

and other people of good will, will reject *TNR's* attempt to drive a wedge between Catholics and Jews. But that is not to deny that the *FT* controversy has revealed real intra-conservative divisions. One of these divisions has less to do with Leo Strauss or Thomas Aquinas than with Thomas Hobbes, the early modern theorist of absolute sovereignty. The Hobbesian streak among conservative critics of the symposium was most evident in *NR's* editorial, which argued, "Our general obligation to obey the laws rests upon the fact that the laws protect us (against our fellow man), not upon the ultimate justice of the government's founding, still less (fortunately) upon its general moral character." Whatever else might be said of this view, it does seem at the very least in tension with the principles and spirit of the American Revolution, in particular with the principle of majority consent.

But the influence of Hobbesianism can also be detected in the insistence of many conservatives that the "legitimacy" of a political status quo should not be the subject of sustained public argument. To be sure, not every proposition is worth discussing. But once one has been raised, to say that it should not be discussed is self-defeating. More importantly, as *FT* has noted, the Supreme Court has itself raised the question of the legitimacy of the law. As Notre Dame Law Professor Gerard Bradley observes in his brilliant essay "Shall We Ratify the New Constitution?" recent Supreme Court decisions (most notably *Casey* and *Lee*) can reasonably be construed as asking the American people "to ratify and thereby legitimate" a constitution of the Court's devising. In that light, the *First Things* symposium was simply a resounding, "No!"

The editors' reference to Nazi Germany—which outraged many of the critics—is a dicier issue. Quoting the papal encyclical *Evangelium Vitae* on the general point that a law's binding force on the conscience depends on its morality, they noted that the footnotes in the encyclical refer to earlier papal statements that specifically condemned Nazi crimes. The editors add, "America is not and, please God, will never become Nazi Germany, but it is only blind hubris that denies it can happen here and, in peculiarly American ways, may be happening here." The passage, in other words, was intended as an antidote to an uncritical version of American excep-

tionism that denies the possibility that human rights could ever be tyrannically violated here. Whether or not the argument was tactfully made, it ought to be openly debatable.

For many of the neoconservative critics of the symposium, the anti-American rhetoric of the 1960s was a formative, and traumatic, political experience. But the parallel is weak, the result of analyzing arguments formally rather than materially. Quips Bradley, "Except for the hair, Hadley Arkes doesn't have much in common with Abbie Hoffman. Nor is Jerry Rubin the same as Dietrich Bonhoeffer." Or as Fr. Neuhaus puts it, "There is nothing so elementary as that there are criteria for just and unjust government. It astonishes me that people think that we came up with something new or something retrieved from the ash heap of the Sixties."

A very mild anti-American strain does indeed exist on the Right—think of the number of conservatives who interpreted President Clinton's re-election as a verdict on the intellect or morality of the American public—but conservatives remain more likely to make the opposite mistake of uncritically embracing populism. I'll get worried about anti-Americanism on the Right when I see Neuhaus burning a flag.

If anything, the symposium could be faulted for laying insufficient stress on the *permanent* nature of the tension between the demands of God and those of Caesar. Putting the symposium in such a context would have raised the needed alarms without being alarmist. It might then have reminded conservatives that liberty requires eternal vigilance—without apocalyptic rhetoric.

Meanwhile, if the Right is repeating an error of the late Sixties Left, perhaps it's factionalism: a tendency for intellectuals to get caught up in theoretical disputes while ignoring points of concordance that have far more practical relevance. Almost all conservatives agree that the federal judiciary has needlessly and destructively intervened in the nation's social and moral controversies (most recently when it blocked implementation of the California Civil Rights Initiative). Almost all conservatives agree that it's important to address the problem. If this debate concentrates the conservative mind on a program to rein in the courts and a strategy to advance that program—if it makes efforts to curtail judicial review respectable—all conservatives would have reason to cheer. Some conservatives may balk at delegitimizing the courts, but an aggressive campaign to *demystify* them is long overdue. Justice Scalia's recent dissents offer a model of how to do this.

First Things may also have performed another public service. After more than 16 years of sitting in the back of the Republican bus, social conservatives are getting restive. Already, important players like Gary Bauer and Phyllis Schlafly are taking shots at Ralph Reed's accommodationism and moving into Pat Buchanan's orbit—which is to say, out of their alliance with the rest of the Right. Something good will have come of this debate if conservative intellectuals are awakened to grassroots discontent with the party's handling of moral issues, most importantly abortion. If the conservative coalition is to be kept together, that sentiment is going to have to be responsibly accommodated. □

IQ and PC

Publishers have become more concerned with their reputations than with disseminating the truth.

KEVIN LAMB

ONE hallmark of modern civil society is its commitment to a free exchange of ideas and viewpoints. Scholars often depend upon unfettered access to colleagues' research. The suppression of peer-reviewed mate-

rial not only restricts the dissemination of scientific findings, but also jeopardizes the academic tradition of free inquiry. Such constraints on open debate threaten the autonomy of free institutions.

Reputable publishers serve as gatekeepers by determining which manuscripts are worthy of publication. The decision to publish a manuscript involves several factors: the author's credibility, the validity of the specific work in question, the book's likely marketability and profitability, and so on. Another critical factor, however, can be the pressure of political correctness. Publishers, fearful of losing access to distributors and wholesalers—and, through them, to the indispensable booksellers—are reluctant to issue books that challenge the prevailing orthodoxy of social taboos. This places politically correct constraints on what major houses consider "safe" to publish.

One leading publisher of academic titles, for instance, no longer even considers studies that examine racial differences in IQ, even though the American Psychological Association issued a task-force report last year that accepts the reality of these differences. This distinguished panel of experts concluded:

The differential between the mean intelligence test scores of Blacks and Whites (about one standard deviation, although it may be diminishing) does not result from any obvious biases in test construction and

Mr. Lamb is a library assistant at Newsweek.

administration, nor does it simply reflect differences in socioeconomic status. Explanations based on factors of caste and culture may be appropriate, but so far have little direct empirical support. There is certainly no such support for a genetic interpretation. At present, no one knows what causes this differential.

Last July, John Wiley & Sons declined to publish Arthur R. Jensen's latest work, *The g Factor*, after reviewing it for ten months. Jensen's eight-hundred-page tome provides detailed evidence for a general level of intelligence, or *g*, as it was called by Charles Spearman, the pioneering British psychologist. Two of the book's fourteen chapters consider possible genetic and environmental explanations for racial differences in IQ. Even though the book received favorable reviews from independent referees, including one who stated that it could be the definitive study on general intelligence for years to come, and though it was supported by the publisher's psychology editor, Jensen received a brief letter simply stating that Wiley had decided to reject *The g Factor*.

When asked why Wiley decided not to publish Prof. Jensen's book, Susan Spilka, Wiley's Manager of Corporate Communications, replied, "I have no idea and we'll probably never know.

Chances are it wasn't a quality factor." Furthermore, Miss Spilka noted that the rejection of Prof. Jensen's book was a "very deliberate decision" since Wiley does "not want to publish in this field."

These views merely confirm the suspicions that scholars had last spring when, in an unprecedented move, Wiley retracted another work on general intelligence *after* review copies and pre-paid backorders had already been distributed. Wiley dropped Christopher Brand's *The g Factor: General Intelligence and Its Implications*, two days before its official publication date. Brand, a lecturer in psychology at the University of Edinburgh, examines the significance of general mental ability, the degree to which it is inherited, and the reasons why society must recognize the reality of innate individual differences. What exactly prompted Wiley to try to suppress a book that was already available in British bookstores and has been acquired by several academic libraries?

In a newspaper interview just before the book's release, Brand rejected the idea that environmental explanations alone can fully account for racial differences in IQ. Defying the conventional wisdom, he stated that these differences are "deep-seated" and probably genetic in origin. He also suggested that in order to curb high rates of illegitimacy

Professor Jensen's Opus

ARTHUR Jensen had been cheerfully recounting his problems in getting *The g Factor* published when finally I burst out, "Art, doesn't it ever make you angry?" Even if he wasn't, I was.

The g Factor is a book that an academic publisher should kill for. Arthur Jensen is among the pre-eminent psychometricians of the last half-century. At age 73, he has completed his summa. It is a book that every scholar working in the area will have to read. An indispensable reference in every psychology library. A book to hold up to young scholars as an example of why a lifetime of patient and meticulous scholarship is worth while.

Mr. Murray is co-author, with the late Richard Herrnstein, of The Bell Curve.

But none of the great university publishing houses Jensen approached would touch it. Wiley—once a good house if not the most prestigious—backed away from it.

It is hard for me to imagine what the senior people at these houses are thinking. The satisfaction they take from their job is—surely—to bring the rare work of great scholarship to the world. Jensen's book is the real McCoy. Is it possible they don't recognize that? I suppose they could be scared. But scared of what, precisely? A cutting remark at a Cambridge cocktail party? Nothing much worse than that will happen to the publisher of *The g Factor*. The remaining possibility is the truly depressing one. The people who make the publishing decisions are refusing to publish Jensen not because they are

scared, but because they think refusing is the right thing to do. They see themselves not as deliverers of great scholarship to the world, but as gatekeepers for the politically correct.

So instead of publishing *The g Factor*, the academic houses will fuss over their lists of earnest books about trivial topics, pretentious books about silly topics, and book by the crits and the deconstructionists signifying nothing but high-IQ drivel. Damn right I'm angry.

Is Jensen angry? A sweet and gentle man, he seems incapable of anything more hostile than a sort of scholarly bemusement. "What good does it do to get angry?" he says. "I'd just like to get the darned thing out. I'm working on some other things and it would really be helpful if I could cite it."

If you fear that the world of scholarship is collapsing, take heart that an Arthur Jensen is still out there. And shudder in horror at the way he has been treated.

—CHARLES MURRAY