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In *The Bell Curve*, Charles Murray and the late Richard Herrnstein showed that in the United States intelligence is an important determinant of educational attainment, earnings, and socio-economic status, and (negatively) of welfare dependency, unemployment, crime, and single motherhood.\(^1\) They also showed that differences in intelligence go a considerable way towards explaining the racial differences in these socially important outcomes. Finally, they showed that there is a racial hierarchy such that Europeans with an average IQ of 100 perform best in these social categories, Hispanics (average IQ of 86) perform next best, while blacks (average IQ of 82) do least well.

Herrnstein and Murray’s analysis was confined to the United States. Richard Lynn’s new book sets out to examine whether there are similar racial hierarchies in other parts of the world. He deals with twelve multiracial countries and geographical regions (Africa, Australia, Brazil, Britain, Canada, the Caribbean, Hawaii, Latin America, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Southeast Asia, and the continental United States) and documents the presence of racial differences in intelligence and socio-economic status. He shows that Europeans and Northeast Asians invariably have the highest IQs, do best in education, have the highest earnings, and are at the top of the socio-economic hierarchies. Mixed race peoples (coloreds in South Africa, mulattos in Brazil and the Caribbean, light-skinned blacks in the United States, mestizos in Latin America) come in the middle of the IQ and socio-economic hierarchies, while blacks and Native American Indians come at the bottom.

Other regions of the world have their own racial intelligence and socio-economic hierarchies. In Australia and New Zealand, Europeans and Chinese outperform the indigenous Aborigines and Maoris. Throughout Southeast Asia (in Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand), the Chinese have higher IQs than the indigenous peoples and outperform them in education, earnings, wealth, and socio-economic status.

Previously, most data on racial socio-economic hierarchies were collected by sociologists, economists, and anthropologists. Strangely, none of these scholars ever considered the possibility that differences in intelligence could be a major factor responsible for these consistent racial hierarchies. Lynn summarizes the three major theories that have been advanced to explain them and argues that all are unsatisfactory. The three theories are (1) cultural values theories proposing that some peoples have socially transmitted cultural values, such as a strong work ethic, that are conducive to educational and socio-economic success; (2) structuralism theories proposing that dominant ethnic groups maintain their position because they have the power to discriminate against other groups; and (3) human capital theories positing that some groups have more abilities by virtue of having acquiring better education.

Lynn argues that cultural values theories are unsatisfactory because cultural values are not measurable. Discrimination theories are implausible because frequently the racial groups that are at the top of the socio-economic hierarchies are tiny minorities that do not have the power to maintain their position by discrimination (such as Europeans and Northeast Asians in the Caribbean and in much of Latin America, and Chinese in most of Southeast Asia, except in Singapore). Human capital theories do not explain why some racial groups are more successful than others at acquiring better education. He argues that intelligence theory provides the best explanation for the racial hierarchies that are consistently present in all multiracial societies.

It is a remarkable feature of Lynn’s analysis that the IQ and socio-economic hierarchies that are present worldwide are associated with skin color. It is invariably the light-skinned who have the highest social status (i.e., Europeans and Northeast Asians). These are followed by the brown-skinned who occupy intermediate positions in IQ and socio-economic hierarchies (e.g., the coloreds and Indians in Africa, the mulattos and mestizos in Latin America, Indians in Europe, and
light-skinned blacks in the United States). Dark-skinned African blacks and Native American Indians invariably come at the bottom of the hierarchies. In Australia and New Zealand, it is the light-skinned Europeans and Chinese who are at the top of the IQ and socio-economic hierarchies, while the dark-skinned Aborigines and Maoris are at the bottom.

These color-coded social hierarchies are so inescapable that sociologists and anthropologists have coined the term *pigmentocracy* to describe them. A pigmentocracy is a society in which wealth and social status are determined by skin color. For instance, “Latin American society is fundamentally pigmentocratic, characterized by a social spectrum with taller, lighter-skinned, European-blooded elites at one end; shorter, darker, Indian-blooded masses at the other end . . .”

Why should high IQs, educational attainment, and socio-economic status be invariably associated with light skin color? Lynn proposes that the most plausible theory is that those populations that migrated into the cold regions of Eurasia evolved light skin to synthesize vitamin D from sunlight and also evolved high IQs to solve the cognitive problems of survival in this harsh environment. This has brought about the high correlations across nations between light skin color, IQ, per capita income, and winter cold shown by Templer and Arikawa.

*The Global Bell Curve* is a major integration of evolutionary biology, the psychology of intelligence, and the sociology of race differences in educational attainment and socio-economic status worldwide.
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