

Introduction

EYSENCK AND THE NAZIS:

Another "Searchlight" Smear Exposed And Refuted

I had intended to publish the interview as part of a much larger work. However, my original exposure of Eysenck's deceptions have proved far more extensive than I imagined in my wildest dreams. I have decided to publish them and series of pamphlets which are being distributed to media outlets, Jewish, Christian, academic and Jewish individuals and organizations. This short study is being published now, March 1994, in order to set the record straight about Eysenck. It may later be combined with similar interviews to a somewhat larger volume.

I have also added an appendix - a critique of the smear led on Eysenck and others produced by Searchlight's "editor" - David Bull, who is currently on the faculty at Longhorough University, Lincoln, England - and by an extraordinary coincidence, Jewish - publisher, has written a number of books and articles on rhetoric. He might use to chew away the following before his next lecture: "It is well known to students of rhetoric that people may become convinced of a false promise or an ill-considered conclusion if it is powerfully asserted. Usually, enough, after enough, or with sufficient persistence. A common tactic of demagogues is to use inflammatory images to drive people into fear and hate beyond the realm of rational discussion." (1)

2nd Printing

Alexander S. D. ...
London

15th February 1994

Introduction

The following interview with Hans Eysenck was recorded on February 16, 1993 at the Institute of Psychiatry, Denmark Hill. Eysenck has held an Emeritus Professorship there since 1983. I should point out that I offered this interview originally to *Searchlight*; not surprisingly the magazine chose not to publish it; I did not even receive a reply. Somewhat more surprisingly, it was also rejected by *Spearhead*. Editor Tyndall did at least send me a rejection slip. The text of the interview is of course the same, although the notes have been augmented. It has been approved by the interviewee.

I had intended to publish this interview as part of a much larger work. However, my on-going exposés of *Searchlight's* lie machine have proved far more extensive than I imagined in my wildest dreams, so I have decided to publish them as a series of pamphlets which are being distributed to media outlets, leftists, rightists, academics and Jewish individuals and organisations. This short study is being published now, March 1994, in order to set the record straight about Eysenck. It may later be combined with similar interviews in a somewhat larger volume.

I have also added an appendix, a critique of the smear job on Eysenck and others produced by *Searchlight's* "academic" henchman, Michael Billig, who is currently on the faculty at Loughborough University. Billig, a distinguished - and by an extraordinary coincidence, Jewish - professor, has written a number of books and articles on rhetoric. He might like to chew over the following before his next lecture: "It is well known to students of rhetoric that people may become convinced of a false premise or an illogical conclusion if it is merely asserted loudly enough, often enough, or with sufficient conviction...A common tactic of demagogues is to use inflammatory images to drive people into fear and hate beyond the reach of rational discussion." (1)

Alexander Baron
Sydenham,
London,

13th February 1994

Who Is Hans Eysenck?

[The following thumbnail sketch has been largely distilled from *Rebel With A Cause: The Autobiography of H. J. Eysenck*, published by W.H. Allen, London, (1990). This book is a refreshingly critical self-appraisal and is transparently the work of an honest man.]

Hans Jürgen Eysenck was born in Germany on 4th March 1916, the son of an actor and actress. His father joined the Nazi Party but the young Hans was perturbed at what was going on around him. When his Jewish mathematics teacher was dismissed from his post, the whole class protested, even though many of them had been enrolled into the Hitler Youth. Hans made more noise about this than most. When the Nazis came to power and he applied to join the Faculty of Physics at the University of Berlin, he was told that he must first join the SS. His father had the ear of Herman Goering, and the Reichsmarschall promised him that his son would have an easy time if he accepted a commission as an officer. Eduard Eysenck would undoubtedly have been proud to see his son in an SS uniform, but for the young Hans this was the last straw, and at great risk to himself, he left Nazi Germany for France, and later came to England. He had been to England three times before, and as he had a flair for languages he didn't fair too badly.

When war broke out he tried to enlist in the RAF but they wouldn't have him because he was classified as an enemy alien. He also suffered harassment on account of his German accent and says he was lucky to avoid being interned at the start of the war. Many of his fellow refugees were shipped off to Canada and Australia. Hans found this humiliating, especially as if Germany had won the war he would have been hanged as a traitor. But it was not Germany he hated, rather its government. He gets very angry when he hears certain people today referring to the Tory government as fascist. "...they insult the memory of the heroic people who dared to oppose a genuine Fascist state", he says. He left Nazi Germany as much as a protest against restrictions on academic freedom as for his abhorrence of all forms of bigotry.

This hasn't prevented him from being targeted by left wing groups in this country though. He was attacked at the London School of Economics by what he calls a group of left wing fascists. (2) He has been branded a sadist and a murderer by the Animal Liberation Front, although he says he has never used vivisection in his work. He took his PhD during the war years, on aesthetics, and in 1949-50 was Visiting Professor at the University of Pennsylvania. His first marriage didn't work out, but his second wife, Sybil, has been with him for over 40 years. She is a psychologist in her own right, as is his son Michael by his first wife, (now deceased).

Eysenck is easily Britain's most distinguished psychologist, and one of the most distinguished in the world. He has over 800 citations in the *Social Sciences Citation Index* and has written and co-written more than 30 books and 900 articles on psychology. The breadth of his work is staggering. More than any other psychologist, he has destroyed the quackery of Sigmund Freud. He has also done some work on ESP and astrology as well as on smoking, in particular the relationship between smoking,

stress, cancer and coronary heart disease. Like all iconoclasts, his work has been far from popular with orthodoxy, and his opponents have on more than one occasion and subject accused him of fraud.

Searchlight On Eysenck

Needless to say, it is Eysenck's supposedly heretical views on race and intelligence which earned him the vituperation of *Searchlight*.

Issue 23 accused him of "providing the devil with his scripts". This refers to Eysenck's claim that blacks - as a race - are less intelligent than whites. An entirely reasonable claim as the Negro never aspired to inventing the wheel. *Searchlight* did not attack the Professor directly, but used its usual smear by insinuation technique to insinuate that he is a *racist* (whatever is meant by that nebulous and increasingly boring epithet) or even that he is somehow sympathetic to Nazism.

Issue 31, page 6, claims that Eysenck, and two other prestigious and highly acclaimed scientists, Jensen and Shockley, aim to show that IQ and race are linked and that intelligence is inherited.

Issue 33, pages 6-7, publishes another smear on Eysenck. The title of this unsigned libel is *SOMETHING ROTTEN IN THE STATE OF DENMARK HILL*. (A reference to the Institute of Psychiatry).

Page 6, "Many people are becoming increasingly concerned how far racist views are encroaching on the so-called 'respectable' Establishment."

Exactly how many is not made clear, but it is a even money bet that most of them subscribe to *Searchlight*. Eysenck is described as an editorial assistant of the "unpleasant, semi-academic journal entitled *Mankind Quarterly*."

And this from a publication which would even deny the existence of race! On page 7, it is stated that Eysenck is "internationally famous for his theories that blacks are genetically less intelligent than whites."

To this they might have added, "and that Jews are more intelligent than us *goyim*", (or should that be you *goyim*?), but of course, they don't.

Issue 46, page 13, contains yet another smear: *Eysenck: Smearing Anti-Fascists* speaks glowingly of Michael Billig's "researches" into "scientific racism" and the extent to which it has pervaded academia. Eysenck is accused of proclaiming the "biological inferiority of blacks and women". He is also accused of moral blindness; coming from the likes of the *Searchlight* team, this is *chutzpah* indeed.

Eysenck In His Own Words

Question: People of a certain political persuasion have attempted to make out that you are somehow sympathetic to Nazism. Is that true?

Professor Eysenck: Hardly. I left the country at some considerable risk to get away from it. My grandmother died in a concentration camp, so that is another thing.

Question: The other controversial area in which you have been involved is in the testing of intelligence.

HE: Again, what is controversial?

Question: I use that word in the media's sense rather than in yours.

HE: Let me put it this way, there has recently been a very interesting study in the States in which a psychologist and a media expert got opinions from over six hundred experts in this field: educationalists, psychologists, mental development people and so on, on a large number of questions about intelligence, and they showed there was a large amount of agreement, and on every one of these points the agreement is fully [consistent] with what I wrote in my text book, so this is just orthodoxy, there's no question of controversy.

The only controversy that exists, as they showed, exists in the media, which simply refused to look at the data, have technical books reviewed [instead] by journalists who know nothing about the topic whatsoever. [These journalists] usually have a left wing inclination, and so on.

Question: There are two areas, one is the environment/heredity quote unquote controversy.

HE: There never has been a controversy, it has always been clear that both exert an influence on IQ.

Question: The other is that certain racial groups might be more intelligent than others.

HE: Again, there has never been any controversy. It has always been shown that there is a difference of about 15 points of IQ between Caucasians [ie whites] and black Americans. The only controversy there has been is about the reason for that, whether it is environmental or genetic.

All I have ever done is to put forward the arguments on both sides. As we cannot perform the biological sort of experiment that is needed to get a definitive answer - interbreed the groups on an experimental basis, which obviously is out of the question - at the moment it is very difficult or impossible to come to a conclusion.

Our latest studies have shown that you can increase the IQs of perfectly adequately fed children by something like eleven points using vitamin-mineral supplementation. Presumably, what you could achieve with poverty-stricken inner city children would be beyond that, and the difference between white and black is only about fifteen points, so it might be possible to erase the difference. But this issue has simply not been looked at in that way. You simply cannot tell at the moment how much to attribute to one side or to the other, if everything is due to a deficient diet, or whatever is the cause.

Question: The allegations which are always made by these left wing "intellectuals" is that this is Nazi race science rearing its ugly head.

HE: It's nothing to do with the Nazis, it's simply an indisputable fact. It has been so since the time of the First World War, and the difference is exactly the same. It's not that anybody doubts it, it's not a question that could be argued. The only question is what causes it.

Question: Are you familiar with the work of Professor Michael Billig?

HE: Oh yes.

Question: Did you see that smear pamphlet that was done on you, *Psychology, Racism and Fascism*?

HE: No.

Question: It was put out by an extreme left wing group quote unquote called *Searchlight*, which is run by British Intelligence. (3) It was published in 1979. Basically, the author starts off with a chapter on Nazi race science and weaves in Jensen and Eysenck. He also mentions *The Mankind Quarterly* and the Racial Preservation Society. I gather you gave an interview to some "right wing" publication once. [*Beacon*]

HE: Yes and no. What actually happened was that a freelance interviewer came and I gave him an interview which he said he would sell to the *Guardian* or whatever, and presumably he couldn't sell it to them so he sold it to this paper I'd never heard of, some right wing or fascist paper.

Question: Articles from *The Mankind Quarterly* have been reprinted in *Spearhead*, the theoretical journal of the British National Party.

HE: I don't know anything about that.

Question: Is *The Mankind Quarterly* still published?

HE: Oh yes, it's a perfectly reputable academic journal.

Question: Its contributors are not all closet Nazis or conspiracy theorists?

HE: No. It is a journal that is mainly devoted to studies of language, particularly the development of languages and so on, a great variety of philosophical issues, and occasionally a psychological article. It has never as far as I am aware, dealt with political questions.

Question: If you read this left wing propaganda - and that's what it is - some of the lies we're fed about smoking are outrageous. Some of the lies we're fed about race though are a great deal worse. I'm thinking particularly of the Institute of Race Relations. Some of them are quite unbelievable; they actually state that race in a biological sense does not exist. That there is no such thing as race. What is your opinion of that as a psychologist and more generally as a scientist?

HE: It's too stupid to comment on. Obviously races do exist: they are characterised by physical characteristics like hair colour and so forth, and they exert an influence on so many different areas like diseases and resistance to alcohol, and all sorts of physical and mental characteristics.

Question: Have you ever been physically attacked?

HE: Oh yes.

Question: Physically?

HE: Yes.

EYSENCK AND THE NAZIS

Question: Can you tell me about that?

HE: This was a famous occasion when I was giving a lecture at the London School of Economics on the psycho-physiology of intelligence, and apparently a group of left wing fascists came down from Birmingham and occupied the first few rows, and suddenly as I was beginning to speak, they came over and began to attack me. (4)

Question: Professor Jensen has also been attacked, I believe?

HE: Frequently, yes.

Question: Do you believe in the concept of *racism*? If so, how would you define the word?

HE: I would say that it means essentially to react to people and judge them not in terms of their own abilities and traits but because of their race. In other words, to reject a person not because he is dull or criminal or whatever, but because he is black or Jewish or whatever.

Question: What is your opinion of that?

HE: I'm totally opposed to it. One of the reasons I left [Nazi] Germany was as a protest against precisely that kind of *racism*.

Question: What do you think of the campaign to eliminate *racism* as it were? Do you think people should be allowed to discriminate on the grounds of race on a personal basis?

HE: Within limits I suppose yes. I remember I was once refused admission to a tennis club because it was a Jewish tennis club and they didn't want me. I think they're perfectly justified in that. If they want to be among themselves, then it's fine. But if it goes beyond personal likes and dislikes, for a job or for a place at a university, then I think it is completely wrong and should certainly not be tolerated.

Question: Do you think people should be judged as individuals?

HE: Absolutely.

Question: What is your view of apartheid?

HE: I think the whole South African problem is almost an insoluble one, and I certainly wouldn't like to be drawn into it one way or another.

Question: I read in one of your books about Jews having a high IQ.

HE: The evidence is that their IQ is considerably higher than that of non-Jews. There was a study in Glasgow of all the Jewish children, and they came out with an IQ of about sixteen points higher.

Question: That's a lot higher.

HE: It's a hell of a lot higher. Again, what the difference is due to is very difficult to establish; there is no way we can quantify it scientifically. There's a possibility that Jewish parents are more likely to induce an academic bias in their children, maybe they spend more on their education, we just don't know. There's also the fact that if you look at any high level achievement, members of the American Academy of Science, Nobel Prize winners and so on, Jews are hugely over-represented, there are ten, fifteen, twenty times as many as there ought to be on a strictly quota basis.

(5)

Question: What does that do to Nazi race theories?

EYSENCK AND THE NAZIS

HE: I don't see any relevance. As you may know, Hitler banned IQ tests because he thought it was [sic] a Jewish invention. So did Stalin, of course; he thought it was [sic] a bourgeois one.

Hitler never thought the Jews were dull; he was objecting to other things.

Question: Yes, some of the stuff the Nazis believed are absolutely ridiculous. But, if you look at the Nazi era and the then massive Jewish presence in say medicine, this was not a parochial phenomenon. Is this why people believed (and still believe) that the Jews are scheming to take over the world? Is this the development of traditional anti-Semitism or is it something more?

HE: I don't think so because it wasn't true in Russia. They were equally anti-Semitic, and in Poland.

Question: Coming back to intelligence in general, having a high IQ is not the be-all and end-all. It's just as important if not more so what you do with it.

HE: Having a high IQ simply means that you can do things intelligently and well, but what it is you do is not determined by your intelligence. I'm sure Robert Maxwell was very bright.

[And I'm sure Gerry Gable is.]

Question: And on the issue of miscegenation, do you have any views on that?

HE: Whom a person wants to marry is their affair, not mine.

Professor Hans Eysenck, thank you very much.

Appendix: *Psychology, Race-Mixing And Searchlight,*

A Critique Of *Psychology, Racism & Fascism,*

by Michael Billig, published by A.F. & R. Publications, Birmingham, (1979).

The author was, at the time, with the Department of Psychology, University of Birmingham. This booklet is anything but subtle. On its black cover appears a skull with a Star of David carved into or painted on it; suspended in mid-air in front of it is what appears to be a pair of callipers, and the whole thing is set on a swastika table cloth.

The foreword written by Robert Moore of the Department of Sociology, King's College, University of Aberdeen, gives a foretaste of the perverted logic which pervades the entire "anti-racist" academic establishment:

"Victory in the second world war and full exposure of the results of Nazi racial policies seemed to have laid 'scientific racism' to rest and its epitaph was written by the scientific community in four UNESCO statements on race."

And

"Most social scientists regard scientific racism as dead."

Leaving aside the fact that the word *racism* is never but never defined by its enemies except in the most general, nebulous and dishonest of terms, the writer is asking us to believe that the outcome of the Second World War can be used to refute scientific theories about race. By the same logic, if the Nazis had won the war, their anti-Semitic ideology would have been validated and the theory of the all-pervasive Jewish world conspiracy would have been vindicated, *Protocols of Zion* and all!

The reference to the UNESCO statement on race is as disingenuous as this statement itself.

What social scientists regard is a matter of social(ist) opinion rather than biological fact. The reality is that there is no real evidence of "racial equality" in a broad sense. Different races have different levels of achievement, in particular, the White Race and to some extent the Yellow Race have created great civilisations while the darker races have created little or none.

This is the plain biological and historical reality. However, all civilisation is the result of the progress of science and technology (and other more nebulous "crafts" such as ethics), and these are the creation of a relatively small number of gifted individuals. It is as individuals that men (and women) should be judged, and raw intelligence is a very poor barometer of the worth of a human being. No one could ever accuse serial sex killers Ted Bundy or Dennis Nilsen of having low intelligence quotients. Nor indeed Lenin or Stalin. But for all their high intelligence and achievements in their chosen fields, it would have been far, far better for the rest of mankind if these four individuals had never existed.

Billig's monograph kicks off proper with a chapter on Nazi Race-science which contains such references as "the perils of Jewish contamination" etc. In fact, the eugenics movement, which has a far older pedigree than Nazism, is not inherently anti-Semitic. Neither by the way are theories of racial supremacy; the introduction to the 1915 edition of the Comte de Gobineau's classic *THE INEQUALITY OF HUMAN RACES*, was written by one Dr Oscar Levy, who praised the author as a "true prophet".

Billig goes on to mention the 1958 establishment of the Northern League by British anthropologist Roger Pearson in order to foster "the interests, friendship and solidarity of all Teutonic nations".

Somehow the author manages to make this sound obscene, but this is probably due more to the *racist* media's ethno-masochistic crusade than to his sneering. Substitute the word Afro-Caribbean for Teutonic, or Asian, or Jewish. It doesn't sound half as bad, does it?

In Chapter Two, the author throws the net around Professors Jensen and Eysenck as *Race-science* returns, and brings up the supposedly controversial but well-established IQ differences between American whites and Negroes. Again, we must stress that although this difference is real and largely genetically determined, it's one thing to have a high IQ, and another thing entirely to use it. Mike Tyson probably has a greater than average IQ (black or white). He also had enormous talent, personality, charm, wealth, prestige, and was heralded as potentially the greatest heavyweight boxer of all time. At the time of writing he is languishing in prison after being convicted of rape. Further comment would be superfluous.

Chapter Three brings in the *Mankind Quarterly* and ties this to the notorious Racial Preservation Society trial of 1968, which resulted in the acquittal of all defendants. Professor Billig also takes a swipe at Nathaniel Weyl for attacking racial intermarriage. Weyl is actually a Jew, a former communist, and the author of the excellent study *Karl Marx: Racist*, which exposes the truth about this great humanitarian and his wonderful though long discredited philosophy.

Predictably, anti-Semitism is dragged in again as the authorship of *The hoax of the Twentieth Century* is attributed to Arnold Butz. This book is said to be "fast becoming a modern anti-Semitic classic..."

It was actually written by Professor Arthur Butz and the only anti-Semitism which appears between its covers are the views of Nazi leaders quoted in context.

The author has a separate chapter on Professors Eysenck and Jensen. On page 29 he cites Jensen, who, in spite of his *racist* views, declares racial segregation to be immoral and running counter to the essential values of freedom and liberty.

Jensen also says that "people should be treated as individuals, not according to their racial, ethnic or social origin."

Billig sounds dismayed at Jensen's "liberal" views, but misses the point. On page 34, in his *Conclusion*, he quotes Noam Chomsky with approval: "A possible correlation between mean IQ and skin colour is of no [great] scientific interest..."

Chomsky was talking about skin colour; Jensen about race. Billig did not miss the point here, he was simply being patently dishonest. The author's conclusion is that

"some very big academic fish can be found in the murkiest of waters." Which would indeed make a fitting epitaph for this distinguished Jewish professor.

Notes And References

(1) From the essay *Misguided, Dangerous and Wrong: an analysis of Anti-pornography Politics*, by Gayle Rubin, page 20 of *Bad Girls and Dirty Pictures: The Challenge to Reclaim Feminism*, Edited by Alison Assiter and Avedon Carol, published by Pluto Press, London, (1993).

(2) The May-June issue of *Patterns of Prejudice* carried an article on this: *violence at universities attack on academic freedom*, (pages 13-5) referred to a physical attack on Professor Eysenck on May 8, 1973. He was said to have been beaten up by 15 members of the audience and his lecture halted after the students had voted 450-15 to allow him to speak. The article was a defence of Eysenck and academic freedom, but on page 14 he was referred to as a Jew. It is doubtful the theoretical journal of the Institute of Jewish Affairs would have even mentioned such an incident if its controllers had believed Eysenck to be a goy. Eysenck is of course not a Jew, although a lot of people on the extreme right assume he is, probably on account of his being a refugee from Nazi Germany. It is ironic that *Patterns of Prejudice* should defend Eysenck's academic freedom when it has spent so much time and effort trying to destroy the academic freedom of others. In 1982, an IJA publication recommended that *Holocaust denial* be made a crime.

(3) This provoked laughter from the learned Professor.

(4) At the time of this attack, *Searchlight* was based in Birmingham, but of course, this is just an extraordinary coincidence.

(5) This is not necessarily as impressive as it sounds when one considers that the recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize include the founding father of the *Holocaust* industry Elie Wiesel and mass murderer Menachem Begin.

Distributed by InfoText Manuscripts

**Published by Anglo-Hebrew Publishing,
BCM Box 2293,
BCM - Mono,
London WC1N 3XX.
England.**

ISBN 1 898318 21 2