

RACE AND SEX DIFFERENCES IN INTELLIGENCE AND PERSONALITY

Helmuth Nyborg, editor

A wonderful survey of the state of intelligence research, and a credit to the driver of the research

Richard Lynn is a differential psychologist. He is interested in differences among people and among populations. He is a man out of his time. This is an era which is dedicated to the concept of equality. Dedicated to the concept of equality, resolutely ignoring any evidence that people and especially peoples are not equal.

Lynn refuses to take things as given. He has an inquiring mind, a deep curiosity, and a phenomenal appetite for work. He will receive, or conceive, a large hypothesis, and then structure experiments, surveys, methodologies to determine whether or not there is any substance to the hypothesis.

He measures the differences in intelligence, personality traits, and other quantifiable aspects of people. Among whom? The different races and national groups, and the sexes. These are of course the lightning rod issues of our time.

Lynn had to have a thick skin. All the researchers in this area have taken an amazing amount of abuse. Steven Pinker discussed the vilification, the ostracism, the lack of recognition by the scientific community, in his 2003 book "The Blank Slate." With the death last year of Arthur Jensen and Philippe Rushton, Lynn survives as one of the few remaining giants in the field.

Most of the articles in this book involve some statistics. It is often above the level of the average practitioner even in the field of social sciences. The treatment of statistics gives the reader an appreciation of how difficult it is to arrive at confident conclusions, and how dedicated the researchers are to impartiality, whatever malign motives their ignorant detractors may impute to them. Lynn, for instance, faithfully reports that measured sex differences in IQ tests have fallen over time. If he had an agenda, he might have been expected to overlook these results. No – he holds nothing back, disclosing precisely what the data tell him.

Two of the articles are especially illuminating. In one, a North African discusses intelligence tests that were administered among Libyans. It is a beautifully written article on the way that they structured the tests. How do you compile a representative sample of the population? How do you construct the test instrument? Then, having assembled the test results, how do you handle outliers, and ensure that results of the tests represent a normal distribution? How do you demonstrate that they are statistically valid, meeting all of the standard tests for statistical acceptability, and that they are significant – that they represent something real? This is an illuminating tour through the world of statistics in the social sciences. I cannot recall other articles that adhered so closely to the rigorous standards of good

practice, and so clearly explained why and what they were doing. The conclusion, incidentally, resulted in no new knowledge. It amounts to no more than a rigorous confirmation of what had long been established, that the average IQ of North Africans is around 81, comparable to the tenth percentile of the British population.

The second one that attracted my attention was the article on sex differences in intelligence. This one involved a lot of structured equation modeling, and confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis. In this one I learned something. The hypothesis is that boys' and girls' intelligences are quite evenly matched up to about the age of 16, but that male IQs continue to grow after that point, ultimately being somewhere around 3 to 5 points above that of females. It is associated with physical maturity. Women achieve their adult growth earlier, while men continue to grow, in cranial capacity among other dimensions. Performance by sex on the different subtests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Survey varies, with women leading men on two of the 11 tests. There was quite a bit of discussion about methodology, the ways in which the measurements could be skewed, and the efforts that the researchers took to offset the bias.

The first article in the collection talks about the evolution of general intelligence. It is the formal statement of a purely Darwinian theory that has been around for a long time. It takes more intelligence to survive in a cold climate. Humans need to cooperate more closely in the hunt, make better clothes and shelter, and think ahead to survive cold winters, droughts and the like. A topic that they do not discuss at great length is the impact of agriculture. Other researchers such as Cochran and Harpending have written about the increased demands on intelligence imposed by more highly evolved societies since the dawn of agriculture. Satoshi Kanazawa advocates a theory of novelty. The more new phenomena and situations confront a population, the more intelligent they become. Turning the logic around, the more novel ways there are to die, the smarter you have to be to survive.

Several articles talk about Lynn and Vanhanen's 2002 book "Intelligence and the Wealth of Nations" and the successor volumes. Many writers, going back to the dawn of intelligence testing, had noticed that there were racial differences in intelligence. Lynn made highly systematic studies, assembling a database of metadata of intelligence tests throughout the world. This rich collection of data was useful for refuting several theories, among them the hypothesis that diminished black intelligence in the United States was a function of the historic treatment of blacks in that country rather than an artifact of their genetic background. In fact, due to the admixture of other races, the average intelligence of blacks in the United States, at 85, is significantly higher than the average of 70 found in Africa. Different African populations differ as well; the Bushmen come in at 54, and the North Africans, as reported above, in the low 80s. It is worth noting that within the history recorded by westerners, Zulus have widely displaced Bushmen and Arabs displaced and/or dominated black Africans down the east coast of the continent. Natural selection on the basis of intelligence has occurred even among purely African populations.

There are a couple of articles on the Flynn effect. All of them note the fact that Richard Lynn observed earlier than James Flynn that intelligences increased secularly, sometimes by substantial amounts. Another researcher named Tuddenham had written about it two decades earlier. Japan and Korea

showed 10 percent jumps from generation to generation. Nonetheless, because Flynn pushed the concept most doggedly, it is called the Flynn effect. While there is no consensus as to the totality of causes of the Flynn effect – better nutrition is certainly part of it – there is a concurrence that its impact is fading in Western Europe and the United States. The Flynn effect has not been operative in England for the past two decades.

The most alarming article in the collection is entitled "The Decay of Western Civilization: Double Relaxed Darwinian Selection" by Helmuth Nyborg. His argument is that native European peoples are becoming less intelligent generation by generation because the less intelligent among them are the ones who have the most children. Moreover, and ultimately more significantly, the native born are not nearly as fertile as immigrants, and those immigrants from Africa and the Middle East have substantially lower intelligence than native Europeans. He plots the decline of Danish intelligence from approximately 99 down to a projected 93 by the year 2072. He modestly notes in his conclusion that the only common thread among such conclusions is that they are inevitably wrong. The article does not discuss politics, but it seems clear to me that the European welfare state is on the ropes even as I write in 2014, and the welfare state policies that support this dysgenic devolution will end substantially before 2072, perhaps within the next two or three years. Their inability to afford to support immigrants may be the salvation of the Danish people.

A final note about the detractors. All respectable members of the establishment – The New York Times, the Guardian, the Telegraph, universities everywhere – deplore science like this. Ironically, these are the very people who will tell you how brave Galileo was to stand up to the orthodoxies of the Catholic Church. There is a new orthodoxy, called variously the New World Order, the Cathedral (by the Dark Enlightenment) or just plain political correctness. It vilifies and discredits researchers such as Lynn as viciously as ever did the Church, and it dominates modern intellectual discourse. Call these worthies on their hypocrisy. Ask them, as they condemn Lynn and his followers and debunk the whole field of intelligence research, if they have ever read Lynn, or if they can cite any peer-reviewed articles which authoritatively refute them. Ask them to explain why sources such as Wikipedia support Lynn and Jensen's findings. When they cite Stephen J. Gould's "Mismeasure of Man," which remains about the best they have, ask why they choose a 30-year-old book which itself argued against 19th century straw men rather than attempt to refute his real target, acknowledged, contemporary experts such as Arthur Jensen and Richard Lynn. Shine a little light. Stand up for freedom of inquiry!

This is a valuable survey of the state of the psychometric community, the world's intelligence researchers. It highlights their recent findings concerning intelligence differences in sex and race. Equally importantly, it illustrates their careful methodologies and the evolution of intelligence research over a long span of years, namely Lynn's lifetime. Its measured, scholarly approach, including the recognition of internal inconsistencies, disagreements, and areas in which more research is necessary, stands as a thoroughgoing refutation of reckless, polemical charges of bias and agenda-driven research. Those detractors could never assemble any science as credible as this; all they have is shrill invective.