

**Author Preprint:** Hegarty, P. (2007). From genius inverts to gendered intelligence: Lewis Terman and the power of the norm. *History of Psychology, 10*, 132-155.

**Abstract:** The histories of “intelligence” and “sexuality” have largely been narrated separately. In Lewis Terman’s work on individual differences, they intersect. Influenced by G. Stanley Hall, Terman initially described atypically accelerated development as problematic. Borrowing from Galton, Terman later positioned gifted children as nonaverage but ideal. Attention to the gifted effeminate subjects used to exemplify giftedness and gender nonconformity in Terman’s work shows the selective instantiation of nonaverageness as *pathological* a propos of effeminacy, and as *ideal* a propos of high intelligence. Throughout, high intelligence is conflated with health, masculinity, and heterosexuality. Terman’s research located marital sexual problems in women’s bodies, further undoing possibilities for evaluating heterosexual men’s practices as different from a normative position. Terman’s research modernized Galton’s imperialist vision of a society led by a male cognitive elite. Psychologists continue to traffic in his logic that values and inculcates intelligence only in the service of sexual and gender conformity.

**Keywords:** Lewis Terman, intelligence, sexuality, gender, normativity

An edited volume on the history of psychology’s power almost requires an essay on Lewis Terman (1877–1956), the individual who did more than any other to endow all Americans with a measurable IQ that located their “intelligence” somewhere under a bell curve. Terman’s (1916) Stanford-Binet was the most successful of several English language tests of IQ, and he contributed to the development of IQ as a “group test” during World War I (Carson, 1993; Hornstein, 1988; Kevles, 1968; Samelson, 1979). In the 1920s, in the wake of the boost to IQ from the army tests (see Yerkes, 1921), Terman began an unprecedented empirical study of intellectual gifted children (Terman, 1925; Terman, Burks, & Jensen, 1930; Terman & Oden, 1947, 1959) - a study that continues to be mined by psychologists today (e.g., Holohan & Suzuki, 2004; Lippa, Martin, & Friedman, 2000; McColough, Tsang, & Brion, 2003). In the 1930s, when many psychologists moved away from eugenics and the hereditarian position within IQ debates, that position became increasingly synonymous with Terman’s name and the Stanford department that he chaired (Minton, 1988; Richards, 1997).

Given this legacy, it is not entirely surprising that the continuing determinative importance of Terman’s work on the psychological meanings of “gender” and “sexuality” has taken second place to the politics of race in historical accounts of the forms of psychological power that he developed. Terman and Miles’ (1936) Masculinity–Femininity (MF) test standardized the development of measures of gender, set the paradigm that “masculinity”

and “femininity” were logical opposites of each other for subsequent psychometric tests, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; see Buchanan, 1994), and was identified as the original attempt to measure gender by second-wave feminist psychologists who overturned that assumption (e.g., Constantinople, 1973). Terman’s marital happiness research (Terman et al., 1938, 1951) has also been taken as foundational to later research relating personality differences to relationship satisfaction (Gottman & Notarius, 2002), and his statistically oriented but motivated critique of the first “Kinsey report” (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948, see Terman, 1948) led one biographer to describe him as Kinsey’s “most determined critic” (Jones, 1997, p. 588).

Thus, through Terman’s work, “intelligence,” “gender,” and “sexuality” all became discernable psychological properties of modern individuals in original and unprecedented ways. This article is motivated by unease with the ways that intelligence has taken precedence over gender and sexuality in Terman scholarship, as when his study of MF is described as appealing to him because he “needed a new field for pioneering” (Seagoe, 1975, p. 142) or became, in time “a new direction for Terman’s research on individual differences” (Minton, 1988, p. 167). Given the often-blatant racism of Terman’s thinking, and the ways that racialized debates about IQ have recurred throughout the 20th century (e.g., Block & Dworkin, 1976; Jaccoby & Glauber, 1995; Kincheloe, Steinberg, & Gresson, 1996), this emphasis is unsurprising. However, the return of those debates also suggests that psychologists, and their historians, have not figured out how to get beyond the forms of power at play in IQ research, and that there is an urgent need to think outside the contours of nature/nurture debates carved out by Terman and his contemporaries. In recent years Terman’s sexology has been examined in the context of lesbian, gay, and queer history (Hegarty, 2003; Minton, 1997, 2003; Terry, 1999), and in histories of sex surveys (Ericksen, 1999) and eugenics (Kline, 2002; Stern, 2005). Yet relationships between Terman’s sexology and his IQ work have largely been left understudied. This article explores the possibility that overlooked relationships between “intelligence” and both “masculinity–femininity” and the homo/heterosexual binaries in Terman’s work provide a new vantage point on the inertia of debates about intelligence.

### *The Power of the Norm*

It is becoming increasingly obvious that it is impossible to analyze the history of “scientific racism” and psychology’s sexual politics as if they were separate from each other. American eugenicists, including Terman, were popular intellectuals because their political visions offered solutions to several intersecting anxieties about race, family, and gender (Kline, 2001), the ontologization of the homosexual body was informed by scientific racism (Sommerville, 1994), dis- courses of homosexuality have had very uneven effects along class and race lines in the United States (e.g.,

Chauncey, 1994; Terry, 1999), and African Americans have often been stigmatized in social science literatures for perceived deviations from White's norms for heterosexual kinship (Cohen, 1997). In the conclusion of his study of Romantic genius, Elfenbein (1998, pp. 210–214) briefly suggested that Terman's work on gifted children is not only about race, but also haunted by 19th century associations between queerness and genius. Following Elfenbein (1998), I will describe Terman's work on gifted children as an underacknowledged part of Foucault's (1978) *scientia sexualis*, not only because it is one more site where the sexualities of individuals are scrutinized, measured, and disciplined, but also because it is a point where the raw material of many adult *scientia* - the intelligent man of reason - becomes increasingly defined by heritable high intelligence produced through heterosexual reproduction.

Foucault (1978) described sexuality as the privileged site of selfhood in modernity because it allows for the articulation of many relationships between the body and the soul, the individual and the population, and the normal and the pathological. For Foucault (1978, 2003a), the secular normalizing sciences that focused on sexuality in the late 19th century operated through differential attention toward abnormal bodies and practices and a relative silence around the bodies and practices of reproductive married heterosexual couples. This understanding of the operations of normalizing power follows Foucault's earlier notion of *individ- ualizing* power, which works through the inscription of the psychology of the powerless practiced by “[a]ll the sciences, analyses of practices employing the root ‘psycho-’” (Foucault, 1977; p. 193). Thus, for Foucault, to be surveilled by psychology is to be in the grips of modern power.

Useful as Foucaultian studies of modern “sexualities” have been, Terman's work on the inheritance of high IQ requires clarification of this now paradigmatic approach to psychological power. The modern human sciences developed two distinct forms of normalization. Historians of 19th century statistics (e.g., Gigerenzer, Swijtink, Porter, & Daston, 1989; Hacking, 1990) have distinguished Durkheim's socially conservative understanding of the average as the ideal - flanked by symmetrical pathological deviations - from Galton's socially progressive notion of people of unusual intelligence as cherished exceptions that might drag society forward from its currently mediocre state (e.g., Galton, 1869). Indeed, there is some evidence that Foucault understood this distinction. He recognized that eugenics operated according to a different logic than the *scientia sexualis*; it appealed to an older logic of inherited bloodlines rather than the superior health of the individual body. Unlike the disciplinary power that worked by making people visible, eugenics was understood by Foucault as a form of the older “sovereign power,” which made the powerful visible as objects of veneration (Foucault, 1978, pp. 147–150; see also Foucault, 2003b). Indeed, within the Galtonian eugenic framework, psychologists often venerate their predecessors. Terman wrote an article

claiming that Galton's childhood Stanford-Binet score would have been 200 had it been measured (Terman, 1917), dedicated his series *Genetic Studies of Genius* (hereafter *GSG*) on his gifted cohort to Galton in its opening volume (Terman, 1925), and published the doctoral research of his student Catharine Cox on the childhood IQs of historical figures as its second (Cox, 1926). To this day, Galton often shows up simultaneously as both founding theorist and exemplar of the theory in psychologists' accounts of the inheritance of genius (e.g., Simonton, 2004).

However, the location of highly intelligent people within a socially progressive discourse of Galtonian normativity was far from uncontested in the late 19th century. Rather, as Becker (1978) describes it, psychologists such as Galton and Terman were engaged in a century-long "mad genius controversy," opposing the work of psychiatrists such as Moreau de Tours (1859), Lombroso (1889), and Nordeau (1905) who conflated artistic genius with disequilibrium, degeneracy, and a host of other forms of pathological nonnormativity. Huertas (1993) describes the pathologizing of artistic genius in 19th century psychiatry as a reaction that discredited the work of authors who critiqued the bourgeois order. Thus, "Zola's novels do not prove that things are badly managed in this world, but merely that Zola's nervous system is out of order" (Nordeau, 1905, p. 499). However, the notion of the genius as other to the emerging bourgeois order was not invented whole cloth by psychiatrists. Rather, it was first cultivated by Romantic authors without education, wealth, or patronage, who presented non-normative personas to legitimate their individual rights to earn a living from writing. In Britain of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, "romantic genius" was understood to be eccentric, and individuals were accorded the label of "genius" to the extent that they were perceived to transgress norms of civil humanism that proscribed moderation and self-regulation for male citizens (Elfenbein, 1998). Thus, like the eugenics that followed it, the romantic notion of genius was forward looking and valued the genius for his or her exceptionality.

This form of genius was paradigmatically male, but relied heavily on the performance of androgyny (Battersby, 1989), and androgyny raised frequent suspicions that a male genius might practice sodomy, or that a female genius might be Sapphic (Elfenbein, 1998). Elfenbein (1998) argues that this construction shaped "the invention of the homosexual," which Foucault (1978) locates in the last third of the 19th century. Indeed, Nordau's (1905, p. vii) classic text on degeneracy opens with the observation that degenerates were not always criminals, prostitutes, anarchists, or lunatics; "they are often authors and artists." Genius individuals were said to show both impaired control over free thought, and "ego-mania," which lead to a desire for strong sensations and a love of the strange, the bizarre, and the perverse. Oscar Wilde was exemplary of such patterns (Nordau, 1905; pp. 320–322). Association with genius was also commonly used to normalize homosexuality. Havelock Ellis (1904) made

no mention of this association in his volume on genius (which included male and female genius in a ratio of 18:1), but his subsequent volume on sexual inversion noted that many sexologists had already drawn links between sexual inversion and genius (Ellis, 1936). Freud (1953/1910) also allowed that the genius could result from the “sublimation” of excessive libido into creative works, and would later refer to Ellis’ work when appeasing one 20th century American mother’s anxiety about her son’s homosexuality (Abelove, 1993).

Thus, the “mad genius controversy” was characterized by a shared assumption that genius was rare and typically male, but varied in the description of exceptional persons beyond societal norms. Were they akin to madmen, or were they naturally disposed to rule more ordinary men? Women were less often positioned as exemplars of the category of genius, but were more often positioned as vectors of its heterosexual reproduction and maternal nurturance, a discourse that is echoed in more recent dismissals of feminist work on genius (Battersby, 1989). For example, Galton (1869) bemoaned the squandering of hereditary genius by male peers who married rich women rather than women from eminent families. Roysce (1891, p. 18) went further with his androcentrism, describing mothers as irrelevant to the inheritance of genius; women were the “conservative factor in reproduction” such that “all new variations as caused by the influence of the male” (p. 19).

Terman was fully cognizant of these Victorian literatures. In the second publication of his long career, Terman (1905) described natural and environmentally induced variations in the development of individuals and racial groups, as “precocity” and “prematuration,” respectively, and morally privileged the former over the latter. Echoing colonial arguments, such as Galton’s, that some racial groups were not fit for democracy, Terman (1905, p. 147) included among prematuration’s ill effects “the engrafting of mature civilization on to primitive races” (see also Pols, 2007). Among individuals in the United States, the acquisition of criminality, neurasthenia, and religious dogmatism were all attributed to prematuration. Voicing caution about modernization, Terman noted how such risks were heightened by the accelerated pace of modern life.

Terman (1905) drew extensively on the literature linking genius with degeneracy, and indirectly associated genius with sexual inversion to do so. He followed Lombroso in theorizing degeneracy and genius as commonly caused by excessive organic activity and nervous instability, and described genius children as particularly vulnerable to the effects of the prematuration that characterized modernity. For Terman (1905, p. 173), sexual development was a particular concern; “no other phase of precocity is so important as that related to the premature development of the sexual functions, and no other is so difficult to treat.” Again, Terman argued that modern life might bring on such precocity and pointed to the increasing

rates of sexual inversion to underscore his point. Thus, from his earliest work, Terman was concerned with sexual inversion as a consequence of modernization, to which gifted children were likely to succumb, leading them to fail to develop as vigorous heterosexuals.

Terman wrote this paper while a doctoral-level student at Clarke and while under the influence of G. Stanley Hall, who defined “adolescence” in that same year as that precarious phase of life that occurred after sexual desires had emerged—at least for males—and before willpower and self-control were firmly in place (Hall, 1904). As Moran (2000, p. 15) notes, Hall’s theory made chastity and self-denial central to adolescents’ task of completing the recapitulation of the species history and affording the transition to civilized adult leadership; “[a]dolescence was precisely that period of chastity between puberty, or sexual awakening, and marriage, when the young man or woman’s sexual impulses could finally be expressed.” For Hall, the adolescent’s dilemma of restraining sexual impulses until marriage was quintessentially male. Adolescent girls did not experience such strong sexual desires; both passions and the rationality required to master them were androcentric categories (see Shields, 2007, this volume).

Like many of Hall’s students, Terman went on to write extensively on the topic of social hygiene when he left Clark, but his most celebrated early triumph was the Stanford-Binet, which made intelligence a measurable property of all American children (Terman, 1916). Throughout this early work on intelligence, Terman torqued the concept such that it did more than identify low-ability children, as Binet’s test had done. In the army work, Terman’s contribution included a focus on the use of the test not only to detect dull soldiers who were unsuited to military work, but also soldiers of higher ability who might be promoted into leadership positions (Carson, 1993, p. 295). In 1919, at Terman’s request, Stanford established a research fellowship for the study of gifted children. The first recipient, Jessie Fenton, was charged with following up 31 children of high IQ that Terman had identified by that point in time (Minton, 1988, p. 111). In Terman’s work, IQ was not only the grounds for explaining why some seemingly normal students failed at school (see Danziger, 1997, pp. 74–78), but also a means of selecting naturally gifted students for selective educational advantages. The bell of the IQ curve foretold the fortunes of both those destined for greatness and leadership, as well as those condemned by nature to intellectual failure.

### *The Genders of Gifted Children*

Given this emphasis on high achieving children, it is not surprising that the opening pages of *Genetic Studies of Genius I (GSGI)* includes a repudiation of Terman’s (1905) earlier views on the evils of prematuration. Rather than being the victims of modernization, undiscovered gifted children were to be

rescued from lives of mediocre education by the modern science of IQ testing, and to progressively move society forward through the nurture of their superior inherited talents. In modernist fashion, Terman described the psychology of genius as having a long past and a short history. Genius had been studied by the ancient Greeks, but its scientific study awaited the undoing of such false beliefs as the idea that “the Great Man” is qualitatively different from others, that “intellectual precocity is pathological,” and democratic sentiments that encouraged “an attitude unfavorable to a just appreciation of native individual differences in human endowment.” The science of genius had to wait particularly for “the tardy birth of the biological sciences, particularly genetics, psychology, and education” (Terman, 1925, v).

Given the almost equal number of boys and girls in the cohort, and the ways that the methods of recruitment lead to the overrepresentation of White, middle-class, and urban children (Terman, 1925, pp. 19–55), this project has been more often critiqued as racist rather than sexist or homophobic (see, for example, Cravens, 1992). However, gender was “in the making” in this work (Haraway, 1997), particularly because the labor of the project was structured along gender lines, and because the “intelligence” of the gifted children was explained in ways that were utterly consistent with 19th century androcentric thought. In 1921, Jessie Fenton organized the 6-week long fieldwork training of Florence Goodenough, Helen Marshall, Florence Fuller, and Dorothy Yates, who were to find gifted children in California’s cities’ schools. Teachers were asked to propose their brightest and youngest students, who were given a pencil and paper IQ test. Initially, Terman had planned to select the top 5% of this group for Stanford-Binet testing. However, extracting giftedness from classrooms was harder than Terman anticipated; 10% of the older children and 15% of the younger children were selected for Stanford-Binet testing. The 307 girls and 354 boys who scored above 140 on the Stanford-Binet were included in the gifted cohort. While women materialized these children as “gifted,” the slight preponderance of boys in the sample was attributed to masculinizing influence, specifically the “vigor or vitality of parents [which] favors maleness of offspring” while also “exert(ing) a favorable influence upon the nervous structure and mental development of the offspring” (*GSGI*, pp. 50–53).

This privileging of natural masculine influences over women’s labor was at odds with the many ways that the field assistants developed “situated knowledges” (Haraway, 1991) in the field that presaged later critiques of IQ research, including those of Black scholars most vulnerable to the tests’ individualizing effects (Thomas, 1984/1995). Helen Marshall (1921) reported to Terman on the social effects of his arbitrary definitions of genius as an IQ of 140 and convinced him to select one girl who fell below this threshold. Dorothy Yates (1922) critiqued the invasive questions she was demanded to ask of parents’ while securing their cooperation and

participation in the study. However, Terman understood the fieldworkers' abilities as defined less by their intelligence than by their *personality*. When M. E. Haggerty (1921) wrote to recommend Florence Fuller for her position, he noted her high scores on several intelligence tests. Terman's (1921) reply to Haggerty was disinterested in these and specified a different type of information; "I think you understand the type of person I will have to have. Personality is extremely important. A field worker must meet with all kinds of people, get on with teachers and be able to run down information. Absolute dependability is of course a primary essential." Terman was aware that a gifted cohort only came into being through women's labor, but in his practice and theory it was their male patriarchs that gave them their intelligence and vigor. Women served only as the media through which gifted children came into his world.

In response to 19th century theories that had questioned the sanity of the genius, the gifted children's bodies and minds were extensively scrutinized to purify them of any abnormality. Psychologist Bird Baldwin conducted a range of anthropometric measures, and Terman happily reported that gifted children had heavier birth weights and reached puberty earlier—as assessed by menstruation among the girls and the first appearance of a kink in the pubic hair of the boys (Terman, 1925, pp. 173–214). Gifted children were precocious not only in their intellectual but also in their physical development, confirming the idea that precocious intelligence involves heritable vigor and vitality, and reflects natural variation among age-mates.

Given the long-standing association between genius and androgyny, and the association of health with masculinity in Terman's text, it is not surprising that the children's masculinities were also measured. But unlike age or weight, no metric existed which could be considered a yardstick of masculinity. However, as with IQ, Terman knew that such metrics could be materialized in the absence of meaningful zero points by comparing people against each other to create statistically normal and abnormal cases. The children's preferred games and activities were given a "masculinity index" based on the proportion of boys and girls - in both the gifted and nongifted groups - liked each activity. Each *child* was then given a "masculinity" score based on the average masculinity of his or her preferred games and activities. In other words, and in accordance with poststructuralist theories of gender (e.g., Butler, 1990), Terman's "masculinity" was a norm, defined in entirely relative terms, unsupported by either coherent theory or external behavioral referent. Half a century later, tests of gender developed along these lines were deemed by Constantinople (1973) to have utterly failed as means of predicting anything about individual behavior at all.

As both feminists and psychoanalysts might expect, Terman's construction of gender encoded masculinity as presence and femininity as its absence. The masculinity of the activities ranged from + 24 ("playing with tools") to + 2 ("playing with dolls"). Gifted boys, but not girls, were

slightly more masculine than the control subjects (Terman et al., 1925, p. 437). When Terman (1925) found the play preferences of gifted and nongifted boys to be similar, he concluded, “these correlations offer no support to the popular belief that the gifted boy is effeminate in his play interests.” Notably, no such parallel conclusion about the gender of gifted girls’ interests was made. However, the ghost of the effeminate genius was not entirely dispelled by Terman’s tests and measures. A histogram of the masculinity scores of all of the gifted and control subjects clearly shows a nine year old gifted boy who scored much lower on “masculinity” than any of the other boys (Terman, 1921, p. 411). Gifted boys were purified of effeminacy when viewed in the aggregate, but not when gifted children were individually visible.

Terman’s interest in the gifted children’s genders grew with the cohort. In 1927, he recruited former student Catharine Cox back to Stanford to collaborate on the development of the “Masculinity-Femininity” test,<sup>1</sup> which was used again in the follow-up study reported in *GSG3*. The test was now labeled “masculinity– femininity,” consisted of seven separate subtests, and was scored on a 200-point scale from –100 (*feminine*) to +100 (*masculine*). The gifted and control groups were again more similar than different. However, a histogram of the scores for 75 gifted boys and 72 gifted girls again showed a gifted boy who scored considerably more feminine than all the others (Terman et al., 1930, p. 156). In addition, *GSG3* broached the topic of the less gender-conforming gifted children’s possible sexual inversion explicitly. *GSG3* contained case histories of two such children: Renwick and Roberta.

Attention to gender nonconformity among gifted children did not lead Terman et al. (1930) to automatic homophobic inferences in *GSG3*. Gibson (1998) argues that gender inversion theories of homosexuality during this period were easier to render complicit with heteronormativity when they focused on the devalued effeminacy of gay men, than the valued masculinity of lesbians. Terman et al. (1930, p. 328) admitted that “invert tendencies are no more common among men of genius but may be so among intellectually gifted women” (p. 328). However, this construction of inversion and female intelligence was part of a broader association of giftedness with masculinity in children of all genders. Terman also remained far more interested in the future achievements of gifted boys than gifted girls. Renwick was a talented musician whose parents installed a pipe organ in their home for him at the age of 11. Roberta had exceptional mechanical abilities, but Terman did not report how her parents nurtured her talents, or whether they thought it important to do so at all. Terman cites “the forecast of professional critics” that Renwick will have a “brilliant future in music” (p. 329), but Roberta’s future career possibilities were not discussed. Rather, her interests in masculine play and games are “perhaps even more interesting than the actual nature of her mechanical output.” In the era of second-wave feminism, when androgyny came to be seen once again as ideal rather than

pathological (Hegarty, 2003), Sears and Barbee (1977) could analyze Terman's data on gifted women and note the conflicts they experienced between their talents and social restrictive roles. This would not be the last time that Terman overlooked this conflict, or that intelligence would be defined in ways that excluded women's capacity to embody knowledge.

### *From Gendered Intelligence to Inverted Genius*

Tentatively purified of effeminacy by the measurement of their masculinity, intellectually gifted boys seemed to be statistically abnormal but well adjusted. The talents of gifted masculine girls described in *GSG3* further suggested that intelligence was a masculine province. The next volume on the gifted cohort was 17 years away. In the interim, Terman and Catharine Cox Miles developed a measure of gender, with seven subtests, recalibrated to range from  $-200$  (*extremely feminine*) to  $+200$  (*extremely masculine*), that could be applied to all (Terman & Miles, 1936). This test, and the 1936 book *Sex and Personality* that described it, were funded by the National Research Council's Committee for Research on Problems of Sex (CRPS), chaired by Robert Yerkes. At this time, this committee was reticent to fund research on human sexual behavior (Clarke, 1998). However, as Terry (1999) notes, Terman was one of a few scientists whose successes in fields other than sexology allowed them to secure funding from the CRPS for human behavioral studies, in part because his success in the IQ field had made him appear trustworthy to the committee. However, Terman and Miles' work was materially tied to Terman's work on intelligence in other ways too.

*Sex and Personality* has received some scrutiny in recent decades. First, feminists criticized the test's arbitrary items, its assumption that masculinity and femininity are logical opposites, its failure to predict gendered behaviors, and its conflation of MF with hetero/homosexual identity among men (see, for example, Constantinople, 1973; Lewin, 1984a, 1984b). Consistent with Butler's (1990, 1993) claims that categories of normative gender coalesce through the repeated abjection of queerness, historians of sexuality have more recently emphasized how "masculinity" and "femininity" result from Terman and Miles' (1936) efforts to detect and normalize people with "abnormal" genders in this work (Hegarty, 2003; Terry, 1999).

These successive waves of criticisms raise the question of whether *Sex and Personality* was a study of inter- or intragender differences. This question cannot be easily resolved in simple either-or terms. To get his work done, Terman strategically presented the test as having different goals to different audiences. To secure approval to run the studies at Stanford, Terman (1926) described it as "simply an investigation of sex differences in nonintellectual traits." But penal institutions were also keen to collaborate on the development of a test that could discern male homosexuals from other kinds

of men. In 1928, Terman wrote to several California Prisons to secure access to homosexual inmates (Terman, 1928a, 1928b, 1928c), and E. Lowell Kelly began by studying inmates in the San Quentin State Prison. When Terman (1928d) wrote to Jessie Fenton's husband Norman, who worked in California's juvenile correctional system, to secure further "homosexuals, inverters, and so forth," he confidently informed him "our San Quentin homos have yielded some exceedingly interesting data. All of them tested in the last decile of men for masculinity." Norman Fenton encouraged Terman to explore the MF scores of "definitely defined homosexuals who have also taken definitely defined masculine and feminine parts in the process." In *Sex and Personality*, this putative distinction between "masculine" and "feminine" parts in men's homosexual practices sex rescued the study's assumption that homosexuality was a form of gender inversion. Men interned in San Quentin scored as feminine on the MF test, but 56 army prisoners in Alcatraz, serving sentences for sodomy, scored on average +66.2, almost identical to the mean for male college students. Terman and Miles (1936) determined that only the former group were "true" inverters; the latter were more likely to be bisexual - much as the Ancient Greeks had been (Terman & Miles, 1936, p. 256; see Hegarty, 2003; Terry, 1999 for discussion).

In making sense of the work reported in *Sex and Personality*, it is useful to remember not only Foucault's (1978) claim that power comes "from below" where the interpolation of homosexuality is in question, but also Terry's (1999, p. 18) description of modern researchers' collaborations with their homosexual participants as "episodic rather than constant, . . . seldom harmonious, and . . . nearly always nonegalitarian." Terman was occasionally asked by men for expert advice about their homosexuality, including at least one psychiatrist who had gathered test scores from homosexual patients (Kline, 2002, p. 136). However, the MF test was particularly attractive within penal contexts because of its potential to materialize psychological properties of individuals without their knowledge or consent. Terman and Miles' (1936, pp. 77-79) studies had shown that female and male undergraduates could fake their MF scores if they wanted to. Thus, keeping participants ignorant of the test's purpose was essential to its functioning. Terman's letters, which introduced Kelly to prison wardens, described how "those tested would not know the purpose of the test" (Terman, 1928a, b, c). Later, while employed at the State Bureau of Juvenile Research, Fenton sent Terman case histories and the MF scores of several boys who were being corrected for their homosexuality and effeminate interests. In one case, Fenton (1932) described the MF test as giving the psychologist "an entering wedge in telling the boy to face reality in regard to his interests," which had focused on art and literature. In a classic Foucaultian formation, artistic inclinations were interpreted as effeminate and transgressive, male subjects were incited to put their sexuality into discourse, and the desired consequence was a normalization that eradicated that homosexuality for the subject's own good.

The development of the MF test as a means of defining “sexual inversion” was unintentionally androcentric. Terman endeavored, but failed, to find a sample of female “inverts.” Katherine Davis, of the American Social Hygiene Association, whose own survey was one of the first to ask women explicit questions about homosexual practices (Davis, 1929), advised Terman to look for lesbians among social workers (Zinn, 1928). Another colleague advised a look to women’s colleges, and to England, where women greatly outnumbered men (Bridges, 1929). Gibson (1998) notes that scientists often protected heteronormativity from the threat of the intelligent masculine lesbian during this period by equating lesbians’ masculinity with that of non-White men who were thought to evidence evolutionary retardation (see Carter, 1997; Sommerville, 1991). The information that Terman received about lesbians was similarly racialized. In one letter, Norman Fenton (1928) described to Terman how Black girls take “the masculine role” with White girls in mixed institutions. Ultimately, Terman found no institutions to collaborate with in studying female inversion, but *Sex and Personality* included a study of “delinquent girls” instead. Once again an association between intelligence and masculinity among women was produced. The girls who scored masculine not only had higher IQ scores, but their true IQ scores were estimated by Terman and Miles (1936, pp. 321–341) to be several points higher than the test scores that were actually observed. However, if Terman considered masculine women to be intelligent, his own network seemed devoid of the intelligence necessary to materialize a sufficient sample of “female sexual inverts” to properly test his theory.

The conflation of high IQ and masculinity at play in the gifted study constructed effeminacy among males as problematic. Terman and Miles (1936) explicitly described their work as oriented toward normalizing children whose genders were atypical, and they deployed a child with atypical intelligence to introduce this goal. An assistant had found the masculinity scores of one of the gifted boys, identified only as “X,” to be so feminine that it suggested that he was a girl who had been classified incorrectly; “[t]he scores was accordingly checked for error . . . but no error was found” (p. 14). This child was most likely the visible outlier on the histograms in *GSG1* and *GSG3*.<sup>2</sup> At the time of the second study:

One of his favorite amusements was to dress himself as a stylish young woman, apply cosmetics liberally, and walk down the street to see how many men he could lure into flirtation.

X is partially excused, and Terman and Miles (1936) project further warranted, by a description of X as working toward self-rehabilitation:

X is an example of the highest type of mental sexual inversion; he has high principles, is passionately devoted to his work, and seems to have rejected all overt expression of his homosexual inclinations (p. 15).

Later, in a discussion of their data on “passive male homosexuals,” Terman and Miles (1936, p. 264) describe the MF scale as useful apropos of boys who develop differently, because “preventative measures might be found that would direct their sexual development into normal channels.”

This abnormalizing description is worth pausing over for several reasons. While Cravens (1992) argues that there is little historical merit in judging Terman by contemporary political standards, I’ll wager a few lines here that there are lessons for the present to be learned from closely examining different forms of normativity at play in Terman’s work, analyzing the range of narratives of research subjects’ lives that they configure, and critiquing the range of human practices that fall within or beyond the category of “intelligence” for Terman, and his many followers. The description of X marks a divergence between the use of Galtonian norms (generally applied to gifted children throughout Terman’s work) and of Durkheimian norms (applied to sexual inversion throughout *Sex and Personality*). Whether or not X and “Renwick” in *GSG3* are the same person or not, there is a world of difference between the narrative of an effeminate boy en route to adult genius and of one in danger of falling to sexual inversion. X’s life is a tragedy that warrants intervention, which he himself has some capacity to assist. Renwick’s narrative of inherited genius unfolds naturally through maturation with occasional epiphenomenal eccentricities. Intervening in the lives of people such as X requires that inversion be a learned unnatural mutable condition. In spite of the claims of almost all of the men that were interviewed as “case histories,” Terman and Miles (1936) repeatedly describe sexual inversion as both acquired and changeable. By 1936 Terman has moved far from the 19th century theories associating sexual inversion with genius, or the gifted child with a tendency to wilt into sexual deviance under the pressures of modernity. Now, the gifted child’s superior intelligence is a resource that makes him a higher form of “sexual inverts,” one that we might even hope will rehabilitate himself into normal heterosexuality.

The possibility that heterosexual normalcy might be what precocious intelligence seeks obscures the possibility that X’s nonnormative enactments of gender and sexuality are manifestations of genius. Yet, it is no small task for a 15-year-old boy to dress as a woman and to lure sailors into flirtation. This must be particularly so when “it is practically certain that at this time X had no knowledge whatsoever of the existence of such a thing as homosexuality” (Terman & Miles, 1936, p. 15). There is nothing strange about the equation of the embodiment of femininity with intelligence among Western male intellectuals. For example, Havelock Ellis offers the patronizing argument that men’s greater capacity for artistic genius was a compensation for their inability to give birth (Ellis, 1934). Fourteen years later, Alan Turing would initiate the discussion of *artificial* intelligence by positioning the behavior of a man passing as a woman as the paradigmatic behavior that a computer must emulate to be deemed intelligent (Turing, 1950; see also Curtain, 1997). I

do not want to conflate X's enactment of gender with "performance" in Turing's (1950) sense of disembodied intentional deception. We do not know, and cannot know, from the spectacularization of X's gender in *Sex and Personality*, much of how X enacted, embodied, or understood that performance. As transgender scholars have argued, it is wrong to assume that X was *not* identified incorrectly as male, but at birth, rather than when he entered the gifted cohort (e.g., Prosser, 1998). Yet, the resistance of X's performance of gender to interpretation as a form of intelligent activity not only shows the separate ontologies of normativity that have developed around sexuality and intelligence, but also the degree to which sexual and gender transgression have become signs of social disorder that are obscure to the masculinist definition of intelligence emergent in Terman's work.

Just a few months before *Sex and Personality* was published, one of the gifted children from Terman's earlier study was incarcerated as a sex criminal in San Quentin, the prison from which the "passive male homosexuals" for *Sex and Personality* were drawn. Composer Henry Cowell was arrested for engaging in a sexual act with a 17-year-old boy, one of several who frequented the swimming pool at his Menlo Park home, a few miles from the Stanford campus (Hicks, 1991). Cowell was not just one-among-many gifted children; he had authored a paper on his genius for musical composition in the *American Journal of Psychology* that Terman had introduced (Cowell, 1926). In Shurkin's opinion (1992) Cowell was the only gifted child that Terman studied who ever "made a name in music or in art." Cowell's trial was spectacularized in San Francisco papers, exemplifying the growing panic about sex crimes that Freedman (1987) describes as typical of the late 1930s. In an appeal for Cowell's release, Terman contributed a statement on the grounds that he was not a "true homosexual" but merely had delayed heterosexual adjustment because of the strong influence of his mother (Hicks, 1991, p. 105). Once again, a higher form of sexual invert was repudiatable, but in this case a feminist mother, rather than femininity per se, was described as being the cause of the inversion. Terman's letter was unsuccessful in convincing the California Board of Prison Terms to review Cowell's 15-year sentence. However, the election of democrat Cuthbert Olson as Governor of California in 1938 initiated a period of prison reform and the commuting of sentences of several convicted "sex offenders." Cowell was released on parole in 1940 (Hicks, 1991).

### *Marital Happiness*

Thus, throughout Terman's work, masculinity is conflated with vigor and intelligence, and masculinity and femininity are logical opposites (see Constantinople, 1973), such that the possibility of intelligence being feminine becomes increasingly unviable. When gifted men and boys queer the pitch of this logic, they may be rehabilitated as heterosexuals in the making, if they actively undo influences coded as feminine. In Terman's work on marital

happiness (Terman et al., 1938), which overlapped with the writing of the *Sex and Personality* volume, this logic reoccurs. As in the gifted study, in *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness* women become unsuited to intelligent creative work, and heterosexual male sexual practices become invisible to the kinds of normativizing schemes linking gender and sexual practice used to spectacularize the “passive male homosexuals” in *Sex and Personality*.

By the 1930s, Victorian marital norms had utterly broken down as a result of a variety of factors; pre- and post-World War I women’s demands for sexual freedom, the failures of sex education to inculcate in men the control of sexual desires through reason and fear, women’s increasing political and workplace participation, continuing urbanization, and immigration and migration being among the most frequently discussed (see Cott, 2000; D’Emilio & Freedman, 1988; Moran, 2000; Neuhaus, 2000; Terry, 1999). Marital advice in the 1920s moved away from unequal Victorian roles based on gendered natures, toward the notion of companionate marriage based on mutual friendship and satisfaction between spouses. This literature, along with an increasing number of sex surveys (e.g., Davis, 1929; Hamilton, 1929) stressed that sexual satisfaction was important for marital happiness. Indeed, published marital advice increasingly blamed unskilled husbands for their wives lack of orgasms, and consequently for any lack of marital satisfaction (Neuhaus, 2000). In other words, men’s heterosexual practices were becoming objects of knowledge that were critical to understand if marriage was to remain stable, and women were positioned as the ones with the uniquely embodied expertise to determine their husband’s measure in this regard.

In 1930, E. Lowell Kelly introduced to Terman the new literature on marital happiness. Kelly believed, along with an increasing number of psychologists, that *personality* might play an underrecognized role in marital happiness (Moran, 2000). He also held that women’s orgasms were not so important after all. Terman dissuaded Kelly from conducting longitudinal research on marital happiness for his PhD (Minton, 1988, pp. 178–179). Upon completing an experimental PhD in 1931, Kelley moved to the University of Hawaii. Terman secured funding from the National Research Council’s Committee for Research on Problems of Sex, headed by Robert Yerkes, for himself and Kelly to conduct both a cross-sectional and a longitudinal study of marital happiness. Terman hoped to fund Kelly’s postdoctoral research at Stanford with this money, but Kelly was hired to the University of Connecticut, and began his project there by recruiting 100 engaged couples from newspaper announcements.<sup>3</sup> Thus, Terman was left with a somewhat unwanted research project on the psychology of marriage.<sup>4</sup> Left without Kelly’s assistance, Terman contacted the American Institute for Family Relations, which was founded and headed by the eugenicist and marriage counseling advocate Paul Popenoe, who expounded the prevailing view that wives’ orgasms and husbands’ skills were

the key to a happy marriage (Neuhaus, 2000, pp. 457–459).<sup>5</sup>

Terman initially wanted 1,000 couples in the study, and particularly wanted Wilson to sample unhappy couples. However, as with his gifted cohort, situated knowledges a propos of data collection frustrated this desire for clean round numbers. Couples were to complete the survey simultaneously, but independently, to satisfy Terman's demands for both anonymity and a complete data set. This made Wilson's job particularly taxing. In addition to the Institute's clients, Wilson worked with a wide range of groups—the California Eugenic Society, Los Angeles Churches, and labor unions among them—to construct the ultimate sample of 792 couples (Terman, 1934; Wilson, 1935a, 1935b).

Like “Masculinity-Femininity,” and “intelligence,” “marital happiness” was a psychological entity measured by multiple scales, averaged to form a single index, and it became a measurable psychological property of individuals only by comparing people against each other. Key items referred to husbands' and wives' subjective marital satisfaction, methods of settling disagreements, and frequency of complaints with each other. Terman pulled out the data on the happiest and the least happy couples in an attempt to determine the basis of marital happiness. As Minton (1988, p. 182) notes, Terman's conclusions were consistent with earlier views; conservative women were happier than feminists, and although education did not predict wives' happiness, women who strived for professions in literature, music, and journalism were more likely to be unhappy. Happy women were instead involved in “such an exacting occupation as that of the laboratory technician” (p. 151), much as Anna had occasionally been with regard to Lewis' career (Minton, 1988; p. 162). Male homosexuals may have been spectacularized for taking up “active” and “passive” roles by Terman and Miles (1936), but for married heterosexual couples, such nonequal role playing was a sign of adjustment and happiness. However much gender roles were in flux in the 1930s, and however much Terman had challenged 19th century pathologizing views of intellectually gifted people, nonegalitarian heterosexual marriage remained the normative form of human intimate relationship, and the maintenance of that inequality required that women not expect too much from the public sphere of paid work.

Women were enjoined to lower their expectations in private arenas, as well as public ones, by this study. As Kelly had originally hoped, Terman et al. (1938) concluded that personality - rather than sexual satisfaction - was the key to understanding marital happiness. This conclusion was anything but data-driven. About one third of the women in Terman's sample reported that they “never” or “sometimes” experienced orgasm during heterosex. Like previous authors, Terman found the frequency of wives' orgasms to be substantially correlated with both partners' marital satisfaction. Terman et

al. (1938, pp. 304–305) conceded that the “inadequacy of the wife” could be a “genuine obstacle to the achievement of a satisfactory marital adjustment,” but that these results “do not support the frequently expressed opinion that it is the one major cause of unhappiness in marriage.” Rather, Terman et al. (1938) expressed disdain for theories that attached importance to sexual satisfaction:

We have no ambition to add anything to the professional sexologist’s glorification of sex as a psychological experience. The lily has already been sufficiently gilded. One even becomes a bit weary of the constantly reiterated emphasis upon sex as the primary basis of marital happiness, at once the soil in which it roots and the choicest product of its flowering. (p. 247).

Terman et al. (1938) ultimately attributed “orgasm inadequacy” to wives’ constitutions rather than husbands’ techniques. Wives were divided into criterion groups according to their reported orgasm frequency, and correlations between personality measures and orgasm frequency were cited to argue that the former were the cause of the latter. Women who never or rarely experienced orgasm were characterized by “neurasthenic tendencies, diminished responsiveness, and lack of zest, vigor, or colorfulness of personality” suggesting “constitutional factors” (Terman et al., 1938, p. 375).

This pathologizing of women’s bodies was criticized by Harry Hollingworth as a conflation of correlational evidence with causal argument (Hollingworth, 1939, see also Kelly, 1939; Terman, 1939). This volume not only delegitimated married women’s judgments of their husbands’ sexual practices, but also relocating the cause of any effects of those husbands’ sexual ignorances in women’s own bodies. Terman reinscribed what Maines (1999) calls an androcentric model of sexuality in which heterosexual insertive sex that leads to men’s pleasure is erroneously thought to be the crux of women’s sexual satisfaction too. This norm is incompatible with the emerging logic that made women’s orgasmic pleasure relevant to the definition of heterosexual men’s functioning. Terman’s theorization of marital happiness closed down possibilities of locating heterosexual men’s sexual practices with respect to some norm for heterosex that women’s situated knowledge of that heterosex would adjudicate.

### *The Sexualities of Gifted Adults*

When Terman returned to study the gifted cohort in adulthood, his understanding of their “adjustment” was colored by his intervening studies on MF and on marital happiness. When the gifted were studied between 1939 and 1941, a measure of marital happiness derived from Terman et al. (1938) showed them to have slightly happier marriages than the control group, just as a measure of gender-normativity had earlier shown them to be well-adjusted children (Terman & Oden, 1947). However, 11 men and six women were “known, or believed” to have a history of homosexuality

(Terman & Oden, 1947, p. 120). Rather than write off such persons as ill-adjusted deviants, as Terman and Miles (1936) had done with the sex criminals of San Quentin, Terman and Oden (1947) cited studies by Davis (1929) and Kinsey (1941) to describe homosexuality as common within the general population, such that the gifted cohort appeared normal in the aggregate. They also reaffirmed earlier commitments to homosexuality as a changeable condition; “an overwhelming majority of persons who have had homosexual experiences make fairly easy transition to heterosexuality, but for a considerable number the transition is less easy” (Terman & Oden, 1947; pp. 120–121).

Like Terman’s earlier work, *GSG4* also illustrates Terry’s (1999) argument that American psychological discourses about homosexuality had very different effects along class and race lines. In contrast to the deceptive practices engendered by the MF test in forensic contexts, Terman and Odens (1947, p. 70) afford the homosexual gifted adults in their study considerable privacy. They describe how “[t]he highly confidential nature of the information on homosexuality prevents the inclusion of case histories of the subjects involved” (Terman & Odens, 1947, p. 70). Where homosexuality is considered in negative terms, class lines structure lines of visibility; the right to maintain privacy over the details of one’s homosexual history is radically different a propos of gifted children and prisoners.

However, with prescriptions for unequal gender roles enforced in both Terman’s imaginary and postwar America at large (May, 1988), it is not surprising that the gifted women had modest achievements. Some were authors, artists, missionaries, and “several of our women have taken a doctorate in science and have done creditable research.” However, near its conclusion *GSG4* contains a telling comment suggesting that the purpose of gifted women remains Galtonian and reproductive, 78 years after *Hereditary Genius* was published:

A good many of the women have made their most notable achievements in the selection of a mate. Two of the husbands are eminent musicians, and several others have won national recognition in the physical, biological, or social sciences. (p. 367)

In contrast, the gifted men’s wives achievements were barely mentioned. These men appeared to fulfill, through their work, Terman’s political vision of a cognitive elite, leading the nation forward at the very moment that it emerged as the ruling nation of only one of two intact empires after World War II. In the postwar period, U.S. national security and dominance over the non-Soviet world would be increasingly presumed to depend on technological dominance. The gifted adult men whose work contributed to this new global formulation fulfilled Terman’s vision the most; the director of an atomic energy laboratory, a physiologist studying semistarvation, a worker in the Office of Strategic Service, an expert in enemy radar, a

psychiatrist who studied Nazis in the Nuremberg jail, and two observers of the first atomic bomb tests in the Bikini islands (*GSG4*, pp. 364–366).

### *Conclusion*

As Terry (1999) notes, the history of sexuality is more than just a jaded wander through the defunct knowledge of the past. To study Terman's commitments and those of the gifted children that he helped and hindered is to study the formation of critical components of the modern present. The dismantling of the New Deal as "Welfare Reform" in the 1990s conspicuously co-occurred with discourses of African Americans as embodying lower intelligence, which led to uncontrolled sexualities (e.g., Hernstein & Murray, 1994). American schoolchildren continue to receive federally funded "abstinence only" education in spite of a wealth of evidence that its Hallian assumptions about the promotion of teenage purity are tragically incorrect, counterproductive, and harmful (Irvine, 2004). Most recently, welfare reform has involved the promotion of marriage among women on welfare, guided by a correlation-causation error that such marriages decrease state dependency, while marriage rights are simultaneously "defended" by being denied to same-sex couples (Cahill, 2005). Even in the current moment when gay and lesbian identities are "affirmed" rather than pathologized by psychology (see, e.g., Coyle & Kitzinger, 2001; Omoto & Kurzman, 2006), it remains "open season" on effeminate boys in ways that Terman and Miles (1936) had a hand in initiating (Sedgwick, 1993; see also American Psychiatric Association, 1980; Burke, 1996; Minter, 1999). IQ is still evoked to explain social inequalities from which elites profit both within, and between, nations (see Jaccoby & Glauber, 1995; Lynn & Vanhanen, 2002)—and to conflate social reputation with innate talent in interpreting the biographies of "great men" to support Darwinian arguments about intelligence. (Simonton, 2004). Even in the 21st century, the view that women might be expert witnesses on sexuality can tellingly still present itself as "new" (Kaschal & Tiefer, 2002).

Not only are all of those enduring forms of psychologically justified inequalities at stake in Terman's work and in our own time, but they are variously implicated in the category of individual "intelligence," which has retained its masculinist inflections despite some most dramatic expansions in its meaning. During the cold war, cognitive scientists paid little attention to the gender imitation that opens Turing's (1950) argument about artificial intelligence, instantiating the question of "can a machine think?" instead with the zero-sum conflict game of chess - that long-standing bastion of inscrutable Soviet male intellectual dominance (e.g., Chase & Simon, 1973; DeGroot, 1965; Newell & Simon, 1972). "Intelligence" has, since Terman's time, become a cyborg concept that has breached the human/machine boundary, but continues to have investments in masculinity, heterosexuality, and race even in the sciences of the artificial (see, for example, Helmreich,

1998). Terman's work shows us that the substitution of Durkheimian norms for Galtonian ones is possible in psychology, and has indeed occurred a propos of gifted masculine boys. What would happen if that substitution were to continue, with wild abandon, such that the unique perspectives of gifted women in science, effeminate artistic boys, men who dress as women, poor women coping on welfare, and married women with unnameable problems became not only "situated knowledges," but forms of "intelligence." By reconfiguring this boundary between Durkheimian and Galtonian norms, modernity itself might be queered in its particulars, and intelligence would become transmogrified into a very different kind of category (Latour, 1993). Ironically, Terman's work shows how such a psychology of the intellect might be achieved; by a different historically contingent application of normativizing logics from the one that he crafted and with which we currently live. Such a substitution would place the category of "intelligence" into the defunct toolkit of the past, and replace it with an as-yet unimagined logic for thinking of differences between the ways that people think.

## Notes

1. It should also be noted that the MF test also normalized racist expressions of "gender." Depending on the form of the test taken, the fourth exercise "emotional reactions" might include questions about one's fear of "negroes" or "foreigners" or the wickedness one perceives in such actions as "not going to Sunday school," "being an atheist," "being a Bolshevik," and "not standing up when the 'Star Spangled Banner' is played" (Terman and Miles, 1936, pp. 495–498, 519–523).
2. That child was aged nine at the time of study that was published in *GSG1*, and in *Sex and Personality X* is described as being fifteen at the time of the six-year follow-up study reported in *GSG3* (Terman & Miles, 1936, p. 14).
3. Kelly published very little on the personalities of these couples over his career (e.g., Kelly, 1950; Kelly & Conley, 1987), but his unpublished data was successfully explored by historian Elaine Tyler May (1988) as an archive of changing gender roles among middle-class White couples during the middle of the 20th century.
4. Terman also knew Popenoe from the Eugenic Human Betterment Foundation, through which he had supported Popenoe's policy of sterilizing mentally ill and retarded people.
5. It is an open question as to how personally relevant the question of "marital happiness" was to Terman and Kelly at this time. As Shurkin (1992, pp. 83–84) puts it "What made this study interesting in relation to Terman's private life is that while he spent so much time investigating what made other people happy in marriage, his own was far from a model relationship." During the late 1920s and early 1930s, Lewis Terman had a series of affairs with younger female colleagues and students (Minton, 1988, pp. 163–166; Seagoe, 1975; 131). Both biographers describe these affairs as akin to open secrets; several people at Stanford appeared to know about them (including Anna Terman), but Lewis was reticent to discuss them. It is also unclear how these dynamics of marital unhappiness affected Lewis Terman's relationship with E. Lowell Kelly. In November 1931, Kelly hosted Anna Terman during a visit to Hawaii (Kelly, 1931). His wife, Naomi, was hosted by the Terman's at Stanford in January

1932 (Kelly, 1932; Terman, 1932). In the summer of 1933, Kelly wrote to Terman to tell him about the Connecticut job, and attached a handwritten note, suggesting that Terman might wish to file it away from his professional papers (Kelly, 1933). He thanked Terman for his continued support, in spite of “the lamentable misunderstanding which arose between our families nearly two years ago.” If Terman responded with a personal note to Kelly’s own, he appears not to have filed it. Both a failure to respond, and a failure to keep a copy of any letter sent, would have been consistent with a general reticence to discuss his personal life, which Seago (1975) and Minton (1988) attribute to Terman. Regardless of whether the events to which Kelly dared to only allude involved infidelity, its suspicion, a clash of personalities, or some combination of the three, it would be wrong to assume that “marital happiness” was only of academic interest to Terman or Kelly.

**Author Note:** Peter Hegarty is a social psychologist and a historian of psychology whose work focuses on sexual politics, normativity, and the subjectivity of scientific thinking in both fields. He is currently working on a much longer manuscript exploring relationships between intelligence and sexuality in modern psychology.

This research was partially funded by a British Academy grant to the author to undertake archival research at Stanford University. Thanks to Toni Brennan, Mick Finlay and Stephanie Shields for comments on a draft and to Maggie Kimball for permission to quote letters from the Terman papers.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Peter Hegarty, Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guilford Press GU2 7XH, United Kingdom. E-mail: p.hegarty@surrey.ac.uk

## References

- Abelove, H. (1993). Freud, male homosexuality, and the Americans. In H. Abelove, M. A. Barale, & D. M. Halperin (Eds.), *The lesbian and gay studies reader* (pp. 381–393). New York: Routledge.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Battersby, C. (1989). *Gender and genius: Toward a feminist aesthetics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Becker, G. (1978). *The mad genius controversy: A study in the sociology of deviance*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Block, N. J., & Dworkin, G. (Eds.). (1976). *The IQ controversy: Critical readings*. New York: Random House.
- Bridges, M. B. (1929, April 4). Letter to Lewis Terman. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.
- Buchanan, R. D. (1994). The development of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality inventory. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 148–161.
- Burke, P. (1996). *Gender shock: Exploding the myths of male and female*.

New York: Anchor Books.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Cahill, S. (2005). Welfare moms and the two grooms: The concurrent promotion and restriction of marriage in US public policy. *Sexualities*, 8, 169–187.

Carson, J. (1993). Army alpha, army brass and the search for army intelligence. *Isis*, 84, 278–309.

Carter, J. (1997). Normality, Whiteness, authorship: Evolutionary sexology and the primitive pervert. In V. Rosario (Ed.), *Science and homosexualities* (pp. 151–176). New York: Routledge.

Chase, W. G., & Simon, H. A. (1973). Perception in chess. *Cognitive Psychology*, 4, 55–81.

Chauncey, G. (1994). *Gay New York: Gender urban culture and the making of the gay male world 1890–1940*. New York: Harper Collins.

Clarke, A. E. (1998). *Disciplining reproduction: Modernity, American life sciences, and the problems of sex*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cohen, C. (1997). Punks, bulldaggers, and welfare queens: The radical potential of queer politics? *GLQ*, 4, 437–485.

Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 389–407.

Cott, N. (2000). *Public vows: A history of marriage and the nation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cowell, H. (1926). The process of musical creation. *American Journal of Psychology*, 37, 233–236.

Cox, C. M. (1926). *Genetic studies of genius, Vol. 2: The early mental traits of three hundred geniuses*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Coyle, A. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Lesbian and gay psychology: New perspectives*. Oxford, United Kingdom: BPS Blackwell.

Cravens, H. (1992). A scientific project locked in time: The Terman Genetic Studies of Genius, 1920s–1950s. *American Psychologist*, 47, 183–189.

Curtain, T. (1997). The “sinister fruitiness” of machines: *Neuromancer*, internet sexuality, and the Turing test. In E. K. Sedgwick (Ed.), *Novel gazing: Queer readings in fiction* (pp. 128–148). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

D’Emilio, J., & Freedman, E. (1988). *Intimate matters: A history of sexuality in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind: How psychology found its language*. London: Sage.

Davis, K. B. (1929). *Factors in the sex life of twenty-two hundred women*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

DeGroot, A. D. (1965). *Thought and choice in chess*. The Hague: Mouton.

Elfenbein, A. (1998). *Romantic genius: The prehistory of a homosexual role*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ellis, H. (1904). *A study of British genius*. London: Hurst and Blackett.

Ellis, H. (1934). *Man and woman: A study of human secondary and tertiary sexual characteristics* (8th ed.). London: Heinemann.

Ellis, H. (1936). *Studies in the psychology of sex, Vol. 2: Sexual inversion*. New York: Random House.

Ericksen, J. A. (1999). *Kiss and tell: Surveying sex in the twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fenton, N. (1932, July 5). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Fenton, N. (1928, October 9). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1: An introduction*. New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (2003a). *Abnormal: Lectures at the college de France*,

1974–1975 (G. Burchell, Trans.). London: Verso.

Foucault, M. (2003b). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the college de France, 1975–1976* (D. Macey, Trans.). London: Allen Lane.

Freedman, E. B. (1987). “Uncontrolled desires”: The response to the sexual psychopath, 1920–1960. *Journal of American History*, 74(1), 83–106.

Freud, S. (1953). Leonardo da Vinci. In *The standard ed. of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 11, J. Strachey, Trans.). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published in 1910)

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Gibson, M. (1998). The masculine degenerate: American doctors’ portrayals of the lesbian intellect, 1880–1949. *Journal of Women’s History*, 9, 78–103.

Gigerenzer, G., Swijtink, Z., Porter, T., & Daston, L. (1989). *The empire of chance*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Gottman, J. M., & Notarius, C. I. (2002). Marital research in the 20th century and a research agenda for the 21st century. *Family Process*, 41, 159–197.

Hacking, I. (1990). *The taming of chance*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Haggerty, M. E. (1921, April 14). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038): Stanford University Archives.

Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence* (Vols. 1 and 2). New York: Appleton and Company.

Hamilton, G. V. (1929). *A research in marriage*. New York: Albert and Charles Boni, Inc.

Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women*, New York: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1997). *Modest\_Witness@Second Millenium. FemaleMan©\_Meets\_Oncomouse<sup>TM</sup>*. New York: Routledge.

Hegarty, P. (2003). “More feminine than 999 men out of 1,000”: Measuring sex roles and gender nonconformity in psychology. In T. Lester (Ed.), *Gender nonconformity, race, and sexuality: Charting the connections*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Helmreich, S. (1998). *Silicon second nature: Culturing artificial life in a digital world*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hernstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: The Free Press.

Hicks, M. (1991). The imprisonment of Henry Cowell. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 44, 92–119.

Hollingworth, H. (1939). Review of the book *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 36, 191–197.

Holohan, C. K., & Suzuki, R. (2004). Adulthood predictors of health promoting behavior in later aging. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 58, 289–313.

Hornstein, G. A. (1988). Quantifying psychological phenomena: Debates, dilemmas and implications. In J. G. Morawski (Ed.), *The rise of experimrntation in American psychology* (pp. 1–34). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Huertas, R. (1993). Madness and degeneration, IV: The man of genius. *History of Psychiatry*, 4, 301–319.

Irvine, J. (2004). *Talk about sex: The battles over sex education in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jaccoby, R., & Glauber, N. (Eds.). (1995). *The bell curve debate: History, documents, opinions*. New York: Random House.

Jones, J. H. (1997). *Alfred C. Kinsey: A public/private life*. New York: Norton & Co.

Kaschal, E., & Tiefer, L. (Eds.). (2002). *A new view of women's sexual problems*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

Kelly, E. L. (1931, November 25). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Kelly, E. L. (1932, February 12). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Kelly, E. L. (1933, July 13). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Kelly, E. L. (1939). Concerning the validity of Terman's weights for predicting marital happiness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 36, 202–203.

- Kelly, E. L. (1950). Consistency of the adult personality. *American Psychologist*, *10*, 659–681.
- Kelly, E. L., & Conley, J. J. (1987). Personality and compatibility: A prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 27–40.
- Kevles, D. J. (1968). Testing the army's intelligence. *Journal of American History*, *55*, 565–581.
- Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., & Gresson, A. D. (1996). *Measured lies: The bell curve examined*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kinsey, A. C. (1941). Criteria for a hormonal explanation of the homosexual. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology*, *5*, 424–428.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.
- Kline, W. (2002). *Building a better race: Gender, sexuality, and eugenics from the turn of the century to the baby boom*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern* (C. Porter, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lewin, M. (1984a). "Rather worse than folly?" Psychology measures femininity and masculinity, 1: From Terman and Miles to the Guildfords. In M. Lewin (Ed.), *In the shadow of the past* (pp. 155–178). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lewin, M. (1984b). Psychology measures femininity and masculinity, 2: From "13 gay men" to the instrumental-expressive distinction. In M. Lewin (Ed.), *In the shadow of the past* (pp. 179–204). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lippa, R. A., Martin, L. R., & Friedman, H. S. (2000). Gender-related individual differences and mortality in the Terman longitudinal study: Is masculinity hazardous to your health? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 1560–1570.
- Lombroso, C. (1863/1891). *The man of genius*. New York: Scribners.
- Lombroso, C. (1889). *The man of genius*. London: Scott.
- Lynn, R., & Vanhanen, T. (2002). *IQ and the wealth of nations*. Westport,

CT: Praeger.

Maines, R. (1999). *The technology of orgasm: "Hysteria," the vibrator and women's sexual satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Marshall, H. (1921, October 22). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

May, E. T. (1988). *Homeward bound: American families in the cold war era*. New York: Basic Books.

McColough, M. E., Tsang, J. A., & Brion, S. (2003). Personality traits in adolescence as predictors of religiousness in early adulthood: Findings from the Terman longitudinal study. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 980–991.

Minter, S. (1999). Diagnosis and treatment of gender identity disorder in children. In M. Rottnek (Ed.), *Sissies & tomboys: Gender nonconformity and homosexual childhood* (pp. 9–33). New York: NYU Press.

Minton, H. (1997). Queer theory: Historical roots and implications for psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, 7, 337–353.

Minton, H. L. (1988). *Lewis M. Terman: Pioneer in psychological testing*. New York: New York University.

Minton, H. L. (2003). *Departing from deviance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Moran, J. P. (2000). *Teaching sex: The shaping of adolescence in the 20th century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moreau de Tours, P. (1859). *La psychologie morbide dans ses rapports avec la philosophie de l'histoire ou de l'influence des Neuropathies sur le dynamisme intellectuel*. Paris: Masson.

Neuhaus, J. (2000). The importance of being orgasmic: Sexuality gender and marital sex manuals in the United States, 1920–1963. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 9, 447–473.

Newell, A., & Simon, H. A. (1972). *Human problem solving*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nordeau, M. (1905). *Degeneration*. New York: Appleton.

Omoto, A. M. & Kurzman, H. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Sexual orientation and mental health: Examining identity and development in lesbian, gay, and*

*bisexual people*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pols, H. (2007). Psychological knowledge in a colonial context: Theories on the nature of the “native mind” in the former Dutch East Indies. *History of Psychology, 10*, 111–131.

Prosser, J. (1998). Transsexuality and the transsexologists: Inversion and the emergence of transsexual subjectivity. In L. Bland & L. Doan (Eds.), *Sexology in culture: Labeling bodies and desires* (pp. 116–132). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Richards, G. (1997). *‘Race’, racism and psychology: Towards a reflexive history*. London: Routledge.

Royse, N. K. (1891). *A study of genius*. New York: Rand, McNally and Co.

Samelson, F. (1979). Putting psychology on the map: Ideology and intelligence testing. In A. R. Buss (Ed.), *Psychology in social context* (pp. 103–168). New York: Irvington. Seagoe, M. V. (1975). *Terman and the gifted*. Los Altos, CA: Kaufman.

Sears, P. S., & Barbee, A. H. (1977). Career and life satisfaction among Terman’s gifted women. In J. C. Stanley, W. D. George, & C. H. Solano (Eds.), *The gifted and the creative: A fifty year perspective* (pp. 28–65). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1993). How to bring your kids up gay. In M. Warner (Ed.), *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory* (pp. 69–81). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Shields, S. (2007). Passionate men, emotional women: Psychology constructs gender difference in the late 19th century. *History of Psychology, 10*, 92–110.

Shurkin, J. L. (1992). *Terman’s kids: The groundbreaking study of how the gifted grow up*. New York: Little, Brown and Co.

Simonton, D. K. (2004). *Creativity in science: Chance, logic, genius, and Zeitgeist*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sommerville, S. (1994). Scientific racism and the emergence of the homosexual body. *Journal of the History of Sexuality, 5*, 243–266.

Stern, A. (2005). *Eugenic nation: Faults and frontiers of better breeding in modern America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Terman, L. M. (1905). A study in precocity and prematuration. *American Journal of Psychology*, 16, 145–183.

Terman, L. M. (1916). *The Stanford revision of the Binet-Simon tests*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Terman, L. M. (1917). The intelligence quotient of Francis Galton in childhood. *American Journal of Psychology*, 28, 209–215.

Terman, L. M. (1921, May). *Letter to M. E. Haggerty*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1925). *Genetic studies of genius, Vol. 1: Mental and physical traits of one thousand gifted children*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Terman, L. M. (1926, January 5). *Letter to R. L. Wilbur*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1928a, December 5). *Letter to Mr. Court Smith*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1928b, October 9). *Letter to Mr James B. Holohan*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1928c, December 5). *Letter to the Commanding Officer of the Federal Prison on Alcatraz Island, December 5th*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1928d, October 5). *Letter to Norman Fenton*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1932, February 3). *Letter to E. Lowell Kelly*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1934, November 15). *Letter to Donald Wilson*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Terman, L. M. (1939). The effect of happiness or unhappiness on self-report regarding attitudes reaction patterns and facts of personal history. *Psychological Bulletin*, 36, 197–202.

Terman, L. M. (1948). Kinsey's "Sexual behavior in the human male": Some comments and criticisms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 45, 443–459.

Terman, L. M., Bayley, N., Marshall, H., McNemar, O. W., & Oden, M. H. (1951). Correlates of orgasm adequacy in a group of 556 wives.

*Journal of Psychology*, 32, 115–172.

Terman, L. M., Burks, B. S., & Jensen, D. W. (1930). *Genetic studies of genius*, Vol. 3I: *The promise of youth: Follow up studies of one thousand gifted children*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Terman, L. M., Bottenwieser, P., Ferguson, Johnson, W. B., & Wilson, D. P. (1938). *Psychological factors in marital happiness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Terman, L. M., & Miles, C. C. (1936). *Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Terman, L. M., & Oden, M. H. (1947). The gifted child grows up: Twenty-five years' follow-up of a superior group. In *Genetic studies of genius* (Vol. 4). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Terman, L. M., & Oden, M. H. (1959). The gifted child at mid-life: Thirty-five years' follow-up of the superior child. In *Genetic studies of genius* (Vol. 5). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Terry, J. (1999). *An American obsession*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Thomas, W. B. (1984/1995). Black intellectuals on IQ tests. In R. Jaccoby & G. Russell (Eds.), *The Bell curve debate* (pp. 510–541). New York: Random House. (Reprinted from *Teachers College Record*)

Turing, A. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 59, 433–460.

Wilson, D. (1935a, January 12). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Wilson, D. (1935b, February 18). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Yates, D. (1922, January 2). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

Yerkes, R. M. (1921). Psychological examining in the United States army. *Memoirs of the National Academy of Science*, 15, 1–890.

Zinn, E. L. (1928, May 28). *Letter to Lewis Terman*. In Lewis Terman Papers (SC038), Stanford University Archives.

