

Race and intelligence part 2

Intro. Hi, I'm Jim; I'm Erik; I'm Jo and this is Speaking of Race

Jo: Hey, guys, last time we left off at this really interesting moment. The guys involved in creating the Intelligence Quotient (IQ) and measuring it through tests were beginning to undercut their own work--people like Brigham and Terman. It almost seemed like intelligence testing was going to die off during the 1930s and 1940s. What are we doing here with another intelligence episode?!

Jim: This is only episode #2 -- and there will be more -- because intelligence testing didn't die off, unfortunately. In fact, it returned with a vengeance in the 20th century and became even more central than it had been in the discussion of race. That's what we are building to in this series. Last time we started with the folk notion of intelligence and race with Thomas Jefferson claiming that people of African descent just couldn't ascend to the intellectual heights of someone like ... well ... him. That sort of racism regarding intelligence only sharpened over the twentieth century -- it didn't go away.

Erik: Our story last time jumped from England to France to the USA to follow intelligence testing itself. Today, we're going to pop back in right at that moment where we took the focus off of the UK in the first decade of the twentieth century. I think we should say right at the outset that listeners who expect us to talk about white versus black intelligence scores and the science behind that in this episode might get confused about what we're doing. The differences *between* racial groups was not the focus of many of the figures we're talking about today. Instead, they usually focused on intelligence *within* the group that we would usually call "white" and about purifying the intelligence of whites. But their work fit very easily into what we will discuss more next time -- differences in intelligence between groups. ... So, with that being said, we have to return to the work of Francis Galton and Charles Spearman about increasing mental degeneracy in Britain that we discussed last time. By 1904, an alarmed British government set up the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-Minded to study just how bad it was getting in the Empire.

Jo: There's that term again, feeble-minded! You know, it occurred to me after the last episode that we never defined what they meant by that. Any intel you can give us here?

Erik: Here's how the Royal Commission defined it in their 1908 report: "[P]ersons who may be capable of earning a living under favourable circumstances, but are incapable from mental defect, existing from birth or from an early age: (1) of competing on equal terms with their normal fellows, or (2) of managing themselves and their affairs with ordinary prudence." Specifically, the Royal Commission hoped to identify: "idiots and epileptics, ... [and] imbecile, feeble-minded, or defective persons." In other words, they were trying to capture more high functioning and non-criminal mentally ill people than were covered by the earlier "Lunacy Laws" in 1886 and 1904. (Thomson, 1998)

Jim: I can see how this was inspired by Galton and his belief that intelligence is heritable across families.

Erik: Absolutely. The 1908 Royal Commission report estimated that about half of a percent of the British population was “mentally defective” -- that means hundreds of thousands of people that were not in a position to care for themselves or earn a living. Immediately a new group formed to push the British government to do something about this. Following the initiative of Francis Galton way back in 1883, they called themselves the “Eugenic Education Society.”

Jo: Did you guys know this organization still exists?! They didn't change their name until 1989! And they now just call themselves The Galton Institute... so of course they're not fooling anyone.

Jim: Do they still advocate for eugenics?

Jo: You know, I could not figure this out based on the very little published stuff on their site-- which probably means, yes, they do. Some people associated with the institute have been accused in popular media of holding racist ideas. There's a fair amount of hand-waving on their site about the dark eugenic history out of which the institute arose, but that's about it. The rest is very, very vague--including what it is they actually DO.

Erik: Back in 1908, the Eugenic Education Society saw the Royal Commission report as evidence that Britain was becoming a “nation of degenerates.” But the British government initially reacted to the findings of the Royal Commission in the opposite way. They passed a progressive program of social welfare and a first-of-its-kind graduated income and inheritance tax—go figure. Eugenicists (many of whom would be affected by these taxes) got angry. In 1910, the EES sent a delegation to petition the new Prime Minister Asquith in person to use some of the new tax money to gradually eliminate the unfit, lest these new social entitlements lead to still higher taxes.

Jim: Huh, doesn't sound all that different from arguments against welfare in the US today

Jo: It's not! In 2008 State Representative John Labruzzo of Louisiana proposed to pay poor people \$1000 to get sterilized and provide tax incentives for wealthier people to have babies. He even said--get ready for this, guys--so when he announced the plan he was preemptively responding to critiques he expected to get, he said: “The black community will say this is some sort of race-based genocide. ... They'll try to say these people are incapable of making such a decision when their life is in turmoil. That if you're dangling money in front of them, of course they'll make a decision that will affect them negatively. My argument would be if they're incapable of making a decision whether to cease reproduction are they capable of raising multiple children to be good citizens? And if they're incapable, maybe Social Services should take their children.”

Erik: That's uncannily similar to what was going on in Britain a century ago! I swear, the old adage that if those who don't learn from the past are doomed to repeat it sounds so true sometimes.

Jo: This hurts your little historian's heart, doesn't it?

Erik: -- joke --

Anyway, so the Eugenic Education Society sends this group to the new Prime Minister in 1910. They don't convince the Prime Minister. But they did convince someone else who would be a powerful ally down the road: the brand new Home Secretary (a powerful position in the PM's cabinet) -- a man named **Winston Churchill**. Churchill would become a cheerleader for the eugenic movement for decades. For two years, debates about what to do with the "degenerate" raged in the press and even on the floor of Parliament. Chief among the pro-eugenics side was **Major Leonard Darwin**, eighth child of Charles Darwin. Major Darwin and the eugenicists argued that the government should incarcerate and sterilize the "feeble-minded" rather than financially supporting them. But he was resisted by **Josiah Wedgwood IV** (who, if I'm counting right was LD's 2nd cousin).

Jo: Wedgwood, like the china! We've made that joke before on this podcast! Remember?

Erik: Yes. It's not a joke. That's the Wedgwood family.

Jim: But it's also the Darwin family! Josiah Wedgwood the first was grandfather to Charles Darwin AND Francis Galton.

Jo: Sounds like the the Darwins, Wedgwoods, and Galtons were a little inbred.

Jim: But THIS Josiah Wedgwood was the fourth one, and he was a bit of an iconoclast. He supported the suffragettes and championed Indian independence and was a big Zionist, among other things, and he fought this particular law because he thought it was way too authoritarian.

Erik: But the wind was behind the eugenicists. Leonard Darwin presided over the First International Congress of Eugenics in London in 1912. With all that momentum, they helped bring a Mental Deficiency Bill to the floor of Parliament to "prevent the increasing propagation of half-witted people."

Jim: Wedgwood tried to hold off the bill. He filibustered the reading of the bill by giving 150 separate speeches. He apparently was only able to keep going because people kept giving him chocolate.

Jo: I think he's my hero now.

Jim: You would love him.

Jo: Ya, I would totally do that.

Erik: What are you talking about -- that's basically a Tuesday in Jo's office.

Jim: Anyway, after two full days of speaking and eating nothing but chocolate, his voice finally gave out, as I'm sure mine would have too. The **Mental Deficiency Act** passed.

Jo: ARGH! In the end, the chocolate and talking very British for a long time just didn't do it...?!

Jim: Sadly, no. But Wedgwood was at least successful in getting Parliament to remove mandatory sterilization from the Mental Deficiency Act—so the UK never became like the USA or, later, Germany, who did legalize mandatory sterilization (Woodhouse 1982). And if you don't know how that story went ... well, maybe we should return to that story one day.

Jo: So, that's a lot of background. What should we take away from all of that? And how does it connect up with Brigham and Yerkes and Terman and the guys we talked about last time?

Erik: The Mental Deficiency Act of 1913 created an immediate need: to find a reliable way to identify the feeble-minded before the British race degenerated!

Jo: Ah! Intelligence testing to keep the race pure!

Jim: Yes! And now enters one of our chief characters: a psychologist named **Cyril Burt**. Burt had grown up accompanying his dad, who was a physician of the rich and famous, on his medical rounds. One of Burt's father's patients was the confusingly-named Darwin Galton. Darwin Galton was the brother of **Francis Galton**. Burt became fascinated with Francis Galton's notions of heritable intelligence and race degeneration. And, as a psychologist, he also became fascinated with **Charles Spearman's** notion of general intelligence, or "*g*." Burt made his life's mission to demonstrate that intelligence was fixed and heritable. And that it was tied to class and race.

Jo: Little *g*! There's someone else we talked about last time.

Jim: Burt published a 1909 paper using Spearman's "*g*" and a new-ish methodology: "factor analysis."

Jo: I sometimes use factor analysis in my own research. It involves the extraction of small numbers of independent factors from a large group of intercorrelated measurements.

Jim: So just like Spearman molested -- i mean "tested" -- school children on the English island of Guernsey, Cyril Burt studied different social classes of children in British schools and supposedly found that upper-class children were smarter and that the broad differences in *g*-intelligence among classes reflect "innate" differences.

Erik: Spearman read Burt's article and wrote to him. The two began a many-year-long correspondence that ended up changing the face of intelligence testing and British education.

Jo: Wow, you think so? That's a big claim. How so?

Erik: Burt used his connections to Spearman and the Darwin and Galton families to get a plum research position in London. After the Mental Deficiency Act passed early in 1913, eugenicists pressured the London County Council to have Burt be their chief feeble-mindedness inquisitor. Spearman let Burt use his laboratory space at University College London. (As an aside, at UCL Burt met **Karl Pearson**. Pearson was a disciple of Galton and the first Chair of Eugenics in the world who had called for the British to take active measures to prevent "race suicide" by establishing immigration restriction and outlawing interracial marriages.)

Jim: But Burt didn't stop there. At the close of World War 1, he was put in charge of the Institute of Industrial Psychology, a foundation paid for by the Carnegie Trust--

Jo: Oh, a lot of Carnegie money went into funding eugenics in the USA, too.

Jim: --right. Burt was charged with surveying laborers across the UK. Part of his job was to come up with tests that would find the "worthless worker" as well as alcoholics and criminals. From this position, Burt was able to perfect his intelligence tests and promote the notion of general intelligence, even while the American intelligence testers that we talked about last time began to question their own tests and the notion of a single general intelligence. As part of the Eugenics Education Society, Burt also published in the *Eugenic Review*, including his work on twins.

Jo: So that's how Burt changed the face of intelligence testing, then?

Erik: Well, that's part of it. But wait there's more! Burt replaced Spearman in 1931 as head of University College London's psychology department. In 1942 Burt became president of the British Psychological society. And in 1946 Burt became the first psychologist EVER to be knighted for his work on intelligence testing among school children.

Jim: Nazi psychologists had conducted many twin studies during World War II. And even though most scientists steered clear of the Nazi stuff after the war, the studies really caught Burt's attention, since he had done many of them himself. He supervised **Hans Eysenck** who later directed **Arthur Jensen's** post-doc. As a result, **Burt's** work ended up being the primary foundation upon which **Jensen** built his case for the connection between race and intelligence, in 1969. Jensen is the one I mentioned back in the beginning of our first intelligence episode, remember? It was his work that the Students for a Democratic Society were protesting that day in '69 when I was tear-gassed and shot at after my handball class.

Jo: Handball. Haha.

Erik: Admit it, you've been practicing handball ever since we made fun of you for not knowing what it was last time.

Jo: for our cohost tournament face-off, yes. Where i will crush you.

Jim: Ahem. ANYWAY...Burt was statistically sophisticated, but he was also finding essentially what he wanted to find: that nature always trumps nurture.

Erik: There was a ton of research, but you're right--the take-home point of most of it was that intelligence is primarily genetically determined and is better in some racial or socio-economic groups than others.

Jim: --and there was always at least an implicit notion that intelligence of society could be improved by controlling the reproduction of not-so-smart people. These nature-over-nurture assertions were preached at Eugenics Education Society meetings (which many of these guys attended) and by their friends, some of whom were prominent geneticists (and eugenicists).

Jo: Geneticists? I thought the story about biology in the twentieth century was that geneticists separated themselves from the eugenicists?

Erik: You're right. That's how the histories are told. But they're wrong. Take **Ronald A. Fisher** for example. He's the British guy usually credited with demonstrating that Mendelian genetics and Darwinian selection could work together -- the so-called *neo-Darwinian Synthesis* that rules the day in the life sciences. But he was an ardent eugenicist. And even closer to Burt was **C. D. Darlington**. Darlington worked with Fisher and Burt to promote the view that there are distinct racial groups even in humans and that traits of those racial groups, like intelligence and criminality, are genetically fixed. In fact, Darlington and Fisher created the genetics journal *Heredity* in part to counteract left-wing ideas about the environment and culture impacting the permanence of genetics that they thought were creeping into Western biology and undermining their eugenic views.

Jo: One thing I think is really amazing here is that ALL of these figures were considered some of the best scientists in Britain in the early to mid 20th century, isn't that right?

Jim and Erik: Yes.

Jo: I mean, none of them were marginal figures. They had large public and professional forums in which to promote their ideas. And they generated lots of students.

Jim: Burt himself would become highly decorated for his twin studies, even becoming an honorary president of the MENSA society in 1960 (because years earlier (in 1946) he had made a comment on the radio about how there ought to be an exclusive society for geniuses).

Jo: But I think even kind of knowing that prominent figures were behind the conjunction between race and intelligence stuff, I was shocked that Raymond Cattell was among them.

Jim: Why don't you tell us about him now?

Jo: **Raymond Cattell** was an incredibly famous British psychologist whose work still resonates in the field a lot today. He's best known for his foundational work in the psychology of personality and temperament, including developing early models of the factors that serve as the building blocks of personality. Have you guys heard of the Big 5?

Jim: Is that half of the big 10?

Jo: The big five, also called the five-factor model, is a really mainstream psychological framework for understanding personality based on these five key traits. You can even take online quizzes to learn more about your personality based on them. Cattell didn't come up with the Big 5, but he did do the pioneering work here that would eventually lead to it. Cattell was also a pioneer in psychometrics--which is just a fancy word for the theory and technique of psychological measurement. I knew of Cattell because in my work on mental health, I've used some of the statistical methods he pioneered, like factor analysis, for testing the function of psychological symptom scales I work on developing. I had no idea before this episode that he had this other dark side to his work.

Erik: What did you discover?

Jo: Well, to start with, Cattell was a very active member of the Eugenic Education Society in London alongside Cyril Burt and others. I guess it makes sense what Jim said earlier that he was influenced by Burt -- because he was in the more exclusive and somewhat more secretive eugenics groups alongside him. While Cattell became an incredibly famous psychologist whose work we still cite today, it was well known (except not to me and, I would guess, a lot of younger scholars) that he published all this racist and anti-semitic stuff. One of his most widely cited early works was *Psychology and Social Progress*, written in 1933. And, looking through it again, I just cringe. Erik, you get the honors...

Erik: Ahem. "Suppose, as may well be the case, that one of these races is naturally courageous, self-sacrificing and enterprising and the other less so. The group will continue to prosper owing to the activities of inventors and explorers of the first race, who, as is generally the rule, will not pass on the usual number of children to the next generation. The nation will be successful in war because the same race has actively responded to the call to arms and to self-sacrifice. Throughout these activities, this first race will on an average be giving more to the group than it can itself recoup. Eventually only the second race will inherit the group advantages acquired largely by the first racial compound. Then like a huge parasite which has devoured its host, will the nation be bereft of all the qualities that gave it power, remain a monstrous frustration of evolution, a biological abortion able in virtue of its inherited wealth, to do untold damage to neighboring races naturally more capable. The hatred and abhorrence which many

peoples feel for the Jewish (and to some extent Mongolian) practice of living in other nations, instead of forming an independent, self-sustained group of their own, comes from a deep intuitive feeling that somehow it is not 'playing the game.' Because our unbiologically-minded civilization cannot perceive or appreciate any intellectual causes for these feelings they are readily branded as 'prejudice' by would-be intellectuals."

Jo: In 1937, Cattell left the UK for America. But his views only sharpened. From his new post at Columbia University, he wrote *The Fight for Our National Intelligence* (1937). He hadn't been in the US for more than a few months, but he was already promoting the same notions that people of lower intelligence had more babies than smart people. He was worried that his new country was going to flood schools and, consequently, society with low achievers.

Erik: Just like Labruzzo's policy in 2008.

Jim: And, more pointedly, like some German doctors were already promoting all across the Third Reich at exactly the same time.

Jo: I feel like this just circulates as common knowledge in the US even today. I remember when i had my last baby, my obstetrician was asking me if i was going to have more babies, and i was like, 'Heck no.' then he started talking about how smart educated people like me need to have more kids, because dumb people are out-reproducing "us."

Jim: a present-day Cattell-ist!

Jo: Totally.

Erik: So, wait. This Cattell dude totally sounds like a Nazi doctor in the making. But I had heard of him before for a very different reason -- didn't he win some huge psychology award in the 1990s?

Jo: Well, it's complicated -- [a historian's answer]. Cattell continued to develop this idea that some groups of people were destined to take over others, and that the low achievers would eventually be phased out. He wrote a book in 1987 outlining the contours of a new "religion" he called Beyondism that was devoted to identifying and following the ethical and cultural principles that would allow its followers to be the ones who took over.

Jim or Erik: whoa, that's....trippy.

Jo: In 1997, the APA named him for a lifetime achievement award for "among the very small handful of people in this century who have most influenced the shape of psychology as a science." However, Barry Mehler, a historian of science --

Erik: -- yay! --

Jo: -- and founder of Institute for the Study of Academic Racism. Mehler reached out to a number of others, including Rutgers U psychologist, William H. Tucker. This group wrote an open letter to the APA protesting the award based on Cattell's long history of racism and anti-Semitism. People defended Cattell by saying that his personal views were a product of their time and that they weren't of the same public prominence as his scientific views. But Tucker and Mehler's group argued that, in truth, Cattell was not mostly a "typical" psychologist with a few naughty little background racist views. Instead they asserted: "These views on eugenics *are* his scientific views. Cattell believes that his scientific work has provided the foundation for his politics. He has built an organization, the Beyondist Trust, to promote these views."

Jim: So what happened? -- also once again I'm glad I went into anthropology instead of psychology!

Jo: In the middle of all this, Cattell issued his own open letter saying that he "abhorred racism," then he actually withdrew himself for consideration for the award. He was 92 at the time, and he died just a few months later. There's still debate today about how racist Cattell actually was, and Tucker wrote a whole book about it (Tucker, 2010). Tucker remains one of the main people opposing Cattell's legacy in the US.

Erik: We can't leave people with the idea that none of this stuff was opposed in the UK or elsewhere.

Jim: Right! I've been itching to talk about **Ashley Montagu**. Ashley Montagu was an anthropologist, a student of Franz Boas—

Jo: --Who we really need to talk about more. Boas keeps coming up on the podcast, and we keep saying we are going to talk about him!--

Erik: All right, all right! But briefly!

Jim: Franz Boas was a German who came to the US at the beginning of the twentieth century and became a vocal opponent of all the racist science that was going on in anthropology at the time.

Erik: Anthropologists often call Boas a founder of cultural anthropology--despite that he wasn't a cultural anthropologist at all. But he taught SO MANY of the most important American cultural anthropologists of the twentieth-century that we historians can let that technicality slide.

Jo: Most importantly, he promoted the idea of "cultural relativism," or the notion that societies need to be viewed with a clear understanding of their own values and priorities, not just judged based on the values and priorities of other societies.

Jim: So Montagu was a fascinating foil to the Cyril Burts and Raymond Cattells--not to mention the Hooton's and Coons--of the world because he was originally trained in psychology (while also studying anthropology) by Charles Spearman!

Jo: "Lil' g"!

Jim: He also took a course with Karl Pearson--Galton's disciple and a professor of eugenics at University College London. But even as an undergraduate, Montagu was becoming skeptical about the conclusions of his professors. In 1926, he wrote an article criticizing the sloppy correlations between race and intelligence -- especially between whites and blacks. By the 1930s, he had emigrated to the US to work on a Ph.D. at Columbia with Boas and his student, Ruth Benedict. Quickly he became convinced that the entanglement of physical characteristics (like skin color) with behavioral characteristics (such as achievement in school) was the key problem with the social implications of a category like "race." By 1939, he was taking this to the public with a radio address where he said,

Erik: "It is an established fact of science that the physical difference existing between the races of mankind are not associated with any peculiar mental differences" (Sperling 2000).

Jim: But the problem is that regular people don't understand the science and so use the concept of race improperly. Over 30 years later Montagu was a common guest on the Tonight Show with Johnny Carson where he continued to bring anthropological ideas to a lay audience. Here's a quote from 1962 where he laments the common man's misunderstanding of race:

Erik: "The man-on-the-street uses the term [race] in much the same way as it was used by his 19th century compeer. Here physical type, heredity, blood, culture, nation, personality, intelligence, and achievement are all stirred together to make the omelet which is the popular conception of 'race.'" (Montagu, 1962)

Jo: I know Montagu best for what was probably his most famous work, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth*.

Jim: You're right, Jo. Montagu published *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* during the War--that's WW II for you youngsters, in 1942 -- right when the Nazi's were misusing race in some of the ways he feared the most. It was a comprehensive book supporting his anti-race stance through the discoveries of modern science. At the close of the War in 1945, he published a study going back into the Army's WW I intelligence tests. Not surprisingly, he showed that the racial analysis of the Alpha and Beta tests was horribly flawed.

Jo: The Beta Test is the one with all the crazy pictures like of two white people playing tennis on a court with no net and you're supposed to draw the net, or the pen knife with the missing implement? The one I was complaining about last time?

Jim: Right. Montagu found that the Black-White differences indicated by the tests were best explained by socio-economic differences; i.e., Northern Blacks and Whites did better than Southern Blacks and Whites so social situation was more important than race. Montagu did a lot of path breaking anti-racialist work. Still, not everyone supported him. He was adamantly opposed on race by Hooton, father of American physical anthropology, and many of his students. Montagu also carried on a long-term argument over the use of the term race with Theodosius Dobzhansky starting in the 1940s.

Erik: Ah! Dobzhansky! He was one of the most famous fruit-fly geneticists of the twentieth century and someone who helped rewrite America's biology curriculum in the 1960s.

Jim: In spite of their differences, Montagu and Dobzhansky were good friends and worked together to oppose arguments about genetic causes of racial differences in intelligence test scores. This can be seen in their 1947 *Science* article where they take the position that natural selection has worked in human evolution to enhance behavioral flexibility, making us a highly educable species--in other words, our intellect is not genetically wired. They felt that differences in achievement on tests or in school were due to differences in the environment--as Montagu had argued in 1945. The same position is seen in the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race, written by Montagu and signed by Dobzhansky. These two collaborated many more times opposing racist views of intelligence.

Jo: We're going to have to wrap this up soon. Clearly we're going to need like seven more episodes on the race & intelligence stuff.

Jim: I don't know about seven, but we need several more. But before we go, I want to circle back around to the story I told last time about the students demonstrating against Arthur Jensen when I was an undergrad at Berkeley. And Erik -- you have to finish the Cyril Burt story!

Jo: Wait, there's more?!?

Erik: Believe it or not!

Jim: Yeah, while Ashley Montagu was railing against genetic race differences in intelligence, the story on the other side of the pond seemed to be unravelling, too.

Erik: After the 1930s, Burt toned down his open support of eugenics, but he still promoted many of the same views in his mainstream psychological work. Burt became something of a household name in mid-century psychology largely because of his study of monozygotic twins reared apart from one another.

Jo: The twin studies! These were the ones where twins who didn't know each other had all these uncanny similarities, right?

Erik: Supposedly. From 1943 to 1966 Burt published a whole series of papers using these twins—53 sets of twins in all—as his subject population. Not surprisingly, given his earlier eugenic past, Burt concluded in all of these studies that heredity plays a much more prominent role in the development of intellectual ability than does the environment. And, in fact, the British educational system altered in part because of his findings. Just after Burt’s death in 1971, Princeton University psychologist **Leon Kamin** carefully examined all of Burt’s findings in those twin studies and became very skeptical about how they were handled. He then went back through this whole history of race and IQ that we’ve been discussing these last two episodes-- back to the Army tests and Goddard and Yerkes. It all seemed deeply flawed. And Burt’s work was just the most egregious modern example. Kamin asserted that the whole thing was a sham

Jo: So it sounds like the 1930s all over again. By the 1970s, the scientific argument tying race and intelligence together seemed to be retreating.

Erik: Ya. The argument that intelligence is a heritable trait like hair color seemed to be hardly supported.

Jim: Ah, but you didn’t mention that **Arthur Jensen** was also involved! Jensen agreed with Kamin that Burt’s number of 53 monozygotic twins raised apart seemed WAY too good to be true. Jensen had this to say in 1974:

“It is almost as if Burt regarded the actual data as merely an incidental backdrop for the illustration of the theoretical issues..., which, to him, seemed always to hold the center of the stage.” This had no impact, however, on Jensen’s genetic view of intelligence.

While the SDS at Berkeley were protesting his racist conclusions that blacks were less intelligent than whites because of their genes, they probably would have burned his office down if they had known that he created a foundation to accept funding from the highly racist organization, The Pioneer Fund--a group that we’ll talk about in the next episode.

Some resources:

- Cattell, R. B. (1933). *Psychology and social progress: Mankind and destiny from the standpoint of a scientist*. London: C.W. Daniel.
- Dobzhansky, T. and M. F. Ashley Montagu. (1947). Natural Selection and the Mental Capacities of Mankind. *Science*, 105(2736), 587-90.
- Jensen, A. R. (1974). Kinship correlations reported by Sir Cyril Burt. *Behavior Genetics*, 4(1), 1-28.
- Kamin, Leon J. (1974). The Science and Politics of I.Q. *Social Research* 41(3), 387-425.
- For those who never saw him, here's Montagu talking anthropology, although nothing to do with race: [Ashley Montagu on the Tonight Show with Johnny Carson \(Sept. 13, 1974\)](#).
- Montagu, Ashley. (1962). The Concept of Race. *American Anthropologist* 64(5), 919-28.
- Montagu, Ashley, ed. (1974). *Race and IQ*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Montagu, M.F.A. (1942). *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Montagu, MF Ashley. (1945). Intelligence of Northern Negroes and Southern Whites in the First World War. *The American Journal of Psychology* 58(2), 161-88.
- Sperling, Susan. (2000). Ashley Montagu (1905–1999). *American Anthropologist* 102(3), 583-88.
- Thompson, Matthew. (1998). *The Problem of Mental Deficiency: Eugenics, Democracy, and Social Policy in Britain, c.1870-1959*. New York: Oxford-Clarendon Press.
- Thomson, M. (1998). *The problem of mental deficiency: eugenics, democracy, and social policy in Britain, c. 1870-1959*.
- Tucker, W. H. (2010). *The Cattell controversy: Race, science, and ideology*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.