

Race Differences in Intelligence

Richard Lynn

What Lynn has concluded is beyond dispute. On a logical plane the argument is won. There have been no statistical works to refute Lynn's work such as "IQ and the Wealth of Nations" or "The Bell Curve." There are ample critics of his motives and methods and the completeness of his analysis. Lynn would agree there is room for more work. The truth is, however, that there have been no serious statistical studies undertaken to refute his findings. While his critics claim that Lynn has painted an incomplete picture, none of them are bringing hard science to bear in an effort to find contradictory results.

People find it morally wrong to accept Lynn's argument. Lincoln's "All men are created equal" is our dogma. We have dropped Abe's qualifier "...under the law." It is taken as the most egregious form of racism even to raise the question that intelligences might be different. Scholarly minds work hard to forget that within our lifetimes it was well known in California that Chinese and Japanese kids were smarter than we white kids were, and ignore the accumulating evidence that nothing has changed since. Here follow two typical paragraphs, these from the introduction to "Measured Lies".

"For the past three decades American society has become increasingly addicted to blatant or unabashed utterance of the unutterable. It is now fashionable to say what one's parents would not have dared to say: perhaps the poor and aged should be terminated; women ought to be replaced with life-like replicas fashioned by Disneyland engineers; children cost more than they are worth; Blacks really are sub-human and dangerous after all; the Indians better stop bellyaching or they'll get their butts whipped again.

"It would be nice if one could merely ignore such utterances; and as Kincheloe and Steinberg argue in their Introduction to Measured Lies, it would be nice to be able to ignore Herrnstein and Murray's utterance. But to do so would be much too dangerous, for unutterables have a way of assuming a persuasiveness and realism that often undergird destructiveness of various sorts. So Measured Lies had to be written."

I too believe it is a moral question, but come to an opposite conclusion as to the moral course of action. Holding the conclusion that all races are equally capable, we have felt compelled to explain the vast difference in observed achievement in moral terms. Either

- a) Certain peoples are morally inferior, unwilling to work, avoid drugs, get married before having children, etc., or
- b) White people are morally culpable for systematically frustrating the aspirations of blacks, Indians and others through subtle racism, disparagement, etc.

Either way, simultaneously holding the hypothesis that all peoples are equally capable, and observing the manifest differences in their situations, many social observers have felt compelled to assign blame. That has led us to adopt measures to remedy problems that may be overblown or not exist. An ongoing

effort to eradicate supposed white racism. Efforts to encourage minority children to give up their self-destructive habits. Vast expenditures inspired by NCLB to arrive at equal school outcomes on the assumption that all children are equally capable of success, which at once frustrates many by asking more than they can achieve, and withholds from more capable students the level of preparation they will need in a competitive world economy.

The assumption of equality also precludes us from observing that the antisocial behavior of some members of society may make sense from within the constraints of their existence. We like to think that dealing drugs and mugging people is not a rational course of action for anybody. For a kid with an IQ of 70 and no marketable skills, however poor the odds, these could be among the most probable paths to success. The decisions he makes may be uncomfortably reasonable given his circumstance. Wouldn't the moral thing be to attempt to see him as he is an attempt to integrate him into society?

To me the argument in the sphere of biology is over. Lynn and company have won. We need to consider ways to legitimize the discussion of public policy options that take different peoples' different average abilities into consideration.

The statistical review Lynn provides is overwhelming: hundreds of studies covering tens of thousands of subjects by dozens of researchers over many decades. This has been his life's work. His evolutionary history borrows more heavily from others, chiefly Cavalli-Sforza, with some references to Coon, Diamond and others.

Human evolution isn't my forte, but I was struck by a few omissions. The first is war. I would expect warfare to exert a strong evolutionary pressure. A related question is whether or not, as Murray and Herrnstein proposed, cognitive stratification has increased since the introduction of agriculture and commerce. It would seem that civilization would bring more mating opportunities to the wealthy and powerful, and that sexual selection would play a more powerful role in communities of more individuals. Think of the Biblical record both of King David's wars and amours. Lynn chose likewise not to address the question of the strong selection for intelligence among Ashkenazim recently raised by BYU researchers. There is a follow-on book to be done.

I add later, see Nicholas Wade's "Before the Dawn" for a fascinating analysis of mankind's evolution over the past 50,000 years. It seems wholly consistent with Lynn's findings.

Revisiting this book after six years, I find Lynn's summary of the case for genetic differences (p189) to be succinct and valuable. I add it here for my own reference and a summary of Lynn's thought.

5. Genetic Determinants of Race Differences in Intelligence

While environmental factors undoubtedly contribute to the differences in intelligence between the races, there are a number of considerations that suggest that genetic factors are also involved. Ten of these are discussed in this section.

First, it is a principle of evolutionary biology that when sub-populations of a species become geographically isolated and occupy different environments, they become genetically differentiated and eventually diverge so much that they become different species. Thus, squirrels in North America have evolved gray fur while those in Europe have evolved red fur. From an original ancestral species, cats have evolved into lions, leopards, and cheetahs in Africa, tigers in Asia, and jaguars and pumas in the Americas. The general principle has been stated by Dawkins (1988, pp. 238-9), who writes that when two populations become isolated from one another “they become so unlike each other that, after a while, naturalists would see them as belonging to different races; after a longer time, they will have diverged so far that we should classify them as different species... the theory of speciation resulting from initial geographical separation has long been a cornerstone of mainstream, orthodox neo-Darwinism.”

The processes by which these genetic divergences take place have been described in Chapter 2. It is in accordance with this principle that the races have become genetically differentiated for all characteristics for which there is genetic variation, including body shape; color of skin, hair, and eyes; prevalence of genetic diseases; and blood groups. It is inconceivable that intelligence would be the single exception to these differences. Some racial differences in intelligence must also have evolved as a matter of general biological principle.

Second, the studies summarized in Table 13.1 show a consistency of the IQs of the races in a wide range of geographical locations that can only be explained by some genetic determination. For instance, in the 57 studies of general population samples of Africans in 17 African countries, all the IQs lie in the range between 59 and 88 (Table 4.1), and in the 14 Caribbean and Latin American countries all the IQs lie in the range between 60 and 80 (Table 4.3). Similarly, in the 58 studies of indigenous East Asians in 6 countries all the IQs lie in the range between 100 and 120 (Table 10.1). Only a genetic factor can explain the consistency of these race differences in so many different environments. It is curious that those who support the environmentalist theory of race differences in intelligence, such as Neisser (1996), Mackintosh (1998), Jencks and Phillips (1998), Nisbett (1998), Flynn (1980), Fish (2002), and Brody (2003), fail to make any mention of the consistency of the racial differences in so many different environments and nations.

Third, the races differ consistently in IQ when they live in the same environments. Thus, Africans in the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, and Brazil consistently have lower IQs than whites. The same is true of South Asians and North Africans in Britain, Continental Europe, Africa, Fiji, Malaysia, and Mauritius; of Native Americans living with Europeans in the United States, Canada, and Mexico; of Arctic Peoples living with Europeans in Canada; of Australian Aborigines living with Europeans in Australia; and of Pacific Islanders living with Europeans in New Zealand and Hawaii. All these differences are consistent and add to the credibility of the genetic theory.

Fourth, when babies from other races are adopted by Europeans in Europe and the United States, they retain the IQs characteristic of their race. This has been shown for Africans in the United States, where black infants adopted by white middle class parents have the same IQ as blacks reared in their own

communities (Lynn, 1994c); for Australian Aborigines in Australia; and for East Asians in the United States and Europe, where Korean infants adopted by Europeans have IQs in the range between 102 and 110 (Table 10.4) shown in Chapters 4, 8, and 10, respectively.

Fifth, mixed-race individuals have IQs intermediate between those of the two parent races. Thus, in the Weinberg, Scarr, and Waldman (1992) study of children adopted by white middle class families, at the age of 17 years blacks had an IQ of 89, those of mixed black-white parentage an IQ of 98, and whites an IQ of 106 (Lynn, 1994c). When the amount of European ancestry in American blacks is assessed by skin color, dark-skinned blacks have an IQ of 85 and light-skinned blacks have an IQ of 92 (Lynn, 2002a), and there is a statistically significant association between light skin and intelligence.

Similarly, mixed-race Australian Aborigines have IQs intermediate between full-blooded Aborigines and Europeans (Chapter 8, Section 2); and mixed-race Native Americans have IQs intermediate between full-blooded Native Americans and Europeans (Chapter 12, Table 12.4).

Sixth, the IQs of races explain the extent to which they made the Neolithic transition from hunter gathering to settled agriculture. This transition was made completely by the more intelligent races: the Europeans, the South Asians and North Africans, the East Asians, the Southeast Asians, and the Native Americans; to some extent by the Pacific Islanders, who were handicapped by living in small and dispersed populations on small islands; minimally by the Africans; but not at all by the Bushmen and Australian Aborigines, with IQs of 54 and 62, who have made virtually no progress in the transition from hunter-gatherers to settled agricultural societies. The only anomaly is the Arctic Peoples, with their IQ of 91, who remain largely hunter-gatherers, but this is due to their very small and dispersed populations and the harsh climate of the Arctic Circle.

Seventh, the IQs of races are consistent with their achievements in the development of early urban civilizations with written languages, systems of arithmetic, and codified laws as shown by Baker (1974), who has documented that only the East Asians, the Europeans, the South Asians and North Africans, and the Southeast Asians developed early civilizations. The less intelligent Native Americans developed a half civilization; and the remaining races failed to develop anything that could be called civilizations. The anomalies of the Pacific Islanders and Arctic Peoples, with their IQs of 90 and 91, neither of which has ever developed anything resembling a civilization, can be explained in the case of the Pacific Islanders as due to their very small and dispersed populations on isolated islands and, in the case of the Arctic Peoples, the severity of their climate, which has made it impossible to sustain urban civilizations. These race differences that Baker (1974) analyzed in the development of early civilizations in the period between approximately BC 4000 and 500 have persisted from 1 AD to the present. Virtually all the advances that have been made in the last two thousand years in science, mathematics, technology, and the arts have been made by the East Asians and the Europeans, with some small input from the South Asians and North Africans. This has been documented in detail by Murray (2003), although he analyzes these advances by geographic region and refrains from pointing out that it has been almost exclusively the East Asian and European peoples who have made these advances. The achievements of the races in making the Neolithic transition, in the development of early civilizations, and in the advances of mature

civilizations during the last two thousand years show that the differences in intelligence go back many thousands of years and are a further expression of genetically based race differences in intelligence.

Eighth, all the twin studies that have been carried out in Europe, India, and Japan, and on blacks and whites in the United States, have found a high heritability of intelligence in national populations. It is improbable that these high heritabilities within races could co-exist with the absence of any heritability for the differences between the races.

Ninth, there are race differences in brain size that are associated with differences in intelligence, and brain size has a heritability of 90 percent (Baare, Pol et al., 2001) (see also Rushton and Osborne, 1995). The only reasonable interpretation of this association is that the races with the higher intelligence have evolved larger brains to accommodate their higher IQs. A further elaboration of this point is given in Chapter 16, sections 3 through 6.

Tenth, the consistency of all the racial differences in so many different nations, in the development of - early and later civilizations, and the high heritability of intelligence wherever it has been investigated, all need to be considered in terms of Popper's (1959) theory of the logic of scientific explanation. This states that a scientific theory generates predictions that are subjected to empirical testing. A strong theory has few assumptions and generates a large number of predictions that are empirically verified. If the predictions are disconfirmed the theory is weakened and may even be destroyed, although a single disconfirmation can generally be explained or the theory can be modified to account for it. For the problem of race differences in intelligence, the theory that these have some genetic basis explains all the numerous phenomena set out in the points listed above, and there are no serious anomalies. The theory that the race differences in intelligence are to a significant extent genetically based fulfills Popper's criteria for a strong theory. Those who assert that there is no evidence for a genetic basis of racial differences in intelligence betray a lack of understanding of the logic of scientific explanation.