

For a variety of reasons, this basic distinction seems difficult to defend. The implied analogy with animal race-formation is vitiated by the facts that human societies are becoming increasingly monocultural, that ethnic mixture within nations is increasingly prevalent, and that the nation in no real sense corresponds to the evolving mammalian species. For one thing, multiracial nations and even multireligious nations seem to develop centrifugal forces they cannot control. Patriotism, the feeling and belief that nationality is the primary social bond, characterizes only those states and peoples who enjoy a threshold level of ethnic homogeneity and of shared history, institutions, beliefs and values.

Dr Cattell proceeds to elaborate an intricate system of human institutional relationships based on the ethics of 'Beyondism. Unfortunately, this seems to involve a transition from the objective level (that is to say, necessary inferences from the basic requirement of species survival) to the subjective. Moreover, Cattell claims for psychology, armed with the tools of multivariate analysis, a scientific authority which few observers believe it possesses.

The book under review would, I believe, have been more powerful had it been confined to an examination of the basic moral principles flowing from an evolutionary approach. Once that foundation had been firmly established, work on the superstructure could have proceeded. Nevertheless, it is an important work, one of several which has not received a fraction of the attention and acclaim it deserves.

NATHANIEL WEYL

GENETICS AND EDUCATION

By Arthur R. Jensen. Harper and Row, New York, pp. 378. Price \$10.00.

As readers of *THE MANKIND QUARTERLY* no doubt know, Professor Arthur R. Jensen published a 123-page article in the *Harvard Educational Review* for winter 1969 which aroused nationwide controversy and made its author the victim of scurrilous, unprincipled and, one must assume, deliberately mendacious attacks by leftwing professors and students.¹ The fury of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and other rowdy organizations of mindless Marxism was reminiscent of the actions of Nazi student organizations some 40 years previously. Jensen's life was threatened; his classes had to be held secretly at times and with guards posted; he was accused of racism, nazism and the general litany of ideological offenses that the communistic element apply in these instances.

The *Harvard Educational Review* had invited Jensen to write the article, had suggested that he include a discussion of race in his paper, and had agreed to devote an entire issue to his contribution. Under pressure, the editors of that distinguished liberal quarterly took fright. They had devoted most of the issue following that in which Jensen's article appeared to rebuttal by his critics.² In the succeeding issue, more outside views were published and Jensen's rejoinder appeared. Under attack for having given Jensen such a magnificent forum, the editors first refused to make reprints of his article available, going to the extreme of declining to sell them to Dr Jensen. They then retreated to the equally untenable position that they would sell Jensen reprints only with the views of his critics appended. This involved the insulting implication that scholars were unable to judge the

¹ "How much can we boast I.Q. and scholastic achievement," *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter 1969, 39, 1-123.

² These critics, particularly such distinguished ones as James F. Crow and Carl Bereiter, tended to disagree on secondary issues or on matters of emphasis.

validity of Jensen's argument without the guidance of the Harvard Educational Review, that poison was being sold and that its antidote must be contained in the same package.

Since then, there have been strong and perceptible signs that the tide is at last turning. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, President Nixon's liberal advisor on domestic problems (of which, the Negro is almost invariably the most exigent and recalcitrant to solution), mildly observed to the Cabinet that they should read Jensen's article. In December 1973, *Psychology Today*, the most widely read periodical on that science in the United States, published a basic article by Jensen, which restated the evidence that the I.Q. gap between Whites and Blacks of about one standard deviation (15 I.Q. points) was probably chiefly genetic in origin.³

Commenting on the Jensen experience, *Psychology Today's* senior editor, Berkeley Rice, detailed some of the attacks on hereditary psychologists and geneticists by professors whose intellectual standards had been deemed above reproach. For example, Professor Martin Deutsch of New York University charged Jensen with "53 major errors or misrepresentations, all of unidimensional and all of them antiblack." He implied deliberate misrepresentation.

Jensen demanded that Deutsch specify the alleged errors, but Deutsch did not reply. Jensen referred the matter to the American Psychological Association's Committee on Ethical Standards. After two years of prodding, Deutsch finally came up with specific charges. Most were of trivial importance. Jensen refuted all of them without difficulty.

"All of these methods of attack," Rice observed, "seem out of place in a community of scholars supposedly committed to freedom of inquiry and the pursuit of truth." He wondered why the presidents of the universities and professional societies concerned had not condemned these tactics. A good question.

The core of the book under review is Jensen's path-breaking article, "How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement?" Its general content is probably too well-known by now to require extended treatment. Two basic points, however, require emphasis.

Here and in another article reprinted in the collection, "A theory of primary and secondary familial mental retardation," Jensen argues that there are two levels of intelligence. Level I can be equated to memory, practical judgment, mother wit. Level II is cognitive intelligence, abstract reasoning ability, Spearman's *g*. Jensen argues that the gap between Whites and Blacks is greatest at Level II and slight to minimal at Level I. Yet, bemused by egalitarian preconceptions, our educational system attempts to teach all pupils in Level II terms, thus inviting fiasco. In other words, Jensen's excursion into the nature of racial I.Q. difference was primarily motivated by an interest in finding techniques by which the majority of Blacks and a substantial minority of Whites could be taught effectively within the limits of their abilities for spatial conceptualization.

The second point requiring emphasis is Jensen's observation that Negro lower-class women have more children than their white counterparts, while Negro women married to professionals have fewer.⁴ This provides a power-

³ "The differences are real." *Psychology Today*, 7, 7, 80-86.

⁴ In 1960, black women aged 35 to 44 married to unskilled laborers averaged 4.7 children, as against a mean of 3.8 for their white counterparts. Negro wives of professional and technical workers, however, averaged only 1.9 children as against 2.4 for similarly situated Whites. Part of the impact of this difference is that three of four Blacks failing the armed forces mental test (AFQT) came from families of four or more children.

ful genetic basis for widening the I.Q. gap between the races. "Is there a danger," Jensen asks, "that current welfare policies, unaided by eugenic foresight, could lead to the genetic enslavement of a substantial segment of our population? The possible consequences of our failure seriously to study these questions may well be viewed by future generations as our society's greatest injustice to Negro Americans."⁵

One of the most admirable of the Jensen papers is entitled, "Let's understand Skodak and Skeels finally." This 1949 study of 100 illegitimate children born to mothers of below-average I.Q. showed a mean increase of 20 I.Q. points over that of their biological mothers after adoption and being reared in superior foster homes. This progress by the children has been deemed telling evidence against high heritability of I.Q.

Jensen shows in simple mathematical terms why the inference is invalid. First, assuming the fathers were of average I.Q., the midparent I.Q. is not 85.7 (I.Q. of the mothers), but 92.85. Making allowance for regression on the mean and for the fact that the adopting families were probably of significantly higher than average I.Q., the 20-point gap is in conformity with Jensen's estimate of heritability.⁶

These papers are well worth reading and having in permanent form in any library concerned with issues of race and anthropology. Jensen's sophisticated and impeccable techniques have brought the argument about the hereditary factor in racial I.Q. differences out of the realm of dissension and prejudice and into that of mathematical and statistical analysis.

NATHANIEL WEYL

THE INEQUALITY OF MAN

By H. J. Eysenck. Temple Smith, London. Pp. 288. Price £3.

This volume has two chief objectives. The first is to review the evidence for the considerable importance of genetic factors in the determination of human intelligence and a number of personality characters such as extraversion, emotionality and dominance. Professor Eysenck does the job with his usual competence and incisiveness. The coverage of the literature is thorough and up to date and even those who consider themselves well informed in this field are likely to find accounts of at least a few recent studies unknown to them. The general conclusion here is that genetic factors account for around 70 to 80 per cent of the variance for intelligence in advanced societies and also make a substantial contribution to a number of major personality traits.

The second purpose of the book is to point out some of the implications of these facts for social policy. The most important is simply that the egalitarian ideal is doomed to failure. There is no political programme that can make all individuals equal and the same applies to the average levels of intelligence in different social classes and certain racial groups in society. We cannot expect that the abolition of intelligence tests or of grammar schools will somehow abolish the fact that middle class children tend to be more intelligent than working class children, and tend to do better both in school and in life.

Rather than striving vainly to engineer an unrealistic equality between individuals and social groups, politicians and administrators responsible for social policy would do far better to recognise the existence of biologically determined differences and base their social policies on these.

⁵ Page 95 of original article.

⁶ Moreover, the orphanage children offered for adoption are generally the most attractive and the most intelligent ones.