London Conference on Intelligence Report Forward

UCL is today releasing a redacted version of the internal report into the London Conference on Intelligence. We have not released this before now because of the significant amount of personal information contained in the report.

However, in the interests of ensuring transparency in the public interest, we are now releasing information from that report about the university’s relationship to that series of conferences, which ran on our campus, without our knowledge, between 2014-17, and which was proposed, but did not run, in 2018.

The conferences were hosted by an honorary senior lecturer at UCL. The university was not informed in advance about the speakers and content of the conference series, as it should have been for the event to be allowed to go ahead. The conferences were booked and paid for as an external event and without our officials being told of the details. They were therefore not approved or endorsed by UCL.

Following the disclosure that the London Conference on Intelligence had been held at UCL, UCL immediately set up an investigation team led by the head of the relevant Division of Psychology and Language Sciences, with three other senior academics.

The information which is being released has been extracted from the university’s investigation report in order to remove the personal data of some individuals involved in the investigation – reflecting the need to balance the public interest in being transparent with the personal data rights of individuals.

UCL views the right to debate and challenge ideas as fundamental to the nature of a university, and is committed to ensuring that free and open discussion can take place in an atmosphere of tolerance for different viewpoints.

Our Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech underlines our commitment to securing freedom of speech within the law for all staff, students and visiting speakers. It makes clear that freedom of expression is protected by the law, but is not unfettered. We expect speakers to be sensitive to the diversity of our inclusive community and to show respect to all sections of that community.
UCL INVESTIGATION INTO LONDON CONFERECE ON INTELLIGENCE

Draft report: Division of Psychology & Language Sciences.

January 2018
6. The London Conferences on Intelligence

What the team was able to learn about the LCI comes largely from studying the handouts distributed at the meeting, a limited search of published versions of the papers presented, a cursory view of some videoed presentations which have since been removed and Dr Thompson’s eloquent verbal accounts of the history and current status of these meetings. Not having been at the conference it is of course impossible to be certain what was said at these closed meetings about some very challenging topics.

Dr Thompson developed the plan for the London Conference on Intelligence at an earlier meeting (The International Studies of Intelligence Research). Dr Thompson’s initial plan was to host an open meeting, including PhD students, where research reporting group differences in intelligence could be presented and discussed. Dr Thompson quickly recognised that this topic could easily “draw heat and criticism”. The speakers he intended to invite indicated that they were reluctant to speak in an open forum as they were researching in ‘an unpopular area’, addressing possible group differences linked to race and gender. Potential speakers felt participation in an open forum might lead to negative impacts on their reputation and ultimately impact their career.

As a result, Dr Thompson planned a ‘by invitation only’ meeting. He identified a small group of people who he viewed as ‘doing interesting work’. Three London Conferences were held in 2015, 2016 and 2017. A further conference was planned for 2018. Each conference involved invited 20-24 attendees. Attendees paid for their own travel and accommodation, while Dr Thompson paid from his own resources the room charges, refreshments and dinner for conference speakers. The table below summarises conference attendance based on the speakers (App 7). Dr Thompson was clear that the list of attendees comprised the speakers and ‘two or three’ invited guests. Speakers gave 30 minute papers over 3 days, listening to each others presentations.

The programme for the London Conference on Intelligence (2015) included 16 talks. It was held over three days (8th-10th May) The book of conference abstracts was badged with the UCL logo. Speakers were international (e.g. Finland, Denmark, Sweden, United States, Brazil, Germany, Slovakia, UK, Japan). Abstracts for talks were available to the panel. On the basis of information in the abstracts, some contributions appeared unlikely to cause controversy or offence (e.g. [REDACTED]: The effects of methylmercury on general intelligence in young adults and children), while others appeared likely to be controversial (e.g. [REDACTED]: A meta-analysis of Roma intelligence; [REDACTED]: Race and sex difference in intelligence and occupational achievement). Their content would require an indication on the room booking form that the ‘speaker or topic [is] likely to be controversial’. For example, [REDACTED], who published his findings in [REDACTED] claimed that observed IQ and educational and occupational differences could be accounted for in terms of gene copy numbers, brain size and steroid hormones and proposed an evolutionary account of sex and race differences which frustrate attempts at eradicating such differences by social interventions.

The programme for the London Conference on Intelligence (2016) included 19 talks. The book of conference abstracts was again badged with a UCL logo which adopted the outline rather than the filled banner - making the link to UCL even more recognisable. An unfortunate, and to many, unjustifiable and offensive quote from E.L Thorndike was placed on the front page (“Selective breeding can alter man’s capacity to learn, to keep sane, to cherish justice or to be happy. There is no more certain and economical a way to improve man’s environment as to improve his nature”). The association of Thorndike’s statement, unchallenged by reference to at least a proposed debate, clearly leaves the impression of tacit approval by ‘the host institution’ whose large banner decorates the page.

The 2016 conference was again held over three days (13th-15th May). Speakers were again drawn from a range of countries. Some presentations appeared to be uncontroversial (e.g., [REDACTED]: Functional architecture of visual emotion recognition ability [REDACTED]. Others were consistent with a classification of ‘speaker or topic [is] likely to be controversial’ (e.g., [REDACTED]: Sex differences in intelligence whose paper in [REDACTED] presents the developmental theory of sex differences in intelligence suggesting that boys and girls have about the same IQ up to the age of 15 years but from the age of 16 the average IQ of males becomes higher than that of females with an advantage increasing to approximately 4 IQ points in adulthood. [REDACTED] claiming that the welfare state creates the problem that each generation living under its
protection has lower work motivation than the previous one and argues that welfare-induced personality mis-
development is a significant part of the problem. [REDACTED]).

The programme for the London Conference on Intelligence (2017) included 22 talks. The book of conference
abstracts was again badged with the UCL logo. It was held over three days (12th-14th May). 13 of these
presentations were from individuals who had already presented in the two previous years. Speakers again
represented a range of countries. As before, some presentations appeared to be uncontroversial, but a number
of abstracts had titles or content which were clearly controversial and could potentially result in serious
reputational risk to UCL (e.g., [REDACTED]: Differential immigrant performance: a matter of intelligence?
This is an unpublished study of PISA test scores (which indicates educational attainment) although the paper
is semi-accessible through citations in an OSF preprint, reporting the correlation between fiscal contribution of
an immigrant group and their desirability to the native population in Denmark and a paper in [REDACTED]
predicting employment rates in immigrant groups on the basis of average IQ in countries of origin.
[REDACTED]: Eugenics, a case for it as the lesser of evils. A paper that seems to be linked to a 2018
as Leaders in Eugenics and “Euthanasia”: Lessons for Today). It is hard to imagine circumstances under
which either of these papers would not require an indication on the room booking form that the ‘speaker or
topic [is] likely to be controversial’. It is important to point out that by controversy, we do not imply that legal
boundaries have been transgressed. Again, this would be impossible to say on the basis of evidence available
to this investigation.

Video recordings of some talks were previously available on YouTube, but these had been taken down prior
to the meeting of the review panel and their content was not available for review. [REDACTED] reported on
four of the videos before they were taken down. ([REDACTED] on the cultural stereotyping of Danish
citizens; [REDACTED] on Christian beliefs and physical attractiveness and intelligence; [REDACTED] on
the relative IQs of white colonisers and indigenous people in far eastern Russia; [REDACTED] on IQ and
criminality in immigrants). Having seen these videos, [REDACTED] was of the view that they had no
scientific or rational basis and they were edited in such a way that they could incite racial hatred. We note
once again that these recordings all included a version of the UCL logo which was linked to this YouTube
channel.

Dr Thompson forwarded a manuscript of an editorial under review by Intelligence, an Elsevier publication
(App 6). The editorial is enclosed as an appendix. The editorial disputes that eugenics was a major theme of
these conferences and asserts that the key topics had been racial, ethnic and national differences in IQ. A
significant minority dealt with sex differences but only two were concerned with reproductive or genetic
interventions. The claim is also made that about as many papers appeared in peer review journals from the
LCI as might be expected from most scientific meetings. The arguments in the editorial do not concern us
directly as it intends to be a dismantling of the arguments from the media against LCI. Dr Thompson is not an
author of the editorial and UCL’s role is not addressed. As pointed out above, our concern is with the
potential reputational damage to UCL via an unmoderated scientific presentation in a public forum. As it will
be made clear below, Dr Thompson endeavoured for LCI to be a private meeting and this has been asserted in
a number of contexts. Thus the only material issue is if through carelessness or other motives UCL became
associated with a meeting where individuals expressed strong, and for many challenging, opinions without
the kind of mitigation and moderation that would be expected from a public UCL event. It is to the LCI-UCL
links that we shall now turn.
7. What is the relationship of LCI to UCL?

What remains controversial is not the nature of these meetings which were private events which a member of UCL’s honorary faculty is entitled to organise, this being one of the ‘perks’ of such an honorary position which is usually part of a quid pro quo where honorary status brings advantages to the University in terms of contributions to its educational or research activities. What remains controversial is if a) the events were organised according to the rules that are expected to be followed in making these arrangements and b) if LCI could reasonably be seen as private events given the circumstances that surrounded their organisation.

The report on the LCI has been completed by UCL Estates and is appended to this report. Our narrative here is based on this report, the email correspondence in relation to arrangements and records provided by Room Bookings for this investigation. All of these materials are available for scrutiny in the appendix.

The LCI meetings at UCL in 2015, 2016 and 2017 were booked by Dr James Thompson using the standard room bookings form, and giving his UCL email address (see App 5). The room was paid for by Dr Thompson (at associate rate, appropriate given Dr Thompson’s long-standing association with UCL). If meetings occur on UCL premises, UCL is obliged to ensure that views presented are legal and do not transgress regulations which UCL always wishes enthusiastically embrace such as the Prevent agenda. For this reason, the room booking form contains the question: ‘Is speaker or topic likely to be controversial?’ Affirmative responses trigger a higher level of scrutiny of the content of presentations.

The corresponding tick box was not checked. As we have seen in the section above, even without being present at these meetings, the inquiry team could readily identify major controversial topics based on the limited information available in the abstracts and the more extensive information that tracing the publication trajectory of the conference presentations yielded. In addition of course, there were the edited highlights of the conference on the YouTube channel, underscoring a very public presentation of extremely controversial ideas.

[This] deprived UCL of the opportunity of taking appropriate action to mitigate the risk of reputational damage. A correct answer would be to acknowledge the controversial nature of the topic and speakers, and to note that the organiser hoped the private nature of the meeting would mitigate any potential negative impact. The booking request could have then been dealt with from an informed position.

The remainder of the section of the room booking form asking for event details, including its title, attendees and entry requirements etc was also not filled in. We have already noted that in line with Dr Thompson’s claim, the presenters at the conference were from a small circle. There were only 45 names on the list of presenters and the majority attended more than once.

Dr Thompson felt that privacy was necessary for his meeting. This may have contributed to his reticence in filling in the form. Nevertheless, even if for understandable reasons, the failure to follow procedure in completing the booking form was a very substantial one. It allowed UCL to be associated with a particular approach to a controversial issue in a way that was evidently unbalanced. Were the event a genuinely private event a view could have been taken in relation to the desirability of offering space to the particular views and particular individuals which participated in the LCI. Because the form was inadvertently or for inappropriate reasons incompletely filled in, UCL was deprived of the opportunity to make this decision and was thus exposed to considerable negative media attention and its reputation may have suffered in consequence.

The Investigating team certainly agree that proposing to organise such a meeting at a university would require careful consideration by the university, which was precluded in this case by Dr Thompson’s failure to correctly follow room booking procedure.
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Exposed: London’s eugenics conference and its neo-Nazi links

Ben Van Der Merwe  10th January 2018  7 min read

A eugenics conference held annually at University College London by an honorary professor, the London Conference on Intelligence, is dominated by a secretive group of white supremacists with neo-Nazi links, London Student can exclusively reveal.

Content note: This article contains references to racism, anti-Semitism and child abuse.

The conference has taken place at UCL four times since its inception in 2014, and now even boasts its own YouTube channel bearing the UCL logo.

UCL have told London Student that they are investigating the conference. A spokesperson said: “We are an institution that is committed to free speech but also to combatting racism and sexism in all forms.”

UCL professor David Colquhoun expressed disbelief that the university would host such "pseudoscience" and stated that the organiser, Professor James Thompson, “clearly doesn’t understand genetics.”

“The actual genetic difference between humans, with respect to race or sex, is absolutely miniscule compared to what they have in common,” he told London Student.

Among the speakers and attendees over the last four years are a self-taught geneticist who argues in favour of child rape, multiple white supremacists, and ex-board member of the Office for Students Toby Young.

A central figure in the London Conference on Intelligence (LCI) is the white nationalist, extremist Richard Lynn, who has called for the “phasing out” of the “populations of
Academic Advisory Council.

Lynn's UISR runs the journal Mankind Quarterly, whose founders include a leading member of Mussolini's eugenics taskforce, and whose board once boasted Nazi Joseph Mengele's personal mentor.

Six members of the current board, including editor-in-chief Gerhard Meisenberg, spoke at both the 2015 and 2016 conferences, while a further 16 LCI speakers have written for the journal in recent years. In total, 82% of those who spoke at both 2015 and 2016 conferences are directly associated with either UISR or Mankind Quarterly.

The UISR is bankrolled by Lynn and Meisenberg's Pioneer Fund, a Southern Poverty Law Centre-listed hate group founded by Nazi sympathisers with the purpose of promoting "racial betterment".

Beneficiaries of the fund include a magazine devoted to a "penetrating inquiry into every aspect of the Jewish Question," and Jared Taylor's American Renaissance, whose conferences have hosted prominent far-right figures Richard Spencer (an white supremacist who gained prominence after Trump's election), Nick Griffin (ex-leader of the British National Party), and David Duke (another white supremacist, and former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan).

Helmut Nyborg, a member of the UISR Academic Advisory Council, gave a lecture at last year's American Renaissance conference which argued that Denmark's gene pool would suffer from immigration from the Middle East. Nyborg spoke at the LCI in both 2015 and 2016. He has written numerous articles for Mankind Quarterly as well as a book for the UISR memorializing the former head of the Pioneer Fund, white nationalist J. P. Rushton.

James Thompson, the honorary UCL academic who acts as the host of the conference, is a member of the UISR Academic Advisory Council. His political leanings are betrayed by his public Twitter account, where he follows prominent white supremacists including Richard Spencer (who follows him back), Virginia Dare, American Renaissance, Brett Stevens, the Traditional Britain Group, Charles Murray and Jared Taylor.

Thompson is a frequent contributor to the Unz Review, which has been described as "a mix of far-right and far-left anti-Semitic crackpottery," and features articles such as 'America's Jews are Driving America's Wars' and 'What to do with Latinos?'. His own articles include frequent defences of the idea that women are innately less intelligent than men (1, 2, 3, and 4), and an analysis of the racial wage gap which concludes that "some ethnicities contribute relatively little," namely "blacks."

Writer and geneticist Adam Rutherford told London Student that, based on the titles and abstracts, some of the views presented were a "pseudoscientific front for bog-standard, old-school racism."
people of recent African descent are likely to be more genetically distinct from each other than either of them is to anyone else in the world:"

Another major organiser of the LCI is Emil Kirkegaard, who has attended all four conferences and even designed the website. Although he refers to himself as a "polymath" and Thompson describes him as a "very bright young guy", Kirkegaard is not an academic. His highest qualification is a Bachelor's in linguistics.

Having dropped out of his Masters degree, instead preferring to be "self-taught in various subjects", Kirkegaard now runs OpenPsych, a platform for non-peer reviewed psychology papers, along with Davide Piffer of Mankind Quarterly. Piffer is a fellow LCI-speaker, and was praised by Richard Lynn as having done "brilliant work identifying the genes responsible for race differences in intelligence."

Authors on OpenPsych include Kevin MacDonald, described by the Southern Poverty Law Centre as "the neo-Nazi movement's favourite academic", who praised Anders Breivik as a "serious political thinker with a great many insights and some good practical ideas on strategy."

John Fuerst, a fellow of the UISR, spoke at LCI 2015 and 2016, and frequently collaborates with Kirkegaard on OpenPsych. As well as writing various blogs, which he describes as "race realist", he also frequently posts anti-Semitic conspiracy theories on Facebook. When questioned about his popularity on the neo-Nazi forum Stormfront, he stated that he had "no beef against... "Neo-Nazis"."

Kirkegaard's own personal blog is home to topics such as 'Is miscegenation bad for your kids?' and how one could empirically verify a Jewish conspiracy. His Facebook features alt-right promotional videos and once featured a friend's Nazi salute with the caption 'There will be an heir to the Führer.'
“having sex with a sleeping child without them knowing it (so, using sleeping medicine. If they don’t notice it is difficult to see how they could be harmed, even if it is rape. One must distinguish between rape because the other was disconsenting (wanting to not have sex), and rape because the other is not consenting, but not disconsenting either.”

He qualifies this with a note that “bodily harm” would undermine this justification, and especially “with small children since their bodily openings are not large enuf [sic] for a regular sized male penis. To avoid this one should [sic] not penetrate.”

Kirkegaard’s reputation as a scientific advocate for neo-Nazism was increased last April when he appeared on Tara McCarthy’s ‘Reality Calls’ to discuss “the future of eugenics.” McCarthy was banned from YouTube for alleging a Jewish conspiracy to commit “white genocide”, supports deporting naturalized citizens and “killing them if they resist”, and said that she hopes “zero” migrants crossing the Mediterranean “make it alive.”

Kirkegaard is not the only LCI speaker to feature on McCarthy’s show. Adam Perkins of King’s College London appeared on the show to discuss his controversial book, ‘The Welfare Trait’. He provoked uproar last year when he shared images of data from one of Kirkegaard’s papers on immigrant crime rates, with the caption “Trump’s Muslim ban makes sense in human capital terms”.

“This is so old-school as to be laughable,” Dr Rutherford said of the views discussed at the LCI. While the views may simply be “bad science”, according to Rutherford, they play into UCL’s “deep and rich history of scientific racism”.

He explained: “Francis Galton, the brilliant but overtly racist UCL academic, may have given the world many valuable ideas, but also created eugenics as a pseudoscientific idea. UCL’s Galton chair, named in his honour, was first occupied by Karl Pearson, another overt racist.”

UCL’s Prevent Officer and those in charge of room bookings did not reply to London Student’s request for comment.
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Government to regulate excessive university vice-Chancellors pay
DETAILS released just before Christmas show how well the lady Legatum Institute (Eyes open) continued to obscure the issue without a whisper.

Lists of Whitehall meetings revealed that Legatum Institute, or whatever it is called these days, had been invited to meet Britain’s top civil servant, Sir Jeremy Heywood, on the day of Theresa May’s Florence speech.

This followed another meeting with an unnamed Legatum representative last February. A month after the September meeting, the institute took to the airwaves on BBC Newsnight’s “Viewscreen” segment to argue for unilateralist guesting tariffs and getting out of the customs union and single market from “day one of Brexit.”

An equally important mandarin in the Brexit process, Department for Exiting the EU permanent secretary (now No 1 at the department), Philip Rycroft, received the benefit of Legatum’s wisdom twice last summer, with meetings in July and August. The previous December, Legatum had met with “sprocess secretary Boris Johnson to chew over ‘post-Brexit issues’.” A few months later, the latter would be unhelpfully telling the EU it could “whistle” for its Brexit bill.

Covering all the big Whitehall Brexit bases, last September Legatum was having a “coffee catch-up” with international trade secretary Liam Fox’s special advisor, Amy Tinley.

For a supposed charity with a mission to “advance education for the benefit of all by identifying and assessing policies which contribute to the pathways from poverty to prosperity” (see last Eye), this looks like an awful lot of straightforward lobbying.

There was much criticism of the Cabinet Office decision — almost certainly Brexit-talks-related — to withhold more than a dozen historic government files relating to the UK’s European policy in the early 1990s, due to be released over new by the National Archives.

The question now is whether the secrecy watchdog, the Advisory Council for National Records and Archives, will do anything about it. As Eye 1425 revealed, the body dominated by civil servants, historians and the military that is meant to represent public interest on disclosure over turns less than 1 percent of government decisions on censorship.

NUMBER CRUNCHING

14: Age Paris Brown was when she posted racist and homophobic messages on Twitter, for which she was expelled as Kent’s youth police and crime commissioner at 17.

46: Age Toby Young was when he posted what he calls “sophomoric and politically incorrect” messages on Twitter, for which he has not yet resigned as board member of Office for Students.

TOBY YOUNG BREEDS CONTEMPT...

After Toby Young’s controversial appointment to the board of the Office for Students, comments he had made on Radio 4 about “progressive...eunuch” were shared far and wide. But his influence in the area has made him some friends.

Last year, 2016, was invited by psychologist James Thompson to attend a secretive conference at UCL called the London Centre for Intelligence (LCI). “Attendees were only told the venue at the last minute...and asked not to share the information,” Young recalled. What he kept to himself was why the conference he attended was so secret.

Although a request for the invitation-only conference’s 2017 programme was declined, the LCI 2015 included papers arguing that racial differences in IQ predict different levels of parental care, that racial “differences” have a negative effect on population quality, that “skin brightness” is a factor in global development, and that country-level differences in the number of Nobel Prizes can be explained by racial differences in male hormone levels.

One paper presented at the 2016 conference argued that “low IQ, high fertility Southern non-Western immigration...threatens the sustainability of European democracy, welfare and civilisation.” Another argued that children from working-class households tend to have “aggressive, antisocial personalities,” and that the welfare state promotes this by letting working-class households have children. Three papers, all by men, were presented on the topic of women being unattractively intelligent.

The conference serves as a rendezvous for academic racists and their sympathisers. One speaker, Emir Khuskoglu, whom Young follows on Twitter, presented papers at the 2015 and 2016 conferences. Writ large about paedophilia on his website, he argued in 2012 that “a compromise is having sex with a sleeping child without them knowing it (so using sleeping medication). If they dont (sic) notice it is difficult to see how they could be harmed.” He added in April 2017 that he advocated a “blank discussion of paedophilia-related issues”.

Another speaker in 2015 and 2016 was Richard normal described by the US non-profit organisation, Southern Poverty Law Center, as a white nationalist and extremist. He has previously called for “incompetent cultures” to be “phased out” and argued that black people have “maladaptive cultures.”

“Now is the time” for an “attack on the numbers issue in the IQ range,” said LCI organiser James Thompson when asked about some of the views at his conference. He then dismissed gender differences in IQ. Thompson then moved to call the eye back by mistake — and promptly asked for Toby.

Responding to the Eye, Young said: “I don’t accept that listening to someone express an idea constitutes tacit acceptance or approval of that idea, no matter how unpalatable. That’s the kind of reasoning that leads to people being ‘nepotism on university campuses.” In the same statement he managed to misquote his own lecture, referring to the “Amanda Holden” Memorial Lecture, rather than Constance Holden.

Young himself kept in touch with Thompson and other attendees over Twitter. Speaking alongside him at a conference in Montreal last July, he reminded LCI had been “like a meeting of Charter 77” in Václav Havel’s flat in Prague in the 1970s. Is this the kind of free speech universities minister Jo Johnson hopes to see more of on university campuses?

AFTER Boris Johnson said Toby Young was “an ideal man for the job” (at least, he was when the Eye went to press), reciprocating the support Young had offered in his resignation when Johnson was London mayor, Michael Gove endorsed that verdict (“Quite right too”). No surprise, as Gove and Young have a long and fond history.

From 2010 until 2015, they were both Members of Parliament in a reshuffle in 2014, Young regularly defended Gove in his columns, hailing him as “the most radical education secretary since the Second World War.”

In June 2016, after David Cameron’s resignation, Young talked up Gove’s credentials as successor to the prime minister in the Sun: “Some have great trust in them and Gove is looking increasingly as if the crown would fit. You can get £550k a year on him before the next PM. You’ve already got £25m.” A month later, Gove dropped out of the Conservative leadership race after gaining just 14 percent of the vote in the first round.

JOINING the board of the Office for Students isn’t Toby Young’s first taxpayer-funded job. In October 2016 he became director of the New Schools Network, a charity that promotes academies and free schools and relies heavily on government funding.

The NSN’s latest accounts, filed in October, show it received £3.9m from the Department for Education — 86 percent of its income. The previous year government money made up 89 percent of its income. The NSN pays £100,000 to £100,000 to Young, who will now also receive £19,198 a year in his new post, playing “a key role” for the Office for Students’ strategic direction.

Young claims to be a “free market” enthusiast, but his high-profile positions are state-funded and crony-looking. The Eye asked him if the NSN had ever funded or run free schools — so far was its running government policy — was more like a quango than a charity. He said the “NSN is a charity, not a quango, I was appointed by the trustees of the charity, not the government. If you look at NSN’s income going back to 2007 when it was set up, less than half of it has come from the Department for Education.”

The aim of the Office of Students is “to ensure that every student enjoys a rewarding educational experience and secures the outcomes they want, whatever their background and whatever their aspirations”. So said a government press release last July.

Oddly enough, aspirations and the hopes of enjoying a rewarding educational experience pop up briefly in Toby Young’s 2001 memoir, How to Love Friends and Alibis. It was in the spring of 1989 when he notes his infatuation with an undergraduate while studying for a PhD at Cambridge in the late 1980s.

“It was the first day of the academic year and, in keeping with College tradition, I met several other students in the bar and chatted over the latest batch of ‘freshers’ subjects.” Young adds, “Not that we had any hope of getting into their knickers...Lusts after first years, and knowing that it would never be reciprocated, was just another exercise in self-hatred, a favourite pastime.”

“My misery was compounded when she chose a seat directly opposite mine in the College library, making it impossible for me to concentrate on my philosophy books. For the remainder of that academic year, until I abandoned my PhD altogether, I tortured myself by imagining what her public, 18-year-old body would look like in the nude.”
London Conference on Intelligence 2015

Prof Charles Spearman, UCL

1863 – 1945
London Conference on Intelligence 2015

Friday 8 May

2 pm Meeting speakers
3:50 Welcome and Introduction. By their words we shall know them.
4:00 Evolution versus culture in international intelligence differences.
4:30 Tea
5:00 Plenary discussion with previous speakers
6:15 Guided London walk (12 minutes) to The Marquis Cornwallis, 31 Marchmont Street, London WC1N 1AP for your choice of pub drinks and gastro-pub food.

Saturday 9 May

9:30 Spearman’s Hypothesis: Hypothesis or Law?
10:00 Androgen Levels and K theory.
10:30 Race and sex differences in occupational achievement.
11:00 Coffee
11:30 Spearman’s hypothesis tested on group differences in personality.
12:00 Admixture in the Americas.
12:30 Meta-analysis of Roma intelligence.
1:00 Plenary discussion with previous speakers
1:30 Lunch break
2:30 Darwin’s “Altruistic Words” Versus Wordsum “Easy Words” and “Hard Words”.
3:00 General and domain-related effects of prenatal methylmercury exposure.
3:30 In chimpanzees, more g-loaded cognitive abilities are more heritable, evolvable, and exhibit more inter-individual variability.
4:00 Tea
4:30 Intelligence is correlated with higher non-verbal ability.
5:00 Hormones and Nobel Prizes.
5:30 Plenary session with previous speakers
6:00 Pre-dinner pub drinks: The Grafton Arms, 72 Grafton Way London W1T 5DU (5 mins away, and very close to the dinner location)
7:30 Speaker’s Dinner: Ask Italian, 48 Grafton Way, London W1T 5DZ. (4 minutes away). Non-speakers welcome at their own cost.

Sunday 10 May

9:00 The efficacy of early childhood interventions in improving cognitive outcomes.
9:30 Does intelligence explain over-representation of liberals and leftists in US academia?
10:00 Well, colour me stupid! Secular declines and a Jensen effect on color acuity.
10:30 Coffee
11:00 Plenary session with previous speakers.
11:30 Communicating our work to the public.
11:45 Planning for next year: inviting the public; date, day of week, conference content, location.
12:30 Close of conference
    Farewell Lunch and drinks at The Marquis Cornwallis.
Does intelligence explain the over representation of liberals and leftists in American academia?

It is well known that individuals with so-called liberal or leftist views are over represented in American academia. By bringing together data on American academics, the general population and a high-IQ population, the present study investigates how much of this overrepresentation can be explained by intelligence. It finds that intelligence can account for most or all of the disparity between academics and the general population on the issues of abortion, homosexuality and traditional gender roles. By contrast, it finds that intelligence cannot account for any of the disparity between academics and the general population on the issue of income inequality. But for methodological reasons, this finding is tentative. Furthermore, the paper finds that intelligence accounts for less than half of the disparity between academics and the general population on liberal versus conservative ideology, and on Democrat versus Republican identity. Overall, the findings of this study suggest that intelligence explains some but not all of the overrepresentation of liberals and leftists in American academia.
Life History Theory allows the categorization of species along a continuum ranging from fast (r) to slow (K) reproductive strategies. A fast LH strategy is characterized by having large numbers of offspring, but providing relatively little parental care. It tends to be observed in unstable ecologies in which it is beneficial to produce many offspring in order to ensure that at least some survive the relatively unpredictable dangers, such as pathogens and predators, which lead to high mortality rates (Ellis, Figueredo, Brumbach, & Schlomer, 2009). Slow LH strategists have smaller numbers of offspring, but provide relatively high levels of parental care. They also tend to mature more slowly and live longer than fast LH strategists. A slow LH strategy tends to be observed in more stable ecologies.

J. Philippe Rushton's Differential-K Theory (Rushton, 1995) applies this model to differences across races, in other words human sub-species evolved to different environments. Rushton's theory predicts that levels of male hormones, i.e., androgen, differ across three large ethnic groups with Sub-Saharan Africans having the highest levels, East Asians the lowest, and Caucasians (Europeans, North Africans and South Asians) being intermediate. Rushton examined a number of hormone indicators in this regard, most notably average penis length. This provoked a great deal of controversy, with accusations that the sources of his penis data was unreliable and similar allegations were levelled when Lynn (2013) published further data on race differences in penis length. Clearly, Rushton's argument can be tested by examining race differences in more androgen measures. If these are in the expected direction and correlate then Rushton's argument is strengthened and, specifically, the reliability of the penis data is validated.

In this study, therefore, we examined 6 national level indicators of androgen: (1) CAG repeats on the AR gene. (2) Androgenic hair (3) Prostate cancer incidence. (4) Sex frequency. (5) Number of sex partners and (6) Penile length. We drew upon data sets allowing us to compare national differences on these measures. We divided the nations up into the three main racial groups, based on the dominant ethnic group in any given nation. We found that the measures correlated in the expected direction, thus evidencing the reliability of the penis datasets presented by Rushton and later by Lynn. In addition, tests of the three ethnic groups showed that, compared to Caucasians, East Asians consistently showed signs of lower androgen level in each indicator. Comparisons involving Sub-Saharan Africans were mixed as this group displayed signs of having the highest androgen levels on some indicators (CAG repeats of the AR gene, penile length), but not on others (androgenic hair, prostate cancer incidence). We argued that the findings in the unexpected direction can likely be explained by differences in diet and cold adaptation. A diet higher in fat is associated with prostate cancer while a hot environment may select against excessive hairiness. Overall, the present findings partially validate Differential K Theory.
The more g-loaded, the more heritable, evolvable, and phenotypically variable: Homology with humans in chimpanzee cognitive abilities

Expanding on a recent study that identified a heritable general intelligence factor (g) among individual chimpanzees from a battery of cognitive tasks, we hypothesized that the more g-loaded cognitive abilities would also be more heritable in addition to presenting greater additive genetic in variance and interindividual phenotypic variability. This pattern was confirmed with multiple analytical approaches, and is comparable to that found in humans, indicating fundamental homology. Finally, tool use presented the highest heritability, the largest amount of additive genetic variance and phenotypic variance, consistent with previous findings indicating that it is associated with high interspecies variance and has evolved rapidly in comparative primate studies.
Following predictions originally made by Darwin (1871), Woodley & Figueredo (2013) proposed a multilevel selection model in which “eminence”, being a relatively rare combination of high g and altruism, was selected for in the process of inter-group competition and selected against in the concurrent process of in-individual competition. There should be associations at the aggregate level between higher levels of cognitive ability and behavioural dispositions that are “altruistic”. No such relation is evident at the individual level, as reflected by the small correlations between g and K, with the latter indicating a “slower” and generally more prosocial life history strategy. Further, the multilevel selection model implies that any temporal trends over historical time showing aggregate changes in cognitive ability should predict the temporal trajectories of any historical trends manifested in aggregate group-selected altruism. To test these predictions, we used Google Ngram to track the relative frequencies of word-usage from 1850-2000 in the Anglophone literature of a sampling of 10 words used by Darwin (1871) to describe altruistic dispositions as lexical indicators of that tendency. An unconditional growth curve multilevel regression model showed that the use of these words declined significantly over the specified historical period, even when controlling for word age, changing literacy rates, and the cognitive load of each individual word. We then constructed two separate unit-weighted factor scales from the subsets of Wordsum items identified as “hard” — theoretically indicating heritable general mental ability (g.h) — and “easy” — theoretically indicating environmentally-influenced specialized mental abilities (s.e) — that in previous work, were observed to be trending historically in opposite directions since AD 1850, consistent with predictions from the co-occurrence model. Unconditional growth curve multilevel regression models also confirmed that these two factor scales collectively increased or decreased significantly over the specified time period exactly as had their individual components. Next, a conditional growth curve multilevel regression model showed that the use of “altruistic” words was significantly disfavoured by higher levels of s.e, which had been increasing over time, but significantly favoured by higher levels of g.h, which had been decreasing over time. The use of “altruistic” words was significantly disfavoured by the item difficulty of each word, and this effect had statistically significant and contrary interactions with s.e and g.h. Even when statistically controlled for these effects, the residual temporal trajectory of the use of “altruistic” words was still significantly negative, indicating that these predictors only account for half of the systematic variance of the observed declines in aggregate altruistic dispositions over time. These findings support the predictions of the multilevel selection model in documenting specific temporal associations between the general and specialized components of human mental ability consistent with multi-level selection.
The effects of methylmercury on general intelligence in young adults and children

Presented is an SEM-analysis of an examination of a birth cohort from the Faroe Islands at age 22 years. The research question is if prenatal exposure to methylmercury, from the mother's diet, originating from the accumulation of methylmercury in the marine food chain, has an adverse effect on the development of the nervous system of the subjects. We have found a slight but significant negative effect on the general factor of intelligence at age 22 years. The work is in progress. The same birth cohort has previously been examined at age 7 years and at age 14 years. In the papers reporting those results, a multiple single test approach was used as is common in clinical neuropsychology. Structural equation modeling was only applied with a first-order factor at age 14 years. The next project will be to reanalyze those data, creating instead a general factor of intelligence from the tests administered at those two ages, and test the effect of methylmercury on the g-factors.
Admixture in the Americas

We review studies from across the Americas examining the association between (1) genomic racial admixture and educational/socio-economic outcomes, (2) socially defined ethno-racial identity and cognitive ability and (3) genomic race and cognitive ability. We find that, within nations, continental ethno-racial identity, genomic racial admixture, and genomic race is associated with cognitive ability and educational/socio-economic outcomes in the way predicted by the global hereditarian hypothesis; specifically African, Amerindian, and Oceanian ethnicity and ancestry is negatively associated with outcomes relative to European (and East Asian) ancestry. We conducted novel analyses regarding the association between regional and national genomic racial admixture, cognitive ability, and socioeconomic well-being. We find that regional and national European admixture is fairly consistently positively associated with cognitive outcomes; and that the association between color and cognitive ability on the national level is mediated by genomic admixture. We find that the association between regional European admixture and national socio-economic outcomes is more complex. Finally, we show that genomic admixture weighted SNP-based cognitive scores strongly correlate with national cognitive ability scores.
A Meta-analysis of Roma Intelligence: an update

The Roma are the only major European ethnic group the average IQ of which is unknown. Although there is a substantial amount of research on this topic, most of it consists of Eastern European studies in various languages and sources hard to obtain. To date, this body of literature has not been brought together in a comprehensive manner, nor is it known to the international scientific community. For example, Lynn and Vanhanen (2012) estimate the IQs of many ethnic groups, but their estimate of Roma IQ is based only on one study. A partial review of the Czech and Slovak literature was conducted by Bakalář (2004), but does not include newer studies and studies from other countries. Our meta-analysis aims to unite the existing literature on Roma intelligence and draw statistical conclusions.

We conducted an extensive search to include texts in English, German, French, Dutch, Hungarian, Romanian, Slovak, Czech, Serbo-croatian, and Bulgarian. Our search methods included electronic search, manual search, and consultation with experts in the field. The search has yielded more than 60 articles with 43 usable samples. Data analysis is in progress.

We will present an estimate of the overall Roma IQ, showing that the Roma are the group with the lowest IQ in Europe. We will compare IQs of different Roma sub-populations (normal schools, special schools, delinquents, orphans). We will show that the Roma are possibly the only group in the world for which there is no Flynn effect.

We will also take a look at the often stated criticism that there is a substantial language bias against the Roma in IQ tests. We will show that such a bias is unlikely, as there is no substantial difference between Roma verbal and performance IQ scores. We will present tests of Spearman’s hypothesis for the Roma. Finally, we will show support for the cumulative deficit hypothesis: the older Roma are, the lower their IQ scores become. We will also deal with the methodological limitations of our data.
Intelligence is correlated with higher non-verbal ability compared with verbal ability

The purpose of the present study was to determine the relationship between national intelligence, geographic latitude, and the relative strength of verbal and non-verbal intelligence. Non-verbal intelligence was conceptualized as those cognitive skills that East Asians are stronger in, when compared to Whites and males to females. By subtracting reading scores from mathematics scores in various data sets such as PISA, we created a “mathematical dominance” scale. Our meta-analysis revealed that it was correlated with higher intelligence ($r = .332, p < .0001$) and with latitude ($r = .345, p < .0001$). Theoretical and practical implications are suggested.
Spearman's hypothesis tested on group differences in personality.

Many studies have been conducted on differences in mean intelligence test scores between ethnic groups. Spearman's hypothesis states that the group differences on the subtests of IQ batteries can best be explained in terms of differences in the complexity of the tasks, that is, the demands they make on the general factor of mental ability, the g factor. So, large differences on subtests with high g loadings and small differences on subtests with low g loadings. In a review of many studies Jensen (1998) reports a correlation of .63 between subtests' g loadings and mean group differences on those subtests for Blacks and Whites. Recent meta-analyses by and co-workers also show strong confirmations for Jews and Amerindians. Spearman's hypothesis has also been confirmed at the item level comparing Libyans to various other groups. Many studies have also been conducted on differences in mean scores on the various scales of personality questionnaires between ethnic groups. Research of the last decade has clearly shown that at the top of a hierarchical personality model there is a General Factor of Personality, the equivalent of the g factor in intelligence. We tested Spearman’s hypothesis for group differences in personality: can the group differences on the scales of a personality questionnaire be explained in terms of the GFP-loadedness of the scales? So, large group differences on scales with high GFP loadings and small differences on scales with low GFP loadings.

In our work in progress we tested Spearman’s hypothesis on several datasets, for instance comparing Blacks and Whites, and comparing Dutch and third world immigrants. In some comparisons Spearman’s hypothesis is confirmed, but in other cases there is no confirmation.
Recent policy proposals in the US and UK focus on the importance of early childhood intervention (ECI) as a potentially important avenue for improving cognitive outcomes. This paper evaluates the credibility of these claims from a variety of angles, reviewing the consequences of severe but specific deprivation in the understudied hearing children of deaf parents, while also reviewing the existing literature on ECI. It is argued that many of the claims in favour of ECI cannot be supported and that programs specifically aimed at boosting academic achievement in older children may show more promise.
Spearman’s hypothesis: Hypothesis or Law?

Originally Spearman’s hypothesis posits that group differences between Blacks and Whites are mostly explained by differences in general intelligence, or g (Spearman, 1927). This finding has consistently been confirmed (e.g. Naglieri & Jensen, 1987; Nyborg & Jensen, 2000; Rushton & Jensen, 2003). In our studies we tested Spearman’s hypothesis on the intelligence differences between several groups, as well as on the differences between regions and countries, to see if these differences are due to differences in g or possibly due to other variables (Cozma, 2015).

Using the method of correlated vectors we meta-analytically tested Spearman’s hypothesis on 1) Hispanics, 2) Amerindians, 3) Northeast Asians and Black and White Prisoners, and 4) several different ethnic groups using non-verbal and culture-reduced tests. Furthermore, we also tested Spearman’s hypothesis 5) between regions in the U.S., Portugal, Spain, Italy, and India, 6) between Libya and several other countries using the items of the Raven’s, and 7) between many countries using achievement test data.

We found strong confirmation of Spearman’s hypothesis for Hispanics, Amerindians, and when using non-traditional intelligence tests. The study of Spearman’s hypothesis for the differences between Libya and several other countries using item scores found substantial correlations between d and g.

However, for the differences in intelligence between regions within countries, we did not find a confirmation of Spearman’s hypothesis for any of the countries in question. Nor did we find a confirmation of the hypothesis between countries. There only seemed to be two exceptions to this law-like phenomena for ethnic groups: Northeast Asians and Black and White prisoners. While the data on these groups were limited, they did not show a strong correlation between d and g for entire tests, but showed some substantial correlations on the performance and verbal scales.
National-level indicators of male hormones (androgen) relate to the global distribution of number of scientific publications and Nobel Prizes

There are country-level differences in the number of scientific publications produced and the number of science Nobel laureates. Factors such as general development of a country and its average intelligence may partly explain such differences. We hypothesized, however, that male hormones (androgen) may also contribute to scientific activity and the number of science Nobel prizes obtained. At the country level, we tested this hypothesis by examining, on the one hand, the national (per capita) number of citable scientific publications in Scopus and the number of Nobel prizes, and on the other hand, a range of national-level indicators of androgen, namely, 1) the number of CAG-repeats in the AR gene (a gene related to sensitivity for testosterone), 2) androgenic hair, 3) prostate cancer incidence, 4) the D2:D4 finger digit ratio, 5) penile length, and 6) libido (e.g., sex frequency). In addition, we took into account national estimates of IQ and Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Results showed that the vast majority of androgen indicators were either directly related to national-level scientific publications/Nobel prizes, or otherwise showed a relationship with them in those countries in which the average national intelligence was relatively high (e.g., IQ > 90). Even after controlling for GDP, many of the relations between scientific measures and androgen indicators remained intact. Overall, the present findings are the first to directly support the notion that at the national level, once a sufficient level of intelligence is present, androgen may further contribute to scientific activity and the odds of winning a science Nobel Prize.
By their words ye shall know them: Evidence of genetic selection against general intelligence and concurrent environmental enrichment in vocabulary usage since the mid 19th century

It has been theorized that declines in general intelligence (g) due to negative selection and the Flynn effect co-occur, with the effects of the latter being concentrated on less-heritable non-g sources of intelligence variance. Evidence for this comes from the observation that 19th Century populations were more intellectually productive, and also exhibited faster reaction times than modern ones, suggesting higher g. This co-occurrence model is tested via examination of historical changes in the utilization frequencies of words from the highly g-loaded WORDSUM test across 5.9 million texts spanning 1850 to 2005. Consistent with predictions, words with higher difficulties (δ parameters from Item Response Theory) and stronger negative correlations between pass rates and fertility declined in use over time whereas less difficult and less strongly selected words, increased in use over time, consistent with a Flynn effect stemming in part from the vocabulary enriching effects of increases in population literacy. These findings persisted when explicitly controlled for word age, changing literacy rates and temporal autocorrelation. These trends constitute compelling evidence for the co-occurrence model.
Spearman's Other Hypothesis predicts that the common factor variance among sensory discrimination measures is identical to general intelligence. The co-occurrence model predicts that low-complexity physiological intelligence indicators reliably measure g across cohorts, and should therefore decline with time due to genetic selection and mutation accumulation. As strong relations exist between general sensory discrimination and g, it is predicted that such measures should show evidence of secular declines. This is tested using N-weighted temporal regression of square-root Total Error Scores (√TES), obtained from four Western normative samples collected in the 1980's, 90's and 2000's (combined N=753) evaluated using the Farnsworth-Munsell 100-Hue color acuity test (g loading=.65). A significant temporal β value of .66 was found (controlling for national IQ), suggesting a decline in color acuity equating to a reduction in g of -4.5 points per decade. Analysis of the subset of the cohorts aged 20-29 years, in which color acuity is maximized, reveals a larger anti-Flynn effect (β=.89, N=199, -8.7 points per decade). Also consistent with the Other Hypothesis is the finding that 100-Hue acuity-IQ correlations are associated with the Jensen effect. The aggregate vector correlation across two studies is .63 (N=932.5).
Selective breeding can alter man's capacity to learn, to keep sane, to cherish justice or to be happy. There is no more certain and economical a way to improve man's environment as to improve his nature.
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10:00 Positive effects of intergroup competition upon in-group collectivism, slow life history, human capital, and intelligence: The case of historical Japan.
10:30 Sex differences in intelligence.
11:00 Coffee
11:30 The Swedish Scholastic Assessment Test.
12:00 Demographic, economic, and genetic factors related to national differences in ethnocentric attitudes.
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Sex differences in school achievement and intelligence are often believed to depend on socioeconomic and cultural factors. Specifically, the expectation is that the extent to which female emancipation has been achieved in countries is reflected either in rising female relative to male achievement, or that the ability profile of females becomes more similar to that of males as females penetrate into previously male-dominated social and economic niches. The present study examines these predictions by analyzing the results of the PISA (Program of International Student Assessment) tests of mathematics, science and reading, administered to 15-year-olds in a three-year cycle from 2000 to 2012. The study looked at three outcome measures:

1. Overall performance (math, science and reading averaged) of females relative to males. In the large majority of countries, females outperform males.
2. Gender-typicality of achievement profiles. Typically, males are somewhat better at math (1.5 points on the IQ scale), females are far better at reading (5 points on the IQ scale), and sex differences in science are minimal.
3. Score variability assessed as the $d'/\sigma$ variance ratio. Males are more variable than females in the large majority of countries.

Of the three outcomes, the female advantage in overall achievement is greatest in the Muslim countries of North Africa and the Middle East as well as the ex-Communist countries of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, and virtually non-existent in Latin America. Other world regions fall in between. Its relationship to measures of social and economic development is near-zero. Although unrelated to composite measures of female empowerment, the female overperformance tends to be positively related to the endorsement of male dominance, according to the World Values Survey. The gender-typicality of achievement profiles varies little among world regions and is virtually unrelated to development indicators and measures of female empowerment or emancipation. It tends to be slightly lower in countries with pro-family attitudes, and slightly greater in countries where people believe that both husband and wife should contribute to family income. The variance ratio is higher (more gender-dimorphic) in economically and socially more “advanced” countries, but does not vary systematically with measures of gender roles and gender-related attitudes. The results show that sex differences in school achievement are quite stable across countries. Neither economic development nor the progress of female emancipation or empowerment have been successful at virilizing female achievement levels or achievement profiles.
Total fertility rates, \( \text{Big G} \) and the cognitive metagene: A cross-country moderation analysis.

Between countries, total fertility rate (TFR) and cognitive ability are negatively correlated, which suggests that the world’s IQ should be declining. Also, the population-level frequencies of several SNPs have been found to predict IQ between countries. Could latent variables among measures of ability and the SNPs moderate the association of these with TFR? Using a \( \text{Big G} \) factor constructed from five measures of cognitive ability, a large-magnitude Jensen effect is found on the TFR-cognitive ability relationship \((\rho=.56, N=60.6 \text{ countries})\). Using frequency data on seven SNPs, it is found that the strength of the loading of the common factor among the SNPs (termed a metagene) is a positive and large magnitude predictor of the magnitude of the TFR-SNP frequency relationship \((\rho=.867, N=18 \text{ countries})\). These findings indicate polygenic selection against \( G \). Finally, when controlled for both Human Development Index and national IQ, metagene frequency remained a modest magnitude and significant predictor of TFR in multiple-regression \((\beta=-.371, N=18 \text{ countries})\). This indicates that polygenic selection operates directly on the genetic variance associated with cognitive ability. Based on these results, it is estimated that differential fertility between countries should be reducing heritable \( G \) globally by -.253 points per decade.
European countries have recently received historically large numbers of immigrants from various countries. Those coming from North East Asian countries generally fare well, whereas many immigrants from Southern non-Western countries find it difficult to assimilate. The biological nature of these ethnic differences, and their consequences for receiving countries, are analysed in terms of Differential Demographic and Cold Winter theory. The analysis suggests that Europe is in the midst of a critical demographic transition, due partly to long-term internal genotypic decay and sub-replacement fertility, partly to significant low IQ, high fertility Southern non-Western immigration. It is concluded that this internal and external double reversal of Darwinian selection threatens the sustainability of European democracy, welfare, and civilisation.
Evidence of dysgenic fertility in China

The relationship between fertility, intelligence, and education was examined in China using a large sample sourced from the population-representative China Family Panel Studies (CFPS) dataset. For the 1951-1970 birth cohort, the correlation between fertility and gf was -.10. The strength of recent selection against gf in China substantially increased between the 1960s and the mid-1980s. Later (between 1986 and 2000), the speed of decline in gf due to selection stabilized at about .31 points per decade with a slightly downward trend. The total loss from 1971 to 2000 due to dysgenic fertility is estimated to be .75 points. A negative relationship between educational attainment and fertility was additionally found. Both negative relations were stronger for women.


Evolutionary indicators for explaining cross-country differences in cognitive ability

Until now all genetic explanations of international intelligence differences suffer from hard and replicated evidence on cognitive ability coding genes and their biological mechanism. However, there is first direct (based on coding genes) and broad indirect evidence. The paper will summarise the findings: Genomewide association studies have detected first candidate genes coding intelligence and differences in intelligence at the individual as well as at the cross-country level. Differences in cognitive ability vary with genetic markers standing for a different evolutionary history. Genetically more similar nations are also more similar in intelligence also if further factors are controlled. Morphological features and indicators of evolution (cranial capacity, skin brightness) highly correlate with results in international intelligence and student assessment studies. Bigger brains lead to higher intelligence. Evolutionary theories explain the development of differences between peoples in psychological traits. There is evidence for recently accelerated evolution among humans. Deleterious effects of consanguineous marriages underscore the effect of genes on cognitive ability at the level of individuals and nations and also show that genetic effects depend on culture. Current humans can be distinguished in different evolutionary branches usually named for living beings subspecies. The total evidence indicates that recent evolution, in the last 20,000 to 100 years, is more important for current human macrosocial differences than former evolution.
Positive effects of intergroup competition upon ingroup collectivism, slow life history, human capital, and intelligence: The case of historical Japan

Competition between groups has been argued to select for ingroup altruism, slow life history, intelligence, and related psychosocial traits evolutionarily. To test if such effects can be observed over historical time in human populations, we used prefecture-level data on the major military events that occurred since AD 1000 in Japan (n=523). Positive effects of per-capita frequency of battles (PCFB) during the highly competitive Warring States period were observed to positively predict prefecture-level collectivism (cohesion and self-sacrifice within extended families), slow life history (an aggregate of longevity, reversed fertility rate, reversed infant mortality, height), intelligence (national achievement tests with adolescent students), and human capital (an aggregate of percentage of high-school graduates pursuing further education, employment rate, socioeconomic position, income, savings), but not social capital (an aggregate of trust in and frequency of socializing with others, and volunteer activity in the community). PCFB in previous and subsequent more peaceful periods, during which conflict was not consistent, showed weaker and less interpretable effects. Prefectures which were more victimized by WW-II bombings present faster life history, lower intelligence and human capital, and more social capital, as targeted prefectures were not necessarily those that were more socially organized for and engaged in competition against enemies. No period predicted psychological health (an aggregate of life satisfaction, happiness, peace of mind, energy, reversed hopelessness, reversed depression, reversed loneliness, reversed impacts of mental-health problems). We discuss the usefulness of theories of group selection, individual selection, and proximate effects for understanding the results.
Sex differences in intelligence

For approximately a century it has been consistently asserted that there is no sex difference in general intelligence defined as the IQ obtained from tests of a number of cognitive abilities. The Wechslers and Stanford-Binet's (1912), Terman (1916), Cattell (1971, p.131): “it is now demonstrated by countless and large samples that on the two main general cognitive abilities – fluid and crystallized intelligence – men and women, boys and girls, show no significant differences”; I have disputed this consensus (1994, 1999) and argued that while there is virtually no sex difference in general intelligence among children up to the age of 15 years, from this age onwards males develop a small average advantage that increases with age reaching approximately 4 IQ points among adults. My thesis and data have been generally ignored by students of this question who have continued to assert that there is no sex difference in general intelligence. Thus, Halpern (2000, p.218): sex differences have not been found in general intelligence”; Bartholomew (2004, p.91) “men have larger brains than women but display no significant advantage in cognitive performance”; Anderson (2004, p.829): “it is an important finding of intelligence testing that there is no difference between the sexes in average intellectual ability”; Halpern (2012, p.233) “females and males score identically on IQ tests”; and Ritchie (2015, p.105): “women tend to do better than men on verbal measures, and men tend to outperform women on tests of spatial ability; these small differences balance out so that the average general score is the same”. My contribution will present new evidence that my thesis is correct.
The Swedish Scholastic Assessment Test

Introduced in 1977, the Swedish Scholastic Aptitude Test (SweSAT) was initially open only for those who had not attended or had failed upper-secondary school, as a way to qualify for tertiary education. It became open to anyone in 1991, and has gradually become a tool for accessing attractive courses, resulting in 100-150 thousand tests taken annually. The purposes of this presentation are to inform about the SweSAT as a potential resource for future research and to present some analyses of sex differences for various subtests from 2005 and 2015. I will briefly describe the structure, types of items, reliability, and validity of the SweSAT. Available standard covariates are age (birth year), sex, secondary and tertiary education, and place of testing. A controversial aspect of the SweSAT is that males tend to perform 0.3-0.5 SD better than females overall, consistent with the typical pattern in school settings that males have poorer grades, better test results, and about the same level of knowledge. I argue that that the SweSAT is effectively an intelligence test, as it was designed to measure learning ability and knowledge, which is also - within a certain cultural context – mainly a product of intelligence. It constitutes a huge and underused data source that has hitherto mostly been studied by the researchers who develop it.
We conducted a review of factors associated with individual and group level differences in positive ethnocentrism and negative ethnocentrism. We inter-correlated data sets on national differences on these factors (such as atheism) or implicitly related factors (such as per capita income) with data from the World Values Survey with regard to national differences in measures of Positive Ethnocentrism and Negative Ethnocentrism. The two different survey items for each construct were strongly correlated, but the constructs themselves were not significantly associated. A series of multiple regression analyses indicated that Negative Ethnocentrism was mainly related to high levels of cousin marriage and the frequency of the DRD4 repeat gene, and that Positive Ethnocentrism was mainly related to a young median population age. We argue that cousin marriage may indicate low levels of trust, DRD4 implies a fast Life History strategy, and young median age is associated with many factors predicting positive ethnocentrism.
ICARS5: a 5-item public domain cognitive test

A 5-item abbreviation of the ICAR (International Cognitive Ability Resource) 16-item sample test was created thru exhaustive search. The 5-item version (ICARS5) was optimized for correlation with the 16-item version and for administration time. To validate the test, it was given to students in 6th to 10th grade in two Danish schools (N=236). Age was used as a criterion variable and showed the expected positive relationship (r=.43). Results furthermore showed that the abbreviated test was too difficult for the younger students (6th and 7th grades), but not for the older students. One item was found not to be very discriminative, so it should be replaced with a more suitable item.
Biogeographic Ancestry and Socioeconomic Outcomes in the Americas: a Meta-analysis

A meta-analysis of American studies reporting associations between socioeconomic outcomes (S outcomes) and biogeographic ancestry (BGA) was conducted. 41 studies yielded a total of 167 datapoints and 57 non-overlapping effect sizes. European BGA was found to be positively associated with S outcomes $r = .16$ [95% CI: .12 to .20, $K=23$, $N=20,837$], while both Amerindian and African BGA was negatively so, -.12 [-.18 to -.06, $K=17$, $N=15,870$] and -.10 [-.16 to -.04, $K=17$, $N=24,142$], respectively. There was considerable cross-study variation in effect sizes (mean $I^2=90\%$), but there were too few datapoints to permit credible moderator analysis. Implications for future studies are discussed.
Publication bias: An exploratory meta-analysis

The tendency to publish studies with significant results far more often than studies with non-significant results is called publication bias and threatens the validity of scientific disciplines. Even though there is sufficient reason to believe psychology is affected by publication bias, it has only scarcely been examined within our discipline. The present research therefore examined if publication bias is present within a collection of psychological meta-analyses and to what extent. Additionally, the presence of publication bias on the right side of the mean and liberal bias were examined. The present research applies publication bias analyses to 109 meta-analyses published in Psychological Bulletin between 2006 and 2014. The cumulative size of the study \(k = 8,703; \ N = 3.5^{+}\) million) makes it possible to cautiously assume the findings can be applied to the rest of psychology as well. The analyses used are the funnel plot, trim-and-fill-analysis, Begg and Mazumdar’s rank correlation test, and Egger’s test of the intercept. The results indicate that 33% of the 109 examined meta-analytic datasets show evidence of publication bias. Additionally, for 60% of the datasets the originally reported average effect size appears to be inflated or deflated by more than 20%, which is considered to be at least a moderate effect. The present research also showed evidence of publication bias on the right side of the mean for 24% of the datasets. Clear evidence for liberal bias was not found.
Emotion recognition has been a focus of considerable attention for several decades. However, despite this interest, the underlying structure of individual differences in emotion recognition ability has been largely overlooked and thus is poorly understood. For example, limited knowledge exists concerning whether recognition ability for one emotion (e.g. disgust) generalizes to other emotions (e.g. anger, fear). Furthermore, it is unclear whether emotion recognition ability generalizes across modalities, such that those who are good at recognizing emotions from (for example) the face are also good at identifying emotions from non-facial cues (such as cues conveyed via the body). The primary goal of the current set of studies was to address these questions through establishing the structure of individual differences in visual emotion recognition ability. In three independent samples (Study 1: n=640; Study 2: n=389; Study 3: n=303) we observed that the ability to recognize visually-presented emotions is based on different sources of variation: a supra-modal emotion-general factor, supra-modal emotion-specific factors, and face- and within-modality emotion-specific factors. In addition, we found evidence that general intelligence and alexithymia were associated with supra-modal emotion recognition ability. Autism-like traits, empathic concern, and alexithymia were independently associated with face-specific emotion recognition ability. These results 1) provide a platform for further individual differences research on emotion recognition ability, 2) indicate that differentiating levels within the architecture of emotion recognition ability is of high importance, and 3) show that the capacity to understand expressions of emotion in others is linked to broader affective and cognitive processes.
The Welfare Trait: how state benefits affect personality.

The welfare state has a problem: each generation living under its protection has lower work motivation than the previous one. In order to fix this problem we need to understand its causes, lest the welfare state ends up undermining its economic and social foundations – and endangering those of the nation as whole. In The Welfare Trait, I present data that suggest welfare-induced personality mis-development is a significant part of the problem. I base this theory on the discovery that childhood disadvantage promotes the development of an employment-resistant personality profile that is characterised by aggressive, antisocial and rule breaking tendencies; tendencies that in the jargon of personality research signify relatively low scores on the major personality dimensions of conscientiousness and agreeableness. The conclusion then, is that the of a welfare state which increases the number of children born into disadvantaged households will erode the nation’s work ethic by increasing the proportion of individuals in the population who possess an employment-resistant personality profile due to exposure to the environmental influence of disadvantage in childhood.
Population genetics in intelligence research: How much can it help to retrace the evolution of intelligence?

The inequality of national, ethnical, cultural or racial defined human populations in intelligence was tried to explain in different ways. Although, inside this issue, we are facing a multi-causal problem, genetic factors are taken into account of many researchers as a more or less important factor. Several theories (cold winter, evolutionary novelty, Neolithic revolution, differential K) about influences of environmental conditions on the evolution of intelligence have been proposed, however, no genes have been found to explain bigger parts of intelligence variations on the individual level hitherto, thus the empirical tests of these theories is difficult. In our talk we want to communicate our ideas and results from the use of methods from population genetics. In the first part, we want to show to the audience how genetic variations, called genetic "distances" between today's populations can partly explain their differences in intelligence, also by taking into account geography, climate and social development variables. Part two includes a look behind these genetic distances and on prehistoric human migration. There we found a pattern we called “cold Siberia hypothesis” which should be demonstrated, explained and brought up for discussion. This also includes an outlook on planned future work and research.
Epidemiological researchers, who study negative effects of neurotoxic substances on the central nervous system, have often used very different and non-overlapping cognitive tests and test batteries, thereby impeding across-study comparisons. The Cattell-Horn-Carrol (CHC) taxonomy has been suggested as an empirically based general framework for describing the structure of the universe of human mental abilities in populations that also provides a map to guide the handling of varied and heterogeneous cognitive outcomes (ISIR conference 2013, Symposium 3). In latent variable theory, meaningful theoretical constructs can be measured and be more easily compared across studies, also when studies have used different test outcomes. This is made possible by the fact that latent constructs are considered independent of their indicators. By this approach, the tendency to make use of arbitrary groupings of tests when attempting data reduction can also be avoided.

The immediate purpose of the work to be presented is to build a model that will enable examination of neurotoxic exposure effects on first-order and second-order CHC-factor in the Faroese cohort 3, and in turn enable a future conduction of a meta-analysis based on the Faroese cohorts 1, 2 and 3. The broader aim is to provide comprehensive, coherent and empirically based methods from differential psychology when psychological measurement is applied in other disciplines, like in medical epidemiology, and to stimulate other studies to model their data within the same analytical framework for easier comparison of findings, thereby also improving the opportunities to perform meta-analyses based on different international studies.

The Faroese birth cohort number 3 consists of 656 children, including 7 twins. The cohort was assembled over 27 months from late November 1997. Levels of exposure to prenatal methylmercury were obtained from analyses of cord blood samples from 603 children, from cord tissue of 108 children as well as hair samples, collected at delivery, from 634 mothers. In addition, levels of prenatal selenium were obtained from cord blood samples from 607 children. By the age of 7½ years (range 7.05 to 7.86), 580 children were neuropsychologically tested over a period of 22 months starting from the end of August 2005. First, an attempt will be made to build a confirmatory factor analytic (CFA) measurement model, in accordance with CHC-theory, from the battery of neuropsychological tests that were originally selected from a different theoretical perspective (multiple single tests supposed to measure specific neuropsychological functions) and that did not include latent variables or a general factor of mental abilities. Some tests were added to the original test battery in advance of the examinations in order to facilitate the CFA option in later analyses. Secondly, a preliminary structural equation model (SEM) will be presented by adding a latent measurement model for the prenatal exposure to methylmercury and letting this exposure model have an effect on the latent measurement model for mental abilities. Thirdly, correction for relevant confounders will be added to the SEM. Preliminary results from ongoing analyses will be presented.
Openness to Experience Predicts Leftism in the Right Tail of Intelligence

Individuals with liberal or leftist views are overrepresented in academia in both the UK and the US. One possible explanation is that cognitively elite individuals who identify as liberal or leftist tend to score high on the personality trait openness to experience, which predisposes them toward intellectually stimulating careers, such as academia. In two separate studies, one based on British data and one based on American data, this paper provides the first direct test of this hypothesis. It finds that: intelligence cannot explain any of the overrepresentation of leftist views in academia in the UK; openness to experience consistently predicts leftism in the right tail of intelligence in both the UK and US; openness to experience does not consistently predict social liberalism in the right tail of intelligence in either the UK or the US. Overall, intelligence and openness to experience interact to explain part of the overrepresentation of leftist views in academia. Candidate explanations for the remaining overrepresentation are briefly reviewed.
Sex differences in brain size do translate into difference in general intelligence: Findings from the Human Connectome Study

Characteristics of the brain such as its general size, the density of neurons, and the proportion of gray and white matter have been shown to relate to cognitive abilities. For example, an extensive meta-analysis of Pietschnig et al. (2015) showed that, in the population, the correlation between brain size and general intelligence is around $r = .24$. Studies on brain morphology revealed that gray matter correlated more strongly with general intelligence than white matter (Narr et al., 2007; Posnensky et al., 2002).

Sex differences in brain size and morphology have also been shown. Males have bigger brains than females and this difference remains even after controlling for body size. Such findings yielded the question whether there would also be sex differences in intelligence. Although, it was initially believed that males and females did not differ on general intelligence, in 1994 Lynn argued that in adult populations there is indeed a sex differences in intelligence of somewhere around .3 standard deviation, which translates in 3 to 5 IQ points. Moreover, he argued that such findings are related to sex differences in brain size. In a more recent study, Burgaleta et al. (2012) replicated sex differences in brain size, operationalized as the sum of Gray and white matter volumes measures. They found that those differences in brain size were accompanied with sex differences in a limited set of cognitive abilities, such as spatial ability, with males scoring higher. However, they did not find sex differences in general intelligence. Subsequently, they argued that dissimilarities in brain size and morphology (gray and white matter) mainly caused sex differences in specific abilities. Burgaleta et al. acknowledged several limitations in their study such as a limited sample size ($N$ was 100) and the use of undergraduate psychology students as participants. Therefore, in the present study we aimed to test sex differences in brain size and intelligence, using a much large population sample. More specifically, we analyzed the brain imaging findings and cognitive ability tests of the Human Connectome Project (Marcus, et al., 2011; Van Essen, et al., 2013). We used the newly released data that included 900 healthy young adults. In line with the previous study of Burgaleta et al, we operationlized brain size as the sum of all gray and white matter, but in addition we also analysed intracranial volume. General intelligence was operationalized as the first unrotated factor extracted from a range of cognitive ability measures. Analyses of brain size were conducted controlling for height.

In the total sample, brain size volume, intracranial volume, and gray and white matter volume showed direct and positive correlations with general intelligence ranging from .16 (white matter) to .26 (intracranial volume). Sex differences in brain size were replicated ($F (1, 892) = 157.51, \eta^2 = .15, p < .0001$ and $F (1, 892) = 164.28, \eta^2 = .16, p < .0001$, for brain size and intracranial volume, respectively). Importantly, we also found a significant sex difference in general intelligence ($F (1, 885) = 13.42, \eta^2 = .02, p < .01$). In terms of Cohen’s $d$, the effect size was .28 which would translate to a difference of approximately 4 IQ points, and is in line with the literature.

Based on the findings from this study, we conclude that sex differences in brain size do seem to be accompanied with a difference in general intelligence. As such, the previous findings of Burgaleta et al. (2012) may have likely been due to sample characteristics such as sample size and restriction of range.
A co-selected suite of traits should be identifiable as a “Co-Occurrence Syndrome” or “Nexus” of temporally-covarying traits whose co-occurrence had previously been systematically favored by the predominance of group selection throughout the “Little Ice Age” (ca. AD 1350-1850), but have been systematically disfavored by the predominance of individual selection during the past 200 years of “Global Warming.” Fifteen hypothesized Nexus indicators (ranging from AD 1810-2010) were each individually standardized then entered as parallel measures into a Multi-Level Model (MLM), using SAS PROC MIXED, with unstructured (UN) residual covariances, random intercepts, and restricted maximum likelihood (REML) estimation. Three Level 2 Chronometric SubNexus Clusters, Somatic Modifications (s.m), Specialized Abilities – Environmental (s.e), and General Intelligence – Heritable (g.h), were used as a grouping factor for Level 1 Chronometric SubCluster Indicators (s.m: Male Fluctuating Asymmetry, Sinistrality prevalence, BMI, Height, and Brain Weight; s.e: GDP Per Capita, Concretization in Language Use, Forwards Digit Span, Psycholinguistic Easy Word Usage, and WORDSUM Easy Word Usage; g.h: Altruism Word Usage, Male SRT, Backwards Digit Span, WORDSUM Hard Word Usage, and Macro-Innovation Rate Per Capita). Nested model comparisons were performed between an three alternative MLM specifications: (1) an unconditional Nexus model, estimating a single intercept and a single logarithmic slope for all SubNexus Clusters and Indicators over time, as well as the same intercepts and logarithmic slopes for all SubCluster Indicators nested within each SubNexus Cluster; (2) a somewhat less restricted model estimating a separate intercept and a separate logarithmic slope for each SubNexus Cluster over time, but the same intercept and logarithmic slopes for all SubCluster Indicators nested within each SubNexus Cluster; and (3) an even less restricted models instead estimating a separate intercept and a separate logarithmic slope for each SubCluster Indicator over time within each SubNexus Cluster. The differences between hierarchically nested models were statistically significant due to the aggregate sample size, but the differences in squared multiple correlations were not very large in magnitude, indicating that most of the cross-temporal covariation was shared in common among the SubNexus Clusters (64.5%) in comparison with the proportions that were specific to each SubNexus Cluster (1.8%) and those that were specific to each SubCluster Indicator (5.9%). These patterns of cross-temporal covariation generally support the hierarchically-structured Nexus Model of the “Co-Occurrence Syndrome” and suggest that selection may be acting jointly upon these observed historical trends in the theoretically-expected directions.
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The dataset of national IQs presented by Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen first in 2002 and most recently in 2012 was both frequently criticized and used in cross-national research. It has also become very popular in public discussions, for example in web forums, and thus well known to a broader audience. Because of this popularity, we consider it important that the dataset behind this list is maintained, continued and improved for future research. Furthermore, an improved transparency and traceability of the methods can be useful in communication of the results.

For about a year a group of researchers decided to carry out this task, beginning with the collection, as much as was possible, of sources for national IQs, along with restructuring of the original work notes, which were shared willingly. In this talk we want to present the first results of this preliminary revision. All available sources which give raw scores for Raven’s Matrices were considered and all data were picked out which are necessary to understand the estimations and calculations from the raw scores to the final national IQ. This includes also a new and standardized estimation of the required Flynn Effect corrections, based on a meta-analysis conducted by Pietschnig and Voracek in 2015. Final and intermediate results were correlated with the original results as well as with common associated variables (PISA, TIMSS, GDP/C, latitude, skin color, etc.).

The talk will include discussions about discrepancies between the original data and the revisit. Problems with our methods will be discussed, and their validity will be assessed. In addition, future plans — further work on national IQ, and an open access online data set — will be presented.
Human populations living in Eurasia during the Holocene underwent considerable microevolutionary change. It has been theorized that the transition of Holocene populations into agrarianism and urbanization brought about culture-gene co-evolution that favoured via directional selection genetic variants associated with higher general cognitive ability (GCA). To examine whether GCA might have risen during the Holocene, we compare a sample of 99 ancient Eurasian genomes (ranging from 4.56 to 1.21 kyr BP) with a sample of 503 modern European genomes, using three different cognitive polygenic scores. Significant differences favouring the modern genomes were found for all three polygenic scores (Odds Ratios=.92, \( p=.037; .81, p=.001 \) and \( .81, p=.02 \)). Furthermore, an increase in positive allele count over 3.25 kyr was found using a subsample of 66 ancient genomes \( (r=.22, p_{\text{one-sided}}=.04) \). These observations are consistent with the expectation that GCA rose during the Holocene.
The welfare state has a problem: each generation living under its protection has lower work motivation than the previous one. In order to fix this problem we need to understand its causes, lest the welfare state ends up undermining its economic and social foundations – and endangering those of the nation as whole. In The Welfare Trait, I present data that suggest welfare-induced personality mis-development is a significant part of the problem. I base my theory on the discovery that childhood disadvantage promotes the development of an employment-resistant personality profile that is characterised by aggressive, antisocial and rule breaking tendencies; tendencies that in the jargon of personality research signify relatively low scores on the major personality dimensions of conscientiousness and agreeableness. This discovery means that if we implement welfare policies which set up perverse incentives that increase the number of children born into disadvantaged households, then we risk proliferating dysfunctional, employment-resistant personality characteristics due to the damaging effect on personality development of exposure to childhood disadvantage.
17.00 Trends in PISA Scores 2000-2015

Reports about Flynn effect reversals in high-scoring countries have become commonplace in recent years. Far less is known about ongoing IQ trends in less developed countries because of limitations of data quality, although recent Flynn effects have been documented for several lower-scoring countries. The perhaps most precise cognitive test results from a variety of countries come from the OECD’s PISA program, which has assessed reading comprehension, science and mathematics in 15-year-old students in 3-year intervals between 2000 and 2015.

The present study investigates possible determinants of country-level PISA trends between 2000 and 2015. The following hypotheses were tested: (1) Scores tend to rise in low-scoring countries while stagnating or declining in high-scoring countries; (2) Rising school enrolment leads to lower scores; (3) Rising government expenditures for education lead to rising scores; (4) Rising per capita GDP leads to rising scores; (5) Smaller family size, measured by declining fertility rate, leads to rising scores; (6) Scores tend to rise in countries in which the educational attainment in the parental generation has increased, thereby improving intellectual home environments of children; and (6) A more positive (less negative) relationship between education and number of children leads to rising scores.

Results provide strong support for hypothesis 1 and weaker support for hypothesis 4. The other hypotheses receive no support from the PISA results. The 1995-2015 results from the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) corroborate the finding that low-scoring countries have gained relative to high-scoring countries, but not that rising per capita GDP is associated with rising scores. The results show that gaps between high-scoring and low-scoring countries are diminishing at the global level.
17.30 'The Mutant says in his heart, “There is no God”': Atheism as Evidence of High Mutational Load under Conditions of Weakened Purifying Selection

The Social Epistasis Amplification Model (Woodley of Menie et al., 2017) contends that relaxed purifying selection, precipitated by industrialization, leads to the accumulation of group-fitness damaging genetic mutations. This is manifested in fitness damaging worldviews and the collapse of important fitness behaviour regulation processes. Religiousness is a group selected trait and, thus, should be associated with lower mutational load in modern environments. This hypothesis is examined through associations between religiousness and five putative indicators of mutational load: (1) Poor general health (2) autism (3) homosexuality (4) Fluctuating asymmetry (5) left-handedness, and (6) negative attitudes and reactions to spanking; i.e. the response to a long-established method of behaviour regulation. In line with the Social Epistasis Amplification Model, religiousness is negatively associated with these indicators of high mutational load.
A mounting body of evidence demonstrating that individuals regularly deviate from their trait standing scores (e.g. Fleeson, 2001; Fleeson & Gallagher, 2009), and that this deviation may be goal-directed (McCabe & Fleeson, 2012), suggests that an examination of this 'adaptive variability' may explain incremental validity over and above traditional mean level personality measures. We therefore propose a new individual difference of "Personality Adaptability" defined as the capacity to regulate expression of personality in order to maximise goal attainment across situations. We investigated the existence of Personality Adaptability, its divergent validity from mean level personality, and self-monitoring, and its incremental prediction of task success in two studies. In a laboratory study 86 participants completed two tasks: One requiring high and one requiring low Extraversion. Task 1 required participants to compete to be the most memorable person in the group, and Task 2 involved scoring response sheets. Personality Adaptability was measured by the match between required and displayed personality characteristics, and the change from task 1 to task 2. The observational study was of 184 comedians performing at the Comedy Store Manchester. In this case, only the match measure of Personality Adaptability could be used. CFA, invariance analysis, and SEM regression models provided substantial support for the construct, divergent, and incremental predictive validity of Personality Adaptability with respect to mean level personality and self-monitoring.
Many countries now admit large numbers of foreigners into their midst and consequently have large populations of immigrants. When looking at the non-natives as a whole, in most Western countries they underperform relative to the natives. Why is this so? I argue that most research on this topic suffers from multiple problems. First, most research does not distinguish between immigrants at the country of origin level, but rather lumps them into one big category or a few macro-categories, which prevents one from seeing important differences. Second, as a consequence of the first, most research ignores important differences between countries of origin that may be able to explain the differential performance among groups. Third, most research ignores intelligence research, as well as other differential psychology, despite many decades of evidence showing this trait to be important in explaining social inequality. Fourth, most research does not examine the potential explanatory role of Islam as a cultural-religious factor. I show using a collection of empirical datasets covering many Western countries that when one approaches the question without the above problems one can in fact explain much if not most variation between country of origin groups. I outline limitations with the current body of research and suggest a research program for further research.
A nationally representative Danish sample was asked to estimate the percentage of persons aged 30-39 living in Denmark receiving social benefits for 70 countries of origin ($N = 766$). After extensive quality control procedures, a sample of 484 persons were available for analysis. Stereotypes were scored by accuracy by comparing the estimated values to values obtained from an official source. Individual stereotypes were found to be fairly accurate (median/mean correlation with criterion values $= .48/.43$), while the aggregate stereotype was found to be very accurate ($r = .70$). Both individual and aggregate-level stereotypes tended to underestimate the percentages of persons receiving social benefits and underestimate real group differences. In bivariate analysis, stereotype correlational accuracy was found to be predicted by a variety of predictors at above chance levels, including conservatism ($r = .13$), nationalism ($r = .11$), some immigration critical beliefs/preferences, agreement with a few political parties, educational attainment ($r = .20$), being male ($d = .19$) and cognitive ability ($r = .22$). Agreement with most political parties, experience with ghettos, age, and policy positions on immigrant questions had little or no predictive validity. In multivariate predictive analysis using LASSO regression, correlational accuracy was found to be predicted only by cognitive ability and educational attainment with even moderate level of reliability. In general, stereotype accuracy was not easy to predict, even using 24 predictors ($k$-fold cross-validated $R^2 = 4\%$). We examined whether stereotype accuracy was related to the proportion of Muslims in the groups. Stereotypes were found to be less accurate for the groups with higher proportions of Muslims in that participants underestimated the percentages of persons receiving social benefits (mean estimation error for Muslim groups relative to overall elevation error $= -8.09$ %-points). The study was preregistered with most analyses being specified before data collection began.
Jensen (1985) formulated "Spearman's hypothesis" which holds that the magnitude of performance differences among populations on various tests should be positively correlated with the magnitude of those tests' g loadings. This conjecture has been confirmed using the method of correlated vectors (MCV) for Black and White mental abilities with vector correlation magnitude ranging from \( r = .62 \) to \( .71 \) (Jensen, 1998; Nyborg & Jensen, 2000). We tested this hypothesis using the 68 subtests of the National Achievement Tests in Japan (2007 to 2015 from 47 prefectures in Japan). The correlations between the tests' g loadings and the largest difference among prefectures was \( r = .67 \) and the second largest difference being \( r = .73 \). We also devised a more general distance measure among the 47 prefectures, which correlated with the subtests' g loading at \( r = .78 \) (all \( p < .001 \)). Subtests for fourteen-year-old students generally showed higher populational differences and higher g loadings than tests for eleven-year-old, as expected.
11.30 Do heritabilities predict $g$ loadings, which predict group differences in intelligence?  
Two very large meta-analyses

Group differences in intelligence and their causes is one of the most fundamental topics in the social sciences and Spearman’s hypothesis goes straight to the heart of it. Spearman’s hypothesis states that differences between groups on the subtests of an IQ battery are a function of the cognitive complexity of these subtests: large differences between groups on high-complexity subtests (high $g$ loadings) and small differences between groups on low-complexity subtests (low $g$ loadings), and it is virtually always confirmed. Jensen (1998) hypothesized that the complexity of the subtests could be predicted by their heritability, and if this is so, it would be in line with the position that there is a strong genetic component to group differences in intelligence. However, the empirical findings, including a recent meta-analysis of Japanese heritability studies, do not yield a clear-cut conclusion.

First, we carried out a meta-analysis of studies testing Spearman’s hypothesis by computing the correlation between $g$ loadings of subtests of an IQ battery and the standardized group differences on these same subtests. Our meta-analytical database consisted of a number of recent meta-analysis on specific groups, such as Black adults, Hispanics, Amerindians, and Jews. Second, we carried out a meta-analysis of studies testing the correlation between heritabilities of a subtest and $g$ loadings of the same subtest; we also checked all studies reporting the heritabilities of all subtests of an IQ battery and tried to match them with good-quality estimates of $g$ loadings. For some of the old studies of heritability it was not always possible to find good-quality $g$ loadings. Both meta-analyses consisted of corrections for sampling error, reliability of the $g$ vector, reliability of the d or h vector, restriction of range, and imperfectly measuring the construct of $g$.

The meta-analysis on Spearman’s hypothesis was based on 155 data points and a total $N = 704,773$ ($N$ higher $g = 626,196$, $N$ lower $g = 78,577$). There was a strong meta-analytical correlation between $g$ loadings and group differences. The meta-analysis on heritabilities and $g$ loadings was based on 66 data points and a total $N = 26,715$ ($N$ twins 16,311, $N$ family studies = 8,308, $N$ hybrid vigor = 2,096). There was a strong meta-analytical correlation between heritabilities and $g$ loadings. The analyses are still in progress and we will present more detailed outcomes at the conference.

Our findings based on a very large meta-analysis of Spearman’s hypothesis support Arthur Jensen’s statement that Spearman’s hypothesis is a law-like phenomenon. The strong link between heritabilities and $g$ loadings suggests that there is a strong genetic component to group differences. However, we hasten to add that our findings are completely based on correlational studies, so it is not possible to draw strong conclusions.
12:00 Intelligence in the Russian Far East

There is little research of group differences in intelligence in Russia, despite of presence of many cultures and ethnic groups. The main research into this problem took place in two periods: the Soviet Era (Grigoriev & Lynn, 2009) and the modern one (Grigorenko & Sterberg, 2003). In the Soviet period, research in psychology was under strong ideological pressures, however some researchers were able to obtain good data on the IQs of various Russian ethnic groups in the past. The aim of this work is to summarize information about population IQs collected in the Soviet Union and to compare these with modern data collected from these groups. The main area covered by this work is the Russian Far East – a big region that was colonized between the XVII and XX centuries. This region is interesting, because two out of the three groups that spread in the Russian Far East were colonists, these being Russians and Yakuts. As Lynn (2006) reported the intelligence of colonists tends to be higher because they need to adapt to new life conditions in order to “take root” in the new land. To investigate this possibility we sampled the IQs of ethnic Russians, Yakuts and the indigenous people of the Russian Far East. The results indicate that those with the highest IQs were ethnic Russians sourced from urban samples – median IQ=103. This is seven IQ points higher than the average for ethnic Russians living in Central Russia (Grigorenko & Sterberg, 2003), but is the same as the value recorded for ethnic Russians in another colonial region – Kazakhstan (Grigoriev & Lynn, 2014). These data are consistent with the migration theory. The next group, Yakuts, whose ancestors were nomads from Middle Asia, have an IQ of 99, putting them closer to their relatives from Mongolia (IQ=100), than to their Turkic “cousins” from Turkey and Kazakhstan (IQ=85-90). This is also consistent with the prediction that genetic factors are more important as a predictor of intelligence than are cultural ones (Shibaev & Lynn, 2016). The last group – indigenous peoples of the Russian Far East – is comprised of people whose ethnogenesis is in the Far East. These can be divided into various sub-clusters. The first are the Tungus – a group that is close to the Chinese – with an IQ score equal to 80 (Shibaev, Lynn, 2015). This score is significantly lower, than the score obtained from previous research on the Tungus in China, which found that they had an IQ of 96 (Lynn & Cheng, 2013). There are two potential explanations for this difference: the first is that poor environmental conditions suppressed the ability of the author’s sample, which was rural, being sourced from a remote village. The second explanation is that their intelligence has declined due to selection favoring lower IQ. There is some evidence, that the modern Tungus in Russian are the descendants of the population of the medieval Northern-Chinese Jurchen Empire. The sample of indigenous peoples from the North – Chukchi, Evens and Koryaks, has an IQ of 99. Lynn reported that the median IQ of their genetic relatives in the US and Canada is 91. The author’s sample was recruited from the University, and the IQ of the Russian students in the same University was 103. As Lynn (2006) reported, the IQ of students from universities can be to 7-10 IQ points higher than the population average.
12.30 Eugenics, a case for it as the lesser of evils

Evolution has produced a tendency for any species, including humans, to rise to its carrying capacity, typically determined by the food supply. Any personality or other traits that limit the number of descendants will be selected against, such as conscientiousness, female ambition, or non-alcoholism. To limit population, eventually some constraints on reproduction will be required. If such constraints are to be used, they might be selected to achieve eugenic goals rather than other goals, or being randomly imposed.

The Differential-K theory, if applied to the study of anxiety disorders, should lead to the prediction that slower life history (LH) racial groups exhibit higher levels of trait anxiety and worry, and higher prevalence of anxiety disorders. Unlike the highly conserved fight/flight response that delivers one from a present threat, anxiety and worry are future oriented varieties of fear that direct attention and behavior to neutralize possible future threats in an anticipatory fashion. We predict that slower LH racial groups will exhibit an especially higher prevalence of anxiety disorders in which: (A) A central symptom is excessive worry rather than affective anxiety only, as worry is an effortful and rational cognitive capacity that permits mentally scrutinizing longer-term future threats and solutions more than affective anxiety; and (B) The central source of concern are social interactions, as sociality is one of the hallmarks of slow LH. A lower prevalence of these disorders in faster LH racial groups would also be in line with the observation that psychopathic personality traits appear to be more prominent in faster LH racial groups, as psychopathy is characterized by emotional detachment, precluding anxious affect and social inhibition. Following an extensive search in international databases of scientific publications, we retained, for analyses, publications that (1) reported data for more than one racial group, rather than collating from multiple publications each report data for one racial group only, and (2) in which the racial groups were assessed in the same country, rather than each from a different country. These criteria were selected to reduce the possible effect of methods variance in the design and language of psychometric instruments, protocols, and variance in psychological health services and sociopolitical conditions. Contrary to the social psychology view that minority racial groups should be highest in the prevalence of anxiety and worry disorders due to social and economic challenges, and mostly in line with the evolutionary hypothesis of race differences based on LH speed, Whites exhibited a higher prevalence of worry-related and sociality-related anxiety disorders than African-Americans and Latinos. Self-report data on worry and social anxiety traits provided stronger support for this evolutionary hypothesis, as in these psychometric measures not only did Blacks and Latinos in general exhibit lower scores than Whites, but also Northeast Asians reported the highest scores. We discuss racial differences in propensity to seek professional help when experiencing distress, in emotional expression to health care workers, and in the validity of psychometric measures as unlikely explanations for the identified race differences in anxiety and worry traits and disorders.
15.00 Using biome mapping and weighting to more precisely predict biogeographic differences in intelligence

Latitude and mean annual temperature powerfully predict the biogeographic distribution of intelligence. As single metrics, latitude and mean annual temperature have only one another as competitors. Of course they are highly inter-correlated, with obvious causal connections. Mean annual temperature may in fact be superior to latitude because of its more explicitly composite nature. This is especially true if mean annual temperature is measured in a sophisticated fashion, across multiple measurement points which are then amalgamated. If this is done, mean annual temperature can implicitly account for oceanic warming trends and high altitude steppes and mountain ranges. However, there are other physical ecological components for which mean annual temperature fails to account, or does so insufficiently. One example is moisture or hydrology. Countries in Saharan and sub-Saharan Africa, for instance, do not greatly vary in mean annual temperature, even while having contrasting amounts of available water. Another example is soil quality. Inceptisols and other soil types can be found across great stretches of latitude, and so are present at a variety of mean annual temperatures. Climatic factors such as hydrology and soil type that remain outside the reach of the predictive powers of mean annual temperature, nonetheless, are of great import to human cognitive evolution.

To improve upon a meta-indicator of climate, in this case latitude, Figueredo and colleagues included a Temperate Broad Leaf Deciduous Forest Factor. This turned out to be a powerful composite predictor variable because Temperate Broadleaf Deciduous Forests only exist within certain parameters; specifically between 40 and 60 degrees north latitude, within a particular band of temperature values, bounded in the north by permafrost, and in the south by competing coniferous tress. Their presence also denotes moderate moisture and rich brown allisols which may be particularly productive of early agricultural yields, while discouraging helminth endo-parasites. The presence of temperate broadleaf deciduous forest biomes seems particularly valuable in accounting for some nations with high outlying intelligence. Notwithstanding these observations, temperate forests are not present in the majority of regions or nations. Accordingly, the present study uses a global biome map made available by the World Wildlife Federation to extend the Temperate Broadleaf Deciduous Forest Factor into a broadly applicable biome classification system that can compass the full range of selective regimes. We present ordinarily ranked biomes via a hypothesized relationship to cognitive evolution. To the extent that the present distribution of cross-national intelligence is analysed, it is analysed in light of migration, population heterogeneity and predicted migration routes. The heuristic value of such a method is compelling. Physical ecology is to some extent better predicted while community ecology is directly measured.
15.30 The gap between genotypic intelligence and phenotypic intelligence in ancient Egypt.

Intelligence is an important predictor of many life outcomes, both at the individual level and at the collective level. If this is true for modern populations, it can be assumed that it was also the case for ancient populations, such as the ancient Egyptians. Therefore, it may be very interesting to ask the following question: how smart were the ancient Egyptians?

Their phenotypic intelligence cannot be directly assessed, but it can be inferred from many factors, including the size of ancient Egyptian skulls, and the cultural and scientific achievement of the Egyptian civilization. Their genotypic intelligence will be assessable after more genes related to IQ are identified. Finally, the gap between the phenotypic intelligence and the genotypic intelligence of ancient Egyptians – which is discussed here – can be evaluated by having a look at malnutrition and infectious diseases in ancient Egypt. Both of them had a significant impact on intelligence (Simeon & Grantham-McGregor 1990; Liu et alii 2004; Eppig, Fincher & Thornhill 2010).

A review of the literature on alimentation in Ancient Egypt (Tallet 2003; Peters-Destérract 2005; Touzeau et alii 2014) reveals that the diet of most Egyptians mainly consisted of bread and vegetables. The iconography of Egyptian tombs, which portrays a cuisine in which poultry and fishes have an important place, comes from the socio-economic elite and is not representative of the Egyptian population as a whole. The consumption of meat and fish was scarce, which has an important implication: since Egyptians rarely consumed the aliments which could provide them with iron, and since iron deficiency has been identified as an important factor affecting IQ (Lynn & Harland 1998), it is very likely that this deficiency affected their intelligence in a significant way. It must be emphasized that their diet remained quite constant over 2500 years, despite the considerable social, political and economic changes (Touzeau et alii 2014).

As for the diseases, the prevalence of many of them such as dysentery, tuberculosis, typhus, typhoid, smallpox, malaria, and plague is well attested (Scheidel 2001). Even though many of them might not have had a direct impact on IQ, according to the “parasite-stress hypothesis” (Eppig, Fincher & Thornhill 2010), the general level of infectious diseases may have had a negative impact on intelligence by requiring a considerable level of energy, which could therefore not be provided to the brain: “From an energetic standpoint, a developing human will have difficulty building a brain and fighting off infectious diseases at the same time, as both are very metabolically costly tasks” (Eppig, Fincher & Thornhill 2010).

To summarize, one cannot accept Herodotus’ statement that Ancient Egyptians were “the healthiest of men, next to the Libyans” (Herodotus, II, 77; transl. Scheidel 2001). It is clear that the environmental conditions of Ancient Egypt, which remained quite constant over 2500 years, impaired the ancient Egyptians’ cognitive ability in a significant way. It is highly likely that these conditions prevented them from reaching the full intellectual potential which their genotype would have allowed.
Is the evolution of European Civilization a function of 50,000 years of northbound migratory Far-From-Equilibrium Thermodynamic selection?

In Hormones, Sex, and Society: The science of Physiology (1994), and Molecular Man in a Molecular World: Applied Physiology (1997), I suggested that culture reflects collective physico-chemical brain processes. Now Boltzmannian/Lotkian non-linear thermodynamics is used to try and explain brain-based evolution of North-European High Civilization in terms of coupled non-linear mass-molecular processes, optimized energetically through evolutionary adaptation to reduced Solar Irradiation during prehistoric northbound migration.
17.00 The Nexus 400 Analysis: Multilevel selection pressures on human intelligence across the Early and Late Modern eras (AD 1600-1999).

According to the co-occurrence model, heritable general intelligence, environmental specialized abilities, and somatic modifications co-varied across the Late Modern Era (1800-1999 AD). We report the findings of a model testing the prediction of an evolutionary multilevel selection theory that heritable general intelligence is largely group-selected trait. Due to variations increases in group competition as a product of harsher and unpredictable ecologies, this study hypothesized a shift from group selective pressures in the Early Modern Era, to individual selective pressures during the Late Modern Era. Hence, more intense competition between groups led to an increase in heritable general intelligence, whereas a reduction in inter-group competition saw a decrease in population values of heritable general intelligence. This project collected climatic data, as measured as mean global temperatures, between 1600 to 1999 such as 1) Global annual land-surface air temperature anomalies; 2) Global land and sea surface temperature anomalies, and 3) Surface temperature for Central England. To determine the degree of group selection, “Altruism Words” were collected from the Darwin’s (1871) Descent of Man (DMAW). Whereas Google Ngram WordSum HardWords was used as an indicator of heritable general intelligence (a measure validated by other studies). It is worth noting however, since Google Ngram exclusively keeps records of English words, this study used data from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and the UK (i.e., Britannic nations). Furthermore, as an indicator of conflict, war fatalities between 1600 to 1999 were collected for each one of aforementioned countries from the Center of Global Economics History. Since population growth is a potential confounding factor at the time of estimating mortality, standardized rates per 100,000 individuals were calculated in accordance to the population size corresponding to each nation on each year. To determine the effect of Britannic world proportion at the time, information was collected from economist Max Roser's demographic data repository. Floating means and standard deviations were used to determine the degree of climatic fluctuations across a 25-years interval. A confirmatory factor analysis supported the presence of a single factor comprised of 10 “Altruism Words”. This factor, along with the Britannic warfare mortality data, and the Britannic world proportion, loaded into a group selection factor. Due to the fact temporal data is thought to cause pseudo-replication, a series of Multilevel models were used to control for the effect of time upon group selection and the HardWords factor (i.e., prewhitening). The extracted residuals were used in a sequential canonical cascade model, with the floating means and standard deviations entered as predictors, followed by group selection. The results from this study found that group selection is fostered by colder annual temperatures. Even though, the floating standard deviation had no effect upon the group selection factor, the interaction between the floating mean and the floating standard deviation indicates in colder climates, supports the fact that group selection is potentiated by climatic variability. The HardWords factor was significantly predicted by the group selection factor above and beyond the climatic variables. Indicating that higher verbal intelligence is fostered by group selective pressures. These findings offer strong support for the predictions of our evolutionary multilevel selection model in that heritable general intelligence is largely group-selected trait.
From a battery of psychometric tests, administered to a Faroese septuagenarian cohort (70 to 74 years of age), I will:

1. Describe the cohort, the very first in the Faroes in this age group
2. Build a couple of psychometric measurement models by confirmatory factor analysis
3. Test for the effects of a set of mandatory sociographic background variables in structural equation models
4. Test for the additional effects of a number of medical measures and conditions on general intelligence in structural equation models

The presented models and results will be preliminary outcomes of ongoing analyses.
9.30 Using the Human Connectome data to examine the psychobiological and neurological aspects of Life History Theory

Life history theory (LHT) has proven to be a powerful unifying framework to explain various individual and group differences. LHT basically emphasizes two reproductive strategies. The fast LH strategy is characterized by relatively large investment in mating and lower investment in parenting. A slow LH strategy implies the reversed (high parenting, lower mating effort). These strategies are accompanied with a wide range of individual differences such as intelligence, personality, psychopathology, delinquent behavior, and sexual attitudes and behavior. In the literature, many of these constructs have been tested in relation to LH strategy. However, there are relatively few studies with human subjects that have focused on the (psycho) biological and neurological aspects of LHT. In this presentation I will illustrate the potential of the Human Connectome Data to test those (psycho) biological/neurological correlates of LHT. The Human Connectome project provides a large dataset of subjects of which neuroimages are available, and who have conducted various psychological and cognitive tests. The latest release of the Human Connectome Project (March 2017) consists of 1200 subjects.

The first illustration of testing LHT with this dataset is on the relation between indicators of LH strategy and a specific ventricle in the brain (The Cavum Septum Pellucidum; CSP). This study (which has been published in *Evolutionary Behavioral Science*) showed that a fast LH strategy was associated with increased volume of the CSP. These findings suggest that a fast LH strategy, on average, is accompanied with delayed or suboptimal development of certain brain areas.

In the second illustration, it will be shown how, in females, early onset of menstruation, higher BMI, and a family history of psychopathology cluster in line with assumptions of LHT. Also, the extent to which such a cluster has a genetic basis is studied.

In the third illustration, it will be shown that group differences in intelligence are present as predicted by LHT. Moreover, it will be shown that these group differences in intelligence are mediated by differences in brain characteristics such as its overall size.
10.00 Sex differences amongst higher academics in Sweden

There are significantly fewer women than men amongst the highest academic ranks in most countries. Many different explanations have been proposed, from sex discrimination to interests and priorities and cognitive ability in the high range. Any of these explanations could be consistent with the widely varying sex distribution amongst professors across disciplines (10-30% in the technical and natural sciences and 40-95 percent in the Humanities, Social sciences, and in Medicine and Veterinary science). In Sweden, several measures have been taken to increase the overall proportion of women to at least 40 percent (Utbildningsdepartementet, 1994, p. 37), but after more than a decade of these policies, women constitute only 24 percent of professors across all disciplines (Sandström & Wold, 2016). Here, we test the hypothesis that this difference is due to discrimination, according to which women should have higher merits than men at the point in their career when they are appointed to the position of professor. Specifically, preferential hiring of men at the expense of equally or more qualified women should be reflected in the latter having published more scientific papers and having had greater scientific impact in terms of more citations, and publishing in journals with higher impact factors.

From the total population of 1,345 professors appointed in 2009 to 2014 at the five largest universities in Sweden, we drew two random samples of about 100 persons from each sex, and compiled all their publications from the Web of Science. Differences across disciplines were relatively small within the social sciences, with a mean of 4.5 publications and 30 citations, but professors in medicine had a mean of 30 publications and 500 citations. Contrary to the hypothesis, male professors had about 80% more publications and 40% more citations than female in the social sciences, and in medicine the males had about 60% more publications and 200% more citations. There were no significant sex differences in impact factor.
Sex differences in chess and bridge: another look at the glass ceiling

The glass ceiling is an invisible and hypothetical barrier that men in top positions impose to prevent women from rising to the top. While the glass ceiling might explain the under-representation of women in corporations and in medicine, the law, the universities and in other institutions that are largely run by men, it is doubtful whether it can explain the smaller numbers of successful women in fields where men are not able to discriminate against women. These include chess and bridge in both of which men greatly outnumber women among top players.
Previous studies have found that cognitive ability is positively associated with socially liberal beliefs and at least some measures of fiscally conservative beliefs. They have also found that openness to experience is associated with left-liberal beliefs, while conscientiousness is associated with conservative beliefs. The present study analyses data on average IQ, average personality dimensions, average socio-economic characteristics and outcomes at the 2015 General Election for the 650 UK parliamentary constituencies. Its findings are as follows. First, average IQ is positively associated with turnout, Conservative vote share and Liberal Democrat vote share, and is negatively associated with Labour vote share and UKIP vote share. Second, average conscientiousness is positively associated with Conservative vote share, and is negatively associated with Labour vote share. Third, average openness is positively associated with Conservative vote share and Liberal Democrat vote share, and is negatively associated with UKIP vote share. Most of these associations are robust to controlling for average age, percentage non-white-British, and average SES.
Event Information Form

Thank you for holding your event at UCL. Please use this form to tell us about your event. This form must be returned at least 14 days prior to your booking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking Id</th>
<th>417618</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name of person making booking**  
James Thompson

**Name of contact on day of event**

**Mobile Number**

**Name of UCL Department or External Organisation hosting the Event**  
Dr James Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th></th>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name for Invoice (If different)**

**Address for Invoice (If different)**

**Postcode**

**Telephone**

**Email**

**Purchase Order Number if required:**

**Company Registration No**

**VAT Registration No**

**UCLH: Department**

**UCLH: Budget Holder**

**UCL payment terms are 30 days net of date of invoice**

**Date of event(s)**  
Friday 8th - Sunday 10th May 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue(s) Booked</th>
<th>Room Rate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pearson LT (14:00-18:00pm Friday 8th  
08:30-18:00pm Saturday 9th  
08:30-13:00pm Sunday 10th) |            |

**Venue(s) booked (from - to)**

**Actual start and end time (If different)**

Please note catering is not allowed in any lecture theatre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catering Venue</th>
<th>Room Rate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pearson G17 Friday 12:00-16:00pm  
Pearson G23 Sat & Sun 08:30-18:00/08:30-13:00pm | LFQOC |
Catering and staff costs are charged in addition and are liable to VAT at 20%

### Event Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the event</th>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Who will be attending the event?</th>
<th>Number of people you expect to attend</th>
<th>Speaker's name(s)</th>
<th>Is speaker or topic likely to be controversial?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If yes, please provide details</th>
<th>Will your event be advertised outside of UCL?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Entry requirements for the event:</th>
<th>If other, please specify</th>
<th>Are you planning to charge people to attend this event?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Additional Event Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is wheelchair access required?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Coat Rails</th>
<th>Please Select:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display boards for exhibition</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top table for speakers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes for how many speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi access</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access for presenter?</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any additional audiovisual equipment required

Please note that if using a Mac laptop you must bring your own cable to connect to a device.

### UCL Conference Suite only

Specify catering delivery times

Any other relevant information

### Declaration of person making booking

I have read and agree to accept, UCL’s Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech. Arrangements for the Management of Meeting and other Functions on UCL Premises available at: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/part-c/c20

Further Information for External Clients available at: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/efd/roombooking/external-clients

Signed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Use only</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Date sent</th>
<th>Date received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form sent to client by [REDACTED]</td>
<td>Form received &amp; processed by</td>
<td>29.4.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Event Information Form

Thank you for holding your event at UCL. Please use this form to tell us about your event. This form must be returned at least 14 days prior to your booking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking Id</th>
<th>163</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name of person making booking: James Thompson

Mobile Number

Name of UCL Department or External Organisation hosting the Event: Dr James Thompson

Address

Postcode

Telephone

Email

Name for Invoice (If different)

Address for Invoice (If different)

Postcode

Telephone

Email

Purchase Order Number if required:

Company Registration No

VAT Registration No

UCLH: Department

UCLH: Budget Holder

UCL payment terms are 30 days net of date of invoice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of event(s)</th>
<th>Friday 13th - Sunday 15th May 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Venue(s) Booked | 12:00 - 21:00 | 12/05/2017 | G22 LT | catering |
|                 | 12:00 - 21:00 | 12/05/2017 | Committee Room | catering |
|                 | 09:00 - 18:00 | 13/05/2017 | G22 LT | catering |
|                 | 09:00 - 18:00 | 13/05/2017 | G23 |         |
|                 | 09:00 - 18:00 | 14/05/2017 | G22 LT | catering |
|                 | 09:00 - 18:00 | 14/05/2017 | G23 |         |

Venue(s) booked (from - to): see above

Actual start and end time (If different)

Please note catering is not allowed in any lecture theatre

Catering Venue: see above

Room Rate(s)
All Room Rates include standard AV equipment and are VAT exempt. Catering and staff costs are charged in addition and are liable to VAT at 20%

### Event Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the event</th>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Please select:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who will be attending the event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people you expect to attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker's name(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is speaker or topic likely to be controversial?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please provide details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your event be advertised outside of UCL?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry requirements for the event:</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you planning to charge people to attend this event?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Event Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is wheelchair access required?</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☐</th>
<th>Coat Rails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display Boards for Exhibition</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td>If yes how many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top table for speakers</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
<td>If yes for how many speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi access</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td>If yes how many users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access for presenter?</td>
<td>Please Select:</td>
<td>PA system with microphone Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any additional audiovisual equipment required

Please note that if using a Mac laptop you must bring your own cable to connect to a device.

### UCL Conference Suite only

Specify catering delivery times

Any other relevant information

### Declaration of person making booking

I have read and agree to accept, UCL's Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech. Arrangements for the Management of Meeting and other Functions on UCL Premises available at: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/part-c/c20

Further Information for External Clients available at: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/efd/roombooking/external-clients

Signed

Position held

Date

Official Use only Form sent to client by

Form received & processed by
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Event Information Form

Thank you for holding your event at UCL. Please use this form to tell us about your event. This form must be returned at least 14 days prior to your booking.

**Booking Id**: 417618

**Name of person making booking**: [Redacted]

**Name of contact on day of event**: [Redacted]

**Mobile Number**: [Redacted]

**Name of UCL Department or External Organisation hosting the Event**: [Redacted]

**Address**: [Redacted]

**Telephone**: [Redacted]

**Postcode**: [Redacted]

**Email**: [Redacted]

**Name for Invoice (If different)**: [Redacted]

**Address for Invoice (If different)**: [Redacted]

**Telephone**: [Redacted]

**Email**: [Redacted]

**Purchase Order Number if required**: [Redacted]

**Company Registration No**: [Redacted]

**VAT Registration No**: [Redacted]

**UCLH: Department**: [Redacted]

**UCLH: Budget Holder**: [Redacted]

**UCL payment terms are 30 days net of date of invoice**

**Date of event(s)**: Friday 13th- Sunday 15th May 2016

**Venue(s) Booked**: Pearson LT 14:00-18:00pm Friday 13th
08:30-18:00pm Saturday 14th.
08:30-13:00pm Sunday 15th

**Room Rate(s)**: [Redacted]

**Venue(s) booked (from - to)**: [Redacted]

**Actual start and end time (If different)**: [Redacted]

**Please note catering is not allowed in any lecture theatre**

**Catering Venue**: Pearson G23 Fri from 13:30pm-18:00pm. Sat 08:30-18:00/Sun 08:30-13:00pm

**Room Rate(s)**: [Redacted]

**All Room Rates include standard AV equipment and are VAT exempt. Catering and staff costs are charged in addition and are liable to VAT at 20%**
## Event Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of the event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will be attending the event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people you expect to attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker's name(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is speaker or topic likely to be controversial?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please provide details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will your event be advertised outside of UCL?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry requirements for the event:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you planning to charge people to attend this event?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Additional Event Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is wheelchair access required?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display boards for exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top table for speakers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access for presenter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat rails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes how many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes for how many speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes how many users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA system with microphone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional audiovisual equipment required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that if using a Mac laptop you must bring your own cable to connect to a device.

## UCL Conference Suite only

Specify catering delivery times

Any other relevant information

## Declaration of person making booking

I have read and agree to accept, UCL's Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech. Arrangements for the Management of Meeting and other Functions on UCL Premises available at: [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/part-c/c20](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/part-c/c20)
Further Information for External Clients available at: [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/efd/roombooking/external-clients](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/efd/roombooking/external-clients)

## Signed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Use only</th>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form sent to client by</td>
<td>Form received &amp; processed by</td>
<td>Date sent 6.5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: FORMS ON FILE FOR JAMES THOMPSON
Date: 10 January 2018 09:09:59
Attachments: 170513 James Thompson.doc
160513 James Thompson.doc
150508 James Thompson.doc

Hello,
Please see forms attached
Regards

UCL Conference Office
UCL
5th Floor, 20 Bedford Way, London, WC1H 0AL
E: [redacted] T: 020 3108 [redacted] Internal: [redacted]
Working days Monday to Wednesday

This e-mail, including any attachments, is confidential and intended only for the use of the addressee(s). If you are not an addressee, please inform the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Do not use, copy or disclose this e-mail.
From: James Thompson
To: Thompson, James
Subject: RE: Event 12th to 14th May 2017 and BOOKING 11-13 MAY 2018
Date: 12 December 2017 12:23:33
Attachments: Book1.xlsx

Hello James
Please see attached confirmation of rooms.

Event registration and catering forms to follow in the new year.

Regards

UCL Conference Office
UCL
5th Floor, 20 Bedford Way, London, WC1H 0AL
E: [redacted] F: 020 3108 [redacted] Internal [redacted]
Working days Monday to Wednesday
W: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/estates/

This e-mail, including any attachments, is confidential and intended only for the use of the addressee(s). If you are not an addressee, please inform the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Do not use, copy or disclose this e-mail.

From: James Thompson
Sent: 23 November 2017 15:59
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Event 12th to 14th May 2017 and BOOKING 11-13 MAY 2018
Dear [redacted],

You may remember that in May of this year I made a booking for 11 May-13 May, as shown below, for Pearson G22 and G23 from 13.00 to 18.00 on Friday 11 May, 09.00 to 18.00 Saturday 12 May, and 09.00 till 13.00 on Sunday 13 May. Can you please confirm that the booking has been made?
Best wishes
James Thompson

From: Dr James Thompson
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 2:22 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: event 12th to 14th May 2017 and BOOKING 11-13 MAY 2018
Dear [redacted],

Can you let me have the bill for the conference in due course?
Can I also make a booking for next year?
I would want Pearson G22 and G23 from 13.00 to 18.00 on Friday 11 May, 09.00 to 18.00 Saturday 12 May, and 09.00 till 13.00 on Sunday 13 May.
Can you please confirm that, and could I have an exact repeat of my coffee/tea bookings?
best wishes
James
From: Thompson, James
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 1:16 PM
To: Thompson, James
Subject: RE: Event 12th to 14th May 2017
Hello James
We currently have these rooms on hold for you.
Please amend spreadsheet in red so that we can send you an events registration form with costs
Regards

From: Thompson, James
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2017 2:05 PM
To: Thompson, James
Subject: RE: Event 12th to 14th May 2017
Please find attached catering form
Regards

Conferences and Events
Room & Conference Bookings
UCL Estates

From: Thompson, James
Sent: 27 December 2016 15:50
Subject: Fw: Event 12th to 14th May 2017
From: Dr James Thompson
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2016 5:14 PM
Subject: Fw: Event 12th to 14th May 2017
Dear Conferences Organiser
A year ago I made a repeat booking with [Redacted] for my Intelligence conference for 12-14 May 2017. Can I just ask if there is space to move it to the following weekend, 19 to 21 May 2017? As usual, I am trying to juggle the needs of researchers flying in from abroad, so I just want to know if I have the option of changing if I need to.

Best wishes

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 2:31 PM
To: Thompson, James
Subject: RE: Inv 1113432 Event 13th to 15th May 2016
Hi there James
Thanks for confirming and certainly will do!
It was nice to meet you and your colleagues.
Best wishes

From: Thompson, James
Sent: 20 June 2016 17:45
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Fw: Inv 1113432 Event 13th to 15th May 2016
Importance: High
Dear [Redacted]
I have sent payment of the final invoice by BACS and also notified accounts of the payment. Thanks for coming in on the Saturday to see that all was in order. I appreciated that.

Can you please book me in again for the same booking, rooms and catering for 12-14 May 2017? Lecture room G22 and coffee room G23 from midday Friday 12 May till midday Sunday 14 May, same catering, and probably for the same number of people.

Please confirm
Best wishes
James

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Thompson, James
Subject: Inv 1113432 Event 13th to 15th May 2016

Dear [Redacted]
Regarding your bookings here at UCL, please find attached a copy of your invoice number [Redacted] with any supporting documentation where necessary.
Payment can be made in the following ways:
By Cheque – As detailed in the payment counterfoil within the invoice attached here.

Please use the Customer Code and Invoice Number as Reference, all payments must be made in
Sterling.
Credit Card – Please call [redacted] quoting Customer Code and Invoice Number when making payment.
If you have any queries on the charges made, do please contact me to resolve these as early as possible using the e-mail address listed on the invoice. Our Payment Terms are 30 days.

Regards

UCL CSC/Room Bookings
Estates Portfolio & Business Services
UCL Estates
From: [Redacted]
Sent: 09 January 2018 14:14
Subject: FW: Urgent query from Pravast - room booking

Importance: High

You may need to do some digging around but can you please see if you can find a completed event details form from Dr James Thompson.

Could it have been somewhere on the S drive, or wherever all event correspondence is stored?

Thanks

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 09 January 2018 13:56
Subject: RE: Urgent query from Pravast - room booking

Further to the email below was Dr James Thompson asked to fill out an event details form, do we have a booked meeting room or any other venue booked?

If so could we take these person's event details forms so that we can see what information is provided regarding the conference?

Many thanks,

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 09 January 2018 13:24
To: [Redacted]
CC: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Urgent query from Pravast - room booking

Hi,

I have just received the attached from my colleague [Redacted].

Please let me know what action we need to take in due course.

Kind regards

Conference Centre Manager
20 Bedford Way

www.20bedfordway.com

Like us on Facebook https://www.facebook.com/20bedfordway
Follow us on Twitter https://twitter.com/20BedfordWay

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 09 January 2018 13:20
Subject: RE: Urgent query from Provoost - room booking

We are currently looking into this as a priority. We'll keep you informed.

Best wishes,

[Name]

Conference Centre Manager
20 Bedford Way

Like us on Facebook https://www.facebook.com/20BedfordWay
Follow us on Twitter https://twitter.com/20BedfordWay

Subject: Urgent query from Provoost - room booking

Hope you are well and had a lovely Christmas break.

I've been working with our Media team this morning regarding a few room bookings that are garnering press attention and Provoost has asked us to look into things quite urgently on his behalf. It looks like the below room bookings were made by a member of your team, which would indicate that the room booking request from the honorary academic [Dr James Thompson] came through you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2421838</td>
<td>12/12/2017 13:56</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>14/03/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building (North East Entrance) G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421838</td>
<td>12/12/2017 13:56</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>11/05/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building (North East Entrance) G26</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421838</td>
<td>12/12/2017 13:56</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building (North East Entrance) G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421838</td>
<td>12/12/2017 13:56</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building (North East Entrance) G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421838</td>
<td>12/12/2017 13:56</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building (North East Entrance) G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421838</td>
<td>12/12/2017 13:56</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>12/05/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building (North East Entrance) G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you able to look into things at your end and send us any emails that you have relating to the above room booking? Apologies for the urgency but Provoost is keen to get an answer on this ASAP, so whatever digging you can do at your end would be greatly appreciated!

Any questions at all, just let me know. I'm on the mobile number below today if it's easier to speak in person.

Many thanks in advance,
From: [name]
Sent: 09 January 2018 09:46

Subject: RE: Urgent query from Provost - room booking

Hi,

I have just received the attached from my colleague [name].

Please let me know what action we need to take in due course.

Kind regards,

Conference Centre Manager
20 Bedford Way

www.20bedfordway.com

Like us on Facebook [link]
Follow us on Twitter [link]

Sent: 09 January 2018 11:20
Many thanks indeed for looking into this so quickly. We'll send you back in your.

Best wishes,

Conference Centre Manager
20 Bedford Way

www.20bedfordway.com

Like us on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/20 BedfordWay
Follow us on Twitter: https://twitter.com/20BedfordWay

Sent: 05 January 2018 12:05

Subject: Urgent reply from Provost - room booking
Importance: High

Hope you are well and had a lovely Christmas break.

I've been working with our Maida team this morning regarding a few room bookings that are garnering press attention and Provost has asked us to look into things quite urgently on his behalf. It looks like the below room bookings were made by a member of your team, which would indicate that the room booking request from the honorary academic (Dr James Thompson) came through your email:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booking</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2421830</td>
<td>12/12/2017 17:14</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>11/06/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building [North East Entrance] G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421830</td>
<td>12/12/2017 17:14</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>11/06/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building [North East Entrance] G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2421830</td>
<td>12/12/2017 17:14</td>
<td>Dr James Thompson</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>11/06/2018</td>
<td>Pearson Building [North East Entrance] G22 LT</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Psychology meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you able to look into these things at your end and send us any emails that you have relating to the above room booking? Apologies for the urgency but Provost is keen to get an answer on this ASAP, so whatever help you can do at your end would be greatly appreciated!

Any questions at all, just let me know. I'm on the mob/number below today if it's easier to speak in person.

Many thanks in advance,

Conference Events and Operations Manager
Communications and Marketing
UCL
Gower St
Verbal intelligence is correlated with socially and economically liberal beliefs
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ABSTRACT
Research has consistently shown that intelligence is positively correlated with socially liberal beliefs and negatively correlated with religious beliefs. This should lead one to expect that Republicans are less intelligent than Democrats. However, I find that individuals who identify as Republican have slightly higher verbal intelligence than those who identify as Democrat (2–5 IQ points), and that individuals who supported the Republican Party in elections have slightly higher verbal intelligence than those who supported the Democratic Party (2 IQ points). I reconcile these findings with the previous literature by showing that verbal intelligence is correlated with both socially and economically liberal beliefs (β = .10–.32). My findings suggest that higher intelligence among classically liberal Republicans compensates for lower intelligence among socially conservative Republicans.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
Sex Differences in Intelligence: The Developmental Theory

Richard Lynn*
University of Ulster, UK

It is a paradox that males have a larger average brain size than females, that brain size is positively associated with intelligence, and yet numerous experts have asserted that there is no sex difference in intelligence. This paper presents the developmental theory of sex differences in intelligence as a solution to this problem. This states that boys and girls have about the same IQ up to the age of 15 years but from the age of 16 the average IQ of males becomes higher than that of females with an advantage increasing to approximately 4 IQ points in adulthood.

Key Words: Sex differences, Intelligence, Developmental theory
Male and Female Balance Sheet

James R. Flynn*
University of Otago, New Zealand

This paper isolates gender differences in IQ that refer to the current generation of women in developed nations and where samples appear large and representative. At no age do such women begin an IQ decline vis-à-vis males. They suffer from a spatial deficit that might dictate fewer of them in “mapping jobs”. Against a male average of 100, they have a fluid intelligence of 100 (university Raven’s data) to 100.5 (Raven’s data from five modern nations); and a crystallized intelligence of 97.26 (WAIS data plus non-Wechsler IQ) to 100 (non-Wechsler GQ).

No matter whether we take the lower values or a mean value, we would expect females to match males on mathematics and do no better than males at school. Both expectations are false. If there are genetic differences between men and women, these have more to do with character than intellect. First, women tend to be less violent and combative than men. Compared to schoolgirls, boys hand in assignments late, miss school more often, drop out more often, and must be disciplined more often. Second, women from infancy are more sensitive to other human beings. The ratio of women falls from dominant to rare as we go from social science to medicine and biology, to chemistry, to math and physics. There are two ways of viewing this progression: either women value math less insofar as it has no immediate human application; or women are deterred by the fact that math gets more difficult as you go from psychology to mathematics. Since either of these traits could be genetic in origin, I can see no easy way of obtaining conclusive evidence one way or the other.

Key Words: Sex differences, Intelligence, Raven test, Wechsler test
Counting is not Measuring: 
Comment on Richard Lynn’s Developmental Theory of Sex Differences in Intelligence

Roberto Colom*
*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

Lynn’s developmental theory of sex differences in intelligence provides one tentative explanation for the observed small male advantage in average IQ scores. Relying on indirect evidence, Lynn suggests that because a) brain size is positively associated with intelligence, and b) men have a larger brain size than women, c) men should have higher average IQ scores than women. However, straightforward evidence obtained using neuroimaging approaches shows that men’s larger brains might be devoted to highly demanding visuospatial processing required by tasks on which they excel. Men’s greater cortical values are not related to the general factor of intelligence (g). This advantage is translated into group abilities and specific skills.

Key Words: Brain size, brain structure, g factor, sex difference, measurement
Common Paradoxes in the Study of Sex Differences in Intelligence

Helmuth Nyborg*
Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark (1968-2007)

The study of sex differences in intelligence reveals a paradox. Data-oriented researchers consistently document reproducible differences, whereas leading textbooks, academics, and media consistently deny them. Perhaps, Lynn's extensive compilation of data on sex differences (this issue) will solve this paradox.

Key Words: Sex differences, Intelligence, ASVAB
Cognitive Sex Differences: Evolution and History

David Becker*
Heiner Rindermann
*Corresponding author: David Becker, Department of Psychology, Chemnitz University of Technology, Wilhelm-Raabe-Str. 43, D-09107 Chemnitz, Germany;

We add results from studies in Germany and Brazil supporting Lynn’s theory on cognitive sex differences and their development. We show that there are associations between hormonal transitions during adolescence, especially in women, and increasing sex differences in cognitive abilities, particularly spatial ability, during adolescence. We suggest that such maturation-related changes make sense from an evolutionary perspective, as cognitive and ecological specializations of the sexes, with the benefit of increasing group fitness due to differentiation of social gender roles. However, historical and cultural change has reduced male-favoring gender differences in education and in many cases reversed them. Together with changes in the job market this has modified formerly stable sex differences.

Key Words: Sex differences, Intelligence, Brain development, Hormonal transitions, Adolescence, Gender roles; STEM
The Male Brain, Testosterone and Sex Differences in Professional Achievement

Edward Dutton*
Ulster Institute for Social Research

Lynn argues that sex differences in intelligence and drive (underpinned by testosterone) help to explain sex differences in high achievement. This comment proposes that this view can be developed by looking at Baron-Cohen’s concept of the ‘male brain’, which in its extreme manifestations presents as autism-spectrum disorders. It shows that this personality type — specifically a moderately strongly male brain combined with the outlier high IQ also more common among men — is associated with genius, and so the highest levels of achievement, and is partly a reflection of elevated testosterone. Thus an optimally high level of testosterone, also associated with faster life history strategy, is behind both elevated male drive and a greater ability to innovate, systematize and make important breakthroughs, leading to the highest levels of professional achievement. The comment shows that the ‘male brain’ is independent of intelligence and that even the highest echelons of the ‘oldest profession’ are male dominated, as the male brain model would predict.

**Key words:** Male brain; Autism, Asperger’s; Genius, Life history theory
Sex Differences in Intelligence: 
Developmental Origin Yes, Jensen Effect No

Gerhard Meisenberg*
Ross University Medical School, Dominica

Richard Lynn’s developmental theory of sex differences in intelligence is evaluated using the administration of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery in the NLSY79. Score increases between age 15 and age 23 are found to be greater in males than in females, supporting an essential element of the theory. On the other hand, neither the sex differences themselves nor their developmental changes are related in any consistent way to the g loadings of the subtests. Therefore sex differences should not be conceptualized as differences in “general” intelligence (g).

Key Words: ASVAB, NLSY, Intelligence, Sex differences, g loadings, Development
Sex Differences in Self-Estimated Intelligence, Competitiveness and Risk-Taking

Adrian Furnham*

University College London, UK

Studies of self-estimated intelligence have consistently shown that males estimate their intelligence higher than do females, and people estimate the intelligence of male family members higher than that of female family members. A number of studies have also shown that males are more competitive and greater risk-takers than females.

Key Words: Sex differences, Self-confidence, Intelligence
Sex Differences in Intelligence: A Genetics Perspective

Davide Piffer*

Ben Gurion University, Israel

Richard Lynn's paper on the existence and the magnitude of sex differences in general intelligence proposes that among adults men have a higher average IQ than women and greater variability, and these contribute to the greater number of men among high achievers. The greater variability of males may be attributable to X-linked transmission of intelligence and/or to higher testosterone that could increase the expression of genes related to neurological development or cognition.

Key Words: Intelligence, Sex differences, X-linked inheritance
Presumption and Prejudice: Quotas May Solve Some Problems, but Create Many More

Guy Madison*

Department of Psychology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

Some Western countries contemplate, or have already implemented, legislative means to counter group differences. Here, I consider the arguments for, and consequences of, sex quotas. I find that it is logically incoherent to impose selection based on group membership, such as quotas, unless one acknowledges that there is a group difference in some trait that affects the outcome in the domain in which the selection takes place. If such a group difference is acknowledged, a quota might decrease the proportion of individuals who are more likely to have undesirable traits that are difficult to measure. However, the fact that traits are normally distributed and overlap across groups means that it is more effective to select for desirable traits than for group membership. Also, quotas inevitably entail negative consequences that should be weighed in. From the perspective of the individual, it is fairer to be selected on the basis of traits one actually has, rather than a stereotype of the group one belongs to. From the perspective of society as a whole, focusing on group differences and selecting based on group membership is divisive and conflict-driving. It stirs hostility by encouraging competition over resources and social status between groups instead of between individuals. These arguments and conclusions are applicable to other groups and group differences in general.

Key words: Affirmative action; Cognitive ability; Intelligence; Interests; Sex differences; Quotas; Equal opportunity; Legislation; Sweden
Sex Differences in Cognitively Demanding Games: Poker, Backgammon and Mahjong

Heitor B. F. Fernandes*

University of Arizona, Tucson, USA
Sex Differences in the Performance of Professional Go Players

Mingrui Wang*

Independent Researcher, Beijing, China
Sex Differences in Intelligence: Reply to Comments

Richard Lynn*
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Table 1: LCI Conference listed presenters 2015 - 2017
UCL INVESTIGATION INTO LONDON CONFERENCE ON INTELLIGENCE

First meeting: Wednesday 17 January 2018 at 8.45 in room 301, 26 Bedford Way

TERMS OF REFERENCE

It is noted the panel had been charged with investigating the circumstances relating to the London Conference on Intelligence. The issues to be addressed are:

1. The procedure followed for booking the events

NOTES OF THE MEETING

It was agreed that the initial meeting should address the following issues:

1. Format of investigation and issues that needed to be resolved
2. Content and possible times for meeting with Dr Thompson

1. Format of the investigation

It was agreed that it was necessary to interview Dr Thompson and that he needed to answer questions relating to the following issues:

Room Bookings, Conference publicity and UCL involvement

Was the conference highlighted as being controversial when the room booking was made?
What was the status of the conference? Was it a genuine conference or was it a private meeting?
How was the conference advertised? Was it by invitation only? How were speakers and attendees selected for the meeting? Was advertisement for the conference and post-conference dissemination of information in line with UCL policies about the use of the UCL branding?