

Paradigm of Intelligence as a factor of Political Control

Tahir Pervez

Ph.D in Psychology, research officer & instructor at the National University of Science and Technology (Pakistan)

S. Farhana Kazmi

Ph.D in Psychology, assistant professor at the Hazara University, Manserha (Pakistan)

Present study reviews the misuse of the paradigm of intelligence in past and present era by power holding classes and nations for the exploitation and political control over minorities and underdeveloped nations. Historically weak nations, minority groups and poor social classes have been exploited emotionally, physically, politically, culturally and as well as intellectually. Colonial powers propagated themselves intellectually superior and culturally developed, using the latest development in social sciences as a weapon to control the minds and the consciousness of the colonized people. Paradigm of Intelligence has logical basis but it was misused with false and subjective evidences, based on invalid and unreliable intelligence tests. Analysis indicates that psychological tests are still being used inappropriately. Many countries are just translating and using Western norms based tests for various academic and clinical purposes by ignoring their own cultural and national traditions. Socially suppressed individuals and minority people, grown up in restricted and conflicted culture, have a tendency to escape from un-essential tasks. They develop a specific hostility, which leads them to reject academic and intellectual achievements. Individual differences are a real phenomenon but intelligence tests are not able to measure complete mental faculties of human beings. It is necessary to be careful while administering the intelligence tests on the individuals from low SES strata.

Keywords: Paradigm of Intelligence, Exploitation, Underdeveloped Country, Colonial Countries, Social Classes, Will to Power, Psychological Testing.

Introduction

The history of humankind is the history of domination and exploitation of powerful groups over others. This exploitation has multiple faces, such as; exploitation of unprivileged classes by the power holding classes, exploitation of people by the ruling state machinery, the exploitation of poor nations by the developed nations and exploitation of the many by the few [38]. The aim of this domination and exploitation was to get hold the available economic resources owned by other countries. Lenin has very rightly asserted that the conquest and exploitation have remained a major function of warfare between nations [6, p. 398]. Study reveals that Imperialism oppressed the indigenous people and destroyed the entire civilizations being most powerful force in the world history over the last five centuries [47, p. 318]. It created and maintained unequal economical, cultural and territorial relationships between states, based on domination and subordination [30].

The most important aspect of this long rooted historical fact is that the both, Imperialism and colonialism developed specific ideologies and practiced them to rule other territories [18, p. 116]. These ideologies were designed to provide *moral force* of exploitation for their domination [70] They made claims about their superiority when they conquered and ruled others countries, designed a system of authoritarian rule based on exploitation and projected them as culturally developed and superior [1, 18, 28]. It proves the assertion of Marx and Hillix

that, «*Advancement in theories takes place when time is right*» [37]. Friedrich Nietzsche and Alfred Adler has theorized that only those ideas are promoted which provide the safe-guard to the interest of the ruling classes also the aim of the promotion of these ideas is the strong «*Will to Power*» of the oppressive nation [2, p. 738; 8]. The most important theory in this regard was the theory of democracy which was projected widely and used as a tool to implement liberal economy. It was used as a camouflage to hide, cover-up and the exploitation and domination [25].

Historical review reveals that in the 5th century BC, Greeks claimed themselves superior than other nation to whom they surrendered [42]. Similarly Chinese emperors at their peak presented similar views about themselves. The Ch'ing Emperor K'ang-hsi (from 1661 to 1722) gave incredible and ridiculous remarks about Westerners, i.e. «It is impossible to reason with them because they do not understand larger issues as we understand in China,» [68]. In sub continent of India, Arians presented the philosophy of cast system and distributed the society into four main classes. They proclaimed themselves the more intelligent and superior race whereas the local races were declared inferior in all aspects [57, p. 47; 63]. Arian propagated the cast theory in such a way that even after 4000 years it is still alive and effective. The individuals belong to low cast are still neglected, considered inferior and are deprived politically and socially.

America and Britain were more '*wiser*' and '*sensible*' in this regard. They presented theories and paradigms to prove their superiority on the basis of scientific grounds

and publicized among the masses to justify their rule. For example it was theorized that; «*It is desirable that the earth should be peopled, governed and developed, as far as possible, by the races which can do this work best, i.e. by the races of highest social efficiency*» [28]. Applying such theories, the small nations and the people were exploited emotionally, physically, politically, culturally and as well as intellectually [15].

In Indo Pak, British presented the notion of «Martial Races», just to control over those militant groups who were against their rule [21, p. 15]. Also, to accelerate recruitment from «loyal» Sikhs, Punjabi Muslims, Dogras, Gurkas and Pakhtuns and to discourage enlistment of «disloyal» Bengalis and high-caste Hindus, who had sided with the rebel army during the war of independence in 1857. In real sense, this theory was also the clever effort of British to divide and rule the people of India for their own political ends [55]. The British exploited this concept to strengthen their rule in India [56]. The concept was strongly disseminated through literature with a result that people of sub continent still believer of this theory.

It seems that ruling elite always thought it necessary to develop various theories and paradigms regarding the cultural emotional, physical intellectual aspects of the nations and groups they had conquered, with the aim to; humiliate them, inferior and incapable, consequently to shatter their confidence and to strengthen their political control [15]. Pettigrew concluded that the racial oppression and conflict have remained a major concern of the USA throughout its history [49]. Fanon [15, 16] has asserted that the colonial powers made every effort to internalize colonial cultural values into the consciousness of colonized individuals and to admit the inferiority of their own. Consequently, a specific type of low self-esteem and alienation became the fate of the colonized people. The paradigm of «*Intelligence*» is also one of such systematic efforts, which was developed on scientific basis and prompted to achieve the aim of «*Will to Power*» and it was used unethically and unfairly to prove the inferiority of colonized nations.

Paradigm of Intelligence

Intelligence is a concept that we use in our daily lives that seems to have a fairly concrete but naive, meaning. However, it is such a rich topic which has extremely complex intellectual, social and political history. Despite a long history of research and debate, there is still no standard definition of intelligence [33]. Sternberg noted that there are as many definitions of intelligence as there are experts asked to define it [62]. That the concept of intelligence is employed to indicate the amount of knowledge available and the quickness with which new knowledge is acquired [36]. Sometimes it stands for the ability to; adapt the new situations, handle concepts, relationships, abstract, symbols. Capron, Adrian, Vetta and Atam have asserted that IQ tests measures some elements of intelligent behaviour which is associated with academic performance [11, p. 115].

Some other psychologists believe that It is also related to many important aspects of behaviour such as quick mastery of the new tasks, adaptation to the new situations, success level in school, job performance, social status, income and also the ability to deal effectively with the emotional side of life [43, 61]. However, such relationships between intelligence and outcomes of life are far from perfection [4]. Smallwood stresses that the IQ Test could be an accurate measure of certain kinds of intelligence, such as; person's lateral-thinking abilities, or an individuals' ability to deal with abstract concepts. Also that IQ Test cannot be considered as a predictor of educational achievement, performance in the workplace and the success of an individual [59].

Though intelligence is an old concept [13, 35] but it is strange phenomenon that the research on intelligence was initiated simultaneously, in various colonial countries in start of 1900s, when colonial nations have made almost complete control over week nations. Initial bases provided the works of: Charles Darwin (1809–1882) and Francis Galton (1822–1911) in Britain; Alfred Binet (1857–1911) in France; Lewis Terman (1877–1956) in US [49]. In the first decade of 20th century many standardized intelligence tests were designed and these became popular among the masses and the institutions [5, 51, p. 8]. On the basis of these so-called «Standardized Intelligence Tests» colonial countries proved themselves intellectually superior to colonized people. After 1900 many researches try to prove (e. g. Galton, Termen, Burt, and Jensen) that heredity plays much more prominent role in the development of intellectual abilities than does the environment and many races possess low IQ because of their differences in heredity endowment [30]. Burt, based on his «scientific studies» concluded that poor people and the working class were regularly of inferior intelligence compared to middle and upper class [10, p. 85]. On the basis of such studies, after using IQ tests on mass level it was theorized that: «Jews are mentally inferior so they should throw out of America; Blacks and Asians have low IQ (IQ 70 to 80) and Black should not be allowed to increase their generation». They also viewed that «Children from inferior Nations lack Imaginative thinking and abstract reasoning, need special schooling, are not fit for higher jobs and are not fit for higher studies» [10, 28].

These findings had a powerful impact on the educational system in England and around the world [29, p. 102]. However, with the reference to the socio-culture controversy on intelligence, the issue became very crucial and controversial. Kamin [31] on the basis of evidences, rejected the theory of hereditarianism. Later studies concluded that Burt [10] falsified his data and invented crucial facts to support his controversial theory [49, 65]. Hearnshaw has reported that most of Burt's data was unreliable or fraudulent. Klineberg also concluded that all such conclusions were biased/bogus and fraud [25]. These studies were based on; biased sampling, non-standardized and culturally biased tests and wrong inferences [17]. Another study concluded that the Stanford-Binet and the WISC IQ tests are «Culture specific tests,» which represent the culture of white middle class. Radical Marxist critics have charged that IQ testing and IQ research done

by the work of Arthur Jensen, are either disguised racist ideology or pseudo-psychological science [57].

The present reports on the basis of several statistical measures of intelligence, reveal that those nations who were once considered below average on the basis of intelligence tests are making higher scores on these tests. For example Asian and Chinese consistently score highest, than the Europeans and Americans descent as well as than those of African descent [33, 34, 68]. Some other studies indicate that African Americans perform better on IQ tests than do Whites. They have been reported to exceed American born whites in several of the cognitive, socio-economic indicators – the areas of educational attainment and occupational status [12, p. 243; 44, p. 70].

We can safely infer from these findings, that some differences in intelligence exist between the different nations yet, many socioeconomic factors and many other unknown factors also play vital role for this obvious group differences in IQ scores. The low validity of the items of the IQ tests which are being used on the individuals of different races and socio cultural background also gives biased results [31, 65]. Restricted cultural environment e.g., insisting the children to work alone and sit still and quietly in class and at home, is another possibility that minority persons score lowest [9]. Actually, minority people grow up in restricted and conflicted culture and fail to develop their self-esteem to face the challenging tasks.

Low self esteem of individuals from under developed communities keep them avoiding exerting themselves on any challenging task [45]. They grow up with low expectancies, believing that effort on their part will not result in better outcomes. Consequently, they develop a specific hostility, which leads them to reject academic achievements and other forms of behavior described by majority group [4]. Gottfried established that intelligence reduce by the absence of certain forms of environmental stimulation early in life and when removing children from sterile, restricted environments and placing them in more favorable settings cause to enhance their intellectual growth [20, 58].

Misuse of Intelligence Tests in Pakistan and in Under Developed Countries

Today standardized testing of intellectual and cognitive functioning is a critical component of psychological assessment despite the widespread criticism of the practice [23, p. 37]. However, these tests are still used inappropriately, misinterpreted or over interpreted for making decisions about the individuals not only in underdeveloped countries but also in developed countries, which causes to harm the individuals and even society as a whole [38]. An important criterion of test development for Pakistani population is to utilize the sources of religion, literature and cultural heritage, side by side of the Western techniques. Just to translate the Western tests by ignoring our Eastern traditions cannot be considered a rational and logical approach. Rather the scores yielded by these tests may misguide us [64]. At present approxi-

mately more than 16 postgraduate psychology departments are present in Pakistan but none is capable to initiate a research program at national level because little government funding goes to research, which means universities focus more on teaching [40]. Because of the economic issues, no any department of psychology in Pakistan could develop national data based /culture faire intelligence test to be used reliably. Rather borrowed tests are being used for every purpose. Analysis reveals Psychological testing has been very neglected area in Pakistan for example only 12 % Research papers were published on psychological testing in Pakistani journals (from 1964–2003) [63]. An interesting fact in this regard is that many civil departments and organizations, which are using tests for screening purpose, are ignorant about the importance of the psychometric techniques and the standardized tests. If any civil organization is using tests for personnel selection these are not properly validated according to the local culture and national requirements [64].

Keeping in view such issues, these tests never be considered culture fair and suitable for all other nations unless they are scientifically adapted, rewritten in local language, with employing the same constructs and under lying logic and standardized on satisfactory sample of local population. As it is a laborious exercise and also demands lot of resources, thus in many cases experts / psychologists avoid it and just try to full fill their immediate need without caring the objectivity and the validity of the results.

It is also necessary that the practitioners should be able to assess not only the significance of general cognitive ability but also the role of other aspects of human intelligence which is not measured by the standardized intelligence tests [52] which create confusion when we use these tests uni-dimensionally. Many underdeveloped nations are just borrowing / purchasing so called «Standardized Tests» from the Western countries and using them without adapting them and without developing local norms. For instance every well-known and widely used psychological tests developed in the USA was in English. These tests can't be valid for non English people even if translated into their own languages because English words with multiple meanings cannot be adequately translated. English idioms cannot be expressed in another language without changing the entire sentence structure along with the underlying logic of the sentence and when that happens standardization and the guarantee of fairness it promises, is lost [54].

In many cases the desired techniques and methodology are not observed to construct test items and test development/adaptations i.e. «The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing» [3]. For example in many cases the development of a standardized test do not follow the suggested strategies by the experts, i.e. qualitative, co-relational, quasi-experimental, and experimental research to detect item biases [39, p. 127] which is also one of the causes for fluctuating results and error based judgment.

Fluctuations in Mental Test Scores also have been observed in many studies [48, p. 198] which have created doubts about the constant nature of Intelligence and the standardized measures. The use of such tests creates harms

to the person being evaluated and interferes with the cause of justice. It also does damage to the reputation of psychologists and the science of psychology as well [66]. To use the intelligence Tests and personality Tests from Internet is another unethical feature of testing. For example thousand of Psychological tests are available on Internet related to «employee recruitment» with very high claims. Many employers and the institutions use the popular tests, which are apparently quite appealing to select suitable employees or to screen the students for admission. The «Test and tell» approach is extremely inadequate and in unethical which is generally applied in such situations [42]. This approach is not only common in Pakistan but also in all over the world, which is necessary to be addressed by the psychologists. A study conducted in Philippine indicate that different test norms are needed for urban and rural children and the format of intelligence test requires new items and a new analysis when new cultural groups are tested [22, p. 3].

The reality of the issue is that the individuals from minority groups and from the poor classes is generally, politically suppressed and they suffer from economic frustrations. Consequently, they in any testing condition they behave casually and remain de-motivated to complete the task assigned to them. They reflect low self-esteem and have a tendency to escape from un-essential tasks. In brief they lack zeal and motivation for all type of challenging tasks. With a result, they perform low on all type intelligence tests. Once the socio-economic conditions are improved, their performance becomes remarkable. So it is necessary that psychologists should be extra careful while administering the intelligence tests on the children from low SES strata of population and drawing the conclusions on the basis of these results. They should also be extremely careful in applying the norms, derived from one specific sample of pop-

ulation to the individuals of other cultural groups. We should not use the norms of any test blindly, derived from the sample from the Europe or USA on the individuals from other regions and the countries unless these tests and norms are objectively and culturally standardized.

Conclusion

Colonial and imperialist powers, designed many fascist strategies to achieve the aim of «will to power» and to get hold the resources of other countries. They used the latest development in social sciences as a weapon to control the minds and the consciousness of the colonized people and structured various paradigms including Paradigm of Intelligence to prove themselves genetically and intellectually superior and consequently to justify their political, economic and cultural supremacy. They used so-called culture fair intelligence tests, which were actually invalid and unreliable. It caused to develop socio-culture controversy and pseudo causes to keep others deprived of their basic rights. In technical sense, these intelligence tests are not able to measure complete mental faculties of human beings, thus to be used with extra care. Borrowed tests from other countries may not be valid and reliable for local population unless these tests are objectively and culturally standardized. Similarly, the institutions and the organizations should be extra careful while using tests available on different websites. These tests may give some information about the individuals who are being tested but must not be valid. Especially, the use of all such tests by the organizations is highly unethical and unjust for; the screening of individuals for admissions in academic institutions or for the selection/suitability of personnel.

References

1. Adims D. The History of the Culture of War // www.culture-of-peace.info/books/history.html. 2009.
2. Anderson R. L. Nietzsche's Will to Power as a Doctrine of the Unity of Science. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science. 1994. Vol. 25. № 5.
3. APA. Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington DC: American Educational Research Association. 1999. // www.apa.org/science/
4. Baron R. A. Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1998.
5. Benson E. Intelligent Intelligence Testing. Monitor on Psychology. 2003. Vol. 34. № 2. www.apa.org/monitor/feb03/intelligent.aspx
6. Bernard I. Bagg B. War and Revolution (Ed. & Trans.). Lenin Collected Works: Vol. 24. Moscow. 1964. www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/may/14.htm
7. Blood P. Pakistan: A country study (ed.). Country data – based on the country studies series by federal research division of the library of congress. 1994. // www.country-data.com/cgi-bin/query/r-
8. Boeree C. G. Alfred Adler Personality Theories. 2006 // webpace.ship.edu/cgboer/adler.html
9. Boykin A. Allen B. Davis L. H. & Senior A. M. Task Performance of Black and White Children across Levels of Presentation Variability. Journal of Psychology. Vol. 131. 1997. // www.questia.com/google Scholar.qst.76932479
10. Burt C. Mental abilities and mental factors. British Journal of Educational Psychology. 1954. Vol. № 14.
11. Capron C., Adrian R., Vetta M. D., Atam V. Misconceptions of biometrical IQists. Current Psychology of Cognition. 1999. Vol. 18. № 2.
12. Charles C. Z. Massey D. S. Mooney M. & Kimberly C. T. Black Immigrants and Black Natives Attending Selective Colleges and universities in the United States. American Journal of Education. 2007. Vol. 113. № 2.
13. Cherry K. The History and Development of Modern IQ Testing. About.com Guide. 2005. // psychology.about.com/od/psychologicaltesting/a/int-history.htm
14. Devillier R. & Donegan B. The Roman Empire in the first century AD. 2006 // www.pbs.org/empires/romans/empire/index.html
15. Fanon F. Reciprocal Bases of National Culture and the Fight for Freedom: Wretched of the Earth. Pelican. 1959. // www.marxists.org/subject/Africa.
16. Fanon F. Black Skin White Masks. New York: Grove. 1967. // www.English.emory.edu/Bahri/Fanon.html
17. Garrett H. E. Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology: A Review Mankind Quarterly. 1960. Vol. 1. № 1.
18. Gilmartin M. Gallaher C. et al. Key Concepts in Political Geography. 2008. Imperialism / Colonialism // www.the full wiki org.

19. Gordon R. A. SES versus IQ in the race-IQ-delinquency model. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*. 1987. Vol. 7.
20. Gottfried A. W. (Ed). Home environment and early cognitive development. San Francisco: Academic. 1984.
21. Greenhut J. Sahib and Sepoy: An Inquiry into the Relationship between the British officers and native soldiers of the British Indian army. *Military Affairs*. 1984. Vol. 48 № 1 // www.jstor.org/
22. Guthrie G. M. Tayag A. H. Jacobs P. J. The Philippine Nonverbal Intelligence Test. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 1977. Vol. 102. № 1.
23. Hale J. B. Fiorello C. A. Kavanagh J. A. Holdnack J. A. & Aloe A. M. Is the Demise of IQ Interpretation Justified? *Applied Neuropsychology*. 2007. Vol. 14. № 1.
24. Hanfi H. When democracy masks exploitation. *Reset Dialogues on Civilizations: The web magazine for all the tribes of the world*. 2008 // www.Reset doc.org/story/
25. Hearnshaw L. S. Cyril Burt: Psychologist. *New World Encyclopedia*. Ithaca N. Y.: Cornell University Press. 1979. // www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/
26. Hjørland B. & Nicolaisen J. The social psychology of information use: seeking «friends» avoiding «enemies» *Information Research*. 2010. Vol. 15. № 3 // informationr.net/ir/15-3/colis7/colis706.html
27. Hobson J. A. *Imperialism: a study*. Cosimo Inc. 2005 // books.google.com/books
28. Jensen A. R. The black white difference on the K-ABC: Implications for future tests. *Journal of special education*. 1984. Vol. 18. № 3.
29. Johnson S. Dome Improvement. *Wired Magazine*. May 2005 // www.zhs4.net/history african/raceiq.htm
30. Joynson R. B. The Burt Affaires. *Behavior Genetics*. 1989. Vol. 19. № 6.
31. Kamin L. J. *The Science and Politics of IQ*. Hillsdale N. J.: Erlbaum, 1974.
32. Legg S. Hutter M. *Universal Intelligence: A Definition of Machine Intelligence*. Minds and Machines. 2007. Vol. 17. № 4.
33. Loehlin J. C. Lindzey G. Spuhler J. N. *Race Differences in Intelligence*. San Francisco CA: W. H. Freeman, 1975.
34. Lynn R. *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations*. Westport CT: Praeg. 1996.
35. Machek G. Brief History of the Measurement of Intelligence. *Human Intelligence*. 2006 // www.indiana.edu/~intell/intelligenceTests.shtml
36. Matrazzo J. D. *Wechsler's Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence*. Baltimore Williams & Wilkins. 1980. Vol. 7.
37. Marx M. & Hillix W. *Systems and Theories in Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hil. 1973.
38. McGrath J. *Ethics in Psychological Testing*. 2009. // www.Associated content.com/article /1759034/
39. Mellenbergh G. J. Item bias and item response theory. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 1989. Vol. 13. № 2.
40. Murray B. Psychology takes a tenuous hold in Pakistan. *Monitor on Psychology*. Vol. 33. № 1 // www.apa.org/monitor/jan02/ pakistan.aspx
41. Nakate S. *Ancient Greek Culture*. 2010 // www.buzzle.com/articles/ancient- greek-culture.html
42. Neault R. & Pickerell D. *Effective Use of Psychological Tests for Recruitment and Selection*. 2011 from // www.bcjobs.ca/content/index.cfm
43. Neisser U. & et al. *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*. *American Psychologist*. 1996. Vol. 51. № 2.
44. Nesbitt N. F. *African Intellectuals in the Belly of the Beast: Migration Identity and the Politics of Exile*. *African Issues*. 2002. Vol. 30. № 1.
45. Ogbu J. *Overcoming racial barriers to equal access*. In Goodlad J. I. and Keating P. (Ed.). *Access to knowledge: The continuing agenda for our nation's schools*. New York, 1994.
46. Parenti M. *Imperialism 101 Against Empire*. 1995 // www.michaelparenti.org/
47. Pettigrew T. F. *The Social Science Study of American Race Relations in the Twentieth Century*. *Journal of Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 2008. Vol. 2.
48. Petty M. F. & Field C. J. *Fluctuations in Mental Test Scores*. *Educational Research*. 1980. Vol. 22. № 3.
49. Plucker J. A. (Ed.). *Human intelligence: Historical influences current controversies teaching resources*. 2007 // www.indiana.edu/~intell.
50. Plucker J. *Learning and Cognition. General Intelligence Objectively Determined and Measured*. Indiana University. 1998.
51. Popham W. J. *Why Standardized Tests Don't Measure Educational Quality*. *Journal of Education Leadership*. 1999. Vol. 56. № 6 // www.ascd.org/publications/ educational-leadership/
52. Purcell J. H. *Preparing for fall-out: A perspective on the bell curve*. *Roper Review*. 1996. Vol. 18. № 4.
53. Richard H. S. & Andrea J. D. *Insurgents terrorists and militias: The Warriors of Contemporary Combat*. 2006.
54. Richmond R. L. *A Guide to Psychology and its Practice*. 2009 // www.guide top psychology.com/testing.htm
55. Rose H. A. *Glossary of the tribes and castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*. *Imperial Gazetteer of India*. Vol. 19. 2009.
56. Ross K. L. *The Caste System and the Stages of Life in Hinduism*. 2010 // www.friesian.com/ caste.htm
57. Senders J. T. *Marxist criticism of IQ*. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'education*. 1985. Vol. 10. № 4 // www.jstor.org/pss/ 1494840
58. Skeels H. M. *Adult status of Children with contrasting early life experiences: A Follow-Up Study*. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 1938/1966. Vol. 31 № 3.
59. Stanovich K. E. *Rational and Irrational Thought: The Thinking that IQ Tests Miss*. *Scientific American Mind*. November / December 2009. <http://www.sciamdigital.com/ index.cfm?fa>
60. Sternberg R. J. *Intelligence, information processing, and analogical reasoning: The componential analysis of human abilities*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum, 1977.
61. Sternberg R. J. (Ed). *General Intellectual Ability. Human abilities: An Information-Processing Approach*. New York: Freeman, 1985.
62. Stoddard A. L. *Untouchables (Dalits) in Hinduism and Caste System in India*. 2010 <http://www.suite101.com/ content/untouchables-251917.#ixzz19>
63. Suhail K. A. *Psychology in Pakistan*. *The Psychologist*. 2004. Vol. 17. № P. 11. <http://www.thepsychologist.org.uk/archive/archive home.cfm/thepsychologist>
64. Tahir P. *Development of a standardized screening test for the prospective candidates of Pakistan Army (PAC- Test)*. PhD thesis Hamdard University Karachi. 2002. // eprints.hec.gov.pk/view/year/2002.html
65. Tucker W. H. *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*. Urbana IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
66. Underwager R. & Wakefield H. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology*. 1993. Vol. 11. № 1 // d eltabravo.net/custody/misuse.php
67. Wertheimer A. *Exploitation*. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.). 2008 // plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/ exploitation.
68. Wise J. *Are Asians Smarter?* *Time Magazine*. 1995. Vol. 146 № 11 // www.time.com/time/ international/ 995/ 950911/essay.

Парадигма интеллекта как фактор политического контроля

Т. Первез

доктор психологических наук, научный сотрудник и преподаватель
Национального научно-технологического университета (Пакистан)

Ф. С. Казми

доктор психологических наук, доцент в Университете Хазара, Маншера (Пакистан)

В данной статье приводится обзор практик неадекватного использования парадигмы интеллекта властью имущих социальных классов и наций для эксплуатации и контроля над социальными и национальными меньшинствами, которые имели место в прошлом и продолжают в наши дни. Исторически «слабые» нации, меньшинства и малоимущие слои населения становились жертвами физической, политической, культурной, эмоциональной, а также интеллектуальной эксплуатации. Колонизаторы позиционировали себя как более интеллектуально и культурно развитые, используя передовые достижения социальных наук как орудие для контроля над сознанием колонизируемых. Парадигма интеллекта имеет свое логическое научное обоснование, но она использовалась на основе ложных и субъективных доказательств, полученных в результате применения невалидных и нерелевантных тестов. Анализ показывает, что психологические тесты по-прежнему используются некорректно. Во многих странах тесты просто переводятся на местные языки и используются в образовательной и клинической практике; их результаты оцениваются по западным нормативам, без учета национальных культурных традиций. Люди, принадлежащие к меньшинствам и социально незащищенным группам, растут в обедненной и конфликтной среде, что приводит их к избеганию задач, не относящихся к практическим аспектам жизни. Возникает специфическое отчуждение, вплоть до враждебности к академическим и интеллектуальным достижениям. Существует феномен индивидуальных различий в уровне интеллекта, но тесты познавательных способностей не могут охватить весь человеческий потенциал. Необходимо с большой аккуратностью подходить к организации тестирования, особенно на выборах из социально незащищенных слоев населения.

Ключевые слова: парадигма интеллекта, эксплуатация, развивающиеся страны, колонизация, социальные классы, стремление к власти, психологическое тестирование.