

Indians in the Canadian imagination, Mackey states that the British (and later the Canadian) Crown "negotiated a series of treaties that extinguished Native entitlement to land in exchange for reserves on marginal unattractive land" (p. 34). This may be the perspective of many Canadians and the historian she cites may even advance it as "fact," but it is certainly not the perspective generally held by First Nations. In their view, treaties established "nation-to-nation" relationships and allowed for the peaceful settlement of the subjects of the Crown on their lands. They were not about extinguishments (Venne 1997). This perspective, along with the pressure applied by the many Canadians who supported the justness of this case, constituted a challenge to governments long content to disregard treaty obligations and to ignore the fundamental political rights of aboriginal peoples. It played a crucial role in the process through which the Canadian state sought and ultimately delivered a new Constitution Act that affirmed and recognized aboriginal and treaty rights. The process contributed to expanding the definition of Canadian national identity as well as to intensifying the xenophobic backlash Mackey so vividly describes. It is a process that is still in play. Lacking sensitivity to these voices, Mackey's account neglects a key factor that gave rise to and shaped the very events she reports on in the text.

When I was a graduate student in the mid-1960s, it was inconceivable that the political relationship between First Nations and Canada would be a consideration for

long. It was commonly held among anthropologists that the ways of life of indigenous peoples in Canada and the United States had largely been lost and that these peoples were well on their way to becoming absorbed into the large, powerful settler states within which they found themselves. Certainly, there were issues, but these would quickly be resolved as the populations became ever more assimilated. Yet, 35 years later, as the books under review here attest, indigenous peoples still have not been assimilated and the issue of political relationship endures. It is well worth considering what this tells us about how we have conceptualized and reported on the encounter between indigenous peoples and such modern states as Canada and the United States, and to ask what we might learn about resolving political relations between ethnonational communities in general, through further exploration of the situation between indigenous peoples and the settlers who came later.

REFERENCES CITED

- Asch, Michael
2002 From *Terra Nullius* to Affirmation: Reconciling Aboriginal Rights with the Canadian Constitution. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 17(2):23-39.
- Venne, Sharon
1997 Understanding Treaty 6: An Indigenous Perspective. In *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada: Essays on Law, Equality, and Respect for Difference*. Michael Asch, ed. Pp. 173-207. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

A Model Approach for Studying Race: Provocative Theory, Sound Science, and Very Good History

The Problem of Race in the Twenty-First Century. Thomas C. Holt. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002. 146 pp.

Race in Mind: Race, IQ, and Other Racisms. Alexander Alland Jr. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. 219 pp.

The Funding of Scientific Racism: Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund. William H. Tucker. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002. 286 pp.

LEE D. BAKER

Duke University

"What the hell is this?" I said to myself after I opened a plain brown envelope containing a special abridged edition of *Race, Evolution, and Behavior* authored by J. Philippe Rushton. During the winter of 1999, Rushton sent this unsolicited pamphlet to some thirty thousand psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists in the United States and Canada. Answering a query about funding, Rushton responded, "the Pioneer Fund is paying the entire bill" (2000: A24).

William H. Tucker explains that this mass mailing was the Pioneer Fund's latest attempt to "affect public opinion by publishing material about racial differences and sending it to select groups" (p. 200). Throughout a six-decade campaign, "the mailing list has remained the Pioneer group's weapon of choice" (p. 201). A year earlier, Rushton tangled with Jane Hill (then AAA President) and Robert Sussman (then editor-in-chief of *AA*) over Sussman's refusal to sell space in *AA* to advertise his book, which argues that races differ in intelligence and reproductive behavior (Alland 2002:168).

The majority of anthropologists dismissed the book as racist and supported their president and editor-in-chief. The point here is that racist science still thrives in anthropology; anthropologists, and especially our students, remain a targeted audience because anthropology continues to shoulder authority as a purveyor of interpretation for that "parasitic and chameleonlike" (Holt 2002:8) set of social practices—race, racism, and culture.

The books reviewed here each explore race, but the authors' point of departure, methods, and scholarly disciplines are completely different. Although each book has important strengths and troubling weaknesses, taken together they offer an ideal approach for learning and teaching about race and racism in general, while offering a comprehensive critique of the specific roles science, money, and merit have and continue to play in the ever shifting social and political articulations of race and racism in the United States. Holt (a historian) focuses on history and theory, Alland (an anthropologist) focuses on the faulty science used by scientific racists, and Tucker (a psychologist) focuses on the history of the Pioneer Fund's effort to maintain white supremacy.

Thomas C. Holt claims "there are *new* anomalies, *new* ambiguities, and a *new* ambivalence in contemporary life that our standard definitions of race and racism simply cannot account for" (p. 5). He forcefully states his argument that "the meaning of race and the nature of racism articulate with (perhaps even are defined by) the given social formation of a particular historical moment" (p. 22). In short, the meaning of race and the practices of racism change over time. Holt is particularly troubled by the way social scientists and historians hold race as a constant and asserts that the method of first defining race, racism, and ethnicity and then tracking them as unchanging entities through time is a practice that employs "an idea that is an even more tenacious trope in racial discourse than the stubborn biological idea [of race]" (p. 18). Privileging both the palimpsest and contingent character of race, Holt does "not to try to define or catalogue" race; instead, he wants to identify and describe the "work race does" (p. 27).

Holt explains that once scholars accept that race and culture share ambiguous boundaries that change, "we immediately confront the fact that both must also be historically contingent. And if they are historical, then their further analysis requires mapping the relations of power, the patterns of contestations and struggle out of which such social constructions emerge" (p. 8).

Holt offers critical insight into the way ideas about race bleed into ideas of culture, noting, "as we speak the new language of social construction and displace biology from its historically privileged place in the definition of race, we tend to substitute another ambiguous and fraught concept—culture." Explaining why, he suggests "that race is biological and thus suspect, while ethnicity is cultural and thus valid" (p. 16).

Although anthropologists are familiar with perks and perils of essentializing culture, Holt holds them partly responsible for being "increasingly uncertain as to just what culture is." Citing work by Sherry Ortner, Clifford Geertz, and others, Holt admits that he cannot get a fix on how anthropologists explain culture. He states frankly, "even without waiting for anthropologists to sort that all out, it is clear that we cannot think of culture as simply a set of voluntaristic social practices that we easily opt into or out of" (p. 15).

Although Holt's argument does not break new theoretical ground, he provides a fascinating synthesis of the work of James Baldwin, Etienne Balibar, Pierre Bourdieu, John Comaroff, W. E. B. Du Bois, Michel Foucault, and Stuart Hall. To illustrate his argument that race is tethered to specific social formations, he employs the familiar pre-Fordist, Fordist, and post-Fordist nomenclature to demarcate his three chapters that coincide with those particular periods, "Racial Identity and the Project of Modernity," "Race and Culture in a Consumer Society," and "Race, Nation, and the Global Economy."

Holt begins by grappling with Foucault's notion of biopower to help frame his discussion about the relationship between the Atlantic slave trade and the rise of nationalism and the modern nation-state, but he is at his best in the second chapter. A smart, fast-paced discussion of change and transformation, he seamlessly integrates various analyses that document changes in the United States in social and economic policy, labor and party politics, cultural and industrial production, and patterns of consumption and migration/immigration. Holt ends this chapter with a brilliant reading of the symbolism produced by Jack Johnson's 1910 boxing victory over Jim Jeffries, the so-called White Hope. Reading the boxing match as a Balinese cock fight in black and white, Holt suggests that Johnson was the first in a long line of black athletes to "form a pattern of representation in which a racial image is appropriated for nonracial (or should I say supraracial) ends" (p. 79).

Well versed in the language of stock derivatives, sports, world trade agreements, and the struggles for racial equality worldwide, Holt's last chapter is peppered with insightful discussions of the relationship between commodities, consumption, celebrities, and economic policy, which springs from a superb overview of the tensions between the Cold War and the Civil Rights movement.

Holt succeeds in using postmodern and postcolonial theory to emphasize the global dimensions of U.S. racial ideologies by highlighting the contradictions that emerge in the current racial regime that idealizes black celebrities in sports, politics, and popular culture while devastating the regular black citizen. However, his analysis of contemporary blackness falls short without more developed discussions of the role of hip-hop in the United States and abroad and the role black people play in the today's economy. He emphatically states, "that although race may indeed do conceptual work in this economy, blacks-as-a-race have no economic role" (p. 102) and barely discusses it further.

Unlike his two other books (1992, 1977), Holt fails to fully sustain the argument he brilliantly outlined in the introduction. As a senior scholar, he tried something new by responding to the shifting needs of his students and the inevitable questions of his young daughter—that should be applauded.

This book is important as it relates to the other two books, because it places race in the big picture and demonstrates

how the concept of race changes over time. Perhaps more importantly, he addresses the fact that race does work within political and economic regimes. Although the work race does is often contradictory and ironic, it is constantly being contested on micro- and macrolevels—race is neither biological nor logical, it is political, historical, and social. These are important facets to keep in mind when reading the other books that emphasize very different aspects of race and racism.

In a unique and spirited book, Alexander Alland delivers a devastating critique of the science of racial difference, focusing specifically on the so-called IQ argument and the major media outlets that promote it. As he notes, "only a small minority of scholars in the English-speaking world makes claims concerning a strong correlation between race and IQ, [but] their influence goes well beyond their numbers" (p. 6). As he observes, "a wide segment of the American public, including government officials, lies in wait for such confirmation of their prejudices concerning race in general and race and IQ in particular" (p. 6). The reason that a handful of scholars' research on racial inferiority is so newsworthy, Alland explains, is "large segments of the public are so willing to accept simple biological explanations for what are actually complicated social problems" (p. 10).

Stated differently, ideas about racial inferiority do the work of transforming equality into equal opportunity, which subtly shifts the burden of inequality from society to the individual. Using bad genes or bad behavior to explain the disparity between blacks, whites, Latinos, and Asians, in virtually every social indicator is more comfortable than admitting that the United States is a bad society that promotes racial inequality. The predicate of that logic is that racialized differences are natural and real, and for many Americans this means biological or genetic differences.

Alland explains how this logic is preposterous and simply inverts it to underscore the premise of this work: "The categorization of people by such external physical attributes as skin color, hair form, and nose shape leads to discrimination in education, housing, medical care, and hiring, all of which affect performance on IQ tests" (p. 10). Alland is specifically responding to the latest round of scientific racism, most notably *The Bell Curve* (Herrnstein and Murray 1994) and *Race, Evolution, and Behavior* (Rushton 1995). He situates the text, however, within recurrent bouts of "'scientific' racism. . . . Examples of it turn up at a relatively constant rate, about once every generation, in academic publications as well as the press, both intellectual and popular" (p. 10).

Alland marks off the word *scientific* with quotes to signal that this well-funded enterprise employs a putative science to articulate a specific type of racism. He warns, however, that "'scientific' racism is a pernicious phenomenon that demands constant vigilance and strongly reasoned counter arguments" (p. 10). Alland highlights dubious funding sources, the role of the Pioneer fund, and the prestigious positions that many of these scholars hold in

universities and at think tanks. Carefully documenting the political economy of scientific racism is Tucker's agenda, while Alland goes after the science.

Alland addresses the arguments that IQ is in part heritable and that race has something to do with human variation. But first, he provides what I think (as a cultural anthropologist) is a great compendium on the basic mechanics and theories of evolution and genetics, to provide "guidance in order to fully understand the analyses and criticisms that make up the bulk of this book" (p. 13). Alland's second chapter, simply titled "Genetics and Evolution," is a refresher course in the basics: natural selection and punctuated equilibrium, Mendelian and population genetics, clines and gene flow, segregation and independent assortment, pleiotropy and penetrance, and so on. While he covers a lot of ground at a good clip, he takes time to elaborate the specific aspects of genetics and evolution often misappropriated by scholars engaged in research on racial differences. He also develops a useful metaphor that he employs throughout the book involving the distinction between the outward appearances of an organism or its "package," which he contrasts with the internal genetic structure of an organism, its "contents," implying the former is less important than the latter.

Careful never to diminish the social significance of race, Alland uses the next chapter to demonstrate how race is an amorphous social category and simply an untenable biological category, explaining how "in biological classification there are two and only two relatively unambiguous categories. These are the species and the individuals" (p. 40).

The first quarter of the book establishes a baseline for the reader—it is pedagogically perfect. He then goes after scholars, one by one, who have misappropriated science to advance racism and begins with Carleton Coon, who "stands as an example of a man whose interpretations of the then-available evidence for human evolution were driven by a bad theory, the notion that blacks are inferior to whites in intelligence" (p. 57). Alland challenges Coon on Coon's own terms, using the concepts of "selection," "drift," and "gene flow" to disassemble his arguments about the origins of the races. Alland then turns his attention to Arthur Jensen and proponents of the IQ argument. Explaining how "merit has come to be objectified as intelligence *plus* acceptable hard work" (p. 81), Alland carefully unpacks the terms *heredity*, *hereditary*, and *heritability* to convincingly identify flaws in many of the experiment's designs. His most effective point is that using race as an independent variable is not reliable because it is such an amorphous social category. And, like Holt, who indicts historians for holding race as a constant through time, Alland indicts sociobiologists and psychologists for holding race as a constant in their experiments (p. 132).

Alland also makes useful distinctions between so-called scientific racists. He terms authors like Arthur Jensen "serious scholars" and explains that they are "well trained" in their respective disciplines, but people like

William Shockley and Michael Levin he simply calls "cranks" (p. 121). Throughout the book Alland's anger and indignation are palpable. He frequently uses exclamation marks, capital letters, and italics to punctuate his emotional stake in these debates. This is refreshing, but when he becomes literally aghast by the fact that bad science is routinely served up to an eager public, it smacks a little of naiveté. Alland is no Pollyanna, but he fails to show how duplicity and hypocrisy have long bedeviled the so-called facts as stipulated by such authoritative discourses as science, religion, and law, especially when it comes to maintaining white supremacy, sexism, and homophobia.

With pithy, logical, and devastating critiques of Rushton, Herrnstein, Murray, and many others, Alland offers students, activists, and hopefully newspaper editors the tools to analyze and evaluate the faulty science behind specific arguments about racial inferiority. Implicitly, there really is this sense in Alland's work that truth will prevail. Long ago, Du Bois observed that scientific truths alone could not change society. Du Bois became a scholar because "the world was thinking wrong about race, because it did not know. The ultimate evil was stupidity. The cure for it was knowledge based on scientific investigation" (Du Bois 1986:596, 591). A decade and a half later, Du Bois came to an understanding that American people were not going to change despite the truth about race. To combat racial inequality he turned from the academic to the political arena. Reflecting on this transition, Du Bois explained "my career as a scientist was to be swallowed up in my role as master of propaganda. This was not wholly to my liking" (p. 622).

Du Bois knew that the battleground for the hearts and minds of Americans was in politics and the media, science was just a means to an end. The founder of the Pioneer Fund, William Wickliffe Draper, knew this, too. According to William Tucker, the Pioneer Fund is not in the business of advancing science but using it "as a tool to support racial separation" (p. 132). Tucker and Alland analyze many of the same people, most notably Levin, Jensen, Rushton, Shockley, and Carleton Putnam, but each comes at them from very different angles. For teaching, these books are perfectly paired. Tucker carefully explores the archives without touching the science, while Alland carefully explores the science without touching the archives.

Tucker never evokes the specter of conspiracy, but he marshals an avalanche of evidence that Pioneer's money and board members were influential in a number of high-profile campaigns that included lobbying for a "Negro-back-to-Africa" scheme, bankrolling some of the most egregious eugenics projects, setting up private white-only schools in the South after desegregation, and successfully lobbying for recent anti-immigrant legislation in California.

Tucker begins by posing a simple question, "what is the truth about Pioneer?" The leadership of this secretive foundation, started in 1937 by Draper, a wealthy textile magnate, has always proclaimed that it only supported

university research to advance science. Tucker questions that

if the many grants made by Pioneer—not only to a number of well-known scientists but also to a host of obscure academics who similarly maintain that blacks are intellectually inferior to whites—mask other, less laudable goals, then the fund may be hiding an oppressive political agenda behind the protection of academic freedom. [p. 6]

Tucker uses his painstaking original research to mount a case that concludes, "the evidence available now strongly indicates that Pioneer has indeed been the primary resource for scientific racism" (p. 9). Organized temporally, Tucker focuses on the Fund's shifting tactics to maintain white supremacy. Wide ranging and detailed, Tucker never loses focus in his four long chapters and manages to compile the evidence while weaving a captivating narrative that twists and turns through major institutions in the country—including Congress, the Supreme Court, Harvard, NBC, and Delta Airlines.

Emblematic of the Fund's support of southern segregationists and the type of "smoking gun" Tucker was able to unearth was this memo submitted by Carleton Putnam, one of the Fund's grantees, to the Governor of the Mississippi. It was on behalf of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, a proposed new organization intended to lobby against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. As Tucker notes, it mirrored other projects the Fund supported. After outlining the support for research on racial difference, Tucker summarizes the balance of the document, quoting from the original:

The results [of the research] would then be circulated to newspapers, periodical, wire services, syndicated columnists, and radio and television stations. In addition, a periodical "of our own," would be subsidized, though not published, by the new organization, and "fronts" would be created to distribute "more subtle writings, those which carry arguments *shaded* with our beliefs." The project's legal arm would engage in litigation and legislation. A final recommendation, "high on our 'must' list," according to the proposal, was to help some interest "ideologically attuned to our thinking" to acquire ownership of a radio and television complex. [Tucker 2002:125]

Space prohibits me from developing the various and sundry actions, tactics, and lobbying efforts that Tucker demonstrates the fund employed. Now that Rushton is the new president at Pioneer, anthropologists will continue to be targeted as the Fund develops new tactics. Tucker's careful history provides transparency and one can now identify the pernicious ideology fueling the fund's "scientific" racism. Above all, Tucker's book confirms that race not only does work but also is worked by powerful individuals, some with very deep pockets and anxieties.

By far the most original, scholarly, and carefully researched of the three books, Tucker is so single minded in his quest that the reader does not get a good picture of the overall context in which the Fund operated, especially in relationship to other agencies, foundations, or even the church. Were Pioneer's efforts dwarfed by the Ford Foundation or

were they more effective? How did it compare to, say, the John M. Olin Foundation? These questions did not concern Tucker, but that is what makes it pair so nicely with the other books. Beginning with the broad and burrowing to the very specific, these three books make for an impressive multidisciplinary and multimethodological approach for better understanding how race and racism operate. In some respects, it is a model approach—provocative theory, sound science, and very good history.

REFERENCES CITED

Chronicle of Higher Education

2000 Hot Type. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 46(19): A24.

Du Bois, William E. B.

1986[1940] *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept*. In W. E. B. Du Bois' Writings. Nathan Huggins, ed. Pp. 550–802. New York: Library of America.

Herrnstein, Richard; and Charles Murray

1994 *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.

Holt, Thomas C.

1992 *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832–1938*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

1977 *Black over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina during Reconstruction*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Rushton, J. P.

1995 *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.