

# EX ORIENTE...A GEOGRAPHY LESSON

---

## The Geography of Thought

How Asians and Westerners Think Differently...and Why

Richard E. Nisbett

New York, NY: The Free Press, 2003

\$24.00 (cloth)

263 pp.

---

*Reviewed by Richard Jones, Jr.*

*I am a lonely monk holding a ragged umbrella, walking alone in the rain...*

-Mao Zedong

*Western interpretation:* Mao is a tragic figure still trying to identify with the "marginalized segments of society, including bandits, beggars, mendicant monks, mercenaries, and...prostitutes."<sup>1</sup>

*Eastern interpretation:* Mao has cited the first part of a famous saying in the *xie hou yu* style, the final part being: "...with no hair, no sky." For Mao, there is no law and no god.

Richard Nisbett's *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently...and Why* (hereafter *Geography*) is a book worth reading not because its logic is flawless (it isn't) or because the author agrees with J. Philippe Rushton or Richard Lynn (he really doesn't). It is precisely because the writer describes such vast differences between East Asian and Western mentalities, and the persistence of these differences over thousands of years, from a strictly environmentalist point of view that the book is so fascinating and irritating at the same time.

*Geography* is aimed at the general audience as well as scholars outside the field of cultural psychology. Think of the book as a Chinese meal that everyone can enjoy without being offended. On the one hand it describes gulfs of cognitive differences between East Asians and Westerners huge enough to make one cry out "How the hell can we all get along?" but at the same time allows that both groups may change their thinking styles after living in the

opposite culture for a few months. Think of the book as *feng shui* meets Jared Diamond, cooked Sichuan-style (covered in a spicy, very un-PC sauce but without any mention of race). The only way the author could say the things he says without being Rushton-ified by his peers and the public is because he satisfies the need to acknowledge the obvious differences without bringing in racial differences. His book is also a very quick read, and I found it hard to put it down.

Do I recommend this book? If the results of the original research presented in this book are repeatedly and independently verified, then *Geography* puts another nail in the coffin of universalism in human thought, though not from the standpoint of race, evolution, and behavior, but from that of *cultural* and *social* psychology. I think that Nisbett's amazingly frank discussion of the cognitive differences between East Asians and Westerners *unintentionally* supplements and bolsters what the scholars who study biological racial differences have uncovered about human diversity. But Nisbett's ideas seem at times more influenced by *feng shui* (Chinese for "wind and water"), and this overemphasis on environmental causation leads to much hot air and tainted water (as in the Stygian kind). He should be praised, though, for his efforts to determine *experimentally* the nature and extent of the vast differences between East Asians and Westerners in the psychology lab. He is on the cutting edge and should be respected for his efforts.

In the first part of my review I will give a quick, objective overview of the book and in the second part I will put forward my own critical assessment and dissect Nisbett's logic and style to find its strengths and weaknesses.

Richard E. Nisbett is the Theodore M. Newcomb Distinguished University Professor at the University of Michigan. According to the dustcover, he became the "first social psychologist in a generation to be elected to the National Academy of Sciences." Nisbett is no stranger to the race and IQ debate, as a quick glance at his website<sup>2</sup> and publications will reveal. He was kind enough to grant me the following interview:

**JONES:** *What is your current view of the work of Rushton and Lynn on race and IQ?*

**NISBETT:** Drivel. I have written on Herrnstein and Murray's pseudoscience and have [published a critique of] Jensen and Rushton.

**JONES:** *How have you been treated by your fellow psychologists after the release of your book?*

**NISBETT:** Respect and admiration only. A few anthropologists have expressed irritation with its generalizations, but none of them know anything about East Asia.

**JONES:** *You once said in an interview that universalism is a kind of religion. Where do you think this religion comes from and do you think that Westerners practice it more than Easterners (I am thinking of Japanese ethnocentrism and xenophobia)?*

NISBETT: I think that the religion comes from a mix of Jewish monotheism followed by Christian monotheism and from the Greek confidence that all humans were the same.

JONES: *What are your plans for future research in this area?*

NISBETT: I am showing that Eastern Europeans and Western Europeans differ from one another in the same sort of ways that East Asians and Westerners differ from one another.

In his recent *Human Accomplishment*, Charles Murray mentions Nisbett in reference to how Confucianism increased the role of familial and social constraints on personal autonomy in East Asian societies and thereby helped shape ways of thinking that “differ profoundly from the West’s.” According to Murray, “Richard Nisbett’s *The Geography of Thought* (2003) has recently brought together the growing literature on how these differences manifest themselves.”<sup>3</sup>

### OVERVIEW OF *THE GEOGRAPHY OF THOUGHT*

The book’s title lured me with its bait of possible explanations, from an environmental point of view, of *how* and *why* Asians and Westerners think differently. No violations of truth-in-advertising laws here: Nisbett offers a geographical explanation based upon “fertile plains, low mountains, and navigable rivers” that “favored agriculture and made centralized control of society relatively easy” in ancient China, versus the mountains that touch the wine-dark sea in Greece that “favored herding, fishing and trade (and let’s be frank – piracy).” Ecology lies at the root of his whole model of “influences on cognitive processes.”

The dust jacket sucked me in even more, with promises of revealing the origins of the “gulf that separates the children of Aristotle from the descendants of Confucius.” The claim that Nisbett “offers both a map to that gulf and a blueprint for a bridge that might be able to span it” got me thinking that a white Gen-Xer like myself should read this book. I might then be able to happily attend UCLA<sup>4</sup> and live contentedly in the San Gabriel Valley,<sup>5</sup> more in harmony with my East Asian roommates (who have included Maoist scientists, shady Chinese businessmen, and immigration violators) and neighbors. (Sometimes I feel that I am the last white man in Alhambra – a pox on Talmadge V. Burke! He was Alhambra’s political boss, serving for over fifty years and helping to promote white flight out of town. Out with Old America and in with the New! A statue in honor of the displaced white family has yet to appear on the steps of Alhambra City Hall.)

Nisbett describes the event that changed his life, starting him on the research path that led to *Geography*. One day a rather gutsy graduate student of his from China named Kaiping Peng confronted him. Out of the blue, Peng, like a wizened sage of political incorrectness, lectured Nisbett on how differently Easterners and Westerners think about the world:

The Chinese believe in constant change, but with things always moving back to some prior state. They pay attention to a wide range of events; they search for relationships between things; and they think you can't understand the part without understanding the whole. Westerners live in a simpler, more deterministic world; they focus on salient objects or people instead of the larger picture; and they think they can control events because they know the rules that govern the behavior of the object.

Nisbett had a real conversion as a result of Peng's lecture. Prof. Nisbett had been a

lifelong universalist concerning the nature of human thought. Marching in step with the long Western line, from the British empiricist philosophers such as Hume, Locke, and Mill to modern-day cognitive scientists, I believed that all human groups perceive and reason in the same way.

He had previously written books with titles like *Human Inference* that "made my sympathies clear," but now, after his liberation from universalism, he felt that that book might have said more about Western or "American college student inference" than about human inference.

So Nisbett began a crash course on "the nature of thought by philosophers, historians, and anthropologists – both Eastern and Western – and found that Peng had been a faithful reporter." Nisbett then combined his interest in cultural psychology, a biology-free reading list (a source of problems later on, as we shall see), and, with Peng's words ringing in his ears, set off on his own Journey to the East:

Where to look for the causes of such vastly different systems of thought? Do they lie in biology? Language? Economics? Social systems? What keeps them going today? Social practices? Education? Inertia? And where are we headed with the differences? Will they still be here fifty or five hundred years from now?

In eight chapters Nisbett hopes to "establish the contention that very different systems of perception and thought exist – and have existed for thousands of years – I draw on historical and philosophical evidence, as well as modern social science research, including ethnographies, surveys, and laboratory research" and will, in his epilogue, offer up his predictions for "where we are headed – toward convergence or toward continued or even intensified separation."

Nisbett tries to show in chapter 1, on the ancient Greeks and Chinese, that "the intellectual aspects of each society make sense in light of their social characteristics." We will see later on to what purpose this is put when he compares *modern* East Asians with *modern* Westerners.

Instead of *personal* agency the ancient Chinese focused on *collective* agency. It was harmony among the collective group that was most important, and self-control was promoted so as "to minimize friction with others in the family and village and to make it easier to obey the requirements of the state, administered by magistrates." Although the Chinese were in many

ways more technologically advanced than the Greeks, their achievements “reflected a genius for practicality, not a penchant for scientific theory and investigation.”

In chapters 2 and 3, Nisbett provides the intellectual underpinnings of his possible explanation for why different peoples like the ancient Greeks and Chinese show differences in their ways of thinking. The title of chapter 2 says it all: “The Social Origins of Mind”; in it he continues his comparison between the ancient Greeks and Chinese, but now he does so in light of the different “homeostatic socio-cognitive systems” that may account for cognitive differences and for the “origin of mentalities.”

A schematic model of “influences on cognitive processes” presents the same material in two ways, one that may appeal more to a Westerner like Nisbett (a linear flow of topics) and one that may make more sense for Chinese Americans (made up of ever more inclusive circles). The influences flow as follows:

**ECOLOGY > ECONOMY > SOCIAL STRUCTURE > ATTENTION > METAPHYSICS >  
EPISTEMOLOGY > COGNITIVE PROCESSES**

Nisbett describes his “economic-social account of cognition” as “at base materialistic” but not deterministic, and admits that this “approach is currently out of fashion in some circles” for this very reason. Nisbett will argue that the ancient Greeks and modern Westerners exhibit the object-oriented way of thinking versus the attention of East Asians to a more relationship-oriented cognitive style.

Attentive readers might notice a Diamond-like quality to Nisbett’s presentation. I am referring to the environmental argument that Jared Diamond presents in his *Guns, Germs and Steel*. Although Nisbett calls Diamond’s book “brilliant,” he criticizes it for being insufficient to explain the “intellectual advances that characterized Europe at an increasing rate from the fifteenth century to the present.”

In Chapter 3 Nisbett brings the cognitive comparison back to the present day by contrasting modern East Asians with modern Westerners. He provides evidence that

East Asians live in an interdependent world in which the self is part of a larger whole; Westerners live in a world in which the self is a unitary free agent. Easterners value success and achievement in good part because they reflect well on the groups they belong to; Westerners value these things because they are badges of personal merit. Easterners value fitting in and engage in self-criticism to make sure that they do so; Westerners value individuality and strive to make themselves look good. Easterners are highly attuned to the feelings of others and strive for interpersonal harmony; Westerners are more concerned with knowing themselves and are prepared to sacrifice harmony for fairness. Easterners are accepting of hierarchy and group control; Westerners are more likely to prefer

equality and scope for personal action. Asians avoid controversy and debate; Westerners have faith in the rhetoric of argumentation in areas from the law to politics and science.

Nisbett presents the non-Western view of self in chapter 4, where he covers the Eastern “cultural prejudice against individuality,” Eastern and Western views of in-group and out-group relations, and the lack of debate in East Asian cultures. Nisbett uses the distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (“collectivist”) and *Gesellschaft* (“individualist”) cultures that manifests itself even when Easterners and Westerners are infants and are treated by their parents in ways that serve to keep Nisbett’s homeostatic feedback loop between social structure and cognition going strong.

Surveys done by the business school professors Charles Hampden-Turner and Alfons Trompenaars seem to demonstrate a continuum of beliefs about independence vs. interdependence. The surveys showed a trend in responses to questions by middle managers from around the globe. The East Asian countries were at one extreme, the Mediterranean countries plus Germany and Belgium in the middle, and the Northern European Protestant countries at the other extreme. Nisbett thinks there is an even greater trend at work here:

Someone has said, “The Idea moves west,” meaning that the values of individuality, freedom, rationality, and universalism become progressively more dominant and articulated as civilization moved westward from its origins in the Fertile Crescent.

*Geography* includes a fascinating section on the utopias that Eastern and Western thinkers have created. Nisbett lists five characteristics of the Western utopia not based on the Bible (Garden of Eden or New Jerusalem):

1. the progress to reach them is linear
2. they are permanent once reached
3. human effort is required to reach it, not supernatural help
4. they are egalitarian
5. the Utopias are “based on a few extreme assumptions about human nature”

The Eastern view of utopia, including the Garden of Eden of the ancient Hebrews, looks back to a time of perfection and a possible restoration of that age in the future.

Chapters 4–7, in which the research findings of teams of international scientists are brought forth to substantiate the theorizing on East-West differences by generations of scholars, form “the heart of the book,” according to Nisbett. This is where Nisbett makes a unique contribution to the entire question. He takes the implications of all the speculations he has offered earlier and puts them to the test in the laboratory.

I will highlight only a few of the results:

- an experiment done by the psychologists Imae and Gentner “indicate[s] that Westerners and Asians literally see different worlds.”

- an experiment performed by a Nisbett-led team had results “indicating that the Chinese had paid more attention to the social cues than the Americans.”
- Han, Leichtman, and Wang found out that American children are typical little Westerners in that they are “the protagonists of their autobiographical novels; Asians are merely cast members in movies touching on their existences.”
- Masuda’s results indicate that Japanese focus more on the environment and Americans more on particular objects, respectively.

Nisbett compares the Indo-European languages with the languages of East Asia, and quite rightly makes the distinction between genetic relatedness and areal or contact influences. Chinese and Japanese are not genetically related languages, but due to geographical proximity they may have influenced each other. If what Nisbett says is true, the cognitive differences that separate East Asians from Westerners may also explain the differences in the respective languages of each region. A recent talk at UCLA by UC Berkeley Prof. James Matisoff entitled “East and Southeast Asian Areal Features: In Search of ‘Asianness’” should be supplemented by a talk on the “Europeanness” of Western languages. I am inspired by Nisbett to look further into this topic.

And so on until Nisbett announces that

I have presented a large amount of evidence to the effect that Easterners and Westerners differ in fundamental assumptions about the nature of the world, in the focus of attention, in the skills necessary to perceive relationships and to discern objects in a complex environment, in the character of causal attribution, in the tendency to organize the world categorically or relationally, and in the inclination to use rules, including the rules of formal logic. Two major questions arise in light of these contentions. Does it matter? Is it going to continue?

In Chapter 8, Nisbett lays out areas where the “large” and “qualitatively distinct” differences between East Asians and Westerners could make a difference. Areas affected range from medicine, law, debate, science, and rhetoric to contracts, international relations, human rights, and religion. He then analyzes each tradition in light of the other and gives his opinion of where each one could improve. Formalism, two-valued logic, the fundamental attribution error (FAE: “ignoring the situation and inventing strong dispositional explanations for behavior”) are Western “habits of thought that seem particularly illuminated by contrasting them with Eastern patterns of thought.” Contradiction, debate/rhetoric, and complexity are areas that Easterners should improve on by taking lessons from Westerners. IQ testing and the genetics of IQ are brought up and dismissed as “dubious propositions” when Nisbett refers to *The Bell Curve*, but he drops this topic as soon as he brings it up.

Finally, Nisbett describes three predictions of the future in his epilogue: Samuel Huntington’s “clash of civilizations,” Francis Fukuyama’s “end of history,” and his own “convergence” view. Nisbett sees mixing and “new

cognitive forms based on the blending of social systems and values." East and West will transform each other as they create a stew in which

The individual ingredients...are recognizable but are altered as they alter the whole. It may not be too much to hope that this stew will contain the best of each culture.

### ASSESSING THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF NISBETT'S WORK

It is noteworthy that Nisbett did not read any biology or sociobiology when he did his preparatory reading that led to *Geography*. Of the four bridge disciplines that, according to E.O. Wilson, will span the gulf separating the sciences and the humanities (genetics, the brain sciences, evolutionary psychology/sociobiology, and ecology), Nisbett only addresses ecology. Why did he turn to humanities and social science scholars first? This flaw in his thought-embryo developed sadly into a multitude of logical flaws in *Geography*. Nisbett makes no mention of human evolution (distal causation) and focuses instead on proximal causes in attempting to find the causes of the differences between East Asians and Westerners.

Nisbett should be praised for admitting that he was wrong to believe in universalism. How many professors drastically alter their professional careers to pursue the truth? But the lesson that I learned is that the propagation of error is not only a danger while doing calculations but also when one is setting off on research paths. Ignore the reality of race at your peril!

Defining his terms in the book's introduction, Nisbett gets into semantic trouble right from the start. East Asians, of course, are the people of China, Japan, and Korea. For the sake of his argument we can accept this generalization without much of a struggle. But his definition of "Westerners" as "people of European culture," including "blacks and whites and Hispanics — anyone but people of Asian descent" gives cause to wonder what Nisbett is up to here. He admits that his definition of Westerner is "somewhat odd," but he thinks that it "can be justified by the fact that everyone born and raised in America is exposed to similar, though of course not by any means identical, cultural influences." Nisbett knows that he may be offending billions with his definitions. Unfortunately, it is only to his East Asian readers that he apologizes to, and not to whites.

In his chapter 1, Nisbett has taken us on a trip back to ancient Greece and China. His purpose is at first glance unclear; as he admits in his introduction:

Aristotle and Confucius are presented as examples of two different systems of thought. Undoubtedly those philosophers also served to entrench habits of thought that were already characteristic of their societies, but chapters 2 and 3 are intended to show that the social-practice differences found in modern societies would tend to sustain or

even create those different patterns even if they had not been present in ancient times.

Nisbett does this kind of waffling and shifting too often in *Geography*, detracting from the force of his argument. For example:

There is no reason to assume that the sequence ending in cognitive processes must begin with ecology. There can be many different economic reasons that might make some societies or groups more attentive to their fellow humans and many reasons that could make them more attentive to objects and their own goals with respect to them.

Yet Nisbett never really tackles the issue of why the East Asians are “more attentive to their fellow human beings” (notice the universalism creeping back into Nisbett’s thinking here) from a deep evolutionary perspective. If ecology was important in shaping them during the time of Confucius as well as modern times, then why not during earlier stages of human evolution? It sounds as if Nisbett is describing the East Asians as more group-oriented. How did this way of living originate and help them to survive? Kevin MacDonald does a better job in contrasting collectivist and individualist cultures from the perspective of evolutionary history in the preface to the paperback version of *The Culture of Critique* (2001). Nisbett does provide a real sense of the uniqueness of the Classical Greeks and of how they distinguished themselves from the rest of humanity in the ancient world with their “remarkable sense of personal agency – the sense that they were in charge of their own lives and free to act as they chose.” He does an excellent job painting a picture for his readers of the Greek love for the theater, athletic competition, debate, and their passionate “curiosity about the world.”

Nisbett compares the philosophies, science, and mathematics of the two great cultures. One part really caught my attention, however – his mention of the Xinjiang mummies:<sup>6</sup>

In the desert of western China are buried bodies of tall, red-haired people, astonishingly well preserved, of Caucasian appearance. They found their way to that part of the world some thousands of years ago. Aside from the way they look, they are different from the peoples who lived in the area in another interesting respect. Many of them show clear signs of having been operated on surgically. In all of Chinese history, surgery has been a great rarity.

I wish that Nisbett had described the world-historical importance of these Caucasian mummies in more detail. They not only throw East-West connections and influences farther back in time, but also explain why the Chinese government has tried to cover up their very existence.

Nisbett ignores class differences, both ancient and modern. When it comes to aristocratic values, how many modern Americans could even describe Aristotle’s upper-class man of *megalopsychia*, let alone the *junzi* “gentleman” of Confucius?

Nisbett's Jared Diamond-esque influences share Diamond's logical weaknesses. Why do those who believe in the importance of geography in explaining the causes of human differences ignore race and biology in explaining human differences? Their opponents who accept the fact that race may have something to do with human inequalities are often much more open-minded in accepting environmental variables into their work.

Nisbett has few kind words to say about the Middle Ages in Europe (it is a "trough" when "European nobles sat gnawing joints of beef in damp castles") and commits one huge logically irrelevant *argumentum ad hominem* against entire generations. The agriculture-centered Middle Ages is the time in European history that most resembles the Chinese:

The European peasant was probably not much different from the Chinese peasant in terms of interdependence or freedom in daily life or in a rational approach to reasoning. And in terms of intellectual and cultural achievement, Europe had become a backwater.

To ignore and belittle Christianity's influences (good and bad) as one of the unique forces that helped shape the modern European mind is simply wrong. Some thinkers (Spengler comes to mind) contend that the West was born during the Middle Ages. Nisbett uses modern Northern Europeans to contrast with East Asians, but why does he not investigate the ancestors of the Northern European in more detail? He traces the modern Chinese back to their Chinese ancestors, but does not do the same with the Northern Europeans he studied; instead, he leaps from the ancient Greeks to modern Westerners without acknowledging the problem here. Viking Age Iceland should at least be mentioned as a good example of how to start a new society. The Goths spread throughout Europe and ruled kingdoms in Spain, Italy, and France. They surely were doing more than just gnawing on bones.

Nisbett's logic is flawed in many other places. For one, he confuses certain symptoms of the decay of modern Western culture known as the "Crisis of Modernity"<sup>7</sup> – excess individualism and an irrational belief in universalism – with the true legacy and unique achievement of Western culture – a belief in freedom – and then takes modernity's hyper-individualism back through time into Antiquity. As a result, the Greeks come across in *Geography* as a culture of rootless, ruthless pirates in the mold of Polyphemus and his fellow Cyclopes.

The ease at which "priming" can predispose respondents to react in either a Western or Eastern style of thinking upon pre-test exposure to images of either culture is quite amazing if the results Nisbett presents hold up to further scrutiny. Also, Nisbett describes situations in which Westerners living in Japan or Easterners living in the West have their thinking styles transformed just by living there for a short while. This mental malleability leads to the ability to learn new things. It also opens the door to indoctrination – a term Nisbett uses to describe how habits of thought are learned from birth and result in "very large *cultural* differences in habits of thought." The deeply ingrained biologi-

cal side of human nature that Nisbett ignores may serve as useful protection against the brainwashing, indoctrination, or reeducation efforts of those who follow the by now long debunked blank slate view of human nature.

Nisbett addresses the ethnic question very unsatisfactorily. He mentions the fact that “even today 95 percent of the Chinese population belongs to the same Han ethnic group,” but he does not contrast this fact with the cataclysmic demographic transformation that threatens Western nations. This should at least influence his predictions for the future.

It seems that authors cannot resist making predictions about the future, and Nisbett is no exception. His handling of the Fukuyama vs. Huntington debate is a little out of date, though. Nowadays, the debate is between Fukuyama and Gregory Stock,<sup>8</sup> over the role of biotechnology in shaping our future and how East Asian and Western nations are handling the rise of eugenics and its ethical implications.

Having read his Huntington, I wonder whether Nisbett would approve of the pathetic attempt by Australian Prime Minister Paul Keating and Foreign Minister Gareth Evans to redefine Australia as an Asian nation in the early 1990s. Did the East Asian nations appreciate this move? Were they impressed by this denial of Australia’s Western roots? Not at all! Lee Kuan Yew (who can say things about East Asians that a white would be persecuted for saying about whites) denied that it was possible for Australia to be an Asian nation, and sneered that Australia would be the “new white trash of Asia.”

Nisbett uses the space cantina scene from the movie *Star Wars* to describe classical Athens. It was this setting that provided the social environment in which Greeks had to sharpen their laws of contradiction in order to make sense of all the multiculturalism. Playing the film-tie-in-and-predictions-for-the-future game along with Nisbett, I do not know whether Tom Cruise’s character in *The Last Samurai* (a self-loathing white man who abandons a totally corrupt mythical West to find himself in a totally idealized mythical Japan), the totalitarian Village from *The Prisoner* (with its slogan “Questions Are a Burden to Others, Answers a Prison for Oneself,” which perfectly describes life on college campuses today when it comes to the racial taboo), or *Blade Runner*’s Los Angeles (where white flight is off the planet) better represents the future relations between East and West. What I do know is that all three are very unattractive alternatives.

---

*Richard D. Jones, Jr. is a graduate student in the Program in Indo-European Studies at UCLA. He has a B.S. in Biotechnology and resides in the San Gabriel Valley of Southern California.*

---

## ENDNOTES

1. Thanks to Angel and her father for helping me out with the Chinese. The Western interpretation is found in S. Courtois, N. Werth, J. Panné, A. Paczkowski, K. Bartosek, and J. Margolin, *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, and Repression*, trans. J. Murphy, ed. M. Kramer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 472–473.
2. <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~nisbett/>
3. Charles Murray, *Human Accomplishment: The Pursuit of Excellence in the Arts and Sciences, 800 B.C. to 1950* (New York: Harper Collins, 2003), 397.
4. Jokingly called the “University of Caucasians Lost among Asians.” By the way, Indo-European Studies is alive and well: <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/pies/home.html>
5. K. Connie Kang and David Pierson, “Asian Population Surges in County,” *Los Angeles Times*, Thursday, February 2004, B1.
6. See J. P. Mallory and V. Mair, *The Tarim Mummies: Ancient China and the Mystery of the Earliest Peoples from the West* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2000).
7. The French New Right’s Manifesto: “The French New Right in the Year 2000” originally appeared in *éléments* 94 (February 1999), but it can be found also on the Internet at <http://www.alaindebnoist.com/index.php>
8. Gregory Stock, *Redesigning Humans: Choosing Our Genes, Changing Our Future* (New York: Mariner Books, 2003).