

Interpol Crime Statistics and Rushton's Racial Dogma

Zack Zdenek Cernovsky*, Larry Craig Litman

Department of Psychiatry, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada

Email address

zcernovs@uwo.ca (Z. Z. Cernovsky)

*Corresponding author

Citation

Zack Zdenek Cernovsky, Larry Craig Litman. Interpol Crime Statistics and Rushton's Racial Dogma. *International Journal of Psychology and Cognitive Science*. Vol. 5, No. 2, 2019, pp. 53-57.

Received: February 28, 2019; **Accepted:** March 28, 2019; **Published:** April 16, 2019

Abstract: Background and Objective: In 1990, J. P. Rushton published his analyses of crime data from Interpol handbooks for 1983-84 and 1985-86, but without explanation, included only the years 1984 and 1986. He reported that countries with predominantly Negroid population had significantly higher crime rates than predominantly Caucasoid or Mongoloid countries. The present article examines if Rushton selected only confirmatory data. Materials and Method: We re-calculated ANOVA on crime rates (rates of homicide, serious assault, sex offenses, rape, theft, robbery and violent theft) from these same Interpol yearbooks while including all 4 years (1983 to 1986). Results: We found significant differences between Caucasoids and Negroids on all variables except for serious assault, but all of these significant trends except for homicide were in the direction opposite to the one claimed by Rushton: the Caucasoids had higher crime rates. Thus, point biserial correlation coefficients indicated that reported crime rates for Negroids were significantly lower than those of Caucasoids with respect to sex offenses with rape included ($-0.77, p < .001$), rape data calculated separately ($-0.63, p < .001$), theft ($-0.69, p < .001$), and robbery and violent theft ($-0.38, p = .006$). Only the reported homicide rates were slightly higher for blacks ($.43, p = .001$), in those 4 years. Discussion: Our reason for re-analysing the data for all 4 years was only to examine if a selection bias was present: we ourselves do not accept such official crime data without great scepticism. Rushton's arbitrary exclusion of data that are strongly non-supportive of his racial theory is indeed suspect and seems consistent with his prior fraudulent attempt to disguise a reference to Penthouse as a reference to a truly scientific article.

Keywords: Racial Differences, Crime Rates, Assaults, Homicide

1. Introduction

A review article published by Williams, Lawrence, and Davis in early 2019 has discussed multiple ways in which racism impairs human health [1]. Anticipating racial rejection unduly escalates interpersonal tension among whites and blacks, it interferes not only with their optimal economic collaboration, but also with medical health on both sides of the racial divide. Racial hatred is fuelled by pseudostatistical studies such as those presented by J. P. Rushton [2] as "scientific evidence of racial differences" with respect to various socially undesirable behaviors. Starting in 1988, and until his death in 2012, Rushton provided receptive readers and gullible audiences with repetitive publications on his theory of genetic differences between Negroids (blacks), Caucasoids (whites), and Mongoloid (Asians). Rushton's

theory postulated that Asians were the most intelligent, least prone to crime, least overinvolved in sexuality, and that blacks were at the bottom level of all these criteria [2]. His public lectures to white power groups in the USA, his lectures posted on YouTube, and massive mail outs of free books to physicians in Ontario promoted his related beliefs.

Rushton's work has been reviewed in early 2019 by James Flynn [3] as misleading when scrutinized via contemporary methodology for analysing empirical data on intelligence scores. In the years before his death, Rushton expanded the inferiority status to South-Asians and residents of the Middle-East. Thus, he estimated the IQ of Mexicans, Middle-Easteners, and of East Indians, to be much lower than the one of American Caucasians (see his lectures on YouTube). With respect to university educated immigrants from these regions, Rushton insisted that their children would

be far less intelligent due to the phenomenon of “regression toward the mean,” a widely used pseudo-scientific explanation popular in certain circles. As pointed out already a few decades ago by Nesselroade, Stigler, and Baltes [4] on the basis of statistical research, “Regression toward the mean is not a ubiquitous phenomenon, nor does it always continue across occasions.” For example, medical data indicate that untreated alcoholics or untreated patients with highly malignant cancer do not regress to the mean of their racial group: their illness usually progresses to adverse or terminal outcomes. It is a pseudoscientific practice to apply the concept of regression toward the mean to IQ scores of ethnic groups, see expert discussion by James Flynn [3] in 2019.

Jackson and Rushton [5] extended their theory of inferiority in intelligence to women as compared to men, based on a correlation coefficient of such a trivial size ($r=.12$) that is normally deemed by competent statisticians as not worthy of interpretations. It is generally accepted in psychology that most data do not indicate a meaningful gender linked trend favouring always the same gender.

Rushton is viewed by many of his followers as a martyred scientist, unfairly persecuted by the media and some of his peers for his refusal to comply with “political correctness.” Ironically, his notorious academic transgressions included, among others, disguising a reference to a pornographic magazine to make it appear as a credible scientific source, see Weizmann et al. [6]: “Vidmar (1990) [7] has also called attention to another curious reference on penis size cited by Rushton and Bogaert (1987) [8]. This is an article by P. Nobile (1982) which is identified in their bibliography as an article which appeared in *Forum: International Journal of Human Relations*. Professor Vidmar's colleague, Michael Atkinson, could find no library listing of this journal (nor could we), but he finally tracked it down. As Professor Vidmar writes: it is more commonly known as the *Penthouse Forum*” (Vidmar, 1990) [7].”

Cernovsky and Litman [9] re-analysed Rushton's [10] crime data for the effect size and showed that only less than 6% of variance was shared between race and crime, when his own data are scrutinized. Our statistical inspection of his data indicated that relying on race as a predictor of crime in individual cases would lead to absurdly elevated rates (99.9%) of false positives.

Rushton's source of crime rate data were Interpol yearbooks for 1983-84 and 1985-86 (see International Criminal Police Organization - Interpol, undated [11, 12]). Without providing a related explanation, Rushton included only data for 1984 and 1986 in his analyses even though the yearbooks listed also data for 1983 and 1985. We therefore decided to re-analyse the data from all 4 years. The yearbooks also contain statistics for other crime variables than those selected by Rushton, e.g., for theft, robbery, and for sex offenses in general: we decided to include those in our analyses. We do not share Rushton's penchant of interpreting correlational trends as indicative of “genetic” racial differences, and we do not aim at presenting our data as a supporting evidence that one race is “innately less prone to crime” than another racial group. Rushton ignored methodological pitfalls involved in inferring evidence

for “genetic” racial differences from such dubious data sets.

Rushton [10] provided neither statistical criteria for classifying the various countries in the Mongoloid, Caucasoid, and Negroid group, by the predominant racial type nor published a list of these countries to allow other investigators to replicate his work. It appears that Rushton included, in his data, many countries with excessively mixed racial groups, which obviously confounded the data. Furthermore, Rushton's literature reviews and his presentation of data sets in other areas of racial psychology have already been found systematically biased, his logic strained, and his methodology dubious and inexcusably outdated, e.g., with a reliance on measures of skull circumference by tape as an indicator of intelligence and with grandiose overinterpretations of weak trends (e.g., of $r_s < .20$) in methodologically poor data as a solid evidence for genetic racial differences [6, 13-21].

We statistically re-examined the Interpol data [11, 12] from the yearbooks used by Rushton. Although we are far from willing to attribute the same meaning to these officially reported crimes rates (Rushton uncritically and rather misguidedly uses them as reliable indicators of actual crime proclivity), it is important to also re-examine his source of “evidence” on the purely statistical level.

2. Materials and Method

The statistics for all four years (from 1983 to 1986 [11, 12]) were included in our analyses. We selected only countries for which data for all four years were available, at least for most of the following six variables: homicide, rape, sex offenses, serious assault, theft, and armed robbery /violent theft. Excluded were countries with large racial minorities that would cause major overlaps on the three racial categories. Excluded were also Hong Kong due to its special problems with overpopulation and the influx of refugees and Luxembourg due to its small size. And, we also excluded countries in which at least some of the crimes (murder and assault) could frequently be motivated by an ongoing notorious religious or political strife or comparable circumstances. It is important to note that data on some major population clusters (e.g., People's Republic of China and Slavic countries) were not available in the yearbook. As Rushton failed to provide any scientific definition of race, we cannot closely replicate his efforts. We therefore focused on countries that are generally viewed, by North-American and West-European neo-racist groups within both the lay and the scientific community as major members of the white or Asian elite, and of the black African population, respectively. The final list included four predominantly Negroid countries (Zambia, Somalia, Angola, and Tanzania), four predominantly Mongoloid countries (Japan, Korea, Thailand, and Singapore), and 10 predominantly Caucasoid countries (Switzerland, Canada, Hungary, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, Germany, and Sweden). If crime rate differences between these three groups indeed had a genetic basis, and if they were of a theoretically useful magnitude, then these differences should be reliably replicable even on similar exclusive subsamples. Although we selected a

smaller sample of countries than Rushton, our sample is more pure (lesser degree of racial overlap) and our data are also likely to be more reliable because statistics for all four years were included.

3. Results

The crime rates (per 100,000 inhabitants), as listed in the Interpol yearbooks (1983 to 1986 [11, 12]) for the four years

Table 1. Mean values (per 100,000 inhabitants), SDs, and ANOVAs *F* values (*df*=2.54) for crime variables.

| | Mongoloids | Caucasoids | Negroids | F (p) | df |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|------|
| homicide | 5.1 (6.2) | 4.1 (2.5) | 7.0 (3.3) | 3.4 (.037) | 2.69 |
| sex offenses (including rape) | 18.7 (13.2) | 47.2 (17.9) | 6.8 (6.6) | 48.8 (.000) | 2.69 |
| rape | 5.1 (3.2) | 7.4 (2.5) | 3.1 (2.3) | 15.5 (.000) | 2.65 |
| serious assault | 26.0 (23.1) | 69.8 (43.2) | 119.7 (177.3) | 4.7 (.013) | 2.64 |
| theft | 599.9 (450.0) | 4181.7 (2158.5) | 234.9 (341.0) | 45.2 (.000) | 2.68 |
| robbery & violent theft | 20.2 (25.6) | 42.7 (23.1) | 20.4 (26.8) | 6.9 (.002) | 2.64 |

An ANOVA was calculated separately for each variable. Significant differences were found for all variables. The post hoc tests (Tukey) indicated no significant differences ($p > .05$) between the Mongoloids and the Negroids on any of the six variables except for assaults: the frequency of reported assaults was higher in the Negroid data.

As the next step, Pearson point-biserial correlation coefficients were calculated to estimate the magnitude of the

for each country for our six crime variables were entered as the raw data in the analysis. The mean values for the three racial groups are listed in Table 1. It is worth noting that the standard deviations are large when compared to the racial differences in the mean values (see Table 1), especially for the homicide and serious assault rates: the visual inspection suggests a marked intergroup overlap and an excessive intragroup variance.

individual relationships, separately for each variable and each pair of racial groups. The coefficients are listed in Table 2. Those descriptive of relationships opposite to Rushton's theory [2, 10] have negative signs. Very damaging to Rushton's theory is that, on the majority of the criteria, the Caucasoids had significantly higher ($p < .01$) crime rates than the Negroids. The Caucasoids' crime rates also significantly exceeded those of the Mongoloids except for murder.

Table 2. Relationships of crime variables to race (point biserial coefficients, with *p* levels, 2-tailed, in parentheses).

| | Negroids vs. Caucasoids | Negroids vs. Mongoloids | Caucasoids vs. Mongoloids |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| homicide | .43 (.001) | .20 (.286, n.s.) | -.12 (.377, n.s.) |
| sex offenses (including rape) | -.77 (<.001) | -.51 (.003) | .62 (<.001) |
| rape | -.63 (<.001) | -.34 (.056, n.s.) | .37 (.006) |
| serious assault | .23 (.105, n.s.) | .39 (.045) | .46 (<.001) |
| theft | -.69 (<.001) | -.43 (.017) | .67 (<.001) |
| robbery & violent theft | -.38 (.006) | .01 (.981, n.s.) | .40 (.003) |

The correlation coefficients comparing blacks to whites are frequently high ($r_s > .60$) and most of them are in the direction opposite to the one postulated by Rushton (1988, 1990): Negroids had lower crime rates. The only exceptions to this overall trend were a nonsignificant relationship involving serious assaults and a significant relationship of moderate size involving homicide (the homicide rates were slightly higher for the blacks).

The coefficients comparing Negroids and Mongoloids were frequently nonsignificant. The two highest significant coefficients (those involving sexual offenses and thefts) point in the direction opposite to the one claimed by Rushton [2, 10]. Only one weak relationship was statistically significant and consistent with Rushton's beliefs (Negroids had slightly higher rates of serious assaults).

Only the results comparing Mongoloids and Caucasoids show an overall trend consistent with Rushton's theory: on all except one variable (homicide), the Caucasoids' crime rates were higher.

4. Discussion

The analyses of Interpol data in this study indicate that almost all significant differences in reports of crime between Negroids and Caucasoids are in the opposite direction than repeatedly re-iterated in various repetitive articles by Rushton [2, 10, etc.]. In fact, 50% of the correlation coefficients for these two racial groups (blacks versus whites) are both high ($r > .60$, i.e. accounting for more than 40% of variance) and disconfirmatory. A similar but somewhat less clear cut failure of Rushton racial theory has been observed in comparisons involving the Mongoloids and Negroids: the majority of the significant relationships were in the direction inconsistent with Rushton's postulates.

His grandiose speculations about genetically based higher incidence of crime in Negroid than in Caucasoid populations cause psychological harm both to the self-concept of billions of black children and certainly impair the relationship of

blacks to whites. The direction of racial differences with respect to crime rates and many other variables (e.g., cranial size) often varies from sample to sample and the etiology of these differences can be interpreted in ways more consistent with contemporary scientific standards (see, e.g., James Flynn [16, 17]). Rushton's racial theory is untenable from a methodological and empirical perspective.

Rushton's tendency to exclude disconfirmatory evidence is noteworthy also in his other publications, e.g., those on racial differences in brain size or cranial capacity [20]. For example, Rushton repeatedly misled his readers in his numerous articles to believe that his own conclusions of superiority, in size, of Caucasoid brains over the Negroid ones, are consistent with anthropological analyses by Beals, Smith, and Dodd [22]. In fact, the extensive statistical analyses by Beals et al. showed that cranial size varies primarily with climatic zones (e.g., distance from the equator), not race. According to Beals et al. [22], the correlations of brain size to race are spurious: smaller crania are found in warmer climates, irrespective of race. In his publications, Rushton erroneously relied on skull size and brain weight as indicators of intelligence [2]: while average brain weight in women is lower than in men, there is no corresponding gender related difference in IQ scores, and furthermore, the black men's brains tends to be heavier than those of white women [18, 19, 23].

A meta-analytic study by Gorey and Cryns [24] also provides a strong statistical evidence of selective bias in data presented by Rushton: his writings are replete with an unbalanced overrepresentation of references to supportive data. When Gorey and Cryns, using the meta-analytical statistics, recalculated data for the same variables as Rushton, but based on a comprehensive computerised random literature search, the mean correlation coefficients were always lower than those presented by Rushton in support of his racial theory, i.e., via what now seems his habitual exclusion of non-supportive data. For example, the mean coefficient based on data sets chosen by Rushton to document black-white differences in desirable personality traits and temperament was 0.37, but with data based on a computerised random literature search, this coefficient dropped to -0.02, see Gorey and Cryns [24].

Fraud committed by scientists passionate about their theoretical beliefs has had a nefarious tradition in academic psychology. The perhaps most notorious case is the one of Cyril Burt who obviously faked his data on identical twins separated at birth in his publications on heritability of intelligence, see details in Fancher [25]. The fraud was discovered by Leon Kamin: in Burt's publications, the correlation between the twins always remained absurdly the same, i.e., impossibly invariant to three decimal places (.771), even while he, over years, kept increasing the sample size from 21 pairs of twins in 1955 to more than 30 in 1958, and finally to 53 in 1966 [25]. Even the prominent staunch supporter of heritability theories and author of publications defamatory to blacks, Arthur Jensen, admitted, for purely statistical reasons, that such absurdly invariant repetition of correlation coefficients to the third decimal place makes

Burt's correlations useless for hypothesis testing "twenty such instances strain the laws of chance and can only mean error" (see Jensen [26]).

5. Conclusions

When Rushton presented crime statistics derived from 2 Interpol Yearbooks as allegedly supporting his thesis that Negroids are more crime inclined than Caucasoids, he arbitrarily excluded disconfirmatory data sets. When all data from the same two Interpol Yearbooks are re-calculated, most of the statistically significant trends in the data are in the direction opposite to Rushton's beliefs: Negroids had lower crime rates than Caucasoids with respect to sexual offenses, rapes, theft, and violent theft or robbery, with most correlation coefficients exceeding .60. While we do not place much credence in such Interpol statistics as they only reproduce information provided by government officials of different countries, our re-analysis indicated that Rushton excluded data that would discredit his theory.

References

- [1] Williams, D. R., Lawrence, J. A., Davis, B. A. (2019). Racism and Health: Evidence and Needed Research. *Annual Review of Public Health*, Jan 2. doi: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-043750. Epub ahead of print.
- [2] Rushton, J. P. (1988). Race differences in behavior: a review and evolutionary analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 1009-1024.
- [3] Flynn, J. R. (2019). Reservations about Rushton. *PSYCH*, 1 (1), 35-43. doi: 10.3390/Psychology1010003.
- [4] Nesselroade, J. R., Stigler, S. M., Baltes, P. B. (1980). Regression toward the mean and the study of change. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88 (3), 622-637. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.622.
- [5] Jackson, D. N. & Rushton, J. P. (2006). Males have greater g: Sex differences in general mental ability from 100,000 17- to 18-year-olds on the Scholastic Assessment Test. *Intelligence*, 34 (5), 479-486.
- [6] Weizmann, F., Wiener, N. I., Wiesenthal, D. L., and Ziegler, M. (1991). Eggs, eggplants, and eggheads: a rejoinder to Rushton. *Canadian Psychology*, 32, 43-50.
- [7] Vidmar, N. (1990). Letter to the editor. *Western News (Newsletter of the University of Western Ontario)*, February 22, 1990.
- [8] Rushton, J. P. & Bogaert, A. F. (1987). Race Differences in Sexual Behavior: Testing an Evolutionary Hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 21, 529-551.
- [9] Cernovsky, Z. Z. & Litman, L. C. (1993). Re-analyses of J. P. Rushton's crime data. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 35, 31-36.
- [10] Rushton, J. P. (1990). Race and crime: a reply to Roberts and Gabor. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32, 315-334.

- [11] International Criminal Police Organization - Interpol. (undated publication). *International crime statistics 1983-1984*. Saint-Claud, France: Interpol.
- [12] International Criminal Police Organization - Interpol. (undated publication). *International crime statistics 1985-1986*. Saint-Claud, France: Interpol.
- [13] Weizmann, F., Wiener, N. I., Wiesenthal, D. L., and Ziegler, M. (1990). Differential K theory and racial hierarchies. *Canadian Psychology*, 31, 1-13.
- [14] Zuckerman, M. (1990). Some dubious premises in research and theory on racial differences. *American Psychologist*, 45, 297-1303.
- [15] Zuckerman, M. & Brody, N. (1988). Oysters, rabbits, and people: a critique of "race differences in behavior" by J. P. Rushton. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 1025-1033.
- [16] Flynn, J. R. (1989). Rushton, evolution, and race: an essay on intelligence and virtue. *The Psychologist: Bulletin of The British Psychological Society*, 9, 363-366.
- [17] Flynn, J. R. (1990). Explanation, evaluation, and a rejoinder to Rushton. *The Psychologist: Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 5, 199-200.
- [18] Cernovsky, Z. Z. (1990). Race and brain weight: a note on J. P. Rushton's conclusions. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 337-338.
- [19] Cernovsky, Z. Z. (1991). Intelligence and Race: Further Comments on J. P. Rushton's Work. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 481-482.
- [20] Cernovsky, Z. Z. (1992). J. P. Rushton on Negroids and Caucasoids: statistical concepts and disconfirmatory evidence. *The International Journal of Dynamic Instruction and Assessment*, 2, 55-67.
- [21] Cernovsky, Z. Z. (1993). J. P. Rushton's aggregational errors in racial psychology. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 19, 282-289.
- [22] Beals, K. L., Smith, C. L., Dodd, S. M. (1984). Brain size, cranial morphology, climate, and time machines. *Current Anthropology*, 25, 301-330.
- [23] Cain, D. P., & Vanderwolf, C. H. (1990). A Critique of Rushton on Race, Brain Size, and Intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 777-784.
- [24] Gorey, K. M., & Cryns, A. G. (1995). Lack of Racial Differences in Behavior: A Quantitative Replication of Rushton's (1988) Review and an Independent Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 345-353.
- [25] Fancher, R. E. (1985). *The Intelligence Men – Makers of the IQ Controversy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- [26] Jensen, A. R. (1974) Kinship correlations reported by Sir Cyril Burt. *Behavior Genetics*, 4, 1-28 (see page 24).