

BEYOND REASON AND DIGNITY

W. Frank Epling and Judy Cameron

Department of Psychology and Department of Educational Psychology
The University of Alberta

ABSTRACT: This paper examines J.P. Rushton's contention that the concept 'race' is useful for distinguishing between Blacks, Whites, and Orientals. He argues that Blacks evolved first followed by Whites, then Orientals. From this perspective, Blacks are the most primitive race and Orientals the most evolved. Thus, the rank order is Yellows > Whites > Blacks. According to Rushton, intelligence, personality characteristics, social organization, and sexual restraint index racial differences. These characteristics are said to covary with the reproductive strategies of races and are explained by r/K theory. This theory is borrowed from population biology and refers to two ends of a reproductive continuum. At the r end, organisms like oysters produce many offspring and offer no parental care. The great apes represent the K end of the continuum since they have few offspring and provide a great deal of parental care. Rushton argues that r/K theory extends to differences within the human species and that some races are more K than others. Yellows, he suggests, are the most K followed by Whites, then Blacks. This view of human nature challenges the importance of contingencies of reinforcement for the control of socially significant human behavior.

In recent years there has been a growing awareness that genetic factors strongly influence human behavior. Radical behaviorists recognize that biological variables play an important role in behavior regulation. However, most behavior analysts emphasize the importance of contingencies of reinforcement for the shaping, maintaining, and elimination of behavior. According to the so called behavioral psychologist¹ Professor J. P. Rushton, this emphasis is a mistake. In a sweeping theory of human nature, Rushton (1989) has discovered that most socially significant human behavior is a result of heredity.

Dr. Rushton has found that people act the way they do because of their race (Rushton, 1989). As we delved into his theory, even more astounding facts turned up. For instance, the Chinese and other yellow people are really the best race and you can tell because they have hardly any babies. Also, they do very well at school even when they go to white ones. White kids don't do as well at their own schools as the yellow kids do. The evidence gets more disturbing. But, before looking at the sad facts, it is instructive to consider why this has happened, so we turn to Professor Rushton's theory.

AUTHORS' NOTE:

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to the authors at the Department of Psychology or Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. We would like to acknowledge our use of Stephen Jay Gould's book *The Mismeasure of Man*. This text is highly recommended for those who wish to obtain background reading on scientific racism and the measurement movement in psychology.

EPLING AND CAMERON

RUSHTON'S r/K THEORY

The symbols r and K come from population biology and refer to family size and parental care. For example, oysters have really large families and are not very involved with their children; they are on the r end of things. Humans, on the other hand, do not have as many babies as oysters, and, generally speaking, do better at child care. Humans are at the K end of the continuum. Dr. Rushton (1989; 1988; 1985) has noticed this fact. He has also noticed that some people have fewer children than others and that some of us are better parents than others. This means that some people are more oyster-like than others.

Now, we all know that no one person has 500 million babies a year, like oysters do. But, and this is the important point, some of us are less K than others are. Orientals have the fewest kids, take the best care of them, and are the most human. We don't know why there are so many Chinese children. This is a major problem for r/K theory. However, the Chinese don't want to have so many kids. If they could, they would stop having them. Even Chinese leaders want fewer Chinese and they encourage people to stop doing whatever they are doing to make more.

Setting aside the Chinese issue, it turns out that in terms of r/K , Blacks are the most r , followed by Whites, then Orientals who are the most K . If all this meant was that some of us had large families and spanked our kids, it would not be a big deal. However, we all know that oysters are not very smart and have limited morals. This means that people who are more r are less intelligent, more excited by sex, into dancing, aggressive, and may be criminals (Rushton, 1988). The only good news for r types is that they tend to have large sex organs (Rushton and Bogaert, 1987). Professor Rushton does not tell us why big organs make more kids, but presumably they do. Maybe it was all Bogaert's idea and he will explain it later.

The reason that some races are close to r and others more human is because they evolved at different times (Rushton, 1988). The first to evolve were the Blacks. This happened in Africa about 200,000 years ago. After they evolved, they didn't do much. Next, the Whites evolved in Europe 110,000 years ago. Rather than just sit around, they built Europe. Finally the Orientals evolved 41,000 years ago in Asia. Even though they have had the least amount of time, Asians make the best cameras and computers in the entire world. Everybody knows that it takes brains to make computers, cameras, radios, TVs, and so on.

BRAINS, RACE, AND CHARACTER

It turns out that the size of our heads is really important. In essence, the larger the brain the smarter the person. Don't get panicked. It's the average head size, not any particular skull that's important. In other words, your race could, on

BEYOND REASON AND DIGNITY

the average, have small heads - but your own could be medium to large. Even people with small brains can do very well in the world and do not need to be sterilized.

Whites have done a lot since their brains came along; Asians have done even better in the last 40,000 years. For some reason, Blacks have neglected their cerebral cortex for up to 200,000 years. It turns out they have been into crime, sex, music, divorce, colorful clothes, and have ignored their children. Blacks can't help this any more than Whites and Asians can help being smart. We just are what we are, it's a matter of evolutionary biology (Rushton, 1988).

Really disturbing is the fact that Whites have slightly lesser brains than Yellows, but the evidence is clear. The Japanese are taking over the world. Even when Japanese people go to a white country they take over. The important thing to understand is that this is because they evolved in the "ice age". In the ice age it was a hard life; people had to scurry for food, build large fires, make clothes, find shelter, take very good care of children and so on. People had to be very smart to live in the ice age. In Africa, people only had to gather fruit and this does not take much intelligence. Luckily, however, a few blacks went to the cold climates and became Asians.

The ice age had other effects on people. Mostly, it built character. Before the ice age, people did not have any responsibilities. They were irresponsible. Only those who went off to the ice age evolved responsible characteristics. For example, Scottish Presbyterians still live in the ice age and are the most responsible people of all. Humans who did not get the ice age experience just sat around, gathered food, danced, stole things from one another, made lots of babies, and refused to build a civilization. In the cold northern climes, it was an entirely different story. These people were serious about life. They evolved lots of character. Their brains grew, their sex organs shrank, and they built civilization.

When Africans evolved into Whites and Asians, their brains got bigger and bigger. The first to evolve were White. For this reason, white brains are only slightly larger than black ones. The Asians evolved last and have the largest brains. Dr. Rushton has not personally measured brain weight or size, but he has found many people who have reported such measures (Tobias, 1970; Ho, Roessmann, Straumfjord, and Monroe, 1980a; 1980b).

MEASURING BRAINS

It turns out that when people are ranked on brain size, Orientals > Whites > Blacks > Females. For women, it doesn't matter what race you are. If you're a woman you have a really small brain. Even an Asian woman's brain is smaller than an African man's brain. Lots of women have been mad about this fact. They point out that women are just as smart as men. Rushton gets around this argument by ignoring sex differences in brain size. He simply lumps brains

EPLING AND CAMERON

together, and says that Yellow ones weigh more than White ones which, in turn, are larger than Black brains. Thus, in order to avoid sex bias, Dr Rushton averages brain weight without regard to gender (Rushton, 1988). For example, he includes data from Shibata (1936) who reports the brain weight of 136 Yellow men and 17 Yellow women. Of course, this procedure ensures that Yellows have really large brains. But, in terms of sex bias, Rushton has evidently decided that this is the fair thing to do.

Although Rushton uses his lumping technique (Rushton, Brainerd and Pressey, 1983) to avoid the problem of brain size differences between men and women, there are additional difficulties with weighing and measuring brains. For example, the way you cut them out makes a difference. If you leave a little bit behind, the brain will not weigh as much. How soon you get the brain out of a dead person influences the weight. Brains left inside people for a long time do not weigh as much as fresh ones. Finally, brains get mature at around 18 years and tend to shrivel up and get smaller as they grow older. Thus, it makes a difference how old they are when you cut them out. Anyway, you can see that there are lots of problems with measuring brains (for a review of these issues, see Tobias, 1970).

One way to get around these problems is to ignore brains and measure skulls. The easiest way to measure a skull is to wrap a tape measure around a person's head. This has been done; Sir Francis Galton had people march through a tent at the international Exposition of 1884 in order to get their heads measured (Galton, 1909). Generally, this method of measurement is not reliable. People do not know what part of their heads to measure, hair gets in the way, and there are lots of other problems. One solution is to measure the inside of the skull. Of course, people must be dead to have the inside of their skulls measured. This is one reason why it is not used to index academic achievement. A major problem with measuring the inside of a person's head is, what do you measure it with? Scientists have filled heads with seeds (Morton, 1839) and others have pointed out that the way you pack the seeds in makes a difference. If seeds are compressed enough heads seem really large. A better way to measure skulls is to fill them up with lead shot. Even here there are problems; shot may dribble into eye sockets or nasal cavities and bias the measure.

The final difficulty with using brain size as a measure of intelligence is the discovery that some people who don't have a brain (cerebral cortex) get along very well. Lewin (1980) reported in *Science* that an English physician (Professor Lorber) discovered a young man who was successfully attending university, had an IQ of 126, and yet had no brain. For these reasons, everyone except Dr. Rushton has given up measuring skulls and brains as an index of intelligence.

INTELLIGENCE AND RACE

Today, intelligence is measured with intelligence tests. These tests have two

BEYOND REASON AND DIGNITY

major advantages. They are not as messy as taking out a brain and a person can be alive while intelligence is measured. The disadvantage is that you can't measure the intelligence of a dead person although this has been attempted (Cox, 1926) and some people still take it seriously (e.g., Jensen, 1979).

Humans have intelligence; it is a well documented fact. Historically, intelligence tests were made up by Alfred Binet (Binet and Simon, 1911). After the tests were made up, Spearman (1904) discovered that human beings have intelligence and it is in their heads. He found this out by factor analyzing intelligence tests. Intelligence does not have a specific location but it is in our brains, so we have it more or less pinpointed.

After intelligence was discovered, Sir Cyril Burt (1972) found out that it was inherited. The only problem with Burt's discovery was that he faked his data (Hearnshaw, 1979). Even though Burt faked his data, Arthur Jensen (1969) found out that different amounts of intelligence were inherited by different races. Specifically, Whites get more intelligence on the average than Blacks do. Rushton enters the picture at this point by adding that Yellows get even more than Whites. This addition is not much given the history of intelligence, but it is his contribution.

Intelligence is 50 to 80 percent inherited depending on who you talk to. The remaining part of intelligence is due to the environment. You can tell this because the closer people are related the closer they are on intelligence. If one identical twin has a bunch of intelligence so will the other twin. Also, it has been found that you really take a chance when adopting a child. You could have lots of intelligence but get a kid with hardly any.

The argument goes like this: since different people inherit different amounts of intelligence so do different groups of people get different amounts. It's sort of like, one race gets so much intelligence to divide up and another race gets a different amount. This is not racist because any one person could get more than their fair share. In other words, you could be really smart even if your race is dumb. Several statisticians, psychologists and others have pointed out that you cannot infer between group differences from within group differences. Nonetheless, Rushton and Jensen say they don't care and do it anyway. So, according to Rushton, it all boils down to this: Take all the IQ scores on all the tests, lump everything together and Yellows > Whites > Blacks.

SEX AND RACE

Professor Rushton had an insight (Rushton, 1988). He reasoned that some races are dumb and others smart because of genes. This is because IQ evolved in the ice age. Since the races evolved different amounts of intelligence, Rushton guessed that they also evolved different amounts of sex drive, sex organs, sex seeds, and babies. It all makes sense; lower animals are not as smart as humans. They tend to have big sex organs, enjoy sex too much and they often change partners.

EPLING AND CAMERON

The lower the species the larger their families. Some really low species have sex most of the time and make millions of babies. This is why the lower races are towards the r end of things and it explains why Yellows don't like sex. This was Dr. Rushton's insight, and except for a little help from Bogaert (Rushton and Bogaert, 1987) he made it up, all by himself.

Scientific evidence supports this hypothesis. About a hundred years ago Dr. Jacobus, a French army surgeon, wrote a book called *Untrodden Fields of Anthropology* (Jacobus, 1896). Dr. Jacobus was a real doctor and he traveled all over the place. His hobby was looking at sex organs and because he was a real doctor, people let him look. He looked at lots of sex organs. He saw young, middle aged, diseased, healthy, old and unusual sex organs. Not only that, he watched people use their organs in all sorts of different ways. He even talked people into showing his friends (he said they were doctors too) their private parts. Since Dr. Jacobus went all over the world measuring sex organs of different races, Rushton (1988) got interested in his book.

Dr. Jacobus found out that Black men have the largest penises, followed by Whites, and Annamites have small ones. For example, he says about Annamite penises "...At its full growth, the penis has an average length of from 4 to 4 and 1/2 inches (in full erection) and a diameter of an inch and a quarter. ...Few attain a length of 6 inches and a diameter of 1 and 1/2 inches" (1896, p.28). You can see that Dr. Jacobus was a careful scientist, he even made the Annamites get erections in order to measure their penises. We don't know what he had to go through in order to get them to do this, but it probably wasn't easy.

Dr. Jacobus also had an eye for unusual cases and did not shrink from his duty to report them. He states that, "I once met with a penis of 7 and 1/4 inches but that was on a Franco-Annamite half-breed" (1896, p. 28). In other passages Dr. Jacobus meets vulvas, vaginas, testicles, and other body parts. Somehow he managed to measure all these parts, even the inside of vaginas. It is obvious that Dr. Jacobus was interested in his subject matter, and he gathered lots of data. It was lucky for Rushton that Dr. Jacobus measured Annamite penises. Evidently, they are good representatives of the Yellow race. In fact, they are so good that Rushton (1988) uses their penises to represent the entire Oriental population.

In science, raw empirical data is often used for theory building. Professor Rushton uses the raw data reported by Jacobus (1896) and many others to support his theory of r/K and race. According to him, if you measure all the penises, vaginas, testicles, etc., then divide by the total number of privates you get Blacks > Whites > Yellows. The reasoning is that large sex organs produce large families and large families mean less K. Races that have lots of K don't have as much fun as others, but they really are the best races.

BEYOND REASON AND DIGNITY

SUMMARY

Behavior analysts have missed the boat. The pendulum has swung from environment-behavior relationships to gene-behavior interactions. Heredity is the basis of crime, intelligence, dancing, care of children, divorce, lust and most other socially important human actions. Perhaps the experimental analysis of behavior can rescue itself by focusing on contingencies of reproduction.

REFERENCES

- Binet, A., and Simon, T. (1911). *A method of measuring the development of the intelligence of young children*. Lincoln, Illinois: Courier Company.
- Burt, C. (1972). The inheritance of general intelligence. *American Psychology*, 27, 175-190.
- Cox, Catherine M. (1926). The early mental traits of three hundred geniuses. In Vol. II. of L.M. Terman (ed.) *Genetic studies of genius*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Galton, F. (1909). *Memories of my life*. London: Methuen.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Hearnshaw, L.S. (1979). *Cyril Burt Psychologist*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Ho, K., Roessmann, U., Straumfjord, V. and Monroe, G. (1980a). Analysis of brain weight. I. Adult brain weight in relation to sex, race, and age. *Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine*, 104, 635-639.
- Ho, K., Roessmann, U., Straumfjord, V. and Monroe, G. (1980b). Analysis of brain weight. II. Adult brain weight in relation to body height, weight, and surface area. *Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine*, 104, 640-645.
- Jacobus, Dr. (1896). *Untrodden Fields of Anthropology* (2 vols.). Charles Carrington, Paris, France Publishers (Reprinted Huntington, New York: Fallstaff Press Inc., 1937).
- Jensen, A.R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 33, 1-123.
- Jensen, A.R. (1979). *Bias in Mental Testing*. New York: Free Press.
- Lewin, R. (1980). Is your brain really necessary? *Science*, 210, 1232-1234.
- Morton, S.G. (1839). *Crania Americana or, a comparative view of the skulls of various aboriginal nations of North and South America*. Philadelphia: John Pennington.
- Rushton, J.P. (1985). Differential K theory: the sociobiology of individual and group differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 441-452.
- Rushton, J.P. (1988). Race differences in behavior: a review and evolutionary analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 1009-1024.
- Rushton, J.P. (1989). Evolutionary biology and heritable traits. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, San Francisco, California.
- Rushton, J.P., Brainerd, C.J., and Pressey, M. (1983). Behavioral development and construct validity: the principle of aggregation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 18-38.

EPLING AND CAMERON

Rushton, J.P. and Bogaert, A.F. (1987). Race differences in sexual behavior: testing an evolutionary hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 529-551.

Shibata, I. (1936). Brain weight of the Korean. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 22, 27-35.

Spearman, C. (1904). General intelligence objectively determined and measured. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 201-293.

Tobias, P.V. (1970). Brain-size, grey matter and race - fact or fiction? *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 32, 3-26.

NOTES

W. Frank Epling is a Professor of Psychology and Judy Cameron is a Ph.D student in Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta.

¹ When Dr. Rushton appeared on the Geraldo Rivera television show, he was introduced as a behavioral psychologist.