

# Race & Class

<http://rac.sagepub.com>

---

**Book reviews : The New Assault on Equality: IQ and Social Stratification Edited by A. GARTNER, C. GREER, and F. RIESSMAN (New York, Harper & Row, 1974). 225 pp. \$1.95**  
**Race and IQ Edited by A. MONTAGU (London, Oxford University Press, 1975). 322 pp. £2.00**  
**Race Differences in Intelligence By J.C. LOEHLIN, G. LINDZER, and J.N. SPUHLER (San Francisco, 1975). 380 pp. \$5.95**

K. Richardson

*Race Class* 1975; 17; 207

DOI: 10.1177/030639687501700212

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://rac.sagepub.com>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



Institute of Race Relations

**Additional services and information for *Race & Class* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://rac.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://rac.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

a means of more efficiently organizing capitalism by persuading the working class to participate in its own exploitation. We hear nothing of this from the author.

Essentially, Gupta provides an invaluable source book which tells the story of the relationship between the social democratic movement in and out of power in Britain and its counterparts in the Third World – and how and why they served capital. But what is really needed is a radical critique of the manner in which the transition from imperialism to neo-colonialism was so ably assisted by numbers of social democratic reformers.

London

DAVID CLARK

### **The New Assault on Equality: IQ and Social Stratification**

Edited by A. GARTNER, C. GREER, and F. RIESSMAN (New York, Harper & Row, 1974). 225 pp. \$1.95

#### **Race and IQ**

Edited by A. MONTAGU (London, Oxford University Press, 1975). 322 pp. £2.00

#### **Race Differences in Intelligence**

By J.C. LOEHLIN, G. LINDZER, and J.N. SPUHLER (San Francisco, 1975). 380 pp. \$5.95

When Arthur Jensen published his notorious article in 1969 about the genetic inferiority of blacks the next issue of the *Harvard Educational Review* was devoted to replies by would-be critics whose confusion turned out to be almost as damaging as Jensen's certitude. After that those who followed Jensen, like Herrnstein, Shockley and Eysenck, had field days. The predicament of the liberal anti-Jensenists (who are often closer to the man than they like us to think) has been fully exhibited in the numerous books and articles which have since endeavoured 'to set the record straight'. These are the avowed aims of the present volumes and, to varying degrees, they fall into the same old traps.

*The New Assault on Equality* comes closest to being the exception to the rule. Indeed the chapter by Bowles and Gintis, 'IQ in the United States Class Structure', is the only account in all three books which can be called consistently radical, in the sense of getting to the root of the matter. First, they examine the assumption, taken for granted by 'hereditarians' and 'environmentalists' alike, that IQ is of basic importance to economic success. A statistical examination of available data shows that it is not; the IQ/success correlation is merely a by-product of two other factors, namely schooling and social class. This just means that doing well on the trivial puzzles of IQ tests is a superficial *expression* of work-role and cannot be said to *cause* it. Of course this can be predicted from the way IQ tests are constructed, but Bowles and

Gintis are just as efficient in a more laborious way. Secondly, they provide a thorough, well-documented, exposé of the ideological function of IQ, by tracing its connection through the education system to the needs of corporate industry for a disciplined, docile labour force. Indeed the IQ racket received its greatest impetus from the heavy financial backing of Carnegie, Rothschild and others in the face of a massive immigrant labour force in the early 1900s. With the legitimization of 'scientific' backing, men were more likely to believe in 'superiors' and the hierarchical division of labour could be put across as nothing less than a biological necessity. This is why genetic arguments are wheeled out whenever a section of the work-force begins to challenge the superiority myths.

The remaining contributions in this collection are anaemic in comparison and to some degree open to the general criticisms which I make below – with the exception of Chomsky, who efficiently destroys Richard Herrnstein's phoney logic about an impending genetic caste system, and David McClelland, who shows that, like IQ, school and college grades have no relation whatsoever with how well a person does his job (whatever it is) once the system has put him there.

Ashley Montagu's book, *Race and IQ*, is (like many of his previous books on the subject) maddeningly inconsistent, combining superb criticism with awful self-contradictions. Uri Bronfenbrenner, for instance, diligently takes apart the credibility of the Jensenists' 'genetic evidence' only to conclude that 'genetic factors play a substantial role in producing individual differences in mental ability'; and while Montagu himself descends both the concept of race and the utility of heritability-estimates in the human context, one of his contributors argues that 'Eysenck deals . . . adequately with the concept of race, and places the hereditarian view in a scientific perspective'.

The approach of the book is to examine the various strands in the Jensenist thesis; while some are historical and philosophical, most accounts are of the 'evidence/counter evidence' sort. The resulting overlap and repetition makes for tedious reading. However it does include some crucial arguments including the following: Montagu's use of G.G. Simpson's thesis that since all mankind underwent virtually identical pressures for selection in the mental domain, group genetic differences for intelligence would not be expected and are extremely unlikely; Lieberman's history of the race concept under capitalism, showing its utility in the press-ganging of a sub-proletariat; and Layzer's rendering of the theoretical hollowness of IQ as a purported scientific measure. But the startling self-contradictions do not recommend the book to the uninitiated.

*Race Differences in Intelligence* is quite a different prospect from the other two. The authors in their preface forgive anyone for wondering 'why any behavioural scientist of good sense would willingly . . . become involved in the tangled morass of data, methods, ideologies and emotions that currently surrounds the question of . . . racial-ethnic IQ differences'. Nevertheless they wanted to 'keep the record straight' and attempt a systematic, scholarly, balanced review of the whole subject. Initial rebuffs from the National

Academy of Sciences led the authors to government bodies, specifically the Committee on Biological Bases of Behaviour, and, suitably equipped with funds and fellowships, they set about their task. The result is an impressive looking volume crammed with graphs, tables, references and academic paraphernalia. But what does it say, and what conclusions are reached?

Their opening is not very encouraging, being a wholly inadequate rendering of the history of the mental testing movement leading to Jensenism. This is followed by chapters on the key concepts of race, intelligence and heritability. The first of these is conventional and indicates the drift of their arguments. This is how it goes. First, they illustrate race formation in a species — the variation of colour and body size among house sparrows: implying that what goes for sparrows also goes for man (much as a Cambridge professor recently claimed to have illustrated the origins of the working class with an experiment on fruit-flies). This is followed with an intended racial classification of man. Only a small section is devoted to the crucial fact that known genetic differences between human groups are actually very tiny. For example, on the frequencies of eighteen sets of blood-groups and protein genes, 90 per cent of the total variance can be found within any one group. Now this fact ought to mean 'end of book', but the authors wriggle out of that one by insisting that a small minority of genes have large between-group variance — and suggest that *genes for intelligence are in that category*. But although they admit that this is extremely unlikely it is only on this premise that they can make a book.

Loehlin *et al* quickly follow-up (you might say cover-up) this side-stepping by a long-winded (and at times very funny) discussion of the possible mechanisms by which race differences in intelligence could have emerged. The next chapter is devoted to a fairly comprehensive, but superficial, account of intelligence testing. It is firmly based on the myth of 'the intelligent man' — you know, the one who 'walks into a situation in which others are floundering, appraises it, and selects an effective course of action'. The authors then review the evidence for the heritability of IQ in white populations, despite the fact that Leon Kamin, two years ago, showed conclusively that the body of data behind such 'evidence' was worthless. In the event, they reach the Jensenist conclusion about the substantial genetic influence on IQ.

The next, and largest section, called 'The Empirical Evidence', contains four chapters, the contents of which can be summarized as follows: a review of three recent twin studies in the USA which comes out to be reasonably critical (but then the defects are so obvious — for example, two collaborating authors of one study independently publishing opposite conclusions); age changes on IQ test performance; cross-cultural comparisons of mental measures (which is no dafter than most on this subject); and a review of the literature on undernutrition and IQ score.

Readers well outside of the IQ controversy will find most of this section informative, especially as the authors interpret the researchers directly instead of merely parroting the original conclusions. They are also perfectly candid in admitting that the evidence discussed is limited, conflicting and

methodologically unsatisfactory. 'The studies we have reviewed . . . provide no unequivocal answer to the question of whether the differences in ability-test performance among U.S. racial-ethnic sub populations do, or do not, have a substantial component reflecting genetic differences.' And yet in 'Conclusions and Implications for Social Policy' (*sic*) they state that 'Observed average differences in the scores of members of different U.S. racial-ethnic groups on intellectual ability tests probably reflect . . . in part genetic differences among the groups' and that '*it would be most unwise to base public policy on the assumption that no such genetic differences exist*' (emphasis added).

What all these books commonly reflect is the nature of the liberal dilemma with all its self-contradictions. Basically they stem from a sickening devotion to two quite false propositions: (i) IQ is a measure of human intelligence; (ii) all human behaviour is just like animal behaviour in terms of genetic control. And this in turn leads to the kind of intellectual dishonesty which recognizes that 'it would . . . be fairly easy to select deliberately items for intelligence tests that would be so distributed between cultures or other groups as to insure that any, desired group would repeatedly test inferior on one set of questions or superior on another set' without acknowledging at the same time that that is how all IQ tests *are* constructed.

In the final analysis the cause of the dilemma is the incapacity, even the refusal, of these IQ protagonists to distinguish fully between science and ideology: there is *nothing* scientific about the IQ controversy.

Milton Keynes

K. RICHARDSON

## Revolutionary Transformation in the Arab World: Habash and his Comrades from Nationalism to Marxism

By WALID KAZZIHA (London, Charles Knight, 1975). 118 pp. £2

*Revolutionary Transformation in the Arab World* is not the definitive analysis of the various radical and revolutionary currents in the Arab world as suggested by the title. It is, instead, a narrative survey of one of the less successful of these currents – the Arab National Movement. Within this more limited framework, Kazziha traces the internal development of the ANM from its founding by George Habash (then a student) in the Beirut of 1948 to its collapse in 1968 and the emergence of its most important successors: on the one hand, the Persian Gulf and South Arabian revolutionary movements, including the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman and the current regime in South Yemen; and on the other, the left-wing of the Palestine resistance movement, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PDFLP). Since Habash is best known as the head of the PFLP, the most interesting – and unfortunately short – section of the book is that which deals with the genesis of the PFLP.