

The IRS was right when it said “public policy” did not now countenance segregation, but Mr. Reynolds pointed out that plenty of tax-exempt institutions went against “public policy:” single-sex colleges, for example, and churches that opposed nuclear weapons. He argued that Congress had the right to revise the tax code against discriminators if it wanted to, but that the IRS’s job was to enforce the code as written. Congress had denied tax exemptions to social clubs that discriminated, so if it wanted to do the same with schools, it clearly knew how. Mr. Reynolds therefore persuaded the Reagan administration to support Bob Jones before the Supreme Court.

It is not hard to imagine the shrieking that resulted. Hardly anyone understood that the issue was not discrimination but whether the IRS had quasi-legislative powers. For liberals, the case was smoking-gun proof of the administration’s naked racism. It only made things worse when the Supreme Court ruled against Bob Jones, eight-to-one. Mr. Reynolds later acknowledged he had been naïve to think the press would re-

port the case accurately rather than bel-low about racism.

Wasted Effort

The reader arrives at the end of this long, carefully-researched book with a sense of dismay at the tremendous amount of legal huffing and puffing as well as the terrible damage to society that has come from abandoning one ancient principle and one simple truth. The ancient principle is that of freedom of association. As a matter of long tradition, except for a few exceptional matters like age of consent or age of majority, government has not poked its nose into private contracts. Free men can hire, fire, patronize, or do business with whom-ever they want—for good reasons, bad reasons, or no reason at all. They need answer to no one. This freedom had long been violated in certain parts of the South, where racial *separation* was required by law, but the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stripped the entire country of its freedom. What began as an obligation not to discriminate against blacks became an obligation to discriminate

against whites. The power to vet private contracts for “discrimination”—against more protected classes all the time—is immense, unprecedented power. 1964 marks one of the great defeats in the unending war to protect our freedoms.

At the same time, the simple truth on which we have turned our backs is that the races are not equal in ability. Some of the harm in giving up freedom of association would have been mitigated if the country had understood from the outset that blacks and whites do not perform at the same level. Widespread insistence that differences in achievement are caused by “racism” rather than differences in ability has led to recrimination, injustice, and incalculable social and economic damage.

The mere fact of multi-racialism causes friction. Neither Japan nor Iceland have ever had to subvert society or the law in the ways Prof. Wolters describes, and if their leaders are wise they will never have to. But to combine multi-racialism with the abandonment of rights and blindness to the obvious is to mix a poisonous brew that could some day prove fatal. **Ω**

Know Your Neighbors

Geolytics, *CensusCD+Maps*, \$250.00 (compact disk) For information: (800) 577-6717

A computer program that puts the census on your desktop.

reviewed by Jared Taylor

There is a tremendous amount of information collected about the people living in the United States. Every ten years, the Census Bureau makes a detailed survey, and in between there are many government estimates and private surveys. Much of this information is available on the Internet, but by packing it onto a single compact disk, *CensusCD+Maps* makes it much easier to find and use.

This CD includes hundreds of different information categories, from estimated annual family expenditure on shoes to average number of vehicles per household to number of Yiddish or Lao-tian speakers in an area. These information categories are in turn available by different geographic areas like state,

county, city, zip code, Congressional district, and even Indian Reservation. Not *all* of the information is available in *every* geographical location. For ex-



For how much longer?

ample, crime figures are tabulated only at the county level, so you cannot get finer detail, nor can you get estimates of shoe (or alcohol) purchases on Indian reservations, but most of the information can be sorted according to the most obviously useful categories. The smallest area that can be examined is the census tract, which usually has about 1,100 people or 400 families in it.

Two features of *CensusCD+Maps* that make it much more useful than

Internet or printed data are that it lets you make calculations with the data and draw maps. For example, it is easy to find racial population data for states, counties, or census tracts, but this information is usually given in raw numbers. If you want to know the *percentages* of particular races you have to divide by the total population. *CensusCD+Maps* lets you write formulae to compute percentages and compare different areas.

For example, by entering a formula for Fairfax County, Virginia, where AR is located, we find that the population is 7.74 percent black. We can also have *CensusCD+Maps* draw a map of the 191 separate census tracts in the county and use different colors to indicate different densities of black population. One tract leaps off the page: Census Tract 4222 has an unusually large population of 6,267, and 96.3 percent of its residents are black. Not one of them is in poverty, yet only six are employed, three in “health services” and three in “educational services.” Ninety-four percent are

men, of whom 75 percent are single. In a year, these 6,267 people spend a total of less than \$1,000 on alcoholic beverages. Census Tract 4222 is, of course, the Lorton Reformatory, which houses the overflow from the Washington, DC jail.

By applying the percent-black formula to counties throughout the country, we discover that Jefferson County, Mississippi, has the highest percentage. Just over 86 percent of its 8,653 residents are black. The median household income is \$10,267 and 47 percent of the people are poor. Average rent in the county is \$168.00 a month. The counties with the next highest percentages of blacks are Macon County, Alabama (85.9 percent) and Claiborne County, Mississippi (82.24 percent), which adjoins Jefferson County. At 35 percent, Mississippi is the state with the highest percentage of blacks.

A similar exercise with Hispanics shows that New Mexico, appropriately, has the highest proportion at 38 percent, followed by California and Texas with

25 percent each (these figures are from the 1990 census). There are five counties in the United States that are more than 90 percent Hispanic and all are in Texas: Starr County (98 percent), Maverick County (94 percent), Webb County (94 percent), Jim Hogg County (91 percent) and Brooks County (90 percent). In Starr County, which has the highest percentage, 59.6 percent of residents are poor. The median household income is \$10,182 and the average house costs \$21,700.

CensusCD+Maps can do rather more upscale comparisons as well. We find that Fairfield County, Connecticut, has more households with incomes over \$150,000 (8.2 percent) than any other county in the country. In its wealthiest census tract, 52 percent of households have incomes over \$150,000 and 76 percent have incomes over \$100,000. The average house costs \$590,000. Surprisingly, even in this pish posh tract of 3,143 people, 4.9 percent of the households have incomes of less than \$15,000.

If we switch to Detroit, Michigan, we find that the average house is worth \$28,804 and 43 percent of the households have incomes below \$15,000. The average rent in the city is \$372 a month. But here, too, there are surprises: Only 29 percent of households get public assistance.

Most users of *CensusCD+Maps* are probably trying to sell you something. The program can quickly snap out an estimate of how much money people who live within a 20-mile radius of any street corner spend every year on such things as "apparel for children under 2," which is handy to know if you are thinking of setting up shop. But for individuals—especially for anyone about to move or buy property—it is full of useful information that realtors are forbidden by law to tell you. The program is not always easy to use, and the instruction manual is sometimes obscure, but anyone who can afford the cost of this disk gets an enormous amount of data that can be sorted and manipulated in virtually unlimited ways. **Ω**

“Even if it Proved Him Wrong”

A welcome tribute to Arthur Jensen.

In a small and belated way, Prof. Arthur Jensen is getting some of the recognition he deserves. A recent special issue of the magazine *Intelligence* was devoted to him, with the title, “A King Among Men: Arthur Jensen.”

More than anyone else, Prof. Jensen rescued the study of intelligence and individual differences from radical environmentalism. Beginning with his famous 1969 article in *Harvard Educational Review* and culminating—at least so far—in his 1998 magnum opus *The g Factor* (reviewed in AR, Sept., 1998) he has continued to study what are probably the most unpopular and maligned subjects in psychology: the heritability of intelligence, its biological bases, and the evidence for racial differences. Despite the bitterest criticism, he has made profound and lasting contributions to the study of the mind. Anyone with a comparable record of achievement in any less controversial field would be showered with honors and awards. This special issue of *Intelligence* is a modest tribute to a great scientist.

There are 13 short articles in the issue, including one by Prof. Jensen himself, in which he describes the early influences on his thinking and the major milestones in his career. We learn that during his undergraduate study of psychology—at a time when it was widely believed to be almost entirely unrelated to genetics—some of his most rewarding

Special Issue

A King Among Men:

Arthur Jensen



Ablex Publishing Corporation
Stamford, Connecticut

reading was extracurricular study of books by M.K. Gandhi, Bertrand Russell, G.B. Shaw, Havelock Ellis, H.G. Wells, Aldous Huxley, and Alfred Korzybski.

Prof. Jensen's first serious encounter with the genetics of mental traits was in 1966 when he was preparing to write a book about childhood learning disorders. He thought he would include a chapter on the inheritance of intelligence, if only to show that this explanation for individual differences was outmoded and discredited. To his surprise,

the more he looked into the subject the more he realized that heredity explained a great deal. It was this line of study that led to his 123-page *Harvard Educational Review* article and set the course of his subsequent career.

Prof. Jensen is generous in his acknowledgment of the influence of Hans J. Eysenck of the University of London, noting that it was not so much the specific content of Prof. Eysenck's research but “his general approach to psychology as a natural science that provided my first real sense of finally having discovered my true vocation.”

The other articles are of varying interest—some go into considerable detail about certain aspects of Prof. Jensen's work—but in different ways they all recognize his contributions to science. Linda Gottfredson of the University of Delaware writes, “I can think of no equal to Jensen in formulating new questions, clever tools, and testable hypotheses to resolve old debates about intelligence and mental tests.” She also admires the restraint and good manners with which he has always handled his critics: “At most he has seemed puzzled or disappointed by their frequent dishonesty and