

Amy Rupert
May 8th, 2019
Columbia University and Slavery
Professor Thai Jones

Race Science at Columbia University in the Early 20th Century

Despite the belief that science is based in fact, reason, and exists independent of bias, history has proven time and time again that that belief is false, especially when it comes to biases such as race. It is not a unique declaration or revelation to state that racism is steeped in the development of modern Western medicine. In the United States, for hundred of years, scientists and doctors devoted time to searching for a scientific reason to prove black people and indigenous people were inferior to white people, as a scientific explanation that would rationalize and justify slavery and colonization. As arbiters of education and key players in scientific developments, colleges and universities, such as Columbia, played a key role in creating and perpetuating lies about the superiority or inferiority of various races, passed off as science. One of the key figures in perpetuating racist science—specifically race psychology—was Robert Sessions Woodworth, a Columbia professor of psychology in the early to mid-20th century¹. An examination of his personal life and education, his professional research and work, and his work as a mentor and editor show just how extensive his role—and the role of the university—was in perpetuating bad science about the psychology of various races.

1. Haggbloom, Steven J.; Warnick, Renee; Warnick, Jason E.; Jones, Vinessa K.; Yarbrough, Gary L.; Russell, Tenea M.; Borecky, Chris M.; McGahhey, Reagan; Powell III, John L.; Beavers, Jamie; Monte, Emmanuelle (2002). "The 100 most eminent psychologists of the 20th century" . *Review of General Psychology*. 139–152.

Before he took a faculty position at Columbia, he attended UMass Amherst where he focused his studies on math, religion, sciences, and history, eventually graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in 1891². During his time at Amherst, he was a brother in the fraternity Theta Delta Chi, charge (Theta Delta Chi calls each campus instance of the fraternity ‘charges’, rather than the more traditional term ‘chapter’) Mu Deuteron³. Upon graduation, he remained an involved and supportive alumnus of the Theta Delta Chi national organization through donations, at least, as there are numerous receipts of his donations in his personal archives⁴. He stayed in contact with other Mu Deuteron brothers from various years and pledge classes, mostly through pleasant, if mundane, correspondence. But, one notable find was a letter from another fraternity brother, Frank P. Stelling, to Woodworth, dated January 22, 1957. The letter is as follows (underlining and emphasis from the text):

“Dear Brother Woodworth,

I have just learned that a NEGRO was initiated into our Amherst chapter of Theta Delta Chi on 11-16-56.

This makes me not only boiling MAD but disgusted!

While in college at Amherst, my test of a prospective would be whether I would like him enough to take home to introduce to my FAMILY AND FRIENDS.

2. Ibid.

3. Theta Delta Chi Alumni Newsletter 1935, Robert Sessions Woodworth Archives, Box 1, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University.

4. Correspondence from Frank Stelling to Robert Woodworth January 22 1957, Box 1, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.

A NEGRO'S relation to me has always been either as a servant or employe [sic]—nought else!

May I ask you whether you are going to let the matter pass or ask that the National Charter be taken from Mu Deuteron?

Phi Kappa Psi and Phi Delta Theta have officially dropped their Amherst Chapters from their National organizations for reasons like the above.

There are ten National fraternities still refused [sic] at Amherst (including our own).

At your convenience, I await your reply!

Yours in the bonds,

Frank P. Stelling

Mu Deuteron 1913"⁵

Unfortunately, there is not a copy of Woodworth's reply—if he replied—in the archives. Two factors need to be considered when assessing the relationship Stelling likely had with Woodworth. Stelling and Woodworth attended Amherst at completely different times; Woodworth graduated in 1891 and Stelling is in the Mu Deuteron pledge class of 1913, which would make the chance they met at Amherst slim to impossible. And, judging from the lack of additional correspondence between Stelling and Woodworth, it's unlikely that Stelling wrote Woodworth because they were close friends. It's more likely that Stelling chose to write to Woodworth because Woodworth was a prominent and influential Amherst and Theta Delta Chi

5. Correspondence from Frank Stelling to Robert Woodworth January 22 1957, Box 1, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.

alum who may have had pull with the National Theta Delta Chi organization. Stelling's tone is also noteworthy; he is extremely candid with Woodworth, almost as if he assumes Woodworth will undoubtedly share his views. Which, if Stelling was familiar with Woodworth's work, would be a somewhat safe assumption to make.

Woodworth's higher education began at Amherst, and he would go on to pursue graduate studies in psychology at Harvard and Columbia⁶. After Columbia, he would spend a year at the University of Liverpool, where he would be offered professorship⁷. But, he ultimately took the professorship position offered to him at Columbia in 1904⁸. Before detailing Woodworth's work about race psychology during his time at Columbia, it's important to put his education and work into some kind of historical context by identifying other prominent figures in the race science and eugenics movement, the existing anthropological and psychological literature on the differences of various races, and how racial pseudoscience became such a popular science to study in the early 20th century in the United States.

6. Haggbloom, Steven J.; Warnick, Renee; Warnick, Jason E.; Jones, Vinessa K.; Yarbrough, Gary L.; Russell, Tenea M.; Borecky, Chris M.; McGahhey, Reagan; Powell III, John L.; Beavers, Jamie; Monte, Emmanuelle (2002). "The 100 most eminent psychologists of the 20th century". *Review of General Psychology*. 139–152.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

A Brief Overview of Race Science in the Early 20th Century

During the time Woodworth pursued his education, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, race science was a popular pseudoscience in the United States, and eugenics just was beginning to make its way across the Atlantic from England. Eugenics, a term meaning “good birth”, was first conceptualized by Francis Galton, an English scientist in the 1870’s⁹. Galton proposed that humans could inherit ‘traits’ from their parents—a very rudimentary understanding of heredity and genetics. Galton was reportedly fascinated with Darwin’s *Origin of the Species* (interestingly, Galton was also a cousin of Darwin’s) and used it as a foundation for his work, applying evolutionary theories—that were developed from observing animals—directly to humans¹⁰. Despite Galton’s efforts, eugenics was not a popular field of study in England¹¹. However, Charles Davenport, a biologist and mathematician, learned about Galton’s theories and took them to the United States, where they were wildly more popular than they had been in England¹².

Davenport combined Galton’s eugenic theories with his own rudimentary understanding of genetics, which he derived from the work of Gregor Mendel’s 19th century pea plant

9. Galton, Francis, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development* (London, England: Macmillan and Co., 1883), pp. 24–25.

10. Galton, Francis (1874). “On Men of Science, Their Nature and Their Nurture”. *Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain*. pp. 227–236.

11. Karl Pearson, “Life of Francis Galton” Vol 3A: image 470. 17 June 2006.

12. Allen, Garland E. “Charles Benedict Davenport”. *American National Biography Online*.

experiments¹³. Davenport saw these ideas as a possible method to “improve the human race”, and he sought to do further research on them, eventually becoming the director of the Cold Springs Harbor Laboratory in New York in 1904¹⁴. In 1910, Davenport would establish the Eugenics Records Office¹⁵. Davenport put these eugenic theories into practice, by first applying them to “feebleminded” people—an open-ended term which could encompass anything from epilepsy to developmental disorders that Davenport felt to be undesirable¹⁶. However, after reading *The Passing of the Great Race*, a work by Madison Grant (another Columbia alum), Davenport applied these theories to different races and ethnicities¹⁷. He eventually created a hierarchy of United States citizen with people of white western/northern European descent at the apex, as they were the most “racially pure”. Considering the legacy of slavery, and the desire by white Americans to find a scientific reason that proves the inferiority of various races, as a way to justify slavery, racism, and the construct of whiteness, it’s not surprising that other American scientists latched onto race science and eugenics.

While I did not find documentation that Woodworth claimed to be a eugenicist, he did have a fascination with “racial differences”, race science and psychology, and had close relationships with other eugenicists, such as Edward Thorndike, a psychology professor at

13. Ibid.

14. “Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory”. *History*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory. 2010. Retrieved 19 March 2011.

15. “The Eugenics Records Office at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory (1910-1939), The Embryo Project Encyclopedia.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

Teachers College¹⁸. And, shortly after his arrival to his position as professor at Columbia in 1904, Woodworth would have a unique opportunity to indulge this fascination on an unprecedented level.

The 1904 St. Louis World's Fair Experiments

On April 20th, 1904 the *Columbia Daily Spectator* printed a short paragraph titled “Anthropology Tests at St. Louis”¹⁹. The news blurb gives a brief overview of the completed construction of a “special lab” the “Columbia's Departments of Anthropology and Psychology” intended to use for the “measuring and testing of savages” at the World’s Fair in St. Louis, Missouri²⁰. The piece continues: “Many Filipinos, Indians, Patagonians and Africans will be put through physical and medical tests which are to be made the basis for permanent anthropological statistics. Mental tests will also be made upon these same races with a special view of ascertaining the rapidity with which the several tribes can grasp civilized ideas”²¹.

Woodworth, along with Columbia anthropology professor Franz Boas, was appointed head of this lab and conducting these experiments²². Frank Bruner, a graduate student in the Columbia psychology department, was appointed Woodworth’s assistant in conducting these

18. Haggblom, Steven J.; Warnick, Renee; Warnick, Jason E.; Jones, Vinessa K.; Yarbrough, Gary L.; Russell, Tenea M.; Borecky, Chris M.; McGahhey, Reagan; Powell III, John L.; Beavers, Jamie; Monte, Emmanuelle (2002). “The 100 most eminent psychologists of the 20th century”. *Review of General Psychology*. 139–152.

19. “Anthropology Tests at St. Louis”, *Columbia Daily Spectator*. April 20, 1904.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

experiments. Unfortunately, I have not yet uncovered the finer details of the experiments in Woodworth's archives, including the tests themselves, and the results of the experiments. However, I found documentation that at least 1,100 "primitives" and an unspecified number of white attendees of the World's Fair were tested by Woodworth and Bruner²³. The psychological component of the tests reportedly included having subjects complete a variety of simple puzzles, answer various questions, while the physical component of the tests included hearing and sight exams²⁴.

While I unfortunately do not have the results of the experiments, I found documentation in his archives that these results were of great interest to Woodworth, and other psychology professionals. Bruner used the results of the experiments, specifically the results of the hearing exams, as the basis for his 1908 thesis, titled "The Hearing of Primitive Peoples"²⁵. Woodworth would use the results as the basis for his work titled "Racial Differences in Mental Traits", which he first used in his 1909 address as Vice President to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in Boston, and later formally published in 1910²⁶. Woodworth reportedly kept the results of these experiments in his office for at least the next thirty years, and would revisit them regularly. I found corroborating evidence of this statement in the form of some correspondence from May 9, 1917 in which Woodworth applied for a grant to the amount

23. Columbia University Career Summary of Robert Sessions Woodworth from 1963, Box 5, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

26. Ibid.

of one hundred dollars from the American Association for the Advancement of Science for the explicit purpose of hiring a statistician to analyze the results from the 1904 World's Fair experiments²⁷. A letter from Woodworth, dated March 11, 1918 shows that, by that time, he used sixty five dollars of the allotted one hundred dollars in hiring a statistician, but Woodworth stated that "on account of the extra demands made on my time during the war, I have been unable to press this work to a conclusion but have not given up hope of doing so within a few months"²⁸.

Woodworth's interest in racial differences and race psychology did not stop at the results of the 1904 World's Fair experiments he conducted. As a Columbia professor, he was in a position to facilitate and guide various psychology studies, edit them, and publish them in a format that made them accessible to the wider scientific community. One of the ways he accomplished this was through the *Archives of Psychology*, a psychology journal published by Columbia University with Woodworth at the editor's helm from 1906 to 1948²⁹. During his tenure as editor, he would go on to publish a variety of studies on race psychology. All of them had elements of bad science and baseless assumptions about various races, which resulted in studies that varied from scientifically and factually questionable to outright unethical and rife with bad scientific practice.

27. Correspondence from the American Association for the Advancement of Science to Robert Sessions Woodworth May 9th 1917, Box 14, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.

28. Correspondence from Robert Sessions Woodworth to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, March 11th 1918, Box 14, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States

29. Columbia University Career Summary of Robert Sessions Woodworth from 1963, Box 5, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.

Editor and Mentor: *Archives of Psychology*

To be clear: the *Archives of Psychology* were not solely about race psychology; the publication covered a wide range of psychological studies³⁰. However, peppered in between more legitimate and factual studies were these studies on race psychology, which, by publishing them alongside legitimate psychological science, gave these studies on race psychology more credibility than they merited.

In order to show how flawed and unscientific these studies on race psychology are, I will examine the assumptions the researchers base their beliefs about race and humanity on, the methods and tests used, and the conclusions the researchers arrived at. Because the *Archives of Psychology* contain entirely too many studies on race psychology to examine them all individually (at this time), instead I selected only several to analyze.

“The Mental Capacity of the American Negro”

Published in 1913 by Marion Mayo, “The Mental Capacity of the American Negro” sought to examine the academic performance of white children and black children in New York City public schools in order to determine how races perform academically³¹. There are several

30. *Archives of Psychology*. Vol. 1, no. 1 (Nov. 1906)-v. 41, no. 300 (June 1945).

31. Mayo, Marion. “The Mental Capacity of the American Negro”, *Archives of Psychology*, No. 25, November 1913.

flaws with the premise of this study. Mayo does not take into account the relative quality and funding of each school examined in the study. Schools were still segregated at this point, and black public schools did not receive funding equal to white public schools, which may impact the efficacy of teachers and teaching materials, as well as the school facility itself. Mayo also does not take into account the home life of each child analyzed in the study. By beginning from the assumption that all children are on an even academic playing field, and that any differences in academic performance are based *solely* on race, is bad scientific practice.

However, this did not impede, or even seem to influence Mayo's study at all. Mayo writes statements such as "Among Europeans and their descendants in all parts of the globe there has always existed a feeling of superiority of the white race. It is a feeling "bred in the bone" and so strong it can hardly be eradicated", without a shred of critical thought³². These "feelings of superiority" are put forth as undisputed fact, rather than the consequence of centuries of racism. Mayo, nor Woodworth, saw anything amiss with this statement, and left it in. Mayo states that the "conclusions derived from this study are, for the most part, coincident with the views that have long been of general acceptance. They differ widely from these views, however, in the way they have been obtained. It is the method of their derivation which gives chief value to these conclusions"³³. Mayo's conclusion bolsters the racist biases held by white people about black people in the United States. But, rather than just racism based on stereotypes, Mayo bases their conclusion on "scientific evidence".

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

“The Psychology of the Negro: An Experimental Study”

One extensive study, titled “The Psychology of the Negro: An Experimental Study”, by George Oscar Ferguson Jr. that analyzed the academic performance to various races of children in schools in three Virginia cities, was published in April 1916³⁴. Ferguson first outlines previous anthropological and psychological studies on various races, on which he uses as his starting point for his own study. For example, he cites studies conducted by Franz Boas about variations in the skull size and shape in different races: “while 50 per cent. [sic] of whites have skull capacities of 1560 cc., only 27 per cent. [sic] of Negroes equal or exceed this capacity” while going on to conclude that “there are differences between the physical characters of races which make it probable that there may be differences in faculty”³⁵. Ferguson cites this logical fallacy concluded by Boas as part of the purpose for conducting this study—and Boas’s work is supposed to be reflective of the less racist side of the scientific debate. Ferguson also cites Le Bon, another scientist who divided all of humanity into four categories based on psychological characteristics: “(1) Primitive races, such as the Fuegians and the aboriginal Australians, (2) Inferior races, such as the negroes, (3) Average races, such as the Chinese, Japanese, Mongolian, and Semitic peoples, (4) Superior races, which are the Indo-Europeans”³⁶. Le Bon concludes that “no confusion is possible between the four great divisions we have just enumerated. The

34. Ferguson Jr., George Oscar, “The Psychology of the Negro: An Experimental Study”, *Archives of Psychology*, No. 36, April 1916. 85-140.

35. Ibid. p. 87-89.

36. Ibid. p. 89-93.

mental abyss that separates them is evident”³⁷. Ferguson bases his study off the assumption that there *is* a fundamental difference in people based on racial divisions that are treated as natural and unalterable, which, besides being completely wrong, is bad scientific practice. Ferguson’s study does not stand out in this matter though, many scientists at the time treated ideas about the superiority of various races that originated during the slavery era in the United States as scientific fact, rather than ideas that need to be rigorously tested and proved or disproved.

As far as the data Ferguson used, he selected three cities in Virginia: Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Newport News, in order to analyze the academic performance of children attending school in those cities³⁸. Starting with a broad overview of census information, he cites that white children are much more literate than black children³⁹. Rather than a critical examination of other possible explanations for this disparity in literacy, Ferguson cites “poor health, poverty, mental or moral deficiency, lack of ambition or energy” on part of the black children⁴⁰. He does not elaborate on *why* poor health or poverty may disproportionately affect black populations, Ferguson accepts it as a set, inalterable fact.

Ferguson further delineates racial divisions in his test subjects by dividing mixed race children as “sub-classes of Negroes” with labels such as “mulatto”—a child whose parents are “pure white or pure Negro”, “quadroon”—the “child of a mulatto and a white”, as well as

37. Ibid. p. 89-93.

38. Ibid. p. 85.

39. Ibid. p. 124.

40. Ibid. p. 97.

“octoroon”—the “child of a white and a quadroon”⁴¹. While Ferguson does not explicitly mention miscegenation—the mixing of different races—these “sub-class” divisions show there is a clear preoccupation with “mixing races” and “racial purity” present in the scientific community at this time⁴². Ferguson cites Le Bon again: “very different races, the black and the white for example, may fuse, but the half-breeds that result constitute a population very inferior to those which it is sprung, and utterly incapable of creating or even continuing a civilization... cross-breeding may be a source of improvement when it occurs between superior and sufficiently allied races, such as the English and the Germans in America”⁴³.

The tests Ferguson uses in his study “were the Woodworth and Wells Mixed Relations, I and II; a form of the Ebbinghaus Completion Test; a Cancellation Test; and one of the Columbia Maze tests”⁴⁴. He divides the results among white children the aforementioned “sub-classes of negroes”. Overall, white children performed better on these psychology tests⁴⁵. In the instances that black children (specifically in high school) performed better, Ferguson credits this to the fact that the high schools black children went to were more “selective” in their students, as black children dropped out of/did not pursue high school at the same rate that white children did⁴⁶.

41. Ibid. p. 110-112.

42. Ibid. p. 110-112.

43. Ibid. p. 130.

44. Ibid. p. 113.

45. Ibid. p. 127-130.

46. Ibid. p. 94-94.

Rather than making a conclusion that pertains specifically to the material at hand, the academic performance of students of various races, Ferguson fixates on the “racial purity” aspect of the study⁴⁷. Which, considering how he cited Le Bon several times as previous scientific literature on the topic, is not surprising. However, the conclusion seems to veer wildly off course, leaping from the academic performance of children of various races, to different, although consistently unscientific, generalizations about human beings, with statements such as “the mulatto is not as tractable or as submissive to white domination as is the pure negro. He thinks and feels more nearly as does the white man” as well as the observation that the “very considerable progress the negro has made has been in large measure due to mulattoes”⁴⁸.

At first glance, this conclusion seems completely out of place—it isn’t related to the results of the study, or the subjects, or even the cities the study took place in; it begs the question: why include it at all? Ferguson’s conclusion addresses the interests of scientists and doctors interested in race medicine and psychology, and it illuminates the beliefs of the scientific community at large. The motives for examining *if* disparities exist in the academic performance of students of different races are not altruistic or even in the spirit of genuine scientific inquiry. The study assumes that the disparity *already exists*, and it exists inherently *because* of racial differences. The motivations almost line up perfectly with the motivations of scientists in the past: to identify a medical, psychological, or scientific reason that justifies the domination of white people over everyone else in the United States.

47. Ibid. p. 129-130.

48. Ibid. p. 129-130.

“Race Differences in Inhibition”

“Race Differences in Inhibition”, a study by Albert Crane, was published in the *Archives of Psychology* in 1923⁴⁹. While the subject of the study is ultimately racist at the core, this study is uniquely racist in the language used to describe the people in the experiment, calling them “one hundred southern darkies”⁵⁰. Additionally, Crane writes how he had to coerce his black test subjects into participating: “threats, cajolery, flattery, bribery, and every other conceivable ruse within the bounds of reason and the law were resorted to in order to bring the number of subjects tested up to the desired hundred”⁵¹.

After cross-referencing Crane’s terminology of the black individuals he coerced into participating in this study with other studies on race science at the time, his language is an outlier. Comparable studies almost uniformly refer to black people as “negroes”, which leads me to believe that Crane’s language is uniquely awful, even for 1923. Crane’s study is also unique in that he explicitly states that he coerced black individuals into participating. I could not find another study from the time that explicitly stated similar sentiments, which leads me to conclude that Crane’s language is uniquely unacademic. But, the fact that Woodworth guided and mentored Crane, as well as editing and publishing the study, shows that Woodworth tacitly endorsed the use of this language and coercive study methods employed by Crane.

49. Crane, Albert. “Race Differences in Inhibition”, *Archives of Psychology*, No. 63, March 1923.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid.

To reiterate: these are just a selected few of the studies on race psychology published by the *Archives of Psychology* during Woodworth's time as editor. When Woodworth retired as editor in 1948, he donated the *Archives of Psychology* to the American Psychological Association⁵².

The Legacy of Race Science and Race Psychology

Although Woodworth never openly advocated for eugenics or preserving “race purity” in the United States, he did seem to consider it to be a legitimate branch of science, and it would be dishonest to say that his work did not influence his contemporaries who did advocate for eugenics.

For example, a 1914 edition of *Columbia Daily Spectator* reported on a series of lectures held at Columbia in a piece titled “Unusual Lectures on Institute Program”, with topics covering “art, eugenics, and modern thought”⁵³. The piece continues as it details the various speakers and topics, with Woodworth being one of the speakers, his speech on “Alertness”, which was followed by another member of Columbia faculty, Professor Crampton, and his first of four lectures on “Eugenics”⁵⁴. Despite not explicitly lecturing on eugenics, Woodworth's presence, not to mention the university itself hosting these lectures, gave the pseudoscience of eugenics more credit than it warranted or deserved. Which, despite Woodworth's insistence on use of the scientific method in science and medical experiments, he consistently overlooked unscientific

52. Columbia University Career Summary of Robert Sessions Woodworth from 1963, Box 5, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.

53. “Unusual Lectures on Institute Program”, *Columbia Daily Spectator*. February 16, 1914.

54. Ibid.

practice and beliefs when it came to race science. For example, he would say statements, such as “[psychological tests] do not enable us to judge differences between the nations of Europe because the immigrants come here in response to different economic demand”, a statement that shows he recognizes the nuance in individual circumstances, rather than making sweeping generalizations based on race^{5 5}. However, he said this comment during a series of talks about immigration law, defending the immigration mental and education tests he created to judge aptitude of people seeking to immigrate to the United States^{5 6}.

In order to properly put immigration discourse into historical context, 1924 is the year that Congress passed the Johnson-Reed Act, also known as the Immigration Act of 1924^{5 7}. This law set a “national origins quota”, which severely limited Europeans who were not of British or Nordic descent from entering the United States^{5 8}. The law also excluded immigrants from Asia entirely^{5 9}. Before passing the law, Congress asked for scientists to testify, to present the arguments about “race purity” and keeping the United States free of inferior people. While I could not find definitive documentation that Woodworth went before Congress, a few of his contemporaries did, such as Robert Yerkes, who presented a “study” he conducted on men in the armed forces that “proved” Europeans from Italy and Eastern Europe were not as smart or good as Europeans of Nordic descent^{6 0}.

55. “Says Individual is Basis of Selection”, *Columbia Daily Spectator*. July 11, 1924.

56. Ibid.

57. “The Immigration Act of 1924 (The Johnson-Reed Act), Office of the Historian. Accessed on May 2nd, 2019.

58. Ibid.

59. Ibid.

60. It should be noted that the *Spectator* article cited in 55 states that Woodworth spoke at an “immigration conference”, but did not state the location, time, or audience. I could not find other sources that gave any amplifying information on Woodworth’s involvement with immigration law. Yerkes, Robert M., *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*, 1961, pp. 381–407.

While Woodworth is not often cited in present day discussions of psychology, the legacy of race science and race psychology still affects just as many issues as it did in the early 20th century in the United States: education, medical science, immigration law and restrictions, and systemic racism. And because these are still ever-present issues, it is important to acknowledge and address the role that Robert Woodworth, as well as Columbia University, played in creating, spreading, and institutionalizing race psychology and race science based on centuries-old beliefs that originated during slavery-era United States. It was science that was completely false and asserted black Americans, and other non-white Americans, had something inherently wrong with them.

Bibliography

Allen, Garland E. "Charles Benedict Davenport". *American National Biography Online*.

Crane, Albert, L. "Race Differences in Inhibition", *Archives of Psychology*, No. 63, March 1923.

Columbia Daily Spectator.

"Says Individual is Basis of Selection", *Columbia Daily Spectator*. July 11, 1924.

"Unusual Lectures on Institute Program", *Columbia Daily Spectator*. February 16, 1914.

"Anthropology Tests at St. Louis", *Columbia Daily Spectator*. April 20, 1904.

The Embryo Project Encyclopedia. "Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory". *History*. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory.

Ferguson Jr., George Oscar, "The Psychology of the Negro: An Experimental Study", *Archives of Psychology*, No. 36, April 1916. 85-140.

Galton, Francis, *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development* (London, England: Macmillan and Co., 1883), pp. 24–25.

Galton, Francis (1874). "On Men of Science, Their Nature and Their Nurture". *Proceedings of the Royal Institution of Great Britain*. pp. 227–236.

Haggbloom, Steven J.; Warnick, Renee; Warnick, Jason E.; Jones, Vinessa K.; Yarbrough, Gary L.; Russell, Tenea M.; Borecky, Chris M.; McGahhey, Reagan; Powell III, John L.; Beavers, Jamie; Monte, Emmanuelle (2002). "The 100 most eminent psychologists of the 20th century". *Review of General Psychology*. 139–152.

Karl Pearson, "Life of Francis Galton" Vol 3A: image 470. 17 June 2006.

Mayo, Marion. "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro", *Archives of Psychology*, No. 25, November 1913.

Woodworth, Robert, S. *Archives of Psychology*. Vol. 1, no. 1 (Nov. 1906)-v. 41, no. 300 (June 1945).

Woodworth, Robert, S. Personal Archives, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, United States.