

parently Caucasoid' skeletons may represent a physical type that was not ancestral to today's Europeans. . . . In other words, the scientists say it is possible that it is only a coincidence that the ancient skeletons have features that resemble those of Europeans." Well, that's much better, because, you see, even though race doesn't really exist and is only a social construct, the prehistoric Caucasoids who came here were not of the same race as the later Caucasoid invaders.

Obviously, the white people who came to this continent 9,000 years ago didn't establish any political or cultural claim to the continent for modern whites, regardless of whether

they were "ancestral" to them. Neither does the presence of Mongoloid ancestors of the modern Indians establish any political or cultural claim for their modern descendants. The claims of each group are based on what their more immediate ancestors contributed to the making of what is today American civilization and the American nation, and it ought to be fairly obvious that the modern European races (excuse me, I meant "population groups") had a bit more to do with that than the Kwakiutls and the Ojibwas.

But another obvious point is that modern racial egalitarians can't bear to look at the evidence from compara-

tive anatomy and molecular genetics that now prances before their eyes, and they have to resort to the most grotesque ideological and linguistic contortions to preserve the egalitarian myth that race doesn't exist. Newspapers like the *Post* and some scientists like (apparently) Professor Grayson are always happy to enlist themselves in the preservation of such myths, to the point that both science and journalism are imperiled. If the trend continues we might as well give the country back to the Caucasoids.

Samuel Francis is a nationally syndicated columnist and the editor of The Samuel Francis Letter.

All the Data Fit to Print

Which publications guard — and which violate — the taboos?

The scientific world divides publications into two groups: journals and magazines. Journals publish hard research data and aim to expand the frontiers of knowledge. Anything else is a mere magazine.

Probably the most prestigious and influential journals published in English are *Science*, *Nature*, and *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. They do not claim that race does not exist or that intelligence is unaffected by genes, but they are extremely cautious about accepting articles that violate current intellectual fashion.

Science is mainly devoted to "big" science — astronomy, nuclear physics and, increasingly, human genetics. In fact, advances in molecular genetics published in *Science* were a strong impetus for launching the Human Genome Project (see AR, March, 1997). *Science* now covers the project regularly and devotes a yearly special issue to it.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, which publishes the journal is strongly committed to affirmative action, and *Science* has a clear distaste for racial differences. Nevertheless, it deplores zealotry. Even before the term PC was invented, its long-term editor, Daniel

Koshland, was publishing editorials denouncing political persecution and self-censorship. More recently, it ran not-entirely-hostile comments on the wrath visited upon Christopher Brand and Glayde Whitney for having suggested that race may have something to do with intelligence and crime rates. It has published letters to the editor from Philippe Rushton and even one from your servant, the editor of AR. It is not inconceivable that it will some day accept a feature article by Arthur

The editor of Scientific American noted with pride that Lenin had liked the magazine.

Jensen, Philippe Rushton, or Richard Lynn, but that would be a major event.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Science (PNAS) is another extremely influential journal. The National Academy of Science (NAS) itself is a government-sponsored body, established in 1863, whose members are elected by the existing members. It glistens with prestige and is supposed to make recommendations to government, perform good works, etc.

Since at least 1934, *Science* had been publishing abstracts of all papers presented at NAS meetings, thus giving them world-wide exposure. This practice came to a sudden end in 1968, after NAS-member and Nobel-

prize-winning inventor of the transistor, William Shockley, began presenting papers on race, IQ, and eugenics. PNAS itself made a similar publishing decision. It used to accept all submissions from members, but changed its policy in 1972 so as to be able to shut out William Shockley.

Perhaps in repentance for this high-handedness, PNAS has since published a number of important papers on the genetic distance between races as well as DNA studies of how long ago the races diverged from each other. It occasionally publishes papers on behavioral genetics and in 1986 even accepted a report by Philippe Rushton on the heritability of altruism.

Nature, published in England, is strongly oriented toward biology. It is of distinguished lineage and at one time regularly published Francis Galton. It has drifted so far from these fine beginnings that in 1992 its editor, John Maddox, wrote a full-page editorial explaining why he would *not* accept Prof. Rushton's work on race and brain size. He explained that science of this kind was so contrary to established opinion that it had to meet higher standards than other research. However, the raging letters controversy that followed this editorial was excellent publicity for Prof. Rushton's findings.

Scientific American is a mere magazine *about* science and does not publish original research. However, it

has a large circulation, is highly regarded, and is the oldest science-related magazine in America. Unfortunately, in the last 15 years or so, it has fallen into the hands of the determined opposition. Stephen Jay Gould, who carries forward the work of Franz Boas, essentially sets the tone for articles about race and human nature. *Scientific American's* current leanings were on display during a radio interview with the editor to mark the 150th anniversary of the magazine's beginning. He noted—with pride—that Vladimir Lenin had read and liked the magazine.

Another influential science magazine with an even larger circulation is *Natural History*, published by the American Museum of Natural History. The indefatigable Dr. Gould writes a column for every issue, and in perhaps 30 percent of them he takes off after racists, racialism, etc.

Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) is in yet another category. It sometimes publishes excellent medical articles and symposia on public health issues, but is known among scientists for its biases. The most obvious is that as the union magazine for doctors it is devoted to

making their profession as lucrative as possible. On social science questions it is no less trendy than the *New York Times*, but can be read to equally good purpose: it reports useful information that undercuts—but somehow never changes—its editorial positions.

Which are the science journals most open to questions of race and genetics? *Personality and Individual Differences*, edited in England by Hans Eysenck, and *Intelligence*, edited in the United States by Douglas Detterman, are clear-thinking and widely read. Their articles are often cited in other journals. *The Mankind Quarterly*, published by Roger Pearson (his latest book will be reviewed in the next issue) has for years been sailing courageously against the wind and has aired a large number of ideas now central to a realistic understanding of race, heredity, and social behavior.

Finally, Transaction Publishers—which has brought out such important books as Prof. Rushton's *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, Michael Levin's



Feminism and Freedom, and *The IQ Controversy* by Mark Synderman and Stanley Rothman—publishes a magazine called *Society*. Although its field is the social sciences, where the political constraints are even tighter, Transaction does seem to try to follow the data rather than the fashion of the day.

Although the science press is not much less unscientific about race than anyone else, it would be a mistake to blame this on a special and shadowy class of people known as editors. People in the field report that science journalism largely reflects the convictions and fears of scientists themselves. They are no different from anyone else in their preference that *someone else* risk his career by publishing "racist" or "sexist" findings. Science is a great ally, which continues to establish the factual basis for ancient wisdom that the current era would deny, but its direction and the uses to which it is put change only as society changes. ●

More Blows to Affirmative Action

Judges are undoing the damage done by judges

The country is in a fearful guddle over affirmative action, with federal judges over-ruling each other, bureaucrats reversing themselves, and sore losers trying to think up new ways to keep on discriminating against whites. We have entered the inevitable chaos of a time when what was once legal—and mandatory—is becoming illegal.

Under our current system of judicial dictatorship judges make—and unmake—policy, and they have been hard at work recently. Perhaps most significant was the April 11th ruling of the 9th U.S. Court of Appeals upholding the California voter initiative banning state-sponsored affirmative action. A black district judge, Thelton Henderson, had ruled earlier that any initiative that forbade discrimination

in favor of women and non-whites was discrimination, but the three-judge appeals panel brushed his silly arguments aside. Private companies in California are still free to indulge in racial preferences, but the great, anti-white apparatus may well have suffered a fatal setback.

William Clinton, whose Justice Department had argued against the voter initiative, intends to circumvent the new principle of non-discrimination: "We'll have to regroup and find new ways to achieve the same objective."

The California university system announced an end to race- and sex-preferences in admissions last year. Although the change will not take effect until 1998, black and Hispanic applications for 1997 are down 7.7 and 5.8 percent respectively. Whites and Asians, who now expect fairer treatment, have increased applications by

10.4 percent and 10.8 percent. Black applications to California medical schools have dropped by a quarter over the last two years while Hispanic applications have dropped by a third.

California whites are beginning to feel their oats. Several recently sued the Peralta Community College District in Alameda County, claiming that it has been breaking the law since 1995, when it adopted a 33 percent hiring quota for blacks. This year, for example, 75 percent of the management positions at the Laney campus were filled by blacks, as were 40 percent of such positions at the College of Alameda. Three of the district's four college presidents are black. Blatant discrimination of this kind is unlikely to survive.

There has been excitement in Texas, too. Last year, the federal appeals court forbade any consideration of race in the academic admissions