

UK sociologist Noah Carl and the cultivation of the far right in academia

Thomas Scripps

20 June 2019

The International Youth and Students for Social Equality (IYSSE) held a second meeting June 9 in Cambridge, England on Noah Carl, the eugenecist appointed to a research fellowship at Cambridge University. Students from Cambridge and Oxford Universities and local residents were in attendance.

The meeting's chair, Alice Summers, explained that Carl had been dismissed at the end of April this year following a six-month campaign organised by student protestors. She raised the urgent need for students and young people to understand the political context which led to his appointment in the first place, drawing attention to the global rise of the far right.

Thomas Scripps delivered the main report, refuting claims made by the right-wing press in Carl's defence, explaining the social and political history of eugenics, drawing comparisons with the case of German academic Jorg Baberowski in Humboldt University and calling on those present to base their opposition to these reactionary individuals on a turn to the working class and the fight for socialism.

In the discussion that followed, IYSSE members stressed that Carl's rise to prominence was closely bound up with an international escalation in class tensions and the deliberate encouragement of fascistic ideology and far-right movements by the highest echelons of the state as a weapon against the working class. Below we post the speech given by Scripps.

I first want to congratulate the Cambridge University students who fought a determined campaign over Noah Carl, and who have won a significant victory against the far right in Britain and internationally.

Protestors were able to expose Carl's work as "ethically suspect and methodologically flawed" and for legitimising "racial stereotypes" being "used by extremist and far-right media outlets with the aim of stoking xenophobic anti-immigrant rhetoric."

One of Cambridge's internal investigations found that Carl "had put a body of work into the public domain that did not comply with established criteria for research ethics and integrity" and that his "appointment could lead, directly or indirectly, to the college being used as a platform to promote views which could incite religious or racial hatred."

Barely had the news of their success reached the student campaigners, however, when a vicious witch-hunt began in the right-wing press. Toby Young, darling of the Tory right and "progressive eugenics" advocate, used his column in the *Spectator* to claim, "Noah Carl's only crime is being a conservative."

In the *Telegraph*, Munira Mirza, former Cultural Advisor to Boris Johnson, wrote, "Intolerant zealots are strangling the intellectual freedom of our universities." Daniel Hannan, Tory Member of the European Parliament and Brexiteer, followed with, "Do you now have to be Left-wing to study at the University of Cambridge?" and Douglas Murray, associate director of the Henry Jackson Society, pronounced, "Cambridge has become the epicentre of the 'wokeness' epidemic plaguing our universities."

The foul Spiked online, whose staff are cheerleaders, candidates and

members of the European Parliament for Nigel Farage's Brexit Party, referred to "The lynch mobbing of Noah Carl."

The Times went into overdrive and published, "Academics defend racism row scholar Noah Carl," "Silencing a 'racist' Oxbridge tutor plays to the far right," "The Times view on the sacking of Noah Carl: Monoversties," "Cambridge scholar Noah Carl 'sacked for questioning sacred left'" and, by Toby Young again, "Roger Scruton is right to highlight political bias in universities—here's what we can do about it."

Making clear the politics behind this campaign, the US-based fascistic website Breitbart ran a piece, "Cambridge caves to left-wing bully mob, fires young scholar."

Carl himself published an open letter "in response to his critics."

An article by the right-wing libertarian publication *Quillette*, "Cambridge Capitulates to the Mob and Fires Young Scholar," included a petition attacking St Edmund's College "for the injustice visited upon this young scholar."

This reads as a who's who of international reaction. Signatories include Adam Perkins, a professor at King's College London who has written in favour of breeding out welfare dependency; Helmuth Nyborg, a Danish researcher who has argued that men are more intelligent than women, that whites are more intelligent than blacks and that immigration from non-Western countries leads to a decline in the average intelligence of recipient countries; Oxford academic Nigel Biggar, who has argued for the civilizing impact of the British Empire; Niall Ferguson, the historian now working for the Hoover Institution; and American academic Charles Murray, author of the infamous *The Bell Curve* alleging an inherent black-white and poor-rich intelligence gap.

Across these tirades, students and supportive academics stand accused of "intimidating" Carl and St Edmund's college, of contributing to a "climate of intolerance" and of clubbing together to "mob" people whose views they simply do not like. Carl, meanwhile, is described as "a young academic at the start of [his] career," whose reputation has been unfairly destroyed and who will now struggle "to forge a new career."

According to these articles, there is "no convincing evidence to support the claim that Dr Carl holds extremist views, or that he had conducted such poor quality research that he could not be allowed to continue in his role." Carl's only crime, in his own words, is to have carried out research "believed to threaten certain left-wing sacred values."

Not a single word of this is true. Carl's research is politically motivated and contributes to a project of eugenecist, Social Darwinist pseudo-science with a long and reactionary history.

Seven of his published articles have appeared in the *OpenPsych* journals run by Emil Kirkegaard, whose highest qualification is a BA in linguistics. Kirkegaard is a Danish eugenecist and extreme right-winger, who believes in the existence of racial "tiers" and that coupling between blacks and whites leads to mental and physical illness in a population.

OpenPsych's editorial staff is comprised of similarly minded individuals, many of whom lack any qualifications in the fields they are

supposed to oversee and review. Over half the papers on the site are authored by Kirkegaard himself, at least one of which—arguing that crime rates among migrants in Germany correlate with low IQ and Islamic faith—was positively reviewed by Carl.

Carl has also co-authored papers with Professor Heiner Rindermann of Chemnitz University, who has written a book called *Cognitive Capitalism*, arguing that global inequality is the product of differences in genetically determined intelligence. Carl, Kirkegaard and Rindermann are all co-authors of an editorial defending *OpenPsych* from numerous criticisms.

One of Carl's most bizarre papers, “The relationship between solar radiation and IQ in the United Kingdom,” is published in *Mankind Quarterly*. This journal is edited by Gerhard Meissenberg, who insists that Africans and women are inherently less intelligent, and Richard Lynn, a white supremacist who once suggested that the predominantly white states of America secede from the union to “preserve civilisation” and who has called for the “phasing out” of “incompetent cultures.”

All these individuals have presented at the London Conference on Intelligence, a secret annual eugenicist conference exposed by a *London Student* investigation. The conference heard such papers as “Meta-analysis of Roma intelligence,” “Sex differences in intelligence” and “Evolution versus culture in international intelligence differences.”

Carl is deeply enmeshed in a network of fascists and eugenicists. These individuals are singularly obsessed with ‘proving’ inherent racial, gender and class differences, especially in terms of intelligence. He has cooperated in and defended these projects, lending his Oxford credentials to their conclusions. In his own papers, Carl has popularised racial and religious categories and the invocation of the causal influence of IQ under the cover of a sociological gloss. His efforts are part of a wider movement.

A timely and important book has recently been published by science writer Angela Saini—*Superior: The Return of Race Science*. Its main achievement is to expose the networks forged and extended by race scientists in the postwar period and their intimate connection with the far right.

Saini explains that the horrific crimes of the Nazis and UNESCO’s 1950 declaration that efforts to categorise humanity into different races were “fundamentally anti-rational” did nothing to dissuade dyed-in-the-wool race scientists. Instead this pseudo-science retreated to the shadows where, with the help of significant private funding, it organised an academic and political regroupment.

The main vehicle for this work, Saini explains, was the Pioneer Fund founded by the multimillionaire heir of a textile business, Wickliffe Draper, in 1937. The fund championed Nazi sterilisation and racial hygiene laws and worked hard to oppose desegregation in the United States. Its most impactful work was in sponsoring continued “research” into claimed racial differences.

As Saini explains, “The Pioneer’s funding priority from the beginning was to back distinguished scientists, the more well known the better, along with racist ideologues. Grants to the former,” says emeritus professor of psychology at Rutgers University William Tucker, “[W]ere intended to provide a facade of intellectual respectability for the latter, as well as results that could be used to justify their policies’.”[1]

Stefan Kuhl, in *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism and German National Socialism*, gives a sense of the scale of this project. Ralph Scott of the University of Northern Iowa, who insisted that black students held back white students in integrated schools, was given \$40,000 by the Pioneer Fund in the 1970s. William Shockley, who proposed that the state pay “intellectually inferior” people to be sterilised, was given \$179,000 in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Guggenheim Fellow Philippe Rushton, who argued for the existence of mental differences between whites, Asians and blacks, received \$250,000 in the late 1980s.[2]

It was the Pioneer Fund which founded *Mankind Quarterly*. Richard

Lynn has been the fund’s director since 2012. In Saini’s book, the original editorial staff of *Mankind Quarterly* is described as “Probably the most significant coterie of fascist intellectuals in the postwar United States and perhaps in the entire history of the country.”[3]

Mankind Quarterly contributors have played vital roles in far-right politics. Jared Taylor founded the magazine *American Renaissance*, supported by City University of New York Professor Michael Levin, another *Mankind Quarterly* writer and recipient of Pioneer Fund money. According to Saini, Levin told an audience at the American Renaissance Foundation, “The two principal race differences I see are race differences in intelligence and motivation … it’s no wonder there are very few black scientists.”[4]

Carl’s work is cited by far-right sites like the Daily Caller, Free West Media and InfoWars. Kirkegaard is publicised on the neo-Nazi forum Stormfront. Rindermann has a following on Unz Review, VDARE and The New Observer. These facts give the lie to the claim that he is a defenceless lone researcher. A network of pseudo-scientists stands behind him, to say nothing of the support of a phalanx of journalists and political figures, writing in some of Britain’s major national newspapers.

Carl’s fellow attendee at the London Conference on Intelligence, Toby Young, was the government’s first choice to run the newly established Office for Students in 2018. In 2017, Carl was invited to present a paper to the Adam Smith Institute, an organisation at the centre of government policy in the UK since Margaret Thatcher’s day and named one of the top-10 most influential think tanks outside the US by *Foreign Policy* magazine. The title of Carl’s paper was “Lackademia: Why do academics lean left?” It sought to justify the litany of articles now claiming that serious research is being shut down by a culture of “authoritarian leftism.”

Among these are “Universities have caved in to [the] dogma and thuggery of left-wing bullies” and “Left-wing hate mobs can’t stand free speech,” published by the *Times*, and Steven Glover’s article in the *Daily Mail*, accusing universities of producing “a left-wing fifth column.” Carl’s Adam Smith paper was reported in the *Telegraph*. Several of his other published research articles push the same agenda, including “Does Activism in Social Science Explain Conservatives’ Distrust of Scientists?,” “How Stifling Debate Around Race, Genes and IQ Can Do Harm” and “The left-liberal skew of Western media.” Just last month, he was a prize speaker at a “Freedom of Speech Conference” organised at Oxford by the conservative Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology, Nigel Biggar.

Carl is playing a significant role in the attempt to—in Biggar’s words—create a right-wing “counter spiral” in mainstream academia. As for the tears shed over Carl’s endangered career, he is already well established on the right-wing lecture circuit, where his profile will be lucratively enhanced by his newfound status as a martyr.

We want to make as clear as possible our view that the appeal to so-called “academic freedom” is bogus. On May 11, we published an article on the *World Socialist Web Site* reporting Carl’s dismissal and congratulating the St Edmund’s students on their important victory over the far-right campaign in the universities. This prompted one reader to comment:

“To pretend that student initiatives to remove a noxious academic are in any way progressive, and not sponsored by college authorities as a means of increasing their power, is to lie in the most dishonest manner.

“Freedom of opinion, expression and speech is meaningless unless one extends it to one’s opponents. To refuse to extend it, on the glib argument that rightists dishonour the cause of free speech, is a pure capitulation … It is to refuse to take the ideological struggle to the class enemy, and instead hand the authorities a bureaucratic means of preventing that struggle.

“WSWS should be promoting the widest and the wisest possible debate on Mr Carl’s disgusting ideas … to try to short-cut it now only reveals shocking cowardice in the realm of theory, and just-as-shocking

kowtowing to student and elite hysteria on campus.”

This response, which echoes the line pushed by Spiked, is based on the false precept that freedom of speech means freedom from questioning or consequence: anything goes and should be up for polite discussion. In practice this means abandoning the field to the far right now being given a platform by the various institutions of the ruling elite.

The attempt to liken opposition to these developments to censorship or an assault on free speech is risible. Precisely how are members of major universities, supported by the state, with published works, newspaper articles and large social media followings to their name being denied the right to have their views heard? Students at Cambridge and the academics who supported them used *their* freedom of speech to bring the substance of Carl’s work to public attention and stop the university legitimizing and facilitating his politically reactionary agenda. That is precisely the sort of progressive end that the democratic right to freedom of speech is intended to achieve.

As for the claim to “academic freedom”: How many flat-earthers are allowed into geology departments? There is no inalienable right to use a prestigious research fellowship to produce and support pseudo-science.

What does Carl’s letter attacking the student protestors at Cambridge accuse his opponents of doing?—“Petitioning,” “Teaming up with activist academics,” “Coordinating with student journalists,” “Coordinating with the Student Union,” “Organising public protests,” “Organising weekly protests” and then what is described as “Boycotting the investigation itself”—that is, criticising its initial composition of unqualified individuals close to the college administration.[5]

Is there any element of democratic protest that Carl deems acceptable? There can be no clearer statement of the right’s intentions on the campuses. Students are to be muzzled while reactionary ideologues get on with fuelling a rightward lurch in bourgeois politics.

Carl’s appointment at one of the world’s most renowned universities was a major step in the campaign underway to secure bastions in academia from which to promote far-right politics. The crucial point now is to identify the underlying social processes driving these developments.

From the very beginning, Social Darwinism has been bound up closely with those interests opposed to an egalitarian, socialist transformation of society. The Dutch socialist, Anton Pannekoek, wrote in a 1912 essay, “Marxism and Darwinism” about how the bourgeoisie tried to claim “from natural law what social form is natural and applicable”—that is, the “survival of the fittest,” the “struggle of each against all” for survival. Against the laws of social evolution worked out by Marx, they asserted the “natural order” of capitalism.

Pannekoek quotes Ernst Haeckel, a German scientist and bourgeois politician, who claimed in 1892:

“Darwinism, or the theory of selection, is thoroughly aristocratic; it is based upon the survival of the best. The division of labour brought about by development causes an ever greater variation in character, an ever greater inequality among the individuals, in their activity, education and condition. The higher the advance of human culture, the greater the difference and gulf between the various classes existing. Communism and the demands put up by the Socialists in demanding an equality of conditions and activity is synonymous with going back to the primitive stages of barbarism.”[6]

In England, social theorist Herbert Spencer was writing, “In the animal world, the old, weak and sick are ever rooted out and only the strong and healthy survive. The struggle for existence serves therefore as a purification of the race, protecting it from deterioration. This is the happy

effect of this struggle, for if this struggle should cease and each one were sure of procuring its existence without any struggle whatsoever, the race would necessarily deteriorate. The support given to the sick, weak and unfit causes a general race degeneration ... Among men and domestic animals sickness and weakness are so general because the sick and weak are preserved. Socialism, having as its aim to abolish the struggle for existence in the human world, will necessarily bring about an ever growing mental and physical deterioration.”[7]

Everything produced politically out of the eugenics movement, for all its claims to be responding to developments in science, comes back to this reactionary perspective: the strong and deserving grow wealthy and rule over the poor; the strong nations or races dominate the weak.

The ideology came to prominence in the first half of the 20th century, specifically in response to the explosive growth of the socialist movement and the ratcheting up of inter-imperialist tensions. As Daniel Kevles explains in his book *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*, “Essential to that [the creation of a eugenicist movement] were the social changes straining both Britain and the United States after the turn of the century.”[8]

Where Marxism explained the impoverishment of the working class by the exploitation of the capitalist, eugenics retaliated with the claim that the poor were simply of inferior stock. A contributor to the *Yale Review* in 1913 wrote, “Statistics have shown a rapid and steady increase in the ratio of pauperism, insanity and crime ... proving that the support of these defectives has become a veritable burden upon the taxpaying community.” In Britain, during the Great Depression, a Joint Committee on Mental Deficiency reported that there were some 300,000 “mental defectives” in the country and defined the poorest 10 percent of the population as a “social problem group.”

Against socialist internationalism, race science demonised and denigrated other nations or supposed “races.” In the US, leading eugenicists Charles Davenport—who believed procreation between blacks and whites led to biological and cultural degradation—and Harry Laughlin—who once suggested sterilising the “bottom” 10 percent of American society—played the central role in passing the viciously xenophobic Immigration Act of 1924.

Social Darwinist ideology justified brutal wars abroad and authoritarian violence at home.

The counterrevolutionary wave reached its fullest and most devastating expression in Germany, where socialism was a powerful and, to the ruling class, terrifying political force. The Nazis were brought to power to obliterate the Marxist movement and pursue a murderous expansion of German imperialism. The anti-socialist heart of race science and Social Darwinism was given voice in Adolf Hitler’s psychopathic rants against “communist subhumans,” the “Asiatic Soviet Union” and “Judeo-Bolshevism.”

In the name of “purifying” and creating “living space” for the Aryan “master race,” the Third Reich sought to exterminate or enslave peoples its scientists and politicians had designated “Untermensch,” or subhuman. This campaign, centred on the Wehrmacht’s war of annihilation in the East, claimed the lives of 6 million Jews in the Holocaust and 11 million others, including 4.5 million Soviet citizens, 3 million Soviet prisoners of war, up to 3 million Poles, half a million Serbs, 250,000 disabled people and up to 500,000 Romani people.

The Nazis realised the genocidal potential of eugenics. There is no impenetrable wall between Social Darwinism and fascism. Just look at the original editorial staff of *Mankind Quarterly*.

Corrado Gini, of Gini coefficient fame, was a close colleague of Benito Mussolini and key architect of his regime. In 1927, he published a book titled *The Scientific Basis of Fascism* and in 1929 he founded the Italian Committee for the Study of Population Problems. He believed in an “organicist” theory of nations—which held that younger, fitter nations

should overcome older, decaying ones—and supported Mussolini and Hitler in World War II.

British academic Roger Pearson believed in a supposed survival of the fittest competition between the races. He founded the Neo-Nazi Northern League in the 1950s, to “save the Nordic Race” from “forces which would mongrelize our race and civilization.”

Most revealing of all, Otmar von Verschuer was a German eugenicist and advocate of “racial hygiene” and of compulsory sterilisation. He was director of the Institute for Genetic Biology and Racial Hygiene from 1935 to 1942 and director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics from 1942 to 1948. Here he tutored Nazi war criminal Josef Mengele, who went on to conduct deadly human experiments as the camp physician at Auschwitz.

Verschuer used blood and bone samples from Jewish and Roma people murdered in the camps in his own research. After the war, he attempted to re-establish his research institution, but had his requests denied by the responsible commission on the basis that “Verschuer should be considered not as a collaborator, but one of the most dangerous Nazi activists of the Third Reich.” He nevertheless went on to become a genetics researcher and a lifetime member of the American Eugenics Society.

After the Second World War, these activities were forced into the shadows. The unimaginable atrocities of the Third Reich dealt race science and eugenics a shattering blow. They should never again have recovered—and amongst the overwhelming mass of humanity they never have.

Yet here we are today: a coterie of eugenicists and their supporters are gaining confidence and influence less than a century later. Fundamentally, this confirms that the postwar period of carefully ameliorated class antagonisms, reduced inequality and rising standards of life was only an historical episode. The humane development of society could not be carried out on a capitalist basis.

From the late 1960s, as the basic laws of capitalist development began to reassert themselves, an all-out assault was already being launched on the reforms gained by the working class. After several decades, this offensive has recreated the social conditions of the early 20th century.

The UN reports that one-fifth of the UK population live in poverty. In the US and Germany, migrants and asylum seekers are rounded up and placed in militarised detention camps. Global inequality is at unprecedented levels. Criminal wars are waged in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria, while conflicts between the US, Europe, Iran, Venezuela, China and Russia threaten a global conflagration. Across the world, far-right forces are being cultivated as shock troops against a resurgence of working-class struggle which now threatens to break the nationalist stranglehold of the labour bureaucracies.

The revival of fascist ideologies is a product of these immense social shifts. Kevles explains that the return of eugenics from the late 1960s “coincided with a sea change in the Anglo-American sociopolitical environment. What had long been assumed—namely, that the principle cause of social pathology was nurture rather than nature—was once again under challenge.” This was reflected, says Kevles, “in the political trend that eventually put Ronald Reagan and Thatcher in office.”[9]

In her book, Saini quotes researcher Kevin Hurt, who explains, “I think there was a whole sequence of events between the late 1980s and the present in which these ideas [of race science] ... were step-by-step progressing, re-establishing themselves.”[10]

In Germany today, Professor of Eastern European History at Humboldt University, Jörg Baberowski, has claimed in *Der Spiegel*, “Hitler was not a psychopath, he was not vicious. He did not want to talk about the extermination of the Jews at his table.” In the same article, Baberowski defended discredited extreme right-wing historian Ernst Nolte, who claimed in the 1980s that the Soviet Union forced the Nazis’ war of annihilation in the East on the Wehrmacht. Baberowski has also held a

lecture to commemorate the Nazi jurist Carl Schmitt and earlier this year he established a think tank to research “Dictatorships as alternative political orders.” He is a vocal defender of the extreme right Alternative for Germany [AfD] and a vicious opponent of migration and asylum.

The International Youth and Students for Social Equality in Germany have opposed Baberowski’s agenda at every turn, exposing his falsifications and reactionary agenda. We have called numerous public meetings on the topic, run in student elections, organised street campaigns and fought and won court cases. All with the aim of mobilising a popular movement of workers and youth against this attempt to revive the darkest period of German history.

The response from the media and the political classes has been severe. Opponents of Baberowski, above all our members, have been accused in the national press of “mobbing” a distinguished academic. The Humboldt University administration, led by Social Democratic Party [SPD] politician Sabine Kunst, has labelled us “extremists” and demanded we and other students cease criticising Baberowski.

Meanwhile the professor himself rages, “With a loaded moral pistol, the dictatorship of political correctness compels the citizen to express only the views of which it approves.” Baberowski has sought to whip up groups of fascist thugs to disrupt our meetings. The far right internationally are all singing from the same hymn sheet.

As this speech was being written, the news came through that the German government had explicitly defended Baberowski. Science Minister Anja Karliczek wrote, “In Germany, the freedom of scholarship is a fundamental right. [...] This also includes the imposition of other opinions. Opinions like those of Professor [Herfried] Münkler and Professor Baberowski from Berlin [...] who were attacked.”[11]

Most serious of all, our party has been placed on the watchlist of the German secret service, by people in direct discussions with the AfD.

As proof of how deeply connected the Cambridge and Humboldt situations are, we have the figure of SPD politician Thilo Sarrazin. In 2010, Sarrazin published a foul anti-migrant book titled *Germany Abolishes Itself*, which argued that Muslim immigrants to Germany had low intelligence, were naturally more dependent on welfare and threatened to outbreed “native” Germans. A key inspiration for this diatribe was the work of one of Carl’s co-authors, Heiner Rindermann. Sarrazin is a member of Baberowski’s “Right-wing Salon” discussion group.

Fascism and eugenics are ideological siblings, both born of a bourgeois politics rapidly shedding its democratic pretensions in the face of mounting war dangers and escalating class tensions.

The witch-hunt on the campuses will make way for an evisceration of democratic rights throughout society, of which the ongoing persecution of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange is a dire prelude. Writing on Assange’s despicable treatment by the mainstream media, esteemed investigative journalist John Pilger has referred to “Vichy journalism”—after the government that served and enabled the Nazi occupiers of France. In Carl, Baberowski and the rest, we have Vichy academics.

Our book on the Baberowski affair and the revival of fascism in Germany asks the question: “Why are they back?” The answer is that the ruling class’ assault on workers’ living standards and pursuit of insane wars requires these ideologues and the far-right mobs they inspire. Author Christoph Vandreier explains, “The return of dictatorship and war is the product of fundamental tendencies within capitalist society and not merely the subjective desire of a few right-wing extremist and neo-Nazi individuals ... [T]hese tendencies have seized the entire political establishment in one form or another. While the media promotes warmongering and xenophobia, and professors trivialise the Nazis’ crimes, the grand coalition of the CDU, CSU and SPD enforces these policies in practice.”[12]

The fight against Baberowski and his ilk has been based on turning students and young people to the working class and the struggle for socialism. It is this social force that will suffer the worst effects of far-right victories, has a fundamental interest in overthrowing a social order based on systemic inequality and has the revolutionary capacity to do so.

The same must be done here in Cambridge. The resurgence of toxic right-wing ideologies in academia points to the urgent need to build a mass socialist movement in the working class to avert a new descent into fascist barbarism. That is the political perspective which the International Youth and Students for Social Equality fights for and which we urge you to take up.

[1] Saini, Angela, *Superior: the Return of Race Science*, 4th Estate: London, 2019, p. 102.

[2] Kuhl, Stefan, *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism and German National Socialism*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1994, pp. 6-9.

[3] Saini, p. 102.

[4] Saini, pp. 127-128.

[5] Carl, Noah, “Intimidation Tactics Used by Student Activists at St Edmund’s College”, *Medium*, May 17, 2019

[6] Cited in Pannekoek, Anton, “Marxism and Darwinism”, *Marxist Internet Archive*

[7] Cited in *ibid.*

[8] Kevles, Daniel, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*, Harvard University Press: London, 1995, p. 72.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

[10] Saini, p. 120.

[11] Cited in Stern Johannes, “German Government Defends Right-wing Extremist Professor Jörg Baberowski”, *World Socialist Web Site*, June 5, 2019

[12] Vandreier, Christoph, *Why Are They Back: Historical Falsification, Political Conspiracy and the Return of Fascism in Germany*, Mehring Books: Peterborough, 2019, p. 125.



To contact the WSWS and the Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact