

amount of what looks like hanky-panky with BU's trustees. Economic theory tells us that, in a non-profit organization lacking owners or stockholders, the organization's revenue will tend to be siphoned off in uneconomic and quasi-crooked ways to the managers and trustees. Since trustees and managers own no capital and can make no profits, they don't have to worry about maximizing profits; they enjoy a very wide zone for inefficiency and hanky-panky which cannot exist in profit-making firms. The non-profit outfit need not even care much about losses, short of bankruptcy, and even bankruptcy doesn't affect the trustees' personal assets. When the New Left invaded the offices of Columbia University during the student riots of the late 1960s, they discovered some interesting peccadilloes by Columbia and its trustees: one trustee, a well-known building contractor, would get the contracts to construct the university's buildings, another would get the job of banker or insurer for that builder, and so on.

At Boston University, Dr. Silber seems to have showered lucrative contracts upon trustees who, in particular, are members of the five-man executive committee on compensation that votes on Silber's extravagant pay. Thus, BU paid \$246,730 to a law firm headed by Edward Masterman, a member of this executive committee. In addition, Silber has asked the well-known accounting firm of Coopers & Lybrand to conduct an independent audit of all the charges against him. But the

problem here is that this same firm has received more than \$400,000 a year over the past several years for accounting and auditing work from the university. Furthermore, Coopers & Lybrand managing partner in Boston, Frank A. Doyle, was a fund-raiser for Silber's failed gubernatorial bid in 1990.

It is instructive to see the way in which BU spokesmen reply to these damning conflict-of-interest charges. After first pointing out that the university has a "strict conflict-of-interest policy," they say, about Coopers & Lybrand, "When you hire them, you are buying their independence." Huh? Eh, what? As for Frank Doyle and his fund-raising effort, says BU, "An individual is free to exercise his right to support a candidate." Well sure, but so what?

As for conflict-of-interest charges and the powerful trustees, BU doubletalk continues: "We recruit trustees precisely because they are leaders in their professions, and so on occasion we do use law firms that have members who are on the board of trustees." Yea, sure.

Dr. Silber and Boston University are now undergoing a continuing investigation by the Massachusetts Attorney-General's office. Complicating the issue is the fact that the Attorney-

General, L. Scott Harshbarger, is not only himself an adjunct professor of law at BU, but may also run against Silber for the Democratic nomination for governor next year.

Regardless of the outcome of this investigation, the political pot is boiling in Massachusetts, and John Silber may get singed. As the Zoe Baird caper demonstrated, you don't have to be actually indicted to become a political has-been. ■

Race and Reality

by Samuel Francis

About ten years ago, I recall, I had a conversation with a friend of mine, a prominent

conservative journalist and editor, who told me he believed the United States had essentially solved its racial problems. The dislocations caused by the civil rights movement, the black nationalism of the 1960s, and the riots of that era were over, he argued, and now all that remained was for blacks to scamper up the ladder of economic and political opportunity. The welfare state and liberal civil rights policies, he thought, were the principal obstacles preventing blacks from making the ascent.

The political pot is boiling in Massachusetts, and John Silber may get singed.

I didn't argue with my friend, except to say that I completely disagreed with him, that I believed the country's racial problems were only just beginning and that they would be exacerbated not only by continuing black disappointments but also by the massive immigration, legal and illegal, that was just then coming to public notice. I haven't talked to him about the subject of race since that time, and nowadays it might be too embarrassing to bring it up at all. Nevertheless, embarrassing or not, race is a subject that needs to be brought up and indeed actually thought about in ways that few conservatives and no liberals at all have yet been willing to do.

Ten years after that conversation, it ought to be obvious that my friend was wrong, and every newspaper and every local news report today offers evidence of his error. Not only has the United States failed to solve its racial problems but race remains the major problem, and the root of other major problems, in the country today, and it shows no signs whatsoever of being solved.

The overwhelming statistics on black illiteracy, educational failure, poverty, unemployment, welfare, crime, family and neighborhood collapse,

political incompetence and corruption, drug use, AIDS and other chronic diseases, and, not least, the emergence of an embittered and increasingly violent black racial consciousness that preaches explicit hatred of whites, Jews, and Asians

all confirm my friend's total misperception of what was occurring even as we talked. But of course it was not his error alone; it was the mistake of an entire generation of Americans who lived through the civil rights movement and desperately grasped at its central premise as the only palatable concept by which the United States could re-

solve the emerg-

ing racial crisis. That concept was the idea of the inherent equality of the races, and if we have learned anything in the last 30 years, it is that racial equality has all the scientific reliability of the theories of the flat earth and the four elements.

In the 1960s, when Jim Crow still fluttered, it was arguable that the races were indeed equal in intelligence and other socially significant mental and behavioral attributes. It was arguable simply because it was an idea that had never been fully tested, though there was already a substantial body of evidence to show that the idea

of racial equality was no less a concoction of pseudo-science than palmistry and the analysis of human character by inspection of bumps on the cranium.

Nevertheless, racial egalitarianism and its environmentalist assumptions about human nature were formulas that served the interests of the country's dominant cultural and political forces. Such doctrines afforded a convenient rationale for creating and managing social engineering programs that placed vast amounts of public money and power in their hands for the ostensible goal of social improvement and therapy. Most Americans, well insulated from the immediate consequences of the experiment in equality, were ready to give it a whirl, or at least to oblige white Southerners to give it a whirl. That the myth of equality would soon be swallowed them in a typhoon of social and political delusion from which they would be unable to escape did not seem to occur to anyone except a few bigots and Bourbon politicians.

Today, with the evidence of black social and economic catastrophe all about them, little else does occur to an increasing number of whites, who have long since abandoned the cities, neighborhoods, urban schools, and most other locations where they or their families are likely to run into blacks for any extended period of time. But not only the experience of black failure discredits the myth of equality; an overwhelming amount of scientific evidence has accumulated in the last generation to explode the myth once and for all.

Race is a subject that needs to be brought up and indeed actually thought about.

The general conclusion of this body of evidence is that the average score of blacks on I.Q. tests is about 15 to 18 points less than that of whites, that only about 16% of blacks have I.Q.'s above 100 (considered "normal") and only about 3% have I.Q.'s above 115 (usually considered the minimum for graduation from an accredited four-year college with grades acceptable for graduate work), that whites are six to eight times more likely to have scores above 135 and that blacks are equally more likely to score around 70 (considered "retarded"), while at the so-called "genius" level of 140 or above, there are hardly any blacks at all.

No one denies that this breakdown by race on I.Q. tests actually exists; what environmentalist critics challenge is the meaning of the tests. They argue the tests are "culturally biased" to reflect the learned skills, values, and ideas of a white-dominated society and that blacks do poorly on the tests because they are victims of oppression, bad education, lack of opportunities, or growing up in a subculture that does not socialize its members in the ways of the dominant culture.

The main problem with such arguments is that when the I.Q. tests are corrected for "cultural bias" (for example, by using tests such as Raven's Progressive Matrices, which contain no verbal or cultural content and rely on recognition of various geometrical patterns), blacks score even lower than they do on tests supposedly steeped in "bias." Moreover, other non-whites from certain foreign,

alien, or exotic subcultures (e.g., Asians) have no problem scoring as well as or better than whites on the tests and certainly better than American blacks.

Finally, it is not only I.Q. tests on which blacks score poorly; they also perform badly on almost all the standardized tests by which educational and professional aptitudes are currently measured in the United States—the Scholastic Aptitude Test, the Law School Aptitude Test, the Medical College Admissions Test, the Graduate Record Examination, etc.—and if there is one point of agreement among scientists and educators about I.Q. tests in general, it is that their results do offer reliable predictions of how those who take them will perform in school and professional life.

Those who make high scores on I.Q. tests can be predicted to make high grades in school and to perform professional jobs well; those who don't do well on I.Q. tests can be predicted not to make good grades and not to do so well in their careers.

The critique of I.Q. testing might be more credible if the actual performance of blacks were at odds with their test scores. Unfortunately, almost everything blacks as a group do seems to be consistent with

what we would expect of people with lower intelligence, namely the economically unproductive, educationally miserable, criminally violent, and socially destructive behavior that greets Americans every morning in the news and which has recently been collected in book form by Jared Taylor in his shattering *Paved With Good Intentions*. Nor is black behavior in other countries much better. Ethiopia and Somalia, Uganda and Liberia, Haiti and Jamaica all exhibit

recurrent patterns of impoverishment, political chaos, tyranny, corruption, and backwardness that do nothing to challenge the conclusions that intelligence testing and other scientific evidence of inherent racial differences reveal.

Quite separate from the evidence offered by mental testing, other studies of the inheritability of intelligence show all but conclu-

sively that a large part of what we call "intelligence" is genetically based—60 to 80%, in the estimates of the most authoritative experts—and psychologist Arthur Jensen, the best known and probably the most respected of the hereditarians, stated in a recent interview in the August 1992 issue of the newsletter *American Renaissance* that "there's no question that the preponderance of the variance

Those who make high scores on I.Q. tests can be predicted to make high grades in school.

in intelligence... is attributable to the genetic variance."

As a layman, I am not in a position to pronounce definitively on this body of evidence, but from what I know of it and of the responses to it by the exponents of environmentalism, I have to conclude that the hereditarian side has much the better of the argument, that there are indeed inherent, genetically based differences between the white and black races in intelligence and perhaps in other socially significant psychological and behavioral traits.

If there is still a case to be made for the alternative, environmentalist thesis, let's hear it; otherwise, let's go with the evidence we have, which is what we normally do in every other scientific controversy, from disputes over the Big Bang theory in astrophysics to the causes of mumps and measles.

The more important question, however, is not whether the available scientific evidence is valid or not but what does "going with" that evidence involve? It is at that point that the controversy gets sticky, though there's really little reason for it.

The conventional implication that is drawn from the evidence of racial differences is that the evidence justifies racial discrimination in one legal or political form or another. Indeed, this implication was in fact drawn by the defenders of segregation, and the fear of it is no doubt the main reason why opponents of segregation and other kinds of racial subordination have so often refused to discuss or take seriously the hereditarian argument and not

infrequently have resorted to outright repression and intimidation of those who do discuss it. Yet the fact is that no such implications can be validly drawn from the scientific evidence about race.

Racial segregation in American education and in the South long predated the availability of reliable I.Q. testing, and Jim Crow codes were largely political reactions to the repression and misrule of Reconstruction rather than applications of racial theory and Social Darwinism. Indeed, one of the most outspoken scientific critics of Darwin's theory of evolution in the 19th century, the Swiss naturalist Louis Agassiz, who taught at Harvard even as Northern armies were ending slavery in the South, was also one of the leading Negrophobes and racists in American history.

Moreover, racial differences in I.Q. simply do not justify racial segregation in schools; certainly their implication is not the "separate and equal" schools of the 1896 Plessy vs. Ferguson decision that segregationists defended against the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education ruling. If racial differences in intelligence are valid and if they implied any educational segregation by race at all, then they would imply *unequal* though not necessarily separate educational facilities for the two races.

Yet racial disparities in I.Q. do not necessarily imply any such racial segregation; they might imply separation of students by I.Q., and for all practical purposes that would encompass racial segregation within a school, though there

would still be a sufficient number of black students whose I.Q.s are commensurate with those of whites to make complete racial segregation of education impossible.

Nor do differences in I.Q. have anything to do with other forms of segregation—in public accommodations, water fountains, conveyances, etc. People regularly eat or share public space with obviously retarded persons whose I.Q.'s are considerably lower than those of most blacks, and I have yet to hear of anyone who objected to such integration of the subnormal into the commonplace institutions of social life.

As a matter of fact, if the biological and psychological inequality of human beings has little to do with racial segregation, neither does the principle of equal rights have much to do with the myth of racial equality. The principle of equal rights is a convenient public fiction by which human social and political relationships can be regulated, and its usefulness is entirely independent of the dubious claims for the equality of natural endowments that egalitarians espouse.

The Constitution, for example, employs the principle of equal rights for states when it establishes equal representation of states in the U.S. Senate. New York and Wyoming each have two votes in the Senate. In that juridical and political sense they are equal, and each state enjoys the same rights as every other state (with the exception of Southern states under the Voting Rights Act). But it would occur to no one planning

a business venture, buying a home, or trying to raise a family in one state or the other to think that the two states really are equal in fact.

The principle of equal rights for citizens was recognized in the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which simply confirmed that former slaves possessed the legal capacity to carry out those civil functions that are inseparable from being free and independent—namely, the ability to make contracts, buy and sell property, sue and be sued, etc.

Not until the civil rights revolution of the 1960s did such legislation as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 actually proceed to join and confuse the useful

public fiction of equal rights with the outright lie of equal people, and by doing so it converted the legitimate principle of equal rights into the ideological sledgehammer of egalitarianism. Having adopted laws that assume that human beings really are equal, the federal government was then compelled to sally forth on a crusade against those social manifestations of the reality of human inequality.

The resulting war against “discrimination” is thus actually a war against those institutions of civil society such as property, patterns of association,

education, and employment that naturally reflect inequality and differentiation, for the purpose of forcing human and social reality into conformity with the fictitious equality of human beings.

By importing egalitarianism into the principle of equal rights, civil rights law and policy essentially committed the federal government to perpetual conflict with American society and its members, and the commitment to the illusion of equality in the civil rights acts of the 1960s quickly led to the whole apparatus of affirmative action, quotas, set-asides, enterprise zones, and egalitarian experimentation that afflicts us today.

If the races really are equal, then their apparent inequality in employment, education, etc. must be due to discrimination, and if the state is committed to rooting out such artificial and unjust discrimination, then the apparatus of affirmative action is perfectly logical. Those, whether conservative or liberal, who reject the inheritability of intelligence must accept an environmentalist explanation for racial differences in I.Q. or reject the validity of I.Q. testing *in toto*. If they accept environmentalist explanations for racial differences, then the crusade against inequality appears to follow.

Whether the races are or are not equal or naturally different in their endowments, then, has nothing to do with the legal and political recognition of equal rights, which do not depend on natural endowments, and the acceptance of natural racial differences implies no legal or political discrimination of one race against another. But the falsity of racial egalitarianism does carry socially significant implications nonetheless. In the first place, the natural differentiation of the races in intellectual capacities implies that of the two major races in the United States today, only one possesses the inherent capacity to create and sustain the level of civilization that has historically characterized its homelands in Europe and America. Awareness of the dependence of Euro-American civilization on the people that created it thus implies that the survival of that people is essential to the survival of the civilization itself.

And secondly, the recognition of racial realities implies that most of the efforts now deployed to combat racism, fight insensitivity, celebrate diversity, eradicate prejudice, and impose racial equality are misplaced, based on a profound misconception of racial capacities and directed toward goals that are neither just to either race nor attainable without the perpetuation of serious injustice to both. Those policies and laws are the fruit of a discredited egalitarian mythology that animates the federal leviathan’s perpetual war against civil society and debilitates white resistance to the gathering storm of racial revolution

Civil rights confused the useful public fiction of equal rights with the outright lie of equal people.

that the enemies, white and non-white, of the white race and its civilization now openly preach and prepare.

The sooner we recognize the truth about race, bring to an end the war for equality that the big lies about race engender, and learn to live with the real nature blacks and whites possess, the sooner we will address the real reasons America has failed to solve its racial problems, and the better off both races will be for doing so. ■

Dr. Francis is a syndicated columnist.

Unions Are Back

by Llewellyn H.
Rockwell, Jr.

The decline in union power and membership was one of the great achievements of the 1980s. Through both structural changes in the economy and Republican policies, we eliminated some union privileges. Now the Clinton administration has started reversing these gains.

First, Bill Clinton and his labor secretary Robert B. Reich will allow members of PATCO, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, to go to work for the government again, despite their illegal strike. (Ronald Reagan's had courageously fired the strikers, just as the law provides, and forbade them to take any other jobs on the federal payroll.)

Second, Clinton reversed the Bush administration's enforcement of the Supreme Court's

Beck decision, which allowed workers to block illegal spending of union dues on (inevitably liberal) political action without the workers' consent.

Clinton called Bush's action "distinctly anti-union," when it was actually pro-worker, unless the worker wanted his hard-earned money spent by union bosses on the likes of Clinton.

Third, Clinton reversed a recent Bush administration ban on government contracts for closed-shop companies. Closed shops, which prevent the employment of non-union members (85% of the labor force), are bad economically and socially. They promote featherbedding and above-market wages, and in this case, will mean spending more taxpayer dollars on the most inefficient firms.

This order was issued as the administration plans its \$20-30 billion "stimulus." This money will be spent on highways, bridges, and that like, and unionized companies will get the inside track.

Clinton, moreover, intends to index the minimum wage with inflation. Outlawing employment below a government-set level is not exactly what the economy needs, and a rising minimum wage will insure that marginal workers are permanently locked out of the job market. Unions, which want to increase their own incomes by outlawing competition in this way, have advocated this policy for years.

If, as a result of the Clinton administration's bias towards big labor, unions stage a comeback, it's easy to see who will benefit. But who will suffer? The non-union employees, who see

their paychecks cut and job opportunities restricted as a result.

Contrary to myth, labor unions don't represent the American worker. Even at their pick in 1953, they only included 25% of the workforce (understandable, since they exist to enrich their members at the expense of other workers). But since 1980, we have seen union membership declines from more than 20% to about 15%. Without Clinton, membership could fall below 10%. Even today, membership is concentrated in public transportation and government.

That's why the political power of unions is out of all proportion to their membership. But bolstered by labor legislation based on Mussolini's Italy, unions wield much power on Capitol Hill, in part through heavy spending.

Liberal think tanks also benefit from union donations, including the Economic Policy Institute, whose positions are identical to the unions'.

It is distressing, if hardly surprising, that Clinton put a long-time associate of the Economic Policy Institute and a beneficiary of union largess, Robert Reich, in charge of labor policy. We can therefore expect a blizzard of pro-union regulations, no matter what damage they do to the economy.

The changes already instituted by Clinton and Reich will do much damage. As the private-sector unions have declined, the government unions have skyrocketed, from 11% of employees in the 1960s to 37% today.

That's why allowing PATCO members to rejoin the federal government sends a very bad