

The Context of Correctness: A Comment on Rushton¹

Andrew S. Winston^{2,3}

According to Philippe Rushton, the "equalitarian fiction," a "scientific hoax" that races are genetically equal in cognitive ability, underlies the "politically correct" objections to his research on racial differences. He maintains that there is a taboo against race unequaled by the Inquisition. I show that while Rushton has been publicly harassed, he has had continuous opportunities to present his findings in diverse, widely available, respectable journals, and no general suppression within academic psychology is evident. Similarly, Henry Garrett and his associates in the IAAEE, dedicated to preserving segregation and preventing "race suicide," disseminated their ideas widely, although Garrett complained of the "equalitarian fiction" in 1961. Examination of the intertwined history of Mankind Quarterly, German Rassenhygiene, far right politics, and the work of Roger Pearson suggests that some cries of "political correctness" must be viewed with great caution.

We geneticists and racial hygienists have been fortunate to have seen our quiet work in the scholar's study and the scientific laboratory find application in the life of the people.—Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer (1939, quoted in Proctor, 1988, p. 295)

Scientific theories do not cause people to commit murder.—J. P. Rushton (1995a, p. 256)

¹Preparation of this paper was not supported by any grant, foundation, political, or religious organization.

²Professor of Psychology at the University of Guelph, specializing in the history of psychology and psychological aesthetics.

³Correspondence should be directed to Andrew Winston, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1, Canada; e-mail: awinston@uoguelph.ca

INTRODUCTION

Rushton (1996) argues that there exists a "taboo on race" in science for which "there is no parallel...not the inquisition, not Stalin, not Hitler" (p. 219). He maintains that this taboo helps explain the protests over his evolutionary theory of average differences between Black, White, and Oriental "races." Given that Rushton continues to hold a tenured professorship, to teach and write about race, and has suffered neither the rack, the Gulag, nor worse, his statement is difficult to interpret. The strength of his words conveys a dire image of the silencing of scientific truth. Certainly he has been harassed; we must all deplore any threats made against Rushton, and all academics must be concerned about threatened government interference in university teaching. My purpose here is first to examine whether or not Rushton has been censored within the academic community, particularly within psychology. Given his assertions of censorship resulting from the "egalitarian fiction" (Rushton, 1996), it is necessary to examine his access to publication outlets and his opportunities to respond to his critics.

Discussion of research on race differences in intelligence must be informed by history and social context, including the history of eugenics. The literature on this history and context is vast and cannot be reviewed here (e.g., see Allen, 1986; Barkan, 1992; Kevles, 1985; Kühl, 1994; Proctor, 1988; Sokal, 1987; Tucker, 1994; Weingart, 1988). Nor is this the place to review the scientific status of Rushton's claims, which have been the subject of strong criticisms by the research community (e.g., Cain and Vanderwolf, 1990; Cernovsky & Litman, 1993; Gabor & Roberts, 1990; Lynn, 1989; Peters, 1991, 1993, 1995a,b; Weizmann, Weiner, Wiesenthal, & Ziegler, 1990, 1991; Zuckerman, 1990; Zuckerman & Brody, 1988).

Nevertheless, it is possible to place some essential features of Rushton's argument in context. I wish to focus on Rushton's assertion that a pervasive "egalitarian fiction" or "equalitarian dogma" has prevented free academic discussion of race differences for some time, possibly since World War II. In this discussion, I will focus on the work of Henry Garrett, who, according to Rushton, proposed that the equalitarian dogma was in full force in 1961, and Roger Pearson, the *de facto* editor (see below) of *Mankind Quarterly*, who described the treatment of Rushton and other "scholar-victims" in detail, and argued that "political correctness" is at work in this arena (Pearson, 1991). Rushton (1994a, 1996) suggested that Pearson (1991) is an authority on the "fascism" of left-wing egalitarians, whose political correctness suppresses the truth.

OPPORTUNITIES TO BE HEARD

Rushton's work on evolutionary approaches to race differences shares theoretical underpinnings with his sociobiological work on altruism, mate selection, and genetic similarity theory. This work, including some discussion of race differences, first appeared in *Behavior Genetics* (Rushton, Russell, & Wells 1984) and in the *Annals of Theoretical Psychology* (Rushton, 1984). The work on genetic similarity theory, which argues that data on mate selection, friendship selection, and ethnocentrism can partly be explained by an evolved tendency to seek out and support genetically similar individuals, also appeared in *Ethology and Sociobiology*, a standard journal in the area. Other work was reported in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* (Rushton, Littlefield, & Lumsden, 1986), and the well-respected *Brain and Behavioral Sciences* (Rushton, 1989). The presentations explicitly dealing with race differences and Differential K theory appeared in a series of five papers in the widely available journal *Personality and Individual Differences*, edited by Hans J. Eysenck. The most important and comprehensive of these is probably Rushton (1988). Four papers also appeared before 1990 in the highly respectable Academic Press *Journal of Research in Personality* (formerly the *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*). Additional papers appeared in *Intelligence*, and *Acta Geneticae Medicae et Gemellologiae*. In sum, Rushton published more than 20 papers on genetic similarity theory and race differences in widely accessible, respectable journals from 1984 through 1989, the year of his American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) talk.

As Rushton (1996) notes, wide publicity and public concern over his work began after the 1989 AAAS paper. The talk was published in *Psychological Reports* (Rushton, 1992), which is not a prestigious journal but one that insures a short publication lag. If publicity over the talk created a politically correct reaction, we might expect subsequent reduction in Rushton's visibility. This does not seem to be the case, although Rushton (1994a) reported cancellations and withdrawals of his work. From 1990 to the end of 1995, Rushton published at least 20 additional papers on race differences, heredity, and evolution. Five more papers appeared in *Personality and Individual Differences*, four in *Intelligence*, and others appeared in *Society, Social Science and Medicine*, the *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, *Canadian Psychology*, *Psychologische Beitrage*, and other sources. Many of Rushton's publications during this time have been in the form of replies to critics, and it is important to note that Rushton was given the opportunity to reply (at the very least in a letter or note) in nearly every journal, including *American Psychologist* (received by all members of APA) and *Psy-*

chological Science (the official journal of the American Psychological Society) in which he was criticized. He has reached audiences in sociology, anthropology, and criminology as well as psychology and neuroscience.

Rushton (1994a) reported a disturbing event: an article to an unnamed journal was rejected *after* the page proofs were returned to the journal, despite the protests of the editor. Clearly such action is wrong, although there may be circumstances (e.g., the discovery of new information) which makes such a decision justifiable. The details of this case are unknown, and probably will never be known. But, as Rushton notes, the "pulled" article was subsequently published in the respected journal, *Intelligence* (1994b). Moreover, Rushton was given an extraordinary opportunity: to write an editorial "The Equalitarian Dogma Revisited" (1994a), which appeared in *Intelligence* in the same issue. What was particularly remarkable about this editorial was the inclusion of a photo of a person writing a slogan on Rushton's door, which is again reproduced in this journal. It is unprecedented for a scholarly research journal to include a photograph of this sort, and its inclusion suggests the latitude extended to Rushton.

Rushton is correct in his report of hostile responses in the media,⁴ but *Race Evolution and Behavior* (Rushton, 1995a) received a cautiously supportive review in *The New York Times Book Review* (Oct. 16, 1994). *The New York Times* (Feb. 21, 1996) recently printed his reply to a column criticizing his research. He made a number of radio and television appearances, during which he was able to explain his findings (see Horowitz, 1995). While some speaking engagements have undoubtedly been canceled due to fear of disruptions, he has continued to present papers at the Annual Meetings of the American Psychological Association, and recently returned to the AAAS meeting to present a poster (*The Globe and Mail*, Feb. 12, 1996). His work is now receiving attention in introductory psychology textbooks. In one case, Rushton's evolutionary theory is presented as a potentially reasonable scientific interpretation of racial differences in IQ scores (Roediger, Capaldi, Paris, Polivy, & Herman, 1996).

One consequence of the public concern over Rushton's work and the calls for his dismissal (which were not pursued by subsequent left-leaning or right-leaning governments in Ontario) was an increased interest in his work among diverse academic audiences, including groups who would never have read his articles in *Intelligence* or *Personality and Individual Differences*. Discussions of his views on brain size and IQ have thus appeared in *Society* (1994c, 1995b) and the *Journal of Social Distress*

⁴See Synderman and Rothman (1988) for a discussion of media responses to race difference research.

and the Homeless, when the topic of the special issue or section in a journal was Cyril Burt or "political correctness."⁵ Table I in Rushton (1996) previously appeared in *Intelligence* (Rushton, 1994a) in his 1995 book, in *Canadian Psychology*, (Rushton, 1991), in the *Journal of Research in Personality* (Rushton, 1989b), and in modified form in other journals. Sections of the present paper in *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* (e.g., "De Facto Censorship") appeared in *Intelligence* (Rushton, 1994a). This repetition of material further illustrates Rushton's extensive opportunities to make his case.

Unfortunately, the technical details and the fundamental controversies over such work are unavailable to these new audiences. In Table I, three measures of brain size are reported, and in two of these Orientals appear to have larger brains than Whites which are in turn larger than Blacks. The claimed superiority of Orientals to Whites on intelligence tests, a debated and unstable phenomenon (e.g., see Flynn, 1988; Sautman, 1995), is, to Rushton, partly the result of larger Oriental brains. What is not shown in Table I or the text is whether these are the "raw" brain sizes, or are corrected for height, as Rushton usually does (e.g., Rushton, 1994b). Without the correction, taller "Europeans" have larger brains than shorter "East Asians," and the IQ interpretation collapses. As Peters (1991, 1993, 1995a,b) has shown, the relationship of body size and brain size is highly complex, and there is no clear rationale for the height corrections that Rushton makes. Readers of the *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* will encounter no hint of this controversy, or the fundamental difficulties with the tripartite division of races, the aggregation of data, and countless other problems in Rushton (1996).

Thus Rushton has had continued access to diverse, respectable scholarly outlets for his work. This pattern is similar to that of Arthur Jensen and Hans J. Eysenck. Despite the intense controversy and public harassment over their writings on intelligence and race, both continued to publish actively in this area. University libraries carry their works, as well as dozens of recent monographs on behavior genetics by the very prolific researchers in this area. Yet Rushton compares the treatment of these researchers to the Inquisition and speaks of "an ideological war over human nature."

⁵Readers should remain cautious regarding the exoneration of Sir Cyril Burt (see Samelson, 1992). The evidence that the chimeric J. Conway "has been found" remains highly ambiguous. According to Samelson (1995), the J. Conway who was found never came forward to exonerate Burt while he was under attack, and never mentioned her work with Burt to her children. She is now deceased. The use of the word "hoax" (Rushton, 1994c) to describe the charges of Burt's dishonesty is noteworthy.

GARRETT, SEGREGATION, AND *MANKIND QUARTERLY*

The belief that the "equalitarian dogma" lies behind the alleged suppression of race differences research is crucial to Rushton's argument. Another researcher in race differences, Linda Gottfredson (1994), referred to the "egalitarian fiction" as a "collective fraud," "a great falsehood," and a "scientific lie" (p. 53).⁶ Given that it is highly unusual in scientific discourse to refer to the alternative hypothesis as a "hoax" or "fraud," and given the rhetorical uses to which this phrase is put, it is important to inquire into its origins and context. Rushton (1994a) opened the abstract of his editorial in *Intelligence*, as follows:

Henry Garrett (1961), a president of the American Psychological Association claimed that "the equalitarian dogma," the belief that Blacks and Whites are genetically equal in cognitive ability, was the "scientific hoax" of the twentieth century. Since then, the dogma has become more ingrained, despite increased contrary evidence. The dogma has been perpetuated by intimidation as well as by pious thinking. Its long endurance is a scandal of great proportion. (p. 263)

The invocation of Henry Garrett (1894-1973), Chair at Columbia for 16 years, president of the APA, Eastern Psychological Association, and the Psychometric Society, fellow of the AAAS and member of the prestigious National Research Council, seems to add respectability to this argument. Racial and group differences were a major focus of his research from early in his 30-year career at Columbia (e.g., Garrett, 1929), and he published research on race differences in intelligence in *Science* and other journals during the 1940s. He is remembered among psychologists for a widely read statistics book and a volume called *Great Experiments in Psychology*. His other, related activities are not well known, but have recently been discussed by Tucker (1994), Popplestone and MacPherson (1994), and Lane (1994) in *The New York Review of Books*.

In 1959, Garrett and others founded the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics (IAAEE). Their purpose was to disseminate research on genetics and race and secondarily, to fight school desegregation in the United States. Garrett and his associates had been very disturbed by the 1950 UNESCO statement on race, in which an international panel of scientists denied any scientific basis for genetically-based differences in intelligence and affirmed that humans were one species (see Barkan, 1992). The UNESCO statement was blamed on Franz Boas

⁶Rushton's (1994) notion of the "equalitarian fiction" is that Blacks and Whites are genetically equal in cognitive ability. Gottfredson's (1994) notion of the "egalitarian fiction" is that "racial-ethnic groups never differ in average developed intelligence" (p. 53). I have never seen a scholarly source which maintained that groups never show mean differences in intelligence test scores. Gottfredson gives no reference for anyone who holds this position.

and the influence of his students, such as Otto Klineberg (see Garrett, 1961a). Founding members of the IAAEE included (among others) Robert Kuttner, a prominent member of Willis Carto's Liberty Lobby, political scientist A. James Gregor who praised the notions of ideal racial archetypes from late National Socialism, and psychologist R. Travis Osborne, who would later become Rushton's co-author on a study of brain size (Rushton & Osborne, 1995). Alfred Avins, attorney for the Liberty Lobby, served as counsel (Tucker, 1994). The Liberty Lobby has been one of the most influential far-right organizations since the 1960. While its membership included a spectrum of right-wing thought, Willis Carto and his organization have emerged as major proponents of White racial superiority, international Jewish conspiracies, and Holocaust denial, with many ties to neo-Nazi activity (Bellant, 1991; Lippstat, 1993; Mintz, 1985; Simonds, 1971).

Garrett and other members of the IAAEE led an open fight against school integration. Garrett gave extensive testimony in 1952 in one of the cases that was then appealed as *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* (see Klinger, 1976). During this period Garrett had access to *Science*, to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, and he was interviewed for *U.S. News and World Report*. He was able to present the following view in a letter in the prestigious journal *Science*:

No matter how low...an American white may be, his ancestors built the civilizations of Europe, and no matter how high...a Negro may be, his ancestors were (and his kinsmen still are) savages in an African Jungle. Free and general race mixture of Negro-white groups in this country would inevitably be not only dysgenic but socially disastrous. (1962, p. 984)

Such words suggest an *a priori* commitment to a racial hierarchy, rather than a conclusion based on data. If the "equalitarian dogma" was indeed in force, it is surprising that such a statement was possible in *Science*.

In 1962, *Stell v. the Savannah Board of Education* was brought as a suit to prevent carrying out desegregation in Georgia, 8 years after *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. R. Travis Osborne testified on the genetic basis of lower test scores of Black vs. White students. Garrett testified that the Black-White differences could not be changed by environmental intervention. Another IAAEE member, Ernest van der Haag, testified to alleged damage caused by integration for both Black and White children. The judge made careful use of research by another IAAEE member, psychologist Frank McGurk, on racial differences before rendering a judgment that the damaging effects of integration had been demonstrated, a judgment soon overturned on appeal (see Tucker, 1994).

Despite this defeat, Garrett pressed on with a series of blatantly racist pamphlets often distributed by White Citizens Councils: "Children: Black & White" (see illustration in Popplestone & MacPherson, 1994, p. 167),

"Breeding Down," "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," and "IQ and Racial Differences." "Breeding Down," which according to Tucker (1994) was distributed free to hundreds of thousands of teachers, warned that the goal of the civil rights movement was to bring Whites down to the Negro level through "mongrelization." Garrett testified at a 1967 Senate hearing on an omnibus civil rights bill that Negroes were "younger" in evolutionary terms, with lighter brains and less developed frontal lobes. He was introduced to the committee by William Hicks of the Liberty Lobby (Mintz, 1985). Thus Garrett's work through the early 1970s continued a cornerstone principle of early twentieth century, "mainline eugenics" (Kevles, 1985): hybridization reduces the "higher" form to a lower level, therefore "race crossing" as it was once called, must be avoided.

This tradition of interest in policy issues such as school integration has continued into the present. Thus, Hans J. Eysenck, Rushton's mentor at the University of London, wrote in his introduction to Roger Pearson's (1991) *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*:

The evil consequences of ignoring scientific facts, and believing instead ideological preconceptions, are well illustrated by the American "busing laws," enforcing racial integration by busing white children to predominantly black schools, often many miles away, and equally, busing black children to predominantly white schools. These laws, spawned by unscientific thinking and wilful ignorance, have had predictable effects, which have been carefully researched by Ralph Scott, whose book *Education and Ethnicity: The U.S. Experiment in School Integration* (Council for Social and Economic Studies, 1987) summarizes the many studies which have been done on this topic. (p. 53)

Eysenck went on to quote two pages from Scott's book, which was published by Roger Pearson. What Eysenck may not have known was that Scott, professor of educational psychology at the University of Northern Iowa, had been vice president of the German-American National Congress, a group which publicized favorable discussions of the Third Reich, and that he had been a candidate for governor under the American Party, supported by the Liberty Lobby's Willis Carto (Bellant, 1991; Mehler, 1989; Tucker, 1994, p. 260). Scott contributed a number of articles to *Mankind Quarterly* promoting the scientific evidence for segregation.

During the 1950s and 1960s, Garrett helped to distribute grants for the now notorious Pioneer Fund, which later provided money for racial difference research by Rushton, Linda Gottfredson, Hans J. Eysenck, Richard Lynn, Thomas Bouchard, and Robert Gordon as well as providing funds to Roger Pearson, William Shockley, Ralph Scott, and anti-immigration groups (see Köhl, 1994). Garrett received Pioneer Fund money as well, partially through the Foundation of Human Understanding, an offshoot group of IAAEE directors, including R. Travis Osborne, Rushton's recent coauthor in a study of brain size (Rushton & Osborne, 1995). During the

1950s, Wycliffe Draper, the fund's founder, personally offered grant money for studies that would not only prove Black inferiority but promote repatriation to Africa and, in his words, insure "racial homogeneity in the United States" (Kühl, 1994, p. 106, Tucker, 1994).

The members of the IAAEE also helped to found and promote the journal *Mankind Quarterly*. Begun in 1960, the journal was edited until at least 1974 by Robert Gayre, a Scottish physical anthropologist. Gayre argued that Black races were genetically suited to humour, music, art, community life, emotional religious experience, boxing and running, while Whites excelled in intellectual skills (see Linklater, 1995). He was a champion of apartheid (Billig, 1979), promoted the work of the premier Rassenhygienist of Nazi Germany, Hans Günther, and he joined Roger Pearson's Northern League for Pan-Nordic Friendship, discussed below.

Joining Garrett as honorary associate editor of *Mankind Quarterly* during these early years was eminent British geneticist R. Ruggles Gates; who actively opposed all racial intermarriage and argued that races were separate species (see Barkan, 1992). Robert Kuttner, important member of Carto's Liberty Lobby and co-founder of IAAEE with Garrett, joined as an assistant editor in 1962, along with IAAEE member Donald Swan, who was later accused of having ties to the American Nazi Party (see Sautman, 1995, note 45). Hans J. Eysenck appeared on the Honorary Advisory Board from 1975 until 1978, when it was described as being re-organized, and Raymond B. Cattell has been an advisory board member since 1980. In 1979, Hans W. Jürgens of Kiel, West Germany appeared, along with Richard Lynn, as the Associate Editors. Both have remained as editors through current issues.

German geneticist Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer, the noted Rassenhygienist, was listed as a member of the Honorary Advisory Board from 1966 to 1978.⁷ In a 1941 race hygiene textbook, he called for "a complete solution to the Jewish question"; by 1944 he could declare publicly that "the dangers posed by Jews and Gypsies to the German people had been eliminated through the racial-political measures of recent years" (quoted in Proctor, 1988, p. 211). During the war, in his position at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, von Verschuer had urged his former graduate student and assistant, Josef Mengele, to take up the opportunity for unique research possibilities at Auschwitz (see Kühl, 1994; Proctor, 1988). It is not trivial to mention Mengele in this context. Both Mengele and von Verschuer shared the view that the study of twins was the premier method of genetics. Accordingly, Mengele sent the results of his "experiments" at

⁷Von Verschuer died in 1969. However, it was common for editors and board members of *Mankind Quarterly* to be listed long after their death, usually with a cross.

Auschwitz, including body parts, to von Verschuer for further analysis (see Proctor, 1988, p. 44). Despite the supposed pervasiveness of the postwar "equalitarian dogma," von Verschuer was called to the prestigious chair of human genetics at Münster in 1951. His reputation as a "neutral scientist" was restored, despite that fact that a postwar German investigation described him as "one of the most dangerous Nazi activists of the Third Reich," and declared that he should not be permitted to teach (quoted in Proctor, p. 307).

Mankind Quarterly also became a place for Garrett to explain who was responsible for the "equalitarian dogma." The shift from an earlier consensus that Blacks were inferior had been accomplished through the propaganda spread by Franz Boas, the noted anthropologist, and his students, such as Otto Klineberg. In his "equalitarian dogma" article, Garrett (1961a, 1961b) also blamed "Jewish organizations," most of whom "belligerently support the equalitarian dogma which they accept as having been 'scientifically' proved" (p. 256).⁸ Garrett was not alone in this view, which was more forcefully presented by Carleton Putnam (1961) in his widely read racist tract *Race and Reason*. Putnam also blamed the Jewish background of Boas and his group and even tracked down Ashley Montagu's Jewish origins (see also Pearson, 1995a). Putnam claimed that scientists who studied race were being "muzzled" (Tucker, 1994). Nor was this a new view in eugenics circles; according to Samelson (1975), Prescott Hall of the Immigration Restriction League wrote to Madison Grant, author of *The Passing of the Great Race*, in 1918 that "I am up against the Jews all the time in the equality argument" (see also Allen, 1986, note 51). In *Mankind Quarterly*, Garrett (1961c) argued that those who supported genetic equality of the races were "mostly members of minority groups" and "seem willing to destroy Anglo-Saxon civilization because of real or imagined grievances" (p. 106). The theme that Jews are "culture-destroyers" is a common one in both old and new antisemitic propaganda of the far right, including the publications of Willis Carto's Liberty Lobby (see Mintz, 1985). It may be useful to compare this tradition of blaming the Jews for the "equalitarian dogma" with Rushton's view in his (1995) book, which he attributed in turn to Degler (1991):

Among the refugees who fled Nazi persecution and entered Britain and the United States in the 1930s and 1940s, there were many who exerted a powerful influence on the Zeitgeist of the social sciences, helping to create an orthodoxy of egalitarianism and environmentalism. (p. 14)

⁸For a discussion of antisemitism at Columbia University and in psychology in general see Winston (1996).

Rushton (1995a) also refers to Franz Boas as a “powerful ideologue” (p. 13). Roger Pearson (1995a) recently echoed this concern, and described Boas as having “forty-six communist front connections” as well as ancestors who were “intimately connected with the radical socialist revolutionary movement” (p. 345). Rushton and Pearson share the belief that the “equalitarian dogma” is a left-wing ideology.

I do *not* mean to imply or suggest that Rushton is antisemitic or that he can be held responsible for Garrett’s work. Moreover, it is clearly true that many of the strongest critics of eugenics and racial research, both before and after World War II, were of Jewish background or held socialist or communist political views; the political inclinations of Richard Lewontin, Steven Rose, and others are well-known. The problem here is that Jewish background and leftist politics are said to account for, and permit dismissal of the criticism. While claiming scientific neutrality, those who decried the “equalitarian dogma,” were clearly committed to preserving a segregated society. For the past 36 years, *Mankind Quarterly* has offered a steady stream of research and argument proclaiming the average genetic inferiority of Blacks and offering policy recommendations based on this assertion. Garrett and others were criticized, but hardly silenced; he even published the same article in two journals in the same year (1961a,b). Yet Roger Pearson (1991) has vociferously argued that the truth has been suppressed.

SCIENCE AND POLITICS: ROGER PEARSON

In an article in *Rolling Stone*, journalist Adam Miller (1994) reported on an interview with Rushton. He showed Rushton a quote from Roger Pearson (1966a): “If a nation with a more advanced, more specialized, or in any way superior set of genes mingles with, instead of exterminating, an inferior tribe, then it commits racial suicide” (p. 26). According to Miller, Rushton’s reaction was “why should I pass value judgments on other people’s political opinions?” When pressed, Rushton is reported to have terminated the interview.

Rushton might well wish to avoid discussion of Roger Pearson’s views, and to avoid exploring Pearson’s use of “race suicide,” a concept used by early eugenicists and Nazi Rassenhygienisten. Pearson’s (1991) *Race, Intelligence, and Bias in Academe* devoted an entire chapter to the treatment of Rushton, along with Jensen, Shockley, and Eysenck whom Pearson termed “scholar-victims.” A similar article on Rushton’s persecution appeared in *Mankind Quarterly* (Macgregor, 1995). It should be noted that Rushton contributed to *Mankind Quarterly* only once (Rushton, 1987). He drew on Richard Lynn’s research in *Mankind Quarterly* for his (1995a)

book, and he relied on data supplied by *Mankind Quarterly* editor Hans W. Jürgens for a study of race and cranial capacity (Rushton, 1994b).

Roger Pearson received a Master's degree in Economics and Sociology and a doctorate in Anthropology from the University of London (Pearson, 1991). In a short pamphlet called "Blood Groups and Race" (Pearson, 1959), he described the basic racial types as "subspecies," which he in turn defined as: "a distinctive group of individuals which are on their way to becoming separate species, but which have not been isolated long enough, or had time to become sufficiently diversified to lose the power to interbreed" (p. 7). This hope that races would subdivide into groups that were biologically unable to interbreed was shared by the eminent psychologist, Raymond B. Cattell (e.g., 1987), whose recent works are published by Roger Pearson. Much earlier, Cattell (1937) had praised the eugenic laws of the Third Reich for promoting racial improvement (see Tucker, 1994 for a full discussion of Cattell). Pearson was clear about the problem of contact between races:

...evolutionary progress can only take place properly amongst small non-cross-breeding groups. Always, a cross between two types meant the annihilation of the better types, for although the lower sub-species would be improved by such a cross, the more advanced would be retarded, and would then have a weaker chance in the harsh and entirely amoral competition for survival. (1959, pp. 9-10)

This position was hardly unique, and was shared by noted geneticist R. Ruggles Gates (see above) and many other scientists (see Provine, 1973). Most critically, this view was a cornerstone of German *Rassenkunde* ("race anthropology") and race hygiene. As shown by Proctor (1988) and other historians, the 1935 German laws against intermarriage of Jews and non-Jews were conceived as measures for public health, and were said to be based on sound, scientific knowledge of the genetic defects of the Jews. One scientific view of the 1930s was that Jews could not be permitted to intermarry because Jews were partly African and partly Oriental, and this hybrid resulted in genetic weakness and susceptibility to disease (Proctor, 1988). Some years later, Roger Pearson (1966b) also suggested that Jews carried African blood, as evidenced by blood group research.

At the same time that he produced *Blood Groups and Race*, Pearson was also publishing a journal called *Northern World*, in which he was much more explicit about Nordic superiority. He urged Nordics to "develop a worldwide bond between our own kind" in order to preserve racial purity and "not to be annihilated as a species" (1959, quoted in Tucker, 1994). Pearson did not merely write about these issues as scientific problems; he devoted himself to their political solution. In England, between 1957 and 1959 he formed the Northern League for Pan-Nordic Friendship, an or-

ganization to instruct those of Nordic descent about their biological heritage (see Anderson & Anderson, 1986; Billig, 1979). Hans Günther, one of the most important Nazi race scientists, was a founding member, as was Robert Gayre, founder of *Mankind Quarterly* (Billig, 1979). Both Pearson and Gayre praised Günther's work. Günther's 1931 *Rassenkunde des jüdischen Volkes* proposed that Jewish ancestry could be detected by observing posture (Proctor, 1988, p. 110-111).

According to Valentine (1978) Pearson moved to the United States in 1965, and formed an alliance with Willis Carto, founder of the Liberty Lobby. Together they continued *Northern World* as *Western Destiny*, a periodical with articles of Nordic supremacy and the dangers facing the Nordic race from the "Culture Distorters," Carto's code phrase for Jews. According to Pearson, the Nordic race would only survive if the "Culture Distorters" could be prevented from "capturing the minds, morals, and souls of our children" (1965, p. 3). The nature of Carto's position is best illustrated by the titles re-issued by Carto's Noontide Press of Costa Mesa, California: *Germany Reborn*, by Herman Goering, *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, by the prominent Nazi ideologue, Alfred Rosenberg; *The Inequality of the Human Races*, by Comte Arthur de Gobineau, the *ur* text of racial theory and Nordic supremacy. Noontide Press published the now classic Holocaust denial books: Paul Rassinier's (1978) *Debunking the Genocide Myth: A study of the Nazi concentration camps and the alleged extermination of European Jewry* and the anonymously authored 1969 book, *The Myth of the Six Million*. In addition to classic Nazi works and Holocaust denial books, Noontide Press distributed books and pamphlets on race differences in IQ by IAAEE members Garrett, Osborne, and McGurk. Carto also founded the Institute for Historical Review, which published the *Journal of Historical Review*, a journal of "revisionist history" (see Lipstadt, 1993).

In 1978, Robert Gayre announced that he was retiring from the editorship of *Mankind Quarterly*, and that publication would continue in America under the editorship of Roger Pearson, although Pearson's name has never subsequently appeared on the masthead, except as a regular author. The General Editor was listed as "appointment pending" in 1979-80. After 1980, no Editor-in-Chief was ever listed, only the Editorial Committee of Hans W. Jürgens (who recently provided head size data for Rushton, 1994b) and Richard Lynn, later joined by others. It is unusual for an academic journal not to have an Editor-in-Chief. In contrast, Pearson is clearly listed as editor of the *Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies*. As Tucker (1994) noted, the manuscript submissions, subscriptions and all business of *Mankind Quarterly* was handled at Pearson's Institute for the Study of Man, of which he was President.

In the mid-1970s, Pearson had set up the Council for American Affairs in Washington, which then became the publisher of a number of journals and monographs, including the *Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies*. The Council for American Affairs became the American representative of the World Anti-Communist League. The extent to which the World Anti-Communist League became a haven for ex-SS officers, members of the British National Front, ex-Ustashi, ex-Romanian Iron Guards, and other neo-fascists has been outlined by Anderson and Anderson (1986) and Valentine (1978). By the 1980s, Pearson was no longer associated with the World Anti-Communist League, and instead concentrated on publishing efforts.

Lest it be thought that the earlier quotations from Roger Pearson reflect his older thinking, and that his views on human "subspecies" (i.e., races) have softened, he wrote recently in *Mankind Quarterly* about the ways in which the Human Genome Project and other advances are opening up new possibility for eugenics, but he warned:

It has been said that when a species is reduced to a single subspecies (e.g., panmixia), it is nearing extinction. Long term evolutionary survival is by way of speciation and this necessarily involves subspeciation. Evolution cannot occur unless "favorable" genes are segregated out from amongst "unfavorable" genetic formulae"...any population that adopts a perverted or dysgenic form of altruism—one which encourages a breeding community to breed disproportionately those of its members who are genetically handicapped rather than from those who are genetically favored, or which aids rival breeding populations to expand while restricting its own birthrate—is unlikely to survive into the definite future (p. 96)... The belief that humankind could benefit from being leveled into a single subspecies also flouts the laws of evolution, since evolution is rooted in differentiation. (1995b, p. 97)

Thus Pearson's ideas seem unchanged from the 1950s, and are identical to the "race suicide" concerns expressed by American eugenicists at the turn of the century. In Pearson's analysis of the human condition, "race prejudice" is an evolved mechanism that is essential to discourage interbreeding and allow the necessary subspeciation. Rushton (1995a) takes a similar view of the biological basis of prejudice, but without the subspeciation concept.

Finally, it must be noted that Pearson (1991) placed quotation marks around the words "holocaust" (p. 246) and "death camps" (p. 248, although not on p. 250). I have seen no other use of quotation marks with these terms other than to suggest that these events are not real or are not as usually represented. The fact that Pearson was directly connected with Willis Carto, one of the foremost leaders in the distribution of antisemitic and Holocaust denial literature (Bellant, 1991; Lipstadt, 1993; Mintz, 1985; Simmonds, 1971), makes the use of the quotation marks more alarming. The issue is particularly acute given Pearson's editorial work with Carto's *Western Destiny*. When one critic (Mehler, 1983) suggested that homosexuals

might be at risk from extreme eugenicists, Pearson argued that this was a “figment of Mehler’s imagination” and since “strict homosexual behavior can never lead to procreation,” then “homosexuals would hardly be a target for even for most far-reaching of ‘negative’ eugenics programs” (p. 249). But the most far-reaching program, that of the Nazis, certainly did classify homosexuals as “sick” or “degenerate” and exterminated them in death camps.

Thus Roger Pearson’s attack on “political correctness” for suppressing the truth about race has a complex context. The disturbing interconnections among Nazi Rassenhygiene, far right politics, holocaust denial groups, and contemporary eugenic and racial theorizing may sound melodramatic, but they should *not* be seen in terms of conspiracy, only as the activities of like-minded individuals. It is understandable that the memberships and boards of *Mankind Quarterly*, the IAAEE, the Liberty Lobby, and other groups overlap substantially, and that these individuals would engage in joint ventures. It would be unjustified to conclude that each shared *all* the views of the others.

The important point here is that writers such as Garrett and Pearson attempted to cloak themselves in the honorific mantle of “scientific neutrality” and to deny that their position of race was influenced by any broader political-social agenda. Such a strategy is often used in charges of “political correctness”—implying that *your* views are based on politics, but *mine* are not, *my* views are based on “value-free” scientific data. When such data consist of the intelligence test performance of Black South African children living under apartheid (e.g., Lynn, 1991) data used by Rushton in his analyses, then the problems are self-evident.

CONCLUSIONS

Rushton’s discussion of the “equalitarian dogma” suggest that brave, politically neutral scientists resisted the attempts of powerful left-wing forces to control their work. However, when the history of postwar racial difference research is examined, the picture that emerges is one where a relatively powerful set of well-funded people, most of whom believed in the basic tenets of early twentieth century eugenics.⁹ Many were strongly opposed to both integration and intermarriage, fearing “race suicide.” They used every scientific and public communication channel available to convince their colleagues and the public of their position. Far from suffering

⁹The diversity of thought within the eugenics community, even in the early twentieth century is beyond the scope of this paper (see Kevles, 1985).

academic censorship, they had access to prestigious scientific journals and meetings, gave court and government testimony, and distributed pamphlets. Their "controversial" work received attention in every textbook. All retained their tenured positions, sometimes funded by the taxes of the people they declared to be, on average, biologically inferior. What they suffered primarily were protests and attacks in the popular press, and some deplorable assaults by protesters, with no serious injuries. Their research was often subjected to special scrutiny, and some were asked not to accept money from the Pioneer Fund. None were expelled from the American Psychological Association. Comparison of these events to the Inquisition, Stalin, and Hitler, is inappropriate, to say the least.

The continued criticism and concern over Rushton's work naturally flow from the view that his theory is one of racial superiority, albeit one in which Asian groups may come out ahead of others. But Rushton (1996) explicitly disavows the terms "inferior" and "superior." The readers must judge whether Table I, in which Blacks are said to have, on average, smaller brains, lower intelligence, lower cultural achievements, higher aggressiveness, lower law-abidingness, lower marital stability, and less sexual restraint than Whites, and the differences are attributed partially to heredity, implies that they are "inferior." Readers must also judge whether Rushton's (e.g., 1995a) r vs. K theory in which the climate of Africa is said to have selected for high birth rates and low parental care suggests the "inferiority" of blacks. No one can doubt the uses that will be made of Rushton's research by such groups as David Duke's National Association for the Advancement of White People, whose newsletter advertised IAAEE's publications and *Mankind Quarterly*, alongside the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* (see Tucker, 1994 for an extensive discussion of the use of racial research by the far right).

Rushton explicitly disavows any policy implications of his research. In this sense, he cannot be considered a eugenicist, since eugenics always involved social policy. However, Rushton simultaneously argues in this journal that "if all people were treated the same, most average race differences would not disappear" (p. 214), a statement which in no way follows from his research and might be thought to carry policy implications for welfare, compensatory education, and employment equity. In contrast to Rushton's cautious approach, Henry Garrett, Roger Pearson, T. Travis Osborne and especially Freiherr von Verschuer, quoted at the outset of this paper, embraced, and campaigned for the implementation of policy based on race difference research.

Philippe Rushton cannot be held responsible for the work of these men, and shares no "guilt by association." But those who maintain that a scientific theory cannot incite people to murder should review the history

of scientific racism, the history of German Rassenhygiene, and the contemporary use of racial theory in Bosnia (see Kohn, 1995). Those who maintain that the data of racial research are "politically neutral" and "value-free" should understand the political commitments of those who conducted and promoted much of this research. Those who wish to promote open, honest discussion should contemplate the meaning of a book on worldwide race differences (Rushton, 1995a) in which "apartheid," "poverty," "colonialism," "slavery," and "segregation" do not appear in the index. Only then can an informed judgement about "political correctness" and racial research be made.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the work of William Tucker (1994) for his outstanding analysis of many of the issues discussed here. I am grateful to Michael Billig for providing a copy of his 1979 pioneering work. I thank Judith Winston for comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Allen, G. E. (1986). The Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, 1910-1940: An essay in institutional history. *Osiris*, 11, 1986.
- Anderson, S., & Anderson, J. L. (1986). *Inside the league*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.
- Barkan, E. (1992). *The retreat of scientific racism: changing concepts of race in Britain and the United States between the world wars*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellant, R. (1991). *Old Nazis, the new right and the Republican Party*. Boston: South End Press.
- Billig, M. (1979). *Psychology, racism, and fascism*. Birmingham: A. F. & R./Searchlight.
- Cain, D. P., & Vanderwolf, C. H. (1990). A critique of Rushton on race, brain size, and intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 777-784.
- Cattell, R. B. (1937). *The fight for our national intelligence*. London: P. S. King.
- Cattell, R. B. (1987). *Beyondism: Religion from science*. New York: Praeger.
- Cernovsky, Z. Z., & Litman, L. C. (1993). Re-analysis of Rushton's crime data. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 35, 31-36.
- Degler, C. (1991). *In search of human nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Flynn, J. (1988). Massive IQ gains in 14 nations: what IQ tests really measure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 171-191.
- Gabor, T., & Roberts, J. V. (1990). Rushton on race and crime: The evidence remains unconvincing. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32, 335-343.
- Garrett, H. E. (1929). Jews and others: Some group differences in personality, intelligence and college achievement. *The Personnel Journal*, 7, 341-348.
- Garrett, H. E. (1961a). The equalitarian dogma. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 4, 480-484.
- Garrett, H. E. (1961b). The equalitarian dogma. *Mankind Quarterly*, 1, 253-257.
- Garrett, H. E. (1961c). The scientific racism of Juan Comas. *Mankind Quarterly*, 2, 100-106.
- Garrett, H. E. (1962). Racial differences and witch hunting. *Science*, 135, 982-983.

- Gottfredson, L. (1994). Egalitarian fiction and collective fraud. *Society*, 31, 53-59.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York: Free Press.
- Horowitz, I. L. (1995). The Rushton file: Racial comparisons and media passions. *Society*, 32, 7-17.
- Kevles, D. J. (1985). *In the name of eugenics: Genetics and the uses of human heredity*. New York: Knopf.
- Kluger, R. (1976). *Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's struggle for equality*. New York: Knopf.
- Kohn, M. (1995). *The race gallery: The return of racial science*. London: Johathan Cape.
- Kühl, S. (1994). *Eugenics, American racism, and German national socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lane, C. (Dec. 1, 1994). The tainted sources of the bell curve. *New York Review of Books*, 14-19.
- Linklater, M. (Nov. 23, 1994). Racism and the barmy Laird of Nigg. *The Times of London*.
- Lipstadt, D. (1993). *Denying the Holocaust: The growing assault on truth and memory*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lynn, M. (1989). Race differences in sexual behavior: A critique of Rushton and Bogaert's evolutionary hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 23, 1-6.
- Lynn, R. (1991). Race differences in intelligence: A global perspective. *Mankind Quarterly*, 32, 99-121.
- MacGregor, J. (1995). Race, prejudice, and a Guggenheim Fellow. *Mankind Quarterly*, 35, 267-285.
- Mehler, B. (1983). The new eugenics: Academic racism in the U.S. today. *Science for the People*, 15, 18-23.
- Mehler, B. (1989). Foundations for fascism: The New Eugenics Movement in the United States. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 23, 17-25.
- Miller, A. (Oct. 20, 1994). Professors of hate. *Rolling Stone*. In R. Jacoby & N. Glauberman (Eds.), *The bell curve debate: History, documents, opinions* (pp. 162-178). New York: Times Books.
- Mintz, F. P. (1985). *The Liberty Lobby and the American right: Race, conspiracy, and culture*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Pearson, R. (1965). Editorials: Our new look. *Western Destiny*, 10(9), 3-5.
- Pearson, R. (1966a). *Eugenics and race*. London: Clair Press.
- Pearson, R. (1966b). *Blood groups and race* (rev. ed.). London: Clair Press.
- Pearson, R. (1991). *Race, intelligence, and bias in academe*. Washington, D.C.: Scott-Townsend.
- Pearson, R. (1995a). The concept of heredity in Western thought: Part two, the myth of biological egalitarianism. *Mankind Quarterly*, 35, 343-371.
- Pearson, R. (1995b). The concept of heredity in Western thought: Part three, the revival of interesting genetics. *Mankind Quarterly*, 36, 73-103.
- Peters, M. (1991). Sex differences in human brain size and the general meaning of differences in brain size. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 45, 507-522.
- Peters, M. (1993). Still no convincing evidence of a relation between brain size and intelligence in humans. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 47, 751-756.
- Peters, M. (1995a). Does brain size matter? A reply to Rushton and Ankney. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 49, 570-576.
- Peters, M. (1995b). Race differences in brain size: things are not as clear as they seem to be. *American Psychologist*, 49, 570-576.
- Popplestone, J. A., & MacPherson, M. W. (1994). *An illustrated history of American psychology*. Madison, WI: Wm. C. Brown.
- Proctor, R. (1988). *Racial hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Provine, W. (1973). Geneticists and the biology of race crossing, *Science*, 182, 790-796.
- Putnam, C. (1961). *Race and reason*. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press.
- Roediger, H. L., Capaldi, E. D., Paris, S. G., Polivy, J., & Herman, C. P. (1996). *Psychology* (4th ed.). Minneapolis/St. Paul: West Publishing.

- Rushton, J. P. (1984). Sociobiology: Toward a theory of individual and group differences in personality and social behavior (with commentaries and authors response). In J. Royce & L. P. Mos (Eds.), *Annals of theoretical psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-81). New York: Plenum.
- Rushton, J. P. (1987). Evolution, altruism and genetic similarity theory. *Mankind Quarterly*, 27, 379-395.
- Rushton, J. P. (1988). Race differences in behaviour: A review and evolutionary analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 1009-1024.
- Rushton, J. P. (1989a). Genetic similarity, human altruism, and group selection (with commentaries and author's response. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 503-559.
- Rushton, J. P. (1989b). Invited review: The evolution of racial differences: a response to M. Lynn. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 23, 7-20.
- Rushton, J. P. (1991). Do r-K strategies underlie human race differences? A reply to Weizmann *et al.* *Canadian Psychology*, 32, 29-42.
- Rushton, J. P. (1992). Contributions to the history of psychology: XC. Evolutionary biology and heritable traits (with reference to Oriental-White-Black differences): The 1989 AAAS paper. *Psychological Reports*, 71, 811-821.
- Rushton, J. P. (1994a). Editorial: The equalitarian dogma revisited. *Intelligence*, 19, 263-280.
- Rushton, J. P. (1994b). Sex and race differences in cranial capacity from international labour office data *Intelligence*, 19, 281-294.
- Rushton, J. P. (1994c). Victim of a scientific hoax. *Society*, 31, 40-44.
- Rushton, J. P. (1995a). *Race, evolution, and behavior: A life history perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Rushton, J. P. (1995b). Race and crime: An international dilemma. *Society*, 32, 37-41.
- Rushton, J. P. (1996). Political correctness and the study of racial differences. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* (in press).
- Rushton, J. P., & Osborne, R. T. (1995). Genetic and environmental contributions to cranial capacity in Black and White adolescents. *Intelligence*, 20, 1-13.
- Rushton, J. P., Littlefield, C. H., & Lumsden, C. J. (1986). Gene-culture coevolution of complex social behavior: Human altruism and mate choice. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, 83, 7340-7343.
- Rushton, J. P., Russell, R. J. H., & Wells, P. A. (1984). Genetic similarity theory: Beyond kin selection. *Behavior Genetics*, 14, 179-193.
- Samelson, F. (1974). On the science and politics of the IQ. *Social Research*, 41, 467-488.
- Samelson, F. (1992). Rescuing the reputation of Sir Cyril Burt. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 221-233.
- Samelson, F. (June 1995). Updating the Burt affair. Paper presented at the XXVII Annual Meeting of CHEIRON, the International Society for History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Bowdoin, Maine.
- Sautman, B. (1995). Theories of East Asian superiority. In R. Jacoby & N. Glauber (Eds.), *The bell curve debate: History, documents, opinions* (pp. 201-220). New York: Times Books
- Simonds, C. S. (Sept 10, 1971). The strange story of Willis Carto. *National Review*, 978-989.
- Snyderman, M., & Rothman, S. (1988). *The IQ controversy, the media, and public policy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Sokal, M. (1987). *Psychological testing and American society, 1890-1930*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Tucker, W. H. (1994). *The science and politics of racial research*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Valentine, P. W. (May 28, 1978). The fascist specter behind the world anti-red league. *Washington Post*, pp. C1, C2.
- Weingart, P. (1988). German eugenics between science and politics. *Osiris*, 5, 260-282.
- Weizmann, F., Weiner, N. I., Wiesenthal, D. L., & Ziegler, M. (1990). Differential K theory and racial hierarchies. *Canadian Psychology*, 31, 1-13.
- Weizmann, F., Weiner, N. I., Wiesenthal, D. L., & Ziegler, M. (1991). Eggs, eggplants, and eggheads: A rejoinder to Rushton. *Canadian Psychology*, 32, 43-50.

- Winston, A. S. (1996). "As his name indicates...": R. S. Woodworth's letters of reference and employment for Jewish psychologists in the 1930s. *Journal for the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 32, 30-43.
- Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences. *American Psychologist*, 45, 1297-1303.
- Zuckerman, M., & Brody, N. (1988). Oysters, rabbits, and people. A critique of "Race Differences in Behavior" by J. P. Rushton. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 1025-1033.