SHATTERING THE MYTH OF RACISM

VOLUME I

Matt Nuenke

Shattering the Myth of Racism:

Volume I

A free Internet book: researched, written and published by Matthew T. Nuenke

© November, 2001 (Last revised May, 2002)

Comments and corrections are invited via my web site at www.neoeugenics.net

Chapter One: Introduction

While surfing the web I came across the Institute for the Study of Academic Racism. Under its purpose was stated: "To serve as a resource for people interested in monitoring the intellectual trends in academic racism, biological determinism and eugenics." I was also pleased to see that they had my Mission Statement listed from my *NeoEugenics' Web Site*, though the URL address was over a year out of date. They also had only a few academics listed, so it seems they are having a very hard time finding so called *academic racists*.

But the site did get me to focus on the term racism, how it is used as a political weapon, but has never been empirically defined to the best of my knowledge. Clearly, the Left's numerous definitions of racism are made up of social constructs to intimidate and harass Whites. The purpose of my undertaking then is twofold: to try and understand how and why it is used as a tool for propaganda on the one hand, and to show what racism really is within a scientific perspective that relies on empirical data rather than hysterical ad hominem attacks against anyone that does not agree with the Left. Institutions that use the charge of racism to silence those who they disagree with are themselves intolerant of *the other*.

And then there is the problem of diversity. If diversity means inclusion of different ways of thinking or different types of temperaments, then clearly however one defines the *other* as something to be eliminated is an act of genocide. To declare war on racists, like declaring war on peaceniks, is an act of aggression. Whether racism is really just another word for ethnocentrism and is part of our innate genetic heritage, or if it is part of our culture alone, in either case to declare it as an unacceptable set of beliefs that do not result in unacceptable actions such as murder or assault makes attacks on racists as ominous as McCarthyism's attack on communists. It is censorship of ideas and is intolerant. It is hatred of the *other*; it is in itself racism if

racism is merely intolerance of those not like you. In essence, to be an anti-racist is to be a racist because you are being intolerant of a group that you have defined as abhorrent.

I was raised in a medium sized city in Minnesota that was a mixture of German, Dutch and Norwegian farmers as the original settlers. Most of the people are now a mixture of the three cultures and race was never discussed or even recognized to the best of my recollection. I was also raised in a very liberal, protestant home, and was free to do pretty much whatever I wanted to do. I was not encouraged to do well in school or to have any high ambitions. Just live and let live.

As luck had it, I went into the Navy before I knew what I wanted to do in life. By the time I got out, I was sure I didn't want to return to my roots and just get a job and be an average mope like the rest of my kin. So with the help of the GI bill, I went to the University of Minnesota and got my degree in Chemical Engineering with a minor in petrochemicals. This opened up an opportunity to travel and work in many different places until settling down finally in Chicago, twenty-five years later.

While at the university during the late sixties, I loved to debate the current political issues of the day from Vietnam to discrimination. It was an exciting time, one filled with conflict but also purpose. There seemed to be more freedom on the one hand, but it occurred to me that the new Left was as intolerant as the bigots we were seeing on television from the Deep South. They both seemed equally caught up in their own agendas, and communication could not progress past yelling and demonstrations. But what influenced me more than any other single event, was the outright thrashing the Left bestowed upon Arthur Jensen in 1969 with his publication of "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement" in the *Harvard Educational Review*. It was apparent to me then that the very movement that was pushing for free speech at the time would not tolerate freedom of speech and ideas from others. So what was free speech to be if not for everyone?

After graduation, and disillusioned with any hope for a truly rational approach to solving political problems, I left my philosophy behind and focused on my career, having fun, and traveling. During those years I found myself working in many different places, including overseas in multicultural environments. I never had a problem acclimating to new environments or working conditions. And I worked with people from many different racial groups and cultures. And the one thing that I learned or came to accept naturally because I was never really aware of any other pattern: people were always treated as individuals. Not as part of some race or cultural category.

Of course, different groups were categorized and classified by generalizations. This is what humans do best; we place things into categories because it is mentally efficient for future use. But these categories or assigning certain behavioral and cultural traits to groups did not transfer to individuals. Once we started dealing with individuals, they were accepted and treated according to their own merits—not those of the group.

I worked for six years in Saudi Arabia in the oil fields. As Americans we had our own compound where Southern Whites familiar with Jim Crow laws worked and played along side of Blacks, in close quarters. I don't remember seeing any racism or squabbles. We had enough to keep us occupied brewing our own moonshine, and knowing the consequences if we got caught—prison was not a very hospitable place in Saudi Arabia. I did not even think about racism at the time—it was not present. Besides, no one had any more power or influence than anyone else. We were all hired by a large and transparent bureaucracy, so we were all treated the same—small cogs in a big oil company controlled by the Saudi government.

It wasn't until years later that I once again became aware of the racial conflicts and the agenda behind calling people and institutions *racist*.

After taking some night courses at a local university, one class's assignment was to compare *equal opportunity* to *equal outcomes* for minorities. For that assignment I read the recently published book *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* by the late Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray, in the fall of 1994. The fallout from the publication of that book shocked me, especially the level of hate expressed by commentators who felt that no one had the right to bring up an issue like the differences in intelligence between races.

At that point I started discussing race issues on the Internet, and the same pattern emerged. Anyone who brought up racial differences was labeled a racist. I then started reading primarily academic books on evolution, intelligence, behavior genetics, genetic engineering, etc. and it rekindled an interest in eugenics that I had dabbled with many years earlier. And now that eugenics has been labeled as racist, I find it necessary to not only defend my views from that criticism, but to lay open what the purpose **is** for calling others *racist* and to discuss just whether such a charge has any basis or real meaning. What I will show is that the term is used for several political reasons: To try and stop any academic discussion about racial differences; to promote an egalitarian/Marxist agenda; to try and curtail freedom of speech; to use it as a tool for extortion, reparations and income redistribution based on race rather than merit; and to subjugate primarily White males to a new form of oppression. And, in addition, the one thing that I became aware of only after reading Kevin MacDonald's book *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements,* was that a large Jewish influence—in the continuing struggle between Whites and Jews for power and control as an evolutionary strategy—was painting the West, and especially White Anglo-Saxons, as *racists* for political advantage. Keeping Whites on the defensive allowed Jews to pursue their own political agendas unimpeded. It is anti-Western gentile- or Anglo-phobia.

Now often in academia it is charged that if you have a bias or animus

towards your subject matter you should refrain from writing or speaking on that subject. Well, like every other human being that was born with a psychology that includes ethnic conflict, I am of course biased in many ways towards my kin. But why should I desist from writing about *racism* any more than Jews should desist writing about *anti-Semitism*? In addition, if Jews are using charges of *racism* against Whites because of their animosity towards us, then they should refrain from all academic research and writing with regards to *racism* (Hoffman II 2000). I bring this point up front because from my experience, charges of anti-Semitism will be made against me for discussing the Jewish role in attacking Whites. Also unlike other ethnic groups, the Jews are predominant in academia, the media and politics because of their extraordinary high average intelligence, so they are formidable foes against Whites. Blacks, on the other hand, along with having a low average intelligence, will also call this book just more *racism*. But unlike Jews, they have very little real influence, and in addition, there are some Blacks who are willing to stand up and agree that the charge of *racism* as an excuse for Black failure is just plain nonsense, as are many other individuals in the *rainbow coalition*.

On the other hand, Jews seem to be rather unique in these battles in that even extremely *right wing* Jews, who for example oppose immigration, are phenomenally silent when it comes to Jewish manipulation of government policy in favor of Israel for example. Virtually all are deafeningly silent on the Jewish influence that pervades the Anti-White agenda. A few notable exceptions are Michael Levin (Levin 1997), Noam Chomsky, and Israel Shahak (Shahak 1999). If just a few scholarly Jews would stand up and state unequivocally for example that Jewish organizations were the predominant forces behind the 1965 immigration act because they wanted to dilute the dominant Anglo-Saxon hegemony in the United States, then I would be less suspicious of the extent of Jewish ethnic cohesiveness. I therefore must assume that Jews and Anglos can agree on many things except one—we are never to be allowed to discuss Jewish animus against us while they can use the

charge of anti-Semitism to deflect any criticism of their agenda—either individually or collectively. I do not believe that Jews act conspiratorially or collectively in any way. In fact I just don't believe in conspiracy theories in general. What I do observe is a brilliant people who are unwilling to allow others to examine their motives as they examine ours—and this genetic cohesiveness I believe comes from their practice of eugenics for thousands of years that not only gave them superior intelligence, but also an insatiable insecurity along with ethnocentrism.

But I did not always feel as I do now. When I first began my independent research into racial issues after reading The Bell Curve, my animus was directed almost entirely at minorities and their demands for more and more handouts. As I started researching the evolutionary basis of intelligence, I stumbled across a book review of MacDonald's 1994 book *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy* that includes Jewish eugenic practices. I found it fascinating because I was interested in eugenics as well as race and intelligence issues. I ended up purchasing all three books by MacDonald on *group evolutionary strategies* and *Judaism* and I felt shocked, duped and betrayed. I wasn't aware of the Jewish influence touching upon the very issues that I was most concerned with. Since then, I have been acutely aware of Jewish influence, as well as another evolutionary phenomena—**that the ruling elite will usually bail on their own kind** (this will be discussed later). So in all fairness, I now have an equal amount of animus for my own kin who have turned on their own as well as for those Jews who have behaved in ways that harm my kin and me. Is any of this right or wrong? Of course not, nature knows not of these things. They are purely emotional within our ancient *human nature,* machinery laid down over millions of years. This animus must be expected and understood if possible, not condemned.

So in defense of my kin, I will show that there is no such thing as *racism*. That is, I will show that it lacks empirical validity, and should be replaced with such terms as xenophobia, ethnocentrism, revenge,

paranoia, etc. That is, if academics want to claim that either individuals, groups or institutions are racist, they must be willing to develop the concept of what racism is in relation to actual actions or beliefs in a systematic manner. They must show that there is such a thing as *racism* in the same manner as other behavioral traits are analyzed and studied.

To do otherwise is to make a mockery of modern science. In the past we have persecuted scientists for believing the earth was not the center of the universe, we have burned witches at the stake, and we have used eugenics in a simplistic Mendelian manner that ascribed a lack of morality to "bad seed." Now we are seeing a renewed inquisition by the Left that is the mirror image of the above politically motivated purges, and its only purpose is to suppress science itself now that we are closer than ever in unlocking the genetic code.

But the most important reason for not submitting to this new oppression is not science but fairness. Science will progress regardless of these politically motivated purges, it will happen just later on rather than sooner. What is really so devastating about the charge of *racism* against groups of people and institutions is that it has one fundamental purpose, to put shackles on free speech. If you look at who is being shouted down and not allowed to talk or to hold meetings you will notice that it is the Left that has become intolerant. Everywhere one looks there are efforts to curtail freedom of speech. There are riots and protests against universities who have ended racial quotas. There are riots and protests against a meeting of the World Trade Organization in Seattle. Any professor or intellectual that the Left does not like is prevented from speaking at universities. The list goes on an on. Virtually every effort to suppress free speech in Western countries is carried out by the Left—and the charge of *racism* is used often as the reason. Racial justice cannot be discussed unless the authoritarian Left controls the dialog and the agenda.

This same suppression of what we take to be the basic freedom of

expression is now spreading globally as the United Nations and the European Economic Union undertakes serious proposals to curtail free Internet access because they don't like so-called "hate" sites. But on the other hand, the Left is free to attack "capitalists" as if they were something other than people. Christian Fundamentalists can be criticized and condemned. The recent riots in Cincinnati (April 2001) resulted in one White being charged with a hate crime while the Blacks attacked Whites for days resulting in just one incident of a hate crime charge. The intolerance by the Left for anyone who disagrees with them is apparent everywhere, and yet only "pro-White" web sites are condemned. Racism is the sledgehammer that the Left proposes to use to suppress free speech. And it is working. In reading academic books, more and more I am noticing that they are finding reasons why freedom of speech may need to be curtailed to stop racism.

So what has happened over the last few years to bring about such paranoia about free speech? Simply this: Before the Internet arrived on the scene, freedom of speech was easily controlled by the monopolistic media. The Left has always controlled newspapers, book reviews, Hollywood, radio and television—virtually every avenue of mass communication has been dominated by the Left up until the Internet came on the scene. For the first time, anyone anywhere can speak out and publish what they think. True freedom of speech has arrived and the Left is determined to shut it down.

In essence then, thanks to the word "*racism*" that came into play as a valuable propaganda tool during our darker days when Jim Crow was rampant in the South, and people watched as the police beat and intimidated Blacks who at that time only wanted freedom, we now have a new use for the term. It is now used to silence dissent. Marxists have moved from a failed class struggle to a new race struggle in order to vindicate their failed ideology. White males are the new villains just as the vague and varying definition of what constituted being a Kulak in Russia was created out of whole cloth and as they were marched off by

the millions to die in concentration camps, without knowing what thought crimes they had committed. Communism needs an enemy to be ideologically sustainable, and Whites are now it. The Marxists are back, here in the West, under new clothing.

The term *racism* as a cultural construct, or as a meme in terms of cultural transmission, must be replicated accurately, many copies must be made, and it must last a long time according to Dawkins (1976). This has been accomplished simply by the fact that the term itself is used ubiquitously over and over again by Marxist academics over many decades. It has stuck because it is never challenged.

The following story illustrates how this *meme* is transmitted. From, "Levels of racism: a theoretic framework and a gardener's tale" by Camara Phyllis Jones (*American Journal of Public Health*, v. 90 no8, Aug. 2000, p. 1212-15) we can see how it is presented. This is a stale rehashing of Lewontin's similar story about plants. But I think it summarizes nicely how the Left keeps *racism* alive in many people's minds:

> "LEVELS OF RACISM: A GARDENER'S TALE. When my husband and I bought a house in Baltimore, there were 2 large flower boxes on the front porch. When spring came we decided to grow flowers in them. One of the boxes was empty, so we bought potting soil to fill it. We did nothing to the soil in the other box, assuming that it was fine. Then we planted seeds from a single seed packet in the 2 boxes. The seeds that were sown in the new potting soil quickly sprang up and flourished. All of the seeds sprouted, the most vital towering strong and tall, and even the weak seeds made it to a middling height. However, the seeds planted in the old soil did not fare so well. Far fewer seeds sprouted, with the strong among them only making it to a middling height, while the weak among them died. It turns out that the old soil was poor and rocky, in contrast to the new

potting soil, which was rich and fertile. The difference in yield and appearance in the 2 flower boxes was a vivid, real-life illustration of the importance of environment. Those readers who are gardeners will probably have witnessed this phenomenon with their own eyes.

"Now I will use this image of the 2 flower boxes to illustrate the 3 levels of racism. Let's imagine a gardener who has 2 flower boxes, one that she knows to be filled with rich, fertile soil and another that she knows to be filled with poor, rocky soil. This gardener has 2 packets of seeds for the same type of flower. However, the plants grown from one packet of seeds will bear pink blossoms, while the plants grown from the other packet of seeds will bear red blossoms. The gardener prefers red over pink, so she plants the red seed in the rich fertile soil and the pink seed in the poor rocky soil. And sure enough, what I witnessed in my own garden comes to pass in this garden too. All of the red flowers grow up and flourish, with the fittest growing tall and strong and even the weakest making it to a middling height. But in the box with the poor rocky soil, things look different. The weak among the pink seeds don't even make it, and the strongest among them grow only to a middling height.

"In time the flowers in these 2 boxes go to seed, dropping their progeny into the same soil in which they were growing. The next year the same thing happens, with the red flowers in the rich soil growing full and vigorous and strong, while the pink flowers in the poor soil struggle to survive. And these flowers go to seed. Year after year, the same thing happens. Ten years later the gardener comes to survey her garden. Gazing at the 2 boxes, she says, "I was right to prefer red over pink! Look how vibrant and beautiful the red flowers look, and see how pitiful and scrawny the pink ones are.

> "This part of the story illustrates some important aspects of institutionalized racism. There is the initial historical insult of separating the seed into the 2 different types of soil; the contemporary structural factors of the flower boxes, which keep the soils separate; and the acts of omission in not addressing the differences between the soils over the years. The normative aspects of institutionalized racism are illustrated by the initial preference of the gardener for red over pink. Indeed, her assumption that red is intrinsically better than pink may contribute to a blindness about the difference between the soils."

Now let's revise the story and tell it from the behavioral geneticist's perspective:

LEVELS OF INNATE DIFFERENCES: A GARDENER'S TALE. When my wife and I bought a house in Baltimore, there were 2 large flower boxes on the front porch. When spring came we decided to grow flowers in them. We went to a nursery and bought some begonias; they were expensive, and bought just a few. Then we planted them in one of the flower boxes, not having enough to fill two flower boxes. The next week was very busy, and we did not have time to get more begonias from the nursery, so we bought them instead from the local Super K Mart. As the weeks passed, the nursery begonias flourished, but he K Mart ones lagged behind, seemingly not growing at all. We tried fertilizing the lagging begonias, but it helped very little. Without fertilizer, the nursery begonias were still doing much better.

By the end of the summer, the K Mart begonias had finally started to show some growth with the extra care and nourishment we gave them, but they never caught up to the nursery begonias in size, color and vigor. We realized that the begonias were not the same. The carefully selected nursery begonias were of much better genetic quality, and no amount of care was going to make the K Mart begonias grow to the same quality.

Now I will use this image of the 2 flower boxes to illustrate the absurdity of the environmentalist argument. Children, like flowers, come with a genetic make-up. Social scientists, using the above analogy about two different soils—one good and one bad—have spent billions of dollars trying to change the soil—but to no avail. All of the attempts to raise the intelligence of disadvantaged Black children have been failures, with the exception of a slight improvement in the average IQ of Blacks adopted by upper class families.

So this is the crux of the argument. The behavioral geneticists have amassed an enormous amount of data on the genetic component of intelligence and behavior—and genes count a great deal. The egalitarian social psychologists on the other hand have failed miserably in trying to raise the intelligence of children by "enriching the soil." The fact is they fail in life because they have low intelligence that they inherited (at least 80% of it) and this is the cause—not *institutional racism*. Asian Indians are just as "dark" as African Americans, and they do very well indeed in academics. Intelligence has nothing to do with skin color, but it does correlate with different racial groups.

This long quote from Roger Pearson's *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe* provides the framework for my task in exposing racism as a hoax:

> "Although Gould's book [The Mismeasure of Man] received extensive favorable publicity in the media, non-Marxist scientists were not so impressed. In a letter dated February 18, 1982, Stephen Goldberg of The City University of New York condemned The Mismeasure of Man, observing that 'it is on Gould's contention that current attempts to measure intelligence, reify intelligence, and therefore render all such attempts worthless, that Gould's argument succeeds or fails.'
>
> "Goldberg contradicted Gould by pointing out that, despite all

> Gould had written: (1) Intelligence is a meaningful word; and that although it is difficult to verbalize what we mean by 'intelligence,' the word does have meaning and individuals do differ in 'intelligence.' (2) That 'those who deny that IQ tests test **intelligence** cannot explain why, when you intuitively rank twenty acquaintances by **intelligence**, you find that the order in which you ranked the twenty is highly correlated with the order of IQ scores.' (3) That although intelligence may assume a number of qualities, and there may or may not be a simple basic quality of 'g', dominating what we call intelligence, nevertheless people generally agree on who is and who is not intelligent. (4) That IQ tests do correlate with intuitively-recognized intelligence, and even if they did not this would not in itself disprove the validity of IQ tests. (5) That regardless of whatever the causal relation might be between heredity, environment and intelligence, one 'cannot avoid the possibility of hereditary causation by denying the meaning of **intelligence** or the ability of IQ tests to measure **intelligence**.' (6) That 'environmentalists have not seriously addressed the devastating hereditarian claim [sic] that the more a test is culturally based . . . the smaller the differences between the scores attained by various ethnic groups.' He argues that this fact 'casts the most serious doubts on claims that **culture bias** explains group differences.' (7) That there is a central flaw in Gould's viewpoint. 'If by reification Gould means that averages are statistical abstractions, we will certainly agree, but our agreement alters nothing: the average height of all pygmies is a statistical abstraction, as is the average height of all Watusis. This fact casts no doubt about the reality of height, the fact that Watusis are taller than Pygmies, the fact that we can know this by comparing statistical averages, or the fact that heredity accounts for more of the height differences between Pygmies and Watusis.'"

What I intend to do in this book then, is to show that unlike *intelligence* that has had over 100 years of research and debate, *racism* has been *reified* by the

Left while not providing any of the empirical data that they demand with regards to intelligence. *Racism* fails on every account that the Left uses to attack *intelligence* research. If you are going to prove or disprove "statistical abstractions" like *racism*, you must provide the same quality of data as is used to show that *intelligence* is a meaningful general factor or that introversion is a meaningful behavioral factor. They have not done so in any empirical way other than using "statistical abstractions" that shows that different groups are not equal when it comes to life's outcomes. And in addition, for the most part, all races are excluded from the charge of *racism* except Whites. Clearly, the focus of these charges therefore are in themselves an attack by one large aggregate group (people of color) against another as part of an ongoing struggle that has nothing to do with fairness or justice.

But one very telling aspect of who is behind this demonization of White Gentiles was the Global Conference on Racism and Xenophobia that took place in South Africa in September, 2001. The Jewish lobby around the world mobilized quickly to keep Zionism out of the discussion of racism. It seems that they somehow exclude themselves from the group labeled "people of color" but also are ever vigilant to exclude themselves from the category of White racism also. By the very separation of the terms *racism* versus *anti-Semitism* they have managed to forge for themselves a special exempt category that I will elaborate on later, while showing that of any group, they are the primary Marxist theoreticians behind the shift from focusing on class struggle to racialism as their fundamental weapon in the ongoing group evolutionary strategy. And in the end, the United States walked out of the conference along with their puppet masters in Israel. No one was going to call the Israeli state racist. As Israel's prime minister Sharon said after the World Trade Center disaster, "Every time we do something, you tell me that America will do this or do that. I want to tell you something very clear. Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Jewish people, control America, and the Americans know it."

Chapter Two: Pseudoscientific constructs of racism

We hear a lot about racism, we see studies showing if it is increasing, how it is changing, and we take it for granted that such a concept has any real meaning. We shouldn't be surprised, we still talk about "evil empires" as if evil was a real definable human trait that could be then attributed to a nation. We hear of terrorist states, as if terror was attributed always to the "other." We forget that during World War Two the United States dropped nuclear bombs on civilians in Japan and dropped firestorm bombs on the German cities of Hamburg and Dresden, killing hundreds of thousands, as a means of terror to win the war. We forget that Israel was born by a terrorist campaign to take over Palestinian lands and secure a religious/ethnic state based on race as the defining criteria for those who would now rule.

These concepts: racism, terrorism, evil, god, morality, equality, justice, etc. are all folk concepts that are spread by the media but have little credibility within academia unless they are discussed and evaluated within an empirical paradigm that keeps simplistic concepts out of the debates, and requires that the participants, in trying to tease away the real meaning must adhere to certain principles of evaluation and rationality. We have stumbled many times in our modern quest for knowledge, but at least in academia the understanding of human nature is progressing along a path of ever-richer meaning and verifiability.

Unfortunately within academia, there has been a split between empiricists and the Left, and they have been conducting research and exploring human nature using different tools and standards of academic review and verification. Over the last 100 years, the pendulum over nature and nurture has swung back and forth. The issues of intelligence, race and racism, eugenics, sociobiology, and the nature/nurture debate of

how humans are constructed were all highly politicized and used as political tools by the Left up until about 1970. Then, the empiricists started digging deep into the methodology of scientific investigation, while the Left just stood back and criticized what they disliked without providing their own research (Segerstrale 2000).

Around that time, new research was just beginning to uncover new discoveries in how our genes have a much more important role in our nature than we dogmatically had accepted possible, and the new neo-Darwinists and psychometricians, as they presented their data, were attacked by the Left as being Pseudoscientists. It was not that hard to do. A few Marxists like Stephen J. Gould and Ashley Montagu published scathing attacks on intelligence and concepts of race, and the attack was sustainable and accepted with the help of the media and the emerging compassion we were showing for the poor and the underclass. But a strange thing happened on the way to liberation. As the Left attacked science itself, the scientists went to work to unravel these new areas of study. The Left on the other hand just put up smoke screens accusing anyone who dared to study or have an illiberal opinion of practicing *scientific racism*. That is, a racist who is also a scientist and motivated by hate rather than empiricism. (Gould really stepped in it when he tried to show the fallacy of correlations between brain size and intelligence. But over the last few years new magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies are showing a correlation of 0.5 to 0.6 between the brain's gray matter size and intelligence, as well as structural differences between the male and female brain, but Gould has never admitted that he was wrong. So much for honesty.)

This ruse is still being used, but it becomes harder and harder to sustain. One by one the pillars of Marxist opposition are falling. Intelligence tests are now unbiased and correlate in meaningful ways with a person's expected academic success and a myriad of other life outcomes from better health to a higher income for the more intelligent lot, and a host of problems for those who are of low intelligence. Genetic

studies have shown that races do vary in average genetic frequencies of alleles that impact a host of intellectual, behavioral, physiological and reproductive differences: races are different and these differences are meaningful. And people do engage in in-group evolutionary strategies that defy any sustainable hope that there is such a thing as *the human race* that can get along without conflict over resources, status, power and control. Evolutionary studies are revealing that not only do genes compete at the genetic and individual level but also at the level of the group. And nature has little tolerance for a normative approach to morality or justice.

So this chapter will show how far the Left has drifted from attacking the empiricists on grounds of being pseudoscientific because their evidence was weak, to taking up the same methodologies as the early researchers in intelligence. They are now using the same anecdotal concepts of racism to **reify** it without data. That is, when intelligence was being studied, the detractors said intelligence did not exist. But now after decades of solid research, intelligence is grounded in science, as is evolution. The Left is using the very same 19th century shoddy techniques to prove that another statistical abstraction, *racism*, is real. But they are doing this primarily by rejecting empiricism itself. The Marxist leaning social scientists and cultural anthropologists have split from the rest of the scientific community because their methods are grounded in Marxist dogma, and cannot meet the critical academic reviews that other scientists submit to. These Marxist oriented academics are now the new Pseudoscientists. They have isolated themselves from cross-disciplinary review so that they can push their political agendas without criticism.

Now that we know that different racial groups vary significantly with regards to average intelligence, and that intelligence is correlated with economic success, the Left has no choice but to ignore this data and fall back on concepts of institutional, systemic, structural, and other pop names for racism. They need to lay the blame at someone's doorstep. At one time it was class struggle against capitalists. White males of the

Protestant variety have replaced the evil capitalists (it varies somewhat but it is always the West who is evil and Whites who are singularly of a racist nature—all other cultures or races are presumed exempt). Without an enemy, Marxism has no basis for its elitist desire to topple the status quo, whatever or whomever it is at the time.

To understand this agenda one has to look at academic books, articles and research. When we apply the same empirical standards to studies on racism that the Left demanded of intelligence research (and they got much more than they bargained for) it was obvious that they had failed to abide by the same standards they had accused others of violating. Research on racism is so flawed as to be less than worthless because it is made to shower hate down upon the Western Christian culture itself. It is an attack that vilifies a culture and a people for no apparent reason other than to support a Marxist dogma. A scapegoat must be provided to sustain the attack through fear of the intentions of others they find distasteful.

This does not mean I believe that there is no such thing as group hostilities. In the Environment of our Evolutionary Past (EEP), humans have been fighting and killing each other quite regularly. Within the band or tribe it was usually over sexual infidelities, and between bands it was for resources, revenge, or a preemptive strike before the other group could attack. But these innate human instincts should be analyzed and called what they really are, ethnocentrism for instance. And the motivations behind human actions should be held to the same academic standards as all other behavioral studies. That is, I will argue that when the Left ponders racism, they do so as a political tool. This is shown by the improper use of the term itself, one that is not found in the biological sciences that are stricter in their methodologies. I will show that racism as defined does not exist, and that the term itself should be shelved for a more accurate description.

Symbolic Racism

An article that appeared in the *Journal of Social Psychology* (June 1, 1992) entitled "A Comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory ...", by Sidanius, Devereux and Pratto, gives some insight on how racism is a social construct. In order to force society into a Marxist egalitarianism way of looking at justice and equality, the first requirement is to make sure that any testing of *symbolic racism* is highly biased. This was the same problem with intelligence testing when some immigrant groups from Eastern Europe were tested and shown to be of low intelligence because the tests were culturally biased and inapplicable. But even then, the people giving the tests realized there was something wrong with the tests themselves.

Now we have tests or surveys of attitudes attempting to find racism. This study admits up front that only samples of Whites were given the test on racism—other races were not given similar tests. That is, all of the questions are formulated up front to only show White racism, as if Whites could only hold these attitudes. This would be equivalent to only sending Whites to schools because it is just accepted that all Blacks would be too stupid to learn anyway. Is this good science? The study states, is it " [possible] that *symbolic racism* serves as an important legitimizing myth in American society? ... In a detailed statement of this reasoning, McConahay and Hough (1976) posited two kinds of racism: the older, blunt, redneck racism marked by public expressions of racial hatred, doctrines of racial inferiority, and support for segregation and a newer, subtler cluster of racial attitudes consisting of a combination of anti-Black affect and traditional American values referred to as symbolic, or modern, racism."

What this means is that White Americans are racist if Blacks do not do as well in life as Whites (anti-Black affect) and that it is racist to have *traditional American values*. That is, whatever values Whites possess

are unacceptable because they are racist! Not actions, not deeds, not oppression—but values. Our **values** keep Blacks oppressed. And where is the proof? Well, Blacks do poorly in life, they live amongst mostly Whites, and therefore it must be the White's fault. Marxism says so. That is the irrational essence of their argument. But it is not even a definitive or clear statement of cause and effect. What exactly do Whites do that keeps Blacks from being successful in school, on the job, and in life in general? That data is missing. The correlation is always the same. Blacks do poorly, and there must be ways that Whites are oppressing them—no other proof is required. Whites are inherently evil because they *have traditional American values*. Apparently Whites all think and act alike, have the same values, and these values are not proper to have and must somehow be changed. We are guilty of some crime by the very *values* we hold. But aren't my values protected by the constitution, especially if they are religious values? So how can these values be changed to be acceptable to a Marxist perspective and therefore no longer racist?

Later on they state, "all major *symbolic racism* theorists conceive of *symbolic racism* as being composed of a blend of anti-black affect [poverty] and traditional American moral values embodied in the **Protestant ethic**." So there you have it. Traditional moral values as expressed in the Protestant ethic are the cause of all the problems. How do they know this? Well, they just state it as fact and then they go about correlating these values with Whites and it becomes a self-fulfilling reality or reification of a social construct. What is so implausible in this fabrication of reality is that you could not even get a decent description of traditional American values, morals or ethics. They are all over the place and even evolutionists do not understand morality or values very well. Later I will cover the research with regards to morality and altruism as a part of our evolutionary past. But suffice it to say I have no idea what this *Protestant ethic* is, unless they mean hard work and a meritocratic expectation that hard work should be rewarded!

So let us take a look at this so-called ethic from another cultural perspective. Apologists point out that Jews and East Asians do better economically and academically than Whites, especially Ashkenazi Jews. When asked to explain this, they say it is because of hard work and dedication, or, more properly stated: conscientiousness. Well if this attitude is acceptable for Jews and East Asians, why is it not acceptable for Whites in the form of a so-called *Protestant ethic*? For one simple reason. The Left has to define racism in some way to keep it alive as an excuse for Black failure, and Whites are the new people that it is acceptable to oppress—especially Protestants or the dreaded Anglo-Saxons. From this most hated core group of Anglo Whites then, hatred of other Whites tends to flow out towards other White ethnic groups in lesser and lesser amounts—diminishing as they tend towards *people of color*. There is no *fixed* group of Whites that is condemned—just being White is justification enough. Of course being female, homosexual, disabled, etc. does cut you some slack and you become a bit less culpable for the world's problems.

Also note that no distinction is made between poor Whites, rich Whites, Whites who are farmers and may never interact with a Black person, etc. Just being White is enough to be a racist and to be the cause of all of the oppressed peoples' problems.

The authors add that, "Meritocracy, especially the *Protestant* work ethic variation, and anti-Black racism are two potent legitimizing myths in the United States." This of course is another reification or making something that is conceptual seem like something real. What exactly is a *legitimizing myth*? That one believes in meritocracy? That one has a Protestant ethic? Is there something wrong with having this work ethic? Would it be better if Whites were lazier? Of course, it is impossible to pin down these concepts because they are so fluid and conceptually flawed as to be useless. And in fact they are unchangeable unless the Left plans on using massive amounts of propaganda and indoctrination of Whites to make them believe that there is no merit in hard work. Is that what this

nation is based on—a socialist ethic that whatever happens to you has nothing to do with your own efforts?

The authors then posit an alternative to *symbolic racism* called *social dominance*:

> "All social systems consist of at least two castes, a hegemonic group at the top and a negative reference group at the bottom. The stability of this social hierarchy is most directly produced and maintained by at least three processes: (a) aggregated institutional discrimination, or the differential allocation of social value by institutions such as the legal system, schools, and corporations; (b) aggregated individual discrimination, or the accumulated effect of discrimination of Individual A from a hegemonic group against Individual B from a negative reference group; and (c) behavioral asymmetry, by which we mean that, on average, the behavioral repertoires of individuals belonging to groups at different levels of the social hierarchy will show significant differences that have been produced by the dynamics of, and in turn reinforce and perpetuate, the group-based hierarchy system (e.g., deference to outgroups with higher status, self-handicapping behavior). This behavioral asymmetry is induced by socialization patterns, stereotypes, legitimizing myths, and the operation of systematic terror. These three proximal factors are, in turn, influenced by a number of other factors, including such things as (a) social comparison and social identity processes, (b) self-esteem maintenance, (c) social dominance orientation, and (d) legitimizing myths."

The authors admit that all groups will try to dominate any other group. So what the above tries to show, via another *just-so* story, is that caste systems perpetuate disparities in equality, or wealth if you will. What they fail to show is how this occurs. Note that the mere presence of a caste system makes Blacks fail. But *why* do Blacks submit to failure? There is no data on how this occurs or how it can occur. In fact, within

groups dominance occurs, but those lower on the pecking order don't just stop functioning because of it. They wait, they plan, they learn, and they try to get ahead. This dominance pattern is found in most social animals including my two dogs. My younger but far stronger dog is totally cowed by his older but dominant bitch. She will retain that dominance until she is no longer able to fake her dominance, and he will eventually dominate her, I suspect. He sure tries, and he gets really pissed when she has a toy that he wants and he has to submit to barking alone to show his angst.

So hierarchies, dominance, submission, retaliation, and cooperation are all in the repertoire of human relations, and humans have been doing just fine with them for over 200,000 years. Why is it only now that certain racial groups are intimidated into being failures? That is what they seem to be getting at. But such acceptance of a lower status would most likely be due to real, not perceived differences. That is, when Eastern Jews and East Asians come into this country they do not submit to being dominated, they do very well indeed. So why do Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans to different degrees oppress themselves into accepting failure? The answer is simple: They don't. The wealth of every racial group correlates very closely with that group's average intelligence (Silbiger 2000, Lynn 2002).

But let's look at just a few of the above allegations. Item (a) claims that Blacks get less than Whites when indeed there has been billions of dollars transferred from Whites to Blacks over the last thirty-five years through affirmative action, de facto hiring quotas, educational programs, set-aside programs, and general welfare that goes disproportionately to Blacks over Whites. Poor Whites, who are just as destitute will see few of these advantages handed to them. So how much are we suppose to give Blacks before (a) is no longer a factor for Black failure? Well I guess if we just handed every Black family a check for say $50,000 each year then this particular form of racism would cease.

Then there is the assertion under (b) that racism also comes from the

members of one group discriminating against others. But how is that done? Most people—yes, even the vast majority of Whites—have no real power. They go to their jobs, they work for someone else, and they get very little say in the economics of others such as who gets hired, promoted, fired or transferred. Companies, in their fear of being sued for discrimination, now in **the aggregate**, favor minorities over Whites. Just look at the restrictions the courts have put on testing. The fairest way to hire people without regards to race is to give them all the same test and let the chips fall where they may. But this is almost never done. It was tried in Chicago in the last few years, where firefighter's promotions were based on a carefully constructed culture-free test that cost millions of dollars to devise. Still, minorities did poorly because they are less intelligent, and the tests were dismissed. The Mayor now wants to be able to include merit in selecting for promotions—that is he wants to select Blacks because they merit special consideration or quotas, not merit promotion based on any identifiable criteria that could be monitored. So it seems that (b) is actually racism against Whites—not against Blacks.

Item (c) is just a backhanded way of saying that Blacks are less intelligent than Whites because, being less intelligent to start with, they must stay that way. But then why are East Asians more intelligent than Whites? This must be answered and it will not suffice to say that it is because they just try harder. These arguments are circular and cannot be falsified—and falsifiability is an important scientific aspect of any hypothesis (but not necessary). The most logical conclusion is that since sub-Saharan Africans have an average IQ of only 70, hybrid American Blacks also have an innate low IQ. But of course, African Americans' intelligence can vary a great deal because Blacks have different percentages of White, Jewish, or East Asian admixture, which means that they should not even be included in the aggregation of a single Black category. The very intelligent ones do very well economically. The only stigma is that they may be successful because of affirmative action rather than on their own talents. But this is the problem caused by affirmative

action, not racism.

So yes, different groups do compete, but it is impossible in a free democracy such as we have in the United States for any one dominant group to hold back any other. Remember, White Protestants are right in the middle of the economic pecking order, with Jews and East Asians above them and Blacks and Native Americans below in terms of wealth. Perhaps what we need is an affirmative action program for Whites to close the economic gap between us and the East Asians and Ashkenazi Jews.

In the statement above, (a), (b), and (c) were said to be induced by "socializing patterns, stereotypes, legitimizing myths, and the operation of systemic terror." **Terror!?** Is that like the fear of being raped, robbed, or assaulted? It seems to me that Whites suffer from *terror*. Hate laws are passed specifically against us, and are mostly unenforced when Blacks overwhelmingly attack Whites. And Black on White crime is ten times the rate of White on Black crime. So where is this terror they are talking about? It doesn't exist. The only people in a position to terrorize Blacks are other Blacks, and yet Whites get blamed? Well of course—we are evil. And evil *terrorizes*. So the fact that Blacks are terrorized by *Whitey* is why they are of low intelligence. This must be so because Marxism demands that there be either class warfare or racial warfare in all of the world's problems. Never mind those Black-run countries in Africa are centuries behind the West. Whites of course are responsible for that also. That damn Protestant ethic has just ruined everything for everyone, and it must be stopped. Only a return to totalitarian communism can make things right again in the eyes of the neo-Marxists.

Finally, this paper summarizes succinctly what a racist really is in their minds. "The more anti-egalitarian one was, the greater was one's traditional racism, symbolic racism, belief in meritocracy or the Protestant ethic, and political conservatism." That's right, a racist is

anyone who is not a Marxist, but believes instead in individualism, hard work, and that those who work hard should reap the benefits. Simply put, a racist is anyone who does not voluntarily give up all of his or her wealth above that of the national average so that everyone has exactly the same amount of money. But of course, as soon as we meet this condition a whole series of other requirements would be demanded. Those not crippled would have to be hobbled in some way to make them less mobile. Beauty would have to be somehow redistributed, or those with better looks would have to wear veils or go through uglyizing surgery to make them less attractive. Then of course since we were really in an egalitarian society, Black males would have to give up several inches off of their penises to the extent that all Blacks, Whites and Asian males all had the exact same penis length. This is what egalitarianism demands. No noticeable disparities between people. What a wonderful proposal.

Structural Racism

In the book *What Racists Believe* by Gerhard Schutte 1995, South Africa's historical apartheid is discussed and the justification for its establishment by the White minority; as well as the American system of racial egalitarianism and provides a further look at how the Left attacks White Americans using again the language of assumed guilt by the (presumed) dominant group. Again, this book is just another tirade against Whites while it misses the obvious contradictions in its positions, as I will point out.

As I will discuss again later, Adorno's work on the Authoritarian Personality is quoted: "A power oriented, exploitively dependent attitude towards one's sex partner and one's God may well culminate in a political philosophy and social outlook which has no room for anything but a desperate clinging to what appears to be strong and a disdainful rejection of whatever is relegated to the bottom." Adorno's work of course had one main objective in mind, to pathologize White Christian culture (MacDonald 1998b). And quoting this part of that work shows how consistent this trend of hate exists among leftist scholars. All ethnic, racial or religious groups are tolerated except for White Christians. But the above quote says absolutely nothing that is not part of all cultures. All groups have used religion or its equivalent doctrines as a moral cohesive mechanism since humans started forming larger communities 10,000 years ago. As evolutionary morality became established in our hominid line one group has always tried to exploit the out-group, and the in-group has always felt superior to the out-group. That was the mechanism of group evolutionary strategies, and all groups—many of which are now voluntary associations, practice it.

Lawyers as a group could be accused of being power oriented, exploitative, and dependent on legislative laws that they write because they dominate politics, and they are disdainful of those of us relegated to

the bottom by their greed. They produce little but we pay them trillions of dollars—for what? My point is not to trash lawyers because they just take advantage of a good thing. But most groups look out after their own interests. Why are White Christians then singled out over and over again as being the root of all evil? Because we are both hated by the Left and we are a passive and convenient scapegoat for the failures of socialistic policies. Failure after failure to raise the poor up as they were promised has hardened them to hate the **other**, rather than blaming themselves. And it is easier if they can put a distinct face on those they need to vilify to promote their program of intolerance towards traditional American culture.

Schutte then states, "[A] group-way-of-thinking tends to construct all social actors in terms of their membership to a group. It is a typifying scheme used by whites to construct, order, and make sense of others and themselves." Used by Whites? How are Whites any different than any other group? Imagine how the Left would howl if we made the same statement about Jews? What if someone wrote, "A group-way-of-thinking tends to construct all social actors in terms of their membership to a group. It is a typifying scheme used by Jews to construct, order, and make sense of others and themselves." You could insert any racial, ethnic, or religious group in the slot. It means nothing unless you have empirical data that group A differs in some way from group B. Later in the book, I will be discussing empirical methods of evaluating the differences between groups. But statements such as the above are ad hominem attacks and could only exist in academic writings where Whites, ipso facto, are found guilty at every turn. It is clear that the Left is extremely xenophobic against White culture. And they show this by making outrageous claims that Whites are the world's primary problem. Get rid of Whites, and the rest of the masses will live in egalitarian peacefulness—Communism all over again.

Now getting to actual charges Schutte states, "Although America's apartheid may not be rooted in the legal strictures of its South African

relative, it is no less effective in perpetuating racial inequality, and whites are no less culpable for the socioeconomic deprivation that results." And how is this known? Simply that when there are group differences that are observed between races, and there are more people that belong to the White race than belong to the Asian, Jewish, Black or American Indian races—and never mind that Hispanics are really just a language category—then it must be the Whites who are to blame. That is a simple given without any empirical data.

1. There are differences in the average economic outcome between racial groups.
2. Blacks and American Indians are below average economically.
3. East Asians and Jews are above average economically.
4. There are more Whites than any other group.

Therefore—Whites are responsible for the *underclass* status of Blacks and American Indians but East Asians and Jews are *themselves* responsible for their *above average* status. **Say What?**

This is proven by using a very simplistic observation of economic differences with the assumption that it is caused by external forces known as *structural racism*. That is, by showing numerous examples of differences between group A and group B, it is assumed all of the differences are caused **by** group A against group B. And some types of collective conspiracy that even the members of the collective are not aware of carries out this collective action. It just happens. Of course, the main underlying premise for all of this research is that there are **NO** differences between racial groups. The possibility of actual differences is never considered. That is, the whole *anti-racist industry* is premised on the false claim of absolute equality in behavioral and intellectual traits. Then by restricting the data sets to exclude real differences, they are allowed to proceed with their witch-hunts unimpeded by empirical facts.

Just imagine if we became an even more egalitarian society and it was decided that all breeds of dogs should be in dog races, and that any average disparity in the number of wins per breed of dog had to be due to the poor treatment of some breeds of dogs over others. And that the greyhounds that were winning races were somehow *intimidating* the other dogs making them unable to compete and win as they should! This is the same argument put forth by the Left with regards to racial disparities.

Statements like:

> "Hypersegregation had created [the] black underclass… .[Racial] inequality still seems to be well entrenched in U.S. society.... [Problematic] aspects of open and hidden white ethnocentrism and racism.... Structural discrimination can justifiably be taken as evidence of underlying attitudes and values [by Whites].... [Racism] as a system of exclusion and privilege, *and* as a set of culturally acceptable linguistic or ideological constructions that defend one's location in that system....Africans were stripped of their cultural resources as their communities of memory were destroyed....In summary, thus, white Americans in this century found themselves at an advantage over other groups. They did not need to entrench their privilege by legal means. It was historically established and symbolically expressed in the distribution of wealth. In their eyes, their entitlement to the major share of resources was a matter of their record or performance."

This last statement is especially interesting because it assumes that wealth is somehow stagnant. This theme is being heard now over the demand for reparations for slavery. The argument is made that the added wealth added to the economy by slavery is somehow still with us today! Whatever paltry wealth available then is long gone by now, used up by the generations of people who have come and gone. Resources have to be made over and over again, especially in a rapidly expanding

population. Any residual wealth left over from the days of slavery is inconsequential today and has been paid many times over with the existing $5 trillion that has been given to Blacks by Whites since 1965 in an attempt at economic parity (per David Horowitz televised debate & Dr. Williams (a Black economist) on NBC television's *Sixty Minutes* 9/2/2001). Where has that wealth gone? If wealth is permanent, what happened to that $5 trillion? Money foolishly spent is lost.

Since 1965 or thereabouts, a massive undertaking has transformed American law such that race based preferences have given Blacks more privileges than Whites. Though these clearly unconstitutional laws are now beginning to be overturned by the courts, Blacks have been literally a privileged class of people. And yet the differences in performance continue. This structural inequality in income, segregation, health, unemployment, educational attainment, crime rates, etc. clearly persists but no other explanation is ever put forth except *racism*, and then it is always just one group responsible—Whites encumbered with the pathological Protestant ethic. No other cause is ever entertained by the Left.

In order to show that *structural racism* is somehow difficult to explain in terms other than overt discrimination, observations are made that, if anomalies are looked at in terms of human behavioral science, they are not anomalies at all. For example, people will tend to associate with others that are more like them, and in particular, people will tend to associate with people that are of similar intelligence. Also there is the real issue of crime. Blacks are more prone to violent behavior and theft (*The Color of Crime* 1999). So why would Whites, Asians or Jews want to live and associate with Blacks who are of lower intelligence and criminally dangerous? There is a great deal of variation of course between individual Blacks. But then we are dealing with statistical probabilities—the higher the percentage of Blacks, the more crime there will be. So is this racist or just plain common sense? Why would anyone want to associate with people of lower intelligence who were prone to

violence?

Schutte then points out that the out-marriage rate among Blacks is very low (0.4% in 1990). Again, why would any other race want to marry a Black? First, a recent study in Brazil where multiculturalism is the norm has shown that even there, White features are considered to be more attractive and Black features far less so.[1] Blacks just are not physically attractive, especially Black women. This has nothing to do with prejudice or anything else. If a woman is sexy enough and does not have any disabilities like a very low IQ, males who are drawn to beauty and youth will readily court Black women with these attributes if they were available in appreciable numbers. Women on the other hand are attracted more to men with resources, power, prestige, etc. So more non-Black women will marry Black men because they are wealthy, or intelligent, or they will settle for a non-Black women who is not found very desirable by her own people. But this lack of mixing is blamed on racism. It is bunk.

On the other hand, East Asians and Whites readily intermarry because they are genetically so similar, especially in intelligence if not in behavioral traits (which have not yet been adequately studied to my knowledge). And there is still a great deal of prejudice against East Asians by many people who couldn't tell a South Asian from a Pakistani from an East Asian. And note that East Asians are genetically more similar to Whites than East Asians are to South Asians (Cavalli-Sforza 1994). So marrying patterns will naturally follow similarity in phenotype and intelligence. Opposites **do not** attract, contrary to popular myth.

Finally, there have been assertions that when Whites are asked how much money it would take for them to change places with a Black, almost no amount of money was adequate. Well, if it is so awful to be Black, why would any non-Black marry a Black and have their children subjected to that awful fate? That alone, by listening to Blacks, would be reason enough not to marry a Black: concern for one's children. As long as Blacks hold special rights under affirmative action initiatives, all Blacks will be suspect, even those who are successful on their own merit alone.

So then all non-Blacks when considering a potential mate must assume that the perceived status of that potentially significant other is due to government intervention—not the quality or conscientiousness of the person. So to a large degree, the stereotyping of Blacks by liberals through affirmative action exacerbates the problems encountered by those Blacks who truly want to stand on their own without a free handout. Though from the hostility shown by the vast majority of Blacks for the anti-quota position of Supreme Court justice Clarence Thomas, most Blacks want the special government mandated privileges that Blackness provides them. (Perhaps the frequency of conscientiousness in Blacks is also very low making handouts entirely acceptable. See Richard Lynn's recently released book *Eugenics: A Reassessment* 2001.)

So structural racism then is just a convenient excuse following the failures of early intervention. Schutte states:

> "Segregation and lack of interracial contacts are the breeding and feeding ground for prejudice and negative stereotypes. The association of African Americans as a category with poverty, unemployment, low-status jobs, and violence gives rise to stereotypes. These stereotypes are the result of a vicious circle in which structural factors marginalize a large section of the African American population, which is then defined in those terms and shunned or avoided out of fear and disgust. Structural factors come into play in helping to reproduce white race consciousness. This mechanism has been demonstrated with regard to South Africa. The United States proves that segregation need not be enforced by law to have similar effects."

Again, it is only Whites who fear Black crime and look on Blacks as less able. But Asians also see the same pattern, as do many Hispanics, Asian Indians, and Semites. And of course these attitudes are not stereotypes if they are generally true. In the park this morning as I was walking my dogs; an older women who I see regularly walking her dogs

started chatting. At some point she said "those Black people; they're not dead and they're not alive. They walk so slow I don't know how they get to work at all." I guess racial prejudice even makes the average Black person walk slower as well. Or could it be that having evolved in equatorial Africa, being slow was an advantage until it was necessary to sprint after game or escape from predators? But the fact is, if Blacks on average walk slower than other races, is this a stereotype or an accurate observation? (This could be an interesting experiment on a college campus using just a video camera and a couple of simple markers to rate walking speeds of different racial groups.)

Note that Whites have been accused of some sort of coordinated group mentalism to preserve their own welfare. And yet, the White majority could have easily opposed many Leftist programs such as immigration, affirmative action, costly intervention programs and housing projects—but they didn't. They stood passively by voting independently and for the most part taking little notice of these issues that would impact them adversely. For example, since the 1965 immigration act that was promoted by industrialists but even more so by the Jewish lobby to reduce the White majority's influence (MacDonald 1998b), Whites stood idly by and said nothing.

With this in mind, Schutte states that:

> "In the U.S., the disadvantaged have realized that the egalitarian rhetoric of the dominant discourse brought them nothing. Instead, group membership has become the basis for achieving a degree of power from a position of disempowerment. I agree with Outlaw (1990), who notes that 'for the past twenty years, however, *race* has been the primary vehicle for conceptualizing and organizing precisely around group differences with the demand that social justice be applied to *groups* and that *justice* be measured by *results,* not just by opportunities.'"

In short, "if we can't get what we wanted after the playing field was not only leveled but tilted in our favor, then we demand our share based on absolute equity of resources based on group membership."

Now this has some very interesting anomalies. Note that to achieve egalitarian equality based on group categories, we would not necessarily reduce poverty or become more egalitarian overall. All that is required under this formulation is for the **average** of each group's overall welfare be identical. For instance, the income distribution for each group could be radically different, as long as the average was the same. So to make Blacks as a group equitable with Whites, we could give all of the money to the better-off Blacks and allow the rest to live in poverty. And, if we are to be totally fair with regards to group-based egalitarianism, then Jews and East Asians should be required to give up their wealth to the American Indians and Blacks because as groups they are far above Whites in status, income and wealth. So if group-based equality is all that really matters, then let us go all the way in assigning everyone to a group and redistributing wealth accordingly. Individualism counts for nothing either within a group or between groups. Only a group's status is to be equalized under this egalitarian formula. After all, if every group is absolutely equal, then every group should get exactly the same income and rewards, as a group. And of course if egalitarianism is a viable goal for reducing differences between racial groups within a nation, then it follows that this equalization should apply between nations! (The Left through the United Nations is of course also promoting this global redistribution of wealth.)

So what do we know about group rights, group-based morality, altruism and legal systems? I will discuss the evolution of morality, egalitarianism, ethics and justice in later chapters, but in short—egalitarianism was a band/tribal form of prosocial behavior that did not extend beyond the group. Cooperation between groups existed in our evolutionary past, but warfare and genocide was also likely. Humans naturally coalesce into groups, either arbitrary or racial, and it can be

expected that groups will try to better themselves when they can. Any Marxist attempt to ignore these natural inclinations will in due course reawaken Whites when they eventually feel threatened just like every other group does. If anything, Whites are altruistic to the point of being maladaptive. That is, they pay little attention to those political programs that harm them in favor of other groups. But that may be starting to change as they realize that they are being attacked and harmed in numerous ways by programs fostered for the promotion of competing groups.

This same situation is seen in the passiveness with which Blacks accept open immigration, especially of low paid workers from Mexico that will compete directly with low paid Blacks. Why do Black activists not oppose this? I think there are several reasons. The Black elite is more concerned with getting control of resources that will benefit **them** rather than helping Blacks in general. And, Blacks see solidarity with all people of color as a way of opposing Whites. But probably more importantly as stated above, Jews have been the primary advocates of open borders and they are also the primary advocates of Black equality. The Black elite then, even if they would like to oppose immigration, would have to go against their Jewish sponsor's wishes. The equal rights movement would have stagnated without direct Jewish involvement and coordination. Likewise, the White elite also benefits from keeping wages lower by having open borders, so they also take a liberal position for their own economic gain. The elite generally will bail on their own race when they reach a certain level of success (Eibel-Eibesfeldt 1998).

What Racists Believe also is not averse to making absurd statements. It claims that the one-drop rule may harm Black stereotyping and yet the people advocating for Black group-based preferences continue to claim that anyone considered to be Black using this rule should be so classified. It would be then advantageous to set up new categories as advocated by Tiger Woods that allows for mixed race categories. Just one would be adequate—race? Mixed. But this would promote a less contentious

division between Blacks and Whites making such a classification anathema to those who use race to oppress Whites.

Schutte then claims that Whites promoted the concept of *people of color*, "the white in-group defines itself by lumping all out-groups into one overarching category 'people of color.' Many groups caught up in this defining ***net*** object to the label, especially people of Hispanic and Asian origin." The fact is, this lumping together of all racial groups except Whites as *people of color* was done in order to try and build a singular *rainbow coalition* against Whites (notice how the Jews are nowhere to be found in this lumping of people—as Semites they should also be people of color but they conveniently like to pretend they are White). Not only would such a strategy be foolish, since it would tend to cause the people of color to band together against Jews as well as everybody else, but the idea that Jews are non-white is flatly incorrect by any standard. Semites belong to the same group as Teutons, Celts, or other Caucasians by virtue of their wavy hair (along with a variety of other traits such as eye shape or skin tonation). Whites have no interest lumping these groups together—in fact it is a great disadvantage. I have always advocated, if we must have high levels of immigration for whatever reason, to admit primarily East Asians. Even though they would compete with Whites for higher-level jobs, at least the United States would not be caught in a dysgenic trend. And, in my opinion, East Asians as a large voting block would have no tolerance for socialistic programs that would transfer wealth to the poor like Whites seem all too willing to do.

Schutte states, "Opposition to quotas and the defense of publicly shared values involve the denial of racism or racial thinking. Denial helps to obscure the problem and creates the impression of correctness and racial innocence. Denial is the art of impression management in the face of contradicting evidence." Notice that Whites are admonished for opposing quotas when the Left promised that affirmative action programs would not include quotas to start with. Remember Hubert Humphrey's promise to "eat my hat" if affirmative action led to quotas?

Then note that Whites are not even supposed to defend publicly shared values. What values should we defend? And finally again, the very act of denying that we discriminate becomes proof that we are racists. This is of course the very same technique used by the Communists when they killed millions of people who could not see their own social failings. They were in denial of their true intentions and to make them see the light they were tortured into confessing and then shot. Is this the type of justice social scientists want to pursue? Whites are guilty of oppressing Blacks and it must be so because we deny we are doing it. It is totally circular and ignores the observed differences in intelligence between Blacks and Whites and all other groups as well.

Note that an American Psychological Association task force has reported that Blacks were in fact less intelligent on average, the gap has not changed for over 100 years, that intelligence is real and meaningful in a number of life history ways including wealth acquisition, and there is no bias in the tests administered (Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns, 1995. A copy is available at http://www.neoeugenics.net/apa.htm). The only thing this report was inconclusive on that kept it from being *Jensenist* was that we still don't know if Black low IQ is due to the environment or due to some unknown factor X (Jensen 1999). But within groups, intelligence has been determined to be about 80% genetic. So clearly, Black disadvantage may cause their low average IQ early in life, but all of the misfortunes of Blacks as adults fall directly on their own merit or abilities. Study after study has shown that they earn about what would be expected for any group with an average IQ of 85. There is no racism needed to cause this.

Schutte then notes that, "The official discourse of government strains itself to sustain the impression of the United States as an egalitarian, just, and free society and goes to extraordinary lengths to make plausible its efforts to keep it that way. The structural evidence—proof of government successes—falls short, however. Phenomena such as ghettos, riots, poverty, and rampant crime and other social problems persist and even become worse." This sounds like a conspiracy, but there are several

egregious errors in this line of reasoning. The United States was never intended to be an egalitarian society to my knowledge. And as to *Justice* and *freedom*, these concepts only exist in the eyes of the beholder. A libertarian would say **each according to his abilities** and the government should keep out of private matters as much as possible. So what exactly is the point? Well again, anything less than a Marxist response to Black failure is somehow treated as a *government cover-up*. But all of these problems have been shown to be caused mostly because of low intelligence, except for perhaps riots. Riots are a direct result of Blacks being told by the Left over and over again that the vicious White man is abusing them, and they react to this with violent outbursts. The Left is therefore responsible for yelling "**fire**" in a theater. And even the separation between Blacks and Whites is blamed for not being able to collect the *empirical* data to counter the "stereotypes" of Black violence, low intelligence, and social irresponsibility. But why is it impossible to collect the empirical data needed? All kinds of other researchers are providing data showing that Blacks are lacking in many ways because of low intelligence. Why can't the Left provide countervailing research? Simply because it is just plain false that *racism* is the cause of these problems. So their logic has to be circular to appear valid. And remember how their *dominant discourse* never includes the possibility of a genetic cause—and those outside of the Marxist circle of researchers then pass their faulty research results onto the press without full and open academic review.

So will we **evil Whites** ever escape our innate racism? Well, not until we have willingly handed everything we have worked for over to the Blacks to prove we are finally cured. Remember, the whole point of this *anti-racism* is to *pathologize* Whites, and especially the Protestant ethic that accompanies it. We should be lazy like all those other folks (except of course Jews and East Asians whose work ethic is just fine). Schutte states, "In the post-civil rights era, a new form of racism appeared, which Kovel (1970) calls 'metaracism': 'Metaracism is a distinct and very peculiar modern phenomenon. Racial degradation continues on a

different plane, and through a different agency: those who participate in it are not racists—that is, **they are not racially prejudiced but metaracists, because they acquiesce in the larger cultural order which continues the work of racism**.'"

This statement has two oddly duplicitous components. First, in a free and open society I do not have any obligation to intervene personally to cure every problem America faces. I vote for my representative and get on with my own personal affairs. But apparently, the mere fact that I don't personally go out perhaps and join in the rioting shows that I am a *metaracist*. Second, how do millions of metaracists "cause" the work of racism? What is this *work of racism*? How does it occur? That is what the left has been unable to produce. They have been unable to show how we go from "trumped up" attitude surveys about how people feel to the actual mechanisms that keep Blacks down. Their whole program is one of creative imagination. They conjure up potential racist plots and mysterious mechanisms like finding witches in Salem Village. Racists are like the witches who were known to be all about us, everywhere lurking and planning; we just need the help of hysterical observers to ferret them out and burn them at the egalitarian's stake.

Systemic Racism

> "It's all calculated. Don't ever believe that the Left acts spontaneously. Even when it is intuitive, it is an intuitive drive for power. These people want to be in control, and the only way they can do this is by exerting moral blackmail on everybody else." (Russian dissident Vladimir Bukovsky)

> "Unlike most behaviorists, Hans Eysenck accepted both the 'reality' of intelligence differences and their mainly biological origins; and he had already upset social scientists in Britain by claiming that Nationalists and Communists might have underlying psychological traits of illiberalism, insensitivity and spitefulness genetically in common." (Brand 1996)

In reading *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations* by Joe Feagin, 2000, in order to further understand the Left's attack on Whites, I had to look beyond what was being stated. I had to *deconstruct* the motive or purpose of this hateful diatribe against Whites, and especially White males. Feagin is a Marxist and uses his dialectics to tell a story about how White Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASP's) were the vilest oppressors to have ever inhabited the earth, directing their oppression primarily against African slaves and Native American Indians, and how this legacy of oppression still exists today. According to Feagin, who relies on story telling rather than the presentation of empirical facts, all of the current wealth held by these WASPs was stolen through slavery, and this wealth is still present today. That is, much of what WASPs earn, own, or control comes from past oppression. But he does not stop there.

He goes on to claim that there is a conspiracy still going on today amongst these WASPs to oppress and exploit Blacks. He calls this *systemic racism*, and he tells some pretty tall tales about how it takes

place. Apparently, within the inner essence of these WASPs, they are maintaining a racist system in order to continue the oppression of Black people to further use Black labor for their own financial gain. Of course, every group tries to benefit its own. But where and how these WASPs still have the power or control to do this he doesn't really address. In fact, most people who put forth such conspiracy theories are usually looked at with great skepticism or as being just plain paranoid. But in the circles of Marxist identity theories, they seem to have an almost mythical explanation about the White human anthill acting as automatons, following some central dictum that keeps their mischief highly coordinated. It reminded me of the conspiracy theories put forth in the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, where Jews were conspiring to dominate the world in some fiendish plot. The truth is simply this, every group is going to act in such a way as to maximize their own benefits, and lately WASPs have been losing that game, not winning it. As David Horowitz has so elegantly pointed out in his attack on reparations for Blacks, there has already been a transfer of 5 billion dollars to Blacks since 1965. Why did the WASPs allow this to happen?

But in simpler terms, Feagin hates WASPs foremost, especially males; with his hatred for whites diminishing the further away they are genetically from the central Anglo core, like concentric circles. In fact, the hate portrayed against Whites in this book was just a tad less ludicrous than Malcolm X's *The End of White Racism*, where Whites are portrayed as beasts with tails, no better than dogs. But is this hatred just another form of bigotry? Perhaps not. It has more to do with an ongoing power struggle between the old Marxists and the general White population that is, contrary to Feagin's thesis, quite apolitical and unwilling to yield to a new totalitarian egalitarian state (Communism). The very fact that Whites are so accepting of any and all races today, unlike in the past, poses a great threat to these Marxists.

So why would the current President of the American Sociological Association take on such a bold indictment of a single race of people? Because

these Marxists feel betrayed by the very people they have sponsored, primarily through massive immigration into the United States after passage of the 1965 immigration act. What has occurred since then is in fact more friction between these different racial or ethnic groups. These new "people of color" immigrants were supposed to act in unison to depose White hegemony as the first step to a return to Communist egalitarianism. They have not done that, and instead they have pursued their own interests and have as much hostility in general for Blacks as Whites do, and very often much more (see Kevin MacDonald's paper "An Integrative Evolutionary Perspective on Ethnicity" at http://www.csulb.edu/~kmacd/ethnicity.htm). Feagin's anticipated emancipation of all the oppressed peoples, forming a singular block of people against the hated White man, is not going according to plan. So he lashes out even more against Whites, accusing them of "corrupting" these marginally "non-Whites" by manipulating this racial conspiracy to fragment them into opposing factions.

Throughout this book, it is apparent that Feagin is trying as hard as he can to be divisive without really being very clear about the groups who are to be reviled. He includes in his "people of color" category: Asians, Asian Indians, North African Caucasians, Amerindians, Semites, and even Latinos. So even if you are White, if you have a Spanish surname you become a "person of color." In addition, he even seems to exclude White women in his grand conspiracy theory. Throughout the book, it is always "White men" who are the oppressors, as if the White women were some other species or race. And to complicate his xenophobia even more, he starts out by attacking primarily those Whites who were slave owners, and then as time goes by he starts including in the same broad category those Whites from countries who not only immigrated long after slavery ended, but also took up residence in parts of rural or small town America where there were no Blacks to oppress or even to give much thought about the matter one way or the other. But he manages to weave his web of conspiracy, through a series of "just so" stories, never providing any real empirical facts or complete explanations.

But this is why social science has strayed so far from the rest of empirically

based science in the last few decades, and why it is so dominated with Marxists. When it comes to explaining the Black-White disparity in earnings, wealth, health, and a myriad of other social pathologies that afflict Blacks, social scientists never include in their studies the fact that Blacks have an extremely low average intelligence. If this fact was included, then the racist argument no longer has any basis and the disparities can be explained in terms of genes, not prejudice.[2]

Scientists today rely on accepted tools and procedures when they try to make a case such as Feagin's mythical *systemic racism*. You can't just make up a theory and indict a whole race of people by supporting its truthfulness with a series of speculations. First, science requires that three simple rules and procedures be followed: The first is parsimony, or the use of simple explanations over the incredulous series of anecdotal observations made by Feagin; the second is the use of meta-analyses, to make complicated correlations between variables by combining many independent and confounding studies; and lastly science requires that ways to disprove the theory are provided which show that it is falsifiable.[3,4] Racist America fails to follow the first and the last, while the Jensenists have used all three to show that the cause of Black failure is low intelligence. But the flaws only begin with these basic scientific errors.

Jensenenism Denied

Over the last thirty years the radical environmentalists or cultural determinists have been in retreat. Simultaneously the left has attacked all of sociobiology, the genetic basis for intelligence, and the fact that there could exist genetic biological and behavioral trait differences between racial groups. Today, those who once attacked sociobiology no longer have any scientific standing; the debate is over (see *Defenders of the Truth: The Battle for Science in the Sociobiology Debate and Beyond, 2000*). In addition, it is commonly accepted that intelligence is about 80% heritable during adulthood and it has been so stated by a task force put together by the American Psychological Association in response to the publication of *The Bell Curve* in 1994. (see Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns, 1995 at http://www.neoeugenics.net/apa.htm) Now, the only final remaining debate with regards to genetic differences in intelligence between different population groups or races is all but over. The differences are real, and the races differ in average intelligence. (see my review of *The g Factor: The Science of Mental Ability, 1998,* by Arthur Jensen at http://www.neoeugenics.net/jen.htm and from the journal INTELLIGENCE, Jensenism is discussed http://www.neoeugenics.net/jensenism.htm.)

Neo-Darwinism Denied

To base a whole book on the evils of White supremacy may appeal to the mass public. After all, the public has been fed this fear of the vast right wing conspiracy for over 50 years now and has been led to believe that humans should all just get along. But Feagin ignores two extremely important fundamental concepts in his racism. First, he holds slave owners of 150 years ago and more to the same moral standards that we have today. Any scholar today with his credentials knows that morality changes, as morality is nothing more than the current ethos or value system of people at any particular time. In fact, these same Marxist sociologists embrace moral relativism except when in applies to Whites. Morality is not constant nor is it sustainable as a normative absolute. So no indictment can be made against the WASP slaveholders in the United States when there were slaveholders of different races, including Blacks and Indians, over most of the world at one time or another. This moral argument is a *non sequitur*. But most of the book is based on laying all of the world's slavery history on Whites only, and WASPs in particular.

Second, Feagin also ignores group evolutionary strategies. There is no evidence that any racial or ethnic group is going to capitulate to some utopian dream of equality and voluntarily give up any acquired resources or privileges easily. Yes, humans do show some universal altruism, but only when it does not hurt too much to give or share. When push comes to shove, every group wants to acquire more wealth, status and power. And I suspect that this desire for power and status is what really drives Feagin's hatred of all White people. He envisioned a multiculturalist society not for its goodness, but for its ability to destroy Whites. Whites are seen as too powerful and too successful and they are in the way of a renewed effort at a universalist egalitarianism that will lead to another totalitarianism by the elite Feagin's of the world. This desire for complete control and dominance has always been the underlying desire of Marxists, to use the masses to destroy their enemies, whoever they are at the time. (See MacDonald's trilogy on evolutionary group strategies with a review of

these works at http://www.neoeugenics.net/mac.htm)

Deconstructing the mind of a Marxist. Feagin states:

- "Police harassment and brutality directed at black men, women, and children are as old as American society, dating back to the days of slavery and Jim Crow segregation. Such police actions across the nation today reveal important aspects of the racism dealt with in this book—the commonplace discriminatory practices of individual whites, the images of dangerous blacks dancing in white heads, the ideology legitimating antiblack images, and the white-dominated institutions that allow or encourage such practices. In the United States racism is structured into the rhythms of everyday life. It is lived, concrete, advantageous for whites, and painful for those who are not white. Each major part of a black or white person's life is shaped by racism. Even a person's birth and parents are shaped by racism, since mate selection is limited by racist pressures against interracial marriage. Where one lives is often determined by the racist practices of landlords, bankers, and others in the real estate profession. The clothes one wears and what one has to eat are affected by access to resources that varies by position in the racist hierarchy. When one goes off to school, her or his education is shaped by contemporary racism—from the composition of the student body to the character of the curriculum. Where one goes to church is often shaped by racism, and it is likely that racism affects who one's political representatives are. Even getting sick, dying, and being buried may be influenced by racism. Every part of the life cycle, and most aspects of one's life, are shaped by the racism that is integral to the foundation of the United States."

Or, there may be differences in the way some races behave and there may be differences in the preferences one shows for his or her own race. Opposition to miscegenation is often lamented as racist, and yet there is sound evolutionary evidence that people like to associate and eventually marry others who are more

like themselves. Blacks are more comfortable with Blacks, Jews are more comfortable with Jews, and Asians with other Asians. In fact, studies have shown that different racial groups will mingle and marry with other racial groups that are more like themselves. For example, genetic studies put Eastern Asians and Whites closer together genetically than even Eastern Asians and Southern Asians. And guess what, Eastern Asians intermarry quite readily with Whites, and there is far more mingling regardless of gender. On the other hand, few White men would marry a Black woman. Men prefer lighter skinned women according to evolutionary studies and they also want their mates to be as intelligent as they are. On the other hand, White women are willing to marry Black men in cases where the men have resources (O. J. Simpson) or where the women can cut a better deal with a Black man because she is either unattractive or of low intelligence, and probably both. But Blacks and Whites do not marry often because genetically they are just too dissimilar. Is this racism? I think not. Other racial groups not only don't intermarry but they also have strong social taboos against race mixing. Asian Indians under their Caste system expect their children to marry into the same Caste. And Orthodox Jews also condemn interracial marriages, even if the other person will convert, for fear of racial contamination.[5]

> "No other racially oppressed group has been so central to the internal economic, political, and cultural structure and evolution of American society—or to the often obsessively racist ideology developed by white Americans over many generations. Thus, it is time to put white-on-black oppression fully at the center of a comprehensive study of the development, meaning, and reality of this nation. In this book I develop an antiracist theory and analysis of the white-on-black oppression that is now nearly four centuries old. Theory is a set of ideas designed to make sense of the empirical and existential reality in and around us. Concepts delineating and probing racism need to be clear and honed by everyday experience, not framed from an ivory tower. Here I attempt to develop concepts, in language understandable to the nonspecialist, that can be used for an in-depth analysis of this racist society. These concepts are

> designed to help readers probe beneath the many defenses and myths about "race" to the often painful racist realities. They are useful in countering inaccurate assessments of the society's history and institutions. They can be used to reshape the socialization that hampers insight into the operation of this society. A critical theory of racism can help us better understand the racialized dimensions of lives."

Interpretation? Feagin is going to tell you one sob story after another, and in your weeping you will come to see that this theory of racism is correct. But of course, everyone has a sob story and it proves little or nothing. Feagin fails to develop any coherence in his story as I will show, but he does do a good job of spreading bigotry and hatred against all White people in general. That is, he is highly prejudiced and shuns all empirical data to prove his point. He is a racist trying to get everyone else to hate Whites. He is encouraging totalitarian actions against the race he so deeply hates and despises.

> "Currently, we have theoretical traditions that are well developed in regard to the systems of class and gender oppression. There is a well-developed Marxist tradition with its many important conceptual contributions. The Marxist tradition provides a powerful theory of oppression centered on such key concepts as class struggle, worker exploitation, and alienation. Marxism identifies the basic social forces undergirding class oppression, shows how human beings are alienated in class relations, and points toward activist remedies for oppression. Similarly, in feminist analysis there is a diverse and well-developed conceptual framework targeting key aspects of gendered oppression. Major approaches accent the social construction of sexuality, the world gender order, and the strategy of consciousness-raising. Feminist theorists have argued that at the heart of sexism is the material reality of reproduction and sexuality, the latter including how a woman is treated and viewed sexually and how she views herself In both the Marxist and feminist traditions

there are also well-developed theories of resistance and change."

Yes Feagin, we have seen this Marxist tradition before. It managed to slaughter over 100 million people over the last 100 years, all in the name of peace and equality. A return to totalitarian Communism is not a good way to solve the problem he describes. If it is really as bad as he states, and there is not a viable way of making all people equal, then it would be far better to allow people who don't get along to just separate peaceably. But here is the dilemma, if other races voluntarily left America, Feagin would feel all alone again against the oppressive White man. Of course, he could just leave himself, and find a country more to his liking, perhaps Israel if they will have him.

> "As I will show in this book, however, the central problem is that, from the beginning, European American institutions were racially hierarchical, white supremacist, and undemocratic. For the most part, they remain so today."

I wonder what utopian country Feagin would like us to emulate that is nonhierarchical and democratic? What is democracy? Does he mean real democracy or representative democracy? Has there ever been a country with direct democracy? Are not humans naturally hierarchical? And aren't most ethnic groups also supremacist if that means just feeling good about themselves? Again, Feagin is showing his hatred of Western culture. He hates Whites and he will throughout this book try to slander us with terms like racist, supremacist, oppressive, etc. And yet, he offers no evidence for any other nation or ethnic group that does not behave similar to White Americans. So what do we stand accused of? As Michael Levin states in his superb book *Why Race Matters*, "Calling claims of genetic race differences 'racist,' in particular, begs not one but four questions: (1) Are race differences in themselves bad? (2) Is believing in race differences bad? (3) Is saying there are race differences bad? (4) Is studying race differences bad? Once it is realized that an affirmative answer to each of these questions must be established before the charge

of racism can be made to stick, the charge itself collapses."

> "I develop a theoretical framework centered on the concept of *systemic racism,* viewed as a centuries-old foundation of American society. Systemic racism includes the complex array of antiblack practices, the unjustly gained political-economic power of whites, the continuing economic and other resource inequalities along racial lines, and the white racist ideologies and attitudes created to maintain and rationalize white privilege and power. *Systemic* here means that the core racist realities are manifested in each of society's major parts. If you break a three-dimensional hologram into separate parts and shine a laser through any one part, you can project the whole three-dimensional image again from within that part. Like a hologram, each major part of U.S. society—the economy, politics, education, religion, and family—reflects the fundamental reality of systemic racism."

Notice he is going to "develop a theoretical framework centered on the concept of *systemic racism*." That's the beauty of Marxism. You can just think up any old theory you want and then talk about almost anything and in the end say it is proven. But there is no proof. He never resolves the circularity of his arguments. He first needs to prove that the two population groups—Blacks and Whites—are absolutely equal in ability and especially intelligence to make his case. But he never even comes close to addressing that issue. And by ignoring these genetic differences in intelligence, he has committed a fundamental error in research—ignoring a known and fundamentally important variable.

> "As we begin a new millennium, whites are a modest minority of the world's population and are gradually becoming a statistical minority in the United States. Today, whites constitute less than half the population of four of the nation's largest cities—New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Houston. They will soon make up less than half the population in large areas of the nation, including the

> largest states. Demographers forecast that if current trends continue whites will be a statistical minority in California by approximately the year 2002 and in Texas by approximately the year 2010. Sometime in the middle of the twenty-first century, whites will likely be a minority of the U.S. population. Over the next few decades this demographic change will likely bring great pressures for change in the racist practices and institutions in the United States. Moreover, as the world's peoples of color become more influential in international politics and economics, still other pressures will likely be put on the institutions of the United States to treat all people of color with greater fairness and justice. . . . The right to a life free from racial alienation and racist oppression is clearly enunciated in international law and morality. Today, the United States stands judged by international human rights doctrine and law as still unjust and inegalitarian."

Here Feagin has just shown how absurd his theory is. White Americans have been told for years that we will soon be a minority. If we were really as racist and as organized as Feagin claims, why would we not change the immigration laws and slow immigration down to a trickle? Is it because we need cheap labor? Are we so in need of this cheap labor that we would sacrifice our own majority and dominant position? Never. No racially aware group would submit to this subjugation. In fact, most White Americans are against current levels of immigration and want to reduce the numbers to give immigrants a chance to assimilate. But the fact is Whites are so disorganized and passive on these issues that only a small percentage of us take much notice, even when Feagin throughout this book warns us that we will suffer greatly once we are outnumbered. How can such a *racist* nation do so little to turn back what every dominant race in every nation in the world is always concerned about, becoming a minority? The fact is, White Americans are extremely passive with regards to race and immigration. If we were even remotely racist, we would close the immigration gates.

> "Generally, the founders viewed Americans from Africa as slaves by *natural law*. Conceptualized as inferior beings, these Africans were fit by nature for enslavement by whites. Natural law was also used to explain why the white male founders and their compatriots could subordinate two other large groups—white women and Native Americans. White women were not directly mentioned in the Constitution, and their legal rights under local and national laws were limited. In Article I of the Constitution, the section dealing with Congress regulating interstate and foreign commerce adds relations with "Indian tribes," indicating that indigenous peoples were not generally seen by the founders as part of their new nation. Until the mid- to late nineteenth century, indigenous societies were generally viewed as separate nations, with some whites advocating treaty making, land purchases, and the "civilizing" of Native Americans while others pressed for land theft, extermination, or removal of all Native Americans to the distant western areas of the new nation."

This was pretty much how the world operated just a few hundred years ago. And in fact it has always been true in our evolutionary past that patriarchy, genocide, and dominance has been the norm for our species. What needs to be answered in terms of human behavior is why we have strayed so far from our tribalism and have become so tolerant and passive with regards to group conflicts. Evolutionists are in fact quite puzzled as to why reciprocal altruism within the tribe has now run amok and has crossed tribal boundaries. No one is quite sure why but I will speculate that it has to do with our very wealth that we pay so little attention to "the other." That is, we have become tolerant because we are safe, and we are well off. So again, Feagin fails to convince. In fact, in terms of ethnocentrism or xenophobia, Northern Europeans have been shown to be the least racist and the most tolerant of any of the major racial groups. They only react when threatened as is human nature, and Feagin does make a good case for Whites to sit up and take notice of what is happening to their once prosperous culture.

-

> "The black intellectual tradition is a rich source for developing a far more accurate and systemic view of this American house of racism. Drawing on the analyses of Frederick Douglass, W. E. B. Du Bois, Oliver Cox, Anna Julia Cooper, Kwame Ture, and Frantz Fanon, among others, I accent here a conceptual framework understanding American racism as centuries-long, deep-lying, institutionalized, and systemic. As I suggested in the introduction, *systemic racism* includes a diverse assortment of racist practices; the unjustly gained economic and political power of whites; the continuing resource inequalities; and the white-racist ideologies, attitudes, and institutions created to preserve white advantages and power. One can accurately describe the United States as a "total racist society" in which every major aspect of life is shaped to some degree by the core racist realities."

Nowhere does Feagin list the "ideologies, attitudes, and institutions created to preserve white advantage and power." In fact, if that were the case and Whites have this kind of power and control, then why are Whites not the ones with all the money and wealth? Over the past few decades, by far the wealthiest and most powerful race of people are the Ashkenazi Jews. By their own admission and bravado, they have declared that they make almost twice as much money as Whites, own ten times the wealth, and control politics, the media, and the professions far in excess of their numbers. In addition, they make up by far the largest majority of students in the Ivy League universities. So what happened to all this so-called White racism? If White racism has made Whites better off than Blacks on a number of parameters like wealth, health, and power; then the Jews have far more explaining to do with regards to institutionalized racism against all other groups because they have those things that Feagin claims Whites have because of racism alone. And in addition to that, Asians have more income than Whites also. So where is this institutionalized racism? It doesn't seem to be helping Whites. Maybe the Jews and the Asians are the new supremacists, and Feagin just never noticed. (See, *The Phenomenon of the Jews* at http://www.neoeugenics.net/poj.htm for the latest tabulation by a Jew of who

owns what.)

> "Undeserved impoverishment and Enrichment. Analyzing Europe's colonization of Africa, Du Bois demonstrated that extreme poverty and degradation in the African colonies was "a main cause of wealth and luxury in Europe. The results of this poverty were disease, ignorance, and crime. Yet these had to be represented as natural characteristics of backward peoples." The unjust and brutal exploitation of African labor and land had long been downplayed in most historical accounts of European affluence. By bringing the unjust impoverishment of Africa back into the picture, Du Bois showed that this impoverishment was directly and centrally linked to European prosperity and affluence. A similar connection needs to be made between the immiseration [incapable of blending in] and impoverishment of black Americans and the enrichment and prosperity of European Americans."

But even today we see that Blacks cannot prosper in Africa. I would submit that no sub-Saharan African civilization ever existed, no language was ever developed, and that because of their low average IQ of 70, reported on consistently by many scholars including a Black psychologist, that Africa's impoverishment is due to Blacks—not Whites. Now that Whites have retreated from Africa those few areas that did have some prosperity are falling apart. Blacks are incapable of civilization as we know it because of their innate low intelligence. In addition, Feagin obfuscates the facts by lumping sub-Saharan Africans in with Northern Africans who are not Blacks but are a mixture and have been labeled predominately Caucasian. And over the past ten thousand years or more cross migrations, and no doubt a lot of slavery not only from the south but from the Northern barbarians, have made this region vary in its racial make-up. No one knows for sure the racial makeup of these people, but they were certainly not sub-Saharan Africans.

> "Slavery's impact extended beyond the economy. Each

> institutional arena in the new nation was controlled by whites and was closely linked to other major arenas. As we have seen, the new Constitution and its "democratic" political system were grounded in the racist thinking and practices of white men, many of whom had links to slavery. Those who dominated the economic system crafted the political system. Likewise the religious, legal, educational, and media systems were interlinked with the slavery economy and polity. Woven through each institutional area was a broad racist ideology—a set of principles and views—centered on rationalizing white-on-black domination and creating positive views of whiteness."

Sounds to me like American attitudes and practices were pretty much the practice for that era around the world. Slavery, intolerance, barbarity, dominance, and all those nasty human proclivities at the time were pretty standard for any civilization that had the opportunity and the technology to take advantage of a good thing. You could take any country, anywhere, and tell a similar story: The Roman empire, ancient Egypt, even American Indians had slaves. Of course, some population groups were too isolated or poor to have a written record of their supposed sins. But our founding fathers were just regular guys, with attitudes that prevailed pretty much everywhere when it came to dominance, democracy and "the other." To single out one race, the White race, is bigotry. As Feagin knows full well, the same story could be told for almost any tribe or any nation in the world prior to the twentieth century. And still, similar attitudes and conflicts are occurring still today in Indonesia, Malaysia, throughout the Balkans, the Arab countries, China and Southeast Asia, and let us not forget—Africa. No, only a bigot and a racist like Feagin would single out one people and one nation and heap all of the world's scorn on them without recourse. We Whites have been judged and found guilty by Marxists for no other reason than Marxists need to destroy us in order to dominate and control the world for themselves. To do that, they must undermine our will to resist these absurd accusations through repetition of the standard fare of media propaganda.

> "People do not experience "race" in the abstract but in concrete recurring relationships with one another. Individuals, whether they are the perpetrators of discrimination or the recipients of discrimination, are caught in a complex web of *alienating racist relations*. These socially imbedded racist relations distort what could be engaging and egalitarian relationships into alienated relationships. The system of racism categorizes and divides human beings from each other and thus severely impedes the development of common consciousness and solidarity. It fractures human nature by separating those defined and elevated as the "superior race" against those defined and subordinated as the "inferior race." As a result, life under a system of racism involves an ongoing struggle between racially defined human communities—one seeking to preserve its unjustly derived status and privileges and the other seeking to overthrow its oppression."

Of course race is concrete. What race you are depends on how you are treated. If you are Black you get treated with advantages that Whites do not have. It is very difficult for an employer to fire a Black person because of Black group privileges. If you want to get a college degree, you do not have to be as smart as a White to get your credentials. If an employer wants to hire fairly by giving examinations to all applicants equally he is prevented from doing so because of special considerations for Black's poor performance on tests. When government contracts are handed out, a certain percentage of the money has to be given to Black owned businesses just because they belong to a select racial group. Billions of dollars are spent on Black special education over what Whites receive per pupil because they account for far more students with remedial skills. Yes, quotas and special programs for Blacks have divided humans who could get past race if it were not for one thing—Marxists like Feagin refusing to admit that different races have different innate abilities—on average. If everyone was just treated as individuals, and allowed to live where and how they desire without special programs for

minorities to slant the playing field in their favor, then these racial tensions would diminish. But Feagin's agenda is not for racial harmony but for racial warfare. Marxism is based on conflict between groups. Without it, they have no program and if need be they will create it for their ultimate goal—complete and total control of human behavior under a totalitarian egalitarian socialism, even if it means a new round of death and slaughter to bring that about. To do this they must fracture apart countries like the United States by pitting races against each other.

-

> "Clashes with whites became frequent as black workers and their families moved into northern cities. Whites sometimes used violence to enforce informal patterns of discrimination. During one white-generated riot in 1900 in New York, a mostly Irish police force encouraged whites to attack black men, women, and children. One of the most serious riots occurred in 1917 in East St. Louis. There white workers, viewing black immigrants from the South as a job threat, violently attacked a black community. Thirty-nine black residents and nine white attackers were killed. This was followed in 1919 by a string of white riots from Chicago to Charleston. Opposition to black workers searching for jobs has been a recurring cause of antiblack violence. Black workers have periodically become scapegoats when a serious economic crisis threatens white livelihoods. They, as well as Asian, Latino, and Jewish Americans, have been singled out as targets of anger, even though they are not responsible for the employment or other economic problems of white workers. Acceptance of the dominant racist ideology has meant that many white workers have little understanding of how a capitalistic system operates against their own interests."

Note here how Feagin says it is wrong and irrational for Whites deprived of work because of bad economic times to lash out at Blacks. It is wrong to blame others for their condition, he says. But, that is in fact what Feagin is doing throughout this book; he is blaming Whites for the poor condition of Blacks. If Whites irrationally blamed Blacks for loss of

jobs it is equally irrational for Feagin to now blame Whites because Blacks do not have jobs in accordance with their increased expectations. Is there any proof for either case? Well, it can be shown that during hard times, one group can compete with another group over jobs. We are using foreign labor now as scapegoats for loss of jobs in the US, where Feagin blames capitalists for sending jobs offshore. Isn't he doing the same thing that the Whites were doing against the Blacks, lashing out at capitalists over loss of jobs? Feagin makes these errors throughout his book, using every bit of history, anecdote and innuendo to lay all of the blame for Black pathology at the feet of Whites, while he simultaneously castigates Whites who express concerns for their own well-being. Such hypocrisy is truly profound. The fact is, as should be known even by a Marxist who is even a little bit familiar with evolutionary principles, kin matters more than class. That is, every racial group will try to get more as a group from every other group if they can. We can see this group evolutionary strategy in play by the very nature of this book, where Feagin is using Blacks to further his goals. That is, he is using Blacks as his surrogates to now oppress Whites for his own advantages, by trying to recapture the moral capital needed to suppress racial comparison with regards to intelligence, conscientiousness and ethnocentrism.

> "The globalization of U.S. racism began in the late 1800s and the early 1900s. U.S. citizens, including government officials, often brought racist ideas and practices to other parts of the world. By 1900 the U.S. government created systems of white dominance in its colonies, including Cuba and the Philippines. During World War I the French government received a formal complaint from the U.S. military command that the French people were treating black American soldiers too well, and U.S. military authorities gave the French government instructions on how to treat black soldiers in discriminatory fashion."

Feagin here needs to establish a mechanism to explain how it is that when foreigners from many different parts of the world come to America,

they express the same attitudes towards Blacks as everyone else. It never occurs to him I guess that immigrants of many countries recognize in Blacks what we here have always seen so easily. But what Feagin fails to establish is how this great transference of racist attitudes with regards to Blacks got transmitted to the masses of foreign countries before movies, radio, television, books and newspaper coverage was readily available to these serfs from many lands. Does Feagin really think they spent all their leisure time studying American literary works? That is absurd and frighteningly naïve. But of course, I think Feagin really knows better, but to make his case against Whites he had to somehow show why other immigrants also have the same attitudes as Whites, including immigrants of color.

-

> "Creating a Racist Ideology. The expansion of Europe from the 1400s to the early 1900s eventually brought colonial exploitation to more than 80 percent of the globe. The resulting savagery, exploitation, and resource inequalities were global, and they stemmed, as W. E. B. DuBois has noted, from letting a "single tradition of culture suddenly have thrust into its hands the power to bleed the world of its brawn and wealth, and the willingness to do this." For the colonizing Europeans it was not enough to bleed the world of its labor and resources. The colonizers were not content to exploit indigenous peoples and view that exploitation simply as "might makes right." Instead, they vigorously justified what they had done for themselves and their descendants. Gradually, a broad racist ideology rationalized the oppression and thereby reduced its apparent moral cost for Europeans."

But of course this is not new. Every great civilization that had the resources, the power, the technology, and the drive to do so conquered without mercy large portions of the known world. From the Greeks, the Mongols, the Aztecs, the Vikings, the Romans, the Muslims, and the Ottoman Empire to name just a few did exactly the same thing. The point is, Europe wanted wealth and to explore the world, and along with the

capability to do so they conquered others (for a time). Just like every other great civilization (and small civilizations alike) tried to do. In nature, might does make right. There is no normative moral system yet devised that can show otherwise. Humans have enormous capacities for barbarism and it can be found in every racial group under the right conditions. To single out Europeans is just plain hate on the part of Feagin, but then I understand it. He carries in him the same capacity for both hate of the other and love of his own as any other human being. It is a part of nature and what makes us social animals. Love of our own and hatred of the other is natural. Especially when the other is seen as a threat or a hindrance to one's evolutionary goals, including power and resource acquisition. What is so sad is that Feagin is using Blacks to get back at Whites via Marxism. We have seen variations of this formula so often now that it is amazing it is still not recognized by other susceptible Whites (see MacDonald link above).

> "An ideology is a set of principles and views that embodies the basic interests of a particular social group [ethos]. Typically, a broad ideology encompasses expressed attitudes and is constantly reflected in the talk and actions of everyday life. One need not know or accept the entire ideology for it to have an impact on thought or action. Thus, each person may participate only in certain fragments of an ideology. Ideologies are usually created by oppressors to cover what they do, and counter ideologies are often developed by the oppressed in their struggle against domination."

Of course, from 1917 to the present the world has been trying to get out from under the tyranny of Communism, the Marxist ideology that is determined to slaughter any group or class of people that gets in the way of their egalitarian dystopia. Feagin follows in that tradition of revolutionaries who try to use the masses and the downtrodden for their personal gain in subjugating all opposition to their unified vision of the culturally determined human. Nature is to be ignored, and he and his elitist ideologues will use class warfare to get control. They hate anyone

and any democratic system that does not yield to their demands, until all that remains is to invent new causations such as *systemic racism* to explain human social dysfunction. And after each one of these new theories are debunked, others will follow. The overriding truism is that all of these social science theories are failures because they do not have a workable paradigm such as sociobiology or evolutionary theory to explain their observations. They still cling to cultural determinism, hoping that behavior genetics and the Human Genome Project will someday disappear under their authoritarian hammer of censorship. Have no doubt, these Marxists are determined to suppress freedom of speech as they have in most of Europe when it comes to discussing racial differences, because it is the last escape from the truth for tyrants.

> "Major ideological frameworks, including racist frameworks, are typically created, codified, and maintained by those at the top of a society, although this construction takes place in ongoing interaction with the views and practices of ordinary citizens. Those with the greater power have the greater ability to impose their own ideas on others. As Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels long ago pointed out, "the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e. the class, which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force." Elites have dominated the creation, discussion, and dissemination of system-rationalizing ideas in business, the media, politics, education, churches, and government. While there is indeed much popularly generated racist imagery and discourse, even this is usually codified and embellished by the elites. As with most important ideas, if the elites had been opposed to the development of the racist ideology, they would have actively combated it, and it would likely have declined in importance. Thus, in his detailed analysis of the racist ideas and actions of presidents from George Washington to Bill Clinton, Kenneth O'Reilly has shown that conventional wisdom about presidents following a racist populace is wrongheaded. The historical evidence shows that most of the men who control U.S.

> political institutions have worked hard "to nurture and support the nation's racism." Racist thought did not come accidentally to the United States. It was, and still is, actively developed and propagated."

Well, we all know what a bigot Bill Clinton is, so there's proof for you! But the fact is the ruling elite in the United States when it comes to the media, academics, government and business is dominated by Jews. As I pointed out before, they have far more power than any other group for their numbers and give far more money to both political parties than any other group (50% of all Democratic contributions and 25% of all Republican contributions come from Jews who only account for 2.4% of the population. Shapiro (1992,116)). So it must be the Jews now who are maintaining this racist system; they have far surpassed the one-time dominance of the WASPs by double or more in influence and power. We have a new elite in town, and it's not Whites. (Feagin never mentions if the Ashkenazi Jews want to be White or "people of color." Semites according to Feagin are people of color. I guess they are just a race unto themselves as genetic testing has shown.)

> "Positive images of Africa: The Early Period. Negative images of Africans and African Americans are now so commonplace that one might think that non-Africans have always held such views. This is not the case. Early Judeo-Christian writings, including sections of the Bible, reveal that images of Africans were often positive in the Middle East. In what Christians call the Old Testament, African kingdoms are frequently portrayed as strong societies and as allies of Jewish kings. Moreover, during the Greek and Roman periods Europeans generally attached far greater significance to Africans' learning, advanced culture, and nationality than to their physical characteristics. Africa and the Africans, from whom Greeks and Romans borrowed substantially for their own development, were seen in mostly positive terms. While individual Greeks or Romans did sometimes express negative views of Africans' physique or skin

color, these views were never developed into a broad color consciousness viewing Africans as a greatly inferior species. Before the European slave trade began in the 1400s, the world had not seen a well-developed racist ideology. However, in the writings of early Christian leaders the idea of spiritual "darkness" was increasingly linked to concepts of sin, evil, and the devil. As Jan Pieterse tells us, "Origen, head of the catechetical school in Alexandria in the third century, introduced the allegorical theme of Egyptian darkness as against spiritual light."

The above is the standard ruse used by Afrocentrists to try and prove that Africa had some culture in the past. But African Blacks came from sub-Saharan Africa. The races of people around the Mediterranean, including North Africa were primarily White during Ancient Egyptian times. This is a common trick, conflating very racially different people who live on the continent of Africa: the Blacks from the very isolated sub-Saharan region with the predominately White to Semitic races of North Africa. They are very different people. The Saharan desert before commercial shipping was a major barrier to racial mixing. Feagin knows this and again is just lying about the accomplishments of African Blacks.

"'Christians' Versus the 'Uncivilized Others.' From the 1600s to the 1800s English and other European Protestants dominated the religious scene on the Atlantic coast of North America, and their religious views incorporated notions of European superiority and non-European inferiority. The early English Protestants regarded themselves as Christian and civilized, but those they conquered as unchristian and savage. Religious and cultural imperialism accompanied economic imperialism. Why were Europeans first to engage in large-scale imperialism and colonialism across the globe? One proposed reason points to the relative absence of mineral and agricultural resources in Europe. Another reason often suggested is that Europeans had the shipbuilding and military technologies to expand and colonize overseas. However, one other society, that of

> China, had developed the technological potential (for example, large sailing ships) for major overseas conquest well before the Europeans, but had not engaged in such large-scale conquest. Perhaps very important to the emergence of European imperialism was the early development of a strong acquisitive ethic, an ethic coupled with a missionary zeal convinced of the superiority of European civilization."

Of course if Feagin had any sense of honesty, he would have included that the Chinese did have ships that could have conquered other countries, but they were destroyed by the eunuchs in an internal power struggle (see *Awakening China,* 1996). Whatever differences there are between the Eastern Asians and the Western Europeans that can account for why the West advanced and the East stagnated is still a mystery and has not been satisfactorily explained. But it could have been them and not us conquering the world. I am glad it was the West, except for the fact that now we have to listen to the moral wailing of sophists like Feagin, haranguing Whites for doing what every other tribe or nation would have done with the same intelligence, culture and technology. The West has a lot to be proud of and we should not apologize to anyone for winning out over others. Our only problem now is how to keep others from trying to steal it away with absurd moral arguments that have no basis in human nature.

> "Why do many whites often react viscerally to the presence or image of the black body, and especially the bodies of black men? Joel Kovel has argued that many whites dislike and reject black bodies because they project onto them their own deep fears, which are often rooted in childhood. As they are socialized, young whites learn, directly and indirectly, consciously and unconsciously, that the dark otherness of black Americans symbolizes degradation, danger, sinfulness, or the unknown—imagery dating back to at least the seventeenth century and still present in white imaginings. Over the course of a lifetime antiblack impulses and actions are strongly

> shaped by the images in whites' unconscious minds. From this perspective, a primary reason for the intensely emotional character of the racist ideology is that many whites project onto the black out-group their own deep-lying inclinations and forbidden desires, which cannot be openly acknowledged."

But rather than speculate as Kovel has done, Feagin could look at empirical evidence as to why many races fear Blacks—they are violent. Person for person, approaching Black males on the street is far more dangerous than approaching members of any other group. High levels of testosterone, an inability to understand the consequences of their actions due to an average low intelligence, or hatred stirred up by people like Feagin are just some of the reasons that Black on White violence far outpaces White on Black violence. See "The Color of Crime" at: http://www.neoeugenics.net/crime.htm. But the fact is people including other Blacks have every reason to fear especially young Black males as dangerous predators.

> "Developing an Explicit Ideology of "Race." We/they ethnocentrism existed long before Europeans built their colonial empires, but a well-developed exploitative, and soon to be fully racist, ideology emerged only with European domination of peoples overseas. As Oliver Cox has noted, the modern racist ideology did not arise out of some "abstract, natural, immemorial feeling of mutual antipathy between groups; but rather grew out of the exploitative relationships of colonialism. There are significant variations in the stereotyping and treatment of external groups across societies. Some societies, for example, do not develop the high level of xenophobia that others do. Historically, many indigenous societies showed a friendliness (xenophilia) toward Europeans when the latter first came into their areas. As it turned out, this friendly attitude was usually a serious mistake."

But of course this is nonsense. Xenophobic reactions are the same for humans as they are for animals. Evolution determines fear reactions, and

xenophobia is expressed differently under different contexts. If the outsiders did not appear to be threatening, then they may have been welcomed. But the same natives that may have welcomed these strange creatures were more than likely fighting xenophobic wars with their neighbors. Maybe the newcomers looked so strange and formidable that they were thought to be gods. No one really knows for sure. But there is no evidence that conquered Native American Indians for example were any less brutal and genocidal towards their neighbors than the Europeans were towards them (see *War Before Civilization*, 1996). Humans without civilization were all potentially genocidal when threatened by neighbor or foe. In fact tribal genocide was one of the primary evolutionary forces that increased the intelligence and ethnocentrism of all humans (see *Demonic Males: Apes and the Origins of Human Violence* (http://www.neoeugenics.net/dom.htm), 1996 and *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*, 1999).

> "By the late 1700s these hierarchical relations were increasingly explained in overtly bioracial terms. This biological determinism read existing European prejudices back into human biology; then it read that biology as rationalizing social hierarchy. Those at the bottom were less than human; they were alleged to have smaller, and thus inferior, brains."

Not really inferior, but less intelligent as a statistical measure. Modern Magnetic Resonance Imaging and other techniques are now being used to show that there is about a 0.4 correlation between brain size and intelligence when body stature is taken into account (larger bodies require bigger brains to work the machinery). The latest research just done by a group of scientists in Turkey also found that men and women have to be tested separately because of gender related brain differences. What this means however is not that people with small brains are inferior. Any time these terms are used: inferior, superior, supremacist, racist, etc. it is meant to invoke emotion but not knowledge. Nature does not infer superior/inferior on singular traits like intelligence. There are times when a large brain requires too much energy and may be

detrimental where intelligence is not needed but energy conservation is. It just happens that now, intelligence is of great benefit in a technological world for most people. Will Feagin ever admit or accept this data? No, because he is as closed to such scientific advances as a fundamentalist is to the principles of evolution. He is beyond reasonableness as his book so elegantly repeats over and over again.

-

> "Immigrants Becoming "White." What the white elites have propagated as racist ideology the white majority has usually accepted. The transmission of the racist ideology from one social group to the next is a critical mechanism in the social reproduction of the system of racism. We noted previously how most ordinary whites had come to look at their social world in racist terms. They have accepted the psychological wage of whiteness and the racist ideology peddled by elites. As Oliver Cox once noted, "[W]e may take it as axiomatic that never in all the history of the world have poor people set and maintained the dominant social policy in a society." From the 1830s to the early 1900s millions of European immigrants bought into the racist ideology in order to gain white privileges. Take the case of the poor Irish immigrants who came in substantial numbers in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The Irish did not initially view themselves as "white," but rather identified with their country of origin. Once in the United States, however, they were taught in overt and subtle ways that they were white by the already established white ministers, priests, teachers, business people, newspaper editors, and political leaders with whom they interacted. They were pressured and manipulated by British American elites and their own leaders into accepting the dominant ideology denigrating blackness and privileging whiteness. Over the course of the nineteenth century most Irish immigrants, who themselves had been viewed by their British oppressors in Ireland as an "inferior race" came to envision themselves as white and deserving of white privileges in regard to jobs and living conditions. Coupled with this move to whiteness was active

participation in efforts to drive black workers out of better-paying jobs in northern cities."

Cannot we assume again, that the Irish as a cohesive ethnic group, were quite capable of forming their own opinions with regards to Blacks? Where is the evidence that they were "duped" by the very English WASPs that they themselves hated and reviled for the Potato Famine and other atrocities against the Irish by the British. My wife's Irish relatives are still bitter against the English for long past injustices. Like Feagin they are living in the past. But unlike Feagin, the Irish do not blame the British for stealing Irish land and food and accusing all Englishmen of having all the money yet today that the Irish should still have. No, they actively debate history, but they get on with their lives and do very well without government aid or whining about past injustices. Feagin has a vivid imagination about how easily people can be indoctrinated. The Irish are White. Why wouldn't they identify themselves as White as well as Irish, just as Germans identify themselves as White as well as German? And think again what that means. He has no faith in people being able to make up their own minds. The masses are just mindless automatons following their leaders. If this is so, then Feagin's insistence on a more democratic form of government is doomed to failure, because people are so easily indoctrinated by the media and the elite that they will just blindly follow whoever is in control at the time. Feagin's many references to an alternative democracy are nothing more than propaganda. He never clearly explains what it is and how it should work under his elite tutelage. But it seems clear he is talking about a form of Communist proletariat democracy, where the Marxist theoreticians decide how the people should vote.

-

"Nonetheless, in recent years some social and behavioral scientists have joined with certain physical scientists to continue to press for the idea of biological races and to connect that idea to concerns over government social policies. Since the late 1960s several social scientists at leading universities, including Arthur

Jensen and Richard Herrnstein, have continued to argue that racial-group differences in average scores on the so-called IQ tests reveal genetic differences in intelligence between black and white Americans. Their views have been influential, especially on white politicians and the white public. In 1969 the *Harvard Educational Review* lent its prestige to a long article by Jensen, a University of California professor. The arguments presented there and Jensen's later arguments in the next two decades have received much national attention, including major stories in *Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report, Life,* and major newspapers. Jensen has argued that on the average blacks are born with less intelligence than whites, and that the "IQ" test data support this contention. In addition, he has suggested that high birth rates for black Americans could result in a lowering of the nation's overall intelligence level.

Perhaps the most widely read example of biological determinism is a [1994] book, *The Bell Curve,* which to this point has sold more than a half million copies. As we move into the twenty-first century, it is still being cited and read. Like Jensen, the authors of *The Bell Curve*—the late Harvard University professor Richard Herrnstein and prominent author Charles Murray—argue that IQ test data show that black (and Latino) Americans are inferior in intelligence to whites. Though the authors have no training in genetics, they suggest that this supposed inferiority in intelligence results substantially from genetic differences. Thus, biological differences account to a substantial degree for racial inequalities. The fact that the book has sold many copies and has been widely debated in the media—in spite of the overwhelming evidence against its arguments—strongly suggests that biologically oriented racist thinking is still espoused by a large number of white Americans, including those who are well-educated. Indeed, Herrnstein and Murray explicitly suggest that their views are *privately shared* by many well-educated whites, including those in the elite, who are unwilling to speak out publicly."

Feagin is caught in two major deceptions and lies in the above statement. He preaches over and over again, ad nauseam throughout his book, that the media promotes racism. And yet, when The Bell Curve was released, it met with such strong criticism from every corner of the media that one could only conclude that the media was dominated totally by cultural determinists. If Feagin is right about how the media spreads racism, why didn't they at least cover The Bell Curve with some balance? But that was not the case. Any mention of racial differences in intelligence were dismissed and condemned from every source accept the rare maverick reporter drowned out by the hysteria. This ONE incident should be enough to destroy Feagin's assertion that racism is rampant in the (mostly Jewish owned and controlled) Media. In fact the reaction was so hateful against the book's conclusions was so hateful that 52 academic researchers found it necessary to take out a full page ad in the Wall Street Journal supporting the book's findings. Later in 1995, because of ad hominem attacks on the book, the American Psychological Association put together the task force discussed at the beginning of this review and also concluded that intelligence was primarily genetic and that tests were unbiased, along with a long list of corrections to the lies that Marxists have been making about differences in intelligence between Blacks and Whites. Since then, ongoing research has only shown conclusively, again based on the principle of parsimony, that there are genetic differences in the average intelligence of different races, and ongoing searches for the elusive environmental cause, Factor X, has never been found even after billions of dollars have been spent on programs to make it different. Nothing works because it is primarily genetic—Blacks fail because they have a low average IQ of 85. And it would be even worse for them if they still had the average IQ of their ancestors in Africa with an average IQ of 70. No, contrary to what Feagin has tried to prove, Blacks in the United States are far better off than their kin in Africa because they have been given a huge boost in intelligence, no matter how brutal that genetic admixture was for slaves who are now deceased (and Feagin never proves that it was not primarily consensual sex between slave owner and slave). But right or wrong, Blacks are far

more intelligent today because of their White genes. They may not be equal to Whites, Asians or Jews—but they are eons ahead of their African kinsmen.

> "In recent years numerous writers and journalists have written accounts of U.S. history designed to preserve the white sense of innocence and of inculpability for the genocide, slavery, and segregation so central to that history. For example, in the best-selling book *The End of Racism* (1995) journalist Dinesh D'Souza, an Asian American whose work has been supported by white conservatives, has argued not only that antiblack racism has come to an end but also that the historical background of white oppression of black Americans has been misperceived. In his view the enslavement of black Americans had some very good features. "Slavery proved to be the transmission belt that nevertheless brought Africans into the orbit of modern civilization and Western freedom," D'Souza claims. As he sees it, "slavery was an institution that was terrible to endure for slaves, but it left the *descendants* of slaves better off in America." Similarly, in a book attacking the idea of racial equality, former *Time* journalist William Henry, a Pulitzer Prize winner, argued that the European conquests were successful in dispersing superior cultures among inferior cultures, which were forced to accommodate."

D'Souza's book is in fact a very fair and balanced look at Blacks in the United States. He is a conservative, and like most conservatives he seems to be unaware of the vast amount of genetic research that shows a genetic basis for Black dysfunction. But at least his book was not filled with hatred and venom for Blacks, Whites or any other race of people like Feagin's book.

> "Racist attitudes and images are revealed and reproduced constantly in the everyday discourse and writings of whites at all class levels. Seeing black Americans in negative terms and viewing

> whites in positive terms are perspectives shaped by elite indoctrination, such as through the mass media, but they also constitute the way most ordinary whites regularly communicate with each another about racial matters. These ideas are perpetuated over generations by means of everyday communication. Racist attitudes and images are constantly available to virtually all whites, including the young, by means of presentations in daily discourse, as well as in the media, through the writings of intellectuals, and in the speeches of politicians and business leaders. Such attitudes and images are adapted and used as the situation warrants, and they vary in expression or impact depending on the situation and the persons involved. Over centuries now, they have had a severely negative impact on their targets. Racist ways of thinking and feeling can be conscious and directly stimulative of discriminatory action, or they can be unconscious and implicit in that action. Moreover, most racial prejudice not only portrays the racial others negatively but also imbeds a learned predisposition to act in a negative way toward the others. In this manner, racist attitudes commonly link to discriminatory practices."

What Feagin states here is of course nonsense. There is no consensus among Whites on a day to day basis with regards to race and attitudes, and there is certainly very little discourse that can be carried on amongst a group of Whites about racial matters without leading to hostile arguments between liberals, conservatives and socialists. Yes, race is discussed sometimes, but I have noticed that Blacks spend far more time condemning and blaming Whites for every problem that exists. Just reflect back on the Bush/Gore election and the pandemonium of the Blacks led by Jesse Jackson that the world would now come to and end for Blacks because Bush won. I am around Blacks, Hispanics and Whites on my job, in about equal amounts, and individuals—not race—is what is important. No matter how bigoted a few backward Whites are, people are judged by their individual qualities, not grouped together by race. And anyone who works in a multicultural environment knows this. And as far

as racial attitudes and animosities are concerned, Blacks are just as likely as Whites to stereotype and act snotty. In my job, I walk into enough private conversations and get enough attitude from Black people just because I am White, as well as on the street and driving my car. These racial tensions exist everywhere, and to think that they only occur to Blacks is nonsense. ("Walking while White" is far more dangerous than "driving while Black" in my neighborhood—yes folks, I live in the inner city with *people of color*.)

> "In addition to admissions about racist stereotyping, many whites still admit to pollsters that they hold other negative views and ideas in regard to black Americans. I analyzed white responses to five items in a recent NORC survey: (1) Do you think there should be laws against marriages between blacks and whites? (15 percent said yes); (2) White people have a right to keep blacks out of their neighborhoods if they want to, and blacks should respect that right (16 percent agreed); (3) Blacks shouldn't push themselves where they are not wanted (43 percent agreed); (4) One law says that a homeowner can decide for himself whom to sell his house to, even if he prefers not to sell to blacks (35 percent approved of this law); (5) Do you think blacks get more attention from government than they deserve? (18 percent said "much more"). Taking the five items together, the majority (59 percent) of these white respondents took an essentially antiblack position on at least one item. These overview analyses suggest that a majority of whites still harbor some negative attitudes toward, or negative images of, blacks."

Not really. As I stated above, Orthodox Jews have religious laws against marrying Gentiles and they are considered *persona non grata* if they do so transgress. (Most Jews from atheist to Orthodox however frown on intermarriage. See Alan Dershowitz's *The Vanishing American Jew* for one of the best rationalizations for Jewish supremacy and separateness.) Asians and Hispanics also are hostile to race mixing, so this is really not unusual. If life were so bad for Blacks, why would any

White in their right mind want to see a White subject their children to such an arrangement. So it seems to me Feagin shows nothing with this concern about "sticking to one's own kind." Even the radio self-help talk show host Doctor Laura warns against inter-religious marriages (which may be just a ruse to keep Jews and Gentiles from marrying each other). As to points 2, 3 and 4 above, it seems that freedom dictates that I should have some freedom about where I live, who I live with, and what I do with my own property. And with item five, there is no doubt that there is a transfer of money from Whites to Blacks under the numerous anti-poverty, welfare, and set-aside programs that cost Whites billions of dollars. And this does not include losses from lawsuits and an inefficient work force dictated by a system of de facto quotas by the courts. So all the survey above proves is that some Whites have a more libertarian sense of freedom rather than a socialist egalitarian set of beliefs. Racism is neither shown nor even inferred.

-

> "Even preferences for body type are racialized in a manner biased against black women. From the seventeenth to the twenty-first century not only white politicians, explorers, and missionaries, but also those whites developing the sciences of medicine, biology, and ethnography and those developing the mass media have set white skin and body type as the standard for aesthetic superiority. For centuries white men have been the standard for male handsomeness, as well as masculinity and manly virtue. White women—in recent decades, especially those who are fair-haired and slender—have long been the standard for female beauty in the United States. As one black woman recently put it in an interview, 'I went through a long, long time thinking I was like the ugliest thing on the earth. . . . It's so hard to get a sense of self in this country, in this society, where . . . every role of femininity looks like a Barbie doll.'"

Well this might be true, but if it is—then who is to blame? Research on attitudes regarding beauty, skin color and preferences has shown that

these norms are hard wired in to humans from our evolutionary past. So why does Feagin blame Whites for being better looking? Is it some White conspiracy? Again, this is just fomenting hate because the objective of this book is to increase the hostility between Whites and everyone else, but using Blacks for this latest Marxist conspiracy theory—*systemic racism*.

> "As a result of these common stereotyped images, many whites have fearful reactions to a black man encountered in public settings such as on streets, in public transport, and in elevators. In my interview studies, numerous black men have reported aversive reactions taken by white women and men when they are walking the streets of U.S. towns and cities. Many whites lock their car doors, cross streets, or take other defensive precautions when a black man is near. Some conservative commentators have asserted that this defensive action is "rational discrimination" because of the high black crime rate. These commentators, like many ordinary whites, seem to assume that the majority of criminals who violently attack whites are black. But this is not the case. Federal surveys of white victims of violent crime have found that about 17 percent of these attackers are black, while about three-quarters are white. Most violent crime affecting whites is carried out by *white criminals*. Yet most whites do not take similar precautions when they are in the presence of those whites—disproportionately white men—who perpetrate most of the violent crimes suffered by whites. The reason for this is that they do not see themselves as being in the presence of someone likely to commit a violent crime when they are around those socially defined as white."

But the numbers still don't dislodge the fact that Whites have to be more careful around Blacks than other Whites. The fact that there are far fewer Blacks in contact with Whites does not change the fact that person for person, when face to face with a Black versus a White or when Blacks are present rather than just Whites, the probability of being attacked,

robbed, raped or assaulted goes up. So there is every reason to fear Blacks. I would ask Feagin to walk in Harlem by himself at night, or walk in an all White neighborhood at night, and tell me the odds of assault, if not death. But here are the facts in more detail (again see "The Color of Crime" report above). Of the interracial violent crimes reported every year, 90% are committed by Blacks and only 10% by Whites. Read the whole report and the numbers are truly staggering; just the opposite of what is reported in the press. But, that is just the opposite of what Feagin claims; that "racist America" distorts the facts **against** Blacks is a lie. For example, 23 million Hispanics are included as White when they perpetrate a crime, but when the victim of a hate crime is Hispanic it is recorded as a hate crime against a Hispanic and not a White. If America has racist institutions, then why does the FBI distort the hate crime data **against** Whites? For every innuendo put forth by Feagin in his book about *systemic racism*, there are far more of these real anti-White or Anglophobe policies and practices in place in both the government and in the private sector, especially the media, that are real and well documented. Feagin has reversed the facts.

-

> "In fact, black youth are *less likely* than white youth to use marijuana or cocaine, smoke cigarettes, or drink alcohol. And rates of drug abuse (and child abuse) are higher for single-parent white families than for similar black families. White and other nonblack Americans account for seven out of eight illegal drug users. However, in spite of these facts, black Americans have become the national symbols of drug abusers and dealers. This stereotyped imagery affects white actions in serious ways. For example, black drug users are disproportionately targeted by the police; three-quarters of those sentenced to prison for drug possession are black. In contrast, white drug crime gets much less police surveillance, even though a substantial majority of drug dealers are white and even though there is much drug selling and use on predominantly white college campuses and in white suburban areas."

Actually I agree with Feagin that far too many people are put in prison for non-violent drug offenses, and that Blacks are probably disproportionately targeted unfortunately because the penalties for crack cocaine over powder cocaine impact Blacks more than Whites. This was an unfortunate fall-out over the country's paranoia over drugs. But aside from that, it seems reasonable that if a White suburbanite is doing drugs discreetly in some dorm room rather than smoking dope while driving around the inner city, yes there could be a disproportionate number of Blacks arrested for drugs. But this again gets back to intelligence, foresight, conscientiousness and caution. And probably also proves that in spite of what some people believe, Blacks also have very little street smarts when they keep getting in trouble where they supposedly have so much savvy. Yes, I watch "Cops" on Fox once in a while. And most of those people have low IQs (apparently including many of the cops, judging by the way they avuncularly lecture and chastise these felons like it is going to make a difference. They apparently are also cultural determinists like Feagin—not understanding that some people are just plain genetically incorrigible).

> "The Role of Elites. In chapter 3 we examined how elites have fostered a racist ideology rationalizing the realities of unjust impoverishment and enrichment. This effort is a major source of the racist ideology and its associated attitudes that are held in the non-elite part of the white population. Through various means the white elites have manipulated ordinary white Americans to accept the racist ideology and its component parts. Moreover, after the elements of an era's racist ideology and structural arrangements are in place, ordinary whites need less manipulation, for they generally understand what is in their group interest. Indeed, groups of ordinary people often generate new permutations on old racist ideas, innovations that in their turn reinforce and reproduce the racist ideology."

And likewise, during the sixties, what Blacks wanted was to be treated

fairly as individuals rather than by the color of their skin. When that finally happened, and Whites shrugged off what most saw as a legacy of racial policies that did not accord with the constitution, they readily accepted Blacks as equals and wished to leave racial animosities in the past. Then, as time went by and Blacks still could not get what they wanted, which was material wealth as seen all about them, **they** started generating numerous permutations of explanations and causes for Black failure to further their own group interests. They cared little about what was right or equitable. Over the next forty years they would come up with one program after another to bring back racial group categories in order to take what they desired, under varying programs of quotas and preferences. It is ironic that Feagin is accusing Whites of doing what in fact the Blacks and their Marxist sponsors have in fact been doing all along—changing the rules and explanations as time moves along because nothing works out as planned. They then have to keep reinventing this mythical racism to justify various programs as they conjure up excuses, instead of accepting the obvious differences in the innate intelligence of different racial groups.

> "Mainstream theories of the cognitive development of children stress that they do not form clear ideas on racial matters until they are at least five or six years old. Until that time, egocentricity is said to be the child's natural state. However, a recent study of young white children in a preschool setting found that even three- to four-year-olds interact with children of other racial groups using clear and often sophisticated understandings of racist ideas and epithets (for example, 'nigger'). White children used such ideas and terms to define themselves as white and to exclude or exert power over other children. This study also found that many white adults, including parents, do not know about or deny the racist language or activities of their children. Even as whites socialize children in racist thought, emotions, and practices, they often deny to themselves and others what they are doing."

Bunk. I'll quote from MacDonald's paper referenced above, entitled "An Integrative Evolutionary Perspective on Ethnicity" as follows:

> "Hirschfeld (Race in the Making, 1996) finds that young children are very interested in human groupings. 'This curiosity is shaped by a set of abstract principles that guide the child's attention toward information relevant to discovering the sorts of intrinsicalities and naturally grounded commonalities that are entrenched in his or her particular cultural environment' (p. 193). Hirschfeld thus posits an interaction between an innate domain-specific module of intrinsic human kinds combined with cultural input that race is the type of human kind that is intrinsic—that it is inherited and highly relevant to identity—more so even than other types of surface physical characteristics like muscularity. Thus even young children view racial categories as essentialized and natural: 'Young children's thinking about race encompasses the defining principles of theory-like conceptual systems, namely an ontology [nature of being], domain-specific causality, and differentiation of concepts' (p. 88). 'But racial kinds are not natural kinds (at least, not as they have classically been conceived), and they certainly are not kinds whose existence is triggered by external reality' (p. 197)."

This quote simply states that children come readily equipped with genetic modules that leads them to categorize people, or the "other." Children, as like other primates, are extremely vulnerable from outsiders and even violent males within the group and they are equipped to learn to categorize classes of people. This is not racism, but a survival mechanism that is part of our evolutionary past. And we have learned, from ethnographic studies around the world, that Blacks are more violent and more dangerous than other races.

> "'When I asked one migrant in Houston why some migrants have antiblack attitudes, he responded that they first learn about blacks from U.S. movies.' Similarly, a research study of foreign-

born and U.S.-born Latinos in Houston found that the former had even more negative attitudes toward black Americans than did the latter. Such data suggest that the foreign-born bring negative views of black Americans from their countries of origin."

Again, Hollywood is predominately owned and controlled by Jews, including producers, writers, directors and owners according to their own bragging. If there is any aberrant portrayal of Blacks in the movies that does not correspond with real life, then it is not White Gentiles who are spreading hate but Jews. But likewise, Hollywood has been also attacking White Christian values for decades now, and especially portraying Whites as bigoted and prejudiced. Does that correlate with what Feagin is claiming; that White Gentiles are using Hollywood to spread lies about Black people? I doubt it. White Gentiles do not have any influence in Hollywood, but Hollywood has plenty of influence on the rest of the nation, including the Presidency of Bill Clinton and his socialist backers. Feagin's accusations make no sense at all.

"To my knowledge, there is no research on the frequency of the incidents and events of discrimination faced by individual black Americans over their lifetimes. In a few exploratory interviews with black respondents, I have asked a question about frequency and gotten large estimates in response. For example, I asked a retired printer from New York City how often he has faced discrimination over the course of his life. After some careful reflection, this man estimated that he confronts at least 250 significant incidents of discrimination from whites each year, if he only includes the incidents that he consciously notices and records. Blatant and subtle mistreatment by white clerks in stores and restaurants are examples he had in mind. Judging from my own field studies using in-depth interviews with black Americans, this man's experience seems representative. Over the course of a lifetime, a typical black man or woman likely faces *thousands* of instances of blatant, covert, or subtle discrimination

at the hands of whites. Today, this omnipresent and routinized discrimination remains a key mechanism in the social reproduction of systemic racism."

I could easily record a similar number of incidents where Blacks treat me with disdain or contempt in my daily life, as I live in the inner city and deal with Blacks often. But hey, shit happens. There are a lot of nasty people everywhere, and for Blacks to encounter Whites on a regular basis who act in ways they do not approve of is no different than what I experience from hateful blacks. People are all different, and some times people may seem racist when they are just generally unpleasant, no matter what color they are. But I do notice it more from Blacks than from other Whites, which only means that each group naturally treats their own with greater consideration than the "other." That is perfectly natural for many people, as it only shows that most racial groups are preferential towards their own kind. If that is racism, then human nature is *racist*, and research has shown that is how we evolved. But the proper term is ethnocentrism or groupism, not the derogatory term used by Feagin—*racism*.

"More Court Discrimination Racial discrimination extends beyond policing to the court system. Few judges in the criminal justice system are black, and most white judges appear to have little understanding of the lives of the black Americans—mostly working-class or poor people—that they often face; they do not come from the same community or socioeconomic backgrounds as the black defendants in their courtrooms. Not surprisingly, some white judges thus discriminate against those in the courtroom. One New Haven, Connecticut, study of 1118 local arrests did a statistical analysis of bail-related variables and found that "after controlling for eleven variables relating to the severity of the alleged offense, bail amounts set for black male defendants [by judges] were *35* percent higher than those set for their white male counterparts." In contrast, the researchers found

> that local bond dealers charged significantly lower bonding rates for black defendants than for whites. The bond dealers set their rates based on experience with defendants fleeing from prosecution, and the probability of flight was greater for whites than blacks. The researchers concluded that this is strong evidence of discrimination in bail setting in the justice system, saying, 'Judges could have reduced bail amounts for minority males without incurring flight risks higher than those deemed acceptable for white male defendants.'"

But isn't this *White profiling* that Feagin finds so offensive when it is done to Blacks? What hypocrisy! The bondsmen have determined, based on real statistical data based on two groups' racial classification that Whites will flee more often than Blacks. And yet, when the same data is used by the car insurance industry for example to set rates, Feagin screams racism and Black profiling. This example shows that every industry tries to maximize profits by using as much data as possible to predict outcomes. Now what needs to be done is for the above-mentioned judges to talk to the bail bondsmen and get their facts straight regarding the flight risks for Blacks versus Whites.

> "Recent White Violence Attacks on black Americans are still part of the U.S. landscape. The number of racially-motivated crimes ('hate crimes') has increased in the last two decades. Thousands of attacks on black Americans and other Americans of color were reported each year in the 1990s."

But once again, there are far more Black on White hate crimes as White on Black. So who are the real racists? Again, see "The Color of Crime" (available at http://www.neoeugenics.net/crime.htm) for the very anti-White methodology used to count Hispanics as White when they commit a hate crime and then classifying them as Hispanic when they are the victim of a hate crime. But all and all, Blacks commit far more hate crimes against Whites than Whites commit against Blacks. A point Feagin conveniently chooses to ignore.

> "In the view of many white employers only certain groups of workers are seen as acceptable, and individuals are judged by their group characteristics. White employers often argue that they choose white over black workers because they feel whites are as a group more productive, and they may defend such choices by recourse to the recurring notion that it is "rational" discrimination. However, the workers they deem unacceptable, such as black workers, are often just as qualified as those whites who are chosen. One major study jointly sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation and the Ford Foundation examined the situation of black workers and other workers of color in four large cities—Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles. The researchers found that the movement of jobs from central cities to suburban areas by employers had a serious impact on black employment in the cities. This is a common research finding. However, this study also found that racial motivations were intertwined with this economic restructuring. Some employers seemed to intentionally choose workplace locations inaccessible to black workers. In Boston and Los Angeles surveys found that employers were more likely to express a desire to move away from neighborhoods with increasing numbers of black families than from other neighborhoods. The spatial mismatch of jobs in many cities, it appears, is often linked to an intentional movement away from black populations by investors."

Some Blacks may be more qualified than some Whites. But thanks to quotas, many employers are forced to hire less qualified Blacks, and then they can't fire them. Is it any wonder that these employers, forced to hire unqualified Blacks to fill quotas, move away from areas where there are a lot of Blacks, to areas that are mostly White? And on top of that, the courts have prevented companies from testing new employees because Blacks do so poorly on exams. And contrary to what is claimed, Blacks *over perform* on exams in relation to their *actual work performance*.[6] That is, they test out higher than their actual job performance according to studies done by the military, the one institution Feagin claims is the least biased. So affirmative action and a host of laws that favor

hiring and retaining Blacks who are NOT qualified has made companies respond in such a way that harms the few remaining Blacks who are made to suffer for the government's and courts' irrational racialist policies.

> "Job Tracking and the Lack of Job Mobility. Racial oppression encompasses the exploitative relationship that enables white employers to take more of the value of the labor of workers of color than of comparable white workers. Today, as in the past, some white employers have paid black workers less because they are black. They do this directly, or they do it by segregating black workers into certain job categories and setting the pay for these categories lower than for predominantly white job classifications. The Marxist tradition has accented the way in which capitalist employers take part of the value of workers' labor for their own purposes—thus not paying workers for the full value of their work. That theft of labor is a major source of capitalists' profit. Similarly, white employers have the power, because of institutionalized discrimination, to take additional value from black workers and other workers of color. White employers can thus superexploit workers of color. This continuing exploitation of black workers not only helps to maintain income and wealth inequality across the color line but also is critical to the reproduction of the entire system of racism over long periods of time."

OK—I get it now. Employers simultaneously move their companies away from areas where there are a lot of Blacks because they are forced to hire them, while at the same time they make more money off of Blacks because they can get more work from them for less money by exploiting them. If this were the case, then companies would be flocking into the inner cities to take advantage of this superb but underappreciated labor pool. Feagin either suffers from some rare form of paranoia and delusions, or he is unabashed in distorting reality to make his Marxist arguments. But that is not unusual considering that his goal is to alienate

different racial groups while stereotyping every White with *racist intents* over all else, as if we had nothing better to do than to plot against those poor Black folks. Feagin's "just so" stories have no credibility when taken alone. But when these "just so" stories contradict each other consistently throughout his presentation of lies, one wonders what he was smoking when writing. As Christopher Brand writes (Brand 1996):

> "Above all, psychologists who have spurned the g factor have been guilty of creating a Western equivalent of the 'ideological pseudo-reality' that Vaclav Havel and others exposed in communist Eastern Europe. By a 'collective fraud' (Gottfredson, 1994), they have condemned scientists and students, as Havel put it, to 'live within a lie.' Between them, psychology's inheritors of empiricism and idealism deny that much is known about the causes of unemployment, crime, welfare-dependency and the neglect and abuse of children: they betray people and psychology for the sake of another research grant."

Feagin goes on:

> "Cycles of relative prosperity in the U.S. economy should not mislead us. Even when most media pundits describe the U.S. economy as 'very good,' a great many workers—especially black workers and other workers of color—are unemployed, or underemployed in low-wage or part-time jobs. If the economy turns sour, as it periodically does, many black workers face even worse conditions. When they are no longer needed, the less-skilled black workers are kept as a "reserve army" in a condition of painful poverty and unemployment, or in the prison-industrial complex, until they may be needed again. It is significant that at no point in the decades since the 1960s has any major business organization or government agency, including the U.S. Congress, shown concern for the plight of black workers and other workers of color in the form of large-scale job training or job creation

programs."

Wow, now we keep Blacks in prison until the job market needs them, and then they are let out to serve their masters! Statements like this should really make a person question Feagin's sanity—he is typical of Marxist paranoiacs seeing capitalist conspiracies behind every Black failure. Are we to believe that Blacks would be let out of jail during times of labor shortage when we just came out of a period of extremely low unemployment as Black incarceration went up? Jeez, I guess the prisons must not have gotten the message from those capitalist pigs. Or maybe the prisoners caught and ate the pigeons carrying the secret encoded messages to let all the brothers out.

> "Black customers face discrimination in the buying process. One major Chicago study examined more than 180 buyer-salesperson negotiations at ninety car dealerships. Black and white testers, with similar economic characteristics and bargaining scripts, posed as car buyers. White male testers got much better prices from the salespeople than did white women or black men and women. Compared to the markup given to white men, black men paid twice the markup and black women paid more than three times the markup. The average dealer profit in the final offers to each category of tester was as follows: white men, $362; white women, $504; black men, $783; and black women, $1237. In another study the researchers used thirty-eight testers who bargained for some 400 cars at 242 dealers. Again, black testers were quoted much higher prices than white men, though this time black men were quoted the highest prices. In some cases racist language was used by salespeople, but the researchers concluded that the more serious problem was stereotyping about how much black customers will pay. The cost of this commonplace discrimination is high. Given that black customers pay two to three times the markup offered to white men—if this holds across the nation—then black customers

> "annually would pay $150 million more for new cars than do white males."

Just one comment, intelligent people know how to shop for the best prices. The above only shows that Blacks are less capable even in buying a car, an area of expertise they should be superb at if there was such a thing as "street smarts." Apparently they just can't do well even at bargaining for a good price on a car. And if they think it is racism, they have every opportunity to go to a Black owned dealership in Chicago where there are plenty to choose from, thanks to the government forcing the car manufacturers to provide Blacks with dealerships since they can't seem to do it on their own. This is just one more example that shows how intelligence, not racism, is responsible for Black failures.

> "In addition, the U.S. political system was originally crafted using European (often English) political ideas about such matters as representation, republicanism, branches of government, and limited democracy. Today, the U.S. political system often does little to implement real democracy in everyday operations at state, local, and federal government levels. This can be seen most clearly, perhaps, in the many ways the political structure allows those with money— especially well-off white men—to corrupt and control its most important aspects and institutions. Whites as a group benefit handsomely from this white control of a theoretically democratic political system."

Once again, all we have to do is look at who contributes the most money to the two main political parties to see that Jews, not White Gentiles, control. And then there are unions and special interest groups, all of which **do** have a corrupting influence on government efficiency, but Blacks have benefited handsomely under the varying government programs. If government officials were really the pawns of White racists as Feagin states, why is government policy so egalitarian? Why wouldn't it be far more pro big business? In Head Start alone, the government

spent $23,000 per IQ-point gained per child (Spitz, 1986).

> "The Many Economic Costs. In recent decades, U.S. government census data have shown the median family income of black families to be consistently in the range of 55 to 61 percent of the median family income of white families. During the late 1980s and into the 1990s this percentage actually declined. In the late 1990s black median household income ($25,351) was still about 60 percent of white median income ($42,439). These data present a clear picture of persisting and substantial inequality across the color line. In addition, today, as in the past, black families face poverty at a much greater rate (26 percent) than white families (8 percent) and unemployment rate roughly twice that of whites."

Again, Blacks do as well as Whites when we consider their overall lower IQ. And, the following quotes from *Intelligence, Genes, and Success*, a very liberal biased book, shows how far off the mark Feagin is. Blacks only have a slightly lower income than Whites when we consider just intelligence differences, but what if there were also behavioral trait differences? What if Blacks also had less conscientiousness as well as lower average intelligence? No one has looked at this possibility, which would mean that Blacks make more on average than Whites based on their qualifications. The above book states:

> "It has frequently been said that intelligence tests predict "academic" rather than 'on-the-job' intelligence. In support of this point, there are a number of studies of 'on-the-job' situations in which one can demonstrate unarguably intelligent performance by people who do not have high test scores. All these demonstrations show is that intelligence is not all that is important on the job, and no one ever said that it was. The studies showing failures of intelligence as a predictor of performance have been so small as to be almost anecdotes.

Massively larger studies of the correlations between various aptitude tests and measures of workplace performance have shown that the correlations between test and measure are only slightly, if at all, lower than the correlations found in academic situations, such as the SAT-GPA example. Furthermore, the findings go beyond studies that simply compute correlation coefficients. During the years when the American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T) had a virtual monopoly on telephone services in the United States, the company conducted a longitudinal study in which candidate managers were interviewed and tested early in their careers, and then followed for more than 15 years. A test much like the SAT, given at the outset of the executives' careers, was the best single predictor of eventual level of management achieved. However, the correlation was only slightly below 0.4, and personality tests added more to predictability. This does not mean that the personality tests were better predictors than the intelligence tests. They were not. It means that the combination of intelligence and personality test scores provides a better prediction than either test score alone. This issue is not whether 'intelligence' or personality is more important to success. . . . The plausibility of the color-blind model can be tested using a Wald test. On implementing this test we reject the hypothesis that the earnings function is color-blind ($p < .Ol$).* We find *de facto* evidence of the presence of racial discrimination in H&M's preferred model, after correcting for gender. This model predicts that earnings for black men with population average characteristics are about 6% lower than comparable white men at the average age of 28.7, and that this earnings gap grows larger for older men in the sample. For women, the picture is reversed, with black women with population average characteristics earning about 15% more than comparable white women. However, serious deficiencies in the H&M model limit its usefulness for making assessments of racial discrimination. These deficiencies are addressed in the following sections."

(Devlin 1997)

> Feagin states, "One dramatic indicator of generations of white access to the acquisition of material and educational resources can be seen in measures of family net worth. The median net worth of white households ($61,000 in 1995) is more than *eight times* that of black households ($7400 in 1995). In addition, black families have most of the wealth they do hold in cars and houses, while white families are far more likely than black families to have interest-bearing bank accounts and to hold stock in companies. Even white families with modest incomes—in the $7,500 to $15,000 range—actually have greater wealth (net worth) than black families with incomes in the $45,000 to $60,000 range."

Resources and wealth are not permanent; they are used up in the process of living. Passing money on from one generation to the next means that money has to be earned over and over again. There is no free ride for anyone. Feagin makes it sound like family inheritances are never used up, but resources have to be earned, they just don't lay around getting passed on to the next generation. Which again means two things: Blacks do not bring to the job skills and knowledge that rewards them well for their labors and they spend their money on short term pleasures like cars that wear out quickly. Whites, according to Feagin invest their money more wisely. So again, the above just shows the low intelligence and shortsightedness of Blacks in comparison with Whites. And then again there is the Jewish question. How did *they* manage to amass in just a few decades enormous wealth far above anyone else? Who did they steal *their* money from?

> "The Price Whites Pay for Racism. Writing in a late-1960s Supreme Court decision cited previously, Justice William O. Douglas argued that 'the true curse of slavery is not what it did to the black man, but what it has done to the white man. For the

> existence of the institution produced the notion that the white man was of superior character, intelligence, and morality.' Thus white-supremacist thinking entails living a lie, for whites are not superior in character, intelligence, or morality. This self-deception takes a corrupting toll on the souls of white Americans."

Then Jews must be in even worse shape, their souls contorted in pure agony from the lies they live. Judaism preaches that the Jews are *Gods chosen people*, they are *the light unto the nations* bringing a higher moral system for all others to follow, and they are more intelligent and have more character than White Gentiles. So if Whites are in bad shape for White-supremacist views, the Jews far outpace us in pure delusion by a magnitude or two in feelings of Jewish-supremacy. (see *Jewish Fundamentalism In Israel* at http://www.neoeugenics.net/Shahak.htm)

> "Each new immigrant group is usually placed, principally by the dominant whites, somewhere on a *white-to-black status continuum,* the commonplace measuring stick of social acceptability. This, socioracial continuum has long been imbedded in white minds, writings, and practices, as well as in the developing consciousness of many in the new immigrant groups. Generally speaking, the racist continuum runs from white to black, from 'civilized' whites to 'uncivilized' blacks, from high intelligence to low intelligence, from privilege and desirability to lack of privilege and undesirability."

Wrong again. Each new immigrant group isn't placed anywhere by Whites, they earn their standing on how they behave and how they perform. It has nothing to do with color or any other physical trait. A dark skinned Pakistani will be less threatening than a light skinned Hispanic depending on how they behave and the averaging of the observations made about them. Humans naturally accumulate data on many things, including different racial groups, so that wise decisions can be made for survival. Is it safe to go into Harlem? Is it safe to go into

Skokie where Asians have moved in as the Jews moved out? These are important facts for one's survival. And each group is categorized and stereotyped by all others so that we can efficiently deal with them without spending months getting to know a person before we interact. This is how the brain operates, decisions based on the best available knowledge, which quite often means putting humans into easily recognized groups that have similar attributes. I wouldn't hit on a nun to try and get a date. I am stereotyping that she is probably not a good bet for my efforts to get laid.

> "Sociologist Nestor Rodriguez has noted a parallel phenomenon of whiteness pressures among Latinos. Some of the latter, especially those up the income ladder, 'share this experience, and some do it in a state of denial, that is, they deny the reality of anti-Latino bias, discrimination and prejudices around them. And they push their children into an Anglo-like existence.' While much more research on this assimilation is needed, among many Asian and Latino Americans it appears that the pressure to look, dress, talk, and act as white as possible increases personal or family stress and reduces their recognition of the racism that surrounds them. This is yet one more destructive consequence of the underlying system of white racism."

This again shows the angst of Feagin's Marxism. People refuse to be placed into classes of oppressed people. They will go where they feel comfortable. This has nothing to do with White racism, but everything to do with White tolerance towards others that they respect and recognize as their equals—intelligent, considerate people are accepted no matter what the color of their skin is. Feagin's hopes for revolution against White hegemony is falling apart as Whites associate freely with other racial groups, and vice versa because they have more in common than Feagin likes to admit. His goal of finally finding a way of oppressing Whites is not going according to plans.

"Hostility among Subordinated Groups: Links to White Racism. Systemic racism affects everyone caught in its web. It is the social context for relations between all Americans, those defined as white and those defined as nonwhite. Intermediate groups often come to stereotype or attack those below them on the racial ladder, who may in turn retaliate, and these internecine attacks reinforce the racist system set in place by and for whites. Historically, whites have encouraged groups below them on the status ladder to stereotype and disparage each other. Stereotypes and prejudices in one racially subordinated group that target those in other subordinated groups are not independent of the larger context of systemic racism. Many negative racial images carried in subordinated communities exist because of the age-old racist ideology originally created by whites to rationalize white-on-black oppression. All groups of color assimilate many of the attitudes of the dominant society. As the black legal scholar Charles Lawrence has put it, 'we use the white man's words to demean ourselves and to disassociate ourselves from our sisters and brothers. And then we turn this self-hate on other racial groups who share with us the ignominy of not being white.' Many other scholars of color have also noted the ways in which oppression is internalized when people of color adopt racist attitudes toward themselves and others. The white supremacist system intentionally fosters hostility between groups of color. When those higher on the white racist ladder express racist views about those lower, this helps preserve the systemic racism that benefits whites the most. By asserting that one's own group, though subordinated, is still better than those considered lower, members of an in-between group underwrite the racist ladder of privilege. Intergroup stereotyping and hostility among communities of color are very useful for whites who can play down the significance of their own racist thinking and practice. Whites can assert that everyone is prejudiced. . . . When these

> stereotyped images and accompanying discriminatory propensities are brought by Asian, Latino, and other immigrants to the United States, they can become the basis for intergroup conflict: These attitudes and practices are not independent, but generated by the now global white-racist order."

Feagin uses the language of all conspiracy theorists, whether it is flat-earthers, UFO fanatics, Jewish world control, Holocaust deniers, or world Masonry. All of these paranoid types seem to think there is a conspiracy that is the cause of what they perceive to be the truth, but only they can figure it all out in its intricate planning and design. This is all "Doctor Evil" nonsense and anyone who thinks humans can be ordered about and manipulated by some hidden hand of control needs to take a rest or at least try to provide some sound evidence. The fact is, many immigrants fight with Blacks over many issues because they are different from Blacks. These animosities are perfectly natural when Blacks lash out at everyone else including Whites. Intelligent Asians and Latinos have no more in common with the average Black than a White person does. Even children it has been shown prefer to be around other children that are as smart as they are.

> "The Demographic Challenge to White Domination. Until major crises in this society occur, most whites are unlikely to see the need for large-scale egalitarian reforms. They are too constrained by their own privileges and conforming minds, by their social biographies, to see the need for radical structural change. Still, at certain times in human history new social options appear. What complexity theory calls "cascading bifurcations" can mean great societal instability and possibly a new social order. Current demographic trends are creating and amplifying societal contradictions that could eventually lead to a major social transformation, including the reduction or destruction of white domination over Americans of color. As we begin a new millennium, Americans of European descent are a decreasing

proportion of the U.S. and world populations. Whites constitute less than half the population of four of the nation's largest cities—New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Houston. They are less than half the population in the state of Hawaii, as well as in southern sections of Florida, Texas, and California. Demographers estimate that if current trends continue whites will be a minority in California and Texas by about 2010. By the middle of the twenty-first century, whites will be a minority of the U.S. population if birth rates and immigration trends continue near current levels. Over the next few decades this demographic shift will likely bring great pressures for social, economic, and political change. For example, by the 2030s a majority of the students in the nation's public school system will probably be black, Asian, Latino, and Native American. They and their parents will doubtless strive for greater representation in the operation, staffing, and curricula of presently white-dominated school systems. In addition, by the mid-2050s demographers predict that a majority of U.S. workers will be from these same groups, while the retired population will be majority white. One has to wonder whether these workers will raise questions about having to support elderly whites (for example, by paying into Social Security) who have long maintained a racist society. As voting majorities change from majority white, there will likely be changes in jury composition, operation of the criminal justice system, and the composition and priorities of many state, local, and national legislative bodies. Where voting majorities change, we will probably see far fewer white politicians opposing affirmative action or pressing for laws restricting Asian and Latin American immigrants. These transformations will, of course, only take place if whites have not reacted to the demographic trend with large-scale political repression."

Well, if Whites do actually have all of the privileges that Feagin claims we do, I can assure him that we will close the doors to future immigration

whenever we feel a real threat from immigrants. That is, before we lose our culture, our freedom, and our safety, we will retaliate against new immigrants who would threaten our way of life. That means, the average White American will retaliate against those who support immigration for cheap labor (corporations) and those who support immigration because they hate Western culture and the Whites that created it (the Jewish lobby). These two groups, as MacDonald has shown in The Culture of Critique (above), were responsible for the 1965 immigration act that threatens to Balkanize the United States. There is NO evidence that egalitarianism will come about the way Feagin describes without a violent overthrow and a return to Communist tyranny. So in a way, he and his kind are setting the stage for a renewed ethnic awareness for Whites, as they face real threats like a loss of social security or the freedom to live and work where they desire.

> "The showpiece of the liberal strategy of job desegregation can be seen in the U.S. Army. Today the army, which has about half of all black personnel in the military, is the most desegregated large institution in U.S. society. In the late 1990s black Americans made up about 11 percent of all officers, a figure much higher than that for executives in almost all large corporations or that for professors at almost all historically white colleges and universities. The 7,500 black officers there constitute the largest group of black executives in any historically white organization in the entire history of the United States. African Americans also make up one-third or more of the sergeant ranks in the army, a proportion much higher than that for comparable supervisors in most other workplaces. In addition, surveys indicate that black personnel generally see intergroup relations as better in the army than in the larger society, which is one reason that many reenlist."

One major flaw with the above optimism with the military success at integration is that the military, unlike the private sector, is allowed to

discriminate at the very beginning by using tests to admit recruits. That is, by law, it is the only organization that can test and skim the very cream of the crop so to speak of Blacks. The military has a cut-off point where anyone with an intelligence test score below 80 is not admitted. This is not the case anywhere else. Then, after enlisting only the very best, they can channel Blacks, based on their relatively low scores, into those units that are not cognitively challenging. For example, if more Blacks are assigned to a mechanics unit versus an engineering construction unit, they will have an easier time being promoted. But both units will have the same percentage of officers and non-commissioned officers. So the army is able to artificially promote Blacks by assigning enlistees to different types of jobs that are more or less challenging with regards to intelligence. They are not hampered by non-military organizations that cannot discriminate in this way, essentially against Whites. However, since Feagin brings up the military, the only organization that uses testing for both recruitment and promotions, it has been subject to analyses by psychometricians. One thing they have discovered is that Blacks score higher on tests than they do on job performance. That is, Blacks tend to test higher than they actually perform in school or on the job. Testing **over** predicts a Black's relative actual job performance—perhaps due to differences in a personality trait like conscientiousness that is second to intelligence in importance for job performance.

> "Building a Real Democracy. It appears that few white Americans have ever envisaged for the United States the possibility of a truly just and egalitarian democracy grounded solidly in respect for human rights. Certainly, the founders did not conceive of such a possibility, even in the long run. Nor did later white leaders such as Presidents Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Dwight D. Eisenhower envision that type of democratic future. In my judgment, as the nation and the world change demographically and dramatically in the future, whites everywhere will face ever greater pressures to create and to participate in a new

sociopolitical system that is nonracist, just, and egalitarian."

Randomly, throughout this book, Feagin will bring up democracy, but he has a real problem in that he never defines it. In *Darwinism, Dominance and Democracy: The Biological Bases of Authoritarianism* (1997), Somit and Peterson take a look at the history of democracy and what it means today as well as in the past. This is a very good short book and is essential reading for anyone who likes to throw around "democracy" as if we understood it. The book shows just how unnatural democracy is, how only representative democracy is tolerated, and how direct democracy is shunned and has never been supported by any philosophers in the past. And yet, if Feagin means by democracy "direct democracy" or the closest thing to it, then let's see what that means. Some states like California have referendums, the closest thing we have to direct democracy. In the last few years it has resulted in ending quotas and reducing support by the State for illegal immigrants. Also, if we had direct democracy we would not have the immigration policy we have in the United States. The majority of Americans do not want open borders, but our representative democracy does not always support what the people want but what the powerful and the elite want. So immigration continues against democratic choice because of the Jewish lobby and big business—for different self-promoting reasons. So I have to infer that what Feagin means by democracy is a form of totalitarian democracy, since that is where Marxism naturally leads. That is, no democracy at all.[7]

"The struggle to deal with the Nazi Holocaust, together with ongoing struggles for human rights by people in many countries around the globe—including black Americans in the United States—led to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This important international agreement stipulates in Article One that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights," and in Article Seven that "all are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law." Article 8 further asserts, "Everyone has the right to an effective remedy. . . for acts violating the fundamental rights; and Article 25 states that these rights extend to everyday life: 'Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the

> health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing.'"

Well aren't these non-democratic declarations convenient for Marxists around the world. Notice that Article 25 states that everyone has a right to have as many children as they can produce, and that the rest of society owes them a living whether they make any effort at all to support their families by their own labor. Under this socialist mandate, I have no obligation to give back to society, but I have every right to refuse to work or take any responsibility for my actions and the world owes me a living wage for my offspring and me. Before Marxism this was called *stealing*. Under Marxism, it is called *class struggle* or *basic human rights*.

> "However, the full eradication of racism will eventually require the uprooting and replacement of the existing hierarchy of racialized power. A developed antiracist strategy will eventually go beyond reform of current institutions to the complete elimination of existing systems of racialized power. One analysis of liberation strategies for the United States concluded that 'oppressors cannot renounce their power and privilege *within* a racist relationship; they must *abandon* that relationship. . . . there is no historical example of genuine, peaceful abdication of racist supremacy by the whole ruling group.' . . . The question hanging over white Americans is this: Do white Americans wish to face open racial conflict, even racial war, for themselves, their children, or their grandchildren? During the 1960s urban rebellion's numerous black leaders and a few white leaders pointed out that without social justice there can be no public order. This is still the long-term reality in the United States."

Feagin is apparently advocating a violent overthrow of the existing society. That is how deeply he hates and despises representative democracy. He believes that it is unrepentant and corrupt beyond

salvation. This is the same Marxist/Leninist proclamation that total revolution was necessary to overthrow freedom and replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat. So I would have to answer Feagin thusly, "White America would rather die than be subjugated by a Communist totalitarian state." I cannot speak for anyone but myself, but I would rather fight than lose my freedom. If Blacks cannot accept freedom, and would rather destroy America than accept responsibility for their individual fates along with other Americans on a level playing field, then I suspect turmoil and open warfare is the only option. This seems to be what Feagin is advocating and frankly what he desires. His need for destroying White Gentile America seems to surpass his need for peace and representative democracy, even with its flawed institutions.

-

Conclusion

Feagin, if you are wondering, looks White as far as I can tell from the cover on his book. I can only infer therefore that he is either a self-hating White or else a Jew who hates all White Gentiles. I could find out I'm sure, but it really doesn't matter. In either case, as an advocate of Marxist pseudoscientific prose for uncovering what he believes to be the truth, he has revealed in this book his unadulterated hate for Western culture and its dominant races. I believe this hate stems from the same viscerally genetic coded algorithms that have always driven us humans to genocidal brutality—an inherent blood-lust. It evolved to high levels during our long stay in the environment of our evolutionary past—when human bands and tribes were advancing to higher levels by killing other tribes who were less intelligent and less maniacal in defense of their own group. We see this same behavior in the chimpanzees. And we carry that legacy with us, ready to unleash our venom whenever we feel that we are not reaching our evolutionary goals.

On the other hand, for most people the sheer prosperity and safety of Western civilization has tamed or subdued this human rage because it is safer to keep it under control than to suffer the consequences of allowing it to be unleashed. Feagin however uses the pen in hopes of getting other people to take up arms for his world vision. This has happened many times before and it will continue to occur as long as human nature is what it is. There will always be those people who want to destroy the "other" because they can't have it all. Happiness is not sufficient; dominance must prevail. Feagin's elite corps must rule and be on top. Nothing less will do for him to meet his evolutionary goals. Those goals are innate, and they are the totality of what he has become. And it sends a clear message to Whites that we are surrounded by these neo-Marxists, and they are intent on seeing our culture and our gene pool destroyed whether it is through immigration, intermarriage, or outright genocide. Whatever it takes will be done, unless we wake up from our slumber.

And finally, with regards to reparations: From: John Bryant's weekly newsletter 1/24/2001 (http://www.thebirdman.org.)

Repairing the Claim for Reparations

In response to black claims for reparations for slavery, I say, "Let's look at the total bill." We should begin with slavery and segue into modern times, noting the following important facts as we go:

- Blacks who were sold into slavery were mostly sold by fellow blacks, so if blacks want reparations, let them go to Africa and non-negotiably demand them. (And while they're at it, let them stay there.)
- Blacks who were sold into slavery were mostly either criminals or captives. In either case, slavery constituted a rescue. So let blacks pay whites for services rendered.
- Blacks who were sold into slavery, tho compelled to work, acquired a better life than they would ever have had in Africa. So let blacks pay whites for services rendered.
- Whites lost 600,000 dead—the flower of their youth—in a bloody Civil War, one of whose major issues was the ending of slavery. So let blacks pay whites for services rendered.
- America has spent five trillion dollars on welfare, a good deal of which went for the uplifting and support of blacks. So let blacks pay whites for services rendered.
- America destroyed her public school system trying to integrate blacks so they could be uplifted. So let blacks pay whites for services rendered.
- Half of America's criminals are black, though only 12% of the population is black. So let blacks pay whites for their destructive behavior.
- Many of America's major cities have been destroyed by black population displacing white. So let blacks pay whites for their

destructive behavior.

- Black demands have brought about affirmative action and other anti-white laws. So let blacks pay for their destructive behavior.
- Blacks have been failures where every other immigrant group has been successful, including many—such as Irish, Chinese and Jews—who were discriminated against in major ways; yet blacks blame whites for their failures.

Which would lead me to say "So let blacks pay whites for their destructive behavior", except for the fact that black failure means that blacks don't have any money, and still wouldn't have any if they were paid reparations—they would just spend it as fast as they got it, with nothing more to show for it than a few hazy, alcohol- or coke-filled memories. Which is to say—not to put too fine a point on it—Reparations, my ass!

Purveyors of Anglophobia

Control of the media with governmental complicity is the primary method of teaching that racism is a White phenomenon and must be wiped out. To this end, the Internet is now the main target for a renewed effort at suppression and censorship. Finally, there is a way around the monopolistic control of the media and the lack of freedom of speech in most Western countries. In an effort to control controversial issues and to suppress objections to immigration, affirmative action, and any other point of contention the Left does not favor, there is an international effort to institute totalitarian controls on freedom of speech. The Wiesenthal Center sponsored a conference in Berlin in June of 2000 to discuss Internet content. They did not talk about pornography or the dissemination of totalitarian Marxist ideologies that threaten democracy. No, they focused on what they term as *hate speech*. And as we have seen, by its very definition as defined by the Left, hate speech is any speech where Whites may try to defend themselves against *charges of racism* rather than capitulating completely to a mandated dominant discourse controlled by Marxists. At this conference, the German government officials called for a set of international rules to govern online speech. These rules will be targeted at any conservative, Islamic, or nationalistic Internet content while any site that attacks Whites will be seen as "educational."

Why do neo-Marxists fear the Internet? Simply stated, the morality of nations is easily controlled by the media. Research shows that humans are easily indoctrinated because it was beneficial to the band to be cohesive with regards to attitudes and shared values (Eibel-Eibesfeldt 1998). Humans, with our genetic make-up molded during our evolutionary past, are easily manipulated. Now that we are controlled and manipulated by central authorities that determine when we should hate out-groups, when it is determined we should go to war, or to hate certain elements of our own society, that monopoly has been cherished as a rich source of control. The Internet threatens to shatter that monopoly and its subsequent thought control. Individuals who are capable of understanding that

the media is heavily controlled turn to the Internet for open access to all sides of issues and debate. And individuals can carry on this discourse across borders where more and more alternative news sources and perspectives are available without government controls. This lack of control threatens the elite. (For a detailed discussion of suppression of speech see the American Renaissance article on suppression of free speech http://www.neoeugenics.net/jared.htm.) But most importantly, the Internet is especially problematic for educators who are in the business of indoctrinating children into accepting multiculturalism, diversity, but more importantly the concept that there are no racial differences and any observed differences with regards to crime or intelligence is the fault of Whites via racism. This is exactly the same paradigm used in Communist countries that blamed all social problems on "capitalist attitudes" that must be purged from society leading to the slaughter of over 100 million people. Every in-group needs an out-group to hate. Whites are the new out-groups.

Ashley Montagu's obituary in the September 2000 issue of *American Anthropologist* summarizes the zeal that Marxists have expended in distorting the empirical evidence for racial differences. Montagu spent his life preaching the big lie—"races don't exist." Born Israel Ehrenberg in 1905 into a working-class Jewish immigrant family, he soon gravitated towards revolutionary movements and heard Lenin speak in 1922 at the age of 17. He later studied anthropology at Columbia University under Franz Boaz, another Marxist who brought radical environmentalism into the mainstream of academia as the pendulum was swinging away from eugenics.

> "As early as the late 1930s, Montagu was pressing his antiracist teachings in public venues, such as a 1939 radio address in which he asserted, 'It is an established fact of science that the physical difference existing between the races of mankind are not associated with any peculiar mental differences.... While the body is for the most part the product of purely physical conditions, the mind is almost entirely, if not entirely, the product of social or cultural conditions.' Boas mentored him in this enterprise and, after reading the draft of his

> presentation, advised him: 'For a radio talk I should be inclined to make the sentences shorter and as little involved as possible. Also avoid such terms as "linkage," and so on, which a lot of people do not understand' (Boas, letter to Ashley Montagu, October 26, 1939)."

The Marxist propaganda machinery was well-honed in Montagu, and it never wavered even as the evidence showing racial differences during the last several decades of his life was overwhelming. What is so ironic is that Montagu was forced out of his teaching position at Rutgers in 1953 during the McCarthy era. And yet, these Marxists today are willing to use the very same methods of character assassination against other scientists that they had leveled at them for being Communists, but now Marxism is back in and White Western culture is out. How the tables can turn when the media is under direct control of a few egalitarians. But even now, the *American Anthropologist* does not twinge even a bit when it writes:

> "Montagu's greatest contribution was his demystification of the race concept. The mistake of viewing races as typological, bounded categories, within both popular culture and academe, was a focus of his work as early as 1926 (Montagu 1926). By the late 1930s and early 1940s, as the dangers of Nazi racist doctrines became increasingly apparent, Montagu engaged in a highly public and often controversial debunking of the myth of biological races. In 1942 he wrote what is arguably his most influential book, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, which called into question the entire basis of race as a biological category. This was a prescient move in 1942, long before the genetic data **that now firmly support this thesis** were available. In 1950 he was asked to become [lead writer] of the first UNESCO Statement on Race (Montagu 1951a), a controversial document for its time in the degree to which it asserted the social constructionist perspective on race.... Up to the end of his life, he asserted that aggression and hatred are not

> innate human characteristics but, rather, products of the human social environment and thus capable of alteration through learning."

Or in short, like Stephen J. Gould, Montagu was not interested in science but in propaganda. To feel safe amongst the goyim, race must be neutralized and the evils of Western culture made into an institution. The way to do that was a life-long attack on Whites and the accusation that we are pathological and inherently racist.

This Marxist ideology has permeated not only social science and cultural anthropology, but even areas one would think to be more objective. A November 2000 article by Alan Goodman in *American Journal of Public Health* entitled "Why genes don't count (for racial differences in health)" he writes:

> "As the 19th century turned into the 20th century, anthropology was united in viewing race as a powerful explanation for biology, culture, and behavior. As the 20th century turns to the 21st, anthropologists have begun to reach a consensus on the limits and significance of race. As is illustrated in the recently ratified American Anthropological Association statement on race, the new consensus maintains that Human biological variation should not be reduced to race. It is too complex and does not fit this outdated idea. Race is real. Rather than being based on biology, it is a social and political process that provides insights into how we read deeper meaning into phenotypes. Racialization and racism come about because, in a racialized culture, we read meaning into skin color and other phenotypic variants. Rather than biology affecting behavior, ideology and behavior affect individuals *under the skin*."

This statement shows how far apart Marxist publications are from mainstream science. Study after study is showing that racial or

population groups do in fact vary with regards to genetic differences, and especially with regards to particular genetic diseases that predominate in one race and not in another. The message? All differences in health problems are the fault again, of Whites and their racism. No other cause is even considered even in the face of new genetic studies that open up the very nature of human genetic differences. (I am anxious to see the hysteria that will ensue in a few years when the genes for intelligence are finally located and this whole ruse of race being only skin deep will no longer be tenable. No doubt, other tactics will be used to try and put the blame for the World's problems on Whites under a whole new set of accusations and blame.)

A similar article in the same above journal by Camara Phyllis Jones (August 2000) discusses the three levels of racism. She claims first that:

> "Institutionalized racism manifests itself both in material conditions and in access to power. With regard to material conditions, examples include differential access to quality education, sound housing, gainful employment, appropriate medical facilities, and a clean environment. With regard to access to power, examples include differential access to information (including one's own history), resources (including wealth and organizational infrastructure), and voice (including voting rights, representation in government, and control of the media). It is important to note that the association between socioeconomic status and race in the United States has its origins in discrete historical events but persists because of contemporary structural factors that perpetuate those historical injustices. In other words, it is because of institutionalized racism that there is an association between socioeconomic status and race in this country."

A simpler explanation is appropriate. All of these so-called institutionalized accusations of racism can be attributed to average

intelligence of the group considered. As I stated above, the average IQ of groups as defined by the census (and some ignored like the Jewish race) show a clear correlation between the above indicators and intelligence by arbitrary racial groupings as advocated by group-based advocates. She continues:

> "Personally mediated racism is defined as prejudice and discrimination, where prejudice means differential assumptions about the abilities, motives, and intentions of others according to their race, and discrimination means differential actions toward others according to their race. This is what most people think of when they hear the word 'racism.' Personally mediated racism can be intentional as well as unintentional, and it includes acts of commission as well as acts of omission. It manifests as lack of respect (poor or no service, failure to communicate options), suspicion (shopkeepers' vigilance; everyday avoidance, including street crossing, purse clutching, and standing when there are empty seats on public transportation), devaluation (surprise at competence, stifling of aspirations), scapegoating, and dehumanization (police brutality, sterilization abuse, hate crimes)."

The problem with this excuse is that all parts of a diverse culture face the same conditions. Reverse discrimination, fear of being attacked by Blacks, poor service by Black civil servants, accusations of hate crimes asserted when Blacks are far more likely to commit a hate crime than Whites. None of the above hold up under the accusation of racism but are real and structural differences between different cultures and races. But overall, all races can conjure up adversity against them in a multicultural society. But the most important thing is that Blacks have equal or better access to jobs than do Whites with the same skills thanks to affirmative action, de facto quotas, and the threat of lawsuits. The few Whites who have the power to hire, fire and promote minorities have a personal interest in keeping out of trouble with the EEOC, Jesse Jackson,

and scores of other parasites looking for a handout. That is, Whites who have *real power* have no need to discriminate unfairly, but in fact find it convenient be biased towards minorities. These people who have the real power to oppress Blacks have no desire to do so because the consequences are real, and when they are oppressive against Whites—or reverse discrimination—it impacts Whites with no power. Finally she laments:

> "Internalized racism is defined as acceptance by members of the stigmatized races of negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth. It is characterized by their not believing in others who look like them, and not believing in themselves. It involves accepting limitations to one's own full humanity, including one's spectrum of dreams, one's right to self-determination, and one's range of allowable self-expression. It manifests as an embracing of 'whiteness' (use of hair straighteners and bleaching creams, stratification by skin tone within communities of color, and 'the white man's ice is colder' syndrome); self-devaluation (racial slurs as nicknames, rejection of ancestral culture, and fratricide); and resignation, helplessness, and hopelessness (dropping out of school, failing to vote, and engaging in risky health practices)."

When I look at this list it is obvious that it is merely a rationalization for failure. Blacks differentiate themselves more with exotic hairstyles than they emulate Whiteness. There is no evidence that Blacks suffer from lower self-esteem. Blacks vote in heavy numbers and they vote overwhelmingly for Democrats. There is no evidence for this assertion of "internalized racism" because the fact is it would not occur if Blacks were similar in behavioral traits to other groups. They are in fact less intelligent on average and prone to criminal behavior. And it has nothing to do with White culture. There is NO evidence that a cultural milieu can suppress the aspirations of a people. Human nature, as it is, is not subject to such universalist reactions. If it were true, then Blacks would

have accepted their status under Jim Crow and the civil rights movement would not have been successful, even under the guidance of their Jewish mentors. And yet, now that they have full equality and more, they somehow have become *self-defeating*. The feeling of failure is due not to Whites, but to the fact that they were told for decades that they were as intelligent as every other group and now that that has not obtained in reality, disappointment and anger have set in. It has been the lies perpetrated by the Marxists that have shattered the Black culture with despair.

Chapter Three: Scientific racism

There are several arguments against research into behavioral and intelligence testing of different population groups, including races. The most simplistic approach is to accuse the scientists of racist motives and claim that because the research may be harmful, they should not do it. This approach is well documented (Pearson 1997) and consists mainly of trying to suppress free speech and research in areas that Leftists disapprove of. It is tantamount to fascism or totalitarianism, where the state decides what is "truth" in lieu of scientific research—dogma replaces science. And it has in fact worked, where many egalitarians are willing to forego free speech in order to bring about a new attempt at instituting a new Marxism based on race rather than class struggle.

Now that communism is all but dead in the West, there is a renewed vigor on the part of academic Marxists to reinvent this totalitarian approach to universal conformity. And it has been working very well indeed with the complicity of the mainstream press, who were taught in journalism school by these well-entrenched Marxists. But the whole argument fails on one simple observation—no one can predict the ultimate consequences of knowing the truth about racial differences over adhering to irrational dogma. When it is stated that revealing average intelligence differences between racial groups will lead to a society that is worse off (whatever that means) it is assumed that they can predict the future. This is clearly false as many alternative scenarios could be speculated on that when we know that races differ in average intelligence, we may be able to put race behind us and judge people as individuals; not members of some arbitrary racial group.

Remember, it is the courts and the legislatures of many Western nations who have destroyed individual merit and have replaced it with racial quotas, prohibiting testing of potential job applicants, etc. These acts in themselves promote racism. A full understanding of human

behavioral types and intelligence will allow us to return to a more meritocratic society where returning to individual judgment of qualifications can reduce racial hostilities rather than group based disparities being used for decision-making.

The second objection used by many Marxists is well represented by Ashley Montagu's attempt to prove that different races could not be different in average intelligence (Montagu 1999 and reviewed at http://www.neoeugenics.net/ash.htm). I will deconstruct what he is attempting to prove, and then I will show how a modern approach using what we know about evolution would predict that we should expect different population groups to differ on average in a myriad of ways including morphology, genetic diseases, intelligence, behavioral traits, etc.

Montagu states:

> "Contrary to Jensen, there is every reason why the brain should be exempt from his generalization [that races differ]. This aspect of the manner of humanity's unique evolution was first dealt with in a joint paper by Professor Theodosius Dobzhansky and the writer as long ago as 1947. In that contribution, reprinted in the present volume, it will be seen, as Professor George Gaylord Simpson later independently put it, 'There are biological reasons why significant racial differences in intelligence, which have not been found, would not be expected. In a polytypic species, races adapt to differing local conditions but the species as a whole evolves adaptations advantageous to all its races, and spreading among them all under the influence of natural selection and by means of interbreeding. When human races were evolving it is certain that increase in mental ability was advantageous to all of them. It would, then, have tended over the generations to have spread among all of them in approximately equal degrees. For any one race to lag definitely behind another in over-all genetic adaptation, the two would have to be genetically isolated over a very large number of generations. They

would, in fact, have to become distinct species; but human races are all interlocking parts of just one species.'"

This nonsense is based on the assumption that the advantages of higher intelligence were "exactly" the same in degree in every part of the world, even though humans in different parts of the world lived under enormously different ecological conditions and stayed separated from each other without interbreeding as stated. Also, the statement that they would have to become separate *species* is absurd. Breeds (races) of domestic dogs are all of the same species and yet they very greatly—including in average intelligence by breed. In fact, there is not even a clear definition between races and species so the assertion is doubly absurd that human races would have to become separate species to be different in average intelligence. Ashley Montagu's absurd proposition is not a part of evolutionary theory—where a similar evolutionary "adaptation" will be selected for equally by the same species everywhere simultaneously. The concept is a contradiction of evolutionary principles that show that genetic change—not "directed" by some invisible hand of adaptation acting on every member of an "arbitrary" species or racial group in lock-step coordination such as a breeding program or eugenics—will in fact be highly random and variable even under very similar selection pressures.

Montagu continues later on:

"The food-gathering/hunting way of life was pursued by the human species the world over during the greater part of its evolutionary history. It is only during the last 15,000 years or so that some societies developed technologically more complex ways of controlling the environment, but even here the challenges required much the same responses, however complex.

"In an editorial in *Nature* it was stated that 'In circumstances in which it is plain that intelligence has been a crucial asset in

> survival, it is only reasonable to suppose that all of the races now extant are much of a muchness in intelligence.' Professor Jensen believes this to be a mistaken inference because it equates intelligence with Darwinian fitness or the ability to produce surviving progeny. But the editorial does nothing of the sort. A trait either has adaptive value—another name for Darwinian fitness—or it has not. Intelligence as a problem-solving ability is most certainly a trait possessing high adaptive value in all environments, and as such has been subject to the pressures of natural selection."

Not correct of course. Different environments would naturally make the complex selection process of many genes dependent on what was important to that group of people. Just for example, the need for planning and strategies during the harsh periods of glaciation would subject those population groups (Caucasians and Eastern Asians) to far more pressure to behave with foresight than say sub-Saharan Africans where speed on foot to chase game during all parts of the year, while selecting for a smaller brain because it is an expensive organ to feed with energy, would cause one group to select for a higher intelligence over fleetness of foot. And that is the current consensus with regards to extreme pressures pushing higher intelligence in those groups that were faced with extremely harsh glacial conditions.

Again later he states:

> "Professor Jensen thinks it not unlikely that 'different environments and cultures could make differential genetically selective demands on various aspects of behavioral adaptability. . . Europeans and Africans have been evolving in widely separated areas and cultures for at least a thousand generations, under different conditions of selection which could have affected their gene pools for behavioral traits just as for physical characteristics.' What Professor Jensen confuses here is the

> environmental pressures of widely separated geographic areas upon the *physical* evolution of the human species, and the virtually identical cultural pressures upon the *mental* development of people living a food gathering-hunting existence. These are two totally different kettles of fish, and it does nothing but add confusion to the subject to treat the pressures of the physical environment as if they acted in the same way upon humankind's mental evolution. The challenges, in fact, to humankind's problem-solving abilities were of a very different order from those which eventually resulted in kinky or straight hair, a heavily or a lightly pigmented skin, a broad or a narrow nose, small or large ears, and so on."

What is so ironic is that Montagu reverses the very Marxist principle of radical environmentalism, where the Marxist Franz Boaz (mentor of virtually every cultural anthropologist in the United States including Margaret Mead) sent his minions out into the still existing primitive tribes to prove that *cultures were so different* that humans had escaped genetic determinism! So how can these allies take completely opposite stances? Well, to a Marxist the science changes to meet the needs of communist dogma, not the other way around. Boaz, by trying and failing to show that all cultures were radically different, wanted to show that humans were highly malleable and the way to improve humanity was through a Marxist interpretation of class conflicts. But when Montagu needs to show that all races have the same intelligence because of evolving in similar cultures, oops, all cultures are now the same. The point is the Marxist position is so flawed that they must reverse their arguments on demand to keep the debate going and to give simplistic answers to complex problems that can be used by the media to promote the egalitarian agenda. The arguments all fail within science, but they make for excellent propaganda for the masses that are not familiar enough with either the motives or the science to understand the lies they are swallowing. If these positions are repeated enough times they become accepted—and Marxist propaganda has won again over rational

empiricism.

With the above (and highly antiquated) arguments against Jensenism stated, I will now take a look at new concepts in evolutionary theory and show how different races, subspecies, or population groups *should* be expected to vary with regards to their average intelligence, behaviors, etc. And let me first state clearly what I mean by this. Instead of races lets take a look at say a modern day cult—the Moonies. This church, headed by the reverend Moon, has been highly successful in recruiting converts from the general public. A simple question can be asked, Are these Moonies, as a distinct population group, different on average with regards to behavioral traits and/or intelligence? Well, they are part of the American culture but one would expect that yes they would be different. The question then is by how much?

Contrary to the Marxist position, every population group, however we define the group, probably varies in the frequency of a number of genetic alleles found in the group. For our example let's just look at two: tough-mindedness versus agreeableness (the organizational domain) and intelligence. There are a number of genetic allele variants that impact these two identifiable factors, and I would be very surprised if they did not vary from the host population—especially conformity to cult dogma. The Moonies' group by its very nature pulls certain types of people in and we would expect that it would therefore have its own 'group personality' types. This type of population group segregation through selective migration and then marriage amongst the members could be called the *founder effect* and if the Moonies maintained their specific culture and recruitment techniques they would in fact be founding a new race of people. That is, the group would be expected to vary genetically, on average, from the U.S. population average.

The only question then is, by how *much* do the Moonies vary? And administering behavioral and intelligence tests to them can easily determine this. I am not claiming the differences would necessarily be

significant, but they almost surely would differ from the general public's. This simple scenario shows how absurd it is to assume that every human population group would be expected to be the same genetically on average—as proposed by egalitarians. The expectation is that when there is *any* differences at all between a population group's formation and eventual propagation that differences in genetic variants will emerge, even if only by chance which I will discuss later. To see how this can work, do your own thought experiments on the Mormons, soccer clubs in Europe, races of people, breeds of dogs, impacts on population demographics due to war (the killing fields of Cambodia), ad infinitum. Gene frequencies are constantly changing, and the causes are as varied as one's imagination.

Expanded understandings of evolutionary principles.

When Montagu first wrote his rebuttal of Jensenism over thirty years ago, we were just starting the pendulum swing from radical environmentalism as promoted by Marxists and liberals alike, towards a more balanced understanding of human nature, starting with sociobiology and followed by behavior genetics, population genetics, intelligence testing and twin studies. It is now an undisputed fact that different races vary greatly in average intelligence from newer unbiased tests, and also that intelligence is about 80% heritable by the time one becomes an adult, according to numerous academic studies and a special task force report by the American Psychological Association entitled *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, 1995. The only thing left to make *Jensenism* the only viable working model to explain the differences in intelligence between races is to show that races do in fact vary in numerous genetic areas that are not just physical, and to show that there are no substantial environmental causes for differences in their expression of intelligence. And remember, if environmental causation is put forth as a reason for differences in the average intelligence between races, it must include environmental reasons for the high average of Ashkenazi Jews as well as the low IQ of sub-Saharan Africans (these two groups represent the known extremes in intelligence: 117 versus 70, unless the Australian Aborigines turn out to have an even lower IQ).

A more modern look at evolutionary processes does not rely simply on adaptation and selection but includes other factors such as chance. In its simpler form, evolution was once seen to be driven towards adaptation out of necessity. That is, the environment as it changed forced the genetic changes necessary to adapt to these changes via selection. Now we know that because of the complexity of genes and the complex ways that they interact, evolution had to act on many competing genes at the same time. The selection of one gene variant over another could not be carried out in isolation, but had to take place along with simultaneous selection on

perhaps a thousand gene variants all at the same time. So it is absurd to state that just one human factor, intelligence, had to evolve exactly at the same rate for every population group around the world. Such a statement contradicts the very understanding of evolution itself, and has no theoretical basis outside of popularized Marxist writings. (And remember, these are the same Marxists that claim that intelligence is both not important and that it doesn't really exist, now stating that it must have evolved at exactly the same rate because it was of such singular importance to our species' survival.)

With the accelerating use of computer models to simulate evolution, we are now seeing how chaos and coincidence have as much impact on the probability of survival as does selection and adaptation. What these expanded understandings of evolution include are a renewed respect for other factors that must be considered—adaptation is not apparently as important as it once was thought to be. Now this might seem like a victory for the Marxists (Gould, et al.), who attacked adaptationism. But it in fact now gives renewed vigor to understanding how human population groups can become very different from each other genetically (Kaufman 1993,1995; McKee 2000).

In *The Riddled Chain: Chance, Coincidence, and Chaos in Human Evolution* by Jeffrey K. McKee, 2000, he brings together the concepts and examples of how evolution is more a random process with selection filtering away the unviable life forms. But in addition, just slight changes in conditions and chance can have profound differences in the genetic makeup of population groups, depending on their size. This leads to the conclusion that we should always expect genetic differences, not the absolutism of genetic equivalence that is put forth by Marxists in their attempt to make all humans identical copies of each other except for *superficial* outward appearances. Genetic change in population groups is chaotic and yet at the same time can get stuck in stasis for periods of time, before exploding again with change.

Chaos theory states that in order for events to have the same outcome, initial conditions must be *exactly* the same; something that never occurs in nature. As we look at human evolution and the great diaspora out of Africa about 100,000 years ago (or two million years ago under the multiregional model) we would not expect sameness in population groups as they spread around the world. Each small change, each migration, each climatic change, and annihilation of any particular individual or group of people would alter the eventual outcome of their particular life histories. These small bands of people would invariably have to have different genetic frequencies of genes; there is no way to preserve identical genomes based on statistical abstractions. And this is so important I will expand on it with an analogy.

Let us assume that every person in the small tribe of people that were our common ancestors in Africa before the great migrations all had a bag of marbles of different colors, sizes and made of different materials from rocks, metals, fur balls, etc. This was the sole currency for this tribe of people, and being a perfectly egalitarian society, every year they mixed up all the marbles and redistributed them equally amongst the tribe. The average number of each type of marble never changed. Then, the tribe started to expand and members took their bags of marbles with them.

As they moved into every corner of the earth, these humans retained their culture (in order to maintain the analogies context) that used marbles as currency. But there were a lot of changes. Some lucky members of some tribes accumulated the most valuable marbles. But as luck had it, every once in a while a wayward lad would fall off a precipice or get stomped to death by a woolly mammoth. In addition, each group would come across new materials and start adding new marbles to their collection made from materials and colors that were only available in certain areas. After 100,000 years, even after some of these groups came back together and even mixed up their marbles at times forming new racial groups, their bags of marbles retained a uniqueness that was different from every other groups' bag of marbles.

Of course in this analogy, the marbles are gene frequencies, and the Marxists would want us to believe that there could not be any differences in the frequencies of the average number of each type of marble in any particular population group. The average in every group would be absolutely the same. If you can swallow this explanation of universalism versus particularism, you must believe that there is some remarkable controlling force making evolution itself directional and absolutely predictable based on a theoretical construct that every group or tribe evolved in absolute synchronization everywhere on earth.

This is the only way I can interpret the Marxist rationalization for assuming that there are no differences in the average intelligence of different races qua population groups. One would have to assume that differences do occur in outward appearances (such as different levels of melanin based on long term exposure to the sun) but not in average intelligence because of this *guiding hand*. It makes no rational sense when considering how coincidental, chaotic and chance-ridden evolution is along with adaptation, selection, mutations, the *founder effect*, genetic drift, etc. The number of ways that different races can vary is enormous due to these evolutionary principles. About all that we have retained as humans is the ability to interbreed, keeping us technically the same species—sort of.

Darwin's famous finches on the Galapagos Islands have been studied and discussed at length because of the obvious evolutionary forces acting on them. A few finches made their way to the Galapagos Islands and eventually started to split into different species. Note how these finches were not separated geographically but occupied the same area and intermingled freely. The original simplistic explanation was that speciation occurred by selection for different types of finches to exploit particular niches. But there are now alternative explanations.

Under chaos theory and coincidence, it could equally be the case that

genetic change happened first and the new genetic variant of finch used the change to exploit a new ecological niche. That is, the change came first and the variant was used to exploit a new environment. This new view of how evolution can occur from randomness is applicable to human races as well. Note that these different species of finches occasionally interbreed and produce hybrid offspring. Then are these finches' different species or different races or subspecies of finches? Obviously, the confusion of what is a species and what is a race is problematic.

Let's look at a human equivalent. Gypsies migrated from northern India around the 14th century, and now live amongst Westerners in Europe, North America and Australia. They have preserved their culture and their genetic uniqueness and they are noted for their nomadic way of life along with begging, stealing and other rather useless parasitical means of survival. They are also highly illiterate and have a low average IQ (The smart ones probably kept leaving the clan in search of a better life). So over the last few hundred years they have become, through their own unique form of dysgenic breeding program, a race or species of human that could not live on their own very easily. But isn't intelligence also beneficial to their culture? It is, but illiteracy and dependency is what keeps the clan isolated and cohesive. This is a classical example of *niche* building.

A similar case could be made for people on welfare. They have more children than the general population and have a low average IQ. As they become isolated and interbreed, and as long as they are supported by the state, they will like the Gypsies become a permanent subspecies that relies on both isolation from and support by the dominant culture for their very survival. And again, low intelligence actually enhances reproductive success. So again, intelligence may be a benefit under normal circumstances within a more libertarian culture, but under a socialistic one it can be a detriment. Many highly intelligent couples devote themselves to their careers and forgo having children or only have one child—below replacement levels.

It is obvious to see that if we can observe these differences, where low intelligence actually leads to reproductive success over higher intelligence, that there is no case for assuming that any two groups will be identical in terms of intelligence. The Marxist position that a common human culture would drive every human race to exactly the same level of intelligence at any particular period of evolutionary time has no credibility. In fact it even lacks face validity or common sense. And yet, this very concept is taken for granted by even liberal non-Marxists because it allows them to avoid the label of *scientific racist*. That is, the academic Marxists have been able to so threaten scientists with censorship that many of them have embraced this or similar absurd positions of racial equality in every respect except physical appearance. But this is not new. Science has had to fight through similar obstacles. It wasn't all that long ago that evolutionists were attacked for denying the existence of God. Now we have to deny the existence of races because of Marxists. The *flat-earthers* will always be with us.

Lake Malawi in Africa is three or four million years old, and extremely deep and stable. There, one can find the greatest diversity of cichlid fishes (McKee 2000). How did this fish go through speciation when they were all found in the same lake? Again, this example contradicts the simple Marxist assumptions of what is required for speciation, "The diversity is usually explained in the standard way, with small populations becoming isolated in the lake and, in a pulse of speciation, diverging into the hundreds of recognized fish species. But it is not unlikely that the variants and species were autocatalyzed, nearly every one of them, during the long prehistory of stable lake environments. Nature may abound with examples of autocatalysis."

Autocatalysis? Again as explained by McKee:

> "Because medicine has changed the rules of natural selection (as have the use of shelter, clothing, and many other ingenious

> products of our busy cerebral activities), new genetic variants, such as those coding for poorer eyesight, can accumulate. And because most new variants tend not to be helpful, we increase the "load" of seemingly maladaptive genes within the population—which is not necessarily bad, because what is adaptive or maladaptive depends on the environment. One person's supposed genetic defect may be another's benefit somewhere else or at some other time. But however we view the results, there is no escaping the fact that we have created our own environment, defined our own ecological niche, shaped our own selective forces. Our evolutionary successes have catalyzed our culture, which in turn creates new environmental contingencies (of our own making) for further evolution. And that is autocatalysis writ large."

So chaos along with chance has driven human evolution in many different directions over many thousands of years. There is no way that population groups will stay genetically equivalent on average. That is autocatalysis. And I will add another example, though we could look at numerous other examples throughout history from the Catholic priesthood to harems in China—from no descendents to thousands of descendents from a small, select group of people in a culture respectively. Chaos is when these events start the evolutionary arrow on a different trajectory.

The current one that I find so fascinating is universal education. It has only been in the last fifty years or so that in at least modern countries, intelligent children are selected from the full spectrum of society—from the poorest to the richest. This most assuredly will be another autocatalytic event of profound magnitude, along with birth control. In the past, many people married those who were far different from themselves in intelligence. First, many people got married because of an unplanned pregnancy. Second, people were less mobile and had a far smaller pool of people to select a mate from. And third, people did not

always know how intelligent a potential mate was nor did they even think about it that much. Illiteracy was acceptable, and a very intelligent but shy and illiterate person looked in many ways like an educated but low or moderate intelligent person. That is, people did not really know much about the people they married. Now, even if someone does marry a significant other that is not well matched to their liking, chances are they will get divorced rather than stick it out as my parents' generation often did.

Now, as children grow up, and the more intelligent go to college while the dummies stay home and go to work in the local factory, there will be increased segregation or assortative mating taking place. This will be another autocatalytic event, where the intelligent will slowly separate from the dumb—the bell curve will begin to flatten and could eventually become bimodal. And humans could begin a new process of speciation. And as the poor multiply, and the elite become even more prosperous, there may come a time when the elite will no longer allow themselves to be held hostage by the unemployable masses and groups will begin to separate physically as well. The elite will tire of beggars and theft—they will form their own protective enclaves and systems of taxation or avoidance of taxes by bartering services and goods within closed communities.

This is not a prediction of what must happen even if it seems highly probable. One thing is sure; no one knows what the future will bring from the current chaos. Chaos theory says anything is possible and predictions will fall far short of the reality. Like all of the environmental catastrophes that are predicted, the result could equally be a much improved environment say from global warming or when we run out of fossil fuels. We may be caught in another autocatalytic change that will thrust us forward or kill us all. But predictions are all "*just so*" stories.

Another reason that the Marxist's position fails under scrutiny is because genetic drift, or the "*founders effect*," falls outside of selection

alone and introduces genetic change in small populations. Again, as humans spread around the world, small groups with unique genetic variants found communities where genetic drift would accelerate genetic change. Any particular gene allele or variant may spread or become extinguished based solely on chance rather than adaptation. So in small communities over and over again, we would expect to see genetic patterns that are unique to that population alone. Selection pressure for say intelligence or for good hearing may be lost. The population may be subject to deafness due to a genetic defect or be different in a myriad of other genetic ways. They have what is known as the *founders effect*: A ship wrecked on an isolated island would show this effect if the new inhabitants interbred from a small founding population. Even a small religious cult that lives in isolated communes like the Hare Krishnas can exhibit this rapid evolutionary change from genetic drift as well as selective migration in the group's formation.

It is easy to see, that if genetic drift is entirely random and is independent of adaptation, then the average intelligence of these small population groups would vary from the norm based entirely on chance. Again, the Marxist assumption that all humans evolved their intelligence at the same rate does not hold. And even if these small groups ended up hybridizing with another group, the genetic variants of the new group would also be different. Hybrids would not be the same everywhere in the world. It is an impossible probability. Evolution causes change, and though it is based on selection, organisms evolve differently in every niche in which they are found. Evolution does not follow some preconceived plan (except of course in the case of breeders or eugenics).

On top of this genetic drift, we also had slow migrations of people around the globe up until the last few hundred years. As neighboring groups came into contact with each other, they again set up chaotic, nonlinear systems that could cause further autocatalytic change. A good example of this is with the introduction of slavery, the average intelligence of Blacks in the United States went through a rapid change

where the average IQ went from 70 to 85 due to hybridization between Whites and Blacks. But the average IQ of the Whites did not change under the one-drop rule. Whites may have a similar hybridization phenomenon occurring now. As Jews begin to increasingly intermarry with elite Whites, the Jews will be providing the White population with their unique genetic intelligence (they have a performance IQ somewhat above average with a verbal IQ of an astounding 127 average). This could set off again an autocatalytic evolutionary event where a new hybridized White/Jewish race is formed—perhaps forming a new dominant elite that will slowly drift ever higher in intelligence due to assortative mating.

But the main point is we would never expect races to be genetically similar. The fundamental assumptions based on evolutionary principles are that they will vary and they will continue to change ever faster because the environment is changing ever faster. Autocatalysis is in full play with regards to the human species and including all the species we are impacting by our rapid increase in both numbers and resource consumption. The genetic arms race has begun; we are in an evolutionary explosion.

So it *was* and *will be* impossible for natural selection not to create more races. Again McKee explains:

> "And so there is no intentional design in life forms, despite the coincidental appearance of design. Necessity, no matter how urgent, cannot be the mother of evolutionary invention. Necessity may be the mother of natural selection, in that survival of the fittest *promotes* the traits an animal needs. But natural selection is not a creative force—it cannot invent those traits. It is merely a pruning mechanism, working as well as nature allows with what it is given. The actual force of *creation* in life, in evolution, is much less efficient than purposeful invention and much less directed than natural selection. That creative force—the mother of invention in life—is chance, not necessity."

Ergo, human races are expected to be genetically different in as many ways as the human genome varies (say about 1,000 genes that vary). And in a rapidly changing environment as we have now, speciation amongst humans will accelerate, not diminish. The only way that the different races would blend and become one homogeneous race would be through forced random procreation under an absolute totalitarianism without exception to the rule. No child would be born that was not absolutely randomized with regards to its parents. A chilling vision; but nonetheless one that is advocated by Marxists under their multicultural model where everyone is exactly the same, so random procreation would be expected.

Finally, there is one more reason why humans thousands of years ago could not have evolved at the same rate with regards to intelligence. Computer models—studying the number of genes, mutations, and individuals—can give us insight as to how complexity works. Since genes are linked and cannot be selected for individually, the only way to get selection on just intelligence would be to hold all of the other possible adaptations constant. That is, nature could not select humans for intelligence alone, but was selecting for a multitude of adaptations.

For example, high intelligence is linked to myopia (no—it is not caused by smart kids reading a lot). In the harsh environment without corrective eyeglasses say 20,000 years ago, not having myopia may have been far more beneficial than having high intelligence, depending on where one lived and the need to hunt or escape from predators. Genes cannot be selected for as discreet units, so increasing intelligence always came at a cost somewhere. As different population groups experienced different environments, it would be expected that gene frequencies would be selected differently. Again, the most parsimonious assumption from what we know about evolution would be that races or population groups should be expected to vary with regards to gene frequencies—including average intelligence and averages with regards to behavioral traits like introversion, conscientiousness and yes ethnocentrism.

And finally, again from McKee:

> "What is surprising, however, is that occasionally, especially with time or with large populations, two or three lucky events do come together and set evolution on an entirely new course. It is clear that when events do come together—mutations for two complementary genes, say, coding for two complementary morphologies—they can break the deadlock, take off in the population, and spread like wildfire. Change is swift and sure. It is classic chaos. And it is classic punctuated equilibrium."

And if that is not enough of a *wildfire*, consider what humans can do when these combinations are discovered. With eugenics, people with these unique mutations can be located and tracked, and the "two or three" lucky chance mutations could be brought together artificially through genetic engineering. The human species will soon be in an arms race for creating new human species—that is our creative nature: to produce children or offspring that will be the ultimate winners.

This chapter shows that the charge of *scientific racism* cannot be sustained when evolutionary theory by its vary fundamentals would predict that races of people would be expected to vary genetically with regards to intelligence and behavior. When this is understood, then it is required that we try to determine what these differences are. Science is about learning about that which we don't understand. We know that the races vary in average intelligence and that there have not been any environmental explanations to account for the differences (Ashkenazi Jews 117, sub-Saharan Africans 70). We do know that the environment can lower a person's intelligence; even soccer players are subject to head knocks that can reduce their IQs. But to date, no one has been able to explain the large gaps between races with environmental explanations.

But what if some lone researcher did discover some environmental

explanation thirty years from now? And what if the politically correct position in the world had changed and Marxism was out and genetics was in. That is, academia and hence the press had become true genetic determinists of the old Mendelian type once again with our cracking of the genetic code. And this new theory of an environmental cause for the difference in intelligence between the races was attacked as a dreaded neo-communist environmental determinist affront to humanity. It would be perceived as a heinous, vile attempt at Marxism—the religion that was responsible for the killing of over 100 million people during the last century. Professors would be attacked and vilified as dreaded Marxists—their research merely being a ruse to reestablish their brand of totalitarianism. "They are not scientists, they are *scientific Marxists*! And they must be suppressed if the world is to be at peace!" They would be shouted down and censored wherever they tried to present their data. Laws would be passed preventing any Marxist remarks or scientific investigations into environmentalism. And the Marxists would eventually be driven out of the universities and eventually out of society—pariahs that had caused so much death and destruction.

Sound insane? Well, that is the game the Marxists are playing against empiricists today who only have one objective in mind—to find the truth. And they throw around fear of a return to *fascism* or *Nazism* as justification for their oppression while ignoring the more recent horrors of Communism with its environmental determinism and 100 million people slaughtered (Rummel 1997). But for attempting to find out what is fact and what is fanciful—they are attacked. How many times must we learn from history that science has no bounds and that knowing is not connected with doing? We choose how we will use scientific results. Science is not policy but investigation. The charge of *scientific racism* is just the inquisition all over again. As long as humans remain largely irrational in many areas of their thought processes, the fanatics and hysterical doomsayers will be able to move public opinion back towards the dark ages in momentary fits of paranoia.

Chapter Four: Racism is really ethnocentrism

When we look at studies in ethnocentrism, it looks like it is the basis for what we know as racism. That is, real attitudes between races or ethnic groups can only be understood within the context of studies in ethnocentrism. These studies are at least more objective and less overtly biased as the "cheap shot" surveys done by some organizations with the explicit purpose of showing that "Whites" are all racists, whether they know it or not.

The research that results from studying ethnocentrism stops short of evolutionary considerations. But still it is a start in understanding human behavior in this regard. For a quick overview of this research, I will use "Multiculturalism and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview" published in the *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* in 1995 by J. W. Berry and Rudolf Kalin of Queen's University. In looking at the results of this study, we can see that ethnocentrism is a natural phenomenon that can be expected to arise anywhere different ethnic, racial or linguistic groups come in contact (that is contact allows its expression, not its development which is innate). Before I start, this study explicitly ignores individual ethnocentrism, which is usually studied as "authoritarianism," and will be covered in a later chapter.

The survey was the result of a representative sample of 2500 respondents. Fourteen ethnic groups were included in all, with nine of the larger groups evaluating their attitudes towards each other.

The first thing of interest was the high degree of consensus among the various groups with regards to relative comfort levels. Virtually all of the groups rated the British as the most comfortable to be around, and the Sikhs the least comfortable to be around (an Asian Indian religious group

or race that practices Sikhism—identified by their unique turbines and beards on the men). That is, a natural hierarchy existed indicating that attitudes towards groups were more universal than expected, and could not result in any form of cultural bias as a whole. Of course, groups usually rated themselves more highly than any other group as would be expected. And finally, there was often mutual agreement between any two groups with regards to how they rated each other—they reciprocated mutual attitudes. Also, the report points out that this survey conducted in 1991 showed a great deal of stability with a similar national survey in 1974 which suggests that these attitudes do not change easily as the political climate changes.

The authors do admit that, "The study of ethnic attitudes in plural societies has, in the past, been primarily concerned with the attitudes of the larger, or whole society towards minorities. The social psychology of prejudice has developed largely in the United States, where it has involved the attitudes of the white majority of European origin towards blacks, Jews and other minorities." Is it any wonder then that studying ethnocentrism, using only the attitude of the majority towards various minorities, would allow for extreme bias in constructing the questions and analyzing the data? Social scientists for the most part fall into the egalitarian/Marxist ideological dogma where they make assumptions first and then try to prove them by using biased surveys or leaving out important possible correlational data (such as intelligence, etc.) that seriously confounds their results. They have been taken to task for this bias many times, but since their commitment to finding White Americans as racists overshadows their empirical objectivity, and they publish their work in like-minded journals, the academic review process breaks down and becomes worthless.

This study, looking at ethnocentrism and bias from all directions at least has *some* legitimacy. I may note that this study looks at prejudice or ethnocentrism as an intergroup process. Later on I will be discussing ethnocentrism as it relates to variance in individuals within ethnic or

racial groups. This study explains that, "The term ethnocentrism has been used ... to refer to the tendency to view one's in-group more positively than others, and to view other groups as inferior. This ethnocentric tendency for in-group favoritism has been identified in many societies, leading ... to [the] claim that it is a universal feature of intergroup relations .... In-group favoritism is a key aspect of ethnocentrism." They also indicate that ethnocentrism, or at least the genetic mechanism, can be found outside of race or ethnicity. The same group bias can be found in sports, university alumni, departments in corporations, or anywhere humans can draw distinctions between "themselves" and the "other." But of course this tendency towards groupish behavior differs between individuals, and we can expect it to also differ between racial groups as much as any other behavioral trait does.

One noticeable omission by the authors of this study was any attempt to determine if any one ethnic group was more ethnocentric than another. It would have been interesting to evaluate the data towards this end, but they fail to try to determine this variance. If ethnocentrism resides in behavioral differences of individuals within racial groups, then the differences in ethnocentrism between racial groups would be a combination of genetic differences in these tendencies, along with cultural attitudes that would push people into more or less ethnocentric attitudes. That is, as racial groups compete their inherent tendencies towards ethnocentrism (or lack of it) would fluctuate with the level of group conflict or multiculturalism.

Ethnocentrism

This study looks at three major patterns: ethnocentrism, consensual hierarchy, and reciprocity. Ethnocentrism again is merely an indication of in-group preference, "I am more comfortable and feel better about my own kind of people." As they expected, every group rated their own group higher than every other group with a couple of exceptions: Germans rated themselves slightly lower than British, and South Asians who rated Indo-Pakistanis less favorably than four other groups. (I will ignore any more references with regards to the several anomalies encountered in the South Asians' attitudes as the authors state they seem to be highly confounded because they lumped several distinct groups under a single category—and subsequently realized it was essentially bad data but they reported on it anyway as it had already been collected.)

In discussing their conclusions on ethnocentrism they state:

> "The evidence for the existence of ethnocentrism, in the form of in-group favoritism, in interethnic attitudes was substantial. Each group rated itself (statistically significantly) higher than the average of other groups.... Each group also received the highest rating from itself and seven of the nine groups rated their in-group the highest. ...the strong evidence regarding in-group favoritism in the present study supports the claim ... that ethnocentrism is a universal feature of interethnic relations. The present findings are also consistent with the findings from six cities in the former Soviet Union, and from the Netherlands.
>
> "In-group preference existed in all groups... but there was substantial variation in the magnitude of this preference. It was highest for French ratings of French, followed closely by Jewish ratings of Jews, and Ukrainian ratings of Ukrainians. That is, while ethnocentrism is universal, the degree of ethnocentrism is

> variable. The reason for this variability cannot be specified on the basis of data in this survey. One of the possible explanations may be defensiveness. An in-group preference may serve as an emotional barrier against the perceived threat from contact with other ethnic groups."

Accordingly then, ethnocentrism does vary by race, but they did not really accept that reality by their description. To dismiss these differences by the simple explanation of an emotional barrier against threats runs to the core of the existence of ethnocentrism. That is, in terms of evolutionary adaptation, it serves the purpose of alerting the tribe concerning real or perceived threats, as well as helping to mobilize the tribe for warfare. These authors again, like so many in the social sciences, totally miss the evolutionary connections with human behavior.

But let's take a look again at the three highly ethnocentric groups above. First, the French have had a mind-set of separation from the British for as long as these two cultures have coexisted in Canada with the British dominating the nation by numbers. Where two languages collide for dominance in any country, ethnocentrism naturally seems to express itself. As to the Ukrainians, they have a history of ethnocentrism, which got them in trouble with Stalin that led to the massive starvation by the Communists of millions of Ukrainians (Conquest 1986). I see no reason why they would perceive any threat in Canada however, as they would fit in easily with the dominant culture. Jews likewise have a history of ethnocentrism, and it expresses itself also whether they are threatened or not. So it seems more probable that the higher ethnocentrism of these three groups is more genetic than cultural (with the possible exception of the French).

The authors state that:

> "Intolerant (ethnocentric) individuals, on the other hand, had a relatively positive preference for those groups at the top of the

> evaluative hierarchy, and a great negative preference for groups at the bottom. In short, ethnocentric individuals endorse the evaluative hierarchy, while non-ethnocentric individuals have relatively similar attitudes towards various ethnic groups. This difference between individuals high and low in ethnocentrism corresponds to the finding... that high and low right-wing authoritarians differ in the pattern of their attitudes and values. The joint results from the intergroup and individual difference perspectives are mutually reinforcing and suggest that ethnocentrism is an apt term to describe these intergroup attitudes."

This seems to reinforce two assertions that I will be making as I look for racism. First, that racism should be labeled or called ethnocentrism. That is, when one group A is more intolerant of racial group Z than racial group B is intolerant of racial group Z it may be for several reasons. The groups may differ genetically in their average levels of ethnocentrism or xenophobia. And also, ethnocentrism when it is part of intolerance may just be a matter of the behavioral attitude of tough-mindedness or some other personality trait, and not necessarily a bad thing. If I am intolerant of rapists is that intolerance? We wouldn't consider it so. But what if I was intolerant of Blacks because in my opinion they are lazier than others and less intelligent? How is that different than being intolerant towards rapists as a group? Intolerance or tough-mindedness then may be similar human attributes and may be neither good nor bad. Like many personality types, intolerance is value neutral depending on the circumstances.

No one yet has been able to show a correlation between any major personality type and ethnocentrism and I do not assert to make such a claim here. What I assert is that racism, as we know it, should be called *ethnocentrism*, and that we as yet do not know what ethnocentrism really is. So we do not know what *racism* is or if it can even be measured as a viable personality factor. Racists or ethnocentrists may just have

discerning tastes in human nature, like those who appreciate fine wines over stale beer or good art rather than graffiti. Again, it is value neutral.

Finally on ethnocentrism the study states:

> "In the literature on ethnic relations, ethnocentrism has substantial pejorative connotations. It is often treated as synonymous with generalized prejudice, or bigotry. The question may be raised as to whether this pejorative meaning of the term is consistent with the measure used in the present investigation. Is it reasonable to say that a given group is ethnocentric because it feels more comfortable with own- than other-group members? It is reasonable if we acknowledge that the term ethnocentrism can vary in meaning from relatively benign own-group preference (without out-group hostility) to out-group hatred and hostile actions."

On the other hand, the genetic basis of ethnocentrism could be constant over time but show itself differently under varying cultural conditions. That is, in a homogeneous society such as Iceland or Denmark, ethnocentrism has no way of displaying itself in a hostile way towards an out-group because there are no out-groups. However, open up their borders to numerous foreigners that they find insufferable to be around and they could become hostile (This may be happening as I write). So who is to blame for the hostility? It is a natural reaction or consequence of human ethnocentrism and cultural clashes over resources and social behavior.

Consensual Hierarchy

The second part of this study looked at *consensual hierarchy*. Probably the easiest way to explain this study is with an analogy. Take football for example at the beginning of the season. This study would determine how much consensus there was between fans of different football teams on how good the different teams are. That is, even though I might be a Chicago Bears' fan, how would my stacking of which teams are better than others correlate with all the other teams' fans? As it turns out for ethnic groups in Canada, all of the different groups rated the British at the top and the Sikhs at the bottom. That is, except for one's own group, different groups rated other groups in a natural order of hierarchy or preference.

The authors state that, "Another measure of similarity in the evaluative hierarchy can be obtained from the correlation between the profile of each rating group and the profile as given by the total sample (with the contribution from the rating group removed). These correlations ranged from .43 to .99. The group that deviated again most on this measure was the South Asian. After eliminating the South Asian group, the lowest remaining correlation was .72 between Jews and the total sample." That is again, Jews were far less likely to accept the natural hierarchy as accepted by the other groups. One has to question why this is, since Jews are the most successful racial group in terms of intelligence and wealth and are far ahead of any other group. So it may be expected that they would rate themselves higher, but why would they deviate from others in the stacking of racial groups outside of their own? It would be interesting to see if they have an innate intolerance towards WASPs as has been observed by MacDonald and others (MacDonald, 1995, 1998A, 1998B; Pearson 1997).

The authors conclude that:

> "Evidence for an evaluative hierarchy was very clear in the present findings, with those of British origin being rated most positively by all groups with only one exception (French ratings of Italians were higher). It appears that Canadians of British origin may be a positive reference group for most other Canadians; this corresponds to the finding from the 1974 national survey. The Italian and French groups were also rated very positively (in second and third position overall), and may also serve as positive reference groups. Regarding the lower end of the hierarchy, there is substantial agreement: Sikhs received the lowest ratings from virtually all groups, and Moslems the second lowest. Despite evidence of decreased educational and occupational differences among ethnic groups, the ethnic mosaic appears to remain notably vertical, at least with respect to attitudes."

This is a very interesting conclusion, considering its stability and the closing gap between groups in terms of income and education. If *racism* were rampant, wouldn't groups resent those who supposedly oppressed them? It appears not. Also, I don't know what the authors mean by a "positive reference group?" How does a race or ethnic group achieve such a position? Well, I assume if they spelled it out they would be *accused of racism*. So they let it go at that. But also, how do the Sikhs become the universally accepted bottom feeders? How does *ethnocentrism* go from in-group preference to all of the other groups rating the Sikhs as the least preferable? It seems that this cannot be *racism* but in fact a judgment of an unfavorable behavioral type that is unique to the Sikhs. I asked an Asian Indian friend of mine about the Sikhs. He laughed and said, "like the Polish, they are pig headed." I don't know about that, but it seems that if every group dislikes the Sikhs, there must be something in their behavior that makes them different enough in a negative way to receive such universal judgment. It could not possibly be media driven considering the liberal bias towards minorities and the minimal coverage that Sikhs get in the press.

But this attitude does segue into another phenomenon that the authors discuss:

> "The concept of a 'rainbow coalition' is sometimes used in the United States to refer to the idea that members of ethnic minorities, particularly visible minorities, should, or do in fact provide mutual support in the face of widespread discrimination by dominant groups. Such support might be evident in positive attitudes held by visible minorities towards other visible minorities, in contrast to the relatively negative attitudes held towards these groups by the dominant groups. In contrast to what might be expected from the notion of a rainbow coalition, results in Tables 1 and 2 show that most ethnic groups in Canada, including visible minorities, subscribe to the same ethnic hierarchy as the dominant groups. The ratings of visible minority groups by raters who are of non-European background are remarkably similar to those from European origin groups. The consensual hierarchy of ethnic groups in Canada is accepted by most groups (always with the proviso of in-group preference) and is not significantly diminished by special considerations for minorities by other minorities. The present results do not challenge the concept of a rainbow coalition as a movement emphasizing the desirability of visible minorities adopting a common front against racism. But they do suggest that it would be naive and incorrect to assume that groups who themselves are the victims of racially based ethnic hierarchies actually do support each other by rejecting the hierarchy."

Note what the "rainbow coalition's" assumptions are: basically Whites discriminate against all other minorities; Whites are assumed to be racists. And yet, the evidence shows that there does not seem to be any desire or need for what in the United States has been collectively called "people of color" to collaborate against Whites. Hispanics tend to

hate Blacks in the United States more than they hate Whites. Blacks tend to hate Jews more than they hate White gentiles. So one has to ask, "unite against what?" The fact is people can't unite against *racism* because it is a hoax, used by those few Left radicals that hate essentially Whites but even more so WASPs.

Whites are basically just the latest excuse for all the world's problems. But what is ironic is that several minority groups do better in terms of wealth than the Whites that are suppose to be discriminating against them. And wealth is the primary indicator of a racial group's success or failure. So if racism and discrimination by Whites leads to withholding wealth from minorities, why then are Whites located at about the median in terms of average wealth rather than being on top?

Reciprocity

The third pattern that was studied was how one group perceived another group and vice versa. How did each set of two groups rate each other. Some interesting generalities emerged, such as groups often rating each other similarly. One exception was that of Jews versus Germans. Jews rated Germans much lower than the Germans rated Jews (is this anti-Germanism by the Jews?). Also, the Chinese rated Aboriginals very low while Aboriginals rated the Chinese much higher.

The authors concluded:

> "The three attitude patterns of ethnocentrism, consensual hierarchy, and reciprocity are independent, and to some extent antagonistic. They are independent in that one cannot be predicted from another. They are antagonistic in the sense that if one applied perfectly, (e.g., consensual hierarchy), another, (e.g., ethnocentrism), could not apply. Because the present patterns of interethnic attitudes are very similar to those identified in an earlier paper... based on a 1974 national survey, it appears that there is substantial stability over time in the organization of these attitudes."

So what are we to make of this and other ethnocentric studies? First, if they are approached in a balanced way with regards to all the racial groups we find that groups do very in their average level of ethnocentrism and that there are some real and persistent patterns in how groups view each other. But most importantly I think it shows that ethnocentrism or xenophobia is the correct way to analyze group attitudes towards each other, and that the term *racism* is just an ad hominem tool of propagandists. It is meaningless and cannot hold up under any methodology of study.

Ethnocentrism is a lot like crime in how it is expressed and the levels of its intensity. For example, there is ample evidence that Blacks are more prone to criminal behavior than Whites and that Whites are more prone to criminal behavior than East Asians (Rushton, 1995); and that this pattern is global in nature. However, the overall level of crime in any one country can fluctuate due to demographics, economic conditions, hatred between ethnic groups, etc. It is not an absolute constant.

Likewise, ethnocentrism may fluctuate within racial groups in levels due to genetic differences, but the expression of it may lie dormant or be forced into violent reaction against some out-group. Ethnocentrism, like criminality, can be highly genetic but it only expresses itself under varying but specific ecological conditions. So when ethnocentric attitudes leading to antagonisms between racial groups flare up, we need to look at the reasons why, and not just blame one group or another of *racism* or any other such simplistic insult.

An excellent scenario of how these ethnocentric hostilities can go from dormancy to full blown cultural warfare (and beyond) is explained by MacDonald in *The Culture of Critique*. This last chapter of the third book of his trilogy on Jewish/Gentile evolutionary group strategies discusses how the very action of Jews to again dominate Western culture in a negative way may mobilize anti-Semitism as a defense mechanism. We are seeing this pattern being played out as social scientists and cultural anthropologists, who are dominated by Jewish academics, have adopted the strategy of once again trying to pathologize White Gentile culture by calling it *racist* at every opportunity (The full chapter is available at http://www.neoeugenics.net/whither.htm).

Chapter Five: How ethnocentrism evolved

The debate on racism and intolerance always assumes that it is bad and that it must be eliminated for a healthy society to exist. This premise is never questioned, and in fact it is wrong for the simple reason that humans are by nature ethnocentric. If ethnocentrism were eliminated, we would be genetically similar to the feline species, where individualism would obviate any possibility of cooperative behavior, empathy, altruism, or morality, which were derived from intergroup hatred as much as from intragroup cooperation. Fear, hate, ego, status seeking, deception and opportunism are as much a part of our human nature as is the good. The difference is we normally hide the selfishness while we advertise our goodness—this is the *deception* and *self-deception* that drove our species to higher levels of intelligence and tribal cooperation. But it also unleashed our genocidal side also.

In the book *Evolutionary Origins of Morality* (EOM) the leading authorities discuss how morality, altruism, ethics and other human behavioral traits evolved from the environment of our evolutionary past when we were small bands of people cooperating in groups no larger than about 150 people. Understanding the evolutionary basis of ethnocentrism and morality exposes the absurdity of the arguments against racism put forth by Marxists and misguided liberals as nothing more than useless attempts to remake humans into literally another species. We are behaviorally equipped not to get along in large groups that naturally compete for resources, and this book shows how this all came about (or at least the best understanding of its development we have to date).

Modern law and justice.

For the last ten thousand years or so we have been leaving our small bands and forming larger specialized communities that today are nations —from despotic to representative democracies. And there is a pattern in the ways we attempt to make these societies work. Our human behavior is linked to the way we make laws and establish justice. Laws are based on sympathy and empathy because society seems innately concerned with behavior that hurts the individual, or at most the family. Laws treating immigrants with compassion, laws against spousal or child abuse, laws prohibiting prostitution, laws that grant asylum seekers permanent residency or citizenship, etc. These laws could only exist because we have an innate compassion that was born in the *band* but was never meant for all humans. This empathy must be considered, in evolutionary terms, as a maladaptation. That is, it harms the people who are being beneficent. Gruter and Morhenn in EOM state:

> "By examining some of the ways in which innate human capacities for reciprocity, retributive behaviors, moralistic aggression, dispute resolution, sympathy, and empathy play roles in contemporary law and legal behavior, one can see that these capacities are both ubiquitous and facilitative of legal systems. However, no attempt is made or should be made to reduce all legal systems or legal behavior to these building block behaviors. To the contrary, numerous other human predispositions and environmental circumstances influence our ability and willingness to create, obey, or disregard laws, often contributing to the development of highly complex legal systems. These factors notwithstanding, however, the creation of legal systems and the willingness and ability to make and abide by laws emerged from innate human predispositions."

This is part of the problem we have with laws that deal with cloning,

racism, abortion, capital punishment, etc. Humans have contradictory feelings and perspectives. But none of them are any more moral than any other. Affirmative action for example should rightly be objected to by Whites, because in evolutionary terms it harms their own well-being. On the other hand, many Whites are conflicted with maladaptive altruism or a sense of justice primarily because they are told to do so by the liberal media that they will voluntarily put themselves at a disadvantage. They are easily *indoctrinated* into believing that they are racists because as one-time members of small bands, they went along with the most common moral position. If it is seen to be the dominant position, they believe it. So the charge of *racism* is easily believed because it is the propaganda that is currently being disseminated. Everywhere Blacks are said to fail because of racism and the counter observation that they fail because they have an average low intelligence is rarely openly discussed.

Just look at the debate about education. It is never argued in public debates that some schools do better because of a different racial make-up, even though this is openly discussed among academics. But it never gets to the floor of legislative debates when it comes to funding, testing or trying to understand the differences in schools. And it is extremely rare for this disparity in innate intelligence to be mentioned in the media. It is just ignored and the failed proposition of equal ability of all children is just assumed to be true without question. So the doctrine of different forms of racism is reinforced in the public's mind because they are never presented with the true cause of Black failure. The propaganda that we are a racist society wins out because the media only presents the radical environmental argument. And laws are passed based on this misinformation costing the United States billions of dollars to try to make all children equally smart.

But then the question must be asked, how can open discussion of the causes of low Black achievement be suppressed in a democratic state, especially one that has freedom of speech as part of its constitution? It is

simply false to believe that democracy and freedom of speech guarantees are sufficient for the truth to prevail. All nation-states have a tendency towards despotism, representative democracy is extremely difficult to sustain, and direct democracy is unheard of and alien to human nature (Somit & Peterson 1997). Eventually, per Boehm in EOM, as democracies mature and age, he states:

> "Normally, in discussions of ethological despotism or egalitarianism, the characterizations are specific to a species. But it would appear that humans, with their noteworthy cultural flexibility, are all over the map. When people live in chiefdoms, primitive kingdoms, or nation-states, political life can be ethologically defined as despotic. When they live in mobile bands, small tribes, or tribal confederations, their political life is ethologically egalitarian. People in the latter type of society also are called 'egalitarian' by cultural anthropologists like Service (1962) and Fried (1967), whereas the contrastive *cultural* term is 'hierarchical'. The fact that human groups reach both of these extremes, and land at various intermediate points as well, raises an important question. As a species, are we innately given to ethological egalitarianism, to ethological despotism, or to neither? ... [Humans can remain egalitarian only if they consciously suppress innate tendencies that otherwise would make for a pronounced social dominance hierarchy. In effect, it is necessary for a large power-coalition (the rank and file of a band) to dominate the group's would-be 'bullies' if egalitarianism is to prevail—otherwise, the group will become hierarchical with marked status differences and strong leadership."

What this means is that an egalitarian democracy cannot come about as the Marxists desire because there simply is no mechanism for it to be sustained in a non-homogeneous society. The power-elite merely uses talk of fairness and egalitarianism, an elimination of racism, the promotion of tolerance and multiculturalism, etc. as a means of control,

not the furtherance of justice. It makes little difference to them collectively how effective these programs are. What matters is that *racism* must be blamed for failed policies at closing the gap between Whites and Blacks. And it benefits the politicians, the wealthy, the Marxist Left, social scientists, educators, and the media equally well. The only ones it hurts is the White majority working class. We have become the scapegoats for the increasing disparity between the rich and the poor. So the charge of *racism* is a convenient tool promoted by Marxists but accepted by the power-elite because most of them find it harmless to their maintenance of power. Only the masses suffer from this deception, and eventually even the minorities will suffer as much as Whites when it all starts to unravel as it surely now is.

Sober and Wilson state in EOM:

> "Group selection offers an alternative hypothesis. All adaptive systems must become differentiated (and often hierarchical) as they increase in size, including adaptive social systems. Thirty people can sit around a campfire and make a consensus decision; thirty thousand or thirty million cannot. Large societies that evolved purely by group selection would be stratified. Once again, we are not arguing this hypothesis to the exclusion of one based on within-group selfishness. Progress involves exploring the middle ground.
>
> "The most that group selection can do is evolve groups that function with the unity and coordination of a single organism. Organisms are frequently adapted to prey upon and compete aggressively with other organisms, so no less can be expected of groups. Group selection does not eliminate conflict so much as elevate it to a new level in the biological hierarchy, where it can operate with even more destructive force than before. Properly understood, multi-level selection theory explains the benign side of human nature as genuinely prosocial without leading to a

naively romantic view of universal niceness.

> "The in-group morality that evolves by group selection falls short of a universal morality that dictates that the difference between in-group and out-group is morally irrelevant."

The above statement helps to explain how the charge of *racism* is necessary in a multiracial society where there are large differences in average intelligence. It is how Whites are suppressed into a temporary position of subordination and benign neglect of their own interests. If it ever becomes common knowledge (so the power-elite thinks) that differences are innate and natural then society itself will become unstable, as I believe it eventually must. So as the cracks in the democratic/pseudo-egalitarian structure widen so will the intergroup conflicts and the eventual balkanization of the United States.

This has happened so many times in the past, but only now are we able to understand the mechanisms based on our shared human nature. We are programmed to cooperate within small groups and to compete with other out-groups. This cannot be simply legislated away, but it can be subdued or put in abeyance as long as either of two conditions is present. The cooperation between groups is economically beneficial and non-threatening for the groups, or despotism forces intergroup cooperation. Under Communism cooperation was made mandatory. Under Western democracy it is mandated through propaganda. That is, laws like affirmative action, de facto quotas, minority set asides, welfare, hate crime laws, etc. are legislated into existence because of a fabricated notion that *racism* is responsible for many of societies problems, and only Whites (primarily Protestant) are to blame for its existence.

Moral systems then can be detrimental to a group's welfare. When moral systems can be manipulated by a power elite in forcing one group to act altruistically towards another group, then it becomes a coercive system. As Sober and Wilson conclude:

> "Since the subject of this special issue is morality, we would like to end by stressing the difference between morality and altruism. Moral systems virtually always include more than voluntary self-sacrifice, which itself can be immoral, as when helping some involves wrongly harming others. Our focus on altruism forced us to put many other issues aside. Perhaps the greatest point of agreement between us and our commentators is that altruism must take its place among a large cast of characters as far as the evolution of morality is concerned."

As is obvious then, if altruism and morality became human attributes to assist the band or tribe, while competing with neighboring tribes over resources, and we still have these innate mechanisms, they are fragile mechanisms indeed within large nations. When men willingly go off to war to defend their country, this could only happen with strong doses of indoctrination. When people give money to starving children in Calcutta, it is due to the special pleading of those in power to get the working class to feel guilty and give scarce money to people far away. It is in the interest of the power-elite to indoctrinate the people they rule to instill guilt and promote altruism. It serves leaders well to "maximize altruism in others, or, more exactly, to maximize others' altruism toward them and their kin." So the task of the media, the powerful, the politicians, the various religions, etc. is to convince us all that we should give until it hurts. Claiming that Whites are all *racists* is just one more way of promoting altruism in others for their own benefit. Notice that it is not required to convince any one White person that *they* are *racists*. It is only required that they convince us that *many* Whites are *racists* and that we should be held morally accountable—that is feel guilty and do what we are told.

Krebs in EOM summarizes how the antiracism industry has been able to take control of our government policies in the West:

> "Social psychological research on group identity and anthropological studies of preliterate societies converge in support of the idea that we are evolved to recruit allies from and form coalitions with other groups. Group membership is, flexible, nuanced, and negotiable. The moral ideal could be approximated if everyone viewed everyone else as members of the same in-group, but in-groups need out-groups to define their identities and defeat in competitive exchanges."

-

So the White majority has become the new *out-group* that is meant to solidify the new *in-group*: All types of minorities under the rubric "people of color" and of course their Marxist sponsors. This is nothing more than a power play between the White majority and *the other*. And the charge of *racism* is the main weapon used to promote this unworkable egalitarianism program. It is simply a power grab; it has nothing to do with compassion for the underclass.

-

Moral Systems

Moral systems underpin human's desire to establish laws and justice. Unfortunately, moral law as it evolved does not reflect moral laws and/or ethics as they are formulated in modern societies. There are inherent conflicts that come about because of the way we are programmed.

Flack & de Waal state in EOM:

> "It is hard to imagine human morality without the following tendencies and capacities also found in other species. These tendencies deserve to be called the four ingredients of morality:
>
> <u>Sympathy Related</u>
> Attachment, helping, and emotional contagion.
> Learned adjustment to and special treatment of the disabled and injured.
> Ability to trade places mentally with others: cognitive empathy.*
>
> <u>Norm Related</u>
> Prescriptive social rules.
> Internalization of rules and anticipation of punishment.*
> A sense of social regularity and expectation about how one ought to be treated.*
>
> <u>Reciprocity</u>
> A concept of giving, trading, and revenge.
> Moralistic aggression against violators of reciprocity rules.
>
> <u>Getting Along</u>
> Peacemaking and avoidance of conflict.
> Community concern and maintenance of good relationships.*

Accommodation of conflicting interests through negotiation.

*It is particularly in these areas—empathy, internalization of rules, sense of justice, and community concern— that humans seem to have gone considerably further than most other animals.

Societies seem to be able to deal with most of these issues and many societies can be rather peaceful, even though the above moral system evolved for the betterment of small bands of people who were also antagonistic to or at least in competition with other bands of people. We have innate rules that cannot just be legislated away, and these rules can cause conflict especially when it comes to societies that are multiethnic or multiracial. The more people see the "other" as different from themselves or the perceived tribe or band, the more we can expect to see a breakdown of a sense of justice, community concern, empathy and the submission to rules. This then is what we mean by ethnocentrism—trying to understand how an innately *tribal morality* operates within modern society.

We now know from extensive research in cognitive neuroscience, especially over the last five years, that emotions and categorization of humans is innately organized in modules, which we are born with (see *The New Cognitive Neurosciences*, second edition edited by Gazzaniga 2000). Humans are very keen on who belongs to a group (brain modules for cues about who is kin) and who doesn't. And it is increasingly thought "children develop moral rules in social interaction with each other, particularly during the resolution of conflict." So what does this mean for teaching children to be non-ethnocentric? Well, it has never been done to my knowledge. The Soviet Union along with their Warsaw Pact allies were politically anti-racist and were intolerant of deviant thinking and propagandized their children to believe that people should all "just get along" in the totalitarian utopia. But when the totalitarianism stopped, ethnocentrism returned with a vengeance. It could not be legislated or indoctrinated away. Humans are programmed to compete individually

and as groups. Ethnocentrism is deeply embedded brain hardware that can be pacified or triggered depending on the social environment. But it is always there when needed for kin and family.

Flack & de Waal state in EOM:

> "To sum up, building blocks of morality are *not* behaviors that are 'good' and 'nice', but rather mental and social *capacities* that permit the construction of societies in which shared values constrain individual behavior through a system of approval and disapproval. Animals, including chimpanzees, have not evolved moral systems anywhere near the level of ours, but they do show some of the behavioral capacities that are built into our moral systems.... Hence, an evolutionary perspective on morality automatically leads us to consider in other animals immoral as well as moral tendencies. Ironically, morality and immorality make use of the same capacities [that one needs to understand the effects of one's behavior on the other]."

So keeping the tribe cohesive and effective as a unit meant developing expressions of empathy, reciprocity, social rules and conflict resolution towards band members only. Others outside of the band were usually seen as a threat, and the more different they were the more they were to be feared. We know that early human tribes engaged in intertribal trading, but there was always cautiousness and a concern for those who were different. And this ethnocentrism then is an inherent part of our moral system. Along with compassion we also needed to be able to punish, go to war, and sacrifice our lives for the tribe. We had to be able to *hate the other* to be moral.

So where does that leave us with egalitarianism versus ethnocentrism? On the one hand we have some people that want to construct society to be "unjust" when it comes to who gets what. They are willing to throw away a meritocracy for egalitarianism by dictating

categorically "all human races are absolutely equal—there are no differences." And yet we know this is false and must therefore lead to what will increasingly be seen as an *injustice* within a tribal moral system. It cannot be sustained except by applying the power of the state and the power of the media to indoctrinate people into accepting what is patently wrong and flies in the face of observation. Remember, humans are uniquely adept at classification. The more contact one group has with another, the more they become aware of differences. These differences can include average intelligence, conscientiousness, wealth accumulation, disgust of the others' behavior, and differences in ethnocentrism itself, etc. Like any human trait, we can expect differences, and to deny that they exist is a betrayal of all that we know about evolution. To build a just society, its structure must meet the conditions of a *tribal moral system*. Accusations of racism will not accomplish that goal because all humans are inherently racist/ethnocentric.

Black in EOM states that:

> "In fact, ancient civilizations have so much inequality and social distance in some conflicts (such as those between masters and slaves of different ethnicities or between the monarchy and its foreign subjects) that their penal law and moralism reach historic levels, including diverse forms of agonizing torture, mutilation (such as the amputation of limbs, facial features, and testicles), and aggravated modes of capital punishment (such as death by burning, boiling, slicing, crushing, and being thrown to wild beasts).
>
> "Because the simplest hunter-gatherers have little or no inequality or social distance within each band, they have no such practices. They have no law on a permanent basis, and little or no penal or moralistic behavior such as punishment by the group as a whole. As noted earlier, they do not even have adjudication, arbitration, or other modes of authoritative intervention. They

> lack the raw materials for penal law and moralism: They are too equal, intimate, and homogeneous. Only when they capture foreign invaders do they collectively humiliate, torture, mutilate, and kill particular individuals. Some North American Indians, for example, rarely if ever executed their own members, but they occasionally roasted their captives alive.
>
> "The handling of right and wrong is everywhere relative rather than universal, variable rather than constant, situational rather than global. It does not originate in society as a whole, and it is not a characteristic of society as a whole."

I wonder as the different world governments increase the layers of politicians between democratic processes and the ultimate ruling elite, if we will not again be entering an age of social stratification and inequality? As the small nation-states with their relatively homogeneous populations are absorbed into larger bureaucratic states, and maybe ultimately a world government, can we not expect an age of increasing political barbarism? That is what it will take to keep billions of people in line. We will be returning to a world similar to that of Soviet and Chinese Communism—a barbaric system where millions perished in search of the egalitarian state.

Tiger in EOM states:

> "How did we solve the problem of migrating from the Palaeolithic system and scale to the agricultural and pastoral? By producing the major moral structures which continue to support the [predominant] legal and ethical systems still governing the planet. Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam later, all were the products of small farmers and shepherds trying to make do. 'The Lord Is My Shepherd' is a clue to the world of the producers of the Bible. That is to say, to deal with the crisis of the suddenly-escalated possibility of that irritating inequality, a series of

> fiercely demanding rules were created and codified, using the improbable weapon of God and the wholly inventive notions of heaven and hell as punitive devices. Obviously language was important here as Boehm stresses, especially when it could be written down in special books which claimed magical power."

This explains the transition from our hunter-gatherer egalitarian form of governing to the present—building upon false dogmas and ethnic cohesiveness to increasingly sophisticated political systems that compete for guiding us into the godless future. But all of the modern political systems are equally irrational as they continue to deny the reality of human nature. That is, there is not one political system that is based on an understanding of evolutionary principles. We continue to deny our primate brain and all of its not so nice machinery of hate, greed and aggression towards others—all nicely packaged in our brain tissue beyond our control or understanding as we act out our deceptions and self-deceptions to manipulate others. "We are moral, but only as moral as we need to be." And the social function of morality is get people to act in such a manner that contributes to the reproductive success of the tribe, including group adaptation in competition with other groups.

Sober & Wilson in EOM states that:

> "What, if anything, do the evolutionary and psychological issues we discuss in *Unto Others* contribute to normative theory? Every normative theory relies on a conception of human nature. Sometimes this is expressed by invoking the *ought implies can principle*. If people ought to do something, then it must be possible for them to do it. Human nature circumscribes what is possible. We do not regard human nature as unchangeable. In part, this is because evolution isn't over. Genetic and cultural evolution will continue to modify the capacities that people have. But if we want to understand the capacities that people *now* have, surely an understanding of our evolutionary past is crucial."

As I write this, and the "World Conference Against Racism" falls apart in Durban, South Africa (the first week in September, 2001), it is all too obvious that these political elites do not understand morality, much less the concept of racism. They work from a false assumption that people are against or adverse to racism, rather than comprehending the fact that it is really ethnocentrism and it is hard-wired into our brains to different degrees. The finger pointing therefore is meaningless. If they really want to get rid of ethnocentrism, they must breed it out of our genetic make-up but they may also be eliminating morality at the same time. That is, we would have to breed a new race of hyper-individualists. But would that be a better world?

Laland, Odling-Smee & Feldman in EOM state:

> "We have suggested that organisms should be prepared to act in a hostile manner towards other organisms that niche construct in a manner detrimental to them. This reasoning might account for a great deal of aggressive behavior, including a form of reciprocal hostility, in which individuals and their descendants trade antagonistic acts. Organisms should actively harm other organisms by investing in niche construction that destroys other organism's selective environments, provided the fitness benefits that accrue to the investing organisms from doing so are greater than their fitness costs. Since this is a general idea, it should extend to the human cultural level, and in some circumstances to human groups, with the qualification that at this level other processes may be operating. Sober and Wilson have only completed half of the story. They owe us a treatise on how group selection favors between group conflict."

And that is we need to know the mechanics of ethnocentrism before we can tackle the conflicts between races and ethnic groups. Our brain machinery, dedicated to ethnocentrism, will not go away because of a

United Nations resolution any more than a ban on sexual desire would end human procreation. Our brains are made to keep us alive and prosperous. And brain modules for morality, altruism, ethnocentrism and hatred are all part of that equipment. When groups demand that land be returned to them, that they be paid reparations, that some countries are using too many resources, that they get special entitlements for being less qualified, etc. then racial or ethnic hatred is soon to follow. And in the past war was not far behind including genocide, the final solution when groups cannot get along. If we are ever to have peace between different peoples, then we must understand the mechanisms involved in our hostilities. Humans can only with great difficulty expand human moral concerns towards the "other." And some ethnic groups or races seem to be more unable than others to do so as their clannishness is legendary through centuries of conflict. It seems that no amount of cultural change or new political arrangements will change the hostility of some groups against each other. In the densely populated regions of the Middle East, Africa, and the Balkans, it seems these xenophobic tendencies seem to be exceptionally virulent from thousands of years of intense competition. So it is to be expected that some racial groups will be on average more clannish or ethnocentric than others—all the while blaming others for their failures or troubles.

This is also why the three great religions arose in the Middle East. At the time these were advanced civilizations, and the genocidal conflicts were frequent. Mysterud explains in EOM:

> Sober and Wilson stand on the shoulders of giant scholars in their view of morality. Both David Hume and Charles Darwin explained human morality as emerging from the complex cooperation within groups competing with other groups, and thus only gradually and with great difficulty does human moral concern expand to include those outside one's own group. This theme is also evident in claims that modern evolutionary accounts of human behavior, claiming that other humans may

have been our most important selective factor (i.e. that the main obstacle to reproductive success in the past has been hostile humans, and not predators, disease or lack of food), and that the propensity to wage war may be a group selected adaptation which is activated in certain situations. Modern accounts of morality, as in the Bible (Old Testament), may also have been a morality for the in-group. For Moses, promoting the survival and reproduction of the Jews required social norms that led individuals to cooperate within their group to compete with other groups. Darwinian theorists have therefore explained the Mosaic Law as promoting the reproductive interests of the Jews. There is no reason to expect that Judaism is unusual in this respect. Modern social psychological literature abounds with articles discussing our tendency to distinguish between in-groups and out-groups.

And Nesse in EOM elaborates:

"As [Sober and Wilson] point out, group selection occurs when a gene that becomes progressively less common within a group is nonetheless increased in frequency because groups in which the gene is prevalent grow faster than other groups, or displace them. The exemplar is a group of selfish individualists being displaced by a group with individuals whose genetic tendencies motivate cooperation. Models show that this kind of strict group selection can work, but only under stringent conditions—especially lack of movement between groups and short individual life-spans compared to the durations that groups exist. These conditions are not unknown, but are rare in the natural world. If group selection had any strength at all, then most sex ratios would be biased towards females since a preponderance of females can double a group's rate of increase. But most sex ratios are 50:50, as would be expected if individual selection were overwhelmingly more powerful than group

selection."

Nonetheless, group selection does occur, as we can observe by the strong inclination towards ethnocentrism in all of humanity to some degree—and its extreme enhancement in some particular racial groups. When ethnocentrism is finally studied as an evolutionary bias that is under unconscious genetic control, and we begin to test different racial groups along with their evolutionary histories, we will have a better understanding of how to ameliorate the problems it causes in an overpopulated world. It seems from the above that only a libertarian, free-enterprise type of economic and political system, where everyone is basically "on their own" as radical individuals, with constitutional safeguards against one group taking advantage of other people, will bring about a just society because justice is never perceived the same by different racial groups in egalitarian states. Or we could just revert back to a totalitarian world government as proposed by Marxism/Leninism to solve the problem. But a third way is to admit that people may be better off competing as nations that are made up of homogenous peoples that can live in relative peace with each other, while competing economically with other nations.

Any other alternative does not seem feasible. Sober & Wilson state:

> "We therefore agree with the commentators who argue that moral systems might be explicable largely without recourse to strong altruism; however, it does not follow that moral systems can be explained without recourse to group selection. In all likelihood, moral systems evolved by increasing the adaptedness of groups relative to other groups, as Darwin originally envisioned. In addition, even though moral systems include much more than voluntary strong altruism, the latter might remain an important component of at least some moral systems."

Or to put it mildly, morality as it is normally envisioned does not exist

within the algorithms of human nature that were put in place over the last two million years of our evolutionary journey. Any pretense of establishing a moral system, outside of our evolutionary past must fail because it is baseless. Ethnocentrism is at the core of our moral system. To attack ethnocentrism in human interactions is to attack morality itself. And as I write this, September 11, 2001, watching the World Trade Center collapse into rubble from a terrorist attack, we should be reminded that these terrorists are also freedom fighters with their own moral convictions. America has stepped on their collective toes, and they are bitter. Is anyone surprised? They shouldn't be when each group has a different perspective of what is moral and just.

The Free Rider Problem

Ethnographic research of the few still existing hunter-gatherer tribes has determined that humans, over thousands of years, once they developed the ability to communicate and to make weapons, became egalitarian. Prior to this evolutionary development, earlier *hominids* were hierarchical. But eventually, it became possible for *free riders* to slowly be eliminated from tribal life along with the genes responsible for these behavioral traits. That is *free riders* when they became a problem, were simply eliminated by banishment or with a hatchet to the head. Tribal groups could not tolerate people who were bullies, lazy, cheats, or who would not conform to the tribal ethos so needed for survival. And especially when survival meant cohesiveness in the face of danger from other tribes.

The *free rider* then was anyone who was detrimental to group evolutionary strategies. And the type of person to be controlled or shunned was different among differing groups. Tribes in densely populated areas for example needed people who were willing to die in battle. Tribes in isolated, hostile environments, with long winters, needed members who would share and not be bullies or disruptive. So the *free rider* was not one typical archetype but varied somewhat between evolving races. But they have one thing in common, their own welfare was always much more important than the group's. In our own society then they could be considered the selfish person, psychopathic, a bully, a conscientiousless person, etc.

As evolution has not stopped, and these *free rider* genes are still in all gene pools but only at reduced frequencies, they will gradually return in numbers. It is now advantageous in large nation-states to have low conscientiousness, be unemotional, be aggressive, etc. These traits no longer carry the community opprobrium that they once did. In fact, in large populations it is easy for people with these traits to find each other

and thrive. Organized crime, political dynasties, unscrupulous stock brokers, people on welfare who make no attempt to work, people who evade the draft, and all sorts of con artists and cheats do very well indeed. The less shame one has, the easier it is to win amongst the guilt-ridden altruists. We no longer live in small communities where conduct is kept under direct observation and is scrutinized. We can all hide in the large crowds and organizations.

So we now have a future problem with democratic types of government (and most others for that matter). Representative democracy, by its very nature, makes *free riders* more successful than the more moral, altruistic, and gullible masses. They can now breed faster because they are not kept in check. Could a Bill Clinton have seduced young girls in a tribal village? Hardly—or at least not for long. Social controls made it difficult for individuals to escape scrutiny. Deviance and social control were integrally linked and we have evolved behavioral traits that makes most people at least reasonably honorable—for now. And ethnocentrism, group cooperation and group evolutionary strategies were all part of the accumulation of high genetic frequencies that brought humans a high level of moral and altruistic behavior. They are intricately linked. So when we attack *racism* or *ethnocentrism*, we attack the very fundamental mechanisms that made us moral in the first place. Without ethnocentrism we would be non-cooperating, individualistic, asocial predators like leopards or sharks instead of canines and dolphins.

Boehm explains in EOM that:

> "Social control is about the power of deviants to harm or distress others, but it is also about the power of a vigilant, assertive group that is bent upon manipulating or eliminating its deviants. In even the smallest band or tribe, the price of deviance can be assassination: capital punishment is one of the sanctions used against those who become seriously out of line. This universal pattern of group vigilance is based on behavioral

> dispositions that are quite ancient, for in effect moral communities amount to political coalitions and power coalitions are found in many of the higher primates. In fact, they also are found in other social mammals, and coalitions sometimes grow very large as entire communities defend themselves against external predators, sometimes unite against neighboring groups, and, rarely but significantly, sometimes turn against individuals in the same group. . . . I would argue that social control based on threat of force (or actual force) is a prerequisite to this emergence. I say this because by themselves, prescriptions, rewards, exhortations to behave properly, and verbal attempts to foster peace, would not remove the problem of serious group-internal predators, some of whom may be sociopathic, or even psychotic. Unless this basic problem of predator-control is addressed, I do not see how the rest of moral behavior could have developed. And even with the degree of moralistic assertiveness we see in extant bands when they become aroused, the social predators keep on coming."

We have now lost the power of the group to control *deviants* or *free riders*. Neither socialism, the law, or our judicial system, etc. are equipped to eliminate for example the psychopath until they have committed multiple crimes and have probably had children since they have no moral restraints. It has been noted that psychopathic and or sociopathic women have children younger and they have more children because of low conscientiousness (Lynn 2000). This means a gradual increase in the overall *free rider* problem over time—with an eventual complete loss of egalitarianism that took thousands of years for human evolution to evolve into. It was the vigilance of the tribe, and the ability to keep track *of* and *act on* the deviant's behavior that allowed humans to overcome male dominance and hierarchical primate social structures.

So what does this all mean? And what does it have to do with racism? Again, Boehm in EOM states:

> "Using criteria of relative plausibility, it is possible to make a case for significant group selection over the 100,000 years that Anatomically Modern Humans have been both moral and egalitarian. Our nomadic forebears surely lived in egalitarian communities that leveled social differences and moralistically curbed free-riding behavior, and this egalitarian syndrome would have had profound effects on levels of selection. First, it reduced phenotypic [cultural] variation at the within-group level. Second, it increased phenotypic variation at the between-group level [groups purposely behaved differently]. Third, and crucially, moral sanctioning also permitted groups to sharply curtail free-riding tendencies at the level of phenotype. The result was group selection strong enough to support altruistic genes, and a human nature that was set up for social ambivalence: that nature was mainly selfish and strongly nepotistic, but it was at least modestly and socially significantly altruistic. The effects on human social and moral life were pervasive, both in hunting bands and in more recent manifestations of human society."

Simply put then, ethnocentrism is a double-edged sword. It causes discord when different racial or ethnic groups come into conflict, but it also allowed humans to control the *free rider* because they were a severe detriment to the tribe during times of intergroup conflict or ecological stress. Those who would shirk their military or patriotic duty could not be tolerated. The most aggressive and ethnocentric tribes, everything else being equal, won the battles and expanded over those they annihilated if they at all could. Genocide is in our nature—it is not unreasonable to assume that to prevent it we must first recognize its innateness in our prosocial makeup.

Group Evolutionary Strategies

In our two million years of evolution as hominids, we have honed our sense of tribalism even further than our nearest relatives the chimpanzees. This came about because neighboring tribes who were in fact very similar genetically acted differently and expressed these differences in cultural ways as our language modules and intelligence increased. In dress, manners, moral behavior, and overall ethos, tribes were making themselves different. And as we evolved, our brains developed mechanisms to discern the slightest differences both culturally and genetically between people. We came to be able to discern the slightest differences in the "other," because the other was very similar. Now we live in a world where the "other" is very different, and the equalitarians want us to accept that we are all the same, even though our internal brain machinery has evolved to be tribal and to act differently towards the *other* versus our own *kin*.

So we humans developed mechanisms to form cooperative groups that were frequently in competition with other neighboring groups. And when tensions mounted or resources diminished, what followed could be war, genocide, enslavement—or even friendly bartering and trade. There was never any one template that fit all occasions, but the tribe over time had to be willing to fight, run or negotiate—and these group evolutionary strategies altered us genetically to be able to respond in a myriad of ways as well as making some groups different genetically in the way they responded: "Biologists such as Alexander (1987) have suggested that dispositions to form large cooperative groups were selected in the human species because large cooperative groups were necessary to combat other large cooperative groups of hominids, giving rise to a kind of *arms race* (Krebs in EOM)."

That *arms race* included the evolution of behavioral mechanisms that enhanced group evolution. If tribal group A on average was more

aggressive, fearless and ruthless in competition with neighboring group B, all things being equal, the genes favoring ethnocentrism with its intolerance and aggression against the *out-group* would increase. Blood lust in defense or expansion of the tribe would win out over the more passive, less cohesive tribe on average and over a very long time. That is, as human tribes engaged in genocidal warfare (as chimpanzees do) they would typically kill the weaker tribe increasing the overall genetic frequency of ethnocentrism. And the ethnocentrism *arms race* was begun—those who were the most loyal, patriotic, intelligent, fearless, and aggressive—won. The lesser genes were thinned out to some degree, depending if the results were complete and total genocide or absorption of the remaining conquered tribe. But evolution works in small incremental steps, and not always in one direction alone. All we know for sure is that humans have powerful behavioral modules that are hard wired for conflict.

So why aren't humans engaged in continual conflict? Boehm explains:

> "On an immediate basis, the 'territorial' behaviors we know about seem to be a response to a combination of scarcity and economic defensibility of resources, but there is also a human tendency to retaliate for homicide that can make conflicts continue beyond a specific time of scarcity. My suggestion, both for [living] and prehistoric foragers, is that the human potential for hostile competition over resources is likely to emerge whenever the appropriate environmental stimulation is present, and once such conflict becomes lethal, a continuing pattern of lethal exchange is not unlikely. We are probably speaking about raiding, here, rather than intensive warfare in which all the males of a group line up to fight—or make genocidal surprise attacks."

But of course, about ten thousand years ago humans started cultivating crops and breeding livestock and civilization was born. How

did we change so dramatically and for the most part shrug off our genocidal ways? Of course we didn't. The rules merely changed, and the conflicts are now larger and entered into more cautiously at the level of lethal group conflict. But the group evolutionary strategy based on race, nation, ethnicity and/or religion is still with us. Now we compete in less hazardous ways unless we are driven to armed conflict. But the antagonisms between groups based on our inherent ethnocentrism is still there in varying degrees. And it varies in its expression or intensity within population groups and between population groups. There is no reason to suspect that the expression of ethnocentrism like intelligence is the same all over the world. How much it varies however, unlike intelligence, is still largely unmapped globally and ethnically. But it is certainly not the same all over.

And of course its expression can change drastically over time. We have seen nations like Japan and Germany go from aggression to pacifism. But much of this change is not elimination of ethnocentrism but a change in the message—indoctrination can awaken people towards hostilities or it can lull people into a dangerous slumber of passivity to real danger. We are witnessing that very process this first week after the World Trade Center disaster. As Americans feel threatened they have awakened to a new aggressiveness. Which may provoke a similar reaction in the Arab/Muslim world when we finally take out our revenge. And genocidal ethnocentrism will have raised its ugly head once again—always asleep just under veneer of civility.

But this book is not about warfare or genocide alone. It is about ethnocentrism and what it really is. And it is everywhere in every thinking person. In our day-to-day activities we are engaged in *group evolutionary strategies* whether we like it or not. Jewish interests manipulate American foreign policy to favor Israel over the Palestinians. Jesse Jackson uses his Blackness to extort money from companies that find it easier to pay-up rather than resist. President Bush is willing to embrace cheap Mexican labor to gain votes and lower wages in the

United States for the benefit of the cloistered elite. Whites are fighting back through the courts to end affirmative action. And this doesn't even begin to consider the special interest groups. But of course, benefits flow disproportionately to some groups over others:

> "Group selection includes, but is not confined to, direct intergroup competition such as warfare. But, just as individual plants can compete with each other in virtue of the desert conditions in which they live (some being more drought-resistant than others), so groups can compete with each other without directly interacting (e.g., by some groups fostering co-operation more than others). In addition, cultural variation in addition to genetic variation can provide the mechanisms for phenotypic variation and heritability at the group level (Sober & Wilson in EOM)."

So the more cohesive a group is, given its own natural resources and abilities, the better that group will succeed in reaping the rewards. Ethnocentrism pays off in the long run because as a member of a cohesive group one has more power than as an individual. And the more cohesive groups will win out over the more individualistic groups over the long run. A survey of 25 different societies using the Human Relations Area File shows that no matter how different societies may be from each other, in one area they were all identical. Group members are expected to act benevolently towards each other and without conflict, with no constraints on how the group acts towards outsiders. Human social nature within the group "contains a very large dose of egoism, a hefty dose of nepotism, but at least a modest and socially significant dose of altruism (Boehm in EOM)." Which is why the Mosaic law of the Old Testament was only meant for the benefit of the in-group—outsiders could be ill-treated or slaughtered at will in a genocidal war. Christians altered the true meaning of the Old Testament later when universal tolerance was preached—but of course never really practiced (see Dr. John Hartung's web site article http://members.aol.com/toexist).

Ethnocentrism must be extremely hard-wired to be effective. For example, when a country goes to war they indoctrinate the people by stirring up their systems for self-less defense of the nation and patriotism/jingoism is rapidly mobilized in the minds of millions of people, utilizing the tribal evolutionary machinery in the brain. Logic is abandoned—a wise individualist would stay out of the conflict and out of harms way. And some do look out for their own safety knowing others will go willingly in their place. The reason ethnocentrism must be hard wired in so deeply is explained by Gintis in EOM:

> "First, when a social group is threatened with extinction or dispersal, say through war, pestilence, or famine, cooperation is most needed for survival. But the discount rate, which depends on the probability of future interactions, increases sharply when the group is threatened, since the group may disband or otherwise become extinct. Thus, *precisely when society is most in need of prosocial behavior, cooperation based on enlightened self-interest will collapse*. To maintain cooperation in a threatened society, what is needed is some form of prosociality that is *not* closely related to the prospect for future personal rewards [or possibility of death]. Second, there is considerable experimental and other evidence that human beings exhibit such forms of non-self-interested prosociality. One such behavior is *strong reciprocity*. A strong reciprocator has an initial predisposition to cooperate with other cooperators, and retaliates against non-cooperators by punishing them, even when this behavior cannot be justified in terms of long-run self (or extended kin) interest."

The scenes in New York after the bombing of the World Trade Center exemplified this innate cooperative behavior. There was nothing to be gained by the average New Yorker to help in the rescue effort, but the images of terrorists attacking the United States *tribe* evoked in us our

innate hatred of the *other*, including those that fit the profile of terrorists. The American *tribe* coalesced and lashed out at the *other* with hatred and calls for revenge, including bombing innocent civilians just because they belonged to the *out-group*—Muslims and Arab types. They were now to be hated no matter what their personal involvement in support of terrorism. On television we all experienced the medias' frenzied call for a lengthy war dance around *ground zero* in preparation for our own fanaticism against the *other* and the impending death and destruction that was soon to take place—even as people were shocked by the horrors they were witnessing. They were incredulous that anyone could do such a thing as they prepared to do the very same thing to hundreds of thousands of innocents in other countries. Ethnocentrism at work and out of control that could easily lead to a world war, for a mirror image of the fanaticism in the United States was taking place all over the Islamic world. Caution was thrown aside as our innate *hate mechanisms* kicked into action in defense of the tribe. Ethnocentrism or racism—so necessary as part of our group evolutionary strategies is now unleashed by millions- or even billions-of-people at a time. The ruling elite uses this ancient genetic behavioral artifact for their own purposes as they lead the sheep to slaughter.

Laland, Odling-Smee, & Feldman in EOM explain this *ruling elite* manipulation:

> "We anticipate that, at least sometimes, social controls may be exploited by powerful individuals, groups, or institutions, that dominate the dissemination of information through societies, to promote their own interests. Powerful individuals may gain by persuading others to conform, perhaps by recruiting extra assistance in modifying social environments in ways in which they, rather than the helpers benefit. Religious, commercial and political propaganda, for example, may be used to persuade, trick or coerce conformity from others against their own individual interests, yet in favor of the interests of a dominant elite. We find

it difficult to believe that all social control mechanisms will be group beneficial."

We are in fact witnessing this group evolutionary strategy again as we follow the aftermath of the World Trade Center disaster. The media in the United States is telling the public that the attacks are due to the terrorists' hatred of the West, and yet knowledgeable people who follow the Middle East conflict know that the causes are more complex than that including: governments who are seen as traitors to Islam and who have capitulated to Western interest; Western military might being used indiscriminately against poorly armed Islamic nations; and of course America's unconditional support for Israel. But the media is frantically trying to keep this message from the public. And what the Islamic world sees is a Jewish manipulation of U.S. policy in support for Israel and hostility towards Islam. Laland, Odling-Smee, & Feldman in EOM summarize this conflict:

"The suspicion that group selectionists view people through rose tinted glasses is reinforced by their consistent focus on the positive repercussions of group selection (that is, within-group altruism), and the equally persistent neglect of the negative repercussions (that is, between-group selfishness, hostility and conflict). Group selection does not directly favor altruistic individuals so much as selfish groups. The group-level traits most effective in promoting group replication may also engender out-group hostility, inter-group aggression and conflict, fear of strangers, slanderous propaganda concerning outsiders, and so on. The same process to which Sober and Wilson attribute the best of human motives may also favor the worst attributes of human societies."

So the United States may in fact be going to war in large part because of the real or the perceived complicity they have shown towards being controlled by Jewish interests, and the Islamic world's hostility for this

terrorism against them when we are perceived as *cowardly* using cruise missiles to kill innocent civilians, the same charge that the United States is leveling against the Islamic terrorists. And this all boils down to the fact that ethnocentrism and patriotism is nothing more than *altruism* in pursuit of in-group fitness. An evolved mechanism meant for small bands of less than 150 people, it is now unleashed in a very different type of world.

In fact, ethnocentrism/altruism is such a strange internalized mechanism that it can show up in many different forms. Vine in EOM states that:

> "I envisage no theoretical bar against acquiring increasingly *socially inclusive* in-group identities—up to the species level, and perhaps beyond. However, such expansions of 'self-interest' must effortfully overcome what can be seen as an evolutionary residue of 'centripetal' socio-affective cognition biases, impelling us unconsciously to give greatest weight to ego-interests, than to those of close kith and kin, and so on. 'Universal human rights' are too readily invoked and deployed rhetorically, in covert pursuit of egoistic or parochial interests. Yet a small minority of persons becomes capable of authentically assuming a humanity-wide self-identity, both motivationally and in terms of bio-altruistic self-sacrifice."

This above statement has two salient observations. First, some people —under the influence of indoctrination—will abide by a universal altruism. That is, some people ride a bike or walk in an attempt to do their part to save the planet. I worked with a woman like that. She walked everywhere, no matter how inconvenient, to save the environment. And we see this universal altruism all about us. The ruling elite hammers universal altruism into our heads relentlessly. These are people who really do want the best for everyone, even neglecting their own family while helping others. They are truly brain washed into

thinking that humans are basically all good and want peace and harmony. But the second point is that the ruling elite in fact indoctrinates the masses while avoiding altruism themselves. They send their kids to private schools while preventing school vouchers for others; they call for energy conservation while living in lavish homes and driving large cars, etc. The list could fill a book showing what the ruling elite says and what they actually do. Of course, I admit that a few who could be considered the ruling elite actually do believe in universal altruism, but they are few and far between; they probably never got the message they didn't need to follow their own advice given to others—only those duped sheep need believe the message.

In the end however, group evolutionary strategies keep on resurfacing no matter how much the government or the media tries to suppress it. Ethnocentrism was suppressed in the Balkan states under Communist totalitarianism. But of course under Communism, group evolutionary strategies served the upper members of the Communist Party. There are endless ways groups can come together to compete with other groups. Warfare, corporations, sports, religions, etc. are all examples of groupishness that comes about as a result of our evolutionary past. But in the end, the most powerful form of groupishness in formed around kin —or true ethnocentrism. And the more alike the genes are, the more cohesive the ethnic group or race.

However, there are differences in the level of ethnocentrism between different ethnic or racial groups that are both genetically and culturally determined (roughly 50/50 for most personality traits). And it is also highly variable depending on the circumstances. During the sixties, America came to grips with its Jim Crow laws and discrimination. As Whites saw on television how Blacks were treated in (primarily) the South, they abandoned their prejudice and went out of their way to provide every opportunity and privilege to Blacks. This was all done with little complaint or resistance from Whites. Democrats and Republicans alike approved program after program to help Blacks. But, like any one-

way benevolence, as Whites kept getting verbal, financial, and physical abuse from Blacks rather than gratitude, Whites now are beginning to turn off that benevolence. It is a slow process, but White ethnocentrism is returning as Whites increasingly are attacked by the *rainbow coalition*. And that is how it will always be, when *group evolutionary strategies* are in play, and one group is seen as causing harm to another.

Concluding Comments on Morality

Neither morality, altruism, group cohesiveness, egalitarianism, ethnocentrism, conformity, patriotism, sexism, nor all the other behavioral traits that humans once possessed to help the group survive are in our genes in neat little neuronal packets. At this time we can only observe the genes at work and predict the level of certain genetic traits like ethnocentrism. But we do know these traits are found in chimpanzees and other animals like dolphins and elephants in varying degrees. And prosocial humans have a unique, however variable, tool chest of these behaviors to draw upon to help us survive. These different traits can be expected to vary greatly within individuals and within different racial groups that evolved in differing ecozones and under differing socio-demographic factors. Even bonobos and chimpanzees, two subspecies that were only separated by the Zaire River in Africa, are extremely different behaviorally. And yet, it was decades before zoologists noticed the extreme differences. Today they are classified as two different species because of their unique sociality, even though they interbreed and produce fertile offspring in captivity (Wrangham & Peterson 1996).

This brings up an interesting contradiction. Cultural Anthropologists like Margaret Mead who were mentored by the Marxist Franz Boas were indoctrinated by Boas to go out into the world and study societies and prove that they are all highly diverse. Their mission was to prove that humans were all the same and races did not exist. Cultural relativism was accepted over the years as genetic influences with regard to personality, intelligence, and behavior were said to not exist. This equalitarian dogma is still kept alive in the media and in government policy though it has long been dead in academia.

On the other hand, another Marxist argument put forth by George Simpson and quoted by the late Ashley Montagu in his 1999 expanded

edition of *Race & IQ* goes as follows:

> "In a polytypic species, races adapt to differing local conditions but the species as a whole evolves adaptations advantageous to all its races, and spreading among them all under the influence of natural selection and by means of interbreeding. When human races were evolving it is certain that increase in mental ability was advantageous to all of them. It would, then, have tended over the generations to have spread among all of them in approximately equal degrees."

We know now that this is impossible, because any species that evolved under highly variable ecological conditions from glaciers to the tropics, and who also evolved under highly variable cultures would evolve differently. The only thing that kept us from evolving into different species was the fact that no one human subspecies stayed isolated long enough. And now, genetic information is being added to the puzzle along with psychometrics and cognitive neuroscience, just to name a few fields of enquiry, that are noting the differences along with the similarities of human races or population groups. And morality and ethnocentrism is one of those genetic factors that would have evolved differently under differing conditions as noted in EOM.

This difference has also been noted by Richard Lynn and expanded on by Rushton (1995) and reiterated in EOM. The r-K theory of human behavior varies from sub-Saharan Africa with its low parental investment (r reproductive strategy) to East Asians with their high parental investment (K reproductive strategy). Caucasians fall between these two extremes that include intelligence, levels of testosterone in males, visual-spatial abilities, number of twin births, violence, and a host of other behavioral and physical average differences between races. Human population groups, especially those that have remained genetically isolated because of geographical isolation (Japanese, Icelanders, and sub-Saharan Africans for example) or isolated by religious or ethnocentric

cohesiveness (Basques, Jews, Gypsies, and Asian-Indian castes for example) will vary to a greater degree from a species typical average. And I may note, the definition of species is not settled. One definition is a species is any breeding population that can have reproductive offspring. This would make all canines—not wolves and coyotes—one species. A second definition looks at behavioral and morphological differences that make wolves/coyotes, chimpanzees/bonobos and Basques/Australian aborigines different species (more on this later). So not only do we not know what racism/ethnocentrism is, we haven't even agreed on a definition for *species*! "There is only one race—the human race" is the most egregious example of Marxist propaganda foisted on humanity. In all likelihood we could just as easily be saying with further genetic and morphological evidence that "there is no one human species—there are many human species and a whole lot of mongrels." Maybe we could establish some type of racial classification system similar to the American Kennel Association's dog breeding classifications. That is, there would be accepted racial types like Basques, Scandinavians, Armenians, Ashkenazi Jews, Japanese, etc. Each racial type would have numerous physical and behavioral descriptors that would determine if an individual was a good archetype of that race. Those that were not even close to any one racial archetype would just be mongrels. Oops, I guess we already do that naturally. After all, if we practiced it to the extent that the AKA does we would probably have to grope other's genitals the way that breed judges do. That may be more offensive to most people than it is to the average dog or bitch.

Boehm notes in EOM that:

> "My view is that the best way to keep discussions of human nature from turning into Endless Controversies is to stop bipolarizing the arguments. Rather, one should look at human nature as producing contradictory dispositions that generate predictable ambivalences at the level of phenotype, ambivalences that help to structure life's practical decision dilemmas. My

> general hypothesis: Humans are innately given to egoism, nepotism, and altruism, and our next task is to sort out how these dispositions feed into everyday decisions. . . .
>
> "The argument begins with the balance of power between within-group selection and between-group selection. Normally, extinction rates get all the attention in debates about possibilities for altruism, but here phenotypic variation is the focus. Egalitarian hunter-gatherers use the force of public opinion, expressed by punitive moral sanctioning, to ensure that alpha-dominated hierarchies cannot form at the band level. Upstarts are effectively stopped, sometimes severely punished, and this means that the overall phenotypic variation [cultural variation] among individuals is drastically reduced. This curtails the force of within-group selection."

Note now that we are as nations and not small tribes, returning to hierarchical dominance. The ruling elite gets pretty much free reign to do as they wish, especially when they can indoctrinate the masses into believing the current dogma. Again, we are seeing this in the World Trade Center bombing and public reaction as the masses will be encouraged to buy War Bonds while the elite will be busy making a killing on the stock market as best they can—they have to recoup those losses!

And the reason the ruling elite tends to bail on their own kin is simple as stated above. First comes egoism, then nepotism before altruism. Given this, the very top levels of society do not see a need to ally themselves with their own kin, and tend to make alliances with other powerful people. Ethnocentrism is abandoned for ego and close family. That is why today, the Saud monarchy in Saudia Arabia plays a balancing act to stay in power by mimicking being the protector of Mecca and Islam while living lavishly as often as they can in the West—free of their own restraints they place on their own people at home. The Daley dynasty in Chicago, the Bush dynasty in Washington, the Kennedy dynasty now all

over the place, and the Jesse Jackson dynasty are just a few examples of the ruling elite bailing out on their own people in favor of power and family. And it seems it is especially prevalent in corporate America as well as Hollywood. These groups usually find it easier to buy into the latest politically correct dogma rather than be concerned with their own kin. Pragmatism gives way to abandonment of one's own ethnic group for personal wealth and influence. A good discussion of this can be found in *Indoctrinability, Ideology and Warfare: Evolutionary Perspectives* edited by Eibl-Eibesfeldt and Salter, 1998 (note, a second release of this book has a new title: *Ethnic Conflict and Indoctrination*).

This behavior is also exemplified by the cultural transmission rule. Globalism is made up of a new ruling elite that is on average the *least* ethnocentric. These members at the very pinnacle of the ruling elite are part of their own group based solely on power, money and influence. It benefits them to stick together and help each other out. One has to wonder, is ethnocentrism all that bad? Is it worse than egotism and nepotism? Sober & Wilson state in EOM:

> "Vine suggests that the genetic foundation of cultural group selection must have evolved by within-group selection. We regard the strong form of this hypothesis as a vestige of the outdated view that genetic group selection is invariably weak (see Stevens for examples of group selection without culture). However, a more moderate form of the hypothesis is more reasonable, since evolution is a tinkering process that fashions new adaptations from old ones that originally evolved for different purposes. Two examples will illustrate the range of possibilities. Boyd and Richerson (1985) have shown that the cultural transmission rule '**copy the most common behavior in your group**' enhances the power of cultural group selection because it quickly creates uniformity within groups and concentrates behavioral variation at the between-group level. However, they think that the genes coding for the transmission rule evolved by within-group

> selection as an adaptation to varying environments. If so, cultural group selection got its start as a by-product of genetic individual selection, as Vine suggests. In contrast, Wilson and Kniffin (1999) show how genes that code for transmission rules that enhance the power of cultural group selection can themselves evolve by genetic group selection. Groups that vary randomly in genetically encoded transmission rules exhibit highly above-random phenotypic variation. Transmission rules that favor uniformity of behavior within groups and also are biased toward altruistic behaviors evolve under reasonable conditions—not because they are more fit than other transmission rules within the same group, but because groups with such transmission rules outperform other groups."

Simply put, if that is possible, humans will act alike or copy the behavior of their group[s]. It has been shown that even children will often have two sets of values—one displayed towards the family and the other displayed for their peer group. This value system switches back and forth every time they step through the door (Hrdy 1999). Is it not reasonable then to assume that adults will do the same thing? In cohesive ethnic communities, people will find comfort in adopting the culture norms of those around them. But the ruling elite must travel more often amongst many different cultures to maximize their own standing—so they collectively adopt and copy new standards of cultural acceptance. This of course requires a great deal of deception and/or self-deception. But it is nonetheless how humans behave, on average. Ethnocentrism will be displayed more by those who are outside of the ruling elite and are closer to their cultural roots. As we look at almost every democratically elected head of state to the despotic head of state the same pattern emerges. They will convince the masses that they are serving their needs while they line their pockets. There are few exceptions from this rule as you look at heads of states around the world.

One very important reason for this ability to abandon kin and country

so easily by the ruling elite is explained by Harms in EOM: "One such model suggests that hostile environments may provide conditions conducive to the emergence and stabilization of cooperative behavior. In particular, simulations show that random extinctions can keep population densities low, provide ongoing colonization opportunities, and insulate cooperative communities from invasion." That is, the ruling elite no longer find themselves in hostile environments. They don't live in dangerous neighborhoods. They don't fight front-line wars. They can pay for the best health care. They don't have to submit to oppressive dominant displays at work from authoritative bosses. They have few worries whereby they need to be loyal to their own kind—whether defined as kin or countrymen. They have bailed on those they rule while parodying their devotion and patriotism. Humans are equally prone to egalitarianism or despotism—whichever serves their needs the best at the time. "I believe this duality is reflected in the structure of our social relations, with individuals dominating when they are able to, submitting when they must, and curtailing dominance in others when it is in their interest (Krebs in EOM)."

So we know that ethnocentrism is a necessary component of our human nature, and to try and eliminate it would be hazardous as we may throw the baby out with the bathwater. Racism or ethnocentrism travel along with altruism, egalitarianism, morality and human bonding. It is not one component that can be dispensed with without losing what it means to be human. So why is racism/ethnocentrism so vehemently attacked by Marxists when it is so bound up in morality itself? Boehm in EOM explains:

> "Unfortunately, [Marx and Engels] who created communism's political blueprint were not informed by primate field studies, nor by cladistic analyses that showed our precursors to be innately despotic. They believed in a 'good' human nature, a cooperative, egalitarian, and probably altruistic nature that would express itself freely—once the evils of capitalism were

remedied. Hence, the state just naturally withers away. For me, this innocent assumption underlies what proved to be a fundamental and tragic flaw in Marxist social and political engineering. The assumption is understandable in historical context, for it was based on the few ethnographic models that were available to these two theoreticians, and Morgan's (1901) work on the egalitarian Iroquois figured prominently.

"The fatal error was a failure to see that humans will predictably form hierarchies—top-heavy ones that are given to the development of despotism—unless the subordinates have enough political leverage to keep individual domination in check. The Iroquois understood this, and they set up their checks and balances accordingly (Morgan, 1901). The error was fatal because problems of uncontrolled central power helped to bring down communism. It also was fatal because dozens of millions of people were liquidated in the name of a political Utopia that was anthropologically misconceived, and major wars (verging on nuclear ones) were fought in the interest of creating this 'truer' type of democracy."

Actually, the number of people liquidated under Communism totaled over 100 million people. But it is not surprising that this fact is so often ignored since the Left still controls the West's propaganda machine and only fascism is attacked. Boehm I think is a bit politically naïve or perhaps he is just being prudently politically correct. But I have no delusions about the purpose of Marxism. It has, and remains to be, a political system for the intellectual elite to gain power and dominance over others. There was never any political utopia planned for the people they did and still do plan to subjugate. Marxism—and it is alive and well in Western academia and politics—is all about power and control. The new group of Marxists come in many forms: postmodernists, cultural anthropologists, gender studies, sociology, public education advocates, anti-racists, anti-fascists, human rights advocates, identity theorists,

queer studies, neo-anarchists, large segments of Christian ecumenicalism, etc.

And the one thing that all of these neo-Marxists abhor is empiricism—the search for knowledge independent of a political agenda. In the search to uncover racism/ethnocentrism I only ask one thing: researchers follow the same strict adherence to culture-free testing that is now universal in intelligence testing. That is, if they are going to show that group X is racist/ethnocentric, then they must do two things. First, they must prove that the tests are free of all cultural or ethnic bias. Second, they must show that the results have some significant meaning in how people interact and its impact on life. Intelligence tests have met both of these conditions, as the Left has demanded. Now let them stop using *racism* as an excuse for their failed political agenda until they abide by the same rules they demanded of the empiricists. Let us pursue our inquiries into human nature, independent of these despotic egotists who want to rise to the ruling elite through intimidation. As governments get larger and more aligned in a common global goal, the ruling elite will become more despotic and indifferent to the needs to those they rule. Only small, homogenous nations can hold their ruling elite on the short leash, which keeps them from betraying their own kind.

Now one final note on ethnocentrism—it is often given up in favor of elite groupism and it is dangerously anti-democratic and possibly leading us towards a globalistic totalitarianism. One of the reasons for this as I stated above is the ruling elite usually bails out on their own kin relationships and opt for aligning themselves only with other people of power. Where we see this with the longest history is with Jews as a small minority aligning with the ruling classes in numerous European countries from monarchies to democracies and Communism (MacDonald 1994). They have a history of being seen as the great manipulators of heads of states against their own people.

The Jews then have been condemned over and over again for their

meddling in the dominant culture's cohesiveness and have been seen as enriching themselves through greed, cunning and avarice. But there is another way of looking at what is actually taking place. Jews (specifically Ashkenazi Jews) in the West are by nature of their racial make-up on average highly intelligent. Because of this, it is only natural that many of them become part of the *ruling elite*. Likewise, any other members of the dominant culture that rises to the level of the *ruling elite*—whether they rise to the *ruling elite* by being movie stars, athletes, corporate executives, etc.—will quite often bail on their own kin and form an alliance with this multiethnic group. As luck [sic] has it, The United States has a large number of Jews, about 2 to 3%, so they have an enormous influence on government policy that favors what is good for Jews and good for Israel. And correctly then, the Islamic world hates the United States as they see us as being controlled by those damn Jews. So hatred of Jews is a lot alike hatred for capitalism. The masses hate in general the ruling elite, because in fact the ruling elite, contrary to what they say, generally behaves with allegiance towards their own self-defined group rather than their kin or citizens.

This has been a problem ever since humans left their egalitarian hunter-gatherer way of life and started to form large hierarchical social structures. It is why we view so many politicians as being corrupt. It is why Hollywood is so liberal (at present) and seems to be out of touch with Middle America. It is why corporate executives pander to Jesse Jackson's extortionists demands to the dismay of the public. One could go on and on. It is because many (not all) of these people we call the ruling elite for lack of a better term, are really no longer part of their own culture or community. They have joined a newer and far more prestigious one that is globally connected. Like any family or village they may fight amongst themselves, but they are no longer part of their grass roots culture.

I watched this phenomenon occur in the Daley family in Chicago. The old man, Richard J. Daley, mayor from 1955 to 1976, climbed from a humble beginning to the top. When he reached the top he kept some of

his roots to his community intact. His son however, Mayor Richard M. Daley, having grown up as an elite, has taken on a universalist, loves everyone (as long as you are rich or famous) tone of governing. He is heavy into pin-stripe patronage, old fashioned patronage, flying to Paris to get ideas for planting trees, and surrounds himself with prima donnas and the powerful. And of course, panders again to every minority and liberal cause because he has no longer ANY connection with his Irish heritage. It seems reasonable we could observe this same phenomenon in Al Gore, George W. Bush, Jesse Jackson Junior, the Kennedys, just to name a few. Their loyalty is to their new group of powerful friends and allies.

I do not condemn this predictable evolutionary behavior on the part of the ruling elite, but it does bring into question whether democracy can work under multiculturalism/multiracialism. If the nation-state is not homogeneous then the ruling elite can never represent the people. They will form their own loosely defined but different culture and group evolutionary strategies. And we are seeing the results of this today. We brought the problems of terrorism on ourselves in the United States when we allowed our leaders to pursue a globalist agenda for their own personal aggrandizement. This is the tragedy of the new Western liberalism. Like Communism, it ignores or denies basic human nature. However, I don't see the inherent problems with democracy going away when a nation is united ethnically. A real democratic nation will still have to pursue a eugenic policy to raise the average intelligence of all of its citizens followed by a method of direct democracy where the politicians propose but the public decides. With the Internet, those who wished could vote directly in favor or against legislation as well as debating legislation on-line before voting.

Chapter Six: Eugenics and Racism

The Greek philosopher Plato in his book *The Republic*, written about 380 B.C, first advanced eugenics. But even before Plato's proposal the breeding of crops and animals had been known and practiced for more than ten thousand years. And in almost every culture or civilization, there were concerns for the genetic quality of the people, though they did not understand the underlying mechanism. They could however readily see the results, and did so in breeding all sorts, including human breeding.

During the turn of the last century, socialists, nativists, conservatives and policy advocates of all types understood this: the underclass was there because of poor racial hygiene or bad breeding. Even the Jewish religion fully understood the consequences of good breeding and racialism. The following excerpts are from "Jewish Eugenics and Other Essays", Three Papers Read Before the New York Board of Jewish Ministers, 1915, Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1916. "Jewish Eugenics" By Rabbi Max Reichler:

> "Who knows the cause of Israel's survival? Why did the Jew survive the onslaughts of Time, when others, numerically and politically stronger, succumbed? Obedience to the Law of Life, declares the modern student of eugenics, was the saving quality which rendered the **Jewish race** immune from disease and destruction. 'The Jews, ancient and modern,' says Dr. Stanton Coit, 'have always understood the science of eugenics, and have governed themselves in accordance with it; hence the preservation of the Jewish race.'"
>
> "To be sure eugenics as a science could hardly have existed among the ancient Jews; but many eugenic rules were certainly incorporated in the large collection of Biblical and Rabbinical

laws. Indeed there are clear indications of a conscious effort to utilize all influences that might improve the inborn qualities of the Jewish race, and to guard against any practice that might vitiate the purity of the race, or 'impair the racial qualities of future generations' either physically, mentally, or morally....

"The very founder of the Jewish race, the patriarch Abraham, recognized the importance of certain inherited qualities, and insisted that the wife of his 'only beloved son' should not come from 'the daughters of the Canaanites,' but from the seed of a superior stock.

"In justifying this seemingly narrow view of our patriarch, one of the Rabbis significantly suggests: 'Even if the wheat of your own clime does not appear to be of the best, its seeds will prove more productive than others not suitable to that particular soil.'

"This contention is eugenically correct. Davenport tells of a settlement worker of this city who made special inquiry concerning a certain unruly and criminally inclined section of his territory, and found that the offenders came from one village in Calabria, known as 'the home of the brigands.' Just as there is a home of the brigands, so there may be 'a home of the pure bloods.'

"Eugenicists also claim that though consanguineous marriages are in most cases injurious to the progeny, yet where relatives possess 'valuable characters, whether apparent or not, marriages between them might be encouraged, as a means of rendering permanent a rare and valuable family trait, which might otherwise be much less likely to become an established characteristic.' Abraham's servant, Eliezer, so the Midrash states, desired to offer his own daughter to Isaac, but his master sternly rebuked him, saying: 'Thou art cursed, and my son is blessed, and

it does not behoove the cursed to mate with the blessed, and thus deteriorate the quality of the race.'

"The aim of eugenics is to encourage the reproduction of the good and 'blessed' human protoplasm and the elimination of the impure and 'cursed' human protoplasm. According to Francis Galton, it is 'to check the birthrate of the unfit, and to further the productivity of the fit by early marriages and the rearing of healthful children....'

"Great, in the eyes of the Rabbis, was the offense of him who married a woman from an element classed among the unfit. His act was as reprehensible as if he had dug up every fertile field in existence and sown it with salt. A quintuple transgression was his, for which he will be bound hand and foot by Elijah, the great purifier, and flogged by God himself. 'Woe unto him who deteriorates the quality of his children and defiles the purity of his family,' is the verdict of Elijah endorsed by God. On the other hand, the mating of two persons possessing unique and noble traits cannot but result in the establishment of superior and influential families. When God will cause his Shechinah to dwell in Israel, only such which scrupulously preserved the purity of their families, will be privileged to witness the manifestation of the Holy Spirit....

"The marriage between the offspring of inferior stock and that of superior stock, such as the marriage between a scholar and the daughter of an am-haarez, or between an am-haarez and the daughter of a scholar, was considered extremely undesirable, and was condemned very strongly. Moreover, no Rabbi or Talmid Chacham was allowed to take part in the celebration of such a non-eugenic union....

"A parallel to the 'rough eugenic ideal' of marrying 'health,

wealth and wisdom' is found in the words of Rabbi Akiba, who claims that 'a father bequeaths to his child beauty, health, wealth, wisdom and longevity.' Similarly, ugliness, sickness, poverty, stupidity and the tendency to premature death, are transmitted from father to offspring. Hence we are told that when Moses desired to know why some of the righteous suffer in health and material prosperity, while others prosper and reap success; and again, why some of the wicked suffer, while others enjoy success and material well-being; God explained that the righteous and wicked who thrive and flourish, are usually the descendants of righteous parents, while those who suffer and fail materially are the descendants of wicked parents.

"Thus the Rabbis recognized the fact that both physical and psychical qualities were inherited, and endeavored by direct precept and law, as well as by indirect advice and admonition, to preserve and improve the inborn, wholesome qualities of the Jewish race. It is true that they were willing to concede that 'a pure-bred individual may be produced by a hybrid mated with a pure bred,' for they found examples of that nature in Ruth the Moabitess, Naamah the Ammonitess, Hezekiah and Mordecai. As a general eugenic rule, however, they maintained that one cannot produce 'a clean thing out of an unclean,' and discouraged any kind of intermarriage even with proselytes [converts to Judaism]. Their ideal was a race healthy in body and in spirit, pure and undefiled, devoid of any admixture of inferior human protoplasm.

"Such an ideal, though apparently narrow and chauvinistic, has its eugenic value, as the following suggestive quotation from a well-known eugenist clearly indicates. 'Families in which good and noble qualities of mind and body have become hereditary, form a natural aristocracy; and if such families take pride in recording their pedigrees, marry among themselves, and

> establish a predominant fertility, they can assure success and position to the majority of their descendants in any political future. They can become the guardians and trustees of a sound inborn heritage, which, incorruptible and undefiled, they can preserve in purity and vigor throughout whatever period of ignorance and decay may be in store for the nation at large. Neglect to hand on undimmed the priceless germinal qualities which such families possess, can be regarded only as betrayal of a sacred trust.'"

It is obvious from this scholarly work that eugenics was a part of Judaism's religious writings and practices since the very beginning and that to a large extent Judaism was and is a eugenic religion (MacDonald 1994). And it was a simple formula. Those males, who were intelligent, especially in scholarly readings and debating the scriptures, were married to the daughters of the wealthy Jews, who no doubt were above average in intelligence as were their offspring. Jews who were not successful or who were not scholarly tended to defect, under almost constant persecutions, to a safer haven among the Christians.

Over the last few decades for the first time in history, the charge of racism has been used to attack eugenics. If you are a *eugenicist* then you are a *racist* (I have reviewed nine books on eugenics and genetic engineering, published in *The Mankind Quarterly*, Spring 2001, pages 315-50. My original article submitted to Mankind Quarterly is available at http://www.neoeugenics.net/gen.htm).

The latest and in my opinion the best book on eugenics is *Eugenics: A Reassessment* by Richard Lynn, 2001, published by Praeger Press as part of the "Human Evolution, Behavior, and Intelligence" series edited by Seymour W. Itzkoff. This book is a remarkable compilation of the current issue of eugenics and how it has returned and what we can expect in the coming battle where everything labeled eugenic will be attacked as racist. I will use it as my primary source for showing why the charge of *racism* is used to try and deter the eugenicists' exponential growth in human genetic engineering and why they abhor it.

The Left, led by Marxists like Montagu, Boaz, Gould, Lewontin, Rose, Kamin et al., captured the reins of ideological propaganda and convinced the West that "race" did not exist and that eugenics was pseudoscience. They managed to do this through sheer force of character and the willing passiveness of the public to believe what they were told—repetition and almost total control of the media by the Left made the indoctrination rather easy. Deception along with moral duplicity allowed these intellectual terrorists to neuter Western society into believing in equalitarianism—or a false belief that under the skin all humans were absolutely equal in every way. We are just now freeing ourselves from those shackles that were placed upon us to keep us from challenging the very concept of racial differences and group evolutionary strategies.

The book covers eugenics from top to bottom so I will discuss just some of the most interesting or informative aspects of the book as it relates to eugenics. First, Lynn finally puts to rest the notion that equates Nazism/racism with eugenics and eugenics with the Holocaust. Galton argued in 1869 that immigration of Russian and Polish Jews into England was eugenic for the overall improvement of the genetic capital of England: they were welcomed because of their genetic quality. And Hitler never argued that the Jews were inferior but quite the contrary. He argued they were of such superior stock genetically that they were a threat to the Aryan race. Many scholars have corrected this misinformation, and Lynn summarizes it elegantly. In addition, Nazi Germany did not have a sterilization program for the mentally retarded or insane that was any broader in scope than other countries at the time. Per capita, Sweden had sterilized far more people, as did many most Western countries. When it came to euthanasia, there was basically one purpose for its implementation when beginning in 1939 the Nazis needed to free up resources and make room in the hospitals for the war effort. Euthanasia had nothing to do with eugenics.

But ethnocentrism was in play in Germany because it was held that the Jews

had "evolved genetic qualities that made them good as middlemen in such occupations as money lenders and traders but that they were not good at production. They viewed the Jewish qualities as 'specialized for a parasitic existence.' The idea that money lenders and middlemen are parasitical and do not make a positive contribution to a nation's economy is, of course, economically illiterate, but it was nevertheless held by a certain number of German biologists and geneticists in the 1930s." But others parasitize ethnic groups when the opportunity avails itself, as explained by Dawkins (1982) (see http://www.neoeugenics.net/host.htm for a discussion of ethnic parasitic behaviors).

So as it turns out, Germany's eugenics' program was never very developed or aggressive: they had war on their minds. Other countries were much more assertive—eugenics was supported by socialists as well as the general public. But to make a case for Marxism in the last few decades, it was very beneficial to link the defeated and hated Nazis with eugenics/racism. When this stuck in the public's mind, radical environmentalism was on its way to being largely unchallenged. And as part of this propaganda "Kamin (1974), Kevles (1985), and Gould (1981) maintain[ed] that eugenic considerations played a major part in the quota restrictions imposed by the act, but Herrnstein and Murray (1994) doubt this, pointing out that no reference to the intelligence of immigrants appears in the Congressional records of the time. However, politicians do not always like to put on paper their motives for passing legislation; and after the elapse of three quarters of a century, it is impossible to assess precisely the degree to which eugenic arguments contributed to the national quota restrictions imposed by the 1924 Immigration Act." So there has been a continuous and relentless distortion of history by these perennial Marxists and for decades they did indoctrinate the West into believing that racism/eugenicism were evils perpetrated by the devious Anglo mind.

Today, this mindset is still in place. In numerous articles and surveys, different racial groups are compared and typically the status of Blacks is compared to that of Whites, and the disparity is blamed always on racism

or the government's failure to act strongly enough to make everyone equal. Never is the point made that different racial groups have incomes equivalent to their average IQs, with Blacks on the bottom and Jews and East Asians at the top. It is always taken for granted that different racial groups are on average equally intelligent, and yet only sociologists and cultural anthropologists still embrace this myth and perpetuate it through the media by routinely issuing new studies and surveys that ignore genetic differences. Lynn shatters the racial equality myth summarizing succinctly what is known today. He even includes a formula for estimating the expected intelligence of your children based on the parents IQ and the average IQ of the general population that the parents belong to.

And levels of average intelligence also have a strong impact on the productivity of nations. Lynn and Vanhanen (See *The Mankind Quarterly*, Summer 2001 and the forthcoming book *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* in 2002) have studied 81 nations showing how the average intelligence correlates with the Gross Domestic Product:

Country	IQ	GDP	Fitted GDP
Hong Kong	107	20,763	19,817
Korea, South	106	13,478	19,298
Japan	105	23,257	18,779
Taiwan	104	13,000	18,260
Singapore	103	24,210	17,740
Austria	102	23,166	17,221

Germany	102	22,169	17,221
Italy	102	20,585	17,221
Netherlands	102	22,176	17,221
Sweden	101	20,659	16,702
Switzerland	101	25,512	16,702
Belgium	100	23,223	16,183
China	100	3,105	16,183
NewZealand	100	17,288	16,183
U. Kingdom	100	20,336	16,183
Hungary	99	10,232	15,664
Poland	99	7,619	15,664
Australia	98	22,452	15,145
Denmark	98	24,218	15,145
France	98	21,175	15,145
Norway	98	26,342	15,145
United States	98	29,605	15,145
Canada	97	23,582	14,626
Czech Republic	97	12,362	14,626
Finland	97	20,847	14,626
Spain	97	16,212	14,626
Argentina	96	12,013	14,107
Russia	96	6,460	14,107
Slovakia	96	9,699	14,107

Uruguay	96	8,623	14,107
Portugal	95	14,701	13,589
Slovenia	95	14,293	13,588
Israel	94	17,301	13,069
Romania	94	5,648	13,069
Bulgaria	93	4,809	12,550
Ireland	93	21,482	12,550
Greece	92	13,943	12,031
Malaysia	92	8,137	12,031
Thailand	91	5,456	11,512
Croatia	90	6,749	10,993
Peru	90	4,282	10,993
Turkey	90	6,422	10,993
Colombia	89	6,006	10,474
Indonesia	89	2,651	10,474
Suri name	89	5,161	10,474
Brazil	87	6,625	9,436
Iraq	87	3,197	9,436
Mexico	87	7,704	9,436
Samoa (Western)	87	3,832	9,436
Tonga	87	3,000	9,436
Lebanon	86	4,326	8,917
Philippines	86	3,555	8,917
Cuba	85	3,967	8,398

Morocco	85	3,305	8,398
Fiji	84	4,231	7,879
Iran	84	5,121	7,879
Marshall Islands	84	3,000	7,879
Puerto Rico	84	8,000	7,879
Egypt	83	3,041	7,360
India	81	2,077	6,322
Ecuador	80	3,003	5,803
Guatemala	79	3,505	5,284
Barbados	78	12,001	4,765
Nepal	78	1,157	4,765
Qatar	78	20,987	4,765
Zambia	77	719	4,246
Congo (Brazz)	73	995	2,170
Uganda	73	1,074	2,170
Jamaica	72	3,389	1,651
Kenya	72	980	1,651
South Africa	72	8,488	1,651
Sudan	72	1,394	1,651
Tanzania	72	480	1,651
Ghana	71	1,735	1,132
Nigeria	67	795	-944
Guinea	66	1,782	-1,463

Zimbabwe	66	2,669	-1,463
Congo (Zaire)	65	822	-1,982
Sierra Leone	64	458	-2,501
Ethiopia	63	574	-3,020
Equatorial Guinea	59	1,817	-5,096

He also tackles the "if everyone is intelligent, who will mow my lawn?" argument. With numerous examples, explanations, and hypotheses about a future world of geniuses, he puts this conundrum to rest. In short, even geniuses are capable of doing the dishes and mowing the lawn. If highly intelligent Jews can share the manual workload on an Israeli Kibbutzim, then a eugenic state of geniuses can also. I would also venture a guess from the evidence that the only intelligent people who would resist doing their share of the more tedious tasks would be those with the behavioral trait of low conscientiousness. And as I will discuss later, this is the only behavioral trait that probably has no benefit to society and should be bred out of the general population anyway.

Which brings us to psychopathy, conscientiousness and agreeableness. Once we all agree that a eugenics' program should reduce genetic disease and raise general intelligence, the only non-trivial question left is should we tamper with human behavioral traits? Psychometricians, astonishingly, have settled on the use of the *Big-Five* behavioral factors: conscientiousness, agreeableness, introversion-extroversion, open-mindedness, and neuroticism. Lynn puts to rest, as do many other psychometricians, any notion that the last three have any consequences in the workplace in general. That is, many different combinations of these three factors can be of benefit or a hindrance depending on the task. So Lynn concentrates on the first two that in

combination results in a psychopathic personality.

He demonstrates convincingly that from all the available research, psychopaths with low intelligence are responsible for society's problems such as crime, drug addiction, unwed mothers, drug abuse, rape, child abuse, unemployment, etc. These people are the underclass. And they result from the combination of two behavioral traits. They almost universally have low conscientiousness and low agreeableness or altruism. (Lynn explains that *altruism* would be a better term than *agreeableness* but that term has now "stuck" as the common descriptor for this behavioral trait). That is, people who are both highly unconscientious and disagreeable are pathological, and both of these traits are highly heritable.

From this observation, Lynn softly recommends that a eugenics' program should include a reduction of both unconscientiousness and disagreeableness. But I have to take issue with this recommendation. My interpretation is that only conscientiousness has no value in modern society, and that its elimination will eliminate the psychopaths, especially in a nation-state with an extremely high average intelligence. Such a society should be able to deal with the occasionally exceptionally *disagreeable* person. There is no need to get rid of disagreeableness because a highly altruistic state may be extremely vulnerable to indoctrination and subjugation. This seems to be why the West is now in a dysgenic spiral downward, the more Scandinavian races have a maladaptive level of altruism (agreeableness) that allows others to become parasitical towards them. This is a dangerous combination and though the society may benefit internally from altruism it can also be overtaken by other racial groups who are far less altruistic and benevolent.

Agreeableness or altruism is interesting then not only because of the impact this trait has on a population group or race, but also between races. First, there does not seem to be any correlation between work

productivity and agreeableness. So in a homogeneous society it seems that it would add little to the economy to eliminate it. But being disagreeable does have an impact on aggressive psychopaths, or those who are violent rather than just dysfunctional. And violence is always a concern in a society. And we also know that Blacks are about ten times more violent or involved in criminal activity than Whites, so what does that tell us about Blacks, crime and behavioral types. Lynn states that:

> "The amoral, antisocial, and aggressive nature of the psychopathic personality has been elaborated by the APA in its 1994 edition of *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)*. It lists eleven features of the condition, now renamed *antisocial personality disorder*. These are: (1) inability to sustain consistent work behavior; (2) failure to conform to social norms with respect to lawful behavior; (3) irritability and aggressivity, as indicated by repeated physical fights or assaults; (4) repeated failure to honor financial obligations; *(5)* failure to plan ahead, or impulsivity; (6) no regard for truth, as indicated by repeated lying, use of aliases, or "conning" others; (7) recklessness regarding one's own or others' personal safety, as indicated by driving while intoxicated or recurrent speeding; (8) inability to function as a responsible parent; (9) failure to sustain a monogamous relationship for more than one year; (10) lacking remorse; (11) the presence of conduct disorder in childhood. It may be useful to note that among these characteristics, numbers 3, 8, 9, and 11 are moral failures in regard to social relationships, whereas the remainder are moral failures in regard to the self and to self-discipline."

The above list looks an awful lot like a description of the people who live in Black ghettos and lends me to conclude from what we know about intelligence that Blacks may very well have, in addition to an average low intelligence, an inordinately high average of disagreeableness or lack of altruism. Rushton (1995) has looked at the differences in behavioral

traits between Blacks, Whites and East Asians and there seems to be real differences between the three groups. So let's look at some of this data. For example, it is often stated that we need to have Mexican immigrants to perform jobs that other Americans will not do. So how is that possible? Why will Mexicans work hard for low wages but not Blacks? I must assume that is has a lot to do with the innate pathology of Blacks—primarily, low conscientiousness.

Lynn also notes that high self-esteem is also a characteristic of psychopaths, and we also know from behavioral studies that low intelligence Blacks have unusually high self-esteem. Since they should be able to infer their relationship with regards to intelligence in comparison to others, I have to assume that this self-esteem is genetic rather than cultural. Which brings us to crime. Are blacks more criminal because of their low intelligence, their innate psychopathic personalities, or is it due to them being told by the Left that they are being discriminated against?

If I as an Islamic imam preached hatred towards the West, and encouraged a jihad to make things right, would I not be complicit in exciting others to commit terrorist acts? Well, that is what the Left has done with regards to Blacks. They have been telling Blacks to hate Whites because we have oppressed them, rather than telling them the truth: races differ in innate intelligence on average. It is not oppression but *fair play* that makes some groups do better than others. So if Blacks have been angered to commit even more crime than they normally would have because they have been promised benefits and rewards that they do not deserve, then the Left should be held accountable for inciting Blacks towards violence. Just as the West should not be held responsible for all the problems in the Islamic world, Whites should not be held responsible for all the problems among Blacks around the world. Rushton (1995) clearly shows that Blacks everywhere are more prone to crime than Whites or East Asians. But the increase in Black crime from animosity incited by the Left is clearly an act of aggression and should not be tolerated. Telling Blacks they could be as well off as Whites or telling

Whites they could be as well of as Jews if only there was no discrimination is clearly wrong and hateful in either case. Races rise to their own innate capabilities in free market economies.

But of course the "right-to-lifers" are just as culpable for increased crime as is the Left. Before about 1930 people generally accepted that crime ran in families, and that the only remedy was to reduce the number of offspring born to the underclass before they overran society. Eugenics was on the verge of overcoming the crime wave from the underclass. But then abortion became legal and has vindicated what the early eugenicists were trying to accomplish:

> "The eugenic impact of abortion in the United States has been demonstrated by Steven Levitt, an economist at the University of Chicago, and John Donohue, a lawyer at Stanford University (Levitt & Donohue, 1999). They noted that following the Supreme Court decision in 1973 effectively legalizing abortion throughout the United States, the annual numbers of abortions increased from approximately 750,000 in 1972 to approximately 1.6 million in 1980. They also noted that most of this large increase in the numbers of abortions occurred among the poor, blacks, and the underclass, who produce the greatest numbers of criminals. Hence, they conclude that approximately 1 million potential criminals who would previously have been born were aborted. They estimate that this explains about half of the reduction in crime that occurred between 1991 and 1997. In further support of this thesis, they found that states with the highest abortion rates after 1973 experienced the greatest reduction in crime some 20 years later. Furthermore, five states that allowed abortions before the 1973 Supreme Court ruling permitting abortion experienced an earlier reduction in crime. This study demonstrates the considerable eugenic benefits accruing from the legalization of abortion. (Lynn 2000)

Lynn then deals with the mechanisms for reducing genetic disease and increasing intelligence. First, he points out that detractors of eugenics are correct in their pessimism of completely eliminating recessive genetic diseases because as they are reduced they become ever more difficult to select against. But he notes that in ten generations, half of all recessive genetic disease alleles could be eliminated. This in combination with genetic testing of the fetus could make the complete elimination of the alleles unnecessary. The genetic disease itself would seldom be expressed in a child.

With regards to increasing intelligence eugenically, he makes a good case for how relatively easy it is. Since the heritability of intelligence is so high at around 80% compared to say behavioral factors around 50% or a little less, intelligence is a no-brainer for eugenics. And with new technologies, remarkable jumps can be made in just one generation. He shows how if a normal couple would just genetically select the potentially most intelligent embryos for implantation, the intelligence of the children selected would increase by 15 IQ points. Yes—15 IQ points in every generation up to the theoretical maximum of about 200 without any new mutations. All we need to do is identify the intelligence genes, and this should be possible in just a few shorts years (Plomin's prediction—not Lynn's). Eugenic selection for intelligence via genetic testing of embryos followed by in vitro fertilization (IVF) is just a few years away. And the advantages would be passed on to every generation that follows! Now **that** is one hell of a *rate of return* on your money. Spend it up front before the child is even born, and the returns are forever.

Up until the last two chapters of the book, Lynn just provides us with what eugenics can do, the mechanics, and ethical foundations for its use. In these final chapters however he states what I also think is the obvious, but he is much more sanguine about the outcome. Let me try to summarize his perspective and then I will embellish it. Basically the West is too *altruistic* or genetically high in *agreeableness* (I can't think of any better term) to institute an effective eugenics' program. But the East

is capable of making these tough-minded decisions, and especially China. They have already fully embraced a eugenics' policy and as the ruling totalitarian oligarchs shift from communism to nationalism, this lone nation with over a billion people will arise as the world power. They will use a combination of eugenics with a population that is already second to none in intelligence (aside from the Ashkenazi Jews) and along with their size will grow in power and technology. But here is where Lynn and I differ. He thinks that once China has dominated the world, we will enter a period of peace even if it is without democracy.

I see a different outcome, based on human nature. There is no point having power unless one can use it to dominate others. As the Chinese eugenic nation-state expands, they will not make peace with other races but they will instead subjugate others, as ethnocentrism has shown us all racial groups will try to do to others. In addition, they will use the females of other subjugated races to raise their children. That is, human slaves will be used as surrogate mothers. This new elite race of East Asians will not tolerate their own women having to suffer the pains of bearing children when there is a plentiful supply of foreign breeders available. These slave breeders will be kept in perfectly controlled environments for this breeding purpose, to assure that the elite women do not have to suffer any inconveniences. And after birth, East Asian professional caretakers will raise the children so that again, the elite will not have to be bothered by the inconvenience of annoying children. Sound impossible? Read Lynn's book and see which scenario seems more plausible.

But of course, the above plausibility is not really even relevant. What is important is that once eugenics becomes commonplace, and it is recognized that the most intelligent races will dominate the world, then the arms race in eugenics will commence. It may happen within one nation-state, it may happen by way of collective cults, it may happen by the wealthiest using the technology aggressively. But it will happen and it will not happen equally to all races or peoples. And this is what an

evolutionary arms race is all about. The next 100 years will see a new human species arise—or the destruction of all humans. But one thing is sure; it will not be peaceably negotiated away. Eugenics is happening now! And it will be accelerating at an exponential rate over the next few decades.

The charges of *scientific racism* then will be used to try and stop this very natural progression of humans wanting to achieve higher levels of perfection for their offspring through directed evolution. But as was stated in Chapter Four, humans are concerned first with egotism, then nepotism, followed by altruism. All humans are going to want the best for their children before yielding to their altruistic sense of raising everyone up equally, especially those outside of their own group—the troublesome and dangerous *other*. Ethnocentrism will make this battle very salient as racial groups compete or try to prevent other racial groups from advancing. And unlike economic competition, the acquisition of genetic perfection is forever to be transferred onto the future generations. The implications for this genetic arms race is really staggering in scope. It will surely result in a zero sum game or winner-takes-all. Once any one racial group gets very far ahead, and maintains their cohesiveness, it will be very difficult for any other groups to overtake the leader aside from warfare, terror or government sponsored genocide.

So eugenics can improve the genetic capital of parents' children, a race of people, a nation-state, or even a cult or religion similar to Judaism's eugenics. How racism will be linked with eugenics then will determine what group is winning and which group is losing. Whether eugenics is individual, national, universalist, or global doesn't matter because it is already well on its way. (For an outline of a modern reformulation of a eugenic religion, one that can prosper in a globalist world, see http://www.prometheism.net.)[8]

Charges of racism are conveniently inserted into arguments for individual freedom over the rights of society even as individual rights versus societies rights changes rather quickly. Again, with the bombing

of the World Trade Center, we see citizens willing to give up individual rights under the perceived threat of harm—no matter how distant or real it really is. It seems that the whole set of arguments for individual rights over societal rights is more an issue by issue means of social manipulation. But the fact is they are linked and one cannot be pursued without the other. As Lynn points out:

> "Yet in the late twentieth century, people with HIV and AIDS were allowed complete liberty in the Western democracies, including the liberty of infecting others, and were allowed to travel freely and to enter the countries without any checks on whether they had HIV or AIDS. Some of those with these conditions have inflicted high social and individual costs in spreading the infection. They have been allowed to do so because of the priority accorded to individual rights over social rights.
>
> "In the second half of the twentieth century, a component of this general trend was an increasing acceptance of the right of those with genetic diseases and disorders, those with mental retardation, and criminals to have children, despite the social costs imposed by the genetic transmission of these pathologies; and this right came to be regarded as more legitimate than the social right of society to curtail the reproductive liberties of these groups. **The fact that social rights ultimately involve the welfare of actual human beings was overlooked.** Eugenics is premised on the assertion of social rights and in particular the right of the state to curtail reproductive liberties in the interests of preserving and promoting the genetic quality of the population. It was this change in values toward according greater precedence to individual rights at the expense of social rights that was the fundamental reason for the rejection of eugenics in the Western democracies in the closing decades of the twentieth century."

Again, think of the single issue of HIV and AIDS. If we looked at this as a health problem not unlike we look now at terrorists, infected people with HIV would have been quarantined. Simply put, HIV infected people have killed millions more by freely spreading the disease in liberal societies. And I would contend that this was allowed to happen not because of an overriding concern with individual rights but because the Left was using it as a means to push radical egalitarianism. It was a way of again using charges of racism to promote homosexual rights thus leading to more suffering and death. Had society undertaken early testing and quarantine, the disease could have been contained.

The reality is that societies routinely prohibit or enforce many behaviors for the good of the nation, and it is only *the set of current controlled behaviors* that changes. We control who can drive a car, what kind of dogs people may own because some are more dangerous (this is a rather recent phenomenon), security checks at airports are now far more stringent, citizens are asked to go to war and lose their lives whether they believe in the war[s] or not, they are coerced to live together in integrated communities even if the heterogynous people don't get along, people are not allowed to smoke pot even in the privacy or their own homes, etc. ad infinitum.

In every nation, prohibitions change over time, and humans are coerced into behaving according to these *current* prohibitions—or value system if you like (every decent person must give to the United Way at work). Eugenics is the same. Once it is recognized fully just how important a nation's average genetic quality benefits the society as a whole in terms of economic viability, good health, low crime, and a myriad of other socially desirable factors the more it will be demanded that the underclass of pathological behavior and the average intelligence of the nation be given more attention. Those nations that cannot produce the bombs are subject to having others drop the bombs on them as we are seeing now in Afghanistan. And as nations compete, and we come to abandon the dogma of equalitarianism and recognize that many

population groups will never escape poverty and despair because of their genetic handicaps, the more eugenics will be embraced as the only economical way to improve the nation-state.

Even more importantly is that eugenics is already all around us but goes by many names **but** eugenics. Lynn states, "The reason the medical profession has sought to deny that these procedures are eugenic is that by the last two decades of the twentieth century any procedure that could be identified as eugenic was automatically condemned.... And Abby Lippman (1991) suggests that the denial that these procedures are eugenic is hypocritical, writing, 'Though the word eugenics is scrupulously avoided in most biomedical reports about prenatal diagnosis, except where it is strongly disclaimed as a motive for intervention, this is disingenuous. Prenatal diagnosis presupposes that certain fetal conditions are intrinsically undesirable.'"

The consensus today is moving towards accepting that people have an obligation not to bring defective children into the world when genetic testing makes it preventable. And those who do so for various reasons usually expect and even demand that others pay the cost for the care and treatment of these unwelcome children. They would never have been allowed to survive in the past if our current technology had been available to them. In our evolutionary past, children who were defective were routinely killed at birth (Hrdy 1999).

It seems evident then that eugenics will continue to be called *racist* as long as it is politically useful for those who use the term for political gain. This is usually political activists who have an agenda that may not always be obvious. But there is one group where it is very transparent. Lynn states:

> "The second social change that took place in the second half of the twentieth century that will make it more difficult to rehabilitate eugenics consists of the growth of groups hostile to

eugenics. These consist of ideologically committed civil liberties groups and of a variety of special interest groups, all of which have a common cause in placing the liberties of the individual above social well-being. Two powerful special interest groups in particular can be expected to oppose eugenic programs. The first of these consists of the administrators, social workers, medical workers, psychologists, educators, and the like, whose careers have been built on catering for the needs of the mentally retarded, criminals, and psychopaths and who have identified with the interests of these 'clients,' as they have become known. These would inevitably oppose eugenic proposals designed to reduce the numbers of the social problem groups on whose existence their own careers depend and with whom they have come to empathize.

"A second special interest group that would be expected to oppose any attempt to rehabilitate eugenics is the racial and ethnic minorities that would be disproportionately affected by eugenic policies. Foremost among these are African Americans and Hispanics in the United States and Africans in Europe, whose low average intelligence and high crime rates would make them disproportionately subject to sterilization and restrictions on immigration. Any proposal to introduce eugenic programs of sterilization and immigration control would inevitably be rigorously opposed by these groups and their advocates. By the closing decades of the twentieth century, it had become politically impossible in the United States for either the Republican or the Democratic parties to reduce immigration, let alone to introduce selective acceptance criteria, because of the voting power of the African Americans and Hispanics, who naturally favor the admission of increasing numbers of their own racial and ethnic groups. This problem is also present throughout Europe where, although the ethnic and racial minorities are fewer in number, they are still sufficiently numerous to deter political leaders from

> introducing measures calculated to offend them. The same problem of adverse impact would also be present in any attempt to introduce measures of positive eugenics, such as the provision of financial incentives for high-earning elites to have children. Disproportionately fewer of the ethnic and racial minorities would qualify, except for the Asians, and on this account they would be likely to oppose measures of this kind."

So it may be difficult in the West to overcome the obstacles for a eugenic national program. But Lynn argues that in the East, in such countries as China, Singapore, Taiwan, etc., eugenics has and will continue to be of national concern. And with East Asians already above average intelligence, they may well win the eugenic arms race. But in the West, individuals with their economic resources will increasingly turn to eugenics to give the best possible opportunities to their children. From assortative mating—the simple awareness of one's mate's intelligence and pedigree—to genetic testing, increasingly the aware parents will apply every eugenic means they can to have the best babies they can. One very exciting prospect is embryo selection, where numerous embryos are fertilized and allowed to divide into eight cells each. Then, a cell from each will be genetically tested and the best one[s] will be implanted to produce the best possible child. Not only will the child be free of genetic defects to the limit of the technology, but the embryos can also be selected for example to have the highest intelligence. We are very close, thanks to the Human Genome Project, of beginning to identify the dozen or so anticipated genetic alleles that contribute to intelligence.

Now think of the economic investment and the future prospects for families—and/or members of a eugenic religion—that chooses to invest in the genetic quality of their children. For example, a couple could spend say $50,000 upfront to select an almost defect-free child with say an intelligence of 130 rather than say a normal child with an intelligence of 110. The added 20 points will make a tremendous difference in the more intelligent child's education. They could be educated at home, allowed to

learn at their own pace, or use computers for their education, etc. In addition, they will be able to get into almost any university and also obtain scholarships. Or, within a few years take advantage of on-line universities at a fraction of the cost of going to a university. Having an IQ of 130 versus 110 can translate into many thousands of dollars in reducing educational costs and in one's lifetime earning. And, this genetic investment can now be passed on to the next generation.

As Lynn shows, each generation can easily increase their average IQ (of the eugenic group under consideration) by 15 points. By the second generation, traditional schooling would be mostly a waste of time. With and average IQ exceeding 145 these children would be bored in traditional classrooms and will essentially be able to self-educate themselves with little direction. And by the third generation, with an average IQ of 160, boredom or lack of challenge would be the greatest detriment for these children. However, these children will no longer be rare. They will grow up with others just like them and will be able to interact and be challenged by each other. They may never even experience in any real fashion the *other's* lack of intelligence—that is they will be raised and associate with primarily others like themselves. And they will have the money and the power to separate themselves in gated enclaves rather than dealing too intimately with the underclass. Speciation by this time will have begun. And that does not even include new methods of genetic alteration.

Lynn summarizes this speciation process:

> "When this point is reached, the two populations will begin to diverge genetically. A gulf will open up between the embryo-selected children and the 'unplanned,' as those conceived by sexual intercourse may come to be known. If, as seems probable, the parents of the unplanned come from the bottom 10 percent to 20 percent of the population for intelligence, their mean IQ would be around 80 and the mean IQs of their children around

> 84. The remaining 80 percent to 90 percent of the population who had their children by embryo selection would have a mean IQ of about 110. By using embryo selection they could have children with IQs about 15 points higher than their own, giving their children a mean IQ of around 125. Thus, in the first generation there would be a difference of around 40 IQ points between the average IQ of the embryo-selected and that of the unplanned. This gap would increase by around 15 IQ points in each subsequent generation because the embryo-selected would continue to have children whose IQs would be around 15 IQ points higher than their own, while the IQs of the unplanned would remain the same. Thus, in the second generation the intelligence gap between the embryo-selected and the unplanned would increase from around 40 IQ points to around 55 IQ points. This would give the embryo-selected children a huge advantage in schools, colleges, occupations, and incomes. The embryo-selected children would also be selected for sound personality traits, and this would give them an additional advantage in their education, careers, and socioeconomic status. This will lead to the emergence of a caste society containing two genetically differentiated castes—the embryo-selected and the unplanned."

Racism and eugenics are linked only in the minds of those who oppose any recognition of human differences, primarily the Left with some residual resistance from religion. But as Lynn shows, socialism and communism are the two ideologies still promoting a radical environmentalism. Attacking eugenics is just one part of the dogma, but an important one. As eugenic practices spread through nations and individuals alike, it will be hard to argue for a malleable social order than can be planned from above by the self-appointed elite. Attacks on eugenics like attacks on racism are nothing more than a means to gaining power by one group over another through a normative moral doctrine that has no empirical basis.

Chapter Seven: Intelligence - revisiting *The Bell Curve*

In 1994 the publication of *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in America* by Herrnstein and Murray resulted in a flurry of condemnations by both the press and academics—screaming *racism* or *scientific racism*. Since then however the academic alarmists against racism in science have been silent with regards to doing research to show that *The Bell Curve* was wrong, and have instead taken the position of censorship.

As expected, the accusations reinvigorated the empiricists and since then they have been fine-tuning and perfecting intelligence research to the point that *Jensenism* is the only accepted theory that has withstood all academic challenges: "intelligence is real, it is primarily genetic, and it is the reason that Blacks do poorly and East Asians do very well in a myriad of life history outcomes." That is, what many people claim is *racism* is really just differences in the average intelligence of different racial groups. It is this average difference that makes the groups under consideration perform differently in school and on the job. For example, from *The Jewish Phenomena: Seven Keys to the Enduring Wealth of a People* by Steven Silbiger (Longstreet Press 2000), Ashkenazi Jews have an average IQ of 117 and an average household income of 1.72 times the U.S. average, Japanese 1.32, Mexicans 0.76, and Blacks 0.62. Note how income correlates strongly with a group's average intelligence.

Comparing just a few groups from his book the average incomes/intelligences are:

Ratio of Average U.S. Household Income	Average intelligence of the group (IQ)

Jews	1.72	117
Japanese	1.32	107
U.S. average	1.00	100
Mexicans	0.76	90
Blacks	0.62	85

However, no matter how much research is produced to show that intelligence differs on average between groups, the Left just screams *racist* while failing to address the data. But to my delight, I stumbled across a recent book *The Relationship Code: Deciphering Genetic and Social Influences on Adolescent Development* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2000), and it goes a long way in validating *Jensenism* and what the empiricists have been saying about intelligence, social problems, and genetics.

First, this book is unique because the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) funded the research over thirteen years ago. That means its primary purpose was not to promote or to deny the arguments regarding intelligence, but to look at adolescent development and how genes and environment interact with each other in causing differences in behavior. The design, purpose, and results of this research were prior to or concurrent with, and independent of, the current IQ debate. It is therefore a highly non-biased research effort in both its application and the results that are published (but of course not totally unbiased as long as humans are involved).

This NIMH funded study set out to merge two perspectives: behavioral genetics and family process. At the time of the study's undertaking, startling results were being discovered about child development: siblings in the same family were quite different in

personality, cognitive abilities, and psychopathology. And research was showing that the two primary causes were *genetic* and the *nonshared environment* of children. That is, differences in children within the same family was a combination of genes and the environment experienced by the child as an individual, not as it was experienced as a member of the family. It appeared that different parenting styles and types of families made little difference in the children's resultant behavioral traits.

Numerous books have been published that look at this phenomena and it is a powerful argument for social science researchers to once and for all abandon their simplistic notions that children are the product of their socioeconomic status, and start looking at all of the data including genetics. It also means that when it comes to scientific bias, it is the *Left* who refuses to pursue non-biased research and include all of the relevant parameters, including intelligence, when they look at the family dynamics and the low performance of Blacks, Hispanics and American Indians as well as the high performance of East Asians and Ashkenazi Jews. When genetic differences are ignored in looking at children's developmental progress, they are invalid studies. Genes matter, and they matter a lot. The authors state that, "If geneticists were myopic, most researchers of the social environment—with notable exceptions—were densely blind to the emerging fields of quantitative, population, cytological, and molecular genetics. A toxic mixture of ignorance, obliviousness, and myth-making kept almost all research on psychological development free of genetic inquiry."

The NIMH study was singularly unique for several reasons:

- It was developed with the help of four different university teams that determined the goals and the design of the study from scratch without relying on any previous research data.
- It was heavily funded by NIMH and could be carried out over many years using numerous tools and methods to collect and analyze the data.

- The families involved included siblings who varied in genetic relatedness including identical twins, fraternal twins, full siblings, half siblings, and unrelated siblings that were part of families with remarried parents for a significant period of time.
- Sibling pairs and the parents were extensively interviewed and studied using not only in-home evaluations, but also videotaped analyses of the parents and children interactions that were reviewed by trained experts who had to maintain a certain level of performance and validity or they were replaced with other trained experts.
- All of the data was collected by The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) of the University of Chicago and was the first study to ever collect and code videotaped data from a nationally distributed sample of families.
- The siblings were studied in adolescence over a period of several years to look at not only how they differed, but also how they differed over time. That is, several types of analyses were used including cross-sectional, longitudinal, etc.
- The study, "received enthusiastic support from many review panels consisting of geneticists as well as psychosocial researchers."

This means that this study was a major undertaking, intensely reviewed and critiqued, and the data had to be so sound that opposing camps could reach a consensus based on the results. With so many researchers involved, any narrow bias or prejudice would be quickly revealed and corrected.

This book will not be a best seller; in fact, most people will be unable to read the whole thing. It is filled with tables and graphs and for the most part, it is a plea for more funds for research; a very typical academic research book meant for a very select audience. Nevertheless, here and there in the book, some precious presentations vindicate the empiricists who have attempted to learn the truth about human development, and it

provides additional proof that races do vary genetically in terms of intelligence and behavior. Human behavior and intelligence are heritable to some degree, and political correctness does not change nature's design.

The book states:

> "First, data indicate that genetic influences are much more important in adolescent development than previously thought, substantially affecting many aspects of adjustment, such as self-esteem, cognitive ability [IQ], personality, and psychopathology. More important, different studies suggest that adolescents' genes influence how others treat them in their social world. Factors such as parenting, the quality of sibling relationships, and characteristics of peer groups are all affected by young people's genetic profiles."

And later in the book:

> "First, the data suggest that parent-child relationships are, as psychosocial researchers have concluded, still central to adolescent development. But our findings, along with those from other genetic studies, suggest a very different reason that this may be the case: adolescents share exactly 50 percent of their genes with their parents. Much of what psychosocial researchers interpret as evidence for the social influence of parents on children may be ascribed to this genetic relationship.
>
> "Second, the role of genetic factors in shaping links between parental and child behavior may help us understand the influence of social processes in a new way. The data suggest—but do not prove—that these social processes may be part of a mechanism by which genetic factors influence adolescent behavior. It now seems entirely possible that particular genetic differences among adolescents cause their parents, as well as

> their siblings and friends, to respond to them in a certain way. It also seems possible that these evoked responses play an additional role in adolescent development. That is, genetic factors initiate a sequence of influences on development, but certain social processes are critical for the expression of these genetic influences. Indeed, we present preliminary evidence that specific genetic factors may be linked to specific relationships within the family.
>
> "Third, the data from our study mostly confirm previous genetic findings that suggest we must pay special attention to the social relationships that are unique for each sibling in the family if we are to understand the impact of social relationships on adolescent development, above and beyond genetic influences. The data strongly suggest that these sibling specific, or nonshared, experiences are not straightforward. In some cases they may be experiences that are not only special for siblings but unique for each family as well. In other cases complex situations within families may cause the social experiences of one sibling to undermine or protect the other."

So the question then is, why are we still barraged by calls to pump money into social programs that are meant to change adolescent behavior when we do not have a clue as yet how to intervene? If anything, this book shows that we are just beginning to understand the *gene-environment* interaction. Social programs that try to solve these problems while ignoring the evidence are wasting taxpayers' money. But again, people who do not want to waste money on programs that don't work are just called *racists* by the egalitarians. It is all they have left to promote their socialist agenda. They have no empirical solutions to offer.

Population genetic studies such as those carried out by J. Philippe Rushton in his 1995 book *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: a life history perspective*, for example, have shown time and again that gene allele

frequencies in different population groups (races) make these groups different—on average—in numerous ways, including intelligence, personality and reproductive physiology. This book goes a long way in vindicating this observation, but also showing us the traits that are not very dependent on genes and can therefore be changed by intervention. This is important, because we need to know first what behaviors are amenable to change before we can efficiently invest money into workable programs. But those behavioral traits that can be changed are few indeed. Most traits, like intelligence, are highly heritable and can change in heritability as children grow.

One observation made by the Left is that intervention programs work on children to raise their intelligence, but then these improvements are lost, as the children grow older. Of course their solution is to keep pumping money into special programs claiming that intervention helps but needs to be continued as children mature. But this book has an alternative explanation.

What these researchers have found is that a person's heritability changes over time. For whatever evolutionary reason, children are more malleable when they are young with regards to learning (intelligence). As they grow older genes take over and increasingly determine intelligence. At adolescence the heritability of intelligence is in excess of 75 percent, and as adults mature and grow older it peaks out at about 80 percent.

This is why it is so hard to compare the data when it comes to the intelligence debate. The data on children was different than it was for adolescents. Enrichment programs for children will raise their intelligence test scores whereas for adolescents enrichment programs are less successful. Now we are beginning to find out why. Genetic influence changes over time and under different environmental conditions. From intelligence to behavioral traits to puberty and sexual drives, there was no reason to believe that any of these were genetically fixed quantitatively at birth. Genetic interaction changes throughout a person's life, and there is

no reason to believe that intelligence is any different. The low heritability of children slowly transforms into the high heritability of adulthood. Spending massive amounts of money on intervention at this early age was wasted eventually, as the child grew older. Malleability was slowly replaced by heritability. All that early learning was wasted trying to increase lasting intelligence. I might point out that what we perceived as improved intelligence in children may have really just been a gain in knowledge. True intelligence, as we understand it, may not be applicable to children. Their pathways of development, with regards to heritability, change over time as this research shows for many behavioral traits. Genetic change for intelligence is as programmed into the person as is sexual maturation and numerous other life history changes.

In fact, this research determined that genetically unrelated siblings were no more alike in intelligence, personality, or psychopathology than any two individuals picked at random from the general population. The family just did not make any difference in how the children turned out in the traditional sense where we think parents make a real difference. The equations are far more complex—with children impacting parents' behavior as much as the other way around. For example, the authors point out that what was once thought to be a correlation of divorced parents causing troubled children is now thought equally likely to be troublesome children causing people to get divorced. Children with genetic propensities towards psychopathology could easily tear a family apart. But we have always blamed the parents rather than the equally probable "bad seed." Some kids just get a bad roll of the genetic dice.

This book also, to my great delight, clears up one of the main arguments against twin studies that have been used to show the high heritability of intelligence and behavioral traits. It has been argued for example that identical twins, separated at birth and adopted, were more than likely placed in similar homes or environments. The assumption of these studies is that identical twins are genetically identical at birth and then are brought up in dissimilar environments. Using well-accepted

formulas, the heritability can then be determined by looking at how similar they are as adults. But what if they were placed in similar types of homes?

Well, as researchers are prone to do, when one challenges their assumptions then research is carried out on the assumptions as well. And research they did. This book discusses numerous studies on the patterns of adoption practices and the results are nothing less than startling. Families who adopt are just as *screwed up* as the rest of society. About a third of the families who adopt have a parent that has mental problems. And the pattern of dysfunction in these families is the same as the general public. There is no evidence that placement agencies are able to place children into nice, conforming, normal families (whatever that means). The environments in fact are different. Families just plain vary too much, and problems can arise at any time after adoption.

They also discovered that even mothers who give up their children for adoption, when they have some say in the selection of the adopting parents, do not choose parents that are like themselves. There just are too many types of people, too many disorders and odd personality types, to ever expect much correlation from one family to another.

Also, in the case of identical twins, we now know that many are not as identical as we once thought. The authors explain that, "In almost all these cases, there is some interconnection between the blood supplies of the two twins. In between 5 and 25 percent of cases the blood of one twin, called the donor, flows to the other twin, the recipient. This is called *twin transfusion syndrome* and can lead to significant differences in hemoglobin level and birth weight between the identical twins and may constitute the first chapter of nonshared environmental experiences, in this case the nonshared intrauterine environment." So it turns out that identical twin studies may eventually show an even higher heritability from this *syndrome* because heritabilities are averaged, and we know that low birth weight can adversely influence intelligence.

One final interesting note on this book, though there are rare gems sprinkled throughout for those who are interested in child development. In selecting what to look at they state, " . . . we included in our measures of adjustment cognitive skills and involvement in school [IQ proxies]; successful involvement with peer groups and other social activities; increased initiative in household responsibilities, outside activities, and leisure activities; **awareness and respect for the rights and perspectives of others**; and general levels of self-perceived competence." Well, isn't this special. Is a person a *racist* if they lack a high level of "awareness and respect for the rights and perspectives of others?" Well, let's see what they have to say about this trait. The term for **awareness and respect for the rights and perspectives of others** is called *social responsibilities* and it is one of the seven traits they studied. What they found was that *social responsibility* like *intelligence* is highly heritable. I would be very interested to see what the hysterical advocates of those who want to reify racism would say about this trait as they have defined it. Could a person have a high level of *social responsibility* and still believe that there are real differences between races? If so, then it seems there is no such thing as *racism* as an easily malleable trait, and it needs to be defined as genetic and therefore labeled as ethnocentrism or xenophobia. And it is either equally distributed among all races or some races are more xenophobic than others—on average.

So no matter where we look, we find incommensurability between those who claim there is such a thing as *racism*—including its various forms such as institutional, personal, systemic, etc.—and those empiricists who study human behavior and try to understand how humans interact. Racism just does not fit into these modern theories wherever one looks. The Relationship Code does shed some light on where we may be able to look for family systems of xenophobia or ethnocentrism however:

> "These overarching perceptions of the social world appear to determine how family rules of conduct are established, interpreted, and implemented. They are also quite stable and play a major role in shaping an emotional ethos in the family. For example, families who see their social world as capricious but feel that they are perceived as a social group (they are low on the first dimension of mastery but high on the second dimension of group solidarity) tend to have high levels of anxiety and suspiciousness about outsiders and draw firm boundaries between themselves and outside groups. In more extreme forms this suspiciousness results in an attitude of "us against the world" that regulates relationships among family subsystems. These distinctive family "world views" may be subtle reflections of cultural differences among families or may reflect how established they are in the communities in which they live, with strong contrasts, for example, between new immigrants and established families. They also may be built up over time within families and may reflect ways in which families have resolved major crises in their history together."

I believe from the above insight into this phenomena, which sounds a lot like ethnocentrism, that it is more prevalent in immigrant families, tight religious groups that keep separate from others, or groups that are for one reason or another prone to innate ethnocentrism.[9] But I see nothing in the above that would indicate extreme ethnocentrism in the major White population. What we need to do to determine the level of ethnocentrism is to determine how it is manifested and determine ways of measuring it. Then we need to understand its genetic component versus its environmental component. And also, we must be aware that ethnocentrism may be a reaction by people to the environment they find themselves in. It can't just be legislated away. It must be understood as a real and salient part of our evolutionary make-up.

It was not my intention to prove that intelligence is highly genetic with this one research program. That is not how science is conducted even though you will often see the Left make statements such as, "Gould

has conclusively shown how correlations between brain size and intelligence were completely fabricated." (Gould was wrong on this one again of course.) Rarely does any "one" study show or conclude anything. It is the preponderance of the evidence, over time, where most researchers eventually agree, with always a few radicals objecting—like the creationists opposed to evolution. However, there is a split between the radical Left and the empiricists. And that is where we are at today—intelligence is highly heritable as shown by numerous studies but all those who so state this are called *scientific racists*. But this book, following such a large and well-funded study shows just how absurd such allegations are. And if the charges are allowed to continue, we are headed down the slippery slope of thought control and totalitarianism.

Chapter Eight: Ethnocentrism and psychometrics

Racism has been thrown around as an identifiable trait for decades now and it keeps changing. As covered in Chapter Two, like many things, every few years the term means something different as the need arises. Since *racism* is a propaganda tool only, it has no need to be consistent or even meaningful, because its sole purpose is that of cultural and political manipulation. To test this assertion out, there is no better place to look than at psychometrics, where those who study behavioral traits rely on sophisticated statistical tools for determining how humans behave and feel about themselves and others.

Psychometrics has been around for thousands of years, just like intelligence testing. But like intelligence, it has only been studied in depth over the last 100 years or so. And it is a sophisticated science that has matured and is highly credible; personality tests have become very useful and are meaningful in terms of how people behave. So I decided to look at different personality types and see if *racism* was anywhere to be found. Certainly, if racism were real, it would at least be discussed, maybe even peripherally by psychometricians. So I decided to take a look at a standard textbook on psychometrics that covered what I was looking for. The book is *Modern Psychometrics: The Science of Psychological Assessment* by John Rust and Susan Golombok, Routledge 1999.

Psychometrics is "the branch of psychology dealing with measurable factors." Certainly, if racism was real, and as there seems to be surveys or studies routinely showing how this or that sector of society is racist, it must be studied by psychometricians. So if it existed it must be at least discussed. But when I first started reading this book I was bewildered by the author's odd statements condemning *racism* and then making statements that would be considered *scientific racism*. What gives? Well,

to be published, every prudent author needs to consider the political consequences of what they are proposing. And psychometricians have felt a lot of heat in the past and it continues today. The thought police are everywhere, and one must show that they are committed equalitarians before proceeding to the facts.

They state that, "Paradoxically, however, by the mid-1980s, testing had become even more common than before. To understand why this happened we need to grasp the nettle that was evaded in the debates of the 1970s. The amount of data available now is so large that we can say confidently as a matter of fact that 50 per cent of the variation in intelligence test scores is inherited. It is also a matter of fact that the mean scores of different racial groups on intelligence tests differ."

But then they hedge their racist bets and state, "As more and more aspects of personality, ability and performance are investigated under the twin model it is found that almost all psychological characteristics that we can reliably measure on human beings turn out to have both a genetic component and an environmental component, each accounting for about half of the variance. . . . Common-sense knowledge has been quantified, translated into scientific jargon and served back to us as a justification for racism. But in spite of its technical format there is little new knowledge there—that is, unless we wish to follow up the technology of biometrical genetics and breed people in the manner we breed farmyard animals." Sure I do, and so does any parent who selectively chooses a high quality mate for intelligence. They are in fact "breeding" or practicing eugenics. But is it *racist* for parents to want their children to be intelligent and healthy? These authors, like so many people today, needed to say something about racism or the wide racist brush might have tainted them like so many other empiricists that forgot about the thought police before speaking their minds.

They then discuss Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences and Robert Sternberg's triarchic model of intelligence, but conclude that,

"Although these new ideas of intelligence have received a great deal of popular attention, particularly since the publication of *Emotional Intelligence* (Goleman 1996), their impact on psychometrics has been rather limited. All of these new forms of intelligence can be measured psychometrically. However, when this is done the resultant tests often prove to be rather similar to other personality or ability tests that are already in existence."

Then of course they have to flip back to their unscientific preaching and state:

> "However, it would be a mistake to suppose that these matters are ones for science alone. Even if the biological theory of eugenics were true and mankind was still evolving in the manner they suggest, it surely could not provide any justification for the policies some of them recommend. Many of the arguments have by now been well covered within the courts. At a more general level, the almost universal recognition of the inherent rightness of campaigns for equality in countries other than one's own demonstrates that the matters of principle that arise within psychometrics cannot simply be treated as questions of empirical verification within science. The fight against the abuses of intelligence testing forms an integral part of the movement for more social responsibility in science, and also demonstrates that science is but a part of human life and cannot stand outside it. While science can develop our understanding, and can help us to predict and control the world, it cannot interpret our findings for us, or tell us how the world should be."

Well if science cannot tell us "how the world should be" then who does? They said, "there is universal recognition of the inherent rightness of campaigns for equality!" Well if it is the *campaign* that is always right, and not human equality itself, then that could be taken as a choice by governments to suppress freedom of speech in order to enslave the

human condition similar to Communism—where totalitarianism was required to make ethnic groups get along. And that seems the path we are headed down again. I am not sure if these authors believe or even understand what they are writing, or if they just want to Teflon coat their own areas of expertise from authoritarian censure from academic Marxists.

This book—after these introductory flip-flops on advocacy—then goes on to lay a firm foundation for psychometrics. They point out that contrary to public knowledge on the subject, psychometrics is being increasingly used to look at personality types. In occupational psychology for example, "local criterion-based validity" is used to match people who are more skilled than others and this is used to match those people to their personality types. Some behavioral traits are more suited for some jobs than others. And then there are of course instances where no one type is best. In engineering for example it may not be a good idea to select one type of personality profile, but some mixture of types might work together to design a better product, even if it caused some conflicts between people.

But the important thing I want to emphasize with regards to criterion-based validity is that one must be able to show that even though abstract nouns are used to describe people's behavioral traits such as extroversion, they become real descriptors when it is shown that introversion correlates with behavior and the way people feel about the world they live in. Does *racism* or *ethnocentrism* contain this same validity? That is what we want to find out.

But do practitioners of psychometrics practice a type of classification that is new or for that matter merely a statistical tool? They explain that:

> "Stereotyping has been shown by social psychologists to emerge from the need of individuals to make decisions in circumstances where data are inadequate. Thus when a person

> meets another for the first time, the only way to proceed is to work on the assumption that some of the person's characteristics are similar to those of people already known. It is difficult to imagine how humans could behave otherwise. The same applies with the folk psychological use of traits of personality and intelligence. These immediately become evident in practice when we look at how personnel experts trained in selection and counseling in fact identify the 'right person for the job'. The assessment of the intelligence and personality of others is a pre-existing part of human functioning within society. Although its mechanism is unknown, it reflects the behavior of people as they actually are."

So psychometricians seem to be very aware of stereotyping, but how about *racial* stereotyping. Does that receive the same concerns or considerations in psychometrics? Apparently not, for as I will show *racism* or *ethnocentrism* is conspicuously absent. Now I must ask a simple question. If psychometricians are used by industry to try and match personality types to specific jobs, as well as to determine personality types that are the best overall generally, then why has *racism/ethnocentrism* been absent from their investigations? If industry and government organizations are concerned about racism, sexism, ageism, homophobia, and all the other sins of certain personality types, why are they not a part of a person's behavioral trait profile? These terms are thrown around as if they exist like flies in the park—but where are the studies?

So after a shaky introduction to psychometrics, the book does settle down to more empirical matters that are relevant to the discussion of racism/ethnocentrism. They go into the advances of factor analysis and how it has matured as a method for making correlations. Gould et al. attacked factor analysis when it was used in studying intelligence. But over the last decade it has matured as a statistical tool and is no longer disputed as valid. In fact, I was very surprised to see that it is one of the

modules that comes standard with the SPSS 10.1 statistical analysis computer program. So it is now a very common and standardized analysis package for finding correlations between multiple personality "factors"—or behavioral traits. It tells us which ones are different and which ones should be combined into the same factor or trait. Just as factor analysis determined that instead of multiple intelligences, there is primarily just one, the unitary "g" factor.

The book then goes into the different types of test bias and validities. They state, "Construct validity is the primary form of validation underlying the trait-related approach to psychometrics. The entity which the test is measuring is normally not measurable directly, and we are really only able to evaluate its usefulness by looking at the relationship between the test and the various phenomena which the theory predicts." So how would one go about testing for *racism* under this criterion? Well, for one you would have to show that there is such a thing as a "racist" personality type and that it was recognizable by a set of measurable behaviors. To my knowledge this is never done. The charge of *racism* is always woven out of whole cloth, without substantiation. That is, it is defined simply as how well different races are doing on a multiple of life history indicators. If Blacks earn less than Whites, that is *racism*. But such a statement has no construct validity because there is no correlation between observing an economic disparity and correlating it with a "real" behavior. Remember, to be valid, a behavioral trait must be measurable by self-analysis, by being observed by others, as well as by showing real measurable psychophysical and psychophysiological differences such as cortical arousal, etc. Groups of people screaming at each other, rioting, raping, or going to war with each other shows nothing more than that humans tend to fight a lot.

Then there is intrinsic test bias:

> "where a test shows differences in the mean score of two groups that are due to the characteristics of the test and not to

> any difference between the groups in the trait or function being measured. It can be due to the test having different reliability for the two groups, or to group differences in the validity of the test (e.g. the same trait being measured in different proportions in the two groups, the measurement of an additional trait in one group, the measurement of unique traits in each group, or the test measuring nothing in common when applied to the two groups). Thus, for example, if a general knowledge test was administered in English to two groups, one of which was fluent in English while the other included people with a wide range of competencies in English language, then while the test may be measuring general knowledge in one group, it would be highly contaminated by a measure of competency in English in the other group. The validities in the two groups would thus be different."

Now consider the numerous surveys that are used to show racism. I will expand on this later but for now just one example will suffice. To show racism, surveys are constructed with questions like: Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural intelligence and "get up and go" of the White race. Well of course this is a loaded question and is obviously highly biased. The reverse of this question towards Blacks would be: Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural athletic ability and love of athleticism of the Black race. If you can't see the obvious cultural bias of such questions then you need read no further. And yet, the first question was actually used in a survey of ethnocentrism! No wonder we can say almost anything we want, the questions are so obviously culturally loaded as to be worthless.

The authors conclude their remarks on intrinsic bias by stating:

> "A further problem with the techniques for adjusting intrinsic test bias has been that, even with their use, the most disadvantaged were still not being selected. Interest in all of these models decreased as it was increasingly realized that, in most

> cases of serious discrimination, the source of bias was extrinsic to the tests themselves. Of particular importance was a meta-analysis of differential validity for ability tests with respect to groups of black and white US residents. Thirty-nine studies were included in the meta-analysis, and no significant differences in validity were found between the two groups."

So when it comes to intelligence testing, extrinsic bias has been eliminated and we can be assured that there is no cultural bias left. Wouldn't it be wonderful if the Left would take the same care with their tests and surveys that purport to show *racism*? But then, they generally prefer rioting and protesting to get their way rather than scholarly debates and empirical enquiries. It relieves them of doing the hard work, and besides they know instinctively that charges of *scientific racism* are just to shut people up. Why bother with REAL research. Newspapers are more than happy to report the results of shoddy surveys and opinion polls to show that there is *racism*, just like we once knew there were witches because the village idiot or mentally ill provided all the proof that was necessary to burn people at the stake. It was obvious!

Extrinsic test bias:

> "Extrinsic test bias is found when decisions leading to inequality are made following the use of the test, but where the test itself is not biased. It has also been described as 'adverse impact'. This can occur when two different groups have different scores on a test due to actual differences between the groups. Thus the use of the test, although itself unbiased, still results in a disproportionate selection of one group at the expense of the other. This situation is much more common in practice than intrinsic test bias, and is most often although not always the consequence of social deprivation. Thus an immigrant group that lives in a deprived inner city area where the schools are of poor quality is unlikely to generate many successes in terms of the

> academic qualifications of its children. The lack of these qualifications does not necessarily represent any bias in the examination but is more likely due to lack of opportunity. Where the community suffers deprivation for several generations the lack of opportunity is reflected in a lack of encouragement by parents, and a cycle of deprivation can easily be established. In other cases, adverse impact may come about as the result of differences between two schooling systems, say between Catholic schools and predominately Protestant state schools in Northern Ireland. Extrinsic test bias may result if selection tests are more closely geared to the academic syllabus of one of the school systems rather than the other."

When it comes to a discussion of *extrinsic test bias* I think it would have been better if the authors had left it alone. Extrinsic tests bias is when for example Whites and Blacks as a group score differently on intelligence tests. Whites have always scored a standard deviation above Blacks, and Ashkenazi Jews have always scored over a standard deviation above Whites—on average. And they really do an Irish jig to dance around this one:

> "It would be pleasant to think that the issues could be rationally debated, leading to ideology-free notions of bias. . . . Conceptions of unfairness, including conceptions of bias, are one of the cornerstones of ideology itself, . . . Psychometricians need to be prepared to make a stand on these issues before they can proceed to offer solutions. . . . [A]ny form of test bias that can result in social inequality must be a central concern. . . . Once extrinsic bias has been demonstrated, it is not sufficient to ignore its basis, or its role in a society that includes disadvantaged groups. One common solution is the introduction of special access courses to provide added educational input. An alternative approach is the reformulation of the curriculum objectives or job specification to eliminate biased components that may be

> irrelevant or relatively insignificant when set against the wider need for an equitable society."

The above is a proclamation of social policy, not psychometrics that is all about measurement. If it is known that intelligence is primarily a heritable trait, why do they persist to blame the environment? Again, they deviate from scientific empiricism and embrace an *egalitarian dogma* that has proven to be a failure. Before they can claim that *extrinsic bias* is due to the environment and not to genetic differences, they must come up with that missing *factor x*. Instead, they just ignore the evidence as if it never existed. Surely they are aware of all the research on intelligence and heritability? I must assume that when it is expedient, dishonesty will prevail over the truth for reasons of political correctness (unless these authors are a rare breed of Marxists outside of the social sciences).

Whites have been accused of *racism* without any proof of the sort that is used to test for intelligence or behavioral traits. Would it be too much to ask that we be treated with the same consideration as Blacks? Before jumping to conclusions about group differences, include all of the evidence—that is you cannot ignore genetics. But if you remember, once it was being stated that Blacks were as racist as Whites (even though we don't know what racism is) they changed the definition slightly and declared that a people couldn't be racist unless they had *the power*—an odd criteria for motivation. Some Black man with a gun pointed at my head in my estimation has *the power* to be a racist! So Blacks could not be racists? This special pleading is the essence of the whole racism debate; the standards of enquiry are different for different groups or races. And they are extremely fluid. No matter how much money we throw at programs trying to make Blacks more intelligent, when the results are returned and there is no improvement, new charges and accusations will be put forth for a new round of trying to buy our way out of reality. Of course, "who will pay?" is the prickly question that will not be tolerated forever. In fact, the recent call for reparations for slavery is

just the most recent incarnation of this blackmail for eventual equality.

Before I get into looking at behavioral traits, the real essence of this book and what makes it an excellent reference book for anyone interested in human behavior, eugenics, race relations or just improving productivity in the work place, I want to revisit human nature with regards to human essentialism. That is, humans are uniquely suited to classifying "the other." And if this is what ethnocentrism turns out to be then it is in all of us to varying degrees and must be understood as a universal and natural mechanism from our evolutionary past. The author's state:

> "While modeling is now generally viewed as an important aspect of social learning, the mechanisms through which this process operates appear to be rather more complex than previously thought. Contemporary social learning theorists, now called cognitive social learning theorists, believe that cognitive skills play a fundamental role in modeling. These include the ability to classify people into distinct groups, to recognize personal similarity to one of these groups, and to store that group's behavior patterns in memory as the ones to be used to guide behavior."

Gosh, that sounds like stereotyping to me!? I am often baffled how scientists like these two can write the above, and then earlier in the book talk about *racism* and the need to stamp it out. What *racism* or *ethnocentrism* at least partially consists of is just what they stated above: an innate human behavioral module to categorize other people naturally —from our evolutionary past. It is efficient to categorize until we can gather more information. Does this also sound like *racial profiling*? Sure is. If Blacks are much more likely to commit rape, and a rape occurs in a mixed Asian/Black neighborhood, it only makes sense that the police would look closer at Blacks than at the Asians, while keeping in mind that it just could be an Asian rapist in this instance. All humans

display this categorization mechanism. It is neither racist nor wrong. But of course it may be subsumed under ethnocentrism, but then we haven't established that ethnocentrism is in itself wrong either if it is an innate part of human nature. We need a lot more information.

Now onto behavioral traits and what we know. I will jump right into the consensus that has emerged among psychometricians; personality traits can be grouped into five categories:

> "the big-five . . . is supported in four ways (1) the five traits have high stability and are identified using different assessment techniques (e.g. both self-report questionnaires and peer ratings); (2) they are compatible with a wide variety of psychological theories including psychoanalytic, psychometric and folk-psychological; (3) they occur in many different cultures; and (4) they have a biological basis. There is good evidence for the first three, and the fourth, while debatable, is not essential to the model."

What this means is that looking at or testing five personality domains (social, organizational, intellectual, emotional and perceptual) psychometricians have been able to capture personality profiles. The importance of the *big-five* is not in the details but in the consensus among scientists. Many different types of personality names can be ascribed to the five domains, and shortly we will be looking for the elusive racism among them. But the *big-five* do a good job of being able to measure any personality type. The following table from Psychometrics illustrates the fundamental categories of behavioral traits:

Domain	***Orpheus***	***Big-Five trait***
		Extraversion

Social	Fellowship	Introversion
Organizational	Authority	Tough-mindedness agreeableness
Intellectual	Conformity	Conventionalit vs. openness-to-experience
Emotional	Emotion	Neuroticism confidence
Perceptual	Detail	Conscientiousr

And they describe the logic behind using the *big-five* factors:

> "Why five and no more or less? Actually, Hans Eysenck has shown that a person's personality can be described quite adequately with just two factors: neuroticism and introversion/extroversion. But when using factor analysis, none of the big-five have a correlation with each other greater than about 0.3, and five factors seems to capture more information than Eysenck's two. R. B. Cattell also located sixteen factors, but many of them correlated too highly with each other, so the big-five was the winner after much debate and mathematical modeling."

What is interesting is that *ethnocentrism* is nowhere to be found in personality traits. Or the book fails to mention any connection even though they seem to be aware of *racism* and seem to think it is real. So going over the text, and all of the permutations of personality traits listed by different studies, the closest I could come to *ethnocentrism* was a reference to Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, and Levinson's 1950 book *The*

Authoritarian Personality—which I will discuss separately later.

I then looked at another table that listed interpretations of specific five-factor profiles. They listed thirteen in all:

Dependency—High Emotion, High Conformity, Low Authority
Social Leadership—High Fellowship, Low Emotion
Intellectual—High Fellowship, Low Conformity
Submissive—Low Fellowship, Low Authority
Need for recognition—High Emotion, High Fellowship
Defensive attitude—High Emotion, Low Authority
Exhibitionism—High Fellowship, High Authority
Autonomy—Low Emotion, Low Fellowship, Low Conformity
Harm avoidance—High Conformity, Low Authority
Supportiveness—High Fellowship, Low Authority
Achievement—Low Conformity, High Detail
Impulsiveness—High Authority, Low Conformity
Authoritarian—**High Authority, High Conformity**

The only one that might seem to apply to *ethnocentrism* was Authoritarian above, since that is the term given by Adorno et al. That is, an *authoritarian personality* is one that is tough-minded and able to make decisions but is also conventional. Is this where ethnocentrism might lurk in the myriad of personality types? If so, it would be quite easy to correlate what we hear about as racist behavior with people of this personality type. But it is a dead end. Later on they state that, "High Authority individuals are generally more senior and also more educated—often at degree level. Such people tend to be more intelligent, which in turn relates to lower scores on Conformity." This seems to state that there are very FEW authoritarian personality types (there was no indication of how many people fall into what category).

The authoritarian personality originated with the Frankfurt School that pursued what they called Critical Thinking. But to address the

authoritarian personality as it pertains to a behavioral trait I will rely on Bob Altemeyer's 1996 book, *The Authoritarian Specter*.

He starts his analysis by stating:

> "By 'right-wing authoritarianism' I mean the covariation of three attitudinal clusters in a person: 1. Authoritarian submissions: high degree of submission to the authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate in the society in which one lives. 2. Authoritarian aggressions: general aggressiveness, directed against various persons, that is perceived to be sanctioned by established authorities. 3. Conventionalism: a high degree of adherence to the social conventions that are perceived to be endorsed by society and its established authorities."

The above personality traits appear to be similar to the behavioral traits we looked at under the *big-five* factors. With this in mind, and understanding how powerful psychometrics had become, why didn't Altemeyer use personality traits to try and correlate a specific type of individual with those personality traits with the mysterious title of "right-wing authoritarian" (RWAs)? My only answer has to be that these two branches have come from different disciplines. Psychometrics has developed from empirical studies of human differences, and the pursuit of authoritarianism and ethnocentrism has developed in the social sciences, with their less than coherent empiricism. Rather, being highly political, they attempt to reach conclusions by setting their objectives ahead of time. That is, increasingly they rely on a new fascist Left to radicalize society by placing labels on groups of people—the *other* as *racist*.

So let's take a quick look at RWAs and see if there is any coherency in determining what type of people they are. I would like to say that I can present a simple analysis of this book, but like many books of this genre

that has a political perspective, it is highly problematic and filled with contradictions. So I will simply point out some of the obvious problems with the whole business of defining a RWA type.

Early in the book he states:

> "By 'submission' to the perceived established authorities I mean a general acceptance of their statements and actions and a general willingness to comply with their instructions without further inducements. Authoritarians believe that proper authorities should be trusted to a great extent and deserve obedience and respect. They believe that these are important virtues which children should be taught and that if children stray from these principles, parents have a duty to get them back in line. Right-wing authoritarians would ordinarily place narrow limits on people's rights to criticize authorities. . . . They often believe the government has been taken over by Jews, homosexuals, feminists, Communists, and so on."

Notice the assumption of who these RWAs are? Whites only! Just to point out the contradictions, note how Blacks are far more in lock-step agreement on issues, and demand that other Blacks conform to the established norms. Clarence Thomas is attacked for not supporting affirmative action. They vote far more consistently in blocks for Democrats or for Blacks, far more than Whites who will vote for Blacks when they see them as the best candidate. And they are far more willing to forgive their leaders such as Jesse Jackson after numerous scandals. So much for 'submission' to established authorities. Deviation from the collective objectives of the Black coalition is met with ridicule and charges of 'uncle tom.' It seems if we compared say Blacks to Whites, Blacks are FAR more likely to submit to Black authority figures.

Then Altemeyer really gives away his objectivity—listing authoritarians as distrustful of "Jews, homosexuals, feminists, and

Communists" while completely ignoring the Left's trying to place limits on scientific racists, the far right, globalists, capitalists, developers, and anyone who disagrees with their agendas. All of these people's rights are trampled on routinely, and today there are new calls for censorship on the Internet of content they disagree with as well as protests, demonstrations, and political pressure to censor anyone they dislike. I am not saying that intolerance resides within any one group, only that Altemeyer shows his obvious bias by the categories he selects. The Left is as intolerant as the radical anti-abortionists. Intolerant people are found within every group, and to single out only Whites as he has done shows that the analysis of RWAs will not be objective.

He states later that, "Authoritarians endorse the traditional family structure in which women are subservient to their husbands. They believe women should, by and large, keep to their traditional roles in society. While advocating a 'decent, respectable appearance' for both sexes, they especially demand it of women." Again, more bashing of White conservative Americans. But I guess that leaves the skinheads off the hook. Apparently they are not authoritarians because they do not conform to the typical family structure. And how about all of those Islamic cultures that oppress women, make them wear veils, and practice genital mutilation to keep them in their place? I guess every one of them is an authoritarian. How simplistic and asinine.

He then states that, "Prejudice, the unfair prejudging of someone, has many roots. But the taproot is probably ethnocentrism. Since white Anglophones raised in Christian homes make up the vast majority of my Manitoba samples, I found it easy to construct an ethnocentrism scale (Exhibit 1.2) assessing their attitudes toward various in- and out-groups."

Exhibit 1.2 The Manitoba Ethnocentrism Scale

1. Arabs are too emotional, and they don't fit in well in our country.
2. Indians should keep on protesting and demonstrating until

they get just treatment in our country. *

3. Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural intelligence and "get up and go" of the white race.

4. The Vietnamese and other Asian; who have recently moved to Canada have proven themselves to be industrious citizens, and many more should be invited in. *

5. It is good to live in a country where there are so many minority groups present, such as blacks, Asians, and aboriginals. *

6. There are entirely too many people from the wrong sorts of places being admitted into Canada now.

7. As a group Indians are naturally lazy, promiscuous, and irresponsible.

8. Canada should open its doors to more immigration from Latin America.*

9. Black people as a rule are, by their nature, more violent than white people are.

10. The people from India who have recently come to Canada have mainly brought disease, ignorance, and crime with them.

11. Canada should open its doors to more immigration from the West Indies.*

12. Jews can be trusted as much as everyone else. *

13. It is a waste of time to train certain races for good jobs; they simply don't have the drive and determination it takes to learn a complicated skill.

14. The public needs to become aware of the many ways blacks in Canada suffer from prejudice. *

15. Every person we let in from overseas means either another Canadian won't be able to find a job, or another foreigner will go on welfare here.

16. Canada has much to fear from the Japanese, who are as cruel as they are ambitious.

17. There is nothing wrong with intermarriage among the races.*

18. In general, Indians have gotten less than they deserve from our social and anti-poverty programs. *

19. Many minorities are spoiled; if they really wanted to improve their lives, they would get jobs and get off welfare.

20. Canada should guarantee that French language rights exist all across the country. *

* Item is worded in the contrait direction; the ethnocentric response is to disagree.

Now can you see any bias in the above? Well, not spending the hours of critical review of these questions that Altemeyer has done, let me revise them to make them a little less Anglophobic:

The Matt Nuenke Ethnocentrism Scale:

1. Palestinians are too emotional, and they don't fit in well in Israel.

2. Palestinians should keep on protesting and demonstrating until they get just treatment in Israel.

3. Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural athletic ability and "get up and go" of the Black race.

4. The Vietnamese and other Asians, who have recently moved to Canada, have proven themselves to be industrious citizens, but with unemployment high we should make sure that the Blacks we have get jobs first before we let anymore in.

5. It is good to live in a country like Israel where there are so few minority groups present.

6. There are entirely too many people from Canada moving onto the lands that have been set aside for indigenous native Indians, they are the wrong sort of people and will not respect nature.

7. As a group Whites are naturally dominant, greedy, and can't be trusted in business dealings.

8. Latin America should open its doors to more Canadian companies needing cheap labor.

9. White people as a rule, by their nature, are more prejudiced than Black people are.

10. The people from East Asia who have recently come to Canada have been very financially successful.

11. Canada should open its doors to more immigration from the United States.

12. Whites can be trusted as much as everyone else.

13. It is a waste of time to try and make Whites tolerant; they simply don't know how others have suffered oppression and lack opportunity that they take for granted.

14. The public needs to become aware of the many ways Whites in Canada feel reverse discrimination.

15. Every person we let in from overseas means either another oppressed minority won't be able to find a job, or another foreigner will be more successful than the Blacks who have no opportunities.

16. Canada has little to fear from the Japanese, who are a homogeneous and very productive nation.

17. Jews should encourage intermarriage for their own people as much as they encourage it for other races.

18. The Indian caste system may bring their form of racism to Canada as they have practiced it for thousand of years, so we should keep these racists from coming here and oppressing other lower caste minorities.

19. Many Whites are spoiled; if they really wanted to improve their lives, they would get a job instead of living off their inheritances.

20. Canada should split into two nations, because the French language and the English language should both have their own cultural experiences.

I produced the above revised list in a hasty manner, but you can see just how biased such tests are. It seems that all of the surveys, tests, studies, etc. that rely on such questions are in fact always biased, and usually anti-Anglo-Saxon. Researchers doing such studies have the same tools available as psychometricians to make sure that there is no racial bias in the tests. So why don't they do it? Because they are not interested

in empirical data, but are in fact part of the new fascist Left. They are not ignorant, but in fact know that they are on a mission to make Whites feel guilty and to neutralize them with charges of *racism*.

Again, Altemeyer states that, "Overall then, the evidence indicates rather solidly that right-wing authoritarians tend to be relatively ethnocentric. If you look over the range of out-groups displayed in Exhibit 1.2, you can see why I have called High RWAs equal-opportunity bigots. Compared with others, they dislike almost every group that is different—regardless of race, creed, or color." It is pretty clear what he is REALLY stating here: "Whites are all bigots, and all other groups suffer because of it, so we must change society and we must have censorship and control these bigots because they have no place in our new multicultural society." This reverse hatred of course is what anti-Western bashing is all about. It is just racist colonialism in reverse. Now everyone else (all peoples of color) are innocent victims and Whites are authoritarian racists.

I think it is safe to say that any research that comes out of the social science departments from the Marxists who dominate cannot produce any empirical evidence for ethnocentrism considering the flawed methodologies. I do think there is such a thing as ethnocentrism, but it is found in all cultures and races. But this is where the Left's research is so flawed—they do not implement the standard psychometric tools for eliminating cultural bias as has been done in intelligence testing and personality testing. If these biases are not extracted, the research is worthless at best and totalitarian at worst because it is purely politically motivated to subjugate Western culture under a new order of doctrinaire egalitarianism.

He does go on and admits later that behavioral genetics does show a high degree of heritability for authoritarianism and ethnocentrism, and that every race or culture is as authoritarian as anyone else. So exactly why are we studying only RWAs and not taking a broader view of human

behavioral types? Because the objective is to spread hatred of Whites in specific and Western culture in general.

Bibliography

My inclusive bibliography for all of my references is available on the Internet at:

http://www.neoeugenics.net/bib.htm

Notes follow:

---

1. From Doug Jones' chapter "Physical Attractiveness, Race, and Somatic [affecting the body] Prejudice in Bahia, Brazil" from the book *Adaptation and Human Behavior: An Anthropological Perspective*, 2000: SUMMARY (1.) The evolutionary psychology of physical attractiveness may contribute to understanding "somatic prejudice," in which members of one racial or ethnic group are evaluated more or less favorably than members of another on the basis of their physical appearance. Three well-documented and universal or near-universal components of attractiveness —color, "averageness," and status markers—are likely to be especially relevant to understanding somatic prejudice. (2.) Brazil is a racially stratified country in which whites have considerably higher status than blacks, but Brazilians generally treat race as a continuous rather than a categorical variable. An investigation of the complex racial terminology in the state of Bahia in northeastern Brazil shows that (a) Bahian racial classification is largely concerned with labeling individuals first by color, and then by African versus non-African features independently of color, and (b) in accordance with the ideology of *mixture*, individuals labeling photographs tend to avoid labels clearly indicating African features, and to emphasize the way different individuals combine white and black features, rather than differences between blacks and whites. (3.) Although Bahians downplay black/white differences in labeling photographs, these differences play a major role in assessments of attractiveness: photographic subjects with pronounced African color and features are rated substantially less attractive than others (1.7 standard deviations), while subjects with intermediate features are not rated significantly less attractive than those with pronounced European features. These findings demonstrate that evolutionary psychology must consider the role of social cues in the development of standards of attractiveness.

2. Later, Binet developed tests of reasoning, drawing, analogies, and pattern recognition that form the basis of modern intelligence tests. Spearman's contribution was the concept of a general intelligence factor *(g)* underlying correlations between tests of intelligence. Early advances in the study of intelligence were reversed by advocacy of testing for racial policies (e.g., sterilization laws). Finally, the 1960s heralded a fundamental shift away from causes within the individual as the source of social ills to causes outside the individual. Social factors that could be redressed by the government were considered the source of deficiencies. In this context of egalitarianism, recognition of biological bases of individual differences was and remains anathema. (Devlin, Bernie and Stephen E. Feinberg, Daniel P. Resnick, and Kathryn Roeder, eds. *Intelligence, Genes, and Success: Scientists Respond to "The Bell Curve"*. Copernicus, 1997.)

3. *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* (No more entities should be presumed to exist than are absolutely necessary) *William of Occam.* [Now known as the principle of parsimony or Occam's Razor in science. Also: Prefer the simplest model that explains the data.] Occam's Razor, originally formulated as a maxim against the proliferation of nominal entities, has become a methodological principle dictating a bias toward simplicity in theory construction. In today's scientific jargon Occam's Razor has become this: Prefer the simplest model that explains the data. The need for such a maxim suggests that scientific theories often exhibit the opposite tendency and, in striving for optimality, become exceedingly intricate. Is natural, unaided, human inference similarly elaborate and tortuous? A well-established trend in cognitive psychology has been to project scientific tools into mental theories: As Gigerenzer (1991a) has suggested, models of the mind's function have often reflected the computationally expensive statistical tools used in scientific induction. This book has a different viewpoint, revealing the

simple heuristics the mind can use without necessarily sacrificing accuracy. . . .Furthermore, Popper (1959) has argued that simpler models are more falsifiable, and Sober (1975) deems them more informative. But the transparency, falsifiability, or informativeness of *models* are not the only grounds to argue for the simplicity of actual mental *mechanisms*. We have provided evidence that simple heuristics are also adaptive for those who actually use them. Simplicity can have both aesthetic appeal and adaptive value. . . .There are two ways a theory can fail: by being wrong, or by being not even wrong, but merely indeterminate and imprecise. The heuristics-and-biases program has too often fallen into the latter category. But we would rather risk the former fate, because indeterminate theories hinder scientific progress by resisting attempts to prove, disprove, or improve them. In this book, we therefore propose computational models of heuristics, putting our theoretical cards on the table so that others can see them—and even pick them up and play with them. (Gigerenzer, Gerd and Peter M. Todd, Eds. *Simple Heuristics That Make Us Smart*. Oxford, 1999.)

4. As a technique for theory construction, meta-analysis is more than useful. It is a necessary tool. Artifacts at the level of individual studies often thwart efforts to draw correct theoretical inferences. Many people know that meta-analysis is a good way to pull together findings across studies to more accurately assess treatment effects, basic correlations, and other facts. To test theories you must have established facts. Because meta-analysis is a good way to accurately establish facts, it is indirectly a key part of theory testing. Fewer people are aware that the results of meta-analysis can differ in quality. Several factors influence the accuracy of meta-analysis findings. Some research domains are extensive, other scant. Some research domains are plagued by method artifacts, others are not. Researchers differ widely in their ability to correct for artifacts when they are present. (Allen, Mike and Raymond W. Preiss eds. *Persuasion: Advances Through Meta-Analysis*. Hampton, 1998.)

5. Orthodox rabbis rip most Jews: Say other branches "not Judaism at all" by Tom Sheridan, Religion Reporter. A group of Orthodox rabbis declared Monday that the Reform and Conservative branches "are not Judaism at all." The 600 member Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, the oldest organization of rabbis in the United States, condemned the two more liberal branches for condoning assimilation and intermarriage. . . .The Orthodox union said Orthodoxy means to oppose "conversions and homosexuality," which "are repugnant not only to Torah Judaism, but also to common morality." Many Orthodox rabbis have long refused to recognize marriages, burials and conversions performed by Reform and Conservative rabbis, but this is the first time that an Orthodox rabbinical group has made such a declaration. [This means of course that since the Orthodox control Jewish immigration to Israel, that a convert cannot go and live in Israel, but an atheist Jew can. You decide: is this a blood cult or a religion?]

6. When the same trend lines are adjusted for the known difference in IQ between blacks and whites, the trend lines show that both in clerical and in professional and technical positions, for individuals in the same IQ range, blacks were being hired at higher rates than whites since the 1960s, with both trends increasing into the 1980s (Devlin, 1997 above).

Complaining about the validity and fairness of IQ-type tests has been a popular way of avoiding serious consideration of the other questions about IQ differences - about their unity, essence, origins and function; but the complaints do not withstand scrutiny. In empirical testimony, two massive research programs on the use of IQ tests in occupational selection in the USA have shown the tests to be equally useful (i.e. valid and predictive) with all racial groups. Reynolds & Brown (1984) brought together the main strands of the voluminous evidence on

whether and when IQ tests were unfair to minorities. Blinkhorn (1985) provides a review and observes that ". . the problem is not that tests under-predict the performance of blacks [in industry] but that they over-predict it." . . . But Project Alpha on the US Army provided the largest-ever trial of psychologists' capacity to help with effective and fair selection, and the most complete resultant vindication of IQ testing; and Herrnstein & Murray's US Department of Defense data have shown that, in today's conditions, IQ differences are much more predictive than anything to do with young adults' social classes of origin. (Brand, Christopher. *The g Factor: General Intelligence and its Implications*. John Wiley, 1996. (Under pressure from Marxists this book was depublished after its release. However, it is available on the Internet using search engines because the location may change.))

7.

I Emailed Joe Feagin requesting that he define his concept of democracy. He emailed me back and stated, "Democracy involves full access and participation in the key decisions that shape one's life. As I see it, the best democratic political system would be a blend of direct and representative democracy, with a constitution protecting broad human rights. The New England town meeting at its best is a good model of democracy at the smaller unit levels, and that is my view of democracy at that level. As you move to larger political units, you have to have representative democracy because the size issue comes in. Representatives should be elected with short term limits, and with all candidates having equal access (undistorted by money) to the means of contacting voters. A constitution with a strong bill of rights protecting speech, press, organization, etc., and minority groups of voters is also necessary. All groups in the population should have equal access to the political system, and should be protected from the tyranny of the majority by appropriate rights guarantees."

This politically correct definition however does not follow from Feagin's attack on Whites. If people do not want a radically egalitarian society, then they should not be forced to accept or adopt one. But that is what Feagin attacks in his book; he concludes that democracy must include egalitarianism. This is the fatal flaw between his PC definition and his radical agenda as spelled out in *Racist America*.

8.

Prometheans coming together to breed a new human species with a higher intellect and love of one's people. A communion of intellect and beauty for the simple reason that it can be done. This creation is what gives us purpose and meaning. No other justification is required for this program to advance our Promethean species.

Principles and Goals

I. We are both a nation and a religion. Whether we will be a diasporic nation, a nation with boundaries, or both, will depend on circumstances currently beyond our control. But in the future, a homeland must be sought for by any means available.

II. Our aim is to create a genetically enhanced race that will eventually become a new, superior species. In the short-term, this will be achieved via eugenics and genetic engineering.

III. There are many reasons why we want to achieve this:

a.) Technology has outpaced the human brain in modernization—we must now play catch-up using eugenics and do it alone if necessary.

b.) The world is caught in a dysgenic trend from which we want to be freed.

c.) This is a way of maximizing our viability—the survival and probability of survival of our genes. A more intelligent species will be more fit to adapt to new environments and to face new threats and obstacles.

d.) We see this as the noble thing to do, the idealization of humanity and beyond-humanity. We seek to bring ourselves closer to Godhood. Through eugenics and other forms of improvement, we will bring higher civilization, higher creativity, higher consciousness to the Universe. What Nature used to do via natural selection, we will now take into our own hands with directed and deliberate evolution.

IV. We must not concern ourselves with others that are caught in the dysgenic cycle. We must only be concerned with the success of other competing eugenics' programs that will pose a threat to our own new species, for speciation will not travel along a single vector when humans compete using the new technologies.

V. Any eugenics' program has equal validity to use the state's coercive power to improve human genetic capital. Genetic capital is now more valuable than land and/or territory aside from some scarce resources. DNA or genetic capital is the most valuable commodity in the universe.

VI. Behavioral tolerance should flow naturally out of a highly intelligent, eugenic society that is ethically cohesive. It must be accepting of many different preferences or freedoms of personal conduct that might offend, but does no harm to the group. That is, elimination of consensual crimes is a given in a society that through intelligence and understanding of human behavior in others can tolerate deviants who do no harm.

VII. We are not a cult or sect. Our principles are firmly grounded in empiricism and neo-Darwinism. Our purpose is merely to do what we believe is noble, using science to create a new human species because that is what we want to do. No irrational dogma is required or desired. The eugenic state is a sovereign state, with or without borders.

VIII. As creators we do not submit to dogma or blind faith, but only to empirical knowledge. Likewise, we have no need of holy men, only wise men. As individuals, we only submit to the goals of the project, and to nothing else. And in allowing us to be part of the creation, the group gives back to the individual a sense of purpose and fulfillment. Eugenic is that which makes us come closer to our image of god in a technological and ever expanding universe. No limits, and no regrets.

Rules and Strategies

I. The danger of curing the effects of genetic disease through postnatal intervention, and the accumulation of bad genes, is equivalent to allowing toxins to build up in the environment and curing them with vitamin supplements. Resources must not be wasted on curing disease when it is more cost effective to merely eliminate the disease from the genetic capital of the eugenic nation. We can easily live with numerous minor genetic flaws, but it should never be policy to correct obviously adverse genetic diseases when they can be detected and eliminated from the gene pool, even though that is not our primary goal.

II. Eventually, the goal of a eugenically equalized society is to displace representative democracy with direct democracy. Only in this way can the corruption inherent in democracy be eliminated. This direct democracy requires that all members of society be highly intelligent and capable of understanding the issues as well as our elite representatives do now.

III. Neither any single woman nor man must be forced to procreate or to spend time raising children. The genes of the group flow in all of us, and resource acquisition is as important as having children to the success of the group. That is, it is each person's choice where to contribute. It may be more beneficial to hire breeders for having the children rather than force women who prefer an intellectual life over being pregnant. And the same with raising children. Group goals are met by everyone becoming a specialist in what they do best, as long as it contributes in some way.

IV. Eugenicists can be classified as breeders, enforcers, or nurturers. That is, there will be those who want to participate but not necessarily pass on their own genes for various reasons. Everyone will be productive and further the cause, but not everyone needs to do it in the same manner. Specialization is efficiency. And our genes run throughout the tribe, not in individual families, though family cohesiveness will not be frowned upon as a natural instinct.

V. Racial purity is not a valid concept for a eugenicist. Since we are breeding and genetically splicing our way into a new species, racial components are ever changing. The only valid concept is one of group cohesiveness. We want to be with people who are like us, that is similarity in phenotype bonds the group together, not racial purity.

VI. Allegiance and patriotism to the group takes precedence before attachment to one's religion or patriotism to the country where one just happens to reside. Going to war for the state because of shared loyalties is dysgenic. Only patriotism to the eugenic state requires your sacrifice and allegiance.

VII. The patterns of sexual attractiveness must be understood and resisted. For example, too many males will seek an attractive woman over an intelligent one. This evolutionary desire must be evaluated and counteracted. But means are available. Sex and reproduction are no longer linked, and communities that extend beyond the simple family unit can live with this anomaly. It should be recognized and tolerated. The same goes for not requiring women to bear children. Bearing children and parenthood need not be linked, bonding to children in humans occurs some time AFTER birth, unlike other species.

VIII. Potential children are in abundant supply and the world is overpopulated with people without a future. Every child brought into this world should be of the finest intellect possible, and free of genetic diseases or abnormalities. Every generation needs to be an incremental step in the evolution to a new species. The only traits to be altered during the first genesis shall be an increase in overall intelligence, typical intellectual engagement (TIE), and patriotism. Other behavioral traits must only be altered when there is no longer a danger from competitive species and our knowledge of our species has progressed to a state of understanding that makes behavioral traits modification beyond question. Until then, we must retain the full spectrum of human variation for the sake of higher adaptability and survivability.

IX. Our genders are equal because no more division of labor is required. The mind is the only machine that is really important. Breeding is no longer the result of sex. Breeding will be directed by intelligent purposefulness for genetically enhanced children.

X. Warfare, that ever present component that drove group evolution to reach Homo Sapiens will continue. Eugenicists will be attacked and we will always be outnumbered. Brains must be used in place of soldiers if we are to hold off attacks and detractors. But war it shall be, even if only intellectual warfare, until we can overcome our own human nature for hostility towards the other—and the other is no longer a threat.

9.

I came across this interesting article by Graham Turner as I was writing this chapter. I have snipped excerpts from the article to shorten it, but it seems to show that Jews have an extreme level of xenophobia and would fall therefore into that classification of a people with not only a cultural ethos for xenophobia or racism but also an innately genetic component as well from several thousand years of breeding for this behavior (MacDonald, 199?). I would assume Blacks could tell a similar story. My explanatory comments are in brackets {my comments}:

ISSUE 2146 Tuesday 10 April 2001. See http://www.telegraph.co.uk for the original unabridged article. 'Our history has taught us to be insecure, that no place is for ever'

How can a people endure appalling punishment yet survive to accomplish so much? Graham Turner has spent four months talking to Jews in Britain, the United States and Israel about their beliefs, their fears and their sense of what the future holds. [. . .]

I once asked Victor Rothschild, father of the present Lord Rothschild, whether - given their history - all Jews felt that, at some stage, they might have to move on from the country where they were living. Rothschild had not only been head of the central policy review staff in the Cabinet Office; he even had his own cricket pitch on his Buckinghamshire estate. No one could

have been closer to the heart of the British establishment. He paused for a long time and then said, with infinite sadness: "Every Jew."

Their history has made the Jews ultra-sensitive to hostility and danger. It is a level of sensitivity of which I, like most of the Gentile community, had been entirely unaware until I began listening to them. As I discovered, their folk memory is infinitely longer even than that of the Irish, and constantly refreshed by their ceremonies. [. . .]

That is why a great many of Britain's 260,000 Jews share Victor Rothschild's underlying anxiety. "That feeling is always in my mind," said Rabbi Lionel Blue, the radio celebrity. "I think: 'Where else would one make a home and would it be a home, because I feel English?'"

You don't belong anywhere. I used to keep a sign on my desk, which said: 'Just because you're paranoid, it doesn't mean they're not out to get you.' The German Jews were the most assimilated of all Jewish communities - and look what happened to them.

"Political anti-Semitism could come again anywhere, even in the United States. It's not hit us in Western Europe for 50 years, but then it's never been tested by an economic slump, with the need to find scapegoats."

"A great many Jews would agree with Victor Rothschild," said Julia Neuberger, chief executive of one of our largest health care charities, the King's Fund. "You just think: 'You never know.' I still feel that myself."

"My mother, after all, was a refugee from Frankfurt and on the gate of the city's ghetto was the Judensau, which said, 'All Jews are pigs'. As a girl, I was surrounded by the sense of displacement, of people having been lost."

"I couldn't agree with Rothschild more," said Sherry Ashworth, a Jewish novelist who lives in Manchester. "You wouldn't get a Jew in this country who'd say an emphatic, 'No!' to the question you asked him. There's always been a tremendous sense of insecurity among Jews here, which is why, in the past, they've usually wanted to keep a low profile. [. . .]

Jeremy Oppenheim, the 45-year-old chief executive of Jewish Care, which provides a range of splendid social services in London and the South-East, agreed: "All my adult life, whenever I meet someone who's not Jewish, I have asked myself the question: 'Would they hide me in their loft?'"

"I'm not worried about anti-Semitism," said Professor Arthur Herzberg, who lives in New Jersey, "but our history has taught us to be insecure, that no place is for ever. There is excellent evidence that the goyim [non-Jews] have an endemic disease called anti- Semitism and, whether I like it or not, part of me is a physician taking your temperature.

"Way down deep in his heart, every thinking Jew, in all his relations with non-Jews, asks himself: 'Could I trust this person to even hide my grandchildren?' I think even younger Jews in America have that feeling."

If true, I thought, that is quite extraordinary. After all, it is difficult to think of a country which has been more welcoming to Jews than America. There have been no expulsions or ghettos, still less a massacre. Yet Professor Nathan Glazer of Harvard, one of America's most

distinguished sociologists, believes that there is an echo of Rothschild's anxiety in as many as half of American Jews. [. . .]

Marc Gopin, a rabbi in his early forties, with a synagogue near Boston, knows what would trigger his anxieties. "It's quite true that anti-Semitism has been decreasing for 40 years," he told me, "but I still have a deep concern about what would happen if there was an economic crash combined with the influence of Christian fundamentalism. There are at least 20 million evangelicals in this country and, to many of them, we are the Antichrist. Just flip through some of the missionary channels on television and you'll see what I'm talking about.

"George Bush has talked about having a Jesus Day and, if ever a Christian evangelical flag flies over the White House, I'll get on a boat. I've already thought where I'd go. It would be either Italy or Canada. It sounds bizarre, I know, but when you've had 2,000 years of being asked to move on, you know what the symptoms are." [. . .]

None the less, even in America, profound anxieties remain which say a great deal about the deeply wounded nature of the Jewish psyche, and suggest that 2,000 years of history may have had a well-nigh ineradicable effect.

"Jews, particularly the older ones, are always paranoid," said Jackie Mason, the comedian. "They've always been persecuted, so they can't imagine it'll stop. They blow up any inconsequential incident, as if the entire Gentile population is about to rise up and wipe them out forever. If someone throws a handkerchief in a synagogue, they think a pogrom is in progress." [. . .]

"What has happened to the Jewish people," said the broadcaster Esther Rantzen, "is that the slow often got wiped out. You always had to be a jump ahead of the pogroms. I am casting no aspersion on those who died but, if you are persecuted for thousands of years, it is a very tough form of the survival of the fittest." {Is this evolutionary selection for xenophobia and paranoia? It would appear so.}

"The Jews in Babylon," said the Chief Rabbi, Jonathan Sacks, "reflected long and hard about what it would take to survive in exile. "After all, they had already lost 10 of the 12 tribes of Israel, who'd chosen to assimilate when they were conquered by the Assyrians. So the rabbis who went to Babylon and the generations of rabbis who came after them knew what was at stake, because so many of their brothers and sisters had simply abandoned their people and their faith. They came to the conclusion that: 'We have got to create a survival mechanism that will enable our people to keep their faith and identity in a diaspora.'" {Is this not racialist supremacy? Why not assimilate?}

That involved fashioning what the eminent Jewish scholar Professor Geza Vermes calls "a way of life astonishing in its completeness". That way of life also, quite deliberately, set the Jews completely apart from the societies in which they lived. They did not want to live in ghettos, but they did want to be separate and different because their very survival depended on it. Otherwise, they would have been swamped by the hostile majority cultures that surrounded them.

The rabbis made sure that did not happen. Jews were told, through the dietary laws of kashrut, what was kosher (fit to eat) and what was not. That, in itself, put an immense social barrier between themselves and non-Jews. They were told, in the minutest detail, how they should dress. They were told that every male child must be circumcised on the eighth day after its

birth. Not satisfied with the 10 commandments of Moses, they were given no fewer than 613 mitzvot to observe. [. . .]

The rabbis who framed that oral law even laid down how often people of different occupations should have sex. Sailors and tanners were told to shtup (make love) only once every six months, rabbis at least once a week. So, while the Catholic Church required many of its brightest sons to be celibate priests, the Jews made sure that their own intellectual high-flyers multiplied as abundantly as possible. "For Jews," said David Rosen, a former chief rabbi of Ireland, "it's actually a sin to be a monk." {Thus the Jewish eugenic program in action—creating the most intelligent race yet tested.}

"I'm so proud of my people," chuckled the American comedienne Joan Rivers. "They didn't want the dopeys to breed, while rabbis were encouraged to keep at it, so that the smarter genes were being passed on all the time. It's a kind of religious natural selection. "Those old rabbis were very shrewd. They knew Jews were going to have to be smart to survive, so they were saying to girls: 'It's up to you, honey!' And they put a lot of emphasis on women's sexual satisfaction because they knew that if they didn't enjoy sex, they weren't going to have a lot of kids." [. . .]

There was one other factor that helped the Jews survive: an entirely understandable pride in their way of life. "It was very attractive and cozy," said Rabbi Blue. "There was a lot of cooking, a lot of love for children and we always looked after the poorer members of the community. It ended up in a life that had a great deal of dignity and humor, that wasn't anti-sex but was highly literate. {So separatism and a homogeneous racialist life was fine for Jews for thousands of years, but now humans need multiculturalism?} [. . .]

"Studying the Talmud," said Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz, a great Jewish scholar who is translating it from the original Aramaic into both Hebrew and English, "is the nearest thing we have to your Holy Communion. It is an act by which we are united to God." Nobody will ever begin to understand the Jews until they have visited a yeshiva - a school for the study of the Talmud - and seen hundreds of young men engaged in a passionate discussion of its text.

It was nine in the evening when I arrived at the Yeshiva University in New York. A buzz of furious sound was coming from one of its libraries. Here, in a largish room, were 400 young men, sitting in pairs across desks rather like chess players and surrounded by piles of hefty tomes, arguing heatedly. It could scarcely have been more different from the obligatory silence of the Bodleian. They were all studying the Talmud, line by line, and this was no exercise in dry scholarship. As I soon realized, I was in the presence of the fissile core of Judaism.

"We take a short section," explained one young man, "discuss it between us, back and forth, give and take. We might be debating an apparently abstruse point, such as whether it's proper to squeeze a lemon on the Sabbath, or the blessings, which you say before and after food. Sometimes, the debate gets fierce and, if it does, I'll switch and take the other position in the argument.

"The satisfaction of doing this is enormous. When we're studying the Talmud, we're connecting with a hundred generations of our people. As we follow the progress of the discussion between the rabbis down the centuries, we become part of that chain ourselves.

"It changes you, it brings you closer to God, but it does even more than that. Just look at the Jewish communities that don't engage in study like this. They assimilate, marry out and are lost.

This is what keeps the Jewish people alive." {Marry out and one becomes lost? Are they dead? Judaism does seem to be highly eugenic and racialist in its doctrine and language. To marry a non-Jew is death. Isn't this the racism they decry in others?} [. . .]

"Rabbinic Judaism," said Rabbi Blue, "was predicated on a small, excluded, closely knit minority which kept itself apart from the rest of society. It was not designed to cope with the sort of open society we've got now. In an open society, you mix and, if a Jewish boy falls in love with a non-Jewish girl he meets at university, what happens?"

What happens is that a huge proportion of Jewish youngsters in both Britain and the United States are now marrying out of the community.

As a result, it has shrunk so dramatically in both countries that many Jews fear for its future. Can Judaism, they wonder, survive tolerance and kindness as successfully as it survived persecution?

"If we don't check the decline," said Norman Lamm, president of the Yeshiva University in New York, "the story of the Jewish people could come to an end, God forbid." {So what? Other cultures are being told they no longer have right to exist. Why is Jewish culture so special? I contend that Jews therefore have a much higher level of innate ethnocentrism than White gentiles because of their eugenic practices and this is born out by tests and by the obvious obsession they have with racial purity as well as the paranoia that surrounds them. They are different because their genetic make-up is different.}