

ETHNIC HEGEMONIES IN AMERICAN HISTORY

GEORGE HOCKING

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND HUMAN GENETIC DIVERSITY

Western Political philosophy tends toward moral and political universalism: the idea that norms are valid for all human beings. This presupposes either that human beings are biologically pretty much the same, or that human biodiversity is irrelevant to moral and political issues. Nevertheless, Western political philosophers initially limited their conclusions to ethnically homogeneous regions they knew and understood. Plato's *Republic*, for example, portrays an ideal society for Greeks, not barbarians, and even well past the Enlightenment John Stuart Mill explicitly excluded many non-Europeans from his conclusions in *On Liberty*.¹

Plato and Mill were prescient to do so. Few pre-modern people could travel widely. Consequently most people they knew were much like themselves. But during the Age of Discovery, which started at the end of the fifteenth century, European voyages throughout the world encountered the full richness of Earth's botanical, zoological, and anthropological diversity, and efforts to understand it contributed to the seventeenth century's Scientific Revolution.

By 1735, in the Enlightenment's full flower, Sweden's Carl Linnaeus developed the system still used to classify Earth's biodiversity. He observed significant morphological differences between the human populations of the different continents, which led him classify these groups as distinct species.² Such human populations are now called races.

The great controversy of our time rages between those who acknowledge or deny the existence of distinct races. The race deniers are motivated by the conflict between human biodiversity and philosophical or religious forms of universalism. Nevertheless, the study of

¹ Edward Sankowski, "Political Philosophy, History of," in Ted Honderich, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

² George M. Frederickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

human diversity remained mainstream science until it was purged and proscribed for political reasons in the mid-twentieth century.³ This is hardly the first effort to censor inconvenient scientific truths. The Catholic Church's temporary suppression of heliocentric cosmology is only the most notorious example among many.

Suppressing the truth of racial diversity is proving as hard as maintaining belief in an earth-centered solar system or a flat earth. Even as early as 1979, the fundamental fact that innate and fixed racial mentalities cause distinctive cultures rather than result from them was proven, even though quietly ignored.⁴ Now we know how truly stable these mentalities remain, even with the increasing mobility of populations. Few factors are as important in human affairs, since they offer the only reasonable explanation for the otherwise inexplicable stability of differences in seemingly disparate phenomena ranging from neighborhood school achievement to international development levels.⁵

For years genetics remained a crutch that permitted differences among races to continue being trivialized, since differences among genes were not readily apparent. Even genetic differences between clearly distinct species like humans and chimpanzees appeared to be few. Now we know better. Significant differences within genes and in non-gene DNA important for controlling gene activity correlate with race so well that DNA can now be routinely matched to racial phenotypes with complete reliability.⁶ Claiming races are alike because they share the same genes is now equivalent to claiming all books written with the same 26 letters say the same thing.

Modern genetic analysis shows that Plato's Greeks and Mill's Europeans are an unusually homogeneous part of the earth's human

³ Carl N. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); William Tucker, *The Science and Politics of Racial Research* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994).

⁴ Daniel G. Freedman, *Human Sociobiology: A Holistic Approach* (New York: The Free Press, 1979).

⁵ Michael Levin, *Why Race Matters: Racial Differences and What They Mean* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1997); Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen, *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2002) and *IQ and Global Inequality* (Augusta, Ga.: Washington Summit Publishers, 2006); J. Philippe Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Natural History Perspective* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1995); Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele, *Race: The Reality of Human Differences* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2004).

⁶ John M. Butler, *Forensic DNA Typing: Biology, Technology, and Genetics of STR Markers*, 2nd Edition (Burlington, Mass.: Elsevier, 2005).

population. European mitochondrial DNA, for example, has fewer haplotypes and is thus more homogeneous in origin than that of the human populations on other continents including those superficially appearing more geographically isolated, a conclusion confirmed by other measures of genetic diversity.⁷

Nevertheless, it is an article of faith for modern political philosophy that races and even their associated cultures are trivial phenomena that should be ignored. What it considers significant are various universally applicable abstract concepts. Consequently it was an ideological bombshell when Samuel Huntington, a leading political scientist, acknowledged the obvious fact that continental fault lines between ethnic groups are more significant and stable sources of human difference and potential conflict than abstract philosophical concepts ever were.⁸ Just as racial and ethnic diversity are relevant to understanding conflicts between societies, they can also illuminate conflicts *within* them. What follows is a sketch of American political history not in terms of abstract philosophical concepts, but in terms of the ethnic rivalries and hegemonies that have played a decisive role in shaping out destiny as a people.

ANGLO-SAXON HEGEMONY

The first settlers of what became the United States came from the British Isles. Britons rapidly dominated other ethnic groups, both the aboriginal Indians they found and the Europeans (French, Dutch, Swedish, German, etc.) who followed, establishing the hegemony of English language, law, literature, religion, and general culture. By convention, this culture is called "Anglo-Saxon," but this term conceals the considerable ethnic diversity of settlers from the British Isles. In fact, there was no unified Anglo-Saxon hegemony, but a series of shifting hegemonies of different British ethnic groups.

In the seventeenth century, East Anglians settled New England. People from the south and west of England settled Virginia and the coastal colonies to the south. Diverse English and non-English groups settled the Middle Atlantic colonies between them. In the eighteenth

⁷ Stephen Oppenheimer, *The Real Eve: Modern Man's Journey out of Africa* (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2003); L. Cavalli-Sforza, P. Menozzi, and A. Piazza, *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, abridged paperback edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

⁸ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

century they were followed by a large migration of lowland Scots and north English who often arrived after a sojourn in Northern Ireland. This second wave of migrants, collectively called the Scots-Irish, eventually brought their distinctive ethnic character to much of the future United States as they spread south and west across North America during the next century from initial settlements in valleys of the Appalachian Mountains.⁹

All these groups were once called "Native Americans."¹⁰ From a biological point of view, this is entirely accurate. Organisms are considered ecologically "native" to a place if they arrive there on their own initiative, irrespective of arrival time. They are non-native or introduced if they arrive due to another entity's activities. For example, in the United States house sparrows are non-native birds because people introduced them around 1850. Cattle egrets, in contrast, are native because they arrived on their own initiative, even though it was in 1941, long after the house sparrows had arrived. Cattle egrets are considered non-native only in places they first reached with human help, like Hawaii.¹¹

America's European settlers are the authentic Native Americans because they invented the concept of America and arrived here on their own initiative. Only later, as part of the concerted campaign to generate self-hatred among Native Americans of European origin, was the title stolen from them and bestowed on the disparate aboriginal peoples called Indians, who had arrived in America earlier but never conceived of it as a unified entity. Non-native people did not exist in North America until slaves were imported from Africa.

The English settlers rapidly came into ethnic conflict with Indians. (There were, of course, many ethnic conflicts between Indians as well, but these fall outside of American history proper.) In 1622, Indians of the Powhatan tribal confederacy launched a genocidal attack that

⁹ David H. Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989); Terry Jordan and Matti Kaups, *The American Backwoods Frontier: An Ethnic and Ecological Interpretation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); James Webb, *Born Fighting: How the Scots-Irish Shaped America* (New York: Broadway Books, 2004); Kevin Phillips *American Theocracy: The Peril and Politics of Radical Religion, Oil, and Borrowed Money in the 21st Century* (New York: Viking, 2006).

¹⁰ Madison Grant, *The Conquest of a Continent* (New York: Scribners, 1933).

¹¹ John Long, *Introduced Birds of the World* (New York: Universe Books, 1981); John Terres, *The Audubon Society Encyclopedia of North American Birds* (New York: Knopf, 1980).

killed nearly one-third of Virginia's settlers, and in 1675 the Wampanoag Indian leader Metacom or King Philip waged a nearly successful war of annihilation against the New England colonists.¹² America's new settlers gradually increased in numbers and technological skills, which caused their conflicts with Indians to eventually become more one-sided. Their frontier, however, was most often defined by isolated and vulnerable Scots-Irish homesteads.¹³ Until well into the nineteenth century, many of these pioneers faced death each night from Indian raiders, and from the 1840s to 1860s Comanches supported by Mexican Comancheros drove the Texas frontier back 100 miles while ethnically cleansing it of Scots-Irish families.¹⁴

Britain's first colonies in North America were gradually surrounded to the north and west by a thin cordon of small French settlements along waterways of the St. Lawrence and Mississippi rivers connected through the Great Lakes. Between 1689 and 1763, a series of wars between France and England spilled over to their North American colonies. The last of these wars is called "the French and Indian War," reflecting alliances between French and Indians that brought death and destruction to the British colonists in general and Scots-Irish frontier families in particular. Final victory over the French in 1763 brought British rule to the St. Lawrence Valley and the Great Lakes region and created colonies that eventually became Canada.

Soon after the first British colonies were founded in North America, the mother country passed, from 1642 to 1651, through a time of troubles that included two civil wars. In the colonies, this resulted in self-reliance and *de facto* independence that the inhabitants were reluctant to relinquish when the troubles ended and British power returned. English divisions leading to the civil wars, mirrored by differences between northern and southern colonies, also accentuated their pre-existing ethnic distinctiveness.¹⁵ Britain's effort to directly control New England under Edmond Andros was aborted in 1688, when locals resisted, and his patron, King James II, was replaced by William

¹² Gary Nash, *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early North America*, 3rd edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1992).

¹³ Webb, *Born Fighting*.

¹⁴ T. R. Fehrenbach, *Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans* (New York: Macmillan, 1968).

¹⁵ Kevin Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars: Religion, Politics, and the Triumph of Anglo-America* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).

and Mary in England's Glorious Revolution.¹⁶ Increased eighteenth-century British efforts to directly control the American colonies eventually led to the Revolutionary War and independence in 1783, followed by the formation of a united national government in 1789.

The first US president, George Washington, initially united the coastal regions of the original thirteen states reasonably well, but discontent among Scots-Irish in the interior led to armed resistance.¹⁷ After 1797, under John Adams, there was a significant shift of hegemony to New England. But this was abruptly ended by the election of 1800, in what might be called America's first peaceful democratic revolution. The defeat of Adams by Jefferson gave the coastal South and Virginia virtually unopposed hegemony in America until Andrew Jackson's 1828 election shifted it to the interior Scots-Irish, who largely retained it for the next thirty years. Opposition to Jackson and his unpopular Dutch-New York successor Martin Van Buren provided an opportunity, however, for growth of the Whigs, a rival Scots-Irish-centered party that won some elections during this period.

Two major new immigrations began in the 1840s with the arrival of large numbers of Germans, who often became farmers in the Middle West, and Irish, who found work as laborers in eastern cities like New York and Boston.¹⁸

In many nations a unifying nationalism develops around a central or core region, but America lacked such a region.¹⁹ The post-1828 hegemony of the Scots-Irish and allied groups was America's closest approximation to an authentic ethnic nationalism capable of uniting its regional ethnic cultures. Nationalist groups like the American Party and Young America²⁰ appeared during this period, which one modern historian disapprovingly calls the "White Republic."²¹ It didn't last, but "white" is still used to this day as a term for European-Americans.

¹⁶ Alan Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation: A Concise History of the American People* (New York: Knopf, 1993).

¹⁷ Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*.

¹⁸ Fischer, *Albion's Seed*.

¹⁹ N. Pounds and S. Ball, "Core-Areas and the Development of the European State System," in F. Dohrs and L. Sommers, eds., *Cultural Geography: Selected Readings* (New York: Crowell, 1967).

²⁰ Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: Norton, 2005).

²¹ Alexander Saxton, *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth Century America* (New York: Verso, 1990).

During the White Republic, New England increased its soft power by emphasizing education, manufacturing, and trade. Its early colleges like Harvard and Yale were academic models that still give America's college towns a New England cultural character. New England's weakness was a lack of political power, but it eventually gained that by exploiting divisions that weakened Scots-Irish hegemony.²²

CIVIL WAR AND EMPIRE

Since colonial times Southerners had used imported African slave labor. Consequently they lived symbiotically with the most genetically different of Earth's peoples.²³ Slavery continued after the Revolutionary War and became increasingly important as commercial cotton cultivation spread westward through the Gulf Coastal region at the start of Scots-Irish hegemony. The resultant Cotton Kingdom, ruled by a mix of Southerners from the old Atlantic coastal colonies and Scots-Irish from the interior, sought expansion into Latin America by conquest, while New England, which then valued ethnic, cultural, and religious homogeneity, opposed it.

The South was thus the region most tolerant of what is now called racial diversity. New England, for example, tended to liken all Indians to the dangerous heathens that nearly destroyed it in 1675.²⁴ Such attitudes led John Chivington, a clergyman and Union officer who defeated a Southern invasion of the New Mexico Territory at the Battle of Glorieta Pass in 1862, to perpetrate one of America's most notorious massacres of peaceful Indians at Sand Creek in 1864. Confederates, in contrast, made Cherokee Indian Stand Watie a brigadier general in their army.²⁵ New England was also extremely hostile to newly arriving Irish Catholics, and many of its political leaders began careers in an Anti-Masonic Party opposed to Masonic religious tolerance. But because blacks were rarely seen outside the South, it was easy for them to be idealized in New England.²⁶

The new Republican Party became the political vehicle for restoring

²² Fischer, *Albion's Seed*; Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*.

²³ Oppenheimer, *The Real Eve*.

²⁴ Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Phillip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Knopf, 1998); Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*.

²⁵ Patricia Faust, ed., *Historical Times Illustrated Encyclopedia of the Civil War* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986).

²⁶ A. J. Reichley, *The Life of the Parties: A History of American Political Parties* (New York: The Free Press, 1992).

New England's hegemony by attacking slavery, but its support was initially limited to Greater New England, both the original coastal region as well as an area south of the Great Lakes settled by immigrants moving west from there.

That changed rapidly, however, when New England's publishing dominance influenced public opinion through publications like *Uncle Tom's Cabin* that demonized Cotton Kingdom whites and idealized its blacks. Calls from a small cadre of abolitionists for slaves to revolt and kill whites created great fear among southerners. They had already suffered through Nat Turner's murderous slave revolt in 1831, and abolitionist John Brown's abortive attempt to touch off another revolt at Harper's Ferry in 1859 raised their fears to fever pitch.²⁷ Meanwhile, crude southern propaganda that justified slavery's expansion by idealizing it as good for everybody raised widespread fears that it threatened the freedom of people who did not own slaves.

By 1860 enough Scots-Irish and German Midwesterners voted Republican to enable Abraham Lincoln to narrowly win a four-way race. In reaction, the Cotton Kingdom seceded from the United States to become the Confederacy, and the war that followed divided the once hegemonic Scots-Irish for more than 100 years.²⁸

New England hegemony and Republican Party dominance was nearly continuous for the next 72 years, even though the Democratic Party of pre-war Scots-Irish hegemony still occasionally won national elections. Former Confederates, who won freedom from Republican occupation and local black rule through an eleven-year insurgency, found common ground as Democrats with urban Irish Catholics, who had themselves resisted discriminatory New England hegemony in the major New York City anti-war revolt of 1863.²⁹ Greater New England, however, was now largely free to economically and culturally dominate America. Regional centers of economic power like Chicago's meat packing and manufacturing industries, Pittsburgh's steel industry, Cleveland's oil industry, and especially New York City's commercial, financial, and railroad dominance arose throughout Greater New England. Its tycoons paid homage to New England's traditional cultural

²⁷ Henry Mayer, *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998).

²⁸ Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*.

²⁹ Barnet Schecter, *The Devil's Own Work: The Civil War Draft Riots and the Fight to Reconstruct America* (New York: Walker, 2005).

hegemony by building opulent mansions in its heart at Newport, Rhode Island and by mimicking New England mores.

But even New Englanders began to question the consequences of the Civil War's power shift as tycoons enriched themselves by depressing wages through mass immigration to the east coast from Southern and Eastern Europe and to the west coast from Asia. Meanwhile, railroad monopolies preyed on German and Scandinavian farmers in the Midwest by keeping costs high for the manufactured goods they bought and low for the crops they sold. Expansion into the nonwhite world, once anathema to greater New England when sought by the Cotton Kingdom, was now embraced as Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines were quickly added to an American Empire. Trusts and corporations gained new quasi-governmental powers, enabling them to increasingly encroach on elected local governments. The extremes of wealth and poverty these policies created caused the last quarter of the nineteenth century to be called the Gilded Age.³⁰

PROGRESSIVISM AND POPULISM

Gilded Age excess met widespread popular resistance. Under often Irish Catholic leadership, labor began to organize in the face of fierce plutocratic resistance. A populist movement by immigrant and Scots-Irish farmers fighting predatory northeastern financial domination led to the foundation of the Populist Party, which was soon incorporated into the Democratic Party by the great Scots-Irish leader William Jennings Bryan. At the same time, Greater New Englanders created a Progressive movement to restore regional values by fighting the destructive effects of plutocratic policies encouraging corruption, imperialism, economic exploitation, and mass immigration. Populism was thus a bottom up movement among those living outside the regional power core, while Progressivism was a top down movement seeking to blunt power's hardest edges.³¹

Both reacted to the increasing prominence of America's Jewish population. Jews first immigrated to the United States in significant numbers from Germany before the Civil War and quickly became prominent in commerce. By the Gilded Age many of them had become tycoons who contributed significantly to its excesses, just as its

³⁰ Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*; Kevin Phillips, *Wealth and Democracy: A Political History of the American Rich* (New York: Broadway Books, 2002).

³¹ Fischer, *Albion's Seed*; Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*.

importation of cheap labor brought a second and much larger wave of Jewish immigrants to America from the Russian Empire. In response, many populists began explicitly criticizing Jewish excess from below, just as progressive elites were attempting reform from above.³²

Populism and progressivism both contributed to creating the Socialist Party, the primary voice of America's first true left. Its social connection to populism was evident in the presidential election of 1912 when its candidate received his highest vote percentage of any state in heavily Scots-Irish Oklahoma, where two years later a Socialist gubernatorial candidate got nearly 20 percent. Left support swiftly disappeared in such Populist regions, however, as the Socialist Party and its later direct offshoot the Communist Party increasingly became vehicles for urban Jewish upward mobility.³³ (Most Russian Jews arriving in the United States during the Gilded Age were initially extremely poor, and many had previously participated in socialist and other leftist organizations that had violently confronted Russians and their government.³⁴ Consequently they were pre-adapted for socialist activity.) Thirty years later, Woody Guthrie was valued by the Left as much for his rarity as an Oklahoma Communist as for his music.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND THE GREAT DEPRESSION

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat, became president for eight years when regular and Progressive Republicans split. Wilson's roots were northern Scots-Irish, but he experienced the South's brutal invasion by northern troops as a child and worked in Greater New England-dominated academic culture as an adult. Consequently his sympathies were more with English-descended northern and southern elites than the Scots-Irish center, and he was more a Progressive than a Populist despite his Democratic affiliation. He appreciated the importance of race, however, and social separation of whites and blacks was maximal in his administration. He is most remembered for bringing America into World War I despite a peace platform, which was largely motivated by his sense of ethnic solidarity with British elites.

³² Fredrickson 2002; Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

³³ Nathan Glazer, *The Social Basis of American Communism* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1961).

³⁴ Nora Levin, *While Messiah Tarried: Jewish Socialist Movements, 1871-1917* (New York: Schocken, 1977); Howard Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America* (New York: Knopf, 1992).

His decision almost certainly saved the British from defeat.³⁵

At the war's end, largely Jewish-led Communist revolutions seized power briefly in Germany and Hungary and for nearly a century in Russia. None of these turned out well for Jews as a whole, however, and all generated intense anger because of indiscriminate killing of non-Jews. Their brief victory in Germany provoked an anti-Jewish revolution, ultimately causing their worst demographic disaster since Bogdan Khmel'nitsky freed Ukrainians from Polish and Jewish domination in 1654. Even in Russia a wily Georgian Communist Josef Stalin broke their power by 1927. The left did not successfully revolt in the United States, however. It barely survived repression falling hardest on its rural non-Jewish former populist factions at the Wilson administration's end. The American left has consequently persisted into the twenty-first century as a Jewish-dominated movement that would otherwise be scarcely recognizable to its post-World War I activists.³⁶

In 1921 Greater New England Republicans returned to power in a landslide made possible by millions of previously politically inert German-Americans and other European immigrants in the populist heartland who had been angered by the war against their ethnic kin in Europe and by intense government-orchestrated discrimination at home.³⁷ Lingering Greater New England progressivism finally ended mass immigration and brought ethnic stability, but financial excess led to economic disaster in 1929.³⁸ The resulting misery returned the Democrats to power for another twenty years.

Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal politically united white Americans more than at any time since the pre-Civil War White Republic, even as blacks remained socially separate. Corporate excesses were curbed and organized labor encouraged. Economic inequality among whites began to decline significantly for the first time since the Gilded Age. A balance between protecting private property and encouraging public purposes was achieved, resulting in infrastructure of lasting value and quality. A national *élan* consequently developed that helped win the

³⁵ Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars*.

³⁶ Howard Sachar, *A History of the Jews in the Modern World* (New York: Knopf, 2005). Cf. Ginsberg's *The Fatal Embrace*.

³⁷ Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics*, 2nd edition, revised (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor, 1956).

³⁸ Milton Friedman and Anna Schwartz, *A Monetary History of the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

Second World War.³⁹

The New Deal had a dark side as well, however. Scientific research on racial diversity was virtually ended because of conflict with its ideology of equality and its association with German National Socialism. Communists and their close allies, still overwhelmingly Jewish, were welcomed into the New Deal as full participants, even while working openly as agents of the Soviet Union.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND AFTER

Roosevelt also secretly maneuvered to subvert a strong peace movement and draw America into World War II on the Soviet side against Germany, despite great public opposition. Anglo-Saxon ethnic solidarity honed during World War I, anti-German pressure from an increasingly influential Jewish community, and Soviet sympathy among the left all helped blind Roosevelt to the nuances of mid-twentieth century European power politics. Germany was consequently demonized while the Soviet Union, a regime surpassing it in brutality and mass murder, was idealized. World War II thus ended with Europe's eastern half enslaved for another 44 years.⁴⁰

National Socialist Germany officially embraced racial research and ethnic nationalism, but paradoxically it ultimately subverted its racial nationalism by emphasizing minor linguistic differences at the expense of authentic kinship. It consequently treated genetically nearly identical Slavic neighbors like the Poles with brutality while allying with the Japanese, who sought to ethnically cleanse Oceania of whites. Its defeat had the long-term result of tarnishing ethnic nationalism into the next century so that even defense against mass non-white immigration remains difficult.

Roosevelt's death near the war's end transferred the presidency to his Vice President Harry Truman, who was not expected to do well politically. As in the aftermath of the First World War, a German-American reaction in the populist heartland, and an Irish Catholic one

³⁹ David Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929–1945* (New York: Oxford, 1999); Robert Reich, *Supercapitalism: The Transformation of Business, Democracy, and Everyday Life* (New York: Knopf, 2007)

⁴⁰ Conrad Black, *Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Champion of Freedom* (New York: Public Affairs, 2003); Patrick Buchanan, *Churchill, Hitler, and the Unnecessary War: How Britain Lost its Empire and the West Lost the World* (New York: Crown, 2008); S. Courtois, N. Werth, J. Panne, A Paczkowski, K. Bartosek, and J. Margolin, *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1999).

in the urban northeast, shifted control of congress to the Republicans for the first time since 1931. Truman soon faced revolts in his party from pro-Soviets led by Henry Wallace because of hardening relations with Stalin, and from southern Democrats under Strom Thurmond for weakening social separation of blacks and whites. Despite expert opinion that he would fail to survive this perfect political storm, Truman won the election of 1948 because of his strong roots in America's Scots-Irish heartland.⁴¹

Republicans finally gained the presidency in 1952, when the party's Greater New England wing and its candidate Dwight Eisenhower outmaneuvered Robert Taft, the candidate of the party's heartland populist wing, which included many World War II skeptics who viewed the Soviet Union rather than Germany as the main enemy. In that year's election Eisenhower easily triumphed over Democrats, who were now reduced to their southern and urban base.

Following the election, the Taft wing's last champion, Senator Joseph McCarthy, representing the German-Irish anti-Communism of Catholic "old immigrants," was quickly suppressed with the blessing of Eisenhower, who used Truman's Cold War with the Soviets as a cover for building America's postwar empire. Governments unfriendly to American corporations in Iran and Guatemala were soon covertly eliminated. Efforts to end American Communist influence, which flourished under Truman despite his occasional resistance, ended for good under Eisenhower with the fall of McCarthy. Paradoxically, as American opposition to anti-Communism increased domestically, the continuing Cold War intensified opposition to Communist states abroad. New Deal policies limiting domestic corporate power and promoting relative income equality continued long past the depression, however, so the Eisenhower years of the 1950s are still fondly remembered as a time of unprecedented happiness and prosperity.⁴²

The Democratic Party slightly expanded its traditional base to win the close election of 1960, but just a few years later its nature changed significantly. By 1964 the civil rights movement, a concerted attack on traditional southern race relations, was elevated to its primary issue.

⁴¹ Michael Barone, *Our Country: The Shaping of America from Roosevelt to Reagan* (New York: The Free Press, 1990); Lubell, *The Future of American Politics*.

⁴² Barone, *Our Country*; Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation*; David Halberstam, *The Fifties* (New York: Villard, 1993).

In response, the South, which was the party's strongest region until 1960, became its weakest region in 1964 and every subsequent election. By 1968 in the name of reform a movement led by Jews like Allard Lowenstein as well as some Greater New Englanders attacked and permanently stripped power from the party's traditional northern Irish-led urban labor base, a split exemplified by the televised confrontation at that year's Democratic convention in Chicago between Richard Daley, its Irish mayor, and Connecticut's Jewish senator Abraham Ribicoff. By 1972 Daley wasn't even permitted to attend the next convention. In the same year, the charismatic George Wallace inspired a momentary flare-up of white nationalist resistance, winning the Democratic Party primaries in northern industrial Michigan and Maryland, before he and his campaign were crippled by one of the gunmen who changed so much in American politics in the 1960s.⁴³

THE RISE OF JEWISH HEGEMONY

Political and economic power in the Eisenhower years was still tightly held by a Greater New England establishment narrowly located in two places: (1) an axis from Fairfield County, Connecticut to Manhattan and (2) in and around Washington, D.C. But it soon began to be challenged by an increasingly powerful Jewish establishment, which lobbied against programs targeting the long involvement of its kin with Communism and other subversive movements.⁴⁴

Jewish influence on American thought had been significant since a virtual Jewish monopoly on motion pictures was established at the start of the twentieth century,⁴⁵ but it increased dramatically in the 1950s when television entered most homes and sharply reduced community discourse.⁴⁶ Jews were also influential in book publishing and dominant in many other areas that shaped culture from art criticism⁴⁷ to Broadway⁴⁸ and comics.⁴⁹ Most significantly, and facilitating the

⁴³ Barone, *Our Country*.

⁴⁴ Stewart Svonkin, *Jews against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

⁴⁵ Neal Gabler, *An Empire of their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood* (New York: Crown, 1988).

⁴⁶ George Kennan, *Around the Cragged Hill: A Personal and Political Philosophy* (New York: Norton, 1993).

⁴⁷ Florence Rubenfeld, *Clement Greenberg: A Life* (New York: Scribner, 1997).

⁴⁸ Michael Kantor and Laurence Maslon, *Broadway: The American Musical* (New York: Bulfinch, 2004).

⁴⁹ Gerard Jones, *Men of Tomorrow: Geeks, Gangsters, and the Birth of the Comic Book*

rest, they controlled the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, the most influential newspapers in America's two power centers.⁵⁰ Media dominance also facilitated successful efforts of well-connected Jews in the scientific community like Franz Boas, Ashley Montagu (born Israel Ehrenberg), Richard Lewontin, and Stephen J. Gould to suppress research on human biodiversity.⁵¹

Since Israel's 1948 founding, its interests have been the number one cause of America's organized Jewish community. In 1956 the United States opposed and forced the withdrawal of an Israeli invasion into Egypt. In 1967 it fully supported Israel's similar invasion and subsequent occupation of Egypt's Sinai region despite a simultaneous Israeli attack on the United States Navy ship *Liberty* that killed 34 of its crew. Since then, the United States has given undeviating bipartisan support to Israel, despite increasingly outrageous actions that have provoked nearly unanimous condemnation by world opinion. When presidents like Jimmy Carter, a Democrat, and George H. W. Bush, a Republican, made just tentative steps toward foreign policy evenhandedness, they suffered firestorms of media abuse and were limited to single terms.⁵² More recently, Israel has even used the United States as a surrogate to attack and destroy Iraq, which was hostile to Israel but never a threat to America.⁵³

Another measure of hegemony is economic power. By 1979 Jewish per capita income in the United States was 66 percent greater than that of the nation's founding British-descended ethnic groups, which had even fallen 26 percent behind descendants of Japanese imported as Gilded Age cheap labor.⁵⁴ It is a cliché in academia and the media that America is run by "privileged white males," disparagingly called WASPs (white Anglo-Saxon Protestants), but this doesn't withstand scrutiny. In Los Angeles, for example, so-called WASPs are 16 percent

(New York: Basic Books, 2004).

⁵⁰ Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America*.

⁵¹ Degler 1991; Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reality: A Search for Solutions* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967); Tucker 1994

⁵² Stephen Sniegoski, *The Transparent Cabal: The Neoconservative Agenda, War in the Middle East, and the National Interest of Israel* (Norfolk, Va.: Enigma Editions, 2008).

⁵³ John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2007).

⁵⁴ Reynolds Farley, "The Common Destiny of Blacks and Whites: Observations about the Social and Economic Status of the Races," in Herbert Hill and James Jones, Jr., eds., *Race in America: The Struggle for Equality* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

behind Jews in median household income.⁵⁵ Mike Davis describes Los Angeles's shift from WASP to Jewish hegemony in detail.⁵⁶

The rise of Jewish hegemony is not like previous shifts of ethnic hegemony in America. Unlike past hegemonic groups, Jews are non-British and claim roots outside Europe despite long residence and significant ancestral origins there. They are also a much smaller group. British groups collectively constitute from 25 to 45 percent of America's population, depending on the method of enumerating a now highly mixed population. Jews, in contrast, are just 2 percent. Jews are also widely dispersed across the country, unlike previous hegemonic ethnic groups, which were the largest population in regions encompassing multiple states. Jews are a majority in only certain neighborhoods of some metro areas, including Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Miami, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and Los Angeles.⁵⁷

JEWES AND THE NEW LEFT

Much of the Jewish hegemony's power came from dominating America's left, but the normal function of the left everywhere else is equalizing incomes and power between social classes, which would have been highly disadvantageous to Jews once they became America's richest and most powerful ethnic group. The experience of National Socialism in Germany taught Jews to regard white working people not as a natural constituency to be organized, but as another "peasantry" capable of erupting into pogroms. The experience of Stalinism in the USSR showed Jews that orthodox Marxism was a golem that could escape their control. The solution was to create a New Left that would more reliably secure Jewish power and Jewish interests. The consequence is the seeming paradox of an America that has become ever more oligarchic as it moves further to the left.

The beginning of this shift can be traced to 1943, when the American Jewish Committee hired the Frankfurt School, a group of refugee German Jewish Marxists, as consultants on making America safe for Jews. Germany had long been a relatively safe place for its small but

⁵⁵ James Allen and Eugene Turner, *The Ethnic Quilt: Population Diversity in Southern California* (Northridge, Cal.: The Center for Geographical Studies, 1997).

⁵⁶ Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (New York: Verso, 1990).

⁵⁷ J. Allen and E. Turner, *We the People: An Atlas of America's Ethnic Diversity* (New York: Macmillan, 1988); S. Lieberman and M. Waters, *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988).

highly prosperous, influential, and assimilated Jewish community. But when National Socialism turned Germans violently against Jews, the Frankfurt School concluded that Jews could be safe only if traditional European culture and values were destroyed everywhere, including the United States. The Frankfurt School saw ethnic homogeneity as a danger to Jews, because they are more apparent as outsiders in homogeneous societies. Conversely, they saw ethnic diversity as good for Jews, because they are less conspicuous in such societies.

Unlike traditional Marxism, the Frankfurt School's constituency was no longer the proletariat, but the "marginalized," the "outsiders." Classical Marxism's images of heroic white proletarians were replaced by the image of Archie Bunker, "America's favorite bigot," who every Sunday delivered moronic tirades against the New Left's constituencies: Jews and their symbolic and political proxies, namely, non-whites, homosexuals, feminists, and the abnormal and subnormal of all descriptions.

Unlike traditional Marxism, the Frankfurt School did not pursue social equality, but social inclusion, access, and upward mobility for Jews and their proxies. The civil rights movement worked to smash white working class communities and public education. Affirmative action effectively excluded numerous whites from the full range of social institutions their ancestors had created. Feminism and gay rights struck at the heart of cultural and biological relations between men and women, devalued children, and promoted narcissistic consumerism that made the rich richer.

Eventually America's Central Intelligence Agency and Ford Foundation spread Frankfurt School ideology to its many satellite countries so the entire world would become safe for multi-national consumer capitalism.⁵⁸ In short, the New Left provided a remarkably functional ideology for entrenching Jews at the pinnacles of wealth and power and crowding out whites resisting Jewish hegemony or deviating from the Jewish agenda.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Volker Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Peter Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Postwar Europe* (New York: Free Press, 1989); Paul Gottfried, *The Strange Death of Marxism: The European Left in the New Millennium* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005); Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007).

⁵⁹ Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Westport, Conn.:

Perhaps the New Left's greatest success was its conversion of America's greatest demographic cohort into its most effective subverters, namely the baby boomers born between 1946 and 1953 who came of age in the 1960s, the decade the Jewish Establishment's hegemony was established.⁶⁰

THE RISING TIDE OF COLOR

The Civil Rights Movement opened doors for some African-Americans, especially those with some European ancestry. Ultimately, however, it probably shut far more. Its initial message of equal opportunity quickly shifted to equal results. Consequently, affirmative action programs started in Richard Nixon's administration forced manufacturers to hire thousands of poorly qualified blacks,⁶¹ which quickly made the United States much less competitive just as international economic competition rose sharply. Its factories continued to pay unionized high wages comparable to those of Europe while making African-quality products even Americans wouldn't buy.

Productivity growth, a respectable 2.7 percent during the 1960–1967 period before affirmative action, fell to –0.1 percent during the 1973–1979 period after it, a level far below that of other industrial nations and a condition from which America has never fully recovered.⁶² A result was deindustrialization and mass factory closures that resulted in manufacturing job losses for blacks 112 percent higher than for other ethnic groups.⁶³ Cities with large black populations like Detroit were hit hardest and turned into urban wastelands aptly named the Rust Belt.⁶⁴ Meanwhile Japanese companies, more insightful about human capital, located their new American auto plants in predominantly Scots-Irish rural areas and had few of the

Praeger, 1998).

⁶⁰ Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987).

⁶¹ Hugh Graham, *The Civil Rights Era: Origins and Development of National Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

⁶² W. Baumol, S. Blackman, and E. Wolff, *Productivity and American Leadership: The Long View* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1989); William Wolman and Anne Colamosca, *The Judas Economy: The Triumph of Capital and the Betrayal of Work* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1997).

⁶³ Norman Glickman and Douglas Woodward, *The New Competitors: How Foreign Investors are Changing the US Economy* (New York: Basic Books, 1989).

⁶⁴ Neal Peirce and Jerry Hagstrom, *The Book of America: Inside Fifty States Today* (New York: Norton, 1983).

quality control problems endemic to Detroit.⁶⁵

Since Mexicans were also favored by affirmative action, America became an enormous magnet for their legal and illegal immigration, which was encouraged by the 1965 Hart-Celler immigration bill.⁶⁶ It ended restrictions on immigration enacted by Progressives in the 1920s and opened the United States to massive Third World immigration.⁶⁷ Mexicans worked more productively and for lower wages than blacks, consequently driving them out of most non-governmental jobs. Since opportunities for government jobs were limited, independent black economic institutions had withered after desegregation and affirmative action, and other jobs had increasingly dried up, more blacks than ever before were left, in the words of the emblematic Otis Redding song, "sittin' on the dock of the bay wastin' time."⁶⁸ In the process, America quickly gained a second non-white population even larger than that of blacks,⁶⁹ a change welcomed by the Jewish Establishment, which contributed significantly to passing the Hart-Celler bill and viewed eliminating America's white majority as a requirement for its survival.⁷⁰

In the same period, blacks were forced into predominantly white public schools in a busing program that sought to help blacks through exposure to white culture.⁷¹ That was the theory, at least. In practice, cultural influence went mostly the other way.⁷² Before long, American public schools, once among the best in the world, were among the worst.⁷³ Destruction of America's rural landscapes by urban sprawl

⁶⁵ David Gelsenliter, *Jump Start: Japan Comes to the Heartland* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1990).

⁶⁶ David Reimers, *Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985); Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America*.

⁶⁷ Reimers, *Still the Golden Door* and David Reimers, *Unwelcome Strangers: American Identity and the Turn against Immigration* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).

⁶⁸ Myron Magnet, *The Dream and the Nightmare: The Sixties Legacy to the Underclass* (New York: Morrow, 1993).

⁶⁹ Allen and Turner, *The Ethnic Quilt*; Graham, *The Civil Rights Era*; Lynn and Vanhannen, *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* and *IQ and Global Inequality*; Reimers, *Unwelcome Strangers*.

⁷⁰ Peter Brimelow, *Alien Nation: Common Sense about America's Immigration Disaster* (New York: Random House, 1995); Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique*.

⁷¹ Richard Kluger, *Simple Justice: The History of Brown v. Board of Education, the Epochal Supreme Court Decision that Outlawed Segregation, and of Black America's Century Long Struggle for Equality under the Law* (New York: Vintage, 1975).

⁷² Nelson George, *Hip Hop America* (New York: Viking, 1998).

⁷³ Myron Lieberman, *Public Education: An Autopsy* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1993);

has many causes, but one of the most significant and least acknowledged is a desperate search for communities and schools distant from urban centers with large black populations.⁷⁴

In the early 1970s the idea of “multiculturalism” was popularized in Canada as a term for equity between Anglophone and Francophone populations, but in American schools by the 1990s it had come to mean establishment of Frankfurt School ideology as a quasi-religion from kindergarten to college.⁷⁵ It claims to promote diversity even while idealizing cultural and biological hybridization, which destroy diversity.⁷⁶

American multicultural education is obsessed with obliterating learning gaps between races, which are among the world’s most stable phenomena since they vary little across vastly different physical, cultural, and economic environments.⁷⁷ In every racial hierarchy, so-called yellow Northeast Asians are invariably at the top, white Europeans are slightly lower, followed by a variety of brown groups, with black Africans and Australoids at the bottom.⁷⁸ These results from standardized achievement tests are reasonably good measures of future economic success, even though they fail to measure such factors as creativity and imagination. A biological cause for any other phenomenon exhibiting such inter-environmental stability would be immediately acknowledged.⁷⁹ American multicultural ideology, however, blames it on “privileged racist whites.”⁸⁰

Magnet, *The Dream and the Nightmare*; Harold Stevenson and James Stigler, *The Learning Gap: Why Our Schools are Failing and What We Can Learn from Japanese and Chinese Education* (New York: Touchstone, 1992); Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997).

⁷⁴ Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton, 2005).

⁷⁵ James Banks and C. Banks, eds., *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1995); Nathan Glazer, *We are all Multiculturalists Now* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997); Philip Gleason, *Speaking of Diversity: Language and Ethnicity in Twentieth-Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique*.

⁷⁶ Judith Rhymer and Daniel Simberloff, “Extinction by Hybridization and Introgression,” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 27 (1996): 83–109.

⁷⁷ Lynn and Vanhanen, *IQ and Global Inequality*; Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*.

⁷⁸ Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*; Lynn and Vanhanen, *IQ and Global Inequality*.

⁷⁹ Paul Gross and Norman Levitt, *Higher Superstition: The Academic Left and Its Quarrels with Science* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994).

⁸⁰ Banks and Banks, *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*; Gary Orfield

THE RISE OF NEO-CONSERVATISM

So many negative consequences arose from the Civil Rights Movement that the Democratic Party won few subsequent elections. Its reputation as the anti-white party that idealized black criminals and sought America's destruction was only briefly overcome when it nominated southerners like Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton.⁸¹ America's Jewish Establishment, now thoroughly coordinated by the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations and the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, recognized, however, that the country's complete destruction would prevent its defense of Israel.

To conserve America as a viable host, neo-conservatism was created in the pages of *Commentary*, an official publication of the American Jewish Committee, whose editor Norman Podhoretz mixed predictable Frankfurt School ideology with *laissez-faire* economics, bellicose advocacy of Israel, and devaluation of nature through anti-environmentalism, his other innovation.⁸²

The nascent neo-conservative movement's first significant candidate was Ronald Reagan, who had been front man for the successful efforts of Hollywood's two most powerful Jews, super mogul Lew Wasserman and super mobster Sidney Korshak, to control organized labor in the film industry.⁸³ Reagan soon became the perfect American president for the Jewish Establishment, since he opened the borders, increasing Mexican immigration by 54 percent,⁸⁴ broke labor unions, and freed corporations from government oversight and regulation. Consequently, income inequality began to rise for the first time since the New Deal, eventually reaching levels unseen since the Gilded Age, creating a new era of excess that lacked the previous

and Susan Eaton, *Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education* (New York: The Free Press, 1996).

⁸¹ Thomas Edsall and Mary Edsall, *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics* (New York: Norton, 1991); Matthew Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

⁸² Gary Dorrien, *The Neo-Conservative Mind: Politics, Culture, and the War of Ideology* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993).

⁸³ Connie Bruck, *When Hollywood had a King: The Reign of Lew Wasserman, who Leveraged Talent into Power and Influence* (New York: Random House, 2003); Gus Russo, *Supermob: How Sidney Korshak and His Criminal Associates Became America's Hidden Power Brokers* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2006)

⁸⁴ World Almanac, *The World Almanac and Book of Facts* (Mahwah, N.J.: World Almanac Books, 2001).

one's mitigating good taste.⁸⁵

A defining feature of Reagan's new economy was the replacement of manufacturing with financialization.⁸⁶ Instead of a broad-based industrial economy benefiting the many Americans who once made things the world needed, a far narrower group was now enriched by financial control of the world's economy through multinational corporations and other vehicles that, though often based in the United States, had little affinity with or allegiance to its people.

Since financialization involves symbol manipulation, at which Jews excel, they were its disproportionate beneficiaries. Names like like Ivan Boesky, Michael Milken, Andrew Fastow, and Jack Abramoff became notorious despite less attention to their ethnicity than the Jewish Establishment expected.⁸⁷ These *Luftmenschen*, those who create money out of air – the stuff that inflates bubbles, before they pop – are a phenomenon with a long history in the Jewish community.⁸⁸

Their exploits paled before what was to come, however. In 2008 the financialized American economy was exposed to all as a gigantic Ponzi scheme that sucked money out of the world economy by selling subprime mortgage-based securities until their worthlessness was exposed.

Like all such pyramid schemes, more and more bodies were needed to postpone inevitable collapse. The marginally employed blacks and Hispanics of America's crime-ridden ghettos provided them, and the American Dream Downpayment Act and similar measures facilitated their movement into new homes. Suburban sprawl continued destroying the biologically rich landscapes of Florida, Arizona, and California until it could no longer be sustained. By 2006 it became evident that something had gone terribly wrong. Stores surrounded by expensive new homes needed security guards to prevent constant vandalism, a ghetto-bred habit of newly-minted suburbanites. Now those homes are empty, vandalized, and foreclosed.

None of this was seen or anticipated by investors around the world

⁸⁵ Philips, *Wealth and Democracy*; Reich, *Supercapitalism*.

⁸⁶ Phillips *American Theocracy*.

⁸⁷ Sachar, *A History of the Jews in America*; Frank Partnoy, *Infectious Greed: How Deceit and Risk Corrupted the Financial Markets* (New York: Times Books, 2003); Lou Dubose and Jan Reid, *The Hammer: Tom Delay; God, Money, and the Rise of the Republican Congress* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).

⁸⁸ Nathan Ausubel, *Pictorial History of the Jewish People: From Bible Times to Our Own Day throughout the World* (New York: Crown, 1953).

who once trusted securities backed by American mortgages. As a consequence the world economy faces its worst crisis since the great depression.⁸⁹ Before the full dimensions of the crisis were apparent, Alan Greenspan, America's Federal Reserve chairman from 1987 to 2006, published a memoir celebrating both his Jewish roots and his responsibility for policies that caused the crisis. In Greenspan's words:

The gains were especially significant among Hispanics and blacks, as increasing affluence as well as government encouragement of subprime mortgage programs enabled many members of minority groups to become first-time home buyers. The expansion of home ownership gave more people a stake in the future of our country and boded well for the cohesion of the nation, I thought. . . . I was aware that the loosening of mortgage credit terms for subprime borrowers increased financial risk, and that subsidized home ownership initiatives distort market outcomes. But I believed then, as now, that the benefits of broadened home ownership are worth the risk. Protection of property rights, so critical to a market economy, requires a critical mass of owners to sustain political support.⁹⁰

Greenspan undoubtedly didn't intend to create the financial black hole now sucking the world economy dry, but he was the primary architect of the hyper-financialization that made it possible.⁹¹ His willful blindness to the impact of race on economics shows he learned no lessons from bad loans to African and other Third World countries that weakened America's banks and left them vulnerable to the financial crisis of 1990, which contributed to George H. W. Bush's defeat in 1992.⁹² Bush's son, who learned nothing either, went on to preside

⁸⁹ Kevin Phillips, *Bad Money: Reckless Finance, Failed Politics, and the Global Crisis of American Capitalism* (New York: Viking, 2008); Mark Zandi, *Financial Shock: A 360 degree Look at the Subprime Mortgage Implosion and How to Avoid the Next Financial Crisis* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: F. T. Press, 2009).

⁹⁰ Alan Greenspan, *The Age of Turbulence: Adventures in a New World* (New York: Penguin, 2007).

⁹¹ Phillips *American Theocracy*.

⁹² Steven Beckner, *Back from the Brink: The Greenspan Years* (New York: Wiley, 1996); Roy Smith, *Comeback: The Restoration of American Banking Power in the New World Economy* (Cambridge: Harvard Business School, 1993); Phillip Zweig, *Wriston: Walter Wriston, Citibank, and the Rise and Fall of American Financial Supremacy* (New York: Crown, 1995).

over a far worse economic meltdown.⁹³

The Scots-Irish are finally united behind the Republican Party as they haven't been with any party since before the Civil War, but it has done them no good. They've become increasingly impoverished relative to other groups under the Republicans,⁹⁴ and even when southern Democrats like Bill Clinton won elections, the financialized economic policy begun by Reagan and fully implemented by Greenspan changed little.⁹⁵ Their chief function now is cannon fodder in wars for Israel, which George W. Bush, a servile supporter of the Jewish Establishment despite his studied Scots-Irish manner, fully implemented in 2003 with the invasion of Iraq. John Hagee and other Christian Zionists even pervert their traditional Protestantism into literal worship of Jews resembling cargo cults of primitive people that sacralize their rulers' culture and anticipate the world's end.⁹⁶

The Jewish Establishment's total control of both major American parties by 2008 was evident in their servile fidelity to its core values of unlimited non-white immigration and wars for Israel. The establishment's wide geographic dispersal, affluence, and tight focus on collective interests enabled it to dominate campaign finance throughout the country.⁹⁷ Consequently the 2008 presidential campaign was a caricature of both parties' worst features symbolized by the dance between them by Senator Joseph Lieberman, who represents the establishment far more reliably than Connecticut. Lieberman, the Democrats' vice-presidential candidate in 2000, campaigned for the Republicans in 2008 but was welcomed back by the Democrats following the election.

The ethnicity of the John McCain-Sarah Palin Republican ticket appealed to America's Scots-Irish and southern English, but their campaign's focus on fighting for Israel became so comically slavish it was eventually lampooned on television's *Saturday Night Live*. In contrast, much of the initial appeal of Barack Obama to many Democrats, despite the slimmest of resumes, was a family background almost caricaturing rootless cosmopolitanism: Obama's mother, a Kansas girl,

⁹³ Zandi, *Financial Shock*.

⁹⁴ Thomas Frank, *What's the Matter with Kansas: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004).

⁹⁵ Phillips, *Wealth and Democracy; American Theocracy*.

⁹⁶ Phillips *American Theocracy*; Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*; Sniegowski, *The Transparent Cabal*; Jonathan Smith and William Green, eds., *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Religion* (New York: Harper Collins, 1995).

⁹⁷ Mearsheimer and Walt, *The Israel Lobby*.

sought out first a Kenyan and then an Indonesian to father her children.⁹⁸ Obama eventually sought roots his mother failed to provide in Chicago's black community and proved to be a smart campaigner. He defeated John McCain, who was only able to carry Scots-Irish, southern white, and some German-American regions. Obama won everywhere else. The future course of his presidency is still unknown, but a hint came when his first significant appointment, that of his chief of staff, was the powerful Israeli-American congressman Rahm Emanuel.⁹⁹

THE END OF JEWISH HEGEMONY

It is evident that the Jewish hegemony has two pillars. One is the destruction of the ethnic consciousness and demographic viability of America's white majority. The other is unconditional support for extreme ethnonationalism among the Jewish majority in Israel, a *Herrenvolk* democracy attaching no value to the rights and lives of Palestinians under its control.¹⁰⁰ In simple terms, it is for minorities and against the majority where it's a permanent minority, and the reverse where it can be a majority. This seeming paradox is no contradiction for the current establishment. It is simply the current version of their traditional litmus test: is it good for the Jews?¹⁰¹ In this case, however, what is good for the Jews threatens the welfare and very existence of America's people in general and its white majority in particular.

Rule of large nations by small ethnic groups is unsustainable and must eventually end, but that can take a long time. Manchus ruled China for 250 years until they were essentially absorbed and nearly extinct by the time they were overthrown in the nationalist revolution of 1911.¹⁰² The vast demographic strength of the Chinese permitted them to readily outlast the Manchus, but white America, a valuable and distinctive part of earth's human biodiversity, lacks that advantage.¹⁰³ Its population share of the nation it founded has fallen from 83

⁹⁸ Franklin Foer, *Election 2008: A Voter's Guide* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Shelby Steele, *A Bound Man: Why We are Excited about Barack Obama and Why He Can't Win* (New York: The Free Press, 2008).

⁹⁹ Michael Barone and Richard Cohen, *The Almanac of American Politics: 2008* (Washington, D.C.: National Journal, 2007).

¹⁰⁰ Jimmy Carter, *Palestine: Peace not Apartheid* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006).

¹⁰¹ Elliot Rosenberg, *But Were They Good for the Jews: Over 150 Historical Figures Viewed from a Jewish Perspective* (Secaucus, N.J.: Birch Lane Press, 1997).

¹⁰² Jonathan Spence, *The Search for Modern China* (New York: Norton, 1990).

¹⁰³ George McDaniel, ed., *A Race against Time* (Oakton, Va.: New Century Books, 2003).

percent to 69 percent in just 20 years, a spiral of demographic disaster that continues to accelerate.¹⁰⁴ Such reduction of an ethnic group's population resulting from overt acts by a hegemonic group constitutes genocide and must be stopped by any means necessary.

White survival requires a movement of national liberation that must begin now. It can come by force of arms, like Hezbollah's liberation of Lebanon from the Israelis, or peacefully, like Gandhi's defeat of the British Raj,¹⁰⁵ but it must come. Demonization of those fighting oppression indicates their effectiveness and is cause for honor rather than reproach.¹⁰⁶ Victory in this struggle may seem impossible now, but surprise is history's nature. Help may even come from unexpected places. Both Jewish¹⁰⁷ and gentile¹⁰⁸ authors discuss the phenomenon of Jewish revolutionary spirit, which helped create Establishment hegemony. It threatens established orders, but recent works by Jewish authors like Finkelstein¹⁰⁹ and Shamir¹¹⁰ suggest that may include the present one.

Most importantly, white America must gain a sense of collective identity to survive. Otherwise it is just an unorganized mob of individuals vulnerable to any group like the current Establishment that has such an identity. American whites once had such identity in embryonic form, but that was weakened by regional divisions and finally destroyed by Frankfurt School propaganda in the 1960s. Even that identity was a folk development never supported by Anglo-American academic political philosophy, which was dominated by the Anglo-French Enlightenment and consequently universalist rather than particularist.¹¹¹

Universalism permitted just two alternatives: world humanity consisting of either isolated individuals or a collective mass. So-called conservatives of the right favored the former and so-called liberals of the left favored the latter, but neither left room for ethnic

¹⁰⁴ Barone and Cohen, *The Almanac of American Politics: 2008*; World Almanac 2001.

¹⁰⁵ Shamir, *Masters of Discourse* (Tel Aviv: Surge Books 2008).

¹⁰⁶ Douglas Rose, ed., *The Emergence of David Duke and the Politics of Race* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

¹⁰⁷ Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, *Jews, Christians, and the New Left* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

¹⁰⁸ E. Michael Jones, *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and Its Impact on World History* (South Bend, Ind.: Fidelity Press, 2008).

¹⁰⁹ Norman Finkelstein, *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

¹¹⁰ Shamir, *Masters of Discourse*.

¹¹¹ Frederickson, *Racism*.

identity. Alternatives celebrating particularity did develop in Europe to the east of France in reaction to Napoleon's attempt to spread the Enlightenment by force, but their particularity focused on relatively recent epiphenomena of language and religion tending to divide Europeans rather than the biological fundamentals uniting them.¹¹² That philosophical turn, proscribed after 1945 for being on the losing side of the Second World War, is now reemerging in Europe as an antidote to the malaise of globalism.¹¹³

Some see this as a model for America, but there are problems despite much of value. The European new right tends to be hierarchical, anti-modern, anti-rationalist, and non-biological at a time when these would be fatal to white Americans. An acceptance of hierarchy¹¹⁴ is the last message needed by white Americans crushed beneath a hostile hegemony's iron heel, especially since proto-neo-conservative Leo Strauss used similar arguments to justify hegemony.¹¹⁵ The new right's anti-modern, anti-rationalist, and non-biological tendencies are equally problematic, since they reject not only modernity's universalism but also the ultimate achievement of white European culture, modern science.

C. P. Snow identified these two sides of modernity in his *Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*,¹¹⁶ but for too long the universalistic one has dominated academia and public affairs.¹¹⁷ That began to change when E. O. Wilson's *Sociobiology* demonstrated clearly that humans are not exempt from the great advances being made in evolutionary biology and ecology.¹¹⁸ In this model there are no longer biological universals, and therefore no human ones as well. Everything is particular, from the earth's infinitely variable environments to its equally diverse biological groups, including human groups. In

¹¹² George Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe* (New York: Rand McNally, 1961); Oppenheimer, *The Real Eve*.

¹¹³ Michael O'Meara, *New Culture, New Right: Anti-liberalism in Postmodern Europe* (Bloomington, Ind.: 1st Books, 2004).

¹¹⁴ Tomislav Sunic, *Against Democracy and Equality: The European New Right* (Newport Beach, Cal.: The Noontide Press, 2004).

¹¹⁵ Ted McAllister, *Revolt Against Modernity: Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin, and the Search for a Postliberal Order* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1996).

¹¹⁶ C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1962).

¹¹⁷ Gross and Levitt, *Higher Superstition*.

¹¹⁸ Edward O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1975).

such groups individuals are important, but their well-being ultimately depends on that of their group and the barriers protecting its integrity.¹¹⁹ Wilson subsequently called for respecting the full measure of earth's biodiversity as God's Creation, a model embracing rather than excluding religion.¹²⁰

* * *

Architectural critic Charles Jencks dates the end of the modern age to 3:32 PM on July 15, 1972, when the Pruitt-Igoe housing project in St. Louis was deliberately dynamited because its black tenants had rendered it uninhabitable after just 17 years.¹²¹ Its architectural award-winning high rises surrounded by gardens were similar to designs that helped Europeans reduce their human footprint, but they didn't work for another race. Modernity is ultimately European culture, which other races often rightly reject and resist. Its zenith was 1969, when Neal Armstrong walked on the moon. White Americans still believed then that modernity could embrace and improve the lives of all human populations.¹²² So 1972 is as good a date as any for when they lost that hope. Political philosophy fails to explain the subsequent postmodern age's pervasive confusion. Only renewed appreciation of our planet's great biodiversity, including human biodiversity, can do that. To paraphrase Patrick Henry: "If this be racism, make the most of it."

George Hocking (Ph.D.) is the pen name of an American scientist.

¹¹⁹ Rhymer and Simberloff, "Extinction by Hybridization and Introgression."

¹²⁰ Edward O. Wilson, *The Future of Life* (New York: Knopf, 2002) and *The Creation: An Appeal to Save Life on Earth* (New York: Norton, 2006).

¹²¹ David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989).

¹²² Fred Siegel, *The Future Once Happened Here: New York, D.C., L.A., and the Fate of America's Big Cities* (New York: The Free Press, 1997).