

THE RIGHT WAY, THE WRONG WAY, AND MY WAY

Which Way Western Man?

William Gayley Simpson

Hillsboro, WV: National Vanguard Books; 2nd edition, 2003

\$39.95 paperback

1070 pp.

Reviewed by John V. Day

In an age of soundbites, audiobooks, and dumbing down, tackling a book that runs to more than one thousand pages might seem a daunting prospect. But it is to William Gayley Simpson's credit that one reads his *Which Way Western Man?* with eagerness. Whether we finally agree with his views or not, we listen to him because he analyzes taboo subjects while maintaining a supreme indifference to liberal orthodoxy. He also has the advantage of a graceful prose style that occasionally rivals the Old Testament for intensity.

Which Way Western Man? treats at length the big subjects that shape our world. Simpson devotes chapters to investigating Jesus' purpose and teachings; the merits and demerits of democracy and aristocracy; the mental differences between the two sexes; the false reading of human nature that underlies pacifism; the drawbacks of industrialism; the importance of practicing eugenics; the mental differences between the races, and principally between blacks and whites; and the conspiracy theory of modern history. These chapters cover familiar ground for anyone who knows the work of those celebrated and racially oriented writers who flourished between the two world wars—men like Oswald Spengler, Lothrop Stoddard, Ellsworth Huntington, Edward M. East, William McDougall, Charles C. Josey, and especially Anthony M. Ludovici.

Time and again, Simpson praises the work of his British friend Ludovici, who was ten years his senior. Simpson acknowledges that Ludovici gave penetrating analyses of democracy, of aristocracy, of egalitarianism, of heredity, of eugenics, and of childbearing. Indeed, Simpson admired Ludovici so much that he bequeathed money for the man's works to be republished. Leaving aside the

bizarre last chapter of *Which Way Western Man?*, which jumbles together every conspiracy theory extant about Jews, Freemasons, Bilderbergers, and the like, one might say that Simpson's ideas more or less duplicate those that Ludovici had been promoting since the 1920s. For example, that a man's intellect is worth less than his character; that birth control will appeal only to intelligent and thoughtful people and will therefore be dysgenic; that, in any society, one part must inevitably be sacrificed to another; that the great civilizations all arose after being segregated from their neighbors; and so on. The only important discrepancy between the two men's outlook is that Ludovici—dark-haired and of French, Basque, and German descent—had a high opinion of southern Europeans and a low opinion of northern Europeans, whereas Simpson—fair-haired and descended from Ulster Scots—naturally reversed these judgements.

By far the most moving parts of *Which Way Western Man?* are the few autobiographical reminiscences—how Simpson became a Christian minister in a poor and industrial part of New Jersey; how he later traveled across America, working in factories, mines, and a steel mill; how he returned to another shabby town to preach and to follow the example of Jesus and St. Francis, taking a vow of poverty and living in a shack six feet square. He was clearly an exceptional man—what Goebbels would have recognized as a *Millionenmensch*, although where the little Rhinelander was cynical and devious, Simpson appears to have been candid and almost saintly. One Christmas, just after the First World War, Simpson even took off his shoes and went barefoot for two years to express his compassion for Europe's starving people. The publishers of *Which Way Western Man?* might also have brought into print two other books, perhaps of more worth, and both still unpublished: the journal that Simpson kept as a young man when he worked his way across America, and his autobiography, of which only excerpts appeared years ago in *National Vanguard* magazine.

The cover of *Which Way Western Man?* promises that "This edition includes all of Mr. Simpson's final updates, additions and corrections," but I failed to see any important differences from the previous edition of 1978. Several small errors of fact crop up in both editions, which shows that National Vanguard Books needs to employ a vigilant proofreader. For instance, in three places the historian and journalist Sir Arthur Bryant is wrongly called a professor, and in three more places he's elevated to Professor of History at Oxford University. George Pitt-Rivers, who owned and directed a museum in Oxford, is also mislabeled an Oxford professor.

As far as I could tell, only two of the book's more conspicuous typographical errors did not also appear in the first edition: the "facial history" on page 872 that should of course be "racial history," and the meaningless sentence on page 681—"It is not *plaid shirta* warfare against us"—which replaces three important paragraphs from the first edition. (On page 212, in addition, "See Chapter IV, p. 85" refers to the first edition's pagination and should be "See Chapter IV, p. 113.")

But all the other typographical errors were reproduced from the first edition. To take just a few examples, on page 257, “John Quincy Adams” should be “Brooks Adams”; on page 413, “Confucious” should be “Confucius”; on page 426, “farmer” should be “former”; and on page 1035, “Steward” should be “Stewart.” William Pierce, the man who edited *Which Way Western Man?*, was also struggling to lead the National Alliance while dying of cancer, and he evidently had more important things to think about than polishing Simpson’s book.

These matters apart, is *Which Way Western Man?* worth a second edition? The book originated as essays that Simpson had issued to interested correspondents, and he then revised these essays over the decades. The chapter on eugenics, for instance, had its first draft as far back as 1946, and was modified in 1970 and 1971. Yet much of *Which Way Western Man?* creaks with old age. To document America’s poor health, the book considers hospital figures from 1937 and 1963. If you want to know about the IQ of American blacks, “two of the latest studies” were done in 1962 and 1963. For “an excellent introduction to genetics,” read a 1936 book that pre-dates the discovery of DNA. And although Simpson was appalled that one in four American marriages ends in divorce, the current rate is double that. He repeatedly emphasizes the threat to the West from the Soviet empire and the spread of communism, but these appear to have receded. As for the spread of militant Islam, though, Simpson remains silent.

The book is strewn with factual errors that friendly critics should have pointed out to him. Such a controversial work ought to be as carefully written as possible. Yet Simpson casually follows a few conspiracy theorists from the past to misidentify various historical figures whom he dislikes as Jewish. He merely speculates that the Rockefellers were originally Jewish, but he is fairly certain that Colonel House, Harry Dexter White,¹ and the German Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg were all secretly Jewish. Why not go the whole hog and add to this list of highly placed Jews, as others have done, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Britain’s postwar prime minister Anthony Eden, and even the British Royal Family?

To refute all Simpson’s cases of crypto-Jews would take some time, but here are a few examples. To begin with, he implies that the distinguished biologist and critic of eugenics, Raymond Pearl, was Jewish, whereas Pearl’s friend, H. L. Mencken, found him “a true Yankee,” and Elazar Barkan’s *The Retreat of Scientific Racism* shows that, in private, Pearl held that Jews were engaged with white gentiles in a struggle for racial supremacy.

Simpson also describes Prof. Frederick Lindemann, Churchill’s scientific advisor during the Second World War, as a Jew because Lindemann allegedly left Hitler’s Germany in 1933. In fact, Lindemann, who had an American mother and a father from Alsace, had been directing the Clarendon Laboratory in England since 1919. Lindemann’s friend Diana Mosley, the wife of the British fascist leader Sir Oswald Mosley, commented in her autobiography that, far from Lindemann being Jewish, he disliked Jews.

Neither was Montagu Norman, the longtime governor of the Bank of England, a Jew. Simpson errs in declaring that “Montagu is exclusively a Jewish name.” Indeed, Roger Pearson’s *Heredity and Humanity* observes that when Israel Ehrenburg metamorphosed into the radical anthropologist Ashley Montagu, he purloined his surname “from one of Britain’s oldest titled families.”

As for the ancestry of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, we learn from Simpson that he had a Jewish grandfather and a Jewish wife, and that Lenin’s family circle spoke Yiddish. Simpson goes further at one point, finding that “there is other very authoritative evidence that he was Jewish.” Actually, the only true part of this is that Lenin had one Jewish grandfather. Lenin wanted Russian Jews to assimilate and he had many Bolshevik allies who were Jews, whereas his enemies in the White Russian armies were violently anti-Jewish, and so it made sense to condemn anti-Semitism. Even so, Lenin’s early invective against Russia’s “exploiters and profiteers” was widely regarded as an allusion to Jews.

Nobody denies that the German banker Max Warburg was a Jew, but Simpson thinks that Warburg once financed Adolf Hitler, apparently to build him up and thereby ensure a big war between the new Germany and her enemies. Although Simpson refers to Stephen Birmingham’s *Our Crowd: The Great Jewish Families of New York*, he misunderstands him. Birmingham simply points out that Warburg became friends with the president of the Reichsbank, Hjalmar Schacht, and in the early years of the Third Reich gave him financial advice, in the forlorn hope that the Nazis would leave the Warburg bank alone.

Neither is Simpson right to state that how the radical Jewish anthropologist Franz Boas “got his Ph.D. appears to be something of a mystery,” because in 1881 the University of Kiel in fact awarded Boas—who only later on studied biological anthropology under Rudolf Virchow—a doctorate in physics and geography for his dissertation “Beiträge zur Erkenntnis der Farbe des Wassers” (Contributions to the Understanding of the Color of Water).

One needs to read *Which Way Western Man?* through some kind of filter to tone down Simpson’s exaggerations. Predictably, he decides that for mental traits the importance of heredity outweighs environment by a factor of about nine to one, although modern twin studies find that the factor in such traits as intelligence, aggression, and sociability is, very roughly, more like two to one. Even Simpson’s basic arithmetic is often way off. In two separate passages he calculates that using a machine to do a man’s work will leave the man with “twenty hours” of leisure each day. Elsewhere, he suggests that for a population “even to maintain a bare equilibrium . . . an average of nearly four children per marriage is necessary,” whereas the true figure nowadays is just over two children. At least Simpson is honest enough to admit that “statistics are contrary to my taste.”

Of course, the three children per marriage that Wilmot Robertson thought appropriate in his *Ventilations* will not be enough in Simpson’s utopia, because from the best people “ten or even fifteen children per marriage would not be too

many.” Furthermore, we should establish polygamous communities so that exceptional men can father children by several wives. And yet Simpson mentions a finding that eminent men have often remained bachelors. Mankind has a problem here: Polygamous communities apart, how can highly talented people find the time to sustain a marriage, have several children, and then look after these children for anything up to two decades? As Cicero once remarked, “I could not cope with philosophy and a wife at the same time.” Indeed, in Simpson’s 1935 book, *Toward the Rising Sun*, a short biography of him recognizes that “to take the part of a husband and a father in the full and ordinary sense was quite incompatible with his chief work in life.”

Although Simpson tends to be more positive than the crabby Ludovici, his extremism occasionally lapses into misanthropy. Simpson envisions that even if our misuse of science destroys the world, there might be “something even Promethean and awe-inspiring” about it. Again, rather than permit cultural standardization to produce human anthills, he says, it would be better if mankind became extinct.

In another exaggeration, Simpson believes that Trotsky stirred up rebellion after arriving in Russia in 1917 with three hundred New York Jews and that fully 95 percent of the leaders of the Russian Revolution were Jewish. If these figures were accurate, and Russian Jews as united as Simpson thinks, then Jews must have been very imperceptive to have allowed Stalin to seize power, then pick them off a few at a time, and eventually murder them in droves. Actually, though, in the early days of the Soviet Union Jews never made up more than about half of the party elite—which is still a huge proportion, of course, even taking into account their high intelligence and the circumstance of their inferior status in tsarist Russia.

Simpson always takes on trust the most severe allegations, whether true or not, about Jewish power. So it is odd that he never quotes, and perhaps didn’t know, Neville Chamberlain’s remark to Joseph Kennedy soon after he had declared war on Germany: “The Americans and the world Jews forced [England] into the war” (which is cited in, among other places, John Lukacs’s *The Last European War*); or Joseph Kennedy’s own warning about Jewish influence in Hollywood coaxing America towards joining the war (which is cited in the first volume of David Irving’s *Churchill’s War*); or the press magnate Lord Beaverbrook’s prediction about the likely outcome of Jewish sway over British newspapers during the 1930s: “The Jews may drive us into war” (which is cited in Robert Skidelsky’s *Oswald Mosley* and also by Irving).

Which Way Western Man? is marred by Simpson’s extreme opinions and violent language. And so Jewish groups in white society are not merely following agendas that are at odds with the interests of the majority. No, in Simpson’s words, Jews are our “Enemy Number One” and a “consuming cancer” and may one day be the white man’s “hangman.” Blacks get off fairly lightly, in comparison: They are merely “savages” and “beasts.” Whether they want to

leave or not, American blacks should be deported to Africa, and American Jews to somewhere like Madagascar. We whites ought to revere Adolf Hitler and George Lincoln Rockwell as “our exemplars, our teachers, our heroes and our inspirers.” *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* fits recent history and must be genuine. And not only do Jews operate international finance and communism, but after the First World War an unnamed Jewish banker even explained to some dim-witted gentiles that Jews do this so that one day they will dominate the world. Anyone credulous enough to believe in this fictional banker and *The Protocols* can easily accept, as Simpson does, that Jesus—whom he regards as no more than an ordinary man—may well have walked on water.

Like most books running to over one thousand pages, *Which Way Western Man?* varies in its tone from place to place. And Simpson often begins a discussion by recalling his previous liberal viewpoint on the subject, thereafter contrasting it with the outlook he came to adopt. Even so, the book suffers from many glaring contradictions that will discourage intelligent readers from taking it seriously. Although Simpson spent decades in writing and revising the book, and received critiques from his many correspondents, a good many of his ideas were never mulled over.

One might begin with an obvious contradiction that crops up in the writings of many “anti-Semites.” In a section on Jews and race, Simpson claims—erroneously, as it happens—that German and eastern European Jews, who make up the bulk of world Jewry, largely trace their descent not from ancient Hebrews, but from the Khazars of southern Russia, who converted to Judaism a little over a thousand years ago. Turn over the page, though, and he declares that “Right down through history, for all of 2,500 years . . . [Jews] have been marked by the most extreme and adamant exclusiveness toward all non-Jewish peoples.” And this non sequitur came from a man who insists that “the exploration of the Jewish question became my chief occupation for some years”!

In fact, Simpson says again and again that Jews are fanatically race-conscious and that gentiles will never assimilate them. “All Jews today, mindful of the fate that overtook the Ten Tribes of their compatriots *who mixed*, know that if ever they begin to intermarry freely with gentiles, they are *finished, as a people* [his italics].” He suggests that of every five hundred Jews getting married only one will marry a gentile, although his source dates from as long ago as 1922. But are Jews in the West unassimilable? In present-day America, although exact figures are hard to come by, something like 40 percent of Jews are marrying out.

Simpson thinks that the postwar Soviet Union merely pretended to be anti-Jewish by cracking down on Zionists, “who are often obnoxious anyway to those dominant and ruthless Jews whose chief reliance is on the power of Money.” But why on earth should Jewish International Finance dislike Zionists? After all, as Simpson sees things, this Jewish conspiracy has its focal point in strategically the most crucial part of the world and the one richest in resources, Israel. Likewise,

Simpson libels Henry Kissinger as a Soviet agent, but if Jewish International Finance controlled the Soviet Union *and* the United States, why would our secret rulers need to have one of their satellites spying on the other?

“My heart,” Simpson confides at one point, “feels for the Negro just as surely as for my own kind.” One might well ask: Are these the same Negroes that he repeatedly calls “savages”? He also claims to feel “shame at the perfidy and the brutality with which the White man wrenched this fair continent from the Indians—and other lands from other primitive peoples.” Yet a page later we find him arguing that all healthy and confident peoples yield large families and will therefore want to expand their territories.

The one place into which he doesn’t want whites to expand is outer space, and so he derides the “junket to Mars” and regrets “Western man’s willful determination to master time and space and Nature.” But some of us think that the American and Russian space programs rank among the greatest achievements of Western civilization.

Simpson knows that healthy peoples will multiply, and he advocates a large and growing population to encourage competition and the selection of the best. Predictably, though, he complains that technology and industrialism allowed Europe’s population to soar from 180 million in 1800 to 460 million by 1914, and that mankind is devouring the world’s resources. So which is it to be: Letting the world’s population rise or husbanding natural resources?

In these and many other examples, Simpson wants to have his cake and eat it.

Considering that Simpson endorses “the absolutely pivotal importance of race in the destiny of all peoples,” his own knowledge of race, or geographical variation, is decidedly shaky. He confirms the truism that the one subject “racists” usually know nothing about is race.

For one thing, Simpson alleges that, in ancient times, “the Greeks . . . , like the Aryans of India and the Iranians of Persia, of ancient Iran, conceived of their gods in their own image, as blue-eyed and blond.” But again he embellishes the truth. In Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which are the earliest evidence for Greek deities, only one or two goddesses could be described as anything like “blue-eyed and blond.” Homer gives Athena light eyes of some color and Demeter fair hair, apparently to suit her role as the corn-goddess. As for the Iranian gods, we know nothing about their eye or hair color. Among the early Indian gods of the *Rig-Veda*, Agni and Savitar are both fair-haired, but the coloring of these gods cannot resemble human pigmentation, because Agni personifies fire and Savitar personifies the sun. So just one Indian god has a human pigmentation: the warrior-god Indra, who also has fair hair. Here, and in many other places, Simpson relies uncritically on just one, and by no means the best, of Hans F. K. Günther’s books.

Simpson also argues, as others have done, that Portugal declined after the Middle Ages because so many natives had mated with their Negro slaves that the quality of the Portuguese population went downhill. True, Portugal did assimilate its black slaves, although their numbers have often been exaggerated.

Older anthropologists, such as Carleton Coon and Robert Gayre, agreed that the Negro influence in modern Portugal is minimal, and recent genetic studies find that Portugal is a fairly typical European nation, with its strongest biological links to Spain and Italy. It seems hard to credit that an admixture of blacks amounting to at most a few percent of the population can precipitate a calamity. Gayre submits that Portugal's slight Negro admixture may have occurred *after* the country began to deteriorate, and if a nation's decline means a loss of faith in itself, then one can understand why decline goes hand in hand with an eagerness to import foreigners.

Of course Simpson eagerly accepts Carleton Coon's thesis that *Homo erectus* evolved independently into *Homo sapiens* in no fewer than five parts of the world, eventually leading to the modern world's five major races. In this racial scheme, Caucasoids and their ancestors would have been evolving more or less undisturbed for hundreds of thousands of years. Like it or not, though, the genetic evidence accumulated since Coon's death points the other way—which brings to mind T. H. Huxley's definition of a tragedy as a beautiful hypothesis killed by an ugly fact. All humans had a common African ancestor who lived as recently as 200,000 years ago, and Caucasoids have been in Europe for only about 40,000 years.

As proof against the effects of miscegenation between blacks and whites, we hear about Charles Davenport's prewar study of Jamaica, which, according to Simpson, provides "evidence of physical, mental and instinct disorders in hybrids." Elsewhere, though, Simpson appears to assume that such black-and-white hybrids will outshine the purer blacks! He protests that integrating blacks into white America and making them compete in the white man's technological society—a society, by the way, that he dislikes, and which he shouldn't therefore be taking as his model—will, unfortunately, hit "hardest those who have no White blood in them." The confused thinking here is all too typical.

Following another antiquated argument, Simpson insists that hybrids may well inherit large teeth from parents who belong to one race but small jaws from parents of another race. But even if Simpson could have proved his point, such a trivial matter as wrong-sized teeth will hardly paralyze a civilization. Of course, we still know too little about the effects of miscegenation. When Simpson's friend Anthony M. Ludovici died in 1971, he left most of his money for the University of Edinburgh to research "the influence of miscegenation on man's quality and well-being," although even thirty years ago such a proposal was too hot for the university to accept it.

Simpson also props up his arguments against miscegenation by quoting Herbert Spencer, who remarked over a century ago that hybrid races are not "fitted for any set of conditions whatever." Certainly, one might say, for example, that, owing to their evolutionary history, whites are better fitted than blacks for life in a very cold climate, being in general less susceptible to frostbite, whereas blacks are better fitted than whites for life in a very hot climate, being in general

less susceptible to malaria and skin cancer. But why would, say, Eurasians of mixed ancestry be less “fitted” than whites for twenty-first century urban conditions? Even the most cultured whites, be they biochemists or classical scholars, still largely have the mindset of hunters who lived during the Ice Age.

Simpson wants white, and especially Nordic, peoples to embrace racial ideals and to begin selecting the men and women who best embody this ideal and then breeding from them. He believes that, over time, such eugenic measures can produce something like “a pure race.” By “a pure race,” he means a population that, whatever its ancestry, will breed more or less true in its mental and physical traits, much as Dalmatians and Siamese cats do in the hands of animal breeders.

Well, as Nancy Etcoff showed in her excellent book, *Survival of the Prettiest*, members of each human breeding population naturally choose as their ideal for the opposite sex a healthy person who approximates the mean of that population—having regular features that are neither too large nor too small. But any breeding population needs to have some variety. Simpson himself quotes Goethe about the need for social inequality—“The more perfect the being is, the more dissimilar are its parts”—and the same holds true for biological inequality. Nature wants each breeding population to have genetic diversity so that she has some choice in selecting among it.

Simpson even falls for the fraudulent Manoilov blood test, which supposedly mixes a few chemicals with human blood to produce various colors. According to Simpson, it can distinguish Jewish from Russian blood because of Jewish blood’s “paler color.” This test was dreamed up in Soviet Russia during the 1920s, and the quack scientists using it also claimed that it could differentiate between the blood of homosexuals and heterosexuals. Although Earnest Hooton’s *Up From the Ape* ridiculed these absurd claims for the Manoilov test as long ago as 1931, Simpson never twigged.

Although Simpson’s hero, Adolf Hitler, once said that a man should wait until he reaches thirty years old before he settles on a political philosophy, Simpson himself lagged a full decade behind that timetable. Until he was about forty he was nothing less than starry-eyed about racial differences, sex differences, pacifism, and living up to the Sermon on the Mount. Simpson, who was born in 1892, only began to investigate racial differences in 1930, he says, and he was “perhaps of middle age,” by his own admission, when the difference between the mentality of males and females began to dawn on him. He remained a pacifist until about 1932, and his attempt to follow in the footsteps of Jesus lasted until 1929, when he abandoned life in the shack. He recalls in his autobiography, moreover, that he began to read widely about Jews only after Anthony M. Ludovici gave him a copy of his book, *Jews, and the Jews in England*, and spoke to him about Jewish power, in the late 1930s. Simpson tells us that he graduated magna cum laude from Union Theological Seminary, but, his study of theology aside, he must have been a very slow learner.

Once Simpson had changed his mind about religious, political, and social questions, however, he traveled as far as he could in the opposite direction. Like the stereotypical convert to Catholicism who astonishes the cradle Catholic by his doctrinaire attitudes, Simpson took up every extremist position going.

In answer to the question, "Which way, Western man?," it must be said that the path for Western man has been illuminated by far more discerning and better-informed guides than William Gayley Simpson. For exceptional studies of particular themes covered by Simpson, one might mention J. Philippe Rushton on racial differences, Jared Taylor on race and crime, Kevin MacDonald on Jewish influence, Glenn Wilson and Anne Moir on sex differences, and Richard Lynn on eugenics. And for a general survey of Western man's current predicament, has anyone ever surpassed *The Dispossessed Majority* by Wilmot Robertson?

*John Day is a writer of British extraction currently living in Spain. He is the editor of **The Lost Philosopher: The Best of Anthony M. Ludovici**, published by the Educational Translation and Scholarship Foundation, of Berkeley, Cal., in 2003.*

ENDNOTE

1. According to a new biography by R. Bruce Craig, *Treasonable Doubt* (U. of Kansas), White was a "pious Jew." See www.kansaspress.ku.edu/cratre.html on book. See epitome at following URL for "pious Jew":
<http://216.239.53.104/search?q=cache:xbxoZ0kyxqsJ:www.kansaspress.ku.edu/craigprolog.pdf+%22Harry+Dexter+White%22+Jew&hl=en>