

Preface

My Years with the Pioneer Fund

by Harry F. Weyher
President, The Pioneer Fund

On 22 November 1994 ABC's *World News Tonight with Peter Jennings* was replete with somber voices speaking of a small penis being a "sign of superior intelligence," "eradicating inferior people," arresting blacks solely because of skin color, race superiority, and mentally ill Jews. This voice-over was spiced with references to Hitler and scenes of emaciated victims in Nazi death camps.¹

I watched this broadcast with more than usual interest, because I was president of the foundation which was the subject of the broadcast, the Pioneer Fund. Fearing such tabloid treatment, I had refused repeated invitations from ABC to appear on tape for the program.² My fears were justified. What I saw was a grotesque distortion, akin to what one used to see in fun house mirrors.

The ABC broadcast was one of an endless series of attacks on Pioneer and the scientists whom it has funded, dating back almost 50 years, most often by making baseless charges of "Nazism" or "racism," thus sometimes inciting student unrest or faculty reaction. The following also has happened to Pioneer and these scientists: One scientist had to be accompanied by an armed guard on his own campus, as well as guarded in his home. Another scientist was required by the university to teach his classes by closed circuit television, supposedly in order to prevent a riot breaking out in his class. Several scientists had university and other speaking engagements canceled or interrupted by gangs of students or outside toughs. Two scientists asked that all professional communications go to their offices and not their homes since their wives were frightened by the abuse their work engendered. Two scientists who had speaking engagements in Australia needed 50 policemen to rescue them from a mob. At one major university a professor invaded the class of another professor, led a raucous demonstration there, and had to be removed by campus police. The son of one of Pioneer's directors agreed to succeed his father on the Pioneer board, but then withdrew when the son's wife objected, citing social ostracism and physical danger.

This was not all. One state university temporarily barred its scientists from doing any research with grants from Pioneer. Another major university retained a large Boston law firm to investigate Pioneer before allowing its scientists to use Pioneer grants. The TV show "Inside Edition" tried to do an ambush interview of Pioneer's president (this writer) at his law office, and then staked out his apartment, questioning his neighbors at random.

Media attacks along the same lines as the Peter Jennings attack were all too common.

How was all of this commotion generated around a tiny foundation whose only activities had consisted of (a) a 1937 study of family size of Air Corps pilots and the giving of some scholarships to the children of those pilots, and (b) hands-off grants for research into human nature at about 60 institutions scattered around the world in eight countries?

This book by Professor Richard Lynn tells the true story of the Pioneer Fund.³ It needs no introduction, but at his request I will add a few personal observations about some of the main events and about the human side of just a few of the people. What I know firsthand about this history is at odds with the media distortions, which unfortunately constitute the only information that many people have.

My role in all of this began in 1951 when I was a young lawyer. My employer law firm, Cravath, Swaine & Moore, asked me whether I would like to be loaned by them to John M. Harlan for work on a temporary crime commission appointed by Governor Thomas E. Dewey. Harlan, later to become a distinguished justice nominated to the United States Supreme Court by President Eisenhower (and grandson of a former Supreme Court justice of the same name), was then known as a rising star among Wall Street lawyers, and I was enormously flattered by the opportunity. I spent two years with him and learned that he was indeed a star, a megastar. Later I learned about the Pioneer Fund, and that Harlan was one of its founders.

Then in 1954 I met Wickliffe Preston Draper, another founder of the Pioneer Fund and its chief,

although not the only, benefactor. I had completed my work with Harlan and had accepted an offer to join a start-up law firm with two other young ex-Cravath lawyers, where I worked as a corporate and tax lawyer during most of the years recounted here. As luck would have it, Cravath at that time received a query from Draper about retaining a lawyer, and they recommended me. When I met Draper, who was usually addressed as "Colonel Draper," I found him to be highly intelligent, learned, physically impressive, unselfishly patriotic — the same traits I saw in Harlan. We got along famously over the years, and eventually I was handling all of his legal affairs.

In 1958 Draper and Henry R. Guild, a prominent Boston attorney and a director of Pioneer for 26 years, asked me whether I would join the board and become president. By then I knew most of Pioneer's history, and knowing and respecting Draper and Guild and being in awe of Harlan, I immediately accepted.

COLONEL DRAPER

From the mid-1950s until his death in 1971, Draper had me present at all his meetings (not just Pioneer meetings) except rare meetings with a family member or college chum. I also became sole trustee of Draper's inter vivos trust and executor of his will. I like to think that I became his closest and most trusted friend, and I have always tried to be true to that trust. As to Pioneer, I tried to carry on in the way I think would have been wanted not only by Draper, but also by General Frederick Osborn, Justice Harlan and the others who preceded me as Pioneer directors and officers.

Draper gave to many organizations besides Pioneer, and we met on non-Pioneer matters with such people as General Mark Clark and General Troy Middleton (both college presidents at the time), Archibald Roosevelt (the son of Teddy Roosevelt and president of the Boone & Crockett Club), and Peter Scott (son of the British polar explorer and a leading conservationist). On Pioneer matters Draper and I often saw such noted professionals as R. Ruggles Gates (the British human geneticist and botanist), Robert Carter Cook (the demographer), John C. Flanagan (the statistician), and Henry E. Garrett (head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia and a president of the American Psychological Association).⁴

As befits a military man, Draper was a stickler for organization. Every other Thursday at 4 o'clock I went to Draper's apartment, which occupied the top three floors at 322 East 57th Street in Manhattan. Usually these meetings were just for the two of us, and lasted about two hours. Occasionally third persons were there. Often I separately met people at my law office or elsewhere in New York, such as an official of the Metropolitan Museum at the museum, or sometimes out of town (such as Gates in London or Garrett in Charlottesville). Draper attended only one meeting outside his apartment during the entire time I knew him, and that was not with a scientist and had nothing to do with Pioneer's scientific research activities.

Meetings at the apartment followed a fixed routine. The doorman at Draper's building said he had been told to expect you and directed you to an elevator operator, who took you in a small elevator to the penthouse. You stepped off the elevator into a small hallway, which opened into a two storied room

running the entire width of the apartment building. Draper stepped forward rapidly with a warm smile and extended his hand.

Draper was tall for his generation, with an erect military bearing and a quick step, seeming to reflect the vigorous life he had led, the army years and the hunting years. He had sparkling blue eyes, appearing slightly owlish behind his horn rims, and his hair was cut short on the sides to mesh with the baldness which dated from his World War I days. His demeanor was formal, and he was prone to use surnames and the word "sir," probably reflecting his family upbringing and later British army training, but he was warm and quick to laugh at incongruities. Although his features would have been called handsome, a more apt term would be distinguished or aristocratic, tending toward the chivalrous.

The big room had an enormous fireplace at the east end, a large oak conference table and four oak chairs in the center, and a 5,000 volume library at the west end complete with rolling ladder to reach the second-story shelves, a library which gave the impression of being well used. Around the walls and on the floor were hunting trophies, including a bongo (a rare African antelope) and all the African "big five" (elephant, rhino, buffalo, lion, and leopard), a gun rack, and an array of classical swords. French doors opened onto balconies on the north, east, and south. A question elicited the answer that on the two floors above were an office, saddle room, card room, handball court, and gymnasium.

Draper led you to the conference table and pointed to a chair across from him. A decanter and glasses were on the table. "Sherry?", he asked, but took none himself.

Then, not more than a couple of minutes after you had entered, Draper said, "Now, sir." There was no wasted time, and he was ready for the business at hand. The extent of his preparation was amazing. Often he would anticipate what you planned to say, and let you know that he understood that point and the conversation could move on. He had a small pad in front of him with only about three lines of pencilled notes - the notes were a bare-bones list of items he wanted to be sure to cover. It was soon apparent that he knew his subject well and needed no notes for the details, that he had extensive background knowledge and an even better memory.

Draper set no limit on the length of the meetings, although he commented that he preferred short ones. He did not seem to tire at all as the meeting progressed but sat erect throughout, even after two hours or more.

When the agenda had been covered, Draper summarized the actions that had been agreed on. Then he again asked, "Sherry?" He accompanied you to the small elevator hall, extended his hand, expressed his thanks, and left you there.

For all his decorum, Draper also had an intense personal side. He had been separated from his boyhood Massachusetts friends for a number of years, first by World War I and then by the years he spent abroad. During this time he went partially bald, with only side fringes of hair remaining. One day he was strolling down a boulevard in Paris when he heard a woman's voice cry "Wick, Wick" (which is how his family and childhood friends addressed him). A chauffeured limousine pulled to the curb beside him. Inside, a boyhood sweetheart - now a beautiful woman - was smiling while holding out her hand to him. The conversation was overshadowed by crisis-

level indecision on his part. Ought he remove his hat as a gentleman should, even though it would reveal his newly bald head to her? Or should he do the improper thing — leave his hat on — and keep his secret hidden from the beautiful woman? I know about this because in later years he would laugh and say he would like to relive that moment, and that he had worried throughout the next 30 or more years about the decision he had made. He had kept his hat on!

Draper liked to laugh at his own foibles. Three nurses had attended him after an operation for prostate cancer, and he asked my wife to buy gifts for them and gave her a price range. She purchased three watches from Tiffany, equal in value but each slightly different in design. Although she had them wrapped separately and told Draper to hand one to each nurse when they came in, he decided to simplify things and to let each nurse select her own. He opened the packages and left the three watches on the table in his apartment and told the nurses, when they arrived at the invited time, to go to the table together and make their selections.

"It was nearly a cat fight," he told me. The nurses had begun arguing over the watches and then appealed to him for a final judgment, which is what he had tried to avoid in the first place. "Nurses are fine," he said, "but have only one if possible."

POPULATION INTERESTS

The periods in Draper's earlier life were delineated by St. Mark's School, Harvard, World War I, the Spanish Civil War, long hunting trips around the world, periods in Paris and elsewhere abroad, military training camps, and World War II. His later

life was marked by his intensified interest in population matters, especially as they affected the United States.

High on Draper's list of matters needing more study were the nature of intelligence and its mutability (as examined later by Arthur R. Jensen and others), the heritability of personality traits (as later demonstrated by Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr. and others), and the importance of intelligence and other traits on our commerce and industry, and even on our civilization (as later demonstrated by Linda Gottfredson, Robert A. Gordon, and others.)

THE BROWN CASE

Since media coverage of the Pioneer Fund often turns to the issue of race, I am glad that in this book Professor Lynn discusses Draper's views on race. I will take this opportunity to add a few comments.

Racial differences might not have been high among Draper's areas of interest except that the political and social developments of the 1950s and 1960s made the issue salient, especially with some of the untruths put out as "science." Almost at the time I first met Draper, the Supreme Court decided the *Brown* case, holding that the public schools must be desegregated. For some time the case was hardly mentioned by us or by others meeting with us. Professor Henry Garrett, an expert on education, told us integration could be most easily carried out if it began at the first grade and worked its way upward. But he doubted that even this "successful" integration would close the known black-white gap in IQ and achievement test scores. These comments were

noted, but seemed not important and were not pursued.

Soon, however, school integration was being rushed forward, with Federal courts even taking over schools. The busing era soon followed. The South was filled with dismay, demonstrations, confusion, and some violence, and these symptoms later spread to some Northern cities. Garrett was saddened by this turn of events, and worried that the public school system would be severely damaged in areas with high black populations. Moreover he predicted a white exodus from those schools.

PROFESSOR SHUEY

The testimony in the four lower court cases which comprised *Brown* included assertions that the black-white intellectual gap would be closed once the new integrated education was made available to blacks. Garrett always said this was most unlikely and, indeed, that the "egalitarian dogma," the belief that blacks and whites are genetically identical in mean cognitive ability, was the "scientific hoax of the century." This dogma, which even then had an almost religious quality, has since become more ingrained despite increased contrary evidence.

Garrett's position received support about this time from three scientists. Ernst van den Haag of New York University showed that Professor Kenneth Clark had misled the Supreme Court as to damage allegedly suffered by blacks from segregation. This was important because Clark's findings were cited by the Supreme Court as demonstrating that segregation was not merely unethical, but harmful — an empirical scientific question. Frank C. J. McGurk of Villanova University showed that the average black-

white intelligence gap had not lessened between World War I and the 1950s, despite intervening improvement in the socio-economic status of blacks. R. Travis Osborne of the University of Georgia conducted a longitudinal study of black and white students and showed that the achievement gap widened steadily with age and grade level. Osborne also showed that the heritability of intelligence was about the same for blacks as it was for whites.

Now Garrett introduced a young and previously unknown psychologist who was to change forever the scientific view of the black-white IQ gap. Audrey M. Shuey of Virginia's Randolph-Macon Woman's College, in the days before computerized literature searches, had compiled all the known black-white IQ studies, including not only the massive testing results from the two World Wars but even relevant unpublished theses. She identified 240 such studies to the year 1958, expanded to 380 in her second edition which included tests to 1965. These showed that blacks averaged consistently more than 15 IQ points (about one standard deviation) below whites.

Garrett contacted publishers, including those of his own many successful books, but was unable to find one willing to publish Shuey's tome *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*. They told him it was too "hot." So Garrett approached Draper and Pioneer for funds to pay a printer. Shuey herself found the printer, not a publisher or distributor, and had to store the inventory in her home, from where she filled mail orders personally, one by one. At first only a few orders came in, but word crept from scientist to scientist, and then a few small coupon ads were placed in professional journals. There were several reprintings, as word got around. Later R. Travis

Osborne and Frank C. J. McGurk compiled a new Volume II of Shuey, covering all the tests from 1965 to 1980, twice the number of tests as were covered in Volume I. Eventually the book appeared in virtually every major library in the United States and many abroad. It has been undoubtedly one of the most cited books surveying black-white testing.

Draper, who often used military metaphors, spoke to Garrett of the book being "heavy artillery," meaning that the empirical weight of so much testing was overwhelming. At that time only a handful of scientists had any notion that the testing was so widespread and produced such consistent results. Some of the egalitarians tried to discredit the book by seizing on the results of a few tests here and there and arguing that they proved the opposite of Shuey's conclusions, but these attempts never posed any serious challenge to her massive survey. Most opponents avoided trying to combat the book head on, and just ducked it. The late Professor Hans J. Eysenck stated in his 1971 book *Race, Intelligence, and Education*:

What finally swayed the balance ... was ... Shuey's book ..., which brought together all the evidence in one convincing volume. ... [N]ever again could [psychologists] assert with honesty that the evidence disproved ... genetic determinants in the causation of racial differences (pp. 20-21).

Later the "Miracle in Milwaukee Experiment," which began in 1966 under the supervision of Richard Heber, brought great fanfare about scientists raising the IQ of black children by early intervention called "Head Start," thus seeming to disprove Shuey's conclusion that the IQ difference was in large part

genetic. At that time Garrett said to me that intervention had already been tried, and the effect wasn't lasting. "It's like taking someone's temperature with an oral thermometer," he said. "If you give them coffee first, they'll test high. If you give them ice cream, they'll test low. But in a few minutes they'll test normal again."

Garrett's analogy was proven all too correct by later studies, and Heber was eventually put in jail for embezzling government research funds from another project. To their discredit the media, which had been quick to give large headlines to the initial claims of raising black IQ, was largely silent on the later discrediting of those claims and the scandal involving the chief investigator.

Shuey herself lived quietly and never interacted with any of the major figures in *Brown*. She was attractive and shy, with a quiet dignity. For those seeking a hate target, Shuey did not fill the bill. Anyone assailing her almost certainly would have cast himself in the villain's role.

HAIRY EAR RIMS; THE FATTENED CALF

Not all Pioneer-aided research produced such tangible results. Professor R. Ruggles Gates, the British author of the book *Human Genetics*, conducted a detailed study of an extended family in India and concluded that the hairy ear rims of some men in the family were linked to genes on the Y-chromosome. At that time most geneticists believed that this chromosome carried no genes except those for maleness. They assailed poor Gates when he claimed otherwise, and name calling quickly ensued.

I had already witnessed the *ad hominem* assault on Garrett for his scientific conclusions about race, but I was astonished to find grown men fighting so viciously over hairy ear rims. Scientific questions, large and small, were being decided by personal abuse, a sort of jousting, rather than in the laboratory. Gates, who had been through a highly charged divorce from Marie Stopes, the birth control advocate, had not lost his fighting spirit, and he responded in kind, but his typical British dignity was reflected in the tone with which he delivered his own strong language. Draper was much amused.

I never saw Gates after the hairy ear rim episode, although once he sent Draper a snapshot of himself atop an Indian elephant, looking very tiny, which he was. He was a delightful companion, a fine scientist and genuinely interested in mankind's welfare.

Professor William Shockley, the Nobel prize winner for co-inventing the transistor, was widely scorned by egalitarians. Many I suspect feared Shockley was smarter and better informed than they were and thus able to better them in any debate.

Once Shockley asked for a small Pioneer grant to assist an expert at a California university (not his own) in researching the "identical twin transfusion syndrome," which caused identical twins (who shared the same genes) to be born with different weights and to show different development. The project was race neutral, as was most of Shockley's research. Pioneer agreed, and sent the grant to the university. But the administration apparently decided to freeze out their own expert because he had been selected by Shockley, and allocated the research funds instead to its agricultural school. There a team of veterinarians operated on an unfortunate cow, and rerouted blood flow to two calf embryos to create the desired syndrome and produce one heavy and one light calf. Detailed data were collected and made public, except that nothing was ever disclosed about the cow. Shockley, accustomed to such politically motivated academic roadblocks, merely shook his head and went about his business. Draper used to chuckle over the lengths to which university officials would go to avoid becoming even remotely associated with the race controversy.

JENSENISM

Soon a new dictionary word was coined, "Jensenism." *The Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (1993) defined it as "the theory that an individual's IQ is largely due to heredity, including racial heritage." The adjective "Jensenist" and the noun "Jensenite" soon followed.

These new words related to Arthur R. Jensen, who is regarded with something exceeding awe by scientists in the field of human intelligence. Jensen burst onto the public scene in 1969 with a 123-page

article in the *Harvard Educational Review* entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" The article covered several aspects of the IQ debate from the hereditarian prospective, especially the review of twin studies, and it concluded that compensatory education measures (such as the "Miracle in Milwaukee Experiment") have generally failed to have real impact. It also suggested that the average IQ gap between blacks and whites was probably not due entirely to environmental differences. The intensity of the reaction to this last small part of the largest article the *Harvard Educational Review* had ever published was difficult to imagine, and included campus demonstrations, votes of condemnation by various groups, and much media abuse.

I, of course, noted this furor, and I telephoned the *Harvard Educational Review* and asked to purchase a copy. A voice amazingly said that the *Review* had terminated selling any more copies of this particular issue. When I asked why, the voice said that the *Review* was obtaining an "answer" to Jensen, and would publish Jensen's paper and the answer together in a single cover, and that the article would be available no other way. I then asked if I could get permission to reprint the article alone and pay the usual royalty to the *Review*. The voice said that no permission to reprint was being given, even for a royalty.

The *Review* did republish the article together with several commentaries, plus Jensen's reply to them. But none of these rose to the level of a rebuttal of Jensen, so I am still waiting for the "answer" the spokesman promised 30 years ago.

The opposition to Jensen was so intense at one time that he had to be accompanied by an armed

guard on campus, and for a while even his home was under guard, and he was advised to have his family move in with friends until things cooled down. It is a sorry example, for which Americans should be ashamed, because no one has ever made any serious challenge to any material part of Jensen's work, or for that matter to even any small part of it. It seemed to me, and it seemed to Draper and others in 1969, that Jensen was headed for greatness. He was, and he has achieved it.

A remarkable trait which I noticed about Jensen over the years is his willingness to help other scientists. He has never shown the slightest evidence of "hogging" anything for himself, even his own work. He feeds out information wherever needed by a fellow scientist, saving many a scientist wasted laboratory time, as well as possible embarrassment. When reviewing an article for publication, a task for which he is in great demand, Jensen will not simply comment, "This article should include a factor analysis (or some other statistical procedure)." If possible, Jensen will perform this analysis and provide it to the author. Where his own area of expertise intersects with another area, Jensen helps the scientist in the other area plan to make the intersection seamless. He has always been as generous as he is great.

The 1969 *HER* article was only a small part of an enormous whole, and a huge flow of original research and scholarly writings has come from Jensen. Jensen has a new 1998 book summarizing much of the work he has done during his lifetime. It is called *The g Factor*. One prominent reviewer called it "magnificent (and awesome)."

Jensen's frustrated opponents have evidenced such a hatred for him, that I am sure many of them secretly wish he would simply vanish from the earth.

I told him for that reason it tickled me that the members of his family often live to be over 100. Thus his enemies might look forward with dismay to several more decades of Jensen productivity, probably outlasting most of them.

PROFESSOR SHOCKLEY

Bill Shockley took almost as much undeserved abuse as Jensen. The main charge against Shockley was that he was a physicist trying to be a social scientist, and thus unqualified. But on examination that charge cannot stand. Shockley was a mathematical genius and it was just as easy for him to apply statistical analyses to data collected by social scientists as it was to apply mathematics to physical formulas underlying the transistor. In fact he probably spent a greater portion of his life on human problems than on transistors. He genuinely was concerned with human welfare, both mothers and children, and devoted much of his life to analyzing relevant problems. Shockley was often unfairly called a racist, but his "thinking exercises" and proposals were always in fact race neutral.

Bill Shockley was frequently in New York, sometimes with his wife Emmy. On several occasions he was addressing audiences and wanted to provide typewritten handouts for them. He would use my law office, then at 299 Park Avenue, as a kind of branch workplace. There he would compose and edit handouts, and he and Emmy would work away. I often marveled that we had a Nobel prize winner in his shirt sleeves operating our typewriters and duplicating machines (these were the pre-computer days), with his wife rushing about to help him, often at late hours when our strong, ambitious young

associate lawyers had become exhausted and gone home.

Shockley attracted abuse for whatever he did. Possibly this was because his intellectual powers so overwhelmed his opponents that they were reduced to *ad hominem* abuse as a last resort. Jensen was aware of this, and said, "Shockley is a lightning rod."

Shockley received death threats several times. Once he was in New York to debate anthropologist Ashley Montagu on TV, and he received such a threat. I called Vince Gillen, the private eye involved in the General Motors-Ralph Nader set-to, and he was our bodyguard (presumably armed) that day.

Once Shockley asked John Trevor, a Pioneer director, to set up a luncheon meeting with a prominent physician. At lunch Shockley asked questions about welfare mothers. He perceived that the physician was giving answers aimed at political correctness rather than truth. In this spirit, Shockley asked the man to submit himself to a lie detector test. Their acquaintance was short.

But Shockley was also a fun lover and a bit of a cut-up. Once my wife and I invited him to the 21 Club for dinner. Somehow he wandered into the nearby area of Times Square while it was still a "combat zone," before its recent rehabilitation. While he seemed to have escaped the worse dives, he did get into a shop selling magic tricks. When we were seated later on a banquette downstairs at 21, he literally thrilled a bejeweled lady sitting next to him, with all sorts of tricks, using cards, dice, handkerchiefs, etc. I imagine she had gone there to be seen by other socialites, not shown magic tricks by a stranger, and I doubt she knew she had a Nobel prize winner on her hands. But at the end I'm sure she would have said he

was worthy of that prize. And, on reflection, perhaps Shockley really was a magician.

On another occasion Shockley said he wanted to have dinner at the elegant Côte Basque, because someone had recommended it. When we were seated Shockley announced he was on a diet, because he had to lose 20 pounds. First he ordered more than one large martini, which must have eaten up a good bit of his calorie allowance. Then he told the waiter he wanted "just a head of lettuce", nothing more. Since the dinner was prix fixe at about \$40 (a big price for those days), that must have been the most expensive head of lettuce in town. It arrived on an oversized round platter, laid out flat like a giant pressed flower, with pimento in the center to add color, and lemon slices on the side. Shockley seemed happy with this weight-losing fare, so he ordered some wine to go with it. I can't remember whether he had dessert and/or brandy, but I wouldn't be surprised.

I meant to ask later about the results of his diet, but I never got around to it. I suppose the diet wasn't successful because a short time later on TV's Phil Donohue Show, dispelling any claims that he thought himself a kind of "genetic superman," Shockley acknowledged being overweight and pirouetted before the national TV audience to model his slightly protruding middle.

PROFESSOR EYSENCK

Hans Eysenck's death in 1997 caused, not merely the usual grief, but an outburst of reverence, as well as quiet homage from those who felt honored to have worked with so great a man.

Eysenck was born in Germany, the son of two silent film actors, but resisted the urge to follow them

in that career. He left Germany rather than be pressured to join the Nazi party, and he studied in France and later England. At the famed University of London he studied under Sir Cyril Burt. In 1950 he started up a new psychology department at the Institute of Psychiatry and headed it for many years. His contributions to psychology were numerous and important, including his work on the role of genetics in personality and intelligence, and his debunking of psychotherapy and the Freudian overemphasis on environment and child rearing practices.

Eysenck was a soft-spoken and gentle man who would patiently answer a silly question, such as I might ask, as readily as a serious one. Knowing his quiet nature makes it difficult to envision the people who once physically attacked him in a lecture hall (where one of his young students, not otherwise known for physical combativeness, named J. Philippe Rushton, then adorned with the long hair of the times, rushed from his seat to help defend Eysenck) or the mobs which sometimes tried to bar Eysenck from speaking.

When Jensen's famed 1969 paper was published in the *Harvard Educational Review*, suggesting that the black deficit in educability was partly genetic, the roar of the anti-Jensen forces was so loud as to drown out the numerous but less noisy supporters of Jensen — except one. One voice came through on Jensen's side, loud and clear, and that was the voice of Hans Eysenck, the man who years earlier had attracted Jensen to study under him at the Institute of Psychiatry. In 1971 Eysenck wrote *Race, Intelligence and Education*, agreeing with Jensen. From that time on the voices of still other Jensen supporters could be heard getting louder. Some of Eysenck's legion of bright students also took a fresh look at the

question and began to make themselves heard. The pendulum was swinging, at least among scientists, partly due to Eysenck.

To scientists and scholars Eysenck is just as alive after his death as before. His 100 scientific books and 1,000 scholarly articles insure that. And scientists and scholars in the future will invoke Eysenck's integrity and brilliance, just as New York Yankee baseball fans invoke the dignity, character and power of their former center fielder to the tune of "Mrs. Robinson":

Where have you gone, Joe DiMaggio?
A nation turns its lonely eyes to you ...

and to another tune:

Jolting Joe DiMaggio
We want you on our side.

Jolting Joe, of course, died recently but still lives as an inspiration to the Yankee side, which is the right side for those fans. Eysenck is still with us too, intellectually, and he too is on the right side — the side of truth.

PROFESSOR BOUCHARD

Ten years after Jensen's famous article, Thomas Bouchard and his Minnesota team came onto the national scene. Starting in that year and continuing to the present, they have studied over 100 sets of identical twins from several countries who were separated at birth and reared in different environments. These twins are compared with each other, with blood siblings and relatives, and with

adoptive siblings and relatives. The broad conclusions: (1) genetic factors have a pronounced influence on social attitudes, vocational interests, psychological characteristics (including IQ) and certain behavior; and (2) the effect of being reared in the same home is negligible for many traits. Bouchard's conclusions accord with Jensen's (and with those of Joseph Horn's University of Texas adoption study, also supported by Pioneer).

Bouchard always rested his case on the scientific analysis and resisted the temptation to place any significant weight on the many interesting anecdotal aspects, such as twins marrying wives with the same name, twins selecting the same breed of dogs, twins giggling constantly at the same things, twins wearing the same number of rings, and the like. Much of this latter material found its way into the popular media, but one tale I heard from Bouchard was never printed. Identical male triplets, although raised separately, had each developed a penchant for pinching the bottoms of uniformed nurses, and then laughing joyously. Bouchard said this could have caused problems when the triplets were reunited in a Minneapolis hospital, where there were many pretty nurses in the halls, except that the nurses looked upon the triplets as laboratory specimens, and viewed the pinching as important scientific data.

Amusingly, although Tom Bouchard has been vilified by radical student groups and professional demonstrators as a reactionary, he himself as a Berkeley student was arrested and jailed overnight for participating in a student takeover of the campus administration building, being bailed out the next morning by his pretty young bride. I don't know when Tom lost most of his hair, as he has, but if he

was balding then and since he is quite tall, he must have been a sight to see in the holding pen.

THE OTHER SIDE OF SCIENTISTS

Sometimes a scientist would say he'd like to visit Draper to thank him for the financial support. Draper always told me he'd be glad to see the scientist on a social level, and hear about his activities, but he preferred not to do so unless the scientist persisted. His reason was to avoid the appearance of trying to influence the scientist. In fact he never met with more than a handful of all the scientists whose research was financed by Pioneer in the post World War II years. And I believe that, except for Garrett, Gates, Cook, and Flanagan, he never saw any scientist more than once.

I felt no such constrictions, although I preferred to avoid discussing work. Whenever a scientist was in New York for a seminar or otherwise, I offered to take him to lunch or dinner if our schedules permitted. And a few times I have been to seminars elsewhere.

Tom Bouchard and his wife Pauline, who has degrees in both law and biology, are delightful companions. The same is true of Art Jensen and his psychologist wife Barbara, and Phil Rushton and his anthropologist wife Elizabeth. Others also had wives with careers of their own, such as Sybil Eysenck, who stays so busy she had to decline a nomination for the presidency of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences. The late Susan Lynn worked with her husband on the worldwide increase in intelligence in the last 60 years, the contributions of improvements in nutrition, and the intelligence of Oriental peoples. Maybe philosopher Mike Levin has

the best spousal deal occupation-wise, because his wife Meg also holds a Ph.D. in philosophy and takes over classes for Mike whenever he has to be away.

Henry Garrett was a fun person I saw often. Once I attended an academic convention with him and his wife in the Virgin Islands. Mildred was a small, vivacious, and popular woman with a piercing voice. She could be heard for blocks when she was excited. When we arrived at our hotel, Garrett discovered that he had come from the airport with the wrong bag. The one he now had contained only ladies underthings. He grumbled. Later on, during a day of shopping for items which were cheaper there, he and Mildred bought some scotch whiskey to take home. After the convention, when we were in the departure room at the small airport, Henry was gathering the baggage and still grumbling about the mistake. Just at a quiet moment, Mildred's piercing voice filled the room, "Forget about those undies and bras you had, Henry. Where's the whiskey?" Garrett was the instant center of attention from his fellow academics, who pressed him amusingly but unmercifully to "come clean" and "tell the real truth, Henry."

Ruggles Gates, also a good companion, once took me to lunch at the Army & Navy Club in London, which was an archetypical English men's club. At that time I was a chain cigarette smoker (no longer, of course). Gates was speaking gravely of boorish academics, who did not know how to behave as gentlemen, with which I suppose I was expected to agree. But before I could say anything about such boorishness, three waiters in black suits, shiny black shoes, white shirts and black bow ties, descended on me from different directions and pushed an assortment of plates and bowls under me, all of them

trying to help me snuff out the cigarette, informing me with English graveness and propriety that smoking was not permitted! Men at other tables briefly looked at me without expression, unless it was disdain. This was in the late 1950s or early 1960s and the first non-smoking club I'd ever been in. England was years ahead of us. I don't think Gates ever invited me to lunch again. I was boorish, I know.

FRACTIOUS ACADEMICS

The scientists mentioned above, and others I will mention later, are worldwide leaders of current scientific thought in their fields. Their work, together with the work of certain others such as the late Richard Herrnstein of Harvard, who was not a Pioneer grantee, constitutes the scientific mainstream today.

Their agreement on many aspects of the race, genetics, and IQ issues makes them seem monolithic to those with only a cursory knowledge of their research, and this enables their opponents and some of the popular media to portray them as all marching in lockstep. But this they aren't! Each marches to the beat of his or her own research program, and they not infrequently disagree with each other.

Perhaps the most dramatic episode involved William Shockley. He wrote a letter to General Frederick Osborn concerning possible research on racial differences as these might be affected by dysgenic breeding patterns. Osborn, who had been president of Pioneer itself at an earlier time and also president of the American Eugenics Society, had written a definitive pre-war (1940) book on eugenics entitled *Preface to Eugenics*, in which he stated at p. 78:

It is very important that there should be further scientific studies on the genetic capacities of the different races.

In his revised edition (1951), that sentence was deleted from the corresponding paragraph on page 122. This deletion probably reflected the rising influence of the Franz Boas egalitarian school after World War II, because the 1951 edition adds a citation to Otto Klineberg, an anti-hereditarian and a Boas disciple, and describes him as being an expert on "international psychology," (p. 121).

Now on 28 February 1968 Osborn answered Shockley in a private letter that said:

so far there is no evidence that white people are on the average (above) Negroes in their genetic potential for intelligence.

He then referred by name to the book *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, but he apparently did not remember the author's name and referred to Shuey as "some woman," and said:

I think you will find that every competent sociologist or psychologist who reviewed it [Shuey's book] considered it fatuous to the point of being childish.

Of course time has been kinder to Shuey than Osborn was, but the episode illustrates the professional schisms that can and do occur between knowledgeable people such as Osborn, Shockley, and Shuey, all three linked to Pioneer.

A long time director of Pioneer, John B. Trevor, Jr., has been active in many historical, patriotic, and conservation societies. I once asked him why some of these did not consolidate, since their functions overlapped almost completely. "Don't you see?" he said, "these people are prima donnas, and they want to be leaders, not followers. They'll cooperate but not obey, and I wouldn't have it any other way."

And that's the way with top scientists. They are independent thinkers. These "pie in the face" fights are a normal and healthy expression of that independence, and often lead to clearer delineation of scientific issues.

In fact, I can laugh to myself at the thought of Bill Shockley being locked in a clique with anyone. He was far too strong willed, and brilliant, to go in lockstep with anyone, except his wife Emmy, who seemed to have his number. Others shortly would be exhausted, frustrated, and bewildered, if not worse. Or perhaps it could be said fairly that Shockley was a one man clique.

Knowledge of the relevant research shows how "un-cliquish" Pioneer grantees are. Arthur Jensen and T. Edward Reed disagreed in the journal *Intelligence* with some of fellow grantee Philippe Rushton's work on Asian and white cranial capacities. Rushton argued back in the same journal, and eventually he and Jensen found themselves in agreement, although Reed has not indicated how he stands now.

One Pioneer grantee even wrote a letter saying that the conclusion in a scholarly article by another grantee was "absurd."

Even more interesting is a tale of strange bedfellows. Rushton has done a blistering review of

some of Stephen J. Gould's work, which certainly could not have generated any love between them. Prior to that time Rushton began to use the "Out of Africa" model of emerging man in some of his theorizing. Pioneer grantees Seymour Itzkoff and Roger Pearson were less than happy, given that they had endorsed the opposing view of "Multiregionalism," which had been espoused by the famous anthropologist Carleton Coon in the 1960s. Once some of them (to remain unnamed) happened to be in my office in New York, and when I had to step outside for a moment I heard loud voices inside, even rough edged, not quite shouting but nearly that. Later Rushton found his position supported by none other than Stephen J. Gould, of whom he was later so critical. It is hard to think of Rushton and Gould as figurative bedfellows, but this is what happened.

A different kettle of fish is the vicious and unfair *ad hominem* attacks made against some scholars by people whose goal is to conceal or smother honest research, sometimes by demonstrations by political groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in the 1960s, sometimes by slanted reporting in certain papers or broadcasts, and sometimes even by other scientists whose political views overpower scientific ethics. Some of these attacks are mentioned in this Preface. I refer to them here, because Professor Lynn's interest as he wrote this book was focused on the scientific research, and in the book, as in his own personal experience, he does not pay much attention to that sort of distraction. Although he personally has been subjected to much abuse, as a dedicated scientist he has been able to shrug it off as irrelevant to science.

PORTRAIT OF A SWASTIKA PAINTER

Unbeknown to Pioneer for several years, a figure had been lurking on our trail. It was Barry Mehler. He had done his doctoral thesis on the subject of the American Eugenics Society (now the Society for Social Biology), and there had come across the names of the above-mentioned General Frederick Osborn (nephew of Henry Fairfield Osborn of the American Museum of Natural History) and Harry H. Laughlin, two of Pioneer's founders who also had been prominent leaders in the pre-war eugenics movement in the United States.⁵ Mehler always unfairly blurred eugenics and genocide as being nearly one and the same,⁶ so now he saw Osborn and Laughlin as contaminating Pioneer. He wrote a total of eight articles about Pioneer, but the early ones were published in such obscure places that we did not even hear of them for a couple of years or more.

Mehler has never attacked the scientific integrity of the Pioneer-funded research. He seems not competent for that. Instead, his attacks were *ad hominem*. With disregard for fact and decency, he has repeatedly labeled people as "racist," "Nazi," or "Nazi sympathizer," and he has tried to link Pioneer and its founders, directors, and scientists to the Holocaust, from Osborn and Laughlin in the early days down to Nancy Segal, then at the University of Minnesota.

When we belatedly heard of Mehler's writings and read them, we were startled that an academic figure would have such a ragged and disjointed style.⁷ I later asked a writer friend to look at them and then tell me how to describe the author. "He's a Swastika Painter," she said, "because that's his line of business."

"No," another female acquaintance said, "he's a Stalker." I think she chose this description because Mehler has seemed obsessed with Pioneer for all

these years and followed its actions from a distance, but never to this day has he sought access to its files or met a single officer or director of Pioneer. I don't believe he has ever met any of the scientists either, except Philippe Rushton briefly on the Phil Donohue and Geraldo Rivera TV shows, and except that he once interrupted a symposium honoring Lloyd Humphreys, head of the psychology department at Illinois, by shouting that Humphreys' research would lead to Nazism and a holocaust.

When we first discovered Mehler trailing us, we were already stuck with him in one sense. His innuendo, quotes out of context, guilt by remote association, proof by tautology, name calling, gross distortions, and the like had already been spread in many places.⁸ Copies of his materials had gone mysteriously to numerous campuses, and copies were sent anonymously to many in the media.

Mehler has appeared in person on several campuses to spread his materials. He has spoken in public where possible and has sometimes gotten himself on TV or radio by claiming to expose Nazis. Mehler personally sat with the Peter Jennings staff to plan the TV broadcast described at the beginning of this Preface, and he gulled the staff. The first paragraph of this Preface lists some of Mehler's false and misleading materials, which were accepted in toto by the Jennings staff, eager to provide excitement.

During Mehler's entire career, he has done little of note, other than these attacks on Pioneer, and except for brief similar attacks on the deceased Stanley Porteus of the University of Hawaii and on 92-year-old Professor Raymond Cattell of Hawaii, using the same tactics.⁹ The former attack sought to change the name of Porteus Hall, originally named in his honor. The latter attack caused the American

Psychological Association to postpone a lifetime achievement award it had planned to give Cattell in August 1997. Then, sadly, Cattell died in February 1998, while still defending himself against Mehler's charges, and before receiving his award, shortly before what would have been Cattell's 93rd birthday.

One scientist said, after hearing one of these false charges, "Mehler has tied a tin can to his own tail, which he'll realize some day — too late!"

Mehler, intentionally or not, has fostered copycats such as Adam Miller, John Sedgwick, and Charles Lane, all tabloid type writers who did not hesitate to adopt Mehler's charges as their own, embellish them, and in some cases add vivid untruths of their own creation. Miller's writings, like Mehler's, have been fed mysteriously to the media.

PAINTED INTO A CORNER?

I was saddened but not surprised when overly eager newspaper and broadcast reporters and magazine writers repeated these Mehler-Miller stories. The stories were easy to find, they were titillating, and they sold papers. The more responsible papers, including the *New York Times* (21 February 1996), the *Economist* (24 January 1998), and the *Wall Street Journal* (9 January 1995 and 22 June 1999), promptly published letters from Pioneer correcting the record. Some others, however, including London's *The Independent on Sunday* and the *Sacramento Bee*, required prodding by Pioneer's lawyers before publishing Pioneer's corrections (8 July 1990 and 9 March 1996, respectively).¹⁰

I was surprised and dismayed to find that a few academic figures, even highly placed ones, fell into the same trap. I had expected them to be more

responsible. The list of academics who repeated the false stories, without contacting Pioneer or its officers or directors and apparently with little or no attempt to verify the facts with non-hearsay evidence, includes Richard Delgado of the University of Colorado, Michael J. Howe of the University of Exeter, William H. Tucker of Rutgers University, Thomas F. Pettigrew of the University of California at Santa Cruz, and Michael Shermer of Occidental College.¹¹

One of these, Professor Tucker, after being criticized by me in the journal *Society* for repeating unverified (and false) hearsay, simply found some new unverified (and false) hearsay and substituted that, in the same journal. Some of them refused to acknowledge error, huffing and puffing while being unable to produce any non-hearsay evidence to support their claims. My writer friend, referred to earlier, said we might call this "the trapped rat syndrome," but I suppose that's a little harsh. Perhaps we should just say they painted themselves into a corner.

This little group of academics is disproportionately influential within many professional organizations. When Pioneer filed a formal complaint against a professor of psychology and against his friend as an editor of the *American Journal of Psychology* for refusing to retract a falsehood, Deborah Carliner of the Office of Ethics of the American Psychological Association replied with a letter to this writer dated 28 July 1997 to the effect that an ethics charge could not be opened against the two men, and that the policy of the Office of Ethics was not to disclose the reason.

Of course there are some academics and others who are motivated by fear or career considerations,

rather than political beliefs. I wish Pioneer had a dollar for each time a scientist, a media person or a publisher said, "I pretty much agree with so-and-so or such-and-such, but if I say anything like that, I'm likely to lose my grant/job/promotion/book contract, etc."

Now I realized that Professor Gates' controversy about hairy ear rims had been mere child's play. Mehler-Miller created far more noise, but of course the enormity of their false charges was greater.

BACKHANDED COMPLIMENTS

In the decades of attacks on Pioneer, we could find a little solace in being deemed worthy of attacks, rather than going unnoticed. Also we could take pride in the failure of the attackers to contradict to any real degree the scientific research itself, but rather their fallback on the default tactics of *ad hominem* attacks on scientists or other individuals connected with Pioneer, or Pioneer itself.

Then, once in a while, the attackers paid us a more direct compliment, unexpected by us and certainly unintended by them. The following passage is from Stefancic and Delgado's (1996) *No Mercy* (p. 142):

It [Pioneer] selects the best proposals from the best scholars and funds them amply; grants of \$200,000 and more are not rare. Known as the preeminent sponsor of research in this area, it is spending so lavishly that it appears to be depleting its capital so that it may eventually disappear. But before this happens, it will have achieved a remarkable record. Much of the research relied on in the influential book by Richard Herrnstein and

Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve*, for example, was financed by the fund. As the *Chronicle of Higher Education* recently put it, "Whether people revere, revile or review the Pioneer Fund from a safe distance, most say that it has successfully stretched [its] dollars a long way." According to Barry Mehler, a historian who has been studying them for nearly two decades, "The Pioneer Fund has been able to direct its resources like a laser beam."

RESEARCH ON RACE

Most of the scientists mentioned above, except Shuey, did not regard race as his or her main field of research. Many were accused of being racist, but only because of the way in which race fitted itself into their bigger research projects on human nature and human variation. For example, the Gottfredson-Gordon team studied the broad field of job qualification, and on average blacks tested lower for police and firefighter jobs than did Asians and whites, not because Gottfredson and Gordon were researching race but because the tested aptitudes were exactly that.

In addition to Shuey, three scientists, although doing work in other fields, did have periods of their careers when they concentrated on the subject of race. These were P. E. Vernon, Richard Lynn, and J. Philippe Rushton.

P. E. Vernon, a president of the British Psychological Society, compiled the first comprehensive book on Asian intelligence, a work almost equal in scope to Shuey's work on black intelligence, and he showed that Asians score higher on average than Caucasians, just as Shuey showed that the latter score higher than blacks.

Richard Lynn has compiled, more than any other scientist, comprehensive studies of worldwide

intelligence patterns, as well as important analyses of the "brain drain," which has lowered the average IQ in Scotland and some other places, the effects worldwide of nutrition improvement, and the like. His latest summary on sub-Saharan Africans, including all known testing through 1995, shows the average black IQ there to be 70, or about a standard deviation below African Americans and two standard deviations below whites.

It has always fascinated me that not a single soul complained about Pioneer financing P. E. Vernon when he showed Pacific Rim Asians to be smarter on average than whites — there hasn't been even a whisper of an objection, not from the media, nor from the Swastika Painter, nor from any academics. But when Jensen, Eysenck, Lynn and others showed whites to be smarter on average than blacks, the skies opened up, and torrents of abuse fell on Pioneer and the scientists. One observer, perhaps in disgust, commented that the difference in response reflected the "peculiar, almost anti-white atmosphere in which racial research must now be carried out."

RUSHTON, RACE RESEARCH, AND HATE CRIME LAWS

Rushton has made racial variation into his primary field of research, at least for the present. In his book *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective*, he has delineated to a greater degree than any other researcher the continuum on which many human traits vary by race, especially focusing on brain size and its relation to IQ. Rushton also did testing of highly selected black university students in South Africa and found an average IQ of 85, which would be consistent with a general population average of 70.

Like Jensen, he is always available to other scientists to help them with questions in his areas of expertise. He is much in demand at scientific conferences worldwide, where he exchanges ideas and is busy coordinating his work with that of others. Also like Jensen and the others, he has been the victim of abuse, including unruly mobs running through his college hallway, calls for his dismissal by the provincial premier, investigation by the provincial police, and much more. That he is able to handle his delicate subject so well under the circumstances is a tribute to Rushton's dignity, perception, and intelligence. Indeed his talent extends also to having a good radio voice and a good TV presence. Several have said he has movie star quality.

Rushton is able to face up calmly to even hot-headed critics looking for a fight. Once he was debating the Japanese-Canadian television science commentator David Suzuki before a large audience at the University of Western Ontario. Suzuki spoke, not of the scientific issues, but of racism and the like. Rushton, sticking to science, stated that research with the state-of-the-art technique of magnetic resonance imaging and other methods showed Pacific Rim Asians on average to have larger brains than whites, and whites on average to have larger brains than blacks. There were boos and catcalls. Rushton then said quietly, "If you don't believe me, just get a tape measure tomorrow and go out on the campus and measure heads."

That brought stunned silence, probably because the students sensed that Rushton must be certain of his ground. Rushton's manner was such that his suggestion did not sound racist or even harsh. It came across as a softly stated proposal, with an underlying factual basis.

The suggestion amused me, however, with the vision of a 130 pound student nerd telling a giant student athlete, "I want to measure your head." Only Rushton could have gotten away with suggesting that.

No wonder that the Peter Jennings TV show edited out its interview with Rushton, who was able to stand up to their most highly trained interviewers and fare well. The Jennings staff also edited out Gordon, Gottfredson, Michael Levin, and perhaps others whom they first interviewed on tape for many hours but then ignored for the Pioneer broadcast.¹²

The most frightening part of Rushton's story is how Canada's hate crimes laws were used in an attempt to silence him and spike his research. While in the United States our Founding Fathers gave us the protection of the First Amendment, this is not so in most of the world. In Canada and many Western European nations there are laws against free speech, ostensibly enacted to inhibit "hate" and the spreading of "false news."

The facts in the Rushton case are as follows. As a result of the furor over his 1989 AAAS paper, hate crime laws were turned against Rushton in a series of legal and political battles. The premier of Ontario publicly called for him to be fired, the Ontario Provincial Police mounted a six-month investigation of him threatening him with incarceration, and when that failed to eventuate, the Ontario Human Rights Commission mounted a four-year investigation of him. On another occasion Canada Customs seized a copy of his book, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, holding it for nine months while their lawyers read it over to determine if it was "hate literature."

The use of hate crime laws to derail scientific research goes well beyond the race issue. Scholars in

the social sciences examining any biological or historical question regarding groups, defined not only by race, but by ethnic identity, sex, age, or sexual orientation are potential targets. Despite the First Amendment and America's tradition of academic freedom, the campaign against Rushton in Canada was used as a jumping off point to attack the academic freedom of Robert Gordon and Linda Gottfredson in the United States and to prevent Pioneer from funding their research. This was so even though Gottfredson and Gordon have never taken a position as to the genetic component in race differences, but only demonstrated their existence and the pragmatic consequences for industry and academia, whatever the cause.

GOTTFREDSON, GORDON, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Linda Gottfredson and Bob Gordon teamed up for some of the most valuable social science research imaginable. American industry widely relies on their work on: (a) the relationship between intelligence and productivity, and (b) the testing of job applicants. It was they who exposed the Labor Department's surreptitious "race norming" and other such tactics. They also exposed the Justice Department Civil Rights Division's efforts to effectively abolish intelligence tests in selecting police and firefighters, raising the horrifying prospect of low intelligence or even functional illiteracy among these public servants. Gottfredson and Gordon have clarified for many of us the role of intelligence in maintaining our standard of living, and even our very civilization.

Yet, at one time abuse was heaped on them — research grants were blocked by the University of Delaware,¹³ promotions were denied to Gottfredson

and a colleague, credits for Gottfredson's course were restricted, they were treated as pariahs in their own two universities. Yet they persevered.

They persevered, and they won. In every administrative and judicial proceeding at the University of Delaware, Gottfredson emerged the victor, always with Gordon's staunch and resourceful support, and the support of some less timorous members of her own faculty. But it took two years of their time, which could better have been devoted to their work.

Here one can credit Mehler with a short-lived success in what he has chosen to make his life's work, at least thus far. His tracts were circulated at the University of Delaware, as elsewhere, and an English professor there wrote a long letter to the interim president of the University alleging that Pioneer was Nazi or racist, citing Mehler and/or his mentor Jerry Hirsch no less than 28 times. Amusingly, the writer claimed that he had not gotten his (untrue) facts from Mehler. The University's interim president, as many academics might do in today's political climate, chose what he must have thought was the safer road, and assumed Gottfredson, Gordon, and Pioneer to be guilty of something evil, although it was never clear exactly what. But he underestimated Gottfredson, and Gordon as well. Today Gottfredson is widely regarded as a real "star," who has brought international academic prestige to the University, probably more than any other Delaware faculty member ever.

She has carried on her research, written extensively, attended to her faculty duties, testified before a congressional committee, and guest edited a major journal, all as a single mother raising teenage

twin daughters. She is someone who won't be forgotten.

PUBLISHING OF RESEARCH

An obstacle faced by many scientists, and one more formidable than student riots or physical threats, has been the media's general unwillingness to publish materials on individual or racial differences in intelligence, even where the materials represent the mainstream of scientific thought. Pioneer witnessed this as early as the 1950s, when publishers refused Shuey's landmark book on Negro intelligence, forcing her to go to private printers and private distribution. Nearly half a century later Arthur Jensen, the world's leading expert on mental ability, submitted his manuscript of *The g-Factor* to three major publishing houses in succession, each of which initially indicated great interest but then without explanation to him lapsed into silence for months, neither accepting nor rejecting the book,¹⁴ until the long silence forced him to go to another publisher and finally to a smaller one independent of the pressures of "political correctness." Scientific journals often have behaved in a similar manner. More recently, the publisher of Philippe Rushton's abridged edition of the scholarly *Race, Evolution, and Behavior* abruptly withdrew the book after 45,000 copies had been printed and distributed, with the publisher claiming it had not known what was in the book.

Snyderman and Rothman, in their 1988 book *The IQ Controversy: The Media and Public Policy*, found that the media leave:

readers and viewers with the very clear impression that expert opinion is decidedly environmentalist and anti-testing. Our survey of experts

demonstrates that this is not the case. The news media have allowed themselves to be influenced by a minority of vocal psychologists and educators whose radical views are consistent with a set of journalistic values emphasizing human equipotentiality and equality of outcome (pp. 233-234).

and so

have come to see themselves not as deliverers of great scholarship to the world, but as gatekeepers for the politically correct (p. 40).

To combat this gatekeeper syndrome, Pioneer has assisted other nonprofit organizations in printing and distributing scientific articles, monographs, and books, and news about scientists and their research, and also has aided public interest law firms where scientific knowledge might be reflected in legal opinions and writings. These organizations of course are limited in their reach. Moreover these organizations sometimes present a dilemma in that they have some political action agenda (which is quite appropriate given their charter and operating guidelines), while Pioneer has never taken a position on any political issue and does not intend to. All too often, no other means of disseminating vital research has been available outside purely academic journals. These organizations have achieved enough distribution to ensure that a record exists of the more valuable work and is accessible not only to researchers, but to interested members of the public.

Among the organizations that Pioneer has supported for this purpose, usually with only small amounts of money, are the American Immigration

Control Foundation (managed by G. Palmer Stacy), Atlantic Legal Foundation (headed by Douglas Foster and Edwin L. Lewis), the Center for Individual Rights (led by Michael Greve and Michael McDonald), FAIR (headed by John H. Tanton, Daniel Stein, and others, and which also does considerable demographic research), the Foundation for Human Understanding (managed by R. Travis Osborne), The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (one time grant to help publish a book on population problems), the Institute for the Study of Man which publishes the *Mankind Quarterly* (Roger Pearson), International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics (then managed by A. James Gregor, Robert E. Kuttner and Donald A. Swan), and the New Century Foundation (headed by Jared Taylor).

In very recent times the previously closed gate to publishing has been partially opened. Rushton wrote a paper on race and sex differences in brain size, which passed peer review at a leading journal, was put into page proof, then suddenly was pulled from the issue and rejected. But Douglas K. Detterman of *Intelligence* stepped forward and accepted the paper, and also asked Rushton to write an editorial about the experience. Somewhat similarly, this writer wrote an article¹⁵ recording Pioneer's funding of scientific research which (because I am not a scientist) was critiqued at my request by several helpful scientists until they thought it in shape for publication. I then sent it successively to two prominent professional journals, each of which rejected it outright, and sent me six reviewers' comments which seemed angry and almost abusive. But Douglas and Carol H. Ammons of *Psychological Reports* accepted it, and sent me the comments of four

outside, and one inside, reviewers, all of whom made constructive comments, totally unlike the earlier six reviewers.

Perhaps the gate is opening.

THANKS TO RICHARD LYNN

The foregoing pages reflect some memories about my years with the Pioneer Fund and about some of the scientists and others who've been involved. I owe these people a big debt for permitting me over the years to see not only the marvelous work they have done but also the roadblocks that others sometimes have thrown in their way and how they coped. This close-up view reinforces my belief that truth will win, not only because it is right but also because these exceptional scientists are on its side.

These scientists and I owe a great debt to Professor Lynn for writing this book setting forth so clearly what these scientists have given to mankind. Professor Lynn's book has hastened the day when the media, society-at-large, and certain hostile segments of academia will see through the myriad of distortions and will have the intellectual integrity to recognize openly our debt to these scientists, who include in their number some of the most cited and honored individuals in their respective fields, for their role in reshaping the face of social science and man's knowledge of himself.

New York, NY
January, 2000

NOTES

1. Professor Robert Gordon wrote a 69-page analysis of the broadcast, in which he concluded that the "broadcast was ... slick political propaganda tricked up as news." The Pioneer Fund distributed this letter and a transcript of the broadcast to 462 schools of journalism. The letter may be found at www.pioneerfund.org.

². Also maligned in the broadcast was *The Bell Curve* by the late Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray. Like me, Murray refused an invitation to be interviewed on tape for the program.

³. A shorter history was written by me. Harry F. Weyher, "Contributions to the History of Psychology: CXII - Intelligence, Behavior Genetics, and the Pioneer Fund," *Psychological Reports* 82 (1998): 1347-1374. Additional facts are also given in Harry F. Weyher, "The Pioneer Fund, the Behavioral Sciences, and the Media's False Stories," *Intelligence* 26 (1999): 319-336.

⁴. In all of this I observed one of Draper's characteristics that helped me evaluate later questionable claims of statements he supposedly made and conversations he supposedly had. To my knowledge he never made research proposals to any people below the top. Aside from the prominent people listed above in the text, for the early non-Pioneer project on race crossing in Jamaica, Draper went directly to Charles Davenport, the head of the Carnegie Institute of Washington. In establishing prizes for demographic papers, he went to Davenport and to Harry L. Laughlin, head of the Cold Spring Harbor Eugenics Records Office. In considering projects involving intelligence, he went to Henry Garrett, president of the American Psychological Association. Draper of course knew, and was always on good terms with, people of lesser rank, but when a project was involved, he dealt only with the top. In the same vein, when Draper established Pioneer, he invited only outstanding men to the board: General Frederick Osborn, later a member of the U. N. Atomic Energy Commission and then President of the American Eugenics Society; Harry L.

Laughlin; John M. Harlan, described above; and Malcolm Donald, a prominent Boston lawyer and later a civilian in the wartime Pentagon with a rank approximately equivalent to brigadier general. The pattern extended as well to his other philanthropies and to his business dealings.

⁵. Teddy Roosevelt, Alexander Graham Bell, John Harvey Kellogg, and countless other prominent Americans were supporters of positive eugenics (helping to increase the number of healthy and bright offspring) long before Hitler came to power. Roger Pearson, *Heredity and Humanity: Race, Eugenics and Modern Science* (Washington, D.C.: Scott-Townsend Publishers, 1996). Indeed, Germany itself enacted some programs of negative or reform eugenics (helping to decrease the number of defective offspring) before Hitler's rise, these being patterned after laws which existed earlier in more than half the United States. To credit eugenics to Hitler or to equate it with the Holocaust is both unfair and inaccurate.

⁶. Both words are partly based on the Greek *genos*, meaning either: (a) birth or (b) kind or race. "Eugenics" uses *genos* in the first sense, and adds the Greek *eu* meaning well. "Genocide" uses *genos* in the second sense of kind, or race, and adds the Latin *cida* meaning killing. So one word means "well born" and the other "killing a race." The two terms have no necessary connection. Mehler could just as easily have blurred "circumscription" with "circumcision," or perhaps adopted William Safire's example of a malapropism, turning "Tannenbaum" into "atom bomb."

⁷. His doctoral thesis is in sharp contrast to his later writings. The thesis generally is restrained, documented, and accurate. All the later writings about Pioneer were the opposite in all respects, unfit for any scholarly journal.

⁸. An amusing example is Mehler's typewritten manuscript, headed "An Edited Manuscript - Final Version Scheduled for Publication in *Patterns of Prejudice* (#419)," which was dated 30 May 1989 and circulated on the campus at the University of Delaware. In this manuscript Mehler discusses whether Professor Philippe Rushton can be called a "racist," and for

proof he says that *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (G. & C. Merriam Co. 1971) defines racism as:

the assumption that psychocultural traits and capacities are determined by biological race and that races differ decisively from one another.

In fact, the full definition in that dictionary reads as follows:

the assumption that psychocultural traits and capacities are determined by biological race and that races differ decisively from one another which is usually coupled with a belief in the inherent superiority of a particular race and its right to domination over others.

Pioneer called attention to this misleading partial quote in the publicly circulated manuscript distributed on the campus, and that partial quote was eliminated in the later published version.

⁹. The attack on Cattell is described by Glayde Whitney, "Raymond B. Cattell and the Fourth Inquisition," *The Mankind Quarterly* 38 (Fall/Winter 1997): 99-125. For Mehler's background, see Roger Pearson, *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Scott-Townsend Publishers, 1997), 258-280. Another Mehler incident not recorded elsewhere involved a man who had collaborated with Mehler on several occasions and who falsely posed as a reporter for the *Baltimore Sun*, or sometimes the *Texas Observer*, calling himself "Ben O'Brien." The *Baltimore Sun* confirmed by a private letter to Roger Pearson of 23 February 1988 that it had no such reporter. In 1988 the impostor, and also a man who identified himself as Mehler, telephoned the widow of the recently deceased Professor Robert Kuttner, a Pioneer grantee. Although Mehler had published innuendo against Kuttner, he and "Ben O'Brien" now posed as his admirers, and asked the

widow to give them all of Kuttner's papers. She was suspicious, checked with friends, and then refused.

¹⁰. The most commonly repeated false charges of Mehler and Miller are listed on Pioneer's Web site, together with the relevant truth, at www.pioneerfund.org.

¹¹. Professor Richard Delgado is a law professor and presumably trained to be alert for false hearsay. Professor Michael Shermer is the editor of a magazine called *Skeptic*, which prides itself on questioning assumptions.

¹². Robert Gordon, Linda Gottfredson, Michael Levin, Philippe Rushton, and perhaps others each spent several hours being taped by Jennings' staff, but all this was reduced in the broadcast to a shot of Gordon a few seconds long. What these scientists said on tape, and which was completely edited out, contradicted the whole thrust of the Jennings broadcast. The Jennings staff had the truth before them, but chose not to use it.

¹³. Private letter to Harry F. Weyher from Andrew B. Kirkpatrick, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees at the University of Delaware, dated 2 July 1990, said the following:

No matter whether [racism] is in fact the orientation of the Pioneer Fund or not, that is perceived as the orientation of the Fund by at least a material number of our faculty, staff and students. Without judging the merits of this perception, the board's objective of increasing minority presence at the University could ... be hampered if the University chose to seek funds from the Pioneer Fund at this time.

¹⁴. Probably not one publisher wanted to be known as rejecting a book by such a prominent scientist, so each just lapsed into silence. Kevin Lamb contacted one of these publishers and was told "Chances are" the silence was a "a very deliberate decision." Kevin Lamb, "IQ and PC," *The National Review*, 27 January 1997, 40.

¹⁵. See footnote 3.