

More on Political Correctness and Race Differences

J. Philippe Rushton^{1,2}

INTRODUCTION

In an exchange on the merits of researching the genetics of race, in the April 1996 issue of the *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, Andrew Winston was certainly right about one thing. I am not responsible for, nor necessarily share the views of, others who have researched racial issues. Nor are others responsible for my views. There is, therefore, no point in my responding to all his innuendo and guilt-by-association. However, I do wish to set the record straight about (1) some of his factual errors concerning differences among races, (2) explain what I mean when I say that the taboo against race is unequaled by the Inquisition, Stalin, or Hitler, and (3) refute with additional case studies his claim that the chilling effect of political correctness has been greatly exaggerated.

RACE DIFFERENCES

Winston cited several articles by his University of Guelph colleague Michael Peters alleging that my findings on race differences in brain size were biased because the data had been "inappropriately corrected" for body size. But my study of a stratified random sample of 6325 U.S. Army personnel (Rushton, 1992), wherein I found that average cranial capacities for Mongoloids, Caucasoids, and Negroids were 1416, 1380, and 1259 cm³, respectively, after correcting for body size, clearly did not depend on my making corrections for body size. In that paper, I also reported the cranial

¹Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Canada.

²Correspondence should be directed to J. Philippe Rushton, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Canada.

capacities *unadjusted* for body size and these, too, showed the same statistically significant rank ordering (unweighted means = 1391, 1378, and 1362 cm³, respectively; weighted means = 1425, 1382, and 1358 cm³, respectively). Moreover, the Oriental/White/Black differences that I found in cranial capacity (cm³) using external head measurements are similar to those found by other modern researchers who estimated cm³ from endocranial volume, and who weighed brain mass (grams) at autopsy (see Rushton & Ankney, 1996 for review).

Winston also claimed that I must have a “political-social agenda” for accepting, in my book *Race, Evolution, and Behavior* (1995), data on sub-Saharan Africans living under Apartheid. But several of the studies I reviewed were from postcolonial Congo, Nigeria, Uganda, and Zambia, as clearly shown in Table 6.9 of my book. The average IQ from *all* these African countries was 70, substantially lower even than that of Black Americans. Asians in Asia, by contrast, often score higher on IQ tests than do Europeans living either in Europe or the U.S.

HITLER AND STALIN

Winston found my statement that there is no parallel to the taboo on race in the history of science “difficult to interpret” and “inappropriate.” Winston should have read, or taken to heart, my statement of explanation that followed: “Nowhere else has there ever been for so long a time such a taboo topic, *and never one imposed in all the Western democracies using self-regulation*” (1996, p. 219, emphasis now added). It is this that will surely become a major topic of investigation by sociologists of science in the twenty-first century. I know of no other example of where something “known to science” has been made to “disappear” in the manner of the racial differences in brain size and intelligence widely known at the beginning of the twentieth century.

OTHER VICTIMS

Finally, consider whether the damaging effects of political correctness are as minimal as Winston claims. Gayde Whitney is Professor of Psychology at Florida State University and has been a member of the Behavior Genetics Association (BGA) since its inception 25 years ago. In 1994 he was elected president of the Association and in his 1995 presidential address, he hypothesized that genetic inheritance plays a role in determining race differences in crime. When he presented data showing a strong cor-

relation between murder rates and the proportion of Blacks across the various states ($r = 0.77$), several of his colleagues walked out in protest. The next morning, the editor of *Behavior Genetics* told Whitney that he was refusing to publish the paper (contrary to understood policy) and the BGA Executive Committee voted (with one abstention—Whitney's) to issue an official statement of denouncement. Whitney (1995) later published his address accompanied by a preface entitled "Ideology and Censorship in Behavior Genetics" in which he said that his speech was intended to show that "ideologically-based dogma and taboo" are hampering research in behavioral genetics. In the preface, he described the reaction to his speech as a "parody of political correctness," and criticized members of the association's executive committee for acting in the "finest Lysenkoist tradition."

Another recent case involves Christopher Brand, a Lecturer in Psychology at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. On February 29, 1996, his book on intelligence, *The g Factor*, was published in the U.K. by the British subsidiary of John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. On April 14, newspaper reports of interviews with him began to appear saying that he thought Black people had a lower IQ than did Whites and that these were probably partly genetic. On April 17, Wiley Inc. of New York denounced Brand's views as "repellent" and withdrew the book from publication (Holden, 1996). U.K. Wiley promptly followed suit. It stopped distributing the book and withdrew copies from bookstores. A blizzard of "refutations" of Brand appeared in the U.K. media under outraged headlines. Protests from members of Parliament, student boycotts of his lectures, and calls for his resignation by faculty at the University of Edinburgh all predictably ensued. Brand's refusal to be silenced and his defense of free speech has led him to be suspended (as I write) for bringing his university into disrepute. His e-mail address has been closed and he faces the possibility of dismissal.

Returning to my own experiences, the latest harassment occurred at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) which regularly allows the militantly disruptive International Committee Against Racism (INCAR) and Progressive Labor Party (PLP) to have official "exhibitor" status, along with a booth, at its annual meeting. At the February 1996 Meeting in Baltimore, INCAR and PLP festooned their booth with posters of Karl Marx and signs taking credit for harassing the University of Maryland Conference on "Genes and Crime" in September 1995. At the 1996 meeting, INCAR targeted my poster presenting a review of the literature on brain-size and cognitive ability (Rushton & Ankney, 1996). When INCAR encountered me the day before the poster presentation, they yelled so many death threats that the AAAS called in the Baltimore police who dispatched an armed officer to stand by the presentation. Despite the guard, INCAR continued to utter threats. One demon-

strator took photographs of me saying they were for a "Wanted: Dead or Alive" poster. "You won't be living much longer," he said. Incredible though it may be to believe, instead of canceling the exhibitor status of INCAR and PLP, the director of the AAAS's Annual Meeting program said, in an interview published in *The Scientist* (March 4, 1996), that AAAS would tighten up the screening process to make it more difficult for posters like mine get on the program!

CONCLUSIONS

Only "one-party science" exists with respect to group differences in brain size and intelligence. Sociologists of science need to investigate how this one-party system (of untruth) came about. It is difficult to disagree with the view arrived at by Charles Murray (1996) following his review of the aftermath to *The Bell Curve*: On the topic of race, social science is corrupt.

REFERENCES

- Holden, C. (1996). Wiley drops IQ book after public furor. *Science*, 272, 644.
- Murray, C. (1996). Afterword. In R. J. Herrnstein and C. Murray (Eds.), *The Bell Curve* (soft-cover ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Peters, M. (1995). Race differences in brain size. *American Psychologist*, 50, 947-948.
- Rushton, J. P. (1992). Cranial capacity related to sex, rank, and race in a stratified random sample of 6,325 U.S. military personnel. *Intelligence*, 16, 401-413.
- Rushton, J. P. (1995). *Race, evolution, and behavior*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Rushton, J. P. (1996). Political correctness and the study of racial differences. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 5, 213-229.
- Rushton, J. P., & Ankney, C. D. (1996). Brain size and cognitive ability: Correlations with age, sex, social class and race. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 3, 212-36.
- Whitney, G. (1995). Ideology and censorship in behavior genetics. *Mankind Quarterly*, 35, 327-342.
- Winston, A. S. (1996). The context of correctness: A comment on Rushton. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 5, 231-250.