

# **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  
<http://neoeugenics.home.attbi.com>

Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Chapter Two: Pseudoscientific constructs of racism.....	9
Symbolic Racism.....	11
Structural Racism.....	15
Systemic Racism.....	23
Jensenism Denied.....	25
Neo-Darwinism Denied.....	25
Conclusion.....	56
Purveyors of Anglophobia.....	58
Chapter Three: Scientific racism.....	65
Expanded understandings of evolutionary principles.....	68
Chapter Four: Racism is really ethnocentrism.....	76
Ethnocentrism.....	77
Consensual Hierarchy.....	79
Reciprocity.....	81
Chapter Five: How ethnocentrism evolved.....	83
Modern law and justice.....	83
Moral Systems.....	87
The Free Rider Problem.....	93
Group Evolutionary Strategies.....	95
Concluding Comments on Morality.....	100
Chapter Six: Eugenics and Racism.....	107
Chapter Seven: Intelligence—revisiting <i>The Bell Curve</i> .....	125
Chapter Eight: Ethnocentrism and psychometrics.....	135
Bibliography.....	146

## 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see that they had my Mission Statement listed from my *NeoEugenics' Web Site*, though the URL address was over a year out of date.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 and 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 the 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 19<sup>th</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 woman 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://home.att.net/~eugenics/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 (WASPs) 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3,4</sup> 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.

### Jensenism 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://home.att.net/~eugenics/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://home.att.net/~dysgenics/jen.htm> and from the journal INTELLIGENCE, Jensenism is discussed <http://home.att.net/~dysgenics/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 it 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://home.att.net/~eugenics/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.<sup>5</sup>

"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://home.att.net/~eugenics/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://home.att.net/~genocides/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://home.att.net/~dysgenics/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 except 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 an 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://home.att.net/~genocides/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*.<sup>6</sup> 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 racist 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 accentuated 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 ( $p < .01$ ).<sup>\*</sup> 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://home.att.net/~eugenics/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.<sup>7</sup>

"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

(john@thebirdman.org) <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://home.att.net/~genophilia/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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.)

<sup>3</sup> *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.)

<sup>4</sup> 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.)

<sup>5</sup> 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?]

<sup>6</sup> 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.))

<sup>7</sup> 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*.

## 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://home.att.net/~genophilia/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 vary 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 let's 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 very 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 turbans 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 Aborigines very low while Aborigines 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 vary 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://home.att.net/~dysgenics/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:

### Sympathy Related

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.\*

### Norm Related

Prescriptive social rules.

Internalization of rules and anticipation of punishment.\*

A sense of social regularity and expectation about how one ought to be treated.\*

### Reciprocity

A concept of giving, trading, and revenge.

Moralistic aggression against violators of reciprocity rules.

### Getting Along

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 is 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 (<http://home.att.net/~genocides/index.htm>). 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 eugenicist 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://home.att.net/~dysgenics/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:// home.att.net/~eugenics/host.htm](http://home.att.net/~eugenics/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
New Zealand	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 it 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 off 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 short 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:// prometheism.net](http://prometheism.net).)<sup>1</sup>

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 of 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 (Hrды 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 an 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> **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. Eugenicians 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.**

## 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:

	<b>Ratio of Average U.S. Household Income</b>	<b>Average intelligence Of the group</b>
Jews:	1.72	117 IQ
Japanese:	1.32	107 IQ
U.S. average:	1.00	100 IQ
Mexicans:	0.76	90 IQ
Blacks:	0.62	85 IQ

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 racist supremacist? 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 racist 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 racist 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.}

## 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:

<b><i>Domain</i></b>	<b><i>Orpheus</i></b>	<b><i>Big-Five trait</i></b>
Social	Fellowship	Extraversion vs. Introversion
Organizational	Authority	Tough-mindedness vs. agreeableness
Intellectual	Conformity	Conventionality vs. openness-to-experience
Emotional	Emotion	Neuroticism vs. confidence
Perceptual	Detail	Conscientiousness

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://home.attbi.com/~neoeugenics/bib.htm>

# **Shattering the Myth of Racism: Volume II**

A free Internet book: researched, written and published by Matthew T. Nuenke  
September, 2002 - Chapters One and Two  
February, 2003 - Chapters Three and Four

Comments and corrections are invited via my web site at  
<http://neoeugenics.home.attbi.com/>

Chapter 1: Why it is necessary to study racism and the differences between races. ....	1
Making Whites feel guilty. ....	1
Demanding White assimilation. ....	4
Economic costs of the egalitarian norm. ....	5
Crime and dependency. ....	7
Loss of political freedom. ....	8
Chapter 2: Intelligence and race. ....	10
John Ogbu's caste system. ....	11
Gardener's multiple intelligences. ....	14
Diamond's geographic explanation. ....	17
The meaning of race. ....	21
Rushton's r-K theory ....	34
Variable ....	35
Brain size ....	35
Intelligence. ....	35
Maturation rate. ....	35
Social organization. ....	36
General intelligence and the Flynn Effect ....	39
IQ and the success of races and nations. ....	48
Chapter 3: Marxist social science - race, evolution and deception. ....	55
The Standard Social Science Model (SSSM). ....	55
Chapter 4: Ethnocentrism and the Semitic Mind. ....	61

## **Chapter 1: Why it is necessary to study racism and the differences between races.**

### ***Making Whites feel guilty.***

"Guilt can have its pro-social uses. Imagine a society in which no one felt remorse for any transgression that he or she performed. Many social commentators have noted that the success of Martin Luther King Jr.'s campaign to desegregate the South was due, in part, to the guilt feelings induced in many white Southerners when his nonviolent actions were met with billy clubs, fire hoses, and attack dogs. Nevertheless, many effects of guilt are, of course, not positive; many guilty feelings are undeserved. Guilt can be induced by reminding the target of past sins that have long since been atoned for, by making small transgressions loom large, or by making it appear that the target is responsible for a crime

that he or she did not commit. Once we are filled with guilt, our thoughts and behavior are directed toward ridding ourselves of this feeling. The end result is, at best, the manipulation of our behavior and, perhaps at worst, long-term damage to our self-esteem." (Age of Propaganda by Pratkanis and Aronson, 1992, pg. 78)

Whites have an obligation to try to understand race and racism if for no other reason than we have been made to feel guilty for our past actions. In the past, people everywhere made comments regarding another's race or ethnicity and openly used racist terms in regards to others. This wasn't just a Western phenomenon, but was universal and has been the norm since humans started to form communities. This openness towards how one feels about others however started to change around 1930, and was brought about by several factors.

First, Marxists from Eastern Europe, made inroads into major departments in universities, especially in social science and cultural anthropology, but also many other areas such as psychology, education, philosophy and history.<sup>1</sup> During the turn of the last century in the United States, public opinion was molded by *religious* institutions, *business*, and the *military*. By 1930, public opinion was increasingly molded by *academia*, the *media* and *government*.<sup>2</sup> The actors and institutions that determined how a citizen should view themselves and what behavior was proper had changed drastically. For the first time the average American citizen, who was overwhelmingly White, was made to feel guilty for various sins.

How far the American mindset has been pushed towards a Marxist worldview struck home when President George W. Bush recently stated that there was too great of a gap between Anglo's homeownership and that of Blacks and Hispanics. He was introducing a plan (circa June, 2002) to increase the number of homes owned by minorities, and he lapsed into a Marxist argument where we have substituted race for class envy. This Marxist egalitarianism has so penetrated our way of thinking, has become such a norm, that Bush's statement passed without notice. If he had stated however that there were too many Blacks working in the postal service compared to Anglos (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants), he would have been attacked as a racist. So the question is, why are only Whites universally made to feel guilty for the world's sins?

This egalitarian norm was discussed at length in the 2001 book entitled *The Race Card* by Tali Mendelberg. A well researched book on how guilt and conformity have made Whites accept almost any and all forms of censorship against racial realism, he discusses how George H. Bush used the release of Willie Horton, a Black man in Massachusetts when Dukakis was governor, to push the fact that Dukakis was weak on crime. The book details how race has become a taboo in politics, and that if any White uses race to win an election it will backfire - Whites will always reject any racial appeal without further consideration. Note however that this only applies to Whites, while other minorities are encouraged to use race in furthering their own causes, as is so well illustrated by Jesse Jackson and his co-extortionists.

Mendelberg writes:

"A new political norm often arises from the concerted actions of a social movement seeking to ameliorate the powerlessness of a group. To gain substantial numbers of adherents, however, a new political norm must be communicated actively and deliberately by influential leaders. The cooperation of influential leaders is necessary especially if the new norm competes with an opposite established norm. The most effective way to combat an old norm and establish a new one is to pass landmark

legislation, to issue momentous judicial rulings, and to engage in other highly salient signals of commitment to the new norm. **Discrediting the adherents of the old norm is also an effective way to undermine the old norm**, but must be supplemented by actions that actively establish the new norm. Once the new norm has passed this initial stage, it may be communicated more passively. Candidates imitate the successful strategies of other candidates who adhere to the new norm. Politicians strive to anticipate and avoid the censure of influential elites who have signaled a commitment to the norm. Voters learn about the new norm from cultural elites and socialization agents in a gradual process of cultural and social diffusion, with successive generations internalizing the norm in an increasingly more effective way. The norm then becomes descriptive - providing information about what a typical member of the culture does, about how everyone acts; and, more importantly, injunctive - providing information about what actions a typical member of the culture approves or disapproves, about what everyone condones. At its most powerful, the norm is internalized and becomes personal - specifying how one's ideal self would act."

What doesn't seem to puzzle Mendelberg is how we came to adopt a Marxist egalitarian norm of behavior. He never mentions it or questions it, it is just assumed to be correct, and any previous norms are just assumed to be false. This is of course true of all dogmas; all other ways of thinking are just wrong, understood to be so without discussion. So Whites now behave in such a way that any time race is discussed, Whites must be made to feel guilty. This has effectively disarmed Whites from acting in concert for their own benefit and that of their children and their children's children. We have been effectively neutralized in defending our own interests. To do so will bring on charges of racism - and we will be compared with the Ku Klux Klan. However, we are not the Klan and would never be part of anything resembling the Klan - not in a modern cosmopolitan world. Those days are forever past, never to be revived.

Another error made by Mendelberg was to assume that the cause of this new egalitarian norm was "to ameliorate the powerlessness of a group." If he is referring to Blacks, the fact is that the egalitarianism or socialism was well established decades prior to the civil rights movement, as he admits to in his book. If this is true then, the egalitarian norm we have been forced to adopt as the new secular religion had nothing to do with Blacks, and everything to do with the shift in social control from religious/business/military to the new academic/media/political control that guides our institutions today. These new *guiding lights* of proper groupthink have been thoroughly accepted without question in an egalitarian/anti-White (male) bias. As Marxism penetrated our institutions, it substituted race-conflict in place of its failed class-conflict.

To illustrate just how absurd this indoctrination has become, there is no better book than Joseph L. Graves Junior's 2001 book entitled *The Emperor's New Clothes: Biological Theories of Race at the Millennium*. Now before proceeding, I must mention that Graves is professor of evolutionary biology at Arizona State University West, so he should be well aware of research that has been ongoing with regards to intelligence and brain size. Still, he is so blinded by dogma that he actually states: "In other words, if Europeans really did have larger heads and larger brains [than Blacks], and if these features did determine intellectual ability, we could not label a scientist reporting these facts as racist (p. 23)." So based on this one observation, Graves should never call another scientist as racist, because the correlation of intelligence with brain size gray matter, has been well established at 60% and climbing, thanks to modern tools for non-invasive measurements of brain component sizes. This book illustrates effectively just how absurd the arguments have become in trying to hold back the advancing sciences of intelligence,

behavior genetics, psychometrics, etc. Almost on every page, Graves manages to mutilate and distort logic and rational inquiry in order to prove that races don't exist. Graves fails so miserably, and is praised so highly by other academic Marxists, that one has to wonder how collectively out of touch they must be?

We have heard over the years about deprogramming, especially with regards to people who have joined strange and bizarre cults, and their friends or relatives try to rescue them from the clutches of evil. Western culture likewise has been brainwashed or indoctrinated into accepting an egalitarian norm - one that primarily attacks White males while showing deference to all other racial, gender and ethnic positive stereotypes. Moreover, guilt has been the main hammer used to silence dissent and suppress scientific inquiry. We have an obligation to look at race and racism empirically, and to reject any and all attempts by others to collectively tar us with the label of racism by using guilt.

### ***Demanding White assimilation.***

There has been an ongoing attempt to portray assimilation and racial intermarriage as the norm, while accusing Whites of racism if they don't marry Blacks as readily as they marry other Whites. There seems to be great jubilation in speculating that all humans will intermarry and eventually blend into one brown race without distinctions. Of course, it has been natural for different racial groups to intermarry; this has been going on for virtually millions of years in our primate ancestors as well as our own species. Nevertheless, that does not mean that race will disappear, in fact it may actually be the case that humans will start to increasingly separate genetically due to hypertrophic group selection, genetic engineering, and assortative mating. I will discuss these issues at length later. What concerns me here is the attitude that unless Whites interbreed with Blacks, or other people of color, we are somehow acting in a collective and racist manner.

Over the last few months, I have noticed an increasing portrayal of Black/White sexuality in the media, as even prime time television is starting to show mixed race couples. At least for Blacks and Whites, this has been a fairly standard taboo because of the resistance Whites have shown for mixing. However, is this racist to react negatively to race mixing? In fact, most ethnic groups take a very dim view of marrying out. Whether the group is Japanese, Asian Indians, Semites, or Irish - traditionalists want their children to marry into their own ethnic group. This is a universal attitude. Therefore, it is not race mixing that I am concerned with, but the *perception* that it is wrong to want to marry someone that is genetically like your own race.

In fact, some races do intermarry very easily. In his study of genetic differences, Cavalli-Sforza et al.<sup>3</sup> has shown that of the four major clusters of racial groups - Whites, East Asians, South Asians, and Blacks - that East Asians are closer genetically to Whites than they are to South Asians. As a result, Whites (Indo-Europeans) and East Asians (Koreans, Japanese and Chinese) intermarry quite readily. Of course, they are far closer in intelligence, with East Asians slightly more intelligent than Whites. On the other hand, South Asians have a lower IQ (around 90), while Blacks in sub-Saharan Africa have an average of only 70.<sup>4</sup> It is no wonder then that typically the only Whites or Asians who typically marry Blacks are either the White/Asian underclass or White/Asian women who marry wealthy or powerful Blacks. (Wealthy and/or powerful males can pretty much have their pick of women.<sup>5</sup>)

In the Middle East - Semites, who are made up of Arabs and Jews and who are classified as Whites by the U.S. Census Bureau - tribalism is even more extreme than it is in the West, and

intermarriage between ethnic groups can cause severe problems for couples who dare to violate tradition. Moreover, this is especially so in India, where the caste system has been in place for thousands of years, making a religion out of racism. So the question is, why are Whites the only group singled out for criticism, when they show a preference for marrying someone that is genetically similar to themselves? The answer can only be understood in light of our complete acceptance of the egalitarian norm. We have been made to feel guilty for not wanting to intermarry with - primarily - Blacks.

However, can there be any justification for not intermarrying with other races? Well, we could use the Jewish rationalization:<sup>6</sup>

"Moreover, on the one hand, Jewish organizations are forever vigilant against any and all manifestations of antisemitism, believing that the ultimate aim of every antisemite is the annihilation of the Jewish people. On the other hand, as frightening as annihilation may be, Jewish organizations are equally worried about the danger that Jews will disappear as a result of assimilation. Major Jewish organizations have made the fight against assimilation a primary goal. Through their cultural and educational programs, Jewish groups emphasize three major points. First, Jews today have a debt to their ancestors to pass on their Jewish heritage to their children. To fail in this duty is to betray the millions of Jewish martyrs who fought and died for their faith and their people over the past four thousand years. Second, Jews as a people have made an enormous contribution to civilization through the philosophical ideals and scientific principles they have introduced. Thus, Jews have an obligation to humanity to maintain their distinctive identities, 'because we are struggling to teach men how to build a better world for all men,' as Woocher has said. Finally, only as self-conscious members of the Jewish community, the Jewish leadership avers, can Jews lead meaningful lives."

It seems straightforward that any racial, religious, or ethnic group could use the same or similar logic, to advocate for the restriction of intermarriage. So why should one racial group be allowed to be secessionists from human reproductive mingling, but not any one else? Well of course, what is intended is to preach one message to Whites and a different message to Jews. In addition, if anyone mentions this hypocrisy, they are called antisemitic - intended to shut them up. Should the Jews worry about assimilation? Of course if they want to exist as a separate racial group. But then no group should be chastised for wanting to remain separate, either biologically or socially. Every person has the right to associate as they see fit, and to try to understand the evolutionary basis for this separation as well as the occasional integration between races, we must pursue the empirical evidence that is available. That means being allowed not only to study human and animal behavior, but also to be able to study how the races differ. We must never feel guilty, or apologize for, having the desire to be close to and associate with those who we are comfortable with, those like ourselves. Without freedom of association, only tyranny will remain.

### ***Economic costs of the egalitarian norm.***

Whites, Semites, Hispanics - all American taxpayers - are in the process of being sued by Blacks for reparations due to past slavery - in the political arena rather than in the judicial system. It is much easier to distort the facts when they are filtered through the media where only *some* facts are allowed to be debated. And the entire substance of the case is based on the assumption that Blacks are just as qualified, as a group, to earn an equivalent amount of money on average, as any other group, so any difference in average earnings must be due to slavery or other forms of



racism. The debate would be fair enough if - and only if - all of the relevant facts could be presented. However, in this debate, the major *refutation* to its claim is that on average, Blacks make less money than some other groups because they are on average behaviorally different. That is, Blacks are on average less intelligent and may have other behavioral shortcomings such as an average low level of conscientiousness, the second most important predictor of economic success after intelligence. A highly intelligent person with low conscientiousness will lack the drive to succeed.

Over a hundred years of research into intelligence and its importance on economic success and a host of other life outcomes, is now undisputed in academic circles, as well as such impartial observers of the debate as the American Psychological Association.<sup>7</sup> I will take up this topic in detail later in the book. However, as the reparations debate continues, take note of these simple facts. First, Whites - as defined in this book as primarily the larger European community - are not the most successful group in America and therefore slavery could not have enriched us as a definable group. Today, Jews in the United States have on average about ten times the average wealth<sup>8</sup>, with East Asians next, then Whites, Hispanics and lastly Blacks. So Whites fall right in the middle between Jews and Blacks, we are not on average *on top* economically as it is portrayed by the media and by Marxist academics, but rather we fall right in the middle. This is easy to understand when we look at average intelligences: American Jews 115, American Whites 100, and American Blacks 85 (sub-Saharan Africans have an average IQ of 70).<sup>9</sup> Average intelligence determines the average success of different groups.

The other major argument for reparations is that America as a whole profited from slavery and those profits continue on indefinitely. Of course, this is an absurd argument. Wealth, as most of us understands it, is consumed. My wife and I both have almost identical salaries, we have no children or expensive hobbies, and yet we consume almost all of our income - that is, what is left of it after the government takes almost half of it for redistribution. Therefore, whatever wealth was made from slavery is gone, consumed in life and reduced in size by a population explosion since the end of slavery. The marginal increase in wealth that was obtained by having slaves versus not having slaves has long ago evaporated, and has now become a negative sum of money as billions of dollars are now transferred from Whites to Blacks through welfare, affirmative action, and the cost of crime prevention.

So let's look at the numbers: by the early 1990s, racial preference costs have exceeded \$350 billion per year, with no end in sight.<sup>10</sup> On top of that, Blacks and Hispanics are given preference for admission into the finest universities where the prestige of a degree translates in a higher income. However, how much are Whites impacted or displaced from the better universities because of quotas? The numbers here are deceiving because Jews and Whites are lumped together as "Whites" when looking at college enrollments. However, the facts are very different from perception. During the turn of the last previous century, major American universities restricted the number of Jews admitted as a form of affirmative action for Whites. That is, Jews were perceived to be a threat to Whites because of higher Jewish intelligence - discrimination was used to keep Jews out. Today, Jews at only about 2% of the population, account for about 40% of the admissions to Ivy League colleges.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, when minorities displace Whites they are in fact displacing so-called Anglo Whites and not the more intelligent Jewish Whites. So non-Jewish Whites are in fact becoming a minority in the finest universities, that leads to a reduction in income and political power in favor of minorities, both upper-class (East Asian and Jews) and lower-class (Hispanics and Blacks). Whites are squeezed into the shrinking middle, and it will become far worse for the next generation as the egalitarian spoils

system continues to disenfranchise White America for new and expanding minority groups. (We are now seeing an ever-greater influx of South Asians, Arabs, and Asian Indians that will also demand their pound of flesh from the shrinking White middle class.)

In employment, the same situation occurs. The White middle class is being squeezed by affirmative action quotas that declares that if any great imbalance occurs between the number of minorities in the population versus those employed in any given company, then the unequal representation (income) is a disparate outcome and must be racist, while equality of intelligence and effort are assumed to be equal. "In 1970 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued guidelines which defined job selection tests as discriminatory if they had an adverse impact on hiring blacks unless the tests could meet these extremely strict standards. In 1971, this recommendation was tested in the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Griggs v. Duke Power Company*. The Supreme Court supported the EEOC's recommendation and effectively made the use of intelligence tests for job selection illegal. Nevertheless, research continued to demonstrate that intelligence tests were useful predictors of job performance."<sup>12</sup>

Therefore, Whites again are trapped in the middle, unable to compete as a group against East Asians and Jews, and forced to be bypassed by Blacks and Hispanics in those jobs that are available because qualifications such as intelligence or conscientiousness are ignored, and only equality of numbers counts. Companies are not allowed to look at the one best measure of performance - intelligence. Corporations have been effectively shackled to a Marxist program of quotas, and there is only one way out, empirical data showing that racial groups are not equal in intelligence.

Therefore, this is probably the most important reason why studies in intelligence by racial groups are critical for a just society. If it is suppressed, Whites will slowly be displaced from a fair representation in the work force - squeezed out from the corporate elite above by Jews and East Asians and by Blacks and Hispanics from below. That is why the only thing the Left has left is to call anyone who studies the intelligence of groups racist, because they have no empirical data to overturn what is obvious to most people, and they are unwilling to allow merit alone to judge who should get what in the game of life. However, note, this hostility towards Whites excludes any hostility towards Jews or East Asians. So, what kind of egalitarian system is it that singles out only one group for disparagement, disdain and repression? Certainly not a coherent one, for if a person did hold to a strictly Marxist egalitarian perspective, then quotas would be an equal burden on all the races, and not just against Whites. Therefore, studies into differences in intelligence are essential to make sense out of the differing successes of racial groups - no other way is available to answer the charges made against Whites by the Left.

### ***Crime and dependency.***

"[O]ne may also subtract from any debt the cost to whites of black crime. Blacks commit about two thirds of all robberies in the US - half of which, or about 300,000 at current rates - victimize whites (white-on-black crime is rare). These crimes give blacks resources properly belonging to whites. Blacks commit felonies of all kinds at three to ten times the white rate, and even when their victims are not white, their crimes are a burden that would be considerably lighter in an all-white society. Public relief or 'welfare' can be seen in the same light. Blacks fall below the threshold that triggers it three to four times more often than whites. White taxpayers therefore give blacks tens of billions of dollars every year; in my book *Why Race Matters* I note that black slums receive a 'Marshal Plan' about once every three years, a rate that every few decades amounts to another trillion dollars."<sup>13</sup> (Michael Levin)

Crime has become almost synonymous with Blacks. This in itself is a fact, but increasingly, this fact has been attributed to racism rather than to any fault of Blacks. The high crime rate of Blacks is attributed to all kinds of sociological reasons, but genetic reasons are rarely looked at even though the data is available and it is global in its phenomena - anywhere Blacks live the crime rate is high. Of course, crime varies markedly from place to place and from time to time. The recent reduction in crime in the United States has been attributed to higher levels of employment, the legalization of abortion where fewer unwanted children are now growing up angry, the fact that many gang members kill each other, and finally we are incarcerating so many more criminals. No one ever knows for sure of course why changes occur, but we do have ways of looking at behavior from many perspectives that tell us that different races in fact do differ in their rates of violence and crime. This will be covered later in more detail, but for now, the reason we need to study differences in the incidence of crime between races is that our safety is being undermined by blaming Whites for what Blacks do.

Blacks are less intelligent, and we now know from brain imaging studies that they also have less grey matter in those regions of the brain that control our aggressive nature. Therefore, if we proceed on the egalitarian assumptions that there is no difference between the races, we will eventually have to adjust the number of Blacks in prison to reflect their percentage of the population. Just like in education, we will have a racial quota system for violent criminal offenders, and we will all be less safe - Blacks, Whites and every other racial group. And even if you don't feel in danger yourself, how are you going to explain to your spouse, your children, your parents and friends that the reason they got mugged, raped or robbed was their fault - not the criminals. It is flat out cowardly not to stand up to intimidation and threats, and not to declare directly, that we will not be made to submit to a Marxist program of guilt for being White. We need to therefore look at all of the evidence and see what causes violence. If it is due to culture and not to genes, then let us see the data. But if it is due in any part to genetic differences between the races, then we have a right in defending ourselves to point these facts out and to get on with making the streets safe - by whatever means we have available. We cannot allow the charge of racism to be used when it will lead to violence against our family and friends.

### ***Loss of political freedom.***

The ultimate price we will pay, if we revert to dogma rather than science, can be seen in institutions that existed in the past and suppressed free inquiry, from religions to Communism. These are oppressive institutions when given free reign to control what can be said and what can be investigated. For many decades now, at least in the West, religious oppression has for all practical purposes died. However, liberal democracy, socialism and the egalitarian norm are alive and well and are as oppressive as any system in the past - and they are gaining strength as the public accepts unquestioned dogmas.

The world is now divided up into antagonistic groups and all outcomes of success are compared based on group outcomes. Individual outcomes are no longer valid; they must be called into question. No one that I know of wants to judge a person by the group they belong to, rather, they want a just world where every person is judged as an individual. This does not mean we will all stop categorizing other people using simplistic rules of observation. However, it does mean that when it comes to education, jobs and politics we can put aside our opinions about groups and let each individual take responsibility for their own condition. That is, let us get on with allowing

the fair and impartial testing of individuals - and not groups - because we will ultimately be silenced otherwise.

In every country in the West, only the United States has a strong constitutional prohibition against suppression of speech. Nevertheless, even here it is being rolled back ever so carefully so that eventually, no discussion of race will be allowed if it violates the sensibilities of any minority other than Whites. Whites will continue to be vilified, but any mention by Whites about any other race will be met with newer expanding prohibitions and laws, justified by socialist goals. These laws are already pervasive in Europe, and they are creeping this way.

In essence, then, whites stand accused of racism when outcomes differ, so a defense is necessary and behavior genetics is the main tool for showing inequality in nature.<sup>14</sup> However, how can we mount a defense when every attempt is rebutted by shrieks of "racism?" Government funds are poured into Marxist leaning social science and cultural anthropology research programs, while behavior genetics, the study of racial differences, gets virtually nil. We try to solve social problems, but we are not allowed to use science - the door to free inquiry is slammed shut - and political correctness is enforced by all means necessary. However, the main tool continues to be White guilt, and not just in the United States. The method has varied from country to country in the West. In Europe images of Nazi extermination camps are called up while the extermination camps of the Communists go unmentioned (the Red Holocaust) - in an effort to enforce White guilt. In the United States, it is slavery. However, the message is always the same - Whites are evil and all other racial groups are innocent, peaceful, virtuous people (at least prior to September 11, 2001 - now Arab Semites may have to be slowly added to scoundrel list).

One of the most persistent arguments made to suppress discussion of racial differences is that there is more variation within races than between races. Well yes, this is true. Whites vary in intelligence from almost zero to an IQ of 200. Yes, that is a large variation - 200. And yes, the difference between say the average Ashkenazi Jew with an IQ of 115 and the average sub-Saharan Black with an average IQ of 70 is only a difference of 45 - on average. However, the question must then be, why do Blacks demand absolute equality with Whites based on group averages? For that matter, using the same arguments that Blacks have used against Whites, why can't Whites use these same disparate outcome arguments against East Asians and Jews? Whites on average are far less well off than East Asians and Jews. Where is the effort for equality of outcome? Well, when it comes to Black failure in terms of wealth it is blamed on White supremacy. When Jews do exceptionally well compared to Whites it is said to be due to Jews trying harder, not because they are oppressing Whites. There is a terrible double standard, and it bears unequally on Whites as the guilty race.

Finally, the other major misconception about studying race is that it is a Western construct, that is, something new that the West invented in the last few hundred years. Of course, we have invented many things in the West in the last few hundred years, but the concept of race was not new, but very old and virtually universal. "I explained that population differences in g were apparent to Plato, who may have derived his understanding from observations as a slave, and from what seems, in the Symposium, to have been his experience of late-night drinking parties with the lower orders. Unfortunately, few Western philosophers followed Plato's lead of mixing widely, and after Plato, it was more than two thousand years before g and eugenics were discussed articulately and systematically."<sup>15</sup> In addition, note that Plato was a living slave and quite brilliant! I thought being a slave or even having a slave as an ancestor made one quite dull?

Actually, what has been invented is not the concept of race, but the concept of simplistic causation. Egalitarians observe that there are differences between racial outcomes and they must therefore be due entirely to White supremacy or racism. But is this valid? We can make all kinds of observations about outcomes, but do we know how these outcomes occur?

"And indeed in the end the Principle of Computational Equivalence encapsulates both the ultimate power of science and the ultimate weakness of science. For it implies that all the wonders of our universe can in effect be captured by simple rules, yet it shows that there can be no way to know all the consequences of these rules, except in effect just to watch and see how they unfold." (Wolfram in *A New Kind of Science*, 2002)

And so it is with so-called *racism*. We can point to all the assumed injustices in the world and declare that underneath these observations are racist motives, or we can undertake an empirical analysis of how people interact - including ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and tribalism - and try to understand that they have been with us for millions of years. We can see that complexity abounds from these basic human urges, but as Wolfram has shown, simple rules can lead to highly complex phenomena. But to understand this complexity requires a great deal of work, and it is not found in the normative dogmas of anti-racism, anti-capitalism, anti-Catholicism or other social movements outside of human rationality. The bellicose nature of the modern Left is totalitarian in that it does not allow for dissent. It is declared as absolute truth based on Marxism that has long been shown to be nonsensical, but to the true believers, the only cult left for them to escape scientific inquiry.

So the question must be, if in fact there is a human innateness for racism and/or ethnocentrism, is it universal or is it variable? Moreover, if it varies, does it vary among different races or is it the same? These are the fundamental questions that are not pursued by the Left because the Left proceeds from a set of doctrinaire principles that are based on hatred of Western culture, and even more so an irrational hatred of White[s] (males). Therefore, it seems we see incredible complexity in human behavior - as poststructuralist, Freudian, and Marxist protagonists labor to show - while some very simple underlying motivations are the cause. From simple rules comes highly complex behavior - not from devious plots by White supremacists, Jewish supremacists, global capitalists, or Free Masons. There is no guiding hand, just simple human needs and often hidden motivations. This book will explore these interrelationships. I expect to have no impact on those who have fully embraced the egalitarian norm, but hope only to explore new perspectives with those who desire an empirical approach to human behavior.

## **Chapter 2: Intelligence and race.**

Races - or if you prefer, *population groups* - vary with respect to looks, genetic diseases, intelligence, and behavioral types. Behavior genetics is that part of evolutionary biology that looks at differences between peoples, and the way they group people can vary from each individual (excluding identical twins) to the great outlier races: Whites, Blacks, East Asians, South Asians - and the remaining melting pot races that lie between them. The underlying dogma of anti-racist egalitarians rest on one simple principle: races do not exist - they are a social construct.

In this chapter I will first look at a few of the anti-racist hypotheses that try to deny racial differences, before moving on to research that explains how the races differ. First, I must point out that there is a fundamental difference between the egalitarian approaches and the behavior

genetic approach. The egalitarian approaches are *just-so* stories, based on stand-alone rationalizations of why the races do-not differ in any appreciable way. That is, they do not have a coherent theory that has been built up over time and continues to become more robust as time passes.

This is not the case with behavior genetics. It is in fact a continuum that has flowed naturally from Darwinism, to sociobiology, to evolutionary psychology, to behavior genetics, and into many other evolutionary sub-disciplines. Through research, the evolutionary sciences, like physics, have built upon a continuing unfolding of what it means to be human, how we got here, and what may be in store for us in the future. It has been a smooth continuation of scientific progress, with few bumps or retreats on the major aspects of the theory. In fact, nothing in the biological sciences from medicine, to human behavior, to genetics, etc. makes any sense at all outside of evolution. Like gravity in physics, there are still mysteries to be determined outside of the observation that it is a real phenomenon, but nobody denies that gravity is grounded in fact, as best we know it.

So just like the creationists who reject evolution because it undermines their belief in a prime mover, the egalitarians reject all or part of evolution because it undermines their desire to build a utopian human presence on earth, through the will of force and propaganda, rather than in an understanding of what is in fact a real human nature. In addition, to deny this, they have provided us with various ad hoc stories that have just one purpose: to derail scientific inquiry. But so far, all Marxist attempts have only fueled the passion of evolutionists to gather ever more data that supports the underlying thesis - humans are just part of the evolution of all species. We are not unique, nor are we really that complex in comparison to say the vampire bat that practices non-kin altruism in sharing blood with their fellow travelers. The rules of evolutionary change and variation are incredibly simple - but the results seem vastly complicated (again, see the complex patterns formed using simple cellular automata in *A New Kind of Science*).

### ***John Ogbu's caste system.***

For an exhaustive list of hypotheses that attempt to disprove differences in average intelligence between races, see Arthur R. Jensen's *The g Factor*, Chapter 12, "Population Differences In Intelligence: Causal Hypotheses." This 1998 summation of Jensen's life work is the most thorough to date on intelligence. (Chapter 12 is available at my web site: <http://home.att.net/~eugenics/jen12.htm>.) For my purpose, I am more interested in using just a few case studies to show the transparency of the arguments rather than listing all of the arguments that have been proposed, for the new excuses that are conjured up via pseudoscientific speculations are endless, though in the end they are disconnected and incoherent.

Ogbu writes, "The people who have most difficulty with IQ tests and other forms of cognitive tasks are *involuntary* or *nonimmigrant* minorities. This difficulty arises because their cultures are not merely different from that of the dominant group but may be in *opposition* to the latter. Therefore, the tests acquire symbolic meanings for these minorities, which cause additional but as yet unrecognized problems. It is more difficult for them to cross cognitive boundaries."<sup>16</sup>

The problem with this *just-so* story is that Ogbu takes a few conveniently selected examples of people who are suffering this low *caste status*, while ignoring many other examples. In addition, he has no well-formulated explanation of how this comes about - it remains an abstract observation and cannot be further tested because it has no real explanation as to the mechanics of

the failures of these lower castes. Jensen (above) shows the invalidity of Ogbu's arguments *per se*, while I will look at the cases themselves.

Ogbu looks at several other *caste systems*, to try to show a pattern. One such example is the Burakumi (also called Etas) in Japan, where their lower status is based, according to Ogbu, on the fact that they are relegated to such undesirable work such as tanning leather, sweeping, butchers, and executions. By traditional Japanese law, they could not marry out, and were separated as undesirables. However, is it their class as a group or are they a different race? Genetic studies show that the Etas have more body hair than the Japanese, and are probably an ancient race - the Ainu. They are in fact very different from the Japanese, and therefore we would expect them to be behaviorally different from the Japanese - including innate intelligence.<sup>17</sup>

Another example Ogbu uses are the untouchables of India, the Harijans. The caste system was established, again according to Cavalli-Sforza et al., by Aryans (Indo-Europeans) thousands of years ago to keep the races separate. It is questionable how *involuntary* it is today, as it is part of their religion. Those who are not Hindu are not forced by society or the government to submit to caste rules with regards to marriage, work and association. The caste system in India is probably the most racist religion/culture in modern times, and yet it is adhered to by the participants. One has to question then, what is the real cause of the low intelligence of the untouchables, and for that matter the high intelligence of the Brahmins? What came first, differences in the innate intelligence of the castes, or a caste system that made some castes dumb and others smart? A lot more research needs to be carried out in India to unravel the differences in intelligence between the differing castes, but to date there is little to go on. Nevertheless, what we do know seems to disqualify Ogbu's hypothesis.

Ogbu also compares the low intelligence of the Irish in Northern Ireland with their Protestant counter parts. Having been discriminated against and made to feel inferior, they are according to Ogbu showing signs of the *caste system*. Then how does he explain the reported low average intelligence in Ireland itself, of only 93?<sup>18</sup> The Irish in Ireland show the same low average intelligence that accounts for rural low intelligence in the United States - selective migration. Smart people everywhere, when they can, get off the farm (or other dead end occupations) and head for the city. In Ireland, they headed for the big cities in America. This selective migration was of course a statistical average: the ones who left were somewhat more intelligent than those that stayed.

Then there is Asia, where there are many compelling observations, that it is intelligence, not caste systems that account for the success of different groups. East Asians have an average intelligence of about 105, while South Asians have an average intelligence of about 90. Where East Asians have gone into South Asian countries like Burma, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, etc. they totally dominate economically, while being subject often to discrimination themselves from the dominate population groups.

Take Malaysia for example:

"Malaysia is a nation of 23 million people, of whom 65 percent are native Malays, 25 percent are Chinese, and about 10 percent are Indians. Malays, or 'bumiputras' (sons of the soil) as they are called, cannot compete with Chinese or Indians and have benefited from 30 years of extensive 'affirmative action' in education, business opportunities, and

land ownership. Prime Minister Mahatir Mohammad, who has run the country for 20 years, is deeply frustrated by how poorly his people do in comparison with the Chinese.

"'Why can't the Malays be like them?' he wants to know. 'Those with AIDS are Malays, drugs also involve the Malays, rape and murders. . . . You name anything that is bad, the majority are Malays,' he says. 'Why does it only involve the Malays? Why not the Chinese?' He adds that if it were not for persistent preference programs Malays would 'fail totally.' He says that if he were granted one wish it would be that 'the Malays would change' and be more like Chinese.

"Lately, Mr. Mahatir has been particularly annoyed with Malay students, who have guaranteed access to a generous quota of university places even when Chinese or Indians get better grades. He is considering making students sign an agreement promising to attend lectures, take notes, and ask questions. He says too many Malays either goof off or join anti-Mahatir political movements: 'Only those interested in study should join the university.'"<sup>19</sup>

Does this sound like Blacks in the United States? This disparity is found around the world, and it can be attributed more to innate intelligence than to any other single factor. Now if Ogbu were to really test his hypothesis, he would include countries like Malaysia, but he conveniently leaves these counter examples out. In addition, what would he find if he looked at Jews around the world? In every case, except perhaps in the Middle East where they have traditionally been oppressed because of their high levels of success, the same pattern emerges. Jews do far better than the majority populations they live amongst.

In Norway, there are communities where Norwegian Lapps predominate along with a minority of Norwegians, primarily in inland regions. Yet, we again find the same racial pattern of dominance by a more intelligent Norwegian race over the less intelligent Lapp race. The Lapps themselves feel that their lack of industrial enterprise is due to their low intelligence. Apparently, they have not learned the lessons of victimization - always blame someone else!<sup>20</sup>

As stated above, Ogbu, along with other advocates of the *symbolic racism* excuse for the cognitively challenged minorities, believes that they cannot cross the *great divide* because their cultures are in *opposition to* the dominant group. Who is the dominant group? Are the Jews the dominant group, the East Asians, just who? As stated before, Whites are not on top, but are sandwiched in the middle. So, who is keeping - *some minorities* - down?

Volumes have been written on *stereotypes* and *symbolic racism*, though the names constantly change and to even get a clear definition is difficult. However, with regards to stereotypes, it is important to answer two things - what are they, and so what? Everyone develops stereotypes, some more true than others do - some positive, some negative, and some just plain useful. Humans naturally stereotype because it is an efficient way to make quick decisions when time is of the essence. We stereotype many things like types of dogs, the dangers of getting struck by lightning or bitten by a shark, the impact of global warming, and differences in behaviors of different ethnic groups. So there is nothing unique in stereotypes, and often they are held but seldom acted upon. Therefore, what significance does stereotyping have for racism studies?

Of course, the egalitarians want everyone to believe first that only Whites hold negative stereotypes, and second that these stereotypes somehow change the outcomes for a vast number



of people. However, what they fail to recognize is that stereotypes may have validity, more or less, and some stereotypes do not.

For example, there is no gap in the perceptions of Whites and Asians in Los Angeles with regards to minorities. In fact, Asians are less likely than Whites to believe that Blacks or Hispanics suffer from job discrimination.<sup>21</sup> On a host of issues: Jews, Asians, Whites and even Hispanics recognize the reality of Black low intelligence, high crime rates, and other various pathologies - all born out by empirical studies that are free of personal bias. These stereotypes have a real basis in fact.

On the other hand, is there any truth to the stereotype of White racism as a cause of Black failure? If there is, where is the proof? If whites really had any power in the United States, why would we stand by and let East Asians and Jews usurp our once prominent positions in academia, business, wealth accumulation, and overall status? How did we manage to abdicate our status to these groups, while simultaneously oppressing other minorities? It looks an awful lot like Whites have been made to take the blame for what is a natural phenomena - racial groups differ in innate abilities. In fact it is this stereotype of *White supremacy* that has so harmed the status of Whites everywhere that we have been made impotent against outrageous charges and calls for reparations without even mounting an effective defense - so thoroughly indoctrinated have we become. Nevertheless, the first step towards rehabilitation is to understand that we have been duped and to demand an end to these racist stereotypes.

The stereotypical image of White racism is the result of media attention on stories that are not the norm, but become exaggerated over time through repetition. "Research suggests that rare or infrequently occurring phenomena, [like real racism] especially if linked to negative or unwanted outcomes [like persistent black failures], can assume exaggerated prominence in memory."<sup>22</sup> Thirty plus years ago, Jim Crow racism was witnessed by Whites, to be eventually shunned as unjust. Now likewise, we must expose the *Jim Crow* subjugation of Whites, and put an end to taking the blame for their inability to overcome their own shortcomings. We are not to blame.

### ***Gardener's multiple intelligences.***

Howard Gardner et al. have spent colossal sums of money at Harvard and Yale Universities trying to show that intelligence should include not only what most people recognize as intelligence, but also other attributes, in fact seven: *linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal* and *interpersonal*. The problem with this approach should be obvious to anyone: a bat given an SAT test that included as one of its components *athletic ability*, would be declared to be a genius, and would probably be admitted to medical school, for no human is capable of the physical abilities of such a bat. Flying blind, and using a sophisticated system of vocalizations and echolocation, they are able to perform amazing feats of maneuverability. Does anyone really believe that we should classify bats as geniuses? Apparently, those who promote multiple intelligences do.

Of these seven intelligences: linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial and to some extent musical, are already heavily g loaded. That is, they are already included in what we mean by intelligence. *Bodily-kinesthetic* is decidedly not a part of intelligence, but is what everyone recognizes as athletic ability that stands separate and in itself is not a singular skill, but made up of separate physical abilities. Intrapersonal/interpersonal are also like athletic ability: they are ancient modules that predate human intelligence and are defined as personality traits. Jensen also asks why stop at just these seven intelligences: "Why is there no *sexual intelligence* (Casanova) or

*criminal intelligence* (Al Capone)?"<sup>23</sup> And the list could go on: religious intelligence for example. Is an atheist therefore less intelligent than a Christian is? Of course not - religion is another very ancient module that evolved to help humans cope with their newfound self-awareness as well as achieving specific group evolutionary strategies.<sup>24</sup>

The concept of *multiple intelligences* came about as a result of the observation that high-IQ people are typically found to have unusual talents in certain areas: physics, math, verbal skills, etc. The problem is, these same people are still very smart in most areas of intelligence, but they may stand out extraordinarily on one or two areas of intelligence. Jensen states: "When I personally asked Gardner for his estimate of the lowest IQ one could possibly have and be included in a list of names such as this, he said, 'About 120.' This would of course exclude 90 percent of the general population, and it testifies to the threshold nature of g. That is, a fairly high level of g is a necessary but not sufficient condition for achievement of socially significant creativity." We do not see this *exceptionality* then in people with average or low intelligence. People (aside from idiot savants) who have average or low intelligences do not have a particular area of talent where they are exceptionally skilled in the areas we normally consider intelligence. Therefore, Gardner just broadened the definition of intelligence so that everyone can have a chance to be equal in some way. This is akin to broadening the rules of athletic sports to where there are no losers, only different kinds of winners. Everyone is a star. Well - it is phony. Its only purpose is an egalitarian one - to set up a new system of rules and values where everyone can be equal.

When we think of intelligence, most of us do not confuse it with innate and ancient mental modules for existence:

"A face recognition module, a spatial relations module, a rigid objects mechanics module, a tool-use module, a fear module, a social-exchange module, an emotion-perception module, a kin oriented motivation module, an effort allocation and recalibration module, a child care module, a social inference module, a friendship module, a semantic-inference module, a grammar acquisition module, a communication-pragmatics module, a theory of mind module, and so on! This extensive and incomplete list of possible modules is perhaps not that different from what Gardner was suggesting (multiple intelligences)."<sup>25</sup>

Are we to believe that these ancient mental modules are what we consider intelligence? Not hardly. "There is no such thing in evolution as wiping the slate clean and starting afresh, of going back to the drawing board. Evolution works by slightly modifying that which has gone before. The human brain therefore must be a modified version of the brain of those animals from which we have evolved.... *reptilian brain*; *palaeomammalian brain*; and the *neomammalian brain*."<sup>26</sup>

Gallistel states that, "whenever learning occurs, it is made possible by an adaptively specialized learning mechanism - a learning module - whose structure is as specific to a particular learning problem as the structure of a sensory organ like the eye or the ear is specific to a particular stimulus modality.... there is no such thing as *the* learning process; rather, there are many different learning processes."<sup>27</sup> So here let us throw in a few more *intelligences*: Excellent eyesight, hearing and tactile sensitivity. Does anyone actually say to a friend: "Wow your intelligent, my eyes couldn't see that small print, or my ears hear those high pitched tones."

Cosmides and Tooby state that there is at least "some evidence for the existence of inference systems that are specialized for reasoning about objects, physical causality, number, the biological world, the beliefs and motivations of other individuals, and social interactions. These domain-specific inference systems have a distinct advantage over domain-independent ones, akin to the difference between experts and novices: Experts can solve problems faster and more efficiently than novices because they already know a lot about the problem domain."<sup>28</sup>

Again then, Gardner has co-mingled these ancient brain modules for specific tasks, brain modules that do not differ much from individual to individual, with the increase in general intelligence that occurred just recently in the last 100,000 years, and is unique to humans. This higher intelligence is *not* domain specific, but general. Cave art, music, verbal abilities, and mathematics were not unitary modules that evolved to solve some specific survival problem. Humans began to evolve an administrative brain able to think beyond the narrow mental boxes of simple hunter-gatherers.

So, what is intelligence? It is the genetically based enlargement of that portion of the brain that is unique to humans in its size - the gray matter or prefrontal cortex, along with other brain characteristics. As Graves tried to save Black pride, he calls using head size to infer *human worth* as pseudoscience.<sup>29</sup> However, no one does that - we correlate head size, and now more precisely the amount of gray matter, with intelligence. In addition, it correlates very well at about 60%, almost as high as the genetic basis for intelligence at about 80%. Intelligence then is that recent change in our evolutionary life history that is unique to humans, but found in some beginning forms in higher primates and some mammals like dolphins. However, humans have by far the greatest amount of gray matter for our body size - far outpacing any other species. Moreover, we all recognize this as what is correlated with what we mean by intelligence. "There are a set of intelligence genes, because you can't have intelligence without genes,"<sup>30</sup> and humans have far more of these genes than any other species, and some races have more of these genes than other races. (When I speak of smart genes, I do not mean necessarily the genes, but rather the allele or specific coding for the gene.)

Jensen quotes Brody: "Thus I find [Gardner's] taxonomy to be arbitrary and without empirical foundation. Neither his rejection of a [higher order] general factor [g] nor the specific subset of intelligences that he postulates appears to have a firm theoretical or empirical basis (pg. 40)."<sup>31</sup> In addition, later Jensen writes: "The g factor, which is needed theoretically to account for the positive correlations between all tests, is necessarily unitary only within the domain of factor analysis. However, the brain mechanisms or processes responsible for the fact that individual differences in a variety of abilities are positively correlated, giving rise to g, need not be unitary. Whether the neural basis of g is some unitary process or a number of distinct processes is a separate empirical question."

So again, egalitarians have expended a great deal of energy and money to confuse rather than enlighten our understanding of intelligence. By mixing together athletic ability, personality traits, and intelligence, they have managed to come up with another *just so* story. This is not the pursuit of science, but is a pursuit in trying to overcome the embarrassment of persistently large differences in intelligence seen between Blacks/Hispanics/Amerindians on the one side and Whites/Jews/East Asians on the other. To keep transferring large sums of money within and between governments from the

cognitively competent to the cognitively challenged, requires that the socialists never admit to any differences in innateness.

***Diamond's geographic explanation.***<sup>32</sup>

*Guns, Germs and Steel* by Jared Diamond is one of those books by the racial egalitarians that try to disprove theories that do not exist in the first place. Diamond wants to show that Western dominance and technological advancement was not a matter of a higher intellect but was due to environmental and historical circumstances. The problem is, I am not aware of any advocates who try to make the argument that because Western culture is more advanced, they are therefore the smartest. In fact, quite the opposite is true. Psychometricians have shown that East Asians are more intelligent than Caucasians, and that they do not lead us technologically (outside Japan) because of environmental or political/cultural differences. Therefore, Diamond has written a book to disprove a theory that does not exist. He is attacking a straw man.

What he is really doing however is attacking Western culture, for no other reason than he finds it distasteful because of his hatred for the existing power structure based on his egalitarian desire to reshape politics. For this reason, this book is filled with a history of how plants and animals were domesticated, how germs became prevalent at the dawn of modern civilization, and how advanced societies use weapons to suppress conquered peoples. The detailed analysis of these issues tends to be too long, and will be of limited interest to most people. But he does go to great lengths to show how only Eurasia could have developed in the way it did, and that other parts of the world just did not have the proper environment for modern development. I don't take issue with his arguments. In many ways they are "just so" stories that I found credible but of little real interest when it comes to judging the *worth* of people, which he seems to be trying to do in this book. However, one must wonder how such a mundane book, with so much speculation and so little impact on the real world, managed to get the Pulitzer Prize. And of course the reason is simple. This is another book by a Marxist with a Universalist agenda. It is the same genre as Gould's *The Mismeasure of Man*, et al. It serves the political interests of those who review, publish and promote authors who are radical environmentalists.

Lynn and Vanhanen's book *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* (2002) point out a number of flaws in Diamond's hypotheses, similar to those oversights by Gardner and Ogbu above. He just plain ignores a lot of countervailing data. For example, they point out that Chinese science and technology was more advanced than that in the West from about 500 B.C. to 1500 A. D. It then stalled even though there was no change in the ecology. However, today, the Chinese have furthered the development in countries like Brunei, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand where the average intelligences are lower than that in China. In addition, contrary to what Diamond states, China was cut-off from the West by the Himalayas and the Gobi desert. Looking at Central and South America, Diamond failed to mention the Aztecs, Inca and Maya civilizations that arose independently. He also lied about sub-Saharan Africa not having any indigenous plants (sorghum, millet, yams, rice) or wild animals (guinea fowl, zebras, giraffes, buffalo and wildebeests) to domesticate. His excuses for lacking in technology are just not credible. Especially when the "wheel" was introduced into sub-Saharan Africa by outsiders, but was never used by Africans. How could they fail to use such a gift from more advanced civilizations?

Therefore, the salient parts of this book are summed up in just a few pages by Diamond, and expose his bias, no doubt a reflection of his extreme ability at self-deception in the promotion of his political agenda. I will discuss these short but important aspects of his argument against Western culture and I should say the sociobiological paradigm he dislikes so much. In fact, he

doesn't even get past the first page before he proclaims the book is not racist because he ignores differences between races.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, before he gets past the first page he boldly claims that only racists would include biological differences between population groups, the standard academic Marxist shrieking that we have heard for the last thirty years. Anyone who even *considers* racial differences is a racist. So on this proclamation alone, the hypothesis put forth, is irreparably flawed because only a biased perspective will be allowed, one that denies that humans have a genetic basis for being human.

He later puts forth his main aim of the book via a question from Yali, a New Guinean philosopher one supposes, who asks why some people have all the *power* and *affluence*. And the rest of the book is all about trying to show that some civilizations have all the power and affluence because of dumb luck, they happened to be born in the right place at the right time. Which is of course no answer at all if one is interested in human nature, not just a crapshoot.<sup>34</sup> However, he also repeats the Marxists favorite mantra, that Western racists are responsible apparently for not only holding certain beliefs, but also being more technically advanced! That is, even though we just happened to luck out being born when and where we were, we are also to be condemned as racists for what - not giving everything, we have to other people? Once one sees through the mixed up logic, we have to assume that Diamond's only real intent is to attack Western culture and pointedly Anglo-Saxon Western culture in particular.

Note how he always attacks Westerners foremost when he states that "Yet many (perhaps most!) Westerners continue to accept racist explanations privately or subconsciously. In Japan and many other countries, such explanations are still advanced publicly and without apology." But what an irony, when later in the book he uses exactly the same technique that Westerners used over 100 years ago to subjectively rank people for intelligence. He states, " While one can contest my subjective impression that New Guineans are on the average smarter than Eurasians, one cannot deny that New Guinea has a much smaller area and far fewer big animal species than Eurasia." So there we have it, if one declares a backward people as being more intelligent than Caucasians, it is perfectly all right to do so, based on merely subjective data, though Diamond had every opportunity to administer culture free IQ tests to his natives if he so wished. So apparently he *does* believe there are differences in intelligence between races or population groups, and he goes on to explain *why* based on environmental factors. This is the very same technique used by J. Philippe Rushton in *Race, Evolution and Behavior* and others that explain the higher intelligence of Eurasians because of the environmental forces from glaciation prior to about 10,000 years ago. The difference between Rushton and Diamond is that Rushton has a massive amount of statistical data on the differences between races, gathered from around the world, whereas Diamond relies only on his own subjective observations! Talk about the kettle calling the stove black!

Lynn and Vanhanen<sup>35</sup> look at the cause of prosperity and technology and like Rushton, find that a nation's average intelligence is responsible more than natural resources or geography. "Diamond tries to explain these extensive differences in economic development between geographical zones by various geographical characteristics and Kamarck by direct effects of hot climates and tropical diseases. Our theoretical explanation is different. We assume that differences in climatic and geographical conditions affected the evolution of human mental abilities in such a way that the average IQs are higher for the populations of temperate zones than for the populations of the tropics."

Ruse restates the same theme: "It has always been recognized that the pace of evolution is something that speeds up and slows down, according to many different factors. There are impinging conditions imposed both from without the organic world, geological factors, for instance, and impinging conditions imposed from within the organic world, competitors and the availability of desirable ecological niches, for instance."<sup>36</sup> And again Rushton: "It is sad to see an evolutionary biologist like Diamond failing to inform his readers that it is different environments that cause, via natural selection, biological differences among populations. Each of the Eurasian developments he describes created positive feedback loops, thereby selecting for increased intelligence and various personality traits (e.g., altruism, rule-following, ability to tolerate greater levels of population density). Subsequently, internecine tribal and ethnic warfare was a potent force in natural selection of human groups. Diamond omits to discuss how intergroup competition over scarce resources influences the human genotype, including why hominid brain size increased threefold over the last 3 million years."<sup>37</sup>

Actually, what Diamond observed in the New Guineans was not intelligence, but observation of ancient behaviors that were laid down *prior to* our increase in brain size. That is we were natural historians, we were one with nature, and we evolved a religious explanation and closeness with nature. That is what Diamond was observing, not intelligence.<sup>38</sup>

Now, what if I wrote a book, from my work experience where I deal a lot with Blacks and with Whites, and I stated some obscure reasons for the Whites being more intelligent and then concluded, based on my observations, that the Whites were more intelligent than the Blacks without any other data but my own subjectivity. Well, it would be dismissed as *anecdotal* and *racist*. That is exactly what Diamond has done. However, since he was trashing the hated Caucasian it was passed over in the book without a mention. So goes the relentless attack on Whites. Anything goes. Any deception, lie or perversion is allowed as long as it is Western culture that is attacked, because they all know only us Caucasians (and mostly males) are real dyed-in-the-wool racists. So much for intellectual honesty.

But it even gets better in a jumbled explanation that is so egregiously dishonest and circular that it can only be summed up as an ad hominem attack on European culture (more pointedly of course its people, not the culture, is what is being attacked since all cultures are equally viable - right?).<sup>39</sup> First, he again uses the "we are better than you are because we are more advanced than you" argument. As stated before, no one uses this simplistic argument to rank people, and it is openly admitted that though China is lacking in technology that they are on average more intelligent than Caucasians. So, who is Diamond attributing as having this simplistic image of IQ versus technology? Many very old dead people, that's who. Moreover, none of them is going to read his book.

He later declares that Aboriginal Australians and New Guineans can master modern industrial technologies. Oh really? He states elsewhere in the book that the Aborigines are in fact having trouble with Australia's technology. However, even more obscure is why he doesn't have the same to say for American Blacks. They have not been successful mastering modern technology (all of this is on average of course). The American Psychological Association's task force on intelligence stated in a 1995 report "*Intelligence - Knowns and Unknowns*" that blacks are in fact less intelligent than Whites by about a standard deviation, that it is robust, there is no bias in the current tests being used, that intelligence is primarily genetic, but the differences between races in intelligence may not be genetic. They are still searching for the mysterious *Factor X* that causes all Blacks, not just the deprived, from doing so poorly at school and at work.

He later declares that "An enormous effort by cognitive psychologists has gone into the search for differences in IQ between people . . . ." Wrong again. Almost all of the research money available has gone in search of environmental causes for the disparity between Blacks and Whites. Very little money was available for IQ studies because of the left's sanctions against such research. Still, there is so much evidence now that virtually no one disputes the genetic basis of intelligence, and the only thing left is explaining the racial differences to everyone's satisfaction, including the radical Marxists (fat chance!).

But one question remains, why do Ashkenazi Jews in the United States show the same intelligence difference between Whites and Jews as there is between Blacks and Whites, and why do these Jews have on average ten times more wealth than the average American? The Ashkenazi Jews, through selective breeding or eugenics, have successfully increased their average IQ to an astonishing average of 115, and their *power* and *affluence* reflect this. According to Diamond, that would make Jews far more prone to kleptocratic [rampant greed and corruption] behavior than Whites!

In addition, the Jewish question arises again when he brings up technological advances.<sup>40</sup> This is again that mushy debate about whether it is the culture, a few unique geniuses, or the overall intelligence of a nation or people that make them excel. Moreover, it gets us back again to the very popularity of this book, his Pulitzer Prize, and the success of Jews in this and other endeavors. A question to Diamond would be, if intelligence does not account for Nobel Prizes for example, why do Jews receive 25% of them amongst Americans when they only account for 2% of the population. Jews are quick to brag that they are useful as a people because of their Nobel Prizes, etc. while they live in the same environment and culture. Well, either there is a difference between Jews and Whites in intelligence (drive alone is not enough) or Jews are being deceptive and are influencing the outcomes through political means. Which is it?

Later, in his continuing promotion of an anti-Western agenda, he makes the point that immigration is merely restoring America to what it was when only the Indians occupied the land. That is, before us racist Westerners came, multi-lingual Native Americans had the diversity that Diamond wants to see again. Nevertheless, of course he fails to mention - *that diversity* - was barbaric and inhumanly cruel. Genocide and warfare was common, along with gruesome rituals of torture for those captured in battle. Is that what he wants us to return to? No thanks. In addition, these were people who were of the same race, but only of different tribes. However, they, like all hunter-gatherers, had a highly evolved tribalism that clearly delineated *the other* as less than human, and they acted accordingly. They didn't need any fancy religion or democratic ideals to slaughter their neighbors. It came quite naturally.

Diamond does seem to understand this human genocidal nature. "As Diamond writes, 'Perhaps the commonest motive for genocide arises when a militarily stronger people attempts to occupy the land of a weaker people, who resist.' In other words, genocide is not practiced in an utterly arbitrary fashion: more often than not, it has as its consequence the acquisition of valuable resources from those who tried to defend what was once theirs."<sup>41</sup> One wonders if Diamond suffers from so much self-deception that he fails to see the contradictions when complaining about Western expansion and genocide and the current Israeli expansion and the genocide against the Palestinians. Diamond seems to be a Marxist when it comes to complaining about Anglo imperialism or Hitler's *lebensraum*, and a Zionist when it comes to Israel's current expansion. In fact, when it comes to issues of race he is highly selective. Jared Diamond states: "There are also practical reasons for interest in Jewish genes. The state of Israel has been going

to much expense to support immigration and job retraining of Jews who were persecuted minorities in other countries. That immediately poses the problem of defining who is a Jew."<sup>42</sup> I wonder if Diamond would be willing to use the same genetic testing for example to determine the percent of affirmative action any particular Black has an entitlement to? That is, if they are 50% White they should be biased against 50% of the time and given special privileges 50% of the time for their Blackness.

(An excellent review by Michael Levin is available at:  
[http://www.lrainc.com/swtaboo/stalkers/ml\\_ggs.html](http://www.lrainc.com/swtaboo/stalkers/ml_ggs.html) .)

### ***The meaning of race.***

Numerous new books have hit the streets, apparently due to the advancement in genetics, denouncing race as a scientific concept. It seems the egalitarians want to destroy it as a concept, at the very time it is regaining meaning, as we unravel the genetic code. Maybe, just maybe, if they can replace *race* with say *population group* or *ethnicity*, no one will notice that they have been lying about race and what it means. Discussing eugenics and race is often like the movie starring Bill Murray - "Ground Hog Day." What if every discussion about medicine had to be preceded by a discussion of medicine's shortcomings centuries or even thousands of years ago. No discussion of race or eugenics could be taken up without at least rehashing slavery, the Holocaust, and of course that ever present *systemic racism* (or whatever the current term is - it seems to change with the seasons).

A typical denial of race goes something like this: "Genetics research is now about to end our long misadventure with the idea of race. We now know that groups overlap genetically to such a degree that humanity cannot be divided into clear categories."<sup>43</sup> The term *clear categories* also goes by the term *pure race*, but the problem is, no one has said that there is such a thing as a pure race. Even Hitler struggled with this dilemma.<sup>44</sup> Should National Socialism be based on an Aryan archetype or on German nationalism? Hitler knew that Germans were more mixed up genetically than the purer Aryans from Scandinavia, but he decided on a form of nationalism that subjugated racial purity to a national agenda. Hitler knew there was no such thing as a pure race, so why would egalitarians keep holding up the purity of race as the doctrine to be destroyed? Because it is already dead. It is the *straw man* that is easily knocked over, so a real debate on race cannot go forward. Any mention of differences in races, and the left can scream "racists - there is no such thing as race!"

If there is no such thing as race, then there is no such thing as breeds of dogs or subspecies of finches on Darwin's Galapagos Island. These finches may look different, have different shaped beaks, eat different kinds of foods, and breed only with their own kind - but they are really just all the same because we don't have any pure genetic markers to determine one finch, or one dog, or one race of human from another. Therefore, the story is spun - in an endless loop of misinformation.

A recent study of dogs also shows how human races and breeds of dogs are very similar.<sup>45</sup> According to recent DNA data, all dogs are descendents of Wolves from China around 15,000 years ago. And all dog breeds have different behavioral traits, specialties, and morphological differences that are based on just a handful of gene differences (alleles) that were present when humans first began breeding animals and crops. In addition, it gets even better. Research data shows that domesticated dogs, bred by humans, have behavioral traits that surpass chimpanzees - they are more socially intelligent, "dogs have minds capable of complex thoughts about other



dogs or people," and the most incredible discovery is that "dogs may be able to think about the thoughts of others." If this is true, they are the only other species aside from humans with this ability, and it came about through selective breeding by humans. "Dogs fascinate genetic researchers because they have blossomed into hundreds of specialized breeds with apparently only a few genetic changes. Such subtle changes have yielded an astonishing variety of physical forms and talents, including abilities such as tracking, herding and sled racing that require the right mix of genetics and training by humans." This clearly should put to rest the assertion that there is not enough genetic diversity in humans for races to have evolved after 200,000 years.

Unfortunately for the egalitarians, they fall into numerous traps when they deny the existence of racial groupings, or human subspecies. The out of Africa hypothesis has less to do with real science than it has to do with a desire by Gould, Lewontin, et al. to be able to shorten the time span for human evolution in order to reduce the time available for human divergence - no time for races to develop. I am not committed personally to the out of Africa hypothesis or the multiregional hypothesis - racial differences do not rest on either one of them. However, Wolpoff's multiregionalism does raise some interesting dilemmas for those who deny that differences exist. He writes, "[M]odern human origins theories, once constructed, directly address ideas of racial histories - how different geographic groups of people were related, and how they interrelated over the years. Origins theories clearly have sociopolitical implications, and it would be naive to think their discussions have been taking place in a sociopolitical vacuum."<sup>46</sup>

Wolpoff later explains that anthropologists *must* look at *differences* in the fossil record to determine how humans evolved, or it means that we have no history at all. The only way that the out of Africa hypothesis then has any meaning, is if human history stopped about 200 thousand years ago - with no changes since. Clearly, this is absurd. We have continued to evolve in different places in different ways.

Wolpoff points out that anthropologists tried to differentiate *modern humans* from *European Neanderthals*, who according to the out of Africa crowd, we displaced rather than interbred with. To find a means to define modern humans from skeletal remains, anthropologists once used the absence of browridges - those large bony protrusions above the eyes we see in movies to depict ancient human types. Unfortunately, someone noticed that Aboriginal Indigenous Australians in fact have browridges. He also points out that we do not know for sure that European Neanderthals even had hair, as is usually depicted to make them look different from modern humans.

All this means is that we have just as much trouble defining when modern humans arrived and how to define them, as we do in classifying ancient racial population groups based on artifacts and bones. However, to ignore our racial differences is to deny our history, for we all came to this place in time not on a single ship but from many distant places at different times and by different means. Humans have a diverse history that cannot be ignored. We are not all the same. Then what determines race?

So desperate are the race deniers that it is informative to begin by defining what races are by looking at the pseudoscientific rationalizations against concepts of race. Again, using Graves' *The Emperor's Clothes: Biological Theories of Race at the Millennium*, I can show just how convoluted and unempirical the arguments can get. First, in a long list of errors and distortions, Graves states that a race is any biological group that can breed viable offspring. Not only is this

what is sometimes used to define a species, it doesn't even apply in that case. In fact "able to breed viable offspring" is a useless definition because we can't even determine what is meant by *breeding* or by *viable*. A mule is a mixture between a female donkey and a male horse. They can't reproduce with other mules, but they certainly are a viable organism, useful for their purpose and living a normal life. There are in fact numerous examples of species that do interbreed and subspecies or races that do not. Dog breeds are just subspecies or races, but a Great Dane is not going to breed with a Chihuahua due strictly to their difference in size, not their genes. Any definition of race or species or even a higher taxonomy is at best highly subjective, and precise delineations or categories are not needed and in many cases counterproductive.

Graves states, "our peculiar evolution has not led to any races." What peculiar evolution? There are two ways to look at such a statement. First, all forms of evolution are *peculiar* if one means *distinct*, but not if one means *odd*. There is nothing odd about human or animal evolution, but all organisms have distinct evolutionary histories, just as no two humans have exactly the same life histories. So, what is Graves struggling with in this claim? It is again the *out of Africa* claim or a variant of it: humans are somehow different from other species, and we have all evolved in perfect lock-step adaptations, gene for gene. An absurd statement to say the least, and one that you would not expect from an academic who teaches evolution.

Graves then tries to make the argument that there needs to be some *threshold* of genetic variation in order for there to be a race or a species. Yet we know that physical anthropologists have been classifying human races for over a hundred years without any understanding of genes, and that these physical classifications are now essentially identical to the racial groupings based on recent genetic data. It seems all the criticisms heaped upon these earlier racial classifications were in error, as the new genetic markers match these early racial categories very closely. However, the new genetic data makes the denial of race even more important to the egalitarians, even if it is only directed at the lay public.

As will be shown later, races and species have no exact threshold of genetic difference to make a distinct classification. In addition, it in fact would reduce the data available when it comes to population studies. As an example, why couldn't we classify the Orthodox Hasidim Jews as a separate species? According to Graves' definition, they do not have viable offspring unless both parents are Hassidim, so any infidelity would lead to exclusion from the Hasidim species. That is, they are a closed breeding group: one that is socially constructed. But whether human races or even species are separated by social barriers or geographic barriers, the separations are in fact in place and allows for the increased salience of race that can lead eventually to new human species. Contrary to Graves, races can be mixing and separating in many different ways even today.

So what do we mean by race? A 1951 definition of race by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) states: "The concept of race is unanimously regarded by anthropologists as a classificatory device providing a zoological frame within which the various groups of mankind may be arranged and by means of which studies of evolutionary processes can be facilitated. In its anthropological sense, the word 'race' should be reserved for groups of mankind possessing well-developed and primarily heritable physical differences from other groups. Many populations can be so classified but, because of the complexity of human history, there are also many populations which cannot be easily fitted into a racial classification."

The most thorough treatment of the definition of race, in my opinion, is the one by Arthur Jensen.<sup>47</sup>

"As small populations of *Homo s. sapiens* separated and migrated further away from Africa, genetic mutations kept occurring at a constant rate, as occurs in all living creatures. Geographic separation and climatic differences, with their different challenges to survival, provided an increasingly wider basis for populations to become genetically differentiated through natural selection. Genetic mutations that occurred after each geographic separation of a population had taken place were differentially selected in each subpopulation according to the fitness the mutant gene conferred in the respective environments. A great many mutations and a lot of natural selection and genetic drift occurred over the course of the five or six thousand generations that humans were gradually spreading over the globe.

"The extent of genetic difference, termed *genetic distance*, between separated populations provides an approximate measure of the amount of time since their separation and of the geographic distance between them. In addition to time and distance, natural geographic hindrances to gene flow (i.e., the interchange of genes between populations), such as mountain ranges, rivers, seas, and deserts, also restrict gene flow between populations. Such relatively isolated groups are termed *breeding populations*, because a much higher frequency of mating occurs between individuals who belong to the same population than occurs between individuals from different populations. (The ratio of the frequencies of *within/between* population matings for two breeding populations determines the degree of their genetic isolation from one another.) Hence, the combined effects of geographic separation [or cultural separation], genetic mutation, genetic drift, and natural selection for fitness in different environments result in population differences in the frequencies of different alleles at many gene loci.

"There are also other causes of relative genetic isolation resulting from language differences as well as from certain social, cultural, or religious sanctions against persons mating outside their own group. These restrictions of gene flow may occur even among populations that occupy the same territory. Over many generations these social forms of genetic isolation produce breeding populations (including certain ethnic groups) that evince relatively slight differences in allele frequencies from other groups living in the same locality.

"When two or more populations differ markedly in allele frequencies at a great many gene loci whose phenotypic effects visibly distinguish them by a particular configuration of physical features, these populations are called *subspecies*. Virtually every living species on earth has two or more subspecies. The human species is no exception, but in this case subspecies are called *races*. Like all other subspecies, human races are interfertile breeding populations whose individuals differ on average in distinguishable physical characteristics.

"Because all the distinguishable breeding populations of modern humans were derived from the same evolutionary branch of the genus *Homo*, namely, *Homo s. sapiens*, and because breeding populations have relatively permeable (non-biological) boundaries that allow gene flow between them, human races can be considered as genetic 'fuzzy sets.' That is to say, a race is one of a number of statistically distinguishable groups in which

individual membership is not mutually exclusive by any single criterion, and individuals in a given group differ only statistically from one another and from the group's central tendency on each of the many imperfectly correlated genetic characteristics that distinguish between groups as such. The important point is that the *average* difference on all of these characteristics that differ among individuals *within* the group is less than the *average* difference *between* the groups on these genetic characteristics.

"What is termed a *cline* results where groups overlap at their fuzzy boundaries in some characteristic, with intermediate gradations of the phenotypic characteristic, often making the classification of many individuals ambiguous or even impossible, unless they are classified by some arbitrary rule that ignores biology. The fact that there are intermediate gradations or blends between racial groups, however, does not contradict the genetic and statistical concept of race. The different colors of a rainbow do not consist of discrete bands but are a perfect continuum, yet we readily distinguish different regions of this continuum as blue, green, yellow, and red, and we effectively classify many things according to these colors. The validity of such distinctions and of the categories based on them obviously need not require that they form perfectly discrete Platonic categories.

"It must be emphasized that the biological breeding populations called races can *only* be defined statistically, as populations that differ in the central tendency (or mean) on a large number of different characteristics that are under some degree of genetic control and that are correlated with each other through descent from common ancestors who are relatively recent in the time scale of evolution (i.e., those who lived about ten thousand years ago, at which time all of the continents and most of the major islands of the world were inhabited by relatively isolated breeding populations of *Homo s. sapiens*).

"Of course, any rule concerning the *number* of gene loci that must show differences in allele frequencies (or any rule concerning the average *size* of differences in frequency) between different breeding populations for them to be considered *races* is necessarily arbitrary, because the distribution of average absolute differences in allele frequencies in the world's total population is a perfectly continuous variable. Therefore, the number of different categories, or races, into which this continuum can be divided is, in principle, wholly arbitrary, depending on the degree of genetic difference a particular investigator chooses as the criterion for classification or the degree of confidence one is willing to accept with respect to correctly identifying the area of origin of one's ancestors.

"Some scientists have embraced all of *Homo sapiens* in as few as two racial categories, while others have claimed as many as seventy. These probably represent the most extreme positions in the 'lumper' and 'splitter' spectrum. Logically, we could go on splitting up groups of individuals on the basis of their genetic differences until we reach each pair of monozygotic twins, which are genetically identical. But as any pair of MZ twins are always of the same sex, they of course cannot constitute a breeding population.... However, as I will explain shortly, certain multivariate statistical methods can provide objective criteria for deciding on the number and composition of different racial groups that can be reliably determined by the given genetic data or that may be useful for a particular scientific purpose."

The term race also includes ethnic group, ethnic-affiliation, population groups, etc. when comparing genes and racial differences. In addition, races are not static, but constantly changing,

being created, etc. As a simple example, consider a closed group of occult members, who voluntarily came together for living an isolated existence in a large city, devoted to making money, living a non-materialistic lifestyle, and pursuing science and technology, with severe exclusion of anyone who showed tendencies towards individualism. From the very start, this group would have certain behavioral and intellectual differences from the general population. After breeding, proselytizing, and excluding those members that did not fit the norm, the group would increasingly resemble a distinct racial group in at least a handful of important ways - not the least of which would be conformity, wealth, and intelligence. Therefore, racial groups need not be static in number or in definition.

To say then that race is a cultural construct flies in the face of everything that we know about evolution. Today, a person's race can be determined by samples of DNA or from skeletal remains. Race is real, and it resides in our genes, not in our collective minds. Again, Wolpoff gives a simple example of racial types: "There is, for example, a breed standard for the Golden Retriever, although many well-bred dogs will deviate from it in some way. The *imperfections* of these members of the breed are considered unimportant in describing what the breed is like; i.e., the range of variation is unimportant in depicting the breed: only the ideal type is described. The typologist or essentialist (or Golden Retriever breeder) focuses on the essence of a category or population and ignores the deviants from that essence as unimportant to the character of the category."<sup>48</sup>

In addition, just like breeds of dogs, human races or species can be constructed through a system of classification, and even more so now than in the past. Cosmopolitanism will accelerate some interbreeding between races, but it will also set up situations where those within races who are very much alike will breed, furthering distinct racial types. "As with all social animals, every human population has a different evolutionary story, with its own historical, biological, and social constraints that affect its evolution. The human evolutionary pattern is even more dynamic than that of other species, because cultural and linguistic factors are added to the list of constraints, even as they expand the different ways in which populations can exchange and share information. Culturally prescribed marriage, systems, trading networks, religious practices, likes and dislikes, all affect reproduction, death, and breeding group size and therefore the evolution of these populations."<sup>49</sup>

This even applies to our primate relatives. Discussing chimpanzee behavior we see: "Once a kill is made, the carcass is likely to become the focus of intense political activity. We see cultural diversity from one wild chimpanzee population to the next in the pattern of sharing that follows. Gombe chimpanzees are utterly nepotistic and Machiavellian in their use of the carcass; captors share mainly with their family members, allies and swollen females. In Tai, hunters receive a share of meat regardless of the captor if they have participated in the hunt."<sup>50</sup>

Marxists have a stake in separating culture from evolutionary principles, primarily in order to deny that races exist. Graves, and others, claim that since Jews are a cultural group, then clearly race is a construct. However, if that is the case, then why are Jews now going about looking for genetic markers to distinguish who is a Jew? They are clearly a race, based on their unique genetic diseases, their unique high intelligence, and now their genealogy of genetic purity - they have mixed very little with their host populations, maintaining their racial uniqueness. "The species molds its environment as profoundly as the environment 'evolves' the species.... Evolution is dominated by feedback of the evolved activities of organisms on their evolution."<sup>51</sup>

Even prejudice in all of its form has a profound effect on the evolutionary fissuring of societies into new variants. As we have moved from farms and small villages to large and diverse megalopolises, we will be reshuffling our genes by choosing mates based on our preferences - or the flip side, our prejudices and intolerances. "[T]he phenomenon of 'prejudice' and explains the possibility that its roots are not purely cultural. The proclivity for prejudice appears to be deeply rooted in the human psyche, and has been shown to be of distinct utility in furthering the process of speciation."<sup>52</sup> Human races are here to stay, and in fact may very well increase, not only in numbers, but in the magnitude of difference between the groups, leading to eventual speciation.

Then there is the *race is only skin-deep* argument. In this argument the Left states, without any factual data, that though humans may be morphologically different (skin color, shape of the nose, stature, etc.), behaviorally and intellectually, they vary more within any group than they do between groups. Of course, this is true of almost everything. Whether you contrast a six-foot Mexican with a four-foot midget Mexican, or a Jew with an IQ of 200 with a Down's syndrome Jew with an IQ of 50, it is obvious there are huge spreads from top to bottom. Nevertheless, what population geneticists look at are the *averages* between groups, and the shape of the bell curve. We all understand that African pygmies are shorter on average than African Tutsis. This argument then is not only meaningless, it is uninteresting. Still, you will hear it often repeated.

How about other differences? Is it true that humans can easily vary by race with regards to outward appearances, but not in behavior or intelligence? One argument states that since outward differences are controlled by only a few genes, but mental or behavioral differences are controlled by thousands of genes, there could not possibly be differences between population groups.<sup>53</sup> The problem with this argument is that no one has claimed that personality types and intelligence are controlled by *thousands of genes*. We know that the brain has been built up over millions of years, and many of the genes like those used to build the face-recognition module, or the sex-attraction modules are millions of years old, and have been passed down to us from reptiles. In fact, different races do not vary much on their abilities to recognize faces. Nevertheless, races do vary a great deal in intelligence, because there are only a few genes that are involved. In addition, the same is true with personality traits such as introversion, conscientiousness, psychopathy or ethnocentrism. We know that different races vary on average on these traits, and personality traits are all around fifty percent heritable.

Looking at the human brain it is noted: "Among the most striking features of human emotion is the pronounced variability across individuals in the quality and intensity of emotional reactions to the same [events]."<sup>54</sup> That is, though many of the genes that we have had handed down to us from our mammalian ancestors have gone to fixation and vary little between us say and a dog or even a rat, behavioral and intellectual genes are still highly in play. The genes responsible for making a heart or a pancreas have been pretty well standardized on the variants that work, and different races are the same as are different species close to humans. However, the genes that vary are the behavioral/intellectual genes - the few that are still in play to see which ones will eventually win out.

"In eastern Ethiopia savanna baboons and hamadryas baboons interbreed. These two [sub-species] are thought to have become separated 300,000-400,000 years ago, before later meeting again. There are few differences in their bones, and none that would indicate to a primatologist of the future how these species differed in their social lives. Yet the differences are large. Hamadryas live in fission-fusion groups, within which exclusive mating units interact with one another through alliances of

adult males, leaving females largely powerless. Savanna baboons live in stable groups, with no exclusive pair bonds but with intragroup relationships strongly influenced by important alliances among adult females. If all that remained of these species were their fossils, it would be difficult indeed to reconstruct these differences. In a similar way, the woodland apes will probably forever conceal much of their diversity in social behavior."<sup>55</sup> This same situation is true for many other species as well. "On the sole basis of a few bones and skulls, no one would have dared to propose the dramatic behavioral differences recognized today between the bonobo and the chimpanzee." There is more variation in behavior than there is in the physical appearance between the species or sub-species. In addition, the same is true of humans; there are real differences between behavior/intelligence, as well as physical appearance. So why would humans be any different from other species, especially those who are our closest relatives - bonobos and chimpanzees? It is unthinkable to imagine that average intelligences would have remained the same in humans separated for many thousands of years, and the same goes for behaviors.

Just think of the differences between two dogs of the same breed. How much more variation is there in human behavior? "The broad range of differences in these varied affective phenomena has been referred to as *affective style*. Differences among people in affective style appear to be associated with temperament, personality, health, and vulnerability to psychopathology. Moreover, such differences are not a unique human attribute but appear to be present in a number of different species."<sup>56</sup> In fact, "The most rapid adaptations tend to be behavioral, not physical."<sup>57</sup>

So let's look at the facts again. Egalitarians want us to believe that physical differences between races are to be expected due to evolutionary selection, but behavioral/intelligence differences are somehow exempt. Rushton explains this absurd position, "The authors appear to find it plausible for evolution to act through differential death rates resulting from differences in the number of wisdom teeth and yet find it implausible that death rates could vary in different regions because of differential intelligence as an adaptation to extreme cold."<sup>58</sup> So let's look at physical differences. We know for example that Blacks are far faster than other races and excel in sports. We also know that East Africans excel in long-distance running while West Africans excel in sprints.<sup>59</sup> We also know now that from all available research, that behavioral/intelligence differences are expected to exceed physical differences, in not only humans, but also many of our closest relatives. Clearly, differences between races are not trivial. They are real and are based on the fundamentals of evolution.

When humans migrated out of Africa, whenever the final migration occurred, they spread to the far corners of the earth and adapted to their new environments. Let us look at three major races plus those that lived between them. After leaving Africa, Indo-Europeans evolved in Western Europe and East Asians evolved in, well, East Asia. These two northern extremes molded two highly intelligent races under the pressures of glaciation (more on that later). The populations that existed around the Mediterranean then were somewhere between East Asians, Europeans and sub-Saharan Africans - genetically. Actually, very little mixing ever occurred between sub-Saharan Africa and the rest of the world due to the almost impassible Sahara desert. However, enough humans made it out to spread the species.

Now how much intermarriage would be required to offset the evolutionary process that creates different races? If any race or subspecies became isolated long enough, we would expect at some point that a new species would evolve. In fact, the fewer the number of people that make up a small isolated community, the faster evolution will take place.<sup>60</sup> The East Asians, for

example, were evolving to adapt to their environment, but they were also getting some genes from neighbors that they occasionally met. That is, at least a few humans were always on the move looking for better opportunities - and probably most were male explorers or adventurers. And what the very slow infusion of occasionally mixing new genes with the established race does, is not dilute the genes that have made that race adapted to the environment they are in, but introduces new genes that may (or may not) be beneficial. If the new genes are better, they will spread; if not, they may hang around in a few people or be eliminated.

As explained by Wolpoff and Caspari, "Far-reaching gradations of anatomical differences were not disrupted by genic exchanges, *they depended on them*, and it was along these gradients that populations toward the extremes could differentiate and remain distinct.... Favorable mutants or gene combinations arrived at in one part (race) of such a species may, under the influence of natural selection, eventually spread to all other parts and thus eventually become a common property of the entire species. ... Genic exchanges were not the opposite of differentiation, they were its cause. They were not the problem but its solution!"<sup>61</sup>

So where does that leave the *browning* of the human race? Well, maybe most people will eventually prefer a slight tan, but races will not go away. Genetic exchanges in the past were more probably due to pillaging and plunder by marauding hordes of warriors or conquerors, or through slavery, than through cordial mixing of adjacent races - what we now consider as an attraction for diversity. What the future holds is more probably, what we have seen in the past: greater racial differences at the periphery and a blending in the middle (Nordics versus Semites). The Roman Empire mixed up the races a bit through slavery, trade, and conquest. However, it wasn't enough to eliminate races, just make them a little confusing around Rome.

Today, we still see the racial mixing where a successful Black will marry a beautiful bimbo, or an ugly White woman will settle for a Black man. Jews and Whites are hard to keep apart, as are Whites and East Asians because we are so close genetically. In addition, similar relationships can be seen in say Australian Aborigines and White Australians - they would rarely intermarry because they are almost a different species. However, the other side to this trend of racial mixing will be greater differentiation at the cultural periphery. As humans become more cosmopolitan, educated, and elitist, they will select mates that are increasingly like themselves, and they will take more care in selecting a mate that will enhance the viability of their children's success. As opportunity increases, new selection criteria will come into play. So we will see the same pattern as before: A Mediterranean melting pot, with distinct races at the peripheries - from the highly intelligent East Asians or Ashkenazi Jews to the hardly human Aboriginal Australians and sub-Saharan Africans. The new differentiation of races will be caused by both cultural and geographical isolation; new races will displace old ones.

As I pass through the Loop area in Chicago, I am stunned by the beauty of White women, along with some of the few East Asians we have in the Midwest. Yet, while associating with people at work or with people in my neighborhood, less than handsome is the norm. Many of these ravishing beauties will marry just regular guys - there are so many beautiful women available for the few elite men. As I peer into the future, speculating that interbreeding may reduce these beauties in great numbers, one can see how the remaining ones could command astronomical attention as everyone else becomes plain and blandly brown. The value in preserving such beauty could be as important to society as the enhancement of intelligence. The few having this unique beauty would then tend to want to preserve it because it would be rare. These types of scenarios, along with numerous others, are how the *number* of races will not decrease but will in



fact increase. Niche builders will plan their own breeding patterns as the market warrants giving the best opportunities for their children to succeed. This includes the exploitation of generosity by the welfare queens to the rich and powerful banding together to inflate stock prices while not being charged with criminal intent. The masses will find niches somewhere in between.

Humans share 99.9% of their genetic code - the last 0.1% however has incredible variability and is easily sufficient for a great range of physical and mental differences between people and between races.<sup>62</sup> The late Glayde Whitney writes: "Different SNPs of the same gene are alternative alleles, or forms, of that gene. Celera's ad in the April 6, 2001 issue of *Science* offers access to '2.8 Million Unique SNPs Mapped to the Human Genome.' Wow, at present it appears that the human genome has around 30,000 coding genes (some think more like 80,000), and here already is a treasure trove of almost 3 million alternative forms. Where did Celera find all these variants? Almost all are from sequencing the genomes of only five individuals. As J. Craig Venter explained on a recent PBS NOVA program - two Caucasians, one Oriental, one African, and one Hispanic. Meanwhile at Celera's competitor Genaissance Pharmaceuticals, 'We've looked at the largest number of individuals and diverse populations that's ever been done,' said Gerald Vovis, Genaissance chief technology officer. They analyzed 313 genes from 82 Americans of four racial backgrounds; 21 whites, 20 blacks, 20 Asians, 18 Latinos, and three Native Americans. Researchers at Genaissance analyzed SNPs by looking at closely bunched sets that are inherited together, called haplotypes. Scientists estimate that there are about 30 million SNPs among humans, but Genaissance's team thinks analysis based on haplotypes is likely to be more helpful in medicine than analyses with individual SNPs. The number of different haplotypes for each of the 313 genes varied from two to 53, with an average of 14. Thus while a single human has only two sets (one from mom, one from pop), each of 30,000 genes, among all of mankind there could be 30 million variants arranged as 400,000 to 500,000 haplotype sets. The company says it hopes to catalogue the haplotypes of every human gene by analyzing DNA of 90 people from Africa, Asia and Europe."<sup>63</sup>

The question is, why would genetic research companies be so interested in testing different races' genetic code if the genes didn't matter? The other side to this research is the interest shown in populations like Iceland, where a very homogenous race of Norwegians have existed in isolation for hundreds of years. Their racial similarity makes the tracking of specific genes easier. However, they would not necessarily be the same race as Norwegians. We now know that small populations in isolation can change very rapidly. Did I hear someone say, "punctuated equilibrium?"

There is one place however where genetic variation is found primarily *within* races. The immune system requires an enormous amount of genetic diversity to fight off not only diseases that are present in a population, but also those that may evolve in the future. This genetic diversity then is primarily directed at our ongoing struggle with pathogens, and would be useless if it were segregated by races - whole races would die out with the introduction of new pathogens. Hardly a fitting scenario for the "genes eye view" of evolution.<sup>64</sup> So when you hear: "there is more genetic diversity within human races than between human races," as an argument against racial differences, be aware of its simplicity. It is the small variation in those genes that are selected for survival at a higher level - between individuals and groups - that account for racial differences.

This is generally true of all species, but even more so for humans: "Nervous systems opened the way for still faster and more potent behavioral, social and cultural evolution. Finally, these

higher modes produced the prerequisite organization for rational, purposeful evolution, guided and propelled by goal-directed minds. Each of these steps represented a new emergent level of evolutionary capability."<sup>65</sup>

As Alcock puts it: "Yet to say that human behavior and our other attributes cannot be analyzed in evolutionary terms requires acceptance of a genuinely bizarre position, namely, that we alone among animal species have somehow managed to achieve independence from our evolutionary history, that our genes have for some undefined reason relinquished their influence on the development of human psychological attributes, that our brain's capacity to incorporate learned information has no relation to past selection, that differences in brain functioning in the past had no impact on the genetic success of people, and many other tenets that would be considered outlandish if applied to the Seychelles warbler or the white-fronted bee-eater."<sup>66</sup>

Marxists argue that humans have escaped evolutionary constraints and more importantly, that we behave according to rules unique to humans alone - culture and history alone account for human and racial differences. As stated above however, it is quite the opposite. Our higher intelligence and complex culture has actually facilitated the maintenance of racial boundaries while at the same time reformulating racial boundaries. Both occur at the same time. We have seen it in the past and there is no reason not to assume that it will accelerate in the future. As some races intermarry, other races will be creating themselves through selective breeding and then maintenance of racial boundaries using culture, dogma or religion.<sup>67,68</sup>

As McGregor puts it: "Amongst the higher more mobile forms of animal life, isolating mechanisms such as prejudice are necessary to preserve the genetic identity of races and sub-species (as emergent species) by inhibiting [racial mixing].... Domestication, by breaking down territorial restrictions and destroying patterns of feral or natural activity, often results in perverted, misdirected, unnatural and anti-evolutionary behavior."<sup>69</sup> Or put another way, as humans have moved from hunter-gatherer to a more cosmopolitan way of life, as we have seen, strange tensions have formed between racial groups to both preserve racial boundaries while some individuals bail out on their own kind for differences - they marry "the other." This is occurring because we are living and unnatural life - one that is foreign to our hunter-gather past. Note, we should not bemoan this predicament but revel in it. Our hunter-gatherer past was far more genocidal, murderous, intolerant, and cruel than our current situation - and aside from occasional wars, there is no reason to think we will not evolve to higher levels of both intelligence and empathy towards others.<sup>70</sup>

As Blackmore states it: "We can now see why group selection might be important in memetics [the generation and movement of ideas]. Religions are a good example of a mechanism that decreases within-group differences, while increasing between-group differences and rates of group extinction. In many religions conformity is encouraged, forbidden behaviors are punished, differences between believers and unbelievers are exaggerated, fear or hatred of people with other beliefs is nurtured, and migration to a different religion made difficult or impossible. Wars between religious groups are common and in our evolutionary history, many groups have lived or died for their religion. All this makes it more likely that group selection has occurred. If there were genetic differences between the groups to start with, then the survival of some groups and extinction of others would have had effects on the gene pool. In this case we could say that the religious memes have driven the genes."<sup>71</sup> Put simply, humans via culture have not escaped the principles of evolution - races will continue to be lost and found - and battle lines formed between emerging races. There is no reason to expect, in fact all the data suggests it would be

impossible, to have one big happy "human race." It could only be held together by an ominous one-world totalitarian state, a horror writ large of Communism.

Graves tries to make the argument that "Jewish persecution clearly illustrates that the idea of race can be socially constructed. The Jews were a cultural group rather than a biologically distinct population (to say nothing of a race)... Few [religious] programs have lasted fifty years to breed a new race."<sup>72</sup> He makes this statement even as Israeli scientists are publishing numerous papers on the genetic unity of the Jewish race, a race that maintained its racial boundaries while *living inside* of other races' boundaries. In addition, how did the diaspora Jews maintain these racial boundaries? "Judaism in its eighteenth-century forms was even more widely condemned; the life of Jews was wrapped in an absurd and unnatural ritualism. The Talmud was even more cluttered and preposterous than the products of Christian scholasticism. As many Enlightened observers saw the matter, the Jews were not only the originators of intolerance, infecting the Christians and Moslems, but they also carried it to even greater extremes than did Christians. Equally damning, Jews denied human solidarity and fraternity by separating themselves from others, considering themselves a race apart, superior and specially selected."<sup>73</sup>

It seems then that the maintenance of racial boundaries is an innate evolutionary mechanism that is enhanced by culture, not eliminated by it. The more educated we become, the more free time we have, and the more we interact with each other, different ethnic groups or races will naturally reinforce existing boundaries or they will be establishing new one. A good example of establishment of *new boundaries* is the one being drawn between people of color and White Western culture. This is a new evolutionary group strategy, where numerous groups have formed an alliance against the West in order to reap individual group benefits. However, even as this boundary is being promoted in academia and the media by the Left, it is falling apart elsewhere as Muslims are now rising up to claim equal notoriety. Racial boundaries are in a constant state of flux, and will only increase as the world shrinks.

As Graves is so fond of saying, "clearly," races have existed in the past and the formation of races will probably accelerate, especially now with the introduction of genetic engineering and neoeugenics. (Actually, you should be very wary of *any* so-called scientist who uses the word *clearly*, or any of its derivatives, to bring closure to an argument - but more on that later.) However, just like the names for different colors, humans learned how to name races.

Susan Blackmore writes, "It is hard to imagine that another culture would divide this obvious looking spectrum in a totally different way. Yet, this is what the relativity hypothesis implied - that our experience of color is determined by the language we have learned - either that, or there must be a lot of people in the world who experience sharp divisions between the colors they see but have learned to use names based on quite different divisions.... Berlin and Kay found that all languages contain terms for black and white. If a language only has three terms then the third is for red. If it has four terms then the next one is either green or yellow and if it has five then it has both green and yellow. If a language has six color terms then it includes blue and if seven it includes brown. Languages with more terms then add purple, pink, orange, gray, and so on. Color naming is not arbitrary and relative, it reflects very well the way our eyes and visual systems have evolved to make use of relevant information in the world around us."<sup>74</sup>

Wow, imagine that! Just maybe humans have always perceived races, just like colors, but only recently have we expanded our language and understanding of evolution and human differences to be able to discuss these racial differences. Racial differences, just like the knowledge it takes

to understand what light is, how it is constructed, and what lies beyond the visible spectrum, are more available to those who are more intelligent and knowledgeable. Around 1500 AD, at the beginning of the great human diaspora, Europeans were the first to sail to all parts of the world. Just like someone who has just seen the full spectrum of light for the first time, these explorers saw all the races in their natural habitat, and they began to wonder and investigate. The science of racial differences was born - again. It was just a *rediscovery* of what others had seen before.

Twentieth-Century anthropologists have described the concept of "the other" in the few remaining primitive tribes. Contrary to what the Left states, the concept of tribalism or racism is universal, understood in meaning if not in understanding of purpose or mechanism. When the Left claims that the West invented racism, I would like to know just one thing - can they demonstrate a society where race is not extremely important? We already know that for thousands of years, humans have permitted rape, theft and murder against "the other," and it is fundamental in understanding the Old Testament and the Ten Commandments. They were not doctrines advocating universal brotherhood but rather tribalism - all for us and destroy the others.<sup>75</sup>

It seems any historian, social scientist or anthropologist would readily admit that tribalism is universal. Nevertheless, the Left declares, "Why do you think that the idea that there are real and fundamental racial differences between groups has been so persistent. It's persistent in particular cultures, but not necessarily in all cultures, which suggests that it's largely a phenomenon driven by social forces [that is White racism]."<sup>76</sup> Now, if it is and has been a phenomenon in all cultures, present and past, then the opposite is true. It must be as real as the spectrum of colors in the rainbow - and more.

In East Asia, in the past and in the present, racial considerations are a universal phenomena.<sup>77</sup> Volumes could be written about how race is understood and how important it is to all of East Asia. Today, Japan still restricts immigration, and China is putting forth a eugenics program to breed a better stock of Chinese, even as they recognize races within the Chinese family of people. In India, the caste system maintains a strict racial hierarchy, and it is voluntarily accepted by Hindus. In the Muslim world, racial boundaries are fiercely defended; women are veiled and allowed contact only with family until married to a fellow tribesman. Throughout Africa, tribes are in constant tension, and competition or warfare and racial differences are clearly observed. Then there is the West, where the least racism is found, but where the Marxists claim, racism is fundamental to "White supremacy!" Considering that the world of about four billion people, people of color, are extremely tribal or racist, how can anyone claim that the concept of race was created out of whole cloth by the West to suppress these other billions of people?

Albert Lindemann<sup>78</sup> describes briefly the history of tribalism/racism, though numerous books can trace its roots back millions of years to our primate ancestors.<sup>79,80</sup> As far back as Aristotle, people from other parts of the world were classified with certain characteristics. People from northern Europe lacked intelligence and skill; some races were suited only for slavery, etc. The Romans had similar racial classifications. With regards to sub-Saharan Africans, "It was the ever more extensive contact that seems to have most reinforced racist interpretations of European superiority. Black Africans had already been subject to enslavement for some centuries at the hands of Arabs, and Arab writers had also developed a rich vocabulary attesting to their belief in the racial inferiority of blacks, which in turn helped to reinforce the racial denigration of Africans that were generated from within European civilization,..."<sup>81</sup> In the nineteenth century

the word race slowly replaced the older terms of blood, family or kin - but the concept was the same. People were fundamentally different, just like colors in the rainbow, and though opinions varied as to how pretty one color is compared to another, they were remarkably correct in identifying the colors.

"In the European Middle Ages the various tribes or 'nations' (Franks, Saxons, Goths, Normans) were widely assumed to have inherent traits, physical and psychological, many of them remarkably like nineteenth- and twentieth-century racial stereotypes." Was this also a conspiratorial attempt to implement a Frank supremacism, a Saxon supremacism, a Goth supremacism, or a Norman supremacism? And how about the Jewish race, assumed by Europeans and Jews alike to be a pure race. How did the Jews fit into this White supremacist conspiracy, one that would only reveal itself fully hundreds of years later? Can anyone believe this is how humans planned to dominate slaves in the United States, planning a strategy before they knew about America's existence? Well, the Marxists would like you to believe this.

Lindemann notes, "In talmudic commentary, protoracist elements are common. The rabbis increase the racist potential of the story of Ham beyond the bare biblical text, for example, by making the sons of Ham 'ugly and dark-skinned. Thus, religious exclusiveness meshed with *racial* exclusiveness, for in traditional Judaism lineage or ancestry (*yikhus*) - indeed, hereditary or *racial* sinfulness, as in the case of the descendants of Ham - remained categories of central importance even if they were elusively mixed with categories of belief or conviction. Traditional Jews conceive of themselves as the *seed of Jacob*, the lineal descendants of the Patriarchs, the chosen of God. In the opinion of later influential Jewish thinkers, such as the Maharal, inborn racial qualities were to be found in every nation; he considered it impossible that a member of one nation could become part of another.... From this perspective converts to Judaism are considered lost souls, Jews who were spiritually there for the covenant but for mysterious reasons were later born in Gentile bodies."<sup>82</sup>

If there is any reality to the notion that tribalism is more innate in some races than others, then it seems obvious that as a continuum, tribalism or ethnocentrism is more prevalent in the Semitic races as can be seen in the current problems of the Middle East and Baltic states - and far less so in the northern European races - which is why Whites find themselves so outmaneuvered by those who seek to undermine and appropriate from us the richness that we have produced.<sup>83</sup> This has been a racial "shakedown," and Whites have been caught between the various manipulators.<sup>84</sup>

### ***Rushton's r-K theory***

J. Philippe Rushton, in his 1995 book: *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: a life history perspective*, shows how there is a continuum from East Asians, to Whites to Blacks in behavior and intelligence. In aggregating these three groups, he does not single out just sub-Saharan Africans, but uses Blacks wherever they are found, so of course they are a mixture of sub-Saharan Africans and other races. The obvious reason for doing this of course is to factor out cultural differences, and to look at these three groups wherever they live. Note also that he does not include other races that may lie somewhere in between East Asians and Blacks, or may be more extreme in some areas but not in others. For example, the Finnish race is extremely introverted, and the Ashkenazi Jewish race is the most intelligent. So there may be particular traits that are outstanding in different races.

Also, whether Rushton is correct or not, the theory does not prove or disprove whether races exist. Nevertheless, the theory does help explain the evolutionary processes that went into making the races different. If a better theory comes along, then it will be compared against the r-K theory and his theory will be overturned or modified. To date however, the theory is the only one proposed that helps explain the differences in intelligence and behavior between the three major races (of the four great races - when including South Asians).

Table from *The Darwinian Heritage*<sup>85</sup>

<i>Variable</i>	East Asians	Whites	Blacks
<b>Brain size</b>			
Autopsy data (cm <sup>3</sup> equivalents)	1,351	1,356	1,223
Endocranial volume (cm <sup>3</sup> )	1,415	1,362	1,268
External head measure (cm <sup>3</sup> )	1,356	1,329	1,294
Cortical neurons (billions)	13.767	13.665	13.185
<b>Intelligence</b>	East Asians	Whites	Blacks
IQ test scores	106	100	85
Decision times	Faster	Intermediate	Slower
Cultural achievements	Higher	Higher	Lower
<b>Maturation rate</b>	East Asians	Whites	Blacks
Gestation time	?	Intermediate	Earlier
Skeletal development	Later	Intermediate	Earlier
Motor development	Later	Intermediate	Earlier
Dental development	Later	Intermediate	Earlier
Age of first intercourse	Later	Intermediate	Earlier
Age of first pregnancy	Later	Intermediate	Earlier
Life-span	Longer	Intermediate	Shorter
<b>Personality</b>	East Asians	Whites	Blacks
Activity	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Aggressiveness	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Cautiousness	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Dominance	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Impulsivity	Lower	Intermediate	Higher

Self-concept	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Sociability	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
<b>Social organization</b>	East Asians	Whites	Blacks
Marital stability	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Law abidingness	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Mental health	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Administrative capacity	Higher	Higher	Lower
<b>Productive effort</b>	East Asians	Whites	Blacks
Two-egg twinning (per 1000 births)	4	8	16
Hormone levels	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Secondary sex characteristics	Smaller	Intermediate	Larger
Intercourse frequencies	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Permissive attitudes	Lower	Intermediate	Higher
Sexually transmitted diseases	Lower	Intermediate	Higher

Rushton's work compliments the five conditions that lead to adaptive explanations in evolution.<sup>86</sup> First, there must be evidence that an adaptation has occurred, like high intelligence. Second, we need to explain why selection has occurred by showing that under a certain environment, like extreme ice ages, humans increased in intelligence and changed behaviorally in order to survive. Third, the traits must be heritable, which the traits in the above table are to different degrees. Fourth, we need to know how gene flow operates and the structure of the selective environment, such as the rapid evolution of small groups and the way glaciation selected certain genes for certain traits.<sup>87</sup> Last, we have to know something about the primitive traits or physiology as opposed to the evolved traits or physiology.

So Rushton's theory, while contributing to several of the above points, for my purpose I want to focus on the evolved traits - that is the comparison between the extremes from Africans, to Euros (that is Northern Europeans or indo-Europeans), to East Asians.

The r-K theory states that reproduction can lean towards having many offspring and investing very little in the offspring's caretaking, or it can lean towards having fewer offspring, with more caretaking. What is fascinating with regards to Rushton's r-K theory is the vast amount of data to support the above table, and how the explanation fits in with other theories.

The only explanation for why East Asians and Euros have higher intelligences is that they were both formed by small groups of people who came under the forces of repeated ice ages, over 10,000 years ago. It was adapt or die. It meant cooperation, planning, pair bonding, etc. All those things that would allow a few individuals to work, plan, and cooperate to survive each winter's harsh conditions. There was little room for error.

One question that arose in my mind when looking at the various glaciation explanations for higher intelligence was of course, "then why aren't Eskimos more intelligent?" Frankly, I don't know, but small populations that are poorly understood are hard to study. As more genetic data comes in however, we should know more about the origin and migration patterns of Eskimos and other races that may have been touched by the ice age. Very rapidly, genetic mapping is taking place that will help identify these racial outliers.<sup>88</sup>

Another trait that is of great interest to egalitarians in explaining away racial differences in intelligence is parental investment - especially Ashkenazi Jews and East Asians. For example, Ashkenazi Jews in the United States have an average IQ of 115. Their high intelligence is often dismissed as parental investment - they come from homes where they are driven to learn and excel, similar to East Asians. What is interesting is that both high intelligence and high parental investment are not traits found in all Semitic races. Look at Israel for example. We know from genetic studies that Palestinians and other Semites in the Middle East have large families and low intelligence. Yet, the Ashkenazi Jews, also part of the larger Semitic races, through eugenics and some genetic mixing, have evolved behavioral and intelligence traits that are even more extreme than East Asians are. Again, they have the highest intelligence and the highest parental investment - they are incredibly devoted to their children.

Likewise, East Asians are constantly held up as examples of what it takes to get ahead - be lucky enough to be born into a family with high parental investment. What the egalitarians fail to realize is that parental investment is largely genetic. It is not that every Ashkenazi Jew and East Asian family will obsess over pushing their children to excel in school, because there are many examples where this did not happen and these children still ended up very intelligent. In addition, there are many examples where Blacks have been devoted to their children and pushed them to do well academically, and it failed. However, always remember that we are looking for statistical averages and difference of the means between races. Yes, there are wide differences in behavior and intelligence within races - that is a given, a fundamental requirement of evolution. What we are trying find out is how different races vary on average so that we can explain the evolutionary process itself.

A purely cultural explanation for these differences fails by the very definition of culture. East Asians are fully integrated into the different cultures found around the world, and they always do well economically. In the United States, they make more money than Whites and they are far more represented in science than Whites. Is this then culture or genes? Many if not most now are part of the *American* culture. Culture, as an explanation for racial differences, fails when the same traits are found in the same race under vastly different cultures. David Buss states: "Two profound implications follow: (1) cultural variability, far from constituting evidence against evolved psychological mechanisms, depends on a foundation of evolved mechanisms for its very existence; and (2) cultural variability is not explained merely by invoking 'culture' (which merely mystifies the actual causal processes involved) but rather represents phenomena that require explanation. Cultural differences in the number and thickness of calluses represent physical differences, but the logic applies with equal force to psychological, attitudinal, ideational, and behavioral differences."<sup>89</sup>

Let us look at other evidence of racial differences. "30-12,000 years ago Europe came alive with cave art, as the ice ages came and went.... We do see a cultural explosion beginning 40,000 years ago in Europe as the first works of art were produced and I would suggest that this can be



explained by new connections between the domains of technical, social and natural history intelligence. The three previously isolated cognitive processes were now functioning together, creating the new cognitive process which we call visual symbolism, or simply art."<sup>90</sup> This was long after humans migrated out of Africa, and is a very convincing indication that humans were changing in fundamental ways in Europe and Asia.

Let us go back to Gardner's theory of *multiple intelligences*. In that theory, *old* mental modules are randomly mixed in with what most people consider intelligence. That is, all humans had well formed mental modules for "technical, social and natural history intelligence" before cave art came into existence. What happened about 40,000 years ago was that humans who were living under ice age conditions became "aware of themselves and their environment and to represent this awareness symbolically. Noble and Davidson argue that the major evolutionary expansion of brain capacity occurred immediately before or coincident with the first expression of art."<sup>91</sup> In addition, the part of the brain that expanded is precisely the part of the brain that is different between races today - the prefrontal cortex - or gray matter. Moreover, this part of the brain allowed these new humans to acquire cognitive fluidity - the world opened up to them in understanding as the ancient brain modules became integrated under a new director.<sup>92</sup>

Intelligence then is closely linked with the volume of gray matter.<sup>93</sup> The second edition of *The New Cognitive Neurosciences* states, "Throughout the history of neuropsychology, the psychological capacities associated with the prefrontal region of the brain have remained enigmatic and elusive. However, the special significance of this region has long been linked to the idea that it provides the neural substrate for a collection of higher-order capacities such as planning, reasoning, self-awareness, empathy, emotional modulation, and especially, decision making."<sup>94</sup> The vary traits that would be selected for under ice age conditions are now found to be linked to the same part of the brain that is responsible for the differences in brain size between the races.<sup>95</sup> This of course does not exclude some other genetic differences that may impact other parts of the brain or even metabolic differences that are found throughout the brain. Nevertheless, the correlation between gray matter and intelligence is just too great not to play a significant role. While a sophisticated, powerful engine still needs the right fuel and ancillary components to operate efficiently, it is still the engine that is different and unique.

McNamara states: "One benefit [of higher intelligence] would be an enhanced ability to engage in deliberative and reflective thought. These individuals would have better planning and analytical skills. Social cooperation would be easier in a group of individuals who could moderate their sexual, aggressive, and appetitive responses. Another benefit would be an enhanced ability to socially compete with, deceive, and manipulate [others].... [P]refrontal lobes participate in three fundamental functions: (1) working memory which serves to keep relevant or salient information on line until it is no longer useful, (2) maintenance of a preparatory set, and (3) inhibitory control over distraction."<sup>96</sup>

OK, we know that our prefrontal lobes, our gray matter, were an important evolutionary enhancement that allowed Euros and East Asians to survive the ice ages. What about Blacks, is there evidence that they did not follow the same evolutionary path? That is where Rushton's work has contributed to the understanding between races. He shows how Blacks, no matter where they live, are more violent, more impulsive, are less able to plan ahead, and generally have a harder time negotiating our more complex world. Crime of course varies over time and under different conditions. However, repeatedly, it is always Blacks who are far more violent and crime prone than Whites, while Whites are more prone to crime than are East Asians. (East Asians stand out in only

one area of crime - they are prone to gambling.)

Aggression and violence then is associated with Blacks, is known to be highly genetic,<sup>97</sup> and it should be expected that this fact would make people behave in such a way as to reduce the dangers of being around Blacks.

It is argued that this avoidance of Blacks is racism, but even Blacks prefer to live away from Blacks. In addition, Asians and Hispanics also do not want to be around or live amongst Blacks.<sup>98</sup> The primary reason is that they are prone to crime, and it is genetically based since no social cause can be found to explain the worldwide differences in crime between Blacks and other races.

At the other extreme, how does the r-K reproductive theory explain the high parental investment and the high intelligence of the Ashkenazi Jews? After all, as Semites, they belong genetically to those Mediterranean races that are a blend - or somewhere between East Asians, Euros, and sub-Saharan Africans. (Note that North Africans and Semites - all Arabs and Jews - are classified as Whites in the United States, a purely arbitrary decision at classifications.<sup>99</sup>) In the case of the Ashkenazi Jews, they had several thousand years to practice eugenic enhancements while existing as a small group, genetically isolated from their host populations. As I stated before, this *founder effect* of isolated small communities can speed up evolutionary change. In Europe, starting out with some initially small percentage of Euro genes before the religious wall of separation was put in place, allowed the necessary genes to be introduced into this small Semitic group. This was followed by extreme selection for higher intelligence through eugenics based on Jewish religious practices that emphasized primarily verbal skills in religious scholarship.<sup>100,101</sup>

### ***General intelligence and the Flynn Effect***

In 1904, Alfred Binet, a French psychologist, devised the first scientific intelligence test to find slow-learning children. Since that time of course, like all new technologies that turn out to be useful, it has been expanded and refined into a precise method of calculating a person's intelligence. What is interesting about Binet is not that he developed the first intelligence test, but the reaction from egalitarians over using the test beyond the original intent.<sup>102</sup> They make the preposterous assertion that since Binet devised the test for purpose X, it should not be used for purpose Y. This is one the most absurd positions I have come across in the Left's attempt at suppressing intelligence test usage, an argument never expressed with regards to other technologies.

Actually, intelligence testing has been going on for at least 40,000 years, at least as far back as cave paintings. "Primitive peoples it has been shown have the same concept of intelligence that we do, and that those thought to be intelligent are in fact intelligent. The same mechanisms are found everywhere."<sup>103</sup> Humans have always been aware of the relative intelligence of others; given adequate socializing between people (an extreme introvert for example could conceal their actual intelligence). Therefore, an accurate numerical index of one's intelligence is not necessary, but testing does allow people who do not know you to determine how intelligent you are. The mindless argumentative distractions from egalitarians, trying to portray intelligence testing as some type of racist plot, does nothing to eliminate the differences in intelligence between people and between races. However, their simplistic arguments do give people an endless array of excuses for denial of empirical facts.

In 1994, shortly after the release of *The Bell Curve*,<sup>104</sup> Gottfredson proposed the following definition for intelligence that was endorsed by 52 leading experts and published in *The Wall Street Journal*: "Intelligence is a very general mental capacity which, among other things,

involves the ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly and learn from experience. It is not merely book learning, a narrow academic skill, or test-taking smarts. Rather, it reflects a broader and deeper capability for comprehending our surroundings - 'catching on', 'making sense' of things or 'figuring out' what to do."<sup>105</sup>

In 1996, the American Psychological Association defined intelligence as the ability "to understand complex ideas, to adapt effectively to the environment, to learn from experience, to engage in various forms of reasoning, [and] to overcome obstacles by taking thought."<sup>106</sup> However, it is flawed by including "to adapt effectively to the environment." Crows are adapting to urban environments and no longer fly south during the winter. This is adaptation, not intelligence. Likewise, "In economically developed nations, the underclass, which consists of the long-term unemployed and welfare-dependent single mothers, is well adapted to its environment in so far as it is able to live on welfare and reproduce."<sup>107</sup> So-called *street smarts* are another example of adaptation rather than intelligence.

Scientists don't always have direct access to what is considered a real *thing*. We know that there are beautiful people and ugly people, but there is no direct test to assign an absolute number to each person's good looks or lack thereof. Temperature cannot be measured directly, as the activity of molecules, but must be estimated using a thermometer.<sup>108</sup> Nor can we determine who is sane versus insane by direct measurement. We can't observe the voices heard by schizophrenics, but must rely on predictors of how schizophrenics behave and make a diagnosis.

Intelligence is similar. It is the constellation of factors that are always present in those who have a high intelligence or 'g', and "Of all individual differences, g is the most powerful as a scientific construct and as a predictor of every day performance."<sup>109</sup> It has been studied for over a hundred years, far longer than other behavioral traits such as aggression or neurosis. To say that "intelligence is what intelligence tests measure" is like saying that "heat is what a thermometer measures," but has no practical purpose. The denial of the significance of intelligence has just one purpose - to try to dismiss that there are average differences in intelligence between races. These differences must be denied, or egalitarianism has no basis and equal opportunity is as far as justice can be taken - equality in life's outcomes is up to nature and luck.

General intelligence, or 'g', is a very specific thing. It is not part of our ancient brain that includes abilities like face recognition or social interaction. These modules are present in many animals like chimpanzees, dolphins, elephants, etc. Even dogs have different levels of interdoggie (interpersonal) skills. General intelligence then is the recent evolutionary increase in our ability to reason and learn that is made available by changes in the human genes that no other animal has - more gray matter, different blood glucose mechanisms, denser packed neurons, etc. "The most recent extensive exposition of g and its heritability, biology, and correlates has been presented by A. R. Jensen (1998) in his book, *The g Factor*. He conceptualizes g as a factor and writes that 'A factor is a hypothetical variable that *underlies* an observed or measured variable' (p. 88). It is not possible to measure g directly, but the scores that are obtained from intelligence tests and are expressed as IQs are approximate measures of g.... To explain the existence of the common factor, Spearman proposed that there must be some general mental power that determines the performance on all cognitive tasks and is responsible for the positive inter-correlation of these abilities."<sup>110</sup>

In response to publication of *The Bell Curve*, the American Psychological Association convened a task force of experts that concluded that intelligence is about 75% heritable - that is the environment can only explain about 25%.<sup>111</sup> The only hedge in the report, and it was a political one, was that the differences between races may not be genetic, but the differences within races were genetic. Their reasoning stemmed from one observation alone, that is a study that showed that the children of German women who had children fathered by Black American soldiers had normal intelligence. However, the study was flawed on two counts. First, the children were never retested when they reached adulthood where the genetic portion of intelligence stabilizes, and second this is not a random selection. More than likely, these German women were having sex on average with Black officers or at least the more intelligent Black soldiers. In addition, Blacks in the United States have on average about 30% White blood, and Blacks in the military have higher intelligence than average because of armed services testing and selection guidelines.

Over the last fifty years, very sophisticated methods have been used to determine the genetic versus the environmental component of intelligence and many other behavioral traits. "[R]esults suggest that 'g' is not simply a statistical abstraction that emerges from factor analyses of psychometric tests; it also has a biological substrate in the brain. Dozens of studies, including more than 8,000 parent-offspring pairs, 25,000 pairs of siblings, 10,000 twin pairs, and hundreds of adoptive families, all converge on the conclusion that genetic factors contribute substantially to 'g'."<sup>112</sup>

Just recently, the first gene for intelligence was discovered, and its contribution is estimated to be about four IQ points.<sup>113</sup> This looks about right as it is estimated that about ten to twenty genes contribute to general intelligence. Eventually, and it may not be that many years away, we should be able to locate all of the genes that contribute to intelligence. This may seem contradictory, for if intelligence is made up of about a dozen or so genes, and different people have different smart genes versus different dumb genes, then it seems logical that people should be intelligent in different ways. Evolution could have worked that way, but it didn't.

Let's take an athletic ability like running. East Africans have innate long distance running ability, and West Africans are excellent sprinters.<sup>114</sup> I remember walking into the hotel where New York marathon runners were gathering - the half dozen Kenyans stood out. Long legs and shortened and small torso, they looked very different from the typical American Blacks that came from Southwest Africa as slaves. So there is no empirical reason that people could not have evolved different types of intelligence, but it just did not happen that way.

What seems to have happened is that all of the intelligence genes contribute to the size of the brain's engine - but in different ways. Some genes could encode for more gray matter, some for increased brain metabolic rates, some for an increased density of neurons, etc. Nevertheless, whatever genes a person has for intelligence, they move up or down together, not as discreet units. If a person is not intelligent, then they are generally not intelligent in every area of the hierarchy of intelligence. If a person is smart, they are then generally intelligent overall - but may excel in one area versus another.

Intelligence then is a unitary factor but does have a hierarchical foundation. "[T]here are eight of these second order factors, consisting of verbal comprehension, reasoning, memory, spatial, perceptual, mathematical abilities, cultural knowledge, and cognitive speed. This is called the *hierarchical model* of intelligence because it can be envisaged as a hierarchical pyramid with numerous narrow, specific abilities at the base, eight second-order or group factors in the

middle, and a single general factor - g - at the apex. This model is widely accepted among contemporary experts such as the American Task Force."<sup>115</sup>

If this sounds like a variation of Gardner's *multiple intelligences*, it is not. Gardener's hypothesis has one political purpose - to be able to make everyone seem equally intelligent in some area. Nevertheless, the hierarchical model, while interesting, does not make intelligence more equitable. However, it does have some interesting evolutionary aspects.

For example, the intelligence of East Asians tends toward higher visual-spatial abilities over verbal abilities. Ashkenazi Jews are even more asymmetric - they have an average verbal IQ of an astounding 127 while their average general intelligence is 115.<sup>116</sup> In the case of the Ashkenazi Jews, this was brought about by thousands of years of selective breeding of Talmud scholars with exceptional verbal skills, while most of the world remained illiterate.

Therefore, it *is possible* for evolution to act upon second order factors of intelligence, but for the most part this has not happened. Intelligence or 'g' moves as a single factor - if you are a genius you will be highly intelligent in all areas with perhaps some specialization in one area or another, say mathematics over verbal skills, that may be due to personal interest and training. At the highest levels of intelligence, focusing in one area can easily strengthen some neuronal connections over others. This same phenomena is found in children, if they are exposed to two or more languages with different phonemes at a young age, the brain does not prune as much of the language acquisition modules, and they are capable of learning new languages later on in life. The young brain does discard to some extent over time those brain connections that are unused in preference for what is used.

One argument used by the Left is that there has not been enough time for the different races to diverge in average intelligence, and therefore differences must be due to racism or some other environmental reason, usually the fault of the evil White man, Western Colonialism, or some such unknown *Factor X* as Jensen puts it.<sup>117</sup> However, "*Australopithecus habilis* evolved into *Homo erectus* in ...few tens of thousands of years - or less. ...They also experienced a larger rise in brain size than previously seen, almost doubling their brain volume to over 1,000 cubic centimeters - well on the way to the 1,355 cubic centimeter value for living humans."<sup>118</sup>

It seems perfectly clear then that if our ancestors could *double* their brain size in say 40,000 years, then some human races could certainly increase their brain sizes by a mere 10% over other races in 40,000 years. Ten percent in average brain size is the difference between Blacks and East Asians. Or looked at another way, a 15% increase in average intelligence between Ashkenazi Jews and Euros over a period of say 5,000 years is well within the same evolutionary change - especially considering that social eugenic practices can increase the speed of evolutionary change as any dog breeder knows.

Graves states, "Clearly, we would not call a scientist racist if in fact Europeans really did have larger brains."<sup>119</sup> This paragon of duplicity seems to have a serious case of *foot in mouth disease*. Page after page of *The Emperor's New Clothes: Biological Theories of Race at the Millennium*, is filled with these errors, omissions and plain muddled thinking. One has to wonder which *millennium* he is talking about?

Byrne writes, "After correcting for the number of studies in progress, I found an unambiguous relation with brain size: neocortex ratio predicts how much a species uses deception. The most

likely hypothesis at present therefore seems to be that larger brains evolved in response to a need for greater social skill; the increased brain size allowed more rapid learning, underlying the social sophistication shared by all monkeys and apes."<sup>120</sup> Isn't it then quite reasonable that as humans became more dependent on each other, especially under ecological pressures like the ice ages, that *greater social skills* required greater intelligence if for no other reason than that cooperation meant survival?

In the same book Wrangham states: "Over the ensuing millennia various forms of humanity came and went - including the Neanderthals, who lived in Europe and adjacent regions of Asia until some 45,000 years ago. Brain size increased and sometimes fell. Language took over. African populations colonized the rest of the world at least once again, ending in a wave of modern *Homo sapiens* around 150,000-200,000 years ago. Then, about 40,000 years ago, cultural diversity bloomed in the creation of ornaments, tools, and art. By 12,000 years ago, agriculture introduced the modern era. . . . In comparison to the great shifts from our ape past, there has been little change for 1.9 million years in features such as body size and degree of sexual dimorphism, or shape of the foot or the shoulder, or nature of the teeth or the face."<sup>121</sup>

For anyone arguing that racial differences are only skin deep, the above should dispel that myth. Note the rapid changes in intelligence and behavior, while physical differences stayed the same. It is just the opposite of what we have been taught by the media, government and socialist academics. Real racial differences are found in behavior and intelligence. These changes were more important to the survival of social animals than physical differences - humans as well as the great apes were living by their wits, stuck as they were with few defenses against predators and climate combined.

As new evidence accumulates about the correlation between brain size and intelligence, and as science focuses more on those specific brain regions that contribute to intelligence, as well as the morphological differences between the average male brain versus the average female brain, the correlation between brain size and intelligence has been moving from about 0.40 using crude brain sizing techniques to 0.60 using the modern techniques like magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).<sup>122</sup>

Jensen states:

"The relationship of the g factor to a number of biological variables and its relationship to the size of the white-black differences on various cognitive tests (i.e., Spearman's hypothesis) suggests that the average white-black difference in g has a biological component. Human races are viewed not as discrete, or Platonic, categories, but rather as breeding populations that, as a result of natural selection, have come to differ statistically in the relative frequencies of many polymorphic genes. The 'genetic distances' between various populations form a continuous variable that can be measured in terms of differences in gene frequencies. Racial populations differ in many genetic characteristics, some of which, such as brain size, have behavioral and psychometric correlates, particularly g. What I term the default hypothesis states that the causes of the phenotypic differences between contemporary populations of recent African and European descent arise from the same genetic and environmental factors, and in approximately the same magnitudes, that account for individual differences within each population. Thus genetic and environmental variances between groups and within groups are viewed as essentially the same for both populations. The default hypothesis is able to account for the present evidence on the mean white-black difference in g. There is no need to invoke any ad hoc hypothesis, or a *Factor X*, that is unique to either the black or the white population. The

environmental component of the average g difference between groups is primarily attributable to a host of microenvironmental factors that have biological effects. They result from non-genetic variation in prenatal, perinatal, and neonatal conditions and specific nutritional factors."<sup>123</sup>

What Jensen is stating is that contrary to what the American Psychological Association's 1995 task force report states with regards to racial differences that I discussed above, all of the empirical evidence points towards the same mechanism accounting for individual differences in intelligence as is found in racial differences in intelligence. That is, the elusive *Factor X* that the Marxists hope to find to explain racial differences has not materialized, even though the effort has been very well funded.

*Factor X* stands for the long litany of excuses expounded by the Left, without any empirical evidence that has withstood scrutiny, which hopes to explain as a minimum the 15-point gap in intelligence between Whites and Blacks. However, need we stop at a mere 15-point gap? If we really want to use the widest spread in average racial intelligence, in order to find this mysterious *Factor X*, we should compare the average intelligence of Ashkenazi Jews (115) with the average intelligence of sub-Saharan Africans (70). With an astronomical gap in average intelligence of 45, this makes the equivalent difference of 45-points in IQ between sub-Saharan Africans and the intelligence of Chimpanzees say of 25, of comparable difference! (See the table of average intelligence by nation below.) Surely, if there is some deprivation or anomaly that causes Blacks to all have a lower intelligence than Whites, there must be an equal deprivation for Whites in relation to Ashkenazi Jews. In the United States - the separation between these three groups is 15-points on average. Surely, if there is any basis for assuming that *Factor X* is in some way racist, historical such as slavery, or any one of the number of other excuses used to try and rationalize low Black intelligence, then there must be an equivalent excuse for Whites not having as high an IQ of Ashkenazi Jews. Where is it?

When this is pointed out to Jews, most of them will explain that it is because of their culture, love of learning, family encouragement, etc. Nevertheless, this is a just-so story with no empirical basis. Moreover, the same goes for East Asians. Yes, East Asians do seem to emphasize learning for their children, but they are also higher on the parental investment scale than Whites. So, what is it, parental investment or innate intelligence? Either way, it can be contributed to genes (Rushton's r-K theory) rather than inequality or some other environmental cause. *Factor X* is a myth - it doesn't exist, at least to the extent necessary to close the enormous gap in intelligence between the racial extremes.

The educational system in the United States, in trying to raise the academic level of Blacks, has been focusing on *teaching to the test*. Over the last 20 years, there have been periodic claims that the gap is closing between Whites and Blacks, only to have the gap open up again. There are several observations that can be made about this so-called closing gap. When it comes to memorization, there is not as great a difference between Whites and Blacks. That is, rote learning can be very successful at increasing raw knowledge with enrichment programs, especially over the short run. Children then will seem to be getting smarter with intense training, but when it stops, and as they grow older, the benefits slowly fade and their ability to think has been increased very little. Most of the Black-White difference is located in the g-factor, that part of intelligence that is not simple learning but abstract thinking.<sup>124</sup>

This also means that Blacks also score lower on culture-fair or culture free tests, because 'g' is

more heavily loaded on those factors that are more than learning or training. General intelligence cannot just be taught - it is the engine and the fuel that allows us to learn and to manipulate concepts and ideas. For example, there are two similar tests, forward and reverse digit spans. Blacks do far worse on the reverse digit span, an observation that precludes any motivational or cultural explanation. Reverse digit span is more heavily loaded on general intelligence.<sup>125</sup>

So while schooling does help prop up intelligence scores somewhat, this is not the same as increasing intelligence.<sup>126</sup> Again, these gains usually fade after compensatory education ends. For example, in Chicago they now have summer school for children who are behind academically. Sure enough, scores have gone up slightly. However, it is a quest, like trying to force toothpaste back into the tube, which just never pans out. These kids have to go to school year-round because of their low intelligence - otherwise they forget their rote learning in the basic skills. When reading is emphasized, then writing suffers; and as history is ignored for math, then history suffers. It is an endless game of excuses and changing strategies, but in the end, when they finally leave school, they are still stupid. Education cannot make a person smart; it can only open up learning opportunities. This is why Head Start and other programs were such a disaster. Children are more malleable, but as they get older, intelligence becomes genetic.<sup>127</sup>

Just today, August 20, 2002, I read where Paul Vallas, the superintendent of schools for five years in Chicago, and now in Philadelphia, is trying to straighten out Philadelphia's schools and is under pressure to provide educational opportunities for music, art, dance, etc. The magic of these educational reformers is a simple one. Teach only what is tested, increase the amount of time, effort and days in school, and grades will improve slightly. Then everyone will think that given even more time and attention, Blacks will some day be as smart as Whites, or maybe even as smart as Jews!

Excuses for Black failure have included nutrition, exposure to lead, feelings of inferiority, etc. ad infinitum. However, any of these *Factor X* explanations must still explain not just the White-Black gap but also the equivalent Ashkenazi Jew-White gap. It is just not possible to make up the 15-point difference, and there is no hope of any environmental explanation closing the Ashkenazi Jew-sub-Saharan African gap of 45-points in IQ! Again, it seems reasonable that such a large gap actually places these two groups so far apart as to constitute separate species.

Family environment, social economic status, etc. was covered in *Shattering' Volume I* with discussion of studies covered in the book *The Relationship Code: Deciphering Genetic and Social Influences on Adolescent Development*, 2000. But two more recent observations summarizes again the findings from these and other studies:

"If we examine those studies that have measured IQ correlations among unrelated children who grew up together, we find that the average result is a correlation of 0.28, which is suggestive of a modest role for shared environmental circumstances in shaping the development of whatever attributes underlie IQ test performance. But this correlation only holds when the individuals are tested as children. By the time they have become adults, the mean correlation falls to 0.04, indicating only a transitory effect of shared upbringing."<sup>128</sup>

"The implication of these results is that common family influences, such as the extent to which some parents have fewer children, sent their children to better schools, give them



cognitively stimulating toys and computers and so forth, have no long term effects on intelligence, because if they did the correlations between pairs of biologically unrelated children reared in the same family would be positive. The environmental factors determining intelligence must be operating before children are adopted, which points to the quality of prenatal and early post-natal nutrition. There were substantial improvements in the quality of nutrition of the populations of the western nations during the twentieth century that were responsible for increases in average heights of about one standard deviation. The increases in intelligence have been of about the same order. Improvements in nutrition brought about increases in average brain size and probably also in the brain's neurological development."<sup>129</sup>

The *Flynn effect* has also been held out as the magic bullet to prove that intelligence is not genetic. (See my review of *The Rising Curve: Long-Term Gains in IQ and Related Measures*, edited by Ulric Neisser, available at the Neoeugenics web site.) In short, the *Flynn effect* states that intelligence test scores have been rising in the industrialized world by about three IQ points per decade for as long as modern tests have been administered - over fifty years. Are people getting more intelligent? Not necessarily. Stature or height is 90% genetic, and yet people have been getting taller. Prostitutes in England during the time of Jack the Ripper were an average of only four feet tall. So yes, with good nutrition, all races will grow in stature, but it is no less genetic because of good nutrition. Therefore, what has caused the observed increase in intelligence test scores and is intelligence really increasing? Nobody knows for sure. The *Flynn effect* is a true mystery - one that may reveal itself as we learn more about intelligence. However, some interesting speculations, including my own, will be presented here to supplement my earlier review of the above book.

Richard Lynn has been a long proponent of better nutrition and prenatal care as the primary reason that there has been an increase in overall intelligence scores.<sup>130</sup> He has also shown that the *Flynn effect* is present before a child reaches the age of two, which makes environmental explanations of longer duration questionable in raising intelligence scores.<sup>131</sup> With regards to being malnourished, Rushton notes that:

"Although the Asian/Amerindian children in Scarr and Weinberg's (1976) study showed little evidence of having IQs above the white mean, four studies of Korean children adopted by white families do support the racial hypothesis. In the first, 25 four-year-olds from Vietnam, Korea, Cambodia and Thailand, all adopted into white American homes prior to 3 years of age, excelled in academic ability with a mean IQ score of 120, as opposed to a U.S. national norm of 100 (Clark & Hanisee, 1982). Prior to placement half the babies had required hospitalization for malnutrition. In the second, Winick, Meyer, and Harris (1975) found 141 Korean children adopted as infants by American families exceeded American children in both IQ and achievement scores when they reached 10 years of age. Many of these Korean infants were malnourished and the interest of the investigators was on the possible effects of early malnutrition on later intelligence. When tested, those who had been severely malnourished as infants obtained a mean IQ of 102; a moderately well nourished group obtained a mean IQ of 106; and an adequately nourished group obtained a mean IQ of 112."<sup>132</sup>

From this conflicting data, it seems that we are no closer to unraveling the *Flynn effect*. An overall rising intelligence may be due to better nutrition, and yet severely malnourished Korean

babies were still above average in intelligence. That is, if all children are well fed, there will still be the same gap in intelligence between Jews, Asians, Whites, Blacks, etc.

A recent attempt at an environmental explanation has been proposed by Dickens and Flynn.<sup>133</sup> They contend that we are experiencing a multiplier effect that inflates both environmental and genetic advantages, and that the higher intelligence of others inflates a person's intelligence. It is simply exposure to smart people that makes one smart. As they put it, "The social multiplier means that environmental components just reinforce genetic components of intelligence in an endless stream of feed-back and reinforcement. Society has become far more complex so everyone is exposed to higher complexity and must try harder to deal with it." Apparently, trying harder is like exercising a muscle, and it gets bigger. However, all of the available evidence shows that a person's intelligence is extremely stable and that it cannot be environmentally inflated. In fact, as the authors point out, these gains in intelligence have been primarily in the problem-solving area or the more 'g' loaded, the area where Blacks do worse *because* it is not influenced by environment.

There is also conflicting, though anecdotal observations with regards to gifted children who end up doing menial work and not being able to fit in when they reach adulthood. Leta Stetter Hollingworth has shown that because they were often brought up in an intellectual vacuum, with few peers who came close to having their innate intelligence - usually IQs above about 155 - gifted children are in a sense deprived of needed stimulation and suffer maladjustments.<sup>134</sup> Yet, their intelligence remains high! They are born gifted and they remain gifted throughout their lives, despite not being challenged intellectually. Genes alone are responsible for their high intelligence when they come from homes where neither the parents nor other children even understand how gifted they are (this does not include gifted children born into families where they are encouraged to excel). So, are genes solely responsible for the high IQs of gifted children, but not responsible for everyone else's intelligence? This seems highly unlikely, and the *multiplier effect* seems problematic in explaining the *Flynn effect*.

It is safe to say that the Flynn effect then is an observed phenomenon that holds little in the way of explanatory power as to whether the environment has much of an impact on intelligence. However, there may be an environmental explanation that *does* contribute to being able to *think outside the box*. "Luria concluded that for illiterate folks, imagination remains largely tied to the person's immediate situation in a rigidly bound manner. Luria noted, however, that the acquisition of literacy freed a person's imagination from the immediate context and made it available for problem solving.... When asked to pay attention to the logical relationships between [a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion] deductive statements, illiterate folk denied it was possible to draw conclusions from statements about things with which one had no personal experience. With the appropriation of literacy, Luria's peasants became able to understand syllogistic, logical relationships."<sup>135</sup>

It seems that over the last 100 years, the industrial world has changed from one of widespread illiteracy and no exposure to modernity to almost universal literacy and involvement in abstract problem solving. Even remote villages in Pakistan or Thailand have some access to stories about people over the British Broadcasting Corporation's radio stations, or our version of soap operas. They are now thinking in a decontextualized way, they can form thoughts and ideas about far away people, situations and things. IQ tests weigh cognitive capacities but ignore cognitive styles and thinking dispositions.<sup>136</sup> Could this be the *Flynn effect*, humans are

becoming more aware of thinking styles and becoming more open minded about what thinking is all about?

What we are probably seeing then in the *Flynn effect* is the increase in intelligence test scores, among those people below the norm primarily, who have been recently exposed to reading, debating, movies, video games, etc. It is not that intelligence is going up but rather innate intelligence is being unleashed. It is being allowed to grow and flourish. However, it will not go on for very long, and it has limitations. In fact, it will probably have more of an impact in pushing those who are more gifted into a wider range of thinking styles, rather than allowing those with a low intelligence to navigate an ever increasingly complex world.

Graves claims that the *Flynn effect* demolishes the claim that there are genetic differences in average intelligence between races.<sup>137</sup> But does the discoverer of the *Flynn effect*, James R. Flynn, think so? Hardly: "There are problems with the *Factor X* explanation for Black-White differences (see Flynn, 1980, pp. 56-63), and those problems are clearly insurmountable for a literal *Factor X* explanation for IQ gains over time. Every plausible factor suggested to explain IQ gains, whether better schooling, better nutrition, altered attitudes to problem solving, smaller families, or the increasing popularity of video games, affected some before others and has a differential impact at any point in time."<sup>138</sup>

Where does this leave us then with regards to social policy? Intelligence is now more than ever a matter of heredity rather than the environment, now that the environment of different races and cultures are becoming more equalized. Literacy is up everywhere, and the disadvantaged are given far more resources than those who are gifted. There is an enormous transfer of wealth from the upper-class to the underclass (at least from Whites to Blacks if not from Jews to Whites). Moreover, it is well understood that as environments are equalized, heritability percentages increase. With this in mind then, it only seems prudent to reduce expenditures for all of the intervention programs that waste money, and focus more on good heredity, challenging gifted children, and pushing ahead with our modern technological world, as it seems to at least improve the thinking ability of those exposed to modernity.

### ***IQ and the success of races and nations.***

The success of different races is contingent on many things, including intelligence and conscientiousness. As stated above, we can look at races as being any subset of individuals based on differences in the frequencies of different genes that have differentiated race A from race B. Likewise, we can look at the average intelligence of nations as a single unit, but also at the different races that make up the nation under investigation. Like racial categories, nations can be racially homogenous like Iceland or Japan, or they can be a hodgepodge of races from mixed marriages between races, like Brazil and Jamaica.

Of the major races, sub-Saharan Blacks make up one of the four main races (Europeans, East Asians, South Asians, and sub-Saharan Blacks). Isolated from the rest of the world by the Saharan desert, humans have migrated out of sub-Saharan Africa, but very few humans have migrated back into sub-Saharan Africa - at least before the great human migrations that began around 1500 AD. Sub-Saharan Blacks have a very low average IQ of about 70, which seems almost unbelievable. Again, let us look at what this number means and what it doesn't. It does not mean that they are any less capable of all those human (and many times animal) mental capabilities or modules that existed in the hominid line for 200,000 to 2 million years. These modules like face recognition, understanding animal behavior, remembering the locations of

plants for gathering and in what season, what we now observe as "street smarts," etc. may be quite similar between races, so they are quite sufficient in hunter-gatherer capabilities that have been around a long time. In fact, they can perform some of these tasks, like tracking animals, with such acumen that we mistakenly equate it with intelligence.

Intelligence then is really something different, something that lies on top of and came after these other human capabilities, as described above. It is simply the latest edition to our brain and what is needed today in a highly complex and technological world. In addition, it is found in unequal amounts in different races, as well as within each race.

There have been numerous excuses or rationalizations for the backwardness of African Blacks. They have never developed a written language nor have they even been able to utilize, on their own, the wheel, even though it was introduced several times by Arab invaders. Instead, they claim primarily two things to justify their lack of development - that they were first enslaved and/or colonized; or that science *was* invented in Africa. The slavery/colonialism excuse of course does not answer why a race was unable to develop a written language, a civilization, or use of the wheel. It is just stated without proof. Moreover, the claim of having developed the wheel, language and science is based on the ruse of claiming that North African nations - especially Egypt - were populated by sub-Saharan Africans. In fact, Egypt as well as all Middle Eastern countries has a mixture of very old races and various influxes of other races. North Africans then, as well as Semites, are classified in the United States as Whites, not Africans (but they really should be classified as mixtures or better yet given their own racial category like Semites).<sup>139</sup>

So let's look at Africans today (the race, not the continent). There is little or no democracy, the economies are mismanaged, economic freedom is absent, and tribalism is rampant. In addition, that has been their legacy since recorded time. Intelligence is required for these modern forms of culture to flourish.<sup>140</sup> In fact, it is safe to say that Africa, without outside assistance, is as developed as it can be. The women are still selecting men who are the best hunters, while women in other parts of the world have ratcheted up their demands for wealth, parental investment, and intelligence.<sup>141</sup>

In Jamaica, the racial mixture is 3% White, 3 % East Indian, 80% Black, and 15% Mulatto. They are a backward nation with an average IQ of 65, relying on outsiders or the few non-Blacks to run the tourist trade. Likewise, "Barbados and South Africa have performed better than predicted because their economies have been largely run by small minorities of whites, who comprise 4 percent of the population of Barbados and 14 percent of the population of South Africa. It can be noted that this is also to some degree the case for Zimbabwe whose quite large positive residual is attributable to much of the economy being run by a small minority of whites."<sup>142</sup>

In the United States, the same pattern emerges. "Thus, analyses of the household and employer data confirm that there are considerable skill differences between white and nonwhite workers, and that nonwhites suffer in the labor market as a result. By some measures, including several reported in this volume, this skills gap can be said to explain most of the racial disparity in employment and wages."<sup>143</sup>

Therefore, while the Left admits there is a large *skills gap*, they go on to lament racial differences. "Race has a deep and enduring historical significance as well, still visible in

residential color lines constructed by years of racial exclusion, violence, and overtly discriminatory policies; in the persistent racial gaps in education, skills, and capital that stem from opportunity denied; and in the mistrust between minorities and local law-enforcement agencies that has once again erupted around the issue of racial profiling."<sup>144</sup>

Admittedly, Whites and East Asians, and to a lesser extent Hispanics, do want to separate themselves from Blacks. Why would anyone want to live around Blacks who are more violent; or send their children into schools where Blacks are more violent, unruly, and are not able to keep up with the curriculum while Whites learn less *waiting* for the Blacks to catch up. This is not discrimination; it is the fact that Blacks have low average intelligence. Every group, whether racially based or other, wants to protect itself. To do otherwise would be to ignore parental responsibility. Blacks, simply put, have reached their highest capable level of achievement, and then some, thanks to quotas and affirmative action.

Burman laments, "Disproportionately few Blacks have achieved high position as corporate executives or entrepreneurs. It is among these latter groups, and the capital they control, that power and wealth is concentrated in the American social system....And the position of the Black working class is made less secure both by rapid technological innovation, which is eliminating *their* jobs with disproportionate impact, and by globalization, which is exporting *their* jobs to locations where labor is cheaper."<sup>145</sup> This again is special pleading. He is basically saying that Blacks are owed: *their* share of power, *their* share of wealth, and *their* share of jobs. Are we going to carve up every resource based on group identity and affiliation, rather than by each individual's contribution and effort?

Hispanics in the United States are hard to define racially because their classification is based on language and/or surname. It is unfortunate because it makes *behavior genetic* studies difficult based on this confounding classification. Nonetheless, taken as a group, Hispanics have an average IQ of about 90 in the United States and this fact alone accounts for the average income and status of this group. Blacks we know are Mulattos in the United States. However, Hispanics can be anything from a Spanish Caucasian to an Amerindian from Mexico. It would seem then that when looking at Hispanics, we should be especially cautious with our conclusions.

When it comes to racial classifications, it would be much clearer to define the country whenever possible, rather than race. When I read of race riots in England for example, when they talk about Blacks, these are people generally from Pakistan or the Caribbean. In France, their troublesome minorities are from Morocco, etc. Too often, we lump races together when they should be more clearly defined. With recent genetic studies, we can now be more precise with racial classifications rather than just lumping everyone into large, broad, categories.<sup>146</sup>

It is often said that Blacks do poorly on intelligence tests because the tests were developed by Whites and reflect Western culture. However, East Asians (Chinese, Japanese and Koreans) do better on intelligence tests than Whites, dispelling not only that these tests are biased, but also showing that East Asians are on average more intelligent than Whites. Their average intelligence is around 105.<sup>147</sup>

The real conundrum regarding East Asian intelligence is why East Asia has traditionally been so far behind the West in terms of science and technology. China led the West in these areas up until 1500 AD and then the West led the way thereafter. The simplest explanation is that the East Asian societies were highly authoritarian with numerous state monopolies suppressing free

enterprise or market economies.<sup>148</sup> This then begs the question, is East Asian societies culturally authoritarian or is there a genetic component[s] in their behavioral traits? We need to gather more information on differential behavioral traits between races to be able to answer these questions.

A very small group in terms of numbers, the Jews are a very interesting race[s] to study with regards to intelligence and behavioral traits for several reasons. First, they have the honor of being the most highly intelligent racial group yet defined, with an average intelligence of 115 (for Ashkenazi Jews). Second, their intelligence is asymmetric which makes their intelligence unique and indicates an evolutionary history that is radically different from all other races. Third, behaviorally they are far more tribalistic or xenophobic versus the non-tribalistic nature of Whites amongst who they have been in contact for thousands of years. (I will go into detail on this subject in a later chapter.)

For now, I just want to highlight how this small racial group, the Ashkenazi Jews, fair with regards to other races:

- "Comparing Jews with non-Jews of comparable socioeconomic status reveals that Jews *over-participate* [in politics] not because they are Jewish, but because they possess considerable resources."<sup>149</sup>
- "In an editorial of July 13, 1923 (p. 177), *The American Hebrew* noted that Jews were disproportionately represented among the gifted in Louis Terman's study of gifted children and commented that 'this fact must give rise to bitter, though futile, reflection among the so-called Nordics.' The editorial also noted that Jews were over-represented among scholarship winners in competitions sponsored by the state of New York. The editorial pointedly noted that 'perhaps the Nordics are too proud to try for these honors. In any event the list of names just announced by the State Department of Education at Albany as winners of these coveted scholarships is not in the least Nordic; it reads like a confirmation roster at a Temple.' There is indeed evidence that Jews, like East Asians, have higher IQ's than Caucasians."<sup>150</sup>
- "[R]ecent data indicate that Jewish per capita income in the United States is almost double that of non-Jews, a bigger difference than the black-white income gap."<sup>151</sup>
- "Studies show, 58 percent of Jewish Americans have a college degree, compared to 22 percent of non-Jews. Twenty-eight percent of Jewish Americans describe themselves as professional, compared to 10 percent of non-Jews. Thirty-seven percent of Jews earn over \$85,000, compared to 13 percent of non-Jews."<sup>152</sup>

This list could go on for pages, but it is safe to say, there is no explanation for the success of the American Jews other than that they are very different genetically, because the same power and success shows up in Jews from the Orthodox to the profane. There is no *common culture* for the Jewish race that has been identified as applicable to all Jews.

An extensive study of urban inequality concludes, "the perceptions and ideas that guide human behavior and interaction are likely to be core elements in determining who gets a larger or smaller piece of the pie. This is perhaps especially so when the issue is how and why privilege or disadvantage is allocated among racial and ethnic groups."<sup>153</sup> According to this explanation, convoluted as it is, the small percentage of Jews in the United States have all the power, wealth and influence because of the "perceptions and ideas that guide human behavior." If that doesn't smack of extraordinary reaching for environmental explanations for inequality, I don't know

what does. The fact is, as groups, races do better or worse based primarily on their own innate abilities and temperaments. The success of individuals of course is far more flexible.

The above publication on inequality does state the obvious later on, "A substantial literature documents differences in labor market performance and rewards across racial and ethnic groups. These differences, it is argued, are largely *due to differential human capital endowments across groups* and/or to larger processes, such as shifts in the spatial distribution of jobs, and to discrimination." So at least they do admit that different groups have different levels of talent, they just have difficulty admitting that capital endowment equals innate intelligence, conscientiousness, etc.

Intelligence then is extremely important. "An IQ of over 110 will get you income 34% above national average, below 90 IQ you will earn 34% below national average."<sup>154</sup> And to show that this is not merely education, the "Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery, a test with ten components consisting of arithmetic reasoning, numerical operations, verbal comprehension of paragraphs, vocabulary, perceptual speed (a coding test), general science, mathematics knowledge, electronics information, mechanical information, and automotive shop information. The g extracted from this battery of tests correlated .76 with attainment on job training courses. The remaining non-g portion of the test variance had a correlation of an additional .02 (Ree and Earles, 1994). Thus, for practical purposes, g is the only useful predictor of attainment on the training program. For particular areas of expertise, *g is a more important predictor* of performance than a test of ability in that area. For instance, performance on a test of mechanical aptitude is more strongly determined by g than by mechanical ability."<sup>155</sup>

Incidence of Various Social Phenomena (percentages) in Five IQ Bands

<b>Social Phenomena</b>	126+	111-125	90-110	75-89	-74
College Graduate	75	38	8	1	0
Below poverty line	1	4	7	14	26
Unemployed 1 month in last yr. (males)	4	6	8	11	14
Work impaired by poor health (males)	13	21	37	45	62
High school dropout	0	1	6	26	64
Single mother	4	8	14	22	34
Long-term welfare mother	0	2	8	17	31
Long-term welfare recipient	7	10	14	20	28
Served time in prison	0	1	3	6	13
Child with IQ below 80	1	3	6	16	30

Source: *The Bell Curve* by Herrnstein and Murray, 1994.

Even still primitive hunter-gatherer tribes are acutely aware of differences in intelligence, and it is similar to what modern societies view as intelligent behavior. There is no need for intelligence testing to have a good understanding of who is intelligent and who is not in small groups where the members can have some time to observe each other's behavior. Intelligence testing now has its benefits in research and in determining who is intelligent when we do not have the time to get to know a person well - such as selecting people for employment or for admittance to a university. It is interesting to note that only the U.S. Military is allowed to use intelligence testing for employment, everyone else is severely restricted from doing so unless cumbersome criteria are met to prove the tests are correlated with job performance. This inability to use intelligence testing for hiring or promotional purposes has taken away one of the most useful tools we have to select the best people regardless of race. A truly race neutral approach is

denied, because the Left knows that there are differences in intelligence between races but refuse to acknowledge it.

The evidence then is overwhelming: Intelligence is the primary factor that leads to success, wealth, health, and a host of other quality of life outcomes.<sup>156</sup> There is virtually no correlation between social economic status and success based on numerous studies.<sup>157</sup> Intelligence, not racism, is why different racial groups fair differently in the market place. And even as a person ages, those tested at five years old with a high intelligence were doing very well in life financially at the age of forty.<sup>158</sup>

The correlation between a person's intelligence and their success in the labor force would be even greater if we lived in a merit-based society. Economic distortions enter in however because of unions, the Davis Bacon Act, minimum wage laws, political patronage, nepotism, corporate insider deals and trading, inheritance, and of course physical and mental disabilities. Even a very bright person who is extremely shy may prefer a menial job rather than risk daily embarrassment in a corporate world that requires aggressive and extroverted behavior. Then there are those who just have very little ambition or have very low conscientiousness. All of these, and many more that others could come up with, tend to reduce the correlation between intelligence and income. Moreover, racism could be one of those. However, due to quotas and affirmative action, racial bias now favors minorities over majorities. Racism is no longer holding Blacks back; race is however propelling them to the front of the line in most cases.

Lynn and Vanhanen have researched the correlation between different nations and the average intelligence of the populations and have found a similar correlation between intelligence and Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The table below, from their recent book *IQ and the Wealth of Nations*, shows the average intelligence, the countries actual GDP, and in the last column the expected GDP if the correlation between GDP and average intelligence was perfectly correlated. That is, based on the average intelligence, what is the expected GDP.

<u>Country</u>	<u>IQ</u>	<u>GDP</u>	<u>Fitted GDP</u>
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
New Zealand	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

Just like individuals, nations have good and back luck. The United States has a freer market economy than Europe. China suffers under Communism, and many former Communist countries are trying to recover from their devastation under Communism. Some countries have more economic freedom and are more democratic, though the authors have shown that democracy and economic freedoms also tend to be correlated with intelligence. It takes a certain level of intelligence to develop, promote, and sustain democracy and economic freedom, and even then, it is not assured as we have seen in many countries in the past and present. Other countries have been blessed with enormous amounts of oil, a thriving tourist industry, diamond mines, or a small ruling elite of Whites, East Asians or Asian Indians that help run the economy. All of these factors tend to alter the actual GDP with the fitted GDP. Still, the correlation between average intelligence and GDP is the most robust explanation for economic development and progress yet. (See Vanhanen and Lynn for a detailed explanation of competing theories of economic development.)

Just like in the United States, where inequality has widened between those who are intelligent and those who are not, the gap between smart nations and dumb nations is also widening.<sup>159</sup> "It is more probable that, with further technological developments demanding high intelligence, international economic inequalities will increase even more [than they have in the past] in the future."<sup>160</sup> The message is clear: to be a progressive, democratic, economically developed nation, make sure that your citizens are as bright as possible. Only immigration and breeding patterns can change the average intelligence over time.

## Chapter 3: Marxist social science - race, evolution and deception.

### *The Standard Social Science Model (SSSM).*

There are numerous explanatory systems that try to make sense of the world: religion, history, Marxism, astrology, folk psychology, political forces, social science, natural science, etc. When we discuss in any formal manner the causes of xenophobia, nationalism, racism, etc. however, social science has dominated the field of trying to explain the dynamics involved - though natural science is rapidly making inroads into providing a more unified and empirical explanation. Still, the social scientists are still the predominant advocates listened to by the

media, government and students and they continue to push their agenda aggressively. That agenda is simply this: if there are inequalities between people, it is due to unfair oppression by one group over another. Innate differences between individuals will be accepted as natural, but innate differences between groups of people will be denied as even possible.

The Standard Social Science Model (SSSM) has been firmly in place over the last fifty years or so, and it continues to dominate the proscriptions and advocacy of political and social programs. It is difficult to assign dates when new paradigms replace faltering ones, because changes taking place like a pendulum: are we talking about where the pendulum is at present or the momentum that it is moving at. The pendulum started shifting away from the SSSM about 1970 when sociobiology along with Jensenism first came on the scene to challenge the status quo, but social scientists have been able to hold back empirical scientific data in support of evolutionary explanations by the force of their numbers, their entrenchment in academia and the media, and their ability to declare that anyone who differs with them is a racist.

The SSSM is in retreat, and it does not seem to have an answer for its demise - however slow it is. The premise of the model is based on these six assumptions:<sup>161</sup>

1. The Psychic Unity of Humanity [the human brain has essentially the same structure];
2. Since adults differ but infants are the same, the differences must be cultural;
3. Infants must acquire these differences from the outside - culture;
4. The social world is the cause of mental organization;
5. Culture precedes the mind, not the other way around;
6. Accordingly, what is interesting about humans is this cultural stuff that we pour into the children.

This model takes as a given that there is no connection between biology and social order. Everything around us, as far as human behavior is concerned, is due to culture alone. However, this begs the question, *when did humans depart from being part of the animal kingdom to being independent or radically different from all other organisms?* This is never addressed in the model, and just like religion, it relies on some prime mover such as god to get things started, while never explaining where god came from. In the case of sociology, it is where did the first social or cultural constructor come from. "If psychology studies the content-independent laws of mind and anthropology studies the content-supplying inheritances of particular cultures, one still needs to find the content-determining processes that manufacture individual cultures and social systems. The Standard Social Science Model breaks the social sciences into schools (materialist, structural-functionalist, symbolic, Marxist, postmodernist, etc.) that are largely distinguished by how each attempts to affirmatively characterize the artificer [the constructor], which they generally agree is an emergent group-level process of some kind."<sup>162</sup>

With its lack of a scientific unified system, one that is at odds with the natural sciences where every advance builds on previous work, social science flops around from theory to theory in an endless cycle of *just-so* stories. Now, in full retreat, and failing to implement scientific tools for constructing a unified methodology, it has begun to splinter into even more fringe groups and radical denials: "For the hard cultural relativists, science is merely one of a myriad of ways of looking at the natural world. Each method is a social construct, the product of cultural rules and systems of thinking absorbed by members of a particular group within society, and each social construct is supposedly of equal value. Anyone who disputes this point is, according to the adherents of this philosophy, suffering from delusions induced by the particular social construct

that they have adopted from the smorgasbord of world views available to them. There is, they insist, no way of determining the superiority or inferiority of an idea."<sup>163</sup> Moreover, we must not forget their final stand against science: *anyone embracing a scientific empiricism is just a racist.*

The best expose of the Standard Social Science Method that I have seen is in *The Adapted Mind*, "Although using culture as an all-purpose explanation is a stance that is difficult or impossible to falsify, it is correspondingly easy to 'confirm.' If one doubts that the causal agent for a particular act is transmitted culture, one can nearly always find similar prior acts (or attitudes, or values, or representations) by others, so a source of the contagion can always be identified....The conclusion is present in the premises. The relativity of human behavior, far from being the critical empirical discovery of anthropology, is something imposed *a priori* on the field by the assumptions of the SSSM, because its premises define a program that is incapable of finding anything else. Relativity is no more 'there' to be found in the data of anthropologists than a content-independent architecture is 'there' to be found in the data of psychologists. These conclusions are present in the principles by which these fields approach their tasks and organize their data, and so are not 'findings' or 'discoveries' at all....The consequences of this reasoned arrival at particularism reverberate throughout the social sciences, imparting to them their characteristic flavor, as compared with the natural sciences. This flavor is not complexity, contingency, or historicity: Sciences from geology to astronomy to meteorology to evolutionary biology have these in full measure. It is, instead, that *social science theories are usually provisional, indeterminate, tentative, indefinite*; enmeshed in an endlessly qualified explanatory [exclusive adherence to a sectarian viewpoint], for which the usual explanation is that human life is much more complex than mere Schrodinger equations or planetary ecosystems."<sup>164</sup>

So how did the SSSM stray so far from science with regards to human nature, especially considering how science is so much a part of Western culture to the point that it almost defines it? The pendulum began to swing from scientific principles to a Marxist/egalitarian perspective during the early years of the twentieth century - very slowly of course. The prime mover for this change was the Boasian School of Anthropology. (For a detailed accounting of what motivated Franz Boas, and how his movement changed American ideology, see Kevin MacDonald's book *The Culture of Critique: ?*. It has been republished - see my web site for a review of the book and/or where it can be purchased.)

Franz Boas was simply an ardent Jewish Marxist who promoted a scientific view that would make Jewish particularism safe from criticism - his *science* was a political movement for the promotion of *Jewish interests*.

In 2001, a book about Jews written by Jews stated that, "[Boas] engaged in a 'life-long assault on the idea that race was a primary source of the differences to be found in the mental or social capabilities of human groups. He accomplished his mission largely through his ceaseless, almost relentless articulation of the concept of culture'.... 'Boas, almost single-handedly, developed in America the concept of culture, which, like a powerful solvent, would in time expunge race from the literature of social science'....There is evidence that Boas strongly identified as a Jew and viewed his research as having important implications in the political arena and particularly in the area of immigration policy [that would benefit Jews]. Moreover, Boas was deeply alienated from and *hostile toward gentile culture*, particularly the cultural ideal of the Prussian aristocracy.... By 1915 the Boasians controlled the American Anthropological Association and held a two-thirds majority on the Executive Board (Stocking 1968, 285). By 1926 every major department of anthropology in the United States was headed by a student of Boas, the majority of whom

were Jewish. By the mid-1930s the Boasian view of the cultural determination of human behavior had a strong influence on social scientists generally....The ideology of racial equality was an important weapon on behalf of opening immigration up to all human groups."<sup>165</sup>

Over the next 40 years, there would be no challenge to the SSSM from evolutionists, psychologists, anthropologists, or any other discipline that dealt with human nature and individual or racial differences. To do so was to commit academic suicide. One by one, critics of Boas's Marxism were nullified by vilification. No one was left standing to dispute the Marxist/egalitarian agenda.

As I stated earlier, the 70's saw the beginning of a renewed interest in human nature based on new work being performed on evolutionary models, renewed interest in genetics, and work that had continued behind academic doors on the average differences in the intelligence of races. The Marxists had no choice but to form a defensive rear guard - they had no real answers to new and exciting discoveries. Their answer to the assaults was one of denial and ridicule, not testable counter hypotheses. Ruse states, " Social scientists surely were going to be made tense, and those for whom any kind of biological approach to humankind was highly suspect (especially Jews) were going to react negatively. And this is precisely what did happen, especially in America where these things were felt somewhat more deeply. Sociobiology, especially the human variety, was accused of just about every sin under the sun.... [Lewontin and Gould] were candid about what drove them. If Wilson's program works, then we are right back in the 1930s or earlier: 'Just as theories of innate differences arise from political issues, so my own interest in those theories arises not merely from their biological content but from political considerations as well. As I was growing up, Fascism was spreading in Europe, and with it theories of racial superiority. The impact of the Nazi use of biological arguments to justify mass murders and sterilization was enormous on my generation of high school students. The political misuses of science, and particularly of biology, were uppermost in our consciousness as we studied genetics, evolution, and race.'"<sup>166</sup>

So where do we go now? Well the Marxists are not going to give in, though they have begun to recant in some areas. Let's take for example the correlation between brain size and intelligence. It has been a debate for over 100 years, and it will not go away. Stephen Gould in his 1981 book, *The Mismeasure of Man*, dealt at length in ridiculing turn-of-the-century studies in cranial capacity and intelligence. He argued at length that the data was doctored because the different measurement by different scientists was all so similar - there must be a racist conspiracy afoot. However, when republished in 1996, *The Mismeasure of Man* conveniently left out all mention of brain size studies - Gould would not admit his errors.<sup>167</sup>

Graves however was unable to learn this lesson from Gould, and in 2001, he was still trying to suppress the brain-size/intelligence correlation.<sup>168</sup> He states that Neanderthals had larger brains than humans, inferring that it is somehow significant (they were larger than humans). Well, whales also have larger brains than humans do. He also states that if anyone raises a number of criticisms against any scientific theory, if just one of them stands then we can dismiss the theory in total. If that were true, we would have no theory of gravity either! All theories have some problematic areas, but it is the preponderance of the evidence that counts, until a better theory comes along. Graves is so desperate to deny race that he thinks that racists believe that skin color is an accurate predictor of intelligence and that since a certain genetic allele correlates with intelligence but it is also low in Whites means Whites must be stupid. I guess no one told him we do not know what genes are involved in intelligence and

furthermore it appears that there are many genes involved in general intelligence. Nevertheless, he will take these simplistic observations as his *proof* that races are alike.

Marxists just spend all of their time trying to find a minor flaw in an integrated approach to human nature, hoping to hold back the advances in evolutionary psychology, behavior genetics, and genetic engineering.

Fagan and Holland tried to produce a study to show that Blacks were as intelligent as Whites. First, they selected their samples from a group of college graduates (assumed to have similar intelligence) instead of randomly as would be required for such a study. Then they administered a test to see how the two groups compared in memorizing words. When the two groups show equivalent results, it was declared that there was no difference in the average intelligence between Blacks and Whites. The problem is, it has already been noted by Jensenists that Blacks do not differ that much from Whites in memorization, which is not highly loaded on general intelligence. Their motive then was not science, but trying to refute racial differences by sleight of hand.<sup>169</sup>

So how flexible are humans in comparison to other animals? Are we devoid of any human nature, as the sociologists want us to believe? "Anger and temper in the three-year-old children predicted their criminal behavior, antisocial personality disorder, suicide attempts, and alcohol dependence at 21 years. Unless we invoke time travel, hanging out with bad peer company did not provoke the three-year-olds to their temper tantrums."<sup>170</sup>

Dunbar states that, "This approach [the SSSM] assumes that each species has a characteristic way of behaving that is driven by one (or at most a few) key ecological or genetic variables. However, if the last 30 years of research on wild primates have taught us anything, they have taught us that primates are so supremely flexible in their behavior that it is almost meaningless to try to define the 'typical' anything for a species. The exemplary fieldwork carried out by Nicholas Davies at Cambridge University has emphasized that even the mating systems of birds can be surprisingly flexible. Obviously, each species' range of possibilities is constrained by its anatomic and neurological structures: no primate flies, for example. Features such as diet (which are heavily constrained by the anatomic design of both the gut and the teeth) are also surprisingly fluid: when pushed to the limit, even the most frugivorous of primate can get by on a diet of leaves - albeit with some difficulty, and only for a limited time. The short answer is that analogical models do not work; they are often misleading when applied to living nonhuman primates, let alone fossil hominids. A primate species comes into the world with a genetic inheritance that sketches out the broad pathways of its life style, but the details of what it actually does depend on local habitat-specific ecological and demographic conditions."<sup>171</sup>

Again later he explains, "Before we focus on primates, however, consider the following thumbnail ethnographic descriptions: *Case 1.* Two communities live along the northwest Pacific coast of North America. One subsists largely on marine mammals, such as seals and sea lions; the members hunt in small, silent parties, roving widely. The other community focuses on fish, especially schools of salmon; its members hunt in big noisy groups and stay close to home. Both societies speak the same language, but with distinct dialects that differ even from clan to clan. *Case 2.* Two populations live 250 kilometers apart, separated by high mountains. One group erects towers of glued sticks on a painted black mossy base, decorated in stereotyped style with black, brown, and gray snail shells, acorns, sticks, stones, and leaves. The other population erects woven-stick huts on an unpainted green mossy base, decorated with much individual variation, using fruits, flowers, fungus,

and butterfly wings, of every color imaginable except a few shades of brown, gray, and white. *Case 3*. Different groups colonized different types of forest, where they found little competition. The empty niches allowed remarkable innovation: these are the only societies known to build arboreal residences. Each group invented a range of efficient techniques to harvest staple foods, focused on the seeds of conifers. The processing techniques require social transmission from one generation to the next; youngsters deprived of such tradition would starve. None of these case studies is of humans. The first is not a society of seagoing canoe-hunters of marine vertebrates, such as the Kwakiutl, but are orcas, or killer whales. The second is not a highland New Guinean horticultural society such as the Eipo, but a population of bowerbirds. The third is not a seafaring, exploratory colonizer of uninhabited islands, such as the ancestral Polynesians, but black rats. The cautionary lesson intended here is that just because humans are primates, cultural processes need not be limited to primates, nor even to mammals."<sup>172</sup>

And again back to *The Adapted Mind*, "The recognition that a universal evolved psychology will produce variable manifest behavior given different environmental conditions exposes this argument as a complete non sequitur... In its place, the relevant distinction can be drawn between what Mayr (among others) called open and closed behavior programs (Mayr, 1976). This terminology distinguishes mechanisms that are open to factors that commonly vary in the organism's natural environment and, hence, commonly vary in their manifest expression from those that are closed to the influence of such factors and are, consequently, uniform in their manifest expression. The human language acquisition device is an open behavior program whose constructed product, adult competency in the local language, varies depending on the language community in which the individual is raised. Certain facial emotional displays that manifest themselves uniformly cross-culturally may be examples of closed behavior programs. The Standard Social Science Model's method of sorting behavior by its cross-cultural uniformity or variability of expression into 'biologically determined' and 'socially determined' categories in reality sorts behaviors into those generated by closed behavior programs, and those generated by open behavior programs. In neither case can the analysis of the 'determination' of behavior be made independent of 'biology,' that is, independent of understanding the participation of the evolved architecture. For this reason, the whole incoherent opposition between socially determined (or culturally determined) phenomena and biologically determined (or genetically determined) phenomena should be consigned to the dustbin of history, along with the search for a biology-free social science."<sup>173</sup>

So this leaves us asking, "where do we go from here?" It seems there will never be any reconciliation between the SSSM position and natural science. At this point in time it is a battle for the minds of people - promoting in academic circles multiculturalism, egalitarianism, and Marxism and hoping that not too many students will be exposed to any critical academic work in the area of human behavior. As for the rest of us, the same advocates will use the monopoly of the media to hammer home the same socialist dogma. Open debate between empiricists and Marxists in academia and in the media has ceased - Marxists are only interested in proselytizing the public to their cause. "There are now a collection of dialogues in the popular press between evolutionary psychologists and their critics. The discussions all seem to have the same form:

"Critics assert that evolutionary psychologists are wrong in believing behavior is genetically determined, that every aspect of the organism is an adaptation, and that discovering what informs what ought be.

"Evolutionary psychologists reply that they never made any of these claims, and document places where they claim precisely the reverse.

"The critics then reply that evolutionary psychologists are wrong in believing behavior is genetically determined, that every aspect of the organism is an adaptation, and that discovering what is informs what should be."<sup>174</sup>

## Chapter 4: Ethnocentrism and the Semitic Mind

"ETHNOCENTRISM: the feeling that one's group has a mode of living, values, and patterns of adaptation that are superior to those of other groups. It is coupled with a generalized contempt for members of other groups. Ethnocentrism may manifest itself in attitudes of superiority or sometimes hostility. Violence, discrimination, proselytizing, and verbal aggressiveness are other means whereby ethnocentrism may be expressed." (*The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed.)

The above definition of ethnocentrism is as good as any, but one should keep in mind that the concept itself is highly problematic - few have attempted to link "ethnocentrism" with actual "behavioral traits." In addition, racism has been used interchangeably with ethnocentrism. For that reason, I will mix the two terms and treat them as a singular construct, similar to a behavioral trait such as "extroversion." That is, I will assume that racism/ethnocentrism are both genetically based and culturally influenced.

To explore the topic of racism and the Semitic mind, I will be using primarily Kevin MacDonald's 1994 book, *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy*. This book and his second book of the trilogy published in 1998, *Separation and its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*, are both available now at <http://www.questia.com/>. I highly recommend this new site with its massive number of on-line books and journals for about \$15 per month. It is designed to help students write term- or research-papers, as well as providing an encyclopedic wealth of information or just a cheap way of reading books.

Tom Spears of the Ottawa Sun (12/21/2002) reports that researchers have found six distinct groups of sperm whales that speak to each other in different dialects. When these groups of sperm whales come in contact with each other, they will speak to other groups in their own dialect, but they do not interbreed. Their distinct dialects keep them genetically isolated. Could this be some strange form of whale racism?

In his 2002 book, *Darwin's Cathedral: Evolution, Religion, and the Nature of Society*, David Sloan Wilson states that the central thesis of his book is that, "Around the world and across history, religions have functioned as mighty engines of collective action for the production of benefits that all people want." An evolutionist like MacDonald, Wilson recognizes that evolutionary explanations of human behavior are powerful, robust, and falsifiable (what is lacking in most social science or religious studies).

In *Darwin's Cathedral*, he looks at Judaism along with several other religious examples, to show that religions that serve the needs of the group can be sustained over long periods. Judaism has the added uniqueness of a religion with a unique identity, maintained over thousands of years, and the history has been well documented. Wilson notes that, "The Ten Commandments are the



tip of an iceberg of commandments that, at least in their intent, regulate the behavior of group members in minute detail....Two facts stand out about what the People of Israel, as depicted in the Hebrew Bible, were instructed to do by their religion. First, they were instructed to be fruitful and multiply. Their religion told them to be biologically successful. Perhaps cultural evolution strays from biological evolution in other cases, but not in this case. Second, the People of Israel were provided with two sets of instructions, one for conduct among themselves and another for conduct toward members of other groups. That is the basic concept of the covenant between God and Abraham. Toward each other, the People of Israel were expected to practice the charity and collective action that we typically associate with Judaeo-Christian morality...."

This theme is apparent to any theological scholar: the Old Testament (the Jewish *Tanakh*) is a racist screed with the purpose of setting the Jewish race apart from its neighbors. It preaches that the Jewish god is theirs alone, not to be shared with anyone else; it preaches that the Jewish race is superior to all other groups; it preaches that God will reward the Jewish race with earthly riches if the Jews abide by the collectivist laws; and that eventually the Jewish race will reign supreme over all other races - God willing of course. It is an earthly religion that preaches racial separatism and racial supremacy.

Rush Limbaugh, the syndicated radio talk show host, likes to talk about the Judeo-Christian culture in the United States, especially since the "War on Terrorism" has become his focus. However, isn't the Christian God closer to Islam than Judaism? Both Islam and Christianity worship the same universalist God, a God that believes in proselytizing, brotherly love, and racial equality. As a eugenicist of course, I prefer the Jewish God that preaches, "be fruitful and multiply." Therefore, my critique of racial attitudes has little to do with morals or what is right, but tries to examine how it came about that Europeans have been accused of racism while all people of color - including Jews - have been assumed to be innocent. This is what I seek to explain.

In Deuteronomy 20:10-18, the Jews' genocidal God instructs this warrior race (at that time): "When you draw near to a town to fight against it, offer it terms of peace. If it accepts your terms of peace and surrenders to you, then all the people in it shall serve you at forced labor. If it does not submit to you peacefully, but makes war against you, then you shall besiege it; and when the LORD your God gives it into your hand, you shall put all its males to the sword. You may, however, take as your booty the women, the children, livestock, and everything else in the town, all its spoil. You may enjoy the spoil of your enemies, which the LORD your God has given you. Thus you shall treat all the towns that are very far from you, which are not the towns of the nations here. But as for the towns of these peoples that the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance, you must not let anything that breathes remain alive. You shall annihilate them - the Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites - just as the LORD your God has commanded, so that they may not teach you to do all the abhorrent things that they do for their Gods, and you thus sin against the LORD your God."

Wilson writes, "There is a widespread tendency to regard in-group morality as hypocritical, leading to a form of moral outrage that becomes especially intense when applied to Judaism. After all, isn't it the ultimate in hypocrisy for a religion to simultaneously preach the Golden Rule and instruct its members to commit genocide? This double standard is indeed hypocritical from a perspective that envisions all people within the same moral circle. I am being sincere when I say that this perspective is laudable, important to work toward in the future, and possible at least in principle to implement. However, it provides a poor theoretical foundation for

understanding the nature of religions and other moral systems as they exist today and in the past. As we have already seen, multilevel selection theory is uniquely qualified to predict both the benign nature of within-group morality and at least three forms of human conduct that appear immoral from various perspectives: conduct toward other groups, the enforcement of moral rules within groups, and the self-serving violation of moral rules within groups. Multilevel selection theory accounts for the double standard of the Hebrew Bible rather than merely reacting to it as hypocritical. No other theoretical framework fits the well-known facts of Judaism and other religions so well, or so I claim.

"Although the double standard of the Hebrew Bible is typical of religions and ethnic groups in general, Judaism is more remarkable in other respects. Most cultures and ethnic groups last for mere centuries before disappearing as recognizable entities by mingling with other cultures and ethnic groups. In contrast, Judaism has maintained its cultural identity for thousands of years against the greatest possible odds, as the religion of a landless people dispersed among many nations. It is easy to explain the persistence of a culture that is protected by military might or geographical barriers, but something about Judaism has proved stronger than the sword or even mountain ranges and oceans. Two questions need to be asked: First, how did Jewish communities remain culturally isolated within their host nations? Second, given their cultural isolation, how did Jewish communities survive despite frequent persecution?"

The Jewish experiment started in Egypt and then flourished in Babylon. This three-thousand-year-old religion, experimented, dabbled, and stumbled upon a formula that would sustain them very well indeed at certain times and in certain places. The Jewish formula was mathematically worked out by W. D. Hamilton in his 1975 paper, "Innate social attitudes of man: an approach from evolutionary genetics." Hamilton showed that evolutionary group strategies are successful when the benefits from altruism towards kin outweigh the individual's loss, including the ultimate sacrifice of one's life. The Jewish strategy is easily observed in Hamilton's description of group evolutionary strategies for both humans and animals.

When the Jews were in Egypt, they inserted themselves between the ruling class and the masses, acting as a tight, cohesive, and literate tribe that became wealthy by acting collectively. When they were exiled to Babylon about 2600 years ago, they polished up their religious/tribal strategy in religious texts that have been used since then to produce a religion that is "this worldly." From that time on, since Babylon, they would become a people that would live amongst others, but never mixing with them, to keep the tribe cohesive - they would henceforth act as a group to increase wealth at the expense of other people.

The formula "be fruitful and multiply," along with universal education or literacy, made the Jews highly valuable in a world that was illiterate. The small number of Jews in each community or nation, could make themselves very useful to the nobility by providing them with services that were unique - they were highly educated and therefore useful where few others could count, keep books, etc. along with a willingness to act against those who were subordinated by the ruling class. That is, the Jews were often times intermediaries between the rulers and the ruled. With strong altruistic bonds for their own race, they were willing and quite motivated to take advantage of non-Jews, or even other Jews that were more genetically distant.

Group evolutionary strategies are not all-or-nothing. Jews do compete aggressively between themselves, between families, and between larger Jewish groups. Their ethnocentrism is not clearly delineated between Jew and gentile. It is a matter of relatedness that is prevalent in the

ethnocentrism we all have. First family, then kin, then nation and finally the rest of the world. However, the Jewish religion is specifically designed to encourage tribal loyalty while encouraging hostility towards others. Moreover, the hostility had to be cloaked and controlled.

If Jews were going to live amongst others while taking advantage of them, it is obvious that they would be occasionally persecuted for their behavior, and indeed, they were. Their entire history is one of spectacular success and growth followed by persecution and slaughter. The fundamentals of this cycle are played out repeatedly from the Egyptian Exodus to the Holocaust - Jews seen as immoral, greedy, and racially different.

This cycle of success followed by persecutions had another interesting side effect. It was the perfect formula for a eugenics' program that operated somewhat like this. First, as a people always on the move, a few would establish themselves in a new region of the world. I will use Europe as an example. From genetic studies, we now know that about 70 A.D. a small number of Jewish (males mostly) moved into Europe and established themselves by marrying local females. But quickly the barriers went up, "Once again, it is important to remember that Judaism, like other major religious traditions, exists in many specific versions that vary along a spectrum from extreme separation to extreme accommodation. This spectrum has existed throughout the history of Judaism in addition to the present day, as I will describe in more detail in chapters 5 and 6. Nevertheless, the strictest and strongest versions of Judaism can accurately be described as cultural fortresses that kept outsiders out and insiders in. The degree to which Jewish communities were isolated from their host cultures is even reflected at the level of gene frequencies. Population genetics data allow this fact to be determined with a high degree of certainty: Jewish populations from around the world are genetically more similar to each other and to the Middle Eastern population from which they were derived than to the populations among which they currently reside (Wilson 2002)."

With these racist enclaves in place, the Jews practiced foremost selection for high intelligence. Every male was expected to excel at learning, and those that excelled the most would be married to daughters of wealthy men. It was the perfect solution for bringing together the brightest couples to have ever-increasing intelligent children. Wealthy men were more intelligent on average, as would be their daughters, and the Jewish males were just given a life-long intelligence test to pick out the smartest. In addition, arranged marriages based on a person's good looks were considered improper.

"Judaism existed before the advent of Christianity and Islam, which were designed to grow by conversion. It has always been possible to convert to Judaism (the Hebrew Bible provides numerous examples) but only with great difficulty. In a sense, this is exactly what Iannaccone would predict for a church that wants to remain strong by forcing its new members to demonstrate their commitment. Many religious sects are hard to join. Fraternity rites and high membership costs for exclusive clubs provide examples for nonreligious groups. However, these organizations usually seek new members, however demanding their initiation procedure. In contrast, Jewish communities almost never sought converts, even though they would accept them. Evidently there are no examples of Jewish missionaries or texts written to recruit outsiders to the faith. In addition, Jewish law sometimes accorded inferior status to converts (Wilson 2002)."

So here, we have numerous small Jewish groups living among other races of people, openly hostile to and keeping separate from them, while demanding high levels of altruism and

community conformity among themselves. "Cooperative groups robustly out-compete less cooperative groups. If Jewish communities were exceptionally cooperative by virtue of their religion, compared to the societies with which they interacted, this would give them an advantage in any endeavor that requires coordinated action. Their survival amidst other nations - at least in the absence of persecution - would be assured (Wilson 2002)."

Eugenics, as any breeder knows, is a simple matter of interbreeding for the qualities desired for, and for Jews the two most outstanding selected traits were intelligence and ethnocentrism. Conscientiousness was obviously necessary: the grueling hours of studying would not be tolerated by individuals without it - and the expression of ethnocentrism may enhanced by high levels of conscientiousness. The development of conscientiousness is a necessary component of acting collectively for the benefit of the tribe. Over thousands of years then, this cycle of selecting for intelligence and ethnocentrism has made the Jews the most intelligent race - but also the most ethnocentric. The cycles of prosperity (reproductive success) and persecutions (death or desertion) made sure of that.

Jews have also practiced a high level of inbreeding, with arranged marriages between nieces and uncles and between cousins. This type of accelerated eugenic breeding program can be deleterious as well as beneficial. In fact, the best type of selective breeding program is inbreeding followed by occasional outbreeding, and then starting the cycle over again. In this way, the genes for intelligence and ethnocentrism could be rapidly selected for by inbreeding, with deleterious recessive gene problems ameliorated through occasional outbreeding with less closely related Jews.

Of course, any eugenic breeding population, while selecting for certain traits needs a means of de-selecting also. Antisemitism has been with the Jews for thousands of years, and it took care of the de-selection problem. The less intelligent and the less committed (the dumb and less racist Jews) were either allowed to defect, forced to defect, or were more easily killed during massacres. That is, the more the Jews were persecuted, the more they could select for the very traits that made them anathema to those they lived with.

"I hope it is obvious that these acts are morally reprehensible, although dismayingly typical of between-group interactions in general. In the aftermath of World War II, psychologists made it an urgent priority to understand why people so easily adopt the kind of us/them mentality that allows atrocities such as the Holocaust to occur. Jewish psychologists such as Henri Tajfel, himself a Holocaust survivor, were at the forefront of this movement, which became known as social identity theory. The main conclusion to emerge was that us/them thinking can be triggered extremely easily in normal people. The seeds of genocide are within all of us.

"Social identity theory was developed in the optimistic spirit that science can help improve the human condition, despite its often sobering conclusions. Multilevel selection theory is the perfect compliment to social identity theory and needs to be approached in the same spirit. It provides the deep evolutionary explanation for why us/them thinking is so easy to invoke in normal people. It reveals the fault lines of moral reasoning that cause people to commit unspeakable acts with a clear conscience. These are not pleasant thoughts, but they must be confronted to discover practical solutions that do, in principle, exist. One purpose of this book is to argue that cultural evolution is an ongoing process capable of discovering genuinely new solutions, even out of old parts. When it comes to evolution, the fact that something hasn't happened before is a poor

argument that it can't happen in the future. Let us now return to the subject of Judaism in this constructive spirit (Wilson 2002)."

The cycle of Jewish expansion and contraction took place at many levels, from individuals in a village (individual selection) to the elimination of entire Jewish populations (group selection). Nonetheless, when Jews did come under attack, the wealthiest were more likely to survive than the less wealthy - they could bribe their way out of harms way. In addition, only the most committed would stay and suffer the many persecutions - less committed Jews bailed out. "The history of Judaism can be interpreted even more plausibly as a process of ongoing cultural and even genetic group selection, in which Jewish communities that fail to exhibit solidarity disappear, leaving the survivors to expand and create new communities. It would be extraordinary if the tragic persecution of Jewish communities over the last two thousand years did not result in a form of group-level selection (Wilson 2002)."

The Jews did not do as well in the Middle East as they did in Europe. In the Middle East, they were surrounded by their own kind, the Semitic people who evolved over at least 10,000 years in a densely populated part of the world, and it resulted in selection for high levels of ethnocentrism, tribalism or racism. Tribal warfare selected for group cohesion or racism. (We can see this tribalism at work today in Afghanistan where nation-building is virtually impossible.) When equally ethnocentric tribes came into contact with Jews, the Jews were suppressed, and they did not attain the high level of genetic intelligence as the European Jewish communities. That is, the Jews in the Middle East did not go through endless cycles of expansion, oppression and genocide. They were kept in an oppressed state without the resources available to set up the schools and system of eugenic selection that was available in Europe. The European Jews (Ashkenazi) have attained today an average general intelligence of 117, an astounding level considering that the average throughout the world is about 90 (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002).

Jews in Europe however did prosper through a strategy that worked quite often, with occasional setbacks. "Jewish history is not as simple as a displaced people struggling to survive amidst hostile neighbors. Jewish groups survived and even prospered through specific activities and relationships with different elements of their host nations. From a purely actuarial standpoint, periods of prosperity were required to balance the catastrophic declines caused by persecution. A common pattern was for Jews to form an alliance with one gentile segment of the host nation, usually the ruling elite, to exploit another gentile segment, such as the peasantry (Wilson 2002)."

The above was the pattern in Europe more than in the Middle East. Europeans evolved over the last 40,000 years in a sparsely populated and often glaciated environment. This ecological niche made individualism, universal altruism, and cooperation with neighbors much more valuable than warfare. As a result, Northern Europeans have exceptionally low levels of ethnocentrism or innate racism compared to other races. This made the Jewish exploitation of the Europeans easy, until the hostilities occasionally boiled over into conflict. Even with low levels of innate racism, Europeans would eventually rebel against outsiders taking advantage of them.

A cultural difference also existed between the European Christians and their Jewish guests, "Even Judaism, the religion from which Christianity is derived, focuses more on establishing the nation of Israel on earth than on what happens after death. Belief in a wonderful heaven must therefore be explained by a different set of principles than a general desire to explain the world and to obtain scarce resources. In his analysis of Christianity, Stark (1996, 80-81) emphasizes the

*secular utility* of belief in the afterlife, as *an adaptation to a particular environment*, quoting with approval the following passage from McNeill (1976, 108): 'Another advantage Christians enjoyed over pagans was that the teachings of their faith made life meaningful even amid sudden and surprising death.... Even a shattered remnant of survivors who had somehow made it through war or pestilence or both could find warm, immediate and healing consolation in the vision of a heavenly existence for those missing relatives and friends.... Christianity was, therefore, a system of thought and feeling thoroughly adapted to a time of troubles in which hardship, disease, and violent death commonly prevailed (Wilson 2002).'"

Life for Christians, under the thumb of feudalism, was tough enough without having the Jews insert themselves into the mix to gain wealth on the backs of the poor. Is it any wonder that antisemitism was so enduring for so long? As an earthly religion - obsessed with wealth, reproduction, and dominance over others - how could Jews be viewed with tolerance except by the elite who used the Jews to exploit the poor?

As Hamilton pointed out, the greater the genetic distance between groups, the greater the competition. Group-hunting carnivores pushed the need for collective cooperation during "the hunt" - only close kin could be depended upon. This is true for humans and for animals. Moreover, it is the basis for ethnocentrism or racism - there is no mechanism in the human species for universal cooperation. Cooperation has only come about due to language and culture - those general intelligence abilities that can at times suppress human group genocides.

An interesting example of group evolutionary strategies may be unfolding before our very eyes. Clonaid Has just announced the birth of the first cloned child. Whether this is true or not, this development shows how groups can be formed and how they can be genetically different from those around them. Clonaid Is funded by the Raelians, a religion that was formed based on the belief that humans were put here by aliens, and that by using genetic engineering it is possible to clone ourselves and to then "transport" our brains continuously from our aging bodies into our younger cloned bodies. Overwhelmingly, the public opposes cloning of humans. What this means is, that there is a real difference in the behavioral traits of the average Raelian and the rest of society.

As a group then, if the Raelians grow as an earthly religion like Judaism, and if they desire to live forever because they do not believe in a religious hear-after, and since genetic engineering requires a great deal of money, they may be the next successful group that will displace a more conservative one - or the status quo. It seems to me that these people have a common set of behavioral traits - they are not afraid of perpetual life, they desire wealth, pleasure, and technological progress. This formulation is not unlike that of Judaism. In addition, if the Raelians do find that they have a lot in common genetically, even though they are not racially exclusive, they could very well be creating a new race via the founder effect. That is, a small group of people who are cohesively genetically-different in some meaningful way from others.

For me, focusing on the Jewish evolutionary strategy has several purposes. First, it shows that a eugenic religion is possible because we have one as an example - Judaism. In addition, what is so exciting about it is how easy it was. Jews used what was common knowledge at the time about races and the differences between races, they discovered a useful tool - universal education, and they set down an earthly set of rules for behavior that gave them an advantage over other groups who they competed with.

Second, there is a need to show that part of the Jewish strategy has been to manipulate the host cultures they lived with. That is, as a group that lived off the labor of their hosts, what we would today call disparate outcomes because the Jews were far wealthier than the people they lived with, they had to "live the lie." Jews believe they are superior to all other races, that this superiority was mandated by God, that their God was only for the Jews, and that the Jews therefore were the natural born rulers of the earth. That is a racially explosive position to take, so within Judaism is an intellectual arm of apologia - or a formal defense or justification for their beliefs and actions.

This strategy, over the last fifty years, has worked best among Whites. As stated above, we are virtually defenseless against more ethnocentric groups to the point where Whites can easily be shamed into yielding to their demands. MacDonald explains this dilemma: Whites will apply universal moralism - even against their own kin. If they believe there was a wrong, they will punish their own kin or race even more than other races. All that has to be done is to make them believe that they have behaved badly. So today, Whites, not understanding how they are manipulated, have come to adopt affirmative action, multiculturalism, and egalitarian positions to the detriment of Whites in general.

Only in the West, do we invite in and support immigrants from around the world. Only in the West, do we give preferences to other races over our own. Only in the West, do we go to war not for profit but for moral causes that have no benefit for us. Only in the West, are we willing to give up much of our wealth and share it with genetic strangers. Only in the West, do Whites condemn other Whites for being racists. Only in the West, do we have Whites who celebrate the day that we will be a minority in our own land. Only in the West, are White males singled out and separated from White females as loathsome and despicable racists - Neanderthals who may have no hope of redemption.

MacDonald has detailed the strategy used by Jews to turn Whites against themselves, over the last 100 years, in his third book on Jewish group evolutionary strategies, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Praeger press 1998; 1<sup>st</sup> Books Library 2002). Entering the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the American people were influenced in their opinions by military, religious, and corporate spokespersons. That slowly changed such that mass-opinion and our values have been molded by government, academia, and the media - all powerfully influenced by Jewish interests.

### **The Jewish race: Exodus (1300 to 1600 B.C.) to 18<sup>th</sup> Century Enlightenment.**

(Unless stated otherwise, all quotes in the following will be from *A People That Shall Dwell Alone* by Kevin MacDonald, 1994.)

*A People That Shall Dwell Alone* is an academic book, and was reviewed by a long list of evolutionists, et al. before publication. For this reason, I will be replacing some scientific terms by more common terms in [square brackets] to make the quotes more readable. In addition, I have left the references to sources in, to fully reflect that most of the material that MacDonald uses is from Jewish sources. Also, since this book is available on-line at Questia, any deletions, footnotes, or out of context quotes can be easily checked by merely searching for the words and checking out the original text.

"This project attempts to develop an understanding of Judaism based on modern social and biological sciences. It is, broadly speaking, a successor to the late-19th-century effort to develop

... a scientific understanding of Judaism. The fundamental paradigm derives from evolutionary biology, but there will also be a major role for the theory and data derived from several areas of psychology, including especially the social psychology of group behavior.

"In the present volume, the basic focus will be the attempt to adduce evidence relevant to the question of whether Judaism can reasonably be viewed as a group evolutionary strategy. The basic proposal is that Judaism can be interpreted as a set of ideological structures and behaviors that have resulted in the following features: (1) the segregation of the Jewish gene pool from surrounding gentile societies as a result of active efforts to prevent the influx of gentile-derived genes; (2) resource and reproductive competition between Jews and gentiles; (3) high levels of within-group cooperation and altruism among Jews; and (4) eugenic efforts directed at producing high intelligence, high-investment parenting, and commitment to group, rather than individual, goals.

"I believe that there is no sense in which this book may be considered anti-Semitic. This book and its companion volume are intended to stand or fall on their merits as scientific works. This implies an attempt on my part at developing a scientifically valid account of Judaism. Nevertheless, one cannot read very far in Jewish history without being aware that historical data do not exist in a theoretically pristine state in which they lend themselves to only one interpretation. While by no means always the case, the historiography of Jewish history has to an extraordinary degree been characterized by apologia [a series of apologies for Jewish behavior] and a clear sense of personal involvement by both Jews and gentiles, and this has been the case from the very earliest periods in classical antiquity. There is therefore considerable controversy about key issues in the history of Judaism which are of great importance to an evolutionary perspective. Jewish history, more so than any other area I am familiar with, has been to a considerable extent a social construction performed by highly interested parties intent on vindicating very basic moral and philosophical beliefs about the nature of Judaism, Christianity, and gentile society generally.

"Indeed, I would suggest that the very fact that the history of Judaism represents such a minefield for an evolutionary theorist (or any theorist) attempting to understand Judaism is itself an important fact about this endeavor that is highly compatible with an evolutionary perspective on Judaism: Theories of Judaism often reflect the interests of their proponents. These issues are discussed extensively in the companion volume, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (MacDonald 1998). The only point here is to say that, like any other scientific account, this one is open to rational, logical debate....

"Nevertheless, the proposal here is that it is possible to provide an account of Judaism that fits quite well with the idea that Judaism is an evolutionary group strategy and to do so by relying on a substantial body of scholarly research in the field of Jewish history, the vast majority of which has been written by Jews themselves....

" Besides social controls, another theoretically important feature of the present treatment is the proposal that the religious ideology of Judaism is essentially a blueprint for a group evolutionary strategy (see Chapter 3). The point here is that although ideology often rationalizes evolutionary goals, it is [inconclusive] by evolutionary theory. Ideologies, like group strategies generally, may be viewed as 'hopeful monsters' whose adaptiveness is an empirical matter....



"The main reasons for supposing that ideologies in general are [inconclusive] by evolutionary theory are that (1) ideologies often characterize an entire society (or, in this case, the subculture of Judaism), and (2) ideologies are often intimately intertwined with various social controls. In the case of Judaism, and as described in Chapters 3-6, these social controls act within the Jewish community to enforce the stated ideological goals of maintaining internal cohesion, preventing marriage with gentiles, enforcing altruistic behavior toward other Jews, and excluding those who fail to conform to group goals. To the extent that an ideology characterizes an entire group, it becomes insensitive to individual self-interest, and to the extent that it is reinforced by social controls, it is possible that individuals who do not benefit from adopting the ideology will be socialized to do so. This is especially important because the thesis here is that Judaism is an altruistic group strategy in which the interests of individuals are subservient to the interests of the group (see especially Chapter 6)."

What fascinates me about the Jewish evolutionary group strategy is that in order to work, several themes had to be played out over and over again. As will be shown later, the Jews have a history of several thousand years of logical debate, analysis, and pondering over great issues and meaningless issues alike. Yet today, when it comes to issues like intermarriage for example, they have no hesitation in promoting others doing it while they try to maintain their own racial purity - what they call the "silent holocaust." That is, in a multicultural society, Jews are starting to intermarry increasingly, while their co-religionists try to prevent it.

Another example is the debate over the Black-White intelligence difference and whether it is partly genetic or not. On the one hand, the Jews have proclaimed for thousands of years that they are the smartest and best scholars, and yet now they are at the forefront in denying that general mental ability is about 80% genetic, as numerous studies have pointed out. In fact, they have lost this battle of promoting radical environmentalism to the point that they do not even try to provide research to prove it is the environment rather than our genes that make us smart, they have had to resort to calling anyone who discusses it "racist."

It seems to me that the only way that most Jews can hold so many contradictory positions is simply this - they have become a race that is low in open-mindedness and high in authoritarianism, ethnocentrism, and innate paranoia. They literally have no choice - they must hold numerous contradictions in order to maintain their positions as they see it for the benefit of the tribe.

Note that I am not saying that Europeans (Euros) are more rational than Jews, only that at the highest levels of academia and politics, Euros are far more scientific - far fewer of them take up Marxist, deconstructionist, egalitarian, and other indefensible empirical positions. These irreconcilable or unscientific disciplines are almost entirely of a Jewish nature.

"Thus, for example, if living as a minority among the Egyptians during the original sojourn recounted in Genesis and Exodus had resulted in a large increase in wealth and population, a similar diaspora strategy might be viewed as viable in the future - a point that we shall return to in Chapter 8 when I attempt to develop an evolutionary perspective on the origins of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. The success of such a diaspora strategy could not have been foreseen with certainty, and its success may well not have been known beforehand by its participants, but given the early indications of success, it would be rational to continue the strategy.

"An evolutionary group strategy thus may be conceived, at least partly (see below), as an 'experiment in living,' rather than as the determinate outcome of natural selection acting on human populations or the result of ecological contingencies acting on universal human genetic propensities. Supporting these experiments in living are ideological structures that explain and rationalize the group strategy, including the social controls utilized by the strategy.

"Social controls in the service of achieving internal discipline (such as, for example, preventing exploitation by cheaters or non-cooperators) are theoretically important for the development of a successful altruistic group evolutionary strategy (D. S. Wilson 1989; see below). But there is no reason why an experiment in living must include such controls. One could perfectly well imagine a group strategy in which there were no provisions at all to exclude cheaters and exploiters. Such a strategy would presumably fail in the long run, just as Alexander's (1979) celibate religious sect failed. But that is not the point. Experiments are experiments: Some are successful and well designed, and others are not. The evidence reviewed in later chapters suggests that Judaism has survived as a group evolutionary strategy (albeit with several important changes) at least since the Babylonian captivity [2600 years ago]. If this is so, there is the implication that it has been a well-designed evolutionary strategy."

Simply put, the Jews stumbled upon a system of laws and behaviors that were so successful first in Egypt and then in Babylon that they continued to practice it. A racially pure group, living among other races, they used their solidarity to enrich themselves as a group, even if some members occasionally suffered at the hands of anti-Semites. To do this, they had to take up residence in the lands of other nations, in small enough numbers not to be persecuted by the illiterate masses that saw Jews as exploiters. This precarious existence or strategy then was not hatched in some grand plan, it was just stumbled upon and then enhanced as time went on, and modified as needed to keep the community unified while keeping the lowly Gentile masses from routinely slaughtering them or expelling them more often than they already were.

"In summary, Judaism is here considered fundamentally as a cultural invention that is underdetermined by evolutionary/ecological theory and whose adaptiveness is an empirical question. However, it does not follow that there are no biological predispositions at all for developing the type of group evolutionary strategy represented by Judaism. In Chapter 8, I suggest that the ancient Israelites were genetically predisposed to be high on a cluster of psychological traits centering around group allegiance, cultural separatism, ethnocentrism, concern with [inbreeding], and a collectivist, authoritarian social structure. Evidence cited there indicates that these tendencies are very strong among widely dispersed Jewish groups in traditional societies and that they appear to be more common among other Near Eastern peoples compared to [Euro] Western societies. Further, it is suggested that Judaism itself resulted in a 'feed-forward' selection process in which Jewish groups become increasingly composed of individuals who are genetically and [behaviorally] predisposed to these traits."

The level of ethnocentrism or racism several thousands of years ago was a continuum, with the most northerly races in Europe having the least, and the Semites the most - racism. As populations mixed between these two extremes then there is a gradual increase in racism from a low level in Scandinavian races to a high level in the Semitic races. (We need to look at other races such as Africans and Asians as soon as we can locate the cluster of behavioral ingredients that make up ethnocentrism from known behavioral traits.) MacDonald's second point above is that once Judaism was in place, it also had eugenic consequences that increased the innate levels of racism in Jews over other races - it became an advantageous genetic quality that improved the

group's cohesiveness while holding hostile and exploitative attitudes towards outsiders. Having no remorse in exploiting the labors of other people of a different race can have important economic rewards for the exploiters. Euros in the United States had slavery, but they were also the ones who ended it. It was not felt to be morally justifiable and Euros slaughtered each other during the civil war to end slavery - a race divided upon itself.

"Human plasticity, which also includes mechanisms such as various forms of learning, provides a mechanism such that humans can adapt to environmental uncertainty and lack of recurring structure within a finite range. The point here is that societies and subcultures are able to take advantage of this plasticity and manipulate their own environments in order to produce adaptive [behaviors]. In the case of Judaism, it will be argued in Chapter 7 that both eugenic practices (taking advantage of human genetic variation) and manipulation of environments (taking advantage of human plasticity) have been enshrined in religious ideology and intensively practiced. By manipulating environments in this manner, Judaism has been able to develop a highly specialized group strategy, which has often been highly adaptive in resource competition within stratified human societies....

"At a theoretical level, therefore, a group strategy does not require a genetic barrier between the strategizing group and the rest of the population. Group evolutionary strategies may be viewed as ranging from completely genetically closed (at the extreme end of which there is no possibility of genetic penetration by surrounding populations) to genetically open (at the extreme end of which there is completely random mating). In the case of Sparta, membership in the group of Spartan citizens was hereditary, and there is no indication of any interbreeding between the Spartans and the Helots [slaves] (see MacDonald 1988a, 301ff). In the case of Judaism, evidence will be provided in Chapter 2 that in fact there have been significant genetic barriers between Jews and gentiles, and in Chapters 3 and 4, it will be shown that these barriers were actively maintained by a variety of cultural barriers erected by Jews against significant gentile penetration of the Jewish gene pool. The evidence provided there indicates that through the vast majority of its history Judaism has been near the completely genetically closed end of this continuum."

In short, Judaism could have been a group evolutionary strategy without its racist policies. That is, if it was a universalist religion, it could have openly encouraged the most intelligent and committed people in society to join their group, and they could still have had maybe even a more successful group strategy - they wouldn't have been perceived as being different from others. In fact, this is the approach of new eugenic movements now sprouting up on the Internet. Some are racially exclusive, but most are at least loosely defined racially. That is, racial purity is not an issue - and genealogies are only of interest with regards to genetic qualities.

"In the case of Judaism, the central [Jewish authority] of the system of self-government in the diaspora provided a powerful mechanism for excluding Jews (often termed 'informers') who failed to conform to group goals by, for example, collaborating with gentiles against the interests of the Jewish community or who engaged in behavior such as dishonest business practices with gentiles that was likely to lead to anti-Semitism. Moreover, as indicated in Chapters 4 and 6, there were strong community sanctions on individuals (and their families) who violated group norms against intermarriage with gentiles, socialized with gentiles, patronized businesses owned by gentiles, or attempted to bid against other Jews who owned franchises obtained from gentiles....

"In the case of Judaism, the material reviewed in Chapters 5-7 indicates that there were indeed powerful forces that tended to minimize conflict of interest within the Jewish community, including economic cooperation and patronage and high levels of charity. Nevertheless, the data do not indicate that Judaism has typically been characterized by a high degree of social and political egalitarianism. Rather, the historical record suggests that Judaism for much of its history has been characterized by the development of a highly competent elite who acted in the interests of the entire group and whose wealth came ultimately not from exploiting other Jews, but as a result of economic transactions with the gentile community."

Gentiles have no equivalent to this group exploitation based on a religion. I can't think of any mainstream Christian religion that uses a central authority to make its members buy from each other, while encouraging their members to exploit other groups. Only Judaism does this and I maintain that they still do. They no longer have a central authority to enforce conformity to pursuing group goals, and many of them defect and are secularists (in fact most), but as a group they are still highly racist in their interactions with Gentiles where it counts - such as support for immigration, hostility to Protestant culture, or support for Israel. Most of them will march to the collectivist tune rather than feel the wrath of their kin for any transgressions.

"The strategizing group can engage in intragroup eugenic practices for traits conducive to the successful pursuit of the ecological role. (The Spartans practiced infanticide against any weak or sickly children. Significantly, the decision was made not by the parents, but by the central authorities - another indication of the privileged position of group interests over individual interests.)"

Later we will look at Jewish eugenic practices that today would be called coercive and beyond the pale ethically. And yet, two of the most successful group evolutionary strategies did just that - the state decided who would live, marry, and breed for the betterment of the tribe. (The Spartans through warfare eventually self-destructed from constant battles, but the strategy was successful in terms of wealth, social control, and conquest - while it lasted.) It is my contention that eugenics can be coercive and yet be very successful in terms of improving the betterment of the members' lives. I will elaborate on how this can be done later on.

"These twelve statements are related to five theoretically significant independent dimensions relevant to conceptualizing human group structure in evolutionary terms: (1) a dimension ranging from complete voluntarism, in which the strategizing group voluntarily adopts its strategy, at one extreme to complete coercion, in which the group is forced to adopt significant aspects of its strategy, at the other; (2) a dimension ranging from complete genetic closure, in which the group is closed to penetration from other individuals or groups, at one extreme to complete genetic openness (panmixia), at the other; (3) a dimension ranging from high levels of within-group altruism and submergence of individual interest to group interests at one extreme to complete within-group selfishness at the other; (4) a dimension ranging from high between-group resource and reproductive competition at one extreme to very little between-group resource and reproductive competition at the other; and (5) a dimension ranging from high levels of ecological specialization at one extreme to ecological generalization at the other. It is proposed that human group evolutionary strategies vary along all of these dimensions independently.

"Because of the lack of theoretical strictures on human group evolutionary strategies, the structure of this volume will reflect the need to provide empirical evidence regarding the status

of Judaism on these five dimensions. Although qualifications to these propositions will be necessary at various points in the argument, the burden of this essay will be to show that historical Judaism can be reasonably conceptualized as follows: (1) Judaism is a self-imposed, non-coerced evolutionary strategy, although at times anti-Semitic actions have had effects that dovetailed with Judaism as an evolutionary strategy; (2) Judaism is a fairly closed group strategy in which much effort has been devoted to resisting genetic assimilation with surrounding populations, and, moreover, this effort has been substantially successful; (3) Jews have typically engaged in resource and reproductive competition with gentile societies, often successfully; (4) there is a significant (but limited) degree of within-group altruism, traditionally enforced by powerful social controls and always enshrined in religious ideology; and (5) there is a significant degree of role specialization, specifically specialization for a role in society above the level of primary producer characterized by cultural and eugenic practices centered around intelligence, the personality trait of conscientiousness, high-investment parenting, and group allegiance.

"At a fundamental level, a closed group evolutionary strategy for behavior within a larger human society, as proposed here for Judaism, may be viewed as pseudospeciation: Creation of a closed group evolutionary strategy results in a gene pool that becomes significantly segregated from the gene pool of the surrounding society."

By pseudospeciation, MacDonald is stating that due to racial purity, social isolation, and building particular social and economic niches for themselves - along with eugenics - that the Jews have been and continue to drift further from the norm of the human species. Many people are fond of saying, "there is just one race, the human race." Not only is this absurd, but with genetic engineering and using Judaism as a model, we can readily see that because of culture, humans can be engaged in socially constructed speciation. That is, there will most assuredly be more than one human species in the future as evolution rapidly accelerates through genetic engineering.

"The present thesis that Judaism is an evolutionary strategy does not rely on the proposition that Jews represent a distinct race. The minimal requirement for the present theory of Judaism as a fairly closed group strategy is that there be genetic gradients between well-defined groups of Jews and gentiles within particular societies that are maintained by cultural practices. It is the genetic gradient and the coincident competition between significantly different gene pools that are of interest to the evolutionist. Clearly, such a proposal is compatible with some genetic admixture from the surrounding populations. However, an evolutionary perspective must also consider the hypothesis that widely dispersed Jewish populations have significantly more genetic commonality than local Jewish populations have with their gentile co-habitants, since this hypothesis is relevant to developing an evolutionary theory of the patterns of altruism and cooperation among widely scattered Jewish populations."

---

"It should be noted at the outset that there are good reasons to suppose that there will be some differentiation of the Jewish gene pool among the different Jewish groups of the diaspora. These groups were separated, in many cases for two millennia or more, so that, even in the absence of genetic admixture with surrounding populations, one would expect that genetic drift as well as natural selection resulting, for example, from differences in climate or parasites, would begin to differentiate these populations genetically. Regarding genetic drift, the high frequencies of recessive disorders among Jewish populations and the fact that recessive disorders tend to be unique to particular communities strongly suggest that Jewish populations have been susceptible to founder effects and genetic drift (Chase & McKusick 1972; Fraikor 1977; Mourant, Kopec, &

Domaniewska-Sobczak 1978). The general picture is that Jewish communities often originated with a very few families who married within the group, typically with high levels of inbreeding (see Chapters 4 and 8).

"There is also evidence that selection within the diaspora environment has been important in differentiating Jewish populations. Thus, Motulsky (1977b, 425) proposes that, given the clear evidence for the genetic distinctiveness of the Ashkenazi gene pool, the resemblance in physical characteristics and the ABO blood group between the Ashkenazim and the gentile European population is due to convergent selection (see also below). Lenz (1931, 667-668) suggests that the phenotypic resemblance of Jews to the local gentile population may arise from natural and sexual selection for individuals who resembled the local population, just as different species of butterflies may come to resemble each other. It is thus theoretically possible that a fairly small set of genes promoting phenotypic similarity could be amplified via natural selection within Jewish populations without precluding a large overall genetic distance between Jewish and gentile gene pools.

"Selective processes within far-flung Jewish communities might also lead to genetic divergence between them. For example, in Chapter 7, data are discussed indicating a great deal of assortative mating for traits related to intelligence, high-investment parenting, and group cohesion within Jewish communities. Although eugenic selection for a common [behavior or appearance] may result in selection for the same genes, this certainly need not be the case, since different Jewish populations may accrue different genetic mutations related to intelligence as well as different genes resulting from low levels of genetic admixture with local gentile populations. Supporting this possibility, Eldridge (1970; see also Eldridge & Koerber 1977) suggests that a gene causing primary torsion dystonia, which occurs at high levels among Ashkenazi Jews, may have a heterozygote advantage because of beneficial effects on intelligence. Further supporting the importance of selective processes, eight of the 11 genetic diseases found predominantly among Ashkenazi Jews involve the central nervous system, and three are closely related in their biochemical effects (see Goodman 1979, 463)....

"The data reviewed in Chapter 4 indicate that in fact there have been low levels of gentile proselytism to Judaism over the centuries, and Patai and Patai (1989) suggest that the rape of Jewish women by gentiles as well as the illicit affairs of Jewish women with gentile men may also have influenced the representation of gentile genes in the Jewish gene pool. It is possible that even this relatively small genetic admixture from surrounding populations could be adaptive for a strategizing group because the group would benefit from new genetic combinations."

The above is the long version of a simple system in evolution. Let us assume that we have a closed population group or race that lives separate from other races. Selection produces a certain type of race, but every so often a few genes from neighboring races (outbreeding) does occur, but at a very low rate (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997). An even easier example to explain the above phenomena goes something like this. I am a dog breeder of purebred attack dogs - Doberman pinschers. My neighbor also breeds Doberman pinschers, but of the friendlier temperament for a family pet - still a good watchdog but not as vicious as the attack dogs. Every once in a while, one of the attack Dobermans interbreeds with one of the neighbor's dogs, passing the attack dog genes to the friendly dog breed. The breeder, not knowing what has happened, may get a litter of Dobermans that are more aggressive than normal, but also they seem to have a very black, shiny coat, and also are a little less intelligent. The breeder then proceeds to breed the friendlier Doberman, but now has some new genes to play with - a very shiny black coat. Eventually the

more aggressive genes are selected against (bred out) but the shiny black coat genes are kept.

In the case of Eastern Jews and Euros, the same thing can happen. A few Euro genes enter the Jewish gene pool every so often. The Jews can then selectively continue to breed for high intelligence (selecting against the less intelligent Euro genes) while selecting for traits like straight hair or lighter skin - that is looking more European. Maintaining high intelligence and a high level of ethnocentrism, while breeding to look more like the host population when you are of a race that lives off lesser people has a great deal of advantage - especially during times of genocide against Jews. The more intelligent Jews that look less like the typical Jew and more like the typical Euro would have had a far better chance of slipping away to safety or hiding out as a Gentile - eugenics at work in all of its various forms.

"Evidence in favor of this hypothesis would be that Jewish proselytism, while highly limited and restricted (see Chapter 4), has been far more successful among wealthy, intelligent, and talented individuals and that this pattern was actively encouraged by the Jewish community. Accounts of proselytes (see, e.g., Patai & Patai 1989) indicate that proselytism was more common among talented and wealthy people. For example, Patai and Patai (1989, 83), in describing proselytes in Germany, note that '[o]nce again history records only the conversions of those few proselytes in Germany who were exceptional among the many converts to Judaism because they were of high status in Gentile society prior to their conversion, or because they achieved renown after they had become Jewish....'

"Moreover, as might be expected, given the strong emphasis on elitism within the Jewish community, there is evidence that Jewish apostates tended disproportionately to be poor and obscure Jews, at least into the 19th century: Lea (1906-07, 1:111, 139) notes that prior to the forced conversions of 1391 in Spain, the converts to Christianity had been mostly of humble status, and prior to the expulsion of 1492, only the lowest classes of the remaining Jews converted to Christianity. Similarly, Weinryb (1972, 94) notes that, although voluntary conversions of Jews to Christianity in traditional Poland were small in number, they mostly involved poor and obscure Jews. Moreover, Kaplan (1983, 275) shows that poor Jewish girls who could not afford an adequate dowry were forced to marry gentiles as a last resort. Pullan (1983, 294ff) finds 12 cases of Jewish apostasy in 16th-century Venice, of whom 9 were poor Jews attempting to better their economic conditions. All three of the wealthy individuals apostatized in order to marry or have sexual intercourse with gentile females and/or obtain property, and in at least two of the cases, the conversions themselves appear to have been insincere. This trend for apostates to be disproportionately of humble status was altered beginning with the trend toward emancipation, but the reverse trend did not occur even then. During this period, Jewish apostates included many individuals hoping to advance their career options, but, as Katz (1986, 54) points out, the apostates did not differ economically or in terms of education or social success from those who remained Jews.

"If in fact poor and obscure Jews were disproportionately abandoning Judaism, there is no reason whatever to suppose that poor and obscure gentiles were even proportionately represented as proselytes to Judaism. Similarly, recent surveys in the United States indicate that more highly educated Jews and those with higher socioeconomic status are more likely to marry [only kin] (Eliman 1987), again suggesting a greater identification with Judaism among elite individuals. These findings are highly compatible with the idea that the few proselytes in traditional societies who did convert to Judaism were in fact disproportionately drawn from among the talented, educated, and wealthy."

To allow a few talented Gentiles to convert to Judaism, while allowing the lesser Jews to leave the tribe served two purposes - eugenics and apologia. With regards to eugenics, it allowed the less intelligent and less ethnocentric Jews to leave the breeding collective, while allowing some exceptional Gentile genes into the tribe - genes that may be of benefit if they were absent among Jews. In addition, and primarily I suspect because the eugenics of the Jews was not that overt, they allowed some Gentiles to convert so that they could claim they were not a closed racial group. They could point to a few high profile Gentiles who had converted to Judaism, without really discussing the closed genetic barriers in place between Jews and Gentiles. This was propaganda at its best.

I came across another form of this apologia by Jews on the Internet while debating conversions, and it was the reason I reread *A People That Shall Dwell Alone*. The reason stated for not trying to convert Gentiles to Judaism was due to the fact that "under Judaism, Jews do not believe that only Jews are going to heaven. That is, there was no need to convert others because we were all going to heaven - Jews, Muslims, Hindus, you name it." Yup, that was it! No racism in Judaism. And I thought I had heard all of the arguments before, but they seem to be endless and shifting to meet the current needs of the tribe.

Understand that I do not condemn Jews for their racism as much as I condemn Euros for being so easily duped and so universally moral. After all, it was the Indo-Europeans that went into India many thousands of years ago and set up the caste system to prevent race mixing once they conquered the natives. Unfortunately, under the ecological circumstances, the elite clans in India practiced female infanticide to the extent that they rarely had any female children, making inbreeding impossible between the elite (Hrdy 1999, pg. 326-7). They had to bring females up from the lower classes to marry their male heirs (though this form of control of wealth may not have persisted for that many generations - and then only in certain parts of India).

"This chapter has three purposes. The first is to show that the Tanakh (the Jewish term for what Christians refer to as the Old Testament) shows a strong concern for reproductive success and control of resources. The second purpose is to show that there is also a pronounced tendency toward idealizing [inbreeding] and racial purity in these writings. Finally, it is argued that the ideology of Judaism as an evolutionary strategy for maintaining genetic and cultural segregation in a diaspora context is apparent in these writings....

"Baron (1952a) notes that Judaism is often referred to as a 'this-worldly' religion. While there is very little concern with an afterlife, '[b]oth early and later Judaism ... continuously emphasized a firm belief in the survival of the group and in the 'eternal' life of the Jewish people down to, and beyond, the messianic age' (Baron 1952a, 9). Throughout the long history of Jewish writings, there is a strong emphasis on 'the duty of marriage and the increase of family' (p. 12) and 'a religious inclination toward [improving the status] of family and nation' (p. 31), as seen, for example, by numerous Biblical injunctions to 'be fruitful and multiply' and injunctions to the effect that one will obtain reproductive success by following the precepts of Judaism....

"There is an extremely strong concern for endogamy (i.e., marriage within the group) throughout the [Jewish Old Testament]. From an evolutionary perspective, [marrying only kin] results in a relatively high average degree of genetic relatedness within the group as a whole, with implications for the expected degree of within-group cooperation and altruism (see Chapter 6). To the extent that a group prevents gene flow from outside the group, the fitness of individuals



becomes increasingly correlated with the success of the entire group, and this is especially the case if the group has a high level of inbreeding to begin with. At the extreme, consanguineous marriage (i.e., marriage with biological relatives) results in the offspring being closely related to parents and each other, again with theoretical implications for familial and within-group solidarity. It is an extremely important thesis of this volume that Judaism has, at least until very recently, been immensely concerned with [marriage with kin] - what is often referred to as racial purity; moreover, Judaism has shown relatively pronounced tendencies toward [uncle-niece marriages and cousins marrying], especially in comparison with Western societies (see Chapter 8)....

"The importance of [marrying kin], at least from the standpoint of later [authors], can be seen in the treatment of the conquered peoples whom the Israelites displace after the Exodus (see also Hartung 1992, n.d.). The policy described in the Books of Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua is to commit genocide rather than permitting intermarriage with the conquered peoples in the zone of settlement. The chronicler of Deuteronomy states as a general policy regarding the displaced peoples that the Israelites 'shalt utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them; neither shalt thou make marriages with them: thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son' (Deut. 7:3).

"As recorded in the Book of Joshua, this policy is then scrupulously followed when the Israelites cross the Jordan and eradicate the peoples there. Moreover, the emphasis on the need to exterminate other peoples in order to avoid intermarriage is repeated: 'Else if ye do in any wise go back, and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and make marriages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you; know for a certainty that the LORD your God will no more drive these nations from out of your sight; but they shall be a snare and a trap unto you, and a scourge in your sides, and pricks in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the LORD your God hath given you' (Josh. 23:12-13). These instructions are carried out: 'So Joshua smote all the land, the hill-country, and the South, and the Lowland, and the slopes, and all their kings; he left none remaining; but he utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the LORD, the God of Israel, commanded' (Josh. 10:40)."

It is amazing how we continuously write our own history to fit the current politically correct ethos. Nevertheless, a close reading of the Old Testament could be an exceptionally good manual for a eugenic religion. It has all of the essential ingredients and much more. Genocide is perfectly all right in order to get rid of lesser races that may be in the group's way, or may have resources to steal. Racial purity is maintained at all costs, and anyone who deviates from it is going against the eugenicists' God. In fact, there is only one real code, the group grows and prospers at the expense of all other races, which are really just lesser human beings anyway. This God wants its people to prosper at the expense of other races. The Old Testament is a book that Genghis Khan could embrace!

"Sexual relationships with the women of the surrounding peoples are invoked as a major source of evil within Israelite society. Thus, Moses orders the execution of Israelite men who consort with Moabite women (Num. 25:1-13). The men are executed and God also sends a plague because of the offense. Later, the Israelites are said to be living among a variety of peoples, 'and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their own daughters to their sons, and served their gods' (Judg. 3:6). As a result of these practices, the Israelites were said to be dominated by the Mesopotamians for eight years.

"The origination of the Samaritans as a separate Jewish sect was also the result of a general abhorrence of [marrying outside the pure Jewish race]. When the northern kingdom fell to the Assyrians and its elite were taken away, the remnant intermarried with the new settlers, creating a 'mixed race' (Schurer (1885) 1979, 17). The intermarriage with aliens meant that 'the Samaritans were not *ethnically* what they claimed to be' (Purvis 1989, 590), the Pharisees going so far as to refer to them as *kutim* (*i.e.*, colonists from Mesopotamia). Their racial impurity was then 'used to deny the Samaritans their original Israelite heritage. From that point onwards, their claim to be part of the chosen people . . . was never again acknowledged by the Jews' (Johnson 1987, 71). **The returning exiles rejected the offer of the Samaritans to help in rebuilding the Temple (Ezra 4:1-5), and intermarriage with the Samaritans was regarded with horror.** Thus, Nehemiah comments on the marriage of the son of the high priest Eliashib to the daughter of the Samaritan Sanballat: 'Therefore I chased him from me' (Neh. 13:28).

"The [deification] of the abhorrence of [marrying outside the Jewish race] appears in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah which recount events and attitudes in the early post-exilic period. The officials are said to complain that 'the people of Israel, and the priests and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the peoples of the lands, doing according to their abominations.... For they have taken of their daughters for themselves and for their sons; so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the peoples of the lands' (Ezra 9:2).

"The use of the phrase 'holy seed' is particularly striking - **a rather unvarnished statement of the religious significance of genetic material and the religious obligation to keep that genetic material pure and untainted.** The result was a vigorous campaign of what Purvis (1989, 595) refers to as 'ethnic purification.' Nehemiah states, "In those days also I saw the Jews who had married women of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spoke half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God: 'Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters for your sons, or for yourselves' (Neh. 13:23-25).

"All who have intermarried are urged to confess their guilt and give up their foreign wives and children. Ezra provides a list of 107 men who renounced their foreign wives and their children by these women. These books also refer to genealogies that were used to deny access to the priesthood to some of the returnees from the Babylonian exile because there was a question regarding the **racial purity** of their marriages. The result was a hierarchy of purity of blood, at the top of which were those who could prove their status by providing genealogical records."

Now that Senator Joseph Lieberman has thrown his hat in the ring for the presidential race in 2004, and considering that he is an Orthodox Jew, will he be asked to answer if he still believes in the superiority of the Jewish race, does he still believe in maintaining Jewish racial purity, is not in fact the Jewish religion one that is based on racial supremacy? Of course, this will be discussed on the Internet, but will it get into the mainstream press? Actually, this may be the time to get it out in the open - do Jews have a double standard in calling all White males racists, while pretending to be of a higher moral character? After all, the Old Testament is the Jewish bible, and as an Orthodox Jew, Lieberman follows the law as the Jewish God proscribes - and it is a God for only the Jews. How will he be able to explain that the Jewish God and the Christian God are not the same. One stands for Jewish supremacy and intolerance towards any human "seed" that is impure. The Christian God is a universalist and tolerant God, inclusive of all.

"For the Israelites, there was really only one purpose for God - to represent the idea of kinship, ingroup membership, and separateness from others. Supporting this view of Israelite monotheism, there is evidence that monotheism became more important in the exilic period - precisely the period in which barriers between Jews and gentiles were being created and enhanced....

"Significantly, Ezra, whose abhorrence of intermarriage was a major influence on subsequent generations and who was revered among the Israelites as 'a virtual second Moses' (McCullough 1975, 49), views intermarriage as a 'great sin against Israel's God' (McCullough 1975, 48), a comment indicating the close connection between ethnic purity and the Israelite concept of God. In a very real sense, one may say that the Jewish god is really neither more nor less than Ezra's 'holy seed' - the genetic material of the upper-class Israelites who were exiled to Babylon."

It seems that today, looking at religions that are the most similar, that the World Church of the Creator headed up by Matt Hale, who was just arrested for planning the murder of a federal judge, is closer to Judaism than any other religion. Before his arrest, I could never understand the WCOTC's stance. Why not just call themselves a new sect of Jew, follow the Old Testament rules against race mixing, declare themselves superior to other Jewish sects, and compete with Jews by practicing eugenics. Love of one's own kind is the flip side of hatred of one's enemies - ethnocentrism is a losing strategy for most Whites who just do not have enough kinship allegiance to be able to win against more racially aware group strategies. Maybe the best we can do is be like the insular Hasidim, and live in our gated communities.

"Worshipping other gods is like having sexual relations with an alien - a point of view that makes excellent sense on the assumption that the Israelite god represents the racially pure Israelite gene pool....

"[marrying outside the Jewish race] is a crime against God - a belief that makes sense if indeed, as argued above, God simply is another way of denoting an inbreeding, unitary ethnic group - the holy seed of Israel....

"This phenomenon can also be seen in the modern world. For example, Meyer (1988, 338) notes that the response of liberal Reform Jews to the increased anti-Semitism of the Hitler years in Germany was increased identification with Judaism, increased synagogue attendance, a return to more traditional observance (including a reintroduction of Hebrew), and acceptance of Zionism. Following World War II, there were upsurges of religious observance and/or ethnic identification among American Jews in response to the Nazi holocaust and as a reaction to crises in Israel. The response to persecution is therefore a tendency to stress a unique Jewish identity, rather than to assimilate....

"Unlike the Christian conception of an afterlife of happiness, the Tanakh makes clear that the rewards of keeping the faith and obeying religious regulations will be a high level of reproductive success, a return to power and prosperity in Israel, and the destruction and/or enslavement of Israel's enemies...."

In a multicultural society, where Whites are about seventy percent of the population and Jews only about 2 percent, it will be harder and harder for most Jews to interbreed. There is a strong attraction for successful Jewish men to marry beautiful White (or Asian) women, because the selection is so much higher. This imbalance is common throughout modernity. Women can now

go to work, be successful, and no longer need a man for support. Many of these successful women, of higher intelligence, are only attracted to men with a higher status, and unless they are ravishing beauties, there are far fewer men to choose from.

On the flip side, the highly intelligent males, having success, can choose from a large pool of women based on their looks, and only moderately on the women's intelligence. This "bimbo effect" acts against assortative mating, and it is also dysgenic. It is a dilemma not only for Jewish racial purity, but also for any eugenic program that relies strictly on matching intelligent men with intelligent women - the pool to select from is unbalanced because of what women desire in men and what men desire in women.

It is safe to assume that Jewish supremacy may die faster than the White gene pool will be annihilated by miscegenation, as the Jews have far fewer numbers to sustain itself. Whites still associate primarily with other Whites, and it will be a very long time before we cease to exist. But on both sides there is a real irony. Let's say that Whites did intermarry in large numbers with Asians, Blacks, Semites, etc. What would happen is that we would lose our individualism, our universal moralism, and our lack of racism - the Jews would have essentially an even more hostile majority to deal with. In that world, if they maintained their advantage in wealth, power, education and status - there would be a new affirmative action directed against the Jews instead of Whites.

"Among the factors facilitating separation of Jews and gentiles over historical time have been religious practice and beliefs, language and mannerisms, physical appearance and clothing, customs (especially the dietary laws), occupations, and living in physically separated areas, which were administered by Jews according to Jewish civil and criminal law. All of these practices can be found at very early stages of the diaspora, and in the ancient world, *a Mitzvoh* of 613 commandments evolved, including prohibitions that very directly limited social contacts between Jews and gentiles, such as the ban on drinking wine touched by gentiles and the undesirability of bantering with gentiles on the day of a pagan festival....

"During the period of Greek hegemony, the Jewish religion was unique in forcibly resisting Hellenizing influences (Schurer (1885) 1973, 146), and the Jewish struggle with Rome was the most prolonged and violent of any of the peoples in the Empire. Indeed, one of the major results of the development of the Roman Republic and Empire was that the great diversity of ethnic groups, which characterized Italy and the rest of the Mediterranean region, was largely assimilated. For example, in Italy during the fifth century B.C., Etruscans, Samnites, Umbrians, Latins, Romans, and a variety of other groups were assimilated into a larger culture in which these ethnic divisions disappeared. The Jews were the only ethnic group to survive intact after the upheavals that occurred at the end of antiquity."

And here is another lesson for neoeugenicists. All around us we see degeneracy, crime, and the indoctrination of our children by the State. Like the Jews did in the past, it is time we set up our own communities to place some distance between us and the "the other." A lot of White separatists feel they have to move to the North West to flee from alien life forms, but the Jews maintained their separatism easily for three thousand years, and it was primarily in the more populated centers where commerce and money was readily available. Hate crime laws, directed at Whites, makes interactions between Whites and other races highly problematic - a simple altercation over a parking spot could end up sending one to jail if the wrong word slipped out. The only solution for such draconian measures directed against Whites is separation. Except at

work, where you might have to interact with minorities, all other activities should be directed at separation. Children should not be taught by the state to hate themselves - home schooling or our own private schools should separate them. From kindergarten through college, Euros are taught to hate themselves while celebrating diversity and racial solidarity for all races except their own. Yes, we can learn a lot about how the Jews have maintained their race while living among hostile people. And now, Whites are the ones in danger of constant abuse and disregard of our rights.

"The issue of Jewish proselytism in the ancient world has received a great deal of attention from historians of Judaism, and often there is a clear apologetic tone in these writings. Several discussions of proselytism by Jewish historians, beginning with the studies of Bamberger ([1939] 1968) and Braude (1940), have developed a revisionist perspective, which attempts to show that Judaism has been a universalist religion at least since the Biblical period. However, they argue that, as a result of the hegemonic actions of governments or other religions (see also Eichorn 1965a; Raisin 1953; Segal 1988), Judaism failed to attract sufficient converts.

"From an evolutionary perspective, the implicit argument would then be that the result of these hegemonic actions of other religions was an unintended genetic and cultural segregation from other peoples. Jewish actions facilitating this segregation were necessary in order to preserve a purely religious/ethical integrity whose correlation with genetic segregation was unintended and purely coincidental.

"The idea that Jewish separatism fundamentally derives from a moral, even altruistic, stance has been common throughout Jewish history. Baron (1952a, 12) notes that an integral aspect of the ideology of Judaism has been that 'segregation is necessary to preserve at least one exemplary group from mixing with the masses of others' who are viewed as morally inferior. Separatism not only is motivated by ethical reasons, but involves altruism: In being Jews, they were 'living the hard life of an exemplar.' And by serving as a morally pure exemplar, 'they were being Jews *for all men*' (italics in text).

"This sense that Judaism represents a moral ideal to the rest of mankind - 'a light of the nations' (Isa. 42:6) - has been common throughout Jewish intellectual history, reflected, for example, in Philo, who depicts Israel 'as a nation destined to pray for the world so that the world might *be delivered from evil and participate in what is good*' (see McKnight 1991, 39); or 'the Jewish nation is to the whole world what the priest is to the state' (McKnight 1991, 46). This theme also emerged as a prominent aspect of the 19th-century Jewish Reform movement and remains prominent among modern Jewish secular intellectuals (see below). Moore (1927-30, 1:229) notes that in the ancient world the ideology contained the thought that 'Israel is not only the prophet of the true religion but its martyr, its witness in suffering; it bears uncomplaining the penalty that others deserved, and when its day of vindication comes and God greatly exalts it, the nations which despised it in the time of its humiliation will confess in amazement that through its sufferings they were saved.

"The implicit argument would then be that, even though the Jewish religion ended up denoting a...genetically segregated kinship group in which there was a great deal of within-group altruism and cooperation, combined oftentimes with successful competition with gentiles for resources (and sometimes with exploitation of gentiles; see Chapter 5), this fact is simply a consequence of its failure, despite its best efforts, to attract adherents, perhaps in conjunction with normative human tendencies for resource competition.

"Apart from the difficult empirical question of whether Judaism was really self-consciously racist and nationalistic in the ancient world (see below), the anti-voluntarist perspective is problematic from an evolutionary perspective. If indeed the present perspective that historical Judaism has often involved successful resource and reproductive competition with host population gene pools is correct (see Chapter 5), it is certainly reasonable to suppose that this behavior conforms to evolutionary expectations that humans often attempt to maximize biological fitness (reproductive success). One must then suppose that, even though historical Judaism often coincided with what one might reasonably suppose to be individual (and group) genetic self-interest, this result was a major departure from the original intention, since the original intention was to develop not only a religion that was theologically universalist, but also one in which ethnicity was theoretically irrelevant and in which there was an eager attempt to foster genetic assimilation with surrounding populations....

"From an evolutionary perspective, in the absence of actual genetic assimilation one is left to conclude that this Jewish sense of moral and religious idealism, which results in genetic segregation, is in fact a mask for a self-interested evolutionary strategy aimed at promoting the interests of a kinship group that maintains its genetic integrity during a diaspora."

Well that was then - how about now? Most Jews, far more than any other Western race of people, are secularists. Does that mean they no longer believe that Jews are morally superior to all other races, that they are no longer the natural leaders of all peoples and of all nations? If you have been following the interactions between the different players leading up to the conflict with Iraq (January 2003 as I write), you will notice that the most vocal advocates for war are the neoconservatives, who are dominated by Jews. It seems that nothing has changed with regards to Jewish supremacy - whether secular or religious. They still consider themselves morally, intellectually, and racially superior to all other races. Because of this, the neoconservatives feel that they can control US foreign policy, and that we can help to dismantle any Arab country that may be a threat to Israel or US hegemony. Actually, from my perspective, there are four forces leading us to war: to protect Israel from its Arab neighbors, to help Bush win the presidency in 2004, to use those wonderful weapons we have (kids with toys), and force democracy on the Islamic world since they can't do it themselves (or the neoconservative agenda).

"There appeared a large apologetic literature intended to present Jewish life, and particularly Jewish separatism, in a positive light and to present Jews as morally superior to gentiles by, for example, extolling their family life: 'Most of the works which have been regarded as propaganda literature show little interest in proselytizing, but show a desire to share and be accepted in the more philosophically sophisticated strata of Hellenistic culture. Salvation is seldom restricted to membership of the Jewish people' (J. J. Collins 1985, 169).

"Modern psychological research indicates that portraying Judaism as open to conversion would have important effects on gentile conceptions of Judaism. Consistent with the results of social identity research (e.g., Hogg & Abrams 1987), portraying Judaism as open to conversions would be expected to result in the perception among gentiles that Judaism is a permeable group, and this latter perception would be expected to reduce gentile hostility and perceptions of conflict of interest with Judaism. The perception that Judaism is a permeable group would also be expected to reduce the ability of gentiles to act in a collective manner in opposition to Judaism.

"In fact, beginning with Hecataeus of Abdera (early third century B.C.) and culminating with Tacitus and others, Jewish intellectuals were confronted with a great many Greco-Roman writers

whose basic criticisms centered around Jewish separatism, xenophobia, and misanthropy. Given this context, there was a felt need among Jewish intellectuals to present Judaism as a universal religion."

Ergo, nothing has changed about the Jews in over two thousand years. Now we debate on the Internet about why they don't want anyone to join their religion. Nevertheless, the debate and the excuses are perennial.

"One might therefore reformulate the ideal strategy for Judaism as a fairly closed group evolutionary strategy as follows: Allow converts and intermarriage at a formal theoretical level, but minimize them in practice. This *de facto* minimization could occur as a result of failing to make strenuous, organized efforts to obtain converts or to encourage intermarriage; erecting imposing cultural barriers that would minimize social intercourse between Jews and gentiles and thus prevent the types of social contacts that would be the normal precursors of conversion and intermarriage; engaging in cultural practices that result in anti-Semitism, with the result that gentiles would be less likely to convert to a stigmatized religion; the existence of special Jewish taxes, such as the *fiscus Judaicus* imposed by the Romans; maintaining hostile and/or ambivalent attitudes to conversion, as well as hostile and/or ambivalent attitudes toward converts after they were admitted to Judaism, within a significant portion of the rabbinic leadership, as well as among the Jewish community as a whole; making the procedures of conversion highly unpleasant and demeaning (by, e.g., including requirements for the physically painful and dangerous rite of circumcision); reminding the convert of the dangers of being a Jew; relegating the convert to a lowered status within the community and giving the convert fewer rights than other Jews; making these disabilities continue for a number of subsequent generations before the convert's descendants could expect to attain full Jewish status; continuing the practices of [inbreeding] among elite groups within the Jewish community and strictly keeping genealogies among these groups to ensure racial purity so that converts would be aware that marriage into these families would never occur, despite its theoretical possibility, even after many generations; continuing vestiges of Jewish national sovereignty, as represented by the existence of families that were reputed to be descended from the priests and kings of Israel and that retained prestige and authority among diaspora Jews; and keeping the **messianic hope of a return to political power** in a particular geographical area."

Of course, Judaism is always changing, and many of the above items are now only strictly practiced by the more religious of Jews, while the secularists have become more like the Gentiles they are around. But have they given up on "messianic hope of a return to political power?" I would contend that they can't, given their eugenic history of breeding a race of people who are far more intelligent, conscientious, and authoritarian than any other group I am aware of. They have been breeding for dominance - and one cannot give up their nature with an epiphany of the contradictions in one's perspective. We all live our lives as our primitive brains direct us, then we make excuses for why we do what we do (see *The Illusion of Conscious Will* by Wegner, 2002). Jews are no different - their desire for power and control is no different from anybody else's, just far more extreme as will be shown below in the discussion on behavioral traits.

"As indicated in Chapters 3 and 8, the Jewish tendency toward [marrying biological relatives] is of considerable theoretical importance. During the Second Commonwealth, the Pharisees attached special spiritual significance to marriages with nieces. Uncle-niece marriage was common during the Second Commonwealth (Epstein 1942, 250ff; Mitterauer 1991; Jeremias 1969, 218). While marriage to nieces was essentially tolerated by the Levitical rules, later it

came to be viewed as desirable by the more devout, including priestly families whose concern with purity of blood and genealogy is a recurrent theme of this volume. Uncle-niece marriage was idealized in the Talmud: 'One who married his sister's daughter - on him the Bible says: 'They thou will call and G-d will answer' (b. Yeb 62b). The *Shulhan Arukh*, an authoritative legal compilation dating from the 16th century, also idealized uncle-niece marriage....

"Maimonides notes that the rules of the Torah and the Sages are fairly lenient regarding intercourse with a slave woman. He states, however, '[n]evertheless, let not this transgression be esteemed lightly in your eyes, just because the Torah does not prescribe a flogging, for this also causes a man's son to depart from following after the Lord, since the bondswoman's son is likewise a slave, and is not of Israel' (p. 83). The offspring of a concubine/slave is thus not admitted to the community, and, indeed, intercourse with such a woman is compared to sodomy, citing Deuteronomy 23:18. Conversion of the bondswoman removes these difficulties, but Maimonides reiterates the general distrust of proselytes typical of the ancient world, citing the Talmudic dictum that '[p]roselytes are as hard to bear for Israel as a scab upon the skin,' since the majority of them become proselytes for ulterior motives and subsequently lead Israel astray, and once they become proselytes it is a difficult matter to separate from them' (p. 91). The latter comment indicates that the community would attempt to remain separate from proselytes....

"It should be noted that the Sephardic sense of exclusivity and superiority is legendary even among the other branches of Judaism (e.g., Patai 1977, 381-383; Chapter 8). After the expulsion, the Sephardim continued to use a dialect of archaic Spanish (*Ladino*) in their communities in other parts of the world, so that in the 19th century most Sephardic Jews living in the Turkish Empire could understand neither Turkish or other local languages such as Greek and Romanian. In Morocco, the Sephardic Jews continued to speak a Castilian dialect which differed from Ladino until the 19th century.

"Benardete (1953) emphasizes that, in addition to this 'secretive language for communication among coreligionists' (p. 59), there was a wide variety of other religious customs, gestures, celebrations, and culinary laws that separated them from gentiles and even other Jews living among them. Benardete cites observations indicating that the Sephardim in the United States considered themselves 'a people apart' with 'hermetic groupings' and superior to Ashkenazi Jews, even though they were of lower social class than the latter (whom they referred to with the derogatory term *tedesco*) (1953, 145-146; see also Patai 1977, 381-383; Sachar 1992, 63; Baron 1973, 36). In Morocco, the Sephardim remained separate for the most part from the native Jews for whom they used the disdainful term *forasteros* (aliens) (Patai 1986)."

Abhorrence of the other, what some would call racism, what behaviorists call ethnocentrism, and what I would prefer to call tribalism because it fits in better with an evolutionary explanation of behavioral differences between races, is the underpinning uniqueness of the "chosen ones." Jews are not a singular race or even a defined group of races. Races rather are any group of people who differ - and the groupings can be subdivided down to identical twins (by splitters) or lumped into the four or five major races by lumpers (Jensen 1998). Jews likewise, with their high levels of racialism, will easily fight amongst themselves. Different Jewish groups do not speak with one voice, nor could there be a "Jewish conspiracy" to control or take over the world. Rather, it is made up of a race of individuals who feel especially entitled. That is, the ethnocentrism or xenophobia is carried by the individual, but its intensity is expressed as concentric circles from the closest kin towards the reviled outer ring of Gentiles.



"Regarding attitudes, the Jews viewed themselves as separate even from the land: Many rabbis viewed Poland itself as defiled and unclean, and not the permanent habitat of the Jews (Weinryb 1972). Reflecting this sense of sojourning, the burial service in traditional Ashkenazi shtetl communities included depositing a small amount of soil from Palestine under the head of the deceased (Zborowski & Herzog 1952). Katz (1961a) notes that Jews were conscious of being only temporary resident aliens and were considered in this manner by gentiles. There was also a powerful sense of separation from gentiles. Katz (1961a, 26ff) describes the common philosophical belief among Jews that Judaism and Christianity differed not merely in matters of ritual and belief, but also in essence. Moreover, this essential difference was often viewed as ultimately the result of racial differences, with Jews descending from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, while the gentiles descended from Esau....

"There are indications that when Jews converted to Christianity, they were able to rapidly intermarry with Poles, indicating that the barriers to intermarriage were mainly erected by the Jews....

"Moreover, from the present perspective, the precise meaning of assimilation is important. Barriers such as clothing and language are important to viewing Judaism as a fairly closed group evolutionary strategy only insofar as they are means toward the end of genetic segregation. However, it is quite possible that these barriers could fall, but that genetic segregation (as well as resource and reproductive competition between ethnic groups) could continue. Indeed, Lichten (1986) notes the broad range of Jewish assimilationist positions in Poland from the late 19th century to the pre-World War II period, the vast majority of which were consistent with continued genetic segregation and resource competition."

Is it any wonder then that the Polish people had as much antagonism as the Nazis for the Jews in their presence, especially when there were so many more Jews in Poland than in Germany as a percent of the population?

"It is not an overstatement to claim that the European Enlightenment has been the most traumatic event in the history of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. We have seen that in traditional societies over nearly two millennia the separation between Jews and gentiles was more or less complete, with the result that 'nobody would have doubted at the end of the eighteenth century that the Jews were an ethnic unit, separate from the local inhabitants in any place where they may have built a community. Similarly, the unity of these communities all over the world was also taken for granted' (Katz 1986b, 90). The barriers erected to restrict the normal intercourse among individuals were very high indeed, and Jews generally organized themselves as a state within the larger gentile political organization.

"However, with the Enlightenment all this changed. Jews were expected to take their place as citizens like any other in nation-states, and the powerful centralized Jewish governments disappeared as a condition of Jewish citizenship. Judaism was forced to come to grips with the fact that the intense cultural separatism characteristic of Jews in traditional societies was widely viewed as incompatible with life in a modern nation-state. Judaism of necessity became a voluntary association, and there was no way for any central authority to prevent intermarriage or complete defection from Judaism.

"The problem, then, was whether separation could be maintained in this radically new environment. Jews were forced to walk a very fine line between two unacceptable alternatives:

On the one hand Jews were strongly motivated to avoid the traditional hermetic Jewish separatism because of its perceived incompatibility with citizenship in a modern state and its tendency to provoke anti-Semitism. On the other hand, there was a powerful fear that abandoning these traditional practices would result in true assimilation into gentile society and the end of Judaism as fundamentally a cohesive national/ethnic entity."

So, who are the real racists? Whites opened up to the Jews, on the condition that they would fully assimilate, not just change their outward appearances. That meant coming to grips with racist attitudes towards those they lived with, taking on the allegiances of the nations they were part of, and giving up their tribalism. Much like the Gypsies (Roma), they were a people that chose separation - would they now become part of the nations via crypto-Judaism? It seems so. The Euros are constantly condemned for not intermarrying more with other races. Failure to do so say the academic egalitarians, dominated by Jews, shows that Whites are racists. However, at the same time, within Jewish culture, there are efforts to prevent intermarriage else, Judaism dies. What about European's culture and race? This double standard is seen by more and more people who do not accept the therapeutic state's message that Whites must be cured of their racism, while Jews are merely preserving their tribe by not breeding with other races. The hypocrisy is so obvious, that the only way it is refuted is not with arguing the obvious, but by calling anyone who questions Jewish separatism an antisemite.

"In the period following the riots of 1391, Jews who had been forcibly converted 'continued to maintain the hold of their class and race on trading and capital' (Kamen 1965, 7). Johnson (1987), Roth (1974), and Salomon (1974) write of the conflict between the Spanish masses and the Conversos that developed when the latter had entered Spanish society in the 15th century, 'quickly penetrating the ranks of the Castilian middle and upper classes and occupying the most prominent positions in the royal administration and the Church hierarchy' (Salomon 1974, ix). The economic progress of the Conversos and their descendants was 'phenomenally rapid.... The law, the administration, the army, the universities, the Church itself, were all overrun by recent converts of more or less questionable sincerity, or by their immediate descendants. They thronged the financial administration, for which they had a natural aptitude, protest being now impossible. They pushed their way into the municipal councils, into the legislatures, into the judiciary. They all but dominated Spanish life. The wealthier amongst them intermarried with the highest nobility of the land' (Roth 1974, 21).

"Indeed, Walsh (1940, 144) describes a common belief during the period that the New Christians [Jews] 'were planning to rule Spain, enslave the Christians, and establish a New Jerusalem in the West.' These beliefs were abetted by two tracts written by the Converso Selemoh ha-Levi, formerly a highly respected rabbi, but later the Bishop of Burgos, in which he declared that the Jews were attempting to rule Spain. Another common belief was that the Conversos had infiltrated both the aristocracy and the Church and were attempting to destroy Spanish society from within (H. Kamen 1985)."

This sounds like the same accusations made against Jews today. Hollywood Jews put out movie after movie on the Holocaust to place guilt on Whites, while they ignore the 100 million deaths from the **Red Holocaust** that they participated in under Communism. Not one movie that I am aware of has been made to show the magnitude of this horror in the West (in the East, *The Killing Fields* was one of the few movies made showing the Khmer Rouge's atrocities). The Jewish strategy has always been to try and weaken the cohesiveness of the nations they live in, to make it safer for Jews to operate without being noticed. The more mixed up a nation is with

different races, cultures, and competing value systems, the easier it is to distract the masses with endless debates about abortion, homosexuality, the death penalty, racial profiling, ad infinitum.

"Mosse (1987, 204) estimates that despite representing less than 1 percent of the population, Jews controlled 20 percent of the commercial activity in Germany in the period from 1819 to 1935, as indicated by percentages of Jews among the economic elite. Moreover, Jewish involvement in the largest companies was even more substantial than this figure might indicate. For example, Mosse (1987, 273-274) finds that in 1907 Jews had a dominant position in 33 of the 100 largest companies and in 9 of the 13 companies with share capital over 100 million marks. Jews occupied a similar position through the Weimar period (pp. 357-358). In some areas where Jews were concentrated, the overrepresentation of Jews was far higher. Thus, in the capital of Berlin, Jews accounted for nearly 45 percent of the official government *Kommerzienrat* awards given to outstanding businessmen, and in Prussia in 1911 44 percent of the 25 richest millionaires were Jews, as were 27.5 percent of the 200 richest millionaires and 23.7 percent of the 800 richest. In Berlin, as in the Hesse-Nassau area, 12 of the 20 wealthiest taxpayers were Jews....

"However, the largest overrepresentation of Jews in Germany during this period was in the media: the theater, arts, film, and journalism. In Berlin in 1930, fully 80 percent of the theater directors were Jewish, and Jews wrote 75 percent of the plays produced. Jews edited leading newspapers and were vastly overrepresented among journalists (Gordon 1984; see also Laqueur 1974). Not surprisingly, average Jewish income was considerably higher than average gentile income, with tax return data suggesting that the Jewish/gentile income ratio was at least 2 to 1, and more probably in the range of 4 to 1.21."

Of course this scenario is played out wherever Jews operate freely without being oppressed. The same situation is happening in the United States, but here the class struggle has been refocused on the disparity between Blacks and Whites, as the Jews have slid into the White category with regards to the census, but not with regards to being labeled as racists. Now the question is always asked, if Jews as a minority continue to emerge in country after country with most of the wealth and power, what is the reason? In the past it has been either labeled as greed or it has been admitted that they are more intelligent than other races and they cooperate together to make money. That is, they are not really greedy or nefarious in their business dealings, but they cooperate with their Jewish kin to take advantage of business opportunities.

"In Russia, restrictions on Jews were justified by the authorities because they feared that the Slavic peasants could not compete with the Jews in the newly industrializing economy - fears made more intense because of the tremendous growth in Jewish population in the 19th century (Lindemann 1991, 135-137). Jews were viewed as more intelligent, more educated, and more able to compete economically than the mass of Russians by a broad range of political opinion, with the result that the authorities viewed completely free economic competition with considerable trepidation. 'There was, in short, a rather widespread consensus in Russia that Jews were a separate, somehow superior race, stubbornly resisting assimilation, and steadily working to dominate those among whom they lived' (Lindemann 1991, 138-139)...."

"Before concluding this section, it is worth making a brief comment on Jewish-gentile competition in the United States in the early 20th century. As noted above in the case of France, there was concern that Jews would 'overrun' prestigious private universities if intellectual merit were the only criterion (Sachar 1992, 328). As a result, quota systems were developed to restrict

Jewish competition not only in private universities, but also in professional schools, although in most cases the percentage of Jewish students was still well above their representation in the population. As expected, the diminished resources available during the Great Depression exacerbated these attempts to limit Jewish access to elite schools and high-status professions, or indeed other jobs. Numerical quotas in the professions became more restrictive, and employment advertisements carried an unprecedented number of restrictions on Jews. These quotas were lifted following World War II, and by 1952, Jews constituted 24 percent of the students at Harvard, 23 percent at Cornell, 20 percent at Princeton, and 13 percent at Yale despite constituting only 3 percent of the population (Sachar 1992, 755).

"There are a number of other indications that Jews very rapidly achieved a highly disproportionate representation in several key areas of American society in the post-World War II era, and especially after 1960. Rothman and Lichter (1982) summarize data on the extraordinary representation of Jews in the American academy in the 1960s and 1970s. A 1968 survey found that 20 percent of the faculty at prestigious schools were Jewish, and there was a strong concentration in the social sciences, with fully 30 percent of the most productive faculty in social science departments at elite universities being Jewish. Similarly, Jews constituted 20 percent of the legal profession during this period and represented fully 38 percent of the faculty at elite law schools. Sachar (1992, 755) notes that in 1957, Jews constituted 32 of the 70 most eminent intellectuals in a list compiled by *Public Interest*, and in 1973, Jews were overrepresented by 70 percent in the *Directory of American Scholars*.

"More informally, Patai and Patai (1989) found that in 1972, 6.5 percent of a sample from *Who's Who in America* were Jewish although, they represented only 2.7 percent of the population. Similarly, Weyl (1989, 21), using the Jewish last name method, found Jews overrepresented on several indices of achievement, including *Who's Who in America*, *American Men and Women of Science*, *Frontier Science and Technology*, *Poor's Directory of Directors*, *Who's Who in Finance and Industry*, *Directory of Medical Specialists*, and *Who's Who in American Law*.

"Rothman and Lichter (1982) note that academic social science departments are an important source of social influence, and this disproportionate Jewish influence on society extended also to the media during this period. A quarter of the Washington press corps were found to be Jewish in a 1976 study, and 58 percent of the television news producers and editors at the ABC television network in a 1973 study were Jewish. A 1979 study found that Jewish background was characteristic of 27 percent of the staff at the most influential news media. During this period, half of prime-time television writers were Jewish, and 32 percent of influential media critics were Jewish.

"Jewish representation in academia and the media may well have increased in recent times. Ginsberg (1993, 1) notes that as of 1993 the percentages of Jewish representation at elite academic institutions were undoubtedly higher than in the late 1960s. Ginsberg also states that despite the fact that Jews comprised only 2 percent of the population, almost half of American billionaires were Jews as were approximately 10 percent of the members of the U. S. Congress. Jewish overrepresentation continues to be apparent in the media. Kotkin (1993, 61) notes that '[t]he role of Jews within Hollywood and the related entertainment field remains pervasive.' Ginsberg (1993, 1) notes that the owners of the largest newspaper chain and the most influential newspaper (*The New York Times*) are Jews, as are the chief executive officers of the three major television networks and the four largest film studios. Rothman and Lichter's (1982, 98) conclusion would appear to be accurate: 'Americans of Jewish background have become an elite

group in American society, with a cultural and intellectual influence far beyond their numbers."

The patterns emerge everywhere in Western nations where Jews are present in any significant numbers - including a fraction of a percent. However, there is no mystery to this phenomenon, it is merely a pattern that emerges due to the innate intelligence of Jews and their innate behavioral traits. The same situation of evolutionary strategies holds in much of South Asia, where East Asians dominate - or Asian Indians in Africa. A more intelligent race can dominate over the majority but less intelligent race.

In the United States, the dominance would hold between Whites and Blacks if it were not for aggressive quota systems and massive amounts of wealth transferred from Whites to Blacks. Whites have an average IQ of about 100 and Blacks 85. Whenever the gap in intelligence is more than a few points, one race will dominate another in a free and open society.

This is one of the reasons that there is so much effort put into calling anyone who points out racial disparities in intelligence - a racist, because ad hominem attacks are the only arguments left. If innate intelligence is understood to be the cause of economic disparity, then Euros will not only be able to use the same arguments against Jews to equalize economic inequality, but they will no longer be so easily demonized by the Left. There are good reasons in a merit-based society for different races to have different economic success as groups. If this was openly accepted, the Jewish strategy would have to reinvent itself with a whole new dogma - "Whites are not the racists they have been made out to be - it was racial differences all the time."

A new strategy of honesty about race would not really impact Jews in my opinion. I think many of us on the eugenics/nationalist Right would accept Jewish apologies for their attacks on our culture and move on - but I just can't see that happening. Instead, as the genetic and psychometric data comes in validating Jensenism, the therapeutic state will make all discussions of innate differences between races a criminal offense, as it is in much of the West already.

"Thus, unlike universalist religions such as Christianity and Islam, Judaism over its history has fundamentally been a large kinship community in which the threshold for altruistic behavior toward group members was markedly lower than for altruistic behavior toward outgroup members.

"In addition, the degree of biological relatedness within the many small and scattered Jewish diaspora communities was undoubtedly much higher than the degree of biological relatedness characteristic of the Jewish population as a whole. This is especially so since these communities were often founded by a very few families, so that the actual level of biological relatedness within particular Jewish communities may well have been very high indeed. Several authors (e.g. Chase & McKusick 1972; Fraikor 1977; Mourant, Kopec, & Domaniewska-Sobczak 1978) have emphasized the importance of founder effects and inbreeding in the population genetic history of the Jews, stemming ultimately from the fact that Jewish communities were often founded by very few individuals who [inbred], including relatively high levels of uncle-niece and first cousin marriage (see also below). The point here is that this phenomenon would also have increased the level of biological relatedness within Jewish communities and lowered the threshold for altruism. Moreover, as indicated below, immigration from other Jewish communities was often strongly discouraged by the Jewish community itself. Such a policy would also have the effect of keeping the level of biological relatedness within the Jewish community relatively high....

"The diaspora situation itself also facilitated within-group cooperation among Jews. The diaspora resulted in Judaism being essentially a large kinship group in which internal divisions were de-emphasized and in which the major division was between Jews and gentiles, rather than within the Jewish community. As discussed below, by shifting to a diaspora context, economic oppression of Jews by other Jews was minimized, and Judaism itself developed a relatively homogeneous set of interests. Economic cooperation within the community was maximized and economic exploitation minimized, but conflict and competition with the gentile societies among whom they lived remained.

"A principal theme of this volume is that Judaism is a collectivist culture in the sense of Triandis (1990, 1991; see also Chapters 7 and 8). Collectivist cultures (and Triandis [1990, 57] explicitly includes Judaism in this category) place a much greater emphasis on the goals and needs of the ingroup than on individual rights and interests. Ingroup norms and the duty to cooperate and submerge individual goals to the needs of the group are paramount. 'Collectivists are concerned about the results of their actions on others, share material and nonmaterial resources with group members, are concerned about their presentation to others, believe in the correspondence of outcomes of self and ingroup, and feel involved in the contributions and share in the lives of ingroup members' (Triandis 1990, 54). Collectivist cultures develop an 'unquestioned attachment' to the ingroup, including 'the perception that ingroup norms are universally valid (a form of ethnocentrism), automatic obedience to ingroup authorities, and willingness to fight and die for the ingroup. These characteristics are usually associated with distrust of and unwillingness to cooperate with outgroups' (p. 55). Each of the ingroup members is viewed as responsible for every other member, and relations with outgroup members are 'distant, distrustful, and even hostile' (Triandis 1991, 80). In collectivist cultures, morality is conceptualized as that which benefits the group, and aggression and exploitation of outgroups are acceptable (Triandis 1990, 90). These themes will be apparent in the following."

It will be interesting to see how these innate differences in the Jewish gene pool will change now that more Jews are marrying Gentiles, with some estimates up to 50% in the United States. If the Jews who marry Gentiles are those who are less tribal or racist than those who marry Jews, then we would expect there to be an increase in these already exaggerated traits. This is interesting because many eugenic detractors claim that because there are so many genes that are involved in behavioral traits, they cannot be selected for, and yet we can see that they **have** been in the past - Jews differ in remarkable ways from Gentiles (as we will see later).

"Communication was also an element of Jewish economic cooperation. Katz (1961a, 151) emphasizes the fact that Jewish economic unity in the face of dispersion was important for its economic success: 'The possibility of constant communication with people living in other countries, with whom there existed a kinship of language and culture, gave an economic advantage to the Jews, who were scattered over many lands.' For example, writing of the Court Jews during the period from 1640 to 1740 in Europe, Stern (1950, 18-19) notes that 'the Jew seemed to be better qualified for the position of war commissary than the Christian. He was in close contact with his coreligionists throughout Europe. He was therefore able to maintain agents and correspondents in all countries and could receive through them necessary goods and important news.'

"Stern (1950, 137) also notes that Jews were also ideally suited to function as financial agents to gentile princes because of their contacts with foreign banking firms. Ties of language were especially advantageous, since Jews from widely dispersed areas could easily communicate with

each other. Shaw (1991, 94) also describes a system of bills of exchange that were honored by other Jewish traders and bankers and that gave Jewish traders a competitive advantage over Christian and Muslim traders."

This "kinship in every land" is an excellent strategy even today. It is also one that could be used effectively by eugenicists. If eugenicists are to be a ruling elite in competition with Jews, then we will no doubt be few in number and will not be located in one area, but will be dispersed everywhere in the world. Breeding programs will be coordinated globally, as we are seeing the Raelians doing now with their attempts to clone humans. With resources, communications, and will, the new eugenics' programs can adopt many of the successful programs that have been used by Jews - and we know they work.

"Despite the Talmudic injunction regarding the obligation to provide dowries for poor girls, the Ashkenazim consistently regulated the marriages of the lower classes (Hyman 1986; Katz 1961a; Weinryb 1972), and Hundert (1986b) notes that the marriages of poor and indigent Jews came under special scrutiny by community officials. (The poor were also prevented from voting in *Kehilla* elections [Katz 1961a]). For example, it was common for the Jewish communities of Poland to have a quota of marriages of individuals with less than a certain dowry. Hundert cites a community regulation of 1595 to the effect that 'no betrothal may take place in which the bride gives under 150 zlotys before there has been an investigation establishing that they will not become a burden on the community' (p. 23). In 1632 a couple was allowed to marry on condition that they not receive any community support for five years, and in 1679 and 1681 in Poznan a regulation was passed prohibiting no more than six marriages in which the dowry was less than 400 zlotys. Other communities had a lottery for poor girls allowed to marry...."

There are numerous arguments against coercive eugenic practices, but the above shows how the Jews enforced the less gifted to forego marriage and reproduction. It was by any standard rather severe - if you were of lesser quality (on average) than other Jews, you would not be allowed to reproduce. The same program could be instituted today by a nation-state or by a eugenic religious group. Only the most fit would reproduce, and the less fit would forego reproduction (but now they could still marry and have sex thanks to birth control or sterilization). I find nothing wrong for example, of requiring anyone who wants to live off the state's welfare to be required to be sterilized first. It is voluntary and fair. What is unfair is an underclass that perpetuates itself year after year, living off the state, and never provides any goods or services in return. We need to separate the idea that people some times need a hand through hard times from the masses of people who are simply unfit for a technological society.

History also teaches us that there are no ethical or moral standards, and that coercive eugenics has been used many times in the past. I see nothing harsh in preventing people from having children. I come across too many happy couples that have decided to not have children because their lives are so rich in other ways. The drive to have children is far less than the sexual drive - so it can't be that much of a burden to ask those who are social parasites not to continue their genetic failures by having more children. As an evolutionary group strategy, it is perfectly legitimate to put group goals ahead of individual self-interest.

"The material summarized in this chapter indicates that historical Judaism can be characterized as a group evolutionary strategy in which individual self-interest was significantly submerged in the interests of group goals. This group orientation does not imply the absence of competition within the Jewish community. On the contrary; in the following chapter, it will be shown that

competition for social and economic status within the Jewish community (and its correlative reproductive success) was intense. However, the data reviewed here indicate that this intense competition within the group was not allowed to compromise group goals. From the standpoint of the group, it was always more important to maximize the total resource flow from the gentile community to the Jewish community, rather than to allow individual Jews to maximize their interests at the expense of the Jewish community. Within the Jewish community, however, there was a significant redistribution of wealth, so that in the end decrements to individual interests resulting from these community social controls were minimized.

"As throughout this volume, in order for a particular practice to be considered an aspect of an evolutionary strategy, there must be evidence of a conscious purpose, rather than passive imposition. The proposal here is that Judaism represents an ecologically specialized group evolutionary strategy. The data presented in Chapter 5 indicate that Jews have competed with gentiles in a very wide range of economic activity and aspects of social status, ranging from artisan guilds to positions of influence with the government. These findings make generalization difficult. However, one very common feature of Jewish economic activity, noted, e.g., by Lindemann (1991, 146) is that Jews have often been overrepresented among middlemen as conduits for gentile primary production, as well as in relationships of manager over gentiles or employer to gentiles. We have also noted a strong tendency for Jews to compete successfully for positions that require education, literacy, and intelligence. In ecological terms, the generalization is that Jews tended to concentrate at the top of the human energy pyramid in prototypical societies throughout their history.

"In this regard, Jews are typical of several other 'middleman minorities' that have occupied a similar ecological role in a variety of human societies (e.g., the Chinese in Southeast Asia; see Sowell 1993; Zenner 1991). The point here is that Jews, and undoubtedly other middleman minorities as well, tend to have a suite of traits that enable them to attain this ecological position above other groups in the society, the most important being intelligence and certain traits related to what personality psychologists refer to as 'conscientiousness.'

"The purpose of this chapter is to show that Judaism as an evolutionary strategy has emphasized education and high-investment parenting, as well as eugenic practices and cultural supports related to intelligence and resource acquisition ability. In addition, however, there is evidence for the development of traits conducive to the group cohesion that is so essential to Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy."

Dawkins dealt with what he termed the *extended phenotype* - where a species interacts with other species to form niches (see my article Maladaptive Altruism). The Jews just like the Gypsies, have formed a niche based on their innate intelligence and behavioral type (the Gypsies niche is that of a bottom-feeder that is also tribal, living off begging, stealing and other socially deviant behaviors). The question is then how should other races react to manipulation by parasites like Gypsies and Jews. Both have been unwelcome visitors, but in the West, both have been protected by a universal moralism that is not in the interests of the majority or in the interests of other less able minorities.

"There is evidence in the ancient world for an intense interest in education among the Jews. The Jewish religious law was incredibly elaborated in the first centuries of the Christian era, culminating with the writing of the Mishnah and the Palestinian (Yerushalmi) and Babylonian (Bavli) Talmuds. These documents not only contain an extraordinary amount of sheer



information, but also are presented in an extremely complex rhetorical style, so that thorough mastering of Jewish law requires an extremely high level of literacy, the retention of voluminous detail, and the ability to follow highly abstract arguments.

"The proposal here is that Torah study as the [greatest virtue] within the Jewish community had four important benefits relevant to the present perspective on Judaism as an evolutionary strategy: (1) Most obviously, scholarly study resulted in knowledge of an incredibly wide ranging set of laws and customs, which constituted an important source of the barriers between Jews and gentiles and therefore was important for facilitating genetic and cultural segregation. There is also a long scholarly tradition that holds that the Pharisees and their successors utilized their knowledge and practice of the law to separate themselves from the [lower-class Jews] (Sanders 1992, 428; see discussion below). (2) Training in the Jewish law would result in a relatively high level of education for the Jewish population as a whole compared to surrounding populations. This training would then be useful in resource competition with surrounding populations. (3) However, apart from the general level of Jewish education compared to surrounding populations, the educational system was geared to producing a highly educated elite. We have seen that the prosperity of the Jewish community in traditional societies often depended on the actions of a highly educated, wealthy elite of courtiers, capitalists, and lessees who in turn employed other Jews and thereby advanced the fortunes of the entire Jewish community. (4) **Scholarly study became an important arena of natural selection for intelligence** by serving as a vehicle of upward mobility within the Jewish community, as well as providing access to resources and reproductive success.

"It should be noted that knowledge of barriers between Jews and gentiles could be obtained by means of oral communication of the law to the masses. As emphasized by Bickerman (1988, 170), if the only goal were to ensure that the people were aware of the large number of segregative rituals, there would be no need to develop a highly educated elite or to emphasize universal education for a high level of literacy within the Jewish community as a whole. Nor would it be necessary to develop a system that resulted in a large overlap among intelligence, education, resource control, and reproductive success. However, beginning around 200 B.C., perhaps with the writings of Ben Sira (Bickerman 1988, 170), there was an attempt to develop an intelligentsia separate from the priestly clans in which wisdom was identified with knowledge of the Torah and there was a concomitant effort to make some level of education available to the entire community of Jews....

"This suggests that the Jewish response was self-consciously motivated by a need to develop an educated intelligentsia able to compete in the Greek world. Indeed, Bickerman suggests that being a sage or a student of a sage was a necessary preparation for success in the Greek world, and by the end of the second century the author of pseudo-Aristeas could say that the ideal Jew not only was learned in the Torah, but also could impress Greek philosophers, with the result that 'the myth of Jewish intellectual superiority began to take shape in Jewish thought' (p. 175)....

"In the language of modern research on intelligence, there is a strong emphasis in the traditional Jewish curriculum on verbal knowledge, rote memory, verbal concept formation, and comprehension of abstract ideas (Levinson 1958, 284).

"It is important to note that the vast literature of the Mishnah, the Yerushalmi and Bavli, Midrashic collections, and subsequent commentary actually 'contributed relatively little to the fundamentals of Judaism. All the essentials had been laid down by the Pharisaic scribes with an

astounding finality, and Talmudic Jewry adhered to them with unswerving fidelity' (Baron 1952b, 310). Although there was a definite need for a body of civil and business law and other aspects of life as a self-governing community in the diaspora covered by the Mishnah and Talmuds, evidence provided here indicates that these documents contain a vast amount of material for which there are no practical functions at all. The incredible elaboration of Jewish religious law in these writings suggests that this mass of material is the result of intense intellectual competition within the Jewish community and that the resulting Torah then provided an arena for intellectual competition within the Jewish community.

"To begin with, these writings are extremely difficult to understand without a great deal of study. There is no attempt to develop an easily comprehensible code of law or religious ideology that would be comprehensible to an individual who did not have an extraordinary degree of education and commitment to study.

"What is said in the Mishnah is simple. *How* it is said is arcane.... Its deep structure of syntax and grammatical forms shapes what is said into an essentially secret and private language. It takes many years to master the difficult argot ....' (Neusner 1988b, xxv; italics in text).

"Neusner notes that although the Mishnah may be described as a law code, a schoolbook, and a corpus of tradition, it is best described as a work of philosophy in the Aristotelian tradition. The Aristotelian nature of much of this work is well illustrated by Neusner's (1988a, 111:204-205) analysis of Tractate Terumot, a tractate concerned with designating a portion of agricultural crops for heave-offering for priests, which is an expansion of six verses from the Book of Numbers (18:8-13). The tractate contains extremely complex discussions of the classification of mixtures and things that fall into different classes. The differences between potential and actual and between intentional and unintentional are important for classification, and the tractate discusses cases that involve several principles of classification. 'I cannot imagine a more profoundly philosophical reading of a topic that, in itself, bears no philosophical interest whatever' (Neusner 1988a, 111:205).

"Many of the problems appear to involve intellectual disputation for its own sake. The Mishnah is thus not constructed in order to produce a logically organized, easily grasped set of laws for purity and legal codes for self-government during the exile. Rather, '[t]he Mishnah begins nowhere. It ends abruptly. There is no predicting where it will commence or explaining why it is done. Where, when, why the document is laid out and set forth are questions not deemed urgent and not answered' (Neusner 1987, 87-88). Sanders (1992, 471) says simply that the Mishnah 'does not consist of set rules that governed society. It consists of debates.'

"Yet the Mishnah is 'the initial and definitive statement of Judaism' (Neusner 1988a, 1:5) - an integral part of Jewish canon. Moreover, and this is the point, the mastery of this canon was the [greatest virtue] of a religion whose elite were not a group of celibate intellectuals, but rather a group of individuals with a great deal of social status and control of resources and whose first religious obligation was to 'be fruitful and multiply.'

"This massive set of writings is therefore substantially *unnecessary* in terms of fulfilling any purely religious or practical legal need. Although, as indicated above, much of the Mishnah itself appears to exist only for the sake of intellectual disputation, this is even more true of the massive set of later writings. Neusner (1986a) shows that the majority of the material in the Yerushalmi and the Bavli is [analysis], including a great deal of expansion, of the Mishnah. Thus, it is

common to generalize from the Mishnaic rules and to raise further questions, or establish entirely new lines of inquiry within the overall framework of the Mishnaic tractate. The consistency of rules from the Mishnah (and sometimes between the Mishnah and Tosefta) is explored.

"Research on psychometric intelligence clearly shows that there is a strong general component to intelligence (Spearman's *g* factor). Being able to master this vast mass of writings is thus an excellent indication of a high level of *general* intelligence, and, as indicated below, especially verbal IQ.

"One need not suppose that there was a conscious intent on the part of the rabbis to develop a Torah that could serve as a forum for high-stakes intellectual competition. Once scholarship was established as the [greatest virtue] and the key to social status, resource control, and reproductive success within the Jewish community, there would be intense competition to develop an intellectual reputation. The writings produced as a result of this competition therefore become increasingly complex and inaccessible to those with less intellectual ability. Within a fairly short time, one could not hope to enter the arena without a very long period of preparation, a firm dedication, and persistence, as well as (I would suppose) native intellectual ability....

"Viewed in this manner, the development of this massive corpus of material is more a consequence of the development of the strategy than a consciously intended aspect of the strategy.

"Despite the logical veneer, the point was not to make a rational, scholarly argument. **A great deal of intelligence was required, but ultimately there was no attempt to seek truth, religious or otherwise.** These writings are thus ultimately irrational. And as is inevitable with irrational undertakings, acceptance of the Jewish canon was essentially an act of authoritarian submission.

"On the other hand, an illiterate [lower-class Jews]... was at the absolute bottom of the hierarchy, despised as not really a complete Jew. Zborowski and Herzog (1952, 152) show that the dichotomy intellectual/non-intellectual was more or less coincident with Jew/non-Jew, and persons without intellectual ability were constantly confronted by the social superiority of those who had intellectual ability. Persons without intellectual ability were also morally suspect - suspected of being more likely to beat their wives and engaging in other horrible deeds (p. 82). Parents scolded their recalcitrant children with the prospect that if they continued to fail to excel at scholarship, they would descend to the depths of being [a lower-class Jew]."

In the book *Taboo: Why Black Athletes Dominate Sports and Why We're Afraid to Talk About it* by Jon Entine, he describes a tribe in East Africa that has exceptional long distance running abilities, resulting in numerous marathon wins for a small racial group. How did they do it? They were cattle rustlers, and after stealing they would run with their booty - the slower runners were caught and were killed or worse. So goes human unnatural selection from niche building (see my review of *Taboo*. Entine is a Jew, and the Tribe came down hard on him for this glimpse into racial realism).

We could speculate on other examples of culturally driven selection, like sub-Saharan African's dancing ability (ritual war dances) or Europeans artistic ability (cave drawings 40,000 years ago). Almost any culturally driven *arms race* can be stumbled upon that results in increasing a naturally occurring trait or skill to higher and higher levels. What MacDonald is describing

above is such an *arms race*, stumbled upon by the Jews thousands of years ago - those male scholars who were more intelligent and more dedicated rose to the top, married the wealthiest female daughters of the elite, and had more children than their lesser peers.

As the competition increased of course, the testing material had to become more difficult. This phenomenon is well known in intelligence testing - the tests test best when they are matched to the group being tested. For intelligence tests, they are more accurate when used to determine people around the norm of 100. When testing people with an IQ of over 150 however, they become less reliable because they are not developed to discern differences between the super smart. Likewise, as the Jewish eugenics' program continued on over time, and as scholars became brilliant in verbal intelligence, they developed written material that became increasingly difficult to analyze and master over years of study. This was necessary, just like intelligence tests are normed for the average, the average Jewish verbal intelligence rose to an average of 127 (while performance intelligence remained closer to the norm). The Jewish brain was evolving asymmetrically towards a very specific cluster of skills, still seen today in the Ashkenazi gene pool.

The other obvious fact is that among Jews, religious or secular, they know they are different and far superior to those around them. It is obvious to them from their first contact with Gentiles - "we have a superior intellect than the Gentiles." It is easy to see that this was accepted as fact by the Jewish religion, but as more and more Jews became secular, how did they reconcile this with their desire to deny that races were different? Jewish dogma today is to either not discuss their superior intellect, or try to make excuses for why they just seem to be so smart.

With the rise of antisemitism at the beginning of the 20th Century, and starting with the Boasian school of anthropology, racial differences had to be denied. If the Jews really were genetically superior in intellect to all other races, they would be in extreme danger of oppression. Therefore, a program of racial egalitarianism took hold and is still firmly entrenched in Western culture. Any assertion that one race is more intelligent than another race must be vehemently denied, and the only way remaining to deny this fact is by censoring those who present the scientific evidence. The egalitarians have no empirical evidence to show that there could be environmental causes for the Jews having an average intelligence of 117, while the average intelligence of sub-Saharan Africans is only 70. It is not that the Jews feel badly about being so smart as any reading of their history will show, they feel threatened by it if it should become known.

Note how the Jews have natural allies in suppressing the known disparity in innate racial intelligence - neither Blacks or any other racial group is willing to accept that they are genetically less intelligent than another, so the dogma is accepted by most people for obvious reasons of pride (allowing for the exceptional empiricist that is). I have seen too many White supremacists on the Internet who will argue that Blacks are stupid, but when it comes to Jews, they are just tricky and deceitful. No amount of evidence is going to make these Whites believe they are any less intelligent on average than Jews.

So, do the Jews present one set of facts to the Gentiles while believing a different set of facts among themselves? This dilemma reminds me of the *Saturday Night Live* skit where there is a bus filled with Whites, and a lone Black male gets on. All the Whites sit quietly, reading their papers, looking out the window, nothing out of the ordinary going on. After a few stops, the Black man gets off, and the party resumes: the Whites are handing out money to each other,

partying, and having a gay old time. This is absurd of course, but humans are naturally prone to believing conspiracies where none exists.

So how do so many Jews, especially in academia, hold such obviously cognitive dissonant perspectives on racial differences? I think the evidence points to a selection process that along with intelligence, also increased authoritarian submission that makes the Jewish mind naturally anxious when their belief systems are contradictory. With that anxiety comes an extreme need to rationalize away these conflicts, using the very skills of debate that MacDonald describes above. This is the same sort of *legal mind* that can defend a criminal with such resoluteness, because the facts are less important than the argument - argumentation exists aside from facts or truths. Arguments are meant to produce results, truth. This rationalization process is a very human response to unpleasant situations or thoughts.

This also explains why Jews dominate in genres such as Marxism, social sciences, deconstructionism, postmodernism, messianism, neoconservatism, politics, etc. They are all anti-empirical in that they start with an objective (quite often Anglophobic) and construct their realities from *whole cloth* - the exact antithesis of the European mind of science. (Of course, I am talking in terms of average racial differences in behavioral traits - there are exceptions on both sides.)

"Eugenicists such as Hughes (1928) and Weyl (1963, 1989) have long emphasized Jewish eugenic practices as resulting in high levels of intelligence among Jews. Although there are major differences between an evolutionary perspective and a eugenics perspective on Judaism, the evolutionary perspective is highly compatible with the supposition that eugenic practices have been an important aspect of Judaism as an evolutionary strategy. From this perspective, not only did the Jewish canon perform an educational function, but also there is evidence that the Talmudic academy often functioned as an arena of natural selection for intelligence.

"The first major eugenic effect occurred when the Babylonian exiles returned to Israel (now a part of the Persian Empire) in the fifth century B.C. The Babylonian exiles were disproportionately wealthy compared to the Israelites left behind, and in Chapter 3 data were presented indicating that these relatively wealthy and aristocratic exiles returning from Babylon refused to intermarry or associate with the "people of the land" - [lower-class Jews]) - both the Samaritan remnants of the northern kingdom and the former Israelites of the southern kingdom. The main reason given for this exclusion was that these groups had not preserved their ethnic purity, but Ezra's policy of removing all individuals of foreign taint from the Israelite community would also have had a eugenic effect.

"Dating the origins of eugenics as a conscious policy among Jews is difficult. The evidence described in this chapter indicates that concern with education originated at least by the second century B.C., and there is evidence for social, economic, and genetic discrimination against the less educated classes at least from the period following the Second Commonwealth (70 A.D.). Moore (1927-30, II:157ff; see also Alon 1977; Safrai 1968) suggests that, following the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D., the new class division was between an educated, religiously observant elite called 'associates'... and the [lower-class Jews], who were either characterized by a withdrawal from Torah education and knowledge or suspected of being careless in the performance of the religious law....

"These comments indicate that the policies of the *haverim* would have had negative economic

effects on the [lower-class Jews], and the social discrimination might reasonably be supposed to result in defections of the [lower-class Jews] from Judaism. Of particular interest here is that 'marriage between the two classes was condemned in terms of abhorrence' (Moore 1927-30, 11:159-160). Thus, the Talmud states that: 'A Jew must not marry a daughter of [lower-class Jews], because they are unclean animals [*sheqes*] and their women forbidden reptiles [*sheres*] and with respect to their daughters the Scripture writes: "Cursed be he that lieth with any manner of beast [Deut. 27:21]! ... Said R. Eleazar: one may butcher a [lower-class Jew] on a Day of Atonement that happens to fall on a Sabbath [when any kind of work constitutes a violation of a double prohibition]. His disciples said to him: Master, say 'slaughter' [instead of the vile word, butcher]. But he replied "slaughtering requires a benediction, butchering does not require a benediction.'" (b. Pesachim 49b)

"The Talmuds show a strong concern with eugenics. Marriage with a scholar or his children is highly recommended: 'For marriage, a scholar was regarded ... as more eligible than the wealthy descendent of a noble family.' The Tannaim did not tire of reiterating the advice that 'under all circumstances should a man sell everything he possesses in order to marry the daughter of a scholar, as well as to give his daughter to a scholar in marriage.... Never should he marry the daughter of an illiterate man' (Baron 1952b, 235).

"Feldman (1939) shows that the authors of the Talmud, like the other ancients, believed that heredity made an important contribution to individual differences in a wide variety of traits, including physical traits (e.g., height), personality (but not moral character), and, as indicated by the above quotations from the Talmud, scholarly ability. 'Every care was taken to prevent the birth of undesirables by a process of selective mating' (p. 32). Individuals contemplating marriage are enjoined to attend to the family history of the future spouse: 'A girl with a good pedigree, even if she be poor and an orphan, is worthy to become wife of a king' (Midra Num. R.i, 5; quoted in Feldman 1939, 34). A prospective wife should be scrutinized for the presence in her family of diseases believed to be inherited (e.g., epilepsy), and also the character of her brothers should be examined, suggesting an awareness of the importance of sex-linked factors. Physical appearance was not to be a critical resource for a woman: 'For "false is grace and beauty is vain." Pay regard to good breeding, for the object of marriage is to have children' (Taanith 26b and 31a; quoted in Feldman 1939, 35).

"Feldman interprets the *k'tsitsah* (severance) ceremony, described in b. Kethuboth 28b, as intended to show the extreme care the rabbis took to ostracize anyone who had contracted a marriage not made according to eugenic principles. A barrel of fruit was broken in the market place in order to call attention to the event, and the following words spoken: 'Listen ye our brethren! A. B. married an unworthy wife, and we fear lest his offspring mingle with ours; take ye therefore an example for generations to come that his offspring may never mix with ours....'

"There is also very clear evidence for eugenic practices among the 19th-century Ashkenazim. Etkes (1989) finds that, although a variety of traits were important in the choice of sons-in-law, including appearance, health, and temperament, particular value was placed on the perceived potential for Torah study. In other words, marriage with the daughter of a wealthy man and consequent support of study during the years of adolescence (the *kest* period) were conditioned primarily on scholarly ability, and, indeed, the prospective father-in-law would give the future son-in-law an examination prior to agreeing to the marriage. The father-in-law would then support the couple for a specified period of years and provide a large dowry, which would secure the financial future of the couple....

"Beginning in the ancient world, wealthy men would marry their daughters to promising scholars and support the couple until adulthood (Baron 1952b, 221). This practice became a religiously sanctioned policy and persisted among both the Ashkenazim (Katz 1961 a) and the Sephardim (Neuman 1969). Katz (1961 a) notes that this pattern of early marriage, and the associated period of prolonged dependency on adults (*the kest* period referred to above), was assured only to the wealthy: 'Only members of the upper class who were outstanding in both wealth and learning could afford the luxury of an early match without lessening their prospects. They were assured of a "good match" by their very position' (p. 142). The poor, even when allowed to marry, would be forced to marry later, and there was a group of both sexes that was forced to remain unmarried - a clear marker of sexual competition within the Jewish community. On the other hand, upwardly mobile individuals would often defer marriage until they had obtained status, whether in the business world or by developing a reputation as a scholar....

"As in all traditional European societies (see, e.g., Herlihy & Klapische-Zuber 1985), Hundert (1992) finds that there was a positive association between wealth and numbers of children in Jewish households in the 18th century, and Weinryb (1972) notes that there were marked differences in fertility among Jews, with successful business leaders, prominent rabbis, and community leaders having a large number of children reaching adulthood, while families of the poor were small. Vogel and Motulsky (1986, 609) note that in mid-18th-century Poland prominent Jews had 4-9 surviving children, while poorer Jewish families had 1.2-2.4 surviving children. As is typical in pre-industrial societies, wealthy families also benefited from having adequate food and were better able to avoid epidemics. Similarly, Goitein (1971, 140) notes that the families of wealthy Jews in the Medieval Islamic world were much larger than those of poor Jews."

Today, most Jews deny that eugenics is a valid practice - even that it is possible. It has been declared a pseudoscience - the false hope of racists. But when eugenics was at its intellectual zenith (if not its practical zenith as shown by Jews, Sparta, and numerous other culturally driven selectionist niches), it was accepted by Jews and Gentiles alike, and both socialists and conservatives. It was not until after the beginning of the Boasian era circa 1930 did eugenics become anathema first to Jews worried about National Socialism, then to the rest of the Western world as it was made to suffer the guilt of incorrect thought.

Again, just like the difference in the average intelligence between races, how could any Jewish scholar be unaware of the Jewish obsession with good breeding? It is threaded throughout Jewish writings; clearly, it must have been stumbled across over and over again. However, just like racial intelligence differences, eugenics had to be denied because they were the practitioners of eugenics, just as they were eugenics' greatest success story.

"Given these phenomena, it is expected that Jews will tend to exceed gentiles in intellectual ability, and particularly in what psychologists term verbal intelligence. As Levinson (1958, 284) notes, traditional Jewish education emphasizes verbal knowledge, verbal concept formation, and ability to understand abstract ideas -exactly the abilities tapped by modern measures of verbal intelligence.

"The belief in the superiority of Jewish intelligence has been common among Jews and gentiles alike. Patai and Patai (1989, 146ff) review data indicating that Jewish intellectual superiority was a common belief among many 19th-century and early 20th-century scholars, including some for

whom the belief in Jewish intellectual superiority had anti-Semitic overtones: Galton and Pearson believed that Jews had developed into a parasitic race which used its superior intelligence to prey on gentiles. Castro (1954, 473) shows that both scholars and the populace agreed that the Jews of Spain had superior intelligence, and, indeed, Patai (1977) summarizes data suggesting that, during the medieval period in Spain, Jews were overrepresented among outstanding scientists by a factor of 18.

"Data reviewed in Chapter 5 indicate a general Jewish overrepresentation in a wide range of fields in the modern world, including business, science, social science, literature, and the arts. At the pinnacle of achievement, Jewish overrepresentation is particularly striking. Patai and Patai (1989, 159) show that Jews received a highly disproportionate number of Nobel prizes in all categories from 1901 to 1985, including 11 percent for literature, 12.7 percent for chemistry, 20.2 percent for physics, 35.2 percent for physiology and medicine, and 26.1 percent for economics. Moreover, the extent of overrepresentation has increased since World War II, since Jews were awarded twice the number of prizes in the years 1943-1972 compared to 1901-1930. In Germany, Jews received 10 of 32 Nobel prizes awarded to German citizens between 1905 and 1931 despite constituting less than 1 percent of the population during this period (Gordon 1984, 14).

"Studies of gifted children are of particular interest because IQs in the gifted range are unlikely to result from environmental influences acting on individuals whose genetic potential is near the population mean. Terman's (1926) classic study found twice as many Jewish gifted children as expected on the basis of their representation in the population, although the true representation of Jews in this group may have been higher because some may have concealed their Jewish identity. These subjects had IQs ranging from 135 to 200 with a mean of 151. One of Terman's Jewish subjects had an IQ of 184 when tested at age seven. His close relatives included a chief rabbi from Moscow, a prominent lawyer, a self-made millionaire, a concert pianist, a writer, and a prominent Polish scientist. His maternal great-grandfather was a rabbi famous for his compilation of a Jewish calendar spanning over 400 years, and the rabbi's descendants (the boy's cousins) had IQs of 156, 150, 130, and 122.

"Research suggests an average IQ of Ashkenazi Jewish children in the range of 117. In two studies of representative samples of Jewish children, Bachman (1970) and Vincent (1966) found an average IQ of 117 and 117.8, respectively, although Vincent's results are said to be an underestimate because they excluded a large percentage of an elite group of Jewish children attending fee-paying schools.

"There is good evidence that Jewish children's Verbal IQ is considerably higher than their Performance IQ. Brown (1944) found several sub-test differences compatible with the hypothesis that Jewish children are higher on verbal abilities, while Scandinavian children are higher on visuo-spatial abilities. Lesser, Fifer, and Clark (1965) found large differences favoring Jewish children over Chinese-American children on verbal ability, but insignificant differences in favor of Chinese-American children on visuo-spatial abilities. And Backman (1972) found that Jewish subjects were significantly higher than non-Jewish Caucasians on a measure of verbal knowledge but were significantly lower on visuo-spatial reasoning.

"Large verbal/performance IQ differences have been found within Jewish populations. Levinson (1958) studied a representative sample of *yeshiva* students and found an average Verbal IQ of 125.6, an average Performance IQ of 105.3, and an average Full Scale IQ of 117.86, although he



suggests that there may have been a ceiling effect for some students on the verbal portion. Whereas in the general population there was a correlation of 0.77 between Verbal and Performance IQs, among Jewish children it was only 0.31. Finally, Levinson (1960b) found that a sample of Jewish boys (age 10-13) with an average Verbal IQ of 117 had a Performance IQ of 98, while Irish and Italian samples matched for Full Scale IQ had Verbal/Performance differences of only approximately 5 points (approximately 110-105). Levinson (1959) provides evidence that the Verbal/Performance difference for Jewish children increases from pre-school to young adulthood. When children were matched on the basis of full-scale Wechsler IQ, pre-school children showed a small (3-point) difference between Performance and Verbal IQ, while elementary school-age and college student subjects showed a difference of approximately 20 points.

"Taken together, the data suggest a mean IQ in the 117 range for Ashkenazi Jewish children, with a Verbal IQ in the range of 125 and a Performance IQ in the average range. These results, if correct, would indicate a difference of almost two standard deviations from the Caucasian mean in Verbal IQ - exactly the type of intellectual ability that has been the focus of Jewish education and eugenic practices. While precise numerical estimates remain somewhat doubtful, there can be no doubt about the general superiority of the Ashkenazi Jewish children on measures of verbal intelligence (see also Patai & Patai 1989, 149)....

"Within this high pressure, relatively homogeneous Jewish environment, individual differences are most likely due to genetic variation. (This is a general principle of behavioral genetics: As one diminishes the environmental variation, the only remaining source of variation must be genetic.) As a result, eugenic marriage practices are assured of being based overwhelmingly on genetic variation, rather than environmental variation. As a result, one can be assured that by marrying a relatively intelligent Jew, one is marrying someone with a relatively high genetic potential for intelligence, rather than simply one who came from a relatively favorable environment."

What MacDonald is saying above is similar to the cattle rustlers described in *Taboo*, they are very good at long distance running, but not sprinting. Differences in athletic abilities between races have not been studied to any great degree of course - not to the degree and for the number of years that psychometricians have been studying mental ability. Nonetheless, the analogy will do. In order to be so genetically asymmetrical in terms of intelligence, an asymmetry not seen in any other race, means that the Jewish brain has been molded very differently from the norm. It also means that the high average intelligence of Jews could not be due to environmental influences for this simple reason: even secular Jews, those who no longer immerse themselves in Talmudic studies, show the same asymmetry - a verbal IQ of 125, an average IQ of 117, and a fairly normal performance IQ. General intelligence or *g* is a hierarchical construct where two lower factors make up overall intelligence: performance and verbal intelligence.

This fact alone should be sufficient to show that genetic differences within races are also responsible for the genetic differences between races. The Ashkenazi Jews as a race have a far higher average IQ than any other race, and the asymmetry proves that it has to be genetic, because it occurs in all Jews - secular or religious. Culture plays no part therefore in the Jewish excellence in academic achievement. Even Jensenists have missed this point, preferring to compare primarily Asians, Whites and Blacks to prove that genetic differences between races account for their average intelligence differences. Note, that this asymmetry is not universal among Jews. Many Jewish groups, such as those from Yemen, do not show either high

intelligence or a higher verbal over performance IQ due to the impoverishment and suppression under Islam. There are many Jewish groups who have been separated for thousands of years, and they evolved under differing ecologies, with differing results.

"The personality system of conscientiousness is a biological system that underlies attention to detail, neatness, orderliness, striving for achievement, persistence toward goals in the face of difficulty, and the ability to focus attention and delay gratification (Digman 1990). At the extreme, such a person is obsessive/compulsive and guilt-ridden (e.g., Widiger & Trull 1992). There is a strong positive association between conscientiousness and academic success ( $r = 0.50$ ) (Digman & Takemoto-Chock 1981). The scales of *neat*, *careful* (of own work), *persevering*, and *planful* load positively on this dimension, while *irresponsible* and *careless* (of property) load negatively (Digman & Takemoto-Chock 1981; Digman & Inouye 1986). Correlations between high school grades and assessments of this factor performed six years previously were in the 0.50 range. Similar correlations occurred for occupational status assessed when subjects were in their mid-20s. Eugenic practices related to ability in Jewish religious studies would clearly influence this trait.

"Studies of conscientiousness also indicate that this dimension includes items such as 'trustworthy,' 'reliable,' 'dependable,' and 'responsible' which comprise what one might call 'social conscientiousness' (e.g., Costa & McCrae 1992). Social conscientiousness appears to be a sort of 'don't let down the group' trait, originally proposed by Darwin (1871) as the basis of group allegiance. As Goldberg (1981, 161) states, '[m]y knowledge of the status of a person X on the trait of Conscientiousness answers the question "Can I count on X?"' Because of the importance of a sense of obligation to the group for Judaism throughout its history, there is reason to suppose social conscientiousness may be of particular importance to Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy.

"Individuals high on this trait would be expected to feel intense guilt for having failed to fulfill their obligations to the group. Moreover, given the importance of conformity to group norms for Judaism, it would be expected that individuals who were low on this trait would be disproportionately inclined to abandon Judaism, while successful Jews who were the pillars of the community and thus epitomized the group ethic of Judaism would be disproportionately likely to be high on group conformity and also likely to be reproductively successful. The result is that there would be strong selection pressures toward high levels of social conscientiousness within the Jewish community. And since social conscientiousness is psychometrically (and presumably biologically) linked to the other aspects of conscientiousness, these pressures would also result in a general trend toward higher levels of all aspects of conscientiousness within the Jewish community.

"For example, Jordan (1989, 138) notes that Jews who defected during the Middle Ages (and sometimes persecuted their former co-religionists) tended to be people who were 'unable to sustain the demands of [the] elders for conformity.' This trend may well have accelerated since the Enlightenment because the costs of defection became lower. Israel (1985, 254) notes that after the Enlightenment defections from Judaism due ultimately to negative attitudes regarding the restrictive Jewish community life were common enough to have a negative demographic effect on the Jewish community. Moreover, in Chapter 4, it was noted that there was discrimination within the Jewish community such that the families of individuals who had apostatized or engaged in other major breaches of approved behavior had lessened prospects for marriage. To the extent that there is heritable variation for such non-conformity (and all

personality traits are heritable [e.g., Rowe 1993]), such practices imply that there will be strong selection pressures concentrating genes for group loyalty and social conformity within the Jewish gene pool....

"Thus, a child reared in a traditional Jewish home would have been strongly socialized to continually monitor his/her behavior to ensure compliance with a vast number of restrictions - exactly the sorts of influences expected to strengthen the conscientiousness system. Indeed, the popular conception of the *talmid khokhem* (scholar) among the wider community of Eastern European shtetl Jews and especially among the Hasidim was that he was pre-occupied with endless rituals and consumed with anxiety that he had neglected some regulation (Zborowski & Herzog 1952, 140). Zborowski and Herzog (1952, 202) also describe individuals who are consumed with anxiety lest they omit opportunities to help others, since failure to take advantage of such an opportunity was a violation of a commandment. One function of the Hasidic rabbi was to reassure people who were anxiety-ridden because of fear that they had violated one of the myriad regulations of rabbinical Judaism (p. 179)...."

Conscientiousness and/or group conscientiousness is only one of the *Big-Five* personality factors that dominates the field of personality traits research - the others being extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and openness. Conscientiousness has been shown to be second only to intelligence for success, so it is not unusual that Jews are dominant not only in intelligence, but in the motivation to excel in academic and other cognitively demanding tasks or professions. It is therefore not surprising that they are more successful as individuals in anything they strive to do. Eugenics works better than natural selection.

What is worrisome however is that social conscientiousness, when it is tribal rather than universal, leads to ingroup/outgroup conflict. How are Euros when it comes to conscientiousness? Without having extensive data between races on this personality trait, it is hard to tell. However, Europeans seem to also have moderate to high levels of conscientiousness, especially when it comes to being or acting proper and being held accountable for their actions, and they are also heavily guilt laden even when they are not guilty. Told that they are racists they now go about beating up on their own race because they feel they have committed a moral transgression - rather than understanding they have merely been indoctrinated into a belief system foisted upon them by others. Having low levels of ethnocentrism, Euros are prime targets by other groups for moral extortion.

"Modern psychological research is highly compatible with the idea that parent-child relationships may indeed be characterized by intense affection combined with hostility (i.e., ambivalence, as in ambivalent attachment), since these emotions are associated with two independent biological systems (MacDonald 1992a). The ability to form close family relationships and engage in high-investment parenting is clearly an extremely important aspect of Judaism as an evolutionary strategy, but it is reasonable to suppose that being able to compartmentalize one's relationships is also a highly important skill (MacDonald 1992a). Being able to engage in close family relationships would thus be highly compatible with engaging in purely instrumental behavior toward other individuals outside one's group, including behavior of a hostile, exploitative nature. This type of flexibility would appear to be a general feature of human evolved psychology and thus common among all human groups (MacDonald 1992a), but the literary and ethnographic evidence suggests that Jewish family relationships very strongly facilitate both the affectional system and the ability to engage in aggressive and hostile interactions with others....

"The common perception of Jewish and gentile psychiatric workers from the late 19th century until at least the end of the 1920s was that compared to gentiles, Jews (and especially male Jews), had relatively sensitive, highly reactive nervous systems, thus making them more prone to the diagnoses of hysteria, manic-depression, and neurasthenia [chronic fatigue, weakness, loss of memory, and generalized aches and pains] (Gershon & Liebowitz 1977; Gilman 1993 92ff). Consistent with these early findings, Gershon and Liebowitz (1977) find that Jews had a higher rate of hospitalization for affective disorder than did non-Jews in New York. Strongly suggestive of a genetic basis for the greater prevalence of affective disorder [disturbance in moods] among Jews is their finding that among Jews bipolar affective disorder constituted a higher percentage of all affective disorder than was the case in gentile populations in the United States or Sweden. Individuals with bipolar affective disorder have periods of intense euphoria or paranoid-anger as well as periods of despondency, worry, and hopelessness - exactly the traits expected to characterize individuals who are extreme on affect intensity.

"There is some indication that Jews tend to be extreme on all personality systems. Patai (1977, 391) provides a long list of personality traits which appear to be more pronounced among American Jews. Although this type of data must be evaluated with caution, the traits involved appear to include items from all of the Five-Factor Personality Dimensions (see Digman 1990), including items suggesting a strong tendency toward neuroticism (e.g., 'is more neurotic'; 'anxious') and extraversion (e.g., 'greater extraversion'). Indeed, this pattern would be expected given the supposition that Jews are higher on affect intensity. Affect intensity is related to all personality systems with a strong emotional component (Larsen & Diener 1987) and may be viewed as a behavioral energizing system that can be directed toward behavioral approach (related to extraversion) as well as behavioral avoidance and attention to danger (related to neuroticism and conscientiousness) (MacDonald n.d.). Individuals high on affect intensity are thus highly motivated to intensive interaction with the environment and often have conflicting goals because both behavioral approach and behavioral avoidance systems are prone to activation. Thus, the proposal is that a critical component in Jewish adaptation has been the elaboration of affect intensity as a personality system.

"The suggestion is that via processes of cultural and natural selection Jews have developed an extremely powerful set of psychological systems that are intensely reactive to environmental contingencies. Personality systems underlie a set of adaptive interactions with the environment (see MacDonald 1988a, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, n.d.). Behavioral approach systems direct us toward active, highly motivated involvement in the world, risk-taking, and the acquisition of resources and stimulation. On the other hand, behavioral avoidance, including the conscientiousness system, underlies the ability to react intensely to anticipated danger, defer gratification, persevere in unpleasant tasks, and be dependable and orderly.

"Another personality system influenced by affect intensity is the affectional system (often termed agreeableness, warmth, or love in personality research). This system underlies the ability not only to form close, intimate relationships related to high investment-parenting (MacDonald 1992a; see above), but also other types of long-term relationships of reciprocity, trust, and sympathy (Buss 1991; Wiggins & Broughton 1985). Such a trait would appear to be critical to membership in a cohesive, cooperative group such as Judaism. In this regard, it is of interest that Jews exhibit low levels of anti-social personality disorder (Levav et al. 1993), a disorder linked to being low on the agreeableness system (MacDonald 1992a; Widiger & Trull 1992).

"Evolution, like a good engineer, designed people with a good engine (the behavioral approach

systems) and a good set of brakes (behavioral avoidance and conscientiousness). Individuals who are very high in all of these systems are likely to have a great deal of inner conflict (also noted by Patai [1977, 391] as a trait of American Jews), since they are pulled in different directions by these biologically and psychometrically independent systems (MacDonald n.d.). Exemplars would be the sort of fictional characters who populate Woody Allen movies: individuals who have very powerful drives toward resource acquisition, social dominance, and sensual gratification, but who also have a high level of anxiety, guilt, and inhibitory tendencies.

"All personality systems are adaptively important, and being high on all of them provides the ability to be flexibly (and, indeed, intensely) responsive to environmental contingencies. An individual who was high on both the behavioral approach systems and the conscientiousness systems would be strongly motivated to engage in highly rewarding approach behaviors, including extraverted behavior related to resource acquisition, social dominance, and sensual gratification (aspects of behavioral approach), but would also show an ability to react intensely to threatened danger, delay gratification, persevere in the face of difficulty, and be dependable and orderly (aspects of behavioral avoidance and conscientiousness)."

MacDonald covers the other four personality traits (of the Big-Five) above besides conscientiousness: neuroticism, agreeableness, openness, and extroversion. He points out that as well as being highly conscientious, Jews are high on neuroticism, extroversion and agreeableness. What really makes Europeans different from the Semites however is not so much differences in neuroticism, conscientiousness and extroversion, but differences in agreeableness and openness. Euros are individualistic, low on ethnocentrism, and when they interact with other people they will tend to feel the same shame or guilt whether the other person is a family member, another European, or someone from another race - at least in degrees compared to Semites.

The Semitic mind, as MacDonald points out, feels no remorse in treating others badly outside of the tribe. It seems to be easy for Jews more than for Euros to view "the other" as a mere tool for gaining or acquiring what they want - others are instruments to their needs. Ethnocentric people are those that will cut in front of someone in a line, are pushy at the grocery store, or overbearing and demanding. Do we see Jews behave like this? No, because a wise person knows when to be pushy and when to be hostile to others - perhaps in business dealings rather than cutting in front of someone in a line. Blacks are more likely to cut into a line for example, while a wise Jew would more likely be a slum lord - a wise form of exploitation.

This ethnocentrism may in fact be an innate characteristic in most races, but relatively absent in Euros because of our unique evolutionary past - but we will only know this when we study other races with regards to personality profiles. But where does this leave open-mindedness? Euros seem to have a slight monopoly on this behavioral trait - MacDonald does not mention it specifically other than alluding to the fact that Jews are high on this trait also. However, I would question this assumption based on Europeans' dominance in science and innovation, results that seem to have a strong connection with openness. As a people, I do not know of any other race that would open its borders like we have, letting in third world immigrants who are prone to criminal activity, low intelligence, and thus requiring welfare assistance, while expecting nothing in return. In fact, many Whites believe it is their moral duty to help everyone in the world (our maladaptive universal moralism) and to attack any Whites who disagree.

For clarification, MacDonald is really discussing two different behavioral trait systems above

(remember, this is an academic book). One is the *five factor* system or OCEAN (Neuroticism versus stability; Extroversion versus introversion; Openness to experience or intellect, imagination, or culture; Agreeableness versus antagonism; and Conscientiousness or will to achieve). It is the most commonly accepted number of factors for describing behavioral traits. Another is a three factor system that seems more reflective of an evolutionary system in all animals:

1. Affectional system - animals care for their young and take care of their own.
2. Behavioral approach - animals have to explore for food and mates like rats in maze.
3. Behavioral avoidance - animals have to be careful not to get eaten or killed.

There are numerous systems in psychometrics for describing personalities, and if they are valid systems they can be transposed from one to the other, or are interchangeable. They vary more on the descriptions they use than on what they actually mean in terms of human behavior.

"A permanent sense of imminent threat appears to be common among Jews. Writing on the clinical profile of Jewish families, Herz and Rosen (1982) note that for Jewish families a 'sense of persecution (or its imminence) is part of a cultural heritage and is usually assumed with pride. Suffering is even a form of sharing with one's fellow-Jews. It binds Jews with their heritage - with the suffering of Jews throughout history....'

"Woocher (1986) shows that Jewish survival in a threatening world is a theme of Judaism as a civil religion in contemporary America. Within this world view, the gentile world is viewed as fundamentally hostile, with Jewish life always on the verge of ceasing to exist entirely....

"To conclude: Judaism as a group strategy has developed a wide range of practices that serve to cement allegiance to the group and the submergence of individual goals to the overall aims of the group. Eugenic practices and the development of intensive cultural supports for group identification have resulted in a very powerful group orientation among Jews.

"'[Ethnocentrism is] a schismatic in-group/out-group differentiation, in which internal cohesion, relative peace, solidarity, loyalty and devotion to the in-group, and the glorification of the "sociocentric-sacred" (one's own cosmology, ideology, social myth, or *Weltanschauung*; one's own "god-given" social order) are correlated with a state of hostility or permanent quasi-war (*status hostilis*) towards out-groups, which are often perceived as inferior, sub-human, and/or the incorporation of evil. Ethnocentrism results in a dualistic, Manichaeian morality which evaluates violence within the in-group as negative, and violence against the out-group as positive, even desirable and heroic.' (van der Dennen 1987, 1)

"I believe that the area of psychological research most relevant to conceptualizing Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy is that of research on individualism/collectivism (see Triandis 1990, 1991 for reviews). Collectivist cultures (and Triandis [1990, 57] explicitly includes Judaism in this category) place a great emphasis on the goals and needs of the ingroup, rather than on individual rights and interests. Ingroup norms and the duty to cooperate and submerge individual goals to the needs of the group are paramount. Collectivist cultures develop an 'unquestioned attachment' to the ingroup, including 'the perception that ingroup norms are universally valid (a form of ethnocentrism), automatic obedience to ingroup authorities, and willingness to fight and die for the ingroup. These characteristics are usually associated with distrust of and unwillingness to cooperate with outgroups' (p. 55).

"As indicated in Chapter 7, socialization in collectivist cultures stresses group harmony, conformity, obedient submission to hierarchical authority, the honoring of parents and elders. There is also a major stress on ingroup loyalty, as well as trust and cooperation within the ingroup. Each of the ingroup members is viewed as responsible for every other member. However, relations with outgroup members are 'distant, distrustful, and even hostile' (Triandis 1991, 80). In collectivist cultures, morality is conceptualized as that which benefits the group, and aggression and exploitation of outgroups are acceptable (Triandis 1990, 90).

"People in individualist cultures, on the other hand, show little emotional attachment to ingroups. Personal goals are paramount, and socialization emphasizes the importance of self-reliance, independence, individual responsibility, and 'finding yourself' (Triandis 1991, 82). Individualists have more positive attitudes toward strangers and outgroup members and are more likely to behave in a pro-social, altruistic manner to strangers. People in individualist cultures are less aware of ingroup/outgroup boundaries and thus do not have highly negative attitudes toward outgroup members (1991, 80). They often disagree with ingroup policy, show little emotional commitment or loyalty to ingroups, and do not have a sense of common fate with other ingroup members. Opposition to outgroups occurs in individualist societies, but the opposition is more 'rational' in the sense that there is less of a tendency to suppose that all of the outgroup members are culpable. Individualists form mild attachments to many groups, while collectivists have an intense attachment and identification to a few ingroups (1990, 61).

"The expectation is that individualists living in the presence of collectivist subcultures will tend to be less predisposed to outgroup hostility and more likely to view any offensive behavior by outgroup members as resulting from transgressions by individuals, rather than being stereotypically true of all outgroup members. On the other hand, collectivists living in an individualist society would be more likely to view ingroup/outgroup distinctions as extremely salient and to develop stereotypically negative views about outgroups.

"Like the Essenes and other Jewish extremist groups, contemporary haredim are also deeply concerned about issues of racial purity. Indeed, the resurgence of Orthodox Judaism and ultra-Orthodox Jewish fundamentalism may well result in a schism of the Jewish people along the lines of racial purity. As indicated in Chapter 4, genealogy is an extremely important aspect of status in the Hasidic community. Moreover, Landau (1993, 291 ff) describes the opposition of the Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox communities to intermarriage and to procedures that facilitate conversion to Judaism. Orthodox Jews and certainly the haredim do not recognize conversions performed by Reform or Conservative rabbis. Nor do they recognize the recent change in traditional Jewish law by the Reform movement that allows individuals to trace their genealogical Jewishness through the father, rather than the mother. Rabbi Aharon Soloveitchik of Yeshiva University stated that the result of the proposed policy would be that "mamzerut [bastardy] will be escalated to a maximum" (quoted in Landau 1993, 320). From the perspective of the Orthodox and the fundamentalists, the rest of Jewry is highly contaminated with non-marriageable individuals whose taint derives from their genetic ancestry."

The mystery of Jewish success and antisemitism all falls into place once we understand that in order to protect themselves, and because they are a hyper racist race, the Jews have managed as a highly ethnocentric/collectivist tribe to convince the tolerant/individualist European majority that "Euros" are the racists. That is, as a highly intelligent tribe, with extreme behavioral attributes for aggression, hostility towards others, and censorship among themselves when it

comes to those who would deviate, they have managed to make Euros feel guilty - even though we are the least tribal of any race. This is not a statement of moral outrage toward the Jews as much as it is a sad statement on the weakness of the Euro mind amidst collectivist cultures. The Jews are typical; Euros are atypical.

Let's take Blacks as another example, even though in the United States they vary greatly in the amount of White genes that any individual Black may have, as a group they are every bit as tribal it seems as Jews are. They censor anyone who deviates from being a fellow Afrocentric brother (Ward Connerly, Clarence Thomas, etc.). They call all Whites racist while they are intolerant of and hostile towards Whites themselves. They violently attack Whites far more than Whites attack them based on race. Overall, they are hostile to Whites while Whites have strived to give them far more than they could have produced by themselves in Africa. It seems to me that the major difference between Jews and Blacks is that the Jews are a highly intelligent tribe and have been able therefore to hold high positions in academia, the media, and government where they have been able to indoctrinate Euros into believing in the racism myth. Moreover, we have swallowed the message so well that liberal Euros have now taken up the cause and will severely punish any European that claims that we have the same right of self-preservation as do other races.

While doing research on ethnocentrism, I stumbled across The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) in *Testing and Assessment in Counseling Practice* edited by Watkins Jr. and Campbell, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates publishers, 2000 (also available at Questia online). In an extremely simple synopsis of what they have to say about authoritarianism/ethnocentrism it is attributed to Alpha type personalities - those people who have very low ego strength, are extroverted, and rule-following. It also states that intolerant or prejudiced people tend to be Gamma type personalities - those people who have very low ego strength, are extroverted, and rule-breaking. Notice that only "rule-breaking" is different, but of the four personality types, intolerance and ethnocentrism fall into separate categories.

What is interesting about the above robust personality inventory, the CPI, is that extroversion and low ego strength are associated with intolerance, ethnocentrism, and/or authoritarianism. Are most Euros extroverted and low on ego strength? It hardly seems like the behavioral traits usually attributed to Euros. In fact, it is extremely hard to find much information at all on ethnocentrism/collectivism and its relationship to personality types, even though it is part of neo-Darwinism and the general principles are discussed at length for all animals, not just humans. So why do we live in a society that talks so much about racism, but virtually no research has been done to correlate what racism **IS** based on behavioral traits? Frankly, that would not be in the Jews best interest, and they dominate the academic disciplines of psychology, social science, and cultural anthropology. Research therefore on racial differences in the levels of ethnocentrism are not just ignored, they are prohibited.

TABLE 1: CONTRASTS BETWEEN EUROPEAN AND JEWISH CULTURAL FORMS, from page xxxi of *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* by Kevin MacDonald, 2002 edition published by 1<sup>st</sup> Books Library.

	<b>European Cultural Origins</b>	<b>Jewish Cultural Origins</b>
<b>Evolutionary History</b>	Northern Hunter-Gatherer	Middle Old World
<b>Kinship System</b>	Bilateral; Weakly Patricentric	Unilineal; Strongly Patricentric



<b>Family System</b>	Simple Household	Extended Family; Joint Household
<b>Marriage Practices</b>	[Outbreeding]; Monogamous	[inbreeding], Polygynous
<b>Marriage Psychology</b>	Companionate; Based on Mutual Consent and Affection	Utilitarian; Based on Family Strategizing and Control of kinship Group
<b>Position of Women</b>	Relatively High	Relatively Low
<b>Social Structure</b>	Individualistic; Republican; Democratic	Collectivistic; Authoritarian; Charismatic Leaders
<b>Ethnocentrism</b>	Weakly Ethnocentric/ Xenophobic	Strongly Ethnocentric/ Xenophobic
<b>Socialization</b>	Stresses Independence, Self-Reliance	Stresses Ingroup Identification; Obligations to Kinship Group
<b>Intellectual Stance</b>	Reason; Science	Dogmatism; Charismatic Leaders (e.g., Freud, Boas); Submission to Ingroup Authority
<b>Moral Stance</b>	Moral Universalism: Morality is Independent of Group Affiliation	Moral Particularism; Ingroup/Outgroup Morality

### **Jews in American Politics**

MacDonald's analysis was based to a large part on Jewish provided research, but that still does not make it fact. He could still twist and distort the interpretations to fit his personal perspective, so to check it out I read *Jews in American Politics*, edited by Maisel and Forman, Rowman & Littlefield Press, 2001. This book seems to verify everything that MacDonald claims, and it was written entirely by Jews about Jews, with an introduction by Senator Joe Lieberman. What makes it even more interesting is that the book was released just months prior to 9/11, and the book seems to reflect that at the time, the Jews were feeling like they had never been safer. Remember, this is a people who are obsessed with concepts of oppression - it is built into their religion and into their genetic makeup. Jews innately have a persecution complex, because it was required to justify their flexible strategizing to both take advantage of the Gentiles they lived with, while rationalizing the blowback when they got caught. Those lacking in the genes that make up the Jewish psyche often defected, and the Jewish unique psychological makeup increasingly reflected those left behind.

*Jews in American Politics* then is a good window into this world of race consciousness, feelings of racial superiority, and fear of persecution behind every goyim action. If only the Jewish mind understood how little Europeans even think about Jews unless the Jews aggressively insinuate themselves into Europeans' affairs - as is happening with the (second) war against Iraq as a stepping stone for the United States to neutralize Arab threats in the region on behalf of Israel. Will the Jews escape culpability if the war escalates into World War III? Not this time, this is the information age and people watch events unfold while being analyzed as to why, by any interested citizen - the Internet has made that possible.

The following excerpts then from *Jews in American Politics* shows a self-confident Jewish race, one that is unaware what will unfold just months away. If the book had been written months after rather than months before 9/11, I believe it would read very differently. All quotes from

this point on are from this book.

**"[Benjamin Ginsberg] Jewish political life in America poses a basic dilemma. Can the Jews succeed where others have failed and lead America while still remaining separate from it? On the one hand, Jews have risen to positions of influence and leadership in America far out of proportion to their numbers. On the other, leaders of the American Jewish community have struggled to maintain Jewish identity and distinctiveness in a nation that 'melts' its ethnic groups - at least its white ethnic groups - into a barely distinguishable mass....**

"For example, the beginning of the century nearly half the students enrolled in Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons were Jews. By the beginning of World War II, less than 7 percent of Columbia's medical students were Jews. The Jewish enrollment in Cornell's School of Medicine fell from 40 to 4 percent between the world wars: Harvard's, from 30 to 4 percent. [Because of quotas]

"During the 1940s and 1950s, Jewish organizations used the threat of legal action to compel universities to end overt discrimination against both blacks and Jews in their admissions policies. In 1945, for example; Columbia University altered its restrictive admissions procedures, when the AJCongress's Commission on Law and Social Action initiated a legal challenge to the university's tax-exempt status. Cohen and Orren show that other universities, including Yale, moved to preclude similar suits by modifying their procedures as well. Through these actions Jewish organizations allied themselves with blacks, although the number of African Americans seeking admission to elite universities in the 1940s was very small. By speaking on behalf of blacks as well as Jews, Jewish groups were able to position themselves as fighting for the quintessential American principles of fair play and equal justice, rather than the selfish interests of Jews alone. College admissions would not be the last instance in which Jewish organizations found that Jews and African Americans could help one another....

"At the national level, Jewish organizations induced President Truman to create a number of panels to investigate discrimination in employment and education. The President's Commission on Higher Education recommended that university applications eliminate all questions pertaining to race, religion, and national origin. Similarly, the President's Committee on Civil Rights attacked Jewish quotas in university admissions....

"Jews played a major role in the coalition that worked to end officially mandated school prayer and other forms of public (and almost always Christian) exercise of religion. The AJCongress, together with the AJC and the Anti-Defamation League, joined with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and a Protestant group - 'Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State' - to initiate a series of federal court suits opposing school prayer. Fearing an antisemitic backlash, the three Jewish organizations were very anxious to diminish the visibility of Jews as opponents of school prayer. The AJC, for example, insisted that the ACLU find both a non-Jewish plaintiff and non-Jewish attorney for its ultimately successful attack on a New York state law providing for released time from school for religious instruction.

"The ACLU complied with the AJC's Wishes. Ironically, the public generally assumed that plaintiff Tessim Zorach and attorney Kenneth Greenawalt - both Gentiles - in the 1952 case of

*Zorach v. Clausen* were Jews. Similarly, according to Samuel Walker, in 1962, in *Engel v. Vitale*, challenging the constitutionality of New York's nondenominational school prayer, the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU) assigned William Butler, the only non-Jew on the NYCLU lawyer's committee to the case....

"This historic background and the continuing relationship between Jews and the national government help explain one of the most notable characteristics of Jews in American politics: their strong adherence to liberalism, and especially to the Democratic Party, as loyal voters, leading activists, and major financial contributors. Geoffrey Brahm Levey has ascribed Jewish liberalism to the inherently humanistic character of Jewish values and traditions. This explanation seems somewhat fanciful, however, since in some political settings Jews have managed to overcome their humanistic scruples enough to organize and operate rather ruthless agencies of coercion and terror such as the infamous Soviet-era NKVD.

"Like the politics of the Catholic Church, often liberal where Catholics are in the minority but reactionary where Catholics are in the majority, the politics of Jews varies with objective conditions. Jews have, at various times and in various places been republicans, monarchists, communists, and fascists, as well as liberals. In the United States, Jews became liberal Democrats during the 1930s because in the face of social discrimination, Jews found protection and opportunity in a political coalition organized by the Democrats around a liberal social and economic agenda....

"The liberal, Democratic coalition also promoted and, to some extent, continues to promote principles of civil rights that serve the interests of Jews. Democratic civil rights policies have worked to Jews' advantage in a direct way by outlawing forms of discrimination that affected Jews as well as blacks. Equally important, these policies have served to expand the reach and power of the federal government (an institution in which Jews exercised a great deal of influence) relative to the private sector and sub-national jurisdictions (where Jews' influence was less)....

"For most American ethnic groups, success and assimilation have gone hand in hand. Though many Jews seem thoroughly Americanized and 'marrying out' has become a major issue in recent years, some argue that Jews remain less assimilated than other American ethnic groups of European origin. The continuing identity and distinctiveness of the Jews is a tribute to communal leadership. Jews have helped lead America for a few decades, but this is but a brief moment in the extended history of Jewish leadership. For more than two long millennia, Jews have practiced and honed the leadership skills needed to maintain communal coherence in the Diaspora. Everywhere that a sizeable Jewish community has existed, Jews have also established a complex of religious, educational, and communal institutions that collectively serve as a Jewish government in exile, regulating the affairs of the Jewish community.

"Often, these institutions were created or transplanted in response to antisemitism and discrimination. However, once established, as is true for any other government, this government in exile has a vested interest in maintaining itself by maintaining its constituency as a separate and distinct group. Whether or not Jews need Jewish institutions, these institutions certainly need Jews if they are to survive. The survival of Jewish institutions, moreover, depends on the continued existence of the Jews as a separate and distinct group. Hence, these institutions and their leaders have promulgated a doctrine of separatism beginning with a religion that emphasizes the uniqueness of Jews as God's 'chosen people',

and a version of history that emphasizes the danger posed by non-Jews.

"The government-in-the-Diaspora is responsible for maintaining Jewish identity despite the temptation faced by Jews to defect. A complex of lay and religious leaders and institutions, making use of secular techniques of governance as well as religious rituals and laws, maintain the existence of a Jewish community. The Jewish philosopher, Ahad Ha-am, once observed; 'More than the Jews kept the Sabbath: the Sabbath kept them.' This observation could be expanded to assert that Jews do not create Jewish institutions so much as these institutions create Jews and work to ensure their continued existence. It is because of the continuing efforts of these institutions that there continue to be Jews in America....

"This enormous complex of organizations and agencies asserts that they exist to serve the needs of the Jewish people. And, of course, they do. They work to combat antisemitism, deliver social services, provide educational opportunities, ensure religious training, resettle immigrants, and protect Israel's interests. However, the major goal of most, if not all these organizations, agencies, and institutions is what Jonathan Woocher has called 'sacred survival.' That is, they work to ensure the continuity of the Jewish people as a distinctive group both by struggling against enemies seeking to destroy the Jews and, at the same time, struggling to prevent the assimilation of the Jews into the larger society....

"Moreover, on the one hand, Jewish organizations are forever vigilant against any and all manifestations of antisemitism, believing that the ultimate aim of every antisemite is the annihilation of the Jewish people. On the other hand, as frightening as annihilation may be, Jewish organizations are equally worried about the danger that Jews will disappear as a result of assimilation. Major Jewish organizations have made the fight against assimilation a primary goal. Through their cultural and educational programs Jewish groups emphasize three major points. First, Jews today have a debt to their ancestors to pass on their Jewish heritage to their children. To fail in this duty is to betray the millions of Jewish martyrs who fought and died for their faith and their people over the past four thousand years. Second, Jews as a people have made an enormous contribution to civilization through the philosophical ideals and scientific principles they have introduced. Thus, Jews have an obligation to humanity to maintain their distinctive identities, 'because we are struggling to teach men how to build a better world for all men,' as woocher has said. Finally, only as self-conscious members of the Jewish community, the Jewish leadership avers, can Jews lead meaningful lives.

"Thus, the great key to Jewish survival over the centuries: a government in exile that has struggled to preserve the identity and integrity of its people; a government in exile, moreover, that has had centuries to perfect three instruments on which it relies in its fight to maintain a Jewish community. These are law and religious practice, education, and communal mobilization.

"A central precept of Jewish law and religion is the distinctiveness or 'chosenness' of the Jewish people. Jewish religious practice, moreover, serves to reinforce this distinctiveness by maintaining the unity of the community and separating it from the Gentile community. For example, Jews have their own rituals, their own holidays, their own dietary codes. All these are justified as the special duties of Jews stemming from their special relationship with God. The effect of these practices is to remind the Jewish practitioner and the Gentile observer - that Jews are different and distinctive, in order to separate Jews from the influence of Gentile society. The notion of the Jews as a people chosen by God begins with God's covenant with Abraham in Genesis: 'I will maintain My covenant between Me and you, and your off-spring to come, as an

everlasting covenant throughout the ages, to be God to you and your offspring to come. I assign the land you sojourn in to you and your offspring to come, all the land of Canaan, as an everlasting holding, I will be their God.' This covenant is renewed in Exodus, which suggests that the Jews, as God's chosen people have a special mission. 'You have seen what I did to the Egyptians; how I bore you on eagle's wings and brought you to Me. Now then, if you will obey Me faithfully and keep My covenant, you shall be My treasured possession among all the peoples. Indeed, all the earth is Mine, but you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.'...

"Every year, hundreds of thousands of Jewish children attend Jewish educational institutions, ranging from Jewish day schools, through afternoon Hebrew schools, to morning Sunday schools. These schools offer a variety of different curricula. In the Hebrew day schools, a great deal of instruction is offered in the Hebrew language and in Jewish law and history. In the afternoon Hebrew schools, some of which meet only once a week, the curriculum is abbreviated. In the weekly Sunday schools, with typically shorter sessions still, the curriculum is very limited. The differences among these schools are instructive. As instructional time is reduced and curricular content abbreviated, training in the Hebrew language is usually the first subject to be eliminated. Next to go is the study of Jewish law. Next is training in prayer and ritual. What is left, then, when everything else has been dropped from the curriculum? **The irreducible minimum, conceived to be more important than law, religion, or language, is the inculcation of Jewish national identity and loyalty. In other words, even where children are taught hardly anything about the substance of Jewish belief and practice, an effort is made to teach them to identify themselves as Jews, to take pride in their difference from other people.**

"Jewish identification and distinctiveness are also the themes of the three holidays that form the pillars on which the education of Jewish children is presently built: Passover, Purim, and Hanukkah. As is often pointed out by religious purists, these three celebrations are not the most significant events in the Jewish religious calendar. Yom Kippur, Rosh Hashanah, and several other festivals are more important. Nevertheless, it is Passover, Purim, and Hanukkah that are chiefly emphasized in the Jewish schools. Not only are these cheerful holidays, deemed likely to appeal to childish sensibilities, but these three holidays help teach three fundamental concepts to Jewish children. **Passover teaches chosenness, Purim emphasizes the potential duplicity of Gentiles, and Hanukkah emphasizes the evil of assimilation....**

"American Jewish support for Israel is also, in part, based on something that Jews will admit to one another but seldom to non-Jews, a fear that, as has occurred so often in Jewish history, Jews just might some day find themselves compelled to leave America and seek refuge elsewhere. **Israel, to many Jews, represents a form of insurance policy against a major upsurge of antisemitism in the United States....**

"In the early 1950s, an accommodation was reached between the Jewish state in Israel and the Jewish state in America. The Israeli government agreed to stop embarrassing American Jews and undermining the American Jewish leadership with declarations that Israel was the only true home for a Jew. The American Jewish leadership, for its part, agreed to provide financial and political support for Israel but to refrain from attempting to meddle in Israeli policies. In the aftermath of this accommodation, previously non-Zionist American Jewish organizations like the AJC became staunch supporters of Israel. The position developed by American Jewish organizations and given the blessing of Israeli leaders was that American Jews had a religious

and moral commitment to support Israel but no obligation to come to Israel to live. Indeed, some prominent Jewish leaders in America argued that American Jews could best fulfill their moral obligation to Israel by remaining in America, where they could use their political influence and organizational strength to assure Israel of American financial and military support.

"In this way, the threat posed by the state of Israel to the Jewish 'state' in America was defused and transformed into an opportunity....

"As the emphasis in this letter suggests, over the past twenty-five years, the Holocaust has become one of the most important vehicles for rallying support and raising funds in the Jewish community. Three major Holocaust museums have been built in the United States in recent years, and **Holocaust history has become an important curricular focus for all levels of Jewish education.**

"While this acknowledgment of the tragedy that took place is important, during the actual Holocaust, unfortunately, American Jewish organizations were mainly silent, more concerned with antisemitism at home than with the fate of millions of Jews in Europe. For example, Leon Wells relates that when Joseph Proskauer became president of the AJC in 1943, his acceptance speech, which dealt with the problems American Jews were likely to face in the postwar period, made no mention whatsoever of the ongoing slaughter of European Jews or of any possible rescue efforts. Similarly, in *Deafening Silence* Medoff states that the 'Statement of Views' adopted by the AJC's 1943 annual meeting has no mention of the Germans' ongoing efforts to destroy the European Jews, something that was already known by American Jewish leaders at that time....

**"The story of the Holocaust, moreover, became a useful parable on the dangers of assimilation and the evil of which even the best Gentiles were capable.** After all, had not the Jews lived in Germany for centuries? Did many German Jews not regard themselves as Germans first and Jews second? Did their German friends and neighbors not turn on the Jews in a murderous rage? During the 1970s, this version of the story of the Holocaust began to join or even to replace Bible stories as mechanisms through which to teach American Jews - especially American Jewish children - to be wary of identifying too closely with the world of Gentile America....

"The prominence currently given to the story of the Warsaw ghetto tragedy is especially ironic given the lack of a response among American Jewish leaders to the uprising when it actually occurred. In April and May 1943, as the ghetto was being liquidated by the Germans, Jewish resistance fighters made a series of dramatic broadcasts and desperate calls for help over their clandestine radio station. On April 22, the station told the world that 'Gun salvos are echoing in Warsaw's streets. Women and children are defending themselves with bare hands. Come to our aid!' On May 25, the BBC reported monitoring a broadcast telling of Jews being executed by firing squads and being burned alive. Yet many American Jewish organizations had other priorities and gave little attention to the grim news from Warsaw. Only years later, when it became an important vehicle for communal mobilization, did the story of the Warsaw ghetto become a prominent focus of American Jewish concern.

"A similar story could be told about another contemporary focus of Jewish organizations' mobilizing efforts - the discovery of the plight of the Russian Jews. When Stalin was actually murdering hundreds of thousands of Jews, little interest in this tragedy was expressed in the

West. In the United States, as Paul Appelbaum has observed, 'The few calls for concerted action [to help the Soviet Jews] were, for the most part, gently put and generally ignored' (614). Indeed, many left-wing American Jewish organizations and leaders denied that Jews were actually persecuted in the Soviet Union. In later years, however, when the utility of Israel as a rallying point for fund-raising and organizational activities was compromised, American Jewish organizations made much of the importance of saving the Russian Jews.

"Communal mobilization has thus been the third instrument through which leadership has preserved the Jewish community in America. **Religious practice, education, and communal mobilization have prevented the Jews from completely disappearing into America.** Because of the community's leadership, the Jews continue to maintain a measure of cohesion and identity in a nation whose other European ethnic groups are now largely indistinguishable.

"[David G. Dalin] During his eight years in the White House, Bill Clinton appointed more Jews to high-level positions than had any other president. Five Jews headed cabinet departments during Clinton's eight years; six others held portfolios with cabinet rank. The positions were of importance and covered the breadth of government activity....

"More Jews also served in prominent White House staff positions in the Clinton administration than at any time since the New Deal....The number of Jews appointed to sub-cabinet positions or to ambassadorships is equally impressive.

"In many respects, the 1990s were a historic - indeed, a golden-era for Jews in American politics and government. In that decade more Jews won election to the Congress and Senate than at any other time in American history. During the first four years of the 1950s, only one Jew was a member of the United States Senate; during the 1990s, eleven served at one time. For the first time in American history, a president, Bill Clinton, appointed two Jews to the United States Supreme Court. In the eight years of his presidency, Clinton appointed almost as many Jews to cabinet posts as had all of his predecessors combined. During the Clinton presidency, Jews received more ambassadorial appointments including the first appointment as ambassador to Israel, than in any other administration in American history.

"Although it has been hardly remarked on, a distinctive legacy of the Clinton presidency was the extraordinary number of Jewish appointees in important policymaking and advisory positions throughout the executive branch of the federal government. Indeed, through appointments to his White House staff, cabinet, and a variety of sub-cabinet and diplomatic posts, President Clinton brought more Jews into high-level positions in government than had any other president. Through these presidential appointments, American Jews have received an unprecedented degree of political recognition and influence in American government and public life that would have been unimagined in any earlier generation....

"[Connie L. McNeedy and Susan J. Tolchin] Jews number only 1 to 2 percent of the population, however, when their influence has been disproportionate to their numbers, antisemitism has tended to emerge. **Fearing this reaction, many politically active Jews have preferred, until very recently to exercise their power behind the scenes and not in the forefront of politics.** More typically, Jews have occupied high-ranking positions as advisers, financiers, publishers, and media figures.

After the 1992 election, for the first time in history, the number of Jews in the Senate grew

to ten, symbolically representing the first time that Jews in the Senate could form a *minyan*, the minimum number required for a 'prayer quorum.'...

"[Robert A. Burt] Of the 108 justices who have served on the United States Supreme Court since its founding, seven have been Jews....

"If the Jewish seat as such once had but no longer has strong social leaning, the question remains whether Jewishness has had any intrinsic significance for its occupants in their conception of their social role as (Jewish) justices. Two sentimentalized claims are often made for such significance: that Jews are inclined toward the legal profession because of the rabbinic tradition of close talmudic reading, and that Jews are inclined toward protection of all vulnerable minorities because of the Old Testament injunction to 'remember that you once were slaves in Egypt.' The causal connection is not, however, convincing. The Hebrew Bible expresses conflicting admonitions: alongside commandments for empathy with other socially vulnerable groups, there are directives for narrow self-aggrandizement [Jewish power] as God's 'chosen people' entitled to oust vulnerable others from divinely promised lands. The special affinity of Jews for the legal profession might well have some connection to rabbinic pursuits, but it is most plausible to see this Jewish concentration in the pursuit of professional credentials as 'helpers' and 'fixers' (whether in law, medicine, or accounting) as a secular strategy for self-protection and aggrandizement in a Gentile world offering limited social acceptance to Jews. **It is less the rabbinic tradition than the hallowed social role of court Jew - as protected servant and financial facilitator of Christian kings in their struggles to exert centralized authority over feudal nobility** - that marked the path leading so many American Jews to the legal profession (and seven of them to the Supreme Court)....

"[Gerald M. Pomper and Miles A. Pomper] The characteristic forms of Jewish politics in America are also broadly related to Lawrence Fuchs's classic description of fundamental Jewish values. Fuchs argues that three basic values provide the sources of American Jewish liberalism: learning (Torah), charity (*tzedakeh*), and nonasceticism, a celebration of life's pleasures. The emphasis on Torah made Jews receptive to intellectual designs for social reconstruction. The duty of *tzedakeh* [charity] stimulated Jews to support efforts toward redistributive justice. The emphasis on worldly pleasures made Jews seek improvements in their earthly life rather than patiently await redemption in a heavenly paradise.

We admittedly stretch these terms in the following three-part analysis. In the first section, we examine machine politics, an expression of materialist values - another possible meaning of nonasceticism. What Fuchs defined as an emphasis on this-worldliness and the enjoyment of life here and now can become manifest in Jewish striving toward the machine's material rewards of money, prestige, and power....

"The Jewish impulse toward reform has not only been evident within the Democratic Party but also - a generation after Franklin Roosevelt - in direct opposition to it. In the social upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s, some Jews came to believe that the Democratic Party had been corrupted by narrow, special interests - too corrupted to be reformed. Dismayed by the weaknesses they perceived in the presidency of Jimmy Carter, they argued that the United States had lost its moral compass both internationally and domestically.

"Inheritors of the ADA tradition on international issues, they came to believe that the Democratic Party was increasingly 'soft' on communism, indifferent to the Soviet Union's persecution of Jews, and acquiescent to third-world countries' domination of the United



Nations on such issues as the notorious 1975 United Nations resolution condemning Zionism as racism. At home, they began to react against such conventional liberal policies such as affirmative action. Racial preferences were seen as contradictory to Jewish ideals of merit-based achievement and objective academic advancement. Not insignificantly, these programs were also seen as harmful to Jewish self-interests.

"These 'neoconservatives' had actually been slowly moving to the Republican Party since the 1950s: a half dozen Jews were among the founding members of *National Review*, the leading magazine of the intellectual right. But two events accelerated their movement to the Republican Party, in the late 1970s: the defeat of their Democratic champion, Henry M. 'Scoop' Jackson, in the 1976 Democratic Party presidential nomination and the emergence of Ronald Reagan as the GOP standard-bearer in the 1980 elections.

"Reagan's moralistic voice in international relations struck a chord with these 'neocon' Jews. They, too, regarded the Soviet Union as an 'evil empire,' and they welcomed Reagan's hard-line defense of Israel. More basically, Reagan's upbeat, optimistic view of the United States' role in the world resonated with these successful Americans, who felt that their fellow Jews had finally found a safe home in the United States, and angrily rejected the left's constant criticism. As one of their leaders, Irving Kristol, wryly said of American tolerance, Christians in the United States were less eager to persecute them than to have them marry their sons and daughters. Kristol's son, William, became an important player in GOP policy circles, serving as a key Republican strategist, editor of the Republican-leaning *Weekly Standard*, and as Vice President Dan Quayle's chief of staff....

"Yet, with a few exceptions, such as Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, who unsuccessfully sought the Republican presidential nomination in 1996, the Jewish role in GOP politics has been largely behind the scenes. But, aside from the major recent exception of Lieberman, that description is also true of the Democrats. **In a role that harks back to the old 'court Jew' tradition of hidden influence over political decisions** and invokes Fuchs's description of Torah or 'learning,' Jews have served as key advisers to both political parties, using their intellect to influence leaders while largely remaining out of the limelight....

"From the early twentieth century through the early 1950s, the primary agenda of the Jewish community was combating antisemitism at home and abroad and the corollary of antisemitism, discrimination, which was pervasive. From the early 1950s to the mid-1960s, the Jewish communal agenda was the civil rights movement, on the assumption that Jews would only be secure if all groups in American society were secure: again, a single issue to the exclusion of virtually everything else. Civil rights were *the* Jewish agenda. The separation of church and state played a significant role during these years as well. The great landmark cases were decided during this period, with essential participation - indeed, leadership - of the Jewish community. But the first priority was civil rights.

"Two events occurred in the mid-1960s that radically changed American Jewish priorities: the emergence of the Soviet Jewry movement in the United States in 1963 and the Six-Day War in 1967. The crucial impacts of these two developments were that they led American Jews to become preoccupied with Israel and Soviet Jewry and to move away from the broad range of domestic advocacy issues that encompassed social and economic justice concerns. Issues on the domestic agenda were yet on the Jewish agenda, but they were no longer the *priority* issues

for advocacy. Almost overnight the Jewish advocacy agenda became more particularistic, more 'Jewish.'...

"Now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, with radical changes in the communal agenda, American Jewry is once again reevaluating those issues it considers crucial to its survival and security. Levels of both behavioral and attitudinal antisemitism are very low, and in any case antisemitism poses no real threat to the ability of Jews to participate fully in the society. With the collapse of the Soviet Union a decade ago, the Soviet Jewry issue no longer constitutes an agenda for political and international advocacy but for social services. Finally, the Israel agenda, long the most critical for American Jews and Jewish advocacy groups, has changed radically. Whatever the serious problems and deep pitfalls in the peace process, the issues that have come to the fore are related more to the relationship between Israel and America's Jews than with the physical security of Israel.

"The Jewish community, then, is clearly in a transitional period. One principle, however, remains the central organizing principle for issues on the public affairs agenda: The issues that the community addresses - that are 'selected' for advocacy - are those in which *there is a consensus of the community that they affect Jewish security*....

"At the center, some issues immediately and directly relate to Jewish security: antisemitism, Israel, and the security of Jewish communities abroad. These issues, tautologically 'security' issues, lie at the core of advocacy.

"We then move one concentric circle out. In the penumbra [outlying region] of Jewish concerns, the relationship to Jewish security remains absolutely central. The separation of church and state - the central guarantor of Jewish security in the United States - is the most obvious in this category. This circle includes First Amendment and other political freedom issues. Jewish communal leader Earl Raab suggests a construct: what government *cannot* do to an individual, and what one individual cannot do to another. Bill of Rights protections - the balancing of the interests of government, the state, the individual, majorities, and minorities - fall under this rubric.

"The next level of concentric circles includes issues that, while they are located at the periphery of Jewish concerns, are clearly important to the health of the society and are therefore important to Jews as enhancing the health of American Jewish society. The questions are not of restraint, as are those of political and personal freedom, but of positive beneficence: what government *can* and *should* do for a person. Social and economic justice, the environment, and other such issues fall into this category.

"As the agenda expands, the inevitable question arises: 'Why is this issue a priority for Jewish advocacy?' **Issues are priorities for Jews when they implicate Jewish security. To take one dramatic example, the Jewish community became involved in civil rights not out of liberal philosophies but out of Jewish self-interest.** As discussed later in this chapter, it was not without vigorous debate within the Jewish community over the question as to whether 'relations with Negroes' was central to Jewish security. The Jewish advocacy agenda, therefore, ought not be refracted through the prism of the 'liberal agenda' - and it never was in any case. The conventional wisdom that the 'old-time religion' of 1950s and 1960s liberalism has driven the Jewish agenda is only partly right - and therefore mostly wrong. **Jewish social and political tradition is neither liberal nor conservative; it is**

**Jewish.** American Jews have long understood that the advocacy agenda is the enabler of all of the other agendas of the community and is the vehicle which a contemporary realization of the traditional imperatives of *kehilla* (community) and *tzedakeh* (justice and charity) is expressed.

"With the receding of the *exogenous* 'security-and-survival' advocacy agenda, the concern of American Jews has turned increasingly *inward*, to its own values - indeed, to its very continuity. **Concern over rates of intermarriage and massive Jewish functional illiteracy has brought about an agenda of identity.** Jewish continuity, and Jewish 'Renaissance.' With the significant shift in priorities toward strategies aimed at guaranteeing Jewish continuity, Jewish advocacy organizations will be called on to rethink their missions and retool their operations. It remains to be seen whether the new emphasis on Jewish continuity can be effected without damage to the community's traditionally broad public-affairs advocacy agenda.

"[Jerome A. Chanes] Although observers perceive the Jewish community, with its multiplicity of organizations, as being chaotic, the reality is that the disparate forces do in fact work together. The resultant voice of American Jewry is an effective one and has had a significant impact on the public affairs agenda of the American polity - indeed, on the shaping of American society. It was the collective voice of American Jews that ensured U.S. support for Israel over the last half-century and secured administration and congressional backing for a tough stand in favor of the emigration of Soviet Jews. This voice immeasurably improved American society, by helping shape the civil rights movement, to repeal the National Origins Quota System for immigration to maintain and to strengthen the separation of church and state, and to provide a model for social service.

"On the other hand, the Jewish community is not in danger of being 'balkanized.' Most Jews in America do not concede to any one organization the right to express their particular views: they may well look to a number of different organizations, and this dynamic is very important in shaping the voices of the community. **American Jews are willing to accept a fair amount of elasticity on views and positions, as long as basic, elemental consensus positions (e.g., the security of the state of Israel) are at their core.** These basic positions remain strong and secure....

"The strength of the Jewish community - and by extension of Jewish communal advocacy - lies in the pluralistic structure of the community. **The community does not seek unity merely for the sake of unity but in order for the community to achieve collectively its shared goals.** One perception has it that the American Jewish community, with its multiplicity of agencies, is chaotic. The reality is that the community possesses the mechanisms that are capable of getting these disparate, often cacophonous, voices to work together. This collective voice - an effective one in terms of its impact on public policy, as we have seen - is the envy of other groups. The vitality demonstrated by this coordinated activity bodes well for the future of the American Jewish polity....

"[Matthew R. Kerbel] From the beginning, the names of the people who witnessed and forged these changes were both Jewish *and* Gentile. They became publishers and editors, reporters and columnists - people with influence owing to their ownership of the press and those with influence owing to their skillful contributions to what was published and broadcast. For the Protestants among their ranks, it is safe to say that religious self-identification was not a

universally important component of how they went about their work. But, for the Jews, it does not overstate the case to say that religious orientation - or, at least those cultural aspects of being Jewish in a Christian world - was of overriding concern. Even for those like Walter Lippmann, who steadfastly avoided all mention of his Jewish heritage, it was throughout his life the five-ton elephant in the middle of the room. The issue is a familiar one: how to handle the countervailing pressures of fitting in and being different.

"[Ira N. Forman] As understood by ordinary members of the 'tribe,' being a 'good' Jew seems to have little connection to religious behavior. By a two-to-one margin, in fact, the participants in Jewish surveys have rejected the notion that 'good Jews' must do something as basically religious as believe in God or attend synagogue faithfully. Rather, most Jews define a 'good' Jew as somebody who contributes to Jewish causes, supports civil rights for black Americans, favors generous social welfare benefits, and embraces other progressive social values. Asked explicitly about the qualities that most strongly define their own Jewish identity, Jews are four times as likely to mention a commitment to social equality as they are to choose either support for Israel or religious involvement. In other words, for many Jews, the values of their religion are understood to promote attachment to a liberal political agenda carried into public life.

"The attachment to liberal values and candidates is just one of the traits that make American Jewry such an interesting phenomenon in American public life. Jewish Americans represent an extremely small percentage of the population, 2 to 3 percent, depending on how Judaism is defined; yet, as voters, donors, activists, leaders, and thinkers, they have had a profound impact on American political debate and the political process. The extent to which liberalism defines Jews' political attitudes is remarkable because it violates all the assumptions we make about the effect of upward mobility and assimilation on political behavior. Most immigrant groups move politically to the right as they become more integrated in American society. By contrast, American Jewry has retained a distinctive political identity and a liberal ideology, despite rapid social advancement and acceptance. We find relatively little political differentiation among Jews based on their economic or educational attainment. While other ethnoreligious groups are said to be dividing politically on the basis of religiosity, the link between religious commitment and political outlooks among Jewish Americans is much weaker.

"Looked at from almost any angle, then, the political attitudes and behavior of American Jews are paradoxical. In this chapter, we explore the puzzling phenomenon by profiling contemporary Jewish beliefs about politics and elections. In most of the chapter, we present information about how Jews differ from non-Jews, taking advantage of a rare public opinion poll commissioned for this chapter. We also look for signs of internal political division among American Jews, emphasizing the role of religious commitment, age, gender, and other potential sources of disagreement. Before turning to the specifics of Jewish political behavior, we first summarize what scholars have written about Jewish politics in the United States, emphasizing in particular the explanations for Jewish distinctiveness and the claims that Jewish political cohesion will disappear in the near future.

"When he wrote that 'Jews earn like Episcopalians and vote like Puerto Ricans,' Milton Himmelfarb nicely captured the central paradox of Jewish politics in the contemporary United States. If politics is about economic self-interest, as so many observers believe, Jews should vote and think politically like Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and other high-status groups. Yet despite their affluence and status, Jewish voting patterns and attitudes are much closer to the norms for African Americans, Hispanics, and other groups who have the most to gain from progressive

economic and social policies. This anomalous pattern has long perplexed scholarly observers and infuriated conservative activists like Irving Kristol who denounce what they call 'the political stupidity of the Jews.'

"In making sense of Jewish political patterns, one should start with the recognition that nothing is inevitable about the contemporary political alignment of American Jews. Although many Jews feel that their community's liberal political slant is nothing more than applied Judaism, the facts tell a different story. At other periods of American history, Jews were attached to a variety of political parties and causes. Although hard to know for sure, analysis of electoral data suggests that many Jews identified with Republican causes before Franklin Roosevelt came to the presidency. Moreover, a look at global and historical information reveals that Jews have been all over the political map. Unlike their counterparts in the United States, Jews in England, Australia, and Canada are often found politically divided or even on the conservative side in public debates. American Jews, who often blithely assume that Judaism by its nature compels support for human rights and progressive social values, are sometimes shocked to discover that Israeli Jews find very different political norms embedded in Judaism....

"Fuchs contends that these political lodestars are in turn anchored by three elements of Judaism. First, the Jewish emphasis on *learning* disposes Jews to support ambitious plans of social reconstruction under the aegis of government authorities. **Jews have no trouble with the idea that experts ought to help plan society.** Moreover, the commitment to education also makes Jews fierce defenders of intellectual freedom and hostile to restrictions on civil liberties. Such issues often divided Republicans and Democrats in the 1950s and 1960s.

"Fuchs's second religious value, *tzedakeh* [charity], is invoked to explain Jewish sympathy for the weak and oppressed and their commitment to social justice and compassion. Third, Fuchs calls attention to the worldly, nonascetic nature of Judaism. Unlike some forms of Christianity, Judaism does not regard human pleasure as something separate from God but emphasizes the godliness of sensuality. Nor does Judaism believe that human beings should postpone gratification for an ideal heaven. Together, these values render Jews enthusiastic supporters of plans to remake the world in God's image....

"Scholars who are puzzled by Jewish liberalism and support for Democrats often assume that such behavior is contrary to Jewish interests. As an affluent community, surely American Jews have more to gain by *embracing* conservatism than by continued attachment to liberalism. These observers frequently wonder aloud why Jews do not follow their 'interests' in politics. In response, some observers have asserted that Jews do indeed pursue their own interests in politics to the same degree as other ethnoreligious groups in the United States. **Their behavior is puzzling only to people who assume that Jewish self-interest is defined solely by economic considerations. Looked at more broadly, advocates of this perspective contend, Jews remain liberal and Democratic because both alliances are good for them.**

"According to this view, Jews have thrived especially well in the liberal political and economic system of the United States. The low level of antisemitism and the easy breaking of barriers to advancement were possible for the Jews because of the pro-civil rights measures and policies pursued over the years by liberal politicians. Jews supported the efforts to make discrimination illegal because they benefited substantially from an open and fair competitive system. At the end of the day, nothing is very puzzling about Jewish political behavior because it simply reflects a rational calculation of the impact of public policies on Jewish existence....

"[Anna Greenberg and Kenneth D. Wald] Clearly, Jewish liberalism, while strong, is by no means monolithic. But what is striking is how little variation shows within the Jewish community on most issues. The absence of internal political diversity distinguishes Jewish Americans from other citizens who are divided by class, religiosity, geography, and race. Certainly younger Jews are less partisan and more socially liberal than their elders, yet Jews overall are politically undifferentiated by class, geography, and, surprisingly, level of religious observance. **In this high level of internal agreement, Jews resemble African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and other minority groups who exhibit a remarkable and enduring degree of internal political cohesiveness. Both in what they believe and how strongly they agree with one another, Jews continue to confound many of the commonplace assumptions about group political behavior.**

"Jewish Americans do not exhibit the same political tendencies as other demographically equivalent groups. For instance, we might expect Jewish Americans to become more conservative in their beliefs and voting preferences as succeeding generations attain higher levels of affluence and education. **In fact, Jewish Americans are among the most highly educated, professional, and affluent members of the population. In the Jewish Public Opinion Study, 58 percent of Jewish Americans have a college degree, compared to 22 percent of non-Jews. Twenty-eight percent of Jewish Americans describe themselves as professional, compared to 10 percent of non-Jews. Thirty-seven percent of Jews earn over \$85,000, compared to 13 percent of non-Jews....**

"At the present time, school vouchers remain hypothetical for the vast majority of American school districts. Although Jewish organizations have joined teachers' groups in challenging their constitutionality, **the Jewish rank and file may not yet have understood the church-state implications of vouchers or considered the possibility that this innovation may hurt public school funding or permit state funds to flow to racist and antisemitic schools....**

"As interesting as these attitude differences are to Jews and students of political behavior generally, the general reader might wonder why they matter. If Jews constitute less than 3 percent of the American population, why should we care about their distinctive political habits? The answer is that Jewish Americans do have an important impact on American politics despite their small numbers. We know that Jews 'over-participate' in politics: they are more likely than other Americans to vote, contribute to campaigns, and embrace social activism. In a society in which politics is a spectator sport with an audience base that ranks somewhere below professional sports, Jews thus have a political impact beyond their numbers. But does this disparity stem from something distinctly Jewish or from the fact that Jews tend to have more resources than other Americans? As we know from studies of political participation, political engagement is closely related to the socioeconomic resources an individual possesses. For a variety of reasons that are beyond the scope of this chapter, highly educated and affluent citizens are much more likely than the disadvantaged to participate and exert influence in politics. But is Jewish participation higher or lower than we would expect after taking into account the social conditions of the Jewish community in the United States?

"**Comparing Jews with non-Jews of comparable socioeconomic status reveals that Jews 'over-participate' not because they are Jewish, but because they possess considerable resources.** Overall, statistically significant differences exist between Jews and non-Jews on making campaign contributions, voter registration, and voting in the 1996 election. But high-

status non-Jews' participation rate across a range of measures is nearly identical to Jewish Americans. The only exception is interest in politics Jews are significantly more likely to be 'very interested' in politics and public affairs than high-status non-Jews....

"Scholars argue that African Americans maintain their political cohesion in the face of increasing internal differentiation because they think of their political interests in terms of group interests. They gauge their understanding of political and economic events by considering their effect on African Americans relative to other groups such as white Americans....

"[Edward Shapiro] Words used to describe the voting patterns of American Jews include *paradoxical, dissonant, peculiar, strange, curious, contradictory, and idiosyncratic*. Things were not always perceived this way. In the nineteenth century, Benjamin Disraeli remarked about the political conservatism of Jews. He once described himself as the blank page between the Old and New Testaments. In his book *Lord George Bentinck*, he calls Jews 'the trustees of tradition, and the conservators of the religious element.... All the tendencies of the Jewish race are conservative. Their bias is to religion, property, and natural aristocracy; and it should be the interest of statesmen that this bias of a great race should be encouraged and their energies and creative powers enlisted in the cause of existing society.'...

"After the Six-Day War of 1967, however, some liberals now described the Jewish state as militaristic, imperialistic, capitalistic, and racist. Jews had once been in the forefront of the civil rights movement and had believed that Jews and blacks comprised a holy brotherhood of the oppressed. By the late 1960s, antisemitism had become an important staple of the rhetoric of black radicals, as, for example, in Harold Cruse's 1967 book, *The Crisis of the Black Intellectual*, and liberals seemed to be willing to overlook or excuse such talk out of fear of lending aid and comfort to the right. 'Whatever the case may have been yesterday, and whatever the case may be tomorrow,' Podhoretz said, 'the case today is that the most active enemies of the Jews are located not in the precincts of the ideological Right but in the Radical Left.'

"In a perceptive 1988 *Commentary* essay, Dan Himmelfarb, the managing editor of *The Public Interest*, stressed the differences between the traditionalist conservatives or paleoconservatives, as they came to be called - and the neoconservatives, a group composed largely of Jews disaffected from contemporary liberalism....

"Paleoconservatives also find it difficult to sympathize with the reflexive support of neoconservatives for Israel. They view the Jewish state as simply another foreign country with its own distinctive interests, and these interests frequently conflict with those of the United States. Russell Kirk, in a notorious crack, complained that neoconservatives such as Podhoretz and his wife, Midge Decter, frequently 'mistook Tel Aviv for the capital of the United States.' This statement deeply angered neoconservatives, particularly Decter, a staunch Zionist. By raising the old antisemitic canard of dual loyalty, Kirk had fostered doubts among the neoconservatives as to whether the conservative movement was truly sympathetic to legitimate Jewish concerns and whether it welcomed committed Jews to their ranks....

"This atrophy of neoconservatism was perhaps best seen in the willingness of some Jewish neoconservative intellectuals to break with the Jewish consensus regarding the danger of religious involvement in public life. Elliott Abrams, the son-in-law of Decter and Podhoretz, even wrote a book titled *Faith or Fear: How Jews Can Survive in a Christian America*, which criticizes the 'high wall of separation' theory of church-state relations popular among Jews,

praises Christian evangelicals, and asserts that believing Christians are not antisemites and do not threaten Jewish interests. In fact, he claims, Christians are now more respectful of Judaism than Jews are of Christianity. **'Anti-Christian bias is apparently the only form of prejudice that remains respectable in the American Jewish community,'** Abrams declares. 'The notion that the more fervent a Christian's belief the more danger he or she represents to Jews should be rejected outright.'...

"[Stephen J. Whitfield] The student radicals who rebelled at Berkeley, Columbia, and Harvard and were also inclined to protest on other Ivy League and Big Ten campuses were privileged. They were not motivated by material self-interest, nor were they hampered by prejudice or discrimination. **Jews constituted about a tenth of all college students in the 1960s, yet they were often half or more of the radicals on leading campuses.** The American Council of Education concluded, after a survey of 1966-67, that the most accurate predictor of protest was the matriculation of Jewish students....

"They identified with the executioners, not the victims, of Stalinism, which means that one needs to explain how, say, leftist Jews selectively applied their religious heritage. Radicals in the post-Emancipation era distanced themselves from both pious and impious homes. But it is by now a commonplace that the most observant Jews are rarely radical, and the most radical are rarely observant. The more radical the Jew, the less he or she is likely to know (or care) about normative Judaic practice....

"Anti-Zionism has been almost entirely a phenomenon of communism and of the putatively revolutionary regimes of the Third World. At the same time the Jewish proletariat largely disappeared, thus eliminating whatever class basis once existed for socialist ideology....

**"If Jews have been disproportionately radicals, it may be because they have been disproportionately intellectuals.** Randolph Bourne and Thorstein Veblen were among the first Americans to recognize - during the era of the Great War - the spectacular impact that Jewish intellectuals were making on Western culture. But the remarks of Nikos Kazantzakis are even more to the point. 'Ours is an age of revolution,' the Greek writer says of the interwar period: 'That is, a Jewish age.' Modern life had become fragmented and decomposed, and 'the Jews have this supreme quality: to be restless, not to fit into the realities of the time; to struggle to escape; to consider every status quo and every idea a stifling prison. This spirit of the Jews shatters the equilibrium.' More than any other immigrant group, the Jews harbored intellectuals among their tired, huddled masses; and they fostered a radical spirit and outlook. According to Murray Polner, linguist Noam Chomsky, for example, has recorded his own indebtedness to the 'radical Jewish working-class milieu' to which his family belonged: 'It was a very unusual culture .... [It was] a mixture of a very high level of intense intellectual life, but at the same time it was really working class.'...

**"Oddly enough, his own youthful radicalism was barely shaped by reading as such. Nathan Glazer's family - itself on the welfare rolls in Harlem during the Great Depression - was so unfamiliar with his own vocation as a writer and an editor that his mother, once asked to describe his occupation, vaguely asserted that he was 'in the pen business.'** Irving Howe also grew up in a working-class home devoid of a single book yet pursued the same inclinations. A hypothesis that emphasizes such vocations does not require the ascription of intellectuality to the Judaic faith, as the source of a certain tendency toward radicalism. That is another advantage of the theory....



"The latter pressure resulted in the pathetic Evian Conference in 1938 in which only the Dominican Republic offered sanctuary to Jews....

"[Steven L. Spiegel] In 1948, as violence escalated between the Arabs and Jews, Truman and his aides were more concerned about a possible communist victory in Italy, the future of Germany, and the Berlin blockade.

"The national security bureaucracy was unanimous in its assessment that the concept of a Jewish state in the Middle East was a terrible idea and injurious to American interests. **The State Department argued that a Jewish state would alienate the Arabs and large sectors of the Muslim world, endanger oil supplies to an impoverished Europe, and even threaten Jewish security in the United States when Americans realized the perils of U.S. support for a Jewish state.** Most bureaucrats in the executive branch thought the Jews could not win after an inevitable Arab attack, and America's demobilized army would not be able to rescue them. Even if the Jews miraculously emerged victorious, the communists would benefit as the Arabs would hold the West, and especially the United States, responsible. Some even thought Israel would be an ally of the Soviets, as many of its leaders had emigrated from Russia and held socialist beliefs. In short, supporting a Jewish state was seen as either a disaster or at best a luxury America could not afford.

"Eisenhower and Dulles went further, concluding the Arabs were essential to blocking the advance of international communism. True believers in the vision of a Middle East organized in the image of Europe, they proceeded to push for the Baghdad Pact - a Near East NATO - meant to contain the Soviets through cooperation with the 'northern tier' of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan, and to promote 'technical' solutions to the problems of the area, such as the equitable sharing of the waters of the Jordan river. **Israel was seen as a burden, even an obstacle, because Eisenhower and Dulles knew they would have to resolve Arab fears concerning Israel in order to get Arab cooperation in their plans to contain Soviet influence in the region....**

"Although Soviet Jews were an important focus of Carter's human rights campaign, and notwithstanding his successful mediation of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, American Jews found others of his actions, most notably his expressed empathy for the Palestinians, disturbing enough to prompt their continued high level of engagement in the foreign policy arena. Despite intense activity by Jewish organizations and lobbyists, however, the pro-Israeli forces suffered a major defeat in Carter's 1978 arms sale to Saudi Arabia....

"Despite its general pro-Israeli orientation, however, the Reagan administration also completed a sale of AWACS jets to the Saudis in 1981, a bitter defeat for the American Jewish community that led to a significant expansion of Jewish lobbying efforts. The AIPAC flagship expanded dramatically. What began as a small office in Washington had, by the mid-1980s, become a national operation with a significantly enhanced capability for lobbying Congress, as well as hitherto untouched branches of government such as the Department of Defense. Other organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, and the Presidents' Conference also increased their foreign policy involvement. Taking advantage of the post-Watergate election-funding reforms, pro-Israeli political action committees (PACs) were created around the country. As PACs made it easier for incumbents to win congressional elections, the strength of the pro-Israeli community was dramatically strengthened in the 1980s.

"By the end of the Reagan era, the pro-Israeli community was in its strongest position ever. An increased number of Jewish legislators headed a bipartisan pro-Israeli coalition that included both liberals and conservatives, prominent representatives from all of the country's geographic regions and many of its ethnic groups. Impressive victories had become commonplace on issues such as foreign aid to Israel, arms sales, dealings with the United Nations, and the disposition of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) offices in the United States. Yet, despite these successes, when George H. W. Bush assumed the presidency, the Jewish community was unable to prevent him from returning to a modified Carter perspective marked by a willingness to pressure Israel for its own good and to improve America's relations with the Arabs.

"The end of the Iran-Iraq War, the continuation of the Intifada (the Palestinian uprising against Israel), and a brief U.S. dialogue with the PLO all encouraged renewed attention to the Arab-Israeli peace process, but Bush saw the Shamir government as an impediment to successfully reaching a deal. The period of working together to reverse Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait notwithstanding, Bush's approach to Israel was most notable for his decision in the fall of 1991 not to approve loan guarantees for Israel so long as the Shamir government continued to expand settlements in the West Bank. Jewish organizations protested vehemently, but Bush stood firm during the ensuing political firestorm. Even though his administration went on to arrange the path-breaking Madrid peace conference in October 1991, the damage was done and American Jews turned against Bush and his secretary of state, James Baker, in passionate form in the 1992 election campaign.

"Bill Clinton came to power with little foreign policy experience, planning to concentrate on domestic policy, celebrate the U.S.-Israeli relationship, and depend on the Arabs and Israelis to negotiate with each other. Surrounded by Jews and comfortable with Israel as a key U.S. ally, Clinton pursued a policy that was a Democratic version of Reagan's, and American Jewish influence blossomed. Given the Clinton administration's strong pro-Israeli leanings, the Democratic Congress was in the unusual position of cheering the president on. That situation would not last long, however, because the Republican revolution of 1994 brought both houses under the control of the Republicans. It is a largely unrecognized achievement of the pro-Israel community that it was rapidly able to gain the support for a new pro-Israel view from new Republicans with hitherto little experience in the Middle East.

"The mid-1990s witnessed a sharp downturn in mass Jewish interest in foreign policy generally and in Israel in particular. The Oslo Accords seemed to suggest the end of Israel's conflict with the Arabs. Other factors also contributed to this downturn in concern: the dissension in Israel between religious and secular Jews, the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin, the settlement of Soviet Jews in Israel and the consequent removal of this issue from the political agenda, and the end of the Cold War, which resulted in a downturn in interest in foreign policy on the part of most Americans.

"Nevertheless, Jewish lobbyists were still able to exercise considerable influence. The official Jewish organ supported and Congress passed additional aid to Palestinians after the signing of Oslo II in September 1995 and after the 1998 Wye agreement and its 'Sharm El Sheikh' annex in 1999. Passage occurred despite conservative and rightwing protestations that the aid should be cut off due to what critics saw as the Palestinian Authority's failure to live up to previous agreements. Congress also approved legislation by huge margins in both houses that recognized a united

Jerusalem as Israel's capital and required that the U.S. Embassy in Tel Aviv be moved to Jerusalem (although Clinton subsequently suspended the action)....

**"Thus, by 2000, the American Jewish community had become a major player in the coalition within the United States that advocated a global and internationalist perspective on foreign policy. As trusted members of the elite, Jews were in a position to express views that no longer seemed outrageous and outside the establishment consensus, as had been the case in 1948, 1956, or even 1967 and 1973.** With 10 percent of the Senate being Jewish, with prime foreign policy advisers in both parties being Jewish, with Jews in government playing key roles even in dealing with Middle East policy, it was difficult to pretend that Jewish foreign policy views did not belong in the political establishment. Indeed, even the prime think tank for Middle East affairs in the nation's capital, the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, was clearly sympathetic to Israel despite its well-deserved reputation for academic quality and professionalism.

"From this brief review of the record of ten administrations, we can extract several lessons about the role of American Jews in the formulation of American foreign policy. First, when the priority of the Arab-Israeli issue is high due to American interest in gaining support in the Arab world, tensions with Jerusalem increase no matter what Jews do. We can see a large range of disputes between Jerusalem and Washington under Eisenhower, in the late Nixon period, and again under Ford, Carter, and Bush. When the priority of this issue is low, in the main because the United States is preoccupied with other, more pressing, global issues, as under Truman and Kennedy, it is difficult to gain the attention of high-ranking policymakers. This situation increases the influence of the national security bureaucracy, which works against close relations with Israel, since the bureaucracy tends to have a more geopolitical view of the issue. American Jews working on behalf of Israel seem to do best either when there is a president ideologically sympathetic to the Jewish state, such as Johnson, Reagan, or Clinton, or when a president sees Israel as playing a positive strategic role in the region, as with Nixon, Reagan, and Clinton....

"There is little consideration in American Jewish community circles of the relevance of Russia, China, or Europe, or economic or Third World policy for an American worldview that Jews can support. This lack of attention is in part because disagreement exists within the American-Jewish community between neoconservatives and liberal internationalists, but it also reflects an inability to conceive of a global picture that would include support for Israel in particular and Jewish interests more generally. Moreover, this lack of a philosophical underpinning has exacerbated differences within the community and weakened the ability of American Jews to speak for Americans as a whole....

"[David M. Shribman] By numbers, Jews account for ten members of the Senate, and twenty-seven members of the House in the 107th Congress - 10 percent of the upper body, 6 percent of the lower. By any measure, these are remarkable figures considering that Jews constitute only 2.3 percent of the nation's population. This prominence is even more striking when contrasted to the period between 1960 and 1967; during those years, only three Jews (Jacob K. Javits, the New York Republican, and Democrats Abraham A. Ribicoff from Connecticut and Ernest H. Gruening from Alaska) sat in the Senate.

"But what is most indicative of Jews' place in the host community is that half of the ten senators serving in 1996 were elected from states where Jews accounted for less than 1 percent of the electorate. Indeed, two Jewish Democrats, Russell D. Feingold and Herb Kohl, now serve in the

Senate from Wisconsin, where Jews constitute 0.5 percent of the population. And for the past twenty-one years, a Jewish senator has represented Minnesota, a state where Jews account for 0.9 percent of the population and a state once widely known as an island of antisemitism. When Republican Senator Rudy Boschwitz, who was elected in 1978, was defeated in 1990, he was beaten by Democrat Paul Wellstone, providing the remarkable situation of one Jew succeeding another Jew in the Senate. In the 1990 race, an unusually bitter contest, Senator Boschwitz attempted to win favor among Minnesotans by suggesting that Wellstone, a political scientist, was an insufficiently observant Jew.

"With two Jews on the Supreme Court and with one Orthodox Jew, Democratic Senator Joseph I. Lieberman of Connecticut, serving in the Senate (and refusing to work on the Sabbath), most of the hurdles to Jewish service in American civic life seem to be eliminated. (Jews have played prominent roles in the cabinet for years, symbolized in modern times by the ascension of Henry A. Kissinger to the position of secretary of state in the Nixon administration.) The final barrier remains the White House....

"This is one of the preeminent issues in American life, occupying the minds not only of Jews but also of other groups, including many of the Jewish people's colleagues among the host population. This issue is so difficult for Americans because it involves a conflict between two important values: the political value, important in contemporary times, of national control of borders; and the cultural value, important in the American heritage, of open borders.

"Jews on the whole are more open to immigration than are many other groups in the United States, in part because they are slow to recognize their status as part of the host community and still regard themselves, in spirit if not in reality, as part of the immigrant community. To Jews, America was and is the golden land. American University sociologist Rita Simon, who has written widely on Jewish life in America, believes that Jews living in America are experiencing what she calls 'the Golden Age of Jews.' For that reason, Jews in the future will be reluctant to close the immigration doors. The people who are proud to have been part of the wretched refuse that found earthly redemption in the Great Hall on Ellis Island are likely to work to offer that redemption to others....

"A decade ago observers found little support among Jews outside the Orthodox community for school vouchers and tuition-tax credits. But in recent years a number of new Jewish private schools, and not only those Orthodox in orientation, have grown and prospered, with prominent examples in Atlanta and Washington. Many of these schools draw students from the children of secular Jews; among the reasons are a growing sense of spirituality among these Jews and their growing skepticism over the rigor, discipline, and curriculum in the public schools. Thus, vouchers and tuition-tax credits, once regarded as anathema among all but the most observant Jews, have become major issues within the Jewish community. The most recent annual survey of American Jewish public opinion by the American Jewish Committee found that 57 percent opposed a school voucher program - but that 41 percent favored it. This debate almost certainly will heat up in coming years."

#### **[End of Quotes from *Jews in American Politics*]**

The above passages from *Jews in American Politics* seem to underpin as true everything that MacDonald presents in *A People That Shall Dwell Alone*. Far too often, when out-groups see Jews acting in concert to enrich themselves, they assume there is some type of conspiracy. In

reality, the racial conflicts that abound today and in the past are best understood as natural, as existing in our evolutionary past. Racial conflict is a part of altruism, group evolutionary strategies, and it will not go away through government decrees or new social initiatives to make people get along.

What makes the study of Jewish racialism so interesting I think is not that it is unique to Jews - even if Jews **have** evolved a heightened form of genetic ethnocentrism; it is the fact that they are more intelligent than any other group. As such, they are able to insinuate themselves into positions that make other groups envious of their success and power - an unfortunate side effect of having both innate intelligence and innate ethnocentrism.

This then evokes a fundamental paradox of the Jewish mind - how do Jews openly claim to be the masters of the world in terms that are so closely akin to say Black supremacy, and yet they fail to see that they behave or think in exclusively racist terms. Throughout *Jews in American Politics*, there are not so subtle references to maintaining Jewish racial separatism, that Jews are the chosen ones, and that Jews are the natural leaders of world. In fact, they claim that because Jews are so superior to any other group, it is necessary for them to maintain their racial purity for the good of all of the other lesser races. I don't know any other way of interpreting their position from the opening quote I presented above. Yet, Jews continually call Europeans racists if they do not willingly intermarry with other races, especially Blacks. Failure of Euros to marry Blacks as if there were no racial differences between Blacks and Euros is proof of racism according to Jews - a standard that Jews ignore when it comes to **them** marrying out.

The other amazing paradox is in the Jewish assertion that Europeans in the United States suppress "people of color" and the proof is in the fact that Euros have "White privilege." That is, because Europeans oppress others, we have more in terms of economic and political success than any other group. Nowhere in *Jews in American Politics* did I see this anomaly addressed, that Jews, due to their high level of conscientiousness and intelligence, have far more in terms of wealth, educational achievement, and political power than Europeans. In fact, in terms of social economic status, Europeans are in the middle - Jews and East Asians are above us, while Blacks and Amerindians are below us. (It seems unnatural not to say Hispanic, but in fact, that term is meaningless in terms of race and really should be tossed out. It only seems to exist as a way of solidifying a large group of racially mixed groups against Europeans.)

Intellectuals make way too much of Jewish power. It seems that the only difference between Jews and other races is the fact that Jews are far more intelligent than other competing races, and Europeans have the unique innate characteristics that include individualism rather than collectivism and universal- rather than particularist-moralism (see chart above from *The Culture of Critique*). What results is the astonishing situation where Europeans, to my knowledge, are the only race to be collectively attacked by other races for being too oppressive, and in addition we not only accept the charges but join in the chorus - we attack our own race as a form of moral outrage for charges never proven. We have simply been indoctrinated into beating ourselves up. The study of group evolutionary strategies can help us understand how we have stood human nature on its head, how far we have strayed from rationality, and how insane it is to adopt any moral stance without understanding behavioral genetics.

Let's look at another race that is as homogeneous as Europeans - East Asians. They have migrated to South Asian nations and they dominate those countries. East Asians have an average IQ of about 105 while South Asians have an IQ closer to 90 on average - the same difference

between races as Blacks are to Euros or Euros are to Jews - about 15 points. "In Indonesia, for example, barely one percent of the population, [East Asians] control about 80 percent of the non-state-owned wealth." The situation is similar in many other countries where the East Asian diaspora has made the minority East Asians economically dominate to the chagrin of the befuddled natives. What is the response from this East Asian oppression? Nothing. The world community totally ignores it, no doubt to a large degree because East Asians, being a more ethnocentric race, would not accept the moral assertions and turn on their own kind like Europeans have on themselves.

To test this dichotomy of positions between Euros and all other races, try your own simple experiment. On the Internet, do a Google search (<http://www.google.com/>) on "White privilege" (including the quote marks) and see how many hits there are. Read through a few of them to see just how vehemently Euros are attacked - it is singularly the most astonishing awakening any European could have that so dramatically illustrates just how much of a smear campaign we have been under over the last few decades. Following are the results of my January 25, 2003, Google search for other races as well:

White privilege - 16,900  
Jewish privilege - 165  
Black privilege - 119  
Asian privilege - 2

My claim is then, that Euros are less ethnocentric than any other race, based on the available empirical evidence. Now, with all of the attention that racism has received over the last fifty years and more, one would think that we could find its quantitative source in psychometrics - which includes the study human behavior and how people vary on such things as dominance, introversion, authoritarianism, etc. Unfortunately, no one seems to be interested in unraveling this mystery - it has primarily been sustained in the popular folk myth of racism. I did however find enough scientific evidence that leads me to believe that psychometrics is fully capable of defining levels of ethnocentrism in people. To that end, I will look at some sources from academic journals, books, and studies to see where we are at with regards to racism/ethnocentrism and authoritarianism.

Numerous attitude surveys try to show how racism is pervasive among Whites. One thing I wanted to know was how empirically valid were these tests? One source is the Buros Institute's *Mental Measurements Yearbooks*, available on-line at [www.unl.edu/buros/14tests.html](http://www.unl.edu/buros/14tests.html).

The 9<sup>th</sup> *Mental Measurements Yearbook*, 1985, lists 260 test reviews. The only one seemed of any interest: System of Multiculturalism Assessment.

The 10<sup>th</sup> yearbook, 1989, lists 210 test reviews. Nothing was found.

The 11<sup>th</sup> yearbook, 1992, lists 330 test reviews. The Racial Attitude Test was the only race/ethnocentrism test of the six most recent yearbooks reviewed.

The 12<sup>th</sup> yearbook, 1995, lists 420 test reviews. Only Diversity Awareness Profile was found, and not very relevant.

The 13<sup>th</sup> yearbook, 1998, lists 370 test reviews. Only the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale was found, and not very relevant.

The 14<sup>th</sup> yearbook, 2001, lists 430 test reviews. Two tests dealt with psychopathy. If racism has some relationship with psychopathy, then these tests may be of interest. But since psychopathy is found in all races, and in very low percentages, it hardly seems that this condition is related in anyway to racism, except for the occasional brutal murder or similar attack by a psychopath[s].

If racism is of such interest, why was there only one test listed since 1985? It seems that accusations and proof of racism has never really been tested, and outside of the evolutionary sciences has never really been rationally approached. What we do have in social sciences, education, political science, etc. are numerous articles and books that discuss racism, but never produce any hypotheses that are scientifically based on the falsifiability standards as discussed by Popper as the only legitimate form of scientific inquiry. Racism is discussed as *just-so-stories*, without facts or empirical data.

In evolutionary biology, the situation is different. There is an active unraveling of group evolutionary strategies that underlie ethnocentrism for example:<sup>175</sup>

Alexander and Borgia (1978) suggested that two characteristics of hominid groups would have favored group selection: rapid increases in group differences in adaptiveness caused by cultural innovations such as the invention of weapons, and the ability and incentive for groups to function as effective units, both by constraining within-group selfishness and dissent and fostering collective action. As discussed earlier, our ancestors probably formed cooperative groups to enhance hunting and defense; these groups may have competed against one another in war, thereby increasing their susceptibility to rapid extinction. Groups with high levels of solidarity may have defeated groups with high levels of individualistic selfishness at relatively little cost, and high-solidarity groups may have weeded out their selfish individualists by killing them off or ostracizing them.

As Alexander (1987), Axelrod and Hamilton (1981), and other theorists have emphasized, the costs of investment in groups may be mitigated considerably when the groups are composed of kin. However, social-psychological research on group formation (e.g., Tajfel, 1982) has found that humans form coalitions on the basis of virtually any commonality of interest, and they change alliances quickly when interests diverge. Krebs and Denton (1997) adduced evidence that cognitive structures have evolved in humans that induce them to categorize others as members of ingroups or outgroups (Devine, 1989), and to process information about ingroup members in systematically more favorable ways than they process information about outgroup members (Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989).

On the other hand, depending on the quality of the research, one can still stumble across statements that are not only wrong, but bring into doubt that we can ever be sure that researchers are presenting a fair assessment of facts. I found the following in a 1998 publication, and it uses the pseudoscientific California F scale that has no empirical basis (MacDonald 1998b; Altemeyer 1996).<sup>176</sup>

When it is considered that authoritarianism, as measured by the Californian F (Fascist) scale, correlates positively with rigidity and the possession of obsessive traits, a personality type emerges which is remarkably similar to traditional descriptions of the military mind. (The

F scale measures anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism, political and economic conservatism, and implicit anti-democratic trends or potentiality for Fascism.) In its most extreme form such a person would be conventional, conforming, rigid, and possessed of a closed mind. He would also be one who is orderly, obstinate, and unimaginative. Finally he would be the sort of individual who believes in force and toughness, is lacking in compassion, and is prone to stereotype out groups (i.e. the enemy) as less gifted than himself.

The goal of the above seems to be a desire to link the fascist mind to Europeans, because the California F scale was a tool of the Frankfort School<sup>177</sup> to place the blame of the Holocaust on European's so-called "natural authoritarianism."<sup>178</sup> But in fact, no correlation has ever been established between Europeans and authoritarianism - or any correlation between the authoritarianism personality and behavioral types as purported by the California F scale.<sup>179</sup> For example, "Asian Americans are more likely to live within authoritarian family and social systems and may thus be less likely to challenge the counselor's 'authority' when the counselor assigns and/or interprets a test."<sup>180</sup> This was in fact one of the "rare" assertions found in my research where authoritarianism seems to be attributed to a specific race. How valid it is I'm not sure. It may be as confounded as the standard social science tool to uncover racism/ethnocentrism and authoritarianism.

Most social science studies into racism/ethnocentrism suffer from face validity - just reading the questions and knowing who the test was given to shows that they are intended as tools for propaganda, not science.<sup>181</sup>

In the strong value-expressive condition, participants received the Thielen-Marsh **Ethnocentrism Scale** ( Marsh & Thielen, 1993). **The scale was designed to arouse a feeling that participants are not quite living up to their values opposing racism and sexism and discrimination, values found to be important in our population.** The first page contains questions that ask students to provide some personal information (e.g., "describe your personal ethnic identity," and "**I have dated an ... Hispanic, African-American, Asian, Caucasian**"). The next six questions deal with the individual's specific behaviors toward members of other groups. For example, participants are asked whether they have ever laughed at racial or ethnic jokes, or **whether they would be frightened if they were walking alone at night and were approached by a group of individuals of another race.** The next section involves indicating their agreement with a series of four belief statements based on items from earlier prejudice scales (e.g., Adorno, Levinson, Frenkel-Brunswik, & Sanford, 1950). For example, one item states that "the minority problem is so general and deep that democratic methods can never solve it." The final set of questions are social distance items for which participants indicate how comfortable they feel with various situations such as, "**If a brother/sister/member of my family married a person of another race, I would feel....**" Participants were then told that for them to get a true feel for the entire scale, they....

The above is the standard form of surveys used by Marxists or the Left to show that Europeans are all racists, and very often just to make sure it shows that, the tests are **only given to Europeans**, just in case Asians or Puerto Ricans might show up as being equally bigoted. The above scale however states right up front that it is designed as a propaganda tool, to make people ashamed if they do not accept interracial dating and marriage. I wonder how an orthodox Jew like Joseph Lieberman would do on such a test. Since Orthodox Jews are inherently averse to race mixing, feel threatened and fearful by other races, would they not be inclined to be the most



racist group in America (second only to Ultra-Orthodox Jews)? Well, maybe Matt Hale's World Church of the Creator might surpass Lieberman's faith, but probably only in expressiveness rather than in fact.

Throughout the literature on racism and race, there is a consistent lack of terms that have no meaning other than to confuse issues and intent - and I will contend that the purpose is to singularly demonize Europeans. The best web site I can think of to demonstrate this is (<http://racetraitor.org/>) *RACE TRAITOR: [where] treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity.* This site is from the venom of Professor Noel Ignatiev of Harvard, and a Jew who acts as if he is White and believes that morality dictates that all Whites give up their White Privilege so that we can have a just society. Their "What We Believe" states:

The white race is a historically constructed social formation. It consists of all those who partake of the privileges of the white skin in this society. **Its most wretched members share a status higher, in certain respects, than that of the most exalted persons excluded from it, in return for which they give their support to a system that degrades them.**

The key to solving the social problems of our age is to **abolish the white race**, which means no more and no less than abolishing the privileges of the white skin. Until that task is accomplished, even partial reform will prove elusive, because white influence permeates every issue, domestic and foreign, in U.S. society.

The existence of the white race depends on the willingness of those assigned to it to place their racial interests above class, gender, or any other interests they hold. The defection of enough of its members to make it unreliable as a predictor of behavior will lead to its collapse.

Race Traitor aims to serve as an intellectual center for those seeking to abolish the white race. It will encourage dissent from the conformity that maintains it and popularize examples of defection from its ranks, analyze the forces that hold it together and those that promise to tear it apart. Part of its task will be to promote debate among abolitionists. When possible, it will support practical measures, guided by the principle, Treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity.

In keeping with the assertion that Jews have been the primary movers in vilifying Europeans for their own group advantages, notice what they say: **"Its most wretched members share a status higher, in certain respects, than that of the most exalted persons excluded from it, in return for which they give their support to a system that degrades them."** As we have discussed previously, races with the highest status are not Europeans, but are in fact East Asians, and at the very pinnacle of power and influence, are Jews in the United States. The question is, does Noel Ignatiev include Jews as needing to be abolished as part of the White race? I doubt it, he seems to be oblivious to the fact that Jews are Semitic, and by omission of discussion, seem to be outside of his venom. I will elaborate later on how this duplicity of both including Jews into the category of the White race generally, while excluding them when it comes to discussions of exploitation, privilege, and disparities in economic outcomes, has been an integral part of allowing Jews to critique European culture while disallowing any discussion of Jewish culture's dominance in America (and most other western nations). The following table from &&& shows just how average Europeans are, contradicting everything that "Race Traitor Incorporated" tries

to make us believe that Europeans somehow put their own race above others. Of course, aren't all races to one degree or another involved equally in promoting their own interests? In addition, as we have seen above, Europeans as a group are the LEAST likely to act as a cohesive racial group to promote their own interests - we tend to be radically individualistic rather than tribalistic like Jews, Blacks, and other minority groups.

#### ETHNIC HOUSEHOLD INCOME

(U.S. Average = 100)

JEWISH - 172

JAPANESE - 132

POLISH - 115

CHINESE & ITALIAN - 112

ANGLO-SAXON/GERMAN - 107

IRISH - 103

U.S. AVG. - 100

FILIPINO - 99

WEST INDIAN - 94

MEXICAN - 76

PUERTO RICAN - 63

BLACK - 62

NATIVE AMERICAN - 60

It is important to understand how the United States has divided people up for use in the census and by the courts. I will exclude smaller groups - but the major groups include Whites, Blacks, Hispanics and Asians. In addition, I will argue that this taxonomy has a political purpose and is therefore devoid of any real meaning when it comes to race.

Hispanic is in fact merely "a Spanish-speaking person." So why is it a separate category in the census statistics and for purposes of affirmative action? And it gets even more muddled - your Hispanic sounding last name determines if you are classified as Hispanic. So, who can get minority preferences? Any European who happened to immigrate to a country where the language is Spanish and the person has a Hispanic sounding last name. Is there any other minority classified by the language of the country they come from? No. It would have made some sense if we had classified people as merely White, Amerindian, East Asian, South Asian, Black, etc. But that classification would have been based on a racial taxonomy - the mixing of race and language muddled the waters so that everyone but Whites could get preferences.

Now let's look who the Left has chosen to include in the category as White: all Europeans and Semites - Jews and Arabs are included as White. Recent genetic studies place Jews clearly in the classification of Semitic people - they are closer to the Palestinians than they are to Europeans. So why were Semites not included as a minority group, with the same preferences over Europeans that every other racial group gets. Well look at the consequences - the Jews would be lumped in with the Arabs and they would have been given preferences as Semites. That would have been an extremely embarrassing situation - the wealthiest minority would not get preferences over Whites. It would also highlight the fact that the Jews belong to a racial category different from Europeans, and that would not have suited their desire for exceptional status in the game of victimhood.

The Jews, in their belief that they are the "chosen ones," must have a separate category for discrimination and oppression. Bigotry is almost always referred to as "racism and antisemitism." Why are the Jews put into a separate category; not just simply "racism?" After all, they are a separate race. They make no distinction between antisemitism against an Orthodox Jew and antisemitism against an atheist Jew. Jews clearly consider themselves a race, even though they will often deny it to non-Jews. A similar and highly elaborate literature has been devoted to the Holocaust as a unique historical event against the Jews - all other genocides, according to the Jews are unique - only the Holocaust deserves museums in every country because only the Jews are worthy of being paid homage for their suffering by all of the lesser races. How about the Red Holocaust - where sixty million people were killed under Stalin? Not one museum, not one memorial, it is just not as important when lesser races are slaughtered.

I wrote earlier about White privilege. So how do the Jews extricate themselves from being included for vilification along with Europeans? Well, along with being oppressed by antisemitism, they also exclude themselves from so-called "symbolic racism" by defining its cause:

Does Laissez-Faire Racism Differ from Symbolic Racism?

We are not the first or only analysts to attempt to conceptualize the changing character of whites' attitudes toward blacks. One important line of research is that concerning symbolic racism. Although defined and ultimately measured in a variety of ways, the concept of symbolic racism proposes that a new form of antiblack prejudice has arisen in the United States. It is said to involve a blend of early learned social values, such as the Protestant ethic and antiblack fears and apprehensions. In a context where segregationist and biological racism are less in evidence, according to the symbolic racism researchers, it is this modern symbolic racism that plays a more formidable role (Sears & Kinder 1971; McConahay & Hough 1976).<sup>182</sup>

How convenient that only Europeans are cursed with the dreaded "Protestant ethic," whatever that means. If there WAS a Protestant ethic, it was lost decades ago, as Europeans today pursue a more leisurely life - especially in Europe where short workweeks and long holidays have supplanted any so-called Protestant work ethic. I did a quick search on Google, and got 12,400 hits for "Protestant ethic;" On Questia, I got 1709 (February 3, 2003). Does anyone actually there is that much interest in the "Protestant ethic" for historical purposes? A quick scan of the articles reveals that they are bashing Europeans for different from other races - we have this drive to subjugate others and to succeed. What a load of crap, when all of the research shows that Europeans are neither concerned with group interests nor are they obsessed with money and success like the Jews are. If anyone has a Protestant ethic, it would be the Jews. So, why is there no discussion of the Jewish ethic? On Google, there were only 284 hits for Jewish ethics, even though Jews like us to believe they are the beacons of ethics and morality.

The above quote from *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*, goes on to explain that there is no data supporting symbolic racism; that it should be called "laissez-faire" racism. Remember that all these forms of racism are dependent on racism being defined as unequal *outcomes* - not unequal *opportunities*. The Left argues that Europeans do better than Blacks must be due to racism, but there is no mention about racism when Jews are doing better than Europeans are. That discussion is "off-limits" as antisemitic. The alliance between Jewish interests and minority interests have coalesced around the benefits of demonizing Europeans - it has nothing to do with morality or justice but everything to do with group interests and

everything to do with what each group can extract from European economic wealth. With Europeans debased and self-flagellating, they are willing to give up their rights, their safety, their culture and their wealth (our modest portion of it) in the interest of universal morality.

I hope opening up this dialog of the differences between an individualistic/universal moralism (non-tribalism) as found among Europeans and the collectivist/particularistic moralism (tribalistic ethnocentrism) of Semites, Blacks, and perhaps all other non-European races, explains why Europeans alone can be black-mailed by the merchants of victimhood. Once it is understood that Europeans are being morally duped, we may be able to put up an intellectual defense where our innate behavioral traits have failed us so miserably. By understanding differences, we can at least *attempt* to protect ourselves from the indoctrination we are subjected to from our government, the media and our educational institutions.

---

Bibliography is located on-line at

<http://home.attbi.com/~neoeugenics/bib.htm>

---

<sup>1</sup> (MacDonald 1998b)

<sup>2</sup> (MacDonald 2002)

<sup>3</sup> (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)

<sup>4</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)

<sup>5</sup> (Low 2000)

<sup>6</sup> (Maisel & Forman 2001)

<sup>7</sup> (American Psychological Association's task force report, *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, 1995 available at <http://home.att.net/~eugenics/apa.htm> )

<sup>8</sup> (Maisel & Forman 2001)

<sup>9</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)

<sup>10</sup> "The Case Against Reparations" by Michael Levin in *American Renaissance*, May 2002.

<sup>11</sup> "While constituting approximately 2.4 percent of the population of the United States, Jews represented half of the top one hundred Wall Street executives and about 40 percent of admissions to Ivy League colleges." (MacDonald 1998a, pg. 73)

<sup>12</sup> (Lynn 2001, pg. 496)

<sup>13</sup> "The Case Against Reparations" by Michael Levin in *American Renaissance*, May 2002.

<sup>14</sup> (Marks 1995)

<sup>15</sup> "g-Men may yet win in overtime" by Christopher Brand in *American Renaissance*, February 2002.

<sup>16</sup> (Jensen 1998, pg. 509)

<sup>17</sup> (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)

<sup>18</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)

<sup>19</sup> "Mahatir Asks Why Malays Can't be Like Chinese", *Reuters*, July 22, 2001.

<sup>20</sup> (Barth 1998)

<sup>21</sup> (Barth 1998)

<sup>22</sup> (Barth 1998)

<sup>23</sup> (Jensen 1998, pg. 128)

<sup>24</sup> (Wilson D.S. 2002)

<sup>25</sup> (Mithen 1996, pg. 45)

<sup>26</sup> (Birtchnell 1999, pg. 5)

<sup>27</sup> (Gallistel in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1179)

<sup>28</sup> Cosmides & Tooby in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1259)

<sup>29</sup> (Graves 2001)

<sup>30</sup> "IQ and Race" in *The Skeptics Dictionary* at <http://skeptic.com/iqrace.html>

<sup>31</sup> (Jensen 1998, pg. 40)

<sup>32</sup> This critique of *Guns, Germs and Steel* was first published on my web site August, 2000. This republication has some minor additions.

<sup>33</sup> "THIS BOOK ATTEMPTS TO PROVIDE A SHORT HISTORY OF everybody for the last 13,000 years. The question motivating the book is: Why did history unfold differently on different continents? In case this question

---

immediately makes you shudder at the thought that you are about to read a racist treatise, you aren't: as you will see, the answers to the question don't involve human racial differences at all. The book's emphasis is on the search for ultimate explanations, and on pushing back the chain of historical causation as far as possible."

<sup>34</sup> "Probably the commonest explanation [why some have power and affluence] involves implicitly or explicitly assuming biological differences among peoples. In the centuries after A.D. 1500, as European explorers became aware of the wide differences among the world's peoples in technology and political organization, they assumed that those differences arose from differences in innate ability. With the rise of Darwinian theory, explanations were recast in terms of natural selection and of evolutionary descent. Technologically primitive peoples were considered evolutionary vestiges of human descent from apelike ancestors. The displacement of such peoples by colonists from industrialized societies exemplified the survival of the fittest. With the later rise of genetics, the explanations were recast once again, in genetic terms. Europeans became considered genetically more intelligent than Africans, and especially more so than Aboriginal Australians. Today, segments of Western society publicly repudiate racism. Yet many (perhaps most!) Westerners continue to accept racist explanations privately or subconsciously. In Japan and many other countries, such explanations are still advanced publicly and without apology." (Diamond 1997, pg. 9)

<sup>35</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)

<sup>36</sup> (Ruse 2001, pg. 239)

<sup>37</sup> (Rushton in van der Dennen 1999, pg. 222)

<sup>38</sup> (Mithen 1996)

<sup>39</sup> "A seemingly compelling argument goes as follows. White immigrants to Australia built a literate, industrialized, politically centralized, democratic state based on metal tools and on food production, all within a century of colonizing a continent where the Aborigines had been living as tribal hunter-gatherers without metal for at least 40,000 years. Here were two successive experiments in human development, in which the environment was identical and the sole variable was the people occupying that environment. What further proof could be wanted to establish that the differences between Aboriginal Australian and European societies arose from differences between the peoples themselves?

"The objection to such racist explanations is not just that they are loathsome, but also that they are wrong. Sound evidence for the existence of human differences in intelligence that parallel human differences in technology is lacking. In fact, as I shall explain in a moment; modern "Stone Age" peoples are on the average probably more intelligent, not less intelligent, than industrialized peoples. Paradoxical as it may sound, we shall see in Chapter 15 that white immigrants to Australia do not deserve the credit usually accorded to them for building a literate industrialized Society with the other virtues mentioned above. In addition, peoples who until recently were technologically primitive - such as Aboriginal Australians and New Guineans - routinely master industrial technologies when given opportunities to do so.

"An enormous effort by cognitive psychologists has gone into the search for differences in IQ between peoples of different geographic origins now living in the same country. In particular, numerous white American psychologists have been trying for decades to demonstrate that black Americans of African origins are innately less intelligent than white Americans of European origins. However, as is well known, the peoples compared differ greatly in their social environment and educational opportunities. This fact creates double difficulties for efforts to test the hypothesis that intellectual differences underlie technological differences. First, even our cognitive abilities as adults are heavily influenced by the social environment that we experienced during childhood, making it hard to discern any influence of preexisting genetic differences. Second, tests of cognitive ability (like IQ tests) tend to measure cultural learning and not pure innate intelligence, whatever that is. Because of those undoubted effects of childhood environment and learned knowledge on IQ test results, the psychologists' efforts to date have not succeeded in convincingly establishing the postulated genetic deficiency in IQs of nonwhite peoples.

"My perspective on this controversy comes from 33 years of working with New Guineans in their own intact societies. From the very beginning of my work with New Guineans, they impressed me as being on the average more intelligent, more alert, more expressive, and more interested in things and people around them than the average European or American is." (Diamond 1997, pg. 18)

<sup>40</sup> "If, on the other hand, no such difference in human neurobiology exists to account for continental differences in technological development, what does account for them? An alternative view rests on the heroic theory of invention. Technological advances seem to come disproportionately from a few very rare geniuses, such as Johannes Gutenberg, James Watt, Thomas Edison, and the Wright brothers. They were Europeans, or descendants of European emigrants to America. So were Archimedes and other rare geniuses of ancient times. Could such geniuses have equally well been born in Tasmania or Namibia? Does the history of technology depend on nothing more than accidents of the birthplaces of a few inventors?

---

"Still another alternative view holds that it is a matter not of individual inventiveness but of the receptivity of whole societies to innovation. Some societies seem hopelessly conservative, inward looking, and hostile to change."

(Diamond 1997, pg. 241)

<sup>41</sup> (Alcock 2001, pg. 144)

<sup>42</sup> "STUDIES OF JEWISH GENETICS AND THE RACIAL DOUBLE STANDARD: IS THERE IS A HIDDEN AGENDA?" By Paul Grubach (Internet article)

<sup>43</sup> Steve Olson, the author of *Mapping Human History*, retells the story of humanity - including the creation of different "races" - through the information encoded in our DNA at <http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/> (Atlantic unbound, April 26, 2002.)

<sup>44</sup> (Birken 1995)

<sup>45</sup> Scientists give dogs their day. Chicago Tribune, November 22, 2002.

<sup>46</sup> (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997)

<sup>47</sup> (Jensen 1998, pg. 424)

<sup>48</sup> (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997, pg. 312)

<sup>49</sup> (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997, pg. 33)

<sup>50</sup> (Stanford in de Waal 2001, pg. 109)

<sup>51</sup> "The Moral Imperative of our Future Evolution" by John H. Campbell is available online.

<sup>52</sup> "The Evolutionary Function of Prejudice" by Alan McGregor, Institute for the Study of Man available at <http://www.xenith.com/>

<sup>53</sup> Steve Olson, the author of *Mapping Human History*, retells the story of humanity - including the creation of different "races" - through the information encoded in our DNA at <http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/> (Atlantic unbound, April 26, 2002.)

<sup>54</sup> (Davidson in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1149)

<sup>55</sup> (Wrangham in de Waal 2001, pg. 132)

<sup>56</sup> (Davidson in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1149)

<sup>57</sup> (Hrdy 1999, pg. 450)

<sup>58</sup> (Rusthton in van der Dennen 1999, pg. 222)

<sup>59</sup> (Entine 2000)

<sup>60</sup> (Wright 1994)

<sup>61</sup> (Wolpoff 1997, Pg. 31)

<sup>62</sup> "Genes, Brain and Cognition" by Robert Plomin & Stephen M. Kosslyn, available on the Internet.

<sup>63</sup> "The Jewish Threat" pg. 63-79 in *The Occidental Quarterly* Vol. 2 No. 2, Winter 2001.

<sup>64</sup> (Dawkins 1976)

<sup>65</sup> "The Moral Imperative of our Future Evolution" by John H. Campbell is available online.

<sup>66</sup> (Alcock 2001, pg. 223)

<sup>67</sup> "The Evolutionary Function of Prejudice" by Alan McGregor, Institute for the Study of Man available at <http://www.xenith.com/>

<sup>68</sup> (Barth 1998)

<sup>69</sup> "The Evolutionary Function of Prejudice" by Alan McGregor, Institute for the Study of Man available at <http://www.xenith.com/>

<sup>70</sup> (Keeley 1996)

<sup>71</sup> (Blackmore 1999, pg. 199)

<sup>72</sup> (Graves 2001, pg. 20)

<sup>73</sup> (Lindemann 1997, pg. 41)

<sup>74</sup> (Blackmore 1999, pg. 113)

<sup>75</sup> (Lindemann 1997)

<sup>76</sup> Steve Olson, the author of *Mapping Human History*, retells the story of humanity - including the creation of different "races" - through the information encoded in our DNA at <http://www.theatlantic.com/unbound/> (Atlantic unbound, April 26, 2002.)

<sup>77</sup> (Fitzgerald 1996)

<sup>78</sup> (Lindemann 1997)

<sup>79</sup> (Wrangham & Peterson 1996)

<sup>80</sup> (Sober and Wilson 1998)

<sup>81</sup> (Lindemann 1997, pg. 79)

<sup>82</sup> (Lindemann 1997, pg. 71)

<sup>83</sup> (MacDonald 2002)

<sup>84</sup> (Timmerman 2002)

---

<sup>85</sup> (Rushton in van der Dennen 1999, pg. 217)  
<sup>86</sup> (van der Steen 2000)  
<sup>87</sup> (Ruse 2000)  
<sup>88</sup> (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)  
<sup>89</sup> (Buss in Rosen 1999, pg. 19-20)  
<sup>90</sup> (Mithen 1996, pg. 162)  
<sup>91</sup> (Snowdon in de Waal 2001, 198)  
<sup>92</sup> (Mithen 1996)  
<sup>93</sup> "Origin of intelligence differences in gray matter" by Tom Siegfried, *The Dallas Morning News*, Jan 14, 2002.  
<sup>94</sup> (Tranel et al. in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1047)  
<sup>95</sup> (Lynn 2001)  
<sup>96</sup> (McNamara 1999, pg. 65)  
<sup>97</sup> (Rowe 2002)  
<sup>98</sup> (O'Connor, Tilly & Bobo 2001)  
<sup>99</sup> (Marks 1995)  
<sup>100</sup> (Marks 1995)  
<sup>101</sup> (MacDonald 1994)  
<sup>102</sup> (Selden 1999)  
<sup>103</sup> "National IQ and Economic Development" by Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen in *The Mankind Quarterly* Vol XLI No. 4, Summer 2001.  
<sup>104</sup> (Murray & Herrnstein 1994)  
<sup>105</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)  
<sup>106</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)  
<sup>107</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)  
<sup>108</sup> (Hull 2001)  
<sup>109</sup> "Editor's Note" by Douglas K. Detterman in *INTELLIGENCE: special issue, Intelligence and Social Policy*, Vol 24 No. 1, 1997.  
<sup>110</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)  
<sup>111</sup> American Psychological Association's task force report, *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, 1995 available at my web site and other sites on the Internet.  
<sup>112</sup> "Genes, Brain and Cognition" by Robert Plomin and Stephen M Kosslyn from Internet source.  
<sup>113</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)  
<sup>114</sup> (Entine 2000)  
<sup>115</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 20)  
<sup>116</sup> (McDonald 1994, pg. 190)  
<sup>117</sup> "Editor's Note" by Douglas K. Detterman in *INTELLIGENCE: special issue, Intelligence and Social Policy*, Vol. 24 No. 1, 1997.  
<sup>118</sup> (Wrangham in de Waal 2001, pg. 123)  
<sup>119</sup> (Graves 2001, pg. 23)  
<sup>120</sup> (Byrne in de Waal 2001, pg. 157)  
<sup>121</sup> (Wrangham in de Waal 2001, pg. 142)  
<sup>122</sup> (van der Dennen, Smillie, and Wilson eds. 1999)  
<sup>123</sup> (Jensen 1998, pg. 418)  
<sup>124</sup> "Jensen on 'Jensenism'" by Arthur R. Jensen in *INTELLIGENCE: special issue, Intelligence and Social Policy*, Vol. 24 No. 1, 1997.  
<sup>125</sup> "A New Twist in Jensenism" by Alan S. Kaufman, Yale University School of Medicine from the Internet.  
<sup>126</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)  
<sup>127</sup> (Fisher et al. 1996)  
<sup>128</sup> (Alcock 2001, pg. 50)  
<sup>129</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 184)  
<sup>130</sup> (Lynn in Niesser 1998)  
<sup>131</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)  
<sup>132</sup> (Rushton 1995, pg. 191)  
<sup>133</sup> "Heritability Estimates Versus Large Environmental Effects: The IQ Paradox Resolved" by William T. Dickens and James R. Flynn available at <http://www.apa.org/journals/rev/rev1082346.html>  
<sup>134</sup> "The Outsiders" by Grady M. Towers available at <http://planeta.clix.pt.cpsimoes/outsiders.html> (The Prometheus Society).  
<sup>135</sup> (Luebbert in Rosen 1999, pg. 177)

- 
- <sup>136</sup> (Stanovich 1999)
- <sup>137</sup> (Graves 2001)
- <sup>138</sup> "Heritability Estimates Versus Large Environmental Effects: The IQ Paradox Resolved" by William T. Dickens and James R. Flynn available at <http://www.apa.org/journals/rev/rev1082346.html>
- <sup>139</sup> (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- <sup>140</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- <sup>141</sup> (de Waal 2001)
- <sup>142</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- <sup>143</sup> (O'Connor 2001, pg. 13)
- <sup>144</sup> (O'Connor 2001, pg. 2)
- <sup>145</sup> (Burman 1995, pg. 49)
- <sup>146</sup> (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- <sup>147</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- <sup>148</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- <sup>149</sup> (Greenberg & Wald in Maisel 2001, pg. 188)
- <sup>150</sup> "Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration Policy, 1881-1965: A Historical Review" by Kevin MacDonald Department of Psychology; California State University-Long Beach Long Beach, CA 90840-0901, Population and Environment, in press.
- <sup>151</sup> (McDonald 2002, preface to second edition)
- <sup>152</sup> (Greenberg & Wald in Maisel 2001, pg. 173)
- <sup>153</sup> (O'Connor 2001, pg. 89)
- <sup>154</sup> "National IQ and Economic Development" by Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen in *The Mankind Quarterly* Vol XLI No. 4, Summer 2001.
- <sup>155</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 22)
- <sup>156</sup> (Fisher 1996)
- <sup>157</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- <sup>158</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- <sup>159</sup> (Fisher 1996)
- <sup>160</sup> (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 194)
- <sup>161</sup> (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- <sup>162</sup> (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- <sup>163</sup> (Alcock 2001)
- <sup>164</sup> (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- <sup>165</sup> "Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration Policy, 1881-1965: A Historical Review" by Kevin MacDonald Department of Psychology; California State University-Long Beach Long Beach, CA 90840-0901, Population and Environment, in press.
- <sup>166</sup> (Ruse 2000)
- <sup>167</sup> *The Mismeasure of Man*, revised edition, 1996 by Stephen J. Gould
- <sup>168</sup> (Graves 2001)
- <sup>169</sup> "Equal Opportunity Eliminates Racial Differences in IQ" by Joseph Fagan and Cynthia Holland, presented at the International Society for Intelligence Research, December 1, 2000.
- <sup>170</sup> (Rowe 2002)
- <sup>171</sup> (Dunbar in de Waal 2001)
- <sup>172</sup> (McGrew in de Waal 2001)
- <sup>173</sup> (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- <sup>174</sup> "Alas Poor Evolutionary Psychology: Unfairly Accused, Unjustly Condemned" by Robert Kurzban in *Human Nature Review* 2002, Vol. 2: 99-109 (March).
- <sup>175</sup> Crawford, Charles and Dennis L. Krebs, eds. *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology: Ideas, Issues, and Applications*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. (Available at Questia)
- <sup>176</sup> Gregory, Richard L. editor. *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*. Oxford University, 1998. (Available at Questia)
- <sup>177</sup> The Frankfurt School left Hitler's Germany and began their domination of American intellectual circles from the grounds of Columbia University in 1933 in New York City. Horkheimer, Marcuse, and Adorno were nihilistic revolutionaries who harbored and advanced a utopian dream quite different from the European Christian format of America. Rather than attempting to foment a direct revolution as is sought by Marxists, they adopted theories of Italian Communist Antonio Gramsci and constructed "Critical Theory" which involved what one student described as "essentially destructive criticism of all the main elements of Western culture, including Christianity, capitalism,



---

authority, the family, patriarchy, hierarchy, morality, tradition, sexual restraint, loyalty, patriotism, nationalism, heredity, ethnocentrism, convention, and conservatism." (From Internet source ascribed to Lincoln Booth, but also is covered by MacDonald in *The Culture of Critique*.)

<sup>178</sup> (MacDonald 1998b)

<sup>179</sup> Mischel, Walter. *Personality and Assessment*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996. (Available at Questia)

<sup>180</sup> Watkins Jr., C. Edward and Vicki L. Campbell eds. *Testing and Assessment in Counseling Practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000. (Available at Questia)

<sup>181</sup> Maio, Gregory R. editor. *Why We Evaluate: Functions of Attitudes*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000. (Available at Questia)

<sup>182</sup> Tuch, Steven T. & Jack K. Martin eds. *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*. Praeger Publishers, 1997. (Available at Questia.)