



**NATHANIEL
WEYL**

**THE
CREATIVE
ELITE
IN AMERICA**

**PUBLIC
AFFAIRS
PRESS**

"Mr. Weyl's book" as William Marclay points out in the introduction, "is a work of outstanding originality, one that breaks new paths through the labyrinthine maze of American social science.

"The first scientific, comprehensive and convincing assessment of the psychic resources of a nation in terms of the peoples who comprise it, *The Creative Elite in America* opens unexpected vistas for the advance of history, sociology and ecology into unexplored terrain.

"Its analysis of the history of the Jewish people, considered as a unique example of eugenic reproduction for the development of innate intellectual excellence, is as profoundly original and important as the survey of the creative elite as a whole. Weyl may well have solved the riddle of the extraordinary Jewish contribution to the intellectual life of the western world. He has unraveled this Gordian knot by analyzing the deep undercurrents of sexual mores, educational institutions, and other aspects of social history in a manner that has never before been attempted.

"The implications of *The Creative Elite in America* are much greater than the book itself. The study of the social forces spawning, enlarging and protecting human intelligence (together with the study of those forces, processes and institutions destroying and sterilizing it) is a most vital and yet strangely neglected field of scientific inquiry. It is particularly important to our generation because we live in an age characterized not only by a dangerous global population explosion, but also by population trends seemingly conducive to the genetic impoverishment of mankind.

"The late Norbert Wiener, the distinguished pioneer in the nascent science of cybernetics, predicted that the largest scientific advances would be made in the interstitial areas between the various disciplines. By entering the unstaked territory between human genetics, ecology, sociology and history, Weyl has made a major contribution to the fulfillment of Wiener's prediction."

PUBLIC AFFAIRS PRESS
WASHINGTON, D. C.



1008557462

NME ✓



SECONDARY


APR 13 1967

301.44 Weyl, Nathaniel, 1910-
W546 The creative elite in America. Public
Affairs Press [1966]
236p. 6.00

1008557462

1. Intellectuals - U.S. 2. Creation
(Literary, artistic, etc.) 3. Jews in the
U.S. - Intellectual life. I. Title.
3-31-67





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE CREATIVE
ELITE IN AMERICA

THE CREATIVE
ELITE IN AMERICA

By Nathaniel Weyl

Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C.

For Sylvia, the companion of my life

Copyright, 1966, by Nathaniel Weyl

Published by Public Affairs Press
419 New Jersey Ave., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Printed in the United States of America
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 66-23828

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Weyl's book is a work of outstanding originality, one that breaks new paths through the labyrinthine maze of American social science.

The first scientific, comprehensive and convincing assessment of the psychic resources of a nation in terms of the peoples who comprise it, *The Creative Elite in America* opens unexpected vistas for the advance of history, sociology and ecology into unexplored terrain.

Its analysis of the history of the Jewish people, considered as a unique example of eugenic reproduction for the development of innate intellectual excellence, is as profoundly original and important as the survey of the creative elite as a whole. Weyl may well have solved the riddle of the extraordinary Jewish contribution to the intellectual life of the western world. He has unraveled this Gordian knot by analyzing the deep undercurrents of sexual mores, educational institutions, and other aspects of social history in a manner that has never before been attempted.

The implications of *The Creative Elite in America* are much greater than the book itself. The study of the social forces spawning, enlarging and protecting human intelligence (together with the study of those forces, processes and institutions destroying and sterilizing it) is a most vital and yet strangely neglected field of scientific inquiry. It is particularly important to our generation because we live in an age characterized not only by a dangerous global population explosion, but also by population trends seemingly conducive to the genetic impoverishment of mankind.

The late Norbert Wiener, the distinguished pioneer in the nascent science of cybernetics, predicted that the largest scientific advances would be made in the interstitial areas between the various disciplines. By entering the unstaked territory between human genetics, ecology, sociology and history, Weyl has made a major contribution to the fulfillment of Wiener's prediction.

WILLIAM MARCLAY

Washington, D. C.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nathaniel Weyl was born in New York City in 1910. He did his undergraduate work at Haverford and Columbia and his post-graduate studies at Columbia and the London School of Economics. After several years as a U.S. Government economist and executive, he resigned to engage in full-time writing.

Over the past decade Mr. Weyl has concentrated his attention on the role of intellectual elites in the rise and fall of civilization. His books include *The Geography of Intellect*, *The Negro in American Civilization*, *The Reconquest of Mexico*, *Treason*, *The Battle Against Disloyalty*, and *Red Star Over Cuba*. In addition, he has contributed articles and book reviews to popular periodicals, technical journals and encyclopedias, and has written analytical articles on the American and international elite for the *Mankind Quarterly* of Edinburgh.

Mr. Weyl has traveled extensively in five continents and is a member of various American and foreign professional, scientific and honorary societies. He is a fellow of the International Academy of Arts and Letters, a Commander of the Military and Hospitaller Order of St. Lazarus and the Secretary of Palm Beach County Mensa.

For the past five years Mr. Weyl has lived in Delray Beach, Florida, with his wife and their 11-year-old twin sons.

PREFATORY NOTES

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Robert Gayre of Gayre, the distinguished editor of the *Mankind Quarterly*, for generously permitting me to use material from six of my articles in that periodical.¹ I am further indebted to Dr. Gayre and to Mr. Robert H. S. Robertson, the gifted author of *Scotland's Scientific Heritage*, for their valuable critical comments concerning the provenance of Scottish and English surnames, regional differences in British intellectual achievement and many other matters.

To Laura Lewis I am indebted for her patient and capable work in making name-counts, machine-computing indexes and preparing statistical tables.

Finally, I wish to express gratitude to my wife, Sylvia Castleton Weyl, for wise criticism and constructive suggestions.

NATHANIEL WEYL

Delray Beach, Florida

This is an independent study sponsored and encouraged by Norman College in its belief that there should be continuing review at an academic level of those sociological, economic and political issues vital to the preservation of a strong, free and prosperous America. In sponsoring this study of American elites, we do not assume responsibility for, or necessarily endorse, its conclusions. We hope and believe, however, that this stimulating, original and scholarly work will contribute to that knowledge of public affairs which is a foundation stone of good citizenship.

GUY N. ATKINSON

President, Norman College

1. "Ethnic and National Characteristics of the U.S. Elite," Vol. I, No. 4 (April-June 1961); "Dynamics of the American Elite," Vol. II, No. 1 (July-September 1961); "Class Origin of Surnames and Achievement," Vol. II, No. 3 (January-March 1962); "The Scots in the United States" and "The Provenance of Scientists," Vol. II, No. 4 (April-June 1962), and "The Jewish Role in the American Elite," Vol. III, No. 1 (July-September 1962).

CONTENTS

	I	
Creative Minorities and Civilization		1
	II	
A New Method of Studying Elites		7
	III	
American Leadership – A Panorama		20
	IV	
The Provenance of Scientists		27
	V	
The Aesthetic Elite		34
	VI	
The English-Speaking Peoples		41
	VII	
Decline of the Puritan Elite		46
	VIII	
Scandinavians, Italians, Slavs, and Chinese		58
	IX	
Internal Differences in Creativity		76
	X	
The Role of the Jews		92
	XI	
A Comparison of German and Russian Jews		105
	XII	
Some Implications For Immigration Policy		113
	XIII	
Emergence of the Children of Israel		123

	XIV	
Concerning the Anthropology of the Jews		130
	XV	
Alternate Theories, Contributory Causes		143
	XVI	
The Rise of Jewish Education		151
	XVII	
The Sexual History of the Jewish People		169
	XVIII	
Eugenics and the Rabbinate		179
	XIX	
Conclusion		194
References		198
Appendices		219
Index		233

I

CREATIVE MINORITIES AND CIVILIZATION

The subject of this book is the composition of the American creative minority or elite. In contrast to other works on the same topic, it presents quantitative findings, arrived at by an entirely impersonal process, which any investigator can verify or disprove at a small cost in time and effort.

By the creative minority, I mean both that element which does in fact lead and that element which has superior talent, entitling it to leadership. In any healthy nation, these two elites largely overlap. In an ideal society, they would coincide.

The analytic method employed is one I first used in 1961.¹ It is based on the comparative frequency of occurrence of selected surnames on U.S. Social Security rolls and on elite rosters such as *American Men of Science*. The names are chosen to represent specific groups in the American population.

Now, for obvious reasons, the meaningful categories which can be reached and investigated by this method are mainly national-linguistic.² If a man is named Walker, the probabilities are that he is of English descent. We may also infer that, around the time of the First Crusade when surnames were adopted in England, one of his ancestors was engaged in cleaning and thickening cloth, for that is what a walker was in the medieval textile industry. But we evidently cannot assume that our contemporary Walker is a textile operative nor can we deduce anything about his occupation from his cognomen.

Accordingly, the focus in this book is on the national-linguistic composition of the American creative minority. This does not mean that I am oblivious of occupational, regional or other differences. It means merely that these differences cannot be presented quantitatively and analyzed by the name-frequency method.

The chapters that follow are largely devoted to a factual presentation of the changing nature of the American elite as revealed by over 70 rosters of scientific, aesthetic, business, political, military and social eminence. They provide data on the comparative contributions of the various national-linguistic stocks that comprise the American population to the creative minority of the nation.³ This panoramic view is

both an instantaneous picture of contemporary American leadership and a dynamic presentation of the emergence of new elite elements, the submergence of old-established ones and the perhaps permanent sedimentation at the bottom of still others. The implications of these static and dynamic patterns for immigration policy and for an appraisal of America's world leadership potential are enormous.

The Crucial Role of Jewry. Perhaps the most significant finding of this book is that creative leadership in the United States does not follow the melting pot theory — that is to say, it is not a blend of the component elements of the population, to which each group contributes approximately equally. On the contrary, there are the sharpest possible differences in the size of these contributions. The burdens and rewards of creative leadership are concentrated in comparatively few hands.

In proportion to population, the outstanding element in the intellectual leadership of the United States is the Jews. While the Jewish position is weak in rosters referring to past elites, it is very strong in those which cover the contemporary elites and enormously strong in those dealing with future elites.⁴

The Jewish position is not merely one of leadership. It is one of pre-eminence in the sense that no other national-linguistic group approaches it. In 58 rosters of contemporary American leadership, the Jewish representation is more than double the average and about 75% higher than that of the Scots who occupy second place. In five rosters of the future elite, the Jewish index of achievement is three and a half times the average and is more than three times that of any other national-linguistic group with the exception of the Chinese who stand in second place.

The reasons for Jewish pre-eminence are multiple, complex and subject to many qualifications as to their reach in space and time. This subject is treated in considerable detail in the pages that follow.

At this stage, it is sufficient to suggest that the fundamental reason for the observed differences is that Jewry bred selectively for intelligence during centuries in which Christendom bred selectively against it. During the millenium and a half which separates the Crucifixion from the Reformation, the calling which above all others attracted intellectuals was the priesthood. Science being nascent and heresy punishable by death, there was in fact scarcely any alternate avenue for those who wished to lead a life of scholarship.

Over this long span of centuries the Christian Church did its utmost

to uphold and enforce clerical celibacy. Wherever it succeeded, it prevented many of the wisest, most intelligent and most gifted from reproducing, thus impoverishing the genetic stock of Christian Europe. While priests, monks and nuns often violated their vows of celibacy, these violations were generally furtive and not conducive to raising large families to manhood and womanhood.

By contrast, the rabbinate, from the fall of Jerusalem to Titus in 70 A.D. to the breakdown of the European ghetti in the 19th Century, enjoyed distinct reproductive advantages over Jewry in general. At best, the rabbis obtained their position as a result of an intense intellectual competition open to all Jewish males. Education was compulsory and universal for boys. Poverty did not prevent the gifted from becoming scholars and rabbis.

There was keen competition among well-to-do Jewish families to acquire rabbis and scholars as sons-in-law. Such marriages occurred before puberty and normally resulted in large families. Judaism has always tended to disapprove of the celibate life and rabbis, in particular, were under a religious obligation to marry and multiply. They enjoyed the major reproductive advantage of being better able to ensure the survival of their children into adulthood than Jewry at large. As a rule, their progeny would be better fed, clothed and housed than most. If, as was often the case, the rabbis combined religious learning with the practice of medicine, they would be in a good position to protect their families against the diseases which caused such fearful mortality in medieval Europe. Rabbis and scholars, married into merchant families, would be more likely to be informed in advance about impending pogroms and attacks on their Jewish communities. Forewarned, they would also have better than average physical facilities for escape; they would be better able to survive while in flight; they would be more welcome than ordinary Jews when they came as refugees to strange communities.

Thus, the history of Jewry over most of the last two thousand years can be viewed as an unprecedented biogenetic experiment in selective breeding for intelligence. The testing ground was a mentally exacting, compulsory educational system in which those who performed most brilliantly became community leaders and were accepted by Jewry as its intellectual aristocracy. This elite tended to marry into wealthy families and obeyed the Biblical command to be fruitful and multiply. Because of wealth, high status and medical knowledge, the scholarly elite was more successful than Jewry in general in ensuring that its progeny survived, married and multiplied.

The most important qualification to this analysis is that these conditions applied pre-eminently to European Jewry and were by no means the rule in the Asian and African regions of Jewish settlement. Hence, it is not at all astonishing that Israeli educational authorities today face major difficulties in training Jewish youth of Afroasian origin. These children enter the public schools about 10 i.q. points behind children of European Jewish stock. With each additional year of schooling, the gap between the two groups widens.⁵

Leadership of Northwest Europe. In the geography of the American creative minority, the Jews are followed, though at a considerable distance, by the Anglo Saxons and other Northwest Europeans. Within this group, the Scots and Dutch appear to be outstanding.

Exclude Jews, Chinese and Japanese from consideration. Then draw gradients from Scotland southward and eastward. As one proceeds in either direction, proportionate representation in the American elite tends to decline. The contribution of the non-Jewish stocks of Eastern and Southern Europe are only small fractions of the statistical expectation.

Protestant peoples tend to outperform Catholic ones. Here we have the same process at work of clerical celibacy competing with clerical fecundity that was outlined in comparing Jewish and Christian reproductive patterns.

After the Reformation, the intellectual center of Europe shifted northward. One of the developments that made this possible was that the children of the highly fertile Protestant clergy made a fantastically high contribution to the intellectual elites of their countries.⁶ By contrast, the Catholic priesthood remained celibate — in fact, its celibacy was much more harshly enforced after the Counter Reformation. This meant biological death for a large part of the gifted intellectual class of the Catholic world and hence continued genetic downgrading of the Catholic nations.

The present survey of the American creative minority shows that northern peoples tend to be more heavily represented than southern ones and that countries close to the oceanic arteries of communication do better than those located in continental hinterlands. The generalization about northern vs. southern peoples seems buttressed by the remarkable and rising contributions of Americans of Chinese and Japanese descent to the intellectual life of the nation. Unfortunately, we do not have as comprehensive data as we would like on the Chinese

and Japanese contributions or, for that matter, on the role of Armenians, Syrio-Lebanese and Asian Indians.

Intellectual excellence in a wide variety of fields appears to be characteristic of the American creative minority. The peoples who lead tend to lead everywhere or almost everywhere. Those who lag generally lag in every sphere of creative achievement.

This versatility is not, however, characteristic of the American business and status elites. These leadership elements, as represented by business executives and country club and fraternity members, tend to be predominately white, Anglo Saxon and Protestant — WASPs to use the pejorative, synthetic word which is being popularized by sociologists hostile to their status. The business and social elites tend to exclude, not only such rising intellectual leadership groups as Jews and Chinese, but most southern and eastern Europeans and almost all non-whites.

In his stimulating, popularized book, *The Protestant Establishment*, C. Digby Baltzell argues that this exclusiveness is destroying the American aristocracy.⁷ He suggests, as I do in the pages that follow, that the Anglo Saxon element in the American population is an established elite that is receding into non-elite status as far as intellectual and creative activities go. When an aristocracy replenishes its ranks by continuously recruiting able men from the masses, as the British aristocracy does by conferring peerages on gifted self-made men, it is able to provide wise leadership and to command popular support. When it closes its ranks to outsiders, arteriosclerosis sets in; it becomes useless and is swept aside.

Baltzell argues that, from a conservative standpoint, a broadening of the American power and status aristocracies is vital. In America today, he urges, exclusion of the Jews from these elites can be suicidal to the future of the latter.

Of course, these barriers are neither uniform nor absolute. The role of college fraternities is dwindling while, at the same time, they are opening their doors to non-Anglo Saxon elements. The same process is occurring, though perhaps at a more glacial pace, in the country clubs. The complex and paradoxical role of Jews and other non-Nordics in the American business leadership is discussed in the pages that follow.

Stupidity and its Consequences. Why study the national-linguistic dimensions of creative minorities? The shortest answer is that today brain-power is both our most important national resource and the one

in which we seem to be in most critical short supply. Many believe that all present and prospective stringencies in world raw material availabilities could be coped with provided sufficiently large and competent intellectual elites existed and were brought into effective use. Raw material wealth, however, cannot compensate for brain-power dearth. It would seem probable that the future of Western world leadership will largely depend on the extent to which we command more brain-power than our adversaries and use it more efficaciously than they to create a fuller, freer, richer and more secure life for mankind.

Name-frequency analysis reveals sharp differences in the contributions of different stocks to the past, present and future American creative minorities. Experts will disagree as to the relative importance of genes and nurture as causes of these differences. Few will dispute the assertion that the existence of such gaps creates serious problems for a free society.

On the economic side, the advance of automation and cybernetics, the progressive displacement of muscle by brain, the ever-increasing intricacy of economic processes and the rise of the ratio of capital investment to labor force conspire to make the uneducable and mentally subnormal less and less able to support themselves or make any significant contribution to the productive work of society.

Moreover, people who make practically no contribution to the American elite are not likely to prove to be responsible citizens. The presence of a vast element which is too indifferent, too uneducated or too stupid to understand any of the great issues which are placed before the electorate for decision threatens the health of any democracy. It runs counter to a basic democratic requirement — the existence of a community of men and women responsible enough, intelligent enough and well enough informed to govern themselves.

II

A NEW METHOD OF STUDYING ELITES

Although discussions of method are necessary, they are seldom interesting and this chapter is no exception to that rule. The general reader might do well to glance at the first two pages up to the heading *Some Advantages of the Method* and then proceed to Chapter 3. If, later on, questions come to his mind about the procedures used and their validity, he can refer back to this chapter and to the index for answers.

The estimates given in this book derive from a new procedure which has the advantages of accuracy and speed and which yields data that can be subjected to statistical tests of significance. Its underlying, tacit assumption is that the bearers of common names of a specific type or provenance (such as Irish, Jewish or of clerical origin) can be assumed to be representative of the classes from which they are drawn.

Since many people are inquisitive about the frequency of occurrence of their family names, the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance (BOASI) of the Social Security Administration compiled a list of the 1,514 most common names in the United States together with the number of times they appeared on BOASI rolls as of mid-1956. Each of these common names was borne by 10,000 or more persons on Social Security rosters. In aggregate, the names accounted for 56.4 million of the 117.3 million people on BOASI rolls at the time, or 48% of the total.

When this list was made available to the public, it seemed evident to me that it would provide a shortcut for estimating the comparative contribution of Americans of different national stocks to various areas of leadership and service. The first step was to select surnames from the BOASI list which were representative of a given national stock until a large and accurate sample was obtained. This involved discarding names which are borne extensively by more than one national-linguistic group, for example, *Lee* because it can be both English and Chinese; *Gordon* because it is frequently Jewish, rather than Scottish; *Brown* because an estimated 31% of the Browns are Negro; *Miller* because it is often the result of a name-change from Muller. Since BOASI uses a coding system which gives the first six letters of the names only, *Martin* had to be discarded, although it is preponderantly English, because of Martínez and Martino.

The second step was to compare the frequency of occurrence of the batches of surnames chosen to represent specific national stocks on specialized leadership rosters with their frequency on Social Security (BOASI) rolls.

This yielded a key index which I call the *performance coefficient*. If bearers of the Scottish surnames in the sample comprise twice as high a percentage of total entries in a roster of geologists as they do on Social Security rolls, the Scottish performance coefficient for geologists is 200. A performance coefficient of 300 on a roster means three times the average performance, one of 100 means average, one of 33 means one-third average.

In computing performance coefficients, I now use the totality of names in the samples as my standard. In previously published articles, I used the total number of entries in each roster for purposes of standardization. Hence, minor differences exist between the estimates shown there and here.

Some Advantages of the Method. To go through the 56,300 names in *Who's Who in America 1962-63* to find, say, the comparative number of Scottish and Irish entries would be a major research task because it would involve scrutinizing each individual case and consulting a variety of other data to determine whether the person belonged to the first group, the second or neither. To do a profile of only these two groups in this way in about a dozen key areas might take years.

By contrast, the name-frequency method requires only an hour or two of work for each roster. The Social Security frequencies have already been computed and tabulated by BOASI. Almost all leadership rosters are alphabetized. Counting a few hundred surnames on these lists and deriving performance coefficients for the 15 to 20 national-linguistic and special groups they represent is quick and easy work — particularly so when the count can be made by ruler.

Additional considerations are accuracy, objectivity and ease of verification or disproof. An examination of all *Who's Who* entries to determine which were Scottish, which Irish and which neither would entail a variety of essentially arbitrary decisions. Since the researcher could not explain his reasons for these choices without becoming unbearably prolix, he would be obliged to remain silent on the subject and the reader would have to accept his procedures on faith. Furthermore, given an estimate of the number of persons of Scottish and Irish descent in *Who's Who*, these would still have to be equated to the total

U.S. populations of these origins, involving still another area of subjectivity and estimate.

By contrast, the comparison between Irish and Scots in *Who's Who* can be made simply, accurately and in a way which others can readily verify or disprove by name-frequency analysis. Few will question the statement that *Dunns*, *Kellys* and *Sullivans* are almost always Irish on the paternal side at least and that *Bairds*, *Dunlaps* and *Kirks* are similarly Scottish. A dozen or so names of this sort for each of the two national groups provide the desired samples. The number of times each name in the two samples occurs in *Who's Who* can be checked by simple count and the ratios of *Who's Who* to Social Security representation are obtained by division. Subject to sound judgment in the selection of representative surnames, the method is accurate and subject to quick verification or disproof by any other investigators.

Size of the Elite. Since name-frequency analysis is a statistical sampling procedure, its reliability varies with the size of the sample. Therefore, the creative minority had to be defined in very broad terms. Thus, all Army, Navy and Air Force officers, rather than general officers only, were included. The professionals as a whole, and not merely the outstanding ones, are considered.

Quantitatively, this American elite is enormous. Some 75 rosters are included, comprising over two million entries. Among them are over 185,000 past and present Phi Beta Kappa members, 315,000 listings in *Who's Whos* and *Who Was Whos*, 218,000 entries in two different editions of *American Men of Science*, 25,000 college faculty members, 195,000 students in institutions of higher education, about 170,000 businessmen and 195,000 authors and artists.¹

Size of Sample. A basic question, of course, is what validity attaches to the findings based on statistical samples. Much depends on the size of the samples. In aggregate, those I use contain 8,077,800 entries on Social Security. This compares with 117.3 million on BOASI rosters, of whom 56.4 million were bearers of the 1,514 most common names. The samples then represent 8% coverage of the Social Security beneficiaries and 15% coverage of the bearers of high-frequency surnames on the BOASI list.

Coverage varies from one group to another. The English-speaking stocks are represented by 4.7 million people. Of these, 2.5 million are English, 1.2 million Irish, 737,000 Scottish and 242,000 Welsh. Of the 3.4 million names of non-English-speaking stocks, some 746,000 are

Spanish-speaking, 675,000 are Scandinavians, 551,000 Jews, 441,000 Germans and 169,000 French. Dutch and Italians are represented by about 100,000 names each, Slavs by 58,000 and Chinese, Hungarians and Greeks by samples of from 10,000 to 15,000 in each instance.

The samples vary widely in comprehensiveness. The four English-speaking groups represent about 10% of the estimated population of those stocks in the United States. The coverage for the foreign-language groups is poorer: it averages only about 7%. The Slavic, Italian and Hungarian samples are not very reliable as they cover less than 3% of the estimated populations of these provenances in the United States in 1960. The Greek, Hungarian and Chinese samples are poor because each contains only one name (*Pappas*, *Toth* and *Wong*). Some national-linguistic groups had to be excluded because no representative surnames could be found for them on the BOASI list. Among these were the Negroes, American Indians, Japanese, Asian Indians, Armenians, Turks, Syrians, Lebanese, Portuguese and Finns.

On the other hand, some of the non-English-speaking groups are well covered. The Jewish and Scandinavian samples represent about 15% of each of these groups. When the initial results began to disclose the unique and commanding position of Jewry in the American creative minority, the importance of a comprehensive and highly accurate Jewish sample became evident. Hence, a major effort was made to obtain a large sample and, at the same time, to exclude names not unambiguously Jewish.

The Scandinavian sample is large because it represents total coverage, that is to say, it includes every name which is both listed in BOASI and described as purely Scandinavian in Smith's standard work on the subject.²

Spanish coverage is ample due to the fact that a large majority of Spanish-speaking people are bearers of a few dozen very common names. The situation is exactly opposite among Italians, Slavs and French.

The Dutch sample, the French, the Italian and the Slavic, Greek and Hungarian include all the names distinctively of these origins on the BOASI list. The German sample, which includes only 4.1% of Americans of German stock is small primarily because names which are borne to a large extent by German Jews had to be discarded.

Name-Changers. The prevalence of name-changers in the American population influences the performance coefficients in a rather subtle fashion. As a rule, name-changing is an effort by a comparatively low-

status group to infiltrate into, or pass as belonging to, a high-status group. In the United States, the names most commonly assumed are those of the Anglo-Saxon majority.

The only instance of name-changing on a sufficiently massive scale to affect the performance coefficients of the Anglo-Saxon majority in America was the assumption of surnames by the emancipated Negro slaves after the Civil War. Other than this, name-changing has been merely large enough to have a major impact on the national-linguistic groups from which the name-changers were fleeing.

One might argue that we need not worry, even in this case, about the loss of name-changers from our samples, since they disappear, not only from the selective leadership rosters, but from the Social Security rolls as well. There is a qualification to this line of reasoning. It cannot be assumed that name-changers are homogeneous with name-retainers. The changers are generally more ambitious and more determined to reject the micro-environment of their minority group and to advance within the total American macro-environment. The social pressures for name-changing will vary from one area to another within the society as will the efficacy of the expedient.³ On the whole, the name-changers are more likely to be members of the elites and hence their absence probably artificially depresses the performance coefficients of the minority groups, doing so to an unknown extent.

The national-linguistic performance coefficients also require correction to the extent that the surnames do not reveal the true facts of mixed national, racial or linguistic background. Where intermarriage takes place, the general tendency will be for the minority groups to marry in the general direction of the dominant Anglo-Saxon majority. Since these Anglo-Saxon peoples contribute about as much as the national average to leadership, the effect of intermarriage will be to upgrade those minorities which are below average and to downgrade those that are above it. In other words, intermarriage and national-linguistic mixture tend to conceal or reduce the real differences in leadership contribution among the different unmixed stocks in the American population.

Extent of Intermarriage. The most authoritative source of data concerning intermarriage is the returns from a question about religion asked by the census in 1957. This was preliminary to a similar query in the 1960 census, but Jewish organizations protested vehemently and managed to get the returns sealed — not, however, before some of them had been made public.⁴ These returns showed that 93% of

Jewish marriages, 91% of Protestant marriages, but only about 78.5% of Catholic marriages were "religiously homogenous." A broad study by John L. Thomas covering 1940 to 1950 concluded that "mixed marriages sanctioned by Catholic nuptials" approximated 30% of all Catholic marriages in the United States.⁵ Since inter-religious marriages were not thus sanctioned, the 30% figure must be an underestimate. Thomas also reported that interfaith marriages increased with the socioeconomic status of the Catholic spouse. This would seem to be a general rule about all such intermarriages.

A very detailed study of intermarriage trends in New Haven, Conn., during 1870-1940 by Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy showed that the rate of endogamy within the various national origins group dropped from 91% at the beginning to 64% at the end of the period.⁶ Religious endogamy was considerably greater. Thus, Mrs. Kennedy found that 80% of British, German and Scandinavian stock married within its own enlarged Protestant group in 1940; 84% of Irish, Italians and Poles married among a similar enlarged Catholic pool, and 94% of Jews married other Jews. Figures for other communities revealed somewhat higher Jewish intermarriage rates. Thus, summarizing a study by Goldman and Chenkin,⁷ Milton M. Gordon stated that "a study of the New Orleans Jewish community in 1953 revealed that 7% of its married members had non-Jewish spouses."⁸ This implies that 13% of the marriages were mixed.

Marriages between Negroes and whites are quantitatively unimportant. Gordon cites a variety of studies to the effect that Negro-white marriages in different communities and at different times have varied from 0 to 4% of all marriages involving Negroes.⁹

In evaluating these estimates a few considerations should be borne in mind. The studies do not cover national-linguistic stocks. They refer to religion or national origin. The three categories are by no means identical. A marriage between a Protestant Ulsterman and a Catholic from Dublin is homogeneous as to nationality and language, but heterogeneous as to religion. Marriage between a Mexican and a Puerto Rican is mixed as to nationality, but homogeneous as to religion and language.

Intermarriage tends to become more frequent as the social and economic level of the partners rises. It is most frequent among those upper class and intellectual groups which are neither bound by convention nor fearful of social disapproval.

Finally, religious intermarriages generally result in the conversion of Jews to Christianity and of Protestants to Catholicism. A reason

for this is that a large proportion of the Jews who intermarry wish to be assimilated into the dominant majority. As for Protestant-Catholic marriages, the decisive factor is probably the strict attitude of the Catholic Church. Finally, there is a good deal of scattered evidence that mixed marriages tend to be comparatively infertile. This is not a biological matter. It is probably due to social insecurity, doubts as to the status of children, the known higher instability of such marriages (as measured by divorce rates) and the fact that they occur very frequently among intellectuals, who generally have smaller than average families.

Natural and Artificial Elites. Leadership groups are those segments of society which excel in achievement, eminence or status. The broad areas in which significant leadership is exercised are mainly: executive, scientific and aesthetic. This can be fragmented into a large variety of specific fields of endeavor and status from corporate directors to ambassadors, Pulitzer Prize winners, nuclear physicists, actors, musicians and chess masters.

How are these leadership types distributed among the major national groups which comprise the American population? To what extent does the executive leadership (and particularly that of business) differ in composition from the scientific and aesthetic elites? How close is the association between the average length of sojourn in the United States of a national stock and its representation in the creative minority? Are there groups which are consistently highly successful and others which are almost total failures everywhere?

A very large problem upon which name-frequency analysis sheds light is the comparative profiles of Americans of different national origins. This is both a *quantitative* matter — one of extent of leadership — and a *qualitative* matter — one of the specific areas in which the various groups are able to contribute to the creative minority.

The profiles, or patterns of performance coefficients, are comprehensive and yield a panoramic view of the adaptation of the various stocks to American conditions. Within these profiles, the most important areas of achievement or leadership have been worked out, though we should have wished to include social contributions, philanthropy, wealth, income, etc., to round out the picture. The medical and criminal fields, comprising such data as comparative morbidities and mortalities from different diseases, admissions for schizophrenia, senile psychosis, alcoholism, drug addiction, convictions for crimes of violence, theft, fraud, sexual offenses, suicides, homicides, etc., also had

to be ignored. There are neutral areas such as religious and political persuasion. There are also zones of special interest such as the breakdown of Communist Party membership.

A common misconception is that most of this information is already available. To be sure, detailed studies have been made of the foreign-born, but this is by no means the same thing. The performance of the foreign-born is affected by recency of immigration and invidious conclusions about foreign groups have often been drawn when this factor was ignored. A comparison of national stocks is much less subject to this disadvantage because the bearers of names of a specific national provenance include the foreign born, their children and native Americans of native parentage and grandparentage.

Leadership and Original Class Origin. Surnames represent not merely groups of common national, regional, linguistic and racial origin, but groups of common occupational and class origin as well. To what extent do these original class and occupational differences correlate with contemporary differences in contributions to the American elite? Has selective mating of an unconscious sort stabilized such differences through the centuries? To what extent, if any, are the names of clerical, noble or guild origin, of Irish kings or Scottish lairds or Jewish rabbinical families over represented in the American creative minority?

At first blush, this sort of inquiry may seem foolish when one considers that Englishmen had adopted surnames by approximately 1200 A.D. and that hence some 750 years, or about 30 generations, have elapsed since the names were chosen. We find, however, that the 386,000 bearers of three British clerical names (*Clark*, *Clarke* and *Palmer*) score above the English average in 68 rosters, below it in only five. A curious aspect of this is that any selective breeding that may have entered the picture as a causal factor must be based on individual preference (primarily, one supposes, the desire of intelligent people to have intelligent mates) rather than on notions of higher or lower caste status. At least, there has never been any assumption in this country that *Clarks* and *Palmers* were better than other Anglo-Saxons. This is indicated by the fact that no American President has borne any of the three clerical names (unless one includes Herbert *Clark* Hoover) whereas one *Jackson* and two *Johnsons* have achieved presidential office.

Limitations and Objections. The surname-frequency method considers linguistic groups primarily rather than racial or national groups. The category of French combines European French with French Canadians, many of whom are partly Indian. The Spanish names are a conglomerate of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, other Latin Americans, Filipinos, peninsular Spaniards and the Hispanic stock which inhabited California and Texas at the time of annexation.

It should be added that the achievements of immigrants and their descendants do not necessarily measure the potentialities of the populations from which they derived. The more recent immigration streams may be handicapped by ignorance of English, by inferior socio-economic and cultural status or by both.

The immigrants may not be a representative sample of their parent populations. For example, the Italian immigration into the U.S. has consisted primarily of Sicilian and Calabrian peasants, driven by poverty. As a result of the invasions and depredations of Berbers, Arabs, Moors and others, this rural south Italian population is to a large extent racially mixed. It has made only a slight contribution to the Italian elite in Italy and there is some evidence that its psychometric intelligence may be lower than that of central and northern Italians. The poor showing of Italo-Americans in the creative minority of the United States and the excessive Italo-American participation in organized crime may or may not justify a negative verdict considering this particular peasant stock, but it cannot justify a low opinion of the Italian people in general.

There are other instances in which the immigrant streams from a country are diverse. Thus, the Puritans formed one of the outstanding creative minorities of Western Civilization, but a similar judgment could hardly be made of the "rogues, vagrants and sturdy beggars" ordered deported to the Colonies by Parliament¹⁰ or of the 50,000 criminals dumped in the Americas prior to the Revolution, 20,000 of them in Maryland.¹¹ The uncharitable Benjamin Franklin compared this Crown policy of deportation with sending American rattlesnakes to England to teach them manners.

In the case of Hungary, the main stream of non-Jewish immigration occurred toward the end of the 19th Century and consisted chiefly of landless agricultural laborers and of peasants with minute land holdings. This mass of unskilled labor was drawn into the burgeoning American heavy industries, chiefly coal and steel. These Hungarian-Americans made a very slight contribution to the creative minority and, in fact, the outstanding Hungarians in the United States have

almost all been Jews.¹² By contrast, the Hungarian emigration of 1956-57, like almost all flights from political or religious persecution, consisted primarily of an intellectual and professional elite. This new Hungarian element is rapidly making its mark in the ranks of the American creative minority.

Status versus Ability. The creative minority comprises both the actual and the potential leadership elements in a society. The contradictions between de facto leadership and ability can reach extremes in caste societies and hereditary aristocracies. These often restrict the upward movement into the leadership element of the most able individuals from the despised castes, the excluded races and the oppressed classes. Similarly, they tend to prevent the effective ejection from the ruling element of those who are mentally, morally or otherwise unfit to wield power. In short, they block the circulation of elites and create a sort of social arteriosclerosis.

If the caste societies create large gaps between ability and leadership by oppression, modern revolutionary regimes do so by the more drastic device of exterminating the creative minority or a large part of it. In German Nazism, the animus was chiefly racial and the blow was directed with most savage fury against the Jewish people, but there was also a vendetta against the intellectuals as such and against the upper classes. In Communist conquests of power, the thinning out of the creative minorities has been a class matter. Smashing the bourgeois state involves decimating a ruling class which looks back nostalgically toward the old order. It is replaced by propertyless elements who can be expected to remain loyal to the revolutionary dictatorship because they owe everything to it. In some of the emergent nations of Asia and Africa, we seem to have a blend of class resentment and race hatred. There is a belief that the European minority must be driven out or killed lest, through superior ability, it regain some of its former power. Both the theoretical proclamations and the actual revolutionary operations of the Chinese Communists foreshadow a combined racial and class policy of aristocracide on a worldwide basis.

In the United States the gap between the actual and the optimum elite is much narrower than that average condition which has prevailed historically in most other advanced countries and civilizations. This is largely the fruit of mass educational opportunity, of comparatively low class and race barriers, of the fluidity and mobility of the society and of the efficiency of its leadership-selection mechanisms and agencies.

It is evident that the "mix" between de facto elite status and creativity will vary widely depending upon the aspect of leadership under consideration. Of the series considered in this book, the *National Social Directory* is probably at one extreme as representing status with no necessary relationship to merit; membership in the Phi Beta Kappa Society might be considered as the other extreme of an elite based upon ability alone.

Yet even here the categories are impure. People get into social registers more rapidly if their ancestors were outstanding in some field of leadership. It is probable that their success was caused in part by superior genes and that some of this superior hereditary endowment was passed on to later generations. Moreover, one can lose one's place in these social orders by putatively unworthy or disgraceful conduct, or by going to seed for long enough. At the opposite extreme, Phi Beta Kappa membership presupposes that the individual could afford higher education at one of the better colleges or universities. The honor is based primarily upon grades. These are awarded by professors who may or may not be swayed by considerations of status, class and race. The fact that prejudicial judgments on these grounds today are more likely to favor the underdog than the overdog does not make them any the less prejudicial.

The American creative minority has several dimensions. One of these is *time*. Societary leadership is continuously changing, sometimes rapidly, at other times gradually, even imperceptibly. These changes can be highly significant barometers of biogenetic and social processes at work within the community or nation. They may reveal the upthrust of underprivileged groups of high potential as well as the downdrift of overprivileged, high status groups which are either resting on their oars or else reproducing dysgenically to such an extent that they are breeding themselves out of brain-power. There are also instances of groups which are both lacking in privileges and poorly endowed biogenetically with mental capacity and which therefore tend to remain at the bottom of every societal pyramid even where the gates of opportunity are insistently widened in their favor.

The intertemporal dynamics of American leadership provides glimpses of the sort of society which is assuming shape in the intermediate-range future. Thus, Jews and Chinese are forging ahead significantly in enrollment in high-prestige colleges and universities. The implication is that they will probably constitute a considerably larger proportion of the dominant intellectual elite a generation hence than they do at present.

The potential elites include individuals who are barred from elite status by youth alone, such as National Merit Scholars contrasted with, let us say, fellows of the various professional and scientific societies or promising West Point cadets as contrasted with general officers of the Army.

Aspects of the Elite. A second dimension to be considered is *promotion*. Group A may furnish a high proportion of general practitioners, but a significantly smaller one of recognized medical specialists. There may be statistically significant differences between the national-linguistic composition of company officers (lieutenant through captain), field officers (major through colonel) and general officers (brigadier general and above). Some groups may account for an impressive proportion of books in print, but for a smaller proportion of the works of outstanding literary merit. In other words, some groups may have the ability to qualify en masse at the less challenging and less creative levels of leadership, while failing to qualify significantly at the top. This is an area which was not systematically explored by name-frequency analysis because the top groups generally provided samples too small for reliable statistical analysis.

A third dimension is that of *value* or *moral direction*. In America today, subversives, although a socially undesirable element, have the characteristics of an elite group. This suggests that the very groups which are providing the preponderant share of creative thinking and operational leadership in society are also furnishing its would-be cadres of grave-diggers. It would thus appear that the American creative minority is significantly infected with that corruption which Benda called "the treason of the intellectuals."²³ If the subversives are a perverse or corrupted elite, the ordinary criminals, the unemployables, the chronic relief spongers and the mentally defective are merely non-elites.

A fourth dimension is *qualitative*. This refers to the nature of the functions performed by the creative minorities under consideration and hence to the type of mental, emotional or moral qualities brought into play. For statistical reasons, we deal throughout with rather large populations and this inevitably means lowering standards and definitions. When the tens of thousands of physicists listed in *American Men of Science* are included in the elite, it is evident that the standard of competence, originality and creativity is far lower than if inclusion had been confined to Nobel Laureates. By including under medicine, all physicians in the *American Medical Directory*, by considering all

authors of published books as writers or all officers in the armed forces as military leaders, we are lowering the standard from excellence to bare qualification.

Moreover, the various types of elites evoke different types and degrees of mental ability. Theoretical work in mathematics and the physical sciences, composition of symphonies and probably grandmaster tournament play in chess require analytic and synthetic mental ability of an extremely high order. The work of the historian and scholar is mentally less exacting. The operational leader in business, politics or military affairs and, for that matter, the judge, lawyer and medical practitioner, call into play a variety of psychic resources other than conceptual thought. Good judgment, the ability to establish rapport, the capacity to gauge the moods and motives of others, the ability to persuade and, perhaps above all, charm, are involved.

The creative minority in the plastic arts has psychic qualities that are in turn different from those of either the scientist or the operational leader.¹⁴ However, the fact that these distinctions exist does not mean that they are necessarily more important than the singleness of mental activity. In fact, this is one of the main questions to be answered. Is there, as Ralph Waldo Emerson believed, a law of compensation by which talents in one area are balanced by defects in another? Or is the real state of affairs closer to the words of Jesus: "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."¹⁵

An understanding of the creative minority, of the forces which are shaping it and of the prospective strength, character and potential of this elite should constitute a major component in any appraisal of national resources. One could go further and state that a comprehensive analysis of the elite in these terms on a worldwide scale would yield information of inestimable value in gauging the impediments to bringing the world as a whole into the matrix of modern rational and technically oriented civilization.

The present study is a preliminary approach to this large task and is confined to the American creative minority. This limitation is not the result of parochial or chauvinistic considerations, but is due to the fact that statistical lacunae have made it impossible to extend the work to international terrain.

III

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP — A PANORAMA

This chapter presents a summary view of the composition of the American creative minority and the dynamics of the elites as a whole. The data presented are averages of the performance coefficients of all 75 rosters and of the 12 past, 58 present and five future rosters. Accordingly, they give a general panorama of the static and dynamic characteristics of the creative minority of the United States. Subsequent chapters deal with trends in specific national-linguistic groups and specific areas of leadership.

The appraisal of the comparative importance of the different components of leadership and creativity is necessarily subjective and the 75 rosters chosen may give greater emphasis to intellectual achievement and less to executive authority and social status than does public opinion.

Of the 75 rosters, 11 consist of different editions of *Who's Who in America*, *Who Was Who in America* and *Who's Who of American Women*.

Eight other rosters refer to science. Seven of them are the listings in the several volumes of the 9th and 10th editions of *American Men of Science*, while one covers patent applications on file in the U.S. Patent Office.

Scholarship and the university are represented by 13 other rosters. These comprise listings in the *Directory of American Scholars*, faculties in elite and non-elite colleges and universities and the student bodies of similar institutions, Phi Beta Kappa elections between 1776 and 1962, National Merit Scholars, North American Mensa membership in June 1965 and listings in the 1963-64 edition of *Who's Who in American Education*.

The fourth group is the professions. The 10 fields covered are: doctors, medical specialists, dentists, psychiatrists, mathematicians, statisticians, engineers, architects, Foreign Service officers and lawyers.

The fifth group is arts and letters. Of the 14 series, two refer to the plastic arts and one is an anthology of poets. The others are encyclopaedias of authors, *Books in Print*, various editions of the *Book Review Digest* and the membership list of the American Newspaper Guild.

The sixth group is business leadership with nine component rosters. These include *Poor's Register of Directors and Executives* (1959) and *Who's Who in Commerce and Industry* (1961). In addition, I have compiled indexes of the 18,537 directors and top officers listed in *Moody's Manuals* of the 500 largest corporations as reported by *Fortune* magazine in mid-1964. These directors and officers were subdivided among industry, banks, utilities, insurance, transportation and merchandising.

The seventh group is politics with five rosters. These cover Republican and Democratic politicians, labor leaders, members of the influential Council on Foreign Relations and persons listed on 1950-61 indexes of Senate and House hearings on subversive activities.

Two military rosters cover active and retired officers in the armed services. The final group, the social elite, consists of the 1963 *Social Register of New York* and the 1964 *National Social Directory*.¹

Correction for Negro Names. The performance coefficients of national-linguistic groups are distorted when significant proportions of those who bear the supposedly representative surnames turn out to be Negroes. To ascertain the extent of this disturbing factor, I used *Who's Who in Colored America* (7th edition, 1950), a roster of about 2,800 eminent American Negroes, and calculations made from Negro poll tax rosters in Texas counties. I concluded that about 19% of the English and Welsh names, 15% of the Scottish names and 9% of the Irish names were Negro. The Negro percentage seemed to be about 10% in the case of French names, 4% for Jewish names and an assumed 2% for all other national-linguistic groups and for the Special Occupational and Puritan groups.

On this basis a correction was made for the Negro presence. While in many instances the Negro performance coefficients approximate or equal zero, it was assumed that they would average about a quarter of the white level. Accordingly, the English and Welsh performance coefficients were increased by 8% and the Scottish and British Clerical names by 4%. French names remained unchanged; Irish were deflated by 1%, Jews by 5% and all other groups by 6%.²

The Creative Minority as a Whole. The table that follows presents a summary picture of the average performance coefficients of the 15 national-linguistic groups and three special occupational groups in the 75 rosters of leadership after correction for Negro names.

Table 1: THE AMERICAN CREATIVE MINORITY AS A WHOLE

(Average Performance Coefficients for 75 Rosters of Leadership —
After Adjustment for Negro Names)

Category	No. of Names on BOASI (thousands)	No. of Rosters Counted*	Arithmetic Mean of Performance Coefficients
A. ENGLISH-SPEAKING:			
English	2,537	75	105
Scottish	877	75	127
Welsh	265	71	108
Irish	1,190	75	89
B. NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING:			
Jewish	551	73	204
German	538	71	90
Dutch	105	59	116
Scandinavian	675	74	83
French	169	62	79
Italian	103	47	40
Spanish	732	58	15
Slavic	58	48	33
Chinese	14	55	64
Greek	11	52	23
Hungarian	11	52	14
C. SPECIAL BRITISH GROUPS:			
Clerical	386	73	180
Occupational	78	64	218
Puritan	34	52	397
<i>Grand Total</i>	8,334		100

* The number of rosters varies in each case. Where a group has one to four representatives on a roster, this is considered too small to be statistically significant and is marked *negligible*: the roster is not counted for that particular group. If the score is zero, however, the roster is counted.

The structure of the American elite, as revealed by this table, is one of concentration of leadership in specific groups.

First. Within the English-speaking group, the three special categories are in a commanding position. The bearers of Puritan names, with an average performance coefficient of 397, lead all other elements, are almost twice as creative as the Jews and are nearly four times as creative as the general English element. Special British Occupations consists of four occupational surnames which were chosen simply because they had higher performance coefficients than any other

non-clerical occupational British surnames in *Who's Who* (29th edition).³ I wanted to see whether this superiority, observed in one roster of leadership, would apply generally. The answer evidently is that it does. These special occupational surnames are twice as creative as bearers of ordinary English names and somewhat more creative than bearers of ordinary Jewish names. Finally, there are the three clerical names. Here again, we have consistent superiority, though of a less dramatic sort. With a mean performance coefficient of 130, the bearers of British Clerical Names rank well above the English and are ahead of all national-linguistic groups, the Jews excepted.

Second. Among the inhabitants of the British Isles, there is a consistent pattern of Scottish leadership, followed after a considerable lag by Welsh and English (bunched fairly closely together) and then, after another considerable lag, by Irish. The reasons for this pattern are not entirely clear. They will be discussed later. As I shall show, this pattern seems to be changing and there is reason to believe that the Irish are gaining ground on the other three groups.

Third. Of the 15 national-linguistic groups, the Jews are clearly in the leadership with a mean performance coefficient of 204, more than 75 points above their nearest rival, the Scots. The pattern of Jewish leadership would be even more strongly accented if the 12 rosters of past leadership were not included. The Jews score way below the national average on these past rosters because they often refer to a period prior to the main Jewish immigration into the United States and to times when most American Jews were of non-elite status.

Fourth. After the Jews come the Scots with an average performance of 127 and the Dutch with 116. The three other English-speaking peoples range between 89 and 108; the Germans score 90, the Scandinavians 83, the French 79 and the Chinese 64. The five other national-linguistic groups range from 14 to 40.

Rank Order. The rank order of the 15 national-linguistic groups in the 75 rosters was computed for first, second and third places. Jews led in 34 rosters, Welsh in 11, Scots in 10, Dutch in five, Chinese in four and Irish in three. The other eight first places were divided among the nine remaining national-linguistic groups.

Of the 225 first, second and third places, Scots held 51, Jews 45, Dutch 31, Welsh 24, English 21 and Irish and Germans 14 each. In terms of larger categories, 110 of 225 places went to the four British Isles groups (English, Scots, Welsh and Irish), 45 to the Jews and 51 to the three Nordic Protestant peoples of the European Continent

(Dutch, Germans and Scandinavians). This left 19 places, of which 10 went to the Chinese, three to the Greeks and only four to the Continental Catholic nations (French, Italian, Spanish, Slavic and Hungarian).

In short, the American creative minority, as revealed by these figures, consists overwhelmingly of people of specific national origins. This elite is primarily Jewish, Anglo-Saxon, northwest European and, to a growing extent, Chinese and Japanese. It derives from Protestant more than from Catholic peoples, from Atlantic more than from Mediterranean Europe and from maritime more than from hinterland peoples.

A composite index of rank can be obtained by scoring one for every first place, a half for every second place and a third for every third place. Using this method, the Jews lead with $39\frac{1}{2}$ points out of a total possible score of $137\frac{1}{2}$. They are followed in that order by Scots with 28, Welsh with 16, Dutch with $15\frac{1}{3}$, English with $9\frac{1}{3}$, Irish with 7.17, Chinese with 6.87, Germans with 5.83 and Scandinavians with 3.67. The remaining six national-linguistic groups range from zero to two and have an aggregate score of only 5.83.⁴

Past, Present and Future. A survey of the comparative performance coefficients of the 18 groups in past, present and future rosters reveals some of the dynamics of elite formation in the United States. Of the 75 rosters, 12 are classified as referring to the past, 58 to the present and five to the future. The arithmetic means of performance coefficients are after correction for Negro name-bearers.

The 12 past rosters show the Scots in first place with an average score of 151, followed by the Welsh with 136, the English with 132, the French with 114 and the Dutch with 110. All other national-linguistic groups score considerably below 100, the rank order being Irish 78, Jewish 66, German 60, Italian 38, Scandinavian and Spanish 32 each, and Slavs, Chinese, Greeks and Hungarians negligible or zero.

These statistics are not too meaningful. The performance coefficients are derived from fractions, the denominators of which are the estimated numbers of people of various stocks on Social Security rolls in 1956. Evidently, the past rosters refer to an American population with a very different ethnic and national composition from that prevailing at present. Thus, the comparatively low position of the Irish on past rosters reflects both the non-elite status of the Irish over most of the period and the fact that some of the indexes refer to years prior

to the massive Irish immigration into the United States. The same considerations apply to the low performance coefficients of all the newer immigration groups in the past rosters.

Puritan leadership is far more heavily accented than in present or future rosters. The Puritan performance coefficient for the 12 past rosters is 948, that of Special Occupations 346 and of Clerical Names 198 as against an average for ordinary English of only 132. While these differences are primarily measures of the amazing concentration of Anglo-Saxon leadership in the hands of bearers of Puritan names and other special groups, they also reflect the fact that the bearers of Puritan names formerly comprised a considerably larger proportion of the total American population of British stock than they do at present.

The performance coefficients for the 58 present rosters require little comment since the pattern closely resembles that already discussed as applying to all rosters. The Jews lead with 220, followed by Scots with 125, Dutch with 118, Welsh with 103, English with 101, Germans with 96, Scandinavians with 92, Irish with 91, French with 71 and Chinese with 65. The remaining five national-linguistic groups range from 13 to 41.⁵ The gap between the Special British Groups and the ordinary English has narrowed considerably. Thus, the average for Puritan names is only 253, that for Special Occupational names 197 and for Clerical names 118.

The five future rosters reveal radical differences in the rank order and composition of the creative minority. The Special British Groups lose their commanding position; there is a pronounced decline in the four English-speaking peoples and a corresponding rise in the overall position of the peoples of Continental Europe. The Jews and Chinese forge forward in a spectacular manner; the role of the eastern European peoples advances, that of the Italians and Spanish-speaking remains more or less unchanged.

In these five future rosters, Jews lead with an average performance coefficient of 362, representing a gain of more than 50% over their position in the 58 present rosters. The Chinese somewhat surprisingly move into second place with a performance coefficient of 215. They are followed by the Dutch with 117 and the Scandinavians with 100. It is only at this late stage that the peoples of the British Isles make their appearance: Scots in fifth place with 96, followed by Germans with 96, Welsh 92, English 87, Irish 83, Greeks 66, French 52, Slavs 49, Hungarians 38, Italians 31 and Spanish-speaking 17. As for the special groups, the Puritan score is only 89, that of Special Occupations 119 and that of Clerical names 117.

Consolidating these future rosters into larger groups, Jews average 362, Chinese 215, the three preponderantly Protestant peoples of North-western Europe 104, the Special British groups 108, the four English-speaking groups 90, the Greeks 66 and the five preponderantly Catholic peoples of Europe 37. In terms of rank order, the Jews lead in three rosters and the Chinese in the other two. Jews and Scots each hold second place in two rosters with the Chinese in second place in the fifth.

These indicated changes in the geography and structure of the future elite are intriguing and far-reaching in their potential implications. The five future rosters, however, cover merely college enrollment and scholastic excellence. These are areas in which Jews and Chinese do better than their averages in the elite as a whole. I hope that some students of the social sciences may find it worth their while to engage in the painstaking search for rosters of future leadership, sufficiently large for statistical reliability, covering such areas as business, political and military leadership, the professions, letters and the plastic arts. This would make it easier to gauge the extent to which the changes observed here apply to the future American creative minority in its entirety.

IV

THE PROVENANCE OF SCIENTISTS

In 1963, Dr. Stefan Possony and I examined the provenance of scientists from the Dark Ages to the present.¹ Taking as one of our basic sources Sarton's monumental history of science in antiquity and the Middle Ages² and applying Beloch's estimates of world population circa 1600,³ we found a pattern that is not dissimilar to what name-frequency analysis discloses. The approximate number of scientists, scholars and philosophers of eminence during 1100-1400 A.D. per estimated 100,000 population was 202 for the British Isles, 178 for Italy, 135 for Spain (including Moorish Spain), 123 for the Netherlands and 101 for France. Despite persecution in Christendom and fierce disapproval of science and secular philosophy by much of the rabbinate, the Jews produced 810 savants per 100,000 population.⁴ As in the contemporary American data, the proportionate contribution of Jews to science and scholarship is far more impressive than that of other groups.

"When we consider outstanding intellectual contributions *in relation to population and urbanization*," Possony and I wrote, "Northern Europe assumes leadership" over Southern Europe.⁵ Sarton's data suggest that during the three centuries of the flowering and ebb of the Middle Ages Europe was the unchallenged center of learning. The total contribution of the Orient (China, Japan, India and other Far Eastern areas) was about equal to that of Jewry. The Muslim contribution was only 40% that of Christendom. As the late Professor Sarton was an Arabist, he cannot be suspected of Europaeocentric bias.

In 1947 Dr. Harvey C. Lehman published a compilation of 9,501 outstanding scientists and composers by nationality. These men flourished between the Renaissance and various cut-off dates between 1911 and 1939. Thus the havoc wreaked by Nazism on the European intellectual community is not reflected in Lehman's figures. The men were chosen on the basis of their inclusion in standard histories of the disciplines in which they distinguished themselves.⁶

Possony and I deflated Lehman's figures by the estimated 1865 population of the countries of origin of the scientists. We found that Switzerland ranked first, producing 87 outstanding scientists and com-

posers per 100,000 population. Swiss leadership, we believe, is due primarily to the Republic's traditional attitude of intellectual tolerance and to its great role as a recipient of refugees from religious and political persecution. Germany was in second place, followed in that order by England and Wales, Scotland, France, the Netherlands, Denmark and the United States.

More than 90% of the thinkers came from 18 listed European countries and the United States. Of these 8,725 scientifically and musically creative minds, 63% lived in primarily Protestant countries, 31% in mainly Catholic lands and 6% in Greek Orthodox ones.⁷ The concentration of intellect in northern and western Europe was even more marked than the religious concentration, for the inclusion of composers with the scientists tended to obscure the geographical pattern. While the Swiss, Dutch and Scots produced hardly any musicians at all, over half of the Italians, two-thirds of the Austrians, three-fourths of the Russians and almost all of the Hungarians on the list were, not scientists, but composers of orchestral music or grand opera. Since Lehman made no effort to differentiate between Jewish and non-Jewish minds, his study sheds no light on the Jewish role in science and musical composition.

The American Scientist. In 1947 Professor Stephen Sargent Visser of the Geography Department of Indiana University published a basic study of the outstanding scientists in the United States during the period 1903-1943.⁸ Dr. Visser's book analyzes 2,607 "starred scientists" appearing in various editions of *American Men of Science* during this 40-year period in terms of such factors as parental occupation, residence, education, college or university, formative influences and racial and national stock.

The procedure of starring scientists was inaugurated in 1903 by J. McKen Cattell, then editor of *Science*. He asked ten outstanding leaders in each of ten scientific disciplines to list the top men in their fields. By consolidating their choices, Cattell arrived at a list of 1,000 scientists who, in the opinion of their peers, were pre-eminent. These names were starred in the first edition of *American Men of Science*. This procedure was continued throughout the next six editions, terminating in 1943. The average starred scientist was born in 1874 and received his star in 1918 at the age of 44.⁹

In 1904, Cattell sent questionnaires to the 1,000 scientists starred the previous year and announced that "more than half" described themselves as of Puritan stock.

In 1942 Visher sent a much more elaborate interrogatory to the scientists who had been awarded stars up to that time. Of the 905 responding, all but 32 replied to the query concerning racial origin. Tabulating the answers, Visher found that Puritans still led the field, but had declined from over 50% to about 30% of the total. This he attributed to the fact that birth control had become prevalent among these old New England families considerably before it affected the general population.

Calculating performance coefficients for Visher's data, the Scots and Scots-Irish lead with 214, followed by the English with 176, the Dutch with 150, the Jews with 119, the Germans with 116, Scandinavians (83), Welsh (78) and French (23). Even though no adjustment was made for Negro names, over two-thirds of the scientists were of British stock.

Comparing his results with those of Cattell about 40 years previously, Visher observed that "three conspicuous changes are a relative decline in Puritan stock, an increase in German representation and an increase in the number of 'Jews'. (A considerable number of persons known to be 'Jewish' reported themselves as German.)"¹⁰ If Jewish scientists were seeking to conceal their racial origin, it was a fair assumption that a large portion of the 32 scientists (3% of the total) who failed to reply to the racial query were Jewish.

The fact that the Irish produced no starred scientists and hence scored zero is astonishing. If the Italians, Spanish-speaking peoples, Slavs, Greeks, Hungarians and Chinese produced any, these were lumped together in the "all other" category which comprised only 30 individuals over the entire period.

Parental Occupations. Cattell investigated the parentage of 885 American scientists. He found that 43% were sired by professionals, 36% by men in manufacturing and trade, only 21% by farmers. Yet, at the presumptive average time of parental employment of these scientists (1850), about two-thirds of the American gainfully employed were in agriculture.¹¹ Of the professionals who fathered scientists, 10.1% were clergymen, 8.3% teachers, 7.5 physicians, 6.6 lawyers and 10.6% other.¹²

In *A Study of British Genius*, Havelock Ellis found that over a third of the fathers of 829 eminent Britishers were professionals, of whom more than half were clergymen. Yeomen and farmers provided 6%, craftsmen 9% and laborers 2.5%.¹³

Visher sent questionnaires to the persons listed in *Who's Who in*

America (12th edition, 1922-23). To the query concerning father's occupation, 18,392, or about two-thirds of the total, replied. Comparing these responses with the occupational breakdown of the 1870 Census, Visher concluded that clergymen's sons were 2,400 times as likely to get into *Who's Who* as laborers' sons. The corresponding multiples were 1,035 for other professionals, 600 for businessmen, 70 for farmers and 30 for skilled and semi-skilled workers.¹⁴ These differences may be somewhat overstated due to the tendency of sons to ascribe unrealistically high status to their fathers. This would apply particularly where the father had had several different occupations over a period of time.

In a later (1946) survey Visher found that teachers and clergymen were about equally efficient in siring starred scientists. Proportionately more grandfathers of starred scientists were clergymen and proportionately fewer were teachers. This reflected the secular decline in the role of the clergy as the matrix of the American intellectual elite.¹⁵

The clergymen-fathers of the starred scientists were 21% Congregationalists, 20% Methodists, 19% Presbyterians, 10% Baptists, 4% Lutherans, 4% Episcopalians and 12% unspecified. The remarkably high proportion of Congregationalists reflects the position of that denomination as the established church of New England. The insignificant contribution of Episcopalians contrasts with the dominant position of that denomination in the social elite. Obviously, the figures shed no light on the Catholic contribution since the priesthood is celibate.

Other studies show, not unexpectedly, that scientists are generally drawn from the middle class,¹⁶ that outstanding scientists usually are of professional or upper-class background,¹⁷ and that Nobel laureates in science are from families of "very high social position."¹⁸ All surveys emphasize the extent to which intellectual and scientific elites are produced by the minority of the population engaged in the professions and, to a lesser extent, in business.

National Academy of Science. Of the 631 members of the National Academy of Science on July 1, 1961, 109 were born and trained abroad and an additional 42 were born abroad, but trained in the United States. Thus, almost a fourth of the outstanding scientists in the nation were of foreign birth. Of the 151, 36 were born in Germany and Austria, 13 in the British Isles, 10 in the Scandinavian countries, eight in the Netherlands, five in France, and five elsewhere in Western Europe. The total for Eastern Europe was 35. By contrast, Southern

Europe was the birthplace of only six Academy scientists, four being from Italy and two from Spain. Of the 151 foreign-born scientists, 118 were of European origin. An additional 17 came from Canada and three from elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere. China provided five, India three and the rest of the world five.

The pattern is similar to that observed in the case of Nobel laureates. Western European leadership is marked. The strong showing of the Eastern European countries is due primarily to the fact that Jews were not eliminated from the totals. The representation of Southern Europe is poor; the absence of Japan from the list is surprising.

In his stimulating book, *The Protestant Establishment*, E. Digby Baltzell presents data on the tremendous contributions made to American science by refugees, "most of whom have been Jews." He cites Maurice Davie to the effect that by 1946 over 300 refugees from Nazi oppression had already gained listing in *American Men of Science* or *Who's Who in America* and that nine of them were Nobel laureates in science. Between 1947 and 1961, some 43,523 scientists and engineers entered the United States as immigrants according to the National Science Foundation.¹⁹

American Science Today. Comparing the performance coefficients of different national-linguistic groups in the 1955-57 and 1960-62 editions of *American Men of Science*, the outstanding position of the Jews and the continuing decline of the traditional Anglo Saxon elite again become evident.

With an average performance coefficient of 274 in the eight rosters covering science, the Jewish score is almost double that of the next ranking group. The Dutch are in second place with 140, followed by the Germans with 126 and the Scandinavians with 118. The Scots rank fifth with 110, followed by the English (93), Welsh (87), French (68), Irish (65), Slavs (55), Greeks (50), Chinese (49), Italians (38), Hungarians (29) and Spanish-speaking (9). Although the role of the special British groups is declining, it is still impressive. The bearers of Puritan names with 199, of Special Occupational Names with 151 and of Clerical Names with 142 were all more than 50% more productive in science than the bearers of ordinary English names.

Examination of the 10th edition of *American Men of Science* makes it possible to compare contributions to the physical and biological sciences (Vols. I-IV) with those to the social and behavioral ones (Vol. V). The Jewish performance coefficient for the more exact sciences is 283 as against 384 for the social sciences. The Scots are

somewhat stronger in the social sciences and the Slavic contribution to the social disciplines is more than 50% higher than Slavic representation in the physical and biological fields. Almost all of the other groups are more strongly represented in the exact sciences.

The most salient feature of the changing composition of American scientific leadership is the submergence of the older elite — that is to say, the English, Scottish and Dutch elements who constituted the overwhelming bulk of the population in Colonial times. This decline can be attributed to social factors, biological factors or a combination of both.

The chief social factor is, as Toynbee puts it, for the established ruling classes to “rest on their oars.” To a certain extent this is reflected in the declining British representation in the most intellectually exacting, creative and challenging fields of leadership — notably the sciences and the arts — as against comparatively efficacious retention of British leadership in the social, political and business elites.

The main biological factor is the spread of birth control in such a fashion as to work against natural selection for intelligence. As Hermann J. Muller, the 1946 Nobel Laureate in medicine and physiology, put the matter:

“In fact, it seems not unlikely that in respect to the human faculties of the highest group importance — such as the neuronal equipment conducive to integrated understanding, foresight, scrupulousness, humility, regard for others, and self-sacrifice — modern cultural conditions may actually lead to a lower rate of reproduction on the part of their possessors than the rate of those with the opposite attributes. Is it not too often true today, when birth control is available, that those persons are likely to have the largest retinue of children, whether legitimate or otherwise, who are most lacking in perspective, or are dominated by superstitious taboos, or are unduly egotistical, or heedless of others’ needs, or shiftless, or bungling in techniques? These considerations raise the possibility that a much faster acting and serious cause of genetic deterioration than the accumulation of detrimental mutations occurring in the wake of relaxed selection is an actual reversal of selection in regard to those psychological traits that are of the highest social importance. Objective data are badly needed on this question.”²⁰

It is self-evident that the process of diffusion of birth control has been generally from the highly educated, socially responsible, urbanized, professional and rational elements of the population toward those groups at the opposite ends of these various spectra. The more intel-

lectually creative elements in the British and other stocks began to practice birth control earliest and practiced it most intelligently and with the greatest success. On the other hand, the poor whites, among them the Appalachian descendants of indentured laborers and criminals deported to the Colonies, the scions of the peasant masses of Eastern and Southern Europe who came to America to form urban proletariats and, last but not least, the Negro tenth of the nation continued to produce large families at a time when the more gifted, educated and successful were practicing family limitation. These differential reproductive patterns may have been sufficient in themselves to account for the observed declines in the contribution of the special British groups to the American creative minority.

THE AESTHETIC ELITE

The hypothesis has been advanced that creative ability in the arts is qualitatively different from creative power in the sciences and therefore that the elites in the two areas should be different. In this chapter, I shall attempt to test the validity of that assertion.

Composers. In an important article which has already been cited, Harvey C. Lehman classified 965 composers of symphonic and orchestral music and 1,451 composers of grand opera by country of birth. Relating these figures to the estimated population of the countries in question in 1865 (which is the approximate average year of creative achievement of the composers), we find per capita creativity to be as follows:

Table 2. COMPOSERS PER MILLION INHABITANTS OF THEIR COUNTRIES OF BIRTH

Rank	Country	Symphony & Orchestral	Grand Opera	Total
1	Germany	9.1	9.5	18.6
2	Italy	0.7	12.1	12.8
3	Austria & Bohemia	6.1	5.5	11.6
4	France	3.4	7.9	11.3
5	Finland	7.2	—	7.2
6	Switzerland	4.7	—	4.7
7	Hungary	3.4	0.8	4.2
8	Russia & Poland	2.1	2.0	4.1
9	United States	1.5	1.8	3.3
10	England & Scotland	2.0	1.2	3.2
11	Ireland	—	2.7	2.7
12	Spain	—	0.4	0.4
<i>Averages</i>		3.1	4.6	7.7

In orchestral and symphonic music, the productivity of Germans, Finns and Austrians is proportionately far greater than that of other national groups. In grand opera, the leadership of Italy, Germany and France is equally impressive. In the total field of classical music

composition, the zone of creativity is primarily the western and central portion of the European Continent from the North Sea to the Mediterranean. The Anglo-Saxon contribution is meager. Within Britain, the Scots provided 2.5 opera composers per million inhabitants, the English and Welsh only 1.1. Unfortunately, no similar breakdown is available for orchestral composition.

The 81 composers accorded more than five pages of text in *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (5th edition, 1960) provide a much more selective list. Of these, 20 were Germans, 13 Italians, 10½ French, 10½ English and Scottish, six Russian, four Hungarian, four Jewish and 13 scattered. In proportion to population, the rank order was German, Jewish, Dutch, British and Italian. The British contribution is overrated because the compendium is English and for English readers.

In ballet music, the Jews furnished 200 composers per 100 million of 1865 population, the French 73, English and Welsh 61, Germans 35, Italians 35 and Russians and Poles 23.¹

Literature. Of the 223 Pulitzer Prizes awarded in literature through 1961, over two-thirds went to writers of British and Irish origin. The number of awards per 100 million of 1960 population was: Jews, 309, English and Welsh 256, Scots 147, French 94, Scandinavians 68, Germans 62 and Irish 60.

This data departs in several respects from the standard pattern. While the English and Welsh lag behind the Jews, they do so only slightly. Moreover, their score is more than double the national average, almost twice that of the Scots and four times that of the Irish.

Performance coefficients were worked out for 12 indexes of the writing profession in the United States and in the world as a whole. Eight of these rosters are considered to be contemporary; four refer primarily to the past. The degree of literary excellence needed for inclusion varies from roster to roster.

The Reader's Encyclopedia, edited by the late William Rose Benet, turned out to be unsatisfactory because some of its contents appeared to be influenced by unintelligent communist propaganda.² Fortunately, a new edition of this work, apparently free of these defects, appeared early in 1962 and was substituted.³ *The Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature*⁴ and *American Authors and Books 1642-1962*⁵ were also used. They cover American letters from the beginnings of white settlement to the present with competence, authority and scholarly

integrity. The fourth reference work referring to the past literary elite is *Granger's Index to Poetry*, an internationally recognized authority.⁶

The fifth roster chosen was the most comprehensive source in existence for the American writing profession as a whole. It is *Books in Print* with about 140,000 entries.⁷ Obviously, it is far too catholic to serve as a selective roster of literary excellence. It is rather a listing of those individuals who are able to organize their thoughts on a sufficiently sustained and articulate basis and to communicate them in a sufficiently lucid manner to obtain publication. Since the compilation is weighted by the number of volumes and editions to each author's credit, it gives multiple entries to writers who are prolific, who stimulate mass interest and whose books withstand the erosion of time. *Books in Print* is basically contemporary. Since about 18,000 books have been published annually in the United States in recent years, it can be assumed that the average entry in *BIP* is about four years old.

The next six rosters used were the *Book Review Digests* for 1942, 1946, 1951, 1956, 1964 and a consolidation of all five years. *BRD* excerpts book reviews from key newspapers and magazines, choosing those review media which are influential, authoritative or widely read. About one in every five new books is reviewed in one or more of these organs and hence is listed in *Book Review Digests*. This roster, accordingly, is much more selective than *Books in Print*.

The last roster used was the membership list of the American Newspaper Guild for 1962, kindly made available by that trade union. This roster covers 32,376 reporters and newspaper writers. It thus represents about one tenth of the 339,000 employees of American newspapers (1961), many of whom are, however, typographers, press room operatives and newsboys who have nothing to do with journalism. Guild membership is a large national sample of American journalists, weighted toward the more able and successful members of the profession since the union has made most headway in the cities and with big papers.

In the four rosters which are largely historical and oriented toward the past, Puritan leadership is visible to a spectacular degree. The Puritan performance coefficient of 875 is eight times that of the ordinary English. French and Scots are well ahead of the other 13 national-linguistic groups. Welsh, English and Jews, all clustering around 100-110, follow in that order.

In the eight indexes of contemporary writing, the Jews lead the other national-linguistic groups by an impressive margin, their per-

formance coefficient being 208. They are followed by the Dutch (147), Scots (140) and Welsh (138). Italians, English, Germans, Irish, French and Scandinavians in that order range from 100 to 70. The other groups lag far behind.

I have already pointed out that the *Book Review Digest* is a more selective roster than *Books in Print*. This being the case, the performance coefficient of a group in *Book Review Digest* divided by its coefficient in *Books in Print* is an index of promotion: that is to say, it suggests the extent to which the group is more strongly represented in writing of high quality than in writing which merely manages to pass the test of book publication. These promotion indexes are high in the cases of the Italians (184), Dutch (176), Germans (149), Slavs (148) and Puritans (136). They are moderate for Welsh (115), Jews (114), Clerical Names (112) and Spanish (109). The index of promotion is negative in this area for the French (97), Special Occupational Surnames (96), Scandinavians (93), Scots (92) and Irish (40). In terms of larger categories, three Protestant peoples of northwest Europe (Germans, Dutch and Scandinavians) are represented 41% more heavily in the more selective index; three Latin peoples (French, Italians and Spanish) are 30% better represented, whereas the four English-speaking peoples are 20% under-represented in the more selective roster.

Theatre. A listing of some 1,600 living "personalities of stage, screen, radio, television — actors, actresses, composers, dancers, musicians, producers, radio-TV performers and singers" was used.⁸

Here the influence of name-changing is much greater than elsewhere in the arts and consequently a determined effort was made to estimate its extent. Of the 132 individuals on the list who bore names used in the samples, a check was possible in 49 cases. It appeared that 40 of these performers either used their birth names or else assumed names of the same national-linguistic origin.⁹ Of the other nine, seven abandoned Jewish names, one gave up a Lithuanian name and one a name that appeared to be Italian in origin. Four of the name-changers assumed Scottish names, two English, one Welsh and one Scandinavian.

Ignoring the effect of name-changing for the moment, the indicated performance coefficients of these stage "personalities" were: Jewish 244, Welsh 136, Irish 134, Scottish 132, English 108 and Scandinavian 83. The other national groups had zero to negligible representation.

If the sample of 49 names is representative, we then reach the almost

incredible conclusion that one out of every seven members of the American theatre and radio-television elite is a Jew who has changed his name to a non-Jewish one. This would raise the Jewish performance coefficient by about 450!

The Plastic Arts. The rosters used in this connection are the *Supplement to Mallet's Index of Artists* and *Who's Who in American Art*. The *Supplement* comprises from 15,000 to 20,000 names of artists not included in the original *Index* which appeared in 1935 and had 27,000 entries.¹⁰ *Who's Who in American Art* (1959) is a representative and largely contemporary listing.¹¹

When these two rosters are combined, the Jews lead with 189, followed by Scots (138), English (124), Dutch (114) and Germans (90). The Irish and Welsh score in the 70's, the Scandinavians and French in the 60's.

Puritan names score 370 in *Who's Who in American Art*, or almost four times the coefficient of ordinary English names. No count was made for Puritan names in *Mallet*. In both rosters combined, the Special British Occupational Group made the respectable score of 221, whereas the Clerical Names yielded only 113.

The "coldly intellectual" attitudes of the Puritans are evidently not incompatible with leadership in the plastic arts. The Scots and other northern and supposedly repressed peoples are frequently contrasted with the Mediterranean nations where artistic talent is supposedly endemic. By reiteration, the idea has been successfully implanted that the peoples of southern Europe of today are specially creative in the plastic arts.

In the contemporary American scene at least, this theory seems refuted by stubborn facts. Moreover, the Irish and Welsh, who are supposed to be aesthetically more gifted, do not show up as well as the Scots and English on these rosters.

A comprehensive worldwide picture of the shifting leadership in the plastic arts through time is provided by an analysis of artists listed in three standard volumes.¹² The table follows on the next page.

It will be noted that decisive leadership passes to Italy during the Dark Ages and that Italian hegemony remains unchallenged until 1600. During the 17th Century the Dutch forge into the leadership. From

Table 3. PLASTIC ART IN THE WEST BY COUNTRY AND CENTURY:
NUMBERS OF ARTISTS LISTED IN THREE ROSTERS

Country	Before 1000	1000- 1400	1400- 1500	1500- 1600	1600- 1700	1700- 1800	1800- 1900	After 1900	Total
French	—	1	1	2	3	9	38	6	60
Italian	—	11	20	13	1	3	6	3	57
American	—	—	—	—	—	5	34	11	50
British	—	—	—	1	2	9	3	4	19
Netherland	—	2	2	4	6	—	3	1	18
Slavic	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	2	17
Spanish	—	—	—	2	1	1	5	1	10
German	—	—	5	—	—	—	22	1	28
Greek	6	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	8
Mexico	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	4
Switzerland	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	3
Japan	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2
Belgium	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2
Scandinavia	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2
Other Latin									
America	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	4	5
<i>Totals</i>	6	14	28	22	13	30	137	35	285
Of which,									
Jewish	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.5	5	23.5

1700 to 1850 France is the supremely creative country in the plastic arts. The more recent figures show American leadership; however, the stature of these contemporary artists is dubious.

When we consider artists born subsequently to 1799 in relation to estimated 1865 population, a pattern emerges rather similar to that noted by Lehman in the exact sciences. The United States leads with 1.26 listed artists per million of population, followed by 1.19 artists for France, .88 for the Netherlands, .77 for Switzerland and .58 for Germany. Belgium, Spain, Great Britain, Italy and the Slavic countries follow in that order. Since Jews produced 3.92 listed artists per million of population, they are far more productive of artists, as measured by this table, than any other national-linguistic group.

In absolute terms, France, the United States and Germany accounted for about 60% of the artists deemed significant by the cited authorities during the 19th and 20th Centuries. The position of the Slavic peoples is actually much weaker than the table suggests since 10½ of the 17 artists listed as born in Slavic countries were Jewish. Of the remaining 13 Jewish artists, seven were born in the United States, two in Germany, two in France, one in Italy and a half-Jew each in Spain and Mexico.

It is also of some interest that of the six eminent Spanish artists of the 19th and 20th Centuries, five were born in Catalonia. This pattern was not characteristic of Spanish aesthetic creativity during the Renaissance and the Golden Century.

Summary. The patterns which emerge from these tabulations of aesthetic leadership are not entirely consistent or clear. However, a few generalizations are possible.

First, the Puritan elite plays a spectacular role in the creative minority of the arts in the United States. Its average in these rosters in which it was counted is about five times that of the ordinary English.

Second, Jewish leadership is evident among the national-linguistic groups. The Jews with an average performance coefficient of 176 are followed by Scots (147), Welsh (134), Dutch (124), French (112) and English (104). Italians, Germans, Irish and Scandinavians made significant contributions in that order. The other five national-linguistic groups are not revealed as creative in this field. Northwestern Europe is again shown to be more productive than Southern and Eastern Europe.

Third, the numerical findings concerning creative achievement in the arts are influenced by the presence of peasantries. They enter the picture directly when we compare the creative achievements of European countries on a per capita basis and indirectly, because of the varying peasant components of trans-Atlantic immigration streams, when we make such comparisons in the U.S. In the arts as elsewhere, the peasant stock would seem to be less creative than the urbanized elements and this difference may well be partly genetic. In all comparisons of creative minorities with total populations, the rural countries will tend to show up poorly either because the peasantries are inherently less creative or because they are largely outside the great worlds of art, science, technology and power or because of both sets of reasons. These considerations obviously apply to the Jews who have not had numerically significant peasantries since their Diaspora (or scattering) in the four centuries that bracket the birth of Christ.

With these qualifications, this compilation of admittedly inconclusive evidence suggests that the geography of creativity in the arts tends to parallel that of creativity in the sciences.

VI

THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES

When we consider the 75 rosters as a whole after adjustment for Negroes, the unweighted average performance coefficient for the four English-speaking peoples (English, Scots, Welsh and Irish) is 107. In the 12 rosters referring to past achievement, it is 124; in the 58 referring to present achievement, it is 105, and in the five concerned with future achievement, it is 90.

The unweighted average performance coefficients by sphere of leadership are: the social elite 126, the military 124, *Who's Whos* 124, literature 117, politics 116, business 104, scholarship 101, professions 92 and science 89.

The profiles of these Anglo-Saxon and Celtic peoples in short are characteristic of a declining elite. Their past performance is superior to their present and their present is more impressive than their future. They are strongest in those areas of leadership which depend upon status, pedigree and tradition (such as the various social registers, *Who's Whos*, and the military, political and business elites.) In general, they are more prominently represented in areas which stress security than in those which involve rigorous competition, in the fields which emphasize teamwork than in those which place a premium on individual initiative. Their high showing in the officer corps and Foreign Service reflects a predilection for status-bound areas. If they do well in literature and the arts, one reason is that four of the 14 rosters refer to the past. They are weak in science, scholarship and patent applications—three intellectually challenging and exacting fields—and weak in college enrollment, which partially mirrors the future of the American creative minority.

The decline of the English-speaking peoples is not catastrophic, however, since the downward slope from past to future is gentle, nor are the differentials between the performance coefficients in the various fields of leadership ominously large.

Scottish leadership of the four English-speaking groups is pronounced and consistent. In the 75 indexes, the Scots place first 36 times, second 25 times and third nine times. The Welsh come next with 19 firsts and 15 seconds. The English account for nine firsts and

23 seconds; the Irish for seven firsts and eight seconds. The composite scores of these four English-speaking peoples, arrived at by adding the reciprocals of their rank orders in first, second and third places, are: Scots 51.50, Welsh 33.83, English 30.83 and Irish 18.00.

Background of Immigration. The preponderant role of the English in the early settlement of the United States can scarcely be exaggerated and needs little comment. The First Census, taken in 1790, reported 83.5% of the white population to be English, 6.7% Scottish and 1.6% Irish. The remaining 9.2% was chiefly German (5.6%), Dutch (2.0%) and French (0.5%). In 1920, a careful study showed that English, Scottish and Welsh stock amounted to 39.2 million of the 94.8 million white inhabitants of the United States. All but 7.4 million of these Americans of British origin descended from Colonial families.¹

Although racially and linguistically homogeneous, the English immigration into Colonial America was highly diverse in class origin, education and character. At the time of the Revolution, approximately half the white population consisted of indentured laborers and their offspring. Some were orphans, debtors, paupers, mental defectives, whores and perpetrators of petty crimes whom English judges were understandably reluctant to send to grisly deaths at Tyburn Dock. Children were spirited off to be transported to the Colonies under indenture. Between 1717 and 1775 some 50,000 English felons were deported to mainland America. The majority of the indentured workers settled in the South where the demand for field labor was greatest.² Despite protests by American writers and political leaders such as Benjamin Franklin against the use of the Colonies as dumping grounds for the unwanted, the impoverished and, in some cases, the vicious and the mentally unfit, the practice continued until the American Revolution put a stop to it and forced England to turn to Botany Bay and Tasmania as substitute destinations.³

To what extent are the observed differences in the contributions of the various groups of English surnames to the creative minority related to their class origin? Do the indentured laborers comprise more or less homogeneous surname-groups comparable, say, to Puritan names and British clerical names? Statistical studies of shipping lists, early census data and other material might provide answers and reveal a new facet of elite structure in American history.

The Scottish immigration was set into motion by the religio-political struggles of the 17th and 18th Centuries. After the battles of Dunbar

(1650) and Worcester (1651), Scottish prisoners of war were sold into servitude and deported to the Colonies. Two shiploads of Jacobites met the same fate in 1717. Eighteen years later, the General Assembly of North Carolina was busily recruiting among Scots Highlanders.

At the eve of the Revolution, most of the Scots in the Colonies were Scotch-Irish, that is to say, they were of Irish nativity, but Scottish ancestry, set apart from the Irish majority by religion and national tradition. Most were prosperous farmers and townspeople from Ulster. Here again, religious and political persecution were the selective agencies of emigration.

They settled relatively untamed country. Toward the close of the Colonial era, they were concentrated in North Carolina and Pennsylvania, where they were estimated to constitute one-third of the white population. A large proportion of these Scotch-Irish crossed the Alleghenies to escape both the English and the Anglican Church.

Eleven of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Scottish origin. Industrious efforts have been made to prove that the core of the Revolutionary Army was Scotch-Irish. Be this as it may, during the Revolution, "Presbyterian churches suffered especially, for the Presbyterians were almost all Whigs. Indeed, it is said that if the British soldiers discovered a large Bible and a metrical version of the psalms of David in any house, they took it as *prima facie* evidence that it was the home of a rebel . . . The Presbyterian churches in New York City were made into prisons . . ."4

The initial Irish immigration was rather similar and at least equally bellicose. It is estimated that Irish formed one-third of the officer corps of Washington's army. They also constituted 11% of a list of Loyalist claimants.⁵ Since they constituted only 1.6% of the population of the United States at the time of the First Census (1790), the implication is that their performance coefficient as officers in the Revolutionary Army was almost 2,000!

Irish immigration into the United States did not assume quantitative importance, however, until after the potato famine of the 1840's. Thirteen bad crop years out of 17 were followed by the Great Famine of 1846-47. In this catastrophe, it was the rural poor who were forced to leave their homeland. After 1835, the Irish emigration "represented classes upon which the country's distress bore with the greatest hardship: evicted small farmers and cottiers or landless laborers. Coming to the country without the advantages of education or technical skills, these latter groups constituted in the middle years of the century our first great immigrant unskilled labor force."⁶

Thus, the Irish immigration into the United States was negatively selective in terms of class whereas the English and Scottish immigrations were positively selective.⁷ Moreover, the newcomers faced hostility, adverse discrimination and religious prejudice. The genetic burden of prior generations of clerical celibacy weighed upon them as it does upon all Catholic peoples.

In addition, the Irish aristocracy had been victims of policies of genocide. In Ireland as in Scotland, station derived from ancestry and not, as in England, from landed estates. Extermination of the Irish aristocracy was a long-range objective of the British crown, one that was pursued with varying determination and with particular ruthlessness during the 16th Century. This had dire consequences, not only for Irish culture, but for the biogenetic resources of the Irish people. Its evil effects were, however, somewhat mitigated by the gradual absorption into the Irish nation of those English and Scottish colonists sent to the island for purposes of pacification and rule.

Finally, each of the four English-speaking peoples represents a somewhat different mixture of the races and subraces who invaded and settled the British Isles. On these grounds alone, one would not expect a priori to find these peoples making equal or identical contributions to creative minorities.

These factors shed some light on the fact that the Irish contribution to the American creative minority has been considerably lower than that of the Scots, Welsh or English.⁸ Today, the Irish are no longer under the handicap of a subordinate status in America. Moreover, the American Catholic college-bred, of whom they form a major part, have been reproducing more vigorously than their Protestant or Jewish counterparts. While Catholicism carries with it the great historical handicap of clerical celibacy, the contemporary Catholic reproduction pattern is eugenic in respect to intelligence, whereas that of the other two major religious groups appears to be dysgenic.⁹

These changes in the Irish situation in America have been associated with a progressive narrowing of the gap in leadership. In the early 1960's, the Irish performance coefficient for National Merit Scholarships was above that of the English and Welsh. Despite the paucity of Phi Beta Kappa chapters in parochial institutions of higher learning, the Irish were above the English and Scots in respect to 1962 elections to Phi Beta Kappa. Moreover, in June 1965, North American membership in Mensa, an organization open only to persons with I.Q.'s in the first 2% of the population, the Irish performance coefficient was considerably higher than those of the Welsh, Scots and English.

The Welsh—Heritage of Isolation. From a blood-group standpoint, it is interesting that among the Welsh “there exists a strain of people with relatively high B frequency who have persisted since prehistoric times and who, being once more widespread than today, contributed to the other peoples of the extreme west of Europe the higher B frequency that distinguishes them from the main Western peoples.”¹⁰ These prehistoric peoples with “skeletal features resembling those of palaeolithic man,” Mourant continues, are still “to be found in Ireland, the Dordogne (France), and Dalecarlia (Sweden); also, in the Mediterranean area, in Sardinia, north Africa and southern Portugal.”¹¹ The Basques may be closely related to these Old Stone Age folk who managed to survive only at the extremities, and in protected enclaves of, the European Continent.

The Welsh ethnic palimpsest has as its substratum the palaeolithic people of the Black Mountains and other remote places with their dark hair and eyes, long high-ridged heads, slender builds and high B frequencies. They are followed by broad-headed, strong-jawed, tall, dark Atlantoids who are associated with Megalithic monuments. Shortly before Roman times, Nordics entered and settled Wales, built many hilltop fortresses and perhaps introduced Brythonic speech. However, Beaker Folk, Romans, Norsemen and English, although they invaded and sometimes ravaged the country, left only a slight ethnic imprint.

Under Roman rule, the Welsh remained apart from their conquerors in the crude stone forts inherited from their ancestors. Wales was not conquered by the English until 1283. The Welsh dynasty was destroyed, but England ruled through Welsh lords who were left undisturbed. The conquest did not bring fundamental demographic or ethnic changes. The utter havoc caused by the Glendower rebellion in the early 15th Century made Wales unattractive for English settlement and reinforced its isolation.

In short, Wales historically has been largely protected from invasion, conquest and colonization by her rugged mountain ranges. Thus, she became an area of refuge and retreat for the defeated. The land was not pacified by the Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Vikings and Normans, as was England, nor did its peoples become blended to nearly so great an extent with these conquering stocks.

VII

DECLINE OF THE PURITAN ELITE

In 1935, Ellsworth Huntington published a comprehensive statistical study of the bearers of six early American surnames in order to test the hypothesis of enduring Puritan pre-eminence in the creative, professional and executive leadership of the United States and to measure the extent of that leadership. The book was the result of a study which began in 1927 and which was assisted by the Committee on Biological Genealogy of the National Research Council and financed by the Huntington Family Association.¹

This chapter recapitulates and criticizes Huntington's findings and makes estimates of the 1960 contribution of his Puritan families to American leadership in a large variety of fields. The conclusions reached are: (a) that the Puritan element, as represented by the six surnames used by Huntington, continues to play a remarkable and impressive role in the creative minority of the United States; (b) that it is, however, a declining element in the American elite; (c) that this decline seems destined to be accelerated, judging by the nugatory representation of bearers of Puritan names in such indexes of the future American elite as recent National Merit Scholarship recipients and 1961-62 Phi Beta Kappa membership, and (d) that the Puritan element is being overtaken by bearers of representative Jewish names.

The Puritans as a Leadership Element. Alexis de Tocqueville was one of the first observers to extol the civilization of New England as "a beacon lit upon a hill, which, after it has diffused its warmth around, tinges the distant horizon with its glow," and to attribute the excellence of New England to the morality, character and intelligence of its early Pilgrim settlers.

"The foundation of New England was a novel spectacle," he wrote, "and all the circumstances attending it were singular and original. The large majority of colonies have been first inhabited, either by men without education and without resources, driven by their poverty and their misconduct from the land which gave them birth, or by speculators and adventurers greedy of gain. Some settlements cannot even boast so honourable an origin; St. Domingo was founded by buc-

caners; and the criminal courts of England originally supplied the population of Australia.

"The settlers who established themselves on the shores of New England all belonged to the more independent classes of their native country. Their union on the soil of America at once presented the singular phenomenon of a society containing neither lords nor common people, neither rich nor poor. *These men possessed, in proportion to their number, a greater mass of intelligence than is to be found in any European nation of our own time.*"³ All, without a single exception, had received a good education, and many of them were known in Europe for their talents and their acquirements. The other colonies had been founded by adventurers without family; the emigrants of New England brought with them the best elements of order and morality — they landed in the desert accompanied by their wives and children. But what most especially distinguished them was the aim of their undertaking. They had not been obliged by necessity to leave their country; the social position they abandoned was one to be regretted, and their means of subsistence were certain. Nor did they cross the Atlantic to improve their situation or to increase their wealth; the call which summoned them from the comforts of their home was purely intellectual; and in facing the inevitable sufferings of exile their object was the triumph of an idea."⁴

The fashion today is to portray the Pilgrims as humble weavers and poor simple folk, as was done for example in Helen Jean Rogers' otherwise excellent television show, "The Pilgrim Adventure."⁴ There is, to be sure, this implication in William Bradford's narrative of the voyage and settlement, but here "humble" should be taken more in a religious, than in an economic, sense. The leader of the Puritan band, William Brewster, was a Cambridge graduate and the son of a country gentleman; his able deputy, John Robinson, was a professor who had taken his master's degree at Cambridge, and William Bradford, the historian of the Plymouth settlement, was a young publisher who had mastered Dutch, French, Latin, Greek and Hebrew while still in his teens.⁵

"By the end of the sixteenth century," wrote Fiske, "the majority of country gentlemen and of wealthy merchants in the towns had become Puritans, and the new views had made great headway in both universities, while at Cambridge they had become dominant."⁶

In other respects the Pilgrims were noteworthy. The majority of them came from East Anglia, that portion of eastern England which lies north of the Thames and south of the Wash and the heart of which

is Norfolk and Suffolk. East Anglia has always been a highway of invasion — by Brythons, Romans, Angles, Normans and Vikings — and a crossroads of peoples. Unlike the rest of England, it welcomed Dutch, Flemish, Walloons and French through the Middle Ages and until about 1700.

In his analysis of British genius, Havelock Ellis found that East Anglia was intellectually the most fertile area of England. It provided a very great proportion of the scholars, theologians and philosophers of the 13th Century flowering of English thought under the Franciscans. Ellis found that "nearly half the British musical composers and more than a third of the painters have come from this region."

East Anglia was also noteworthy for an independent attitude of mind which persisted through the centuries. It was "rife in heresy and independency" and for many generations "a veritable *litus haereticum*." Later, it became the one region of England in which Roundheads were at all times an undisputed majority over Cavaliers. Oliver Cromwell himself was an East Anglian who began his military career as a leading spirit of the Eastern Counties Association.

Ellis pointed out that the founders and leaders of New England were largely of East Anglian origin, that the Emersons came from Suffolk and that Winthrop, who more than any other man shaped Massachusetts, had his origins in central Suffolk. In Fiske's opinion:

"Perhaps it would not be far out of the way to say that two-thirds of the American people who can trace their ancestry to New England might follow it back to the East Anglian shires of the mother-country; one-sixth might follow it to those southwestern counties — Devonshire, Dorset and Somerset — which so long were foremost in maritime enterprise; one-sixth to other parts of England."

The further case for Pilgrim or Puritan superiority is that they were rigorously selected for character, depth of conviction, moral firmness and physical stamina. It took strength of will and self-sacrifice to adhere to the tenets of a persecuted minority sect. The weaklings no doubt dropped out. A second test was the migration to Holland, a movement in which only a minority of the most steadfast took part. The crossing of the Atlantic and the settlement of Plymouth was again a brutal selective process. At the end of the first year, half of the 102 who had originally taken passage on the *Mayflower* had died of disease, hunger, exposure or weariness. This could not have been entirely a physical matter, for the will to live and to surmount hardship is a spiritual quality. As the history of persecution has abundantly shown, the psychically strong are able to withstand pressures and depri-

vations that annihilate those who are weaker of heart.

In terms of this unusual background of selection, the comparison of the achievements of the descendants of the earliest settlers of New England with those of more average families of English stock should hold a great deal of interest. Huntington began his task with a detailed, comprehensive analysis of persons bearing his own surname. This was done chiefly by questionnaires. From the responses, the author inferred "that at least 90 per cent of the persons called *Huntington* in this country are descended from Simon Huntington, a Puritan emigrant from eastern England who died of small pox at sea in 1633, and whose widow landed at Dorchester, now part of Boston, with four young sons and a daughter." The *Huntingtons* seldom married with non-Puritan stock. They contracted marriages "with such a great number of old Puritan families that they now represent a composite descent from the average family of that type which came to America three centuries ago."¹⁰

The author added four very similar names of Puritan origin — *Coolidge*, *Hooker*, *Lyman* and *Trumbull*, the great majority of whom descended from Puritans who came to New England between 1620 and 1642, and *Van Dyke*, a family of Dutch origin which came to New York between 1636 and 1640.

Huntington's next step was to select a group of what he called "partially Puritan" names. Bearers of these names were "comparatively numerous" in New England before 1692, but they were also the descendants of later immigrants to other sections of the United States. This second group intermarried to a much greater extent with stock which was not Puritan, not from New England and, in some cases, not of Anglo-Saxon descent. Huntington estimated that there were 1,781,000 bearers of these names in the United States population.

Finally, Huntington chose names which he believed were representative of other elements in the American population. For the Irish, he used *O'Brien* with an estimated 155,000 representatives in the U.S. population; for the Germans, *Schwartz*, (110,000) and *Wagner* (142,000); for the Jews, *Cohen* (162,000) and *Levine* (51,000); for the Scandinavians, *Larsen* (103,000); for the Italians, *Russo* (25,000), and for the Scotch-Irish, *Flood* (18,000).

These surnames were considered to be random samples, representative of the national stocks from which they were drawn. Huntington counted the number of bearers of each of these selected surnames in 17 rosters of leadership and in two rosters of negative leadership, that is to say anti-social behavior. He then estimated the contribution

of each surname to each roster of positive or negative leadership per every 100,000 adult males in the general United States population. This gave him quantitative measures of the comparative contribution of each group to different areas of leadership and intellectual achievement.

Criticism of Huntington's Procedure. This pioneering venture in analysis of the American elite received only scant attention and, as a matter of fact, I published five articles, using a similar method, before I became aware of its existence.¹¹ Huntington's application of the method suffered from several imperfections and errors. The name *Flood* was an unfortunate choice to represent the Scotch-Irish. Elsdon Smith considers the name English in origin and deriving from the common noun; it may also be a corruption of *Floyd*, which is Welsh; for these reasons, it has been omitted from my recapitulation of Huntington's findings.¹²

Smith classifies the name *Russo* as Polish, meaning the man from Russia. Here he is in error. The name is primarily Italian. However, it is a poor choice to represent Italians and Americans of Italian stock, because a significant minority of the *Russos* are Jewish.¹³

The choice of *Schwartz* as one of the two representative German names is extraordinary. Of the 32 *Schwartzes* listed in *Who's Who in America 1962-63*, internal evidence indicates that at least 25 are Jewish. Accordingly, I have discarded *Schwartz* and taken Huntington's other choice, *Wagner*, as representative of people of German stock in the United States.

The sample of "partially Puritan" names is also somewhat unsatisfactory. Two of the them, *Brown* and *Williams*, are among the five most common surnames in the United States. As a general rule, the most common names are underrepresented in elite rosters. In part, this is because bearers of such names often change them or change their spelling when they achieve distinction. There are probably other reasons. The inclusion of *Brown* and *Williams* as representative Anglo-Saxon names is inaccurate for another reason. They have a large Negro component, because the emancipated slaves tended to choose the most common surnames, particularly patronymics. Comparing name frequencies in the records of the North Carolina Mutual Insurance Company, the largest Negro institution of its kind in the United States at that time, and in two lists of 13,000 Negro families compiled in Howard University with the corresponding name frequencies in the rolls of the Confederate States Army, Howard F. Barker found that

about 31% of the *Browns* in the United States were colored.¹⁴

If the names chosen by Huntington were not consistently appropriate, his estimates of their frequencies in the United States population were also fairly erratic. This is particularly so in the case of his Irish and Jewish samples. His calculations were quite accurate, however, in the cases of the Puritans, English, Italians and Scandinavians.

Another respect in which Huntington's work is defective is lack of dating of sources. Table 37 of Appendix G of *After Three Centuries* gives a panoramic view of the comparative role of the bearers of the surnames chosen by Huntington in 17 indexes of positive, and two indexes of negative, leadership. The rosters presumably refer to approximately 1930, but this is merely an assumption. In citing his reference sources, Huntington failed to mention either edition or date. In other instances, the leadership roster covers an indefinite period, such as the biographical entries in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

Despite these errors and lapses, Huntington's data are significant as comparisons of the elite role of bearers of Puritan names with the role of bearers of ordinary English names. Equating the latter to 100, we get the following picture of Puritan leadership circa 1930:¹⁵

Table 4. PERFORMANCE COEFFICIENTS OF PURITAN NAMES

(Ordinary English Names = 100)

Category	Performance Coefficient
<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i> entries	1,685
Notable Americans	1,155
Library card holders	839
Authors	776
<i>Social Register</i>	774
A.A.A.S. Members	669
<i>Who's Who in America</i>	630
Scientists	493
Corporate Directors	350
Lawyers	303
Social Service ¹⁶	223
Doctors	213
Patentees	184
Government Officials	159
Dentists	151
Criminals ¹⁶	148
Businessmen	130
Directorates	123
Dun & Bradstreet Ratings ¹⁶	106
<i>Arithmetic Means</i>	480

Thus, the Puritan families emerge as the outstanding element in virtually every area of American achievement. The performance coefficients of the 34,000 or so bearers of these distinguished names¹⁷ range from 106 to 1,685 and average 480, or almost five times the contribution of ordinary Americans of English stocks. They occupy first place in 17 of the 19 areas studied by Huntington. The areas in which the Puritan names are outstanding are letters, science, general status and achievement (*Who's Whos*) and social leadership. They are particularly pre-eminent in rosters which rely heavily on the past (such as *Encyclopaedia Britannica* biographies) as would be anticipated considering their great role in the government and cultural formation of the nation. The standing of the Puritans is less eminent in business, professional membership, government service and avoidance of crime and social dependence.

After a great lag, the English and Jews follow in that order, the English average performance coefficient being 100 by definition and the Jewish 93. During the period covered by Huntington, the Jewish position was strongest in business and law, average in science, poor in literature, weak in government officialdom and in *Who's Who* and virtually non-existent in society. The Jews were strongly represented among the negative elites, ranking sixth out of seven in dependency on social agencies and fifth out of seven in crime.

In Huntington's tabulations, the Germans followed the Jews with a 10-point lag, their average performance coefficient being 83. They were strong in science, invention, business, commercial probity and avoidance of crime and relief rolls. Lagging some 18 points behind the Germans, the Scandinavians played a significant role in science and invention, but lagged in many areas, partly because their population pattern was largely rural.

The Irish ranked slightly below the Scandinavians with an average performance coefficient of 61. Their contribution was significant in law and business, but slight in science and literature. They had the second highest crime rate of the seven groups.

The Italian performance was typical of a non-elite. They were well represented in small business, but scored zero in 11 of the 19 rosters and made no contribution to literature, science, encyclopaedia entries, *Who's Who*, society, corporate directorates or medicine. They had the highest crime and dependency rate of the seven groups listed.

Huntington discovered after an intensive genealogical study of his own family, that eminence was concentrated in a small number of lines. Ten branches of his family died out, leaving 23 remaining. Of these,

one line produced more than a quarter of all the eminent Huntingtons the United States has known, another produced nearly 14%, four others produced a total of 32%, while 10 other lines produced in aggregate about 30% and seven lines produced no eminent persons whatsoever.¹⁸

Huntington found that the fertility of these lines had an erratic negative association with eminence. Thus, the three most fertile lines produced an average of 174 adult men from the beginning to 1930, but only 0.6 eminent persons per hundred adult men. The remaining lines averaged only 42 adult males per line and produced an average of 4.2 eminent persons per 100 adult men.¹⁹

Huntington argued that rapid biogenetic divergence between the successful and the unsuccessful lines within families must occur. The successful and eminent men have wide choice of spouses. In general, they can be expected to place a high premium on intelligence, character, integrity and the other psychic virtues. The unsuccessful men usually lack this choice and in addition are not likely to choose women who are their mental and moral superiors.

Biogenetic divergence within the different Huntington lines (and presumably in the other Puritan families as well), coupled with considerably higher reproduction rates in the less successful lines, would tend to impoverish these families genetically from generation to generation. Thus, we would expect a decline in the leadership role of the Puritan element. This decline, which Huntington forecast, has in fact occurred.

One place where it is clearly visible is in the performance coefficients of the Puritan names in different editions of *Who's Who in America* and *Who Was Who in America*. The Puritan performance coefficient for the 1910-11 edition of *Who's Who* was 1,224. In the 1918-19 edition, this had declined to 1,011; by 1930-31 to 644 and by 1964-65 to 301. The first volume of *Who Was Who in America*, covering subjects who died between 1697 and 1896, gave the Puritan names a performance coefficient of 987. This rose to 1,169 for 1897-1942, then declined to 537 for subjects who died during 1943-50 and recovered slightly to 572 for those who died during 1951-60. Thus, the performance coefficient for Puritan names has sagged by one-half to two-thirds during the half century between 1910-11 and 1964-65. Even so, the Puritans are still the outstanding element in the American creative minority to the extent that that minority can be measured by performance coefficients in *Who's Who*.

Puritan performance coefficients circa 1960 can be compared with

those reported by Huntington for the 1930 periods in nine categories. The Puritan decline is 72% for authors, 58% for scientists, 52% for *Who's Who in America*, 40% for doctors, 39% for corporation directors, 30% for dentists and 13% in the New York Social Register.²⁰ The Puritan role increased by 10% in patentees.

When all 75 rosters are considered, Puritan leadership is seen to be paramount. The Puritan performance coefficient of 397 compares with 218 for the Special Occupational Surnames and 130 for British Clerical Names. It is almost double the Jewish, and more than triple the Scottish, performance coefficients.

The Puritan lead, however, is accentuated by the inclusion of 12 rosters referring to the past. In the 58 present rosters, the Puritan performance coefficient is only about 17% higher than the Jewish performance coefficient.

The prospects for the future are not promising. The rising generation of bearers of Puritan names (and, for that matter, of clerical and special occupational names) attends college in only slightly greater proportion than the national average as measured by enrollment in the institutions of higher education here examined. This is quite extraordinary when one considers that the national average includes Negroes, Latin Americans and other minority groups with a much weaker tradition of higher education. Moreover, if the college sample had included parochial institutions, the Puritan representation would have been even less.

If the Puritan name-bearers of the present younger generation seem to lack the eagerness for higher education which would be anticipated given their traditions, they appear to fail even more conspicuously in academic achievement. Their representation in 1962 Phi Beta Kappa, 1965 Mensa and National Merit Scholarships is nugatory to nil.

Old Southern Names. A final question to consider is whether the distinguished role of bearers of Puritan names is characteristic of old and eminent American families in general. With this in mind, a representative group of old Southern family names was chosen and its performance coefficients in various rosters of eminence were computed. Only those names with a frequency of 10,000 or more on 1956 Social Security rolls were chosen. This made it possible to use BOASI figures for frequency and obviated the time-consuming process of estimating the number of bearers of each name from city directories.

Unfortunately, such distinguished Southern names as *Pinckney*, *Breckenridge*, *Allston*, *Wythe*, *Lamar*, *Telfair*, *Fitzhugh*, *Spottswood*,

Cobb, Ravenel, Rhett and Oglethorpe had to be omitted because of their rarity of occurrence. *Washington* was discarded because it is four-fifths Negro and *Jefferson* for a similar reason.²¹

The names chosen were *Byrd, Calhoun, Polk, Randolph* and *Rutledge*. While this group is not comparable to the Mayflower families in terms of length of American residence, it is distinguished in the history of the South.

The *Byrds* came to Virginia in 1674 and to the Carolinas with the earliest settlers. They were planters and gentlemen and have been prominent in the public affairs of Virginia from the 17th century to the present.

The *Calhouns* are of different stock. Patrick Calhoun was a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian, who came to the United States in 1733 and settled in western Virginia, where he distinguished himself as a successful surveyor, a scholar and a member of the Virginia legislature. His son was John C. Calhoun, the philosophical champion of chattel slavery.

The *Polks* are also of Scotch-Irish Presbyterian origin. Settling in Maryland in the 17th century, the *Polks* removed to North Carolina and were prominent in the public life of the colony and later of the state. Thomas Polk was a large landowner. The grandson of his brother, James K. Polk, was the eleventh President of the United States.

One of the most distinguished families in the history of Virginia, the *Randolphs* came to the colony in the 17th Century. Their ancestors in England were judges, ambassadors, poets and university officials from the 14th Century forward. The *Randolphs* intermarried with the *Jeffersons* and *Wythes*, were rich planters and high officers of the British crown. A *Randolph* served as delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and later as the first Attorney General of the United States under President Washington. Another was Majority Whip under President Jefferson and still another served the Confederacy as its Secretary of War.

The *Rutledges* came to South Carolina in 1735, attained wealth, prominence and social position and played a major role in the struggle of the colony for independence. The name *Rutledge* appears as a signatory to the Declaration of Independence, delegate to the Constitutional Convention from South Carolina and Chief Justice of the United States under Washington.

The 107,037 bearers of these very distinguished names do not, however, compare with the Puritan group in their contribution to American leadership. In fact, they are not an elite at all in terms of the performance-coefficient method of measuring leadership. As early as

40 years ago the old Southern names were contributing no more than the average to the American creative minority as it is represented by *Who's Who in America*. In the contemporary United States, the bearers of these eminent Southern names do worse than the national average in *Who's Who* and contribute only about three-fifths the average in science. They also fall behind in college attendance.

Strangely enough, the Southern families contribute less than their share of active and retired officers in the regular army. Although the Southern gentlemanly tradition is military, the contemporary bearers of these names fall short of the national average in this area. By contrast, the descendants of the Puritans, whose tradition is essentially non-military, do better than average here as in other areas of achievement and service.

This unimpressive performance by the bearers of old Southern names is part of the general decline of the Southern creative minority since the Civil War. Northerners do not always realize that this struggle was a genetic catastrophe for the Confederacy in the sense that it decimated the best of Southern manhood. The consequences for the North were different in character and not nearly on such a vast scale.

From the outset, the Confederacy imposed universal conscription on all white males. Nobody could legally buy his way out of military service or claim exemption because of wealth, position or family.

By contrast the Union armies consisted primarily of the poor. In 1863, universal manhood conscription was imposed in the North. The physically unfit and certain hardship cases were exempted. In addition, any man could pay \$300 for a substitute instead of serving himself. This provision meant that even the moderately well off consistently avoided the dangers of combat. On February 14, 1864, Provost Marshal James B. Fry reported to Congress on the effects of the draft. Of 14,741 men called up in sample districts in eight states, 7,016 had been rejected on physical or other grounds. This excessive rejection rate suggested bribery of draft officials on a large scale. Of the remaining 7,725 men deemed fit for service, 5,050 paid the \$300 commutation money while another 1,416 escaped service by furnishing substitutes. The remnant of 1,250 men was inducted. Thus, as late as 1864, less than 10% of the males of draft age were being called up. Those who served in the ranks were mostly poor people without solvent relatives or influential friends.²⁹ The \$300 exemption was dropped later in 1864, but not the provision concerning substitutes. At the time of the bloody battles of the Wilderness, the rich were buying substitutes for \$2,000 and over.

Thus, the North raised armies in a way that exempted the wealthier classes from service in the ranks. The consequence was that the cost in blood to the Union was paid chiefly by the poorer classes and those without much education or influence. The Confederacy, by contrast, enacted draft laws which bore on rich and poor equally.

Union deaths in the Civil War were about 360,000, Confederate losses perhaps 260,000. Since the white population of the South was only about a third that of the North, the blow fell much harder below the Mason and Dixon Line. In fact, about a fifth of the Southern white male population of military age was killed in battle or by starvation and disease.

Since the South was the only part of the United States which had a tradition of landed gentry, the Southern upper class regarded military leadership as a primary duty. The gentry of military age enlisted en masse, formed the Confederate officer corps and suffered appalling casualties.

An interesting example is the fate of general officers in the two armies. Many of these generals were young men who had most of their reproductive life before them. Of the approximately 2,000 Union generals, 45, or 2.5%, met death in battle. Of the 435 or so Confederate generals, 72, or 17%, were killed in action.

Thus, the Civil War was a genetic catastrophe for the South which decimated the gentry, the old established families, the successful, the prominent and the well-educated. This may well have been the principal cause of post-bellum Southern intellectual decline. As for the poor performance of the bearers of distinguished Southern names, decimation of the aristocratic lines during the conflict would mean that their descendants would today form a comparatively small proportion of those who currently bear these names.

The comparison between the performance coefficients of Southern and Puritan name-bearers suggests, in any event, that the contributions of the latter to American leadership are unique and not merely the normal concomitants of prestige, social status and a tradition of leadership and public service.

VIII

SCANDINAVIANS, ITALIANS, SLAVS AND CHINESE

This chapter considers the contributions of ten non-English-speaking peoples to the 75 rosters of American leadership. The Jews are not included as they are reserved for special treatment.

Leadership shows the same pattern of pre-eminence by the denizens of cold climates that has already been noted. In the 75 rosters, the Dutch lead with 116, followed by the Germans with 90, the Scandinavians with 83, the French with 79 and the Chinese with 64. Italians, Slavs, Greeks, Spanish-speaking and Hungarians trail in that order, their performance coefficients being in the 14-to-40 range.

The French led in past elites; the Dutch lead in the present elite; the Chinese lead in the future elite. Second places went to Dutch, Germans and Dutch respectively.

The strong Dutch position was to be expected in view of the long-established position of persons of Netherlands origin in American society and the extent to which the Dutch immigration dates from Colonial times. The French, another component of the older immigration, are a declining leadership element. To a superficial eye, the Spanish position at the bottom of the ladder appears to be static. Since the proportion of Spanish-speaking people to total population has been increasing, however, this apparent immobility masks a real and substantial decline. The Greeks, Hungarians, Slavs and, to a much greater extent, the Chinese have been vigorously advancing and making increasingly significant contributions to the American creative minority.

The Dutch Immigration. The Dutch are one of the oldest stocks in the United States. A 1920 study of the white population of the nation in terms of national origins concluded that 81% of the British, Welsh and Ulster stock descended from persons already in the Colonies at the time of the Revolution. The Dutch in America in 1920 were 73% of Colonial stock, the French 42% or so, the Germans and Austrians 19%, the Irish 17%, the Scandinavians 9% and the Italians, Greeks and Hungarians were not Colonial to any extent.¹

The earliest Dutch settlers were fur traders. These were followed by other merchants. A vigorous effort to persuade Netherlands farmers

to settle *patroon* estates in the Hudson was only moderately successful due to rural prosperity in Holland. A later, mid-19th-Century emigration was of a very different sort. It was spurred by rural distress and affected very poor peasants, "the most orthodox among the Calvinists, to whom the Dutch Reformed Church seemed to have swerved from the true teachings of John Calvin. They seceded from its fold and met in conventicles, which, being forbidden by the authorities, were forcibly broken up and dispersed."² Like the Puritans, these schismatic Dutch Calvinists were rigid in belief and inflexible in purpose, but, whereas the Pilgrims were highly successful, the Dutch dissenters were economic failures and social outcasts.

The Netherlands emigration was drawn from a people which had for centuries been invigorated by a policy of political and religious toleration. The Dutch had enriched their stock by offering asylum to both Christian and Sephardic Jewish victims of religious persecution. This policy would be reflected in the impressive contributions which persons of Dutch stock have consistently made to the American creative minority.

Germans in the United States. Of the 15.5 million Americans of German stock in 1920, about 11% of the total were immigrants, 26% the children of immigrants, 43% later descendants of non-Colonial immigrants and 19% of Colonial stock.

The first wave of German settlement of any consequence came from the Palatinate (*Bayerisch Pfalz*) in the early 18th Century and was a reaction against religious persecution. For the most part skilled farmers, these newcomers occupied parts of the Hudson Valley and later the "Pennsylvania Dutch" region. A second wave, mainly of artisans and skilled farmers, came after the Napoleonic Wars.

Far more important was the wave of immigration following the collapse of the 1848 revolutions in Germany. These migrants included highly educated writers and professionals. Motivated by a belief in democratic institutions and inclined to prefer cities to the raw life of the frontier, this wave played a substantial role in the political life of the United States and in the founding of the Republican Party.

The last and largest wave brought 2.7 million Germans into the United States between 1870 and 1900. These men were again largely craftsmen, skilled workers and artisans, but with a considerable mixture of small businessmen.

Scandinavia and Natural Selection. Of the 4.5 million people of Scandinavian stock in the United States in 1920, 44% were of Swedish, 31% of Norwegian, 16% of Danish and 9% of Finnish origin. About 70% of these Scandinavians were either immigrants (1.4 million) or children of immigrants (1.8 million).

The Norsemen were the beneficiaries of a bracing climate which stimulated exuberant health and intellectual vigor and which was harsh enough to weed out those too weak or too stupid to master its challenges. The climate is cold with a good deal of seasonal variation and the stimulus of cyclonic storms.

Scandinavia was one of the last areas of the globe to be freed from glacial ice and hence its colder regions have been inhabited for a few thousand years only. Thus, it was populated by migrants in comparatively recent times. This was in itself an advantage since the selective forces of migration, under conditions of hardship, are generally positive: it is the bolder, more self-reliant and more intelligent who dare to make the move; the journey itself, with inevitable fights with hostile groups for rights of passage, eliminates those least competent at persuasion, maneuver or battle.⁸

Norse society was divided into three chief classes, which may have been racially distinct: the Jarls, Karls and Thralls. The Elder Edda known as *Rígsmaal* describes the new-born Thrall babe as follows: "And, as it grew, it throve, but on its hands were fingers thick, a shriveled skin, and knotted knuckles. A hideous face it had, a curving back, and sharp, protruding heels. As it gained strength, it proved its might by binding bast in heavy loads, and carrying faggots home unwearied all day long."⁴

The Karl child, who would grow up to be a farmer, was described as ruddy with twinkling eyes. As for the Jarl toddler of warrior Nordic stock, he is delineated in these terms: "Light was his hair, bright were his cheeks, and his young eyes gleamed keen as any serpent's. In his own home he grew, learning to hold the shield, to draw the twanging bowstring, bend the bow, and shape the arrow with a smooth and deadly shaft. He likewise learned the javelin to hurl, the spear to brandish, the fleet horse to ride apace, dogs too he managed, and he learned to wield the sword, and boldly swim through fierce and boisterous waves."

The Viking conquests were for the most part the achievement of a highly select minority of Norsemen. They consisted in the main of Jarls. The *drakkars* and other long boats were oared by fighting men, not, as were the Graeco-Roman biremes, by slaves. This is evidenced

by the excavated Gokstad ship which has 32 holes through which to hang shields corresponding to 32 oar holes.

The colonization of Iceland in particular was the achievement of intrepid Jarls. At the time, King Harald Fairhair was consolidating a Norwegian monarchy and destroying the traditional rights of the nobility. The Vikings who settled Iceland in the 9th Century were, for the most part, peers who chose emigration to a hard and desolate land rather than lose their freedom. "They came to Iceland to save the old order of heroic society," wrote E. V. Gordon, "and they preserved it there much as it had existed in early Germanic times before the great kings made their power absolute by destroying the free fellowship of the small lord and his men. The settlers of Iceland were men of more than usual force of will and love of liberty, the best of the Norwegian aristocracy. The proportion of well-born there was greater than in any other Scandinavian land, and it was in the gentleman's household that the literary arts were practiced most. Half or more than half of the literary power of Norway was thus concentrated in Iceland, and it throve the more for its concentration."⁸ Thus, the brilliant flowering of Icelandic civilization was the achievement of a highly select group among peoples who had been shaped for physical strength and vigor, hardihood, intrepidity, self-reliance and intelligence by a combination of biogenetic, climatic and cultural forces.

The Norse and Clerical Celibacy. Another powerful, though heretofore unnoticed, cause of the development of intellectual vigor in Scandinavia derives from the religious history of the peninsula. That part of Europe which was destined to become Protestant suffered under the onus of sacerdotal celibacy from approximately 400 A.D. until the triumph of the Reformation in the 16th and 17th Centuries. To the extent that the rule was observed, it meant that the priesthood was sterilized. Since the clergy was almost the only possible profession for a scholar during this period of over a thousand years, the institution of clerical celibacy was nothing more nor less than a means of breeding the best brains out of the genetic pool of the peoples of Europe. The fact that the clergy was often licentious did not necessarily prevent priestly celibacy from having its pernicious effects.⁹ The question after all was not whether priests had sexual intercourse or even whether they kept mistresses: the basic issue was whether or not they lived under circumstances that encouraged them to have large families, to recognize them and to nurture them into manhood and womanhood. As a rule, this was quite impossible for the priest-

hood. For every priest's bastard, such as Erasmus, who survived to enrich the thought of the world, there must have been half a dozen who were not conceived or, if conceived, were aborted or, if not aborted, were allowed to die of neglect.

Elsewhere, Possony and I have suggested that the chief significance of the Reformation was biogenetic. In those places where it triumphed, it ended the institutional sterilization of the brain-power of Christendom. We presented evidence concerning the tremendous contribution made to the intellectual life of Europe by the progeny of Protestant ministers, a progeny which, for the most part, would have remained unborn had the areas in question stayed Catholic. We suggested further that Max Weber was wrong in attributing the victory of rationalism, modern science and capitalism in Europe to the Protestant or Puritan "ethos." What was involved was a much more fundamental process: the unleashing of the reproductive power of the most creative component of the intellectual elite of the Protestant world — its clergy. This was done through sanctioning and encouraging marriage by Protestant priests.⁷

The intellectual vitality of the peoples of Europe must have been profoundly affected by the length of time that they lived under the shadow of clerical celibacy and by the extent to which this celibacy was in fact imposed. Unfortunately, the historian of this deplorable institution, Henry C. Lea, failed to see that the main issue is the extent of reproduction and child-rearing by the priesthood. Instead, Lea devoted an enormous amount of research and scholarship to demonstrating the "vices" and "immorality" of the Catholic clergy at various times and places.⁸ The truly serious and significant book on sacerdotal celibacy has yet to be written.

Most of modern Europe was brought under Christian domination between 300 and 500 A.D. The Scandinavians were much slower to embrace the new faith. Thus, Christianity came to Denmark in 975 A.D.; Sweden was converted under Olaf, the Lapp King (993-1024); Norway under St. Olaf (1015-1030).

This process of christianization was courageously resisted by many of the Jarls and by others attached to the old religion. The imposition of clerical celibacy was vigorously resisted. For example in 1117 A.D. we find Pope Pascal II writing the King of Denmark that his country cannot be exempted from the rule that the clergy may not marry. In 1180, the people of Scanta in Sweden revolted and demanded that the clergy be allowed to keep their wives. The Church replied that they would have to give them up. However, it seems to have retreated

because by 1237 we have Pope Gregory IX ordering merely that the marriages of priests in Sweden should not be publicly celebrated.

This experience with priestly celibacy came to an end with the Reformation, which was embraced by Sweden, Norway and Denmark between 1523 and 1560, that is to say, about the time it was established in England, but long before its victory in Germany.

In short, the Scandinavian countries lived under Catholicism for about five centuries as against the eleven centuries or so in which it prevailed in other countries that would ultimately become Protestant. During much of this period, the institution of clerical celibacy was vigorously resisted: priests continued to marry and, in some instances, to celebrate their marriages publicly. Thus, Scandinavia was not subjected to nearly as much church-made biological havoc as most of Christendom and this does much to explain its intellectual superiority to most other European areas.

The French in America. The estimated French-speaking population of the United States in 1960 was about 8.5 million.⁹ French immigration has been a fairly steady factor over the entire period of American history. Immigrants have included a large number of skilled artisans, small businessmen, professionals and service trade workers. In addition, the U.S. acquired an indigenous French population with the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. The French Canadians are chiefly unskilled and semi-skilled mill workers. The decline in the French role in the American creative minority has been associated with the displacement of French-speaking stock originally from France by French Canadians.

The Italians in the United States. The Italians score above 100 in only three of the 75 rosters.¹⁰ They have an average performance coefficient of 40, after adjustment for Negroes, which puts them in 11th place among the 15 national-linguistic groups. They are a declining element in the American creative minority.

Italian immigration into the United States assumed large proportions about a decade after the unification of Italy. Approximately a million Italians entered the country during 1880-1900, some 2 million in 1900-1910, another million in the 1910-1920 decade and almost 800,000 between 1920 and 1961.

At first, Italian immigrants came primarily from fairly industrialized portions of northern Italy and consisted of small businessmen, artists, skilled artisans and other trained people. By 1901-1910, however, some 1.9 million immigrants had come into the U.S. from southern, as against

only 370,000 from northern, Italy. The new Italian immigrants were for the most part scarcely literate peasants, speaking regional dialects, capable only of unskilled labor, superstitious, fiercely loyal to family, clan or village, but not to country, hostile to education, but sympathetic toward crime because of long traditions of vendetta, mafia and hatred of police authority.

"Of 2,300,000 Italian immigrants to the United States between 1899 and 1910," Glazer and Moynihan wrote, "1,900,000 were South Italians. Of these, less than half of 1 per cent were in the professions, only 15 per cent were in skilled occupations, and 77 per cent were farm workers or laborers — that is, without any skill of value in an urban, industrial setting. By contrast, three times as many North Italians were professionals, and 66 per cent were laborers. North Italians had on the average twice as much money as South Italians when they came in, and slightly more than the average immigrant. More than half of the South Italian immigrants over fourteen were illiterate, but only 12 per cent of the North Italians. This difference was reduced when, after the First World War, adult immigrants were required to show literacy."¹¹

Hostility Toward Social Order. The South Italian culture has been characterized as "amoral familism."¹² The habitual attitude toward government officials is that they are thieves. In the South Italian culture, Glazer and Moynihan state, "it was the 'bad' son who wanted to go to school instead of to work, the 'bad daughter' who wanted to remain in school instead of helping her mother."¹³ The situation was quite different among the North Italians and among South Italians not of peasant origin.

Glazer and Moynihan claim that these mores have "prevented Italo-Americans from making effective use of the public school system in New York."¹⁴ Whatever the reasons may be, the facts are self-evident. In 1960, only 11% of the graduates of Hunter College and 6% of the graduates of City College had Italian names despite the fact that the population of the city was about 17% of Italian stock.¹⁵ Two-thirds of the second-generation Italo-American men and a majority of the women in 1950 were still employed as factory workers. The progress between first and second generation in income and occupational status was less than that for any other major European immigrant group.¹⁶

While the differences between South Italian and North Italian mores and attitudes are real, they can easily be exaggerated. Almond and Verba recently made a comprehensive, carefully controlled study in depth of the "civic culture" of the peoples of five non-communist na-

tions: Germany, Mexico, Great Britain, the United States and Italy. Their stratified Italian sample was by no means mainly South Italian: it was 47% from North Italy, 19% from Central Italy, 23% from South Italy and 11% from the Italian islands.

The conclusion the authors drew from their interviews in contemporary Italy was that the country is "an alienated political culture." As they put it: "The picture of Italian political culture that has emerged from our data is one of relatively unrelieved political alienation and of social isolation and distrust. The Italians are particularly low in national pride, in moderate and open partisanship, in the acknowledgment of the obligation to take an active part in local community affairs, in the sense of competence to join with others in situations of political stress, in their choice of social forms of leisure-time activity, and in their confidence in the social environment."¹⁷

After explaining that Italy suffered "centuries of fragmentation and external tyranny" in which good citizenship could scarcely develop and thereafter learned to associate nationalism with humiliation and democracy with ineffectiveness, the authors proceed with this verdict:

"We may add two more features to this description of the Italian political culture. Italian national and political alienation rests on social alienation. If our data are correct, most Italians view the social environment as full of threat and danger."

South vs. North Italians. The Italian immigration to South America — largely concentrated in Argentina and Brazil — reached its peak at a somewhat earlier period. These Italians made an outstanding contribution to the Latin American elite. In Brazil, the Italians built up coffee agriculture and created a grape and vine industry. They played a great role in the development of the Sao Paulo industrial colossus. Among others, Giuseppe Martinelli from Lucca in Tuscany made millions in shipping, banking and coal mines and erected the tallest building on the Continent. Other business and industrial magnates of Italian extraction include Francesco Matarazzo, the Gambas, Puglisis, Crespis, Lunardellis and Pignatoris.¹⁸ In Argentina, the Italians have played a comparable role. "All the Italians have prospered," Edward Tomlinson claimed, "and many have accumulated tremendous fortunes. They have long dominated the wheat- and corn-growing industries."¹⁹ Their power in politics was illustrated by the election of Arturo Frondizi to the Argentine Presidency.²⁰

Among the reasons advanced for the much greater success of the Italians in South America than in the United States are similarities

of language and culture and the theory that the Latin countries, being newer and less developed, offered the immigrants greater opportunities.²¹

A more fundamental factor would seem to be that the Italian immigration into South America was much more heavily weighted with North Italians. Around 1900, the main direction of Italian emigration veered from South America to the United States. At the same time, the Sicilian and Calabrian component in the Italian emigration reached about the same magnitude as the North and Central components. Soon after, the South Italian element became predominant. These South Italians tended to go to the United States where relatives and *paisanos* from their native villages were already established. The North and Central Italians preferred Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay for the same reasons.

Italian scholars have argued that the poor performance of their compatriots in the United States is due to the alleged racial inferiority of the South Italian.²² There is some evidence on this point, but it is by no means conclusive.

Southern Italy and Sicily were less affected bigenetically by the successive barbarian invasions of Teutonic peoples that inundated the Roman Empire of the West during its centuries of decline, infusing Alpine and Nordic genes. On the other hand, Sicily in particular was massively infused with the genes of Moors, Berbers, Arabs and other invading peoples, so much so that it was described by a French anthropologist as "a veritable crossroads of peoples."²³ Sicily is one of the few areas in Europe west of the Vistula which has a B-gene frequency higher than 10%. Blood group B is generally referred to as Asiatic. Its high frequency in Slavic Europe was attributed by Candell to successive Mongoloid invasions and occupations.²⁴ In Sicily, the B-gene frequency has been attributed to Moorish, Egyptian "or Negro incursions."²⁵ The primary source of the last would be the Negro slaves brought into Sicily by the Arabs during their period of occupation.²⁶

The evidence on brain capacity is of some interest. Different investigators found that female brain capacities varied from 1,401 cc. for modern Trentines (Tyrol), to 1,323 cc. for the people buried in ancient Pompei, to 1,294 cc for contemporary Neapolitans and 1,256 cc. for modern Sicilians. The brain capacity for adult males generally ran from 110 to 200 cc. higher. This was without allowance for the shorter stature and smaller size of the southern Italians.

Finally, there are comparative studies of intelligence tests scores. One was made by Professor Otto Klineberg of Columbia in 1931. Its

apparent purpose was to disprove the theory that Nordics rank above Alpines and Mediterraneans in intelligence. Pintner-Paterson Point Scale Scores were obtained for European boys aged 10 to 12 of different racial types in 10 different areas belonging to three European countries. In the three Italian cases, the racially mixed Roman boys had an average score of 211.8, the Alpine types from Piedmont averaged 188.8, while the Mediterraneans from Sicily scored 173.0 Standard deviations ranged from 42.6 to 54.2.²⁸

Klineberg's findings show that differences between races appear to be much less significant than differences within each racial group, reflecting regional and cultural variations and the comparison between peasantry, townsmen and city dwellers. The Sicilians were at the bottom of the ten groups.²⁹

In 1935, Dr. R. N. Franzblau made a more competent study of the subject. Testing 300 girls in four groups (Danes in Denmark, Italians in Italy, Danish Americans in the United States and Italo-Americans in the United States), she eliminated the influence of language by using the International Intelligence Test. Unlike Klineberg, she equated the four groups in respect to socioeconomic level. Her findings were that no significant score differences existed between Danes in Denmark and Italians in Italy. However, the Danish Americans scored markedly higher than the Italian Americans.³⁰ These results were consistent with the hypothesis that the Southern Italian peasant elements who emigrated to the United States were mentally less well endowed than Italians in general.

The Spanish-Speaking. In the 75 rosters, the Spanish-speaking rank at the bottom and there are only two cases in which they score above 50 — or half the national average. At least half the Spanish-speaking people in the United States are of Mexican stock. These are mainly workers from the northern states of the Republic, a region which, while *mestizo*, has less Indian blood than central and southern Mexico. The northerners tend to be more prosperous, more self-reliant, better farmers and better educated than the Mexican national average.

In 1950, Hilding and Henderson made a carefully controlled study of the I.Q.'s of Mexican American children. After taking various precautions to minimize the effect of inferior environment and the language handicap, they found that the Mexican American children nonetheless scored on the average 13.9 points below the U.S. average on the linguistic portions of the California Test of Mental Maturity and 14.5 points below the norm on the non-linguistic portions. They ad-

mitted reluctantly that there seemed to be "intellectual differences between 'races' or national groups, at least in so far as intelligence is measured by the tests involved in this study."³¹

As for the Puerto Ricans, they seem to be a cross-section of the population of the Island with the significant qualification that, because of race discrimination on the mainland, those who migrate are generally lighter-skinned and racially less Negroid than those who stay at home.

Like the Mexicans, the Puerto Ricans in the United States tend to score very poorly on intelligence and aptitude tests. On "unadjusted" and "adjusted" AGCT tests of U.S. Army recruits,³² there were only from one-twentieth to one-half as many Puerto Ricans as mainland whites in the "very superior" category. From five to seven times as many Puerto Ricans as mainland whites were in the mentally backward category.³³

The Hungarians. The mass Hungarian immigration into the United States lasted from about 1880 until the restrictive immigration laws of the 1920's, reaching a peak in 1907. Emil Lengyel estimates that 1,600,000 people emigrated from Hungarian territory to the United States. This total includes Slavs, Latins, Germans and Jews as well as Magyars.

The spurs were poverty and rural distress. The emigrants were drawn from the poor peasantry with tiny farms and from the 1,500,000 peasants who were totally landless. The Hungarians gravitated toward the burgeoning coal, steel and other heavy industries of the United States. With such outstanding exceptions as the 1937 Nobel laureate in Medicine and Physiology, Dr. Albert von Szent-Györgi, few non-Jewish Hungarians contributed much to the American creative minority.

The second wave of Hungarian emigration, that generated by the revolt against Soviet oppression and its defeat by the Red Army, was of a very different character. Of the 200,000 or so Hungarians who fled their country after the uprising, 38,045 had reached the United States by June 30, 1958. According to M. H. Trytten of the National Academy of Sciences National Resources Council, some 2,000 of these refugee immigrants, or almost 6% of the total, were scientists and engineers.³⁴ Most were placed in American scientific institutions. Reports on their professional contributions to science in this country "have been almost entirely favorable."

Slavs and the Mongol Heritage. The overwhelming bulk of non-Jewish immigration from Slavic countries has consisted of peasants

motivated by rural distress. However, in the 13 years following the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, some 50,000 Russians came to the United States, many of them political refugees who had been uprooted and scattered by the holocaust. Among them were the cream of the surviving remnant of the professional, scientific and upper classes of the *ancien regime*.

The comparatively poor Slavic performance coefficients can better be understood when one considers the various biogenetic afflictions that have fallen upon the Russian people.

Of these, perhaps the most dramatic was the Mongol invasion and conquest. Between 1223 and approximately 1240, the Mongols carried out the conquest of Russia and at one time brought their armies to Liegnitz in Silesia and to the Adriatic coast of Yugoslavia. Russia suffered under the Mongol yoke for about a century and a half. In 1380, Dmitri, Prince of Moscow, defeated the Golden Horde in a major battle and a century later, Ivan III was able to renounce his allegiance to the Mongol Khan.

The unanimous view of Christendom was that the Mongols were "the scourge of God," an affliction brought down upon their people for their sins. "The churches of God they devastated," we read in *The Tale of the Ravage of Riazan* by Batu, "and in the holy altars they shed much blood. And no one in the town remained alive: all died equally and drank the single cup of death. There was no one here to moan or cry — neither father and mother over children, nor children over father and mother, neither brother over brother, nor relatives over relatives — but all lay together dead. And all this occurred to us for our sins."

In Russia as elsewhere, the Mongols exterminated the entire populations of the cities which resisted them. Thus, "they took Kiev by storm, exterminating the population, and leveled the city. The same fate befell other towns of the area, whose inhabitants either died or became slaves. After Kiev, the Mongols swept through the southwestern principalities of Galicia and Volynia, laying everything waste. Poland and Hungary came next."²⁸⁵

The Papal Legate and Archbishop, Piano Carpini, who traversed southern Russia in 1245-46, was an eyewitness of Mongol havoc. He saw "a great massacre in the Russian land," with towns and fortresses destroyed and Kiev, chief town of southern Russia, levelled and its inhabitants put to death. He found "lying in the fields countless heads and bones of dead people; for this city (Kiev) had been extremely large and very populous, whereas now it has been reduced to nothing:

barely 200 houses stand there, and those people are held in the harshest slavery."

The scholars, the scribes and the clergy, the upper classes, the merchants and the skilled artisans would be located primarily in the cities. Hence, when the Mongols destroyed these, putting everyone to the sword, they imposed an immense genetic handicap on their victims.

There is no reason to believe that the annihilation of the intellectuals was the objective; it seems to have been merely an inevitable effect. As a semi-nomadic people, the Mongols had no need for cities. The requirement of their chaotically run empire was vast populations of enslaved peasants to provide food and fodder for the Golden Horde and the Mongol rulers.

The area of Mongol depopulation of cities included Turkestan, Persia, Arabia, Palestine-Syria, Turkey, the Balkans, Poland and Russia. The destruction of the great cities of Islam in successive Mongol holocausts and the extermination of their inhabitants brought about a genetic catastrophe which was reflected in the stagnation of Arabic civilization in Asia. In Russia, a similar policy, but genetically a less destructive one since the country was much less urbanized or civilized, set back the development of civilization. If China escaped this terrible regression and permanent genetic handicap, the reason was that the Mongol conquerors occupied the Chinese cities intact, refrained from their habitual massacres and became quickly absorbed into Sinic civilization.

Historians of an earlier generation were virtually unanimous in regarding the Mongol explosion as an unmitigated catastrophe to civilization, though they regarded the trauma as physical and cultural, rather than biogenetic. While the Mongols built no pyramids of skulls in Russia, they kept the country in darkness and prevented her from participating in the Renaissance. Writing in the *Cambridge Medieval History*, Peisker expressed the view that there would have been no European civilization at all if the Mongol advance had not been checkmated on the plains of Hungary.

More recently, a school of Russian historians which stresses the relationships between Russia and Asia has tried to discover constructive elements in the experience of Mongol domination. Riasanovsky's judicious examination of these claims suggests that they are without substance.⁹⁰ Quite aside from the tragic genetic consequences already discussed, the Russians were subjected to a system of laws extremely harsh even by their own standards, were kept in comparative illiteracy and ignorance and emerged from this painful background truncated

from Europe and centuries behind it in cultural development.

Even more appalling genetic catastrophes were engineered by the Nazis and by the Communists. The extermination of more than one-third of world Jewry impoverished the world's creative minority more than any other event in the history of mankind. In addition, the ebb and surge of Communist and Nazi forces through Russia, the Baltic states, Poland, Hungary and the Balkans involved successive liquidations of non-Jewish "political unreliaables" by both sides. These occurred on a vast scale. Those executed or murdered were generally of the minority which has enough intelligence to have political convictions and enough force of character to advocate them effectively.

The history of communism in Soviet Russia from 1917 to the death of Stalin can be regarded as a series of experiments in *aristocracide* — not the killing off of the aristocracy of birth, but the extermination of the *aristoi*, that is to say, the best.

Thus, the Bolshevik Revolution and the civil wars that followed it resulted in the annihilation or exile of almost the entire nobility, middle class and non-revolutionary intelligentsia of Russia. The intellectuals who were revolutionaries, but sided with political factions other than the Bolsheviks, were similarly dispersed, exiled or put to death. After the Bolshevik regime emerged triumphant over its many adversaries, a brief period of comparative stability ensued in which the chief victims were the millions of peasants who were deported, starved or shot in connection with collectivization. Then, the Soviet dictatorship turned against its own leading cadres of political leaders, economic administrators, politicians, generals, scientists, artists and writers. In a series of purges, outstanding intellectuals were liquidated, the exceptions including uncritical Stalinists and those with a phenomenal capacity for deception and survival.

These purges and liquidations were not accidents nor were they merely the expected outrages and enormities that occur in periods of war and revolution. They were part of a deliberate strategy. The representatives of the old regime were liquidated because they opposed the new one, because they were too individualistic to be satisfied with the life it offered or because they were too sophisticated to become docile instruments of its propaganda. The cadres of rival parties and schools of thought were similarly destroyed because their existence endangered the totality of the dictatorship. The Old Bolsheviks were purged primarily because they had one foot in Western Civilization and hence could not become reconciled to the deification of the *Vozhd* or to the absolute despotism he imposed.

The attack on the Russian Jews as "cosmopolitan" and "rootless" reflected this mentality of distrust of any intelligence which is broadly based, eclectic and independent. The concept of the new Soviet man implied a basic uniformity of thought on fundamental political issues; hence it implied the elimination of individualists.

Finally, it is interesting that Robert Payne closed his excellent biography of Lenin with a brief chapter entitled "The Ape and the Skull."⁷⁷ This referred to a small statue Lenin always kept on his desk showing an ape peering at the skull of an evidently extinct human being. As Payne interpreted it, the statue suggested to Lenin that communism would have to reverse the direction of evolution in order to create men simple and docile enough to accept it.

The Hakkas — A Chinese Elite Element. The Chinese and Japanese who first came to the Pacific Coast and to Hawaii were mainly farm workers, peasants and city laborers. They were recruited for the sugar and pineapple plantations, to help build the railroads, to work in the mines and for other unskilled, back-breaking tasks. The Chinese brought into the United States for these purposes were for the most part Hakkas, "a people who were exposed to the full force of natural selection in three historic migrations, which ruthlessly eliminated the weak and incompetent, and who, in the intervening centuries, kept themselves biologically separate from their neighbors."⁷⁸

After making a study of this remarkable Chinese group, Ellsworth Huntington wrote:

"The history of the Hakkas deserves careful study. Recall the fact that in the opinion of many good judges they are today the 'cream of the Chinese.' Their energy and cleanliness, their respect for women, and their high degree of education are almost unique. They differ markedly from the Chinese of earlier migrations who surround them, and the difference is the same kind as that which differentiates those same surrounding Chinese of the south from the less progressive and active Chinese of the north. The qualities of the Hakkas are in many respects like those of the energetic barbarian invaders of Tartar, Mongol and Manchu stock from the dry northern regions to whom northern China owes so much of its historic dominance. In the case of the Hakkas, we have written evidence that they were impelled to leave their northern homes under the stress of famine and invasion. We get glimpses of the way in which hardship and war inexorably cut down their numbers and left only a chosen remnant of unusual capacity. We also find that this process of selection took place three successive

times. Finally, when the Hakkas, especially those in the central and most typical area, were free from the difficulties and hardships which induced migration and natural selection, they kept themselves aloof from their neighbors and thus preserved their inheritance. The competent, wide-awake, progressive Hakkas, on the one hand, and the incompetent, dull, conservative people of the villages near Peking where the houses are left sealed while the villagers beg for bread, on the other hand, seem to represent the two extremes due to natural selection and migration in China. In the one case we have migrants in whom a high degree of ability has been concentrated; in the other, we have the stay-at-homes from among whom most of the more able elements have gradually been eliminated.³⁹

The Chinese in the Professions. The Chinese are the most rapidly growing element in the United States population. Between 1950 and 1960, the number of Chinese Americans rose by 58%. During the same decade, American Indians increased by 47%, Filipinos by 44%, Japanese Americans by 42%, Negroes by 25%, whites by 17.5% and all others by 18.5%. The gain in the Chinese American population was due to favorable provisions of recent immigration laws under which 27,502 Chinese entered the U.S. as immigrants during 1951-60, to the return of Chinese Americans to the States because of the conditions prevailing in China under Communism and to natural increase.

The prominent position of Chinese Americans in the professions is of very recent origin. According to an invaluable study by S. W. Kung, there were only about 137 racially Chinese teachers on American campuses in 1943-53.⁴⁰ The liberalizing features of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952 changed that situation and by 1959-60, there were 1,124 Chinese college and university teachers.⁴¹ Only 5% of these teachers were instructing students in Oriental languages, culture, history, politics or civilization. Some 648 of them were in natural sciences and engineering; almost half were engaged in research.⁴²

By 1963-64, there were 106 teachers of Chinese origin on the California faculty and 39 on that of Maryland as against the 79 and 28 reported in 1959-60. These were increases of 34% and 39% respectively. A survey of other college faculty lists suggested that Chinese participation was increasing rapidly on a nationwide basis.

An examination of the faculty rolls of six American colleges and universities (California 1963-64, Dartmouth 1961-62, Harvard 1961-62, Maryland 1963-64, Missouri 1963-64 and Princeton 1960-61) revealed that there were a total of 233 Chinese and 284 Japanese members of

these faculties. On this basis, the combined performance coefficients for these six colleges and universities were 708 for the Chinese and 439 for the Japanese.⁴³

The performance coefficients obtained for Chinese Americans by name-frequency analysis of the name, *Wong*, are unsatisfactory for several reasons: Since there are only 14,303 *Wong*'s on the BOASI list, there is a large random error of sampling. Many of the smaller rosters report fewer than five *Wong*'s, making it necessary to score them as negligible. Finally, Mr. Y. K. Lee, a Chinese friend, informs me that *Wong* is an undistinguished name in China which one would expect to find underrepresented on elite rosters.

A count of all the Chinese and Japanese names appearing on several representative rosters was made and performance coefficients were computed for the two groups on this basis. In the 1961-62 combined membership list of three mathematical societies, we found 121 Chinese (not resident in China, Taiwan or Hongkong) and 94 Japanese (not resident in Japan) out of a total of 20,847 entries.⁴⁴ The indicated performance coefficients were 440 for the Chinese and 172 for the Japanese. This compared with a performance coefficient for Chinese of 421 in the same roster obtained when the name *Wong* was used.⁴⁵

Using this somewhat laborious method, performance coefficients were obtained for the Chinese and Japanese in a few representative elite areas. Chinese performance coefficients were 558 for statisticians, 305 for 1962 Phi Beta Kappas, 161 for social scientists⁴⁶ and 133 for 1956-62 National Merit Scholars. The Japanese P.C.'s were 116 for statisticians, 225 for 1962 Phi Beta Kappas and 158 for National Merit Scholars.

The performance coefficients for the mathematical and statistical associations were obtained after eliminating Chinese members who live in China, Taiwan and Hongkong and Japanese members who live in Japan. This was a major correction in the Japanese case, since over half the Japanese members of each society were residents of Japan.

The Chinese and, to a lesser extent, Japanese performance coefficients for faculty members at the university level may be somewhat inflated by the fact that Oriental students often come to the United States to do their postgraduate work and are given part-time teaching or research positions to help them defray expenses. Thus, some of the Orientals included on faculties might not have received these appointments had they been American nationals. This may be a more significant factor among the Chinese, since Japan has excellent postgraduate facilities at home and probably sends proportionately fewer of her top graduates to the United States for further study.

Even with these qualifications, the Chinese and Japanese show up as outstanding elite groups in the American academic and professional world. The real performance of the Chinese is considerably better than that indicated by the P.C.'s for the name *Wong*. Both Chinese and Japanese seem to be rapidly emerging and advancing elements whose future contributions to the American creative minority will almost certainly be even greater than their present contributions.

IX

INTERNAL DIFFERENCES IN CREATIVITY

Different groups of surnames, all pertaining to the same national-linguistic stocks, sometimes have consistently different performance coefficients. This fact is quite obvious in the case of the Puritans, as I have already shown. The areas in which these differences arise and persist are much more extensive than one might suppose and sometimes the rationale of the differences is baffling and hard to unravel.

Intra-national differences in representation in the creative minority may be due to any of several causes. The most interesting cases are those in which the differences existed at the times surnames were taken and have persisted ever since. This always presupposes that occupational, caste, class or educational status-differences, which were in effect during the late Middle Ages, have been preserved over a period of several centuries by mate selection.¹

A second situation is one in which a batch of names denotes a group of people who went through experiences together that led to the winnowing out of those lacking in high intelligence and superior moral fiber. These experiences could be of recent or of remote date. The example that leaps to mind is that of the bearers of Puritan names.

A third possible situation is that of contamination. Thus the performance coefficients of *Washington* have been significantly affected by the fact that the emancipated Negroes admired the first president to such an extent that four-fifths of the present bearers of the name are colored. The fact that Jews tend to adopt *Gordon* and *Irving* as family names or that the ambitious may wish to drop such surnames as *Belcher* or choose such as *Best* are cases in point.²

Closely related to this is the case of names being changed after success has been attained, presumably as a means of distinguishing one's self from the common herd. The transformation of *Smith* into *Smythe* or *Turner* into *Tournure* would be examples. Obviously, differences of the first sort are of much greater significance as indicators of the pervasiveness of intra-national differences in leadership and creativity.

The Paradox of Color. A fairly large proportion of the British and Irish names of the BOASI list refer to color or complexion. Thus, of the 140 Irish names listed, 19 refer to color and these names are borne by 531,121 of the 3,839,863 bearers of Irish names on the roster.

The stress on color is less among the English. Of 618 English names borne by 30,071,000 persons on BOASI, only 18, borne by 1,631,000 persons, denote color. In the Scottish case, seven of the 60 listed names, borne by 302,000 of 1,849,000 persons, refer to color.

The color names comprise 16.3% of the Scottish, 13.8% of the Irish and 5.4% of the English listed on the Social Security rolls.

In all three countries, the predominant type, whether Norman, Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon or Celtic, was blond and Nordic. Therefore, to describe a man as fair did not suffice to identify him. For this reason, most color names in Britain and Ireland mean dark.

Of the English color names, five mean fair, four ruddy and six dark. In the Scottish case, two signify fair and six signify dark. Among the Irish, who are one of the lightest-skinned and lightest-eyed peoples on earth, 13 names mean dark, four mean ruddy or red and only two mean fair.³

Professors Robert Alexander Stewart Macallister and Anthony Thomas Lucas write in their article on "Ireland: Archaeology" in the 1961 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: "In the literature which a little later began to come into being, an aristocratic product, the distinction between fair and dark people is of paramount importance. Every person who is spoken of with respect, save for a number of individuals of exceptional character who 'prove the rule' much more clearly than in most cases of the kind, is described as being tall and fair, with long flowing locks. Every person who for any reason is spoken of with disdain is described as being short, dark and with close-cropped hair."

This literature was, of course, a Celtic product and it mirrored the Celts' belief in their own superiority over the dark, short, dolichocephalic people of Mediterranean racial origin who had been predominant in Ireland throughout the Stone and Bronze Ages, but who had succumbed to the blond Celts armed with iron weapons. This Irish attitude is almost exactly parallel to the Viking differentiation between the blond, Nordic *jarls* and *karls*, on the one hand, and the swarthy, enslaved *thralls*, on the other.⁴

Given this racial differentiation, we might have expected *prima facie* to find the Irishmen with names indicating blondness more creative than those with names indicating swarthy. Since the blond Celts were the ruling element, they were able to breed selectively, choosing

the strongest, most beautiful and most intelligent women and thus, generation by generation, widening the gap between their stock and the dark people they dominated. *Prima facie*, therefore, we might expect to find that, at the present time, either this difference or some portion of it would have persevered or else that the groups had become inextricably intermixed and that no remaining difference between them was discernible.

What the figures do show is contrary to both of these alternate expectations. The Irishmen with "dark" names are significantly more eminent in the United States than those with "light" or "red" ones. This difference is equally emphasized in *Who's Who in America 1955-1965* and in Volume 1 of the 9th edition of *American Men of Science*, which covers the physical sciences.

Thus, 13 Irish names meaning *dark* with a frequency in BOASI of 403,112 have a performance coefficient of 122 in *Who's Who* and 64 in *American Men of Science*. Four names meaning *red*, with some 82,000 BOASI entries, have performance coefficients of 87 and 53 respectively and two names meaning *light* (46,000 BOASI entries) score 82 and 35. The superiority of the Irish bearers of "dark" names is manifest.⁵

The English picture is very similar. Here we must first eliminate the names *Black*, *Blackman* and *Blake* as their meaning is obscure. When they derive from the Old English *blaca*, they mean black. However, they may also stem from the Old English *blac*, meaning "bright, shining, pale, wan."⁶ The name *Brown* must also be eliminated because almost a third of its bearers in America are Negroes.

When this is done, English color names show up much as Irish color names do. In *Who's Who in America 1956-57*, the average performance coefficient for "dark" names is 197, that for "ruddy" names is 145 and that for "fair" names is 118, as against a coefficient of 109 for English names in general. In the physical sciences, "dark" names average 182, "light" ones 101 and "ruddy" ones 98 as compared to an overall English performance coefficient of 84.

In the case of the Scots, the average performance coefficient in *American Men of Science* (physical sciences) is 89 for names meaning dark and 83 for names meaning fair. The corresponding figures in *Who's Who in America* are 142 and 119.⁷

The superior performance of names meaning dark is too large and too consistent to be attributable to chance. While it is contrary to *prima facie* expectation, upon reflection the pattern appears logical.

As a general rule, we can assume that individuals were given names

meaning "dark" only when they lived among people who were overwhelmingly fair, and vice versa. Obviously, dark-complexioned people who lived among the swarthy, conquered elements would not be called *Dunn* or *Cronin* since these names would not have identified them. Similarly, a blond man, living among the blond ruling class, would not be given a name denoting color.

We can infer that the people with names meaning *dark* were primarily those who succeeded, through superior ability, in rising into the blond ruling class, despite the color prejudices of the latter, together with dark individuals who moved into primarily fair communities. Correspondingly, the men given names meaning light-complexioned or light-eyed may have consisted primarily of those who were demoted for one reason or another to become part of the despised conquered population.

On this theory, the "dark" names may denote advance into the elite and the "fair" names demotion and rejection by the elite. The distinction would then be between "upstarts" and "downstarts." It is not surprising that the "upstarts" show greater ability.*

Aristocrats and Clan Leaders. Name-frequency analysis is of little use in gauging the contribution of European aristocracies to American leadership. Aristocrats are generally named for the places where their estates are. These names are naturally infrequent and hence are generally not included on the BOASI list. Where they are so included, it is a safe inference that they have been adopted by people not genealogically entitled to them.

The Scottish clan names do, however, occur with sufficient frequency so that over half of them are on the Social Security roster. The bearers of these clan names are not necessarily descended from Scottish lairds; they are in many instances the scions of tenant farmers and retainers of the lairds and even of the local poor who sought clan protection.

In unsettled periods, commoners assumed clan names to acquire clan protection and this was encouraged by clan leaders as a means of aggrandizing their power. The expansion of the Clan Mackenzie in the 16th and 17th Centuries was a result of the absorption of the tenantry on lands taken or bought by the clan chieftains.

"'Fraser of the boll of meal' were poor Bissets," writes Reaney, "who had changed their name to Fraser for a bribe. Oppressed people from the neighboring districts sought the protection of Gilbert Cumin who adopted them as clansmen by baptizing them in the stone hen-trough at his castle door. Henceforth, they were 'Cumins of the hen-trough'

to distinguish them from Cumins of the true blood."⁹

On the other hand, during the 17th Century, the more irredentist clans were persecuted by the British Crown and, for a considerable period of time, the *McGregors* were ordered to relinquish their surname on pain of death.

The influx of Irishmen into southwest Scotland added to the confusion as they naturalized their own Gaelic names in many instances into Clan equivalents. Some of the present-day *Cummings* are actually Irish name-changers from *McSkimming* and there are Irish *Grahams* who were originally *McGrimes*.¹⁰

Of the 101 Clan names listed by Reaney, 54 are on the BOASI roster of common surnames and are included in the tabulations which follow. Excluded are *Anderson*, *Brodie*, *Henderson*, *Kennedy*, *Morrison* and *Robertson*. All of these excluded names are hybrids of Scottish and other names. Thus *Anderson inter alia* is Scandinavian; *Henderson*, *Morrison* and *Robertson* are significantly English; *Kennedy* is mainly Irish and *Brodie* is to an unknown extent Jewish, Slavic and German.¹¹

When the Clan names are broken down by origin, they show up as follows in two key rosters:

Table 5. LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF SCOTTISH CLAN NAMES

Origin of Clan Names	No. on BOASI Rolls	Performance Coefficients in:	
		Who's Who in America 1956-57	American Men of Science, 9th Ed. (Volume 1)
French-Norman names	449,845	157	119
Scandinavian names	66,287	147	106
Scottish place-names	596,352	142	108
English names	864,722	128	99
Gaelic names	775,809	89	89
<i>Total and Arithmetic Means</i>	2,753,015	125	101

The table does not indicate that the Clan names do consistently better or worse than Scottish names in general. The bearers of Clan names are higher in the production of physical scientists, but lower in general eminence (*Who's Who in America*). This difference is not readily explicable, particularly since, in their valuable study of Scottish scientific achievement, Clement and Robertson find that the middle class, rather than the landed gentry, has provided most of Scotland's scientists and it has become increasingly unfashionable for the aristocracy to engage in scientific pursuits.¹²

Of the different Clan groups, the French and French-Norman names lead in both rosters. They are followed immediately by Scandinavian names and Scottish place-names. After a considerable lag, we find the English Clan names and, at the bottom of the list, the Gaelic Clan names. The very inferior performance of the Gaelic Clans is particularly noteworthy in *Who's Who in America*, though in both rosters they are way below the Scottish averages.

These Gaelic Clans are those which begin with "Mac" or "Mc." They tend to be concentrated in the Western Isles, the West Coast and Inner Hebrides and in the Central Highlands.

These regions were less accessible to the successive invasions which inundated Britain from the Continent. In fact, the Atlantoids in Scotland are settled all down the West Coast, including the Western Isles, and their presence there may provide a clue for the fact that the Highland area is less responsive to intellectual challenge than other parts of the country. In Northeast Scotland, the Southeast, the Lothians and the Border areas, regions heavily imprinted with Celtic, Anglo-Saxon and Norse genes, we tend to find a considerably more effective response to the leadership demands of modern civilization. If the Western Isles score considerably higher than the Central Highlands, this is perhaps partly due to the fact that the former were raided, conquered and partially settled by the Vikings.

Regions of High Ability in Scotland. An analysis of 65 Scottish names, borne by 2,629,000 persons on Social Security rolls, suggests that ability, as measured by inclusion in the 1956-57 edition of *Who's Who in America*, is concentrated in the Lowlands more than in the Highlands and is more marked in Eastern than in Western or Central Scotland. The zones of greatest achievement appear to be the Southwest and the Border; those of least accomplishment the Central Highlands and the East Coast Highlands.

Specifically, the average performance coefficient of the Lowlands was 160, that of the Highlands 138. The P.C.'s for the various regions were: Southwest (195), Border (191), Central South Scotland (160), Fife (157), Moray Firth (157), Buchan and Banff (154), North of the Clyde (154), South of the Clyde and Arran (145), Angus and Mearns (137), Western Isles, West Coast and Inner Hebrides (136), East Coast Highlands (127) and Central Highlands (125).

The poorer performance of the Highlands can be attributed, not only to the ethnic factors already noted, but to the character and institutions of Highland society. In the traditional civilization of Northwest Scot-

land, which still shows late Bronze Age features, marked physical prowess was admired, but not technical capacity. Society was not organized on highly competitive lines and class divisions were much less accentuated than elsewhere in Europe. With few exceptions, any Highland man could marry any Highland girl. Elsewhere, assortative mating had been the rule for centuries, and, in the most fertile areas of the Scottish Lowlands, the ownership of farms was carefully preserved among an elite who had enough money and leisure to allow many of its members to embark on intellectual pursuits.

In general terms, the pattern of Scottish regional ability disclosed by the performance coefficients is in accord with the findings of earlier observers. In 1869, Francis Galton observed in *Hereditary Genius*: "The average standard of the Lowland Scots and the English North-country men is decidedly a fraction of a grade superior to that of the ordinary English, because the number of the former who attain to eminence is far greater than the proportionate number of their race would have led us to expect."²⁸

Havelock Ellis published an analysis of British genius in 1926. It was based on some 1,030 entries in the 66 volumes of the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Ellis excluded all of the 30,000-odd entries who owed their eminence to advantages of birth, all who were merely notorious (Titus Oates being perhaps the most flagrant example), all women who were famous merely because of their connection with great men and all persons who were given less than three pages of text. This gave him about 700 names. He then added 330 entries, who in his personal opinion were "undoubtedly of very eminent ability and achievement . . ." Taking the English production of men of genius as his standard, Ellis concluded that "Wales has produced slightly less than her share of persons of ability, Ireland still less and Scotland decidedly more than her share."²⁹

As to regions in proportion to estimated population, Havelock Ellis found that "both Aberdeen and Edinburgh really are very prolific in ability, and that Ayr, Fife, and even Sutherland are little, if at all, inferior in intellectual fertility, while Haddingtonshire, Berwickshire, and Dumfriesshire would appear to stand probalby at the head. It would seem that even on a population basis the dark-haired populations show a somewhat less intellectual fertility than the fair-haired populations . . . If this tendency prevails in Scotland it is the reverse of the tendency which prevails in England (though not in Wales), where the darker-haired districts seem on the whole to be more prolific in ability than the fair-haired regions."³⁰

Ellis' regions of high creativity correspond fairly closely with ours. Ayrshire is in the Southwest (P.C. of 195), Dumfries and Berwick are in the Border (191), Edinburgh and Haddingtonshire are in the Lothians (156), while Fife has a P.C. of 157.

In 1927, Ellsworth Huntington attempted a quantitative analysis of the geography of intellectual achievement. He tabulated the 8,576 entries in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* who were born after 1600 by nationality and field of eminence.¹⁷ While this procedure obviously inflated the performance of the British Isles, it should have been more or less impartial in evaluating the comparative achievements of Scots and Englishmen.

When Huntington deflated his figures by his estimates for population in 1800, he found that Scotland produced 381 eminent men per million inhabitants, England and Wales 324 eminent men and Ireland 58 eminent men. As for scientists per million, the Scots provided 71.8, the English and Welsh 43.0 and the Irish 56.

The Decline of the Scottish Intellect. The decline of Scottish genius is a continuing trend which has been visible for a long time and which causes grave concern among far-sighted Scots. Summarizing what occurred in the century between 1850 and 1950, Robert H. S. Robertson wrote: "In round figures, therefore, the decline in actual output per million of inventors and discoverers since the peak has been 87%, in the less original though still very bright sample of Fellows of the Royal Society about 47%, and in the more numerous class of people who take out patents 28%. The results are consistent among themselves, and prove that the decline in the first and most valuable group is catastrophic; in the second group disastrous, and in the third group serious."¹⁸

Other symptoms of this decline are backward business methods, stagnation in higher education and insufficient entries into the Scottish medical school.¹⁹ Robertson also found that the failure rate in Scottish universities was 18.8%, as against 12.7% in English universities. Moreover, "failures among English students at Scottish universities were very much smaller than among the Scots . . ."²⁰

In summarizing the reasons for this dramatic loss of intellectual vigor and capacity, Robertson stated: "Environmental arguments fail to explain the observed decline in output of Scottish genius since 1800. The effects clearly have a genetic cause, namely the slow destruction of a breeding stock of very bright Scots due to emigration of the brightest. This emigration was due to the attraction to places of

greater opportunity and is now avoidable since opportunities and research and development expenditure can be spread geographically by government or industrial decision."²¹

The decline in Scottish leadership is associated with alcoholism. Alcoholics in Scotland usually die before the age of 50 and 15% die within three years after becoming alcoholics, according to the Scottish Council of the British Medical Association as reported by Reuters on May 23, 1964. The Council added that in 1962 more than 10% of all admissions to Scottish hospitals were due to alcohol and that seven times as many alcoholics in Scotland as in England (in proportion to population) were admitted to hospitals.

Clerical and Occupational Names. In the chapter on the Puritan elite, I gave details of the role of these two special groups in the American creative minority. To recapitulate: The average performance coefficient of the Special British Occupational Surnames was 218 and that of the British Clerical Names was 130 in the 75 rosters.

The Special British Occupational Surnames are *Cooke, Draper, Miner* and *Potter*. They were chosen simply because they were found to be the four highest British non-clerical, occupational surnames in *Who's Who in America 1956-57*. They were analyzed in the other rosters to find out whether a high score found in one representative listing would be repeated in all, or nearly all, of the others. The finding was affirmative.

When I first published performance coefficients for the Special British Occupational Surnames, I pointed out that this consistent superiority was an observed datum I was unable to explain in terms of original intellectual or occupational status.²²

The distinguished editor of the *Mankind Quarterly*, Dr. Robert Gayre of Gayre, after observing that the trades, together with the aristocracy and the clerics, formed the leading element in medieval society, made the following interesting suggestion:

"I would expect, therefore, to find trade names making high scores, since tradesmen in the Middle Ages were the people who provided the whole impetus of civil life, development and merchant venturing, and out of its profits built cathedrals, and fine parish churches — such as those built out of the wool trade in East Anglia, and which are a marvel to this day. We ought not to confuse the relatively low estimate of tradesmen today with tradesmen of 700 to 500 years ago. In fact, they were the equivalent of what are often enough today the business executives and bankers of our time. Wolsey was the son

of a butcher, for instance, and out of these tradesmen came many of the clerics. Therefore, I would, in fact, expect the leading trade names to do well, perhaps as well as the clerical.

"This I would especially expect for the *Drapers*, who were the leading merchants and merchant venturers, and *Miners*. The miners were not merely mine workers. They were engineers and sappers and master men. In Cornwall, they were so privileged that they were allowed their own Stannery Courts and could not be tried before the Royal Courts."²⁸

The three British Clerical Names chosen were *Clark*, *Clarke* and *Palmer*. They represented 386,000 of the 117,300,000 persons on Social Security in mid-1956. The hypothesis to be explored was that this group, being presumably genetically superior at about the time of the Crusades when surnames were first adopted in England, continued to mate and reproduce selectively, thus preserving its superiority. An affirmative answer presupposed the persistence of sexual selection for intelligence over about 25 generations and 750 years, despite the fact that, during the latter part of this time-span at least, the bearers of these names did not enjoy any status superior to that of their neighbors of English descent.

Given this statement of the case, a finding of superiority for the British Clerical Name Group seemed most improbable. As it turned out, however, these names are generally superior, particularly in those leadership rosters which measure scholarship, scientific ability or aesthetic work.

In making comparisons of this sort, it is vitally important that the names be intelligently selected. *Pope's* and *Bishop's*, for example, do not belong in a sample of British clerical names. The former are obviously not the illegitimate scions of Pontiffs at Rome, but probably the descendants of people who played the role of Pope in miracle plays. English *Bishop's* may be descended from actors in the same fashion or may alternately descend from the children or servants of bishops.

As for the three names used in the Clerical sample, the *Oxford English Dictionary* has this to say about *clerk*, from which *Clark* and *Clarke*, of course, directly derive: "The original sense was 'man in a religious order, cleric, clergyman.' As the scholarship of the Middle Ages was practically limited to the clergy, and these performed all the writing, notarial, and secretarial work of the time, 'clerk' came to be equivalent to 'scholar,' and specially adapted to a notary, secretary, recorder, accountant or penman."

As for *Palmer*, the same admirable source gives this definition: "A pilgrim who had returned from the Holy Land, in sign of which he carried a palm-branch or palm-leaf; also, an itinerant monk who travelled from shrine to shrine, under a perpetual vow of poverty; often simply an equivalent of *pilgrim*."

Writing around the time surnames were taken in England, R. Brunne observed: "A schort staf he dide hym make, Als palmeres in handes take."²⁴ And some three centuries later, there is this interesting comment by Stavely:

"The Pilgrim had some home, or dwelling place, but the Palmer had none. The Pilgrim travelled to some certain designed place, or places, but the Palmer to all. The Pilgrim went at his own charges, but the Palmer profest wilful poverty, and went upon Alms."²⁵

Uncommon Spellings of Common Names. Minority spellings of very common names yield exceptionally high performance coefficients. This applies particularly to the addition of a terminal "e," which Guppy terms "an affix usually significant of a rise in the social scale, or as it might perhaps be more correctly expressed, of a transference from the Trade to the Court Directory."²⁶

The terminal "e" and other unusual spellings are often regarded as evidence of snobbery and pretentiousness. Thus, Abraham Lincoln was fond of remarking that his wife had been one of *the* Todds of Kentucky and that they spelled the name with two "d"s although one had sufficed for God.

As a rule, the differences between the performance coefficients of the two spellings will vary directly with the commonness of the name and inversely with the ratio of unusual to usual spellings of it. The gap was much greater in the past than it is today, indicating the increasing tendency of American leadership to put on democratic airs and strive to appear "folksy."²⁷ Obviously, the difference is more marked in leadership rosters which emphasize status, such as social directories and *Who's Whos*, than in rosters of professionals and scientists, where ability and competence are the admission tickets.

These differences are almost always hereditary, but we cannot estimate the number of generations separating the acquisition of the unusual spelling from the present. Since spelling of names became stabilized in the United States around 1800, it is safe to assume that a large proportion of the changes occurred more than five generations ago.

The observed differences between the performance coefficients of

rare and common spelling are sometimes overstated because of the Negro element in the American population. The emancipated slaves "seem not to have converted any place names into surnames."²⁸ They avoided animal names and almost all occupational names other than Smith. Their usual practice was to adopt the Christian name of their master, a name denoting color, or else the surnames of whites whom they admired.

The choice of heroes was of interest. Four-fifths of all *Washingtons* are Negro. Over a third of the *Howards* are of African descent, this being in honor of General Oliver Otis Howard who was in charge of the Freedmen's Bureau between 1865 and 1874 and hence fed, clothed and voted the emancipated blacks. *Davis* is a very common Negro name in honor of the President of the Confederate States of America, and many are named *Jefferson*, *Jackson* and *Johnson* for three Presidents, all of whom held very low opinions of the Negro. (The Johnson in question was, of course, Andrew, not Lyndon.) By contrast, there are few colored *Lincolns*, *Sumners* or *Grants*.

In the large majority of instances, the Negroes chose the commonest spellings of the commonest names. The distortion effect of the Negro presence is indicated by the case of *Brown*. Barker found that, in a list of 13,000 Negro names, 163 per 100,000 bore the name *Brown*, whereas there were only 60 *Browns* per 100,000 in the Confederate States Army, an exclusively white organization.

The names chosen to compare common with rare spellings were *Cook-Cooke*, *Clark-Clarke*, *Green-Greene*, *Brown-Browne*, *Thompson-Thomson*, *Johnson-Johnston* and *McDonald-MacDonald*. The first four name-pairs require no comment. As for the others, *Thomson* is more generally Scottish and *Thompson* English. The same applies to *Johnston*, which is also sometimes a place name (Johnstone meaning John's Manor in Dumfriesshire). As a general rule, *McDonald* is Irish and *MacDonald* Scottish.

The arithmetic means of the performance coefficients of the name-pairs in 14 rosters, without adjustment for Negroes, are as follows:

As the table shows, the ratios of the rare to the common spellings range between 1.4 and 4.5 to one. The differences between the leadership contributions of those with common and those with uncommon spellings is steadily declining. Thus, the ratio fell from 4.5 in *Who's Who in America 1910-11* to 2.3 in the 1962-63 edition of the same volume. The inference is that, with increasing deference to the common man in America, the elite progressively loses interest in setting itself apart from the herd.

Who's Who in America 1962-63
Performance Coefficients
(Averages of 14 Rosters)

<i>Names</i>	
Brown	79
Browne	360
Clark	108
Clarke	245
Cook	83
Cooke	242
Green	75
Greene	164
Johnson	57
Johnston	161
McDonald	57
MacDonald	159
Thompson	84
Thomson	265

Common and Rare Names. In an article in *Names*, the journal of the American Name Society, Elsdon C. Smith dealt with the question of whether possession of a common surname is conducive to success in the United States.²⁹ His method was to compare the presence of the the 200 most common names in the United States in *Who's Who in America 1960-61* with their presence in the general population. Using estimates by Odell and Strong, he found that 127 of these most common names were English, 27 Welsh, 15 Irish, 15 Scottish, eight Scandinavian, five German, one Dutch, one Jewish and one of mixed Nordic origin.³⁰

Smith found that the bearers of the more common names are definitely less distinguished and this by a wide margin. The 200 names had a performance coefficient of only 88 in *Who's Who in America*. The English performance coefficient was 90, the Welsh 86, the Irish 79, the Scottish above 100, the Scandanavian 65 and the German 94.

An examination of the 1,029 names on the BOASI list which can be unambiguously attributed to one of six national-linguistic groups covers 40.5 million of the 117.3 million persons on Social Security rolls in 1956.³¹ The indications are that the most common names have the lowest achievement.

Table 6. COMMONNESS OF SURNAME AND PERFORMANCE COEFFICIENTS
IN WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA, 1956-57

<i>Surname Category</i>	<i>Number of Names</i>	<i>Number on BOASI List (Mils.)</i>	<i>Mean of Performance Coefficients</i>
Over 80,000	92	18.5	92
30,000 — 80,000	210	10.0	118
20,000 — 30,000	197	4.3	117
15,000 — 20,000	188	3.7	127
10,000 — 15,000	342	4.0	122
<i>Totals and Average</i>	1,029	40.5	111

The relationship between commonness of surname and performance coefficients varies from one national-linguistic group to the next. Thus, the most frequent English names have an average P.C. of only 104, those in the 30,000 to 80,000 category score 126, the 20,000-30,000 bracket averages 111, the 15,000-20,000 group makes 145 and the 10,000-15,000 group averages 134.

As for the other national-linguistic groups, Scottish names over 80,000 score 120, whereas the four groups of rarer names have averages of 135 to 151. In the Irish case, the most common category averages 101, the other four range between 96 and 125. The Welsh and Germans, like the Irish, are erratic, but there is a tendency here as in the other series for the highest scores to be manifest in the 15,000 to 80,000 area. The Spanish names have performance coefficients which are clearly correlated with rarity of occurrence. Spanish names with more than 80,000 representatives on BOASI average a P.C. of nine, those with from 10,000 to 15,000 representatives on BOASI rosters average 20.

Smith found that people bearing patronymics were less distinguished than those belonging to other name groups. In his 200 most common names, the average P.C. of the bearers of patronymics was 82, that for descriptive names was 94, that for place names 95 and for occupational names 96, the average for all the 200 common names being 88.²⁸

Smith's attempted explanation of this difference is ingenious. He points out that family names were generally arbitrarily assigned to people by manor clerks and others of that sort. Those who had special occupations might be named accordingly (for example, *Ward* for the game warden), similarly with those with some peculiar characteristic (thus, *Kennedy*, the man with an ugly or misshapen head) and still others for the places where they lived (for example, *Snooks*, the man who lived near seven oaks).

"But if he were not outstanding in any way," Smith writes, "and was

just a mild, colorless individual, he might be identified by a reference to his father, a patronymical surname. So the son of Will became Wilson, the son of Harry became Harrison. Would such persons be less likely to have descendants in *Who's Who*? The table above bears this out. Out of 50,000 people, 6,224 would bear common patronymical surnames, but only 5,097 with common patronymical names are found in *Who's Who*.²³⁸

This is an interesting theory, but it is not the principal cause of the difference in achievement between the bearers of patronymics and the bearers of other names. The other causal factor is that most colored people assumed patronymics after the Civil War and almost invariably took the simplest and least sophisticated ones.

The influence of the Negro presence is indicated by this comparison: Some 61 English and Welsh names, deriving from common Christian names have an average P.C. of 90.5 in *Who's Who in America 1956-57*.³⁴ The 13 most common of these names, borne by 5,560,000 persons on BOASI, had an average P.C. of 87, whereas the 48 less common ones, borne by 1,486,000 persons on BOASI, had an average P.C. of 108. The dividing line between most common and less common was whether a name had 200,000 BOASI entries.

Summary. Thus, in examining the structure of nomenclature within countries and with particular reference to Great Britain and Ireland, we have found significant differences, not all of which would have been expected *a priori*.

In the area of color names, names meaning "dark" are uniformly associated with higher achievement than those signifying "ruddy" or "light" among the English, Scots and Irish.

Gaelic Clan names are significantly lower in leadership representation than French-Norman, Scandinavian, English and Scottish place-names borne by the Clans of Scotland.

Name-frequency analysis provides a means of detecting zones of high and of low ability. In Scotland, the East Coast, Lowlands, Lothians and Border, regions of heavy Anglo-Saxon settlement and of subsequent invasion and mixture, appear more productive of intellectual elites than the more isolated and more Atlantoid Highlands, Western Coast and Inner Islands.

Clerical and Special Occupational Surnames tend to be superior.

Common names with rare spellings are much more productive than common names with common spellings. The presumed reason is that people with common names who are ambitious for success, or who

have already attained it, take steps to differentiate their names from those of the mass of the population.

Finally, rare surnames are more heavily represented in the elite than common surnames; moreover, patrynomics do more poorly than descriptive, place or occupational surnames.

THE ROLE OF THE JEWS

The persistence of Jewish intellectual ability on a scale utterly disproportionate to Jewish numbers is a riddle which sociologists have vainly attempted to solve in environmental terms. I have already suggested a biogenetic explanation: namely, that Jewish intellectual eminence can be regarded as the end-result of seventeen centuries of selective breeding for scholars. The history of the Jewish people is biologically unique in that its aristocracy has consisted of a carefully selected intellectual elite, in that this elite was encouraged to reproduce and in the fact that social institutions conspired to ensure to the progeny of this elite greater chances of survival than to the rest of Jewry.

A more recent historic influence on the Jewish differential reproductive pattern was the effort of Austria and the German states to prevent any increase in Jewish numbers. Throughout Central Europe between 1745 and 1848, the law provided that only the eldest son of a Jewish family could marry and build up a family.¹ In Berlin, the size of the Jewish community was fixed by law around 1700 A.D. Only one son and one daughter could marry free. The others were permitted marriage only if their possessions reached a stipulated amount, the requirement being higher for each successive child. Moreover, the charge imposed for the 'marriage privilege' was increased for each successive child who claimed it.²

Despite these laws, Jewish population increased; in fact, it increased rapidly. In 1705, there were 15 Jewish families in Dresden; in 1763, 200. The main Jewish communities of Germany, Austria and Bohemia had only 18,000 inhabitants in the early 17th Century;³ by 1770, there were 200,000 Jews in Germany alone. Some of this increase can, of course, be attributed to immigration. However, the ghetti were rigorously controlled by the police and Jews were not free to enter the cities without paying a humiliating entry tax that was also imposed upon cattle.

To the extent that the gains in Jewish population were the result of natural increase, the rich must have fared much better than the poor. The former could obtain the marriage privilege for all their children either by paying the tax or by bribing local officials. Wherever

these laws were strictly enforced, the poor were compelled to let their younger children live and die as bachelors and spinsters. With only two married children per couple, the indigent Jews would not even have been able to maintain their numbers.

Thus, this despicable legislation probably brought about a major change in the genetic pool—the collective hereditary endowment—of German and Austrian Jewry. The premium it placed was on wealth alone. Yet, as I have already indicated, under the peculiar social conditions of the Jewish religious enclave, the well-to-do were inextricably mixed through marriage with the Jewish aristocracy of learning. Hence, the unintended effect of the laws limiting Jewish marriage was to ensure that the scholarly class contributed a disproportionately large share of the population increase.

Petty, unfeeling and sordid as were the motivations for these laws, their objective effect was of a very different nature. Virtually at the very moment when the Jewish demographic expansion of the era of the European Enlightenment got under way, they served to channel it in such a manner that the best and most gifted outbred the rest and thus further raised the hereditary mental endowment of Jewry as a whole. The laws furthered, in short, that eugenic evolution which was silently shaping the dispersed, persecuted and superstitious ranks of European Jewry into an aristocracy of intellect which has had few equals since the eclipse of Hellenistic Civilization.

General Position of the Jews. As could be expected on general biogenetic grounds, the Jewish position of intellectual leadership among the national-linguistic stocks amounts virtually to pre-eminence. For self-evident reasons, the Jews trail in the rosters referring to the past elite. Here they are in seventh place. In the present elite, they are in first place and, in the future elite, decisively so.

More specifically. In all 75 rosters, the Jews lead with an average performance coefficient of 204—more than 75 points above the Scots in second place. In the five rosters of future leadership, the average Jewish performance coefficient almost doubles to reach 362. The Jews occupy first place in none of the 12 past rosters, in 31 of the 58 present ones and in 3 of the five future ones.

The Jews as a whole are not in competition with any other national-linguistic group as a whole. Rather they are in competition with the highly selected Puritan, Special Occupational and Clerical elite groups chosen from the mass of British stock. When a simple, unweighted average of these three groups is taken, we find that they do about

seven and a half times as well as the Jews in past elites, almost as well in present elites, and only a third as well in future elites.

Jews in Phi Beta Kappa. With approximately 180,000 members living and dead and a continuous existence since 1776, Phi Beta Kappa is the outstanding academic honors society in the United States. However, it was not always so. In its early years, it was a college secret society, founded for social purposes and not materially different from other fraternities of the sort.⁵

The Jewish performance coefficient for Phi Beta Kappa membership during the 1776-1922 period is 102. Currently, Jews comprise about 3% of the United States population. In 1904, which is the approximate midpoint of the Phi Beta Kappa membership data under consideration, they were about 2% of the population and probably about 2% of the college students. This is indicated by a survey which shows that 2% of the college graduates who were over 50 in 1946-47 were Jewish.⁶ It follows that the Jewish performance coefficient for Phi Beta Kappa membership in the first decade of the 20th Century, adjusted for the fact that Jews comprised only 2% of the population, was 153.

During the 1923-61 period the Jewish performance coefficient in Phi Beta Kappa was 386.⁷ At the time, the Jews were approximately 3% of the population, as they are today. They constituted about 6% of college enrollment.⁸ Thus, the Jews were about twice as heavily represented in college student bodies as in the general population and more than three times as heavily represented in Phi Beta Kappa membership as in the U.S. population.

The Jewish performance coefficient for 1962 elections to Phi Beta Kappa was 439—an increase of about 14%. By 1955, some 62% of the Jews of college age were in higher education institutions as against 26% for the general population.⁹ Another study, based on careful analysis of Census data, showed that 22% of the Jews, but only 9% of the Protestants and 7% of the Catholics, were college graduates. Moreover, 33% of the Jews, but only 20% of the Protestants and 16% of the Catholics had had some college education.¹⁰ Jewish college enrollment was evidently approaching its saturation point whereas non-Jewish enrollment still had a long way to go. On this basis, a narrowing of the gap between Jews and non-Jews in the future, both in college attendance and in Phi Beta Kappa membership, seemed not improbable.

The Jewish performance coefficient for Merit Scholarships averaged 205 for the 1955-1961 period. This was dramatically lower than the Phi Beta Kappa figures for approximately the same period. One

reason for the difference is that financial need is a significant factor in choosing the 1,300 or so Merit Scholars from the 11,000-odd Semi-Finalists who qualify by passing a three-hour test of educational development (NMSQT) with a very high score.¹¹ Since Jewish incomes are much higher than non-Jewish, proportionately fewer Jews would qualify as needing the stipend.

The Jewish performance coefficient among North American members of Mensa is 474, which is very close to the Jewish score of 439 in 1962 elections to Phi Beta Kappa. Mensa is primarily a social organization, the sole membership qualification of which is to rank in the first 2% of the population in psychometric intelligence. At the time these performance coefficients were taken (June 1965), Mensa had about 6,500 members in the United States and Canada. Their average age was about 30.

In the *Directory of American Scholars* for 1957, Jewish representation is about 70% better than the national average. In both the 9th and 10th editions of *American Men of Science*, covering the middle 1950's and early 1960's respectively, Jews contributed about 2½ times the statistical expectation to the physical and biological sciences. Jewish participation in *American Men of Science* rose from 254 in the ninth edition (1955) to 287 in the tenth (1961).

The Professions. Jewish leadership is marked in most of the professions. In descending rank order, the Jewish performance coefficients are: psychiatrists 578, medical specialists 408, dentists 399, mathematicians 383, statisticians 381, lawyers 363, doctors 331, architects 170, Foreign Service officers 118 and engineers 109.

This array contains few surprises. The Jews are particularly heavily represented in the free professions and, above all, in those related to healing, as was the case in pre-Nazi Europe. Not unexpectedly, psychiatry is the profession with proportionately greatest Jewish representation. Not only was the founder of psychoanalysis a Jew, but virtually all of Freud's early collaborators were of Jewish origin. The label of "the Jewish science" so disturbed Freud that he did everything possible to persuade Jung to remain in the leadership of the International Psychoanalytic Society despite Jung's basic disagreements with the Freudian system.

In Glazer's opinion, the popularity of psychoanalysis among American Jews is a reflection of the rapid disintegration of Judaism and the dwindling of Jewish religious belief. "For here was a scientific form of soul-rebuilding," he writes, "to make them whole and hardy, and it was

divorced, at least on the surface, from mysticism, will, religion and all those romantic and obscure trends that their rational minds rejected. And then too, it was a new field with room for new people, which fact may explain why so many Jews became analysts. But it is primarily the secularization of the second-generation East European Jews in America that explains why so many became patients."¹² The calling of psychoanalysis was no doubt also attractive to Jews of East European origin who were steeped in Talmudic traditions, because it involved a highly abstract manipulation of abstruse concepts and a minimum of scientific experimentation. In general, sciences which impinge on ethical terrain, and particularly on such concepts as equality, brotherhood and internationalism, have been differentially attractive to Jews.¹³

The Jewish performance coefficient for members of the American Psychiatric Association reflects this very high concentration. This figure suggests that almost one psychiatrist out of every five in America is Jewish. One should remember that this is an area in which name-changing may well obscure the real extent of Jewish participation. Moreover, most psychiatrists are not psychoanalysts and it is the latter field which is commonly believed to be the concentration area par excellence of the Jewish professionals.

Turning to some of the other professions, the high Jewish performance coefficients for dentists, medical specialists and physicians reflect a traditional concentration on medicine. During the Middle Ages in particular, Jewish physicians were renowned for their skill and learning. Despite Church injunctions against their employment by Christians, some became the personal physicians of kings and a few of Popes. Often the rabbi-theologian was a physician as well.

The *American Medical Directory* (1960-61) is a roster of the 251,500 members of the American Medical Association in the United States, its overseas possessions and the Canal Zone. The *Directory of Medical Specialists* (1961) is a more selective roster which contains the names of the 71,846 doctors who were certified prior to June 1960 by 19 official boards. The specialists' roster, therefore, represents a more rigorous selection process and usually presupposes higher professional standards than does mere membership in the A.M.A.

Accordingly, a group's performance coefficient in the directory of specialists, divided by its coefficient in the more general *American Medical Directory*, can be considered as an index of promotion, that is of advance, within the medical field to more exacting, more remunerative and higher-status levels. This index is 124 for the Jews. The only other national groups with positive promotion indexes in medicine are

the Scots (105) and Germans (101). English, French and Scandinavians all have a promotion index of 96, meaning that their representation is 4% lower among specialists than among ordinary doctors. The three special groups have an average index of 98; they are followed by the Dutch (89), Irish (87), Slavs (84), Welsh (76), Italians (75), Spanish (65) and Chinese (46).

These findings are substantially confirmed by detailed sociological studies of Jewish representation in the professions. By the mid-1930's studies in San Francisco and Pittsburgh showed that there were proportionately about 3½ times as many Jews as non-Jews in medicine and law.¹⁴ Comparing these early studies with surveys by local Jewish communities of the U.S. cities between 1948 and 1953,¹⁵ we find that the proportion of professionals had increased from about 11% to approximately 15% of the Jewish gainfully employed.¹⁶ The contribution of the Jewish communities to medicine and law was already very high in the 1930's and probably has not increased since that time.

College faculty members were not included in the array of performance coefficients as they were put in the category of *scholarship* rather than that of *professionals*. Based on faculty rosters for five elite colleges (Bryn Mawr, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton and Wellesley) and 12 other institutions of higher education (Arizona, Auburn, Cincinnati, Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, M.I.T., Miami, Missouri, Northwestern, Virginia and Western Michigan), the Jewish performance coefficient for all 17 institutions was 258. This is slightly higher than the Puritan score and about 2½ times the coefficient of the English, who are in second place. In the five elite colleges, the Jewish performance coefficient was 395; in the 11 others, it was only 195. In short, the same factor of promotion is at work here that was noted in the field of medicine.

This pattern of Jewish leadership in all higher institutions, and of concentrated Jewish leadership in the socially and intellectually elite fraction of these institutions, applies not merely to faculty, but to student bodies as well. The Jewish performance coefficient for attendance at five elite colleges is 465 as against only 343 for enrollment in 10 other higher educational institutions.¹⁷

The Jewish performance coefficient in *Who's Who in American Education* (21st edition, 1963-64) is only 90 and the Jews rank eighth among the 11 national-linguistic groups with positive scores. This roster has other peculiarities not characteristic of the customary pattern of the scholarly elite: for example, the Scots are in fifth place. It is primarily a listing of deans and other educational administrative

officers. A spot check revealed that professors who were Nobel science laureates, but who lacked administrative rank, were not included.

In general, Jewish performance in the salaried professions is less spectacular than in the free professions. Discrimination no doubt plays a significant role, but it is not necessarily the most important element in the picture. As an individualist, who values originality, prefers to make his own decisions and enjoys playing for high stakes, the American Jew has tended to shun those status-bound careers which stress security and team work and in which seniority plays a major role in promotion.

Who's Who in America. The successive editions of *Who's Who in America* and *Who Was Who in America* provide a synoptic picture of the changes in American leadership over three and a half centuries. The elites covered by these volumes are broad in scope and represent a mixture of status and individual ability.

The Jewish record in this area is one of steady ascent. For the period 1607-1896, the Jewish performance coefficient is 13. In 1897-1942, it advances to 48; in 1943-50 to 56 and in 1951-60 to 90. Shifting now from *Who Was Who* to *Who's Who*, we get a Jewish performance coefficient of 45 in 1910-11, 43 in 1919, 58 in 1930-31, 121 in 1956-57, 154 in 1962-63 and 161 in 1964-65. The turning point, as far as Jewish emergence into this comprehensive elite is concerned, was the era of Roosevelt and Eisenhower.

Even in the most recent volumes of *Who's Who*, Jewish leadership is less marked than in certain more specialized intellectual rosters. *Who's Who in America* seeks to include those residents of the Western Hemisphere who "have accomplished some conspicuous achievement . . . which distinguishes them from the vast majority of their contemporaries" and which makes them "subject to wide inquiry or discussion" by Americans.¹⁸ The sphere of achievement covered is rather broader than the fields of intellectual and aesthetic creativity on which I have concentrated and in which the Jews tend particularly to excel.

In addition, *Who's Who in America* is a roster of men and women of high status and position, regardless of whether this is obtained by merit, popular election, inheritance or chance. It automatically includes a large number of elected and appointed public officials, officers of the armed forces, business executives, educators and clergymen, as well as scientists, artists and writers. Rising elites—and the Jews are a conspicuous example—are not usually prominent in rosters of high status, for it takes time for achievement to be translated into prestige.

Invention, Business, the Military. The Jewish performance coefficient for patents granted between 1952 and July 1963 is 210, which is about equal to the Dutch (223) and the Puritan (203) performances.¹⁹

The Jewish performance coefficient in business leadership is 217 as measured by *Poor's Register*, but only 144 as measured by *Who's Who in Commerce and Industry*. This very large difference can almost certainly be attributed to the fact that the latter index is much more selective than the former. *Poor's* includes about 75,000 entries; the commercial and industrial *Who's Who* contains only some 23,000.

Two conclusions are suggested. First, the frequently voiced complaint that Jews suffer from discrimination in corporate employment does not tell the whole story. In the 75,000 top business positions in the country, the Jewish representation is over twice that of Americans in general and is higher than that of any other national stock. Among the 23,000 top positions, Jewish representation is almost 50% above average and the Jews rank first among the 15 national-linguistic groups. This finding corresponds to the generally known and widely reported fact that the Jews of America *as a whole* belong to the middle and upper classes and that their average income is much higher than that of other racial, religious, national or linguistic groups. In a business society, high income presupposes heavy representation in the leadership of industrial, financial, and commercial establishments.

As to the extent of these differences in income, Bernard Lazerwitz reported that 28% of U.S. Protestants, 19% of U.S. Catholics, but only 7% of non-New York Jews had incomes under \$3,000. Some 18% of the Catholics, 18% Protestants, but 54% of the Jews, made over \$7,500.²⁰ A more comprehensive report by Herman P. Miller stated that about one out of every five Jewish family heads made over \$10,000 as against one out of every 20 Protestant and Catholic family heads. Some 51% of the Protestant family heads, but only 42% of their Catholic and 27% of their Jewish counterparts, earned under \$4,000.²¹ Miller's figures refer to the 1953-55 period.

On the other hand, Jewish leadership in business tends to vary inversely with the size of the corporation. *Fortune* for July 1964 published a listing of the 500 leading corporations in the United States. Taking the first 250 of these in terms of size, it was found that they had 7,868 officers and directors listed in *Moody's Manual*.

The Jewish performance coefficient for leadership of these 250 top corporations was only 82, placing the Jews almost at the bottom of the seven national-linguistic groups with positive scores. By contrast, the Puritan performance coefficient was 358 and that of British Cleri-

cal Names 123. Scots led the national groups with 182, followed by Irish (124), Welsh (123), English (110) and Scandinavians (108). The Germans scored 56 and all other national groups were negligible or zero.

The pattern is very similar among 1,393 directors and top executive officers of big utilities companies, 4,501 leaders of banks, 1,734 key men in insurance and 1,603 heads of transportation companies. The Jewish performance coefficients vary from 75 in transportation to 38 in banks and are negligible in the other two categories.

The only sector in which Jews excel in corporation leadership is merchandizing. On the basis of 1,438 listed officers and directors of merchandizing corporations in the *Fortune* roster, the Jewish performance coefficient is 404, or more than double the rating of the Scots who are in second place.

Considering the 18,537 officers and directors listed in the *Fortune* corporations in all six categories combined, Scots lead with 158, followed by Irish (126), Dutch, (117), English (107), Jews and Scandinavians (95), Germans (73) and Welsh (72). The other stocks score negligible to nil. The suggested inference that leadership of the greatest American corporations is largely a prerogative of the old-established, socially elite stocks is reinforced by the fact that Puritan Names score 283, Clerical Names 199 and British Special Occupations 124. It is noteworthy that the usual rank order among the English-speaking groups does not prevail here. The Irish are well ahead of the English and the Welsh lag far behind. The very low German score is also atypical.

Proportionately, non-Jewish graduates of Harvard Business School outnumbered Jewish graduates in leading U.S. corporations by 30 to one, according to an American Jewish Committee study.²² Of 844 vice-presidents and higher officers of eight of the largest banks in New York City, only 30 were found to be Jews in a 1960 study by the Anti-Defamation League.²³ This represented less than 4% in a city which is approximately 25% Jewish.

In very many of the top corporations of the United States, no Jews, or hardly any Jews, are employed at senior executive levels. Where they are so employed, the tendency is to put them in internal specialized positions, rather than in line jobs.²⁴

The compensatory factor, of course, is the rather substantial portion of American business enterprise which is Jewish. In the construction and real estate field, there are such giants as Webb and Knapp, Uris Brothers, the Tishman, Levitt, Rudin and Wolfson enterprises, to name

a few outstanding ones. The Jewish position is also exceptionally strong in hotels, in TV-radio-electronics-cinema, in department stores and in various other areas.

The unimpressive position of the American Jew in the military profession is too well known to require extended comment. The Jewish performance coefficient is 52 among active and 86 among retired officers in the American armed forces. *Prima facie* causes of the paucity of Jewish officers are anti-military and radical attitudes, the low prestige which the military career enjoys among Jews and dislike of routinized, conformist occupations.

Politics Jewish performance varies between 42 and 487 in five different rosters of politics and politicians. *Who's Who in Politics* is a 1950 compendium of professional politicians. It shows a Jewish P. C. of 42 for Republicans and 66 for Democrats. The trade union counterpart of this volume is *Who's Who in Labor* (1946), in which the Jewish P.C. is 201. Subject to the qualification that these directories are 15 and 20 years out of date, they reveal a Jewish aversion to politics as a career and the strongly liberal-to-leftwing tendency of Jewish activity. For every two Jewish Republican politicians, there were three Democratic and ten Jewish union leaders.

The Jewish performance coefficient for membership in the Council of Foreign Relations is 199. The Council is a most influential organization which engages in the study of world affairs, proposals for American foreign policy and the dissemination of information and advocacy of internationalist views through books, conferences and its distinguished journal, the *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*. Membership is limited to 700 persons from the Greater New York area and 700 from elsewhere in the country. The members are elected. They are almost always eminent in the foreign policy field. They are generally committed to far-reaching international cooperation.

Within the limits suggested by this summary, the membership of the Council (in this case for the year ended June 30, 1962) is an outstanding roster of the power elite in the field of foreign affairs. At first blush, the Jewish P.C. in this group appears impressive. Actually, when one considers that half the membership of the Council must live within commuting distance of New York City, a metropolis that is 25% Jewish, it becomes evident that the Jews are under-represented. This is merely another instance in which Jewish leadership in prestige-laden rosters is far less than Jewish leadership in fields where promotion is based on intelligence, creativity and hard work.

Finally, there is the roster of "subversives." It is essential to be quite clear as to what this rubric covers. It comprises the proper names in the House Committee on Un-American Activities *Supplement to Cumulative Index, 1955-1960*, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, *Cumulative Index, 1951-55*.

Some of the names on these rosters are those of persons mentioned in an innocent context. Others were named because of peripheral involvement with communistic activities. However, the rosters consist primarily of people charged with Communist activities by sworn witnesses. Since the Senate and House are not much concerned with the activities of the rank and file of American Communism, the rosters concentrate on the leadership element. With the qualifications already noted, these directories can be considered as a listing of the leadership of a political movement dedicated to the destruction of American institutions, but nonetheless a *political movement*. We are not dealing here with a non-elite, such as narcotics addicts, prostitutes or the feeble-minded; we are dealing with an elite which, by American standards, is a morally perverse one.

The Jewish performance in these rosters is 487, reflecting the well-known fact that, despite the anti-semitic policies of the Soviet Union, the world Communist movement is particularly attractive to Jews. To what extent is this figure a valid index of American Jewish participation in Communist activities? There would seem to be two important qualifications. The first is that a very large number of Jewish Communists assume "party names" or *noms de guerre*. This is done either for conspiratorial reasons or to make the Communist movement more acceptable to native American recruits. In either case, the Jewish Communist will typically assume an Anglo-Saxon name. Cases of changes in the reverse direction are virtually non-existent. The second modifying factor is that some of the names in the rosters are those of non-communists. The pattern in these instances in respect to Jewishness should lie somewhere between Jewish representation in the general population and in the general American elite, say a P.C. ranging between 100 and 200. *Thus, for both reasons, the reported Jewish performance coefficient of 487 seriously understates Jewish participation in the American Communist movement.*

These estimates can be compared to data released by the Attorney General on the national background of 4,984 "of the more militant members of the Communist Party" of the United States in 1947.²⁸ This showed that 44.0% of these Communist cadre elements were Russian-born, had at least one Russian-born parent or had a spouse of Russian

stock. Another 12.5% were similarly of the stock of countries adjacent to the Soviet Union or married to persons of that stock. Still another 34.9% were of, or married to, foreign stock of different provenance, leaving only 8.6% who were native-born, of native-born parentage and with native-born spouses.

Between 1840 and 1951, 3,343,000 persons immigrated into the United States from what is now the Soviet Union.²⁶ During this period, the total Jewish immigration into the United States was 3,143,000 and of this an estimated 72% came from Russia.²⁷ Accordingly, 67.7% of the Russian migration to the United States can be assumed to have been Jewish.

If we assume that the Communist Party was equally attractive to Russian Jews and to Russian non-Jews, it would follow that in 1947 some 29.3% of the Red militants were Russian Jewish or married to Russian Jewish spouses. Eliminating the latter category, the Russian Jewish component in American Communism declines to 28.3%.

Finally, let us assume that non-Russian Jews were as attracted to Communism as were Russian Jews.²⁸ Since the Jewish immigration into the U.S. was 72% of Russian origin, *it follows that an estimated 39.3% of the American Communist Party activists in 1947 were Jewish. Jews constitute about 3% of the American population. Accordingly, the indicated Jewish performance coefficient for Communist Party membership is 1,310.* If this is more than double the figure arrived at by name-frequency analysis, the difference can be attributed primarily to the adoption of gentile Party names by Jewish Communists.²⁹

From the fact that proportionately more Jews than non-Jews have been attracted to the American Communist movement, it does not by any means follow that a significantly large portion of American Jewry is either Communist or pro-Communist. Moreover, Jewish participation in American movements hostile to Communism and in the exposure of the Communist system as a form of totalitarian regression has been both quantitatively and qualitatively important.

Social Elite. Name-frequency analysis of the 1964 *National Social Directory* and the *New York Social Register* reveals Jewish performance coefficients of only 20 and nine respectively. These extremely low figures seem quite incongruous with the upper-class status of American Jewry, with its leading position in the professions, science, the arts and business, with its superior education and with its very high income levels. In another place, I commented as follows on this anomaly:

“The Jewish case deserves special mention because it is the group with maximum variation in elite status. Accordingly, efforts by leaders of Jewish organizations to identify the problems of their ethnic group with those of the Negroes reveal blindness to the realities of the structure of American society. Groups with an elite status which is homogeneous have few problems. Groups with a homogeneously non-elite status may suffer from misfortunes, but not from ambiguities. The heterogeneously elite and non-elite is unique in its uncertainty of its relationship to society and the reciprocation of that uncertainty by society.”⁸⁰

To this, I might add that one of the roots of the disturbed Jewish attitude toward American society is a feeling of social rejection, expressed specifically as a conviction that, regardless of the extent to which American Jewry becomes a leading element culturally, educationally, economically and in science, business and the arts, it will be excluded from the social aristocracy. These feelings of rejection, as various surveys have shown, sometimes exaggerate the actual extent of exclusion. From the non-Jewish standpoint, the essence of the problem may perhaps be defined as the anomalous behavior of a group which, while part of the elite, rejects certain basic elite attitudes and norms of conduct. Or, stated more succinctly, considering themselves socially deprived, Jews often tend to identify with the underdog and with movements for the radical transformation of society in the putative interests of the underdog. The elite approves of the attitude of *noblesse oblige* toward the underprivileged, but it tends to disapprove both of the philosophy of egalitarianism and of the practice of fraternization.

XI

A COMPARISON OF GERMAN AND RUSSIAN JEWS

When the Jews of Europe took surnames in the 18th and 19th centuries, they usually appropriated those current in the countries where they lived, but assigned esoteric meanings to them. A Gentile might be called *Brill* because he sold or made spectacles (*Brillen*); if a Jew chose the name, it was because he claimed descent (*ben*) from Rabbi Judah Lowe (hence BRJL). *Baum* and *Bloch* are similar rabbinical anagrams. *Kaufmann* may mean, not merchant, but "Jacob born in the month of Ab" and *Bernstein* may either refer to amber or to descent from the fifth son of Jacob. Since there are no vowels in the Hebrew script, the former can be inserted arbitrarily when Hebrew words are rendered into modern European languages. For example, a large proportion of the *Gordons* in the U.S. are not Scots, but Jews; in this instance, the name indicates that its bearer came from the town of GRoDNo (formerly in eastern Poland, now in Byelorussia.)¹

The sample of Jewish names used in computing performance coefficients includes several which are definitely of Hebrew origin, for example, *Cohen*, *Katz*, *Levin*, *Levine*, *Levy* and *Shapiro*. If these alone had been used, they would have yielded a distorted sample of Jewry since the Western Jews (those of non-Slavic and non-Balkan provenance) have tended to avoid them.

Accordingly, I compared the frequency of occurrence of possibly Jewish names in the Berlin City Directory for 1930 (a pre-Nazi year) with their corresponding frequencies in the West Berlin Directory for 1957. Those names which virtually disappeared are Jewish, those which showed substantially unimpaired or even increased frequencies are not.²

I have worked out composite scores for each of the 26 names in the Jewish sample for each of 20 rosters of eminence.³ The procedure was to score each position of rank order by its reciprocal and to add up these reciprocals. Thus, a first place scored 1, a second place $\frac{1}{2}$, a third $\frac{1}{3}$, etc. Since there are 20 rosters, the maximum possible score would be 20 (all firsts) and the minimum score .769 (all 26th place). The results are shown below:

The table shows a consistent concentration of leadership in a few names. *Levin*, *Epstein* and *Stern* account for 14 out of 20 possible

Table 7: COMPOSITE SCORES OF 26 JEWISH NAMES IN 20 ROSTERS
(Summation of Reciprocals of Rank Order)

Rank	Name	Composite Score
1	<i>Levin</i>	8.954
2	<i>Epstein</i>	8.060
3	<i>Stern</i>	6.030
4	<i>Shapiro</i>	4.735
5	<i>Kaplan</i>	3.912
6	<i>Friedman</i>	3.903
7	<i>Rubin</i>	3.880
8	<i>Rosenthal</i>	3.632
9	<i>Weinstein</i>	3.276
10	<i>Weinberg</i>	3.202
11	<i>Bernstein</i>	2.702
12	<i>Rosen</i>	2.653
13	<i>Berman</i>	2.331
14	<i>Katz</i>	2.243
15	<i>Marcus</i>	2.156
16	<i>Levy</i>	2.025
17	<i>Levine</i>	1.678
18	<i>Rosenberg</i>	1.658
19	<i>Isaacs</i>	1.510
20	<i>Goldberg</i>	1.402
21	<i>Greenberg</i>	1.287
22	<i>Abraham</i>	1.231
23	<i>Silver</i>	1.176
24	<i>Goldstein</i>	1.171
25	<i>Solomon</i>	1.139
26	<i>Cohen</i>	1.060
Arithmetic Means		2.964

firsts and 10 of 20 possible seconds. The leading 10 names account for all 20 firsts, for 16 seconds and 15 thirds.

The reasons for this concentration are not easy to fathom. *Levin* (like *Levine* and *Levy*) merely denotes descent from the tribe of Levi and the hereditary function of serving as assistant to the priest. The status of these Levites in ancient Palestine incidentally is by no means clear. In *Exodus*, they are persons who perform menial service and a warning is given that "Levites shall not approach the holy thing," but in *Deuteronomy* Levites and priests seem to be synonymous.

Evidently, the status and duties of the Levites changed from period to period. Thus, in *I Chronicles*, the Levites were singers, porters, bearers of the ark, cult functionaries (acting under the direction of priests), judges, prophets, royal officials, temple cleaners, money

raisers, foremen for temple construction, persons who acted under the orders of King David, individuals listed genealogically after the high priests, but before the priesthood in general (the sons of Aaron), etc. This summary of often incongruous duties is taken from Professor Jacob M. Myers illuminating discussion of their role in his introduction to the Anchor Bible edition.⁴

If we take a weighted average of the three forms of the name *Levy* the composite score is 3.597, which is by no means outstanding. This suggests that the name *Levin* has become the preferred variant in the American milieu and that those Jews who are most ambitious to succeed tend to change into it from *Levine*, *Levi* or *Levy*. (In France, *Levy* or *Levi* would probably be deemed preferable.)

Epstein is "one of the oldest Jewish families in the Slavic countries."⁵ The fact that the surname is known from at least the 15th Century on (whereas the great majority of Jewish names were adopted three or four hundred years later) indicates extraordinarily high status, that is to say, an outstanding position in scholarship and the rabbinate. Since the Jews were excluded both from the nobility and from the feudal system, their only aristocracy was one of learning. The antiquity of a Jewish name depends on its intellectual eminence. It is a question of whether or not the family in each particular generation produced men of sufficient learning to maintain genealogical records.

Stern is a German Jewish name of Rhenish international bankers, comparable to the *Rothschilds*, but operating on a smaller scale.⁶ The fourth ranking name, *Shapiro*, is a family name of "hasidic *tzaddikim* and printers" from Volhynia in eastern Poland.⁷ The Hasidic movement was one of religious mysticism which was strongest in the Slavic areas of Jewry. The *tzaddick* (Hebrew for "righteous man") was regarded by the Hasidim as the intermediary between God and man. Originally the office of *tzaddik* was handed down by the Hasidic rabbi to his chosen pupil, but in the course of time it became hereditary.

Some may think it strange that *Cohen* should be at the bottom of the list. The name indicates descent from the priestly caste of Aaronites of ancient Canaan. The *Kohanim* kept apart from other members of the congregation since they "were given a preferred status in being called up to the Torah, performed the ceremony of the first born" and were barred by religious law from marrying converts to Judaism. To establish their status in the community, they added the title *Hakohen* (Hebrew for "the priest") to their names.

The functions of the *Kohanim* disappeared with the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, the abolition of animal sacrifice in Jewish ritual and the election of rabbis by their congregations, processes which were largely completed by the early Middle Ages. Since *Cohens* were ritually prohibited from approaching a dead body, they could not be physicians and were not wanted as rabbis of small congregations.

The fundamental reason for the bottom position of present-day *Cohens* in Jewish contributions to the creative minority is that properly speaking *Cohen* is not a name, but a title. As a rule, the only Jews of priestly descent who adopted the name *Cohen* were those who had no other basis of distinction. The others either retained the surnames they had or assumed distinctive ones.

Moreover, the name *Cohen* is pre-eminently Jewish and hence, in most areas, disadvantageous. Hence, greater amount of name-changing may have occurred among *Cohens* than among Jews in general. Since the name-changers usually consist of that element which is most ambitious and most successful, their defection would cause a more than average loss of elite elements.⁸

Probably from a half to two-thirds of the Jews of priestly descent abandoned the designation *Cohen* when surnames were adopted. This is revealed by these facts: Joseph Jacobs found that when the Jews returned from the Babylonian Captivity under Nehemiah, the *Kohanim* comprised 8% of the total. In two lists of martyrs killed at Nürnberg in 1298 and 1349, the proportion was about the same. Among 200 inscriptions in the Venetian Jewish cemetery, 6.5% were *Kohanim*. However, Jacobs found the ratio to be only 3% among 4,720 English Jews and only 2.3% among 4,600 Continental Jews.⁹ Similarly, I found that, of the approximately 24,080 entries in Malcolm H. Stern's comprehensive genealogy of old American Jewish families, 765, or 2.9% of the total, were *Cohens*, *Cohns* and *Solis-Cohens*.¹⁰

Thus, the retrograde status of *Cohens* does not contradict my thesis that, through the rabbinate, Jewish society functioned over thousands of years in favor of eugenic selection for intelligence. First, as a general rule, only the less distinguished of the descendants of the *Kohanim* adopted *Cohen* as a surname. Second, there was probably more name-changing among *Cohens* than among Jews in general. Third, the *Cohens* were not only not the rabbis, but they had a disability for the rabbinate which other Jews lacked. They were, in short, an hereditary group which had been destitute of ecclesiastical function for almost two thousand years.

Western vs. Eastern Jews. There is a definite social and supposedly intellectual hierarchy among Jews. The *Sephardim* from the Iberian Peninsula traditionally occupy the first rank, followed by German and other West European *Ashkenazim*, then followed, at a considerable distance by East European Jewry, which also consists of *Ashkenazim*. Within East European Jewry, those from Lithuania, and particularly those from Galicia, are generally looked down upon. (One of the reasons frequently advanced for their low status within Jewry is the allegation that they are racially largely alien, being supposedly descended from the partially Mongoloid peoples of Khazaria, a kingdom occupying much of present-day Crimea and the Ukraine. The Khazars were converted to Judaism, probably in the 8th Century A.D. They were a people primarily of Ugro-Finnic extraction who were called "white Ugrians" by the Russians to differentiate them from the Magyars who were termed "black Ugrians." The Khazar converts were called "red Jews" by the rest of Jewry because they frequently had florid complexions and red hair.) Finally, Jews of African and Asian origin are at the bottom of the social pyramid.

Prima facie, the superiority of the contribution of Western European over Eastern European Jewry would seem incontestable.¹¹ Few people would challenge the statement that the three most influential Jewish thinkers of the modern world were Marx, Freud and Einstein. Two of them were German-born; Freud was born in Austria. Of the 214 Nobel Prize winners in science during the period 1901-1960 inclusive, a minimum of 33, or 15.4% of the total, were Jews.¹² Of these Jewish Nobel scientists, 15½ were born in Germany, four in Austria, two in Switzerland, one in France, a half-Jew in Denmark and another in Italy: in other words, 23½ were of West European origin. Of the remainder five were born in the United States, whereas Eastern Europe furnished only four and a half names (two from Czechoslovakia and two and a half from Russia). West European Nobel scientists outnumbered East European ones by more than five to one.

However, the situation may be very different in so far as inclusion in the broad elite is concerned — not a handful of outstandingly creative individuals, but the intellectual, executive, artistic and political leadership elements *en masse* as measured by name frequency analysis.

It seemed worthwhile to test the assumption of Western Jewish superiority in this larger elite. Unfortunately, there are too few Iberian Jews in the U.S. population to make it possible to analyze their contribution to the creative minority by name-frequency methods. The same difficulty precluded separate analysis of the contributions of

Jews from Lithuania and Galicia. The comparison was thus limited to Jewish names of West European origin vs. those of East European origin.

The method used was to count the frequency of each of 25 Jewish names in the 1881 New York City Directory and to divide that figure by the frequency of the name on the 1957 Social Security (BOASI) roll. The great emigration of East European Jewry began in 1881; hence the Jewish entries in the New York City Directory for that year consist almost exclusively of West European, and primarily of German, Jews. On the other hand, the BOASI roster reflects the present Jewish population of the U.S., which is two-thirds to three-quarters of East European (chiefly Russian) origin. Consequently, the quotients for each name serve as indexes of the extent of East European provenance and these can be compared with composite performance coefficients. The results are shown in the table on page 111.

The table clearly shows superior performance by the primarily Slavic group and that the Jewish position in American life, as measured by these rosters, tends to decrease with the extent of West European provenance. The unweighted average performance coefficient of the eight Group I (primarily East European) names is 393, that for the nine Group II mixed names is 289, while that for the eight Group III (primarily West European) names is only 229. Of 20 firsts, the Slavic group took ten, the mixed group six and the German group only four. There is also a suggestion of differences in character structure. The Western Jews excelled primarily in practical activities, the Eastern Jews in intellectual pursuits. Thus, the four firsts of the Western Jewish group comprise: position in *Who's Who in America*, engineers, *Poor's* executives and directors, and membership in the American Newspaper Guild.

Superior performance by Jews of Eastern origin would be expected *a priori*. The ghetto broke down in Western and Central Europe about three-quarters of a century earlier than in the territory of Imperial Russia. This breakdown disrupted the traditional Jewish pattern of selective reproduction for intellectual ability. Moreover it introduced into Western Jewry mixed marriages on a large scale between Jews and non-Jews. In a study of 25,000 early Jewish settlers in the United States, Malcolm H. Stern found that over 15% of the marriages occurring before 1840 were mixed and that of these barely 8% involved the conversion of the non-Jewish spouse to Judaism.¹⁸ Figures collected by Kautsky showed that there was a steady and rapid increase in the proportion of mixed marriages during the nineteenth century and that, by

Table 8: EASTERN AND WESTERN JEWS IN LEADERSHIP ROSTERS

Rank	Name	BOASI/NYC Directory 1881 (East/West Ratio)	Composite Index of 20 Rosters
GROUP I: PRIMARILY EAST EUROPEAN			
5	Kaplan	5	3.912
4	Shapir	9	4.735
17	Levine	11	1.678
7	Rubin	13	3.880
12	Rosen	16	2.653
9	Weinst	35	3.276
1	Levin	40	8.954
13	Berman	42	2.331
GROUP II: MIXED			
15	Marcus	45	2.156
21	Greenb	48	1.287
14	Katz	52	2.243
2	Epstei	60	8.060
20	Goldbe	71	1.402
10	Weinbe	93	3.202
6	Friedm	101	3.903
24	Goldst	110	1.171
11	Bernst	113	2.702
GROUP III: PRIMARILY WEST EUROPEAN			
25	Solomo	128	1.139
18	Rosenb	132	1.658
26	Cohen	141	1.060
22	Abraha	193	1.281
19	Isaacs	234	1.510
8	Rosent	254	3.632
3	Stern	258	6.030
16	Levy	438	2.025

1900, one-fifth of all marriages involving a Jewish spouse were mixed in Prussia, one-third in Hamburg and two fifths in Copenhagen.¹⁴ Jacobs, Lorimer, Osborn and others have reported that these marriages were, on the whole, considerably less fertile than homogeneous marriages.¹⁵ The influence of intermarriage on Jewish performance coefficients, however, can easily be overstressed for several reasons: (a) the marriages often involve non-Jews of exceptional capacity, frequently of the intelligentsia or the aristocracy, and hence serve to produce children more able than the Jewish average (this will be evident to anyone who compares the proportion of Jewish to half-Jewish Nobel scientists); (b) the marriages are so infertile that the breed lines

tend to die out; and (c) since the vast majority of these marriages represent a flight from Jewry and jewishness, a high concentration of name-changers will be found among the spouses and the progeny of these unions.

The fundamental reason for expecting higher intellectual achievement and ability among the Jews of the Russian Pale of Settlement than among those of the more civilized West is that, in the Slavic areas, zealotry and isolation from the real world produced a Jewry with an extraordinarily intense religious life in which the competition of scholars to shine in dialectical battle and the striving by merchants to join their lines with those of rabbis and other men of learning achieved unusual intensity and displayed amazing durability. Thus, a parataxic backwardness produced a pre-eminent breeding ground for the brain. In the West, by contrast, the emancipation of the Jews caused the deterioration of those biological conditions which had endowed them both with outstanding mental ability and with strongly eugenic fertility.

XII

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR IMMIGRATION POLICY

Before discussing U.S. immigration policy in relation to name-frequency analysis, a brief resume of the evolution of that policy seems in order.

Until the early 1920's the United States admitted European immigrants without restriction as to national origin. Following temporary restrictive legislation in 1921, the basic Immigration Act of 1924 was passed. This established a national quotas system and limited the immigration quota of each eligible country to 2% of its stock in the U.S. population as reported by the 1890 Census. The primary aim of this law was to check the torrent of immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe and to encourage entry from Northern and Western Europe, which had been the preponderant sources of American population prior to the 20th Century.

In urging enactment of the law, President Calvin Coolidge said: "American institutions rest solely on good citizenship. They were created by people who had a background of self-government. New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them into the ranks of good citizenship."¹

The *New York Times* also supported the restrictive law. Observing that "it is not for any foreign country to determine our immigration policy," the *Times* added that "the great test is assimilability. Will the newcomers fit into the American life readily? Is their culture sufficiently akin to our own to make it possible for them easily to take their place among us?" The *Times* went on to emphasize that this was not a question of the 'superiority' or 'inferiority' of different racial groups, but merely one of their adaptability to American institutions.

The basic issue behind the debate on the national origins quota system was whether large-scale immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe was in the national interest. Advocates of restriction pointed to the lack of skills and education of the newcomers, to their contributions to pauperism, slums and crime, to the fact that they had gained little experience of free, democratic institutions in their countries of origin, and to their alleged failure to contribute significantly to American leadership. Partisans of unrestricted immigration replied that

the poor performance of the new immigrants was due to environmental handicap. Under the stimulus of American conditions, they predicted, the newcomers would become as useful and law-abiding Americans as the waves of Anglo-Saxons, Teutons and Celts who had preceded them.

Neither protagonists nor antagonists bothered to distinguish between the component elements of the new immigration. Jews were lumped together with Sicilians and Hungarians with Greeks without any effort to differentiate between their institutions, histories, cultures or capacity.

The 1924 Act drastically changed the national character of U.S. immigration. In 1920-21, before its passage, 67% had come from Southern and Eastern Europe, 26% from Northern and Western Europe. Three years later, the proportions were changed to 27% and 56% respectively. At the same time, the tides of immigration were subsiding and the issue ceased to inflame the nation.

Immigration Trends Since World War II. Between 1946 and 1958 approximately 2,854,000 immigrants entered the United States. The shape of this immigration was profoundly influenced by the human havoc caused by Nazi oppression, by World War II, and by the determination of the U.S. to do its share in resettling displaced persons.

Partly due to these factors, nations north of the Pyrenees and west of the Vistula provided 1,510,000 immigrants, or 53% of the total.²

Eastern Europe accounted for an additional 519,000. They included 36,000 Hungarian freedom fighters and anti-communist refugees, 18,000 veterans of the Free Polish forces stranded in Britain (admitted by 1950 amendment to the Displaced Persons Act) and 47,000 refugees from Soviet-bloc countries (admitted under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.)³

Southern Europe furnished 287,000 immigrants, of whom 212,000 came from Italy. Europe accounted for 64% of total immigration and Canada for another 11%. Ten per cent came from Mexico, 9% from other Latin America and 5% from Asia.

Under the Kennedy Administration there were further changes. Europe's share fell from 64% to 40%. Mexico increased her proportion from 10% to 15% and other Latin America from 9% to 19%. Africa emerged as a new immigration source with slightly less than 1% of the total and Asian immigration increased from 5% to 7%.⁴

Immigration: the Continuing Debate. During the 1960's the debate over immigration policy was less strident, but scarcely more sophisti-

cated, than the controversy of the 1920's. Substantially the same arguments were invoked, often without adequate investigation of the facts.

On the restrictive side, Bouscaren, in a brief book already cited, quoted Warren S. Thompson as predicting that immigrants "will constitute a considerable proportion of the lowest income group and will live largely in the 'blighted' areas, for some years at least. Their families will be raised in neighborhoods which are now known as the breeding spots of dependency, delinquency and poor health." They will have "at the best, poor training for responsible citizenship."⁸

Since Thompson failed to distinguish between the various streams of immigration, his predictions fell wide of the mark. The bulk of postwar immigration, coming as it did from Europe and Canada, has not settled in slums, inhabited breeding grounds of vice or done any of the other dire things that Thompson prophesied in 1947 and Professor Bouscaren uncritically reproduced 16 years later. Nor is it accurate to charge these immigrants or the tens of thousands of Asian refugees from Communism with "poor training for responsible citizenship."

Bouscaren also uses the demographic argument against immigration. Here he quotes Professor Joseph J. Spengler to the effect that since free land no longer exists in quantity in the United States, since there are water shortages and since certain minerals must be imported, "increasing economic entropy is shrinking the resource base of the American economy . . ."⁹ With the American resource clock running down, it is folly, Spengler believes, for the nation to import more mouths to feed. The quoted passage suggests an ignorance of the American economy and of its technological potential on the part of Professor Spengler which can only be described as appalling.

Moreover, the immigrant is not a homogeneous entity. The country may have unlimited horizons for Chinese physicists, Japanese engineers, self-reliant Polish refugees from totalitarianism, Jewish intellectuals and English professionals who are fed up with the red tape and socialistic stultification they experience at home. It does not follow that similar horizons exist for the unskilled, the uneducated and the unintelligent, for those who have nothing to sell that a sophisticated, technological and scientific society wants to buy. Such people are likely to end up as slum dwellers and public charges regardless of whether they are peasant immigrants from backward regions of Europe or internal migrants from the slums of San Juan or the black belt of Mississippi.

Discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of immigration in general is seldom fruitful. The basic question is not how many immi-

grants a nation should admit, but rather what sort does it need and what sort is it getting.

The Influence of John F. Kennedy. Throughout his political life, the late President Kennedy was the standard bearer of a "liberal" approach to immigration problems which was curiously parallel to the outlook of Professors Thompson and Spengler and which was destined after his death to be embodied in the Immigration Act of 1965. Mr. Kennedy was a tireless advocate of the view that it makes no difference whence the immigrant comes and that to assert otherwise marks one as a racist and a reactionary. He worked equally tirelessly for the enactment of measures designed to lower immigration barriers in the interests of national groups whose contributions to American society had in the past been inconsequential or negative.

As early as April 4, 1952, we find then Congressman Kennedy urging that low-quota countries be permitted to take up the unused quotas of other nations. Over a million unused quota numbers were at stake and, had the Kennedy proposal been enacted, they would have been largely filled by Sicilians and other south Italians.⁷ The future President in fact engaged in special pleading for Italy "with its entire population crowded into an area no larger than the state of California . . ." He also proposed that the 65,721 unused places on the British quota be made available to the almost wholly Negro population of the British West Indies.⁸

As Bennett points out in his valuable survey of American immigration policy which I have already cited, Kennedy was chiefly concerned while in Congress with using the immigration laws to alleviate the impact of overpopulation in southern Italy and in the Caribbean. Most competent economists believe this to be an ineffectual and self-defeating approach. On a more immediate political level, the Italo-Americans were a powerful ingredient in Massachusetts politics; on the national scene, a gesture to the West Indian Negroes had obvious advantages.

The campaign to increase immigration from southern Italy was carried on by Kennedy's followers. Thus, in 1964, Senator Pastore of Rhode Island managed to get the law amended to permit immediate non-quota entry of 16,000 siblings, married sons and married daughters of U.S. citizens together with their wives and daughters.

Emphasis on family unity was stretched to include even the illegitimate offspring of aliens who had lived in the United States, but had never bothered to become naturalized or were ineligible for naturali-

zation. To the extent that this applied to Italy, it meant freezing the regional and class pattern of immigration. The laws were being revised in short to favor south Italians of peasant stock and to discriminate against central and north Italians and the urban and educated Italians in general. The American experience with these two streams of Italian immigration was deliberately disregarded. Presumably in the interests of vote-getting, those Italian groups with least education least skills, lowest psychometric intelligence and greatest propensity to crime were given favored treatment.

The liberal approach contained the further implicit assumption that diversity of immigration source is a positive good because the more diverse a population is the more its component elements will be tolerant of each other. This was the old melting pot theory. Yet a number of sociological studies have shown that the melting pot does not exist.⁹ It would be nice if increased inter-group and interracial contacts always brought about acceptance. The facts of the matter are that most surveys conclude that they are at least as likely to cause greater hostility.

The Immigration Act of 1965. President Kennedy's persistent campaign to destroy national quotas bore fruit posthumously in the Immigration Act of 1965 which reversed the direction of the immigration legislation of the previous 41 years. This law provided that, during a transitional period until mid-1968, quotas would remain partially in force. During this period, unfilled quotas, amounting to about 60,000 persons a year from Northern and Western Europe were made available primarily to the inhabitants of such poverty-stricken countries as Italy, Greece, Poland and Portugal. If one excludes Polish Jews, who are not likely to be allowed to leave Poland, these are areas which have provided immigrants in the past who have made comparatively slight contributions to the American creative minority.¹⁰

The overwhelmingly Negro areas of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, which in the past had been given token quotas of 100 immigrants each, were treated as fullfledged nations under the 1965 law. That entitled them to 20,000 immigrants a year. It is difficult to see how the acquisition of 60,000 immigrants annually from tropical slums inhabited by unskilled workers of low intelligence and rudimentary education could be of benefit to the United States. The fact that England has found it impossible to absorb immigration from the West Indies apparently made little impression on the Senate.

By 1968 the quota system is to be abolished and immigration is to be

on a "first-come-first-served" basis. A total of 170,000 are to be admitted annually from the Eastern Hemisphere and a total of 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere, subject to the qualification that not more than 20,000 may come from any one country. In addition, 50,000 parents, spouses and children of American citizens are to be admitted over and above the quota.

The new law changes the previous system in several ways. Total immigration will increase by about 60,000 to reach a maximum of 350,000. Immigration from the United Kingdom and Germany will be curtailed from about 50,000 to a maximum of 40,000 thus reducing the inflow from areas which have been highly productive in the past. The flood from Latin America will be curtailed considerably, and that from sources in eastern and southern Europe massively increased.

The law was presented to the American public as designed to suppress unfair discrimination against nations and peoples and to substitute admission of people on the basis of their individual merit, ability, training and potential contribution to the United States. Unfortunately, this is not an accurate description.

Fifty thousand relatives of American citizens are admissible without regard to national origin. Then first preference goes to more distant relatives of Americans, regardless of their education, ability or potential value to the United States.

The preference given relatives perpetuates previous immigration patterns, particularly undesirable ones. In the Italian case, it means continued favoring of the comparatively unproductive south Italian peasant element. The preference given relatives also favors those with the largest families. These are generally, though not always, people from backward countries with low educational levels, unimpressive I.Q.'s and minimum skills.

After all relatives within the categories specified by the law have been admitted, the door is next opened to scientists, professionals and those with needed skills, as certified by the Department of Labor. However, the total of these specially trained people needed by the United States was officially estimated at only 5,000 to 10,000 a year, or about 3% of total immigration. The final category—refugees from Communism—is estimated officially at a mere 10,000 a year.¹¹

The abolition of national quotas eliminates clear, enforceable legal provisions in favor of vague ones. What is involved is yet another power shift from Congress to the White House, from the rule of law to that of subjective executive decision. Purely political decisions and pressures will probably play a much greater role in the new system

than they did in the old one. Highly organized pressure groups, such as those of the Negroes, can be expected to make strident demands that the United States admit more people of their color, nationality or language. The fact that the least skilled, least successful, least educated and least law-abiding elements in the U.S. population tend to be the most fervent supporters of the Democratic Party may well influence the dominant political majority to shift immigration decisively to these unproductive sources.¹³

The Larger Problem of Stupidity. Our society is becoming increasingly complex and increasingly automated. As this occurs, the demand for brain rises and that for brawn recedes. In all societies, there is a minimum threshold of intelligence in the sense that those below it are in normal times unemployable. As societies move more deeply into the promising, nascent world of science and technology, as inanimate power replaces muscle power, as capital investment per worker rises and as automation takes command, this threshold rapidly rises. In the case of the United States, 97% of the increase in employment between 1947 and 1963 occurred in professional, managerial, clerical and sales jobs — that is to say, in white collar areas demanding brains and training.

Another general point is worth making. The fact that a stupid man may possess some skill which is in demand does not necessarily make him good immigration material. One reason is that swiftly changing technology wipes out specialized skills, making them economically worthless. Security against unemployment today means ability to adapt, to learn new skills and to understand and carry out complex instructions. As Charles E. Silberman has pointed out, the key ability or skill is being truly literate.¹⁴ I would like to add that the underlying pre-requisite is possession of enough innate intelligence so that complete literacy can be attained.

As John Fischer, the editor of *Harper's*, put the matter in a courageous article entitled "The Stupidity Problem," we must recognize that "all men are *not* created equal, except in the limited political sense which Jefferson had in mind when he drafted the Declaration of Independence. Until we do that, it will be impossible for our public officials to find useful work for the 20-plus percent of the population with below-normal intelligence, or to train them for jobs they are capable of handling. And it will remain almost equally hard to make the best use of our limited supply of high I.Q.s."¹⁴

Towards a National Immigration Policy. The implications of all this for a future American immigration policy are fairly obvious. It is commonsense to design immigration laws which will admit aliens whose abilities and talents can be used by American society and to discourage or bar those who face chronic unemployment in this country.

The rule that the United States should favor those who are employable should, however, be interpreted in broad terms. It is not primarily a matter of specific skills that may be in demand today and in surfeit tomorrow, but of the high level of intelligence (and, where possible, of knowledge) that an evolving and expanding society will always need.

The suggestion in short is that immigration policy should be directed toward admission of the intellectually gifted. This naturally does not preclude relaxing standards for humanitarian reasons (orphans, people uprooted by wars, revolutions and natural disasters) or giving special consideration to the victims of, and fighters against, totalitarian tyrannies (displaced persons, survivors of the concentration camps, freedom fighters, etc.) or facilitating the uniting of families. Nor does it imply that intelligence by itself should be sufficient reason for admission. Obviously, the admission of intelligent Communists is more harmful to the country than the admission of stupid ones.

After all these qualifications are taken into consideration, the performance coefficients provide rough indicators of the direction which national immigration trends should take if the United States is to use immigration to reinforce good citizenship and to maximize its leadership potential.

This line of reasoning is based on one or two premises and assumptions which, while fairly obvious, are often forgotten in discussions of the subject.

First, immigration into the United States is a privilege. The number of people wanting to get in is far in excess of the numbers which the United States is prepared to admit. Therefore, America can choose the sort of immigrants it wants. The choice should be dictated by national interests.

Second, immigration implies probable American citizenship, not only for the immigrant, but for his descendants generation after generation. American citizenship carries with it more power and more responsibility than citizenship in any other nation. Immigration should be so channeled as to bring into the United States a leaven with leadership potential and with dedication to free institutions.

The immigration pattern of the 1960's has been rather mixed. On the positive side, there was greater emphasis on scientific and professional personnel and a variety of provisions favoring intellectuals. Of the 96,000 quota immigrants in fiscal 1961, for instance, over 7,000 were admitted under first preference as persons with high skills and special abilities or the spouses of such persons.¹⁶ The barriers against Asian immigration were considerably relaxed and, in consequence, the United States gained valuable recruits to its potential elite from China, Japan, Israel and other Asian lands.

On the other hand, about 15% of immigration came from Mexico and another 20% from other Latin America. The available evidence indicates that most Mexican immigrants and their children test very low on intelligence scales even when every effort is made to adjust for socioeconomic and linguistic handicaps. They bring little to the country in the way of skills or culture and contribute disproportionately to crime, delinquency and the relief burden. This does not apply to the Cuban refugees from Castro Communism as they include a large proportion of the Cuban intellectual aristocracy.

The evidence of name-frequency analysis suggests that, as a matter of national policy, no quantitative limits should be placed on Jewish immigration into the United States. As a matter of fact, no significant barriers to such immigration exist at the present time. When they were being exterminated by the Nazis and had no homeland, the Jews found most doors closed to them or left only partially ajar. But now that the emergency has passed, the situation is very different, illustrating the Biblical maxim that "to him who hath shall be given."

It is in the interests of the United States to do whatever is possible to induce the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet-bloc states to allow their Jewish subjects to depart, whether to the United States, to Israel or elsewhere. The primary political purpose of this would be to deprive the Soviet Union of its most gifted (and persecuted) minority. This applies particularly to Soviet science in which the Jews appear to play an almost commanding role. If Soviet Jewry is free to immigrate, this will massively weaken Soviet science and weapons technology, changing the balance of power significantly in favor of the West.

A special effort should be made to enable gifted Chinese and other Asians to enter this country either as students or as permanent immigrants. Except for Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Israel, Asia suffers from an appalling dearth of the facilities needed to train and intelligently utilize full-fledged scientists. Denial of an American visa to a German intellectual may simply mean that he must pursue his profes-

sion at home. A similar denial to an Indian or Iranian may permanently prevent a gifted human being from using his intelligence productively. The underdeveloped intellectual resources of America are not the segregated schools of the South, which provide a mere handful of pupils capable of graduating from integrated Northern universities without coaching and favoritism. A far more promising source is facilitated immigration of intellectually gifted Asians and citizens of other poverty-stricken areas who are mentally outstanding and who have no chance of fulfilling their promise if they must stay where they are.

XIII

EMERGENCE OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL

This and the five chapters which immediately follow it deal in some detail with various factors that have shaped the Jewish people and given rise to Jewish intellectual eminence. There were several reasons for including this material. It seemed desirable not to rest on large generalities, but, in one area at least, to go into detail and thus indicate the abundant biogenetic, historic and social evidence available in support of some of the hypotheses which have been advanced. To do this for all the national-linguistic groups would have presupposed more knowledge than the writer possesses and probably more patience than the reader would be willing to extend. The choice of Jewry for this excursion into more detailed treatment was indicated because of the unique role which the Jews play in the American creative minority.

Provenance. The first question is where did the ancient Hebrews come from. The classical answer is given in *Genesis* (13:28-32 and 14:1-7). According to this, "Terah took his son Abram, his grandson Lot, son of Haran, and his daughter-in-law Sarai, and they all left Ur of the Chaldeans to move to the land of Canaan; but when they reached Haran, they settled there."¹

Even such excellent modern Biblical scholars as Emmanuel Anati have uncritically inferred that the original homeland of the patriarchs was "Ur of the Chaldees, a region in the southwestern part of Mesopotamia, probably not far from the city of Ur excavated by the British archaeologist Sir Leonard Woolley."² Professor Harry L. Shapiro, Chairman of the Anthropology Department at Columbia, advances the same view and seems even to harbor the illusion that Ur and Haran were in the same country.³

More modern scholars tend to reject this view. Thus, Professor Ephraim Avigdor Speiser, the head of the Department of Oriental Studies at Pennsylvania, writes: "The one fact beyond serious dispute is that the home of the patriarchs was in the district of Haran, and not at Ur. According to (*Genesis*) xii:1 and 5, Haran was Abraham's birthplace. The toponymic models for the names of Abraham's close relatives have been found in Central Mesopotamia (see above). And

the cultural background of many of the later patriarchal narratives is intimately tied up with the Hurrians of Haran and the regions nearby rather than with the Sumerians and Babylonians in the south. Thus Ur proves to be intrusive in this context, however old that intrusion may have been.”⁴

A decisive reason to reject “Ur of the Chaldeans” as the original homeland of the patriarchs is that the Chaldeans arrived on the scene before the end of the second millenium B.C., which is too late. It is possible, as Dr. Speiser suggests, that the confusion arose in the minds of the authors of *Genesis* because both Ur and Haran were centers of moon worship, but this is speculative.

Placing the patriarchal homeland in Haran moves it about 600 miles north by northwest from the torrid and enervating region of the debouchement of the Tigris and Euphrates into the Persian Gulf. It is removed to northern Syria, near the modern city of Aleppo, an area of hot summers and cool winters. The Haran location is centered in a distinctly western Semitic region. In fact, Crete, Cyprus, Aleppo and Haran are at about the same parallel of latitude.

This dovetails with and seemingly reinforces the revolutionary theories concerning the common origins of Greek and Hebrew civilization which have been advanced in recent years by Professor Cyrus H. Gordon, Chairman of the Department of Oriental Languages at Brandeis University. As Dr. Gordon put the matter in a 1965 article:

“The classical civilizations of Greece and Judea have traditionally been regarded as entirely distinct cultures, yet today two lines of evidence are combining to support the hypothesis that they have a common background. One line of evidence falls within the realm of historical and literary scholarship; the strength of its case lies in vivid parallels between the early Greek and early Hebrew literature. The other is essentially archaeological and linguistic; in the past few years it has become increasingly apparent that the oldest inscriptions found on the island of Crete are written in a Semitic tongue.”⁵

As early as 1957, Gordon concluded that he had found west Semitic words in the very early Linear A script of Minoan civilization, the first of the great civilizations of Crete. He concluded that Minoan might be a Semitic language and civilization.

“Few scholars suspected,” he wrote, “that prior to the fifteenth century B.C. all of the east Mediterranean islands and coasts were dominated by northwest Semitic sea lords, who were known to the ancient Hellenes as Phoenicians. Crete, and for that matter the coastal areas of peninsular Greece, belonged to northwest Semites before the

Greeks began to take over. Semitic names occur in the Greek Linear B tablets, but Greek names do not occur in the earlier Linear A Tablets. It is interesting to note that the Semitic names of Minoan individuals are exclusively west Semitic."

In 1961, further deciphering convinced Gordon that the script had to be west Semitic (Phoenician, Aramaic, Hebrew and Ugaritic family) and not east Semitic (Assyrian or Babylonian). The affinity was sufficiently close so that the word *Yashashalam* appeared, meaning *Jehovah's peace*. "In Minoan times," Gordon suggested, "Knossos may well have been the chief palace-city of the entire northwest Semitic sphere."*

In 1961-62, Professor S. Davis of the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa published the decipherment of four Cretan texts in Greek letters dated 600 to 300 B.C. Professor Gordon showed that these texts were Semitic and contained phrases readily comprehensible to anyone who knew Hebrew. Then in 1962, a Graeco-Eteocretan bilingual was deciphered which seemed to show that Eteocretan was west Semitic. A similar bilingual, deciphered in early 1963, showed, according to Dr. Gordon, how Hebrew was pronounced at the time the Septuagint was rendered into Greek at Alexandria.

From this and other linguistic evidence, Gordon infers that "both the Greek and the Hebrew heritage are rooted in a single cosmopolitan culture that flourished throughout the eastern Mediterranean during the second millenium B.C. with Crete as its major center."⁷ Specifically, the development of trade from the two great civilization centers of Egypt and Mesopotamia not only diffused civilization, according to Gordon, but made possible the rise to power throughout east Mediterranean waters of the Phoenician *thalassocrats*, or seafaring lords, who used central and eastern Crete as their main base and built the palaces of Minoan civilization. These Phoenicians spoke a language closely akin to Hebrew. Perhaps associated with them or in competition with them were the seafaring Israelites of the tribe of Zebulon.⁸

These views are not accepted by all archaeologists. Professor L. R. Palmer finds, for instance, that the Linear A script was written in the language of the Luvians, an Indo-European people who entered Anatolia before the Hittites and whose chief palaces and archaeological sites have been largely destroyed. Interestingly enough, Drs. Palmer and Gordon proceed from the same methodological premise, namely, that signs in the earlier, undeciphered Linear A similar to signs in the later Linear B, so brilliantly deciphered by the late Michael Ventris,

denote similar syllabic sounds. The Semitic-Luvian controversy is one which laymen join at their peril.⁹

Patriarchal War Chiefs. We learn in the Bible that Abram and Lot entered the land of Palestine and occupied it with their flocks without encountering resistance. We know from the work of Nelson Glueck and William F. Albright that Amorites and others had settled in Jordan late in the third millenium B.C., but that these settlements disappeared from the Jordan Valley by the 19th Century before Christ.¹⁰ This suggests that some natural disaster may have depopulated the country before the patriarchs occupied it.

As their flocks and herds multiplied, Abram¹¹ and Lot quarreled over pasturage and water. The two decided to separate amicably. Lot and his Ammonite and Moabite tribesmen settled eastern Jordan whereas Abram and the Hebrews moved into western Palestine. According to *Genesis* 16:10-13, at this time, that is to say before Jehovah "rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire", destroying the plain, its inhabitants and all that "grew upon the ground," the entire Jordan valley was abundantly watered and like the Garden of Eden.

The Hebrews settled in the land of Canaan and prospered there, but were not entirely cut off from their ancestral homeland in northern Syria. When Jacob, the grandson of Abraham, was ready to take a wife, his father, Isaac, sent him back to Haran to find one.

From *Genesis* 14, we see Abraham as the non-Hebrew local potentates probably saw him; he is not a simple nomad, but a powerful and resolute warrior-leader who throws his 318 fighting men into a struggle against foreign invaders and decisively routs them. This view of the patriarchs as comparatively powerful warlords is also emphasized in the *Genesis* account of the meeting between Jacob and Esau. Having previously swindled his brother out of his birthright and his father's blessing, Jacob was understandably apprehensive. To placate Esau, he sent a present ahead of him with servant-herdsmen of 500 camels, cows, asses, sheep and goats. When the two brothers met, Esau was accompanied by 400 retainers. The Abisha frieze of the Semitic Mari kingdom, which included Haran, probably accurately depicts Asiatic herdsmen-leaders of the Hebrew patriarchal type. They ride accompanied by warriors, herds, women and servants, but also with musicians, mined metals and stones and dyes for barter.¹²

The Habiru. Around 1800 B.C., the Hyksos swept into Syria. Crossing the Sinai Peninsula some 70 years later, they easily overthrew the

reigning Egyptian dynasty and imposed their rule on Egypt for a century and a half. Familiar with metallurgy, employing new weapons, sophisticated in strategy and tactics, they rode to victory on war chariots and established centralized government.

There has been a great deal of controversy as to whether the Hyksos were Semites or Indo-Europeans. Some of their kings had Semitic names and the deities they introduced into Egypt were largely Semitic.¹² If Yakub (Jacob), Hur and Nahman are plainly Semitic; Bnon, Khyan, Edire and Og are Indo-European. Such distinguished scholars as Professor William Foxwell Albright have concluded that the Hyksos were northwestern Semites; others have assumed they were Indo-Europeans; still others that they were racially mixed. Like Aryan peoples elsewhere, they buried horses and chariots with their masters; used the solar wheel and spiral ornamentation characteristic of Celts and Indo-European Greeks and probably introduced the light, fast war chariot, an invention which almost presupposes prior residence on the steppes.

Under Hyksos rule, the nomadic element was seemingly subdued and the moving frontier between range and sown land favored the latter. As the Hyksos domination disintegrated, a belligerent nomadic element known variously as the *Habiru* or *Apiru* increasingly intrudes into the tablets. Since the discovery of references to this element about 70 years ago, there has been debate among scholars as to whether the word is synonymous with Hebrew. The issue remains unsettled.

These *Habiru* first appear on the stage of history in the latter part of the 19th Century B.C. on Egyptian tablets. They are mentioned in the account of Sinuhe, the Egyptian expatriate who lived among the Jordanian Amorites, married the daughter of their chief and, as a member of the tribe, took part in their semi-pastoral life, agriculture, hunting expeditions and incessant inter-tribal wars. Sinuhe's account of the war expeditions of the Amorites is strongly reminiscent of the Biblical story of the conquest of Canaan. Armed with bows and daggers, the Amorites fought technologically more advanced inhabitants of the plains who were protected by shields and wielded battle-axes. In Old Testament style, Sinuhe boasts of how he plundered the cattle of a hostile town, "carried off its inhabitants, took away their food, and slew people in it by my strong arm, by my bow and by my successful plans."¹⁴

The *Habiru* appear as mercenaries in the Hittite empire. In the time of Hammurabi, they are mentioned as raiding and pillaging a Mari town not very far from Haran. In the 16th Century B.C., King Idri-mi

of Alalakh, having been ousted from his fortified city and palace by Egyptian invaders and driven into exile in Canaan, organized landless *Habiru* into a mercenary force and won back his kingdom. He had these facts inscribed on his statue, which was found buried in the ruins of the temple annex. Alalakh on the eastern bank of the Orontes on the present Turkish-Syrian border commanded the intersection of two important trade routes connecting Europe, Anatolia and the rich regions to the south of them.¹⁵

The *Habiru* are described in the documents of their contemporaries as "raiders, rebels, traders, captives, slaves, mercenary soldiers and government employees."¹⁶ Seemingly they were landless fighting men with a pastoral and nomadic background.

At the height of Hyksos power, they were kept in restraint, but, as the rule of the Shepherd Kings began to disintegrate and a time of troubles set in, marked, Anati believes, by increasing population pressure against limited supplies of arable land and irrigation water, they became a scourge of the sown and settled areas. Cities were increasing in population as were the agricultural areas needed to feed them. This necessitated a more vigorous search for irrigation water which upset the balance between herdsmen and peasants, transforming the former into marauders and rebels.

Under Pharaoh Ikhnoton, who repudiated orthodox Egyptian religion in favor of monotheistic sun-worship, the social order rapidly crumbled. Chaos spread to tributary Canaan. The prevailing aura of doom has been preserved in 370 Tell el-Amarna tablets, containing the tears and pleas of princelings and chieftains to Pharaoh. In alliance with the common people, the *Habiru* were driving the local nobles and war leaders into their fortified castles, from which the latter often did not dare to emerge.

The complaints of these satraps to the Egyptian ruler are reproduced extensively by Anati.¹⁷ Thus, one Dagantakala begs the king to "send chariots to fetch us, lest our servants smite us." Another complains to Ikhnoton: "Why do you like the *Habiru* and dislike the governors?" A third asks for garrison troops so he may "enter and see the two eyes of the king," implying that he considers himself a prisoner in his fortified palace. Another reports that all the lands of the king and all the governors are lost. As the plebeian revolution gains in fury and strength, a certain Abdu Heba writes that he has become "like a ship in the midst of the sea," that the *Habiru* are conquering all the cities and, as for the governors, "all have perished."

The archaeological record confirms the picture these letters limn of

a Palestinian time of troubles roughly coterminous with the indecisive rule of the visionary, iconoclastic monotheist, Ikhnaton. Social order is temporarily restored by Tutankhamen, son-in-law of Ikhnaton, who brings the rebellious towns back under Egyptian control.

The emergence of Moses as the inspired, charismatic leader of a comparatively small band of Hebrew slaves and serfs, released from Egyptian bondage, has been interwoven with the class struggles of the *Habiru* by Anati and others. The hypothesis offered is that Moses managed to unite behind his banner the great majority of the *Habiru*, men who had never been Israelites in Egypt and who were not necessarily of the seed of Abraham, but who must have been closely related to the Israelites ethnically.

According to this theory, the conquest of Canaan can be viewed nationally and ethnically as a tribal movement to oust the Egyptians, dispossess, expel, subjugate or kill the local peoples who occupied the land and pre-empt the country for the Israelite tribes and their allies. Socially, the theory holds, the movement was interrelated with a revolt of slaves, marauding nomads and perhaps the semi-dependent *khupshu* class, which was bound to the soil, against the hereditary, and largely non-semitic nobility.¹⁸ An aristocratic order, with strongly accentuated lines of caste and class, was opposed by a theocratic society, rooted in semi-nomadic tribal institutions which were in many respects democratic, and marked by an historically precocious dedication to law and the concept of justice.¹⁹

XIV

CONCERNING THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE JEWS

What we know about the anthropology of the ancient Hebrews is based on scattered finds of skeletons and skulls. Since the soft parts of the face and body decay and disappear, only certain measurements can be made. Of these, the one most frequently resorted to is the cranial index—the ratio of skull width to length.¹

Skulls excavated by Macalister at Gezer, which date back to the early period of Israelite settlement of Canaan, show that only about 10% of the specimens are brachycephalic (short-headed). The preponderant majority are dolichocephalic (long-headed) and have crania characteristic of the Mediterranean race.

The only other large series of skulls found in Palestine from the early period of Israelite occupation are the 695 crania discovered at Lachish and dating from about 700 B.C. These were found in underground chambers under conditions which suggested that their owners had died in some holocaust or catastrophe. The skulls belonging to children were not measured carefully on the theory that they were of "smaller anthropological value."² It was noted that about 1% of the skulls had been artificially deformed by the application of bandages or boards during infancy, a practice rare in Egypt, but known in Crete and Cyprus.³

The Lachish skulls were found to be basically Mediterranean in type. "Of exceptional interest," Professor Shapiro wrote, "is the extraordinary identity of the Lachish crania with several of the fully documented and large series from Egypt. The resemblance was close with a fourth-fifth dynasty series from Deshasheh and Medum in Lower Egypt and with eighteenth dynasty samples from Thebes and Abydos in Upper Egypt. On the basis of his statistical analysis, Risdon has concluded that the Lachish population of 700 B.C. might well represent an Egyptian colony; the similarity is so close for so many individual points of comparison."⁴ These Lachish skulls were equally similar to a series of Iranian skulls dating from the 3rd millennium B.C.

Mediterranean and Armenoid Elements. Based on these finds and other evidence, many scholars held that, prior to their dispersion, the

Jews were primarily a Mediterranean people—long-headed, small and delicately boned, short of stature. The obvious difficulty with this theory was that the so-called *Ashkenazim*—the descendants of the Jews who migrated northward through Italy and Asia Minor and who settled in Germany, Slavic Europe, Hungary, the Balkans, Turkestan and northern Iran—are preponderantly brachycephalic (short-headed). They belong to, or are affiliated with, the Alpine and Armenoid races. The latter differ from Alpine man primarily in being high-headed as well as short-headed and in having flattened occiputs and fleshy, aquiline noses with wide tips.

Over the past five centuries, the Jews who have made the greatest intellectual contributions to the world have been overwhelmingly of non-Mediterranean type. In their majority, they have belonged primarily to the short-headed Alpine and Armenoid types. Those that were long-headed were often more Nordic than Mediterranean in appearance.

Thus, the theory that the ancient Jews were a basically Mediterranean people would presuppose that the intellectuality of modern Jews is due primarily to a racially mixed element which does not even belong to the same ethnic somatype as ancient Jewry. Adherents of this Mediterranean hypothesis have pointed to the influence of religious conversion and intermarriage; they have particularly stressed the point that the Khazars of the Crimea, or at least their ruling class, went over to Judaism in the early Middle Ages and that these Khazars were a round-headed Tartar people. However, during most of the two thousand years that have elapsed since the Jewish Diaspora, conversions to Judaism and marriages between Jews and non-Jews have been the exception. As for the Khazars, it seems far-fetched to suppose that modern Jewry owes its intellectual eminence to partial descent from south Russian semi-nomads.

New light was cast on this matter by the exploration of Nahal Hever, or the Cave of Horrors, by Hebrew archaeologists in 1960. The Cave of Horrors was located high in an escarpment which rose abruptly from the desert floor and was virtually inaccessible and impregnable. It was a refuge and hiding place for the women and children of the military and civilian leaders of the last great Jewish revolt against Rome—that of Bar Kochba in 132 A.D.⁵ It is presumed that the men were killed in raids and forays against the Roman legions which were besieging the area and that the women and children starved to death or killed themselves rather than fall into Roman hands.⁶

Because of the extreme heat, the aridity and the high salt content

of the air in the environs of the Dead Sea, skeletons, documents, even shreds of skin, cartilage and hair were in an excellent state of preservation. High above the plain and gouged into sheer rock walls, the caves and their contents had been safe from grave robbers and wild animals for almost two thousand years.

From the standpoint of physical anthropology, the importance of the Cave of Horrors is that it casts new light on the physical characteristics and racial heritage of the ancient Jews. The skeletons found in the Cave of Horrors did not belong primarily to dolichocephalic Mediterranean people. Of 49 crania that could be measured accurately, Dr. Nathan found that 24 were brachycephalic. Of the rest, more were mesocephalic than dolichocephalic.

For comparison, Nathan examined 81 skeletons found by Avigad and 10 skeletons found by Yadin in En-gedi, a village near the shores of the Dead Sea. These En-gedi skulls belonged to a typical village and agricultural population, which had lived during the first or second centuries B.C. and which, judging by age-distribution of the remains, had died of normal causes. These En-gedi crania were mainly mesocephalic with a minority of brachys and dolichos.

Several conclusions could be drawn provisionally from these finds:

In the first place, it appeared that the Jewish population, during approximately the four centuries straddling the birth of Jesus, was already racially heterogeneous. It probably consisted primarily of Alpine and Mediterranean people and of crosses between them.

Secondly, the upper classes, as represented by the women and children of the Bar Kochba high command, were primarily brachycephalic, to a lesser extent mesocephalic and only slightly dolichocephalic. That meant that they were, for the most part, Alpines, to a secondary extent Alpine-Mediterranean crosses and only to a very slight extent Mediterranean. The common people as represented by En-gedi, by contrast, were mainly Alpine-Mediterranean hybrids in which the Mediterranean element was predominant.

Substantially, the same situation prevails in Israel today. If the entire Israeli population were instantaneously frozen into immobility and preserved, like those residents of Pompei who were suffocated by volcanic dust, one would find that the high officials of the armed forces and the civilian departments, the professors at the universities, the scientists, the artists, the professionals and the inhabitants of the wealthy districts would be preponderantly either brachycephalic (Alpine) or mesocephalic (Alpine mixed with Nordic or Mediterranean). The inhabitants of the poorer quarters, the soldiers, unskilled and

semiskilled workers and farmers would be chiefly dolichocephalic, as they would be Jews from Yemen, Iraq and North Africa. There would be an admixture of brachycephalic and mesocephalic types among the poor, representing the Jewries of such places as Kurdistan and northern Iran.

“The organization of the ancient Hebrews into different tribes, each occupying a particular region of the country,” Dr. Nathan writes, “may have reflected some measure of ethnic heterogeneity.”⁷ If so, it is logical to suppose that the short-headed Alpine and Armenoid tribes, when they had to leave Palestine, would have migrated northward into areas inhabited by peoples of similar ethnic stock and that the long-headed Mediterranean tribes would have made the same decision and either travelled south into Yemen or eastward along the North African coast and into Spain. This is in fact what seems to have happened.⁸

These are interesting speculations, but the skeletal evidence supporting them is skimpy. The characteristics of the skull finds at Engedi and the Cave of Horrors may have reflected special and local conditions. Unfortunately, we are not likely to find representative collections of skulls two thousand years old from the various areas of Israel since the conditions necessary for the preservation of this sort of material seldom arise. Some apparent support of Dr. Nathan’s theory of tribal ethnic diversity seems to be provided by Sauter’s 1953 investigation of the skulls of living Samaritans. He found that those who claimed descent from Manasseh, the King of Judah, were short-headed and Armenoid in type, whereas those who asserted they were of the tribes of Levi and Ephraim were long-headed to middle-headed.⁹ This however, is largely vitiated by blood group analysis which strongly indicates that the Samaritans are not of Jewish ethnic origin, but closely akin to the Arabs.

The Jews of Modern Israel. Physical anthropologists consider Israel a superlatively rich area of study. The Jews inhabiting their new state are the result of a prodigious ingathering of a people dispersed for millenia throughout the world. Israel is not only ethnically, nationally and culturally extremely diverse, it is also unique in the sense that its population is a composite of different Jewries who left their original Palestinian homeland between the Babylonian Captivity of the 6th Century B.C. and the 19th Century A.D. Some of these Jewish groups have been inextricably mixed with other strains through intermarriage, conversion and the blending of Jewish streams of different origin and

provenance. Others have remained almost totally isolated, not only from non-Jewish society, but from other Jewries as well. The most salient example of such an isolate is usually considered to be the Jews of Yemen in southern Arabia, who were airlifted in toto to Israel after the establishment of the Jewish state. However, blood group evidence suggests that these Yemenites are not ethnically Jewish, but primarily the descendants of Arab converts.

The outstanding analysis of the physical anthropology of the people of Israel is a volume edited by Professor Elizabeth Goldschmidt of the Zoology Department of Hebrew University, which I have already cited. It is a condensation of the proceedings of a conference on the genetics of Jewry held in Jerusalem in September 1961 and attended by 148 geneticists and cognate scientists from 15 countries.¹⁰

The interest of the participants was not in the once much-discussed issue of whether or not the Jews are a race. Today there is agreement among all competent scholars that they are not. It was rather in the light cast by genetic evidence on the interrelationships and ethnic affiliations of various Jewish populations.

Genetic Clues. First, let us consider a very rare disease known as familial Mediterranean fever (FMF for short). By 1961 all sufferers from this genetically caused illness in Israel had been registered by the authorities. It appeared that 486 out of every million Mediterranean Jews suffered from FMF as against only six per million *Ashkenazim* and no Persian or Yemenite Jews at all.

Now FMF is primarily a Jewish disorder. Of the cases that have been reported in medical literature, 51.6% of the sufferers were Jews, 29.4% Armenians, 14.3% Arabs and 4.7% miscellaneous. On the basis of this, Dr. H. Heller asked whether the fact that FMF is largely confined to Armenians and Mediterranean Jews points to "a common prehistoric origin for the two peoples." Or had large numbers of Mediterranean Jews, in some manner unrecorded by history, intermarried with Armenians or fobbed themselves off as Armenians.¹¹ Another question was why is it that in North Africa only the Jews get FMF, and not the Muslims or Christians.

Another intriguing genetic tracer is Glucose 6-Phosphate-Dehydrogenase deficiency (G6PD deficiency, for short), a well-established human polymorphism found in all Jewish communities. Dr. A. Szeinberg of Tel-Hashomer Hospital presented a table of the frequency of this enzyme deficiency among different Jewries.

The Kurdistan Jews had the astoundingly high deficiency rate of

58.2% and G6PD deficiency percentages seemed to radiate outward from this center like diminishing ripples. Thus, the Jews of Caucasus and Iraq had incidences in the high 20's, the Iranian, Afghan and Cochin Jews were in the 10-15% bracket; Syria-Lebanon and Yemen were around 5%, Turkish and Egyptian Jews 2 to 4%, whereas the rest of North African and all European Jews scored less than 1%.

A parallel study of 19 Sardinian villages by M. Siniscalco revealed G6PD-deficiency rates as high as 35%.¹² This suggested an intriguing hypothesis, namely, that G6PD deficiency had been originally very high among the ancient Hebrews and Phoenicians, but had diminished and, in some cases, virtually vanished as they interbred with other peoples.

In support of this hypothesis is the fact that the Kurdish Jews are, as Dr. Chaim Sheba pointed out, "a concentrate of the ancient Hebrews exiled to Babylon" in the 6th Century B.C.¹³ It is also significant that in neighboring Iraq, Jewish deficiency rates are highest in the northern part of the country and markedly lower in Baghdad. An explanation for the difference is that two severe epidemics of cholera and plague afflicted Baghdad in the 18th Century, decimating its original Jewish and Arab populations which had lived in the area for about 2,000 years. A flood of the Tigris in 1831 also caused great mortality among both Jews and Moslems. The recovery of Baghdad Jewry came after construction of the Suez Canal, at which time Jews from other parts of the Ottoman Empire migrated to the city. The G6PD-deficiency rate would be lower among Baghdad Jews than among Mosul or Kirkuk Jews then because the former group has been diluted by mixture with other Jewish elements.

As for Sardinia, its isolated situation and extreme poverty made it possible for an original Phoenician population to live there for thousands of years with little contact or mixture with other races and strains. This applied particularly to the isolated villages.

Several highly significant conclusions suggest themselves. First, the Kurdish Jews may well be mirrors of a significant element in the ancient Hebrew population of Palestine. I used the phrase "significant element" because the Jews of this general area are even more short-headed than the Jews of Europe.¹⁴ Hence, they are preponderantly of Alpine-Armenoid stock and hardly of Mediterranean stock at all. They are prototypes of the *Ashkenazim*, not of the *Sephardim*. Secondly, it would follow that the Sardinian village population is a parallel mirror of the original Phoenician population (or a significant part of it.)

An equally important corollary would be that these Phoenicians and ancient Hebrews "could have a common origin," as Dr. Sheba put it.

Thus, the genetics of Jewry suggest the same conclusion of Phoenician-Jewish kinship that Professor Cyrus H. Gordon elaborated in his analysis of the West Semitic character of Minoan Linear A script.¹⁵

When we turn to color blindness among various Jewish groups, we get a pattern which is somewhat different. Broadly speaking, the incidence of color blindness among non-Jews varies from 1 to 4 percent among African Negroes, is about 5% for the Moslems of Egypt and Turkey and ranges between 6% and 11% for Western and Central Europeans.¹⁶

We find that the *Ashkenazim* have a higher color blindness rate than any other Jewish group (8.0%), suggesting a considerable degree of intermarriage with European Gentiles. They are followed by Egyptian Jews (7.4%), North African and Libyan (6.2%), Kurdish and Iranian (5.7%), *Sephardim* (5.5%), Yemeni (4.7%) and Iraqi Jews (only 3.9%). The *Sephardic* Jews and those of North Africa and the Middle East are found, as might have been expected, between the Moslem and the European ranges.

Drs. Sachs and Bat-Miriam made an admirably comprehensive study of the fingerprint patterns of Israeli Jews from eight different regions: Germany, Poland, Bulgaria, Turkey, Egypt, Morocco, Iraq and Yemen. Indexes of whorl, loop and arch count were prepared, based on counts of 5,000 fingers for each Jewish population. Needless to say, fingerprint pattern is an hereditary characteristic.¹⁷

The Jews were found to occupy a specific portion of the range very close to that of Middle Eastern non-Jews, but rather wide of the European part of the range. While all Jews were between these two groups, their affinity was much closer to that of the East Mediterranean peoples. Of the European non-Jewish peoples measured, such preponderantly Nordic elements as the English and Dutch were much lower than the Jews; Spain, Germany and Russia were considerably closer to the Jewish position; Italy was the closest of all European countries. On the other side of the range, the Israeli Arabs and Egyptian Copts were practically at the upper frontier of the Jewish range, whereas the Lebanese and Syrians were further away. The fingerprint evidence provides further corroboration of the hypothesis that the Jews are a more or less homogeneous racial stock with close affinity to the ethnic pattern of other East Mediterranean peoples.

The Evidence of Blood Groups. Generally speaking, blood groups are regarded as the most important available indexes of ethnic origin and affiliation. However, so many genes are involved that it is vir-

tually impossible to summarize the significance of the available evidence briefly. The literature on the subject is vast and growing. New blood groups are constantly being discovered. The blood groups, moreover, are not always stable genetic markers. Susceptibility to certain diseases varies with blood group and it follows that the emigration of a people to an area in which a certain group of diseases is endemic can change their blood group pattern through impact on mortality.

Dr. A. E. Mourant of the Blood Group Reference Laboratory of the Lister Institute has made classic studies of world blood group distribution and of blood group distribution among Jews.¹⁸ "The chief fact which emerges from the present study," he wrote, "is the remarkable uniformity of the *Ashkenazim* as a whole and, similarly, of the *Sephardim* as a whole. There is also a rather surprisingly close resemblance between these two major groups but, where there are systematic differences, the *Sephardim* not unexpectedly show more marked Mediterranean characters than the *Ashkenazim*. Thus, though the Jews of Europe and North Africa may have migrated widely and intermarried to some extent with various peoples, they have maintained their genetic identity more obviously than have the more heterogeneous Jews of Asia."¹⁹

Both the *Ashkenazim* and the *Sephardim*, Mourant concluded, have the blood group compositions to be expected from a mixture of Mediterranean populations with people from central or northern Europe. The Jews of Kurdistan, Baghdad and Iran are basically similar to the European except for the high CDe factor of 60% in the Rh blood groups among Iranian Jews. This suggests Asiatic admixture.

The CDe frequencies within the Rh group are around 5% to 10% for most Jewish groups as compared with 2% to 3% in Europe, 10% to 20% in the Middle East and 45% to 90% in Africa south of the Sahara. Mourant believes this factor is of African origin and that, therefore, "Jews in general . . . have several percent of an African component in their ancestry."²⁰ The non-Jews of the Middle East have more.

A study of the ABO blood groups convinced Mourant that some Jewish groups must have entered Europe through Asia Minor. This is particularly evident in the case of Georgian Jews, who have more than 30% A genes despite the fact that they live among a non-Jewish population with the lowest A frequency in eastern Europe.

Surveys of Jews from Romania, Kharkov and White Russia show B frequencies above 19%. "These suggest an origin even farther east than

Asia Minor, as do the still higher B frequencies found in the culturally distinct Karaite and Krimchak communities of the Soviet Union.”²¹ An obvious explanation of these high B frequencies would be descent of these Jewries from the Khazars, the Tartar people which ruled a kingdom centered in the Ukraine and Crimea in the early Middle Ages and which was converted to Judaism.

The Jews of the Moroccan cities are ethnically Hebrew on the evidence of blood groups, but the Jews of rural Morocco seem not to be. They are probably descended from converts to Judaism. This is indicated by the fact that their ABO blood group pattern closely resembles that of the surrounding Moorish and Berber populations.

As one moves west in Europe, the percentage of A blood type among Jews falls drastically. It is about 9% in the Netherlands as against more than double that figure in Romania and the Ukraine. The cause of this may be extensive inter-marriage with non-Jews.

There is considerable evidence that not all the *Ashkenazim* entered Europe via Asia Minor and either Russia or the Balkans. Many came through Rome, which has one of the oldest continuously occupied Jewish communities in the world, and thence via Spain or France. These differences in migration routes are indicated by variations in blood group patterns.

Judged in terms of ABO blood groups, the Samaritans and the Yemenite Jews are very different from known Jewish groups and very similar to the Arabs in their possession of low A and B gene frequencies. In RH and MN blood group composition, there is very little difference between Yemenite Jews and Arabs. Again the Yemenites do not resemble the observed RH and MN patterns of other Jewish groups. The obvious inference would be that the Yemenites, like the rural Moroccans, are primarily the rescendants of proselytes to Judaism.²²

Jewish Diversity and the State of Israel. The material I have presented on the physical anthropology of contemporary Jews suggests such an intricate and complex picture that it is very difficult to summarize the evidence and paint a picture with broad strokes.

On the whole, the evidence supports the traditional view that Jewry is divided into two main groups—*Ashkenazim* and *Sephardim*. The former are short-headed and preponderantly Alpine or Armenoid; the latter long-headed and primarily of Mediterranean type.

There is evidence that the Jews of Kurdistan (and, to a lesser extent, of Georgia and Iraq) may be the purest extant representatives of ancient Hebrew stock. These Kurdish Jews may be genetically closely

akin to rural Sardinians and these Sardinians may in turn be the purest extant examples of unalloyed ancient Phoenicians and Carthaginians.

Blood-group analysis suggests strongly that the Jewries of Western Europe are heavily mixed through intermarriage.

The Jewries of Yemen and rural Morocco appear to be preponderantly the descendants of non-Jewish proselytes. Similar anomalies and abrupt variations in the blood-group patterns of various Asian and African Jewries suggest that other groups may be of mixed racial, or even of non-Jewish, origin. On the other hand, the fingerprint patterns and certain other markers seem to point in the opposite direction.

The class and educational demarcation line in modern Israel is not between *Sephardim* and *Ashkenazim*; it is between Jews of European origin and Jews of African and Asian origin. The former group includes both the dolichocephalic *Sephardic* Spanish Jews and the brachycephalic German and Slavic *Ashkenazim*. The latter group comprises both long-headed North African Jews of Mediterranean type and short-headed Jews from Asia Minor of distinctly Armenoid type.

During the years of immigration and attempted assimilation of the Afroasian Jews, it was hopefully assumed that these differences were solely due to the economically, socially and culturally depressed status of the Jews from the Middle East. Quite evidently, they had lived for the most part in huddled squalor, under humiliating conditions, subject to persecution, ignorant of the modern world and, to a large extent, Oriental (one might say Moslem) in their basic mores and attitudes.

A corollary to this environmentalist hypothesis was that the Afroasian Jews could be raised to the level of their European brethren and assimilated into the modern state of Israel by changing their milieu, that is to say, through weakening the hold of the patriarchal Oriental family, through the influence of public education, through compulsory military service and through assimilation into such adult Israeli communities as the *kibbutz*, or communal farm.

These expectations have not materialized. I have already pointed out in a previous chapter that Israeli children of Asian and African stock enter the public school system about 10 I.Q. points behind children of European stock and that *with each year of schooling that gap widens*.

Many studies have revealed this. Thus, in a 1961 study of kindergarten and first and second grade pupils in Israeli schools, Sarah Smilansky found that the average I.Q. of the European children on the

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (wisc) was 104.4 as against 94.2 for Oriental Jewish children. Further studies showed that the basic correlation was between I.Q. and area of origin and not between I.Q. and socio-economic status of parents.

"In theory," wrote Moshe Smilansky, "one might assume that once children enter school, which is supposed not only to impart knowledge, but also to develop abilities, the intellectual level of the children would gradually rise. Yet two further researches in the first field, based on the examination of groups of children of different ages coming from the underdeveloped sections of various communities, showed that this was not the case and that, in fact, the reverse was true: *it was found that there was a continuous decline in the level of the intelligence of the children tested, starting with the nine to ten year-old and reaching a peak at the age of fourteen with the completion of elementary school.*"²³

Sarah Smilansky noted that "statistically significant deterioration" in the I.Q.'s of children from the underdeveloped countries occurred from the first year of school forward, whereas no such deterioration took place among the children of European Jewish origin. As in the case of American Negroes, the I.Q. gap widened with age and scholastic level.²⁴

The gap is widening in other respects. Of the 162,000 Israeli illiterates, 137,000 are Orientals. While more than 50% of the first-grade pupils in Israeli schools are of Afroasian origin, they are weeded out so rapidly that by the 12th grade they constitute only 16% of the student body. Some 43% of the North African and 34% of the Middle Eastern Jews in Israel do unskilled labor against an unskilled labor percentage of only 17% for Israeli Jews as a whole.²⁵

Since the Afroasian Jews reproduce much more rapidly than the European Jewries, Israel is rapidly being transformed into an Oriental state. To the extent that this becomes the case, the intellectual brilliance of the new republic will become tarnished and the support of Israel by the Jews of America will probably abate.

The Government of Israel is doing what it can to discourage "prejudice" against the Orientals, to raise them educationally, to bring them into the world of modern Jewry through fostering integration with Western Jews and to enable some of their more promising members to enter the Israeli elite through special privileges of various sorts.

Yet there is little evidence that these measures are working. The Afroasians are the main source of delinquency and crime in Israel.

Private hostility between the two major groups of Jews has erupted in riots over alleged discrimination in housing and is expressed in the bitter attitudes of Orientals toward the Western-oriented school system. The two groups tend to avoid close relations with each other.

Beneath all the official talk deploring "prejudice", there is the tacit recognition that the Afroasians have contributed and are contributing very little to science, culture or leadership of any sort. "The Moroccan Jew took a lot from the Moroccan Arab," former Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion observed, "and I don't see much we can learn from the Moroccan Arabs. The culture of Morocco I would not like to have here. And I don't see what contribution present Persians have to make."²⁰

The cleavage is not only social, but political. The Afroasians tend to support the orthodox religious party, to oppose the social democratic tendencies of the European Jews and to resent domination by the Western Jewish elite in toto. Some sociologists predict total schism. Yet partition of the small state of Israel would leave both sectors appallingly vulnerable to Arab military attack.

A concentrated effort is being made to raise the Afroasian Jewish children to the level of European Jewry. Kindergarten and pre-kindergarten programs, analagous to the Operation Head Start of the Johnson Administration, are being attempted. Oriental Jewish children are favored with special scholarships and a proposal has been made that their families be paid wages for their attending school. In the case of both Afroasian Jewish and Arab children, the qualifying examination marks necessary for advanced education are lower than in the case of Jews of European origin. When I was in Israel in the summer of 1964, I was told by educational authorities that the Arabs and Oriental Jews test about the same in intelligence and school achievement.

This system is designed to provide greater equality of opportunity by compensating for the superior environmental position of the Western Jews in general and the professional and upper classes within this Jewry in particular. As of now, there is little evidence that it is working. Despite favoritism, few Arabs and Oriental Jews qualify for the University or reach the higher echelons of either civilian officialdom or the armed forces. The most striking visual evidence of this is that the creative, power and status elites in Israel are generally comparatively tall, fair and brachycephalic, whereas the Oriental Jews are usually much darker and shorter.

It is difficult to believe that the widening gap between the European

and Afroasian Jews is primarily due to environment, since this gap widens when the environmental barriers to Oriental Jewish progress are partially broken down.

To the extent that the Afroasian Jewries are the descendants of non-Jewish proselytes, the problem involves deep-seated ethnic differences. The mere fact of religious conversion to Judaism cannot transform Arab and Berber masses into intellectual elites. Yet the nascent state of Israel could scarcely have taken this fact into consideration and placed barriers against the immigration of people who had steadfastly adhered to their religion, despite centuries of indignity and persecution. Born in the aftermath of the Nazi extermination camps, the state of Israel came into being as a haven for the persecuted Jews of the entire world with its criterion for admission simply that all those who considered themselves Jews were Jews.

Not all of the Afroasian Jews are the descendants of non-Jewish proselytes. In fact, most of them are probably Jews in an ethnic sense. In these cases, the hypothesis I should like to suggest is that their educational and intellectual shortcomings are due to the fact that the Oriental Jewries were not adequately exposed to the eugenic processes of breeding for brain-power which I have already described. In some instances, the rabbinical educational system never took hold; in other instances, it lapsed; in still others, it became "orientalized" — that is to say, it developed rote memory to the exclusion of reasoning power and logic.

The cleavage between Western and Oriental Jews presents a problem critical to the future health, and perhaps even to the survival, of Israel. No clear solution seems to be in sight. Meanwhile, the measures currently in force and proposed to develop the Afroasian Jewish children toward the limit of their intellectual abilities may partially alleviate tension and schism. For the longer run, the most essential first step would appear to be a comprehensive and open-minded investigation of all the facts to determine the basic causes of the educational and cultural gap.

ALTERNATE THEORIES, CONTRIBUTORY CAUSES

This chapter is devoted to an examination of some of the alternate theories which have been advanced for the intellectual eminence of the Jewish people. Not all of these hypotheses are necessarily in conflict with the central thesis of the immediately preceding chapters. In fact, some of the theories discussed in this chapter originate, to the best of my knowledge, with me. All institutions are the product of a variety of interacting forces which combine in unknown proportions to produce the observed effects.

One of the most self-evident peculiarities of the history of the Jewish people is that the Jews were outside the feudal system. As I have already pointed out, they were servants of the crown. This had several consequences and implications. During the Middle Ages, hardly any Jews were peasants or lords of manors. Standing outside the feudal hierarchy of rights and duties, they were untouched by the institutions of chivalry.

Above all, the Jews were not allowed to bear arms and were exempt from military obligations. The importance of this exemption from the biogenetic standpoint is that, from the decline of the Roman Empire in the West to the development of modern nationalism and its twin, universal conscription, the negatively selective forces of private and national wars did not affect the Jews.¹

In the medieval system war was the profession of the nobility. Crusades, national wars, civil wars and private wars took a tremendous toll of life within this specialized warrior caste. The Wars of the Roses, for instance, decimated the English peerage. As the Middle Ages advanced, the English long bow made the knight in armor vulnerable and firearms made him obsolete. This brought the profession of war down to the level of the yeomanry and made war less class-selective as a winnowing agent. However, at the same time, the dynastic nation-state began to burst through the shell of the moribund feudal society. In this contest, the nobles were brought to heel by wholesale proscriptions and executions on the charge of treason. One need merely read Shakespeare's historic plays to realize the extent to which entire lines of the peerage were exterminated in private wars, civil wars and under

the headsman's axe in the Tower. The same or similar processes were at work throughout Europe up to the borders of Russia and of the Ottoman Empire. In the case of Spain, the injection of a religious element made the war against the Moors continuous and savage, probably causing a proportionately greater mortality among the nobility than the military struggles elsewhere in medieval Europe.

Thus, the upper classes were being thinned out by wars and prosecutions, their ranks being filled by the promotion of people of lower status. The decimation of the aristocracy was genetically unfavorable to the development of intelligence for at least two reasons. First, qualities such as courage, strength, judgment and mental ability were needed to get and hold the power positions from which aristocracy develops. Second, the nobility had first choice of women and thus tended to improve its strain generation by generation.

The Jews enjoyed the substantial biogenetic advantage of immunity from the negative selection of warfare and prosecution for treason. As the power of the nobles was broken and standing and mass armies successively replaced the knights at arms, this advantage narrowed. It did not disappear entirely, however, for the nobility continued its tradition of professional soldiering and formed a disproportionately large part of the combat officer corps of European armies until very recent times.

The Influence of Social Revolution. A perhaps equally significant factor, in my opinion, is the class-selective nature of the Jewish revolt against Rome of 66 to 70 A.D. As Josephus pointed out, the Jewish resistance to Rome was both a struggle for national independence and a social revolution.

The chief leader of this revolution was Simon bar Giora, a man who was probably not entirely of Jewish blood since his name means "the son of the convert." Cecil Roth, the distinguished Oxford historian of the Jews, views Simon bar Giora as "obviously a radical with extreme tendencies" who liberated the slaves, "attacked the wealthy, sacking their houses and molesting their persons."²³

"By proclaiming liberty for slaves and rewards for the free," Josephus tells us, Simon "gathered around him villains from every quarter."²⁴ Once in power in Jerusalem, Simon and his colleague, John of Gischala, tortured the rich to make them surrender their hoards of food to the common store. The wealthy were "falsely accused of conspiracy and executed, as were others on the charge of betraying the city to the Romans . . ."²⁴ Others were accused of trying to desert by informers

who had been bribed and were then hurled over the walls to their deaths.⁵

While several warring Jewish factions, for the most part extremist, exterminated each other in Jerusalem, the richer and more intelligent Jews tried to disassociate themselves from the insurrectionaries. Josephus, after defending his Galilee command to the best of his ability, turned over to the Romans and served as translator and advisor for Titus, the Roman commander in chief. The Jewish king, Agrippa, furnished auxiliary troops to the Romans and Agrippa's sister, Berenice, became Titus' mistress. Tiberius Alexander, the Jewish Alabarch of Alexandria and nephew of Philo, the philosopher, became one of Titus' chief generals.

The political motivations of these leaders and of the myriads of less distinguished Jews who either aided the Roman cause or abstained from the struggle no doubt included such factors as personal ambition, self-preservation and a realistic understanding that the power of Rome was so immense as to make the uprising hopeless. But an additional motivation was implacable class opposition to the social revolution which Simon bar Giora, John of Gischala and the *sicarii* were carrying out.⁶

Moreover, Jewry outside Palestine took no part, or virtually no part, in the uprising. Thus, the tragic and heroic revolt of 66 to 70 A.D. was primarily an uprising of the have-nots and of the ignorant. The 600,000 to 1,100,000 Jewish deaths must have occurred chiefly among peasants, landless workers and slaves, not to mention semi-nomadic peoples such as the Idumaeans who had been more or less forcibly converted to Judaism. The blow fell hardest, in other words, on "the slaves of the soil" and "the ignorant people of the country" whom the religious leaders of Judea had despised as wholly ignorant and had treated as virtual pariahs. The fact that non-Palestinian Jewry abstained from the struggle was also of biological advantage to Jewry. These Jews of the dispersion were almost entirely townsmen rather than peasants. Jewish communities such as that of Alexandria were intellectually considerably above the level of Jewish Palestine.

The Influence of Christianity. The influence of Christianity on Jewry tended to operate in a similar direction — that is to say, the Jewish converts to the new religion consisted chiefly of impoverished Jews, on the one hand, and of the "Greek Jews," on the other. The latter were ethnically non-Jewish or only partially Jewish stocks from the hellen-

ized eastern sector of the Roman Empire who had become converts to or sympathizers of Judaism.

As for the first group, the Gospels contain such abundant evidence that Jesus preached to the poor that the point hardly seems worth laboring. The primitive Jewish Christians were at first known as *Ebionites*, that is to say, "the poor." This group, however, which comprised those who wished to preserve the Mosaic Law, virtually disappeared after the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

Paul's converts were chiefly hellenized Jews and converts to Judaism from Greek cities in Greece and Asia Minor. The intellectual subtlety of Paul's epistles makes it most improbable that he was addressing simple or uneducated people.

The elaborate investigation of the spread of Christianity during the first three centuries of our era by Adolf Harnack shows that it gained most in the hellenistic Jewish communities. Thus, Harnack lists Asia Minor, Thrace, Cyprus, Armenia and Edessa as regions which were preponderantly Christian at the onset of the 4th Century. All had Jewries of this mixed type. On the other hand, Christianity made hardly any headway in Palestine itself with the exception of Jerusalem, a city barred to Jews after Titus' victory. Nor did the new religion manage to strike deep roots in Alexandria, which had a large, well-educated and, for the most part, racially unmixed Jewish community.

In the West, Mithraism was stronger than Christianity and, in the ranks of the legions, it was much stronger. In what would later become the Roman Empire of the West, Christianity was strongest in southern Spain, southern Gaul and northern Africa, all areas of Carthaginian settlement in which previous Jewish proselytism had been successful.⁷

In later centuries, massive Christian pressure on Jews to abandon their religion tended to sift out those whose convictions and moral stamina were weaker than average. This pressure was unrelenting and it was exerted over a time-span of many centuries. Often the Jews were faced with the choice between conversion or performing some ritually unclean act such as eating pork, on the one hand, and instant death, on the other. In 1492, the Jews of Spain were forced to choose between professing Christianity and being expelled from the country. Of the majority which chose expulsion, less than half survived the vicissitudes of emigration.

As a general rule, religious persecution and enforced conversion strengthens the genetic pool of those who successfully resist by winnowing out those weakest in mind and moral fibre. This was certainly true in the case of the Puritans. In the Jewish instance, there are at

least two qualifications to the rule. First, Christian theologians often concentrated their conversion attempts on individual Jewish scholars and religious leaders who had great prestige among Jewry. The strategy was to win over these leaders in the hopes that others would follow them. In the second place, some of the Jews who accepted conversion did so because they were skeptical of both religions. An outstanding example was Benedict Spinoza.

Natural Selection and Non-Violence. The theories I have advanced are all historic — that is to say, they assume that Jewish intelligence evolved due to various events, forces and institutions at specific periods in Jewish history. Others have assumed that the Jewish people were originally or always mentally outstanding. Thus, Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, who is regarded by those who do not bother to read his books as a virulent hater of the Jewish people, wrote in 1853 about how the Jews built an extremely complicated and admirable political system in the hard environment of Canaan, adding:

“Since the chosen race ceased to dwell in the mountains and the plains of Palestine, the well where Jacob’s flocks came down to drink has been filled up with sand, Naboth’s vineyard has been invaded by the desert, and the bramble flourishes in the place where stood the palace of Ahab. And what did the Jews become in this miserable corner of the earth? They became a people that succeeded in everything it undertook, a free, strong and intelligent people, and one which, before it lost, sword in hand, the name of an independent nation, had given as many learned men to the world as it had merchants.”⁸

The late Professor Ellsworth Huntington of Yale also dated Jewish intellectual superiority to Biblical times. “The Jews are probably the greatest of all races,” he wrote. “Has any other so persistently produced an almost ceaseless string of great men for three or four thousand years? Has any other produced so many great men in proportion to its numbers? Certainly no other, unless it be the Chinese, has consistently maintained a prominent position for millenium after millenium.”⁹

Quite outside of the fact that Huntington was in error when he called the Jews a race, this and similar assertions of Jewish pre-eminence since Old Testament times are not based on adequate evidence. The Jews of genius Huntington lists are Moses, David, Isaiah, Jesus, John, Paul and Mendelssohn. The historicity of some of these figures is questionable; in other cases, the boundaries between fact and folklore are vague. We do, however, know enough about Paul and Mendelssohn to agree that they were geniuses.

In the same book, Huntington made a more fruitful suggestion. He advanced the theory that the character structure of the modern Jew results partly from the great struggles against Rome during 66 to 135 A.D. which cost the lives of about two million Jews, or perhaps a fourth of world Jewry. Huntington observed that the moderate Jews abstained from these hopeless contests, whereas the fanatics and zealots fought and were exterminated. The natural selection of war, he concluded, may have largely eliminated aggressive, bellicose and sadistic strains from the Jewish people.

There is some historic evidence in support of this theory. In the uprisings against Rome, the Jewish forces were not distinguished for gentleness. They killed and let themselves be killed with a depreciation of life incomprehensible to modern Western man. During one of these uprisings, over half a million Greeks were allegedly killed by the Jews in Cyprus, Cyrene and Egypt, many of them being sawn apart according to a precedent of King David.¹⁰

Around the time of the defeat of these risings, Jewish aversion to violence becomes manifest. By the 1st Century A.D., capital punishment became rare among Jews. During the last centuries of the Roman rule in the West, the rabbis "scarcely resented their loss of capital sanctions, as they had long been reluctant to issue death sentences."¹¹ During the Middle Ages, the Jewish communities frequently put to death one type of criminal — the informers — for they threatened the existence of the entire Jewish group.¹² Except for this, penal practice was mild and civilized. There was imprisonment, but not mutilation or torture. Heretics and apostates were sometimes flogged in the synagogues. Excommunication was resorted to, but it was seldom permanent. Since most Jews did not believe in punishment after death, excommunication merely meant ostracism, not eternal hell fire.

Like the Greeks, the Jews disapproved of the tortures of the Roman arena. It is true that they also opposed the more manly Greek substitute of boxing, wrestling and pancration, but this disapproval was solely on the grounds that the contestants were naked.

The mild medieval Jewish punishments contrasted with public executions, carried out in a variety of gruesome ways, which constituted a favorite spectacle for the peoples among whom the Jews lived. The public *auto-da-fés* contributed immensely to the popularity which the Spanish Inquisition always enjoyed with the common people. In Protestant countries, witch-burning was a substitute.

The generally humane attitudes of the Jews of the Middle Ages could be illustrated by a variety of examples, of which one or two

will suffice. Thus, while the Christian world until recently regarded wife-beating with tolerance, the Jews punished this practice, which was rare among them, sternly. In the 9th and 10 Centuries, a Jew who beat his wife was fined heavily; by the 12th Century, he was obligated to provide her with maintenance apart from him; in later centuries, it was automatic grounds for divorce.¹⁸ Even hunting was frowned upon as inhumane and un-Jewish. "He who hunts game with dogs, as non-Jews do, will not participate in the joy of the Leviathan," wrote Rabbi Meir bar Baruch of Rothenburg (1220-1293 A.D.), the first chief rabbi of Germany.

Jewish repudiation of unnecessary violence becomes increasingly marked as we enter the medieval world. Jewish passivity and lack of aggressiveness are associated with the enforced withdrawal from political affairs into scholarship. The change is, therefore, part of the general process of Jewish intellectualization. The shattering political defeats which the Jews suffered at the hands of Rome, their precarious condition after the triumph of Christianity as a puny, persecuted minority — all this created a milieu in which it would have been suicidal for the Jews even to contemplate violence as a possible solution. The intellectual elite of Jewry accordingly shaped the doctrines of Judaism increasingly in the direction of gentleness and non-violence.

Intelligence or Drive? A commonly expressed view is that Jews are highly intelligent because they have "an intellectual tradition." This is putting the cart before the horse. It is equivalent to saying that the Irish are pugnacious because they have a tradition of fighting. The capacity or drive creates the tradition, and not vice versa. Pugnacity induces people to fight; sexual vitality induces them to make love; intellectual ability induces them to think.

It is also frequently said that the Jews directed their energies into intellectual channels because Christian antisemitism closed almost all other doors in their faces. There is a grain of truth in this. However, it does not explain the almost unique reaction of the Jews to economic, social and political persecution. The untouchables of India, the despised Etas of Japan and most similarly situated minorities have not reacted to economic exclusion and social ostracism by producing intellectual giants and dedicating their people to learning. On the contrary, they have reacted to exclusion by simply sinking more deeply into the mud. The Jewish reaction required a great deal more than oppression. It required exceptional will-power and intelligence.

A third theory is that Jews succeed more than non-Jews in intellec-

tual fields because they have more drive and because they work harder. This is a much more constructive approach to the problem than the two preceding theories. It is also one which, in my opinion, could be readily verified or disproved.

Without asserting that the modern intelligence test is completely culture-free, we can state that it is much more a measure of native intelligence and much less a measure of hard work than school or college grades. Hence, a statistically controlled study of Jewish intelligence test scores compared with Jewish academic performance should provide an answer to the question. If Jews do significantly better in academic work than their I.Q. scores indicate, it is fair to infer that they work harder than non-Jews. If, on the other hand, their I.Q. scores indicate better school grades than they actually obtain, the implication would be that they do not work as hard as non-Jews.

The evidence I have seen on this matter is conflicting. Thus, in 1949, Clark found that Jewish Northwestern freshmen "work more nearly to the limit of their ability in college than do non-Jewish students."¹⁴ A 1927 Master's thesis by Irma Loeb Cohen, however, reached an opposite conclusion.¹⁵ A fresh approach, covering a much broader cross-section of the student population is needed.

I have not attempted to survey the literature systematically to discover all extant alternate theories of Jewish mental ability and appraise them. Some hypotheses are so badly thought out and so incoherently expressed that they are not worthy of serious consideration. The main impression one gets from the literature is that little serious thinking has been devoted to the topic. Jewish writers in particular seem to have sometimes blinded themselves to the evidence because of their eagerness to find an environmental or sociological explanation of Jewish achievement, one that in no way suggests even the possibility that, because of a unique biogenetic history, the Jewish people may be inherently more intelligent than their neighbors.

THE RISE OF JEWISH EDUCATION

Judaism assigns to education a role of tremendous importance, one far greater than that accorded to it by any other religion. Learning the Law, understanding its implications and hence being able to learn how to live justly are considered the birthrights and obligations of all Jewish males, regardless of their class, status or economic condition. Education begins with the very young and is supposed to continue up to the grave.

These attitudes are rooted in the Old Testament. As it is put in *Deuteronomy*: "Therefore impress these My words upon your very heart; bind them as a sign on your hand and let them serve as a symbol on your forehead, and teach them to your children — reciting them when you stay at home and when you are away, when you lie down and when you get up; and inscribe them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates . . ."1

The educational institutions of the Jews in the centuries prior to the Babylonian Captivity must have been informal for the Old Testament stresses the duty of fathers to instruct their sons rather than the obligations of teachers.² The efficacy of this educational effort can be judged by the extent of literacy in ancient Judea. Fortunately, we know a good deal about this because of J. L. Starkey's excavations of the ancient Palestinian town of Lachish between 1932 and his murder in 1938. Starkey's most important find was 21 letters written on clay tablets in Hebrew during the 6th Century B.C.

"Written by different scribes, these letters indicate, according to Torczyner, 'that the ancient Jews could write quickly and boldly, in an artistic flowing hand, with the loving penmanship of those who enjoy writing' (*The Lachish Letters*, p. 15). We certainly must not assume, without further proof except a general disposition to exaggerate ancient illiteracy, that the small Lachish garrison included several professional scribes, lay or priestly."³

Education beyond the level of paternal instruction fell into the hands of the priests, or *kohanim*, an hereditary caste which soon came to be referred to as the anointed ones. After the return from the Babylonian Captivity, these priests became increasingly absorbed with

their religious functions and with filling the chief public offices. Higher education devolved upon scribes who were scholars without any official position. Young children entered an elementary school; the intellectually most promising of those who completed this course were admitted to an institution of higher education known as the *Bet Ha-Midrash*.⁴

Education was free and open to all boys. "Take care of the children of the poor," was one maxim, "for it is they who advance learning." Another was: "As water is free for all, so is the Torah."

The Sadducees, one of the two chief Jewish factions during the Hellenistic and early Roman period, opposed free universal male education because they believed that leisure was essential to a life of scholarship and because they feared dilution of the priestly caste. They were concerned about the consequences of creating an impoverished class of intellectuals who, having no real stake in the social order, would espouse drastic religious and social reforms.

However, the political power of these urbane, skeptical and sophisticated rationalist reactionaries was seriously weakened by the nationalist fervor of the Maccabean era — an emotional force which the Sadducees were unable either to direct or suffocate. Toward the end of the Hasmonean dynasty, secondary education for boys was institutionalized. This reform is traditionally attributed to Simon ben Shetah, the brother of Queen Salome and vice-president of the powerful Sanhedrin. By about 75 B.C., schools of this sort were established to prepare pupils for the Jerusalem academy. Instruction was free and the authority of the by now predominantly Pharisaical priesthood was exerted to see that fathers sent their sons to the new schools.

The last stage was creation of the base of the educational pyramid. The establishment of free primary schools for boys in all Jewish communities was ordered, according to tradition, by Rabbi Joshua ben Gamala in 64 A.D. — two years before the suicidal struggle of Palestinian Jewry against Roman power.⁵ Baron, however, argues that the schools were actually established either during or shortly after this sanguinary struggle as a device by the rabbis to win popular support and to solidify their authority.

The destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D. marked the final victory of the Pharisees. The geographical center of Jewish worship had been razed. What remained was the Torah — the book. The spatial dimensions of Judaism disappeared; it became more emphatically worldwide. The hereditary priesthood, administering to the Temple, vanished; it was replaced by a rabbinate of scholars, dedicated to teaching the Law.

The Primary Schools. Wherever there were 25 boys, it was ordered that the community furnish a teacher; where there were 40, the teacher had to be given an assistant. Parents who refused to send their children to school were largely ostracized and were referred to as "people of the country" or the "common, ignorant people." The moral authority of the rabbinate was exerted to prevent educated Jews from marrying into this recalcitrant, backward element.

The teaching of the young was considered a holy work and, even in the era of disintegration of the 3rd Century A.D., scholars resorted to heroic measures to see that knowledge of the law was not lost.

"How can you argue with me?" asked Rabbi Hiyya. "I am preventing the Torah from being forgotten in Israel. I go and plant flax and weave nets and catch gazelles. Their flesh I give to orphans for food; of the skins I make scrolls on which I write out the five books of Moses. Then I go up to a town where there are no teachers for children and teach five boys to read the five books, each a different book."^a

Then, in the same manner, he would teach six boys the six books of the Mishna. Each thus taught would have to have imparted his knowledge to another boy by the time Rabbi Hiyya returned to the community. Whether these measures were characteristic of Jewish education during the early centuries of the Christian era or simply expedients used in isolated communities, where, because of conversions to Christianity or for other reasons, the Jewish population had fallen below the minimum necessary to support a teacher, is unknown.

The Jewish primary and secondary schools were located in the synagogues, buildings which generally had two rooms and which were used for coaching whenever services were not in progress. The words *synagogue* and *school* have been synonymous among Jews ever since. The wholesale destruction of synagogues in Jerusalem after the Bar Kochba uprising of 135 A.D. and the vigorous campaigns to destroy them throughout the Roman Empire when the latter became christianized created chronic overcrowding in the Jewish schools. This lasted until the French Revolution in Catholic countries because of clerically inspired prohibition of building new synagogues.

During the Graeco-Roman period, the pupils went to school early in the morning and remained there until evening with no lunch period. Like other peoples of antiquity, the Jews ate only two meals daily and one of the reasons for not beginning formal education until five was that smaller children could not last all day without eating. In the Middle Ages, the children generally went home for breakfast, lunch

and the evening meal. Their study hours lasted from an hour or two before dawn until the evening prayer. In the *yeshivas*, or higher schools, the students lived together.

As for teaching methods: A lesson should be given four times so that it would be committed to memory verbatim. The students were to recite and intone aloud, in fact, they were to move their hands as they intoned in the manner prevalent today in the Near East. The theory was that a student who studied silently would forget all he learned within three years. Efforts at silent study, therefore, were sometimes rewarded with kicks from the teachers. The emphasis on memory was partially a result of the high cost of books and paper, making it difficult to obtain a permanent record of what was taught. The teachers used slates and afterwards erased what had been written on them. Books were scarce. Before the age of printing, a copy of the Torah, or Pentateuch, cost about four months of the teacher's salary.

There were said to be four types of students. The sponge absorbed everything. The coarse mesh forgot everything. The strainer lost the wine and kept the lees. Finally, the sieve rejected the chaff and kept the fine flour.⁷ Students who learned swiftly and forgot slowly were considered golden; those slow to learn and quick to forget hopeless.

Together with the heavy stress on developing memory, there was an equally intense effort to sharpen analytic ability. Conciseness of expression was esteemed in a teacher. Ability to organize material was the chief gift sought for among students who had not yet reached the higher educational level. Teachers were always to give the sources of their statements. After each lesson, the students were given a period for reflection on what they had learned. To test the mental keenness of pupils, teachers would often express views contradictory to what had been taught in class and expect their students to point out the contradictions.

The golden time for learning, in the sense of absorption and memorizing of material, was childhood. "When one learns Torah in his childhood, the words of the Torah seep into his blood and come out distinctly from his mouth," wrote Rabbi Nathan.⁸ And again: "He that learns as a child, what is he like? To ink written on new paper. He who learns as an old man, what is he like? Like ink that has been written on paper that has been blotted out."⁹

Punishment and Discipline. At school as at home, discipline was maintained with the whip and the rod. "Folly is bound up in the heart of a child," wrote the author of *Proverbs*, "but the rod of discipline

drives it far from him."¹⁰ The good father, according to *Ecclesiasticus*, should be stern and unbending: ". . . play with your son, and he will bring you heaviness. Laugh not with him, lest thou have sorrow with him, and lest thou gnash thy teeth in the end. Give him not liberty in his youth, and wink not at his follies."¹¹

The Mosaic code was even sterner. If an incorrigible son after many whippings refused to obey his parents, they were to bring him to the elders of the city and say: "This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard." Then all the men of the city shall stone him to death with stones; so you shall purge the evil from your midst; and all Israel shall hear, and fear."¹²

However, as Eby points out, paternal authority among the ancient Hebrews was less sweeping than among the ancient Romans where the *patria potestas* gave the father absolute power of life and death over his children.¹³ It is also worth noting that, according to *Deuteronomy*, the mother had to consent before the son could be brought to the elders to be stoned to death.

Elementary school teachers were often depicted with a strap in their hands. "Let the fear of thy teacher be as the fear of Heaven," the Tannaim counselled.¹⁴ At one time, a teacher could not be held accountable if the child died under flogging.¹⁵ Despite this, Drazin, one of the leading authorities on Jewish education in Graeco-Roman times, claims that there are no cases of brutality on record.¹⁶ Certainly, Jewish school discipline in the classical period was milder than the Roman or, for that matter, than the public school training of the privileged English youth of Swinburne's time.¹⁷

As one turns to the Middle Ages, Jewish attitudes seem extremely mild by comparison with the harshness and brutality of the period. Possibly the Jews had been softened by suffering. Whatever the cause, the teacher was permitted to strike a pupil only when necessary to make an immediate disciplinary impression. If he left marks on the pupil's body or caused an injury, the teacher was suspended.¹⁸

The Vocation of Teacher. Unlike the Greek and Roman schools, Jewish primary and secondary education was free. Where possible, the teachers taught gratis as the Bible commands that those who know the Law impart it free of charge. Where this was out of the question, they were supposed to receive from teaching what they would otherwise earn at their trade.¹⁹ Later, teachers received regular tuition fees. They were never organized in guilds and Baron records that a hundred rabbis are known to have earned a living as artisans.²⁰

On the other hand, whether they taught or not, scholars enjoyed tax exemption, the first fruits of the harvest, and sometimes the opportunity of marrying into well-to-do families and becoming silent partners in profitable business ventures. These material rewards were, however, small in relation to the arduous and almost endless study required. "You shall eat bread without salt, sleep on the ground and live the life of misery and yet labor on the study of the Torah."²¹ This life of poverty and deprivation, involving protracted separation from their families, did not prevent the most famous scholars of the Law from having a power and prestige among their co-religionists comparable to that of the highest prelates of the Roman Catholic Church.

As for the Jewish academies, a daily admission fee was charged during the 1st Century B.C. except for priests and levites who served in the Temple and could not earn enough there to pay tuition. At about the time of Jesus, the school of Shammai "favored the wealthy students and held that material wealth should be one of the four criteria to be applied in the selection of students for the college."²² Shammai's great rival, Hillel, had gained his education by working as a woodcutter. According to tradition, he earned a tropaic, half of which he set aside to feed himself and his family, the other half for tuition. One day, he was unable to find work and, on being refused admission to the academy, he climbed to the roof and listened through the skylight. When he was discovered, his body was covered by several feet of snow.²³ When he became a full-fledged master of the Law and head of the academy, Hillel abolished the practice of charging fees.

At the time of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai gained Roman permission to establish an academy at Jabneh. The schools of Hillel and Shammai were united. No tuition was charged, but students could be barred for lack of "sincerity." A porter kept out students who were not certified. When Johanan's successor, the Patriarch Gamaliel, was deposed by a student rebellion, the porter was dismissed and the academy was opened to all. From then on, according to Drazin, scholarship was the sole criterion of admission.²⁴ This applied also to academies in six other Judean towns, most of which had been set up to preserve the tradition of the oral law in the event of Roman suppression of the Jabneh academy.

Uniqueness of Jewish Education. In theory at least, the establishment of free, universal, male education among the Jewish people occurred about a century after the birth of Christ. In realistic terms, one might do well to assume that the system was not as spatially

homogenous or comprehensive as Drazin and other students of the matter assume. The massive forces of social disorganization, which were shattering both the Roman power and the dispersed Jewish people — depopulation, adverse climatic change, accelerating barbarian invasions, the laying waste of Palestine in the wake of hopeless uprisings and the worsening status of Jewry under rising Christian persecution — these factors, together with the general lack of the technical means for efficient organization, would easily have sufficed to prevent the system from being uniform and all-embracing.

Even with these limitations, the Jewish educational system that now arose was a momentous break with the rule of most previous civilizations. These had confined education generally to the classes of priests and scribes, the former being charged with mysteries, rites and religious doctrine, the latter being engaged in the paper work and bureaucratic administration necessary for the material functioning of the civilization and the division of its social surplus. For obvious reasons, the size of the educated class had been limited by the ability of the civilization to produce a surplus of goods and services beyond the quantities needed to keep its hordes of peasants, laborers and artisans alive and working. With more or less stagnant productive techniques, this surplus was severely limited and so necessarily was the educated class which fed upon it.

Athens marks a major departure from these Mesopotamian and Egyptian models. The economic feasibility of general education was based in part on the work of the slave population and in part on the superior productivity and wealth of a mercantile and maritime people. As for the Romans, the extension of education was made possible by, and moved apace with, the profits of world dominion.

The Jewish case is very different; in fact, it is unparalleled. Universal male education was not a corollary of increasing prosperity or rising political power. On the contrary, it was instituted after a shattering military defeat in which over half a million Jews lost their lives,²⁸ during a period of general economic decay and at a time of successive retreats before the rising Christian faith.

By contrast, in a previous period of comparative Jewish stability, prosperity and political power, mental and moral decay were painfully evident. A priestly caste ruled instead of an aristocracy of learning; the "artificial aristocracy founded on wealth and birth" substituted for the natural one based on "virtue and talents";²⁹ force and oppression took the place of persuasion and justice; educational opportunity was the prerogative of the well-born and wealthy; a widening schism

existed between priesthood and people. During Roman rule a decade or so before the great uprising that Titus suppressed, the servants of the high priest Ananias "went to the threshing floors and took away tithes that belonged to the (local) priests by violence . . . so that priests that of old were wont to be supported with those tithes died for lack of food."²⁷ Others amassed greater wealth by sending out their slaves with cudgels to exact more work from the peasants or else to squeeze tithes from the poor.

By the beginning of the 2nd Century of the Christian era, the Palestinian peasants could be termed "the slaves of the soil." They had degenerated mentally and morally; they knew only the rudiments of their faith and their law, and their miserable economic status was a reflection of the incessant rebellions which had devastated their country. The *Chaberim* — Jews who lived by the Law — regarded these masses as outcasts. They "would not eat or live with them, and even kept aloof from them that their clothes might not be made unclean by contact. It was said by contemporaries that the hatred between the two classes was greater than that between Jews and heathens." In Graetz' opinion, the fact that the educated and priestly classes turned their backs on the masses of Judaic peasants largely explains the susceptibility of the latter to Christianity.²⁸

Two centuries later a similar set of tendencies toward caste formation and priestly oppression arose in Babylonia, the land which, during the *Voelkerwanderungen* and early Middle Ages, gave Jewry protection, order and prosperity. Thus, in the early 4th Century A.D., the Jews of the great rabbinical and educational center of Sora complained that Saurin, the brother of the head of the institute, was in the habit of enslaving all poorer members of the Jewish community who did not seem to him sufficiently devout and using them to carry him through the city in his gilded litter. Saurin's conduct was upheld as in accordance with the Law by rabbinical authority.

These episodes were perhaps the exception. The dominant Jewish tendency was to create a very different sort of aristocracy — one based on morality and intellectual power — and this would be chosen increasingly through educational competition.

Since the Jews had no state, the incentive to scholarship had to be more than power and material gain. To induce the Jewish masses to devote their lives to the mastery of their sacred books, to persuade the poor and uneducated to support schools and rabbis with their taxes, to accord to scholarship an aura and prestige sufficient to make it seem

the supreme end of life — all of this required an incredible propaganda and indoctrination effort on the part of the rabbinate.

The objective was to create a competitively selected intellectual elite which would have the mental and moral force needed to hold together a defeated and dismembered people and to transform this people into the solidified congregation of a despised and persecuted religion and into the patriotic citizenry of a state long since dead. This effort was successful during the course of almost two thousand years. It was a *tour de force* concocted of nerve, perseverance and genius which perhaps has no historic counterpart. If it served to create impenetrable walls around Jewry and hence to occasion, in the centuries that followed, unspeakable persecutions that would never have occurred had the Jews decently disappeared, it also preserved for the Jewish intellectual elite a spiritual power that was in some respects greater (or at least less frequently challenged) than that of other priesthoods. The desire for this prestige and authority was no doubt one of the motives which made the priests and scribes lay the foundations for this scholarly aristocracy. The hyperbolic reverence for the religious scholar which occurs so incessantly in Hebrew literature is less a description of the actual state of affairs than a desire on the part of the rabbinical writers to receive unstinted homage.

Mishna, Talmud and Science. Jewish schooling was confined to males. It is true that there were "lady rabbinites" in 14th Century Germany and that the daughter of one of the Babylonian Exilarchs taught young men the Bible (through a latticed window which made her invisible to them), but these were the exceptions. Most Jewish women remained illiterate. Some of the medieval rabbis held that it was a sin to teach women.

Unless they were sickly, boys began school at five. For the average Jew who was not destined to be a scholar, formal education ceased at 13. The course of study was rigorous and exacting enough, however, so that the Jewish masses emerged literate in at least two languages, familiar with the Bible and with the broad outlines of the Jewish Law.

The curriculum did not compromise with stupidity or indolence. Thus, the first month was devoted to mastering the difficult Hebrew alphabet, the second to the vowel sounds, the third to combining consonants and vowels into syllables. By the fourth month of schooling, the boys began reading the Pentateuch, beginning, not with *Genesis*, but with *Leviticus*, and translating the Hebrew text back into what-

ever vernacular their Jewish community spoke. In his second year, the student read the Aramaic version of the Pentateuch, again translating back into the vernacular. Thus, by the age of seven — an age at which the average American schoolboy can scarcely read, write or spell correctly in his own language — the Jewish pupils of the Middle Ages had learned two dead semitic languages (the roots and structures of which were very different from the patois they spoke) sufficiently well to read the Bible in them and translate back into the vernacular.

The third and fourth years of study were devoted to the prophetic books and hagiographa, thus completing the reading of Scripture and the preliminary phase of education.

At ten or thereabouts, the boys began reading the *Mishna*, or the so-called oral law, a very exhaustive commentary on the Bible with an elaboration of its rules and their applications. This had been codified by the Tannaim, or great teachers of Jewish law, about 200 A.D. The topics of this work fall into six categories: Deeds, Seasons, Women, Damages, Holy Matters and Purities. Designed to serve as "a textbook of the guidance of judges and religious teachers" the work is similar in organization and content to a law text.²⁹ On each point of law or doctrine, it contains the governing decisions and the judicial opinions supporting it, together with the dissenting views.

The subject matter of secondary education was those issues of law and faith which were deemed to have been definitely settled. This included some of the smaller tractates of the *Talmud*, but not the great ones. The task of the student was to memorize those matters set before him so he would have an exact knowledge, not only of the law, but of the logical methods by which it was constructed and interpreted.

Higher education, which began at between 13 and 15 and lasted seven years, consisted usually of an intensive study of the *Talmud*. It marked the transition from preponderantly rote learning and mnemonic exercise to an analytic effort which gave full scope to imagination and originality of mind. The subject of higher education was principally the creation of the Law — that is to say, the commentaries of the greatest Jewish scholars on the *Mishna*. By definition, these commentaries dealt with matters deemed still open to question, for otherwise they would have been incorporated in the *Mishna* itself. During the death agonies of the Roman Empire in the West, the commentaries of the Jewish textual scholars were codified into the Palestine *Gemara* (about 400 A.D.) and the Babylonian *Gemara* (about 500 A.D.). Together with the *Mishna* itself, these commentaries comprise the *Talmud*.

Every statement in the *Mishna* is weighed here, examined for logical consistency, for its possible implications and corollaries, as well as for allegorical and esoteric significance. The *Talmud* follows the course of dialectical debate as it presents the clashing views of the Jewish scholastics alternately in a compact, elliptical Hebrew and in a more meandering Aramaic. This is a work excellently designed to sharpen the intelligence, a judgment quite consistent with the fact that it contains some absurdities. There are swift, unexpected transitions from close deductive reasoning to rambling anecdote. In addition to jurisprudence, the *Talmud* enters the fields of theology, esoteric theosophy, ethics, natural science, mathematics, astronomy, history, legend and folklore. It is both rigidly intellectual and emotional.

Nonetheless, Jewish knowledge of the physical sciences during the Graeco-Roman period was paltry in comparison with that of Greece, Alexandria and Rome. Relegated to the status of a mere handmaiden of religious ritual and Talmudic law, Jewish science was a feeble and badly organized corpus of information and fancy, perhaps midway between the achievements of the Alexandrian schools and peasant superstition.³⁰

By the early Middle Ages this was no longer the case. Italian Jewish education "included the whole domain of intellectual pursuits: Theology, Poetry, Philosophy and Natural Science in all its branches."³¹ The Jewish higher education in 12th Century Spain included the relation of philosophy to revelation, Aristotle's *Logic*, Euclid's *Elements*, arithmetic, the mathematical works of Nicomachus, Theodosius, Meneaus and Archimedes, optics, astronomy, music, mechanics, medicine, other natural sciences and metaphysics. In the mid-13th Century, Jehuda ben Samuel Ibn Abbas outlined a curriculum which proceeded from the *Talmud* to the commentaries of Rashi, whereupon the students should "taste the honey of science," beginning with medicine and continuing with "Indian arithmetic" (that is to say, algebra and summation of series, using the new-fangled decimal notation and zero). After mathematics and music, the student proceeded to study Aristotelian logic as interpreted by Averroes, the great Arabian scholar. With this sort of higher education, which embraced virtually the total scientific knowledge of the day — Arabic, Christian and Jewish — the elite of Spanish Jewry became men of admirable breadth of culture. "The Rabbi, the financier, the man of letters," Abrahams writes, "was also poet, philosopher and often physician."³²

In the North the Jewish cultural pattern was much narrower. Until the 14th Century, German Jewry was "altogether untouched" by philos-

ophy and the minority who wished something broader than an exclusively theological training went to Spain to acquire it.⁸³ "As for the secular sciences, blessed be the Merciful who saved me from them" was a viewpoint characteristic of the German Jews of the Middle Ages.

While most of the original Talmudic work came from France and Germany after the 13th Century, these northern areas of Jewry contributed little else. Their greatest rabbis, like their Christian counterparts, believed in crude superstitions, in spells, omens, in the evil eye, in witches and ogres that devoured children and in men who cast no shadows behind them. After the massacres of German Jews during the Crusades and the Black Death, an intellectual decline set in which was not arrested for centuries. By the early 17th Century, however, a German rabbi, who was also a friend of Tycho Brahe, could call science "the wisdom of all men."

Maimonides, probably the greatest figure of medieval Jewry, was a vigorous advocate of an education that would stress the sciences and liberal arts, of an allegorical interpretation of the Bible and of a rejection of everything in Judaism which was repugnant to reason. Maimonides' attempt to establish a sort of Aristotelianism as the core of the religion of the intellectual elite of Jewry was thwarted by a combination of forces. He was attacked by the fundamentalists of his day, particularly the Jews of France and Germany. At the same time, the Kabbalist movement, with its mysticism, its belief in the transmigration of souls and in esoteric books and magic numbers, arose as an angry protest against Maimonides' rationalism.⁸⁴

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain lessened the power and influence of the vanguard of the Jewish people, but, by dispersing them, brought light and reason to the Dutch, German and Polish Jewries. With the centuries of the ghetto, the central European Jewries relapsed into theology; the brilliant humanistic tradition of Maimonides was carried forward by the Spanish Jews of Amsterdam, in the farflung settlements of the Marranos and by a portion of the Italian Jews.

But the defects of the Talmudic attempt to synthesize man's relationship to the universe did not vitiate the excellence of this scholastic discipline as a process for training the intelligence and separating the brilliant from the mediocre and the dull. One can conceive of a society in which all promotion is based on one's ability to play chess. Certainly, this would reveal a distorted view of what is important in life, but it would nevertheless not be a bad way of bringing the mentally gifted to the fore. Thus it was with the Talmudic scholars and with their Moslem and Christian counterparts. The most precocious prod-

ucts of such an educational system will tend to be the intellectual elite of their society, regardless of the truth or falsity of the basic axioms of the dominant theology.³⁵ Nor need they necessarily be inferior in inherent mental ability to the most brilliant of those educated in a more scientific manner.

Jewish Education and the Ghetto. The Jewish educational system was to endure from the Diaspora to the French Revolution — a time-span of about 16 centuries. It prevailed over the many farflung areas with their radically different environments into which Jewry gravitated, or toward which it was driven, in the course of these centuries.³⁶

The glacial changelessness of this educational system, both as to form and content, are testimony to the enduring power of Jewish scholasticism. The task of Jewish higher education was not to examine the *Talmud* in order to eliminate its errors, but rather to encrust it with successive carapaces of interpretation, gloss and expansion to cover new cases. This process was not materially different from the elaboration of constitutional law by the Supreme Court during the century and a half of American history when that tribunal consisted of judges learned in the law and dedicated to preserving the Constitution. Judicial decisions and opinion served to push up the frontiers of law into the new and unforeseen ground created by changing circumstances. In the American instance, however, laws are continuously being amended, repealed and supplanted by new ones and hence the forces of change and growth are not stultified. The processes by which Judaic scholasticism expanded the Law emphasized continuity and unity, but made drastic revision impossible. The result of this system, which has certain analogies and counterparts in Muslim law and the history of the Chinese literati, was to create a widening gap between the corpus of Jewish scholarship and the realities of the world in which the Jews found themselves.

This schism was tolerated because Jewish education was religious. It was concerned with values more than with actualities. More precisely, its primary purpose was to regulate conduct in accordance with concepts of righteousness supposedly acquired through divine revelation. The political purposes of Jewish education included Jewish separatism, that is to say, preventing Jewry from being submerged and drowned by the more powerful intellectual and cultural waves that surged around it.

As for the major discrepancies between Judaic concepts and those of the larger systems within which the Jewries were enclaves, these,

during the Middle Ages at least, often seemed to reveal the superiority of Jewish over Christian scholasticism. Sharp demarcation was one of the functions of education. The emphasis on withdrawal and difference tended to cement the Jews into a tight and unbreakable unity, to increase the authority of the rabbis and to prevent the evaporation of Judaism and the assimilation of the Jews.

A strange fact about European Jewry is that it sank into gloom and darkness just at the period when the gentile world began to break out of the confining prison of the long age of faith and superstition. This process of liberation — the Renaissance, the Reformation and the age of religious wars — was one in which the Jews were driven by clerical authority into pariah communities; they were the centuries of the ghetto, the centuries of retreat into a narrow scholasticism infected with crude superstitions.

“The Renaissance produced a violent transformation in the relative excellence of the Jewish and Christian systems of education in Europe,” Abrahams writes.⁸⁷ Before the revival of letters, the Jews were probably better educated than any other section of the European population. The average Jew could always read and write,⁸⁸ which is more than can be said of the ordinary layman in the Middle Ages. But at the Renaissance, Christian education not only took a vast stride forwards, but a backward blow was administered to the Jews, except for those who dwelt in Italy, which left them in the rear for some centuries.”

The era of maximum Jewish degradation and ignominy was the Reformation. The decisive turning point was the election in 1555 of Cardinal Caraffa, spokesman of the Catholic reaction, to the position of Pontifex Maximus, where, as Pope Paul IV, he promulgated in that same year the Bull *Cum nimis absurdum*. Beginning with a denunciation of Jewish “guilt . . . ingratitude . . . shamelessness,” it provided for an almost total cessation of intercourse between Jews and Christians. Thenceforth, the Jews were to be confined in ghetti throughout Catholic Christendom; they were to wear the Jew badge at all times; they were not to have Christian servants; they were not to be addressed by any title of respect; they were not to pursue any occupation other than dealing in second-hand goods and old clothes. The next 300 years were the centuries of the ghetto during which the Jews lost their educational and intellectual leadership. The same forces which were modernizing Europe hurled the Jew into isolation and gave him his “one real experience of medieval gloom.”

The reasons for this are complex and, in the present context, require only the most cursory examination. The first phase of the

process was loss of function and status. Prior to the Renaissance, the Jews had had a major intellectual role — that of serving as the carriers of both Graeco-Roman and Islamic learning to Christendom. The process by which this was accomplished was translation of the corpus of scientific and philosophical knowledge then available from Arabic to Hebrew and from Hebrew to Latin. This laid some of the foundations of the Renaissance, but it was a merely transitory process.

With the bursting forth of the Renaissance, Christian scholars went directly to the classics, searched for and found the original texts, learned Greek, studied Hebrew, went to Hebrew Biblical texts to confute Rome and to the murk of the Kabbala to find an esoteric faith. The economic expansion of the Renaissance burst other traditional dikes. The special position of the Jews in money lending was challenged and overthrown, primarily by means of edicts of expulsion. The Jews were driven from the skilled trades and crafts they had in many instances dominated.³⁹ With the rise of the universities, from which Jews were automatically excluded, the pre-eminence of the Jewish physician ceased.⁴⁰

In previous centuries, when political power might be limited to fiefs no larger than English shires or else to cities whose frontiers were visible from their walls, the expulsion of Jews was not necessarily an overwhelming disaster, for often they could proceed to the adjoining principality and either settle there or wait for a change in the climate at the place whence they had been ousted.

With the rise of nations, expulsion meant expropriation, uprooting of thousands, long treks in which they were subjected to the dangers of being plundered or killed. Eventually, some would arrive in a new place as paupers, to add additional burdens to the Jewish communities which received them and whose position might be precarious. The Jews were expelled from England in 1290 and from France in 1306 and again in 1394. These migrations, however, were of trivial importance in comparison with the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, an event which occurred in 1492 and for which the Grand Inquisitor, Torquemada, was primarily responsible. This act, which involved a minimum of 150,000 people, was among the causes of the downfall of Spanish power and civilization just as the movement of Marranos (the more or less forcefully and superficially christianized Spanish Jews) to the Netherlands and other northern areas contributed to the economic, cultural and political ascendancy of Protestant Europe. It is ironic that, in the very years in which Spain began the acquisition of the greatest empire since that of the Mongols, she should have man-

aged to eliminate such a large portion of her intellectual elite from her social body and that she should for the next few centuries have combined the policy of expanding her empire with that of burning and slaughtering the Jews, Protestants and other enemies of the Inquisition who would have been so eminently capable of administering it.⁴¹

The Reformation was a culminating factor in the retreat of Jewry into the ghetto. As a class, the wandering friars had been fiery denouncers of the Jews and often eager advocates of their physical destruction. The Dominican and Franciscan Orders were in charge of the medieval Inquisition; they were the defenders of the purity of the faith. The Jew was an enemy, not only in his direct repudiation of Christianity, but in the influence of his religious thinking in the direction of monotheism.

The Albigensian heresy of the 13th Century and its various variant and affiliated groups (Bogomils, Cathars, Waldenses) was supported by Jews and possibly influenced by Jewish thought. It is worth recalling that the Dominican Order arose out of the ruthless extermination of these Albigensian enemies of clerical corruption in southern France.

Since the Reformation sought to go back to the Bible and to eliminate the clerical myths, forgeries and glosses which had accumulated around it in the interests of aggrandizing the power of the Church,⁴² its chief leaders — Luther, Melancthon, Servetus, Tyndale, Zwingli — learned Hebrew, some of them using Jews to teach or assist them. The forces of the Reformation had to fight the charge that they were engaged in "judaizing" Christianity. The bases for this Catholic assertion were that they tended to go directly to the Bible as the source of their authority; that they tended to repudiate the authority of the Church and substitute the relation of the worshipper to his God; that they were in essence monotheistic rather than trinitarian; that they rejected the emphasis on the Virgin Mary, on image-worship, saints and holy relics; that they ended the sale of indulgences, discarded confession, rejected clerical celibacy and represented a force which would eventually make the congregation more master of the priest than his servant. All these changes were clearly in the direction of Judaism.

The Counter-Reformation, and above all its highly effective political arm, the Jesuits, were bent on the extermination of heresy and the quarantining of Jewry. As for the Protestants, Luther, like Mohammed, began his career as a defender of the Jews. He once declared: "When I see how Christians have treated the Jews, if I were a Jew, I would rather be a hog than a Christian." When the Jews failed to abandon their faith for the new church Luther had created, how-

ever, he denounced them with the intemperance for which he was notorious. His followers rejected the charge of being judaizers by competing with the Catholics in persecution.

The schism of the Christian Church was in the long-range interest of the Jews since it hastened the demise of a world which was intellectually closed by reason of the unified structure of its premises and thought — one in which Jewry was bound to be at best an outsider and at worst an outcast and victim, a world of too limited intellectual horizons for the Jews to realize their potentialities within its confines.

But in the here and now, the Reformation was a blood bath and a regression of 150 years, in which the Jews were by no means the only, or necessarily the worst, sufferers. As in most such eras of fanatical strife, the spirit of compromise in the interests of preserving the social order was temporarily stifled; zealots and extremists moved to the forefront; in both camps, the cold, incorruptible bigot replaced his more urbane and skeptical predecessor in the leadership of the clergy. The period was democratic in the sense that a proselytizing fanaticism sought support among the masses by distorting reality into grotesque nightmares and arousing hatred to fiery action.

Thus the Jew was driven backward in history. The insalubrious ghetto was prepared for him. He was compressed into it. He lived in his isolated and despised communities, in Rome the victim of malaria whenever the Tiber overflowed, everywhere deprived of the space and light that man needs. This fearful overcrowding was coupled with poverty since every occupation was in theory closed to him except hawking the meanest and shabbiest of castoff goods.

The imposition of plain, drab clothes on a people traditionally concerned with neatness, dignity and, in fact, splendor of attire was only one of the many blows to Jewish self-respect.⁴⁸ The ghetto in time shapes its man. The Jew becomes cringing and sycophantic in his dealings with gentiles; there is a great loss of self-respect.⁴⁹ In physique, he is transformed into a pale, small, pigeon-chested human being. The intellectual counterpart of this isolation and degeneration is the failure of Jewish education to escape the archaic boundaries of medieval scholasticism.

Yet, throughout these three centuries of ghetto impoverishment, isolation, ignominy, cultural decadence and intellectual decline, the schooling of Jewish boys remained substantially unchanged from what it had been when the Exilarchs had ruled Jewry from their Babylonian centers of learning. The schools continued to select, train and advance the most brilliant minds. Religious scholarship continued to be held

in the highest honor. The most gifted of the young *yeshiva* scholars continued to contract advantageous marriages and hence to live and bring up their children under conditions far more favorable than average to health and survival. Thus, throughout this gloomy period, the basic processes of eugenic selection and differential breeding for intelligence continued unchecked.

XVII

THE SEXUAL HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The broad pattern of Jewish sexual mores is familiar because Christian sexual ethics derive from the same sources. The Puritan code was far closer to the Jewish than that of Catholicism for one of the many ways in which the Reformation represented a return to the Old Testament and hence to the Jewish ethos was in its rejection of celibacy and of virginity as permanent ideals. Unlike the pagan civilizations around them — Graeco-Roman, Oriental, Islamic — the Jews rejected all sexual activity outside of marriage; they regarded sensuality as a snare and a sin; they considered that the primary justification of intercourse was procreation.

Celibacy and Marriage. Every Jew had the obligation to marry and, where possible, to remain in the married state. "A Jew who has no wife lives without joy, without blessing, without good," was one saying. "A Jew who has no wife is not a man" was a shorter one.¹

After the return from Babylon in the 6th Century B.C., the Jews were urged by their leaders to be fruitful and multiply without limit. By Alexandrian times, economic conditions had ceased to favor huge families and the traditional law was modified to state that a Jew had fulfilled his religious obligation when he had two children. Sons were esteemed more highly than daughters, for they could be educated, might become rabbis, would continue their father's name and tend his grave. Like the Chinese and the Greeks, Jewish men thanked God for having created them male and not female. Yet daughters, as well as sons, were loved and cherished. It was said that the spirit of the Lord shines in the faces of children and that "the world is saved by the breath of schoolchildren." According to a Midrash, "a childless person is accounted dead."² Barrenness, according to the Bible, is divine punishment for a wicked life.³

Virginity in unmarried girls was not only esteemed; its absence in a bride was considered sufficient reason for sending her away. Yet virginity was not an ideal state; rather motherhood was the fulfillment of the female. In the days of the Messiah, an eminent rabbi hoped, women would bear children daily.

Celibacy was an offense; in mature men, it brought them into public contempt. To be sure, the Chasidim of the Hellenistic era were ascetics and Pliny found the Essene sect "remarkable beyond all the other tribes in the whole world, as it has no women and has renounced all sexual desire, has no money and only palm trees for company."⁴ Both groups reflected conditions of general societary disintegration and stood outside the main stream of the Jewish tradition. Some scholars have concluded that the Dead Sea scrolls refer to an Essene community and have suggested that the early Christians may have borrowed their un-Jewish worship of the virginal condition from the doctrines of the Teacher of Righteousness.⁵

In the eyes of Jewry as a whole, the celibate was repugnant, not only because he violated the Law by making no effort to reproduce, but because, given the Jewish high valuation of virility, he seemed merely a half-man. Durant asserts that the word *testimony* comes from a Jewish custom of binding an oath by taking it while laying one's hands on the genitals of the man to whom the pledge was made.⁶

Marriage was an institution of cardinal importance. As Josephus put it: "The Law recognizes no sexual connections except the natural union of man and wife, and that only for the procreation of children. Sodomy it abhors, and punishes any guilty of such assault with death. It commands us, in taking a wife, not to be influenced by dowry, not to carry off a woman by force, nor yet to win her by guile and deceit, but to sue from him who is authorized to give her away . . . The woman, says the Law, is in all things inferior to the man."⁷

Homosexuality, Masturbation, Infidelity. In the early Biblical period, homosexuality and mouth-genital contacts were associated with Jewish religious practices as they were associated with most of the religions of the Middle East. The Sodomites referred to in *II Kings* 23:7 and *Deuteronomy* 23:17-18 were male homosexual temple prostitutes.

When the Jews returned from their Babylonian Captivity in the 7th Century B.C., their priestly leaders took drastic steps to separate them totally from the surrounding pagan populations. Hence, homosexuality was sternly denounced as un-Jewish conduct, or the way of the Canaanite.

As the Judaic code on sexuality crystallized, all extra-marital expenditures of libido were condemned and the more heterodox forms of this expenditure were severely punished. According to the Pentateuch, male homosexuals "have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death, their blood is upon them."⁸ The Talmud considers female

homosexuality a "mere obscenity"; yet the enlightened Maimonides recommended that it be punished by flogging.⁹ The Bible provides that, if a human being have coitus with an animal, both man and beast be put to death. The Talmud is so concerned with the danger of this occurring that there are provisions against leaving a woman alone with an animal.

Masturbation was excoriated. Jewish ethical literature "endlessly harps on the severity of this sin, exhorts its avoidance, points out its danger to health, threatens dire punishment on the day of reckoning and pleads for penitence and expiation."¹⁰

The scriptural justification adduced for this condemnation is the story of Onan. It will be remembered that Onan was ordered by his father to perform the customary levirate marriage with Tamar, the widow of his elder brother, so she should have a man and bear children to take the elder brother's name and inherit his property. Onan "went in to his brother's wife (and) spilled the semen on the ground, lest he should give offspring to his brother,"¹¹ whereupon the Lord slew him. The text is seemingly plain. Onan's offenses were to disobey his father, to show disrespect to his elder brother's memory, to deceive his sister-in-law and, because of avarice, to deny her children. The rabbinical interpretation until recently (and the Catholic gloss as well) makes the deadly sin of Onan masturbation. Jewish theological authorities extended this to *coitus interruptus*, which they designated by such euphemisms as "threshing inside and winnowing outside" and "ploughing in the garden and emptying in the dunghill."¹²

The levitical rule was that "if a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death."¹³ The seriousness with which this offense was regarded is indicated by the fact that, during the savage persecution of the Jews under Hadrian, the assembly of rabbis at Lydda decided that a Jew might violate any of the laws if absolutely necessary to escape death by torture except those against idolatry, murder and adultery.¹⁴ Adulterous wives had to be divorced regardless of their husbands' wishes and the offspring of adulterous intercourse were called *mamzerin*, were totally declassed and were forbidden to marry Jews even after a thousand generations.¹⁵

Pre-marital coitus was also sternly condemned. If a girl's hymen was not intact on her first marriage "the men of the city shall stone her to death with stones . . ."¹⁶ This penalty was abandoned with time, however, and by the 2nd Century A.D. capital punishment had become a rarity in the Jewish courts.

During the Middle Ages, and particularly during the centuries of the ghetto that followed, the offenses of adultery and pre-marital coitus became increasingly rare. The reasons for this were the early age of marriage, the ease of divorce and the growth of Jewish puritanism and segregation of the sexes.

As for the last factor, puritanism, in the sense of depreciation and suppression of sexual pleasure, this gained strength among the Jews in direct proportion to their isolation from the larger gentile world. It was fostered by those conditions which were simultaneously propitious to a withdrawal into theological obscurantism, a surrender to the religious leadership and an emphasis on moral conduct (compensatory to the brutal facts of persecution) which reached morbid excesses.

In ancient Palestine on the Day of Atonement and on the 15th of Ab, the Jerusalem girls went into the vineyard, wearing white clothes — always borrowed so none of them would be embarrassed by her poverty — danced before the young men and called on them to admire their beauty and take them. Even to the Jews of the Middle Ages, this would have seemed immodest; to the Jewry of the Renaissance, or for that matter of the European Age of Reason, it would have appeared scandalous. By the 18th Century, even betrothed couples were not allowed to kiss and the rabbis at Amsterdam attempted to see to it that single women appeared in the streets and synagogue veiled. In Poland, prudishness reached such absurd lengths that engaged men pledged themselves not to see their fiancées until the wedding day.

Ghetto condemnation of sexuality had not been characteristic of earlier centuries. Thus, a Babylonian rabbi defended sexual pleasure for, without it, "no one would build a house, nor take a wife and beget children." Rabbi Aquiba contended that a Jew might divorce his wife for any reason, including "because he had found a better-looking woman."¹⁷ During Roman times, travelling rabbis would sometimes advertise for wives for the time of their sojourn. While the laws prohibited prostitution with flogging, there were red-light districts in Jewish cities during Graeco-Roman times.

Jewish Prudishness. The dominant attitude, however, was one of dread of being physically aroused, particularly (though not exclusively) in extra-marital situations. A Jew "should never walk behind a woman along a road, not even his own wife . . . A man should walk behind a lion rather than behind a woman." The Jewish religious texts demanded that women's heads be covered in public, that their hair be hidden and that their naked armpits should not be visible.

The Sanhedrin decided that a woman might not stand naked before a man even to save her life.¹⁸

The rabbis devoted an immense amount of effort to minimizing marital pleasures. For two thousand years, Judaism has prohibited men from seeing the naked female body and particularly the female genitalia. This rule applied even to husbands and wives. Spouses must have intercourse only in the dark or semi-dark; they were not permitted any contact between naked portions of their bodies during love-making other than those genital contacts necessary to procreation.¹⁹ The rabbis demanded that Jews have intercourse "in the most possible modest manner" and declared it was unchaste for the woman to be on top.²⁰ Whereas Catholic doctrine considered procreation to be merely the primary justification for sexual intercourse, orthodox Judaism considered it the only justification.²¹

The times during which intercourse between husband and wife was permitted were also specified. During menstruation, a week before and sometimes a week afterwards, at seed-planting time, sometimes during the harvest, during certain phases of the moon, and from the discovery of a pregnancy to 40 days after a birth, sex was tabu. Kinsey suggests that these restrictions were so severe as to prevent sexual intercourse during three weeks in every lunar month.²²

Castration. Emasculation was a crime in Jewish law and eunuchs were allowed to marry only the lowest caste Jewesses. By contrast, self-mutilation was common in the classical world, the priests of Cybele being primarily male homosexuals who had had themselves castrated and those of the Syrian goddess, Gallos, addicted to the same perversion. In the latter instance, the injury was self-inflicted as part of an orgiastic religious service.²³

Early in its history, the Christian Church opposed emasculation. Yet Jesus spoke of "eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven"²⁴ and as subtle and profound a patristic philosopher as Origen castrated himself in the belief that he was complying with religious duty. While the Church condemned Origen, Justin Martyr approved self-mutilation as meritorious in a Christian and the rather obscure Valesian sect seems to have performed this operation on its communicants.²⁵ Nor did the Church's condemnation prevent the castration of choir boys to provide the soprano voices for the Pope's private chapel, a seemingly un-Christian practice which continued through the centuries and was only stopped by the resolute intervention of Pope Leo XIII.²⁶

Age of Marriage. The age of marriage among the Jews, as was the case throughout most of the ancient and medieval world, was low. By eighteen, most men were married; for girls, marriage at twelve and less was not uncommon. As Friedlaender has shown, these nuptial ages were more or less representative of the standard of the general population of the Roman empire.²⁷

As we pass from the classical to the medieval and then to the ghetto world, the age of marriage among Jews falls. The Talmud, reflecting conditions just before the onset of the medieval period, declares: "A man must not betroth his daughter while she is a minor; he must wait until she attains her majority and says, 'I love this man.'"²⁸ This command was foreign to the *mores* of the European Jewry of later centuries, first because it would be "indelicate or impudent" for any Jewish woman to express a preference for one man over another²⁹ and, second, because the legal minority of Jews extended until their 13th birthday and, by the 13th Century, a large proportion of Jewish girls were already married at that age.

One motivation for early marriage was the preservation of chastity. During the ferocious persecution of European Jews at the time of the Crusades, girls were often married before they were 12 because "if a man can afford to give his daughter a dowry, he fears that tomorrow he may not be able to do it, and thus his daughter would remain forever unmarried."³⁰

The shortage of eligible Jewish males in the wake of these and other massacres was an equally powerful incentive to disregard the Talmudic prohibition of child marriages; here one finds, in short, an instance of collective biological defense against the attempt of the surrounding gentile society to crush and exterminate its Jewish minority. As one proceeds in time toward the nadir of Jewish existence (the Nazi extermination excepted), the marriage age falls still further. In the second half of the 17th Century, the groom was often ten and his bride still younger. This was a pre-eminent period of messianic impostors; the people of the ghetto were swept up in fervent movements of eschatological hope. Since the Jewish religious tradition declares that all souls created from original chaos must be incarnated before the Messianic age can begin, it must have seemed a religious duty of the most cardinal importance to marry off one's children as early as possible so as to hasten the birth either of one of the last human beings destined to have an earthly body or else perhaps of the Messiah himself, thus bringing into existence the millennial era.

The basic Jewish law on the marriage age for men read: "Every Jew

is commanded to marry at 18, and he who does so earlier is obeying the commandment in the very best way. But none should marry before 13, for that would be lust. Under no circumstances, should one pass his 20th birthday without marrying and, if anyone does so, the court should force him to marry so he may fulfill the commandment to propagate. However, if he is deep in the study of the Torah and afraid of marriage, since it might force him to neglect his study of the law to make a living, then he is allowed to delay.⁷⁹¹

Rabbis were compelled to marry. Since the chief purpose was fertility, unions between the very young and the very old were condemned in contrast to India, for instance, where the ideal, according to Manu and many later codifiers, was that the husband's age should be three times that of the bride. Common law marriages, unlike Roman and Anglo-Saxon practice, became effective immediately on sexual union. By the 3rd Century A.D., however, a more prudish age condemned these unions and required that the participants be flogged.³⁹

Polygamy and Divorce. The rabbis originally ruled that a man could marry as many women as he pleased. Deteriorating economic conditions among Roman Jewry during and after the great revolts of the 1st and 2nd Centuries A.D. made plural wives a luxury beyond the reach of all but the wealthiest. When Caracalla extended Roman citizenship to all Jews (212 A.D.), he automatically extended to them the Roman prohibition of polygamy. Plural marriages continued among Babylonian Jewry and, as Roman power disintegrated, they re-emerged in Europe.

The Jewish attitude was essentially a mirror of Christian society, for it was almost a millenium after Christ before the Papacy took an unrelenting attitude toward polygamy and, as late as Luther's day, Landgraf Philip of Hesse was permitted two wives.

Rabbi Gershom (960-1028) prohibited plural marriages in general, but there were exceptions: the wife's sterility, refusal to have intercourse, insanity, infirmity, forceful capture or refusal to join her husband in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Gershom's prohibition is generally credited with sounding the death knell to Jewish polygamy; yet the institution continued in Moslem Spain through the 13th Century and among the Jewries of other Islamic areas until even later. The first wife, however, was generally protected and the customary African Jewish marriage contract pledged the groom not to marry again without his first wife's consent and offered the latter freedom to depart, the marriage settlement and a penalty as well should he break his oath.³⁸

Divorce was always permitted by mutual consent. The man's agreement was essential; that of the wife might sometimes be dispensed with. Some rabbis, particularly those of the school of Hillel, held that a man might put his wife away for any reason, but most rabbis attempted to prevent frivolous rupture of the marriage contract. A deterrent was that the husband had to return the dowry and marriage settlement unless he could show that his wife had been culpable. If a marriage was barren for ten years, the rabbis urged the husband to find another wife.

During the Middle Ages the prevalence of child marriages, which frequently linked incompatible people, made for a high divorce rate among Jews, and this, of course, applied particularly to couples who were so young that they had consummated their marriage merely in a technical sense and were not bound to each other by sexual desire. There was no stigma attached to the separation and the divorcée had little difficulty in remarrying.⁵⁴

Perhaps unique to Jewry was the institution of the conditional divorce, a document which Jewish merchants and voyagers gave their wives before starting on a long or hazardous journey and which gave the woman her freedom if the man failed to reappear on a specified date. The motive was to circumvent rabbinical courts which generally insisted on eyewitness testimony of death and hence left young women bound to be faithful to husbands who would probably never return.

As for concubinage, the straight-laced exponents of the Jewish law flatly prohibited sexual relations with slaves unless the latter were emancipated, converted to Judaism and married. This rule flew in the face of the customs of Roman good society and particularly the propensity of matrons of high rank to preserve their independence through maintaining liaisons with their slaves. The Christians, under the wise leadership of Callistus,⁵⁵ took a shrewd and tolerant attitude toward this institution for they realized that the new faith was making spectacular gains among women. Hence liaisons between Christian slaves and pagan masters or mistresses were condoned as means of converting people of wealth and position under most propitious circumstances. Partly because they had come to fear as much as welcome proselytes, the Jews took a far more rigidly moralistic attitude toward concubinage.

Birth Control. The Jewish attitude toward birth control, however, was considerably more tolerant than the Christian. Contraception was not deemed immoral *per se*; its use, however, was related to the duty

of procreation. The primary obligation of every Jewish man was to have at least two children. He was exempt from this duty only when engaged in religious studies and unable to both continue them and assume the financial burdens of marriage, if married because of love to a sterile woman, or if parturition would endanger the health of his wife.³⁸ Jewish law holds that the life of the mother must always take precedence over that of the unborn child.

Coitus interruptus was permitted under special circumstances, but the rabbinical authorities preferred the use of a sponge or tampon, because here the woman took the positive action. She was free from the duty to procreate (because it was the man's) and not bound by the entire Law (since she was taught at most its rudiments).³⁷

The Babylonian Talmud permitted contraception with a sponge for three classes of women: "a minor, a pregnant woman, and one who nurses her child — a minor because she might become pregnant and die; a pregnant woman because the foetus might become a *foetus compressus* (or *papyraceus*); one that nurses her child because she might kill her child."³⁸ The minor who was to use the sponge was a girl of 11. Before that she was a child and could copulate without fear of pregnancy; after that a woman who should bear her young.³⁹

The sponge referred to was an occlusive and was placed against the *os uteri* to prevent the introduction of semen — a sensible and reasonably effective precaution in contrast to the magical remedies imposed on the inhabitants of Christian Europe by their doctors. By the 12th Century, however, some rabbis misunderstood the procedure and imagined that the sponge should be inserted after intercourse. The Hebrews also believed, as did Galen, that a woman could expel the semen by violent, self-induced convulsions.⁴⁰ Rashi, the 11th Century clarifier of Talmudic law, held that any woman who did this could be divorced.⁴¹

Throughout the Middle Ages, both Jews and Arabs were reasonably well informed concerning contraceptive techniques. In Christendom, clerical suppression drove its practitioners underground. They were associated in the official mind with witchcraft and at many times lived under the shadow of a gruesome death. Even among the upper classes, effective techniques yielded to intricate and distasteful magical potions and to symbolic obsessional acts.

The general effect of the elaborate Jewish regulation of sexual practices was to increase fertility. This applies to the stern prohibitions against masturbation, *coitus interruptus*,⁴² homosexuality, animal intercourse, emasculation, prostitution, concubinage and adultery. The

detailed regulation of the manner of engaging in the sexual act may have tended toward the same result since it discouraged all attempts to reach orgasm without risking pregnancy. The banning of sexual intercourse during three weeks out of very four on religious, ceremonial or magical grounds may paradoxically have also increased the likelihood of impregnation because it forced the men to be abstinent immediately before coitus and thus accumulate sperm.⁴⁸

XVIII

EUGENICS AND THE RABBINATE

Eugenes and *eugenstatos*, meaning well-born and very well-born, were common terms among the Jews of the time of Jesus. Josephus states that a priest could marry any Jewess provided he first investigated her pedigree, "obtaining the genealogy from the archives and producing a number of witnesses."¹

Whoever achieved eminence in the field of learning automatically became a member of the Jewish elite. Scholarship took precedence over all other criteria of status and no family tie was considered more desirable from a marriage standpoint than one with an impressive lineage of learned men. "Thus family purity tended to direct natural selection into intellectual channels," Baron observes. "Here the survival of the fittest meant primarily that of the best educated."²

The Tannaim — that is to say, the rabbinical scholars who prepared the *Mishnah* — emphasized that: "One should always sell all one possesses in order to marry the daughter of a scholar" or to give his daughter to a scholar in marriage.³ Failing this, he should choose in this order: the daughter of a community leader, of an archisynagogue, of a charity supervisor, or of an elementary schoolteacher. Under no circumstances should he marry the "daughter of the illiterate people of the land." Such marriages were characterized as ugly and foredoomed to failure.

The snobbishness and consciousness of caste which this passage breathes are characteristic of the Jewish aristocracy during the first few centuries of the Christian era, but they are far less typical of Jewry after the completion of the Diaspora. "The illiterate people of the land" had in fact virtually disappeared from the Jewish communities of Europe by the Middle Ages: first, because Judaism, alone among the faiths of the dark centuries, had accomplished the amazing feat of establishing universal male literacy; second, because the contempt for the Jewish peasantry, so characteristic of Josephus' contemporaries, was no longer applicable to a people who had been largely driven from the land into the towns, and, third, because the rural poor had been decimated during the Jewish War of 66-70 A.D. The Jewish eugenic emphasis shifted from the avoidance of unions with the common people

to the search for spouses whose lineage showed scholarly eminence, this eminence being, in the light of the fact that the educational ladder was available to all Jewish males, consistent with the most humble social origin.

This process of eugenic selection presupposed the more or less continuous existence of an intricate educational machinery which imposed heavy burdens on a people at all times subjected to persecution and discriminatory legislation. To assert that there never were interruptions in the smooth functioning of this educational system would be unrealistic. During the chaotic centuries of the *Voelkerwanderungen*, the records are meagre and the indications are that, in the former territories of the Western Roman Empire, Jewish education tended to atrophy. By the 9th and 10th Centuries, there are powerful processes of revival. The Italian Jewish scholars serve as the transmission belts between the ancient Palestinian and Babylonian centers of erudition and the more uncouth Jewish settlements of northern Europe. Similarly, Italy and Spain serve to transmit Arabic and Graeco-Roman culture to Christian Europe and tradition credits erudite Jews with a large role in founding and guiding the great medical school, or *Civitas Hippocratica*, of Salerno.⁴

Wandering Jewish Scholars. A large class of wandering Jewish scholars — in some respects comparable to the Christian *goliards*, but certainly not entirely so, for the Jews were seldom roisterers, drunkards, gamblers or, for that matter, poets, nor did they create their *Vagantlieder* — this new Jewish social class developed during the Middle Ages and created with its growth new problems and communal responsibilities.

Until the 12th Century the Jewries of Europe had, on the whole, been sufficiently prosperous to support their scholars without undue difficulties. The First Crusade, at the close of the 11th Century, was the first of several tidal waves of mob expropriation and slaughter of European Jews which degraded and impoverished the settlements north of the Alps and the Pyrenees and reduced them to a status which was worsened only by the imposition of the ghetto. The Crusades both animated the spirit of feral fanaticism among the ignorant masses and gave arms, immunity and a moral pretext for plunder to the riffraff and criminal element. During the First Crusade, 12,000 Jews were massacred in Germany alone. During the Black Death two and a half centuries later, Jews were put to the torture and made to confess that they had caused the pestilence by dropping into the wells a concoction

of frogs, lizards, the hearts of Christians and consecrated Hosts. Although Clement VI, a gay, secular and woman-loving Pope, denounced the well-poisoning charge and excommunicated those who used it to justify slaughtering the Jews, his temperate and rational voice was drowned by greed and fanaticism. Sixty large Jewish communities were totally destroyed and no Jew left alive in them. Among them was Worms, which had had a Jewish community — the progeny of Teutonic soldiers from the legions of Titus and the Jewish women they seized when Jerusalem was stormed — before any Christian had set foot in Germany. A hundred and fifty smaller communities suffered a similar fate and, in Basel, the entire Jewish congregation was burned to death in an improvised shack built on an island in the Rhine.⁵

These slaughters were naturally accompanied by, or more accurately had as their cause, the plundering of Jewish wealth. "Money was likewise the poison which killed the Jews," wrote the pious Strasbourg Chronicler of the Black Death, ". . . if they had been poor and if the nobility had not been in their debt, they would not have been burned." Another contemporary observer, Archbishop Gerlach, wrote: "The Jews had a multitude of debtors and in order to avoid paying them, the debtors put them out of the way — for a dead dog no longer growls."⁶

These expropriations, massacres and annihilations of once flourishing communities, coupled with legislative provisions to the same effect, such as the annulment of all debts owed Jews by those who joined the Third Crusade, reduced the Jewish communities outside of Spain and Italy to penury.

Under these circumstances, the *prima facie* expectation might have been that the Jewish communities would have considered their elaborate system of higher education to be disproportionate to their vastly reduced means and would hence gradually have allowed it to lapse. But the contrary occurred. To be sure, as persecution, quarantine and impoverishment increased, the content of higher education suffered; the emphasis became Talmudic and theological to the exclusion of the far broader non-Jewish heritage in metaphysics, science and literature. Persecution drove the Jews toward absorption with their own internal religious life; Talmudic law and Talmudic scholasticism became their escape mechanism and enabled them to avoid contemplating the real conditions of an existence which had become almost unbearable.

Their position was made worse by a series of restrictions on Jewish economic activity, which multiplied to the point where the Jews were eventually confined to such shabby occupations as dealing in old clothes and second-hand goods. At the same time, the Church promul-

gated legislation designed to eliminate all intercourse between Jews and Gentiles, thus minimizing the danger of intellectual contamination of the latter and of the rise of heresies threatening the Church's monopolistic position as the spiritual arbiter of Christianity. These progressively constrictive measures further narrowed the scope of Jewish opportunity. They compelled the Jews to concentrate their intellectual energies, which then as now were outstanding in relation to the peoples around them, into the one channel that remained open.

The ideal of Talmudic scholarship was, if anything, intensified. The Jewish communities made the necessary sacrifices to preserve the educational system intact. This was done through extensive community organizations, through Jewish self-government, through community-imposed taxes and through enhancing the traditional Jewish emphasis on charity.

During the Middle Ages famine was intermittent in the Christian and Moslem worlds and, even in plentiful years, so little provision was made for the poor that death from hunger was commonplace. Between 970 and 1100 A.D. 60 famines scourged France; men died of hunger in the churches during services; an astonished bishop watched emaciated peasants devour his horse. Famine, plague, mayhem, warfare and public executions taught the ubiquity of sudden and early death.

By contrast, even in periods of almost universal Jewish indigence, few Jews ever died of hunger while within a Jewish community. In general, the forces of natural selection, operating through the death rate, were weaker in the Jewish enclaves than in the gentile societies which surrounded them. The primary reason for this was the Jew's consciousness of brotherhood with all other Jews and his religious duty to extend charity to the poor and unfortunate.

The wandering *bahurs*, or scholars, were often companions of equally itinerant teachers. They suffered terrible privations on the road. Coming frequently from communities which had been impoverished or ruined, where the schools had closed down, they wandered, not only in search of an education, but in search of a means of remaining alive. As refugees in other Jewish communities, they were generally exempted from all taxes imposed by the congregation or, at least, they refused to pay them.⁷ To the extent that the Jewish communities were responsible for raising the money which the Crown demanded for the protection of Jewry, this exemption was important, for the Jews paid a fantastically large share of the taxes imposed during the Middle Ages.

The travelling students and teachers were likewise beneficiaries of the poor-relief organizations of the Jewish communities. Normally,

each community had a charity overseer who assessed each according to his means, not exempting the poor or women and children, for the support of communal charities. Two other community officials would supervise the expenditure of these funds, judging which cases were deserving. After the havoc of the First Crusade, careful sifting of claims became necessary. Vagrants would be put up in communal hostelries; *bona fide* students and teachers would be guests at the homes of the well-to-do. Before a traveller who claimed he was hungry could receive food from community funds, his need had to be investigated and established. However, since clothing was a matter of fundamental human self-respect, the rule was that a poor man should immediately be given clothes upon request; moreover, someone who had come down in the world was to be clothed in accordance with his former status.

These or similar arrangements continued uninterrupted from medieval times until the European Enlightenment broke down the walls of the ghetti and made the ingrown life of the Jewish communities obsolescent and unnecessary.

Consider, for example, a very small Jewish community—the 12 Hebrew families who lived in Sugenheim in Franconia in 1756. This place had no rabbi. Its only paid official was a cantor, who not only sang, but served as spiritual leader, ritual slaughterer, school teacher and proprietor of the community lodging house. For the rest, the congregation was governed by an elected committee of three.

On arrival, wayfarers were given meal tickets, lodged, and then sent on their journey. They received additional meal tickets for holy days and Sabbaths, at which times they were not allowed to travel. The food corresponding to the meal tickets was supplied by a different household every day.

During the year, 220 meal tickets were issued to 12 families. Each of the 12 Jewish families had to take eight meal tickets and one additional ticket for every 100 florins of capital he possessed. The richest family, Callmann, with 3,000 florins, took 38 tickets; the poorest Jew in the community, Nathan Saloman, with only 100 florins, was assessed nine tickets.

This general system of relief was by no means confined to Germany. In Poland, the Jews enjoyed a privileged position for several centuries. They became locally autonomous in the 13th Century. By about 1550, the Polish kings encouraged them to set up a central governing body of a Jewish state within the greater state of Great Poland, Little Poland, East Galicia, Podolia, Volhynia and, until, 1623, Lithu-

ania. This *Waad arba arazot*, or Council of the Four Lands, collected taxes, organized courts, decided cases, protected Jewry at court and regulated the financial, economic, social and religious life "of the greatest Jewish community in the world."

The Council of the Four Lands met at the great fair of Lublin and the fairs, which were to be a large extent Jewish because of the dominant Jewish position in Polish domestic and foreign trade, were equally centers of Talmudic disputation, marriage markets and places where the acute intellectuality of the rabbinical students was exhibited, appraised and rewarded.

The Miry Depths. "To the fairs held at Lemberg and Lublin," wrote the remarkable 17th Century rabbi, Nathan Hannover, "came young students and their teachers in shoals. He who had a son or a daughter to marry journeyed to the fair and there made a match, for everyone found his life and his suit. At every fair, hundreds of matches were made up, sometimes thousands . . ."

Heinrich Graetz, the historian of Jewry, describes the summer fairs at Jaroslav and Zaslav and the larger ones at Lemberg and Lublin where thousands of students of the Talmud assembled and engaged in public disputes open to everyone. "The keener intellects received wealthy brides as a reward for their mental exertions. Rich parents took pride in having sons-in-law educated in Talmudic schools, and sought them at the fairs."

During the decline of this Talmudic era, Rabbi Nathan Hannover, who was to be murdered in a pogrom in 1683, wrote *The Miry Depths*, an evocation of the intellectual aristocracy of Polish Jewry as he had known it in his youth and a contrast between those times and the sorrier days of the present. Although it shares the tendency of other golden age encomia to exaggerate the wonders of the past, it is impressive in defining the norms of the formation and incentives of this special scholastic elite.

The ordinary traveller, Hannover points out, when he comes to a strange community and asks for assistance must apply for a meal ticket; then he is kept three days and taught a trade, if he wishes to learn it, given clothes if he needs them. But with the impoverished and wandering scholar, things go very differently. He is not embarrassed by being obliged to apply for assistance, but, upon showing his credentials, is invited to stay as long as he wishes and is then sent away with a gift of food.

"If a person wanted to study," Hannover writes, "they would hire

a teacher to instruct him, and afterwards, when he had become a worthwhile student, some rich man would take him into his home, give him his daughter to wife along with many thousands of gold pieces as a dowry, and would dress him royally. *And who, if not the rabbinical students, are to be regarded as royalty?* Then, after the marriage, he would be sent away from home to study in the great academies. After two or three years, when he returned to his home, his father-in-law would maintain a school for him in his own house and spend money lavishly that distinguished scholars might come there for years until he also was appointed president of an academy in some community.

"And even if the young man was not at first a good student, but had an apt mind for learning, so that there was a prospect of his developing as a scholar if he studied, some rich man with a young daughter would occasionally turn up and give him food and drink and clothes and all that he needed, as he would for his own son, and hire a teacher for him until he had become a worthwhile student. Then he would give him his daughter to wife as I have described above. There is no finer practice of charity than this."¹⁰

The Scholar During the Enlightenment. A century later the precocious genius and tragic skeptic, Solomon Maimon, cast interesting light on the rabbinical scholarly aristocracy, its sexual life and its procreative pattern during a period of stagnation and squalor for Polish Jewry. The century that separated Hannover from Maimon was distinguished by Cossack massacres of the Polish Jews, by a triumph of clerical and Jesuit forces in Poland, and finally by the three partitions of the country. The result for the Jews was regression, impoverishment, withdrawal behind their Talmudic carapace, the growth of ignorance, squalor and superstition.

Solomon Maimon was sent to school, but to a master named Yossel, who "treated his charges with incredible cruelty, flogged them until the blood came even for the slightest offense, and not infrequently tore off their ears . . ." The schoolhouse was a smoky hut; the master in a dirty blouse ground tobacco into snuff; the pupils sat on the ground. The latter were imprisoned from morning to night with no rest periods except Friday afternoons and at the new moon. As a result, "all under his discipline became either blockheads or good scholars."¹¹

Even in this period when Jewish elementary education was wretched and Jewish learning was in a miserable state of decay, the gifted students were apparently segregated from the herd and rapidly advanced.

Maimon himself was almost immediately removed from the pedagogical care of the sadistic Yossel and was sent to the city to be taught by the Chief Rabbi. Here, he was no longer put to work memorizing texts, but was trained instead in the logical organization of his ideas, their clear and terse expression, and argumentative skill in defending or attacking them.

The eugenic aspects of the Jewish worship of erudition are clearly shown in Maimon's autobiography. At a very early age, he was recognized by the Jewish community as an intellectual prodigy and, consequently, there was so much competition to secure him as a son-in-law that his shiftless and dishonest father collected dowries from two different families. At 11, Maimon was married to an innkeeper's daughter. Ownership of the tavern was made over to the daughter as part of the marriage settlement; the widow who owned the inn agreed to board and clothe the child-bride and groom for six years (so nothing should interfere with the continuation of his studies) and in addition she gave Maimon a Talmud and his father 50 thalers cash.

These marriages were supposed to be consummated at once and to result in a prompt and uninterrupted series of pregnancies. When it was discovered that the 11-year-old Maimon, though precocious enough in other matters, did not know how to copulate, both families were alarmed and it was assumed that he was bewitched. This sorcery did not apparently have permanently bad effects since Maimon fathered his first son at the age of 14.

As a Talmudist, Maimon and others had "the first claim upon all offices and positions of honor in the community. If he enters an assembly whatever his age or rank, everyone rises before him out of respect . . ."² These honors were paid to him when he was in his early teens; they continued during the rest of his life.

In a mighty effort to escape the medievalism of the Polish ghetto and learn the sciences, Maimon travelled as a vagabond to Berlin. En route, he arrived in Posen. Here the Jewish community examined his credentials. Although he was filthy, hungry and in shabby clothes, once he had proved his ability as a Talmudist in discussion with the local scholars, he was treated with honor, given new clothes, good lodgings and food, and invited to stay indefinitely. As a matter of fact, Maimon did stay in Posen for two years, during which time he was fed, clothed and sheltered by a chief rabbi and a Jewish community which were far from wealthy. He was exercising one of the prerogatives of Talmudic erudition and brilliance.

The Jewish schools of Poland may have taught little that was useful,

but they nonetheless trained an extraordinary, perhaps an unequalled, intellectual acuity. This standard of reasoning power served for a while as a barrier between the Talmudists and the secular learning that was becoming available to them. In discussing means of injecting modern knowledge and the study of science into the Polish ghetto, Maimon argued that it was imperative that the reformers begin with mathematics. He wrote to Moses Mendelssohn, the philosopher and grandfather of the composer:

“For my part, I believe that to enlighten the Jewish people, we must begin neither with history nor with natural theology and morals. One of my reasons for thinking so is that these subjects being easily intelligible, are not adapted to instil regard for science in general among the more learned Jews, who are accustomed to respect only those studies which involve a strain upon the highest intellectual powers.”¹⁸

In the Pale of Settlement. A century later, there had been no abatement in the adulation of rabbinical scholarship and the emphasis on an intellectual heredity throughout the Jewish Pale of Settlement of Czarist Russia — an area which housed the majority of world Jewry at that time and which comprised a large part of a Poland that had become extinct.

In a charming book of memoirs of Jewish life in the Pale at the turn of the century, Miriam Shomer Zunger describes the process of match-making. The physical appearance of the bride is of such secondary importance that the groom's father does not see her until the settlement has been concluded and, as for the groom, he is not even notified of his impending marriage until his father announces to him that he is engaged. The entire matter is concluded by matchmakers who commute between the towns of groom and bride.

The search, as Mrs. Zunger describes it, was for families “kneaded and soaked through” with rabbis. Despite the Jewish reputation for preoccupation with money, matchmakers would praise a prospective groom as “a find, an ornament, a savant, a scholar who did not know the face of a coin.” (My emphasis — N.W.)

“Now in those days,” Mrs. Zunger writes, “seeking a wife did not mean looking for a girl. It meant searching for a family, for *yiches* — pedigree, or caste, if you will. The girl was really the last thing to be considered. Of prime importance were not only her immediate forbearers, but those of generations back, as well as uncles, aunts and kinsfolk of all kinds, no matter how distantly related. Everything that happened in, and everybody who was connected with a family, was

important in the matter of marriage. Although affluence and influence were considerations of importance, *yiches* generally involved learning and scholarship. The more scholars a family boasted, the greater was its standing. You realize, of course, that 'learning' did not mean secular or professional knowledge of any kind. Doctors and lawyers were not only exceedingly rare among the Russian Jews of that time, but where they existed they were regarded as outside the Jewish ken. Nor did 'learning' concern itself with the arts, sciences or languages of the time. It was entirely confined to Talmudic and Biblical literature. Though this knowledge was applied to the Jewish community, it concerned itself mostly with life as it was practiced in Palestine two thousand years before . . .

"Here was a people holding itself in actual readiness to take up its existence again in a country from which it had been separated for that length of time. Is there anything to equal this in history? Here were several millions of people living in the land of the Czars, studying the rules and regulations, not of the government under which they lived, but those which existed in an ancient land that would be restored to them with the coming of the Messiah. Here were thousands of little boys taken out of their warm beds at the break of icy mornings, to be hurried off to schools where they would be taught the laws of a nation which no longer ruled, the geography of a land that had been turned into a barren waste, the language of a people who no longer spoke it. And these children would be mercilessly whipped if they did not take these subjects to heart, or if they did not know how to treat a stranger within the gates of cities that they themselves could not enter."²⁵

Indeed, it was perhaps the longest and the most consistent escape from reality of any people. It was the counterpart of segregation and persecution. As they waned, it and the tightly knit Jewish community tended to disintegrate. The formation of the Jewish intellectual aristocracy by competitive educational selection and the intensification and dissemination of mental ability through eugenic mate selection reached a climax of intensity in the ghetto and in the Pale of Settlement. Yet the Jewish brain-power which they helped create could not become manifest to the world as a whole, or for that matter fully useful to truth and civilization, until the institutions which had created them had lost their power. The further paradox was that, as the Jew became assimilated, he abandoned, not only the superstition and scholasticism of his former life, but its eugenic practices as well.

As a member of the great society, one of the distinguishing features of the Jew was that he tended to remain an intellectual — that is, he

honored thinking and engaged in it in preference to all other activities. But he ceased to be a fertile intellectual. In their sexual practices, the assimilated Jews conformed to those of their milieu; to the extent that they were urbanized, intellectual and irreligious, they failed to reproduce sufficiently to offset their normal mortality. This failure was most conspicuous among the gifted.

Thus, after emancipation from the ghetto and from the parochial attitudes of the ghetto world, the Jews became absorbed into modern society. Here, as a result of an inherited capacity for intellectual achievement which was the end-product of centuries of breeding for intelligence, they easily attained positions of eminence and, in many fields, of pre-eminence. Yet, while they achieved this, the assimilated Jews abandoned the biological policies which had given them superiority and adopted reproductive habits which were designed to reduce the intellectual ability of each new generation below that of its predecessor. Whether the dysgenic phase of the sociology of the Jews has at last come to an end remains an open question.

Fertility and Survival of the Intellectual Elite. We have seen that from the time of Josephus to the breakdown of the enclave conditions characteristic of the Russian Pale of Settlement — that is to say, from the beginnings of the Christian era until about 1900 — Jews as a rule sought to marry their children either to scholars or into families with a pedigree of intellectual distinction.

The most obvious result of this striving would be that the intellectually distinguished families would generally marry with each other and tend to avoid mixing their genes with those whose heredity was intellectually less distinguished.

This process is one of *polarization*: it is the selective breeding of a minority of outstanding gifts. The obverse of the process is that the masses only moderately endowed with intelligence are not given a genetic lift by intermarriage with the more creative elements. Among the possible consequences are that the gap between the gifted and the mediocre may widen so far as to prevent effective intercommunication. The dangers here are obvious. The creative processes of a society, particularly science, are generally conducted by the most gifted whereas the processes of decision may be in the hands of people whose thought processes and levels of intelligence are far closer to those of the masses. This similarity of mental functioning in fact enables them to communicate and hence to lead. The distrust with which the scientist is often regarded by the American public is an example of the

possibly antisocial consequences of polarization, particularly if this distrust is in reality rooted in feelings of inferiority, envy and anxiety.

Polarization by itself could not create a genetically superior people; it could merely create a minority of outstanding gifts within that people. The extent to which polarization did occur historically in the case of the Jewish people could best be discovered by studying the genealogies of rabbinical families and by ascertaining the proportion of Jewish geniuses who have an heredity of scholars. A cursory investigation of both matters suggests that polarization was extensive enough to be a significant factor.

The more important phase of Jewish eugenic development, however, was selective breeding for intelligence, affecting Jewry as a whole and raising the general level of inherited mental capacity.

Selective breeding, in this instance, means simply that the intellectually gifted tended to raise more offspring to maturity than the average. Thus, their genes tended to become an increasingly larger portion of the genetic pool of Jewry.

That this was the main causal force at work is suggested by the statistics on the Jewish contribution to the creative minority which have already been presented. These data do not show a concentration of Jewish minds at the pinnacle and a wasteland immediately below (which is what would be expected were polarization the only causal factor at work), but a concentration of Jews at all levels of the creative minority, including that of bare qualification.

Of the selective breeding forces at work to favor the intellectual element, the less important are those which affected the birth rate. Here, one can observe that the scholars probably tended to marry younger and to stay married longer since they were in such fierce demand at all ages as husbands. For the same reasons, widowed scholars would find it hard to avoid remarriage.

Moreover, the usual goal of scholarship was to serve as rabbi. Since an unmarried rabbi would not be tolerated in any Jewish community, the pressure to remain in the married state would have been exceptionally strong within the community of learned men. This point has a somewhat wider application. If not rabbis, the scholars would commonly serve as community leaders of some other sort. All such dignities radiated outward from the synagogue and it is improbable, given the contempt in which they were held by Jewry, that bachelors would be so honored.

A force in the opposite direction is that scholars were often permitted to postpone marriage where it involved economic burdens that would

prevent continued study. These postponements would be strictly limited as to time. Moreover, the most outstanding scholars would normally not be affected since rich men with marriageable daughters would be eager to support them as sons-in-law.

All Jews, regardless of economic condition, were under obligation to marry. Yet, it can be assumed that many were unable to do so. The Jewish communities habitually raised dowries for poor girls, extending this aid without discrimination to the crippled and even to the feeble-minded. Yet, as the Jewish communities were generally poor, provision could seldom be made for more than a minority. In the Roman ghetto, for instance, girls from families which were both poor and without a scholarly lineage, would draw lots for the available dowries and only the winners would find husbands. Actually, an average of only 12 girls were helped each year in this manner during the 17th Century.¹⁶ If the sex-ratio was more or less equal, about the same number of Jewish men as of dowryless Jewish girls would be condemned to celibacy.

A more direct and perhaps more powerful influence on Jewish differential birth rates was the German and Austrian policy during the 18th and early 19th Centuries of limiting Jewish natality by providing that only the first-born could marry or by making younger children pay increasingly high fees for the "marriage privilege." This legislation has been described in a previous chapter.

So much for the forces which bore upon the Jewish birth rate to favor the intellectually gifted. The other force at work was the differential death rates of the various classes in Jewish society. Here, unfortunately, data are fragmentary and imprecise. A vast amount of scholarship has gone into detailing the history of the persecution of the Jews, but nobody, as far as I know, has made a quantitative study of the role of these persecutions in natural selection. Until this quantitative work is done, all that lies within our power is to use historic analysis to try to discover the forces at work. The appraisal of the strength of these forces must await detailed study of the evidence.

Although the social welfare organizations in the Jewish communities prevented the principle of "the survival of the fittest" from operating in ways unmodified by a consciousness of moral obligation to one's fellow man, the factor of differential survival was nonetheless at work. The first and most obvious point is that the class of rabbis and scholars tended to be relatively well-to-do — their wealth resulting from their lineage, their status in the community and their marriage alliances with merchant families. Hence, the *net reproduction rate* of the scholarly

families, the number of daughters surviving through the reproductive ages produced per mother — would be far higher than among the Jews as a whole even if the fertility of the scholars were no more than average. Poor diet, inadequate shelter, the squalor and congestion of the ghetti and their vulnerability to disease, not to mention the occupations into which the poorer Jews were driven, such as working shoddy which caused diseases of the lungs — all these factors combined in various ways to give the children of the rich better-than-average survival chances. The importance of such differentials was very great in ages where high birth rates and appalling infant and child mortality were universal, where the measure of population increase was not so much the birth rate as the probability of surviving childhood.

A second factor which influenced this differential in mortality was that the most common profession of rabbis was medicine. Throughout the Middle Ages, the list of rabbi-physicians is impressive; it includes philosophers such as Moses Maimonides and doctors who were brought to the bedsides of Popes and secular sovereigns. In fact, the path of the rabbi to the role of political, financial or foreign affairs advisor to the state in medieval Spain often began with ministering to the physical ailments of the king. In respect to medical care, the children of the rabbi-physicians were considerably more fortunate than other segments of the Jewish population.

The final set of factors related to differential mortality are those which concern abnormal times. From at least the time of the Second Crusade, the Jews enjoyed, or rather suffered under, the special status of *servi camerae* — servants of the chamber — either of the Holy Roman Emperor or of some lesser sovereign. In theory, this meant that the Jews were protected by the crown against persecution; certainly, their status and rights devolved directly from the sovereign and could be cancelled at his pleasure. The position of *servi camerae* meant exclusion from the hierarchic structure of feudalism — from feudal power as well as from the duties of serfs, from the guild organizations and from the engrossing activity of warfare. Except under unusual circumstances, Jews between the fall of Rome and their emancipation by Napoleon were not allowed to bear arms and were exempt from military duty. Of the apocalyptic horsemen who tended to symbolize the hazards to life in abnormal times, war was a calamity from which they were immune insofar as the risks of the soldier were concerned. Its place in the struggle of the Jews for survival was taken by massacre. Closely related, moreover, to the actual massacres as

a hazard were the successive expulsions to which the Jews were subjected. For the most part, these entailed thinly disguised expropriations; the departure was generally on short notice to prevent the Jews from selling their goods on a normal market; hence, the inevitable hazards of a migration of unarmed and unwanted people over hostile and lawless terrain would be accentuated by lack of advance preparation. Expulsion often entailed manstealing and holding for ransom, death by violence, death from hunger or sickness while on the road, being stranded by shipowners who first robbed them, being captured by pirates and being sold into slavery.

Most of these vicissitudes bore unequally on the different classes. The intellectuals, scholars and merchants would be more likely to have advance warning of impending trouble and would hence be better able to guard against it. Wealth would give them the means for effective flight; superior knowledge and sophistication would protect them against many of the swindles to which refugees frequently fall victim; as religious scholars and perhaps physicians as well, they would not be part of the pitiful, untrained horde of unwanted refugees, but would be welcomed in every Jewish community and often in non-Jewish ones as well.

Thus, a congeries of complex historic forces converged to bring about a unique process of genetic selection for intelligence — one that has almost entirely escaped the attention of the legions of specialists on Jewish history and civilization. The combined operation of these forces brought about a flowering of intellect which has probably not been equalled or surpassed since 5th Century Athens and which today leaves its visible imprint in the disproportionately large contribution of Jewry to the world's creative minority.

XIX

CONCLUSION

We have found that the outstanding components of the creative minority in America are the Jews, the peoples of northwestern Europe and the Chinese. Within the Anglo-Saxon element, moreover, creativity is dramatically concentrated in the hands of a few special or elite groups. Finally, the natural aristocracy of intellect appears to be basically homogenous in the sense that those people who excel do so generally and those who fail tend to fail in all fields.

These findings concerning the unequal distribution of the creative minority suggest many social and political implications and raise disturbing problems for the nation's future. In these final pages, I shall enter this controversial terrain. The validity of the findings in the substantive chapters of the book is in no way affected by acceptance or rejection of these opinions, speculations and value judgments.

Self-evidently, human intelligence is determined both by heredity and by environment. We can estimate the comparative strength of these two sets of forces by studying situations in which heredity is heterogenous and environment uniform and vice versa. An example of the former would be children brought up from birth in orphanages. The outstanding instance of the latter is monozygotic (genetically identical) twins reared apart. From these and similar studies, psychologists have concluded that, under contemporary American and West European conditions, heredity may cause as much as 88% of the observed differences in I.Q.¹

Through the cooperation of computer experts and experimental neurologists, we are approaching a state of affairs in which we may be able to determine the exact quantitative contributions of heredity and environment to brain and in which intelligence can be read directly from electroencephalographic (EEG) patterns. Dr. Carleton S. Coon predicts that experts in this new science will be able to "plot their findings in terms of populations and races."²

The approximate values we already have for the genetic component in I.Q. differences in our society suggest that anti-poverty schemes and other programs of environmental amelioration are not going to contribute much to narrowing the gap between the normal and the stupid.

The scope of contemporary educational and welfare programs in the United States is already sufficient to ensure that virtually all high-I.Q. individuals can obtain higher education without financial hardship. As for those with below-average I.Q.'s, the indication that less than a quarter of psychometric intelligence is correlated with environmental conditions suggests that it will be virtually impossible to raise more than a few of them into the normal intelligence bracket.

Professor William Shockley, who won the Nobel Prize in 1956 for his work in developing the transistor, has recently expressed grave concern over the proliferation of stupidity in the U.S. Moronic and semi-moronic elements in the population are reproducing considerably more rapidly than the rest of us, producing new generations destined to live and die on relief because they are not genetically equipped to make productive or creative contributions to society.

The most obvious disadvantage of this is that these people are burdens upon the productive majority. A further consideration is that, as citizens, they enjoy the right to vote and hence to participate in the political decisions of the greatest of all world powers.³ The final reason why the proliferation of the mentally incompetent is socially undesirable is that it creates a growing chasm between man's improving mastery of the forces of nature and man himself. In an ideal social situation, we would see a continuous, forward-moving interaction between the human species and its systems of science, technology, humanities and the creative arts. In Marxist language, this would be a dialectical process; in Toynbee's system, the dynamic interaction of challenge and response.

Some interesting suggestions have been made for solving the stupidity problem. Professor Joshua Lederberg, another Nobel Laureate in science, believes that we might inject foetal brains with growth hormones before the number of neurons has been fixed. This would increase the neuron population of the brains in question and presumably their intelligence. Manipulation of DNA might also be developed to the point where the genes in people's reproductive cells could be changed for the better.

Two warnings concerning the neuron-proliferation proposal, which seems the more immediately feasible of the two. It has not been done as yet in any animal more advanced than micro-organisms. Moreover, it is predictable that the parents who requested hormone injection of fetuses would belong to the intelligent minority, that is to say, to what Jefferson called "the natural aristocracy."

Another device that could bring about a vast forward movement in

the genetic equipment of future generations is euselection (the artificial insemination of volunteer female receivers with the sperm of living or dead geniuses). This plan, which is eminently practicable today, has been tirelessly advocated with little success over the past 30 years by Professor H. J. Muller — incidentally, also a Nobel scientist.

The people who are attracted by the idea of euselection, however, are also members of the creative minority. Average parents might be disturbed at the thought of rearing children who might grow up to regard them as backward and dull. As for the moronic and semi-moronic elements, their institutionalized way of life is being perfected through a variety of governmental welfare programs to such an extent that they have no reason to wish that they themselves or their progeny were brighter. Nor do they have incentives to refrain from exuberant and uncontrolled reproduction.

Perhaps the prospect before us is of a society divided essentially into three great classes. The first of these would be an intellectual minority more superbly endowed genetically with psychic resources than any persons living today, except perhaps for a few geniuses, enormously versatile in reach and abilities, serving as custodian and creator of man's intellectual and spiritual heritage, in short, the leaven without which life would be stale. The second class would be the mass of average people, moving, one would hope, through gradual acceptance of the new genetic techniques, into the creative minority. Finally, there would be an expanding parasitic class, living outside the modern world, without function, without adequate intelligence, without ambition, without internal standards or goals. This class would continue to reproduce its own kind without internal or external restraint.

There would seem to be only a few possible lines of action. State regulation of the right to reproduction would probably be rejected by most Americans as invading a very basic liberty. The "natural" Malthusian checks of starvation, disease and premature mortality imply a deliberate return to morally intolerable conditions. We are left with the alternative of massive efforts to disseminate effective birth control devices among those whose I.Q. is so low that their reproduction is socially undesirable. Paradoxical as it may seem, lavish material rewards bestowed upon the most unintelligent segment of the population for abstinence from reproduction might prove a long-range economy.

Before solutions can be found, the existence of the problem must be generally recognized. This implies abandoning the egalitarian fallacy, the assumption that because people are entitled to equal juridical rights we should pretend that they are equal in talents. This means

jettisoning the cult of incompetence and with it the suspicion that success is proof of misconduct and failure evidence of having been wronged.

On international terrain, a great unexplored frontier does exist. A vast program to search for, discover and intensively educate the myriads of gifted children in the impoverished countries of Asia, Latin America and Africa would be an immensely constructive undertaking, enriching both the countries of origin and mankind as a whole. In the underdeveloped areas of the world, one cannot for a moment assume that less than a quarter of I.Q. differences is due to environmental factors. On the contrary, omnipresent hunger and disease, bondage to the soil for lack of other opportunities, dearth of schools, libraries and laboratories prevent all but a small fraction of the gifted from realizing their gifts. No serious quest for an undeveloped human potential can be concentrated internally, where even the most shiftless and untalented enjoy the benefits of American citizenship and of governmental largess. It must be directed externally, toward those areas of the world where dearth of resources, adverse institutions or both conspire to deprive those who have ability of their birthright.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER 1

1. Nathaniel Weyl, "Ethnic and National Characteristics of the U.S. Elite," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 4, April 1961, pp. 242-248.
2. National-linguistic does not mean racial. Thus, Negro names are preponderantly Anglo-Saxon. Spanish names are borne in the United States chiefly by Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, other Latin Americans, Filipinos and peninsular Spaniards. The racial substratum may be Caucasoid, Negroid, Amerindian, Mongoloid or any combination of these ethnic groups.
3. The most important exception to this generalization is the American Negro. Upon their emancipation, the Negroes assumed Caucasoid surnames. Name-frequency analysis, therefore, sheds little light on their role in the American creative minority.
4. An example of a roster of a future elite is 1962 elections to Phi Beta Kappa.
5. M. Smilansky and L. Adar, *Evaluating Achievement, Summaries of some Studies Carried out by the Henrietta Szold Institute on Schooling in Israel*, Educational Studies and Documents #42, UNESCO, Paris, 1961, pp. 6, 10.
6. Stephen Sargent Visher, *Geography of American Notables*, Study #79, Indiana University Studies, Vol. XV, Bloomington, Ind., 1928; J. McKenn Cattell, *American Men of Science*, appendix to 3rd edition, New York, 1921; also Havelock Ellis, *A Study of British Genius*, Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston, 1926, p. 66.
7. Random House, New York, 1964.

CHAPTER 2

1. The weight given to these groups in the composite portrait of the American creative minority does not depend on the number of entries in these rosters, but on the number of rosters used. Also, the elite, as measured here, probably includes considerably less than two million people, since many individuals appear on two or more of these leadership rosters.
2. Elsdon C. Smith, *Dictionary of American Family Names*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1956.
3. The pressure in favor of name-changing tends to increase with the promotion of the individual. Those who resist these pressures are likely to be more secure people than those who succumb, to have more pride and a more positive identification with their family and to be stronger in character. Intense pressure in favor of name-changing is often exerted on motion picture stars and others who must create and project a glamorous self-image to succeed in their vocations. Such pressure is probably at a minimum among other intellectual groups.
4. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, M.I.T. and Harvard, Cambridge, 1963, p. 138.
5. John L. Thomas, "The Factor of Religion in the Selection of Marriage Mates," *American Sociological Review*, 16, No. 4 (August 1951), pp. 487-491.
6. "Single or Triple Melting Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940," *American Journal of Sociology*, 49, No. 4 (January 1944), pp. 331-339.

7. *The Jewish Population of New Orleans, 1953*, Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds, 1954.
8. Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 181.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
10. Statute of 1663.
11. Deportation of felons to the Colonies began in 1717.
12. For example, Ferenc Molnar, Adolph Zukor, William Fox, David Lilienthal, Leo Szilard and Edward Teller. Half-Jews include Joseph Pulitzer and Eugene Wigner.
13. Julien Benda, *La Trahison des clercs*, Paris, 1927.
14. Excellence in the world of sports has been excluded from consideration since there is no evidence that kinesthetic learning is correlated with reasoning ability (as a matter of fact, it can be outstanding in the mentally dull). The kinesthetic fields have little relationship to civilization-building and those who are outstandingly proficient in them are not necessarily part of that minority which is the leaven of civilization.
15. *Matthew*, xxvi:29, (KJV).

CHAPTER 3

1. The 75 rosters are listed in Appendix II.
2. Other sources on Negro names are three articles by Howard F. Barker: "Surnames in the United States," *American Mercury*, June 1930; "Ancestry of Family Names," *Atlantic*, August 1935, pp. 182-186, and "The Family Names of American Negroes," *American Speech*, 14, pp. 163-174. Also Oscar W. Eagleston and Antoinette D. Clifford, "A Comparative Study of the Names of White and Negro Woman College Students," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, pp. 57-64 (February 1945) and Melville J. Herskovitz, *The Myth of the Negro Past*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1941.
3. The special British Occupational Surnames are *Cooke, Draper, Miner* and *Potter*.
4. The breakdown of this is: French 2.00, Greek 2.00, Italian 1.00, Hungarian .50, Slavic .33 and Spanish zero.
5. Italian 41, Slavic 39, Greek 26, Hungarian 16 and Spanish 13.

CHAPTER 4

1. Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan T. Possony, *The Geography of Intellect*, Regnery, Chicago, 1963, pp. 124-136, 140-144.
2. George Sarton, *An Introduction to the History of Science*, Carnegie Institute of Washington, D.C., 1927-1947, 3 volumes.
3. Julius Beloch, *Die Bevolkerung Europas zur Zeit der Renaissance*, 1900.
4. The estimate of world Jewish population is taken from Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Vol. III: *High Middle Ages (500-1200), Heirs of Rome and Persia*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1957 (2nd edition), p. 114. Dr. Baron places world Jewish population circa 1200 at about 2,000,000.
5. *Op cit.*, p. 126. It is estimated that at about 1200 A.D. southern Europe had three cities with population of half a million or over (Constantinople, Cordoba and Palermo), whereas the largest city in northern Europe was Paris with only 150,000 inhabitants.

6. Harvey C. Lehman, "National Differences in Creativity," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII, No. 6 (1947), pp. 475-488. The disciplines chosen were: chemistry 1,707, genetics 249, entomology 828, mathematics 1,442, pathology 388, medicine 1,405, philosophy 1,066, grand opera 1,451, orchestral and symphonic composition 965.

7. "When countries with different religions, but ethnically and culturally similar and geographically adjacent, are compared," we wrote, "analogous differences become evident. Thus, the genius rate for Protestant Scotland (as revealed by the table) is 55, that for Catholic Ireland 17. The rate for Holland is 39, that for Belgium only 8." Weyl and Possony, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

8. Stephen Sargent Visher, *Scientists Starred 1903-1943*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1947.

9. Cattell's procedures were subject to criticism because he decreed that during his lifetime the proportionate breakdown of the starred scientists among the listed fields should not vary from that determined by him in 1903. This made no allowance for the rise of new disciplines, for the expansion of some fields and for the contraction of others or for work in the interstitial areas between the different disciplines. Moreover, the proportion of starred scientists declined steadily from about 25% of the listings in the 1903 edition of *American Men of Science* to less than 1% of the listings in the 1943 edition. Finally, Cattell was prejudiced against the applied sciences in general and against medicine in particular.

10. *Op. cit.*, p. 541.

11. 4.9 million out of a total of 7.7 million.

12. J. McKeen Cattell, *American Men of Science*, 3rd edition, New York, 1921, appendix.

13. London, 1904.

14. Stephen Sargent Visher, *Geography of American Notables*, Study #79, Indiana University Studies, Vol. XV, Bloomington, Indiana, 1928.

15. Visher, *Starred Scientists*, p. 97.

16. Robert H. Knapp and Hubert B. Goodrich in *Studies in Motivation* (edited by David C. McClellan), Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1955.

17. Anne Roe, *The Making of a Scientist*, Dodd Mead, New York, 1952.

18. Leo Moulin, *British Journal of Sociology*, VI, No. 3 (September 1955), pp. 246-63.

19. Baltzell, *op. cit.*, pp. 316-17.

20. Hermann J. Muller, "Should We Weaken Or Strengthen Our Genetic Heritage?" *Daedalus*, Summer 1961, p. 433.

CHAPTER 5

1. Anatole Chujoy, *The Dance Encyclopedia*, Barnes & Company, New York, 1949, Appendix II: "Discography of Theatre Music — Composers."

2. For example, two eulogistic columns follow the headings 'communism' and 'communist,' but only four lines are devoted to 'republican.' Among the 'literary figures' considered worthy of inclusion are Ernst Thaelmann, the semi-literature leader of the German Communist Party in the 1930's and Ella Reeves Bloor, a veteran American Communist agitator and organizer. George Orwell and Arthur Koestler were omitted, presumably because their writings were displeasing to Stalin and to his regime.

3. Thomas Y. Crowell, New York, 1965. The propaganda seems to have been elimi-

nated: at least, Thaelmann and Bloor have been ousted from the literary pantheon whereas Orwell and Koestler have gained admission.

4. Edited by Max J. Herzberg, Thomas Y. Crowell, New York, 1962, 1,280 pp.
5. Edited by W. J. Burke and Will D. Howe, New York, 1962, 833 pp.
6. Columbia University Press, New York, 1959 (5th edition).
7. R. R. Bowker Company, New York, 1960.
8. *The World Almanac 1963*, pp. 406-413.
9. Obviously, some of the name-changes took place because of marriage.
10. Peter Smith, New York, 1948. Although the listing is worldwide, it is sufficiently heavily weighted with Americans to be useful.
11. R. R. Bowkers Co., New York, 1959. Edited by Dorothy Gilbert under the auspices of the American Federation of Arts, this volume covers about 7,000 professional artists of recognized competence.
12. Eleanor C. Munro, *The Golden Encyclopedia of Art: Painting, Sculpture, Architecture and Ornament from Prehistoric Times to the Twentieth Century*, Golden Press, New York, 1961; Museum of Modern Art, *Masters of Modern Art* (edited by Alfred H. Barr, Jr.), Simon & Schuster, New York, 1954; Carl Einstein, *Die Kunst des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Prophylaeen Verlag, Berlin, 1926.

CHAPTER 6

1. Senate Document 259, 70th Cong., 2d sess., table A, p. 5. Reprinted in *The Immigration and Naturalization Systems of the United States, 81st Congress, 2d Session, Report No. 1515*, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1950, Appendix XII, Table 1, p. 886.
2. Nathaniel Weyl, *The Negro in American Civilization*, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1960, p. 23.
3. Many were deported for political reasons. Oliver Cromwell believed that the Irish were admirably suited for slavery. He had the survivors of the Drogheda massacre transported to Bermuda as indentured servants and his agents scoured Ireland for children to be sold and shipped to America.
4. J. Franklin Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*, Beacon Press, 1925, pp. 91-92.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
6. Carol Zeleny, "Irish Americans," in *One America*, edited by Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960 (3rd edition), p. 60.
7. Negative selection means simply that, in terms of class, the immigrants were of lower status than the parent population.
8. The poor performance of Irish on rosters of past leadership is due primarily to the fact that the bulk of the Irish immigration had not yet occurred. The performance coefficients are computed by using a breakdown of surname frequencies as of 1956.
9. Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan T. Possony, *The Geography of Intellect*, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1963, pp. 169-170. Also "Growth of American Families," *Population Bulletin*, XVI, No. 4 (1960), p. 66.
10. A. E. Mourant, *The Distribution of Human Blood Groups*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1954 (2nd edition), p. 46.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 47.

CHAPTER 7

1. Ellsworth Huntington, *After Three Centuries: A Typical New England Family*, Williams & Wilkins Company, Boston, 1935.
2. Emphasis not in original.
3. *Democracy in America*, Longman, Green & Co., London, 1889 edition, Vol. I, pp. 28-29.
4. Part of the ABC "Saga of Western Man" series, viewed May 10, 1965.
5. John Fiske, *The Beginnings of New England*, Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston, 1889, pp. 72-73.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
7. Havelock Ellis, *A Study of British Genius*, London, 1904.
8. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
9. *After Three Generations*, p. 10.
10. *Idem.*
11. "Ethnic and National Characteristics of the U.S. Elite," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 4 (April-June 1961), pp. 242-248; "Dynamics of the American Elite," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 1 (July-September 1961), pp. 48-56; "Class Origin of Surnames and Achievement," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 3 (January-March 1962), pp. 159-166; "The Scots in the United States," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 4 (April-June 1962), pp. 246-250; and "The Jewish Role in the American Elite," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 1 (July-September 1962), pp. 26-37.
12. Elsdon Smith, *Dictionary of American Family Names*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1956.
13. Thus, *Russos* in the 1960 Greater Miami telephone directory have such given names as Abraham, Benjamin, Isaac and Samuel.
14. Howard F. Barker, "Surnames in the United States," *American Mercury*, 26 (June 1932), pp. 223-230.
15. The reference works used by Huntington were: Authors (*Who's Who Among American Authors*); Scientists (*American Men of Science*); Doctors (*Medical Directory*); Lawyers (*Martindale-Hubbel Law Directory*); Government Officials (*Who's Who in Government*); Dentists (*Dental Register*); Patentees (patents granted in 1927 and 1930); Businessmen (*Dun and Bradstreet's Mercantile Directory* in 14 cities); Notable Americans (*Twentieth Century Dictionary of Notable Americans*); Library Cards (count of cards in the libraries of Yale, Harvard, New York City and Boston); Who's Who (*Who's Who in America*); Social Register (*Social Register*); AAAS Members (members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science); Directorates (directorates per person listed in *Poor's Register*); Dun & Bradstreet ratings (reciprocals of these ratings multiplied by 100); Social Service (persons on Social Service Exchange lists of 14 large cities—reciprocals times 10,000), Criminals (persons recorded in Bureaus of Criminal Identification in seven cities and three states—reciprocals of rates times 10,000).
16. These three rosters were expressed in terms of reciprocals of scores to provide greater homogeneity and to make adding and averaging meaningful. A low Dun & Bradstreet rating indicates financial soundness. Reciprocals were also used in handling the two rosters of demerit: Social Service lists and criminals listed by the Bureau of Criminal Investigation (later to become the F.B.I.). In the interests of homogeneity, the first index was multiplied by 100, the last two by 10,000.
17. None of the six Puritan names in Huntington's sample is on the BOASI list of the 1,514 most common American names. Hence, their frequency of occurrence was esti-

mated from lineage of entries in the directories of 21 American cities and suburban areas. 1962 directories were examined for Boston, San Francisco, New Orleans, Dallas, Rochester, Richmond (city), Richmond (suburbs), Minneapolis, Providence, San Diego, Miami, Newark, St. Louis (city) and Milwaukee. In the cases of Pittsburgh and Phoenix, 1961 directories were used. The Seattle directory was for 1961-62 and in the cases of Baltimore (suburbs), Cleveland, Indianapolis and Arlington County, Va., 1963 directories were used.

18. *After Three Centuries*, p. 106.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 112.

20. The rosters used were: *Books in Print*, 1960; *American Men of Science*, 10th edition; *American Medical Directory*, 1960-61; *Poor's Directory of Directors and Executives*, 1959; American Dental Association membership list, 1962, and patents granted between 1952 and 1963.

21. Howard F. Barker, "The Family Names of American Negroes," *American Speech*, 14 (October 1939), 163-174.

22. Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 1939, Vol. III, p. 170.

CHAPTER 8

1. *The Immigration and Naturalization Systems of the United States*, *op. cit.*, p. 886. Hereafter cited as *Immigration* report.

2. A. J. Barnouw, "Dutch Americans," in *One America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-85.

3. Ellsworth Huntington, *The Character of Races*, Scribner's, New York, 1927, pp. 252-263. These generalizations apply to migrations into wilderness, to migrations of conquest and to voyages into the unknown. It does not follow that the immigration into the United States in the 19th and 20th Centuries, involving little hardship or danger, was positively selective.

4. v. Huntington, *op. cit.*, p. 256. The "sharp, protruding heels" suggests Negroid origin and Dixon did suggest that the Thralls were proto-Negroid. A more modern theory is that they were aboriginal Cro-Magnoids or perhaps Beaker Folk from the Mediterranean or even Laplanders. v. Bertil J. Lundman, *The Racial History of Scandinavia*, I.A.A.E.E. Reprint No. 7.

5. E. V. Gordon, *Introduction to Old Norse*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1937, p. xxv.

6. Clerical celibacy was first enjoined by the Council of Elvira in 305 A.D. It was adopted by the Latin Church in 384 and introduced into England by Augustine in 597. Naturally, there were many times and places in which it fell into desuetude and there were always movements of protest against it.

7. Weyl and Possony, *The Geography of Intellect*, *op. cit.* Weber's version of the history of the rise of science in the West has been elegantly refuted on other grounds by Lewis S. Feuer, *The Scientific Intellectual*, Basic Books, New York, 1963.

8. Henry C. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church*, Watts & Co., London, 1932 (4th edition).

9. Adjusting 1920 data on the population of the U.S. by national stocks, already cited, to the 1960 population. It is assumed that 10% of the Swiss immigration was French-speaking (*Immigration* report, *op. cit.*, p. 130) and that 25% of the Belgian immigration was Walloon. The *Immigration* report (p. 147) stated that 908,000 French Canadians were in the United States in 1940.

10. American Newspaper Guild membership where their performance coefficient is 120.
11. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, M.I.T. Press and Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1963, p. 184.
12. Edward Banfield, *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1958.
13. *op. cit.*, p. 199.
14. *op. cit.*, p. 201.
15. Italians constituted about 22% of New York's non-Negro and non-Puerto Rican population.
16. *op. cit.*, p. 206.
17. Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture, Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1963, pp. 402-3, 513.
18. William Lytle Schurz, *Brazil, the Infinite Country*, Dutton, New York, 1961, p. 142.
19. Edward Tomlinson, *Look Southward, Uncle*, Devin-Adair, New York, 1959, p. 27.
20. They have also been prominent in the Argentine revolutionary movement. Victor Codovilla, for 20 years the whip of Moscow in Argentine Communism, was an Italian; Ghioldi, the General Secretary of the Argentine Communist Party, was an Italian Jew.
21. Certainly, the last reason is invalid. Proportionately, many more individuals rise from the lower social strata to become millionaires in the United States than in South America.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 339, referring to Leonard Covello, *The Social Background of the Italo-American School Child*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, New York University, 1942, pp. 35-36.
23. Jacques Millot, *Biologie des races humaines*, Collection Armand Colin, Paris, 1952, p. 36.
24. P. B. Candell, "The Introduction of Blood Group B into Europe," *Human Biology*, 14 (1952): 413-414.
25. A. E. Mourant, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.
26. Carleton S. Coon, *The Living Races of Man*, Knopf, New York, 1965, p. 66.
27. Rudolf Martin and Karl Saller, *Lehrbuch der Anthropologie*, Gustav Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1959 (3rd edition), Vol. II, p. 1,217.
28. Otto Klineberg, *A Study of Psychological Differences between "Racial" and National Groups in Europe*, Columbia University Press, New York (Archives of Psychology #132), 1931, pp. 17-19, 27.
29. However, the validity of Klineberg's findings are seriously impaired by his failure to control his samples and his use of an inappropriate tests. The tests he used were designed for 8-year-olds. When given to 10-to-12-year-olds, they measured, not so much intelligence, as speed. On the inadequacies of Klineberg's work, see Leona E. Tyler, *The Psychology of Human Differences*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 2nd edition 1956, pp. 306-307.
30. v. Tyler, *op. cit.*, p. 307.
31. R. Carlson Hilding and Herman Henderson, "The Intelligence of Children of Mexican Parentage," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. XLV, No. 3 (1950), pp. 344-351.
32. The adjustments are designed to raise the Puerto Rican scores.
33. John B. Miner, *Intelligence in the United States*, Springer, New York, 1957, p. 74.
34. National Science Foundation, *Scientific Manpower from Abroad*, NSF 62-24, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., undated, p. 7.

35. Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1963, p. 77.
36. *Op. cit.*, pp. 78-83.
37. Robert Payne, *The Life and Death of Lenin*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1964.
38. Weyl and Possony, *op. cit.*, p. 182.
39. Ellsworth Huntington, *The Character of Races*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1927, pp. 199-200.
40. S. W. Kung, *Chinese in American Life*, University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1962.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193.
43. Using faculty directories, Chinese and Japanese names were counted and expressed as percentages of total faculty. These were then compared to the percentages which persons of Chinese and Japanese stock bear to the total U.S. population.
44. *Combined Membership List 1961-1962*: American Mathematical Society, Mathematical Association of America and Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
45. After adjustment for Negroes.
46. *American Men of Science*, *op. cit.*, 9th edition, Vol. III.

CHAPTER 9

1. Authorities differ as to when surnames were generally adopted. One view is that they became the norm in England in the 13th and 14th Centuries and in Wales by the 18th Century. v. E. G. Withycombe, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1947, p. xxv.

2. Things are seldom what they seem. *Belcher* derives from *bel* and *cher* and hence means handsome and adored; *Best* derives from *bête* and means either beast or stupid.

3. ". . . the Irish are almost uniquely pale skinned when unexposed, untanned parts of the body are observed. Out of 10,000 men, over 90 per cent had skins of the pale pink shade represented by von Luschan #3, while not a single individual was darker than von Luschan #11 . . . In the proportion of pure light eyes, Ireland competes successfully with the blondest regions of Scandinavia." Carleton S. Coon, *The Races of Europe*, Macmillan, New York, 1939, pp. 380-381.

4. In a 1961 study, A. E. Casey and R. B. Franklin used 36 factors, including blood type, skin, hair and eye color and physical measurements to compare Cork-Kerry Irish with 136 other peoples, using multiple correlation. "The Irish, Northern Scots, Icelanders, S. W. Norse, N. Dutch and Frisians," they concluded, "form a racial entity with 97% inter-correlation and very little change over the past 1000-4000 years. There is a high correlation with the ancient Scythians. The living Cork-Kerry Irish retain elements of Paleolithic and Neanderthal man." ("Cork-Kerry Irish Compared Anthropometrically with 139 Modern and Ancient Peoples," *Irish J. Med. Sci.* 429 (1961): 409-415. The quotation is from F. Winder's summary in *Biological Abstracts* 1964, Part 2, 13,604.

5. Here and throughout the chapter, performance coefficients given are prior to adjustment for the presence of Negroes. The names meaning dark are: *Sullivan*, *Dunn*, *Carey*, *McDowell*, *Donnelly*, *Duffy*, *Donovan*, *Donahue*, *Dolan*, *Dwyer*, *Dooley*, *Coyle* and *Cronin*. Those meaning red are: *Flynn*, *Flanagan*, *Goff* and *McElroy*. The names meaning light are *Finn* and *McGuire*.

6. P. H. Reaney, *A Dictionary of British Surnames*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1961, p. 34.

7. It will be noted that the English names meaning color score markedly higher than the English average in both rosters. This is not true of the Irish or the Scots. The reason for this difference eludes me.

8. The regional distribution of these names would be of interest in this connection. Cork, Kerry and Clare are the Irish counties where the majority of the population is Neolithic, according to Coon, *The Races of Europe, op. cit.* The color names prevalent in these three counties seem to be *Carey, Donovan* and *Flynn*.

9. Reaney, *op. cit.*, p. xlvi, from G. F. Black, *Surnames of Scotland*, New York, 1946, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

10. Reaney, *op. cit.*, p. xlvi.

11. *Brod* means beard in Polish and there is a town named *Broda* in Mecklenburg.

12. A. G. Clement and R. H. S. Robertson, *Scotland's Scientific Heritage*, Oliver & Boyd, 1961, p. 124.

13. Second American edition, Appleton, New York, 1871, p. 340.

14. Havelock Ellis, *A Study of British Genius*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Cambridge, 1926, p. 4.

15. There were 659 English, 137 Scottish, 63 Irish, 28 Welsh, 97 mixed British and 46 mixed British and foreign. Of the mixed group, the Irish-English cross did better than the Scottish-English.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

17. *The Character of Races*, Scribner's, New York, 1927, pp. 220-236.

18. "Secular Changes in Scottish Genius," *Mankind Monograph #2, Mankind Quarterly*, 1962, p. 9.

19. *Ibid*, pp. 11-12.

20. *Ibid*, p. 13.

21. *Ibid*, p. 21.

22. "Ethnic and National Characteristics of the U.S. Elite," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 4 (April 1961), p. 246.

23. *Ibid*, p. 247.

24. *Chron. Wace* (Rolls) 15834, circa 1330 A.D.

25. *Rom. Horseleach*, London, 1674, p. 93.

26. Guppy, *The Homes of Family Names*, London, 1890, p. 18.

27. Among the recent crop of multimillionaire American politicians, 1964 Republican aspirant Nelson Rockefeller went out of his way to munch hotdogs with the masses and to get himself known as "Nels" or "Rocky."

28. Howard F. Barker, "The Family Names of American Negroes," *American Speech*, Vol. 14 (October 1939), pp. 163-174.

29. Elsdon C. Smith, "Common American Surnames and their Relation to Eminence," *Names*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (March 1962), pp. 38-44.

30. Margaret K. Odell and Earl P. Strong, *Records Management and Filing Operations*, New York and London, 1947, p. 191.

31. English, Scots, Welsh, Irish, German and Spanish.

32. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

33. *Ibid*, p. 41.

34. The names are: from JOHN: Johns, Johnson, Johnston, Jackson, Jennings, Hancock, Hankin; from THOMAS: Thomas, Thompson, Thomson, Tomlinson, Tompkins; from RICHARD: Rich, Richards, Richmond, Dick, Dickens, Dicker, Dickey, Dickinson, Dickson, Hickey, Hicks, Hickman and Hudson; from HENRY: Harrington, Harris, Hawkins, Hale, Haley, Hall, Henson, Hendricks, Henderson, Hennings, Hensley, Herring and

Herron; from WILLIAM: Wiley, Wilker, Wilkins, Willard, Williams, Willis, Wills, Wilson and Gil; from DAVID: David, Davidson, Davies, Davison, Dawson; from ROBERT: Robbins, Robertson, Roberts, Robison, Hobbs and Hopkins.

CHAPTER 10

1. Marvin Loewenthal, *The Jews of Germany*, Longman's, Green & Company, New York, 1936, p. 190.
2. Isaac Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, Macmillan, London, 1895, p. 175.
3. Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1891, 6 volumes, Vol. IV, p. 694.
4. Loewenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 270.
5. Oscar M. Voorhees (editor), *Phi Beta Kappa General Catalog 1776-1922*, Press of the Unionist-Gazette Association, Somerville, N.J., p. viii.
6. Ernest Havemann and Patricia Salter West, *They Went to College*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1952, p. 207. The survey covered 9,064 graduates of 1,037 American colleges. On the other hand, a 1908 survey of 77 colleges and higher educational institutions by the Immigration Commission came out with the odd conclusion that 8.5% of the male students were first- or second-generation Jews- (v. Nathan Glazer, "Social Characteristics of American Jews," in *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion*, edited by Louis Finkelstein, Harper & Brothers, New York, 3rd edition, 1960, p. 1,706.) This estimate is untrustworthy because of the small number of institutions covered and because of the improbability that proportionately three times as many Jews as non-Jews went to college at a time when 1,200,000 of the 1,400,000 Jews in the United States were of East European origin and for the most part impoverished.
7. The Phi Beta Kappa Association was kind enough to make this calculation for me from its membership lists.
8. Havemann and West, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-208. The authors found that in 1946-47 the college graduates under 30 were 69% Protestant, 25% Catholic and 6% Jewish. Thus, Jewish college graduation was at twice the average rate for the nation, Catholic graduation 32% above the national rate and Protestant graduation 12% below it. Under-representation of Protestants among the college-bred was mainly due to the presence of Negroes and Southern poor whites.
9. Robert J. Shosteck, *The Jewish College Student*, B'nai B'rith Vocational Service, Washington, D. C., 1957. Quoted in Glazer and Moynihan, *op. cit.*, p. 156.
10. Herman P. Miller, *Rich Man, Poor Man*, Thomas Y. Crowell, New York, 1964, p. 123.
11. National Merit Scholarship Corporation, *Annual Report 1962*, p. 6 *et seq.*
12. Glazer and Moynihan, *op. cit.*, p. 175.
13. In this respect, social anthropology has become a close rival to psychiatry.
14. Glazer in *The Jews*, *op. cit.*, p. 1,716.
15. Camden, Charleston, Gary, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, Miami, Nashville, New Orleans, Newark, Newark suburbs, Passaic, Portchester, Trenton and Utica.
16. Glazer, *op. cit.*, p. 1,719.
17. The elite colleges are: Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, Vassar and Yale. The others are: Alabama, California, Cincinnati, George Washington, Illinois, Iowa State, Michigan, Ohio State, Penn State and Texas. The rosters for both students and faculty are for years during the period 1960-64.

18. *Who's Who in America 1962-63*, A. N. Marquis Co., Chicago, 1963, p. 2.

19. Instead of making actual name counts, the thickness of the files in the Patent Office was measured in millimeters for each name.

20. "Jews In and Out of New York City," *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, III:2 (December 1961), pp. 254-260.

21. Miller, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-122, citing Donald J. Boggue, *The Population of the United States*, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1959.

22. *New York Times*, April 22, 1960 and October 25, 1960.

23. Glazer and Moynihan, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

24. The line job is part of the ordinary chain of command and corresponds to the pre-atomic-age concept of the infantry officer as a man who is capable of discharging any military responsibility because he is an expert in nothing. The line executive deals largely with people; his work is closely bound up with socializing. Membership in the right country clubs and possession of the readily recognizable badges of elite social status are considered important. Hence, the socially non-elite groups, the Jews among them, are more strongly represented in specialized areas of corporate leadership such as research, new processes and products, production, finances, etc.

25. Report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate (81st Congress, 2d Sess.) #1515, *The Immigration and Naturalization Systems of the United States*, Washington, D. C., 1950, pp. 783-784.

26. Marion T. Bennett, *American Immigration Policies*, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 334.

27. *The Jews*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1,561, 1,563, 1,580.

28. If this assumption inflates Jewish participation in the Communist movement, the hypothesis that the Communist Party was as attractive to non-Jewish as to Jewish Russians deflates it.

29. Theodore Draper, *American Communism and Soviet Russia*, Viking Press, New York, 1960, p. 191, estimated that not more than 15% of American Communist Party membership in the mid-1920s was Jewish. This would correspond to a P.C. of 500. However, Draper's figure is ridiculously low. Moreover, in the same paragraph, Draper concedes that of the nine daily papers published by the Party, the Freiheit (Yiddish) reported the largest circulation and had 5,000 more readers than the English-language Daily Worker.

Nathan Glazer's invaluable study, *The Social Basis of American Communism*, Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, 1961, pp. 130-169, 220-233, implies much higher Jewish percentages. Thus, in 1945, John Williamson observed that the Brooklyn Communist Party membership (8,000 members, comprising perhaps one-seventh of the Party) was concentrated in predominantly Jewish districts. In April 1929, C. P. leader Jack Stachel complained that "practically 90%" of the Los Angeles Party membership was Jewish.

30. Nathaniel Weyl, "Dynamics of the American Elite," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 1 (July-September 1961), pp. 54-55.

CHAPTER 11

1. Article on "Names" in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1905, and the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, New York City, 1942. Of somewhat less value is Konrad Krause, *Die jüdische Namenwelt*, Essener Verlag, Anstalt, 1943.

2. The retained names are: *Abraham, Berman, Bernstein, Cohen, Epstein, Friedman, Goldberg, Goldstein, Greenberg, Isaacs, Kaplan, Katz, Levin, Levine, Levy, Marcus, Rosen, Rosenberg, Rosenthal, Rubin, Shapiro, Silver, Solomon, Stern, Weinberg and Weinstein.*

3. American Psychiatric Association, *List of Fellows and Members, 1961-62*; Phi Beta Kappa Society membership, compilation kindly made by the Society for the writer; American Statistical Association, *Directory of Statisticians 1961*; *Directory of Medical Specialists Holding Certification by American Specialty Boards, 10th* edition, 1961; American Dental Association, *American Dental Directory 1962*; American Medical Association, *American Medical Directory 1960-61*; *Combined Membership List of American Mathematics Societies, 1961*; *American Men of Science, 1955-56* edition: Vol. I (Physical Sciences), Vol. II (Biological Sciences) and Vol. III (Social and Behavioral Sciences); 1962 student enrollment in 15 U.S. colleges and universities (University of Alabama, University of California, University of Cincinnati, Cornell, Dartmouth, George Washington University, Harvard, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, University of Michigan, Ohio State, Pennsylvania State, Princeton, University of Texas, Vassar and Yale); membership of American Newspaper Guild, kindly made available by the trade union; *Mallet's Index of Artists: Supplement*, Peter Smith, New York, 1948 (about 15,000 to 20,000 names, mostly, but not entirely, contemporary); *Poor's Register of Directors and Executives, U.S. and Canada, 1959*; *Directory of American Scholars, 3rd* edition, 1957; *The Biographical Register of the Department of State (1959)*; *Who's Who in Engineering (1959)* and *U.S. Army Register (January 1960)*—officers on the active list.

4. *I Chronicles* (Jacob M. Myers, Editor), Doubleday, New York, 1965, pp. lxxviii-lxxxi.

5. Article on "Epstein" in the *Jewish Encyclopedia, op. cit.*

6. According to Cecil Roth, *The Jewish Contribution to Civilization*, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, 1940, pp. 268, 353. Roth adds (p. 213) that Abraham Stern (1769-1842) invented the first calculating machine.

7. Cecil Roth (editor), *Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*, Doubleday, New York, 1959, articles on "Shapiro" and "Tzaddik".

8. The extent of name-changing among *Cohens* is illustrated by the number of variants of the name today prevalent, for example, *Kohn, Kahn, Hahn, Cohn, Coon, Cone, Coffen, Kahan* and *Kagan*. (In most cases, however, *Hahn, Coon, Cone* and *Coffen* are not Jewish.)

9. Joseph Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics*, D. Nutt, London, 1896, p. xxvi.

10. Malcolm H. Stern, *Americans of Jewish Descent*, Hebrew Union Press, Cincinnati, 1960.

11. As for the Sephardic Jews, like many aristocracies, the most distinctive feature of their intellectual contribution is that it belongs primarily to past centuries.

12. These are: *physics*: Michelson, Lippmann, Einstein, Franck, Hertz, Stern, Rabi, Bloch, Born and Frank; *chemistry*: Wallach, Willstaetter, Haber and Adler; *medicine and physiology*: Ehrlich, Barany, Meyerhoff, Landsteiner, Warburg, Loewi, Erlanger, Chaim, Carl Cori, Gerty Cori, Reichstein, Waksman, Lipmann, Krebs, Lederberg, Muller and Kornberg. Half-Jews are: *physics*: Bohr and Fermi; *chemistry*: von Baeyer and *medicine and physiology*: Metchnikoff.

13. Malcom H. Stern, *op. cit.*

14. Karl Kautsky, *Are the Jews a Race?*, International Publishers, New York, 1926, pp. 153-6.

15. Jacobs, *op. cit.*; and Frank Lorimer and Frederick Osborn, *Dynamics of Population*, Macmillan, New York, 1934, p. 314. The infertility in question is not biological, but social and cultural. Tension arising from religious differences, confused group identification, etc., presumably lead to more drastic family limitation than prevails in homogeneous marriages.

CHAPTER 12

1. Message to Congress, December 6, 1923.

2. "Postwar Immigration to the United States, 1946-1958," *Migration Facts and Figures*, July-August 1959.

3. Anthony Bouscaren, *International Migrations Since 1945*, Praeger, New York, 1963, p. 129.

4. Of these, China furnished 35,000, Japan 34,000, the Philippines 16,000 and Israel and Jordan 11,000.

5. Warren S. Thompson, "The Present Status of our Immigration Laws and Policies," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, April 1947, pp. 178-179. Quoted in Bouscaren, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

6. Spengler and Duncan, *Demographic Analysis*, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1956, pp. 293-296. Bouscaren, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

7. Marion T. Bennett, *American Immigration Policies*, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 288.

8. In the 1965 debates on immigration, Senator Robert Kennedy of New York, the brother of the deceased President, stated that it would be false to believe that whatever intellect he might possess would have been less had he been of Negro, rather than of Irish, ancestry. Meanwhile, in the United Kingdom, Labor Prime Minister Wilson was engaged in convincing some of his more emotional followers that drastic restrictions on West Indian immigration were absolutely necessary to avoid racial explosions similar to the Negro riots in Los Angeles in the summer of 1965.

9. See, for example, Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1964, and Glazer and Moynihan, *op. cit.*

10. A State Department study suggests that in 1966 under the new statute, 20,000 unused quota immigrants will come in from Italy, 9,000 from Poland, 4,200 from Greece and 3,900 from Portugal.

11. Government estimates as reported by *U.S. News & World Report*, October 11, 1965, "A New Mix for America's Melting Pot," p. 57.

12. In the 1964 presidential elections, 61.4% of the popular vote went to Johnson, 38.6% to Goldwater. The Voter Profile Analysis (VPA) service, operated by Louis Harris, C.B.S. and International Business Machines Corporation, showed Negro precincts voting 93% to 99% for Johnson. VPA and NBC showed Italians voting 68% to 89% for the Democratic standard bearer.

13. Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in Black and White*. Random House, New York, 1964, p. 40.

14. "The Stupidity Problem," *Harper's*, September 1962.

15. Bennett, *op. cit.*, pp. 258-9.

CHAPTER 13

1. Anchor Bible.
2. Emmanuel Anati, *Palestine Before the Hebrews*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1963, p. 382.
3. Harry I. Shapiro, *The Jewish People*, UNESCO, Paris, 1960, p. 14.
4. The Anchor Bible, *Genesis*, introduction, translation and notes by E. A. Speiser, Doubleday & Company, New York, 1964, p. 80.
5. Cyrus H. Gordon, "The Greeks and the Hebrews," *Scientific American*, February 1965, p. 102.
6. Cyrus H. Jordon, "The Decipherment of Minoan," *Natural History*, November 1963, pp. 22-31.
7. Gordon in *Scientific American*, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
8. According to Jacob's testament (*Genesis 49:13*):
 "Zebulun shall dwell by the seashore;
 "Which shall be a haven for ships;
 "And his flank shall be based on Sidon."
9. Leonard E. Palmer, *Mycenaeans and Minoans*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962; a highly critical review of this book by George E. Mylonas, *Archeology*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Autumn 1962), pp. 213-214, and Joseph Alsop, *From the Silent Earth: A Report on the Greek Bronze Age*, Harper & Row, New York, 1964, pp. 168-170.
10. Anati, *op. cit.*, p. 381.
11. It will be recalled that Abram did not become Abraham until God made a covenant with him that he would become "the father of a host of nations," in token of which his name was enlarged. (*Genesis 17:1-8*).
12. Anati, *op. cit.*, pp. 388-389.
13. *Concise Encyclopaedia of Archeology*, edited by Leonard Cottrell. Hutchinson of London, 1960, article on *Hyksos*.
14. J. A. Wilson in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, edited by J. B. Pritchard, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955 (2nd edition), pp. 18ff.
15. Anati, *op. cit.*, pp. 428-429.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 420.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 431-434.
18. William Foxwell Albright, "The Biblical Period," in *The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion* (edited by Louis Finkelstein), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1960 (3rd edition), pp. 14-15.
19. The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites under Moses' successors, however, was not primarily due to their possession of a morally superior ideology. It was facilitated, if not solely made possible, by the fact that three weak and incompetent Pharaohs occupied the Egyptian throne after the death of Marniptah in 1225 B.C.

CHAPTER 14

1. Unfortunately, the Bible gives us practically no information about the physical appearance of the ancient Jews.
2. D. L. Risdon, *Biometrika*, 31, pp. 99-166.
3. Harry L. Shapiro, *The Jewish People: A Biological History*, UNESCO, Paris, 1960, pp. 33-45.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

5. H. Nathan and N. Haas, "Anthropological Data on the Skeletons of the Judean Desert" and Y. Aharoni "Recent Geological Discoveries in the Judean Desert," *The Genetics of Migrant and Isolate Populations* (Elisabeth Goldschmidt, editor), Williams & Wilkins, New York, 1963, pp. 284-286 and 9-18 respectively; also articles by Aharoni and others in *The Expedition to the Judean Desert, 1960* and *The Expedition to the Judean Desert, 1961*, Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem, 2 volumes, 262 pages; also "Old Israel Held Racially Diverse," *New York Times*, April 22, 1962.

6. It is of incidental human interest that Professor Y. Yadin of Hebrew University was one of the leaders of the expedition that discovered the caves. Before joining the staff of Hebrew University as an archaeology professor General Yadin has been Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army. Thus, the leader of the victorious Israeli invasion of Egypt was instrumental in discovering the cave where his predecessor may have made his last stand against the Romans.

7. Goldschmidt, *The Genetics of Migrant and Isolate Populations*, *op. cit.*, p. 284. Baron (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 39-43) argues that the twelve tribes of Israel were ethnically the same, but he wrote before the discoveries in the Judean desert caves and he gives no evidence for his conclusions.

8. Needless to say, no implication is intended that brachycephalics in general are more intelligent or able than dolichocephalics. There is no reason to believe this to be the case.

9. v. Henry Field, *Ancient and Modern Man in Southwestern Asia*, University of Miami Press, Coral Gables, 1956, pp. 303-304; Carleton S. Coon, *The Races of Europe*, 1939, pp. 432-444, and G. E. Genna "I Samaritani," *Anthropologia* 1938, Vo. I (Comitato Italiano per lo studio della popolazione.)

10. *The Genetics of Migrant and Isolate Populations*, *op. cit.*

11. Goldschmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-41.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 69-75.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 105

14. Field, *op. cit.*, table 122, found that the cephalic index for six groups of Daghestan, Georgian, Caucasian and Iraqi Jews was 83.4 as against 81.2 for *Ashkenazi*. The former areas overlap with or adjoin Kurdistan.

15. Dr. Sheba added that Phoenician (that is to say, Carthaginian) settlement and invasion had bridgeheads to Rome in Sardinia, Malta and Minorca and in agricultural settlements scattered along the North African coast and eastern coastal Spain. Hannibal took this route and had posts for supply and reinforcement along it. Many finds of Hebrew inscriptions on shards in these places "provide evidence that a Hebrew population followed the same route as the Phoenicians or replaced them." (*Ibid.*, p. 105.) These Semitic areas provided according to Harnack more converts to Christianity during its first three centuries than other regions of the Roman Empire of the West.

16. It may be of incidental interest that color blindness among the Druzes of Israel is 10.1% or higher in the European range. This is in accord with the theory that these people are of Crusader stock.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 282-283.

18. A. E. Mourant, A. C. Kopic and K. Domaniewska-Sobczak, *The ABO Blood Groups: Comprehensive Tables and Maps of World Distribution*, Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, 1958; A. E. Mourant, "The Blood Groups of the Jews," *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. I, pp. 155-176; also A. E. Mourant in Goldschmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-263.

19. Goldschmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 262.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 259.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
23. Sarah Smilansky, *Evaluating Achievement, Summaries of Some Studies Carried out by the Henrietta Szold Institute on Schooling in Israel*, editors M. Smilansky and L. Adar, Educational Studies and Documents #42, UNESCO, Paris, 1961, pp. 6, 10 (emphasis supplied).
24. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
25. J. Robert Moskin, "Prejudice in Israel," *Look*, October 5, 1965, pp. 70-72.
26. Quoted by Moskin, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

CHAPTER 15

1. The concept of total mobilization or "the nation in arms" dates from the French Revolution of 1789. See Alfred Vagts, *A History of Militarism*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1937, pp. 109-136.
2. Cecil Roth, "Simon bar Giora, Ancient Jewish Hero," *Commentary*, January 1960, p. 54.
3. Josephus, *The Jewish War*, Book IV, 508.
4. *Ibid.*, Book V, 440.
5. *Idem.*
6. The *sicarii*, or dagger men, were so called because of their habit of drawing short knives from inside their cloaks and murdering those they considered appeasers. They also kidnapped and murdered for personal gain.
7. v. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 162-169.
8. Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races*, translated from the French by Adrian Collins with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1915, Vol. I, pp. 58-59.
9. *The Pulse of Progress*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926, p. 176. This encomium on the Jews did not prevent a liberal Harvard professor from grouping Huntington with such racists as Madison Grant in such a way as to imply that Huntington believed Jews to be inferior to "the original Americans." (Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life*, Doubleday, Garden City, 1957, p. 140-1.)
10. Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Modern Library edition, New York, 1932, Vol. I, p. 446. Gibbon adds that the victorious Jews "devoured the flesh, licked up the blood, and twisted the entrails (of their victims) like a girdle around their bodies." His chief source is Dio Cassius who, on this point, was not unprejudiced. Graetz (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 397) suggests that the culprits were probably recent Syrian converts to Judaism and anti-Greek pagans, a probable hypothesis in view of the charge of cannibalism, a crime regarded with horror by Jews.
11. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 267.
12. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
13. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 88.
15. Edward L. Clark, "Motivation of Jewish Students," *J. Soc. Psychol.* (1949), 29, pp. 113-117.
16. Irma Loeb Cohen, *The Intelligence of Jews as Compared with Non-Jews*, Ohio State University Studies No. 8, Ohio State University Press, 1927, 43 pp.

CHAPTER 16

1. *Deuteronomy* 11:18-21.
2. *Proverbs* 1:8, for example.
3. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 334.
4. Julius B. Maller, "The Role of Education in Jewish History," in *The Jews*, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 1238.
5. Joshua ben Gamala ordered that teachers of young children be "appointed in each district and each town, and that children should enter school at the age of six or seven." I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Soncino Press, London, 1935, Vol. III, pp. 105-106.
6. From the Talmud. See Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 274-9.
7. Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.*, Baltimore, 1940, p. 106.
8. *Aboth* of Rabbi Nathan, chapter 24.
9. *Ibid*, 4, 20.
10. *Proverbs* 22: 15.
11. *Ecclesiasticus* 30: 7-11.
12. *Deuteronomy* 21:20-21.
13. Frederick Eby and Charles Flinn Arrowood, *The History and Philosophy of Education, Ancient and Medieval*, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1953, p. 153.
14. *Aboth* 4, 12.
15. *Makkoth*, 2, 2.
16. Drazin, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
17. *Lesbia Brandon* by Algernon Charles Swinburne is perhaps the best-known novel on the whipping perversions of the tutors of the 19th Century British upper class.
18. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 350.
19. Drazin, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
20. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 277.
21. *M. Abot*, IV, 4. Quoted in Baron, II, 277.
22. Drazin, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
23. *Ibid*, pp. 52-53.
24. *Idem*.
25. Tacitus estimated Jewish losses in the war against the legions of Vespasian and Titus at 600,000; Josephus at 1,197,000.
26. Thomas Jefferson. Letter to John Adams, October 28, 1813.
27. Quoted from an unidentified source by Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 272-273.
28. Graetz, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 364.
29. Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx, *A Short History of the Jewish People*, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1927, p. 222.
30. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 306-307.
31. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, pp. 365-366.
32. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, pp. 366-367.
33. Marvin Lowenthal, *The Jews of Germany*, Longman's, Green and Company, New York, 1936, p. 103.
34. Rabbi Judah Loew.
35. Provided the false system uses rigorously logical methods which provide a test of reasoning ability and provided, of course, that the falsehoods are not so glaring that the most intelligent (like Julien Sorel in *The Red and the Black*) cannot disguise their contempt for the deception and therefore perhaps fail in the educational competition.

36. Abrahams wrote: "Up to the 13th year, the education of Jewish boys all the world over was practically identical." *Op. cit.*, p. 357.

37. *Op. cit.*, p. 340.

38. Abrahams presumably meant the average *male Jew*.

39. For instance, the expulsion of the Jews from Sicily in the late 15th Century was protested by the state counselors because "nearly all the artisans in the realm are Jews" and because the manufacture of iron goods, mechanical implements, agricultural tools and ship's gear were virtually Jewish monopolies. v. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

40. Even after England had expelled her Jews, English kings, such as Henry IV, imported Jewish physicians from abroad as did Dick Whittington, the original of the Mother Goose rhyme. Queen Elisabeth had a Jewish physician. The kings of France and the doges of Venice used Jewish doctors during the Middle Ages. Although Canon Law forbade a Christian going to an infidel to be healed, "at the curia of the Pope in Rome there was a long succession of Jewish practitioners, considered in their day among the most eminent in Europe." Cecil Roth, *The Jewish Contribution to Civilization*, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, 1940, p. 229.

41. Doubly ironic if Salvador de Madariaga and other biographers are correct in their belief that Christopher Columbus was himself a converted Jew.

42. Among these forgeries was the so-called Donation of Constantine, according to which the first Christian Emperor transferred sovereignty over the Western World to the Popes at Rome. This was exposed as fraudulent by Lorenzo Valla in 1440.

43. The traditional Jewish view is that to be well-dressed is a mark of self-respect. "Withhold from thy belly and put it on thy back," Maimondes wrote his son. In Spain, when sumptuary laws were imposed upon the Jews, the men obeyed, but had their women continue to wear splendid silks and embroideries. The king of Castile overrode the Jews' plea to allow this condition with the observation: "It is not fair that you should go like the coalman's donkey, while your wives prance about harnessed like the mule of the Pope."

44. Graetz, the sympathetic historian of the Jews, wrote thus of their condition at the end of the 17th Century: "Several circumstances had contributed to render them utterly demoralized and despised. The former teachers of Europe, through the sad course of centuries, had become childish, or worse, dotards. Every public or historical act of the Jews bears this character of imbecility, if not contemptibility." *Op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 198.

CHAPTER 17

1. Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Volume II: *Ancient Times*, Part II, Columbia University Press, 1952, p. 218.

2. *Genesis Rabbah*, lxxxi, 6. Quoted by Will Durant, *The Age of Faith*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1950, p. 360.

3. *Deuteronomy*, xxviii, 18.

4. In *The Jewish War* (Thackeray translation, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1951, Book II, 119-121) Josephus gives a more accurate exposition of the Essene attitude. "The Essenes," he writes, "have a reputation for cultivating peculiar sanctity. Of Jewish birth, they show a greater attachment to each other than do the other sects. They shun pleasures as a vice and regard temperance and the control of the passions as a special virtue. Marriage they disdain, but they

adopt other men's children, while yet pliable and docile, and regard them as their kin and mould them in accordance with their own principles." Josephus adds, however (II: 160-1): "There is yet another order of Essenes, which, while at one with the rest in its mode of life, customs and regulations, differs from them in its views on marriage. They think that those who decline to marry cut off the chief function of life, the propagation of the race, and, what is more, that, were all to adopt the same view, the whole race would very quickly die out. They give their wives, however, a three years' probation and only marry them after they have by three periods of purification given proof of fecundity."

5. A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, Macmillan, New York, 1955. A contrary view, which I find convincing, is that the Dead Sea scrolls are the product of Zealots—that is to say, militant Jewish nationalists—and that they date from approximately 70 years after the birth of Christ. This thesis is argued by the eminent Oxford historian of Jewry, Cecil Roth, in various articles, notably "New Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Commentary*, Vol. 37, No. 6 (June 1964), pp. 27-32.

6. *Op. cit.*, p. 381.

7. *Against Apion* (Thackeray translation, Loeb Classical Library), Book II, 199-202.

8. *Leviticus* 20:13. While the Pentateuch, or Torah, refers to the early Biblical period, it was written many centuries later.

9. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*, W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1953, pp. 507-508.

10. L. M. Epstein, *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism*, Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1948, pp. 146-147.

11. *Genesis* 38: 7-10.

12. Norman E. Himes, *Medical History of Contraception*, Gamut Press, New York, 1963 (original edition 1936), p. 71.

13. *Leviticus* 20: 10.

14. Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1956, Vol. II, pp. 423-424.

15. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 222.

16. *Deuteronomy* 22: 20-21.

17. Durant, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

18. Kinsey, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-260.

19. *Ibid*, pp. 259-260.

20. *Ibid*, p. 370.

21. Stimulation of conjugal affection and lessening of lust are recognized by Catholicism as subordinate justifications.

22. Kinsey, *op. cit.*, p. 368.

23. Hans Licht, *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece*, Barnes & Noble, New York, 1953, pp. 507-508.

24. *St. Matthew*, 19:12.

25. Henry C. Lea, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

26. Leo XIII became Supreme Pontiff in 1878.

27. Ludwig Friedlaender, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, George Routledge & Sons, London, 1910(?), Vol. IV, appendix xviii.

28. Quoted by Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

29. Harkavy, *Responsa* of Geonim, Berlin, 1887. A 10th or 11th Century rabbinical opinion.

30. Pérez of Corbeil, 14th Century. Quoted by Abrahams, whose discussion of this topic (pp. 166-170) is fundamental.
31. Joseph Caro, *Shulhan Aruch*, the definitive 16th Century abbreviated codification of Talmudic law.
32. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
33. *Ibid*, pp. 120-121.
34. *Ibid*, p. 121.
35. Bishop of Rome between 218 and 223 A.D.
36. Summary statement by Professor Z. Lauterbach of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. Quoted by Himes, *op. cit.*
37. Himes, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-74.
38. *Tosepha Niddah*, ii, 6, p. 642. Quoted by Himes, p. 73.
39. *Idem*.
40. Alex C. Rentoul, "Physiological Paternity and the Trobrianders," *Man*, xxxi (1931), Art. No. 162, explains infertility, despite general pre-marital promiscuity, among Trobriand teen-age girls, as due to the fact "that the female of the species is specially endowed or gifted with ejaculatory powers, which may be called upon after an act of coition to expel the male seed. It is understood that such powers might be increased by use and practice, and I am satisfied that such a method does exist." Bronislaw Malinowski in *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia*, Routledge, London, 1929, not only denied this, but even asserted that the Trobrianders were ignorant of the role of intercourse in producing children. Rentoul, however, was a Resident Magistrate in the area and a very keen observer; I believe him to be a more credible witness.
41. Quoted by Himes, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
42. During the 24 months of breast nursing following the birth of a child, however, *coitus interruptus* was recommended by the rabbis.
43. Similarly, the rise in the British birth rate during that part of World War II in which a large part of the British forces was stationed outside the Isles was at first resentfully imputed to the presence of American forces in Britain. Medical opinion, however, credits the exceptional natality to the high fertility, due to prior abstinence, of soldiers home on furlough.

CHAPTER 18

1. Josephus, *Against Apion*, Loeb Classical Library, I, 7:31.
2. Baron, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 235.
3. *Pesahim*, 49b. Quoted by Salo W. Baron, *The Jewish Community*, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1942, Vol. I, p. 124.
4. Cecil Roth, *The History of the Jews of Italy*, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1946, p. 62.
5. Cecil Roth, *A Short History of the Jewish People*, East and West Library, London, 1948, p. 232.
6. Marvin Lowenthal, *The Jews of Germany*, Longman's, Green and Company, New York, 1936, pp. 28-129.
7. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
8. Marcus, *Source Book*, p. 205.
9. Graetz, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 640.

10. Marcus, *op. cit.*, p. 207.
11. Solomon Maimon, *Autobiography*, edited by Moses Hadas, Schocken Books, New York, 1947, pp. 11-12.
12. Maimon, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 97.
14. Miriam Shomer Zunser, *Yesterday*, Stackpole Sons, New York, 1939, p. 78.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.
16. Abrahams, *op. cit.*, p. 326.

CHAPTER 19

1. Sir Cyril Burt, "The Inheritance of Mental Ability," *The American Psychologist*, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (1958), pp. 1-15.
2. Carleton S. Coon, *The Living Races of Man*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1965, p. 318.
3. Our forefathers believed that intelligence, education and property were the prerequisites of citizenship in a free society. The newer doctrine would seem to be that the essential thing is to be an adult member of the human species.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

STANDARD SAMPLES OF SURNAMES*

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency on Social Security</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency on Social Security</i>
ENGLISH NAMES	2,532,342	Kelley	74,398
Bell	132,819	Kelly	134,271
Bennet	121,656	Malone	51,867
Brooks	121,031	McCart	81,129
Carter	172,090	McCoy	51,032
Cook	149,135	Murphy	162,942
Cooper	134,376	O'Brien	69,323
Cox	126,764	Riley	64,830
Hall	233,673	Ryan	79,305
Hill	206,924	Sulliv	122,004
Reed	133,541	BRITISH CLERICAL NAMES ...	385,972
Turner	163,633	Clark	274,398
Walker	241,834	Clarke	32,563
Ward	128,867	Palmer	78,471
Watson	120,035		
Wood	130,192	SPECIAL BRITISH OCCUPATIONAL	
Wright	215,772	SURNAMES	77,630
		Cooke	17,944
SCOTTISH NAMES	736,956	Draper	11,372
Alexan	93,181	Miner	10,974
Campbe	181,930	Potter	37,340
Cummin	51,250		
Cunnin	70,006	PURITAN NAMES	34,000
Douglá	53,562	Coolidge	
Fergus	72,427	Hooker	
Ross	116,284	Huntington	
Wallac	98,316	Lyman	
		Trumbull	
WELSH NAMES	242,066	Van Dyke	
Morgan	136,390		
Powell	105,676	JEWISH NAMES	550,726
		Abraha	13,844
IRISH NAMES	1,189,840	Berman	12,039
Boyd	73,466	Bernst	15,185
Bryant	85,072	Cohen	65,874
Burke	67,701	Epstei	10,141
Dunn	72,500	Friedm	25,718

* Except in the case of Puritan names, names are listed by their first six letters only to correspond with the BOASI coding system.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency on Social Security</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency on Social Security</i>
Goldbe	26,987	Johans	11,224
Goldst	27,940	Jorgen	13,885
Greenb	22,684	Larsen	29,163
Isaacs	11,405	Larson	64,965
Kaplan	20,553	Lund	13,522
Katz	21,023	Nielse	20,933
Levin	11,845	Paulso	10,512
Levine	26,363	Peders	18,317
Levy	24,261	Rasmus	19,237
Marcus	11,171	Sorens	21,508
Rosen	16,247	Swanso	45,609
Rosenb	40,403	Swenso	12,034
Rosent	12,963	Youngb	10,118
Rubin	15,016		
Shapir	17,770	FRENCH NAMES	169,204
Silver	40,139	Bernar	21,581
Solomo	22,251	Blanch	25,234
Stern	15,657	Bouche	11,067
Weinbe	10,757	Boudre	10,779
Weinst	12,480	Brouss	10,589
GERMAN NAMES	441,077	Gagnon	11,181
Hendri	60,185	Landry	16,104
Hoffma	84,019	Leblan	17,280
Schmid	87,036	Morin	12,731
Schult	70,664	Perrin	10,087
Wagner	82,439	Pettit	10,443
Weber	56,734	Rouse	12,128
DUTCH NAMES	100,516	ITALIAN NAMES	102,799
DeWitt	12,932	Caruso	10,466
Haas	19,532	Costa	14,265
Vander	40,979	Esposi	11,914
Voss	10,552	Ferrar	18,933
Witt	16,521	Marino	16,510
SCANDINAVIAN NAMES	674,555	Romano	16,908
Carlso	75,073	Rossi	13,803
Dahl	11,852	SPANISH NAMES	746,276
Ericks	48,658	Garcia	111,566
Fredri	10,218	Gonzal	112,906
Gustaf	17,330	Hernan	71,271
Hansen	72,347	Lopez	81,254
Hanson	56,177	Perez	63,318
Henson	20,848	Rivera	73,415
Holman	15,539	Rodrig	126,098
Jensen	54,936	Sanche	54,873
		Torres	51,576

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency on Social Security</i>
SLAVIC NAMES	57,708
Kamins	11,620
Kowals	12,023
Michal	14,030
Novak	20,035

<i>Category</i>	<i>Frequency on Social Security</i>
CHINESE NAME Wong	14,303
GREEK NAME Pappas	10,706
HUNGARIAN NAME Toth	11,172

APPENDIX II

LIST OF ROSTERS USED

I. WHO'S WHO

- (1) *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, Appleton, New York, 1895†
- (2) *Who Was Who in America*, 1607-1896 *†
- (3) *Who Was Who in America*, 1897-1942 †
- (4) *Who Was Who in America*, 1943-1950 †
- (5) *Who's Who in America*, 1910-1911 †
- (6) *Who's Who in America*, 1918-1919 †
- (7) *Who's Who in America*, 1930-1931 †
- (8) *Who Was Who in America*, 1951-1960 ‡
- (9) *Who's Who in America*, 1956-1967 ‡
- (10) *Who's Who in America*, 1962-63 ‡
- (11) *Who's Who in America*, 1964-1965 ‡
- (12) *Who's Who of American Women*, 2nd ed., 1961-1962 ‡

II. SCIENCE

- (13) *American Men of Science*, 9th ed., all vols. ‡
- (14) *American Men of Science*, 9th ed., Vol. I, Physical Scientists ‡
- (15) *American Men of Science*, 9th ed., Vol. II, Biological Scientists ‡
- (16) *American Men of Science*, 9th ed., Vol. III, Social Scientists ‡
- (17) *American Men of Science*, 10th ed., all vols. ‡
- (18) *American Men of Science*, 10th ed., Vols. I-IV, Physical and Biological ‡
- (19) *American Men of Science*, 10th ed., Vol. V, Social and Behavioral ‡
- (20) Patents on file, U.S. Patent Office, 1962-1963 ‡

III. SCHOLARSHIP AND THE UNIVERSITY

- (21) *Directory of American Scholars*, 3rd ed., 1957 ‡
- (22) Phi Beta Kappa membership, 1776-1922 †
- (23) Phi Beta Kappa membership, 1923-1961 ‡
- (24) Phi Beta Kappa membership, 1962 §
- (25) North American Mensa membership, June, 1965 ‡
- (26) National Merit Scholars, 1955-1961 §
- (27) Faculties — 17 colleges *†
- (28) Faculties — 5 elite colleges, circa 1963 (Bryn Mawr, Harvard, Dartmouth, Princeton and Wellesley) *†
- (29) Faculties — 12 other colleges, circa 1963 (Auburn, Cincinnati, Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, M.I.T., Miami, Missouri, Northwestern, Virginia and Western Michigan) *†
- (30) College Enrollment — 15 colleges, circa 1963 §
- (31) College Enrollment — 5 elite colleges (Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, Vassar and Yale) §
- (32) College Enrollment — 10 other colleges (Alabama, California, Cincinnati, George Washington, Illinois, Iowa State, Michigan, Ohio State, Penn State and Texas) §
- (33) *Who's Who in American Education*, 21st ed., 1963-1964 ‡

* Varies from usual name samples. † Past. ‡ Present. § Future.

IV. PROFESSIONS

- (34) Doctors (*American Medical Directory*, 21st ed., 1961) ‡
- (35) Medical Specialists (*Directory of Medical Specialists*, 10th ed., 1961) ‡
- (36) Dentists (*American Dental Directory*, 1962) ‡
- (37) Psychiatrists (American Psychiatric Association, Fellows and Members, 1961-1962) ‡
- (38) Mathematicians (American mathematical societies, combined membership, 1961-1962) ‡
- (39) Statisticians (*Directory of Statisticians*, 1961) ‡
- (40) Engineers (*Who's Who in Engineering*, 1959) ‡
- (41) Architects (*American Architects Directory*, 2nd ed., 1962) ‡
- (42) Foreign Service Officers (*The Biographical Register*, 1963) ‡
- (43) Lawyers (*Martindale and Hubbell Law Directory*, 94th ed., 1962, based on sample of an equal number of names taken at random from each page) ‡

V. ARTS AND LETTERS

- (44) *Books in Print*, 1960 ‡
- (45) *Book Review Digest*, (5 years combined) ‡
- (46) *Book Review Digest*, 1941 ‡
- (47) *Book Review Digest*, 1946 ‡
- (48) *Book Review Digest*, 1951 ‡
- (49) *Book Review Digest*, 1956 ‡
- (50) *Book Review Digest*, 1964 ‡
- (51) *Supplement to Mallett's Index of Artists* ‡
- (52) *Who's Who in American Art*, 1959 ‡
- (53) American Newspaper Guild membership, 1962 ‡
- (54) *Granger's Index to Poetry*, 4th ed., 1953 ‡
- (55) *American Authors and Books*, 1640-1962 ‡
- (56) *The Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature*, 1962 ‡
- (57) *The Reader's Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed., 1965 ‡

VI. BUSINESS

- (58) *Poor's Register of Directors and Executives, U.S. and Canada*, 1963 ‡
- (59) *Who's Who in Commerce and Industry*, 12th ed., 1961 ‡
- (60) Leaders of Largest U.S. Corporations (all) * ‡
- (61) Leaders of Largest 250 Industrial Corporations * ‡
- (62) Leaders of Largest Banks * ‡
- (63) Leaders of Largest Transportation Companies * ‡
- (64) Leaders of Largest Insurance Companies * ‡
- (65) Leaders of Largest Utilities * ‡
- (66) Leaders of Largest Merchandizing Companies * ‡

VII. POLITICS

- (67) *Who's Who in Politics*, 1950 (Republicans) ‡
- (68) *Who's Who in Politics*, 1950 (Democrats) ‡
- (69) *Who's Who in Labor*, Dryden, N.Y.C., 1946 ‡
- (70) Council on Foreign Relations membership, June 30, 1962 ‡

- (71) "Subversives" (proper names listed in House Committee on Un-American Activities *Supplement to Cumulative Index*, 1955 through 1960, plus Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, *Cumulative Index*. ‡

VIII. MILITARY

- (72) Active Officers (consolidated list of active officers in the Army and Air Force plus active and retired Navy officers) ‡
(73) Retired Officers (Army and Air Force retired officers) ‡

IX. SOCIAL

- (74) *Social Register of New York*, 1963 ‡
(75) *National Social Directory*, 1964 ‡

APPENDIX III

PERFORMANCE COEFFICIENTS OF THE 75 ELITE ROSTERS

(After Adjustment for Negroes)

GROUP I: WHO'S WHO
(Category and Number of Roster)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
English	184	161	186	187	144	149	143	127	116	109	106	117
Scottish	152	161	139	139	137	147	160	128	127	123	127	150
Welsh	154	121	149	166	154	159	173	145	131	107	110	92
Irish	58	58	86	89	82	72	76	101	103	105	105	90
Clerical	189	182	229	202	209	182	180	207	159	152	150	142
Occupational	518	541	320	235	347	293	242	262	229	207	187	286
Puritan	1,502	987	1,169	537	1,124	1,011	644	572	367	292	301	286
Jewish	12	13	48	56	45	43	58	90	121	154	161	134
German	43	41	47	72	59	64	68	71	79	77	82	88
Dutch	129	133	131	76	99	111	148	73	133	137	122	125
Scandinavian	11	11	20	55	24	27	37	42	80	95	96	88
French	159	82	79	77	93	73	58	52	70	75	71	75
Italian	*	—	*	*	—	*	*	*	22	24	24	*
Spanish	51	*	5	—	*	5	3	*	10	8	7	6
Slavic	—	—	—	*	—	—	*	*	27	35	32	*
Chinese	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*	*	*	*
Greek	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*	*	*	*
Hungarian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*	*	*	—

GROUP II: SCIENCE

	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
English	108	95	89	94	96	88	86
Scottish	107	109	116	107	105	118	106
Welsh	111	59	96	87	90	80	80
Irish	65	70	62	65	67	59	63
Clerical	157	151	145	138	136	122	138
Occupational	169	177	121	144	147	133	149
Puritan	229	†	159	206	210	189	203
Jewish	235	246	322	237	269	365	211
German	123	124	117	120	123	110	169
Dutch	144	133	120	125	129	108	223
Scandinavian	121	136	112	111	114	104	137
French	53	45	96	81	85	68	126
Italian	35	37	*	37	39	29	56
Spanish	7	9	8	8	8	8	8
Slavic	39	59	*	46	41	69	80
Chinese	64	*	—	73	83	*	27
Greek	*	*	*	45	*	*	55
Hungarian	*	*	—	*	*	—	86

GROUP III: SCHOLARSHIP AND THE UNIVERSITY

	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	(33)
English	98	132	89	81	64	94	106	89	113	89	82	90	121
Scottish	138	125	103	78	84	127	94	69	106	100	74	102	102
Welsh	129	111	81	107	86	90	93	75	103	91	78	93	106
Irish	81	59	65	92	97	110	75	78	74	73	64	75	97
Clerical	131	269	113	116	92	156	118	88	132	101	113	98	148
Occupational	205	385	154	*	*	121	231	359	171	111	139	105	137
Puritan	311	903	†	—	*	—	209	475	*	102	277	67	157
Jewish	173	102	336	439	474	200	258	395	195	363	465	343	90
German	112	61	98	71	138	106	95	96	95	109	79	115	95
Dutch	129	119	102	*	*	*	112	90	122	130	80	140	142
Scandinavian	102	50	98	110	81	145	103	81	115	80	84	79	124
French	85	69	71	*	*	83	75	87	70	57	64	55	84
Italian	46	*	23	—	*	*	37	*	34	44	31	47	43
Spanish	18	*	6	*	*	*	16	16	16	20	9	22	10
Slavic	*	*	39	—	*	*	49	*	60	63	72	61	*
Chinese	*	*	126	—	*	—	*	*	—	401	244	432	*
Greek	*	—	63	—	—	*	*	*	*	102	*	96	—
Hungarian	*	—	*	—	*	—	*	—	*	71	*	80	—

GROUP IV: PROFESSIONS

	(94)	(95)	(96)	(97)	(98)	(99)	(40)	(41)	(42)	(43)
English	88	80	76	64	81	84	140	100	106	87
Scottish	103	108	96	82	108	99	135	96	116	63
Welsh	114	87	82	53	82	69	157	85	102	53
Irish	89	77	85	63	66	75	85	73	117	148
Clerical	99	95	75	73	93	83	157	134	118	121
Occupational	120	133	101	164	135	188	†	249	312	*
Puritan	127	111	105	*	*	*	†	†	*	†
Jewish	331	408	399	578	383	381	109	170	118	363
German	93	94	96	88	115	83	128	118	61	64
Dutch	109	97	81	76	58	72	138	227	84	64
Scandinavian	76	78	96	49	101	104	119	180	118	60
French	70	67	83	75	104	53	78	135	94	96
Italian	71	53	81	57	44	*	*	54	45	58
Spanish	31	20	18	47	21	23	10	13	24	8
Slavic	69	58	96	74	*	*	*	*	81	*
Chinese	224	102	263	*	421	*	—	917	*	*
Greek	97	*	92	—	*	*	*	—	*	224
Hungarian	52	*	*	—	—	—	*	309	*	†

GROUP V: ARTS AND LETTERS

	(44)	(45)	(46)	(47)	(48)	(49)	(50)	(51)	(52)	(53)	(54)	(55)	(56)	(57)
English	112	96	109	93	106	99	78	149	98	81	120	125	117	81
Scottish	151	139	156	155	171	121	113	112	164	114	167	141	164	184
Welsh	126	145	164	195	104	137	133	66	80	97	77	139	123	112
Irish	72	68	61	62	81	76	61	80	71	157	107	73	106	66
Clerical	154	172	218	141	188	184	120	124	102	91	185	197	149	*
Occupational ..	265	254	*	478	283	290	180	226	216	119	226	408	291	*
Puritan	221	300	*	*	*	*	574	†	370	†	475	1,187	1,140	694
Jewish	191	218	134	197	181	200	343	136	242	203	84	120	88	121
German	62	92	102	102	91	73	95	70	110	92	61	52	66	86
Dutch	88	155	138	*	*	288	*	102	125	65	67	86	*	*
Scandinavian ..	76	71	72	86	59	81	58	65	69	69	34	39	39	35
French	75	73	*	*	*	*	88	64	66	75	85	84	*	297
Italian	50	92	*	*	*	*	135	*	*	120	*	*	*	229
Spanish	11	12	*	—	—	*	29	24	17	34	88	*	*	120
Slavic	40	59	—	—	—	*	*	—	*	80	—	*	—	—
Chinese	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	*	*	—	—	—	—
Greek	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	216	—	—	—	—
Hungarian	93	*	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—

GROUP VI: BUSINESS

	(58)	(59)	(60)	(61)	(62)	(63)	(64)	(65)	(66)
English	98	116	107	110	114	107	124	78	80
Scottish	129	135	158	192	120	145	173	153	145
Welsh	92	112	72	123	*	*	*	—	—
Irish	101	98	126	124	106	195	113	75	101
Clerical	135	150	199	123	356	163	252	244	151
Occupational	193	163	124	131	*	*	*	—	*
Puritan	212	210	288	358	—	*	*	*	—
Jewish	217	144	95	82	38	75	*	*	404
German	102	107	73	56	108	*	*	159	*
Dutch	114	126	117	*	*	*	*	*	*
Scandinavian	94	87	95	108	92	64	72	148	65
French	71	56	*	*	*	—	—	*	—
Italian	17	*	*	—	—	*	—	—	*
Spanish	2	*	*	*	*	—	—	—	—
Slavic	31	*	*	*	—	—	—	—	—
Chinese	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Greek	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hungarian	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

GROUP VII: POLITICS

	(67)	(68)	(69)	(70)	(71)
English	124	99	91	117	81
Scottish	145	145	98	222	123
Welsh	118	138	64	*	95
Irish	89	179	135	87	62
Clerical	149	109	130	*	87
Occupational	232	145	172	*	132
Puritan	331	—	†	—	267

GROUP VIII: MILITARY

	(72)	(73)	(74)	(75)
English	111	117	134	126
Scottish	120	128	139	156
Welsh	125	130	83	168
Irish	134	128	88	113
Clerical	131	123	262	123
Occupational	147	150	599	149
Puritan	115	†	676	418

GROUP IX: SOCIAL

	(76)	(77)	(78)	(79)
Jewish	52	86	9	20
German	95	78	61	86
Dutch	102	102	198	106
Scandinavian	118	94	33	91
French	88	91	54	101
Italian	48	85	—	*
Spanish	14	17	8	*
Slavic	41	61	*	*
Chinese	22	*	—	—
Greek	130	55	—	*
Hungarian	45	*	—	—

NOTES:

The numbers correspond to those in Appendix II.
 † Means not available.
 * Means negligible and refers to situations in which a group is represented on a roster by from one to four individuals, a quantity too small to be statistically significant.

INDEX

- Abraham as patriarchal warlord, 126
 Abrahams, Isaac, 164
 Aesthetic elite, 40
 Afroasian Jewish backwardness, 141-2
 Albigensians, 166
 Albright, William Foxwell, 126-7
American Authors and Books 1642-1962, 35
American Medical Directory, 96-7
American Men of Science, 20, 28, 31-2
 American Newspaper Guild, 20, 36
 Anti-Defamation League, 100
 Anti-Jewish marriage laws, 92
 Aristocracide, 16
- Baltzell, E. Digbie, 5, 31
 Bar Kochba, 131
 Beloch, 27
 Benda, Julian, 18
 Benét, William Rose, 35
 Ben-Gurion, David, 141
 Birth control and dysgenic reproduction, 32-3
 BOASI roster, 7-10
Book Review Digest, 20, 36-7
Books in Print, 20, 36-7
 Bouscaren, Anthony, 115
 Bradford, William, 47
 Brain shortage, 5-6
 Brewster, William, 47
 British elite, 21
 Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, 7-8
- Cambridge Medieval History*, 70
 Carpini, Piano, 69
 Catholic mixed marriages, 12-13
 Cattell, J. McKeen, 28-9
 Cave of Horrors, 131-3
 Celibacy, Jewish attitude toward, 169-170
 Chinese, 2, 4, 17, 24, 26, 29, 72-5
 Chinese in U.S. professions, 73-5
 Christianity, rise of, 145-7
 Civil War, genetic effects, 56-7
 Clerical names, 14, 33-6, 84-6
 Clarks and Palmers, 85-6
 Creative elite, 21-3
 Creative elite components, 13-14, 18-19
 Cohen and *Kohanim*, 107-8
 Color blindness among Jews, 136
 Common and rare surnames, 88-90
 Communist extermination of elites, 16, 71-2
 Composers, 34-5
 Coolidge, Calvin, 113
 Coon, Carleton S., 195
 Council of the Four Lands, 183-4
 Council on Foreign Relations, 21, 101
- Directory of American Scholars*, 20, 95
Directory of Medical Specialists, 96-7
 DNA, 196
 Drazin, Nathan, 155-7
 Dutch, 23-5, 58-9
- East Anglia, 47-8
 Ebionites, 146
 Elites: changing through time, 17; in the arts, 19-20, 38-40; literary, 35-7, 40; moral quality of, 18; natural vs. artificial, 16-17; past, present and future, 24-6; political, 21; promotion of, 8; rank order of, 23-4; size of in U.S. 9-11
 Ellis, Havelock, 29, 48, 82-3
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 19
Encyclopaedia Britannica, 51-2
 English, 23-26, 29-30, 42
 En-gedi skulls, 132-3
 Eugenics and clerical celibacy, 3-5
 Euselection, 196
- Familial Mediterranean Fever, 134

- Fischer, John, 110
 Fiske, John, 47
 Foreign Service officers, 20
Fortune, 21, 99-101
 Franzblau, R. N., 67
 French, 24-5, 29-30, 63

 G6-PD Deficiency, 134-6
 Gamala, Joshua ben, 152
 Gayre, Robert Gayre of, 84-5
 Germans, 23-25, 29, 59
 Chetto, 164-8
 Giora, Simon bar, 144-5
 Glazer, Nathan, 64, 95
 Glueck, Nelson, 126
 Gobineau, Joseph Arthur, Count de, 147
 Goldschmidt, Elizabeth, 134
 Gordon, Cyrus H., 124-6, 136
 Gordon, E. V., 61
 Gordon, Milton M., 12
Granger's Index to Poetry, 36
 Greece and Judea, 124-6
 Greeks, 24-5
Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 35

 Habiru, 126-9
 Hakka elite, 72-3
 Hannover, Nathan, 184-5
 Harald Fairhair, 61
 Hebrew tribes and ethnic diversity, 133
 Hebrews, literacy of, 151
 Heller, H., 134
 Hiyya, Rabbi, 153
 Homosexuality and Jews, 170
 Hungarians, 24, 25, 68
 Huntington, Ellsworth, 46, 49-54, 72-3, 147-8
 Hyksos, 127

 Iceland, settlement of, 61
 Ikhnation, 128-9
 Inter-marriage, extent of, 11-13
 Immigration, Negro, 117
 Immigration, Oriental, 121-2
 Immigration policy, 120-3
 Immigration restriction, 113-9
 Immigration Act of 1965, 117-120
 Immigration and Soviet Jews, 121
 Immigrants and parent stocks, 15-16
 Irish, 23-25, 29, 43-44
 Irish aristocracy, genocide of, 43
 Italians, 24-25, 63-7, 116

 Jabneh academy, 156
 Jacobs, Joseph, 108
 Jarls, 60-1
 Japanese, 4-5, 72, 74-5
 Jewish education, origins, 151-2
 Jewish mixed marriages, 12-13, 110-112
 Jewish names, 105-8
 Jewish Nobel scientists, 109
 Jewish primary schools, 153-4
 Jewish Puritanism, 171-3
 Jewish wandering scholars, 180, 182-7
 Jewish wars against Rome, 144-5
 Jews: Afroasian, low I.Q.'s of, 138-142; age of marriage among, 174-6; ambiguous elite status of, 103-4; and American Communism, 102-3; and Black Death, 180-1; and punishment, 147-9, 154-6; and non-violence, 147-9; and politics, 101-3; and psychiatry, 95-6; and the Reformation, 164-7; eugenic history of 189-193; birth control, 176-8; blood groups of, 136-8; castration, 173; charity in Middle Ages, 182-3; dowries for poor, 191; economic status of American, 99-101; fingerprint patterns of, 136; German v. Slavic, 109-112; in American business, 99-101; intelligence v. drive, 149-50; in medicine, 96-7; in professions, 95-8; in the U.S. elite, 2, 17, 23, 26, 29, 93-4; of medieval Spain, 161; polygamy and divorce among, 175-6; skull types of, 130-3
 Josephus, 144

 Kautsky, Karl, 110-1
 Kennedy, John F., 116-7

- Kennedy, Ruby J. Reeves, 12
 Khazars, 109, 131
 Klineberg, Otto, 66-7
 Kung, S. W., 73
 Kurdish Jews and Sardinian Phoenicians, 134-6

 Lazerwitz, Bernard, 99
 Lederberg, Joshua, 196
 Lea, Henry C., 62
 Lee, Y. K., 74
 Lehman, Harvey C., 27, 39
 Levites and priests, 86, 106-7
 Lincoln, Abraham, 86
 Luther on the Jews, 166
 Luvians, 125-6

 Maimonides, 162
 Maimon, Solomon, 185-7
Mallet's Index of Artists, 38
Mankind Quarterly, 84-5
 Mari Kingdom, 126
 Masturbation, Jewish attitude toward, 170-1
 Mayflower, 48
 Meir bar Baruch of Rothenburg, 149
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 187
 Mensa, 20, 95
 Method used: advantages and limitations, 8-9, 15-16
 Mexicans, I.Q. of, 67-8
 Miller, Herman P., 99
Miry Depths, 184-5
 Mishna, Talmud and science, 159-163
 187s
 Mogol devastation and genocide, 69-70
 Mourant, A. E., 137-8
 Muller, Herman J., 32, 196
 Myers, Jacob M., 107

 Name-changing, 10-11, 37-38
 Names denoting color, 77-79
 Nathan, H., 132-3
 National Academy of Science, 30-1
 National Merit Scholars, 20, 95
 Nazi extermination of elites, 16
 Negro names, 21, 87
 Negro-white marriages, 12
New York Times, 113
 Norse and clerical celibacy, 61-63
 Norse classes, 60-61
 Northern intellectual leadership, 5

 Pale of Settlement, 187-9
 Palmer, L. H., 125
 Phi Beta Kappa, 17, 20, 94
Poor's Register of Directors and Executives, 21, 99
 Pope Paul IV and the ghetto, 164
 Population of world in past eras, 27-28
 Possony, Stefan T., 27, 62
 Presbyterians, 43
 Priests' wives, 62-63
 Puerto Ricans, 68
 Pulitzer prizes, 35
 Puritans, 21-26, 28-29, 46, 57

Reader's Encyclopedia, 35
Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature, 35
 Robertson, Robert H. S., 83-4
 Robinson, John, 47
 Rogers, Helen Jean, 47
 Roth, Cecil, 144

 Sadducees, 152
 Sarton, George, 27
 Scandinavians, 23-25, 29, 62-3
 Scientists, parentage of, 29-30
 Science, Protestant and Jewish leadership in, 27-28
 Scottish intellect, decline of, 83-4
 Scotland, alcoholism in, 84
 Scotland, elite regions of, 81-3
 Scotts, 2, 23-24, 42-3, 79-84
 Scots and American Revolution, 32-3
 Shapiro, Harry L., 123, 131
 Sheba, Chaim, 135-6
 Shetah, Simon ben, 152
 Shockley, William, 195
 Sicily, blood groups in, 66
 Siniscalco, M., 135
 Sinuhe, 127
 Slavs, 24-5, 68-72
 Smith, Elsdon C., 88-9

- Smilansky, Sarah and Moshe, 139-40
Social Register, 21, 103
 Southern leading families, 54-7
 Soviet genocide, 71-2
 Spanish-speaking peoples, 24-25, 62-3
 Special British Occupational Groups, 22-3, 26, 84-6
 Speiser, Ephraim Avigdor, 123-4
 Spengler, Joseph J., 115
 Starred Scientists, 28-9
 Status elites and creative elites, 16
 Stern family, 107
 Stern, Malcolm H., 110
 Switzerland, role in science of, 27-28
- Tell el-Amarna tablets, 128
 Thomas, John L., 12
 Thompson, Warren F., 115
 Thralls, 60
 Tocqueville, Alexis de, 46-47
 Toynbee, Arnold J., 32
 Trytten, M. H., 68
- Uncommon spellings, 86-9
- Ur of the Chaldees, 123-4
- Ventris, Michael, 125
 Visher, Stephen Sargent, 28-30
- Weber, Max, 62
 Welsh, 23, 24, 29, 31, 45
Who's Who in America, 20, 52-4, 56, 98
Who's Who in American Art, 39
Who's Who in American Education, 20, 97-8
Who's Who in Colored America, 21
Who's Who in Commerce and Industry, 21, 99
Who's Who of American Women, 20
 Woolley, Sir Leonard, 123
- Yemenite Jews as Arab converts, 138-9
Yiches, 187-9
- Zakkai, Johanan ben, 156
 Zunsner, Miriam Shomer, 187-9

Nathaniel Weyl, the author of *The Creative Elite in America*, was born in New York City in 1910. He did his undergraduate work at Haverford and Columbia and his post-graduate studies at Columbia and the London School of Economics. After several years as a U.S. Government economist and executive, he resigned to engage in full-time writing.

Over the past decade Mr. Weyl has concentrated his attention on the role of intellectual elites in the rise and fall of civilization. His books include *The Geography of Intellect*, *The Negro in American Civilization*, *The Reconquest of Mexico*, *Treason*, *The Battle Against Disloyalty*, and *Red Star Over Cuba*. In addition, he has contributed articles and book reviews to popular periodicals, technical journals and encyclopedias, and has written analytical articles on the American and international elite for the *Mankind Quarterly* of Edinburgh.

Mr. Weyl has traveled extensively in five continents and is a member of various American and foreign professional, scientific and honorary societies. He is a fellow of the International Academy of Arts and Letters, a Commander of the Military and Hospitaller Order of Lazarus and the Secretary of Palm Beach County Mensa.

For the past five years Mr. Weyl has lived in Delray Beach, Florida, with his wife and their 11-year-old twin sons.

BOOKS OF LASTING MERIT

NEGRO IN AMERICAN CIVILIZATION. By Nathaniel Weyl. Written from an historical perspective, this volume throws much new and surprising light on complex sociological problems. \$6.00

AVARICE: A HISTORY. By Stanton A. Coblenz. An authoritative account of man's acquisitive tendencies since earliest times. \$4.75

THE LOBBYISTS. By James Deakin. An incisive, up-to-date, and informative book about the techniques used to influence Congress. Written by a Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. \$5.00

VIETNAM AND THE UNITED STATES. By Hans J. Morgenthau. A leading critic of American policies presents his views. \$3.25

RANDOLPH BOURNE: LEGEND AND REALITY. By John A. Moreau. A biography of an unjustly obscure, physically damned man who had an extraordinary influence on the conscience of America. \$5.00

PROPAGANDA COMES OF AGE. By Michael Choukas. An examination of historical roots and modern trends by a Dartmouth College expert. Introduction by Hadley Cantril. \$5.00

THE POLITICS OF RESEARCH. By Richard J. Barber. A bold appraisal of practices and problems arising out of publicly financed undertakings in the United States since World War II. \$4.50

THE PARADOX OF MAN'S GREATNESS. By Stanton A. Coblenz. A comparison of the success and failures of modern civilization in such fields as science, government, race relations, etc. \$6.00

AMERICAN LEARNED SOCIETIES. By Joseph C. Kiger. An authoritative and comprehensive appraisal. Foreword by Luther Evans. \$6.00

AMBASSADORS ORDINARY AND EXTRAORDINARY. By E. Wilder Spaulding. A composite portrait by a former State Department official who knows his subject as an historian and diplomat. \$5.00

EUROPE VIEWS AMERICA. By Edward W. Chester. A critical evaluation based upon a survey of the ideas of leading thinkers. \$4.50

FORCE OF WOMEN IN JAPANESE HISTORY. By Mary Beard. A supplement to Mrs. Beard's great work "Women as Force in History." \$3.75

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS: By Edward G. Hudon. The evolution of First Amendment doctrines in decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Introduction by Justice William O. Douglas. \$4.50

NEW FRONTIERS OF KNOWLEDGE. A collection of papers by Arnold Toynbee, Carl Jung, Margaret Mead, Sidney Hook, Jules Romains, and a score of other noted scholars, writers, and thinkers. \$2.75

ORDEAL OF THE PRESIDENCY. By David Cushman Coyle. How great Presidents—including Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt—have been subjected to vilification. \$6.00

WONDERS OF NATURE. Edited by Esther Singleton. A compilation of writings by Alexandre Dumas, Percy Shelley, Charles Dickens, Victor Hugo, John Keats, and others. \$4.50

WHAT'S A COLLEGE FOR? A symposium by Robert M. Hutchins, Mark Van Doren, Max Lerner, and others. Sponsored by Miami University. \$2.50

PUBLIC AFFAIRS PRESS, 419 New Jersey Ave., S.E., Washington, D. C.