

or the politicians. The genius of Mr. Le Pen is to have broken through to the people, to have fought off the press and the politicians long enough to give the French a chance to vote for the things their grandparents took for granted: France, race, and nation.

What are the prospects for the FN? Today, only the conservative Rally for the Republic (RPR) and the Socialist Party outpoll the FN, and the RPR does so by only a few percentage points. Although Mr. Le Pen is growing older and there may be some changes at the top of the party, an FN prime minister is no longer out of the question. Indeed, at this point the right might be more inclined to break the B'nai B'rith oath if the old warrior were to step down. At the same time,

if the insurgency among the conservatives is successful, the RPR and the UDF may offer to cooperate in the next legislative elections. At the moment, there is debate within the front over whether to forgive the "rotten right" its past treachery or whether simply to try to crush it. But if the right cooperates across the board and the front outpolls the RPR, it could find itself the senior partner in a governing coalition. Jean-Marie Le Pen's mission to reawaken France could be on the verge of success.

This possibility is not lost on the opposition. *Reflex*, a French "anti-racist" magazine, notes that what it calls "fascist gangrene" continues to spread. Its post-elections summary glumly concludes that the nation faces

"the very real prospect of an extreme-right government in France for the first time since Vichy."

Derek Turner, editor of the British nationalist magazine *Right Now!*, writes: "If an FN government, or a government strongly influenced by the FN, comes to power in France (as now seems likely), the effects will be incalculable." He goes on to argue that a nationalist success in such an important country as France could not help but stimulate similar successes elsewhere in Europe, and even bring the British Tories—many of whom already agree privately with Mr. Le Pen—out of the closet. By reawakening France, the FN could reawaken Europe, and perhaps even the United States. ●

Who is a Frenchman?

French citizenship laws are almost as crazy as ours.

France is one of the few countries that, like the United States, grant citizenship to children of foreigners born within their territories. In other words, it practices *jus soli* (right of soil), as opposed to *jus sanguinis* (right of blood), according to which nationality is transmitted only by biological descent.

The American version is by far the more lunatic. If a Japanese woman, who happens to be changing planes in New York, suddenly gives birth to a baby in the airport, she can demand U.S. citizenship for the child. Theoretically, the mother need not even touch the ground; if she gives birth in an airplane while it is in American airspace, she has just produced a new American citizen.

The French practice is somewhat more nuanced. The first modern citizenship law dates back to 1889, and reflects the radical egalitarianism of the French Revolution. Any child born of parents who were, themselves, born in France, was a French citizen at birth. This was known as the "double right of the soil." A child born in France of non-French parents had a right to French citizenship at age 21 if

he was reared in France. A foreigner who moved to France could apply for French citizenship after living in France for 10 years. French law was unlike any other in Europe and was based on the revolutionary assumption that nationality was a matter of assimilation rather than blood. The law was further liberalized in 1927, in the hope of making up for the losses of

the First World War: Foreigners could apply for naturalization after living in France for only three years.

The Vichy government promptly established *jus sanguinis*—citizenship by descent—and naturalization was made considerably more difficult. In 1945, General Charles de Gaulle reinstituted the 1889 law, arguing that "a lack of men" explained the defeat of 1940 and that looser citizenship requirements would swell the population. In 1973 the "double right of the soil" was expanded to grant birthright citizenship to children born in France of parents born in former French colonies and overseas territories. This foolish law meant that Senegalese and Moroccan immigrants—who were living in France but born in Senegal or Morocco before independence—could count on instant citizenship for their children born in France.



Children of French residents of other nationalities had a right to citizenship when they reached their majority.

Unlike immigrants from other former colonies, Algerians could always claim the "double right of the soil" for their French-born children, since Algeria was administratively part of France until independence in 1963. This meant that the Algerian immigrants streaming into France seeking work had been producing French babies even before the 1973 law. This had awkward consequences after the immigrants were no longer wanted and began to get chips on their shoulders. Beginning in 1981, there were spectacular cases of young Algerian-Frenchmen contemptuously renouncing their unwanted French citizenship.

A new law in 1993 did not revoke the "double right of the soil" for children of immigrants from the former colonies, but it did mark a slight retreat from *jus soli*. Children born in France of parents who were neither French nor from the colonies could no longer anticipate automatic French citizenship when they reached their majority. At some point between their 16th and 22nd birthdays they had to make a positive declaration of loyalty to France, and prove they had been living in France for the five years preceding the declaration. In 1998,

with the left once more in power in the National Assembly, this requirement was removed; French-born children of foreigners still do not get birth-right citizenship, but they are automatically granted citizenship at age 18.

Needless to say, the FN advocates a return to *jus sanguinis*, and its deputies have repeatedly proposed new nationality laws. Although there is increasing popular opposition to non-

white immigration, France continues its distinctive practice of *jus soli* for several reasons. First, the idea that France adopt the *jus sanguinis* of its European neighbors can no longer be evaluated rationally but must turn into an emotional debate about "racism." At the same time, France still has a lingering attachment both to revolutionary sans-culottism and to a more recent "*mission civilisatrice*," or

civilizing mission. The glory of France that was once spread by empire can now be spread by opening the portals of civilization to barbarian aliens. Since foreigners of *all* races—particularly Americans—are barbarians, the *mission civilisatrice* has not been tossed out with its 19th century British equivalent, the white man's burden. ●

The Galton Report

A sampling of recent scientific literature.

by Glayde Whitney

What's New in Genetics and Intelligence

A leading researcher in behavior genetics has published his views on the latest findings in genetics and intelligence. Robert Plomin of the Institute of Psychiatry in London writes that "research that goes beyond heritability has led to some of the most important findings about the nature of intelligence in the past decade."

One approach that goes beyond heritability is developmental genetic analysis, in which researchers track genetic influences as people mature and grow old. Prof. Plomin reports that "one of the most interesting discoveries of the past decade is that genetic influence on intelligence becomes increasingly important throughout the life span." The heritability of general cognitive ability increases from about 40 percent in children to 80 percent in people over age 60. This is said to be the highest heritability ever found for any behavioral dimension or disorder. It is a finding that has been replicated in two separate studies of very elderly twins.

Prof. Plomin points out that this finding is particularly interesting because it is counterintuitive. For many years it has been theorized by every one from sociologists to medical researchers that as we age the cumulative slings and arrows of environmental encounters increase the environmental causes of individual differences and decrease the effects of genes.

Now that it has been found that heritability actually increases with age the theories are changing. A popular new interpretation is that genetically influenced preferences and predispositions lead people to seek out different environments and to encounter different experiences. The result of these gene-guided environmental encounters is that as we get

It is only because children share their parents' genes that there is a correlation between home environment and a child's mental ability.

older genetic differences become more important in determining individual differences.

In another new field, called "multivariate genetic analysis," researchers investigate the "covariance" among traits rather than simply study each trait separately. For example, one can measure both math performance and verbal ability, and see if the same genes affect both. Of course, covariance analysis is nothing new when conducted at the level of actual traits rather than genes. Indeed, Charles Spearman discovered *g*, the general factor for cognitive ability, back in 1904 by studying the covariance of different measures of intelligence. What is new is multivariate analysis that separates the genetic from the environmental influences on commonalities among traits.

Prof. Plomin writes that "the same genetic factors largely influence different cognitive abilities. For example,

genetic influences on verbal ability have a high degree of overlap with those affecting spatial ability." This finding is an essential part of most theories that propose a genetic basis for *general* intelligence. This profoundly important finding is profoundly unpopular among liberal egalitarians. The kindly-intentioned social engineers, when forced to accept genetic influences on ability, like to decompose general ability into a number of separate abilities. They can then argue that with separate (and uncorrelated) abilities, everyone excels at something and we should celebrate our diversity. Sorry. Nature does not distribute talent fairly. As Prof. Plomin puts it, "the same genetic factors largely influence different cognitive abilities." People who are smart in one way are likely to be smart in others.

Another type of research defines the real effect of "environmental" influences. Sociologists have tried for years to assess the quality of home environments and have found, for example, that the number of books in a home correlates with the mental abilities of children raised in that home. Many studies, including the famous Coleman report of the 1960s, reported that the best predictor of school performance was "family background," as measured by characteristics of the home environment.

When proper genetic experimental designs are incorporated into studies of "environmental" influences, it turns out that much of the effect is actually genetic. That is, measures such as "number of books in the home" are mostly indirect and sloppy indicators of parental genotype. Brighter parents