

McCULLOCH, NORDISHISM & ENLIGHTENED WHITE SEPARATISM

TRISTAN TORRIANI

Richard McCulloch's advocacy of North European racial preservation deserves close examination from all Europeans, because if his views become dominant in the coming decades, they will have profound consequences for the future of Western bio-cultural societies. My view is that while it is important to preserve North European populations in a separate homeland, the survival and continuity of Iberian, Italic and Balkan (henceforth IIB for short) groups should not be neglected, as they are equally legitimate members of the European family of nations. Europeans may vary in phenotype from a Richard A. Gephardt to a Mario Cuomo, from a Danny de Vito to a Dolph Lundgren and a Brigitte Nielsen. Given this wide range, it may be tempting for some to simplify things by excluding what appear to be less exalted groups. However, while no group should be forced to co-exist with another it dislikes (one is reminded of the Balkan situation), an enlightened white separatism will respect the ethnic rights of all groups that over the centuries have grown roots on European soil as their homeland.

There are two major difficulties in commenting on McCulloch's work that should be mentioned beforehand to prevent an unfair critique. First of all, one should acknowledge the massive multilevel campaign waged against North European (and in a general sense, but less intense, European and Christian) identity after the WWII by either Jewish influence or ownership of mass media outlets. The practical effect of this has been to instill a deep sense of guilt and shame in us all, while the genocide perpetrated against Slavs in the name of Marxism and Bolshevism goes unmentioned. In this context, any attempt by a Northern European to reclaim his or her identity and dignity by setting the situation straight can only be commended. Nothing can justify the irreversible destruction of any European existence, certainly not a highly dubious notion of "collective guilt." On the contrary, it is imperative that European cultures be preserved and allowed to reach their highest degree of development, thus realizing their ultimate destiny. However, one should not ignore the massive defamation of Italian-Americans by the very same media, ranging from "funny" sit-coms about organized crime to suggestions that Italians are

Negroes. Both North and South Europeans have had their share of discrimination and it would be only reasonable that we make a common cause in combating this together.

One should add, moreover, that as the multiracial-state model begins to show its unstable and destructive nature, our political culture may change radically in the next years. Some kind of racialism, if not racism, is bound to become fashionable as ethnic conflict intensifies and its lines become more visible. This is why it is so important to assure a place for scientifically-grounded and politically-enlightened racialism. Politically correct hysteria and race-denial, coupled with more race-mixing propaganda, will clearly not do, and any clamping down on free-speech will only blind us to the real issues and increase the force of the explosion when the current multiracial system falls apart.

Another difficulty in discussing McCulloch's project is that I, being a Spanish-North-Italian hybrid, do not belong to the constituency he is concerned with. This makes me an outsider and hence I may not have the same racial perceptions consistent with his Nordish self-identification. For practical purposes, that means that while I do appreciate differences in eye, hair color, and skull shape that distinguish me from a Scandinavian, I still consider myself as much a full-blooded European and heir to Western civilization as any other. The future of Europeanhood depends as much on the preservation of our genetic characteristics as it does on the study and continuation of our ethnic traditions. The avoidance of in-group conflicts by bonding will also require, at the very least, reciprocal respect and a pact of mutual non-aggression among groups of European descent. For all its bureaucracy and its threat to local autonomy, the EU has learned the lesson to be drawn from two World Wars. Similarly to McCulloch on Nordish preservation, however, it is not so much "what" but "how" a European Union should develop that needs to be discussed. And this becomes harder by introducing a questionable racial division that excludes European IIB nations such as Greece, Italy and Spain from the debate. A couple of quotes from McCulloch himself deserve some space here.

As one would expect from this protected insularity, all of the indigenous races of Europe belong to the same subspecies -- the Caucasian. (Non-Caucasians did not begin entering Europe in significant numbers until 1957). But they do not all belong to the same race, as they are not all able to interbreed without negating or diminishing the racial traits of one or both parent stocks. In fact, the European population consists of several different regional racial groups or geographic races whose traits are not genetically compatible but are negated or diminished by interbreeding between the groups. (<http://www.racialcompact.com/nordishrace.html>)

According to McCulloch's racial perception, Europeans do not form a single race because of what he calls "negating or diminishing the racial traits of one or both parent stocks." The problem here is that, as Mike Rienzi points out, McCulloch understands racial traits mostly in phenotypic terms, while it is the ethnos that should be the unit of racial preservation, encompassing the whole bio-culture, with its distinctive historical and genetic inheritance. A narrow understanding of Nordish identity has a radically reductionist effect upon our views of what civilization is all about because it leaves out IQ, moral traits such as loyalty and in-group solidarity, and extended phenotypic features such as cultural and technical artifacts. By singling out phenotype as *the* principal criterion of in-group membership, it is theoretically possible that white-looking mulattos (or Jews, for that matter) be considered Nordish, allowing for an unperceived influx of Sub-Saharan genes into the Nordish gene pool. This makes it an insufficient criterion for deciding in-group membership. Besides, the civilizational accomplishments of Non-Nordish men from Greek antiquity to the Italian Renaissance would either become something distant and foreign or would have to be appropriated in a dubious Gobinist fashion.

The fact of the matter is that Europe, throughout its history, has most of the time been beset by external aggression and infiltration, torn asunder by internal conflicts among its peoples and has enlightened humanity also at a great cost to itself. If we are to claim what is our rightful heritage, we must do it in full. It makes no sense whatsoever to lop off our civilization's roots and dismiss them for being Mediterranean. McCulloch's single-minded focus on the Nordish phenotype is not balanced by any other consideration as far as I can see, and this is why it is dangerous. It is neither a sufficient criterion for European status, for a mulatto or Jew may look Nordish, nor is it necessary, for not all Europeans must look Nordish. Nietzsche would have probably remarked that the best that can be achieved by a policy based on McCulloch's principles is a Nordish-looking herd, in which the only thing that matters is phenotype. Perhaps this longing to live in such a herd may be McCulloch's deepest motivation, and this is a personal choice of his to which he is wholly entitled. But if the result here is to tear up the fragile unity of Europe because of a purely phenotypic criterion invented to satisfy McCulloch's racial preferences, disregarding all else, it is unacceptable.

A recurrent expression McCulloch uses is that Nordish are the "most threatened" by miscegenation. Again, the problem here is that this depends very much on what alleles are involved. Basques have a high percentage of individuals with *Rh-* blood type, the inheritance of which is "recessive" (actually, it may involve multiple alleles, but for the sake of the argument, we can leave it at that). The influx of Mongolid genes (which have a 0.0 frequency for the allele *rh*) or even Scandinavian genes with low *rh* frequencies would increase the pregnancy cases of erythroblastosis fetalis in the Basque population. This would threaten the Basque survival much more than an influx

of brown haired and hazel eyed central Europeans into Scandinavia. The relative threat to Europeans in general may vary according to what genes are involved, but good sense would suggest that we help each other out instead of playing the victim and claiming to be the “most” threatened.

Another equally serious issue regards the alleged greater purity of Scandinavian populations in comparison to Southern Europeans. Recent Y chromosome studies of male Finns show a substantial Mongolid contribution to their gene pool. The fact of the matter is that while undesirable, this non-European genetic influx has to be assessed in an enlightened way so that reasonable policies can be developed to deal with this inheritance. If a European group has successfully survived such an unwanted genetic influx and has become a viable nation, such as the Finns, it makes no sense whatsoever to exclude it from the European community. To avoid this kind of absurdity, it is critical that we develop multiple criteria of European status, which do justice to the complexity of human nature and the vicissitudes of our history. Reductionist approaches that single out phenotype or specific gene markers to define in-group membership will clearly not do.

Perhaps the greatest problem of all in McCulloch’s project is his attempt to provide a foundation for it in the idea of collective rights. The original idea of “right” coming from Hobbes is that there are individuals in the state of nature who make a pact and form a “Leviathan” state that will protect them and allow them to have a more productive and safer life. This is a contract established on individual terms, and is not made between an ethnic community and a state. For this reason, rights are always conceived as pertaining to individuals, not to communities or minorities. If we try to conceive contracts between collectives or ethnic groups, as McCulloch does, one gets to the following result, in his own words:

Under the Racial Golden Rule non-Northern Europeans would not be permitted to enter the Nordish homelands for the purpose of establishing residency. They could be permitted temporary entry for limited and legitimate purposes, but they would not be permitted to live there. This rule would apply to all non-Nordish immigrants, including refugees and adopted children. As non-Northern Europeans, they do not belong in the Nordish homelands, and their presence there violates the Nordish right to racial separation, independence and continued life. They belong in their own racial homelands, among their own people, who must deal with their own refugees, take care of their own orphans and solve their own problems in accordance with full racial independence and self-determination. For the Nordish race, threatened with racial death by the already too-numerous other races in its midst, each new non-Nordish immigrant into its homelands, and each new non-Nordish child born in its homelands, is just another nail in its coffin. (<http://www.racialcompact.com/racialgoldenrule.html>)

Now it should be obvious that if Nordish collective rights override individual rights of Non-Nordish Europeans, then it would be legal to forcibly evict them from Nordish homelands. While this may not violate the rights of the collectives as a whole, nor may it threaten their existence in their appropriate and respective homelands, it can conceivably put the lives of the individuals involved at risk. What happens then is that the priority given to collective rights destroys individual freedom among Europeans, which is such a distinguishing characteristic of the West. Of course, one would expect that Nordish individuals in their homelands should enjoy more rights as citizens than Non-Nordish foreigners, but again, it is important to at least try to balance individual and collective rights and respect the principle of reciprocity, the idea which rights commits us to. The current situation in Zimbabwe shows us the plight of Whites in what is now in all practical terms a Black homeland. Unless and until White Zimbabweans can be brought back to a European homeland, in so far as the politics of human rights is still operational, it will be necessary to defend their individual (and, if possible, minority) rights there.

Although I accept to discuss ethnic rights and to work within this framework as long as reciprocity is respected, I must confess that I am skeptical of any theory of rights, be it individual or collective, metaphysical or political. It is not just because "might makes right" (to which many replies are possible), but because, once unleashed, the intensity of ethnic hatred is so great that it precludes any rational solution of conflicts, principally in the general population, who really counts in keeping any peace. Conciliatory efforts by racial elites are not lacking today, but such top-down approaches are bound to fail unless there is a widespread desire for peace. Similarly, if talk about rights is going to be taken seriously, this will require a degree of rationality and fairness that humans have historically proven over and over again not to possess. The needs of each racial group are different because of their evolved traits. Therefore, the collective rights each group aspires to are different. In the European case, our reproductive conditions require racial separatism, but African nations depend on foreign aid, without which their collective survival could be threatened. Moreover, claims to rights of one kind or another have become banal in the current political culture and often accomplish nothing but reveal the 'will to power' on the part of the dispossessed. We should not delude ourselves with theories of rights. Sooner or later, talk about rights, being a mere mask for ethnic advocacy as it already is, will lose all its credibility and give way to a politics of raw force.

My conclusion is that even granting the need to assure the survival of Nordish peoples in a separate homeland, racialism must be informed scientifically and be politically enlightened. Balance is needed between genetics and history, between individual and collective rights. The analysis of specific genetic traits must be complemented with holistic understanding of European bio-cultures. While I do not take the above to be a sufficient refutation

of McCulloch's views, I do think it points out issues that must be discussed openly and honestly. If the differences between Europeans are so serious that McCulloch is justified in inventing the Nordish and Non-Nordish categorization, so be it, but then his historical role in the survival of the West will have been that of dividing us instead of helping us to unite in face of our common enemies, who will then conquer us one by one.