

The Idea Of Race And Racial Differences

Burhan Ozfidan

Zirve University, burhan4977@hotmail.com

Omer Ugurlu,

Istanbul University, omerugurlu1@gmail.com

Abstract

This study has explained the scientific validity of race with biological approach (IQ and gene profile) with its criticism in sociology and anthropology. In exploring the scientific validity of race the researchers will give emphasis to the works on intelligence quotient (IQ) and genetic aspects (Alland, 2004; Graves, 2006; Herrnstein & Murray, 1996; Lynn, 2008). Race is mostly used to classify human beings in large and distinct populations by cultural, ethnic, genetic, geographical, historical, religious, or social affiliation (Abercrombie, Hill, & Turner, 1984). Many debates on race have increased and have major effects on the development of race as a scientific area such as biological race, cultural race, anthropological race (Banton, 1998). First of all, this study will examine some historical background of race and distinction between race and ethnicity. Next, the researchers will explore mental abilities as highlighted by IQ showing a discrepancy among racial groups. In the third section of the study, the researchers will focus on genetically distinguished populations. As a result of this study, scientific validity of race implies that different branches of science on the subject of human distinction lack concurrence. Some branches of anthropology and sociology have a strong consensus on race, but some branches of biology recognize the word race by IQ score and some of them link race and gene.

Key Words: Race, IQ, Ethnicity, Gene

İrk Fikri ve İrksal Farklılıklar

Özet

Bu çalışma biyolojik bir yaklaşımla ırkın bilimsel geçerliğini sosyoloji ve antropolojideki eleştirisiyle açıklamaktadır (Zeka katsayısı, IQ, ve Gen profiliyle). İrkin bilimsel geçerliğini keşfetmede, araştırmacılar IQ ve genetik yönler üzerine yapılan çalışmalara vurgu yapmışlardır (Alland, 2004; Graves, 2006; Herrnstein & Murray, 1996; Lynn, 2008). İrk insanları etnik, genetik, coğrafik, tarihi, dini, ve sosyal ilintilerini kullanarak büyük ve ayrı topluluklar halinde sınıflandırmada çoğunlukla kullanılır (Abercrombie, Hill, & Turner, 1984). İrk üzerine birçok tartışma yaşanmaktadır ve bu tartışmalar biyolojik ırk, kültürel ırk, antropolojik ırk gibi bilimsel bir alanın gelişmesinde önemli etkileri vardır (Banton, 1998). İlk başta bu çalışma ırkın tarihi arka planını ve ırk ve etnisiteyi inceleyecektir. Daha sonra, IQ tarafından ırksal gruplar arasındaki farklılıkları göstererek zihinsel kabiliyetleri inceleyecektir. Çalışmanın üçüncü kısmında, araştırmacılar genetik olarak farklılaşmış topluluklara odaklanacaklardır. Bu çalışmanın sonucunda, ırkın bilimsel geçerliği insan farklılığı konusunda bilimin farklı dallarının bir rekabet eksikliği ima etmektedir. Antropoloji ve sosyolojinin bazı branşları ırk üzerine hemfikirdir. Fakat biyolojinin bazı branşları dünya ırkını IQ puanıyla tanımakta ve bazıları ırk ve gen arasında bağlantı kurmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İrk, IQ, Etnisite, Gene

Introduction

Race is mostly used to classify human beings in large and distinct populations by cultural, ethnic, genetic, geographical, historical, religious, or social affiliation (Abercrombie et al., 1984). Many debates on race have increased and have major effects on the development of race as a scientific area such as biological race, cultural race, anthropological race (Banton, 1998).

The concept of race goes long way back to the 17th century scientific thought (Freeman, 1998). Initially, this term was often used in taxonomy and genetics to indicate inherently distinguished human populations defined by physical differences (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). In this context, racial classes were founded on externally apparent traits, above all skin colour and facial scrub features, as well as in the form and size of the head and body (Banton, 1998). The belief was that constant visible traits shaped the measure of all other traits in an individual (Thompson & Hickey, 2005).

Despite the fact that natural researchers use the notion of race to make distinctions among phenotypes, other voices within the scientific world suggest that the idea of race is often used in an unsophisticated way (Keita et al., 2004). The claim of this position is that all human beings belong to the same species, 'Homo sapiens' or 'subspecies' (Keita et al., 2004, p. 18). At the same time, definitions of race do not have any standards because various social ideas and groupings of race have arisen over time (Montagu, 1997). Some scholars (Alland, 2004; Barker, 2011; Gould, 1996; Graves, 2005; Montagu, 1997; Nisbett, 1998) carry on to discuss which racial categories are naturally necessary and which ones are socially constructed, as well as the extent to which the truths about race should be recognized for society to understand and address racism adequately.

There are many scientific aspects to demonstrate the validity of race. Indicators of intelligence quotient (IQ) and genetic studies can moot human beings' race and explain racism. This field is contradictory and complex. For this reason, in this study, the researchers argue that the idea of race and racial difference can be scientifically valid from biological, sociological and anthropological perspectives. In exploring the scientific validity of race the researchers will give emphasis to the works on intelligence quotient (IQ) and genetic aspects (Alland, 2004; Graves, 2006; Herrnstein & Murray, 1996; Lynn, 2008). In addition, the researchers will provide some criticism from the opposing part (Barker, 2011; Montagu, 1997; Nisbett, 1998) to support concepts of race. In this regard, this study has three main sections. The first section will cover some historical background of race and distinction

between race and ethnicity. The second section will explore mental abilities as highlighted by IQ showing a discrepancy between racial groups. In the third section, the researchers will focus on genetically distinguished populations. In the second and third part, a critical perspective will be given to the issues discussed. Furthermore, this study will focus on debates on-going in the United States and Great Britain.

Historical Background

Race is a new concept. Ancient societies, although they came across and included people from many different parts of the world, they did not have any social distinctions based on bodily appearance (Smedley, 2007). People were distinguished according to traditions and beliefs (Smedley, 2007). For instance, Persian and Arabic races were mentioned in *The Travels of Marco Polo* where he travelled to the Middle East and Central Asia in order to introduce new traditions and religions (cited in Smedley, 2007). The meaning of the race used by Marco Polo defined traditions and beliefs of different ethnic groups. In this context, Montagu (1997) argues: "A study of the cultures and literatures of mankind, both ancient and recent, shows us that the conception of natural or biological races of mankind differing from one another mentally as well as physically, is an idea which was not born until the latter part of the eighteenth century" (p. 10-11). Conversely, many scientists (Morgan, 2003; Smedley, 2007) point out that contemporary race concepts are raised in the United States. According to the study in 2007 Smedly affirmed that it was created as an ideology within the American Slavery process from the 17th century onwards. America was explored by Europeans, but was inhabited by populations now known as Native Americans (Freeman, 1998; Smedley, 2007). Countless social inequalities between Blacks and Whites in America have been generated merely on the foundation of race (Freeman, 1998; Smedley, 2007). This conflict continued for many years; because of cultural discrimination, strong nationalism created the foundation of racial discrimination in America between Blacks and Whites (Smedley, 2007).

The mentioned racial interaction between White and Black people constituted the first debate on contemporary concepts of race (Morgan, 2003). After the first and second wave of African immigration to America, the racism suffered by these immigrants raised a massive debate in American society (Freeman, 1998). For this reason, race has been possibly the only defining social issue in the history of America (Freeman, 1998). A civil war was fought (1861- 1865) as part of the slavery debate; the 'Emancipation Proclamation' was signed in 1863 by Abraham Lincoln, and reforms followed the Emancipation Proclamation (Freeman,

1998, p. 2). The ‘Supreme Court’ resolution in 1896 ‘reversed’ advantages introduced reforms and recognized “separate-but-equal” as the law of the land (Freeman, 1998, p. 2). Suitable separation was preserved until the 1960s when the ‘civil movement’ in effect (re) established equality under the law for all Americans. These past proceedings influenced the resolve of racism this country (Freeman, 1998, p. 2). All these events in the United States constituted the roots of the concept of race. For these reasons, scientists have tried to explain the race in science to prevent conflicts between individuals.

Many scholars and researchers (Fish, 2010; Gould, 1996; Montagu, 1997; Nisbett, 1998) discuss concepts of race such as race relations, and racial differences after a long time from racial separation in the United States. For instance, in a study 2010, Fish suggests that race in the biological sense does not exist, then people should rethink about who they are, how they have been understanding each other, and how they have been viewing others and related to them (Fish, 2010). Naturally, humankind enables continued existence of the species (Montagu, 1997). At the same time, inherently, people have been interacting with each other. Individuals have started to define differences between people racially or ethnically (Montagu, 1997; Thompson & Hickey, 2005). In addition, many individuals think that race is only about the structure of human biology. Both sociologists and anthropologists point out those things are not essentially what they appear to be (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). Especially, race and ethnicity are deeply held story that are wrong in social understanding. Bias and discrimination were most serious social problems in the United States as well as globally in the last century because of different beliefs about human race (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). For this reason, the concept of race has a few different scientific explanations such as biological and social races.

Furthermore, in the last decade race has been discussed in sociology, anthropology and biology. Accordingly, race plays a large role in everyday human interactions, and scientists want to study this field. Due to this reason race is identified by each discipline within their specific approach (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). For example, biologists define concepts of race very differently from sociologists or anthropologists.

Difference Definitions of Race in Science

According to biologists, “biological race is a population that differs from others in the frequency of certain hereditary traits” (Thompson & Hickey, 2005, p. 260). Templeton (2008) defines race as follows:

Race is a distinct evolutionary lineage within a species. This definition requires that a subspecies be genetically differentiated due to barriers to genetic exchange that have persisted for long periods of time; that is, the subspecies must have historical continuity in addition to current genetic differentiation. (cited in Keita et al., 2004, p.468)

The biological notion of race defined in the quotation above implies that people are hereditarily distinguished. Indeed, a widely held genographic investigation project that traces out DNA indicates that everybody in the world can be hereditarily mapped out to a group of people in Africa around 60,000 years ago (Wells, 2002; cited in Thompson & Hickey, 2005).

On the other hand, according to sociologists, race is a social conception, and races are classes of individuals separate from others because of socially defined physical characteristics (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). Furthermore, sociologists claim that race or ethnic relations are the explanation of sociological inquiry (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). The sociology of race tried to reframe racial relations from the biological perspective (Abercrombie et al., 1984). This way, the sociology of race contributes with the specific sociological perspective to major debates on race and ethnicity. For example, sociological race research in Britain has occasionally been assessed for viewing ethnic cultures primarily from the viewpoint of the main culture (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). Thus, standard white stereotypes have been innocently imposed on coloured minorities, and white racism existing in economic and political structures has been neglected (Abercrombie et al., 1984). The sociological approach on race frequently looks at the interaction between social class and ethnicity in social stratification; for this reason we should clearly distinguish ethnicity from race. This is very important to understand the concept of race.

The Difference between Race and Ethnicity

The actual concept of ethnicity derives from the Greek ‘ethnikos’, the adjective of ‘ethnos’(Cashmore, 1996, p. 142), this denotes individuals or nation. In the contemporary form, ethnic still retains this basic meaning in the sense that it defines a group having some degree of consistency and harmony composed of people who are aware of having common roots and interests (Cashmore, 1996). As a result, an ethnic group is not a simple collective of people or a sector of a population, but a ‘self-conscious’ group of people united, or faithfully linked, by common experiences (Cashmore, 1996, p. 142).

Race, primarily, is a grouping system that describes human beings into great and separate people or groups by functional, cultural, ethnic, genetic, geographical, historical, linguistic, religious, or social relationship(Thompson & Hickey, 2005).

A strong relationship between ethnicity and race has been reported in the definitions above. However, race and ethnicity are not synonyms. Moreover, common roots and interests of individuals imply that ethnicity is about custom, learned activities and traditions and celebrating the traditions and ideas that are part of that region where individuals come from (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). On the contrary, race usually refers to biological and regional alterations. For example, anyone can be born Turkish, but it does not mean that they are not obliged to comprise Jewish traditions and religious beliefs.

A considerable amount of literature has been published on race and racial classification. Some of these studies (Herrnstein & Murray, 1996; Jensen, 1998; Lynn, 2008) have shown that race can be explained by IQ, but some sociologists and anthropologists (Gould, 1996; Montagu, 1997; Nisbett, 1998) claim that racial differences can be explained completely on account of social and economic inequities. These researchers criticized measuring human beings' race by IQ. All above-mentioned researchers aim to explain the scientific validity of race and racial difference in their specific approach. However, both sociology and anthropology naturally do not agree with biology about race in modern debate. In the last decades, measuring of race with IQ has been a very popular matter of debate between these disciplines.

Scientific Validity of Race and Its Debates

1. Intelligence quotient (IQ). Comprehensive examination of race by Gould (1996) classifies humans into distinct races within biological determinism. As he argues: “the claim that worth can be assigned to individuals and groups by measuring intelligence as a single quantity” (p.52). In the meantime, he draws attention to conceptualizing the biological difference showing how mental abilities create a discrepancy between racial groups. According to Gould (1996), European scientists have categorized white people as the most intelligently able, a common belief among certain scientists that has been grounds in scientific racism. This view gained wide success with the increasing of IQ testing which defined the average IQ test scores of racial groups (Gould, 1996). For instance, one of the world's most well-known scientists, James Watson, suggested that black people were less intelligent than white people (Milmo, 2007). Watson's statement caused massive confusion, because he inferred that black people were genetically inferior to white people. Watson

stated: “inherently gloomy about the prospect of Africa because all our social policies are based on the fact that their intelligence is the same as ours — whereas all the testing says not really”(Milmo, 2007) . At the same time, Watson published his ideas about race in his book, where he emphasized: "There is no firm reason to anticipate that the intellectual capacities of peoples geographically separated in their evolution should prove to have evolved identically. Our wanting to reserve equal powers of reason as some universal heritage of humanity will not be enough to make it so" (Milmo, 2007). These views are supported by Arthur Jensen (1969) who wrote that a 15-point difference in I.Q. between blacks and whites was mostly due to a genetic difference between the races that possibly will never be removed (Nisbett, 2007).

In the same way, some intellectuals (Herrnstein & Murray, 1996; Jensen, 1998; Lynn, 2008) consider that race can be valid in biological terms, particularly within intelligence quotient. For example, Richard Lynn, who is the author of *The Bell Curve*, has claimed that such differences have an important genomic factor between black and white people. Lynn (2008) supported his view with some scholars from the past such as the seventeenth century British authors who stated that blacks are less intelligent than whites. Lynn stated as follows:

I am apt to suspect that Negroes, and in general all other species of men (for there are four or five different kinds) to be naturally inferior to whites. There never was a civilized nation of any other complexion than white, nor even any individual, either in action or speculation. No ingenious manufacture amongst them, no arts, no sciences. (Lynn, 2008, p. 84)

The foundations of David Hume’s discourse dated back to 1555 when the first blacks came to England from Ghana. The British slave trade began after this time. According to (Lynn, 2008), many of these people became beggars on the streets of London. The government looked upon them as a serious social problem. The main purpose of these debates in Britain was to find out why black people were always a problem in the streets of London. After many years, this situation has become the research field explored by the authors of *The Bell Curve*.

In another major study, Jensen (1998) found that African-American IQ scores had failed, and that it was expected that these scores never improved. He found that 80% of the difference in IQ in the people studied was the result of genetics. Moreover, in the United States, Herrnstein and Murray (1996) pointed out that white people are at the top of socioeconomic hierarchy with the top average IQ (103) and the highest socioeconomic

positions and incomes, while Hispanics are next with an average IQ of 89 and intermediate socioeconomic position and incomes. Blacks have the lowest average IQ of 85 and the lowest socioeconomic position and incomes (Herrnstein & Murray, 1996). This study provided to argue that the racial socioeconomic hierarchy is mainly based on differences in intelligence. Besides, (Lynn, 2008) pointed out that race differences in education and other social outcomes and differences matched for IQs in the United States as follows ;

	Social outcomes	Blacks	Hispanics	Whites
1	College degree	11	10	27
2	Matched for IQ	68	49	50
3	Poverty	26	18	7
4	Matched for IQ	11	9	6
5	Unemployment	21	14	10
6	Matched for IQ	15	11	11
7	Illegitimacy	62	23	12
8	Matched for IQ	51	17	10
9	Welfare	49	30	13
10	Matched for IQ	30	15	12
11	Crime	13	6	2
12	Matched for IQ	5	3	2

Source: (Herrnstein & Murray, 1996, p. 14)

All rows in this table show that the principal reason of poverty, unemployment, illegitimacy, college degree, welfare, crime has to do with low IQ and an evident gap can be seen between Blacks, Hispanics and Whites.

Criticism of IQ

As argued above by Herrnstein & Murray, 1996 Jensen, 1998 and Lynn, 2008, IQ differences between blacks and whites have genetic factors and the IQ test, developed early in the 20th century, re-enforced this view, since whites scored higher than blacks (Nisbett, 2007). However, (Nisbett, 1998) pointed out that people should not trust such deceptive and indirect outcomes when individuals have direct evidence about the foundation for the IQ. He highlighted that around 25% of the genetic factor in the American black people are European, the sense of this that the genetic factor of any individual can disperse from 100% African to regularly European (Nisbett, 2007). For instance, for the period of World War II, equally black and white American soldiers fathered children with German women. Consequently, a number of these children had 100% European heritage and some of them had considerable African-American heritage (Nisbett, 2007). Likewise, Nisbett (2007) claimed that the German children who had white fathers had an average I.Q. of 97, and those of the black fathers had an average of 96.5 in a test performed in later childhood in Germany. In this

regard, if hereditary factors are greater in European intelligence, then black people who have comparatively more European genetic factor should have higher I.Q. than those who have a more African genetic factor (Nisbett, 2007). Furthermore, Nisbett (2007) suggested that this kind of correlation could arise within environmental causes.

At the same time, this view supported by Gould (1996) leads to errors of biological reductionism and determinism such as the following meaningless statements: "intelligence is 60% genetic and 40% environmental" (p. 34). He maintained that 60% of the inheritance of intelligence comes to mean nothing. It does not mean that 29% is environmental and 71% genetic. Thus, Gould (1996) views interactionism as significant individual relationships in society.

Interactionism is the role of social interaction and how it reduces racial and ethnic hostility, and how race and ethnicity are socially constructed (Abercrombie et al., 1984). When causative features interrelate so complexly and produce an intricate adult being, certainly we cannot parse distant root causes of human behaviour into measurable percentages (Gould, 1996). A trait can be 90% heritable, yet completely flexible. In this context, a 60% bio-determinist approach is not subtle in interactionism. However, a determinist approach on this issue is still possible (Gould, 1996). As both (Gould, 1996) and (Nisbett, 2007) emphasized that genetic origins do not provide evidence for a relationship between IQ and heritage.

Another major study by Montagu (1997) stated that race does not mention about physically separable populations existing. The legend of race refers to the belief that bodily and mental qualities are connected, that 'physical differences' are linked with rather marked differences in 'mental capacities', and that these differences are measurable by IQ tests and cultural accomplishments of these populations. For this reason, Montague (1997) argues: "racial dogmas have been made basis for an inhumanity brutal political philosophy which has resulted in the death or social disfranchisement of millions of innocent human beings" (p. 13). His approach is more philanthropists; he emphasizes why people had died because of race distinction.

Consequently, many researchers, particularly natural scientists have defended measuring of race by IQ; on the other side, various intellectuals have criticized those differences between Blacks and Whites do not arise from genomic factors as IQ. Both sociologists and anthropologists suggest an explanatory theory for social race that social groups are social ideas, created by materials in their environments (Gould, 1996; Nisbett,

1998). Indeed, IQ is not alone in such a kind of debates about race and racial classification. For instance, there is another debate to indicate race that is genomic profile of people or individual.

1.race and genes. Another scientific way to look at racial differences between people is to measure hereditary differences by genes (Rushton, 1996). The connection amongst race and genetics is related to the on-going arguments about race. Genetic studies assist to specify the geographic lineage of an individual in the distant past (Cavalli-Sforza, Menozzi, & Piazza, 1994). In addition, Claude Levi-Strauss briefly explained racism as the belief that one race is biologically superior-that superior genes, genetic material, DNA was an improvement over all others (cited in Cavalli-Sforza et al., 1994). He stated that people genetic difference accrued many years ago, that most polymorphisms occur before the separation of beings into provinces (Cavalli-Sforza et al., 1994). Besides, he argued that the same polymorphisms are found in all people within the species (Graves, 2006). Furthermore, a short time ago, The Human Genome Project pointed out that individuals who have lived in the same environment for many generations may have some genes in common (McCann-Mortimer, Augoustinos, & LeCouteur, 2004) .

In general, personality traits (skin colour and physical appearances) are highlighted by human genetics (Cavalli-Sforza et al., 1994). Physical characteristics occur in a global scale, where groups take physical characters such as skin colour, hair texture, and other supplementary genetic traits and make them into important symbols to understand racial differences. In this sense, races may possibly seem to be about genes. However, according to Thompson and Hickey in 2005, all physical characters are in fact, “pseudo-biological classification systems.” (p. 261). A brief example might clarify this concept. When one parent is black and the other one is white, the child can be born hereditarily 50% white and 50% black in America (Thompson & Hickey, 2005). Another way to measure people's genes is the *Fixation Index* that was developed by geneticist Sewall Wright (Graves, 2006). This method is used to match differences between any two populations by measuring genetic differences between populations to individuals' genes (Graves, 2006). If the index of this method shows about 0.15, it means that it is likely that 85% of the difference measured in the general human population is found within beings of the same population, and about 15% of the variation occurs between the population (Graves, 2006). In this context, according to Graves (2006), the human genetic difference is real. Genetic difference describes that

individuals have ancestry in particular geographic regions are more likely to share genes than those from disparate regions.

Our primary concern is that racial categories are constructed from the indication of apparent traits. Especially, this claims bears on skin colour and physical appearance. In this context, ethnic groups are grounded on their belonging belief in their shared descent. According to Graves (2006), a passport is the only indication of someone's ethnic group, and sometime or other costume and names may show as signs of gender, class, religion or ethnicity as skin colour in the concept of racial classification.

Criticism of Gene

According to Patrinos (2004), particularly the US are founded by immigrants from different parts of the world, and they brought with them a subset of genes from their mother country. From this standpoint, the most direct characteristic of race is that most of them can be described as Caucasian, Asian or African. On the other hand, Patrinos (2004) claims that the term race does not define the most American people with the subtlety and complexity called to capture and raise the value of their genetic diversity. Furthermore, it needs to be pointed out that a migration movement impacts race and the concept of race is non-overlapping, blurred and obliterated in modern times (Gould, 1996).

Montagu (1997) maintains distinct categories of race beliefs often observed in different human groups. For example, Germans do not vary adequately from English or any other Western European people to explain their separations into a physical different population of diversity (Montagu, 1997). It was identified that all Western European people belong to the Caucasoid race, only some of them represented themselves with small local differences (Montagu, 1997). When we consider Eastern Europe, for example, amongst the Russians, the effect of Mongoloid blending is to this day apparent in a small extent of Russian far distant from the geographical environment of the Mongoloids (Montagu, 1997). But this mixture does not make such Russians members of a distinct race. Russia resembles from one side America since it has many different local types of human groups (Montagu, 1997). The majority of both countries belong to the white or Caucasoid group. Some people in Russia are clearly related to the Mongoloid group, and in America some are clearly of Negroid origin (Montagu, 1997). Furthermore, (Montagu, 1997) pointed out that many individuals have migrated from homeland to other parts of the World, they have made

inroads into miscegenation for many years. For this reason, it is difficult to say whether an individual belongs to the one major group or the other.

Conclusion & Recommendation

This study has explained the scientific validity of race with biological approach (IQ and gene profile) with its criticism in sociology and anthropology. All mentioned disciplines (sociology, anthropology and biology) have a consistent approach about race itself. The biological concept of IQ defines race in terms of individuals who are hereditarily distinguished. This outlook (Herrnstein & Murray, 1996; Lynn, 2008) increased wide request with the aggregate of IQ that was stated in the average IQ test scores of racial groups. On the other hand, sociologists and anthropologists (Montagu, 1997; Nisbett, 1998) pointed out that races are not classes of individuals distinct from others and neither race is not inferior than others and IQ is not an indicator of superiority. Furthermore, all beings are not the same; however, there are hereditary appearances such as hair, eye colour, size, facial traits, but as mentioned above, we cannot say easily there are main races such as Caucasoid and Negroid. Otherwise, some researchers in sociology and anthropology, for instance, Richard Nisbett, argue that the differences can be described completely by means of social and economic inequalities.

Scientific validity of race implies that different branches of science on the subject of human distinction lack concurrence. Some branches of anthropology and sociology have a strong consensus on race, but some branches of biology recognize the word race by IQ score and some of them link race and gene. Moreover, sociologists and anthropologists do not accept that the biological idea of race has any meaning to the study of society.

After this discussion, the researchers would like to recommend new race concepts. The term is produced by Martin Barker, as part of Margaret Thatcher's thoughts in the UK (Cole, 2005). Barker (2011) argues that the new racism desires to be democratic and respectable, and therefore denies that it is racism at all. The discourse of new racism was started as a new tendency of anti-immigration. Barker (2011) suggested that the main role of new racism had to cope with the typical authorized repudiation of racism. The purpose of new racism is to take the place of the old understandings of race and biology, together with the concept of cultural identity (Cole, 2005). All issues mentioned above are that the thoughts of social scientists on race and racism, which reflect my position, are scientifically valid.

References

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., & Turner, B. S. (1984). *Dictionary of sociology*: Penguin Books.
- Alland, A. (2004). *Race in mind: Race, IQ, and other racisms*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Banton, M. (1998). *Racial theories*: Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, M. (2011). The new racism: conservatives and the ideology of the tribe.
- Cashmore, E. (1996). *Dictionary of race and ethnic relations*: Routledge.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., Menozzi, P., & Piazza, A. (1994). *The history and geography of human genes*: Princeton university press.
- Cole, J. (2005). *The new racism in Europe: a Sicilian ethnography* (Vol. 107): Cambridge University Press.
- Fish, J. M. (2010). *The Concept of Race and Psychotherapy*: Springer.
- Freeman, H. P. (1998). The meaning of race in science--considerations for cancer research. *Cancer*, 82(1), 219-225.
- Gould, S. J. (1996). *The mismeasure of man*: WW Norton & Company.
- Graves, J. L. (2005). What We Know and What We Don't Know: Human Genetic Variation and the Social Construction of Race'. *Is Race Real*.
- Graves, J. L. (2006). What we know and what we don't know: Human genetic variation and the social construction of race. *Is Race "Real"*.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. A. (1996). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*: Free Press.
- Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The g factor: The science of mental ability*: Praeger Westport, CT.
- Keita, S., Kittles, R. A., Royal, C., Bonney, G. E., Furbert-Harris, P., Dunston, G. M., & Rotimi, C. N. (2004). Conceptualizing human variation. *Nature genetics*, 36, S17-S20.
- Lynn, R. (2008). *The global bell curve: Race, IQ, and inequality worldwide*: Washington Summit Publishers.
- McCann-Mortimer, P., Augoustinos, M., & LeCouteur, A. (2004). 'Race'and the Human Genome Project: constructions of scientific legitimacy. *Discourse & Society*, 15(4), 409-432.
- Milmo, C. (2007). Fury at DNA pioneer's theory: Africans are less intelligent than Westerners. *The Independent*, 17, 2007.
- Montagu, A. (1997). *Man's most dangerous myth: The fallacy of race*: AltaMira Press.
- Morgan, E. (2003). *American slavery, American freedom: The ordeal of colonial Virginia*: WW Norton & Company.
- Nisbett, R. E. (1998). Race, genetics, and IQ. *The Black-White test score gap*, 86-102.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2007). All brains are the same color. *New York Times*, 9.
- Patrinos, A. (2004). 'Race'and the human genome. *Nature genetics*, 36, S1-S2.
- Rushton, J. P. (1996). Race, evolution, and behavior: A life history perspective. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 141.
- Smedley, A. (2007). The history of the idea of race... and why it matters. *The American Anthropological Association*.
- Templeton, A. R. (2008). Human races: a genetic and evolutionary perspective. *American Anthropologist*, 100(3), 632-650.
- Thompson, W. E., & Hickey, J. V. (2005). *Society in focus: An introduction to sociology*.
- Wells, S. (2002). *The journey of man: A genetic odyssey*: Princeton University Press.