profile which is not everybody's cup of tea. They are often difficult people. Their combination of high dominance and introversion is not always easy to deal with. But there is, as you suggest, a definite difference between personality traits associated with examination success and those associated with creative research.

I believe all promotions and scholarships should be based on personality tests, as well as on measures of intellectual ability. If this were done, selection could be directed toward creative people. The personality traits associated with creativity have now been worked out quite well. For example, we've compared administrative academic people to creative researchers of the same age, and we've compared creative writers and artists to those who aren't really so creative. There's an amazing similarity--you see the same high dominance, the same high ego strength, in creative people in all these fields.

In nearly every interview in The Eugenics Bulletin the same question is asked: "Specifically, what should people who are concerned about eugenics do?" How would you answer this question?

CATTELL: I agree with Carl Bajema's suggestions in the Fall '83 issue--the only way to progress is to enter political controversies, to set up programs for research in the area, to support the Eugenics Special Interest Group, and in general to stir up people's thinking by critical observations. Instances of neglect of eugenics are all around us. I haven't seen a single reference in all the current discussions on jobs for women to the dysgenic effect of having more women employed full time so that they can't beget as many children. This amazes me, this current

trend in which women get so involved in their professions that they cannot take time off to have children. In addition, of course, there are lots of things in the economy that could be changed. For example, taxing those of higher social status more tends to be dysgenic, and this hould be changed. One policy I view as eugenic is the rule in the British civil service which allows a woman to take off at least three months when she has a child without any effect on her promotional status or income.

There should also be much more emphasis during the last years of schooling on reminding children that not only their own children, but their own lives, will be happier if they choose more intelligent and stable individuals as spouses. It isn't impossible for even average members of the population to have a certain sense of dynasty. In some parts of the world, notably in Sweden and Japan, people know their genealogies much further back than most Americans do. This attention to genealogy would be, I think, a real aid to eugenics.

If society wants to go on at a proper cultural level, it should be handling these problems by economic means so as to achieve a eugenic balance. There are, in fact, many other things that could be done in economic terms to aid eugenics; for example, there could be a far larger child allowance in income taxes than presently exists. Obviously, a person with eugenic ideals should have as large a family as health and circumstances permit. Intelligent people, for example, university graduates, should be thinking in terms of four children per family, because this is little more than replacement. Nothing beats a good example.