

A CLOSER LOOK AT THE PIONEER FUND: RESPONSE TO RUSHTON

*William H. Tucker**

INTRODUCTION

Recently in the *Albany Law Review*, Professor Paul Lombardo described the origins of the Pioneer Fund, noting the Nazi sympathies of Wickliffe Preston Draper, its founder, and Harry H. Laughlin, its first president.¹ My own recent book—*The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund*—came to similar conclusions about Pioneer’s early history and went on to document the role played by its key directors in opposing the civil rights movement on the basis of putatively scientific evidence of black intellectual inferiority.² In response, Professor J. Philippe Rushton, the new president of the fund, denied all these charges as based solely on the distortion of “misleading pieces of evidence very selectively picked” and the use of “invective and name-calling.”³ Rushton accused me in particular of taking the “low road” and characterized my work as “propagandistic.”⁴

Before offering my own reply to Rushton, let me first observe that I am pleased he has decided to air this issue in an academic journal. Even before reading my book—indeed, even before its publication—Rushton wrote to the executive editor at the University of Illinois Press and to the university president, with a copy to Pioneer’s attorney, claiming, on the basis of the description on the Press web page, that I had defamed Pioneer, and suggesting that the Press “withdraw or amend” its advertisement.⁵ This apparent attempt to

*William H. Tucker is a Professor of Psychology at Rutgers University, Camden.

¹ Paul A. Lombardo, “*The American Breed*”: Nazi Eugenics and the Origins of the Pioneer Fund, 65 ALB. L. REV. 743 (2002) [hereinafter Lombardo].

² WILLIAM H. TUCKER, THE FUNDING OF SCIENTIFIC RACISM: WICKLIFFE DRAPER AND THE PIONEER FUND 67–69 (2002) (detailing the activities of individuals associated with the Pioneer Fund, including their opposition to desegregation) [hereinafter TUCKER].

³ J. Philippe Rushton, *The Pioneer Fund and the Scientific Study of Human Differences*, 66 ALB. L. REV. 207, 222–23 (2002).

⁴ *Id.* at 254.

⁵ Letter from J. Philippe Rushton, President, The Pioneer Fund, to Judy McCulloh,

exert legal pressure on my publisher was both disappointing and ironic since Rushton has justifiably complained about attempts to suppress his own academic freedom.⁶ The fact that he has now chosen to engage in, rather than attempt to stifle, debate is to be commended.

Although my book is filled with evidence—much of it from previously unexamined archives—amply demonstrating the truth of Pioneer's origin and agenda, I cannot, of course, reproduce the entire case in the limited space here. As a consequence, I shall confine myself to the major points raised in Rushton's article.

I. THE VIEWS OF PIONEER DIRECTORS

A. *Wickliffe Preston Draper*

Rushton describes Pioneer's founders as “[d]istinguished Americans,”⁷ who created a fund to support “resolute, path-breaking scientists intrepidly working at the frontiers of knowledge in the study of human heredity.”⁸ Actually, Draper's attorney and fellow board member recounted in 1947 that Draper was “not . . . concerned with research in human genetics since he felt that enough was known on the subject”⁹ and was more interested in doing “something practical” with the knowledge, such as “moving the colored race to Liberia.”¹⁰ Consistent with this view Draper provided, during the 1930s, the finances for a campaign by Klansman Earnest Sevier Cox to repatriate blacks to Africa, an effort that Draper planned to resume after the war.¹¹

Executive Editor, University of Illinois Press and James J. Stukel, President, University of Illinois 5 (Aug. 1, 2002) (on file with author).

⁶ See Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 259 (extolling the Pioneer Fund for persisting in its research in the face of “ignorance, fear of knowledge, and suppression of academic freedom”).

⁷ *Id.* at 212.

⁸ *Id.* at 218.

⁹ Letter from Malcolm Donald to Frederick H. Osborn (Oct. 21, 1947) (on file with Frederick H. Osborn Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) [hereinafter Osborn Papers].

¹⁰ Letter from Malcolm Donald, to Frederick Osborn (July 22, 1947) (on file with Osborn Papers, *supra* note 9).

¹¹ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 33–42 (detailing the relationship between Draper and Cox and their collaboration in the movement to repatriate blacks); see also Letter from Sheldon C. Reed, Director, Dight Institute, to Dr. M. Demerec, Department of Genetics, Carnegie Institution 4 (Oct. 4, 1948) (noting in the Biennial Report of the Dight Institute that Draper had offered as much as \$100,000 to fund a study of human genetics focused on “shipping the Negro inhabitants back to Africa”); Letter from Earnest Sevier Cox [sic] to Colonel W. P. Draper 2 (Sept. 15, 1938) (discussing plans to repatriate large numbers of American Negroes

However, when a movement arose in the 1950s, not to repatriate blacks but to grant them long-deferred rights, Draper changed his priorities and poured millions of dollars into the segregationist cause¹²—most of this money going to scientifically-based attempts to keep blacks separate and unequal.¹³ Harry Weyher, president of the Pioneer board, orchestrated these efforts, and John Bond Trevor Jr., another board member, participated in their planning and implementation. The two men together with Draper comprised the core of the organization.¹⁴ In addition, Draper sent annual and very substantial personal gifts to numerous segregationist scientists as “token[s] of . . . appreciation of [their] scientific efforts during the past year.”¹⁵ Anatomy professor Wesley Critz George, for example, received a series of checks from Wickliffe Draper¹⁶—totaling tens of thousands of dollars adjusted for inflation¹⁷—after writing pamphlets encouraging defiance of the *Brown* decision because blacks were genetically inferior and would “further[] the deterioration of our race and our civilization.”¹⁸ Another recipient of

to Liberia with the support of Sen. Bilbo and other members of Congress); Letter from Sen. Theo. G. Bilbo to Hon. Ernest [sic] Sevier Cox (Feb. 8, 1938) (praising a manuscript written by Cox on the history of repatriation and pronouncing that he had “almost made up [his] mind to specialize on [sic] the repatriation of the negro [sic]”).

¹² See Douglas A. Blackmon, *Silent Partner: How the South's Fight to Uphold Segregation Was Funded Up North*, WALL ST. J., June 11, 1999, at A1 (exposing Draper's connection to the Sovereignty Commission, an entity created by the State of Mississippi in 1957 to infiltrate civil rights organizations, whose budget to oppose the Civil Rights Act was largely funded by Draper), available at 1999 WL-WSJ 5456164; see also TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 65–130 (describing generally the anti-civil rights campaign).

¹³ See Ronald W. May, *Genetics and Subversion*, THE NATION, May 14, 1960, at 420–22 (revealing Draper's Congressional connections, which he used to find recipients for grants to scientists willing to engage in genetic research to prove racial inferiority); Ron May, *Rich New Yorker Trying to Prove Negroes Inferior*, THE CAPITAL TIMES (Madison, Wis.), Mar. 5, 1960, at 1 (reporting on Draper's furtive efforts to find researchers willing to support his ideals and the generally negative reaction from the scientific community).

¹⁴ See John Sedgwick, *Inside the Pioneer Fund*, in THE BELL CURVE DEBATE HISTORY, DOCUMENTS, OPINIONS 153–54 (Russell Jacoby & Naomi Glauberman eds., 1995) (describing the partnering of Harry Weyher and Wickliffe Draper); TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 68–69.

¹⁵ Letter from Harry Weyher, to Dr. W. C. George (Dec. 7, 1962) (on file with Wesley Critz George Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) [hereinafter George Papers].

¹⁶ *Id.*; Letter from Harry Weyher, to Dr. W. C. George (Dec. 17, 1963) (on file with George Papers, *supra* note 14); Letter from Harry Weyher, to Dr. W. C. George (Dec. 2, 1964) (on file with George Papers, *supra* note 14); Letter from Harry Weyher, to Dr. W. C. George (Dec. 8, 1965) (on file with George Papers, *supra* note 14); Letter from Harry Weyher, to Dr. W. C. George (Dec. 9, 1966) (on file with George Papers, *supra* note 14); Letter from Harry Weyher, to Dr. W. C. George (Dec. 8, 1967) (on file with George Papers, *supra* note 14).

¹⁷ Blackmon, *supra* note 15, at A1 (calculating that adjusted for inflation, the contributions would add up to over \$1.1 million).

¹⁸ W. C. GEORGE, THE RACE PROBLEM FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ONE WHO IS CONCERNED ABOUT THE EVILS OF MISCEGENATION 5 (1955); see also PROFESSOR W. GEORGE, RACE

Draper's generosity was psychologist and eventual Pioneer board member Henry E. Garrett, who led the scientific assault on integration. Garrett wrote that "the normal African Negro resemble[d] the European after a frontal leucotomy"¹⁹ but that no matter how intelligent "a Negro may be, his ancestors were (and his kinsmen still are) savages . . ."²⁰ In private correspondence Garrett suggested that "our best bet" to prevent implementation of the *Brown* decision would be to "[m]ake the white schools so unpleasant for them that the Negroes withdraw . . ."²¹ In addition to annual gifts in appreciation for these efforts, Garrett received a bequest of \$50,000 in Draper's will—now over \$200,000 adjusted for inflation.²² The will also left millions of dollars to Pioneer and one other foundation directed by Weyher and Trevor to support a system of private, segregated schools in Mississippi, developed as a method to avoid the *Brown* decision.²³

There is also little doubt about Draper's Nazi sympathies. As Lombardo's article noted, Draper participated in a 1935 conference in Berlin as one of two American delegates, the other of whom toasted "that great leader, Adolf Hitler" and praised German racial policy as "a pattern which other nations must follow."²⁴ Draper later became the principal source of financial support for the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies,²⁵ which was named by the United States Department of Justice in a 1942 sedition indictment

HEREDITY AND CIVILIZATION (1962).

¹⁹ HENRY E. GARRETT, PH.D., RACE: A REPLY TO RACE AND INTELLIGENCE: A SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION BY THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH 8 (1964).

²⁰ Henry E. Garrett, *Letter to the Editor*, 135 SCIENCE 984 (1962).

²¹ Letter from Henry E. Garrett to Dr. Wesley Critz George (Mar. 1, 1961) (on file with George Papers, *supra* note 15).

²² Memorandum concerning the estate of Wickliffe P. Draper, General Information Item 10, Individuals Who Receive Benefits From the Estate, Jan. 23, 1967 [hereinafter Estate Papers] (on file with his Estate Papers available at the Surrogate's Office, New York City).

²³ See *id.* (leaving over 1.5 million dollars to the Puritan Fund, which helped preserve segregation); see also TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 132 (pointing out that Weyher also distributed money from his account for the same cause after Draper's death); TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 126-29 (discussing the creation of a system of private schools to avoid the desegregated public system).

²⁴ Lombardo, *supra* note 1, at 774 (quoting *Praise for Nazis*, TIME, Sept. 9, 1935, at 21). Dr. Clarence Gordon Campbell, who served as president of the American Eugenics Research Association, also attended the World Population Congress in Berlin. *Praise for Nazis*, TIME, Sept. 9, 1935, at 20.

²⁵ See American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., Second Quarter Budget 1964, (on file with the Group Research Archives, Columbia University, "American Coalition of Patriotic Societies" folder) [hereinafter Group Research Archives] (including, in its total receipts for the year, two gifts from Draper totaling \$35,750).

for pro-Nazi activities.²⁶ In 1962, the coalition, now headed by Pioneer board member Trevor, called for an immediate amnesty for convicted Nazi war criminals.²⁷

One of Draper's last acts before his death in 1972 was to finance publication of *The Dispossessed Majority*²⁸ by the pseudonymous author Wilmot Robertson—another project in which Weyher and Trevor were also involved.²⁹ Explaining that almost all of the nation's contemporary problems stemmed from the presence of "unassimilable minorities"—not only blacks but also Asians, Hispanics, Greeks, Southern Italians, Arabs, Amerindians, and Jews³⁰—Robertson declared that these groups should not be entitled to Constitutional protections. In particular, Robertson obsessed over "Jewish hegemony,"³¹ noting their fear and loathing of Western civility and their "vendetta . . . against all things non-Jewish."³² West Germany, however, had emerged from the war an "economic miracle," "free of Jewish financial domination."³³ "[T]o put a stop to the Jewish envelopment of America," wrote Robertson, "history should not be repeated;" this time, "[t]he operation ought to be accomplished with . . . finesse."³⁴ When Carleton Putnam, one of the activists for segregation supported by Draper, was particularly enamored of Robertson's work, Trevor wrote to Weyher, expressing his surprise that Putnam had such "a good understanding of the broad spectrum of problems which face us—excellent as his views are" on the racial issue.³⁵ To Draper, Trevor, and Weyher—the "us" in the above observation—behind the struggle to preserve American apartheid lay the real enemy—the Jew.

²⁶ See MARTIN A. LEE, *THE BEAST REAWAKENS* 364–65 (1997) (discussing the indictment which was reported by investigative journalist Adam Miller).

²⁷ See AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, *RESOLUTIONS* (1962) (on file with the Group Research Archives, *supra* note 25) (adopted at its annual convention, Feb. 1, 1962).

²⁸ WILMOT ROBERTSON, *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY* (rev. ed., 1973) [hereinafter ROBERTSON, *DISPOSSESSED*].

²⁹ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 136; see also Letter from John B. Trevor, Jr. to Harry F. Weyher (July 30, 1970) (on file with Frank E. Mason Papers, Herbert Hoover Library, West Branch, Iowa) [hereinafter Mason Papers].

³⁰ See generally ROBERTSON, *DISPOSSESSED*, *supra* note 28, at 143–204 (discussing each group's limitations and their inability to be properly assimilated into "white" culture).

³¹ ROBERTSON, *DISPOSSESSED*, *supra* note 26, at 188.

³² *Id.* at 192.

³³ *Id.* at 186.

³⁴ *Id.* at 193. Robertson wrote that the "operation" of restricting Jewish influence should not take the form of futile attempts at assimilation nor of repression. Instead, the process should be guided by morality and reason. See *id.*

³⁵ Letter from John B. Trevor, Jr., to Harry F. Weyher (July 30, 1970) (on file with Mason Papers, *supra* note 29).

Incidentally, Rushton emphasized Draper's military record as evidence that Pioneer's founder could not possibly have had "pro-Nazi" leanings.³⁶ This is an obvious *non sequitur* as exemplified by the fact that Robertson, who considered Hitler's defeat "shattering to Northern Europeans, both in Europe and America," served with the allies in combat during World War II.³⁷

B. Harry Hamilton Laughlin

According to Rushton, Harry Laughlin held "anti-racist" views and offered a "nuanced" analysis of the differences between blacks and whites.³⁸ Actually, Laughlin—the man selected by Draper to be the first president of the Pioneer Fund—was a virulent white supremacist, who wished to rid the United States of blacks. When Earnest Cox wrote *White America*, proposing the repatriation of all Blacks, Laughlin reviewed the book in a journal that he edited. Laughlin declared that Cox could be "a greater savior of his country than George Washington" if he could save America "for the white race" by implementing this solution to "the worst thing that ever happened to the . . . United States, . . . the bringing of large numbers of the Negroes, nearly the lowest of races, to our shores."³⁹ Laughlin later arranged the meeting of Cox with Draper that led to the latter's financial support of the repatriation movement.⁴⁰

Rushton argued that the claim that Laughlin wished to exclude Jews from American society is based on "misleading" evidence and benign observations to which an "anti-Semitic spin" had been imparted.⁴¹ The "most casual perusal" of the Laughlin archives, writes Rushton, reveals Laughlin as an objective scientist.⁴² Perhaps Rushton's perusal was a bit too casual. My own inspection

³⁶ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 212–13.

³⁷ WILMOT ROBERTSON, VENTILATIONS 76 (1974). Robertson's combat service in World War II is noted in "About the Author" on the inside front cover.

³⁸ See Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 215–16, 231 (taking Laughlin's willingness to consider individual differences when examining statistical disparities among racial groups as evidence that he was not a racist).

³⁹ Harry Hamilton Laughlin, *White America* 9 EUGENICAL NEWS 3 (1924) (reviewing Earnest Cox's book, *White America*).

⁴⁰ See Letter from Harry H. Laughlin (unsigned), to Colonel Draper (Mar. 18, 1936) [hereinafter Laughlin Papers] (recommending a meeting between Draper and Cox) (on file with the Harry H. Laughlin Papers, Pickler Memorial Library, Truman State University); see also Letter from Harry H. Laughlin, to Colonel Earnest S. Cox (June 1, 1936) [hereinafter Cox Papers] (attempting to arrange a meeting between Cox and Draper) (on file with the Earnest Sevier Cox Papers, Special Collections Library, Duke University).

⁴¹ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 223, 232–33.

⁴² *Id.* at 237.

of Laughlin's papers immediately revealed page after page of numbered lists, in his own unmistakable handwriting, labeled "Jews" or "Jew traits," containing almost every known anti-Semitic stereotype: "chisel," "dishonest," "lie," "steal," "persecution complex," "intellectual freedom (for me not for you)," "hypocritical," "bore within," "other fellow fight your battle for you," and—the Nazi's favorite characterization of the Jews—"parasite."⁴³ Obviously no *spin* is necessary to portray Pioneer's first president as anti-Semitic, a task he performs nicely without assistance of any kind.

Laughlin's correspondence also indicates that he would have liked to apply to "the Jewish problem" the solution intended for blacks, but realized that it was impractical.⁴⁴ "The deportation of four million Jews," he wrote, "would be many times more difficult than the repatriation of three times as many Negroes."⁴⁵ Thus resigned to the fact that "[t]he Jew is doubtless here to stay," Laughlin maintained that "the Nordics' job [was] to prevent more of them from coming."⁴⁶ In keeping with this goal, in 1939 when Jews were attempting to escape from the Third Reich, Laughlin recommended not only a reduction in immigrant quotas⁴⁷ but procedures to denaturalize and deport some immigrants who had obtained citizenship,⁴⁸ singling out Jews as a group "slow to assimilate."⁴⁹

C. Frederick Osborn

Rushton charged that, in my zeal to make a case against Pioneer, I omitted the information that Osborn—who succeeded Laughlin as the Fund's president—suggested "an environmental, rather than a genetic, explanation for [racial] difference"⁵⁰ and "was explicit in his opposition to 'racial prejudices.'"⁵¹ It is hard to believe that Rushton has actually read my book, which clearly states that Osborn found

⁴³ See Laughlin Papers, *supra* note 39 (citing handwritten lists entitled "Jews" and "Jew Traits" (undated) in folder labeled "Semitic view of general formula of heredity papers, clippings, etc. Jews, Germany").

⁴⁴ Letter from H. H. Laughlin, to Madison Grant 2 (Nov. 19, 1932) (on file with Laughlin Papers, *supra* note 39).

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ HARRY H. LAUGHLIN, IMMIGRATION AND CONQUEST 20–21 (1939) (proposing that race, rather than birthplace, be used in determining immigration quotas for Jews in order to reduce the number permitted to immigrate per year).

⁴⁸ See *id.* at 89–95 (outlining specific recommendations for accepting immigrants and deporting immigrants who did not assimilate properly).

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 20.

⁵⁰ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 217 n.41.

⁵¹ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 216.

no evidence for 'superiorities or inferiorities of a biological nature' between races or social classes A eugenic program based on belief in the superiority of a particular race or social class, he concluded, ran 'contrary to . . . scientific knowledge' and 'to human ideals which are widely held in the United States.'⁵²

But nothing could be more revealing about Pioneer's true nature than the way in which this progressive opinion on the part of its most prominent board member was treated. Unwilling to tolerate an environmental explanation for racial differences or a reluctance to support segregation, Draper first made an unsubtle attempt to buy Osborn's agreement, offering extremely generous support for the American Eugenics Society (AES), of which Osborn was also president, but only if Osborn "would take a strong public position" in favor of both genetic differences in ability between races and segregation as its practical consequence.⁵³ When Osborn refused, Draper not only withdrew all financial assistance from the AES but pressured Osborn to resign from Pioneer, informing him that their "values and aims were so different that further meetings might not be mutually advantageous or agreeable."⁵⁴ It seems, therefore, that a president of the fund who believed in racial equality—genetic or political—was not welcome at Pioneer.

II. HAS PIONEER'S RECORD BEEN CONFLATED?

Rushton charges that by "conflating . . . Pioneer's record with that of particular individuals acting as individuals,"⁵⁵ I have committed "a travesty of both scholarship and justice."⁵⁶ That is, on the one hand, Draper, Weyher, and Trevor—acting as individuals—financed, planned, and supervised a campaign designed to overturn the *Brown* decision, prevent its implementation, and oppose every other measure to grant blacks political equality, all on the basis of claims by specific scientists about racial differences in intelligence and other personal characteristics.⁵⁷ Yet on the other hand, Rushton wishes to argue that these activities are totally unrelated

⁵² TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 49 (citing F. Osborn *Implications of the New Studies in Population and Psychology for the Development of Eugenic Philosophy*, 22 *EUGENICAL NEWS* 106 (1937); F. Osborn, *Science Contributions*, 16 *CHILD STUDY* 95 (1939).

⁵³ TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 58.

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 223.

⁵⁶ *Id.* at 210 n.13.

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 254.

to the decisions made by these same three individuals, acting as directors of the Pioneer Fund, to award grants for the study of racial differences to scientists—many of whom were involved in the campaign against racial equality.⁵⁸ On the face of it, this position seems untenable, indeed risible.

In addition, archival correspondence indicates that the distinction Rushton wishes to make in theory did not occur in practice. To cite but one example, the writings of Carleton Putnam—one of the most virulent opponents of civil rights—were published and distributed in mass with the help of Draper's money.⁵⁹ This distribution was an activity that Weyher and Trevor helped to plan and coordinate. In fact, Weyher systematically monitored public reaction to Putnam's work to ensure that it was having a favorable impact.⁶⁰ When William Bradford Shockley—the physicist who claimed that Blacks were genetically less intelligent than Whites—began to receive Pioneer grants, Putnam, who was not a Pioneer grantee, recommended to Weyher “a partial phasing out of funds” that he was receiving from Draper and “the transfer of these funds to Professor Shockley's budget.”⁶¹ That is, the same money originally allocated by Weyher—acting as an individual—for Putnam's efforts to preserve segregation was to be redirected by Weyher—acting as the president of Pioneer—to Shockley in the form of an official grant. The apparently fungible nature of these resources, the blurred boundary between these two projects that allowed such easy transferal of funds from the segregationist to the physicist, clearly suggests the existence of a single pool of money provided by Pioneer's founder, managed by Pioneer's president, and intended for one purpose—opposition to civil rights—which was to be pursued through different means. Thus, it is not I who have conflated Pioneer's activities with those of other organizations. That conflation is a documentable fact, the existence of which I have merely reported.

III. INVECTIVE OR ACCURATE DESCRIPTION?

Rushton charges that I have taken the “low road” by the use of

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 258–59.

⁵⁹ See Tucker, *supra* note 2, at 71–78.

⁶⁰ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 77.

⁶¹ Letter from Carleton Putnam, to William B. Shockley (Dec. 9, 1969) [hereinafter Shockley Papers] (on file with the William Bradford Shockley Papers, Stanford University Archives).

“such inflammatory epithets as ‘nigger,’ ‘dago,’ and ‘kike’” and by sprinkling the text with “hot-button ‘hate’ words” such as “fascist,” “Nazi,” “racist,” and “Holocaust.”⁶² These words do indeed appear in my book. The epithets are all direct quotations from persons whose efforts were supported by funds from Draper. The burden of proof to account for their appearance would thus seem not to be on me but on Rushton to explain how the *distinguished American*, who founded Pioneer solely for scientific purposes, came to subsidize those who routinely employed such ethnic slurs.

I agree with Rushton that the hot-button words he cites can lower the level of discussion if used connotatively, intended to insult or namecall. I have not done so. Rather I have used them in two contexts. In a number of cases they are direct quotations, in which these words are considered compliments. For example, Robert Kuttner—another scientist who received cash gifts from Draper,⁶³ participated in the anti-*Brown* campaign,⁶⁴ and who then became a Pioneer grantee—was described by his close associate, Willis Carto, as an “extremely valuable man for our side and a racist to his toes.”⁶⁵ Donald Swan—another key activist in many of the Draper-supported efforts against civil rights and later an official Pioneer grantee⁶⁶—blamed the “Yiddish stooges in Moscow” for keeping the superior “Nordic Peoples from realizing their rightful aspirations” and proudly concluded that “I too am an American fascist.”⁶⁷ It is instructive that words that most people would find demeaning or appalling are indications of praise or pride in the circles traveled by many recipients of Pioneer funds.

The second context in which these words appear is denotative—as an accurate description of a person’s politics or beliefs. Roger Pearson, for example, one of Pioneer’s major recipients, was previously the pseudonymous publisher and editor of a journal dedicated to the view that World War II had been an attempt by the Jews to bring about the complete “extermination or genocide of the German nation.”⁶⁸ After becoming a Pioneer grantee, Pearson’s first

⁶² Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 254 (quoting TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 34, 70).

⁶³ The list of gifts from Draper during the last three years of his life are contained in his Estate Papers available at the Surrogate’s Office, New York City [hereinafter Estate Papers].

⁶⁴ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 81–84, 116.

⁶⁵ Letter from Willis Carto to Col. Cox (Jan. 26, 1957) (on file with Cox Papers, *supra* note 40) (noting that Carto was provided with funds from the Cox estate to have his work published). For more on Carto, see *infra* note 73, and accompanying text.

⁶⁶ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 85–87.

⁶⁷ Donald A. Swan, letter to the editor, EXPOSÉ, Sept. 1954, at 4.

⁶⁸ Dr. Richard. Bevan, *Analysis of the Hate-Germany Campaign*, 8 NEW PATRIOT 41, 51

two publications—extolling the importance of Nordic racial purity and praising the virtue of killing “the weaklings and misshapen”—appeared on the front page of *White Power: The Revolutionary Voice of National Socialism* just under the large swastika serving as the periodical’s logo.⁶⁹ Glayde Whitney, a more recent recipient of Pioneer money, was a featured speaker at the annual conference of a Holocaust denial group, at which he explained that Jews were using the same tactics in science as they had used to invent the Holocaust: creating confusion to advance their own interests—in this case weakening whites by convincing them “to accept blacks as equals.”⁷⁰ A description of these views—and many other similar views expressed by Pioneer grantees—is relevant to any attempt to understand the fund. Once again, the burden is not on me to explain the inclusion of these observations but, on Rushton to explain how it is that they are so often characteristic of persons associated with Pioneer.

IV. MONEY LAUNDERING

Rushton objects to such terms in my book as “money laundering,” which he calls an “utterly false” charge.⁷¹ Again, to cite just one example, when Earnest Cox—who had dedicated his life to the repatriation of blacks—died in 1966, Draper decided to finance the reprinting of one of Cox’s pamphlets as a memorial “to a zealous defender of our race [and] nation.”⁷² Weyher—who at the time was disbursing Draper’s money to numerous opponents of equality for blacks—collaborated with the Cox estate to have the work published by Willis Carto—a professed admirer of Hitler—who believed that the removal of blacks would not only prevent the “niggerfication of

(Dec. 1966). Pearson acknowledged that he was “Stephen Langton,” the publisher and editor of the journal in a letter from Roger Pearson to Pedro del Valle (Mar. 30, 1966) (on file with the Pedro del Valle Papers, Division of Special Collections and University Archives, University of Oregon). Given his penchant for pseudonyms (documented in TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 172), he was probably “Bevan” as well.

⁶⁹ Roger Pearson, *The Fall of Rome*, WHITE POWER: THE REVOLUTIONARY VOICE OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM, Aug. 1974, at 1; Roger Pearson, *Ancient Greece*, WHITE POWER: THE REVOLUTIONARY VOICE OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM, Sept. 1974, at 1.

⁷⁰ Glayde Whitney, *Changing Views on Race and Society*, Remarks at the Thirteenth Institute for Historical Review Conference (May 29, 2000), at <http://www.ihr.org/conference/13thconf/schedule.html> (last visited Mar. 16, 2003) (available in streaming audio form).

⁷¹ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 255.

⁷² Letter from Wickliffe Draper, to Mrs. Nelson (July 16, 1966) (on file with Cox Papers, *supra* note 40).

America"⁷³ but also would exert "the strongest blow against the power of organized Jewry."⁷⁴ In order to provide the money for publication while preserving Draper's anonymity, Weyher arranged for payment to be funneled through the Virginia Education Fund—itsself created to oppose integration—which passed the check on to the estate's executors.⁷⁵ "Please be assured," wrote one of the executors to Weyher, after receiving the money from an official of the Virginia organization, "that this donation . . . will be treated as anonymous."⁷⁶ My understanding of the term money laundering is that it refers to a process designed to conceal the origin of money by passing it through an intermediary before it arrives at the intended destination—exactly what transpired in this case.

V. IS PIONEER A FUND OR LOBBY?

Finally, Rushton rejects any characterization of Pioneer as a lobbying operation. In this case his own campaign to promote the "special abridged edition" of his book, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*⁷⁷ provides the best example. Although the original unabridged version was published by Transaction Press in 1995, five years later Pioneer provided the funds for some 100,000 copies of the abridged edition.⁷⁸ These were then sent unsolicited to persons on the mailing lists of a number of professional associations in the social science fields.⁷⁹ The work itself claimed that, for centuries, visitors to Africa had characterized blacks as "wild animals," describing them as unintelligent, dirty, impoverished, incapable of complex social organization,⁸⁰ and more interested in "the pursuit of sexual thrills" than responsible parenting;⁸¹ as

⁷³ Letter from Willis Carto, to Earnest Sevier Cox 2 (Feb. 2, 1955) (on file with Cox Papers, *supra* note 40).

⁷⁴ Carto's observations about the "power of organized Jewry" is quoted in C. H. Simonds, *The Strange Story of Willis Carto: his fronts, his friends, his philosophy, his "Lobby for Patriotism"*, NAT'L REV., Sept. 10, 1971, at 979. On the same page Simonds also quotes Carto's letter to Norris Holt, in which Carto states that "Hitler's defeat was the defeat of Europe. And America." *Id.*

⁷⁵ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 40 (citing Letter from Edith W. Nelson, to Willis A. Carto (Apr. 19, 1967); Letter from Edith W. Nelson, to Willis A. Carto (Apr. 27, 1967) (on file with Cox Papers, *supra* note 37)).

⁷⁶ Letter from C.M. Tribble, co-executor of Cox's estate, to Harry F. Weyher (June 8, 1967) (on file with Cox Papers, *supra* note 40).

⁷⁷ J. PHILIPPE RUSHTON, *RACE, EVOLUTION, AND BEHAVIOR: A LIFE HISTORY PERSPECTIVE* (2d spec. abr. ed. 2000) [hereinafter RUSHTON, *RACE, EVOLUTION, AND BEHAVIOR*].

⁷⁸ *Hot Type*, CHRON. HIGHER EDUC., Jan. 14, 2000, at A24.

⁷⁹ *Id.*

⁸⁰ See RUSHTON, *RACE, EVOLUTION, AND BEHAVIOR*, *supra* note 77, at 8.

⁸¹ See *id.* at 8, 12 (using the r-K scale—the r scale representing high reproductive rates

Rushton put it, they were more likely to be “cads” than “dads.”⁸² The lower intelligence levels of blacks, Rushton explained, were a consequence of evolutionary history, in which whites and Asians developed more advanced genetic traits in order to cope with the demanding northern winters.⁸³

This was a campaign obviously designed to influence the public. In the paperback’s preface, Rushton promised to account, in a more “popularly written style,” for the experience of “teachers in America [who] know the races differ in school achievement; policemen [who] know the races differ in crime rates; [and] social workers [who] know the races differ in rates of welfare dependency or getting infected with AIDS.”⁸⁴ A tearsheet in the back of the book offered bulk rates “for distribution to media figures (especially columnists who write about race issues).”⁸⁵ Moreover, Rushton, together with three other Pioneer grantees announced the paperback’s publication—actually for the second time since *Transaction*,⁸⁶ which did not wish to be identified with the work in any way,⁸⁷ had forced Rushton to junk an earlier run of 60,000 copies also published by Pioneer but bearing the Press’s name⁸⁸—at a press conference held at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. The mass distribution of a breezy paperback containing speculative claims originally published half a decade earlier to tens of thousands of persons, none of whom had expressed any interest in the topic, accompanied by appeals to the media and an event at the National Press Club, has nothing to do with science—it’s a public relations campaign.

VI. CONCLUSION

Rushton states that the “previous presidents of the Pioneer Fund

and the k scale representing high levels of parental care—to describe the sexual reproduction and parenting differences between the races).

⁸² *Id.* at 12.

⁸³ *See id.* at 40–41 (correlating intelligence increases in colder climates with the need to find food and shelter in order to survive, and contrasting this with the development of people in warmer climates where less intelligence was needed to survive).

⁸⁴ *See id.* at 6 (claiming that a taboo among Americans concerning the topic of race stifles any real discussion of existing statistical disparities).

⁸⁵ *Id.* (unnumbered page).

⁸⁶ Press Release, National Press Club, *New Book Breaks Taboo on Genetic Race Differences in Crime and Intelligence* (July 11, 2000) (on file with the author).

⁸⁷ *See* RUSHTON, RACE, EVOLUTION, AND BEHAVIOR, *supra* note 77 at 6.

⁸⁸ *See Hot Type*, *supra* note 78 at A24 (identifying the Pioneer Fund as bankrolling the entire cost while simultaneously characterizing the Fund’s interest in eugenics as “long past”).

have . . . left a clear written record of opposition to Nazi policies and in favor of democracy and personal freedom.”⁸⁹ Pioneer has had three former presidents—Laughlin, Osborn, and Weyher. Laughlin looked to the Third Reich as a model, and he wanted to rid the country of blacks and Jews.⁹⁰ Osborn did indeed believe in democracy and personal freedom, which caused his departure from the fund,⁹¹ and Weyher—who led the organization from 1958 until 2002—orchestrated the scientific opposition to extending constitutionally guaranteed rights to blacks and coordinated the efforts of many segregationist scientists who subsequently became Pioneer grantees.⁹² Incidentally, Rushton suggests that, in the course of writing my book, I should have contacted Weyher to “check [my] facts.”⁹³ I saw no reason to do so since Weyher was already on record denying the existence of activities in which archival records clearly indicate that he was a central participant. For example, he denied that Draper had any interest in the repatriation of Blacks despite having not only arranged for the republication of Cox’s polemic at Draper’s expense but having made suggestions of his own to strengthen the case for repatriation.⁹⁴ And until faced with the evidence, he professed no recollection of his role in transferring some quarter million dollars of Draper’s money⁹⁵ (1.25 million adjusted for inflation) to an organization established solely to defeat the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁹⁶

Founded and financially supported by a multimillionaire who wanted to move the colored race to Liberia,⁹⁷ who provided regular and generous gifts to scientists opposing civil rights, who dedicated much of his wealth to the preservation of American apartheid, who

⁸⁹ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 214.

⁹⁰ See Lombardo, *supra* note 1, at 746–47; see Tucker, *supra* note 2, at 46.

⁹¹ See Lombardo, *supra* note 1, at 800–01; see Tucker, *supra* note 2, at 48–50.

⁹² See Lombardo, *supra* note 1, at 752.

⁹³ Rushton, *supra* note 3, at 210–11 n.13.

⁹⁴ See Letter from Edith W. Nelson to Drew L. Smith (Sept. 28, 1966) (on file with Cox Papers, *supra* note 40). To assist in the posthumous completion of a manuscript by Cox, Weyher recommended a book by a Northern general who could vouch for Lincoln’s intention to repatriate blacks. See *id.*

⁹⁵ See Douglas A. Blackmon, *Silent Partner: How the South’s Fight to Uphold Segregation Was Funded Up North*, WALL ST. J., June 11, 1999, at A1 (noting that when the evidence made his inability to recall any role in the transaction untenable, Weyher responded that he had done nothing illegal), available at 1999 WL-WSJ 5456164; Harry F. Weyher, *Letters to the Editor: The Pioneer Fund and Mississippi*, WALL ST. J., June 22, 1999, at A23 (claiming that Blackmon’s “misleading story” was “totally erroneous”), available at 1999 WL-WSJ 5457319.

⁹⁶ See TUCKER, *supra* note 2, at 122–26.

⁹⁷ See *id.* at 37–38.

could not abide as president of his board a leading eugenicist with insufficient enthusiasm for segregation and who financed publication of a book blaming Jews for all contemporary social problems, Pioneer has provided the resources for just about every scientist in the second half of the twentieth century who has opposed the rights of Blacks on the basis of genetic inferiority. Although the fund may have supported some projects of genuine scientific interest, they have been incidental to its true and less benign purpose—to provide intellectual justification for racial prejudice.