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**Abstract:** In this article the author explores an aspect of racism in education that has received scant attention from scholars of Canadian educational history, the use of intelligence tests to confirm notions of racial superiority and inferiority. The use of intelligence tests by Professor Peter Sandiford of the University of Toronto in his testing program of British Columbia school children for the 1925 Putman/Weir “Survey of the School System” became problematic when he found “Oriental” or Asian (Chinese and Japanese Canadian) school children achieved superior results compared to white children. How this instance of anti-Asian sentiment fits into the broader educational history of Vancouver schools and the troubling manner in which this racism was justified will be examined. This example of scientific racism through intelligence testing is a disturbing instance in British Columbia’s history but when examined in the context of the time period seems to be an extension of popular social attitudes about the province’s racial identity. It serves as a cautionary historical tale of racial tensions and social relations.

**The “Oriental” or Asian Challenge to the Dominance of the Anglo-White Race in British Columbia:**

 The fear of “Orientals” or Asians has been a feature of British Columbia’s history since the gold rush era of the mid-1860's when large scale Chinese immigration into the then Crown Colony first begun. “Orientals” is an archaic and racially derogatory term used by Anglo-Whites in the late 19th and early 20th centuries to refer to a variety of Asiatic peoples from the “Far East” including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Filipinos, Malays, Javanese, Thai, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Laotian as well as Hindus and Sikhs from the Indian sub-continent. The term also encompasses various Arab peoples inhabiting what used to be called the “Near East”. In strict terms “Oriental” denotes a broad geographic region stretching from the Middle East to India, China, Japan, Mongolia and South East Asia. “Orientals” was a general term used to describe all the peoples from this vast, large region while those from the West were “Occidentals”.[[1]](#endnote-1) Edward Said situates “Orientalism” within a developing Western Imperialism of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. To Said: “the essence of Orientalism is the ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority.” Said believes a hostile global division emerged in the late 19th century between “us” Westerners and the decaying empires of “they” Orientals that justified European territorial expansion.[[2]](#endnote-2) To historian Henry Yu it was more simple; “‘Oriental’ was a racial classification that not only was bounded by presumed origins in Asia...but also reflected a history of struggles over the threat of cheap labor to supposedly ‘native whites’.”[[3]](#endnote-3) The image of the Orient in the Anglo-White mind was a mixture of fascination and horror; such abominations as Eastern despotism, rampant disease, drug addiction, as well as the imminent threat of human inundation by mass Asian immigration to the West fostered widespread fear. British Columbia’s Anglo-Whites were influenced by the xenophobia of California’s gold rush but their world view was also shaped by the growing Western hostility to Asians. The “Victoria Daily Colonist” asked its readers on the 21st of May 1900 should not the province be saved for White British subjects “– or must it be given over entirely to the yellow and brown hordes of China and Japan?”[[4]](#endnote-4) The Asian was undesirable because they were ultimately unassimilable into Anglo-White society.

 “Orientals” was a generic label was used by the dominant Anglo-White population of British Columbia to delineate the growing numbers of Chinese, Japanese and East Indians (South Asians) whose immigration levels rose after Confederation with Canada in 1871 into the early 20th century. The anti-Asian sentiment of the Anglo-Whites stem from several fears about these racial groups, some based in fact but the majority born of irrational beliefs. In 1921 73.9 per cent (387,513) of British Columbians were of British ethnicity or birth, 13.9 per cent (72,743) were Continental European, only 7.6 per cent (39,739) were Asian and as little as 4.3 per cent (22,377) were First Nations. The total population of the province was 524,582 and Asians as percentage of the population would decline over the next several decades due to immigration restrictions.[[5]](#endnote-5) Anglo-Whites believed they would be overwhelmed by hordes arriving from Asia; labour unions feared competition from low wage Asian workers and Chinese men were perceived as narcotics dealers who corrupted White women. The numbers of Asians in the province between 1911 and 1931 remained constant at 7 per cent of the total provincial population. Asian or “Oriental” immigration had been curbed as a result of the 1885 “Head Tax” on Chinese immigrants and the 1908 “Gentlemen’s Agreement” with the Imperial Japanese government.[[6]](#endnote-6) Labour unions did have reasonable grounds to fear competition from poorly paid Asian workers such as the Chinese miners used by Robert Dunsmuir in his coal mines on Vancouver Island. Other coal mine owners employed British miners but Dunsmuir preferred Chinese workers who were “little more than serfs.”[[7]](#endnote-7) The image of Asian men as the sellers of opium who enslaved White women in the sex trade was popular among Anglo-Whites of British Columbia in the early 20th century.[[8]](#endnote-8) The image of Chinese “Oriental” evil can be seen in novels as British author Sax Rohmer whose “Mystery of Fu Manchu” (1913) was the first in a series about a Chinese crime boss and his battle with Anglo-White policemen. Asians or “Orientals” were stereotyped as the debasers of White women and the corruptors of society through drug addiction. This in a city as Vancouver which at the time was rife with narcotic patent medicines in every drug store and open houses of prostitution in the red light district.[[9]](#endnote-9)

 Originally Asians had come to British Columbia as labourers and gold miners. The Chinese labourers were recruited for the construction of the transcontinental railway through the provinces’ mountains.[[10]](#endnote-10) The Japanese were attracted to British Columbia between 1880 and 1920 by opportunities in the fishing industry, lumbering, mining and later agriculture.[[11]](#endnote-11) East Indians or South Asians came to the province in the early 20th century and their numbers reached a peak in 1907 with a population of four thousand. The majority were Sikhs from the Punjab state of British India and worked as casual labourers in lumbering and farming, largely in the south coastal region.[[12]](#endnote-12) However, as the first waves of Asian immigrants settled in British Columbia and gradually began to send their children to public school, unless they organized their own, a new cause for alarm arose within the Anglo-White community. Historian Patricia Roy calls this new prejudice the “fear of Asian superiority” particularly “in the classroom.” In 1925 a Japanese boy, Nobuichi Yamaoka, achieved the highest provincial score on the high school entrance examination even though he had only arrived in the province in 1923 knowing no English. Alarmed at how quickly the young Japanese boy had adapted to Anglo-White society “The Vancouver Sun” proclaimed on the 4th of July, 1925, that the real “yellow peril” was not a military force coming from the East but rather those “yellow settlers” and their children’s “yellow intelligence.”[[13]](#endnote-13) Various attempts had been made to segregate Asian school children; Vancouver and Victoria “practiced partial segregation” by separating lower grade students into their own classes. Older immigrant students who could not pass grade level English proficiency tests were segregated. This lasted in Vancouver schools until 1936 and Victoria schools until after the Second World War.[[14]](#endnote-14) In 1914 school trustees in Vancouver demanded Chinese students be kept apart from Anglo-White students after a Chinese servant boy murdered his White mistress and stuffed her body in the household furnace. However, the consensus of the Vancouver School Board was that their was no need to segregate Asian school children as teachers found no evidence they impeded the progress of white children despite their lack of English skills.[[15]](#endnote-15) Attempt were made in the province’s capital, Victoria, from 1901 to 1908 to isolate Chinese students in a single school in Chinatown but a strike/boycott by Chinese parents of the scheme kept their access open to integrated public education. The Anglo-White community in Victoria initiated the plan because they believed “there would be more Chinese scholars in some ward schools than Whites.”[[16]](#endnote-16)

 In this article the use of intelligence tests on Chinese and Japanese students during the inter-war period of the 1920's in the Vancouver public schools system will be examined for a specific aspect of anti-Asian sentiment. This paper will look at the challenges Chinese and Japanese students posed to Anglo-White intellectual dominance. Within this article the term Asian is used to describe only Chinese and Japanese students and does not include South Asians from the Indian sub-continent. Some of the primary sources refer to Chinese and Japanese Canadian children as “Orientals.” Set against a back drop of societal racism that resulted in such events as the 1907 Vancouver anti-Asiatic riots which saw angry white mobs wreck Chinatown as well as Japantown, the use of intelligence tests on Chinese and Japanese Canadian children in 1925 failed to produce the expected results, a clear confirmation of Anglo-White mental superiority. The test results only affirmed a long standing fear; Asians or “Orientals” would over take Whites intellectually. It was one of British Columbia’s first historians, Judge W.F. Howay, who warned in 1914 “that the Japanese is a far more dangerous antagonist” because of “his superior education, his training, and his more plastic nature” which allowed “him to compete in a far greater variety of occupations.”[[17]](#endnote-17) Others were more blunt as journalist Ernest McGaffey who declared “the yellow man can never become a white man.”[[18]](#endnote-18) He would later state a widely held social belief that Orientals or Asians “cannot be assimilated into the life of the predominant race” and were unassimilable even through such mechanisms as public education in a common school system.[[19]](#endnote-19) By the late 1920's Nisei youth, the first generation of Japanese Canadians, had attained professional and university training but found their career aspirations denied because they were not allowed on the voters list.[[20]](#endnote-20) Educational achievement and attaining professional status did not mean upward social mobility as racial barriers kept Asians in the ranks of labourers and shopkeepers. Intelligence and education attainment were made subservient during the early 20th century in British Columbia to ones place in the racial hierarchy as dominated by Anglo-Whites.

**Scientific Racism in Canada: Dr. Peter Sandiford, Eugenics and Early Canadian Intelligence Testing:**

 In 1924 British Columbia’s Department of Education initiated an educational survey of the public school system with the full support of the province’s teachers. Under the direction of the first Professor of Education at the University of British Columbia (UBC), George Moir Weir, and a senior Ottawa School Inspector, Harold J. Putman, the study was the first American style survey of a Canadian school system. It had been initiated at the urging of the Provincial Teacher’s Federation which had come under the influence of American Progressive educators from the State of Washington in the early 1920's.[[21]](#endnote-21) The person placed in charge of the intelligence testing component of what would become known as the Putman/Weir “Survey of the School System” (1925), or simply the “Survey”, was Professor Peter Sandiford of the University of Toronto. Intelligence testing was an integral part of the school survey process because the tests were believed to be an accurate scientific measure of pupil achievement and thus school efficiency. The American “National Education Association” (NEA) created a committee on “Tests and Standards of Efficiency in Schools” as early as 1911 to promote the use of intelligence testing within American public education.[[22]](#endnote-22) However, in Canada intelligence testing in the public schools was primarily advocated by one man, Peter Sandiford. His social/racial biases and academic training must be considered before the actual testing he undertook for the Putman/Weir “Survey” can be examined.

 Peter Sandiford was born on January 15, 1882 at Little Hayfield in Derbyshire, England, into a solidly middle class family. His father, John E. Sandiford, was a professional engineer and he ensured that his son was educated at one of Derbyshire’s finest private schools, New Mills. After graduating with distinction in 1901 Peter Sandiford attended Victoria Manchester University where he earned an Honors Bachelor’s of Science in 1904 and a Master’s of Science in 1907. From 1906-1908 Sandiford was a science lecturer at Manchester University.[[23]](#endnote-23) Sandiford’s training was in biology and he would have been exposed to the rediscovered theories of Gregor Mendel on genetic inheritance and the new “germ plasm” cell genetics of August Weismann. He would have been familiar with the social application of biological hereditarianism to human beings put forward in the writings of Francis Galton on eugenics and the work of Charles Spearman on the fixed nature of general human intelligence from birth or the “g factor”.[[24]](#endnote-24) From 1906 Sandiford became associated with the Department of Education at Manchester University through the Fielden Demonstration School for teacher training where he lectured. His background in biology facilitated his first published work on the pedagogy of science instruction. His first research study concerned the work/study system of education in the textile mills of the Manchester area. In the introduction to the volume containing Sandiford’s work on “The Half-time System in the Textile Trades” the Head of Teacher Training, M.E. Sadler, identified him as “a member of the staff of our department.”[[25]](#endnote-25) However, Sandiford’s career as an educational psychologist only began to emerge in 1908 when he left Manchester to work under Edward L. Thorndike at Columbia University’s Teacher’s College in New York.

 Thorndike and Sandiford shared a common background in biology. Thorndike had conducted his early research on primates and arrived at Stimulus-Response or “S-R Theory”. When hired at Teacher’s College in 1899 it as assumed anyone who “had made a study of monkeys” could just as easily study children as they were highly analogous.[[26]](#endnote-26) His interest in the biological basis of learning and the scientific measurement of intelligence had made Thorndike one of America’s leading educational psychologists. Before Sandiford’s arrival at Columbia Thorndike had published his “Measurement of Twins” (1905) which drew heavily upon his conviction that heredity and sex differences were predictors of school ability.[[27]](#endnote-27) Sandiford rapidly completed his Master’s of Education submitting his paper “Some Aspects of the Training of Teachers” in early 1910. By late 1910 Sandiford earned his doctorate from Teacher’s College when he published “The Training of Teachers in England and Wales”. Sandiford was a fellow at Columbia University in 1908-1909 and became a tutor at Teacher’s College from 1909-1910. He temporarily returned to Manchester University from 1910-1913 as an education lecturer and Superintendent of the Fielden Demonstration School. In late 1913 he was recommended for an appointment to the College of Education at the University of Toronto and became an associate professor of Education. Shortly after taking up the position Sandiford published “The Mental and Physical Life of School Children” (1913) as a textbook for his psychology course. The book was dedicated to his mentor, Edward L. Thorndike. Sandiford’s view of school children was shaped by his belief in biological destiny as determined by genetic heredity. He made it quite clear that heredity “not only determines what traits a man shall posses, but also limits their possible developments.”[[28]](#endnote-28) In a series of three diagrams of ray arrows emanating from a single point Sandiford illustrated his concept. The genius (A) has a series of ray lines that extend well beyond the limits of an outer boundary of dashed lines marking normal mental growth. The normal person (B) has a series of ray lines that extend to the dashed boundary of normal mental growth. The mental defective © has a single ray line that fails to meet the dashed line boundary showing subnormal mental development. “Present day schooling”, Sandiford wrote, “largely neglects the factor of nature [heredity].” Schools try in vain to “develop all [children] to an equal degree irrespective of endowment.”[[29]](#endnote-29) Sandiford believed the “bulk of Children” were mediocre at best, while a small minority were of “exceptional superiority” and another small minority had a marked “inferiority.”[[30]](#endnote-30) Schools had to scientifically detect these groups of school children and concentrate on segregating the subnormal. Sandiford was an early supporter of eugenics in education and was a prominent member of the “Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene” (CNCMH).[[31]](#endnote-31) In 1920 Sandiford was appointed professor of educational psychology and in 1931 was made director of the Department of Educational Research at the University of Toronto. He taught widely teaching Summer Sessions at Columbia University in 1917, 1922, 1927 and 1928. He also did Summer Sessions at the University of California and Stanford University in 1930, 1933 and 1936.[[32]](#endnote-32)

 Sandiford has been described by historian George S. Tomkins as “basically a hereditarian” who believed “individual differences...could be identified by tests.” In 1914 Sandiford proclaimed that although he wanted “no lethal chambers” to deal with those afflicted with severe mental disabilities he did advocate sexual sterilization as a means of preventing the addition of more “defective offspring to [the] already heavy burdens of normal society.” Like his fellow eugenicists in the mental hygiene movement, Tomkins states Sandiford’s rhetoric was often “alarmist and hysterical in tone.”[[33]](#endnote-33) Central to the mental hygiene agenda was an unalterable belief that race, intelligence and social class status were linked through biological heredity. Intelligence testing in the public schools was a mechanism that would “lead to a more scientific grading of pupils in the future.”[[34]](#endnote-34) In 1918 Sandiford declared Canada was becoming a “dumping ground for misfits and defectives.”[[35]](#endnote-35) He was echoing the nativist sentiments of the times in North America where the political will to stop all non Anglo-White immigration was becoming a dominant sentiment.[[36]](#endnote-36) In 1917 American psychology began to have an influential role in determining social and military selection. Henry Herbert Goddard of the Vineland Training School for Mental Defectives in New Jersey reported the results of his testing of immigrants arriving at the Ellis Island Reception Center in New York. He claimed two out of every five arrivals were feeble minded. Also in 1917 the American Army commissioned a panel of prominent psychologists headed by Robert Yerkes of Harvard University to test recruits for their mental fitness and use the results to promote the most mentally competent. The Army Tests were popularized by a Canadian psychologist, Carl C. Brigham, in “A Study of American Intelligence” (1923); the test results served to foster the notion of a decline in national intelligence due to the uncontrolled influx of mentally defective immigrants.[[37]](#endnote-37) More sensational but popular with the American public was Lothrop Stoddard’s “The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy” (1920) as well as Madison Grant’s “The Passing of the Great Race” (1921) which openly advocate immigrant removal. Peter Sandiford was in the forefront of the CNCMH’s efforts to promote restrictive immigration laws in Canada similar to those enacted in 1924 by the American Congress.[[38]](#endnote-38)

 Sandiford’s most complete statement on racial and mental differences was a 1927 lecture in Regina delivered to the general meeting of the Saskatchewan Education Association. Drawing heavily from the American Army Tests and his own testing of school children in Canada, Sandiford concluded “all evidence points to the desirability of scanning more closely...the intellectual credentials of many racial elements seeking admission to this country.” He warned “the average intelligence of Americans has been seriously lowered by the reckless immigration policy” because the United States increased its “population irrespective of the intellectual caliber of the immigrants.” In conclusion Sandiford admonished that the “quality through inheritance will leave its permanent mark on our people.”[[39]](#endnote-39) Sandiford would continue to believe throughout his professional career that race was linked to intelligence and the Caucasian race, in particular Anglo-White peoples, were genetically more intelligent than other races. Only a year after this talk Sandiford published an article with his graduate student, Elmer Jamieson. Jamieson was a full blood Mohawk and he assisted Sandiford in testing 717 Mohawk school children in Quebec and Ontario. “Pure blood Indian children” gave “inferior performances” on intelligence and achievement tests. However, “IQ seems to rise with the admixture of White blood.”[[40]](#endnote-40) Late in his academic career Sandiford sponsored another graduate student, H.A. Tanser, to conduct research on Canadian black children in Kent County, Ontario. The children were the descendants of escaped American slaves who came to Canada on the underground railway and except for a brief period they had been educate with their white peers in common schools since 1890. In Sandiford’s opinion the blacks had failed to achieve mental equality with whites; he endorsed Tanser’s conclusion that environmental advantages could not over come genetics and thus blacks were intellectually inferior to whites.[[41]](#endnote-41)

 Peter Sandiford cannot be held solely responsible for the spread of scientific racism through intelligence testing in Canada. His Anglo-British upbringing and his views on the superiority of Anglo-Whites was hardly unique in early 20th century Canada but not all subscribed to this race dogma.[[42]](#endnote-42) However, Sandiford’s role as a leading advocate of educational testing in Canada, his public pronouncements to Canadian educators and his training of graduate students constantly advanced the concept of an individual’s intellect being determined by genetics as well as racial origins. During his 1924 project to test Asian or Chinese and Japanese children in the schools of Vancouver Sandiford would have his views on race and intelligence challenged in a very fundamental manner.

**The Testing Program of Dr. Peter Sandiford and Miss Ruby Kerr for the Putman/Weir Survey of the School System, 1925:**

 When Sandiford came to British Columbia in 1924 and began his testing program for the Putman/Weir “Survey” he did so in a social environment of open racism towards Asian minorities in the province. It was also a society in which eugenic principles and mental hygiene measure had gained wide acceptance. As early as 1919 Dr. J.D. Maclean in his role as Provincial Secretary had invited Dr. C.M. Hinks of the CNCMH to conduct a mental hygiene survey of various public institutions. Hinks reported that 72 per cent of patients in the Public Hospital for the Insane and inmates in the provincial Goal or jail were mentally deranged coming from foreign born stock although given the historically high rate of First Nations incarceration this finding has to be questioned. Collectively, Hinks believed, they posed a significant threat to the province.[[43]](#endnote-43) The public schools of Vancouver had segregated special classes for subnormal or feeble-minded students as selected by intelligence tests as early as 1910.[[44]](#endnote-44) By the mid 1920's the special class supervisor, Miss Josephine Dauphinee and her school psychologist, Miss Ruby Kerr, presided over system of twenty special education classes containing 211 pupils as taught by twenty-one teachers. An Observation Class teacher and a social worker provided clinical services to Vancouver school’s subnormal children. The use of intelligence tests to select and segregate subnormal children was an established practice.[[45]](#endnote-45) Many of the students in these special classes under Dauphinee were foreign born. In 1921 she described two of her students as “brothers from sunny Italy, lazy, degenerate, dissolute and mentally deficient.” Canada was “allowing to enter our fair land this degenerate stock of foreign countries”, Dauphinee wrote, and many of these were immigrant children who became special class students “clogging our educational system.” However, she cautioned that the cost of the special classes could not be “viewed in dollars and cents” as they served as “a preventative of pauperism, vagrancy and crime.”[[46]](#endnote-46) Vancouver public school pupils were routinely being given intelligence tests long before Sandiford arrived on the west coast in a “progressive” program of screening tests to find special class students.

 Sandiford came to British Columbia in the late Spring of 1924. He prepared a series of preliminary tests for administration on elementary school children based upon the tests he had developed for Ontario schools. He tested 1,100 pupils in the “six upper grades of the elementary school course” in Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster and Chilliwack. The preliminary tests were not standardized on a sample population of school children producing norming tables and were “not to be considered scientifically accurate.” Scoring was done by an outside examiner and random papers were checked to assure grading uniformity. The results showed that British Columbia’s students form grades four to eight scored lower than Ontario students in spelling and arithmetic. The results were an indication to Putman/Weir of how useful the testing data would be in “evaluating the efficiency of the schools.”[[47]](#endnote-47) In the preliminary testing there was no discussion of race differences and intelligence. In fact the testing program was presented as a way to compare the achievement of rural pupils to urban, reform school finance, guide curricular choices and generally increase the efficiency of the public schools as American school surveys purported to do.[[48]](#endnote-48) Putman/Weir believed those who criticized intelligence testing on moral grounds did not appreciate the usefulness of such “objective” scientific data collection; they believed that normal intelligence was related positively to an individual’s social worth.[[49]](#endnote-49) However, in their description of the testing data no specific reference was made race, intelligence levels and genetic hereditarianism. These links would be made by Sandiford alone in his eugenic interpretation of the testing data.

 The educational historian and former British Columbia Deputy Minister of Education, Charles Ungerleider, has written “there is little doubt that eugenics provided part of the frame of reference for the interpretation of Sandiford’s data.”[[50]](#endnote-50) In fact Sandiford’s entire testing program could be seen as an exercise in verifying certain eugenic concepts about race. The higher intelligence of northern Europeans, the intellectual superiority of professionals over manual workers, the inheritance of superior intelligence by the offspring of professionals, the mental superiority of males over females in certain areas of reasoning as mathematics and the genetic differences of intellectual abilities among racial groups were but a few of the eugenic notions Sandiford sought to substantiate through testing data. The testing program examined 17,300 pupils from elementary/secondary schools up to young adults at UBC and student teachers at the Vancouver/Victoria Normal Schools. The sample size consisted of 10,000 elementary pupils, 5,000 high school pupils, 800 Normal School student teachers and 500 first year university students from UBC.[[51]](#endnote-51) There were two broad types of tests administered; standardized intelligence tests to determine intelligence quotients (IQ’s) and achievement tests (standardized and non-standardized) in specific academic skills/subjects.

 The first testing instruments Sandiford administered were intelligence tests. Younger children were given the Pinter-Cunningham Primary Mental Test and the National Intelligence Test. Older pupils and adults were given a variation of the American Army Alpha Test and the Otis Proverb Test adapted by Sandiford to create a battery of eight sub-tests which he called “The BC Intelligence Test.” The results encompassed a full range of pupils from high school, the Vancouver Normal School and first year students at UBC. Sex performance difference were noticed generally on the testing results but the data from the Vancouver Normal School was the most telling to Sandiford. Normal School students were a highly selected population as their ages were about the same and they had to attain good results on high school matriculation examinations to be admitted to teacher training. The intellectual homogeneity of Normal School students made the sex performance differences on the tests highly significant to Sandiford. The female Normal School students had an IQ range of 100-109, while the male IQ range was higher at 110-119. Considering this group was selectively generated as opposed to a random sample Sandiford concluded “the intellectual superiority of the males over females is...clearly shown.”[[52]](#endnote-52) Modern psychology has found sex performance differences on intelligence tests but have not reached the sweeping conclusions of Sandiford.[[53]](#endnote-53)

 Another way Sandiford used his testing data was as a link to parental occupation and social class. Sorting parents into occupational groups from unskilled labourer (e.g. miner, logger) to farmer (e.g. market gardener, rancher), semi-skilled labourer (e.g. janitor, fisherman), skilled labourer (e.g. electrician, carpenter), clerical/business workers (e.g. clerk, book keeper), and professionals (e.g. teacher, civil engineer, lawyer) Sandiford found that results confirmed “Haggerty’s findings” that “the intelligence of children is conditioned by the occupational status of the parents.” The natural intelligence of the parents “is handed down to children” and if the birth of children is to be socially planned then professionals should “eugenically” be “the group in which large families should be encouraged.”[[54]](#endnote-54) Positive eugenics advocated increased breeding of the upper social classes, as professionals, while negative eugenics would discourage large families in the lower social classes, unskilled and semi-skilled labourers. Negative eugenics took the form of voluntary but more often forced sterilization as sanctioned by law in North America in the inter-war period of the 1920's and 1930's.[[55]](#endnote-55) Sandiford’s eugenic beliefs became very evident when he linked his test results to the racial origins of students he tested. English, Scotch and Irish pupils showed “little difference in mentality” while Scandinavians, particularly Norwegians, had “regrettably low scores.” There were low levels of intelligence from pupils born in continental Europe, particularly the southern and eastern regions. Sandiford warned that the “continued immigration of inferior stock could only end in disaster.”[[56]](#endnote-56) Clearly Anglo-Whites of British stock were the preferred candidates for entry into British Columbia in Sandiford’s view. The omission of students of Asian birth or ancestry was quite noticeable on Sandiford’s data charts, tables and graphs. He did not specifically state if he was asked not to test these students or he simply made the decision himself. “A few Japanese and Chinese students” were included in the general study of intelligence but the use of the English language during testing was judge not to be “fair to them.” Therefore a “special study of the mental capacity of Japanese and Chinese pupils” was included as a separate section of Sandiford’s test report.[[57]](#endnote-57)

 The other type of testing instruments administered by Sandiford and his assistant, Ruby Kerr, were achievement tests. Elementary students wrote the BC Spelling Test, Ayres-Burgess Silent Reading Test, Thorndike-McCall Reading Test, Ayres Handwriting Test, Woody-McCall Mixed Fundamentals of Arithmetic Test, BC Test of the Fundamentals of Arithmetic, BC Geography Test (Grades VI to VIII) and the BC History Test (Grade VIII). High school pupils were given the BC Geography Test, BC History Test, BC Test in General Science, Ruch-Popenoe General Science Test, Holtz Algebra Test, Henmon Latin Test and Henmon French Test. Males outperformed females in Science, Geography and Latin.[[58]](#endnote-58) In Algebra males and females had equal skills.[[59]](#endnote-59) Females had superior skills to males in French.[[60]](#endnote-60) Urban pupils did better than rural pupils on most of the achievement tests given. Urban pupils scored significantly higher in history and science.[[61]](#endnote-61) Rural students only managed to match their urban counterparts in algebra but in geography “rural districts make higher scores...than city pupils.”[[62]](#endnote-62) Sandiford’s urban bias was shown in his comparison of Vancouver and Victoria, even though they had only one half the school age population of the province, the other half was rural or found in scattered small towns. He declared “Vancouver wins in every grade” and then suggested the adoption where feasible of the urban junior high school model currently “sweeping the United States.”[[63]](#endnote-63) Overall Sandiford’s testing program was a highly subjective interpretation of the testing data complicated by his racial, gender and urban biases. In the testing program his data seemed to fit the explanations and conclusions he was looking for. However, when Sandiford belatedly decided to test the Chinese and Japanese students of Vancouver’s schools he encountered testing results that confounded many of his underlying assumptions.

**The testing of Chinese and Japanese Canadian Pupils in Vancouver’s Schools:**

 The idea of simply removing Chinese and Japanese children from local schools may have been the motivation behind Sandiford’s belated testing program. If judged to fall in the feebleminded mental category they could be segregated into special classes. In the period before the First World War local educational authorities did not seem to be preoccupied with the need to scientifically justify the removal of Asian students as when New Westminster’s school board placed all their Chinese and Japanese students, thirty five, in a tent in a city park due to “school crowding.” New Westminster Board of Trade head L.B. Lushy made his views known to the local School Board; he did not mind younger Asian or “Oriental” children born in Canada going to school with white children but “older pupils fresh from the Orient” needed segregated “special accommodation.”[[64]](#endnote-64) This continued in the inter-war period in 1921 when the Nanaimo School Board on Vancouver Island segregated its Chinese Canadian students, many the offspring of Chinese coal miners, following an earlier move by the Cumberland School Board.[[65]](#endnote-65) Even School Boards in communities with large resident Japanese Canadian populations as Marpole and the fishing village of Steveston on the Fraser River isolated their Asian students in designated schools.[[66]](#endnote-66) Sandiford stated the separate testing program was undertaken because the province “should be interested in determining the mental capacities of her alien groups.” In trying to gain accurate mental measurements even Sandiford realized that most standardized intelligence tests required a fluent knowledge of English. To blindly administer such tests “would not be fair to them.”[[67]](#endnote-67) The Pinter-Paterson Performance Tests were chosen by Sandiford because they have “proved suitable for use with alien groups.” Most of the tests were a variety of “form boards” with precut holes into which different shaped blocks fit. It is the “speed and accuracy of the performance” which is “used to judge the intelligence of the pupil.” The Pinter-Paterson tests “correlated highly” with other standardized intelligence tests as the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales.[[68]](#endnote-68)

 Sandiford first reported his test results in a abbreviated form in a testing appendix of the Putman/Weir “Survey” and later wrote an article for “The Journal of Educational Psychology” (September 1926). Integrating both documents provides the most accurate appraisal of his testing data. In the “Survey” Sandiford stated his sample size was 305 (155 Chinese and 150 Japanese pupils), while in the journal article he claimed to have used “500 records.”[[69]](#endnote-69) The sample was composed of “an unrelated group of Chinese and Japanese pupils attending the Public Elementary Schools of Vancouver.” The actual testing was not done by Sandiford himself as he personally trained Ruby Kerr of the Vancouver School’s Psychological Clinic in the Pinter-Paterson Test protocol and she in turn trained her staff. There were strict measures taken to “secure uniformity of procedure and technique” in order to assure standardization.[[70]](#endnote-70)

 The results could thus not lack validity in Sandiford’s mind. In the article he reviewed several previous testing studies on Asian, Chinese and Japanese, school children by American researchers. W.H. Pyle’s early study of Chinese boys and girls as compared to American children of the same age; K.T. Yeung’s later study of 150 Chinese children ages nine to eleven in San Francisco; and M.L. Darsie’s study of Japanese children in California aged ten to fifteen years are cited. Pyle found Chinese boys superior to American boys but that was not the case with girls. Yeung found that his Chinese children had a median IQ of 97 which was equivalent to that of white children. Darsie found median IQ’s of between 90 to 99 on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales which relied on English fluency but the Beta Army Test results, using non-language based assessment criteria, were “indicative of superiority.”[[71]](#endnote-71) It was readily apparent from Sandiford’s own literature review that the scores he would generate on the tests should place Asian children in the average range of intelligence.

 When the testing data was calculated the results were not quite what Sandiford expected. In the article Sandiford states the “results are somewhat surprising, even startling.” In the “Survey” Sandiford summarized the testing data he found by noting “the Japanese are superior to the Chinese and both are greatly superior to the average white population.”[[72]](#endnote-72) The article detailed that the median IQ of Japanese males was 115.4; Japanese females 112.8 for a combined IQ for Japanese pupils of 114.2, well above the average range of white IQ’s. The median IQ of Chinese males was 107.77; Chinese females 107.0 for a combined IQ for Chinese pupils of 107.4. Five-sixths of Japanese males exceeded IQ levels that only one-half of all whites tested could reach. Fully 80 per cent of the Japanese children reached or exceeded the scores of whites. Approximately 71 per cent of Chinese children reached or exceeded the scores of whites.[[73]](#endnote-73) Sandiford validated the results by explaining that four methods had been used to calculate the scores; year scale, median mental age, point scale and percentiles. Pinter recommended the percentile method as the “simple and most accurate.” Modern standards of test validity rely on such factors as a diverse sample and large geographical population for test norming. An individual’s test performance is usually measured through standard scores. Standard scores are determined by an individual’s test performance as calculated from the mean average utilizing standard deviations.[[74]](#endnote-74) Sandiford noted evidence in his article version that the Pinter-Paterson test scores “tend to run higher” than those obtained on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales but that was because the Standford-Binet tests depended on a fluent knowledge of English. He also found evidence the year scale method “magnifies the true values” while the median mental age method tended to “greatly reduce them.” The year scale method provides values that were “probably too high.” The point scale method provided values that fell between the year scale values and the median mental age calculations. It seems as if Sandiford was trying to find fault with the Pinter-Paterson Test itself but not the accuracy of his test score calculations. He concluded that “the Japanese and Chinese are not so intelligent as Table I makes them out to be”; Table 1 displayed the high median IQ values for the Oriental pupils tested as compared to whites.[[75]](#endnote-75) Sandiford’s test results have been re-evaluated by a contemporary psychologist, Philip E. Vernon. He found the “method of arriving at IQs for this battery [Pinter-Paterson Tests] have always been somewhat dubious.” Vernon determined that when Sandiford’s test results were “recalculated by an alternate method” the IQ scores of the subjects “were considerably reduced.”[[76]](#endnote-76)

 Sandiford was desperately trying to seek an explanation for the seemingly unexplainable, that the children of Asian immigrants to British Columbia who were decidedly not Anglo-White possessed superior mental capacity. The very basis of his racial and social assumptions about intelligence as found in the “Survey” would be shattered if he did not find a plausible explanation. Sandiford decided that the key factor behind his finding of superior Asian mentality was “undoubtedly due to selection.”[[77]](#endnote-77) He had approximately the same explanation in both his journal article and the “Survey”:

In the main it is the Japanese and Chinese possessing the

qualities of cleverness, resourcefulness and courage who

emigrate to British Columbia; the dullards and less enterprising

are left behind. This superiority of an emigrant stock is no new

phenomenon in world history. There are those who maintain that

Great Britain owes her eminent position in the world to the fact

that only the clever and sturdy could secure a footing on her shores.

The American Army tests showed that those who had forced the

Rocky Mountain barrier and reached the Pacific slopes were of

higher intelligence than the groups they left behind. Secondly,

the groups tested in the elementary schools are probably selected;

the relatively more intelligent Chinese and Japanese children will

be sent to school in higher proportion than obtains among the

Whites. Thirdly, the comparative smallness of the groups (150 and 155)

should not be forgotten, although it is doubtful if ten times the

number would have given radically different results.[[78]](#endnote-78)

Sandiford, as a eugenicist, had to rely on a rather vague argument that pulled together elements of Herbert Spencer’s human improvement through “Social Darwinism” and Frederick Jackson Turner’s “Frontier Thesis” to explain the failure of his racial science.[[79]](#endnote-79) He warned in the “Survey’s” testing appendix that “the presence of an industrious, clever, and frugal alien group, capable, so far as mentality is concerned, of competing successfully with native whites...constitutes a problem which calls for the highest quality of statesmanship if it is to be solved satisfactorily.”[[80]](#endnote-80) The article conclusion was similar in that Sandiford warned the “presence of so many clever, industrious and frugal aliens constitutes a political and economic problem of the greatest importance.”[[81]](#endnote-81) Vernon stated such a conclusion concerning the Chinese who came to British Columbia was preposterous as they “were originally of poor peasant stock” while the Japanese “were better educated”; to Vernon Sandiford’s explanation was basically absurd.[[82]](#endnote-82) The real problem was that the test results Sandiford generated seriously dislocated his social and scientific belief system. His strained explanation for the tests results would have been readily accepted by the ordinary public in the inter-war period. A conversation between two of the characters in British Columbia author Hilda Glynn-Ward’s 1921 racist penny-dreadful novel displays the attitudes held by Vancouver’s Anglo-Whites:

They’re uppish now, you even see that in the yellow brats

coming out of school; they’re cleverer than us and they

know it and you and I know it too! Specially the Japs, you’ll

see them at the top o’ the class and the white kids at the

bottom every time! There’s a school in Vancouver where

there’s 324 Jap and Chink children to 275 whites, a precious

fat chance they got to keep their end up.[[83]](#endnote-83)

Japanese and Chinese Canadian school children in Vancouver were perceived as social threat.

**Criticisms of Sandiford’s Testing:**

 However odious and racially discriminatory we find Sandiford’s testing today even more interesting is the criticism he received at the time. In 1928 a Vancouver school principal, J.E. Brown, published a stinging rebuke to Sandiford’s treatment of Chinese and Japanese Canadian school children in “The BC Teacher” magazine. In reference to Sandiford’s immigration selection thesis accounting for higher IQ scores among Chinese and Japanese students Brown stated “it would impress many as rather a sweeping conclusion to draw on the basis of the evidence.” Brown had done his own study on 80 Japanese and 120 white pupils in grades 6, 7 and 8 at his own school, Strathcona, located in Vancouver’s Downtown East Side near Japantown on Powell Street. He had undertaken this study even though such “comparisons are sometimes odious” but Brown felt his test data would “likely rebound to the benefit of the children themselves.”[[84]](#endnote-84)

 With the expert assistance of Robert Straight, newly appointed head of Vancouver School’s Bureau of Measurements, Brown gave the 200 pupils in the study the Stanford Achievement Test.[[85]](#endnote-85) The test battery included subtests for Reading, Arithmetic, History, Spelling, Dictation, Literature, Language Usage and Nature Study. English proficiency was a requirement for some of the Stanford subtests and Brown found that on these tests the Japanese pupils were “inferior to the white children.” However, in “mechanical operations” such as arithmetic “they are distinctly superior” and ranked one year, four months above their white counterparts. To Brown the conclusion was “not that the Japanese children are inferior or superior to white children in ability” but rather the fact “they are labouring under a distinctly greater handicap in learning the English language.”[[86]](#endnote-86) Brown reported they spoke Japanese at home and attended a Japanese Language School in Japantown after public school which would not foster English acquisition. To Brown the Japanese Canadian pupils in his school were polite, clean, studious and athletic.[[87]](#endnote-87) They were model pupils with supportive parents and obviously Brown felt Sandiford’s testing had done them an injustice.

 Much the same can be said of the 1930's study of Japanese Canadian children by Charles H. Young and Helen R.Y. Reid of the University of Toronto. They described Sandiford’s testing as inconclusive as the “project suffered form a serious limitation in that comparisons was not made with a group of white pupils in British Columbia.” The IQ scales or Norming Tables upon which the “theoretical white group” was based were in fact American children from the eastern United Sates upon which the Pinter-Paterson Test was originally standardized.[[88]](#endnote-88) Similar objections had been raised about using American testing instruments on British Columbia school children as early as 1926 by A.R. Lord of the Vancouver Normal School who believed even in “tool subjects” or basic skills as Reading and Mathematics “the Norms are quite unreliable.”[[89]](#endnote-89) These objections are not unusual as contemporary achievement and psychoeducational tests suffer from a similar fault because Canadian students are not used as norming samples for standardization.

 However, Young and Reid cite the fact that the Pinter-Paterson test was given to white pupils in 1933 by Robert Straight of the Vancouver School’s Bureau of Measurements. Young and Reid interviewed Straight in the Summer of 1934 and he relayed that the testing data revealed “no material difference in the intelligence rating of the Orientals and the Whites.” Young and Reid surveyed nine elementary and six high schools in Vancouver with Japanese Canadian pupils and found a great deal of consensus about their school abilities. English problems caused poor subject knowledge while in mechanical skills that required controlled hand movement, as drawing or penmanship, they were superior. In abstract subject knowledge as Arithmetic, behaviours such as deportment, attendance and punctuality, “opinions are almost unanimous that Japanese children are much superior to the Whites.”[[90]](#endnote-90) Japanese Canadians pupils suffered from a language handicap which caused many to fall behind their white school mates in subjects like English and Social Studies.

 Vancouver schools had seen a definite rise in their Asian school population. In 1911 Vancouver’s schools had 3,559 Chinese pupils, in 1921 6,484 and in 1931 13,011. Similarly in 1911 there were 2,036 Japanese pupils, in 1921 4,246 and in 1931 8,328.[[91]](#endnote-91) The increase was not due to immigration, which remained small and highly regulated, but from the birth of a new generation of Japanese and Chinese Canadian children within British Columbia. It was entirely probable that at a community level in the neighbourhood schools of Vancouver these children were increasingly seen as a permanent part of the social landscape and not the dangerous alien element described by Sandiford. This is confirmed by Timothy J. Stanley who references school officials who described Canadian born Oriental (Chinese) students as active participants in school life through dramatics and team sports; immigrant students born in China were reported as indifferent to school culture.[[92]](#endnote-92) The Strathcona school study by Principal J.E. Brown was entirely sympathetic to Japanese Canadian students, while the reference in Young and Reid to the conclusions of local school official Robert Straight concerning “no material difference” between the intelligence of Japanese Canadian students as compared to white students was also indicative of a desire for social fairness. However, the outside world and its turmoil would soon overshadow such socially progressive views. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour, Hawaii on December 7, 1941 would bring about the “evacuation” of Japanese Canadians from the Pacific coast and their internment in prison camps in the interior of British Columbia. Redress for this wrong would only come in the late1980's. Chinese Canadians received little benefit from the Chinese Nationalists being allies in the Second World War as social and political rights would only begin to be realized in the late 1940's after the war ended.[[93]](#endnote-93)

**Conclusion: Scientific Racism and Canadian Cultural Diversity:**

 In 1939 Peter Sandiford observed in a journal article that only in North America had intelligence testing been enthusiastically embraced. He believed it was primarily due to “the presence of the immigrant” and the social challenges they posed for the ruling Anglo-White majority. The tests were an attempt to scientifically preserve the intellectual endowment of “native” North Americans, meaning Anglo-Whites, against the onslaught of inferior immigrant stock.[[94]](#endnote-94) The Asian or Chinese and Japanese students present in Vancouver’s schools presented a real problem to Sandiford as they achieved higher test scores than their white counterparts. Angus McLaren notes that to Sandiford “it was clearly unthinkable that they were racially superior to Anglo-Saxons.”[[95]](#endnote-95) The use of intelligence tests in public education was promoted by Sandiford as a vital defense mechanism against supposed inferior immigrant pupils swamping the Canadian school system. Educational discrimination against minority pupils was scientifically justified by Sandiford as a matter of progressive educational policy.

 The social context of British Columbia during the early twentieth century encouraged the process of turning all non whites into “others.” Timothy Stanley believes Sandiford’s very comparison of IQ scores on the basis of where the students were born or racially descended from set up preconceived racial categories of inferiority which acted to separate minority groups from “native” or students racialized as white. Thus to “Sandiford, these categories were self-evident and required no explanation.”[[96]](#endnote-96) Making the provinces’ minorityAsians into “others” as well as First Nations people who were liken to mere parts of the natural environment was a deliberate action according to Stanley. It was taught to school children through school textbooks, Anglo-Whites were at the pinnacle of a racial hierarchy while “others” were in distinctly lower positions. This “imperial racist ideology” permeated the province as “Racism in B.C. was not an aberration.” It was a “sustained reality, part of the air that people breathed”; even groups that traditionally supported democratic rights as labour unions viewed Asian workers as a threat.[[97]](#endnote-97)

 The testing of Chinese and Japanese Canadian students in 1924 by Peter Sandiford was meant to confirm long standing notions of Anglo-White superiority and Asian or “Oriental” inferiority. When this finding did not materialize Sandiford’s testing program was put into doubt as well as his notion of racially based mental abilities. Sandiford failed to perceive the fact minority groups were a part of the Canadian social landscape and there was a strong desire by them to integrate into the larger community through such mechanisms as education. Vancouver’s Downtown East Side was the very center of minority education in the city’s public schools. Principal J.E. Brown’s 1928 study of Japanese Canadian students was conducted to refute Sandiford; he obviously felt the original testing had done his students a great injustice. Brown noted the dedication of his Japanese Canadian students and how hard they tried at school. This sense of an emerging minority identity among the children of Asian immigrants to British Columbia seems to be absent from official histories. Robert A.J. McDonald’s historical study of Vancouver focusing on the East Side paints a picture of social, economic and political divisions among the working class of the city. Only in “growth boom[s]” was there a lessening of “class tensions” which “created a shared sense that material advancement was possible.”[[98]](#endnote-98) At no point does McDonald talk about the shared school experience of minority and white school children; did the shared school experience create pro-social outcomes or did the groups taunt each other reinforcing racism?

 Jean Barman has found school officials in Vancouver during the 1920's had a negative view of East Side school children. A 1920 survey by school officials found that in one East Side school 48 per cent of children slept three or more in a room, well above the average for the city of two children to a room. The “pupils are chiefly Orientals and foreigners...many of them cannot speak English when they enter school” declared a Vancouver School Trustee in 1924. The high Grade One failure rate of Strathcona area pupils in heart of the Downtown East Side was caused by “foreign parentage, undernourishment, low mentality and an environment which fails to provide experiences essential to mental growth.”[[99]](#endnote-99) Barman concludes that “for many East End children, schools were likely not very hospitable.” In a 1923 survey of East Side pupils less than 12 per cent were of “Anglo-Saxon extraction” and such “a large foreign element” seemed to trouble school administrators.[[100]](#endnote-100) On the wealthier and Anglo-White West Side of Vancouver a Kitsilano principal complained that “the presence of Oriental children in schools” makes it difficult “to transmit to the next generation the social inheritance of the present and past generation.”[[101]](#endnote-101) Clearly Vancouver was divided between the wealthier West Side and the poorer East Side; it also constituted a highly visible racial divide. But were there any indications of attitudes of tolerance and acceptance? A clue is found in a school soccer team photograph Barman includes in her study; the students are posed on the steps of an East Side elementary school with their teacher. Most of the students are Asian males, Japanese or Chinese, and only one student is clearly white.[[102]](#endnote-102) They appear to be enjoying a high degree of comradery despite their racial differences. The desire of second generation immigrant youth in the Chinese Canadian community to integrate with the larger Anglo-White society has been well documented; this desire was even expressed through the sociological research conducted in 1924 by Winifred Raushenbush for Robert Park of the University of Chicago. Raushenbush interviewed UBC student Foon Sien Wong head of the Vancouver Chinese Students Alliance or CSA who presented a portrait of the gradual social acceptance of westernized Chinese Canadian youth into Vancouver society which was in fact largely fiction.[[103]](#endnote-103)

 Sandiford’s scientific testing was meant to reinforce eugenic notions of race and intelligence. J.E. Brown called these racial comparisons of intelligence “odious” and made to “satisfy idle curiosity or to bolster up an argument derogatory to any person or group.”[[104]](#endnote-104) Brown as a school principal was more concerned for his students and the community in which they lived. His was a very contemporary attitude of cultural diversity and acceptance within the school system as distinct from the eugenic racism of Sandiford who used intelligence testing to marginalize minority students and foster anti-Asian sentiment. As the contemporary dialogue about historical racism in Canada assumes new importance this example form the inter-war period of British Columbia deserves examination and thoughtful consideration.
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