those who fled to Canada during the Revolutionary War vigorously opposed!). It is quite another to *advocate* everything which Transaction publishes. I admit to being a terribly old fashioned follower of John Stuart Mill.

His essays on liberty are at the core of how I try to direct the intellectual efforts of Transaction. Such a "liberal" First Amendment posture toward publication does not absolve me or you of the responsibility to demand scientific evidence in a world of conflicting claims.

I am forced to conclude that you have never quite understood the reasons for the depth of animosity felt toward your work. I hold that it is not primarily a result of your scientific findings, rather it is a consequence of a reductionist view of society that essentially sees the "races of mankind" as all embracing and hence all-explanatory. Yours is a universe that returns us to a place anthropology left behind one hundred years ago. The expansion of the world of transportation and communication has led to a corresponding reduction of the value of racial categories for even the most benign reasons. To beat the drums for racial types as a unique explanation for very real differences in culture and achievement amongst peoples is to invite back to the scientific table every mean-spirited and ideologically motivated person with agendas far removed from the issue of intelligence and far closer to insidious aims. I hope that you come to appreciate the authenticity about the concerns about your work; admittedly political as well as psychological, before you embark on a policy crusade with uncertain and even unworthy aims.

Professor Irving Louis Horowitz
Editor-at-Large, Society
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey