

EUGENICS AND GLOBAL IQ

Future Human Evolution

Eugenics in the Twenty-First Century

John Glad

Schuylkill Haven, PA: Hermitage Publishers, 2006

\$12

136 pp.

IQ and Global Inequality

Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen

Augusta, GA: Washington Summit Publishers, 2006

\$34.95

420pp.

Reviewed by Matt Nuenke

As the genetic revolution accelerates its pace, over the last few years there have been numerous books written on eugenics. The majority of these are intended to link eugenics with Adolf Hitler, white supremacy, or the terrible inhumanity of forced sterilizations. Doctor John Glad's recent book *Future Human Evolution: Eugenics in the Twenty-First Century* does an excellent job of recalling the primary purpose of past and present eugenics – the ongoing effort to improve the quality of life.

The book begins with an introduction by Seymour W. Itzkoff, who argues that the Holocaust was the result of warfare, not eugenics. Even if there were no genetic differences between ethnic groups, intergroup hatred and genocide would still be possible. The eugenics movement was a global enterprise and had robust programs in Europe and North America in the pre-WW II era. Eugenics policies under the National Socialists reflected similar programs in other Western nations. Eugenic discussion and speculation were commonplace, and only became tainted for political purposes – to deny racial differences.

Glad sums up the times,

The Great War and subsequent Depression undermined the mentality of Empire and class privilege, leaving a vacuum which was filled by an intellectual

climate of extreme egalitarianism. Western society of the twentieth century came to be dominated by a new, unified ideology. Freudianism, Marxism, B. F. Skinner's Behaviorism, Franz Boaz's cultural history, and Margaret Mead's anthropology all stressed the marvelous "plasticity" and even "programmability" of Homo sapiens. It was explained over and over that human minds differ little in their innate qualities, and that it is upbringing and education which explain the differences among us. Software is everything; hardware is identical and thus meaningless. The road to utopia lies through improved nurture alone.

Even though the heyday of this radical egalitarianism only lasted a number of decades, the hangover it caused has been very enduring. On the one hand, science has long since turned its back on these failing movements, but the public, still partly intoxicated, is unaware of the facts. *Future Human Evolution* clarifies the history of race and eugenics in a way that is concise, clear, and enjoyable to read. This book, along with others along parallel lines, has unshackled genetics: "The censorship has now been lifted, and there is agreement even among the most implacable foes of the eugenics movement that the taboo on eugenics can no longer stand."

A chief merit of *Future Human Evolution* is its demonstration of how the contemporary explosion in genetic research has established the vast importance of inheritance in who we are and how we behave, without scanting the role of nurture (when there is empirical evidence for it), Glad puts the anti-eugenicists on the hot seat by showing their real problem is not with eugenics, but with biology itself.

Like most eugenicists, Glad believes that raising the average intelligence of humans is the primary objective, and thus he explains intelligence testing, the Flynn Effect, dysgenics, the demographic transition and its impending failure to control the reproduction of the less mentally endowed, etc. He also discusses the eugenic practices of Jews, and discusses the link between eugenic aspects of the Jewish religion and the State of Israel's active eugenics program, which far surpasses any other nation's attempt to control declining birth rates.

My only objection with Glad's eugenics is his effort to make it a universal program, thus raising everyone's intelligence. That seems unlikely, because races with higher average intelligence will embrace eugenics, while those that cannot understand genetics will continue to breed as they always have – often and without forethought. This will eventually lead to an arms race towards human quality (IQ, good looks, health, stature, etc.), and as in all races, not everyone will finish first.

Future Human Evolution avoids lengthy historical recapitulations and marginal characters, so that readers seeking a history of eugenics should look elsewhere. For anyone seeking a short book on eugenics – past, present, and future – this book is the one I would recommend.

Glad's book is available free on the web as a download:

www.whatwemaybe.org/txt/glad.john.2006.future_human_evolution.web.003f.en.pdf

Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen are data collectors and analyzers, and together they have challenged the causes for inequality between nations. In their first book, *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* in 2002, they compared IQ and the wealth of nations, and challenged economists to find a more robust cause for wealth formation than average intelligence between nations.

They could have stopped with the above book, but such a politically incorrect assertion would come under a great deal of challenge – and it did. So they continued to collect data, review the criticisms, and wrote their second book, *IQ & Global Inequality* in 2006. Today, race is the single greatest challenge to the current zeitgeist of globalism, equality, open markets, etc. As long as everyone is assumed to be equal, both the Left and the Right can promote their agendas. However, if people do differ in innate intelligence, especially between races, all of the relationships change in perspective. From President Bush's No Child Left Behind, to trying to eradicate AIDS in Africa, to bringing democracy to Iraq, these programs are doomed to failure.

Surprisingly, "Our theory has received a mixed reception among social scientists, with positive and negative reactions being about equally divided." But just like the other nurture/nature wars, Lynn and Vanhanen have now put the challenge to economists who study national differences, and some have joined them in the research. In fact, it falls nicely into place with the decades of research in positive outcomes from psychometric studies of individuals and groups within nations. In terms of scientific parsimony, the simple observation of high intelligence has explanatory power for many human conditions and contexts.

This book has something else that is a real asset – a vast amount of data on different countries such as quality of life, average income, corruption, level of democracy covering almost all the countries. As a reference guide, it is invaluable for the traveler, the retiree, the investor, or governments that need to know what constitutes "the other." If the Bushites had read this book, they would have known that Afghanistan for example is unconquerable and uncontrollable – and the same is almost as true for many other countries in the Middle East.

They reiterate the challenge to Lewontin's *strawman* that most genetic differences are between individuals and not between population groups or races. The facts are there is a great deal of diversity in the human genome, and where there is genetic diversity there will be population group diversity over time due to genetic drift, ecological pressures, unique mutations, etc. Any two groups can differ as much between them as any two individuals can differ.

They note, "About the same time differences in intelligence were recognized in China. In the Sui dynasty, tests of ability were used about the year 500 BC to select applicants for the administrative class of mandarins who governed the provinces of the empire. These tests, normally in mathematics, astronomy, Chinese literature, and Chinese history, continued to be used up to the twentieth century."

And having amassed data on national IQs, other researchers are using this data to expand on its implication. For example, "Marina Counter has explored the relationship between national IQ and life expectancy extensively in her paper 'IQ and the Health of Nations.' She notes that even 'casual observation reveals that more intelligent people tend to do better in most areas of life, including health status, than less intelligent people do.' She continues that it is 'reasonable to ask if the same observation could be made of nations.' She used the national IQ data published in our book *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* and found that the Pearson correlation between national IQ and life expectancy is 0.80. Satoshi Kanazawa has also demonstrated on 126 nations that income inequality and per capita income have no effect on life expectancy once national IQ is controlled. The results of our analyses are similar."

They also look at regions and not just nations. They point out that the Arab Middle East for example, is a region of extreme autocratic political systems. No doubt, it is not just intelligence but culture and perhaps other psychometric differences such as openness or neuroticism. When it comes to "quality of the human condition," they show that 60% of global inequalities can be attributed to intelligence.

Global inequalities are extreme to say the least. They note that half the world's people live on less than \$2 a day, 1.2 billion on less than \$1 per day. And yet, even a moderate transfer of wealth would not help people with very low IQs. IQ impacts too many areas of life, making the transfer of wealth unadvisable. Besides, "The zero correlations between national IQ and the two measures of human happiness and life-satisfaction (0.029 and 0.033) show that human happiness and life-satisfaction do not depend on the level of national IQ...The results imply that human happiness and life-satisfaction are not strongly dependent on material conditions of life."

From an evolutionary standpoint, this should not be surprising. As hunter-gatherers, there was little accumulated wealth. And like all animals, the organism is so constituted not to be overly happy or dysfunctionally unhappy. Organisms, from the perspective of genes, are provided rewards for behaving in such a way as to propagate. Pleasure and pain go together to provide organisms with incentives to grow, stay alive, and reproduce. Humans it seems are unique in that they can become unhappy, angry or hostile if they are told that they are not being treated fairly. It seems for example that Blacks were happier and less belligerent before affirmative action advocates convinced

them they we equal to everyone else, and the only thing holding them back was racism.

Lynn and Vanhanen also point out that income has only a moderate heritability because other factors play a large part. To be intelligent allows you to make a higher income but does not assure a higher income if a person does not strive to make money. Conscientiousness, value achievement, and valuation of status all have high heritabilities similar to intelligence, so intelligence alone is not sufficient for income success.

They divide the major races (an arbitrary number of divisions, but based on genetic clusters):

(racially homogeneous)

East Asians

Europeans

South Asians & North Africans (South Asian & North African Caucasoids)

Southeast Asians

Pacific Islanders

Sub-Saharan Africans

(racially mixed)

Latin America

Caribbean

Between these geographic areas are known as clines, where the races are more mixed. That is why when using three major races they include North-western Europe, East Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa where the races have not had much mixture by other races.

Lynn and Vanhanen then show that the average IQs for the six homogeneous racial clusters are similar, with differences greater at the boundaries where hybridization can cause the average IQ of a nation to deviate from the geographical norm. They also discuss these average IQs in different nations where the environment varies significantly between nations within these IQ clusters, meaning they must be largely genetic. If the environment had any significant impact on IQ, then average IQs should show a pattern correlating with different environments, not geographical regions.

In addition, where different races come together and live under similar environments like the United States, the average intelligence for that group does not change. For example, East Asians continue to express an average IQ of 105, Southeast Asians an average IQ of 90, and Blacks an average IQ of 85 (due to about a 25 percent admixture of European genes – sub-Saharan Africans are closer to 70).

Determining the average IQ of any nation takes a lot of data, proxies, comparisons, and common sense. Lynn and Vanhanen point out however that sample sizes are not as important as the sample being representative of

the population group being studied. In addition, other researchers have not stepped forward challenging these average intelligences with their own research, though they would love to sabotage this less than egalitarian research. Marxists have over the last 20 years given up finding their own environmental explanations for differences in intelligence between races and have been left to attack empirical research with moral and methodological arguments – that is pseudoscientific objections.

They also discuss reliability of IQ measures, and show, along with other researchers, that the correlation actually increases between national IQ and Gross Domestic Product when nations are divided into just three categories: IQs below 90, IQs between 90~99, and IQs 100 and above. That is, even with very rough estimates of average IQ by nation, it is strongly correlated with GDP.

Stated succinctly, “The results of our study show that great global inequalities in human conditions persist despite all efforts to mitigate disparities and to help economic and social development in poor countries.... Our basic theme is that global inequalities in human conditions are causally related to evolved human diversity, especially to differences in the average intelligence of nations. According to our hypothesis, the quality of human conditions is expected to be the higher, the higher the average level of mental abilities (intelligence) of a nation.”

Inequality between nations is not just wealth, but numerous other variables studied by Lynn and Vanhanen. The strongest correlation was found between average intelligence and the Quality of Human Conditions (QHC) that consists of:

per capita income, adult literacy rate, tertiary enrollment ratio (percentage that get some schooling), life expectancy at birth, and the level of democratization.

National IQ explains 28~57 percent of the variation “in these five components of QHC.... Our conclusion is that differences in national IQs explain better than any other independent factor the average differences in the quality of human conditions. This can be regarded as the major result of our study. We have shown that the enormous global inequalities in human conditions are principally due to significant differences in national IQs.”

Lynn and Vanhanen conclude, “[W]e replied to arguments presented in several critical reviews of our previous book *IQ and the Wealth of Nations*. Our counter-arguments are that it is possible to check by empirical evidence the reliability and validity of national IQs, that the direction of causation is principally from national IQs to human conditions, and that we have presented evidence for a substantial genetic basis of national IQs. Besides, we have not argued that intelligence is the only determinant of differences in per capita income. On the contrary, we referred in our book to several other explanatory factors, including the impact of economic freedom and the nature of political and economic institutions.

“Our study has two major policy implications. First, economists and political leaders believe – or pretend to believe – that all peoples of the world have the same intelligence. If this were so, closing the gap between rich and poor nations should be relatively easy. All that is required is for rich nations to give poor nations more money so that they can improve education and this will increase their human capital up to the level at which they can produce goods and services that are competitive with those of rich nations. As a condition of this aid, the donor nations should require the recipient nations to introduce free market economies. Our study has shown that the belief that all peoples of the world have the same average intelligence is incorrect. On the contrary, there are large differences in the intelligence of nations and these are the most important cause of the differences in wealth and poverty. These intelligence differences will be hard to change because they are partly determined by genetic differences and the environmental factors contributing to them will be difficult to modify. It will therefore be much more difficult to alleviate world poverty than is generally believed.

“Second, in so far as intelligence is determined environmentally, there is a growing consensus that the major environmental factor affecting intelligence is the quality of nutrition. Inadequate nutrition stunts the growth of the body and also of the brain, and this impairs the development of intelligence. The most promising way of increasing the intelligence of the populations of poor countries would therefore be to direct some of the aid programs to the improvement of the quality of nutrition for pregnant women and infants. While we believe that this would increase the intelligence of the populations of poor countries and this would lead to a reduction in world poverty, it cannot be anticipated that it would eradicate the intelligence differences between nations and the consequent differences in per capita incomes. The persistence of differences in intelligence between nations is inevitable, and so too will be the consequence: the persistence of national differences in wealth. Or, as St. John put it two thousand years ago: *The poor you have always with you.*”

Matt Nuenke hosts a website that reviews academic studies on eugenics, IQ, and behavior genetics: neoeugenics.home.comcast.net/
