

# 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:  
[www.neoeugenics.net](http://www.neoeugenics.net)

---

# Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Why it is necessary to study racism and the differences between races.....	3
Making Whites feel guilty.....	3
Demanding White assimilation.....	7
Economic costs of the egalitarian norm.....	10
Crime and dependency.....	13
Loss of political freedom.....	14
Chapter 2: Intelligence and race.....	19
John Ogbu's caste system.....	20
Gardener's multiple intelligences.....	25
Diamond's geographic explanation.....	29
The meaning of race.....	36
Rushton's r-K theory.....	59
General intelligence and the Flynn Effect.....	66
IQ and the success of races and nations.....	82
Chapter 3: Marxist social science - race, evolution and deception.....	94
Chapter 4: Ethnocentrism and the Semitic Mind.....	103
The Jewish race: Exodus (1300 to 1600 B.C.) to 18 <sup>th</sup> Century Enlightenment.....	115
Jews in American Politics.....	185

# 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>i</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>ii</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>iii</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>iv</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>v</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>vi</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>vii</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>viii</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>ix</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>x</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>xi</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>xii</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>xiii</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>xiv</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>xv</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://www.neoeugenics.net/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>xvi</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>xvii</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>xviii</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>xix</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>xx</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>xxi</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>xxii</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.

### ***Gardner'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>xxiii</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>xxiv</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>xxv</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>xxvi</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>xxvii</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>xxviii</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>xxix</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>xxx</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)."xxx<sup>i</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>xxx<sup>ii</sup></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>xxxiii</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>xxxiv</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>xxxv</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>xxxvi</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>xxxvii</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>xxxviii</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>xxxix</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>x1</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>xii</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>xiii</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>xliii</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>xliv</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>xlv</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>xlvi</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>xlvii</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>xlviii</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>xlix</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>i</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>ii</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>iii</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>liii</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>liv</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>lv</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>lvi</sup> In fact, "The most rapid adaptations tend to be behavioral, not physical."<sup>lvii</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>lviii</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>lix</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>lx</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>lxi</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>lxii</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>lxiii</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>lxiv</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>lxv</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>lxvi</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>lxvii, lxviii</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>lxix</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>lxx</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>lxxi</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>lxxii</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>lxxiii</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 vary 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>lxxiv</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>lxxv</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>lxxvi</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>lxxvii</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>lxxviii</sup> describes briefly the history of tribalism/racism, though numerous books can trace its roots back millions of years to our primate

ancestors.<sup>lxxix,lxxx</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>lxxxi</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, proracist 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>lxxxii</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>lxxxiii</sup> This has been a racial "shakedown," and Whites have been caught between the various manipulators.<sup>lxxxiv</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>lxxxv</sup>

<b>Brain size</b>	<b>East Asians</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Blacks</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>	<b>East Asians</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Blacks</b>
IQ test scores	106	100	85
Decision times	Faster	Intermediate	Slower
Cultural achievements	Higher	Higher	Lower
<b>Maturation rate</b>	<b>East Asians</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Blacks</b>
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>	<b>East Asians</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Blacks</b>
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>	<b>East Asians</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Blacks</b>
Marital stability	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Law abidingness	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Mental health	Higher	Intermediate	Lower
Administrative capacity	Higher	Higher	Lower
<b>Productive effort</b>	<b>East Asians</b>	<b>Whites</b>	<b>Blacks</b>
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>lxxxvi</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>lxxxvii</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>lxxxviii</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>lxxxix</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>xc</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>xcii</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>xcii</sup>

Intelligence then is closely linked with the volume of gray matter.<sup>xciii</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>xciv</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>xcv</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>xvii</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>xviii</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>xviii</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>xcix</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>c,ci</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>cii</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>ciii</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>civ</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>cv</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>cvi</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>cvi</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>cviii</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>cix</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>cx</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>cxii</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>cxiii</sup>

Just recently, the first gene for intelligence was discovered, and its contribution is estimated to be about four IQ points.<sup>cxiii</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>cxiv</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>cxv</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>cxvi</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>cxvii</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>cxviii</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>cxix</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>cxx</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>cxxi</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>cxiii</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>cxixiii</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>cxxiv</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>cxxv</sup>

So while schooling does help prop up intelligence scores somewhat, this is not the same as increasing intelligence.<sup>cxxvi</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>cxxvii</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>cxviii</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>cxix</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>cxxx</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>cxxxi</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>xxxii</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>xxxiii</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>xxxiv</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>cxxxv</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>cxxxvi</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>cxxxvii</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>cxxxviii</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>cxxxix</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>cxl</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>cxli</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>cxlii</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>exliii</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>exliv</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>exlv</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>cxlvi</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>cxlvii</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>cxlviii</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>cxlix</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>cl</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>cli</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>clii</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>cliii</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>cliv</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>clv</sup>

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

<b>Social Phenomena</b>	<b>126+</b>	<b>111-125</b>	<b>90-110</b>	<b>75-89</b>	<b>-74</b>
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>clvi</sup> There is virtually no correlation between social economic status and success based on numerous studies.<sup>clvii</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>clviii</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.

Country	IQ	GDP	Fitted
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

<b>Country</b>	<b>IQ</b>	<b>GDP</b>	<b>Fitted</b>
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

<b>Country</b>	<b>IQ</b>	<b>GDP</b>	<b>Fitted</b>
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 bad 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>clix</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>clix</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>clxi</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>clxii</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>clxiii</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>clxiv</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>clxv</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>clxvi</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>clxvii</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>clxviii</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>clxix</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>clxx</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>clxxi</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>clxxii</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>clxxiii</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 is 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>clxxiv</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 be 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



racism 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.

"Worshiping 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 *Mitzvoth* 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 separtists feel they have to move to the North West to flee from alien life forms, but the Jews maintained their separtism 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 infenitum.

"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 racialist 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 Decker 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 online 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>clxxv</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>clxxvi</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 Frankfurt School<sup>clxxvii</sup> to place the blame of the Holocaust on European's so-called "natural authoritarianism."<sup>clxxviii</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>clxxix</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>clxxx</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>clxxxi</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 some how 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 muddied 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>elxxxii</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 their 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***

Located on-line at: <http://www.neoeugenics.net/bib.htm>

***Notes follow:***

- i (MacDonald 1998b)
- ii (MacDonald 2002a)
- iii (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- iv (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- v (Low 2000)
- vi (Maisel & Forman 2001)
- vii (American Psychological Association's task force report, *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, 1995 available at <http://www.neoeugenics.net/apa.htm> )
- viii (Maisel & Forman 2001)
- ix (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- x "The Case Against Reparations" by Michael Levin in *American Renaissance*, May 2002.
- xi "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)
- xii (Lynn 2001, pg. 496)
- xiii "The Case Against Reparations" by Michael Levin in *American Renaissance*, May 2002.
- xiv (Marks 1995)
- xv "g-Men may yet win in overtime" by Christopher Brand in *American Renaissance*, February 2002.
- xvi (Jensen 1998, pg. 509)
- xvii (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- xviii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- xix "Mahatir Asks Why Malays Can't be Like Chinese", *Reuters*, July 22, 2001.
- xx (Barth 1998)
- xxi (Barth 1998)
- xxii (Barth 1998)
- xxiii (Jensen 1998, pg. 128)
- xxiv (Wilson D.S. 2002)
- xxv (Mithen 1996, pg. 45)
- xxvi (Birtchnell 1999, pg. 5)
- xxvii (Gallistel in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1179)
- xxviii Cosmides & Tooby in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1259)
- xxix (Graves 2001)
- xxx "IQ and Race" in *The Skeptics Dictionary* at <http://skeptic.com/iqrace.html>
- xxxi (Jensen 1998, pg. 40)
- xxxii This critique of *Guns, Germs and Steel* was first published on my web site August, 2000. This republication has some minor additions.
- xxxiii "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."
- xxxiv "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)
- xxxv (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- xxxvi (Ruse 2001, pg. 239)
- xxxvii (Rushton in van der Dennen 1999, pg. 222)
- xxxviii (Mithen 1996)
- xxxix "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>xi</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>xli</sup> (Alcock 2001, pg. 144)

<sup>xlii</sup> "STUDIES OF JEWISH GENETICS AND THE RACIAL DOUBLE STANDARD: IS THERE IS A HIDDEN AGENDA?" By Paul Grubach (Internet article)

<sup>xliii</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>xliv</sup> (Birken 1995)

<sup>xlvi</sup> Scientists give dogs their day. Chicago Tribune, November 22, 2002.

<sup>xlvi</sup> (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997)

<sup>xlvi</sup> (Jensen 1998, pg. 424)

<sup>xlvi</sup> (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997, pg. 312)

<sup>xlvi</sup> (Wolpoff & Caspari 1997, pg. 33)

<sup>l</sup> (Stanford in de Waal 2001, pg. 109)

<sup>li</sup> "The Moral Imperative of our Future Evolution" by John H. Campbell is available online.

<sup>lii</sup> "The Evolutionary Function of Prejudice" by Alan McGregor, Institute for the Study of Man available at <http://www.xenith.com/>

<sup>liii</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>liv</sup> (Davidson in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1149)

<sup>lv</sup> (Wrangham in de Waal 2001, pg. 132)

<sup>lvi</sup> (Davidson in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1149)

<sup>lvii</sup> (Hrdy 1999, pg. 450)

<sup>lviii</sup> (Rusthton in van der Dennen 1999, pg. 222)

<sup>lix</sup> (Entine 2000)

<sup>lx</sup> (Wright 1994)

- lxi (Wolpoff 1997, Pg. 31)
- lxii "Genes, Brain and Cognition" by Robert Plomin & Stephen M. Kosslyn, available on the Internet.
- lxiii "The Jewish Threat" pg. 63-79 in *The Occidental Quarterly* Vol. 2 No. 2, Winter 2001.
- lxiv (Dawkins 1976)
- lxv "The Moral Imperative of our Future Evolution" by John H. Campbell is available online.
- lxvi (Alcock 2001, pg. 223)
- lxvii "The Evolutionary Function of Prejudice" by Alan McGregor, Institute for the Study of Man available at <http://www.xenith.com/>
- lxviii (Barth 1998)
- lxix "The Evolutionary Function of Prejudice" by Alan McGregor, Institute for the Study of Man available at <http://www.xenith.com/>
- lxx (Keeley 1996)
- lxxi (Blackmore 1999, pg. 199)
- lxxii (Graves 2001, pg. 20)
- lxxiii (Lindemann 1997, pg. 41)
- lxxiv (Blackmore 1999, pg. 113)
- lxxv (Lindemann 1997)
- lxxvi 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.)
- lxxvii (Fitzgerald 1996)
- lxxviii (Lindemann 1997)
- lxxix (Wrangham & Peterson 1996)
- lxxx (Sober and Wilson 1998)
- lxxxi (Lindemann 1997, pg. 79)
- lxxxii (Lindemann 1997, pg. 71)
- lxxxiii (MacDonald 2002a)
- lxxxiv (Timmerman 2002)
- lxxxv (Rushton in van der Dennen 1999, pg. 217)
- lxxxvi (van der Steen 2000)
- lxxxvii (Ruse 2000)
- lxxxviii (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- lxxxix (Buss in Rosen 1999, pg. 19-20)
- xc (Mithen 1996, pg. 162)
- xc1 (Snowdon in de Waal 2001, 198)
- xcii (Mithen 1996)
- xciii "Origin of intelligence differences in gray matter" by Tom Siegfried, *The Dallas Morning News*, Jan 14, 2002.
- xciv (Tranel et al. in Gazzaniga 2000, pg. 1047)
- xcv (Lynn 2001)
- xcvi (McNamara 1999, pg. 65)
- xcvii (Rowe 2002)
- xcviii (O'Connor, Tilly & Bobo 2001)
- xcix (Marks 1995)
- c (Marks 1995)
- ci (MacDonald 1994)
- cii (Selden 1999)
- ciii "National IQ and Economic Development" by Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen in *The Mankind Quarterly* Vol XLI No. 4, Summer 2001.
- civ (Murray & Herrnstein 1994)
- cv (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)
- cvi (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)
- cvii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)
- cviii (Hull 2001)
- cix "Editor's Note" by Douglas K. Detterman in *INTELLIGENCE: special issue, Intelligence and Social Policy*, Vol 24 No. 1, 1997.
- cx (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)
- cx1 American Psychological Association's task force report, *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, 1995 available at my web site and other sites on the Internet.
- cxii "Genes, Brain and Cognition" by Robert Plomin and Stephen M Kosslyn from Internet source.
- cxiii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 19)
- cxiv (Entine 2000)
- cxv (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 20)
- cxvi (McDonald 1994, pg. 190)

- cxvii "Editor's Note" by Douglas K. Detterman in *INTELLIGENCE: special issue, Intelligence and Social Policy*, Vol. 24 No. 1, 1997.
- cxviii (Wrangham in de Waal 2001, pg. 123)
- cxix (Graves 2001, pg. 23)
- cxx (Byrne in de Waal 2001, pg. 157)
- cxxi (Wrangham in de Waal 2001, pg. 142)
- cxix (van der Dennen, Smillie, and Wilson eds. 1999)
- cxixiii (Jensen 1998, pg. 418)
- cxixiv "Jensen on 'Jensenism'" by Arthur R. Jensen in *INTELLIGENCE: special issue, Intelligence and Social Policy*, Vol. 24 No. 1, 1997.
- cxixv "A New Twist in Jensenism" by Alan S. Kaufman, Yale University School of Medicine from the Internet.
- cxixvi (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- cxixvii (Fisher et al. 1996)
- cxixviii (Alcock 2001, pg. 50)
- cxixix (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 184)
- cxixxx (Lynn in Niesser 1998)
- cxixxxi (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- cxixxxii (Rushton 1995, pg. 191)
- cxixxxiii "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>
- cxixxxiv "The Outsiders" by Grady M. Towers available at <http://planeta.clix.pt.cpsimoes/outsiders.html> (The Prometheus Society).
- cxixxxv (Luebbert in Rosen 1999, pg. 177)
- cxixxxvi (Stanovich 1999)
- cxixxxvii (Graves 2001)
- cxixxxviii "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>
- cxixxxix (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- cxli (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- cxlii (de Waal 2001)
- cxliiii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- cxliiiii (O'Connor 2001, pg. 13)
- cxlv (O'Connor 2001, pg. 2)
- cxlvi (Burman 1995, pg. 49)
- cxlvii (Cavalli-Sforza 1994)
- cxlviii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- cxlvix (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- cxlix (Greenberg & Wald in Maisel 2001, pg. 188)
- cl "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.
- cli (McDonald 2002, preface to second edition)
- clii (Greenberg & Wald in Maisel 2001, pg. 173)
- cliii (O'Connor 2001, pg. 89)
- cliv "National IQ and Economic Development" by Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen in *The Mankind Quarterly* Vol XLI No. 4, Summer 2001.
- clv (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 22)
- clvi (Fisher 1996)
- clvii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- clviii (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002)
- clix (Fisher 1996)
- clx (Lynn & Vanhanen 2002, pg. 194)
- clxi (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- clxii (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- clxiii (Alcock 2001)
- clxiv (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- clxv "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.
- clxvi (Ruse 2000)
- clxvii *The Mismeasure of Man*, revised edition, 1996 by Stephen J. Gould
- clxviii (Graves 2001)
- clxix "Equal Opportunity Eliminates Racial Differences in IQ" by Joseph Fagan and Cynthia Holland, presented at the

- International Society for Intelligence Research, December 1, 2000.
- clxx (Rowe 2002)
- clxxi (Dunbar in de Waal 2001)
- clxxii (McGrew in de Waal 2001)
- clxxiii (Barkow, Cosmides and Tooby 1992)
- clxxiv "Alas Poor Evolutionary Psychology: Unfairly Accused, Unjustly Condemned" by Robert Kurzban in *Human Nature Review* 2002, Vol. 2: 99-109 (March).
- clxxv Crawford, Charles and Dennis L. Krebs, eds. *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology: Ideas, Issues, and Applications*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. (Available at Questia)
- clxxvi Gregory, Richard L. editor. *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*. Oxford University, 1998. (Available at Questia)
- clxxvii 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*.)
- clxxviii (MacDonald 1998b)
- clxxix Mischel, Walter. *Personality and Assessment*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996. (Available at Questia)
- clxxx Watkins Jr., C. Edward and Vicki L. Campbell eds. *Testing and Assessment in Counseling Practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000. (Available at Questia)
- clxxxi Maio, Gregory R. editor. *Why We Evaluate: Functions of Attitudes*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000. (Available at Questia)
- clxxxii Tuch, Steven T. & Jack K. Martin eds. *Racial Attitudes in the 1990s: Continuity and Change*. Praeger Publishers, 1997. (Available at Questia.)