

The Greatest Collective Scientific Fraud of the 20th Century: The Demolition of Differential Psychology and Eugenics

Helmuth Nyborg¹

University of Aarhus (Retired, 2007)

Supporters of differential psychology and eugenics were allowed to freely reflect on the importance of individual differences, on how to avoid dysgenic development, and even on how to improve the human condition. This basic proviso for meaningful scientific inquiries changed radically around 1950 when the topics were banned and their adherents demonized, despite supportive evidence. The present paper provides examples of typical attacks and analyzes the reasons for this bizarre deviation from normal science. It points to some of the people and institutions responsible, discusses the unfair tools they use, and illustrates how damaging their inexcusable intellectual corruption has been for the academic life at many modern universities. It remains an important future task to find ways of breaking the spell and return differential psychology and eugenics to normal science again.

Key Words: Academic fraud; Differential psychology; Eugenics; demonization; Political correctness; Institutional bias.

Introduction

Until the first half of the 20th century scientists could openly talk about differential psychological (DP) and eugenics (E) questions, such as the origin and development of individual and group differences in intelligence and personality and the trans-generational consequences of genetically based individual differences in the presence of differential reproduction, and they were allowed to reflect on the most likely consequences of genetic differences for learning, education, occupation, amounting

life and society in general. There was little risk of negative repercussions, because most informed people realized that human nature also reflects important biological constituents. Stringent operational definitions of how and which genes affected development were sparse, as were

¹ Address for correspondence: helmuthnyborg@msn.com

knowledge of the precise nature of presumed environmental impacts. However, this has never prevented creative scientists from hypothesizing and testing all sorts of ideas believed to explain the development of individuals, groups and nations, and from discussing how to improve the human condition.

This is normal science, but it all changed radically around the mid-20th century. Notions of the human mind as a blank slate became common during the 1930s, and "... behaviorism and hostile anti-nature attitudes [came to] dominate, fuelled partly by communist ideology, partly by Nazi misuse of eugenics to promote nasty genocide programs (Nyborg, 2003, p. 451). DP and E fell into disrespect. Entire research topics were condemned, and specialists in the areas became increasingly demonized. Respected departments, learned societies, and journals closed or changed their name to something more "innocent" sounding, e.g. from *Eugenics Education Society* to *Galton Institute* in London, from *Eugenics Quarterly* in 1969 to *Annals of Human Genetics*, and from the *American Eugenics Society* to the *Society for the Study of Social Biology*, in 1973. Prominent proponents of DP and E became increasingly disgraced, sacked or even threatened with their life, and had good reason to worry about their career and family. Some self-censored or left the fields to take up less risky and more profitable mainstream research. Some discretely compiled relevant data for publication in more friendly times. Then, of course, there were the few stalwart scientists who dared stand up against the strong headwind and openly continue their research. They had to endure unbelievably vicious attacks from angry colleagues, hateful laypersons, and a biased press. The eugenicists "all ran for cover" and reclassified themselves as population scientists, human geneticists, anthropologists, demographers and genetic counselors (Glad, 2006).

These bizarre changes marked an extraordinary deviation from normal science. Typically scientists flesh out all sorts of theories great and small, well knowing that the more unexpected a theory is, the closer will it be subjected to critical scrutiny in the long self-correcting process of scientific advance. Then, their theory will either solidify or

suffer oblivion – fast or slow pending on the amount, quality and direction of further evidence. Some theories live an entirely unsubstantiated life right until their pigheaded proponents pass away. Some long-dead theories become revived as new positive evidence piles up. Such variation is part and parcel of normal science. Precisely the opposite happened in the case of DP and E, and the present chapter presents an attempt to understand the reasons and consequences of this odd and indeed counterintuitive development in academic life. It further discusses what can be done to restore DP and E to their proper scientific position.

Principles of Demolition

Examination of the enormous and widely dispersed antagonistic popular press and critical scientific literature leads to a truly astonishing observation: Animosity rises almost exponentially as more and more solid evidence favors DP. Adoption studies, begun in the first third of the 20th century (Leahy, 1935; Burks, 1928), began to convincingly demonstrate genetic influences on IQ, as did later studies by Skodak and Skeels (1949). The later first large-scale longitudinal study of twin IQ detailed the development and confluence of genetic and environmental factors (Wilson, 1983), and an impressive review of genetic research by Erlenmeyer-Kimling and Jarvik (1963) suggested definitive heritability of general intelligence (*g*). Virtually every major, well designed study ever after has found genetic influences on abilities, personality traits and attitudes. E suffered a similar misfortune in the face of steady growing empirical support (Lynn, 2001a, p. vii).

Rational explanations for such abnormalities are out of the question, so we have to look for irrational explanations. One way is to identify the motives behind, and line up the tools used in the act of demolition to see how it happened, but this is not without problems, as the diverse nature of oppositional forces seems at first to elude any simple account. Then again, ruthless application of Occam's razor to the immense critical literature eased the explanatory burden somewhat, and use of the razor led to the identification of two major groups of critics.

The first draws inspiration from the academic left (AL),

whose members believe that evolution can work without genetically based individual differences, and from religious people, who are burdened by an internally consistent ideological edifice and are guided primarily by moral indignation. Its growing aversion can be understood in terms of the first inverse principle of DP and E demolition:

The more *feeling moralists* and the *religiously disposed* become offended, the first by evidence of individual genetic restrictions, the second by evolutionary principles, the more they will actively oppose DP and E research.

The second group of critics is a highly mixed group of professional, semi-professional, interested laypeople, feminists, and political ideologues, all united by the idea of equality – the belief that people are in principle genetically and/or phenotypically equal. Their problem is not so much moral or religious indignation, but rather the stubborn phenotypic existence of inequality in society of educational and occupational outcomes. They wish to eliminate current individual differences in educational and occupational areas, as they see them as a result of unfair discrimination. They find the currently increasing economical, political or global inequality unacceptable, and want to bring it under societal and political control in order to eliminate it. They have no particular problem with the production of solid DP documentation for large individual and group differences, as they take it as a useful reminder of much needed, radical, and long-overdue societal changes and feel completely justified in demanding equal access and outcome for all in all areas of society. They even systematize some of the archival evidence on the differences, themselves. They warmly support international harmonization and globalization programs, and recruit AL (academic liberal) sympathizers who believe in an ideal society where the right culture makes the right citizen, such as in the former Soviet Union. They actively support future social scientists who are not prepared to accept an unequal world “as is” and who seek quick fixes for changing the world to a much better “should be” place. They wholeheartedly support equality programs in progressive universities and trade unions, and demand politically predefined racial- and sexual quota

systems. Many of the academics and publicists in this group make their careers by telling well-intentioned, honest, but poorly informed people what they want to hear. It is food for thought that early eugenicists promoted equality of opportunity (e.g. Crew, Darlington, Haldane, et al. (1939), but that their method to achieve equality of outcomes, namely a reduction in the prevalence of harmful genes, is completely beyond the planning horizon of today's opportunistic social engineers.

The aversion of this group of critics can be characterized by the second inverse principle of DP and E demolition:

The more the pragmatic-opportunistic critics produce or become exposed to evidence of genetic and evolutionary restrictions on educational, occupational, sexual, racial and global equality, the more they will attack notions of restriction, typically in form of *ad hominem* attacks rarely used by supporters of genetic causes for individual differences.

The widely scattered literature finally indicated that “feeling moralists”, “the religiously disposed” and “pragmatic opportunists” are equally prepared to use scientifically unacceptable tools to up-scale their deliberate destruction of DP and E. This observation led to an overall characterization of the phenotypic nature of the demolition:

The demise of DP and E is the end product of a slowly progressing multi-faceted, comprehensive, collective, morally or opportunistically based scientific educational, religious and political fraud. The intensity of the demolition appears to increase exponentially to the extent scientific evidence favoring biological restrictions builds up. The scientific findings cause defensiveness and aggressiveness in the protagonists of unscientific ideologies in the same way that criticism causes defensiveness and aggressiveness in an incompetent employee or politician.

This is a brief description of the greatest scientific collective fraud of the 20th century. Others have called attention to the problem at regular intervals (e.g. Garrett, 1961; Eysenck, 1971; Rushton, 1995; Gottfredson, 1994, 2000; Nyborg, 2003), but without much of an effect. It may seem grossly unfair to some in times where so many “good”

scientists strive so hard to remedy the consequences of unfair individual and group difference, so I will use some space to justify the accusation in the following sections. First I briefly describe a variety of the unworthy attacks made by moralist and pragmatic opportunists, and then sketch some types of scientifically unacceptable tools and tricks they use (for details, see Jensen, 1972; Nyborg, 2003).

Prototypic Examples of Attacks

The Jensen IQ educability case. In 1969 the American educational psychologist Arthur R. Jensen from Berkeley University in California, USA, published an invited 100+ pages-long article in Harvard Educational Review (HER). Jensen's rhetorical title was: "How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement?" The short answer was: "Not much". Basically, the article acknowledged the empirical existence of individual and race differences in intelligence and documented the failure of compensatory education. It suggested that a purely environmental hypothesis perhaps no longer sufficed, and that help for the disadvantaged better acknowledges the differences. Despite Jensen's careful formulations on heritability, the article evoked strong moral indignation in group 1 critics, and the suggestion of biological restrictions on learning and the failure of compensatory education enraged group 2 critics. This single paper elicited an unprecedented storm in the public press, and a flood of furious and vitriolic articles and books followed, culminating in threats of bombs in his house. The reactions made Jensen exclaim "Most of the main points of my [HER] article were never mentioned, being completely displaced by the racial issue, which was often a grotesque parody of what I had actually written" (Jensen, 1972; also see Eysenck, 1991; Nyborg, 2003, p. 453). Harassed at lectures and subjected to various threats, Arthur Jensen had to be accompanied by body guards whenever on campus, and he was forced to leave his private home after realistic threats. The many irate reactions to this single well-researched paper illustrated what was in store for other DP researchers, as all the attacks reveal an astounding degree of uniformity.

The Cyril Burt nature-nurture twins case. This attack was announced by critics to reveal "the greatest hoax of the 20th

century,” and its public exposure was meant to deliver the final blow to notion of high heritability of IQ. Here, a prominent pioneer in the study of individual differences in intelligence and education, Sir Cyril Burt from the University of London, UK, was accused of massive fraud. It was alleged that he had “invented” two non-existent co-authors and reported identical heritability coefficients, to the point of 3 decimals, in three studies with differing numbers of twins. Alleging this his critics claimed that this illustrated the rotten nature of DP and genetic determinist research. When I later asked professor Hans Eysenck from the University of London, who worked for some time as an assistant to Burt, about the missing co-authors, he said: “Why didn’t the critics ask me. I have met them both!” (personal communication, 1995). Joynson (1989) found that the accusations were ill-founded, and Fletcher (1991) concluded that the alleged fraud was “not proven”. Moreover, Burt’s correlations of IQ scores for monozygotic twins brought up apart (i.e. 0.77) is well in line with the weighted average of five other studies (i.e. 0.75; Jensen, 1992). The alleged hoax thus transpires as a deliberate framing of a prominent ID researcher in the higher service of “proving” no biological restrictions on IQ and educability.

The Cattell race case. The American Psychological Association (APA) decided in 1997 to award Raymond B. Cattell, one of the prime authorities on IQ testing and twice president of the APA, its gold medal for Life Achievement in Psychology for having collected solid data, developed methods, and formulated theories. The then 92 year old Cattell traveled from his retirement home in Hawaii to the Chicago meeting, only to be told that the ceremony had been cancelled. APA had “in the meantime”, been informed that his “... writings were racist and advocated the separation of the races ...”, so it would appoint a special Blue Ribbon Panel to review the award (Whitney, 1997). One of the main critics appeared to be the national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, Abraham Foxman. He had informed APA that Cattell had “... exhibited a lifelong commitment to racial supremacy theories” (Hilts, 1997). Another critic was historian Barry Mehler from Ferris State University, Michigan, USA. Pearson (1991/1997) describes

Mehler as a person who rarely presents scientific evidence to contradict those he criticizes, but instead falls back on *ad hominem* attacks, labeling some of America's and Britain's finest scientists 'racists', 'Nazis', and 'Fascists' (more on Mehler later). Pearson provided a long list of prominent academics who had been attacked by Mehler, including Cattell (*ibid.* p. 262). Cattell died shortly after this without receiving the award.

The Rushton race case. J. Philippe Rushton from the University of Western Ontario in Canada offended equality adherents and anti-racists alike when he, based on empirical evidence, rank-ordered Orientals, whites, and blacks in accordance with more than 60 variables, such as brain size, fertility, temperament, personality, and intelligence. Rushton, who in addition to a Ph.D., holds a D.Sc. awarded for outstanding contributions to science, explained the pattern in term of r-K evolutionary theory (Rushton, 1988), but cautiously warned against generalizing from group averages to individuals and that his theory did not exclude the possibility of external intervention. Even so the press abounded with condemnation. The Ontario Premier and the Ontario Attorney General made it clear that "... all doctrines and practices of racial superiority are scientifically false ... [and] ... contrary to the policies of this government" and the Premier asked the president of the university to dismiss Rushton. So did the *Communist Party of Canada*, the *Urban Alliance on Race Relations*, and others. Characteristically, members of the *Academic Coalition for Equality* found that Rushton should not be allowed a platform to defend himself, and Barry Mehler from Ferris State University once again waved the Nazi card by alleging similarities between Rushton and the Nazis.

The university admirably refused to take action against Rushton, but then Mr. Matas, senior council for the *B'nai B'rith League for Human Rights*, told a newspaper (*Globe and Mail*, March 8, 1989) that the academic reputation of the University of Western Ontario was "foundering" because it refused to take action against Rushton. Matas asked that Rushton be fired, and demonstrators then occupied the psychology department, smeared swastikas on the walls, and wrote "racist pig live here" [sic] on Rushton's office door.

On March 1989 the Attorney-General of the Province of Ontario ordered a police investigation of Rushton to check if his writings violated the federal criminal code of Canada, in particular paragraph 2, which read in part: "Everyone who ...willfully promotes hatred against any identifiable group is ... liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years". Six months later the police concluded that Rushton was "...falling noticeably short of expected professional standards", but had not committed a federal offence. The Attorney-General of Ontario then announced at a press conference in November 1989, that Rushton's theories were "loony but not criminal", but this did not conclude the case, because the dean of Social Science, Emöke Szathmary, stated in the official university paper that there was no evidence to support his ranking ordering of the human races (Pearson, 1991/1997, p. 237). She emphasized that this was her own view, not that of the university, but the statement nevertheless revived the case with full force, and in July 1989 Rushton was given an unsatisfactory rating on his annual performance evaluation despite his eminent publication record. Three such evaluations in a row could mean dismissal. Rushton successfully appealed his case, but then in September 1989 the dean instructed him to videotape his undergraduate lectures, so that they could be presented in a private room without his presence. A faculty grievance committee later ruled to drop the arrangement again, but the first six weeks of his lecturing were often disrupted, and he was physically assaulted and had to go to the hospital for treatment. Various students and political organizations continued to demand Rushton's dismissal, and so did a parliamentary candidate for the *Marxist-Leninist Party* and member of the *Academic Coalition for Equality*. This brief account does little justice to Pearson's (1991/1997) more detailed coverage of the Rushton case.

The James Watson sub-Saharan case. In 2007, Nobelist James Watson told the press that he was worried about the low average IQ and future of African countries south of Sahara. This single remark made the academic and public ceiling come tumbling down upon his head. He apologised several times, but the battle was already lost: He first had to cancel a long planned international lecturing tour and then

had to leave his chair at the internationally acknowledged Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory in New York, which he himself had brought to fame. He was excoriated galore in the press and explicitly defamed by leading academics. His only sin was to refer to empirically verifiable data on low Sub-Saharan IQs, massively documented in mainstream peer-reviewed journals and books for more than a century (e.g. Lynn, 2006; Rushton & Jensen, 2005; 2008). More details on the Watson case are in Charlton (2008), Malloy (2008), and Rushton & Jensen, (2008).

The Helmuth Nyborg sex difference case. Helmuth Nyborg (the author of this paper) from University of Aarhus in Denmark caused havoc in 2002 by reporting a minor average sex difference in intelligence. Hate letters and email threats began to pour in daily for months. Phone messages read: “We know where you live” and similar unkind things. The university switchboard was blocked for days with calls, mostly asking for Nyborg’s removal from office. Instead of supporting a troubled scientist, the director of the psychology institute, Jens Mammen (member of the former Communist Party), immediately assured the press that he would investigate what he saw as a “serious case”. He later gave Nyborg a first time unsatisfactory rating on the annual performance evaluation, after 40 years of widely published impeccable research. The dean, also an AL sympathizer, set up a committee with multi-page detailed instructions to investigate every part of in Nyborg’s still uncompleted huge 30-year longitudinal project, of which the sex difference data constituted only a microscopic part. The committee was even asked to re-evaluate the sex difference article already published in 2005 in the peer-reviewed journal *Personality and Individual Differences*. The dean then suspended Nyborg in 2006 for bad research, but Nyborg submitted his case to an official governmental committee for proper research. This independent committee, chaired by a judge, found no sign of fraud, so the university had no choice but to reinstall Nyborg in his chair, from where he retired six month later, due to age.

Nyborg asked for emeritus status, but the reply made it obvious that the case had all the time been about unacceptable values. The new director of the institute,

professor Jeppe Jeppesen (also a vocal AL sympathizer), denied Nyborg emeritus status because, he said, Nyborg's values differed from those of his own, and from those he would like to see forwarded by the institute to the public. A succeeding director also refused emeritus status, but now for the reason that he had asked faculty members for their view and found that this would annoy about a third of Nyborg's former colleagues and thus represent a disturbance to the valued internal peace at the institute.

This hostile atmosphere dated many years back to occasions where Nyborg's lecture series on behavioral genetics was twice cancelled after massive resistance from a majority of AL sympathizers, and where the study board demanded that the obligatory literature list for a lecture series on the biological basis of child development was supplemented by "less biased literature". Another sign of collegial hostility was that a detailed critique of Nyborg's "natural science" position was secretly distributed by unknown individuals each year to new students before they attended his lecture series. These actions must be considered in light of the fact that, in Denmark, more than 50% of faculty self-admit that they are predominantly AL-oriented. Among the remaining, nearly 20% voted for the Radical Left party favoring strong humanistic values (Tanggaard, 2003). Even eight years later dean Svend Hylleberg and former director Jens Mammen continued to feed the popular press with misleading information about the project, emphasizing its potentially provocative standard measures of normal pubertal body development, intimating pedophilic and Ku Klux Klan sympathies. The university rector, Lauritz B. Holm-Nielsen, saw nothing wrong with this (see www.helmuthnyborg.dk), and told the public press: "I have to pay primary attention to the picture the university paints of itself in the public, and secondary attention to research". Such statements reflect, in my understanding, a shift away from science toward the importance of branding, and can be observed in the many academically corrupt universities today.

The Michael Bailey sexual orientation case. After Michael Bailey published *The Man who would be Queen* (Bailey, 2003) he had to endure two years which "... were the hardest of my

life” (Carey, 2005). The book essentially describes the biology of sexual orientation and gender to the public. One of Bailey’s prominent critics, Deirdre McCloskey at the University of Illinois at Chicago, characterized him as a person who delivered “...a false and unscientific and politically damaging opinion.” Other well-known transgendered academics found that Bailey promoted a theory that was inaccurate, insulting and potentially damaging, and Lynn Conway from University of Michigan, USA, compared Bailey’s view to Nazi propaganda. The *Southern Poverty Law Center* (SPLC) also waived the Nazi card (Beirich & Moser, 2003), this time by connecting Bailey to the *Human Bio-Diversity Institute*, directed by Steven Sailer. This institute, of which the present writer is a long-standing member, is accused of being bent on overturning widely held “...scientific views of gender, sexual identity and race”; this confirms that “... racist science of old is still just as alive and well as their current sex research”. This guilt-by-association technique is commonly used by the SPLC (McHugh, 2010) and many other critics. Bailey was further accused of grossly violating scientific standards, and stepped down as chairman for the psychology department in 2004 – without providing a reason for this. Collaborators were advised to distance themselves from him if they hoped for research money. It is food for thought that Dreger (2008), who investigated the case in detail, found the accusations essentially groundless (also see Bailey case at Wikipedia). Certainly, important discussions of complicated effects of biology on sexual orientation are not best reduced to angry reactions and accusations of Nazism.

The Larry Summers female scientist case. When *Massachusetts Institute of Technology* (MIT) in 2005 invited university president Larry Summers from Harvard University to a closed meeting, he was asked to explain why there were so few women in the science and engineering departments. Summers first outlined a list of likely “innocent” reasons, but eventually also hinted at the possibility of an innate difference in aptitude. He cautiously stressed that there is no evidence for an average sex difference in IQ (actually there is!), and talked instead about the well-established difference in the dispersion of scores. This latter difference implies that

there will be more males at the bottom – and also at the top end of the IQ distribution, from where most (natural) scientists are recruited. This scientifically well-documented observation caused physical outcry among leading feminists present. Soon their angry voices could also be heard in other parts of academia and in the popular press. The ensuing year-long intense discussions, carried out mostly outside science departments, ended, as might have been expected, in calls for Summers's resignation. He apologised internally and publicly time and again, and donated 50 million dollars for the recruitment of more females, but to no avail. A year later he resigned the presidency – just a week before a planned second vote of non-confidence. Apparently, not even truth-telling university presidents are safe anymore at modern universities – Harvard, of all places!

The Richard Lynn account of Eugenics. Richard Lynn (2001a) has provided an interesting overview of the history of eugenics: “In the first half of the century virtually all biological scientists and most social scientists supported eugenics ...” Such biological or genetic luminaries as Sir Ronald Fisher, Sir Julian Huxley, Sir Peter Medawar, J.B.S. Haldane, and Francis Crick expressed worries, as did many before them, over the break-down of natural selection and the onset of genetic deterioration in modern societies. They were moved by the empirical observation of sub-fertility in high IQ classes and super-fertility in the lower IQ classes. This is a reverse of the previous pre-industrialization situation – a dysgenic direction which in the long run would lead to genetic disaster and eventually to a collapse of civilization. Fisher (1929) suggested two countermeasures: Economic incentives for the sub-fertile socially successful in order to raise their fertility, and setting up a moral pressure to instill the knowledge that “... parenthood by worthy citizens constitutes an important public service” (p. 283). Huxley (1936), director of UNESCO and later president of the British Eugenics Society from 1959-62, reaffirmed the inverse association between socioeconomic status and fertility and argued for “... faster reproduction of superior stocks” (p. 30). Then, according to Lynn (2001a): “... in the second half of the century, support for eugenics declined; and in the last three decades of the century, eugenics

became almost universally rejected.” (Preface, p. vii). Lynn suggests that the reason for the rejection of E may be found in a notion by the founder of the topic, Francis Galton (1883), that the concept of E is crucially dependent on health, intelligence, and character, all traits under at least some genetic influence. With their high inheritance, Galton concluded that they must be “...eminently transmissible by descent” (p. 19). In other words, Galton acknowledged that we can selectively breed for such traits, and added that we also should, because the course of modern human development has become dysgenic. These ideas are equally unacceptable to feeling AL moralists and opportunistic equality sympathizers.

More cases. There have been many more attacks on DP and E research (Hunt, 1999), such as the attacks on twin researcher Thomas J. Bouchard from Minnesota University and professor Hans J. Eysenck of London University, UK, (but read Eysenck’s telling introduction in Pearson (1991/1997)). Eysenck and Arthur Jensen had to literally run for their lives because of organized and violent demonstrations while on a lecturing tour in Australia, accompanied by a contingent of police officers striving to protect them from a raging mob. Camilla Benbow from Vanderbilt University, who came under siege for publishing a sex difference in mathematics; Michael Levin from the City University of New York, was attacked by the Marxist International Committee Against Racism; and Vincent Sarich from the University of California at Berkeley learned the hard way, like many others, that colleagues rarely dare stand up to defend good research. Sandra Scarr from the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA, got warnings in 1974 that she would be killed if she continued to do research on the intelligence of black children, and in 1976 she was physically threatened and spat upon as she tried to rescue Arthur Jensen from a rampant mob; Donald Templer from Alliant International University, got into trouble because of severely restricted academic freedom concerning the study of race differences. Nobel-prize winning physicist William Shockley experienced extensive *ad hominem* abuse and was several times prevented from lecturing because of his interest in intelligence and

eugenics. Socio-biologist Edward O. Wilson and psychologist Richard J. Herrnstein, both from Harvard University, were charged with racism. In Herrnstein's case this was after he hypothesized in 1991 that a society based on equality of opportunity would turn out to be a society with its social stratification based on IQ; students carried posters around campus saying: "Wanted for racism" and Herrnstein was viciously attacked in the media. It could fill several books with details on the tumultuous publication in 1994 of *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* by Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray, which elicited a full-scale academic and media war with a deluge of hateful attacks. Linda Gottfredson from Delaware University, USA, had to spend years protesting over her university criticizing her for receiving a grant from the Pioneer Fund; she eventually settled the case in a favorable out-of-court disposition. Chris Brand was sacked by Edinburgh University for alleged out of class "racial" comments, and the university had later to partly compensate him economically. Edward Miller, faculty member of the University of New Orleans, was accused by the media of racism in 1996 and got into serious trouble with the university authorities as a result; Lars Kovereid and Evgueni Vinogradov from the Business School at Bodø, Norway, used Lynn and Vanhanen's (2002) national IQ averages to demonstrate that immigrants from high IQ countries achieve better than immigrants from low IQ countries, and ran into serious trouble from academic liberals as a result. They were immediately attacked, and a prominent professor, Carl-Erik Grenness from Oslo University, informed the press that this kind of research was "crazy". Richard Lynn (2001b), himself attacked a number of times, lines up further cases of witch-hunting.

Dirty Tools and Tricks

The critics use a wide array of tools in order to demolish DP and E, with a few examples provided here.

Biased newspapers. Some media subdue, negate or propagate in unfair ways what they think is wrong with DP and E, and even prominent newspapers like the *New York Times* uncritically lend space to grossly misleading information. In the slipstream of Jensen's 1969 HER article, the paper thus printed a *Resolution against Racism* in 1973,

signed by more than 1,000 academics from all over the U.S. Entirely disregarding contrary evidence, the resolution declared that "...all humans have been endowed with the same intelligence". It opposed the principle of academic freedom of speech by saying that "racist" researchers who say otherwise deserve no protection under the name of academic freedom. It went as far as to actively urge liberal academics to resist "racist" research and teaching. The idea seems to be that 1,000+ signatures with no data suffice to annul established scientific research, justify censure, and provide reason for restricting academic freedom to research and teach.

Biased journals. The editorial board of the Harvard Educational Review (HER) came under considerable pressure after the publication of Jensen's 1969 HER article – and then acted in a cowardly way. First they sent out a false statement denying that they had explicitly invited Jensen to comment on race differences in IQ. Then they denied Jensen a copy of the statement and refused to sell him reprints of his own paper while everybody else could buy copies. The article was published after considerable delay in the Spring Issue, accompanied by an atypically large number (seven) of critical papers. Two positive papers were excluded in the process despite being delivered on time. The ensuing Summer-1969 HER issue was crowded with 20+ articles and papers "... masquerading as serious critiques ..." and "... likening me to Hitler" (Jensen, 1972, p. 592). Jensen was refused to make a rejoinder to the critique, and sympathizers were censored too.

Biased journalism comes in many shapes to fit the Zeitgeist of the moment. In general, many articles and books reflect unreasonable skepticism in relation to individual, sex and race differences in intelligence and personality. One way to identify this sort of bias is to look for "Balanced Journalism". Here, the journalist carefully attributes less weight to the body of all solid empirical statements about DP and E than to that of "correct" ideological reflex thinking, or attributes provocative, offensive, potentially harmful and very tentative characteristics to undisputable evidence. The ploy is to strike an unfair balance between evidence-based conclusions and ideological counter-arguments. Another

trick is to oppose representative evidence with the outcome of small unrepresentative studies that produce “better results”. The journalist may repeatedly question the motives of the scientist or induce in the reader the impression that rock-solid evidence amounts to “sheer postulates”. He may try to catch the scientist off-guard with trick questions, misrepresent statements, or take them completely out of context, as in Jensen’s and many other cases. The journalist may start and end the article by characterizing the DP or E scientists or their results, as “highly controversial”, whereas critics are presented as authoritative and their data as widely accepted. Observations of minor mean average IQ differences are often blown out of proportion on the front pages in capitals like: “WOMEN ARE MORE STUPID THAN MEN,” SAYS PROFESSOR! “RELIGIOUS PEOPLE ARE DUMB,” SAYS IQ RESEARCHER. Typically, the article then leaves out clearly stated reservations, and documented overlaps in distributions of sexual or religious scores are deliberately neglected. The well-documented observation that there are definitely more low-IQ men than women rarely gets mentioned. Empirical documentation of black-white IQ differences is described as an inexcusable attempt to claim white superiority, while the fact that some Oriental groups score significantly higher average IQ than whites is ignored. The vital difference in talking about statistical averages and specific individual IQs is often blurred, and generalization from average group IQs to individuals in the group is routinely made despite explicit warnings. Often unscientific terms, such as stupid, clever, wise, moron, smart or superior versus inferior, are substituted for precise technical terms and measures, and acknowledged reservations are lost. Inconvenient truths are often glossed over by new-speak: Low IQ people are called intellectually or culturally “challenged”. Such new-speak redefines genetically based learning deficits in terms of “lack of competence”, which by definition can be compensated, given enough economic and educational reparation. Hormonally conditioned “sex” easily morphs into socially constructed “gender” with excellent prospects for change through social intervention. This new-speak not only threatens the clarity of scientific expression but provides ample room for

promoting illusions in a wonderland where everything can change. Then there is of course the “Hamlet without the Prince” syndrome (Eysenck, 1991). This refers to the reality that DP and E papers and books are often criticized without ever mentioning the facts and arguments the writer thinks are the most important and convincing, or by contradicting arguments the author never made. Both ploys are used surprisingly often by critics. A damaging, but mostly hidden, type of censure unfolds when a journalist, long before doing an actual interview, begins pondering whether the reporting of a sex or race difference could possibly be seen as “hurting” or “offensive” to politically correct people and thus leads to accusations of promoting “Hate Speech”. The journalist may at this early point decide to self-censure and not to present even highly valuable research. More visible is the bias when the journalist, in an attempt to defuse anticipated critique, begins and ends the article with warnings that all sensible and qualified people will undoubtedly find the data or the researcher highly controversial and provocative. The journalist may further patronize readers by warning them against drawing “unwanted” conclusions. I have personally met many journalists who admit in private that they worried whether politically correct readers or their own editor would mete out some hidden hate motive or assign bad morals to the journalist (or the scientist) which could hurt their own journalistic career or future newspaper sales.

Editors and publishers often make it difficult for DP and E researchers to publish their books and articles. A typical example of this is when several large publishing houses refused to publish Jensen’s landmark 1998 book: *The g factor: The science of mental ability*. One publisher asked Jensen – after many months of reviewing – to add a further chapter on sex differences in intelligence to the manuscript. He did so (and reported no sex difference in *g*), but then the publisher nevertheless declined to publish it. After years of delay, Jensen finally had to accept an offer from a post-order company (Praeger Press). Eysenck’s 1971 book *The IQ argument* defended Jensen’s position, but the book remained almost invisible and impossible to buy due to threats to potential wholesalers and retailers, and because newspapers

refused to review it. Forty-five thousand copies of a book on race and evolution by Philippe Rushton (1995) was retracted by the publisher. A DP book, critical of social reductionism and favorable to the physical and chemical basis of human nature, was rejected by several large printing houses. One reviewer said that most psychologists would not understand this technical book on individual difference in psychoneuroendocrinology, but if they did, they would not accept its devastating critique of equality and dualism. The book was published 10 years later (Nyborg, 1994) by the same Praeger Press that published Jensen's book. It is one of the few current publishers who dare print politically incorrect and controversial DP books. Wiley even retracted a book on IQ and education by Chris Brand six weeks after its publication in 1996 (see Brand, 1996; Brand, Constaes & Kane, 2003), after public controversy. The list of difficult-to-publish or rejected books and articles is undoubtedly much longer, but the largely hidden process leaves few traces behind. One effect of this type of censoring is to leave the public in a scientific limbo.

Institutional bias and censure surface regularly through publication of politically correct "statements" by learned societies. In fact, many prominent academic societies use this suppressive tool to bias evidence and to scorn. Surprisingly often this goes unopposed even by their qualified members. The powerful *American Psychological Association* (APA) sponsored in 1969, right after Jensen's HER article, a division called *The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*. This division issued a statement (*American Psychologist*, November 1969) which was aggressively distributed to newspapers across the nation and to professional journals. Aside from completely neglecting massive data from twin, adoption, and educational studies, it declared without qualification that "... statements specifying the hereditary components of intelligence are unwarranted ..." and that "... carefully planned intervention ... can have a substantially positive influence on the performance of disadvantaged children", and it affirmed that present-day intelligence tests "... tend to be biased against black children ...". Jensen later summarized all the evidence on possible biases in a lengthy book *Bias in mental testing* (1980),

and proved that this is not the case. To my knowledge APA has never issued an *erratum*.

Such incidents leave the question whether all honest scientists ought to ask themselves five times a day in a loud voice: "Why do prominent scientific associations like APA feel forced to deny solid scientific evidence and grossly distort what DP and E researchers actually write, in their attempt to discredit them?" APA becomes pathetic in its reaffirmation of "...support for open inquiry..." Such a knee-jerk response appears obligatory and accompanies most attacks. On March 5 1970 the American Anthropological Association (AAA) provided a list of 16 resolutions in which they "...obfuscated Jensen's position, implied positions he never held, and called Jensen a 'chauvinistic, biased racist'". It stated that Jensen's article "...is not consistent with the facts of psychology, biology or anthropology..." and that "All races possess the abilities to participate fully in the democratic way of life and modern technological civilization" (see Jensen, 1972, p 42). Jensen's praiseworthy response was typical of an honest scientist: "In science the only thing that really counts is a preponderance of the facts and converging lines of evidence". Again, we notice the veritable lacuna of dissenting voices among the many thousands of members of APA and AAA. Still worse, the AAA even found itself capable of endorsing a major series of critical attacks on Jensen and IQ research, under headlines such as "Promotion of Prejudice", "Pseudo-issues", "Racialist Comeback" and "Jensen's dangerous half truth" (Brace, Gamble & Bond, 1971).

Even higher-profiled organizations like UNESCO and the UN seem prepared to promote the collective fraud. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan thus stated "ex cathedra" that intelligence "... is one commodity equally distributed among the world's people" (Hoyos & Littlejohn, 2000). No doubt his intentions were good. Perhaps he was also strategically motivated by the fact that such statements raise the public and scientific respect for organizations as they indicate that they remain within the lines of current politically accepted dogmas such as equality. However, even the UN ought to realize that polite statements are less than data, particularly so when the statements are factually wrong. There really is

no excuse for the deliberate deception of people, and no escape from the conclusion that organizations like that play an important part in the great collective fraud. In the slipstream of the Harvard president Summers case, the American Sociological Association (ASA, March 8th, 2005) issued a statement so misaligned as to claim that presently there are virtually no "... gender differences in such areas as verbal, mathematical and spatial abilities ...". and "... social and cultural assumptions and stereotypes about differences in women's and men's abilities are the cause of noticeable differences in their interests and performance." It further assured readers that "... changeable social factors, not innate biological differences, provide the most powerful explanation for the continuing gap between women's abilities and their occupational attainments". This is another sad example of a supposedly respectable professional organization which systematically feeds the public with contra-factual evidence in the service of collective academic fraud.

Doubting IQ testing and heritability. Nobel-prize winner, self-declared socialist, and molecular biologist at MIT Salvador Luria provides a good example of the common phenomenon of wilful and ill-intended ignorance about IQ measures and heritability. In an interview that Luria had with Segerstråle (2000, p. 245) about his view on Arthur Jensen's research, Luria declared that: There is "...zero ...evidence for intelligence..." and "... having expert teachers interview children we would get much more information than in IQ tests ..." and "... those tests ... are not based on any scientific background". Luria also stated that "... claims about a high heritability of IQ [are] nonsense". Like many others, Luria saw no need to check the relevant research literature. I have previously dubbed this behavior the "Lord Nelson strategy": Put the telescope to your blind eye and declare you see nothing" (Nyborg, 1972).

Intellectual corruption at modern universities. An intellectually corrupt university attacks, or make only pathetic pseudo-attempts to defend, the academic freedom of its politically incorrect researchers and their right to report unpopular results, while at the same time claims to be

a staunch defender of academic freedom. Wolf (1972) finds that in corrupt universities social scientists are forced to comply with the practices of "... presenting inconclusive data as if it were decisive; [are] lacking candor about 'touchy' subjects ...; [are] blurring or shaping definitions (segregation, discrimination, racism) to suit "propagandistic" purposes; [are] making exaggerated claims about the success of favored policies (compensatory education or school integration) while minimizing or ignoring contrary evidence. In corrupt universities researchers know that even a minor digression from politically correct ambitions may irreparably damage a professional career whereas honoring, defending, or even failing to condemn "wrong" scientists "...might stain one's reputation" (ibid, p. 156). Such universities breed intellectual corruption (Gottfredson, 1994).

Ad hominem attack and character assassin. Some individuals and institutions seem to have specialized in naming and shaming DP and E researchers with an almost obsessive hostility. One example of this is provided in the preface to a book discussing research funded by the Pioneer Fund (Lynn, 2001b). Here president Harry Weyher (1999; 2001) admits (p. xl) how flabbergasted he was to see how vicious were the *ad hominem* attacks by historian Barry Mehler [from Ferris State University in Michigan; conf. the Cattell case]. Mehler had commented on the Fund over many years by "... quotes out of context, guilt by remote association, proof by tautology, name calling, gross distortions, and the like ..." (also see Tucker, 2002). The *Southern Poverty Law Center* and the *B'nai B'rith League for Human Rights*, also mentioned earlier, provide other examples of long-term vitriolic attacks. A final example of prolonged infatuated critics is demonstrated at the www.eugenic.dk home page, managed by associate professor Morten Kjeldgaard from University of Aarhus, Denmark. Kjeldgaard initially began the attacks in response to the *Biennial Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences* taking place in 1997 at Aarhus University. Most prominent DP researchers were present, and Kjeldgaard compared their research to Ku Klux Klan activities and to what took place during Hitler's and Stalin's

worst periods. DP research obviously is humbug, fraudulent, and repressive, he said. Kjeldgaard then generalized the accusations to members of another organization – the *International Society for Intelligence Research* (see www.helmuthnyborg.dk), and was further infuriated when Nyborg reported a modest sex difference in IQ. The director of Nyborg’s psychology institute, professor Jens Mammen increased tension by calling the attention of colleagues and the media to Kjeldgaard’s homepage. The left-oriented dean and economics professor Svend Hyllegaard, who actually suspended Nyborg, then admitted that he “knew” of Nyborg’s “association” to “that Klan”, but repeatedly assured the press that this knowledge had nothing to do with his decision to suspend him. One might presume that neither knew that the university had an ongoing investigation of faculty sex bias at the university (Langberg, 2006), coinciding with the fact that Nyborg had rather inconveniently documented a largely inherited sex difference in IQ related to achievement, a result which clearly offended highly vocal feminists and equality supporters alike.

The list of telling cases and dirty tools and tricks used for demolition is much longer, but the present suffices to illustrate the mechanisms of demolition in action. It remains an important future task to find ways to break the spell and return modern universities to normal science again with respect to differential psychology and eugenics.

References

American Psychologist

(November 1969)

Pp. 1039-1041.

APA

(1997) Gold medal award for life achievement in psychological science. *American Psychologist*, 52, 797-799.

APA

(1997) <http://www.apa.org/monitor/sep97/award.html>.

ASA

(2005) <http://www.asanet.org/public/summers.html>.
(Statement about the Larry Summers case)

- Bailey, M.
(2003) *The Man Who Would Be Queen: The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism*. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press. Bailey case at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J._Michael_Bailey
- Beirich, H. & Moser, B.
(2003) Queer Science: An 'elite' cadre of scientists and journalists tries to turn back the clock on sex, gender and race. *Intelligence Report*, Southern Poverty Law Center.
<http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?sid=96&printable=1>.
- Brace, C.L., Gamble, G.R., & Bond, J.T. (Eds.)
(1971) *Race and intelligence. Anthropological Studies*, No. 8. Washington: American Anthropological Association.
- Brand, C.R.
(1996) *The g factor: General intelligence and its implications*. Chichester, UK.: Wiley & Sons (withdrawn, but a revised (2001) version is available free online at:
<http://www.douance.org/qi/brandtgf.htm>.
- Brand, C.R., Constales, D. & Kane, H.
(2003) Why ignore the g factor? – Historical considerations, Chapter 21 in H. Nyborg (ed.). *The scientific study of general intelligence: Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen*. Oxford: Elsevier/Pergamon, pp. 502-529.
- Burks, B.
(1928) The relative influence of nature and nurture upon mental development: A comparative study of foster parent-foster child resemblance and true parent-true child resemblance. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1*, 27, 219-316.
- Carey, B.
(July 5, 2005) Straight, Gay or Lying? Bisexuality Revisited. *New York Times*.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/05/health/05sex.html>.
- Charlton, B.G.
(2008) First a hero of science and now a martyr to science: the James Watson affair –political correctness crushes free scientific communication. *Medical Hypotheses*, 70, 1077-1080.
- Charlton, B.H.
(2009) Clever sillies: Why high IQ people tend to be deficient in common sense. *Medical Hypotheses*, 73, 867-870.
- Crew, F.A.E., Darlington, C.D., Haldane, J.B.S., et al.
(1939) Social biology and population improvement. *Nature*, 144, 521-522.
- Dreger, A.
(2008) The Controversy Surrounding The Man Who Would Be Queen: A Case History of the Politics of Science, Identity, and Sex in the Internet Age. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37, 366-421.

- http://www.bioethics.northwestern.edu/faculty/-work/dreger/controversy_tmwwbq.pdf
- Erlenmeyer-Kimling, L. & Jarvik, L.F.
 (1963) Genetics and Intelligence: A Review. *Science*, 142, No. 3598, pp. 1477-1479. Doi: 10.1126/science.142.3598.1477.
- Eysenck, H.J.
 (1971) *The IQ argument*. New York: Library Press.
- Eysenck, H.J.
 (1991) Introduction: Science and Racism (p. 1-23). In Roger Pearson (ed), *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*. Washington: Scott-Townsend Publishers.
- Eysenck, H.J.
 (1995) Personal communication.
- Fisher, R.A.
 (1929) *The genetical theory of natural selection*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fletcher, R.
 (1991) *Science, ideology and the media: the Cyril Burt Scandal*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Galton, F.
 (1883) *Inquiries into human faculty and its development*. London: Dent.
- Garrett, H.E.
 (1961) The equalitarian dogma. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 4, 480-484.
- Glad, J.
 (2006) *Future human evolution: Eugenics in the twenty-first century*. Schuylkill Haven, PA: Hermitage Publishers.
- Globe and Mail*
 (March, 8, 1989)
 Western criticized for policy on Rushton.
- Gottfredson, L.S.
 (1994) Egalitarian fiction and collective fraud. *Society*, 31 (3), Whole No. 209.
- Gottfredson, L. S.
 (2000) Equal potential: A collective fraud. *Society*, 37(5), 19-28.
- Herrnstein, R. & Murray, C.
 (1994) *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hilts, P.J.
 (1997) Award for controversial psychologist postponed. *New York Times*, August 15.
- Hoyos, C. & Littlejohn, M.
 (2000, April 4th.)
 Annan draws up a road map to guide UN. *Financial Times*, p. 16.
- Hunt, M.
 (1999) *The new know-nothings: the political foes of the scientific study of human nature*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

- Huxley, J.S.
(1936) Eugenics and society. *Eugenics Review*, 28, 11-31.
- Jensen, A.R.
(1969) How much can be boost IQ and scholastic achievement. *Harvard Educational Review*, (Preprint Series No. 2), 1-123.
- Jensen, A.R.
(1972) *Genetics and education*. London: Methuen (New York: Harper & Row).
- Jensen, A.R.
(1980) *Bias in mental testing*. New York: Free Press.
- Jensen, A.R.
(1992) Scientific fraud or false accusations? The case of Cyril Burt. In D.J. Miller, & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Research fraud in the behavioral and biomedical sciences* pp. 97-124). New York; Wiley.
- Jensen, A.R.
(1998) *The g factor. The science of mental ability*. Westport, CT.: Praeger.
- Joynson, R.B.
(1989) *The Burt Affair*. London: Routledge.
- Langberg, K.
(2006) Gender-gap and pipeline-metaphor in the public research sector. Main case: Universities in Denmark. Working paper from The Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy 2006/1. Aarhus: University of Aarhus, Denmark.
- Leahy, A.M.
(1935) Nature-nurture and intelligence. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 17, 236-308.
- Lynn, R.
(2006) *Race differences in intelligence: An evolutionary analysis*. Augusta, GA.: Washington Summit Publishers.
- Lynn, R.
(2001a) *Eugenics: A reassessment*. Westport, CT; Praeger.
- Lynn, R.
(2001b) *The science of human diversity: A history of the Pioneer Fund*. New York: University Press of America.
- Lynn, R., & Vanhanen, T.
(2002) *IQ and the wealth of nations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- McHugh, P.
(2010) *Immigration and the SPLC: How the Southern Poverty Law Center invented a smear, served La Raza, manipulated the press, and duped its donors*. Center for Immigration Studies:
<http://www.cis.org./print/immigration-splc>.
- Malloy, J.
(2008) James Watson tells the inconvenient truth: faces the consequences. *Medical Hypotheses*, 70, 1081-1091.
- New York Times
(October 28, 1973)
Resolution against Racism (p. 211).

- Nyborg, H.
(1972) *Psykologi og genetik: Psychogenetik*. København: Dansk Psykologisk Forlag (in Danish).
- Nyborg, H.
(1994) *Hormones, sex, and society: The science of physiology*. Westport, CT.: Praeger.
- Nyborg, H.
(2003) The sociology of psychometric and bio-behavioral sciences: A case study of destructive social reductionism and collective fraud in 20th century academia. Chapter 20 in H. Nyborg (2003, Ed.). *The scientific study of general intelligence: Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen*. Oxford: Elsevier/Pergamon, pp. 441-502.
- Nyborg, H.
(2005) Sex-related differences in general intelligence *g*, brain size, and social status. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 497-509.
- Pearson, R.
(1991/1997) *Race, intelligence and bias in academe*. Washington, DC: Scott-Townsend.
- Rushton, J.P.
(1988) Race differences in behavior: A review and evolutionary analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 1009-1024.
- Rushton, J.P.
(1995) *Race, evolution, and behavior: A life history perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Rushton, J.P. & Jensen, A.R.
(2005) Thirty years of research on race differences in cognitive ability. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 11, 235-294.
- Rushton, J.P. & Jensen, A.R.
(2008) James Watson's most inconvenient truth: Race realism and the moralistic fallacy. Editorial in *Medical Hypotheses*, 71, 629-640.
- Segerstråle, U.
(2000) *Defenders of the truth: The battle for science in the sociobiology debate and beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skodak, M., & Skeels, H.M.
(1949) A final follow-up of one hundred adopted children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 75, 84-125.
- Tanggaard, M.
(2003) Til venstre for midten (To the left of the middle). *Magisterbladet*, 11, 14 (in Danish).
- Tucker, W. H.
(2002) *The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund*. Urbana, IL.: University of Illinois Press.
- Weyher, H.F.
(1999) The Pioneer Fund, the Behavioral Sciences, and the Media's False Stories. *Intelligence*, 26, (4), 310-336.

Weyher, H.F.

- (2001) My years with the Pioneer Fund. In Richard Lynn: *The science of human diversity: A history of the Pioneer Fund*. New York: University Press of America.

Whitney, G.

- (1997) Raymond B. Cattell and the Fourth Inquisition. *The Mankind Quarterly*, vol. 38: 1&2, Fall/Winter, p. 99-124.

Tucker, W.H.

- (2002) *Conclusion: Pioneer or Pamphleteer, The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund*, University of Illinois Press.

Wilson, R.S.

- (1983) The Louisville Twin Study: Developmental synchronies in behaviour. *Child Development*, 54, 298-316.

Wolff, E.P.

- (1972) Civil rights and social science data. *Race*, XIV (2), 155-182.

www.helmuthnyborg.dk

homepage for Helmuth Nyborg.

www.eugenik.dk

homepage for Morten Kjeldgaard.