

A Catalogue of Shame: The British Psychological Society as a Dysfunctional Organisation

David F Marks

Independent Researcher, Arles, Bouches-du-Rhône,
Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, 13200, France

Corresponding author

David F Marks: dfmarksphd@gmail.com

Submitted: 30 Dec 2022; Accepted: 06 Jan 2023; Published: 24 Jan 2023

Citation: Marks, D. F. (2023). *A Catalogue of Shame: The British Psychological Society as a Dysfunctional Organisation*. *J Edu Psyc Res*, 5(1), 575-587.

Abstract

The purpose of this opinion piece is to discuss the legitimacy of the British Psychological Society as a learned society in light of evidence of a crisis of dysfunctionality. ¹ In this author's opinion, judging from past and present actions, the Society of today is not fit for purpose. It has lost its moral compass and become a fraudulent organisation. ² A 'Catalogue of Shame' consists of multiple ethical and academic betrayals. The Society's core business is to serve the members, accredit degree programmes, produce scholarly publications and protect the public from misinformation, false therapeutic claims and malpractice. The Society's legitimacy to perform these functions is compromised by its negligence of ethical probity and academic values that include human rights, equality and freedom of expression. I discuss three specific failures: i) the failure to fulfil the first object of its Charter to disseminate the science of Psychology in an impartial and even-handed manner; ii) the failure to apologise for its long and sordid track record of institutional racism, eugenics, and classism; iii) the failure to investigate allegations of fraud in the research publications of one of its most distinguished members. These failings suggest that the Society is incapable of serving its members in an equitable and respectful manner and of protecting the general public from harmful therapies and misinformation in the Society's duty of care.

Keywords: British Psychological Society, Classism, Eugenics, Fraud, The Psychologist, Racism, White Superiority, Psychology, Failure, Probity, Misinformation, Managerialism

Introduction

The British Psychological Society (BPS) was founded on 24 October 1901 at University College London as *The Psychological Society*. The organisation initially admitted only recognised teachers in the field of Psychology. According to Wikipedia,³ the ten founder members were: Robert Armstrong-Jones, Sophie Bryant, W.R. Boyce Gibson, Frank Noel Hales, William McDougall, Frederick Walker Mott, William Halse Rivers, Alexander Faulkner Shand, William George Smith and James Sully. The current name of *The British Psychological Society* was taken in 1906. Under the guidance of Charles Samuel Myers, membership was opened up to members of the medical profession in 1919. In 1941 the society was incorporated. ⁴ The mission of the Society is to raise standards of training and practice in Psychology, raise public awareness of Psychology, and increase the influence of Psychology practice in society. Specifically, the key aims of the Society, are listed as follows:

- Setting standards of training for psychologists at graduate and undergraduate levels.
- Providing information about Psychology to the public.
- Providing support to its members via its membership networks and mandatory continuing professional development.
- Hosting conferences and events.

- Preparing policy statements.
- Publishing books, journals, the monthly magazine *The Psychologist*, *The Research Digest* blog, including a free fortnightly research update, and various other publications
- Setting standards for psychological testing.
- Maintaining a History of Psychology Centre [1].

The Society aims to be both a learned society and a professional body. It is also a Registered Charity which imposes certain constraints on what it can and cannot do. The BPS is not the statutory regulatory body for Practitioner Psychologists in the UK, which is the Health and Care Professions Council. The Society has a large number of specialist and regional branches throughout the United Kingdom. It holds its Annual Conference, usually in May, in a different town or city each year. In addition, each of the sub-sections hold their own conferences and there is also a range of specialist meetings convened to consider relevant issues. The Society is also a publishing body with a commercial relationship to Wiley, ⁵ publishing a range of specialist journals, books and reports. ⁶

In 2022 the BPS had "more than 65,000 members", ⁷ in all fields of Psychology, at least 20,243 of whom were Chartered Mem-

bers.⁸ There are a number of grades of members: *Student*; *GMB-PsS*: Graduate Member of the British Psychological Society; *AFBPsS*: Associate Fellow of the British Psychological Society; *FBPsS*: Fellow of the British Psychological Society; and *Hon-FBPsS*: Honorary Fellows of the British Psychological Society.

According to the BPS website:⁹ the British Psychological Society ...is responsible for the promotion of excellence and ethical practice in the science, education, and application of the discipline... As a society, we promise to:

- Uphold our position as the recognised learned organisation and professional body for Psychology
- Foster an equal, diverse and inclusive community
- Champion Psychology and psychologists
- Be the voice of Psychology¹⁰

In regard to diversity and inclusion, the BPS website claims that it “strives to be national and global champion for equality, equity, diversity, inclusion and human rights. Our diverse membership and workforce are a source of strength in developing our services, and building a reputation for inclusivity, creativity and innovation in the delivery of EDI and Human Rights work.”¹¹

The BPS website continues:

It is our responsibility to protect, influence and uphold the values of human rights, equality, diversity and inclusion within the BPS. We are fully committed to eliminating unlawful and unfair discrimination and will not tolerate discrimination, harassment, bullying or victimisation of members, employees or contractors who work on behalf of BPS. Everyone who works for and with BPS has an important part to play in achieving our ambitions and commitments in relation to EDI.

It defines terminology as follows:

Equality means treating people fairly (not necessarily the same), and not treating them unfairly because of reasons protected by discrimination law such as a person’s sex, gender identity, sexuality, age or race.

Equity an approach and a process that recognises the existence of systemic social inequalities and introduces actions to proactively reduce, if not remove, institutional structural and cultural barriers to equal opportunity and inclusion.

Diversity is about recognising and valuing the differences in the range of people in our workforce and membership, so that we can benefit from having a range of perspectives in decision-making.

Inclusion means everyone feels valued and that they belong without having to conform. It means that members and employees with different backgrounds, characteristics and ways of thinking feel psychologically safe and are encouraged to come up with different ideas and suggestions, to raise issues, and try new ways of doing things.

Human rights are basic rights and freedoms afforded to all people in the UK regardless of their nationality or social status. They are not privileges that can be taken away. They are founded on fundamental principles such as dignity, fairness, equality, respect and autonomy.

Intersectionality is when an individual’s race, gender, disability, sexual orientation and other characteristics or identities overlap

or ‘intersect’ so that they can be affected by a number of discriminations and disadvantages.¹²

All of the above appear appropriate and worthy goals for any society, especially a psychological society. There can be little doubt that, over its 120+ years, the Society has provided a valuable role in the promotion of Psychology in the UK. The Society has supported the professional development of its members by conferences, publications, the accreditation of teaching and training and the appointment from time to time of inspirational figures into the Presidential and other leadership roles. However, changes have been detected that are less than helpful to those goals. There is a huge difference between a membership society of psychologists and a company selling soap. These two kinds of organisations require a different skill-, mind- and value-set and the attempt to run them in the same way is doomed to failure. Once a society run by psychologists for psychologists, the British Psychological Society today has become a society run by managers for managers, and with a contentious form of managerialism at that [2]. There appears to be an almost total lack of leadership and a turn away from democracy.

Here I turn away from the Society’s fine words about itself to look at the picture that emerges from the Society’s public record. This author’s analysis of this record reveals what can only be described as a ‘Catalogue of Shame’.

A Catalogue of Shame

The historical record reveals a pattern of advocacy and shameful practice that repeatedly neglects its professed core values and duty of care.¹³ I do not claim that the entire historical record is worthy of shame. Far from it, there are many achievements that can make members feel justifiably proud. However, there have been wins and losses and here I examine the loss side of the ledger. Examples from the ‘Catalogue of Shame’ are as follows:

1. The first President of the Society (Charles Samuel Myers) at King’s College, London, and Editor of the *British Journal of Psychology*, was a white supremacist advocate of eugenics who wrote unashamedly about the ‘mental differences between the ‘higher and lower races’. To this day, the Society names a special annual lecture after him.¹⁴
2. The second President of the Society (Charles Spearman) was another white supremacist advocate of eugenics. At University College London he wrote about the inferiority of working-class people¹⁵ and questioned their right to have children. Until recently, a prestigious medal named after him was awarded over several decades to up-and-coming Psychology researchers.¹⁶
3. A leading Psychology professor at University College London (Cyril Burt) wrote in the *British Journal of Psychology*¹⁷ that large families are breeding grounds of the feeble-minded. After his death, this person was found guilty of faking the existence co-workers, authors, data and correlations to bolster his claim that intelligence is genetically determined.
4. A 1990 paper in *The Psychologist* by a Canadian psychologist (J Philippe Rushton) claimed that racial group differences in intelligence occur worldwide and these IQ differences

are “paralleled by more than 50 other variables including brain size, maturation rate, personality and temperament, sexuality, and social organisation”.¹⁸ This thoroughly un-scholarly work was supported by Britain’s most famous psychologist (Hans J Eysenck) and by the BPS President at that time (Peter Morris).

5. A 2006 paper by a Japanese academic at the London School of Economics (Satoshi Kanazawa) in the *British Journal of Health Psychology* proposed that black, sub-Saharan African people have problems living in the modern world because they are less intelligent than people living in richer, more egalitarian countries.¹⁹ In a well-known Psychology magazine, the same writer later claimed that black women are objectively less attractive than women of other races.²⁰
6. At a BPS webinar on ‘How to implement anti-racist practice’ on 12 October 2021, the President of the Society, Katherine Carpenter, Chair of the Division of Neuropsychology, stated that she was “absolutely aghast to discover that other psychologists think that neuropsychologists think that – uhm – black people may be less intelligent...”²¹
7. At a BPS Clinical Psychology conference in 2019, a live portrayal of the slave trade was presented as ‘entertainment’. The organisers failed to warn participants, obtain their informed consent or to stop the performance to prevent audience members becoming upset.²²
8. In 2020, a BPS Division of Clinical Psychology annual conference delegate displayed a poster describing her research on forensic services. Another participant wrote a sordid racial slur onto the poster, which was left on display for other participants to see.²³
9. On multiple occasions, a Clinical Psychology professor sexually abused a vulnerable 20-year-old patient. Claiming drink problems, the professor was permitted by the Society to continue as a member.²⁴
10. Britain’s most famous Psychology professor (H J Eysenck) secretly obtained tobacco industry funding and used fraud-

ulent data to claim that tobacco is less harmful than the smokers’ own personalities and that behaviour therapy can be used to lower smokers’ risk of fatal diseases. An investigation at the professor’s university later concluded that the professor’s publications are ‘unsafe’ and many papers have been retracted by journals. However, the professor’s fraud was never investigated by the Society and it continues to have a special lecture named after him.²⁵

11. According to the Chair of the Society’s Ethics Committee, alleged ethical breaches and misconduct by the Society’s employees are not dealt with by the Society’s Ethics Committee but by a Complaints Procedure.²⁶ However, the Complaints Procedure is moribund.
12. The Society has existed for more than 120 years and grown to 65,000 members with a pungent legacy of racism, classism and eugenics advocacy and yet it has not apologized or attempted to make amends. It appears that the majority of Society members have chosen, to date, to do or say nothing about these issues. However, one detects a growing wave of frustration with the autocracy and current structure that may not continue in silence for much longer.

The ‘Catalogue of Shame’ is no dystopian fiction. All of these things actually happened. The ‘Catalogue of Shame’ is a sample of incidents selected out of many. I have omitted convictions of criminal fraud by a Society officer, the violation of human rights of the 2020-21 President-Elect, Professor Nigel MacLennan, the libellous *YouTube* video about the same person, lack of accountability of the ‘Change Programme’, secret procurements of services, the unexplained use of membership fees for legal costs, and – no doubt - a thousand-and-one less visible infringements that will never see the light of day (Figure 1). Does this Catalogue provide any reason to be confident that the perpetrator of these deeds is to be trusted as a learned society? I am not alone in expressing such concerns. A detailed analysis of the Society’s dysfunctional organisation can be found in Pilgrim [3].



Figure 1: Catalogue of Shame

How does a Society that professes “excellence, ethical practices and highest standards” be responsible for this catalogue manage to survive and why should one care?

Why Should One Care?

I joined the Society as a student in 1963 (membership number 3829). I first discovered Psychology as a discipline in the reading rooms of the library at school in Portsmouth. I became in-

terested in Psychology as a scientific discipline for the potential it had to provide a set of general principles for human behaviour. On arrival at Reading University in 1963, on the recommendation of my tutor, Professor Magdalene D Vernon,²⁷ I joined the BPS as a ‘wet-behind-the-ears’ undergraduate, an enthusiast for all things psychological. These were exciting and life-changing times. Never, in my wildest dreams, could I have ever imagined what, 60 years later, would crystalize into the Society’s ‘Cata-

logue of Shame. As my experience with Psychology developed, however, I became increasingly concerned with what appeared to be blatant prejudice and disadvantage in the practice and teaching of university courses. A discipline that professed to be a science seemed little more than a hotbed of prejudice, fads and fallacies across a wide spectrum of the subject matter.

In my first post as a lecturer at the University of Otago in New Zealand from 1970-1986, among the several thousand students that I taught, I was aware of only one Māori Psychology undergraduate (and no postgraduates) in the 16 years there.²⁸ I found this unsettling for a country and a discipline that professed equality of opportunity.²⁹ Returning to the UK in 1986, and having 'tuned in' to ethnicity as an issue, it was equally apparent that the numbers of Psychology students in British Psychology departments from different ethnic backgrounds nowhere near represented the general population. I became aware of disparities for class and gender that were hardly ever discussed in spite of the 'official' code of fair treatment. In my frequent contacts with psychologists in London, I witnessed classism, elitism and ethics breaches by luminaries that appeared to be 'normal' practice. I felt an urge to challenge this by making diversity and equity cornerstones of my publications: *A General Theory of Behaviour*,³⁰ *a textbook on methodology*,³¹ *seven editions of Health Psychology Theory, Research and Practice*³² and *two peer-reviewed journals, Journal of Health Psychology and Health Psychology Open*. I let the contents of these publications speak for themselves. The most highly cited article in the *Journal of Health Psychology* with 4545 citations was: "Racial Differences

in Physical and Mental Health: Socio-economic Status, Stress and Discrimination" by David R. Williams, James S. Jackson and Norman B. Anderson [4].³³ At the same time, I fully acknowledge that it is impossible for anyone to not have racist attitudes, however well hidden. That includes this author and, with all due respect, the reader too. None of us is ever immune.

Over the last decades, I have felt increasingly disillusioned and let down by the Society's managerial, 'top-down', autocratic approach to members while retaining the status of only "representative body" for psychologists in the UK. Psychologists and the public deserve to be represented in a more responsive manner. I always have believed that improved scientific understanding of behaviour can be a positive force for good in applications to social and economic problems. To achieve such a 'noble' objective, associations of psychologists with the professed object of improving the lot of fellow humans should actively help, not hinder, that objective.

In the 1990s, I was elected chair of the BPS Health Psychology Section. We took the Health Psychology Section to BPS Division status. We invented the criteria for BPS accreditation of the first MSc and Stage 2/doctoral training programmes in Health Psychology in the UK. I was a member of the Council of the Society (Figure 2), attended APA conferences, represented the BPS on international bodies such as the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations and the International Association of Applied Psychology. A number of Society Presidents and senior officers became trusted colleagues and friends.



Figure 2: The Council of the British Psychological Society, 1993. At centre of the second row is the Society's President, Ann Mary Colley. Second from left, bottom row, the author. This photograph of the Council includes several Society Presidents. Although totally lacking diversity, the Society was democratically run by psychologists without a 'Chief Executive Officer'. The 'Executive Secretary' was a society member, Dr Colin Newman (third from right, back row).

The potential of the Society to take Psychology forward as a vehicle for individual and societal well-being seemed huge and I was excited by this. My motivation was to work towards expanding the scope of Psychology as an applied scientific discipline, which also became a vehicle for career advancement.

The links forged with the Society helped my career directly and indirectly. I feel a debt and I want to repay it. Telling the truth to the Society, as one sees it, 'my truth', is one way of doing that. Others are working similarly, for example, the team of critics at 'BPSWatch': Pat Harvey, Peter Harvey, and David Pilgrim,

all clinical psychologists. Their multiple blog posts and building frustrations with the BPS have led to a forthcoming book [3]. I

find myself in almost total agreement with the points that BPSWatch has been making (Figure 3).



Figure 3: A, on left side: The BPSWatch website (<https://bpswatch.com>) and B, on right side: An illustrative tweet on the BPSWatch's twitter account (@psychsocwatchuk)

The BPS website³⁴ states:

“The British Psychological Society is a registered charity responsible for the development, promotion and application of Psychology for the public good. Through our Royal Charter we are charged with overseeing Psychology and psychologists in the UK, and we are governed by a number of democratically-elected boards and committees.”

My 60-year experience with the BPS³⁵ demonstrates to me that the BPS has become unfit for purpose. On a number of fronts, the BPS of today is failing to meet its obligations. The Society has: ineffective governance; lack of accountability; lack of transparency; institutional racism; improper complaints procedures; wilful neglect of fraud and malpractice. None of these are attributes, I would assume, of any organisation that professes to be a ‘learned society’.

The managerial cabal in the Leicester head office conducts the Society’s business in an autocratic, tick-box manner that wastes resources and it has spun out of control. Large sums are invested in ill-founded projects such as the £6M ‘Change Programme’ operating beyond the attention of members. Under the sleepy eye of the pretend Charity Commission, the BPS is quickly descending into Kafkaesque calamity, seeking legitimisation from a ruinous existential crisis. The dead hand of tick-box managerialism is anaesthetising and appears irreversible. In essence, the Society is dying.

Pilgrim describes the Society as follows [3]:

Riven by poor governance and outright corruption, the British Psychological Society (BPS) may now be in terminal decline. Individual members have left it in despair and some groups (for example clinical, educational and organisational psychologists) have already organised themselves outside of the Society, in protest against its mismanagement and distorted priorities. Onlookers are bemused by a simple fact: a psychological organisation has demonstrated total incompetence at understanding itself. Accordingly, today, the BPS is neither a learned nor a learning organisation.

...Though it has charitable status, [the Society’s] governance has lacked independent trustees. Instead, priorities in the organisation have been compromised repeatedly by conflicts of interest, with an oligarchy of recycled names losing sight of the Society’s shortcomings. In more recent times, these problems have been amplified by a managerial culture with little respect for academic integrity. These weak governance arrangements have led to policy capture by some interest groups which have led to public safety being threatened by the production of poor psychological advice to those on the outside. Those ordinary members opposing this skewed and risky advice have been suppressed by those at the top of the organisation [3].

Rather than resigning, I had hoped that change would spring from within. More recently, seeing the chaos, lack of transparency, unaccountability and dishonesty with members, I became increasingly doubtful that reform would ever be possible. Remaining a member had become untenable. Enough is enough. I could no longer accept the high level of cognitive dissonance necessary to remain as a member. With sadness and mixed feelings, on 16 July 2022, I posted my resignation.³⁶ With a few keyboard clicks, a part of my identity as a psychologist had been deleted.

In the remainder of this article, I explain three of the reasons.

Failure to Fulfil the First Object of the Society

The first object of the Society³⁷ is: *to promote the advancement and diffusion of a knowledge of Psychology pure and applied and especially to promote the efficiency and usefulness of Members of the Society by setting up a high standard of professional education and knowledge.* One key way that the Society implements its first object is to accredit academic programmes for awards of Psychology degrees within British universities. Such degrees require BPS approval to fulfil the conditions of the *Graduate Basis of Chartered Status (GBC)*.³⁸ Graduate Basis for Chartered Membership (GBC) ensures that, before any student can start a professional training course, they have already studied Psychology in sufficient breadth and depth to provide a sound basis for their postgraduate training. BPS accreditation

of awards presumes a foundation of academic values that have evolved over centuries. Sadly, these values have been manifestly betrayed by the BPS, with nobody in the university system seeming to have noticed.

A primary academic value is freedom of speech.³⁹ Exercising freedom of speech requires institutions to enable and encourage open expression of thought, ideas and beliefs through discussion, criticism and debate. It also requires the institutions themselves to be open and transparent. If an institution hides or redacts or fails to openly display its decision making, the members are themselves powerless to even form opinions, never mind actually to express them. The fitness of the BPS to operate as a learned society rests on its ability to demonstrate its adherence to academic ethics and values including freedom of expression.

In March 2021 the Society published a paper⁴⁰ outlining its current thinking. In processing this document, as any other, it is necessary to distinguish words and actions, and to judge the organisation's authenticity by the latter. Unfortunately, the actions of the Society's officers and paid employees betray a concerning lack of openness and transparency. Letters remain unanswered or receive cursory or cryptic responses. Postings on the Society's website are deleted if judged to be critical of the Society. Freedom of expression is routinely blocked by the Editor of *The Psychologist*. To give one example, when this author questioned the xenophobic conduct of the Editor of *The Psychologist*, my comments were deleted from the public record.⁴¹ The Society's CEO failed to respond to an open letter published three years previously.⁴² Such experiences of non-response, cancellation and deletion have been the repeated experience of critical or questioning members. Critical and dissident members are not tolerated by the officers of this organisation. The Society refuses to engage. It lacks the psychological and managerial competence to engage constructively with its membership.

The Psychologist's official guidance states: "In terms of ethical practice, *The Psychologist* will not publish material that is discriminatory, libellous, prejudiced or otherwise offensive, either by the nature of the content or by the manner of presentation." Yet the monthly mouthpiece of the Society, *The Psychologist*, has broken this principle on numerous occasions. There is a notable betrayal of the code of ethics and academic values including freedom of expression within the offices and outlets of the British Psychological Society on frequent occasions. Its recent public actions show that the Society:

- i. Lacks commitment to the pursuit of truth (e.g., the Memory and Law Task Force);
- ii. Fails in its responsibility to share knowledge (e.g., its partisanship over scientifically contentious issues of memory and gender dysphoria);
- iii. Cancels freedom of thought and expression (e.g., the deletion of criticism on the Society's websites; partisanship on scientific issues including improperly evaluated therapies such as IAPT).
- iv. Fails to analyse evidence rigorously by reasoned argument to reach a conclusion (e.g., again the lack of discussion on memory, gender dysphoria the IAPT programme)
- v. Is unwilling to listen to alternative views and judge them on

their merits;

vi. Neglects to consider how its conduct will be perceived by others (e.g., xenophobic public statements by the Editor of *The Psychologist* and blocking of the author's criticism of same on Twitter).

vii. Betrayal of the Society's ethical code of conduct. The lack of ethics applies to senior BPS officers (e.g., criminal fraud by an officer in the BPS Leicester office, the illegitimate dismissal of the President-Elect, Professor Nigel MacLennan, and the publication of a libellous YouTube video about Nigel MacLennan). The betrayal of ethics also includes the failure to investigate alleged fraud by prominent members (e.g., the late Professor Hans J Eysenck).

All of the above demonstrates that the Society's fitness to be a learned society that accredits academic programmes can no longer be supported.

The British Psychological Society as Institutionally Racist

The British Psychological Society is mired by a long history of systematic racism, advocacy of eugenics and discriminatory professional practice. The Society has never apologized for its Catalogue of Shame, never retracted several sordid publications, and never reformed its practices by adopting an anti-racist policy of professional practice. The CEO and senior officers of the Society maintain a veneer of virtue while taking none of the necessary actions. To give one example, on 1 April 2021, Diane Ashby, Deputy Chief Executive of the British Psychological Society, stated:

The findings of the report [of the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities] represent a missed opportunity to identify the causes of disparities in our society, systemic racism, and to drive forward the positive change the Government said it wishes to deliver.

We are [not] particularly concerned that the re-traumatising of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic people through a denial of their lived experience, will have an adverse psychological impact.

As stated previously we [do not] recognise that institutional racism exists and as an organisation we will tackle it.

We [do not] stand shoulder to shoulder with our allies in striving for anti-racist practice and are committed to tackling racism within our profession. We will [not] be complacent.⁴³ (Ashby, 2021).

Diane Ashby's statement is a sham, complete, hypocrisy, 100% bullshit [5]. The words inserted in square brackets provide an accurate version of the truth. The Catalogue of Shame proves that the BPS has done absolutely nothing about the legacy of scientific racism that is in the permanent record of the Society's journals. The Society refuses to do the right thing and apologise. It covers up, pretends everything is ok, and carries on business as usual. All the while it uses virtue signalling and management-speak about 'change', 'equality', 'diversity' and so on when nothing convincing is ever done. Sambaraju and McVittie stated [6]: "*The visibility of race alongside the invisibility of*

racism is a dilemma all of us continue to deal with" Invisible or not, British institutions are permeated by racism, often a racism that is evidenced as micro-aggressions rather than out-and-out plain nastiness. Multiple significant health differentials between ethnic groups are one of the consequences [4]. Professional organisations like the BPS that are responsible for accrediting academic programmes and training must themselves be free of all forms of racism. Sadly, as a microcosm of British society, the BPS manifests in ways I have documented above all of the features of a racist organisation. The only way the BPS can avoid this situation would be to actively adopt a policy of anti-racism to prevent racist incidents in its activities and publications, but no such policy decision has even been taken.

The scientific context is that biological 'races' do not exist and the term 'race' is an anachronistic social construct. The term is placed here in single quote marks. In agreement with Richards, there is no core of objective scientific knowledge about 'race' and there have been, and can be, no enduring gains in scientific understanding about 'race' [7]. In spite of this, racism and racialism are potent determinants of social and scientific conduct and both have been prominent in BPS publications. All such publications based betray academic values and the Society's Code of Ethics.

The term 'racism' refers to any attitude or practice that is hostile and denigratory towards people defined as belonging to another 'race' with emotional or psychological involvement on the racist's part. Racism and racialism within science extended into the 20th century including a significant number of prominent British psychologists who belonged to the eugenics movement. This aimed to improve the 'quality' of the human population using a variety of control measures such as attempting to influence the genetic 'mixing' of people that are alleged to be of higher/brighter and lower/duller quality, e.g., sanctioning 'mixed' marriages, confining the 'feeble-minded' in institutions, using apartheid policies to separate 'races', and sterilization of people of low intelligence or of perceived poor 'quality'. Sir Francis Galton of University College London coined the term 'eugenics' and was the first president of the Eugenics Educational Society. From the perspective of the colonial British Empire, the eugenics mission was an emblem of 'white supremacy', the traces of which seep into the British Psychological Society to the present day.

Before his death Galton wrote a book about a eugenic Utopia, called 'Kantsaywhere' where "a system of competitive examination for girls, as well as for youths, had been so developed as to embrace every important quality of mind and body". The results of this examination defined the status of the individual and the number of children they would be permitted to raise. Reproductive functions were to be regulated by an oligarchy selected by tests; social status was decided by four tests which together took only four hours" (Galton, n.d.). Galton's fantasy was brought to fruition by several distinguished British psychologists who saw Galton as their mentor. This train in thought has not yet been extinguished and a few recent studies help explain why.

Historically, indigenous, First Nation people were called 'primitive' or 'savage' and likened to animals or children. Saminaden,

Loughnan and Haslam examined these associations as they still exist in a subtle, implicit form [8]. Consistent with colonial portrayals, research participants associated traditional people with animal- and child-related stimuli more readily than people from contemporary, industrialized societies. Indigenous people were ascribed fewer uniquely human attributes. The authors suggest vestiges of colonial 'images of savages' persist in contemporary western society as a cultural 'residue'. Such racial stereotyping from colonial times could be having a residual impact on psychologists' practices and research publications. Dehumanization of living people is common:

Victims of genocide are labeled as vermin by perpetrators. Slaves are officially adjudged to be worth a fraction of a person. Immigrants are likened to invasive pests or infectious diseases. African players are greeted with monkey noises in European football stadiums. Indigenous people are stereotyped as brute savages, noble or otherwise. Outraged members of the public call sex offenders animals. Psychopaths treat victims merely as means to their vicious ends. The poor are mocked as libidinous dolts. Passers-by look through homeless people as if they were transparent obstacles. Dementia sufferers are represented in the media as shuffling zombies. Degrading pornographers depict women as mindless, pneumatic objects. Exhausted doctors view their patients as inert bodies. Patients feel their individual identities have been stripped away by depersonalized medicine [9].

In May 2020, a Minneapolis police officer, Derek Chauvin, murdered 46-year-old George Perry Floyd by kneeling on the victim's neck for 9 minutes and 29 seconds in broad daylight in front of members of the public. A teenager Darnella Frazier made a video of this incident that went viral and triggered an unprecedented level of protest and huge support for the 'Black Lives Matter' movement.⁴⁴ The response by British psychologists was muted. However, the Society's President, Professor David Murphy (2020) published a statement⁴⁵ and *The Psychologist* collated members' letters.⁴⁶ In my own letter, I openly wondered if the BPS is structurally racist. The evidence comes from two main sources: accounts by psychologists from ethnic minority backgrounds of racism they have encountered and the Society's publications.

Several members wrote moving accounts of their struggles as psychologists from an ethnic minority. Bruno De Oliveira (2020) argued that "We must act to decolonise Psychology" stating that:

During my educational and academic life, I have struggled with the lack of diversity in Psychology. To this date as a lecturer, I ask myself whether Psychology is for me. Can I make it in my field? As I look around me, there are still a few Black, Asian, and minority ethnic (BAME) academics in senior positions. From the research topic to the participants, Psychology is not a welcoming environment for minorities.⁴⁷

Dr Rosabel Ng, an Educational and Child Psychologist, offered her thoughts as a so-called 'BAME' psychologist working with diverse communities. She suggested that such work involves "reading, listening and actively engaging in discussions with others, while adopting an explicitly self-aware, open minded and

curious position throughout."⁴⁸

Shameema Yousuf (2020)⁴⁹, an HCPC Registered Practitioner Sport Psychologist, had written about the 'perpetuation of unequal access' in sport and sport Psychology. The article sparked discussions with two white colleagues who argued that Yousuf's experience did not suggest racism, which Yousuf perceived as a 'microaggression'.⁵⁰

The majority of the BPS membership was, apparently, struck dumb by #BlackLivesMatter. British white psychologists appeared unprepared and untrained to deal with ingrained racist concepts and practices instilled like 'residues' conditioned by early experiences, training and textbooks. We tacitly know the meaning and the harm of our silence, which is to make matters worse, most likely providing deeper offence and confirmation that, as an organisation, the BPS is indeed systemically racist. DiAngelo's book about 'white fragility' attempts to explain why any talk about racism leads to the resistance and defensiveness [10]. The fragility of our silence supports the status quo and fails to challenge racism in any way significant enough to be threatening.

In his Presidential Address to the Society of Counseling Psychology, Derald W Sue spoke about "Racism and the Conspiracy of Silence", the belief that "no one born and raised in the United States is free from inheriting the racial biases of their forebears [11]. It states explicitly that it is impossible for anyone to not to have racist, sexist, and homophobic attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors". This prospect appears daunting if we extend it to the universe of humankind, which does not seem an unreasonable suggestion.

Our complicity as white people in holding the fragile and guilty residues of colonial society, offering political correctness but lacking the ability to produce authentic actions of solidarity with our so-called 'BAME' colleagues is weak and shameful. Unless and until the non-'BAME' membership of the Society fully implements a transformative anti-racist policy at all levels of practice, nothing significant will change. Tinkering with reports, committees and warm words from the President achieve nothing. The Society needs to retract all of its racist publications. The racist underbelly of the Society is revealed by the appearance of essentialist, racist works in its peer-reviewed journals. As the statues of slavers fall, BPS publications by racists like Charles Spearman and William McDougall should be retracted, as should recent examples such as the publication by LSE academic Satoshi Kanazawa.⁵¹ Given the complexity of contemporary society and the relative sophistication of the social sciences today compared to the 19th century, it is a disgrace that this sordid article could have passed peer-review in a BPS journal - the British Journal of Health Psychology - in the 21st century. What does this publication signal about the core values of the BPS?

Next, I discuss one of the most wretched articles ever to have appeared in print in a Psychology journal: J. Philippe Rushton's 1990 paper on 'race' differences published in *The Psychologist*.⁵² In spite of the furore created by this 30-year-old publication, the article remains published on the website of the BPS.⁵³ It difficult to understand how a professional body can maintain its

position as a self-proclaimed anti-racist organisation while continuing to have overtly racist publications on its website without any explanatory commentary of regret. There is nothing covert about Rushton's repugnant paper, which was given full approval by the editors of *The Psychologist*. It is one of the most blatant statements of undiluted racist science one could ever find in the 20th Century. I surely cannot be the only BPS member seeking retraction of racist science from BPS journals.

Professors Glynis Breakwell and Graham Davey, Honorary Editors of *The Psychologist* in 1990, apologised and promised that: "all academic articles (and replies) appearing in *The Psychologist* will have been reviewed by at least two independent referees".⁵⁴ However, that promise has not been kept; to the best of this author's knowledge, articles in *The Psychologist* are not peer reviewed. In a derogation of duty, the BPS President at that time, Professor Peter Morris, forgave the unforgivable.⁵⁵ As if matters could not get worse, Professor H J Eysenck⁵⁶ defended Rushton, and while doing so, the Pioneer Fund⁵⁷, and the most welcoming journal to racist science, the journal Eysenck founded, *Personality and Individual Differences* [12].

So, there we have it: an undivided front of the leading British psychologists in defence of a blatantly racist article in *The Psychologist*. Apparently, the entire BPS, its Presidents, Trustees, senior officers, committees and student members still can see nothing wrong here, nothing requiring correction. Such inaction is complicit: "He who accepts evil without protesting against it is really cooperating with it." (Martin Luther King). An opportunity exists for the BPS to 'get its house in order' by apologizing and retracting racist articles from its journals. It's never too late to say sorry and move on.

The Society's Failure to Investigate Probity in Research

A major figure within British Psychology, the late Professor H J Eysenck, has already been mentioned above. Eysenck has been the subject of allegations of fraud and malpractice [13]. This matter has been discussed since the early 1990s when Pelosi and Appleby (1992) first published the allegations and Anthony Pelosi submitted a complaint to the BPS in 1995, but the Society declined to take any action. As Editor of the *Journal of Health Psychology*, the publisher of Pelosi's article, I wrote an Open letter to the Chief Executive of the Society, Mr S Bajwa, requesting an investigation [13]:

Dear Mr Bajwa,

I am writing about a serious matter concerning the research integrity of a person who one can presume was a member of the British Psychological Society. In the interests of openness and transparency, this is an Open Letter. If left unresolved this is a matter that can be expected to produce potential harm to patients, to biomedicine and science, to your institution, to its members and students. Although Professor Hans Eysenck died in 1997, the issue of alleged falsified science committed by the late Professor remains current to the present day.

To give a few examples, the 2017 edition of Eysenck's autobiography published by Springer, in relation to the causal link between smoking and cancer, states, 'On a purely statistical basis

the causal efficacy of smoking – if this can be deduced at all from a simple correlation – is very much less than that of psychosocial factors; about one-sixth in fact’ (Eysenck, 2017, Rebel with a Cause. *Kindle Locations 3759–3761*). *Is the claim that psychosocial factors are six times more important than smoking something that the British Psychological Society is content to endorse or is it a claim that the BPS would like to see corrected? Or consider where Eysenck describes the effectiveness of psychotherapy in preventing cancer: ‘The total number of deaths in the control group was 83 per cent, in the placebo group 81 per cent, and in the therapy group 32 per cent, again demonstrating the efficacy of the method in preventing death from cancer and coronary heart disease’ (Eysenck, 2017, Kindle Location 3804–3806). Or the section where Eysenck claims that ‘there is some evidence that behaviour therapy may be useful in prolonging life, as well as in preventing disease’ (Eysenck, 2017, Kindle Locations 3821–3822).*

I hope that the Society will add its voice to those who are requesting that the relevant publishers and journals should correct or retract Eysenck’s publications wherever they can be shown to contain questionable data-sets or claims that are known to be false.

The case is fully documented in Dr. Anthony Pelosi’s peer-reviewed article: ‘Personality and fatal diseases: revisiting a scientific scandal’. As the Editor responsible for the peer review and publication of Dr. Pelosi’s article, I have every confidence that Dr. Pelosi’s evidence and conclusions are reliable and true. In light of the policies and statutes of the British Psychological Society concerning research integrity I bring this case to your attention for investigation. A full and thorough investigation would be good for Psychology, for the research integrity of the BPS as a professional society and for the welfare of patients and the general public.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards,

David F Marks BSc PhD CPsychol FBPsS

Editor, Journal of Health Psychology

Three years passed without any response. In November 2021 I re-sent my letter to Bajwa seeking an explanation. Again, Bajwa declined to respond. Was he perhaps too busy dealing with criminal fraud inside the Society’s head office? The Head of Quality Assurance and Standards, Dr Rachel Scudamore, was deputed to respond with the following:

“We accept that a failure to respond is discourteous and that it would leave you in a position of not knowing what action has been taken. I can only apologise on behalf of the Society for this error on our part.”

On November 9, 2021, the Chair of the BPS Ethics Committee, Dr Roger Paxton explained the Society’s position thus:

“The BPS Ethics Committee shares the concerns that you, Anthony Pelosi and others have expressed about some of Hans Eysenck’s publications. At its meeting in June this year, the Com-

mittee established a working group to consider these and other apparent instances of historical unethical conduct, including the work of Francis Galton and others on eugenics. The work of the group is underway and is drawing on a range of information sources, including the recent investigations by KCL and UCL into Eysenck and Galton respectively. The group is also considering the integrity of research by Eysenck reported in journals published by the BPS. The group regrets that the BPS did not respond more strongly when Anthony Pelosi first raised concerns about some of Eysenck’s research.

The aim is that this project should comment publicly on these historical matters, refer to the Society’s current ethical standards and procedures, and offer recommendations about the teaching of these topics. We hope that the outputs from the project will be broad and emphatic, with the BPS taking a clear ethical stance, and, if appropriate, expressing regret that the Society, and the discipline of Psychology, have at times been on the wrong side of history.”

Dr Paxton said that he would keep me updated on the outputs of this working group. In December 2021 The Psychologist printed a half-page notice calling for statements of interest for a new Chair of the Ethics Committee with immediate effect. Paxton had gone.

The second recipient of my Open Letter was the Principal of King’s College London, Professor Edward Byrne. Professor Byrne set up an enquiry, published the enquiry report, and contacted multiple journal editors pointing out that Hans J Eysenck and collaborators’ findings were deemed ‘unsafe’.⁵⁸ This action led to 14 papers being retracted and several dozens of Eysenck’s papers being listed with expressions of concern.

Why has the British Psychological Society kept its silence about the Eysenck affair? Craig, Pelosi and Tourish discuss the formal complaint that was originally lodged with the Society in 1995 [14]. Craig et al. use an “institutional logics” framework in examining the Society’s decision not to hear Pelosi’s original complaint at a full disciplinary hearing.

Craig et al. concluded [14]:

There are significant conflicts in the institutional logics that guide professional associations, academic institutions, and scholarly journals. In this case, a major national professional association, appears to have prioritised a market-oriented institutional logic over a classical medical logic or an academic logic. A persistent failure of ‘transparency of process’ is also displayed. This has involved prioritising self-serving behaviour over ethical propriety. Rather than behave in this way, we urge all professional associations to investigate complaints of research misconduct against members in a way that prioritises integrity over reputation. [14].

Over a 30-year period the BPS has demonstrated that it lacks the moral fibre to deal effectively with fraud and malpractice. The Society put a market-orientated, reputational logic ahead of its professed core values. Craig et al. urged the BPS to investigate this complaint afresh and they supported the call by this author

for an independent National Research Integrity Ombudsperson to deal with allegations of research misconduct [23-24].

Conclusions

- 1) The current organisation of the British Psychological Society is failing the public good, its members, and the discipline of Psychology.
- 2) The current crisis in the BPS cannot be solved by tinkering with the system, which has been tried unsuccessfully on a frequent basis over several decades.
- 3) Only root-and-branch restructuring would be capable of making the necessary changes to achieve the objects of its charter.
- 4) It appears doubtful that the BPS has the will or the competence to achieve the necessary structural reorganization without external intervention. It appears unlikely that the Society will request such assistance.
- 5) This leaves two tenable options: i) the members themselves retake control of the Society and restructure it so that it better serves its members and the public; or ii) continue its trajectory towards terminal decline.

References

1. Pilgrim, D. (2023). *British Psychology in Crisis: A Case Study in Organisational Dysfunction*. Phoenix Publishing House.
2. Klikauer, T. (2015). What is managerialism?. *Critical Sociology*, 41(7-8), 1103-1119.
3. Wikipedia (2022). *British Psychological Society*.
4. Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. *Journal of health psychology*, 2(3), 335-351.
5. Frankfurt, H. G. (2009). *On bullshit*. In *On Bullshit*. Princeton University Press.
6. Sambaraju, R., & McVittie, C. (2021). Mobilizing race and racism: Visible race and invisible racism. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.
7. Richards, G. (2012). *Race, racism and psychology: Towards a reflexive history*. Routledge.
8. Saminaden, A., Loughnan, S., & Haslam, N. (2010). Afterimages of savages: Implicit associations between primitives, animals and children. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(1), 91-105.
9. Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and inhumanization. *Annual review of psychology*, 65(1), 399-423.
10. DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Beacon Press.
11. Sue, D. W. (2005). Racism and the conspiracy of silence: Presidential address. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 33(1), 100-114.
12. Rushton, J. P. (1990). 'Race' Differences, r/K theory, and a Reply to Flynn. *The Psychologist: Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 3(5), 195-198.
13. Pelosi, A. J. (2019). Personality and fatal diseases: Revisiting a scientific scandal. *Journal of health psychology*, 24(4), 421-439.
14. Craig, R., Pelosi, A., & Tourish, D. (2021). Research misconduct complaints and institutional logics: The case of Hans Eysenck and the British Psychological Society. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 26(2), 296-311.
15. Marks, D. F. (2018). *A general theory of behaviour*. Sage.
16. Burt, C. (1950). The Trend of National Intelligence: Review article. *British Journal of Sociology*, 1, 154-168.
17. Flynn, J. R. (1984). The mean IQ of Americans: Massive gains 1932 to 1978. *Psychological bulletin*, 95(1), 29.
18. Flynn, J. R. (2020). *A book too risky to publish: Free speech and universities*. Academica Press.
19. Kanazawa, S. (2006). Mind the gap... in intelligence: Re-examining the relationship between inequality and health. *British journal of health psychology*, 11(4), 623-642.
20. Marks, D. F. (2007). Literacy not intelligence moderates the relationships between economic development, income inequality and health. *British journal of health psychology*, 12(2), 179-184.
21. Marks, D. F., & Yardley, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Research methods for clinical and health psychology*. Sage.
22. Marks, D. F., Murray, M., Estacio, E. V., Annunziato, R., Locke, A., et al. (2023). *Health Psychology Research, Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publishing.
23. Marks, D. F. (2019). The Hans Eysenck affair: Time to correct the scientific record. *Journal of health psychology*, 24(4), 409-420.
24. Marks, D. F., & Buchanan, R. D. (2020). King's College London's enquiry into Hans J Eysenck's 'Unsafe' publications must be properly completed. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 25(1), 3-6.
25. Myers, C. S. (1920). Psychology and industry. *British journal of psychology*, 10(2), 177.
26. Spearman, C. (2008). *The Abilities of Man-Their Nature and Measurement*. Pierides Press.

Endnotes

- ¹An earlier version of this article was published at: davidfmarks.com. I am aware that other BPS members and ex-members share similar views to those expressed here, along with, I suspect, many within the silent majority of BPS members.
- ²'Fraudulent' means deceiving others, not telling the truth, acting illegally: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fraudulent>
- ³The information in this section is drawn from an independent source at Wikipedia (2022) and reproduced under a Creative Commons license.
- ⁴Bunn, Geoff. "A Short History of The British Psychological Society" (PDF). The British Psychological Society. Available at: <https://cms.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-06/A%20Short%20History%20of%20The%20British%20Psychological%20Society.pdf> Accessed 30 December 2022.
- ⁵<https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/hub/bps-books>
- ⁶"About us", British Psychological Society. Accessed at: <https://www.bps.org.uk/about-us>. Retrieved 28 December 2022.
- ⁷<https://www.bps.org.uk/who-we-are>
- ⁸"Review of the year 2019". British Psychological Society. Retrieved 28 July 2020.
- ⁹<https://www.bps.org.uk>
- ¹⁰<https://www.bps.org.uk/about-us>
- ¹¹<https://www.bps.org.uk/diversity-and-inclusion>
- ¹²<https://www.bps.org.uk/diversity-and-inclusion> op cit

¹³A recent criminal case of fraud has been reported in national and local newspapers. See e.g., <https://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/news/leicester-news/assistant-stole-more-70000-leicester-6470440>

¹⁴Charles Samuel Myers was one of the first psychologists to provide an account of ‘shell shock and his early work on this topic was highly influential. In the *British Journal of Psychology*, Myers wrote: “Advantage has also been taken of Nature’s own variation such conditions, as in the clinical and laboratory study of individual mental differences, normal and abnormal, of excess or defect, including those produced by disorder, disease or injury, racial mental differences, e.g., the mental differences between the higher and lower races...” Myers (1920). Myers’ contributions are memorialised by ‘The C.S. Myers Lecture of the British Psychological Society’.

¹⁵In the *British Journal of Psychology*, Charles Spearman advocated the use of intelligence testing to select people who would be given the right to have offspring: “an accurate measurement of everyone’s intelligence would seem to herald the feasibility of selecting the better endowed persons for admission into citizenship—and even for the right of having offspring” (Spearman, 1927).

¹⁶Almost a century after Spearman’s eugenicist publications, the BPS ‘retired’ the Spearman Medal which, from 1965 to 2020, had been willingly accepted by 47 of British Psychology’s brightest and whitest: <https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-34/april-2021/spearman-medal-retired>

¹⁷Sir Cyril Burt (1950) discussed the alleged reduction in average intelligence that had been appearing in the literature as an empirical finding: “One of the earliest results was the discovery that the birth rate among families from which the duller children were drawn was about twice as high as among those supplying the brighter junior county scholars. What seemed most significant of all was the fact that, even within the same social and economic class, fully significant correlations were found. From the correlations observed (about 0.20) it was calculated that, if no counteracting factors were operative, the intelligence quotient would drop at the rate of about 11/2 points per generation; and (what would be far easier to verify) “in little over fifty years the number of pupils of scholarship ability would be approximately halved, and the number of feebleminded almost doubled.” This is exactly the opposite to the facts which show sustained increases in IQ scores over the last century (Flynn, 1984).

¹⁸The article by J. Philippe Rushton, president of the Pioneer Fund, was published by *The Psychologist: Bulletin of the British Psychological Society* in 1990. One of the most blatant statements of undiluted racist science one can find in the 20th Century, this article remains on the BPS website to the present day. Rushton justified his racist science in the following terms: “... racial group differences in intelligence are to be observed worldwide, in Africa and Asia, as well as in Europe and North America and that they are paralleled by more than 50 other variables including brain size, maturation rate, personality and temperament, sexuality, and social organisation”. (Rushton, 1990). In July 1990, the magazine’s Editors, Professors Glynis Breakwell and Graham Davey apologised but remained in post. The BPS President at that time, Professor Peter Morris, wrote in support of the publication, as did Professor Hans J Eysenck. The Society membership witnessed an extraordinary closing of the ranks in supporting the most egregious form of scientific racism.

¹⁹Kanazawa (2006). There was considerable embarrassment at LSE and flaws in Kanazawa’s analysis were published by this author who provided a very different conclusion about the data: Marks, D F (2007) [20].

²⁰In *Psychology Today*, Prof Kanazawa stated that black women are objectively less attractive than women of other races. LSE subsequently prohibited him from publishing in non-peer-reviewed outlets for 12 months. Prof Kanazawa later apologised.

²¹The recording of the webinar was available on YouTube at: <https://youtu.be/mIxstDoqbq0> (see 1:29:37) but it appears to have been taken down.

²²Delegates at the Group of Trainers in Clinical Psychology (GTiCP) forum viewed a 12-minute dramatisation of the transatlantic slave trade in which one scene could be interpreted as a slave auction. A clinical psychologist Chris Jones later wrote: “Let’s not equivocate: The re-enactment of the slave auction at #GTiCP2019 was a shameful day in the history of British Clinical Psychology”.

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/11/15/british-psychological-society-apologises-distressing-members/> Subsequently a survey of 352 clinical Psychology trainees and a twitter site @AntiRacismDClin were organised: <https://www.bps.org.uk/sites/www.bps.org.uk/files/Member%20Networks/Divisions/DCP/Racism%2C%20power%20and%20privilege%20in%20Psychology.pdf>

²³Dr Kimberly Sham Ku (2020) describes her experience in an article in *The Psychologist*, A culture of silence and denial: “Disappointment. That was the emotion when I came face-to-face with the words ‘keep BME out of services’, boldly and shamelessly graffitied on my poster. The poster considered a project to support African and Caribbean men in forensic services who are transitioning back into the community, a population often facing the double challenge of cultural stigma and a lack of community support. Hostility towards minorities in all forms, be it religious, gender and the like, is a centuries old problem that we are tackling daily. The disappointment came from the ‘who’ and the ‘where’ – these words were written by a fellow Psychologist at the British Psychological Society’s Division of Clinical Psychology (DCP) annual conference held in Solihull. This was a conference with the overarching theme of social inequality and racism.” <https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-33/april-2020/culture-silence-and-denial>

²⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/1999/jun/04/sarahboseley1>

²⁵For further details, see: Pelosi (2018); Marks (2018); Marks and Buchanan (2019); Craig, Pelosi and Tournish (2021).

²⁶The Complaints Procedure is dysfunctional and under investigation by the Charity Commission. <https://davidfmarks.com/2021/08/13/the-silly-season-psychologists-at-the-british-psychological-society-not-subject-to-the-societys-ethics-code/>

²⁷Professor M D Vernon had been President of the Society in 1958-9.

²⁸Sadly, this single Māori student withdrew and never completed the degree course.

²⁹With staff and policy changes, the situation has improved significantly, with Māori students at every level of the programme.

³⁰Marks (2018) [15].

³¹Marks & Yardley (2004) [21].

³²Marks, Murray, Estacio, Annunziato, Locke and Treharne (2023) [22].

³³The article by David Williams et al. (1997) is included in 'Black Lives Matter', a Special Collection of Articles Published in The Journal of Health Psychology Concerning Ethnicity, Race and Culture by Year of Publication, 1996-2020. See: <https://journals.sagepub.com/page/hpq/collections/ethnicity-race%20-culture>

³⁴<https://www.bps.org.uk/about-us/who-we-are>

³⁵This 60-year period is exactly half of the Society's entire 120-year history.

³⁶<https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-33/september-2020/standing-against-racism>. A BPS membership login is necessary to access this article.

³⁷Specified by its Royal Charter.

³⁸Or 'GBR' as it was previously known.

³⁹James Flynn (2019) describes freedom of speech thus: "the great goods of humanity include human autonomy and the liberation of the human mind. It argues that this is possible, or at least likely, only under certain conditions, one of which is that free speech prevails. It also assumes that the university has a peculiar mission: the good society has designated it as an institution that, above all, not only seeks truth but also graduates people whose minds are prepared to seek the truth. I am not sure that there are many good universities today. Rather than feeling free to debate, professors and students walk about, and indeed, even off of campus are apprehensive of making slips of the tongue or behavior and being sent to mind – cleansing sensitivity training, harassed by mobs of their angry fellows, pilloried on social media, or brought before nebulous administrative tribunals with the power to punish them with consequences up to expulsion or termination of employment." (Flynn, 2019, pp. 14-15).

⁴⁰"The Psychologist Policies and Protocols" (PPP) published by 'The Psychologist and Digest Editorial Advisory Committee' (PDEAC)

⁴¹The author was blocked from the twitter account of The Psychologist and my comments on the online version of The Psychologist were deleted.

⁴²This letter is discussed later in the article.

⁴³<https://www.bps.org.uk/news/british-psychological-societys-response-report-commission-race-and-ethnic-disparities>

⁴⁴BlackLivesMatter (2020). Black Lives Matter – About. Retrieved from: <https://blacklivesmatter.com/what-defunding-the-police-really-means/>

⁴⁵<https://www.bps.org.uk/news-and-policy/bps-statement-racial-injustice>.

⁴⁶<https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/volume-33/september-2020/standing-against-racism>.

⁴⁷De Oliveira noted the negative impact that psychological theories and practices have had on minority groups, which has been "further exacerbated by the failure of the bodies that oversee the discipline to recognise the key, distinctive cultural and social determinants that contribute to forming the subject. As the BPS oversees the university's course for validation, the BPS could also ask for evidence as for what are Psychology departments across the country doing to decolonise their curriculum. By decolonising the curriculum, I mean the fundamental reconsideration of who is teaching, what the subject matter is and how it is being taught. To illustrate, a report from the University and College Union stated that in the 2016-17 academic year 25 black women were recorded as working as professors compared to 14,000 white men."

⁴⁸Dr Ng used a family resilience perspective to explore the views, stories and experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic parents raising a child with autism. She commented that: "The research revealed that in order to go beyond a tokenistic glance at race and culture, reflection needs to be applied at different levels. This is needed so that we can recognise and manage underlying power imbalances that might persist. We would need to recognise the impact race and culture has on our own decision making and responses. At a less conspicuous level, we need to be introspective, being aware of cultural assumptions and the nuances that exist, recognising our own biases and blind spots and therefore explicitly locating our position in relation to others." (Ng, 2020).

⁴⁹Yousuf, S. (2020). 'It is a system that perpetuates unequal access'. <https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/it-system-perpetuates-unequal-access>

⁵⁰It is valuable to quote Yousuf more fully as follows: "It is also problematic that the people working with diverse athlete clientele are predominantly homogenous White. A recent conversation with a trainee sport psychologist in BPS Stage 2, highlighted that in group supervision, the impact of recent Black Lives Matter (BLM) events had not been discussed nor had any aspect of 'Race' and ethnicity ever been explored...I am curious why it is our British colleagues – except for a few people – have not taken a stance just as they do for male mental health, cancer, LGBTQ+ and women in sport, all of which are necessary. How many colleagues have explored the connection between mental health and racism?. My identity is intersectional, my heritage raised in Rhodesia during the Apartheid (segregation) era. As a British citizen my entire life of nearly 50 years, I am still judged and socialised by the colour of my skin (along with my name and gender), by the very British ideology that forcibly separated during Apartheid. In the UK, the words 'you Paki, go back to where you are from', have been hurled at me despite not being Pakistani. This ideology still exists institutionally in less oppressive, but more insidious forms of racism. As psychologists we would rightly stand united against sexism and sexual abuse, discrimination of LGBTQ+, ageism, and disability. So let's stand together against all forms of racism and racial abuse. As a Boston University alumna, I will end with the words of Ibram Kendi, who leads an anti-racism research centre at the university: 'it is not enough to say you are not racist, you need to be anti-racist!'.⁵¹Kanazawa, S. (2006). Mind the gap ... in intelligence: Re-examining the relationship between inequality and health. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 11, 623–642.

⁵²J. Philippe Rushton (1990): "'Race' Differences, r/K theory, and a Reply to Flynn," *The Psychologist: Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, Vol. 3, 5 (May): 195-98.

⁵³<https://thepsychologist.bps.org.uk/archive?page=30>

⁵⁴"The article by Rushton, for which the Honorary Editors took pre-publication responsibility, was not reviewed by independent referees, but was published as a reply to the earlier critical article by Flynn...Although the majority of the material in the Rushton article had been published previously in journals elsewhere, the Honorary Editors admit that it was a serious error that the article was not submitted for independent review. Among other things, the process would have subjected the table in the paper to greater critical scrutiny. The Honorary Editors agree that the scientific content of the table is below the standard which is required by *The Psychologist* and regret its publication. Publication of an

article in *The Psychologist* does not constitute an endorsement by the Society of the views expressed by the author, and this disclaimer appears in every issue of *The Psychologist*. However, both the Honorary Editors and the Psychologist Editorial Committee have acted on the concerns expressed by members of the Society over this issue (including some members of Council), and have introduced an explicit policy for dealing with academic articles published in *The Psychologist*. In the future, all academic articles (and replies) appearing in *The Psychologist* will have been reviewed by at least two independent referees, and any articles that are signalled by reviewers as likely to cause offence will be published only with the consent of the Managing Editor and the Psychologist Editorial Committee. The Honorary Editors deeply regret any offence that this series of articles may have caused to some members. We hope that having made editorial procedures explicit, *The Psychologist* can continue to provide members with a forum for the discussion of controversial issues in contemporary Psychology.”

⁵⁵“As President, on behalf of Council, I welcome the frank and positive response by the Honorary Editors published above. I wish to express my confidence in them, the Editorial Committee and the new procedures that they have introduced.”

⁵⁶In 1990 Hans Eysenck was Professor Emeritus of Psychology, University of London, Editor-in-Chief of *Personality and Individual Differences*.

⁵⁷The Pioneer Fund is a major funder of racist science from which he and Rushton both obtained research grants.

⁵⁸King’s College London (KCL) (2019) King’s College London enquiry into publications authored by Professor Hans Eysenck with Professor Ronald Grossarth-Maticek. May 2019. Available at: <https://retractionwatch.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/HE-Enquiry.pdf>

Copyright: ©2023 David F Marks. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.