

## Race and intelligence part 3

Erik: Today we are on a mission.

Jim: We need to get to Arthur Jensen, Charles Murray, and *The Bell Curve!*

Jo: True, but last time we said we'd pick up by talking about the organization that funded Arthur Jensen's research, the Pioneer Fund. So, we need to talk about this shadowy research fund and the role that it continues to play.

Jim: This is true.

Jo: But first we need to address something we said on our last episode. We sort of raked psychology over the coals for its role in racist intelligence testing, some of which is still done today.

Jim: Yup I sure did--and I meant to!

Jo: But psychology has been the source of some really important anti-racist work, too, including people like William H. Tucker, who we mentioned last time...

Jim: Jefferson Fish, too.

Jo: Yes, and we need to acknowledge that foundational work in understanding how prejudice works, for instance Brian Nosek's research on implicit bias--that comes out of psychology too. So I don't want our listeners to get the impression that the field deserves a bad rap.

Erik: Ya, that's fair. Anyway, let's see, when we started this series on race and I.Q.--

Jim: -- sometime earlier this century --

Erik: -- we talked about the origins of intelligence testing in the UK and US including the concept of I.Q. itself. And then, last episode, we touched early 20th century eugenics in Britain and how British psychologists including Cyril Burt and Raymond Cattell kept intelligence testing alive to further their eugenic and racist aims. And we brought up one individual in particular, Ashley Montagu, who pushed back against the correlation between race and I.Q. So we have a few of the major pieces of the puzzle out there now and can start putting things together.

Jim: The next puzzle piece is the Pioneer Fund. To understand the importance of this fund to American racism, you have to start with it's founder and funder, Snidely Whiplash, I mean Wickliffe Draper. Draper came from a prominent Massachusetts manufacturing family.

Jo: How prominent?

Jim: The company was the largest of its kind in the world and one of Draper's uncles was a congressman and ambassador to Italy and another was the governor of Massachusetts.

Jo: That checks out. (pretty prominent)

Jim: When he inherited the family fortune in 1923, Draper decided he wanted to use the money to promote eugenic science and policy.

Jo: What'd he do?

Jim: He first got together with Charles Davenport, the director of the Eugenics Record Office in New York State, to fund a study of miscegenation--that is, interracial reproduction--in Jamaica, of all places.

Erik: Oh, is this the origin of Davenport and Steggerda's book *Race Crossing in Jamaica*?

Jim: That's it--Draper's money, supported Steggerda's field work and Davenport's pseudo-analysis that tried to show children of interracial couples as intellectually inferior. After Draper incorporated the Pioneer Fund in 1937, he recruited Harry Laughlin, Davenport's second in command to serve as its first president.

Erik: We should talk about Laughlin more in a future episode. He was key in American anti-immigration legislation in the 1920s, and his lobbying inspired Nazi physicians to draft the Nuremberg Codes.

Jim: Laughlin had serious Nazi connections which he used to introduce Draper to high-level Nazis in the 1930s, which led to Draper paying for the distribution of fascist white supremacist literature throughout the US in the run-up to World War 2, even swaying some Congressmen.

Jo: But then the War came, right? --

Jim: --- that's World War 2 to you youngsters --

Erik: -- Deja vú --

Jo: --and Americans saw the horrors of race science played out in the Holocaust. Isn't this when Ashley Montagu started his anti-race science stuff that we talked about last time?

Jim: He had started long before the war, but Montagu ramped up the case against racist ideology during and after the War.

Jo: And after the war, Montagu and other like-minded anti-race scientists gathered at the newly formed United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)...

Jim: In that hotel in Paris that had been the U.S. Army headquarters.

Jo: Oh, I didn't know that, cool. So these guys got together, there were about eight of them, to craft a formal statement on what was then called "the race question." In other words, how should the world view race and racism in the wake of this global racially motivated tragedy? They released a statement that addressed head-on the question of whether race and intelligence were linked or not. Here is what it had to say. Erik, quote reader, please do us the honor:

Erik: "Wherever it has possible to make allowances for differences in environmental opportunities, [intelligence] tests have shown essential similarity in mental characters among all human groups. ...The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups."

Jo: And then it goes on to call race a 'social myth'. The Holocaust had shown that "race" is a dangerous social construction. The term should just be done away with. Instead, the group suggested that people should use the term "ethnicity," to talk about human groups.

Jim: This could be a happy ending!

Jo: Nope, 'fraid not.

Erik [shakes paper]: "Dear Montagu: This letter is Confidential. ... The protests against the UNESCO race statement of yours"--

Jo: --Wait. What is that?

Erik: It's a secret letter about the UNESCO statement.

Jo: A secret letter?

Jim: How did you get a secret letter?

Erik: Superpowers. You get those in my field.

Jo: No. Seriously. What is that?

Erik: So, the famous fruit fly geneticist, Theodosius Dobzhansky, who we mentioned last time, wrote a secret letter to Ashley Montagu in February 1951. (I used my \*powers\* to get a copy.) Apparently, there was a pretty severe backlash to Montagu's insistence that intelligence is essentially similar across racial lines.

Jo: Right! So just one year later 14 different scientists--mostly geneticists and physical anthropologists--gathered at UNESCO to draft a new statement.

Jim: Uh oh, don't tell me--

Erik: Thankfully, according to Dobzhansky's secret letter, he intervened to get his friend, the geneticist Leslie Dunn to head up the 1951 UNESCO revisionists. Dunn mostly sided with Montagu. And it was a good thing he was put in charge. According to the secret letter, C. D. Darlington -- who as we mentioned last episode had worked with Cyril Burt to establish the biological basis of inferior intelligence in Africans -- was the original choice to head the group.

Jim: So the 1951 rebuttal wasn't completely racist?

Jo: It's a mixed bag. It back-pedals on Montagu's original assertion that race is entirely socially constructed. It even asserts, "some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner in one human group than in another..." But it also concedes that, "within different populations consisting of many human types, one will find approximately the same range of temperament and intelligence." I think to the everyday observer in the 1950s, the revision might not look all that different than Montagu's version. But in several places, it cracks the door back open for those who aren't yet convinced that race is a social construction. It's a subtle difference, but important.

Jim: So, it could have been worse. And perhaps this quibbling was a kind of setback. But Montagu's original initiative to discredit racist science still carried the day when it combined with a newly empowered Civil Rights movement in 1954.

Jo: Oh, '54! Isn't that the year Crew Cuts recorded "[ShBoom ShBoom](#)" (Yah da da da da yah dadadah)? I love that song.

Jim: Actually ... I was more thinking the landmark Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas*.

Jo: Oh yeah. Pretty important.

Erik: It's kind of cool that if you dig into the text of Chief Justice Earl Warren's decision in *Brown v. Board*, you hit "footnote #11" -- a very sciencey footnote.

Footnote 11. K.B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950); Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making (1952), c. VI; Deutscher and Chein, The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 26 J.Psychol. 259 (1948); Chein, What are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities?, 3 Int.J.Opinion and Attitude Res. 229 (1949); Brameld, Educational Costs, in Discrimination and National Welfare (Maclver, ed., 1949), 44-48; Frazier, The Negro in the United States (1949), 674-681. And see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1944).

Jim: Yes, and a very weird angle for the court to take! Some call it an "infamous" footnote because the decision didn't flow directly from the "Equal Protection Clause" in the Fourteenth Amendment --

Jo: -- that's the Amendment that makes everyone a citizen regardless of race --

Jim: -- but instead based the decision on the social science regarding psychological harm of segregation in schools. Footnote 11 is just a list of works that supported Chief Justice Warren's claim that segregation hurt kids emotionally. He might have been right. Nevertheless, it sparked an immediate backlash that went right along with the backlash to the first UNESCO anti-racism statement. And our buddy **Wickliffe Draper** was still there, ready to pounce with financial backing for all kinds of racially motivated research.

Jo: So, if we need to go the route that takes us to Arthur Jensen and the Bell Curve, who is the next person we have to discuss?

Jim: Another American businessman, Carlton Putnam.

Jo: You mean Carlton Coon the physical anthropologist?

Jim: He was Carleton Coon's cousin -- can you believe that? **Carlton Putnam** wrote a very famous book called *Race & Reason* in 1961.

Jo: Good god, I've actually heard of this book! This is the one that's written like a Q&A session, right? The one white supremacists still use all the time as, like, a white supremacy cookbook of ideas?

Jim: Exactly. In the book he takes on the Ashley Montagu's mentor, Franz Boas, saying his conclusions about race can't be right because he himself is Jewish—an inferior race. Then Putnam argues against Footnote 11 in the *Brown v. Board* decision.

Jo: Wait, how in the world can he argue that segregation doesn't hurt kids in school?

Jim: He doesn't. He does something more devious --

Erik: -- something we're going to see again and again after *Brown v. Board* --

Jim: --which is weird, because it sounds vaguely like it's going back to the 19th century measurement stuff! Putnam cited psychologists who worked in intelligence testing like we talked about the last two episodes, and anatomists who looked at brain size and shape. Putnam concluded that black people either have lower innate intelligence or brain shapes that suggest lesser ability (e.g., in smaller frontal lobes). Erik, wanna read for us?

Erik: "Personally, I feel only affection for the Negro. But there are facts that have to be faced. Any man with two eyes in his head can observe a Negro settlement in the Congo, can study the pure-blooded African in his native habitat as he exists when left on his own resources, can compare this settlement with London or Paris, and can draw his own conclusions regarding relative levels of character and intelligence—or that combination of character and intelligence which is civilization. Finally, he can inquire as to the number of pure-blooded blacks who have made contributions to great literature or engineering or medicine or philosophy or abstract science."

Jo: Yeah, that sounds ... old.

Jim: Yeah, do you see what he's doing there? I can't emphasize this enough. THIS IS 1961!!! But Putnam's argument is the 19th century argument that Africans in Africa haven't created European cities so they're intellectually inferior. And their brains are the wrong size and shape, so no amount of schooling is going to help. And note that he couches it with the whole "I'm not personally racist -- 'I feel only affection for the Negro'."

Jo: And we hear that same sentiment repeated today: "I'm not racist, but it's got to be more than a coincidence that black people score lower on SATs all the time"

Erik: It's funny --

Jo: -- not ha-ha funny --

Erik: --no, not ha-ha funny, but you immediately hear this language pop-up in other prominent scientific places. For instance, **Henry Garrett**, who in 1946 was president of the American Psychological Association, and was chair of Columbia University's psychology department until 1955, actually gave statements like these in his testimony in the case *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*. The *Davis* case was one of the five cases combined to make *Brown v. Board*. Garrett said school integration would threaten the "racial hygiene" of whites. Here's a money quote from Garrett: "No matter how low (in a socioeconomic sense) an American white may be, his ancestors built the civilizations of Europe; and no matter how high (again in a socioeconomic sense) a Negro may be, his ancestors were (and his kinsmen still are) savages in an African jungle. Free and general race mixture of Negro-white groups in this country would inevitably be not only dysgenic but socially disastrous" (Garrett, Gregor, & Genovés, 1962, p. 984).

Jo: Tell me these guys weren't unopposed...

Erik: Oh no, Garrett faced opposition on this stuff. He left Columbia and joined the University of Virginia in the 1950s. But he couldn't get tenure in the psych department because of his views.

Jim: And then he went on a diatribe. In 1961, he wrote an article "The Equalitarian Dogma."

Jo: I know this one -- it claims black intellectual inferiority is biological but that naive social scientists --

Erik: -- and don't forget those of us in the Humanities. We're equally guilty of this --

Jo: --yes, you guys, too. We're all enforcing some iron-fisted dogma against the poor defenseless biologists who know that racial differences in intellect are fixed and aren't afraid to say it.

Erik: Do you guys have an Iron Fist? If so, could you share it with me?

Jo: Jim, is that what you get when you become a Professor Emeritus?

Jim: Oh yeah. That's why we hang around in the department after they stop paying us. It's all the RAW POWER you gain when you level up in academia.

Jo: That sounds pretty good!

Jim: Notice again that Garrett's claim is, "hey, I'm only reporting science here -- there's no racism or bias; it's you people arguing for racial equality who are denying the science." You hear this claim more and more through the second half of the century.



Erik: Yeah, Garrett gathered together four like-minded “scientists” and they started an ostensibly peer-reviewed journal called *Mankind Quarterly* to promote the notion that people of African descent were intellectually inferior using the language of physical anthropology.

Jo: This journal is still published today!

Jim: You should probably mention some of these other founders.

Erik: They’re a pretty unsavory cast: G. Robert Gayre—a Scottish anthropologist and fascist who defended apartheid in South Africa. **Roger Pearson**—a British economist who claimed to be an anthropologist, founded the fascist Northern League to promote Nazi racial ideas --

Jim: -- our friendly neighbors down at Southern Mississippi University gave him an Honorary Doctorate just a few years ago after he had chaired a department referred to as CRAP (comparative religion, anthropology, and philosophy) and got rid of people so he could hire two Pioneer-funded neo-Nazis! And Roger Pearson helped publish some of the most racist stuff of Raymond Cattell, who we talked about last time, in the *Mankind Quarterly*. But probably most egregious was that Pearson allowed Hans Günther to publish his race science under a pseudonym -- Günther was called the “Pope of Race” (Rassenpapst) in Hitler’s Germany.

Erik: Former Nazis popped up all over the place in *Mankind Quarterly*’s early days. R. Ruggles Gates, the Canadian fascist who wrote Nazi propaganda during the War and Otmar von Verschuer—the Dutch-German “anthropologist” who mentored Josef Mengele (doctor at Auschwitz)—were editorial board members.

Jo: Lordy, it was like a collection of leftover angry race scientists.

Jim: But because it was funded by Draper’s Pioneer Fund, it had some staying power.

Jo: Ah -- that again!

Erik: They also were echoing the words they heard in the halls of power in Washington. The so-called “Southern Manifesto” opposing racial integration in schools as stipulated in *Brown v. Board* was signed by 101 Senators and Representatives. Of the Senators of southern states, only Al Gore, Sr., Estes Kefauver, and Lyndon B. Johnson refused to sign it.

Jim: Draper’s Pioneer money was behind that, too. As it was behind the founding of the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics (IAAEE), which published *Mankind Quarterly* and books promoting the notion that races were inherently unequal in intelligence throughout the 1960s and beyond. And they nabbed an enormously important spokesperson: **William Shockley**.

Erik: Oh, Shockley!? He was the Bell Laboratories guy who won a share of the Nobel in ‘56 for his work on semiconductors and the transistor effect!



Jo: Yeah, isn't his work basically the beginning of Silicon Valley as we know it today?

Jim: That's the guy. Basically, he thought that, since he did physics, he could do anything else, and he moved into promoting the genetics of racial differences in intelligence, some of which he picked up from Cyril Burt's work. Shockley came to the attention of the Pioneer Fund after he gave a talk at a 1965 Nobel conference on "Genetics and the Future of Man," which was followed up by an interview published in *U.S. News & World Report* (Shockley, 1965). He promoted belief in genetic deterioration, especially as the result of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs,

Jo: That was the program Lyndon Johnson introduced on the heels of the 1964 Civil Rights act to address racial inequality and poverty.

Jim: Right. Henry Garrett, who we talked about a minute ago, convinced Shockley to put a supportive blurb on the book jacket of Carleton Putnam's *Race & Reality*. His blurb said, basically, 'I'm not a racist,' but "there do exist significant genetic differences in distribution of potential intelligence between races."

Jo: -- just like Putnam in *Race and Reason* with the whole, "personally, i feel nothing but affection for the Negro"! This is really nothing more than the marshalling of the "objectivity" of science to promote racism.

Jim: Shockley began receiving funding from both the Pioneer Fund and direct gifts from Draper himself. In 1966–1967, Shockley used some of these funds to court Arthur Jensen, who was on a Guggenheim Fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University.

Jo: Ah! And we've now finally reached Arthur Jensen! We did it, guys!

Jim: I think it's important to point out that, In spite of spending two years post-docking with Cyril Burt's mentee, Hans Eysenck, Jensen's earlier work did acknowledge the importance of family and environmental situations: "...the fact that Negroes and Mexicans are disproportionately represented in the lower end of the socio-economic-status scale cannot be interpreted as evidence of poor genetic potential. For we know that there have been, and are still, powerful racial barriers to social mobility." (Jensen, 1967a, p. 10) This statement was from a paper that Jensen wrote before visiting with Shockley at Stanford.

Jo: Wait, so you're saying...Jensen didn't actually believe that race and IQ were linked at first? I thought he was one of the bad guys in this story.

Jim: Don't get your hopes up; his beliefs shifted. The same year that paper was published, just after he had started working alongside Shockley, Jensen spoke at the California Advisory Council of Educational Research. He titled that talk "How Much Can We Boost IQ and

Scholastic Achievement?” Listen to how much he had changed after just a couple of months with Shockley:

Erik: “It appears that forces are at work which may create and widen the genetic aspect of the average difference in ability between the Negro and white populations, with the possible consequence that no amount of equality of opportunity or improvement of educational facilities will result in equality of achievement or in any improvement of the chances for the Negro population to compete on equal terms.” (Jensen, 1967b, p. 10)

Jo: So Jensen really quickly adopted the stuff Cyril Burt and Hans Eysenck had been preaching once he visited Shockley.

Jim: From this point forward in 1967, Jensen would be a key player in the Pioneer Fund’s project of somehow “proving” that African-descended peoples were intellectually inferior to whites. His was the major work that was being protested when I was tear-gassed at Berkeley in 1969, remember?

Jo: Oh yeah, way back in episode 1 of the race and intelligence series we’ve been doing lately. I ... can ... barely ... remember...

Jim: Shockley mass-mailed screeds to the National Academy of Sciences trying to gin up support for overturning *Brown v. Board*, but nobody really paid attention to him by that point. But as Jensen began to build up an audience—even having his “How Much Can We Boost IQ” go through the peer-review process at the *Harvard Educational Review*—Shockley saw an opening. He began contacting journalists before Jensen’s paper came out and was able to stimulate positive coverage in *Newsweek* (article: “Born Dumb”) and *U.S. News & World Report* (article “Can Negroes learn the way Whites Do? Findings of a Top Authority”). Even *Time* magazine covered him, though, it took a slightly more skeptical point of view toward Shockley in “Intelligence: Is There a Racial Difference?”

Erik [rattling papers]: “PICKET AGAINST JENSENISM AT PSYCHOLOGY TODAY OFFICES, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16 --”

Jo: -- are you using magic powers again?

Erik: Yeah, I found this flier in an archive using magic. It’s a flyer advertising a protest...

Jim: Yeah, that was the same kind of protest I ran into that day at Berkeley. The biggest attack on Jensen always seemed to come not from the mainstream media, but from students and educators. Jensen was refused reprints of his *Harvard Educational Review* article by the student-run journal at first because of his blatantly racist take on intelligence, and the editorial board wanted to include dissenting replies from other experts (they printed 5 replies in the next issue). Then the Pioneer Fund stepped in, and nearly 2,000 copies of the 123 page article went to members of the National Academy of Sciences, members of Congress, Vice President Spiro

Agnew, Director of the FBI J. Edgar Hoover, and to members of the Supreme Court, among others. By late summer of 1969, the *New York Times Magazine* had coined a new term: "Jensenism, n. The Theory That IQ Is Largely Determined by the Genes."

Jo: ...Hence the title of the flyer resisting it.

Jim: Despite this pushback, with Pioneer Fund support, Jensen's star rose. By the time of Draper's death in 1972, it eclipsed even Shockley's, since it was by that time obvious that Shockley wasn't so great with the poiticking. Jensen set up the Institute for the Study of Educational Differences with him as president and his wife as vice president specifically so the Pioneer Fund could channel money to him. And between 1973 and 1999, Jensen received nearly \$2½ million (adjusted for inflation) without the bother of having to meet IRB guidelines or anything else that UC Berkeley might have put in front of him.

Jo: Well, I'm glad someone protested him, though I'm sorry you got tear gassed, Jim.

Erik: We've almost gotten to our stopping point for today, the 1994 book *The Bell Curve*, by psychologist Richard Herrnstein and political scientist Charles Murray.

Jim: Yeah, that was an important book for me. It inspired me to teach the ANT275 course on race and science, the one Jo eventually took over.

Erik: Me too. I remember standing in a bookstore reading it for what seemed like hours and being so confused.

Jo: So maybe we should describe the book for listeners who haven't heard it before.

Erik: The book's main premise is pretty straightforward. Herrnstein and Murray think there is general intelligence --

Jo: -- LI'L G!!! --

Erik: -- and that it's apportioned by race. Putting together so many of the puzzle pieces that we've laid out these past few episodes, they assume intelligences for each race fall into a normal distribution --

Jo: You mean, that most people fall somewhere around the average intelligence level, with fewer people at either extreme of very high or very low intelligence.

Erik: Yes. So, don't get me wrong, it's big ol' book with many different sorts of claims. But in the infamous chapter 13, Herrnstein and Murray posit that, while there is overlap to some degree, the overall range of intelligence in Africans and their American descendants is lower than the range for whites, who have a lower range than Asians, and that this intellectual endowment is essentially stuck because: biology.

Jo: -- ah, that's the infamous bell curve distribution that even Francis Galton used to work with. C'mon Charles Murray! --

Erik: They, of course, claimed it wasn't racist because they didn't put whites at the top and they said that there was some overlap.

Jo: Did they, you know, define what they meant by these groups and terms like "inferior and superior" or were they just the "your skin and face look like X so you *are* an X" thing and "there's a number that equals 'intelligence'" thing -- the same stuff that we have seen over and over on this podcast?

Jim: There's a veneer of statistics -- but we all know there's good statistics and bad statistics. They have the two basic assumptions one that intelligence is a single, unitary capacity; and that the races are real biological groups that have genetic differences including genetic differences in intelligence. It's the same pseudo-science we've been talking about since we started the podcast way back in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Herrnstein and Murray weren't supported by the Pioneer Fund directly, but the work they draw on in the book was. Richard Lynn was their primary source of so-called scientific proof of the heritability of intelligence differences by race. Lynn, a psychologist, received about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a million dollars from Pioneer between 1971 and 1996 and became a co-director of the Pioneer Fund in 2012 and served on the editorial board of *Mankind Quarterly*. He has published numerous books and articles about racial differences in intelligence supposedly being the source of differences in economic development between countries. It's telling that Lynn is cited 24 times in *The Bell Curve*. Herrnstein and Murray describe him as "a leader and scholar of racial and ethnic differences." Afterward, Lynn was one of the chief defenders of the book, too.

Erik: Speaking of, we should note that there was an immediate and substantial backlash to *The Bell Curve*, much more so than at earlier points in history when these race and intelligence ideas were introduced. Richard Herrnstein had died by the time *The Bell Curve* was released in 1994. But Charles Murray returned to these themes in books like *Income Inequality and IQ* (1998), *The Underclass Revisited* (1999), and *Coming Apart: The State of White America, 1960–2010* (2012).

Jo: He's still returning to them today! The book *Coming Apart* re-introduced him to the world apart from *The Bell Curve*. So Murray was invited to give a public lecture at Middlebury College in the winter of 2017, which student protestors shut down. I'm not sure there was any teargas or shotgun blasts this time, though, Jim. Then Sam Harris interviewed him on *Waking Up*, which led to a backlash by Ezra Klein, and then there was the second whole go around that led to our flash episode last spring, right, Erik?

Erik: Flash!

Jim: Again, the book is just a rehashing of all of the ideas that started back in our first episode on race and IQ and go right through, now drawing on Pioneer-Fund-backed research!

Jo: Good god, so we start AND END this entire gargantuan episode with the dirty money of Wycliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund. Amazing! This stuff really isn't going away, is it?

Jim: And it is still funding white supremacist politics in this country. Not just research and publications, but actual political activism. For instance, there was a good deal of Pioneer Fund money behind proposition 187 in California.

Jo: Which was?

Jim: Which was the effort in California to make immigrants *persona non grata* in the state.

Erik: So next time, we're going to have to discuss the trajectory of the IQ and race stuff since The Bell Curve. It turns out, the story is not over -- not by a long shot.

Some sources:

1. Davenport, C. B., & Steggerda, M. (1929). *Race crossing in Jamaica*. Washington DC: Carnegie Institution of Washington.
2. Garrett, H. E. (1961a). The equalitarian dogma. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 4(4), 480-484.
3. Garrett, H. E., Gregor, A. J., & Genovés, S. (1962). Racial differences and witch hunting. *Science*, 982-991.
4. Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. A. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Free Press.
5. Jensen, A. R. (1967a). The culturally disadvantaged: Psychological and educational aspects. *Educational Research*, 10(1), 4-20.
6. Jensen, A. R. (1967b). How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Speech given before the annual meeting of the California Advisory Council of Educational Research. In San Diego, CA.
7. Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard educational review*, 39(1), 1-123.
8. Lynn, R. (2006). *Race differences in intelligence: An evolutionary analysis*. Augusta, GA, US: Washington Summit Publishers.
9. Montagu, A. (Ed.) (1974). *Race and IQ*. New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Putnam, C. (1967). *Race and Reality: A Search for Solutions*. Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.
11. Shockley, W. (1965). Is quality of US population declining. *US News and World Report*, 59, 68-71.
12. Sussman, R. W. (2014). *The myth of race: The troubling persistence of an unscientific idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
13. Tucker, W. H. (2002). *The funding of scientific racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.