



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Criminal Justice

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jcrimjus

Academic freedom and race: You ought not to believe what you think may be true

James R. Flynn

Psychology Department, University of Otago, Dunedin 9001, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

There should be no academic sanctions against those who believe that were environments equalized, genetic differences between black and white Americans would mean that blacks have an IQ deficit. Whether the evidence eventually dictates a genetically caused deficit of nil or 5 or 10 or 20 IQ points is irrelevant.

The hypothesis is intelligible and subject to scientific investigation. If that is so, you must have already investigated it if you are to know what is true or false. To prohibit others from investigation or publication of their results is to designate certain truths as the property of an elite to be forbidden to anyone else. It is to insulate them from whatever new evidence the scientific method may provide that would modify belief. A word to those who seek respectability by banning race/gene research: how much respectability would you get if your position were stated without equivocation? What if you were to openly say genetic equality between the races *may or may not be true*; and that is exactly why I forbid it to be investigated. Or: “I do not know if genetic equality is true and do not want anyone else to know.”

There should be no academic sanctions against those who believe that were environments equalized, genetic differences between black and white Americans would mean that blacks have an IQ deficit. I will call this the genetic hypothesis as opposed to an environmental hypothesis. In passing, I wish to say that scholars who hold the genetic hypothesis are not thereby, guilty of racial bias. There is no doubt in my mind that Arthur Jensen was innocent of this (Flynn, 2013). Moreover, research into this question should not be forbidden. This is so, no matter what the outcome of the race and IQ debate, that is, no matter whether the evidence eventually dictates a genetically caused deficit of nil or 5 or 10 or 20 IQ points.

I will begin my case for this by discussing five propositions: (1) That the hypothesis is intelligible and subject to scientific investigation; (2) The advice that you ought not believe what you think may be true; (3) The advice that you ought not attempt to persuade those who may be in error; (4) The advice that you ought not to use the scientific method to enhance belief in the truth; (5) The use of sanctions to enforce the three pieces of moral advice just stated. Note that 2, 3, and 4 are simply that, only 5 advocates sanctions to coerce the behavior of those who refuse to be advised.

1. An intelligible hypothesis

Four arguments are used to challenge the coherence of the hypothesis that “on average black Americans have inferior genes for IQ

than white Americans.” First, that it makes a racial distinction and that there are no such things as pure races, that is, there are no groups of humans that have interbred exclusively within one another during their evolutionary history. That is true but the hypothesis asserts only that there are two sociologically identifiable groups in question. Those who deny this would have to be against affirmative action: blacks must be sociologically identifiable for benefits to be conferred.

Second, that if groups are sociologically identified, when there is a trait difference, you cannot claim that there is a genetic difference. This is manifestly false. Watasi and pygmies are two sociologically identifiable groups (they cannot be pure races because no such thing exists) and they differ on average for height. No scientist has ever doubted that genes are involved. Even prior to scientific investigation, they had sound empirical grounds: under conditions when food was plentiful within both groups, no one could find an adult pigmy that was as tall as an adult Watasi. A few years ago, Price et al. (2009) identified two genes involved in the iodide-dependent thyroid hormone pathway as likely causes.

A hypothetical example is instructive. Irish immigrants to America establish a town. Initially, they are randomly distributed in terms of residing north or south of the railway tracks. North become more desirable (better views, less fog, less flooding, etc.). Those who do better in school make more money, purchase homes north of the tracks, and tend to marry one another. Those who do worse make less money, tend to live south of the tracks, and wed one another. Within a few

E-mail address: jim.flynn@otago.ac.nz.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.05.010>

Received 28 February 2017; Accepted 15 May 2017
0047-2352/ © 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

generations, there will be a mean IQ difference between these two sociologically defined groups with a genetic component. Anyone who denies this must assert that school does not affect income or that intelligence does not affect success at school or that intelligence is not influenced by whether those have more children possess above or below average intelligence

Third, that unlike a tape measure, IQ tests are not culture free. This is true. I have advocated that societies at different stages of modernity should have IQ tests that prioritize cognitive abilities as each culture does (Flynn, 2016). In America, at the top of the list would be analytic abilities that predict success in the formal schooling that predicts occupational success. In Aboriginal society, top would be mapping abilities that predict how well you would do in finding water in a near-desert (mapping ability also useful for London taxi drivers). It would be quite absurd to test Aborigines for logical analysis of abstractions that are missing when they cognize about how to make use of their concrete world.

But as Thomas Sowell has said, no one lives in a culture-free society. What you want in America are tests that are culturally significant in the society in which both blacks and whites live. Let us assume that blacks are genetically favored for skills that once fostered success among African tribal groups. That is little solace to blacks in Chicago who want their children to rise out of the ghetto and become food chemists. They would prefer that blacks are not genetically disadvantaged for cognitive skills that bring educational success. It is worth noting that IQs predict academic success at least as well for blacks as for whites. The fact that IQ tests are not culturally free is a double-edged sword: what you gain from better adaptation to a pre-industrial society is no compensation for what you lose if you stay in America.

We no longer hear much from those who once proposed a fourth argument: that all races share so many genes in common that it would be absurd to look for genetic differences (note: even this argument assumes the question is subject to investigation; they just think the answer is as obvious as height differences between Watusi and pigmies). We share 99% of our genes with Bonobo Chimpanzees. That 1% makes a huge difference in cognitive capacity: one hundredth of 1% might make a huge difference between socially identified groups.

2. Not believing what you think may be true

This piece of moral advice is psychologically impossible. You cannot ask someone to deny to themselves what they think may be true. Coercing thought gets you into the realm of sanctions (the rack and the thumb-screw, or at least making job applicants for university posts take a loyalty oath about racial traits).

3. Not discussing what some think to be true

I am happy to discuss the race and IQ debate with colleagues who hold contrary views and do so at conferences and in the common room. I want to persuade and that is much more difficult if we both know that I have hidden behind my back an instrument of coercion. Telling someone that what they believe is morally remiss or telling them that if they persist in disagreeing, I will expose them is not my style. I got enough of this when defending democratic socialism during the McCarthy era. I take it as conceded that when we academics discuss this issue among ourselves, we will use evidence and persuasion as we do on all matters of substance.

4. Not using science to investigate the truth

To advise scholars that they should not systematically investigate race and IQ seems to me to raise the question of what we are afraid of: that we will discover that genes do play a significant role? A few years ago I addressed scholars at one of America's most distinguished universities who admitted that they had never approved a research grant

that might clarify whether black and white had equivalent genes for IQ. I had some suggestions and said I knew that they might have reasons for ignoring them other than pessimism: they were just intimidated by the public furor that would ensue. That was not fair because they could not publically admit that they curtailed scholarly research because of intimidation. They had to argue that the most trivial grant they had approved (something like whether chipmunks like Mozart) was more important than clarifying the causes of racial differences.

This may seem to prejudice the outcome of a systematic investigation. I do not intend this. The research should be done no matter what the outcome, as I will show. I am merely asking those who would forbid research to be honest (at least to themselves) about their own beliefs.

I should add that, to my cost, I have discovered another motive that discourages research. Let us assume that it is not genes that cause the black IQ deficit. Then it must be environment and if it is environment, the most immediate environment, namely, black subculture, must be examined. If causes exist there, we will hear rhetoric about blaming the victim. For example, a relevant cause might be black child-rearing practices. However, to avoid criticism, I am not going to disempower blacks by keeping them ignorant. Note the penalty for ignoring reality: no knowledge of causes, hard to alter effects. This is a theme to which we will return. Irish Americans were persecuted (“no Irish need apply, black man preferred”). The ultimate causes of their disadvantages were written in their history rather than their genes. But that history had engendered a subculture that had become an active cause in itself. Rather than merely dwelling on the sins of England, they really did have to change in order to reduce their alcoholism and domestic violence.

I know of no alternative to the scientific method to maximize accumulation of truth about the physical world and the causes of human behavior. If scholars are to debate this issue, do we not want the best evidence possible – and this can only come from science.

Assume that everyone who at present leans toward an environmental hypothesis eschewed scientific investigation. That would be equivalent to unilateral disarmament. The only science that would be done would be by those who at present lean toward a genetic hypothesis. Such a state of affairs carries its own price. Twice a year I get emails from young scholars who tell me how glad they are that they have read my work on race (Flynn, 1980, 2008 chapters 2–4, 2012 pp. 132–141). They say that up to then, they had assumed all the evidence was on the side of Jensen and Ruston and that the lack of any evidential rebuttal was a confession of bankruptcy. Research on race and IQ has competed with my chief interest of moral philosophy and earned me opprobrium. But I felt obliged to rectify the fact that the evidence on record in 1978 was not fair to the environmental hypothesis, and I was determined not to embrace unilateral disarmament. I did not, however, pre-judge the issue: I knew that the evidence can always go against you and results can be unwelcome.

Those who believe in the relative equality of the races may choose not to research race and IQ, but they have not thereby discovered something that turns all beliefs into ones of which they approve. There has never been a time since World War II during which all Americans had more “progressive” views on race than Arthur Jensen. He always emphasized overlap between the races for genes for IQ and stated that the brightest person in America might well be a black male (no sexism: there is some evidence that black women have a higher mean IQ than black males). I discovered this as a CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) chairman in the South in 1961, although I really knew it already from being raised in Washington D. C. I know of no reputable scholar who has addressed this question whose conclusions were not at stark variance with those of the classical racist who abhors the notion that there is substantial overlap between the races for valued traits.

There will be bad science on both sides of the debate. The only antidote I know for that is to use the scientific method as scrupulously as possible

5. From advice to sanctions

Everyone knows that universities apply sanctions to alter behavior among academics that refuse to accept the advice given thus far. A stated intention of doing race/gene research on a vita will mean no job; doing that research may mean no tenure, no promotion, no research grants, or even a campaign for dismissal. Some like Jensen, who are at a prestige university such as Berkeley, survive.

In the *Emile*, Rousseau included a long footnote in which he addresses the world of scholars. He knows that many of them are atheists but warns them against any attempt to spread atheism to the masses: the latter need the fear of hell as an incentive to compensate for or refrain from injustices. The notion that there is an elite who can discuss what may be true or false but who must present a united front to others on a point of dogma is recurrent in human history. Newton could not make known his doubts about the Trinity; G. E. Moore felt he ought to resign his fellowship at Cambridge because he could not accept the Anglican credo (he got the stipulation scrapped).

The use of sanctions against those who do not confine their views on race and IQ to the common room dictates limiting debate to the faculty, and turns an environmentalist position into a dogma in the sense that no wider discussion is allowed. That includes your students; and, of course, no sign of dissent can be allowed to reach the public (no frank interviews given, no research pursued, etc.). There are almost no courses on intelligence in Psychology departments in America. When I ask staff why, they give the same answer: what if a student raised a hand and said, what do you think about the race and IQ debate? You either have a potted lying answer that makes the debate seem simpler than it is (every sophisticated environmentalist knows that Jensen has a case to answer), or you say, “well that goes beyond the scope of this course” (why?), or you admit heresy.

Universities should welcome a full discussion of any topic within their walls. In *On Liberty*, John Stuart Mill sets out why. Sanctions always assume that truth will be maximized by the winners of a prizefight (a test of political strength) rather than by free debate. Those who want to forbid discussion and scientific investigation ignore three things. There may be a truth hidden in an erroneous position that is not present elsewhere: we all owe Jensen a debt for exploding simplistic explanations of black under achievement, such as that it was merely a matter of class (matching black and white for SES does not nearly eliminate the IQ gap). Having to defend your position means you can have knowledge rather than just right opinion. Let us assume that those of us who think the causes are environmental are correct. It is one thing for our students to believe correctly simply because they have been indoctrinated by a united front and another for them to be able to defend their position. Finally, truth gains vitality from being challenged rather than being an unquestioned inheritance. Converts to Christianity are often more pious than those who inherit their faith.

Mill closes by claiming that those who favor sanctions have presumptions to infallibility or absolute certainty. They are so sure of their position they are willing to use power to ensure that no case for another opinion is ever to be heard throughout the entire course of human history. This kind of ban is far more serious than it might seem. To kill an idea is to forfeit all rewards that may flow from reaction to that idea. If I had not read about Arthur Jensen and his research, with its emphasis on IQ and the general intelligence factor, I would never have documented massive IQ gain over time, or urged a revolution in the theory of intelligence, or connected cognitive gains and moral gains, or cooperated with Bill Dickens to formulate the Dickens/Flynn model, which unifies phenomena from the dynamics of cognitive development to the results of interventions. There are actually people who are still alive “because” of Jensen: those on death row who were proved to be mentally retarded thanks to application of the Flynn effect to their IQ test scores.

What kind of crystal ball do they have, those who wish the University of California at Berkeley had deleted Jensen from the history

of ideas of our time? Was it not better to debate with him, and learn from that debate? Does academia really want to ally itself with those who reserve free discussion to Philosopher Kings, and create dogmas to deaden the minds of all others? However benevolent the intent, there is a flaw in imprinting beliefs in people’s minds never to alter. The beliefs have become like instincts rather than reasoned conclusions. A creature with a frozen mind can qualify as an insect but it is not fully human.

6. The dead hand of ignorance

By ignorance I mean unawareness of what science reveals about the real world. It always extracts a price. Let us assume the “worst” possible outcome of this debate: black American school children have a genetic deficit worth 20 IQ points. I cannot make this very plausible given that the present IQ gap is far less than that. We would have to assume either that blacks today are privileged environmentally or that some unlikely event had occurred: cosmic radiation has struck only black neighborhoods and caused harmful mutations. But if so, would we really want to be ignorant of that? Doubling the present IQ gap would mean that black underperformance at school would be twice as evident as it is today. If we dogmatically assumed that only environmental factors were relevant, we would be embarking on a frantic scramble to identify them and one doomed to failure.

We need not be fanciful to assess the price of ignorance. Assume that the entire IQ gap between school children today (10 points) is genetic. Take the principal of a high school in an affluent neighborhood where both black and white students all come from professional homes. The principal may be doing everything he or she can think of to give the best education to all. However, if black students get worse grades than white students, there will inevitably be suspicion of institutional racism. Something has to be wrong if only the fact blacks find the environment less friendly. The principal may actually come to believe that she is remiss. The greatest tragedy is an innocent person suffering from guilt. In some pre-industrial societies people think dreams can kill. A person can be perfectly innocent of a murder but think they are guilty because of murderous dreams or thoughts. Again I say: ignorance of reality always extracts its price.

The following is not always true, but the constituency that wants to ban race/genetics research includes many who have a “shoot the messenger mentality”. They try to discredit IQ tests. I will not digress to show how mistaken they are but will only say that IQ tests provide priceless data about the cognitive development of parents and their children and the injustices the latter may suffer (Flynn, 2016). This does not mean IQ tests should be used for streaming. If that is to occur, it should be based on past academic performance, which is a better predictor of future academic performance than anything else.

7. The appeal to paradigms of irrationality

Are there to be no limits on what the university will tolerate? Will academics offer courses on holocaust denial, or on the extraterrestrial sources of crop rings, or teach a course in Algebra using roman numerals? In passing, anyone who wanted to hire a room on the university campus to speak on such issues should be free to do so and treated with formal courtesy. If they are willing to have a critic nominated to debate their views, fine. If not, someone can hire the same room for a presentation immediately following. To ban them by force is to assume that university students, of all people, cannot make up their own minds about what to believe.

But allocating money to conduct such courses or finance research of this sort would test the resources of most universities (if there were many volunteers). To use such examples in order to ban research into a serious question is the rhetoric of an enemy of liberty. In my classes, I advocate giving the Nazi party the right to exist in America and publish its literature (if they plan violence or intimidation, there are plenty of laws that are relevant). Inevitably, a student will say, but what if we

were living in Germany in 1930. The answer is that by 1930 free debate had given way to battles in the streets and only force could settle whether democracy survived. To pretend that such a situation existed in American in 1950 when the Communist Party was banned was the mark of an enemy of liberty. To appeal to extreme cases that show the university cannot make liberty absolute, in order to justify suppressing freedom of inquiry where it is perfectly possible, is the mark of an enemy of truth.

8. Compromises

Universities are the focus of irrational pressures that hope to compromise their purpose. I sympathize with an American university president who says something like the following.

You don't know how hard I struggle to maintain what freedoms we have. We are free to debate evolution versus intelligent design, atheism versus theism, socialism versus the welfare state versus the free market. Within limits, we can freely debate US foreign policy as long as we do not say too much about the Middle East. We do research without restriction into economics, philosophy, politics, and biology. We hire without prejudice in these areas (never entirely true: when I was a young academic during the height of the Cold War, the left had trouble; now the right have trouble). I simply *have* to trim my sails on race/genes research. I will try to defend you but must do so semi-dishonestly: publically lament what you do but say we must not fire you because of academic freedom. And strictly in private, I suggest that you get research money from some source less inhibited.

This I can respect. What is far worse is the academic who marches with the legions that want to curtail academic freedom. They should be a pressure group on the side of freedom that helps the president fight in the trenches.

9. The bright light of knowledge

I want to summarize some results that have come to light only because scientific investigation was not banned. They are not chosen to show that an evidential approach was worthwhile only because some of the evidence favors an environmental hypothesis. Rather they are chosen to show that knowledge is better than ignorance. The reader should assess whether or not we would be better off if the research had not been done.

Moore (1986) did a study would have been forbidden by a prescription against race/gene research. She identified adoptees all of who were black and thereby, controlled for genetic differences between black and white. Of these, 23 were adopted by white middle-class couples and 23 adopted by black middle-class couples. The white and black adoptive mothers had the same number of years of schooling, that is, 16 years. As is characteristic of the black middle-class, the black fathers did not quite match the white fathers, with 15.6 years of schooling compared to 17.3 years. As a consequence, the income of the black homes was a bit lower, with a socio-economic index of 63.5 compared to 70.3, both quite respectable. When tested at age 8.5 (ages 7 to 10), the black-adopted black children had a mean IQ of 103.6 and the white-adopted black children a mean of 117.1, a difference of 13.5 IQ points. This easily matched the black-white IQ gap for that age at that time.

Her results were significant and their significance goes far beyond the fact that they count on the environmental side of the ledger. Moore observed (over two 20-minute periods) the mother's interaction with her child while the latter was trying to perform a difficult cognitive task. The mothers were told they could help their children. Although both sets of mothers had the same number of years of education, there was a sharp contrast. White mothers tended to smile, joke, give positive encouragement (that is an interesting idea), and applaud effort. Black mothers tended to frown, scowl, criticize (you know that doesn't look right), and express displeasure (you could do better than this if you

really tried). Understandably, children were more likely to ask for help from white than black mothers when confronted with cognitive problems.

Remember the high school principal. Was she aware of these results, she would know that black underperformance at her school might well be a sign that black professional homes are on average less educationally efficient than white professional homes. Everyone accepts that the homes of East Asians are more efficient than those of whites. She might be able to gentle parents toward looking at their own behavior rather than looking for "institutional racism".

What would this mean? Asking the following questions: do black professionals sit down with their children and help with homework; are they too censorious when they do so; do non-professionals see their child's education as a chance to upgrade their own; is there a special effort made to repair deficiencies (or does the child hear "I was never any good at math either"); do older achieving children help younger non-achieving ones; is their praise for academic achievement more enthusiastic than for making a sports team (or when a child settles down to homework, does the father say, "let's go out behind the garage and shoot a few baskets"); can you get them to associate with at least some peers who are academic rather than the smart set (one can go too far here: when Tom Sowell stopped at the library on the way home, his father beat him for hanging out on the street); do parents read good literature setting a model for their children; do parents perceive hanging out at shopping malls as the first symptom of mental illness.

Moore's numbers are too small for strong inference. However, if over the last 30 years, we had compiled a complete register of all black children adopted and had the relevant parental data, we might have the numbers to put the issue beyond doubt. Forget the race and IQ debate. We could be certain that the black family environment is less cognitively challenging, and could try to alter real world behavior.

My research (Flynn, 2008) convinced me that there are other factors of black subculture worthy of investigation particularly youth culture: when half black and white school children (offspring of US occupation soldiers) were compared in Germany after World War II, their IQ profiles matched in terms of *g* loadings (loading on the general intelligence factor). Take my word for it that this is highly significant. The half-blacks being raised in Germany were simply dark-skinned Germans. What was missing was a black American youth subculture.

The Harvard sociologist Patterson (2006) has investigated black youth culture. The fact that he is black protects him from some, but not only from some, opprobrium. He argues that young black males do not despise education and are aware of the benefits it brings, but that their youth culture offers rewards that they cannot resist. Dressing sharply, hanging out, sexual conquests, party drugs, and hip-hop music and its ambiance are powerfully attractive, and the admiration they get from both black and white peers bolsters self-esteem. White teen-agers find imitating the postures of this culture attractive but they do not live it. Rather it is a hobby, something they set aside every time they think of the looming presence of the SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) that will determine their fate.

Perhaps survey data can be supplemented with something that helps us penetrate to the reality of black youth culture (cameras that record what actually goes on during the hours of homework reported?). For now, I will add my own impressions for what they are worth. It seems to me that a subculture that legislates atypical speech and puts song and dance ahead of cognitively demanding leisure activity has to be a negative influence.

Finally, on the Nation's Report Card, between 1971 and 2008 (averaging scores for reading and mathematics), blacks gained 6.39 IQ points on whites and the final gap for all ages stood at 9.94 points. Using all Wechsler and Stanford-Binet standardization samples, Dickens and Flynn (2006) concluded that between 1972 and 2002, blacks gained 5.5 IQ points on whites and that the average gap had fallen to 10.0 points for ages 9 to 17. The two data sets offer remarkably similar results. The Dickens and Flynn data cover all ages between 4 and 24

and sadly, black IQ steadily loses ground on white IQ as children age. In 2002, the gap was only 4.6 points at age 4 rising to 16.6 points at age 24.

Any analysis of race and IQ should be banned, of course. It should be replaced with some meaningless gibberish about how IQ means nothing and that black and white Americans do not really exist. I believe the fact that the IQ gap increases suggests (but does not prove) that certain facets of black culture are an increasingly heavy burden with age. I offer a scenario in which child-rearing practices are eventually outweighed by teenage subculture, which in turn is outweighed by the high incidence of male blacks in prison during the “university years” and of young black women who become solo-parents (Flynn, 2012).

10. Armageddon

My most important point is this. The race and IQ debate has taken on the role of Armageddon, a war between the forcers of righteousness (the environmentalists) and the armies of the night (those who posit genetic differences). This fixation has overshadowed the fact that there are real people out there. When they try to improve the prospects of their children, they will not be attempting to score one more point for the environmental side of the race and IQ debate. Enormously helpful things have come to light without regard as to which side of the debate was being argued. Jensen's point that equating for SES does not close the black/white IQ or educational achievement gap was a step forward. Moore's point that factors more subtle than SES seemed to count was another step forward. Scholars should stop playing games and let science do its job. Those of us who have turned their research into a contest rather than a diagnosis should be ashamed. I am not exempt from this censure.

Anyone who ceases to research what environmental handicaps blacks have will have to acknowledge that what motivated them was not helping real people but the excitement of a contest.

I have no illusions, of course, that the debate about race and IQ will end. And I do not deny that it could have social and political consequences. Perhaps someday we will conclude that a portion of the present gap will prove to be genetic in origin. I do not want to sugar the pill but will only say I am not too alarmed. Unless you believe black and white environments are today equivalent, genes will count for less than 10 points among schoolchildren.

But even that would mean that the group socially-classified as black will on average have somewhat worse social statistics for unemployment, crime, and so forth. And the free market will always penalize black individuals to some degree by making it rational to classify them as members of their group rather than incur the cost of getting to know them as individuals. A landlady with a room to rent is confronted with a female Korean American and a black male youth. She will not hire a private detective to check them out. She is likely to play the statistical odds: an almost sure thing versus someone from a group one-third of whom are convicted felons.

I have tried to show how affirmative action can compensate individuals who are handicapped by their group membership (Flynn, 2008). This case has nothing to do with genes versus environment; it simply focuses on the fact that rational market actors must discriminate against blacks without regard for their personal traits. But I want to add that if genes are part of the gap, helping individuals will not mean equal outcomes for all social groups. As a group, blacks would tend to have worse social statistics than whites. Perhaps we can accept that. Assume that the lower job profile of Irish Americans compared to Chinese Americans is due in part to genes: I do not know one Irishman who cares (the English would be a different matter).

Then there is the struggle over racial quotas in the private job market and at universities. It is worth noting that such quotas do not exist in the United Kingdom. The case for quotas is fought out, at least at universities, on whether diversity outweighs lower SAT scores.

Assume that those quotas disappear. Would it be a tragedy if blacks were matched with quality of university by educational competence? Blacks marginal at Harvard would be good students at Illinois, and blacks marginal at Illinois would be good students at Southern Illinois, and so on down the ladder. There is a price for the fiction that someone is competent to meet the pace of courses, and competence of competing students, when it is not so. Someone who would be encouraged to aspire to (and qualify for) a profession at Illinois may be daunted by the competition at Harvard.

Moreover, if blacks admitted with lower SAT scores really are competent to do well, that must be judged by the individual case. It has nothing to do with how genes and environment divide the IQ gap between blacks as a group and whites as a group. No doubt, real racists will seize upon a genetic component in the racial IQ gap as a defense of their position. But we know that in fact, it does not provide the classical racist with any defense at all. Better to confront them with the truth rather than a fiction, and whatever the rhetorical disadvantage, forfeiting the benefits of knowledge over ignorance is too heavy a price to pay.

11. Some history and rhetoric

Once Christians admitted that blacks had souls, slavery was doomed. As Thomas Sowell says, once you grant that black and white so overlap that the brightest person in America may be black, the real ball game is over. Whether all people as individuals, no matter whether black or white, get justice as fairness will be a test of our humanity. Nothing will be gained by systemic sanctions that protect ignorance.

Having made a rational case, it is allowable to use rhetoric to try to bring people's emotions into line with their heads. Assume that the data showed that black Americans had a mean IQ 5 points above white Americans. How many would still want to forbid academics from doing race/gene research? Would not casting aspersions on IQ tests be labeled as an outrageous attempt to hide from a truth that cried out for amelioration? Look into your hearts. Suppressing free inquiry is by its nature an expressive of contempt for truth by power. The truth can never be racist.

A final word to those who seek respectability by banning race/gene research: how much respectability would you get if your position were stated without equivocation? After all, those who refuse to investigate genetic equality between the races cannot label it true; yet if you openly say *it may not be true* would you not reap the whirlwind? Honesty dictates this assertion: “I do not know if genetic equality is true and do not want to know.” Say that, and see if your views are deemed innocent rather than pernicious.

References

- Dickens, W. T., & Flynn, J. R. (2006). Black Americans reduce the racial IQ gap: Evidence from standardization samples. *Psychological Science*, 17, 913–920.
- Flynn, J. R. (1980). *Race, IQ, and Jensen*. London: Routledge.
- Flynn, J. R. (2008). *Where have all the liberals gone? Race, class, and ideals in America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Flynn, J. R. (2012). *Are we getting smarter: Rising IQ in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge University Press.
- Flynn, J. R. (2013). Arthur Robert Jensen. *Intelligence*, 41, 144–145.
- Flynn, J. R. (2016). Does your family make you smarter? *Nature, nurture, and human autonomy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, E. G. J. (1986). Family socialization and the IQ test performance of traditionally and transracially adopted black children. *Developmental Psychology*, 22, 317–326.
- Patterson, O. (2006). *A poverty of the mind*. New York Times (Op-ed, Sunday, March 26, 2006).
- Price, A. L., Tandon, A., Patterson, N., Barnes, K. C., Rafaels, N., Ruczinski, I., ... Myers, S. (2009). Sensitive detection of chromosomal segments of distinct ancestry in admixed populations. *PLoS Genetics*, 5, 213–221.

Further Reading

- Mill, J. S. (1859). *On liberty*. London: John W. Parker & Son.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1979). *Emile or on education*. Translation and notes by Allan Bloom. New York: Basic Books.