

RACE & CULTURE*

ANDREW HAMILTON

“Evolution under bioculturally driven group selection, including migration, war, and genocide, may account for a substantial amount of change in human gene frequencies.”

—J. Philippe Rushton¹

If we assume that white civilization is ultimately an expression of the white genome, analysis could proceed in two directions. It could specify those elements that epitomize or define our unique culture, or it could examine ways in which culture itself, via feedback effects, negatively or positively impacts demography and racial fitness.

This essay will take the latter approach. The basic focus is political, social, racial. Everything is examined, implicitly or explicitly, from a racial—a white racial—perspective. However, given race realists’ understandable inclination to emphasize nature over nurture, heredity over environment, I take some pains to demonstrate that these features of the natural world are in reality intricately interwoven and essentially non-dichotomous. This is true even for plants and animals. As for man, from the earliest times to the present, his predominant adaptive “environment” is the one he constructs himself: human culture.

European society—the collection of similar cultures originating in the prehistoric past among proto-Indo-European speakers later differentiated to some degree by language, religion, customs, and ethnicity—evolved over many generations to fit our people. We developed institutions and ways of doing things suitable to our special nature. When whites colonized North and South America, southern Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, we took the essential elements of our culture with us.

* See Louis R. Browning, “Bioculture: A New Paradigm for the Evolution of Western Populations,” *The Occidental Quarterly*, vol. 4, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 31–46 for an analysis parallel to that presented here.

¹ J. Philippe Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective*, 3rd ed. (Port Huron, Mich.: Charles Darwin Research Institute, 2000), 89.

One defining feature of European society was its biological homogeneity, developed over thousands of years. There was enough genetic similarity, enough historical and biological continuity, enough cultural affinity, to impart a common sensibility and set of values to the members of the European population. A bedrock sense of kinship, loyalty, and responsibility extended throughout society. In fact, anyone who lived prior to the mid-1960s has a sharp sense of what social solidarity meant. It was still common for people to leave their doors unlocked; church attendance was an integral part of life; mass pornography did not exist; and one was surrounded by extended families consisting of parents, children, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, nieces, and nephews. That world has been irrevocably shattered, leaving alienation and loneliness in its wake, intensified by the weirdness, endemic violence, and anti-white discrimination of an immoral society.

AN ANALYTICAL MODEL

There is more to race than just morphology (anatomy) or phenotype in the narrowest sense of the word (the physical body),² which perhaps played disproportionately important roles in classical physical anthropology. As Western understandings of race were subjected to decades-long excoriation by anti-white Boasians,³ empirically-minded scientists retreated to the last redoubt available to them: morphology, the straightforward measurement of physical traits after everything else had been jettisoned. Objective measurement seemed more certain, less controversial, and less subject to denial than nuanced, complex racial analyses.⁴

² "Phenotypic characteristics can be usefully categorized as structural (morphological), functional (physiological), and psychobehavioral." Richard B. Mazess, "Biological Adaptation: Aptitudes and Acclimatization," in E. S. Watts, F. E. Johnston, G. W. Lasker, *Biosocial Interrelations in Population Adaptation* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 12.

³ Jewish radical Franz Boas (1858–1942) was an enormously influential anthropologist with Communist Party ties who expunged race from the literature of the social sciences in favor of ideologically-skewed "cultural relativism," summarized by Ukrainian-American geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky as follows: "No culture is really superior to any other; one should not talk about savagery or barbarism, or even primitive and advanced cultures; euphemistic adjectives like 'preliterate' and 'literate' must be used instead. No one culture's way of life is better than another; people live differently, and that is all . . ." *Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), 9.

⁴ This statement requires qualification. Many morphologists believed physical differences between the races logically implied group psychological, behavioral, and

But morphology, too, was finally severed from the body of science by the Censor's guillotine.⁵

The idea that race encompasses more than morphology or even genotype finds support from the field of conservation biology: "[F]actors other than genetics need to be considered in understanding relationships below the species level. . . . [H]igher levels of confidence can be obtained in classifications based on the concurrence of multiple morphological, molecular, ecological, behavioral and/or physiological characters."⁶ Because human beings differ qualitatively from other animals, behavior plays a more important role, and the dimensions of group psychology and culture must be superadded as well.⁷

Similarly, when Italian-born population geneticist Luigi Luca Cavalli-Sforza and colleagues analyzed racial evolution (euphemistically, "the history of human differentiation"), they did not employ an exclusively genetic approach. The populations they sampled were aboriginal to their respective geographic locales as of 1492, and had

cultural differences as well. In *Race* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), John Baker emphasized morphology, but noted that cranial capacity "sets a limit to the size of the brain in the different taxa" and asserted, "all morphological differences are also relevant in an indirect way, since it is scarcely possible that any taxa could be exactly the same as one another in all the genes that control the development and function of the nervous and sensory systems, yet so different from one another in structural characters in other parts of the body as many taxa in fact are. Apart from this, considerable morphological differences in the brains of different taxa have in some cases been observed" (pp. 533-34). Baker also studied in great detail racial differences in cognitive ability and capacity to originate civilizations: "Part Four: Criteria of Superiority and Inferiority" (pp. 419-534).

⁵ "In the introduction to the first book [*The Origin of Races* (1962)] I stated my intention to discuss in this one racial differences in blood groups and the anatomy of the brain, but only blood groups have been covered. Racial differences in the brain imply differences in intelligence, a subject so laden with emotion that its mere mention evokes unsolicited acclaim and feverish denunciation. Even without reference to the brain or to intelligence, the simple statement that races exist drives a small coterie of vocal critics into a predictable and well-publicized frenzy." Carleton S. Coon with Edward E. Hunt, Jr., *The Living Races of Man* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), ix. The "small coterie" quickly grew into the monolithic scientific/cultural establishment of today.

⁶ Susan M. Haig et al., "Taxonomic Considerations in Listing Subspecies Under the US Endangered Species Act," *Conservation Biology* 20 (December 2006): 1590-91.

⁷ "So, what's a European? We have to look at the totality of genetic, phenotypic, ancestral, historical, and cultural data." Michael Rienzi, "Why Not 'Y'?", n.d., <http://www.legioneuropa.org/IOE/autoy.htm> (accessed 2-20-2003). This website no longer exists.

remained free from significant admixture (race-mixing) ever since. Populations and individuals that did not meet these criteria were excluded from study. The authors next correlated genetic data with evidence from other disciplines, including geography, environment, prehistory (paleoanthropology and archaeology), history, physical anthropology, demography, migrations, and linguistics.⁸ This represents a good example of a holistic approach to race. (The authors' "populations" are races in our sense, since "race" can signify "discrete" groups at any level in the nested hierarchy of human populations.)

Besides greater realism and increased confidence in racial classification, the holistic model possesses two further advantages. First, it retains biology as its core or foundational principle, emphasizing the need to analyze and weigh biological factors carefully before addressing secondary issues. Second, its widened scope encompasses closely-related matters too often ignored. This second function is vital, since viable social movements cannot be predicated on biology alone. Twentieth century German nationalism, for example, was grounded in race, but propelled politically by the related concept of *Volk*.⁹

The concept of phenotype can be extended beyond the physical body of an individual, or the characteristic bodily traits of a population, to encompass individual/group physiology, psychology, intelligence, behavior, character, and even culture/civilization.¹⁰

Therefore, in place of an overly-restrictive genetic-phenotypic view of race, we propose an alternative which takes human culture into account.

The holistic model of race may be diagrammed as follows:


Population genetics (genotype) → group phenotype → group psychology/behavior → culture/civilization ("extended phenotype").

⁸ L. Luca Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi, Alberto Piazza, *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, abridged paperback ed. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994).

⁹ Christopher M. Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk* (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 2005). Hutton blasts holes in academically constructed myths about the roles of Aryanism, Nordicism, and "racial purity" in German anthropology, ideology, and state policy that are dear to the hearts of anti-white racists—myths brilliantly dissected a half-century ago by Italian-American scholar of fascism A. James Gregor (born Anthony Gimigliano) in Oswald and Diana Mosley's magazine. See "National Socialism and Race," *The European* (July 1958): 273–91. Hutton does not cite Gregor.

¹⁰ Browning, "Bioculture: A New Paradigm."

At the psychological, behavioral, and cultural levels feedback loops emerge, causing conscious and unconscious behavior and choices to exert significant demographic and genetic effects upon populations, thereby enormously affecting the development and the fates of races. Thus:



The arrows represent directional flow. To an important extent each level gives rise to and loosely determines¹¹ the next, although levels above that of genotype are characterized by increasingly elastic "norms of reaction," and elements or even whole components of racial culture can influence, be adopted by, dominate, or distort the cultures of others.

It is this plasticity in part which has enabled a socially dominant race to seize control of our culture, distort it out of all recognition, and feed the results back into the population in the form of radically altered beliefs, norms, and behaviors. Positive feedback is initiated, leading to a runaway process. The system becomes more and more unstable. Suppression of intellectual and political rights cedes the dominant race a monopoly over political and social affairs. The dominant race uses the monopoly to attack the subordinate race from every direction. Essential safeguards of genetic integrity are ruthlessly stripped away. Alien ideas and influences permeate society. Fertility falls drastically. Replacement migration is instituted. Pushed along, gene exchange occurs on a massive scale. White fertility drops further. Immigration ratchets up. Resources and privileges are transferred

¹¹ "The genetic model . . . is the polygenic threshold model, which assumes that a large number of genes contribute equally and additively to the trait, and that there is a threshold point beyond which the phenotype is expressed. In addition to the genetic effects, environmental factors can act to shift the distribution, thus influencing the position of the genotype with respect to the threshold . . .

"Thus, genetic 'influence,' not genetic 'determinism' is the appropriate catchphrase when it comes to social behavior. . . . About 50 percent of the variance in human social behavior seems to be of genetic origin, with the remaining 50 percent environmental." Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, 58-59.

from whites to non-whites at an accelerating rate. It is a vicious cycle with no end in sight but the destruction of the race.

On the behavioral, genetic, and demographic levels, the result has been an unmitigated disaster for our race.¹²

THE ORGANISM AND NATURE'S ENVIRONMENT

Textbook population genetics teaches:

[T]he environment is not a fixed situation that is experienced passively by the organism. The environment of an organism is defined by the organism itself. . . . [T]he environment that is defined by the life activities of an organism evolves as a result of those activities. . . . Organisms define and alter the environment. Thus, as they evolve in response to the present environment, they find themselves in new environments that are direct consequences of their own evolution. Environment is both the cause and the result of evolution of organisms. Organisms are both the cause and the result of changes in the environment.¹³

Animals can and do move to where conditions "please" them:

[T]he animal, unless it is being controlled by a man, a domesticator or an experimenter, can within limits choose its environment. A varied species of animal, unless it is living in the invariable environment of the deep sea where evolution is commonly brought to a standstill, can and will move to the place that suits each individual best. In this way the cost of selection is economized and the process of evolution is accelerated.

For the plant the problem is quite otherwise. It has no choice at all; when its seeds are scattered the environment of each is thrust upon it as the parable of the sower vividly tells us. It has therefore to provide copious variation as well as numerous

¹² "[A]ny major social or political change is bound to be reflected in an alteration of the gene pool of the population subjected to such change. This is a consequence of the fact that the magnitude as well as the direction of natural selective processes depends on the environment, and the environment that exerts a decisive influence on the human species is the social environment." Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving*, 322.

¹³ Chap. 19, "Population Genetics" in David T. Suzuki, Anthony J. F. Griffiths, Richard C. Lewontin, *An Introduction to Genetic Analysis*, 2d ed. (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1981), 882.

progeny if new variants are to meet situations that are ecologically suitable. . . . [T]he highest plants have made good their disadvantage by a network of protective environments. These are more elaborate than anything known in the higher animals.¹⁴

In other words, even plants extend their phenotypes to exert some measure of control over their "fixed" environments.

MAN'S ENVIRONMENT

The foregoing principles apply to man as well:

[E]nvironmental conditions perceived as natural today are in fact quasi-natural only, because they are uniquely shaped by humans The natural foundations of human existence are culturally mediated . . . humans are genuinely biocultural by definition. . . . [B]iological conditions need to be explained as a result of the establishment and perpetuation of cultural strategies.¹⁵

John Baker adds: "[T]he environment of all but the most primitive human beings is to a large extent man-made; and it is made not by instinct, like that of certain animals, but by the use of reason. . . ."¹⁶

Man is an active part of the environment. He both influences and is influenced by it. His "environment" is not like the weather—a thing to which he is exposed but cannot change. As English geneticist C. D. Darlington put it, "There is the notion of a social environment, an environment determined by the genetic character of the society in which the individual lives."¹⁷

Men powerfully—perhaps overpoweringly—choose, control, and create their own environments. Human technology and social organization have radically altered the entire planet—lithosphere, hydrosphere, and atmosphere—in ways unparalleled by any other life form. Recent statements by two scientists suggest the magnitude of the impact. The Ukrainian-Canadian psychologist Albert Bandura writes:

¹⁴ C. D. Darlington, *The Little Universe of Man* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978), 136.

¹⁵ Holger Schutkowski, *Human Ecology: Biocultural Adaptations in Human Communities* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2006), 3–4.

¹⁶ Baker, *Race*, 528.

¹⁷ C. D. Darlington, *The Evolution of Man and Society* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1969), 672.

Humans are not just reactive products of selection pressures served up by a one-sided evolutionism. They are not only prime players in the coevolution process, but are gaining primacy in this bidirectionality of influence. For example, humans have not evolved morphologically to fly, but they are soaring through the air and even in the rarified atmosphere of outer space at break-neck speeds despite major biological constraint. Agentic inventiveness trumped biological design in getting them airborne. Humans are not only cutting and splicing nature's genetic heritage but, through synthetic biology, they are even creating new types of genomes.

Were Darwin writing today, he would be underscoring the overwhelming human domination of the environment.¹⁸

Compare the views of Chinese-American geneticist Bruce Lahn:

I think we as a species now stand at a watershed moment in the history of life. For billions of years, the evolution of life forms has been governed by the Darwinian process of random mutations followed by selection. Now, we are about to revise that principle dramatically by genetic engineering. Instead of starting with random mutations, of which only very few are advantageous, we can now prospectively change our genome (and the genomes of other species) in ways we intend. In a sense, genetic engineering will make Lamarckian evolution a reality. Given the revolutionary nature of this new technology, it is impossible to predict where the technology will take us into the future. But suffice it to say that genetic engineering, coupled with other technologies such as pre-implantation genetic screening, would likely speed up evolution enormously, and create life forms, including those derived from our own species, in ways that the Darwinian process can never hope to accomplish.¹⁹

¹⁸ "Just One Question: What's the next step in human evolution?" *Stanford Magazine* (May/June 2006). Bandura was named the fourth most eminent psychologist of the twentieth century after B. F. Skinner, Jean Piaget, and Sigmund Freud in a 2002 ranking. Steven J. Haggblom, et al., "The 100 Most Eminent Psychologists of the 20th Century," *Review of General Psychology* 6 (2002): 139-52.

¹⁹ Interview, "10 Questions for Bruce Lahn" (October 10, 2006), http://www.gnxp.com/blog/2006/10/10-questions-for-bruce-lahn_10.php (accessed 4-4-2009). Lahn had previously been execrated for conducting genetic re-

This is not to suggest that man's environment is infinitely malleable. In the long run, population growth, for instance, is constrained by available resources. Resources are not static, but expand and contract in response to incessant human activity. Climate, plagues and other diseases, land availability, and food supply are also constraints. Rapidly expanding non-white populations, environmental deterioration, and potential exhaustion of crucial resources pose sustainability issues. A worldwide economic collapse could likewise have enormous consequences.

EXTENDING THE CONCEPT OF PHENOTYPE²⁰

Theodosius Dobzhansky included behavior, character, and psychology as well as morphology and physiology within the concept of phenotype. He summarized the complex interrelationships between

search with unwelcome implications for race and intelligence: "Dr. Lahn says he is moving away from the research. 'It's getting too controversial.'" "Scientist's Study of Brain Genes Sparks a Backlash: Dr. Lahn Connects Evolution in Some Groups to IQ," *Wall Street Journal*, June 16, 2006.

This is a good example of organized obscurantism at work. Orchestrated cultural responses like the attacks on Lahn repeatedly corral investigation and discovery, successfully precluding entire empirical domains from entering the knowledge base of culture.

²⁰ Despite the overlap in terminology, I am not following English evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins, author of *The Extended Phenotype* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982; rev. ed., 1999), who rejects any racial or ethnic basis for culture:

Darwinism working on genes produces the brains that we all have, without which there would be no culture. There is, then, ordinary gene-level Darwinism going on, but that is seldom helpful in explaining differences in human culture. When we marvel at the differences in cultures in New Guinea, South America, and so on, it is very unlikely that looking for genetic differences will illuminate those cultural differences, which from a naive Darwinian point of view is a bit of a pity. To help understand these, we should, instead, focus on the similarities among genetically programmed brains that are susceptible to cultural influences. What all people have in common is a tendency to develop cultures, which from a biological point of view means things like the tendency to imitate your parents and peers. Given that brains are set up in such a way, you would expect that in different parts of the world, different cultures would arise, because of arbitrary local differences that become reinforced.

"Encarta Interview: Richard Dawkins,"

<http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/refpages/RefAuxArt.aspx?refid=1481506714> (accessed 3-18-2009).

phenotype, environment, and genotype as follows:

The appearance and behavior of an individual is called his phenotype. Though changing with age and even from one moment to the next, the phenotype is always the product of the interactions of the heredity, the genotype, and the environment. What we observe directly, or with the aid of instruments and laboratory tests, are the phenotypes of individuals.

Good or bad health, beauty or ugliness, goodness and honesty or wickedness and evil, are phenotype characteristics. It is the phenotype which lets some individuals survive and others die, some to leave offspring and others to remain childless. The statements found in some biological writings, that only the genetic endowment, the genotype, is important is wide of the mark. The genotype is important inasmuch as it engenders some phenotypes and not others. The quality of a genotype is appraised through the phenotypes which it produces in the environments that exist or can be devised by our technology. Analysis of the evolutionary process deals nevertheless with genotypes. Natural and artificial selection are powerless if the materials at their disposal are genotypically uniform. Biological evolution can be defined as sustained genetic change.²¹

Importantly, Dobzhansky identified human culture—not the outdoors—as man’s primary evolutionary environment: “In man, the key features of the environments are those created by human cultures. The array of genotypes which comprise the adaptive norm of the human species allow their carriers to function . . . as members of human societies.”²²

Entire peoples exhibit distinctive characters beyond those comprising external appearance—similarities in mental qualities, general intelligence, behavior, shared values and aesthetics, proclivities for certain cultural forms and institutions, and so on. Informal descriptions of national, racial and ethnic psychology have been ubiquitous for centuries, testifying to the readily-grasped reality of the concept. A representative specimen is Austrian-born philosopher Friedrich Hayek’s depiction of

²¹ Theodosius Dobzhansky, “Genetics and the Races of Man” in Bernard G. Campbell, ed., *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man: The Darwinian Pivot* (Chicago: Aldine, 1972; repr. ed., Piscataway, N.J.: AldineTransaction, 2006), 59–60.

²² Dobzhansky, “Genetics and the Races of Man,” 63.

Germans in *The Road to Serfdom*:

Few people will deny that the Germans on the whole are industrious and disciplined, thorough and energetic to the degree of ruthlessness, conscientious and single-minded in any tasks they undertake, that they possess a strong sense of order, duty, and strict obedience to authority, and that they often show great readiness to make personal sacrifices and great courage in physical danger. . . . Deficient they seem . . . in most of those little yet so important qualities which facilitate the intercourse between men in a free society: kindness and a sense of humor, personal modesty, and respect for the privacy and belief in the good intentions of one's neighbor.²³

Hayek—whether accurately or not—is following a common practice in delineating what might be termed a group psychological phenotype. Ethno-racial mental characteristics exist, despite the fact that they have never been systematically studied, defined, or analyzed. In fact, it is this, rather than skin color or appearance, that marks Jews as a population radically distinct from whites and, for that matter, everybody else.

With respect to one critical artifact of culture—namely language—Dobzhansky theorizes: "Another possibility that should not be dismissed out of hand is that *the genetically conditioned differences between the modes of thought of different groups of people* may come to be reflected in their languages"²⁴ (emphasis added).

"Western cultures," psychologist Kevin MacDonald writes, "have experienced certain unique cultural transformations that cannot be predicted by any biological/evolutionary theory, but they also have had a unique evolutionary history. Western culture was built by people who differ genetically from those who have built the other civilizations and cultures of the world."²⁵

²³ F. A. Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 148.

²⁴ Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving*, 73. See also Baker on primitive versus complex languages: Races containing "a sufficient proportion of people possessing a high capacity for logical and abstract thought invented [more sophisticated] languages suited to their intellectual needs." *Race*, 503.

²⁵ Kevin MacDonald, "What Makes Western Culture Unique?" in *Cultural Insurrections: Essays on Western Civilization, Jewish Influence, and Anti-Semitism* (Atlanta: The Occidental Press, 2007), 271.

According to our proposed model, then, it is axiomatic that if white civilization perishes but a numerically sufficient segment of our race survives and subsequently expands, the civilization can and will (under appropriately favorable circumstances), more or less faithfully replicate itself—i.e., white civilization is an external expression of our genome. But if our race is destroyed, our civilization dies with it. This hypothesis can be stated as follows: white culture or civilization, and the cultures of other races as well, are extended phenotypes—distinctive expressions—of the unique genetic attributes of identifiable human populations.

CULTURE

Group differences that are primarily learned, including distinct forms of dress, gesture, language, and religion, “may play an important role in maintaining the genetic isolates we call races. Languages are effective isolating mechanisms, as are religions. In various parts of the world there are *sympatric races*, occupying the same territory, but reproductively isolated because of religious practices or language differences.”²⁶

Human evolution has two components, the biological or organic, and the cultural or superorganic. These components are neither mutually exclusive nor independent, but interrelated and interdependent. Human evolution cannot be understood as a purely biological process, nor can it be adequately described as a history of culture. It is the interaction of biology and culture. There exists a feedback between biological and cultural processes.²⁷

Human biological and cultural evolution are parts of the same natural process and serve the same basic function: adaptation to and control of man’s environments, constructed and non-constructed. According to Peter Richerson and Robert Boyd, “Everything from evolutionary biology has to be rethought in the light of the massive importance of culture in our species . . .”²⁸

²⁶ Stanley M. Garn, *Human Races*, 3d ed. (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971), 27.

²⁷ Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving*, 18.

²⁸ Peter Richerson and Robert Boyd, *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 248. This is a good, non-mathematical introduction to the theory of cultural evolution (also called gene/

The remainder of this article will focus on specific cultural developments that in recent years have radically altered or shaped selection in ways highly detrimental and possibly fatal to the white race.

THE WAY WE WERE

The prehistoric Proto-Indo-Europeans emerged sometime around 4000–2500 B.C. Their subsequent fracturing and differentiation along linguistic, cultural, and ethnic lines, while limiting desired social cohesion,²⁹ did not destroy their essential biological unity, at least in Europe: "Despite their linguistic differentiation . . . the living Europeans are to a large extent unified racially."³⁰

For thousands of years, despite internal feuds, wars, famines, tribal dissolutions, plagues—and assaults from without—Europeans kept the form of their population relatively intact. As a race, they stabilized the composition of their gene pool and resisted sudden changes in their hereditary component. As a society, they successfully made the necessary internal adjustments to adapt their culture to changing ecological, social, technological and other circumstances. Until the middle of the twentieth century, whites benefited from this natural process:

Once a race has become established as the principal population of a region, it has a tendency to stay there and resist the genetic influences swept in by later invasions. . . .

. . . Genes that form part of a cell nucleus possess an internal equilibrium as a group, just as do the members of social institutions. Genes in a population are in equilibrium if the population is living a healthy life as a corporate entity. Racial intermixture can upset the genetic as well as the social equilibrium of a group, and so, newly introduced genes tend to disappear or be reduced to a

culture coevolution or dual inheritance theory). Be aware, however, that Richerson and Boyd claim that "Recent research in behavior genetics . . . provide[s] no evidence that variation among *groups* has any genetic component. Moreover . . . virtually none of the behavioral differences we see among the peoples of the world have a genetic basis" (p. 35). Other pioneers in the field of cultural evolution include L. L. Cavalli-Sforza and Marcus Feldman, and E. O. Wilson and Charles Lumsden.

²⁹ Guido Barbujani and Robert R. Sokal, "Zones of sharp genetic change in Europe are also linguistic boundaries," *Proc. Natl. Acad. of Sci.* 87 (March 1990): 1816–1819. "English Only" and equivalent laws in multiracial nations are ill-advised because language barriers serve as barriers to gene flow. Removing them increases interracial gene exchange.

³⁰ Coon and Hunt, *The Living Races of Man*, 61.

minimum percentage unless they possess a selective advantage over their local counterparts.³¹

By the medieval era, Europe had evolved a common, unifying Christian culture — “Christendom”:

Thirteenth-century Western Christianity was, ideally at least, a *societas christiana*: “All of society came to be viewed as an organic unity, whose *raison d’être* consisted of striving for and ultimately realizing the perfect unity of Christ on earth.” Christianity had become “a single social organism” — unified under the pope, substantially independent of secular power, and with a high level of religious enthusiasm and commitment at all levels of society. The group, not the individual was paramount, and every aspect of behavior was evaluated according to its effect on the harmonious organic whole.³²

Later, particularly in American society where three main races lived in mutual contact for hundreds of years, individuals utilized their God-given freedom to speak out on racial matters, both critically and supportively of Jews and non-whites. No one — not government, not Jewish organizations, not other powerful institutions — could sanction or seriously harm citizens for their personal beliefs.

Prejudice in the form of cognitive attitudes about the nature of race, or subjective likes and dislikes, though socially conditioned, was not consciously manipulated and imposed from above. Rather, it sprang naturally from the innate tendency of people to prefer their own kind. The defining characteristic, the secular religion, of contemporary society — anti-white hatred — was unknown. There were no elite ideologies or policies aimed at eliminating the white race or its civilization, no Noel Ignatievs, Jane Elliotts, Abraham Foxmans, Mossads, or FBIs. Indeed, as robust colonialism and the worldwide popularity of such bestsellers as Houston Stewart Chamberlain’s *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* (1899) (much admired among white elites) demonstrate, pride of self-kind was the norm.

³¹ Carleton S. Coon, *The Origin of Races* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 660, 661.

³² Kevin MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998), 119.

Active and overt racial discrimination by individuals was also widespread. Citizens were free to choose. They could hire whom they wanted, send their children to the schools of their choice, sell their homes to whom they chose, include restrictive covenants in their deeds, and associate privately, in clubs or elsewhere, with whomever they desired.

In addition to individual psychological and behavioral mechanisms that preserve the race, society as a whole developed institutional and legal arrangements to safeguard the integrity of the gene pool. These institutional-level isolating mechanisms were *consciously evolved* by our forebears to adapt to challenges posed by external conditions. As Carleton Coon observes, a population naturally resists

. . . the intrusion of large numbers of outsiders into its social and genetic structures. Call it xenophobia, prejudice, or whatever, people do not ordinarily welcome masses of strangers in their midst, particularly if the strangers come with women and children and settle down to stay. Social mechanisms arise automatically to isolate the newcomers as much as possible and to keep them genetically separate.³³

European societies for thousands of years remained biologically white. Their genetic and cultural integrity even endured nearly half a millennium of the transportation revolution and great migrations and mixing of peoples that began in 1492—the year traditionally employed by scientists as the cutoff to demarcate the various populations of mankind studied by physical anthropologists and contemporary population geneticists. For although geographic isolation had broken down, various *culturally-constructed barriers to gene flow* substituted as isolating mechanisms.

EXAMPLES OF CULTURAL BARRIERS TO GENE FLOW

Psycho-Behavioral Barriers

- ❖ Knowledge of fundamental racial facts
- ❖ White racial consciousness

³³ Coon, *The Origin of Races*, 661. "[M]an alone has culture and culture imposes barriers to gene flow absent in other species." Carleton Putnam paraphrases Coon's view in *Race and Reality: A Search for Solutions* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967), 55 n22.

- ❖ White pride
- ❖ "Racism"³⁴
- ❖ Prejudice
- ❖ Discrimination
- ❖ Implicit Whiteness³⁵
- ❖ Pro-white, pronatalist sexual, marriage, reproductive, and family mores

Institutional Barriers

- ❖ Immigration Restriction

"Immigration policy is a paradigmatic example of conflicts of interest between ethnic groups because immigration policy determines the future demographic composition of the nation. Ethnic groups unable to

³⁴ "The assumption that psychocultural traits and capacities are determined by biological race and that races differ decisively from one another which is usually coupled with a belief in the inherent superiority of a particular race and its right to domination over others." *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (1981).

"[T]he word 'racism' did not even exist until the 1930s and was not used in its current sense until the 1960s. Before that time there was no need for the word, because 'racism' was simply the way everyone thought about race." Jared Taylor, "The Racial Revolution: Race and Racial Consciousness in American History" in Samuel Francis, ed., *Race and the American Prospect: Essays on the Racial Realities of Our Nation and Our Time* (Mt. Airy, Md.: The Occidental Press, 2006), 140.

According to Samuel Francis, the term "racism" was first used by Jewish "sexologist" Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935), founder of Berlin's Institute for Sexual Science and campaigner for legalization of homosexuality in Germany. Hirschfeld's anti-white screed was translated into English as *Racism* (1938). Francis observes:

"Racism" is a term originating on the left, and has been so defined and loaded with meanings the left wants it to have that it cannot now be used by the supporters of white racial consciousness for any constructive purpose. Anyone who uses the term to describe himself or his own views has already allowed himself to be maneuvered onto his opponents' ground and has already lost the debate. . . . Hirschfeld's polemic also makes clear the uselessness of the word for any other purpose. No one seems ever to have used the word to describe his own ideas or ideas with which he agrees; its only application has been by the enemies of the ideas it purports to describe, and hence it has no objective meaning apart from its polemical usage.

"The Origins of 'Racism': The Curious Beginnings of a Useless Word," *American Renaissance* (May 1999), 7.

³⁵ Kevin MacDonald, "Psychology and White Ethnocentrism," *Cultural Insurrections*, 300-31.

influence immigration policy in their own interests will eventually be displaced by groups able to accomplish this goal."³⁶ Therefore, walls were erected to prevent geographic penetration by non-white peoples.

- Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 (US)
- Immigration Act of 1924 (US, 1924–1965)
- Chinese Immigration Act of 1923 (Canada)
- White Australia Policy (1901–1973)

These are but examples of a general disposition. Mass immigration of non-whites was nowhere the accepted norm. "It is remarkable that the sea change in immigration policy in the Western world occurred at approximately the same time (1962–1973) and in all countries the changes reflected the attitudes of elites rather than the great mass of citizens." After an exhaustive historical analysis, MacDonald sums up: "It seems fair to conclude that Jewish organizations have uniformly advocated high levels of immigration of all racial and ethnic groups into Western societies and have also advocated a multicultural model for these societies."³⁷

Today, as white populations plummet due to below replacement fertility, developed nations have adopted "replacement migration" to replace their dying white populations with non-whites.³⁸

Line-Drawing: Specifying Who Belongs

- ❖ *Limpieza de sangre* ("purity of blood": Spain and Portugal, 1400s–1800s)
- ❖ The One Drop Rule (US)
- ❖ Blood Quantum (American Indians)³⁹

³⁶ Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998; Bloomington, Ind.: 1stBooks Library, 2002), 240.

³⁷ MacDonald, "Jewish Involvement in Shaping US Immigration Policy" including "Appendix: Jewish Pro-Immigration Efforts in Other Western Countries" in *The Culture of Critique*, 301, 303. See also his *Cultural Insurrections: "Immigration and Ethnic Interests,"* 342–46 and "Was the 1924 Immigration Cut-Off 'Racist'?", 347–54.

³⁸ Population Division, Dept. of Economic and Social Affairs, *Replacement Migration: Is It a Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations?* (New York: United Nations, 2000).

³⁹ Bureau of Indian Affairs, Certificate of Degree of Indian or Alaska Native Blood: Instructions <http://www.doi.gov/bia/docs/CDIBApplication2008-2011.pdf> (accessed 4-9-2009).

- ❖ Population Registration Act (South Africa, 1950)

Segregation

- ❖ Jewish ghettos and *shtetls* (Europe)
- ❖ The Pale of Settlement (Russia, 1791–1917)
- ❖ Indian Reservations (US)
- ❖ Indian Reserves (Canada)
- ❖ The May Laws (Russia, 1882)
- ❖ Aboriginal Protection Acts (Australia)
- ❖ Segregation (US): “Jim Crow Laws”
- ❖ Apartheid (South Africa)

Removal

When non-white populations existed or managed to coalesce within predominantly white regions, actions were frequently taken to repatriate, resettle, or deport them.

- ❖ Expulsions of Jews from Europe (1290–1944)
- ❖ Expulsion of Moors and Moriscos from Spain (1492/1609)
- ❖ Repatriation of blacks to Africa: The American Colonization Society (ACS) (1816–1847) and Liberia
- ❖ Indian Removal Act (US, 1830)
- ❖ Russian resettlement of Muslim Circassians, Ubykhs, Abkhaz, and Abaza to the Ottoman Empire (1864–1867)
- ❖ Mexican Repatriation (US, 1930–1935)
- ❖ Russian deportation of Koreans to Soviet Central Asia (1937)
- ❖ Russian deportation of 1.5 million Crimean Tatars, Chechens, Ingush, Karachais, Kalmyks, Balkars, Greeks, Armenians, Kurds, Hemshin, and Meskhetians (1943–1944)
- ❖ Operation Wetback (US, 1954)

Direct Barriers to Gene Flow (Bans on Interracial Sex and Marriage)

- ❖ Anti-Miscegenation Laws
- ❖ Racial Integrity Act (Virginia, 1924)
- ❖ Nuremberg Laws (Germany, 1935–1945)
- ❖ Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act (South Africa, 1949)
- ❖ Caste Systems

Elaborate caste systems like India’s or Latin America’s constitute a

separate phenomenon loosely connected to race. They do possess a genetic component, so studying them can be instructive. However, they are not *racially* focused due to their fixity and numerous extraneous elements – hierarchy, status, wealth, occupation.

The Indian caste system, which lasted two millennia, was described by Dobzhansky as:

the grandest, though perhaps not deliberate, apparently unsuccessful genetic experiment ever performed on human populations. . . . The caste system . . . attempted to breed varieties of men genetically specialized in the performance of different [occupational] functions. To all appearances, such a specialization has not been achieved.⁴⁰

THE CENTRAL IMPORTANCE OF THE GENE POOL⁴¹

The global gene pool of the white population is shrinking rapidly due to below replacement fertility. The "gene pool" is not something fixed; it must be circumscribed – not by anti-white academics or ideologues, not by Jews, not by racist governments, but by *us*, the subset of whites determined that there should be a future existence for our kind. Distinctions, sometimes difficult and painful, must be made, substituting for badly blurred, fast-disappearing boundaries clear bright lines consciously drawn, lines stipulating unambiguously, "You belong – and *you* don't." Decisions will necessarily be arbitrary to some extent, but not capricious.

Replacement immigration and the hybridization occurring because of the eradication of the "social mechanisms that arise automatically to isolate newcomers and keep them genetically separate" exacerbate an already dire situation. Indeed, social mechanisms today work in precisely the opposite direction: promoting ever more immigration, ever more gene exchange. The nurseries of a people have been destroyed.

The resulting dilemma is multidimensional. But a crucial first step toward clear thinking and rectification is specifying the perimeter of the gene pool.

Who belongs? Who doesn't?

⁴⁰ Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving*, 234, 238.

⁴¹ A gene pool is the collection of genes in an interbreeding population at a particular time; the genetic information of a population of interbreeding organisms.

Who's white? Who isn't?

When Madison Grant declared, "The cross between a white man and an Indian is an Indian; the cross between a white man and a negro is a negro; the cross between a white man and a Hindu is a Hindu; and a cross between any of the three European races [Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean] and a Jew is a Jew,"⁴² he was practicing statesmanship, not science. His instinct was unimpaired; his judgment clear, vivid, and unambiguous. He was unapologetic. He stood closer in time to our unadulterated patrimony than we do.

Whites evince as much proclivity for interracial sex as does any other population—a fact the masters of the planet cynically exploit. Therefore, opportunities for such contact must be strictly limited and transgressors punished.

The essential point, however, is classification of offspring. It is imperative that the direction of gene flow be deflected away from (out of) the white gene pool rather than into it. Two basic possibilities exist, as illustrated by the white/Amerindian experience: "In Latin America, Southern European miscegenation diluted the white stock. In North America, Northern European miscegenation diluted the Indian stock."⁴³

In this regard, the historical experience of blacks and whites in North America and southern Africa should serve as the model for relations with all races, including Jews. According to Arthur Jensen, who has studied black/white differences for decades, a low number of interracial matings over hundreds of years produced a steady infusion of white genes into the black American gene pool. Today, virtually all American blacks have some white ancestry. The US average is 25 percent, varying from as high as 40 percent in some areas to as low as 10 percent in others. But, remarkably, the white American gene pool consists of less than 1 percent African genes.⁴⁴

⁴² Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), 16.

⁴³ Wilmot Robertson, *The Dispossessed Majority*, 209. "During the twenty generations, more or less, which have been born since the initial settlement of Santo Domingo by the Spaniards, members of primary races that had not met each other for millennia, or at least since the end of the Pleistocene, have hybridized with each other." Coon and Hunt, *The Living Races of Man*, 291.

⁴⁴ Frank Miele, *Intelligence, Race, and Genetics: Conversations with Arthur R. Jensen* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2002), 126.

This is the result of strong barriers to gene flow – the conscious decision to classify the issue of interracial unions as non-white.

Strikingly, virtually all black-white matings during the historical era involved white males with African females. Today, the situation is nearly reversed. In 2000, 73 percent of black-white marriages involved a black man and a white woman. The ratio is even higher among blacks and whites cohabiting outside marriage⁴⁵ – convincing evidence of loss of dominance.

For perspective, between 1492 and 1965, gene flow created hybrid populations wherever whites settled – in the Americas, Africa, Australia-New Zealand, and elsewhere. The net result to 1965 is presented graphically in Coon and Hunt's *The Living Races of Man* (1965), 291, Fig. 8, "The Principal Directions of Massive Gene Flow Since 1492." Without exception, the direction of gene flow in every case was *out* of the Caucasoid "lozenge" and *into* the lozenges of the other primary races: American Indians (Mongoloids), Australoids, Negroes (Congoids), and Capoids (mostly Hottentots and Bushmen). *No* arrow points from any other race into the Caucasoid lozenge. Cultural barriers were again at work.

Of course, not everyone who qualifies biologically will desire to join the incipient white community (or would be accepted by it). Today, essentially no one biologically qualified would want to join it. Still, the community must be envisaged as potentially open to a limited set of members from the outset. Genetic similarity and shared population history establish the initial biocultural threshold.

CULTURE DISTORTION

The essential question is: What makes it the case that a particular cultural variant – say, anti-white hatred, rather than "racism"/"anti-Semitism" – is preferentially transmitted? Why are some ideas and norms propagated but not others?

Group dominance may be one factor. "Even within a species such as ours," Carleton Coon observed, "certain subspecies and races may show dominance over others. This is part of the evolutionary proc-

⁴⁵ Steve Sailer, "2000 Census Shows Interracial Marriage Gender Gap Remains Large," UPI, March 14, 2003.

http://www.isteve.com/2003_Census_Interracial_Marriage_Gender_Gap.htm (accessed 4-10-2009). See also Sailer, "Is Love Colorblind?," *National Review*, July 14, 1997. <http://www.nationalreview.com/14july97/feature.html> (accessed 4-10-2009).

ess."⁴⁶ Whites "in the wild" (prior to their subjugation by Jews) were racially dominant over blacks and Amerindians to such an extent that the latter could not possibly cope with it. As a result, the natives' downfall was instantaneous. Jews exercise a similar, if not greater, dominance over whites. In each case dominance is a function of contact followed by attempted coexistence. Once Ashkenazi Jews passed some specific but unknown numerical and organizational threshold, whites were as helpless before them as blacks or Indians had been before whites.⁴⁷

One facet of the problem may be traceable to behavior described by Julian Huxley which seems peculiarly characteristic of whites: "[M]ost competition within civilized human societies is between individuals. The difference of course is that success in this competition is not biological, measured by increased survival to later generations, but social, consisting of monetary and other satisfactions; in fact social and biological success are usually inversely correlated."⁴⁸

Unfortunately, Jews are fanatically ethnocentric and function as a unit. Superior Jewish intelligence, ethnocentrism, psychological intensity, and aggressiveness contribute to the formation of "focused, effective groups able to influence the political process and the wider culture. In the modern world, Jewish influence on politics and culture is channeled through the media and through elite academic institutions into an almost bewildering array of areas . . ."⁴⁹

"The remarkable thing about anti-Semitism," MacDonald notes elsewhere, "is that there is an overwhelming similarity in the complaints made about Jews in different places and over very long stretches of historical time." Among these "independent replications" is "the idea that Jews have dominated the culture of a society. A fundamental feature of human adaptation is the manipulation of culture to achieve evolutionary goals . . ."⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Coon, *The Origin of Races*, 49. See also 660–63.

⁴⁷ Among other reasons: "[T]he average IQ of American Jews is well above the average for whites and is the highest of any known human group." Kevin MacDonald, *Cultural Insurrections*, 351. It should be added that in terms of Darwinian reproductive fitness, blacks are currently among the world's most fit populations.

⁴⁸ Julian Huxley, *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis*, 3d ed., with a new Introduction edited by John R. Baker (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974), 482.

⁴⁹ Kevin MacDonald, "Understanding Jewish Influence I: Background Traits for Jewish Activism," *The Occidental Quarterly*, vol. 3, no. 2 (Summer 2003), 6.

⁵⁰ Kevin MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents*, 32, 50.

Traditionally, the family played an important role in cultural transmission. But today the mass media is dominant, particularly given the universal dissolution of traditional white family structures and communities. "Theorists of elites," MacDonald writes, "have often argued that the creation and dissemination of cultural symbols have assumed ever greater power and influence in recent times."⁵¹ Richerson and Boyd point to "a revolution in the structure of the transmission of ideas of all sorts."

High literacy and the industrialization of printing led first to the emergence of print mass media and later to ongoing innovations in the broadcast media and the film industry. In the contemporary world, cheap electronics brings entertainment produced in Hollywood, Mexico City, Sao Paulo, and Mumbai to the remotest villages. The rise of mass media and universal education suddenly exposed people to much more nonparental cultural influence than had been experienced in more traditional societies. Proportionally, the scope for the spread of cultural variation in conflict with genetic fitness increased.⁵²

The decline in family influence "became massive with the development of the cheap mass media. And the more nonparental transmission, the greater the opportunity for [biologically] maladaptive variants [ideas] to spread." Audiences "would be ill equipped to manage a flood of newly evolved beliefs and attitudes."⁵³

Summarizing Cavalli-Sforza and Marcus Feldman's theory of cultural evolution, anthropologist Stone and geneticist Lurquin state that in "horizontal transmission mode" (as opposed to vertical or oblique modes) horizontal cultural evolution may occur rapidly. "With modern means of communication like the telephone, radio and television, and the Internet, horizontal transmission can be almost instantaneous." Three forms of horizontal transmission are described. "One-to-many" transmission results in "rapid culture change and can successfully spread more radical innovations. . . . In many contemporary societies,

⁵¹ MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents*, 56.

⁵² Richerson and Boyd, *Not by Genes Alone*, 171. "TV's constant availability, low cost, and curiously addictive hold on our attention apparently allow it to crowd out more highly rated activities, such as social activities away from the home," 275, n61.

⁵³ Richerson and Boyd, *Not by Genes Alone*, 174.

the media act as a powerful type of one-to-many cultural transmission that can effect rapid cultural change."⁵⁴

Once an elite has successfully replaced one paradigm with another – in our example, “racism”/“anti-Semitism” with anti-white hatred – subsequent cultural transmission must continue advancing the permanent revolution while at the same time *conserving* the newly-established anti-white paradigm.

“Many-to-one” horizontal transmission helps accomplish this. It consists of many persons or institutions “transmitting the same idea or practice to one individual. This mode of transmission is highly conservative; it tends to maintain the *status quo* through the application of what we conventionally understand as ‘social pressure’ or ‘peer pressure.’ Because this many-to-one transmission is concerted, with every transmitter giving the same signal, this group effect provokes very powerful conformism . . .”⁵⁵

[S]election can favor a psychology that causes people to conform to the majority behavior even though this mechanism sometimes prevents populations from adapting to a change in the environment. Evolution also favors a psychology that makes people more prone to imitate prestigious individuals and individuals who are like themselves even though this propensity can result in maladaptive fads.⁵⁶

The influential experiments of Jewish psychologists Solomon Asch and Stanley Milgram analyzing conformity and obedience to authority vividly demonstrate how important such dispositions are in society. But the context of their work occurred within what MacDonald identifies as “face-to-face” encounters. He elaborated upon such interactions in an insightful essay about his own experience after being attacked by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a powerful racist

⁵⁴ Chap. 4: “Excursions into Human Culture (1970–),” 85–113 in Linda Stone and Paul F. Lurquin, *A Genetic and Cultural Odyssey: The Life and Work of L. Luca Cavalliforza* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005) at 101.

⁵⁵ Stone and Lurquin, *A Genetic and Cultural Odyssey*, 101. Richerson and Boyd state that “Conformist cultural transmission in our sense is that part of ‘informational conformity’ that results in relatively durable changes in attitudes, beliefs, skills, and the like.” *Not by Genes Alone*, 269, n44. They emphasize that “Conformist bias can lead to maladaptive self-sacrifice,” 162.

⁵⁶ Richerson and Boyd, *Not by Genes Alone*, 13.

organization.⁵⁷ "Cold shoulders, forced smiles, and hostile stares became a reality. Going into my office to teach my classes became an ordeal." His essay should be read and taken to heart by every honest person who desires a better world, as should accounts by University of Vermont education professor Robert S. Griffin, who was subjected to similar demeaning treatment.⁵⁸ It is sobering to contemplate the thousands of white people who have suffered humiliation and worse in this manner for more than a century.

MacDonald had previously quoted excerpts from the 1941 diaries of Anne Morrow Lindbergh describing her identical subjective reactions to face-to-face hostility and hatred after her husband, aviator Charles Lindbergh, spoke out publicly against Jewish power.⁵⁹ Richerson and Boyd label such furtive abuse "moralistic punishment," and note its powerful ability to induce conformity. The targeted individual may be attacked, defamed, shunned, and subjected to malicious gossip. He may lose his status, friends, employment, and even his spouse and children. In its various forms, moralistic punishment is designed to assault the psyche of its victim on every level of need: physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem, and self-actualization.

Two radically incommensurate forms of media must be distinguished: the mass media, which propagate messages to millions or billions of people simultaneously over long periods of time, and diverse, short-lived "individual" or "small-scale" media (pamphlets, newsletters, small magazines and presses, self-published books, individual websites, soap box orators) reaching only micro-audiences. The latter have limited social effect (most have none), while the former adjudicate "truth" and impose norms upon whole societies. For one social group to possess sole access to the means of mass communication to propagate a unified message represents Communist-like power:

By permitting the Jews to control our news and entertainment media we are doing more than merely giving them a decisive influence on our political system and virtual control of our gov-

⁵⁷ Kevin MacDonald, "Heidi Does Long Beach: The SPLC v. Academic Freedom," November 14, 2005, http://www.vdare.com/macdonald/061114_splc.htm (accessed 4-8-2009).

⁵⁸ E.g., Robert S. Griffin, "A Knock on the Door: My Experience Writing for AR," <http://www.robertsgriffin.com/Knock.pdf> (accessed 4-8-2009).

⁵⁹ Kevin MacDonald, "Preface to the Paperback Edition," *The Culture of Critique*, xvi-xviii. Online: www.kevinmacdonald.net/PrefacePPB.pdf (accessed 4-8-2009).

ernment; we also are giving them control of the minds and souls of our children, whose attitudes and ideas are shaped more by Jewish television and Jewish films than by parents, schools, or any other influence. . . .

To permit the Jews, with their 3000-year history of nation-wrecking, from ancient Egypt to Russia, to hold such power over us is tantamount to race suicide. Indeed, the fact that so many White Americans today are so filled with a sense of racial guilt and self-hatred that they actively seek the death of their own race is a *deliberate* consequence of Jewish media control.⁶⁰

It is highly unlikely that elites need to proscribe marginal speech already excluded from mass dissemination in order to successfully perpetuate their brand of racism. The sheer power of the media is enough. Nevertheless, their peculiar psychodynamics drive them to do so. Communal organizations like the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the SPLC, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, organized thugs and domestic Left-wing terrorist groups (foreign ones, too, probably), and laws criminalizing "hate speech," "Holocaust denial," "racism," and "anti-Semitism," keep a tight gag on micro-speech, making sure it never gains a foothold. Besides the overwhelming desire to dictate and suppress, there may be an element of totalitarian rationality behind such behavior. According to the Cavalli-Sforza-Feldman model of cultural transmission, "one-to-one horizontal transmission" (one transmitter to one transmittee) "follows an epidemiological model, working like the spread of a contagious disease through the population."⁶¹

Ethnoreligious elements and governments can and do effectively transmit unvaried messages to tens of millions of people via the mass media while selectively suppressing marginal speech. These two processes working in concert systematically eradicate entire systems of culturally-transmitted ideas, some of which would have influenced the course of human events. Biological evolution itself is thereby altered, changing relative gene frequencies and the racial compositions of populations.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the cultural revolution has been

⁶⁰ William L. Pierce, *National Vanguard Book Service Catalog*, No. 16 (November 1995), 22, quoted in Kevin MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents*, 56.

⁶¹ Stone and Lurquin, *A Genetic and Cultural Odyssey*, 101.

its complete and instantaneous triumph in white societies everywhere. Five hundred years of accumulated experience was upended overnight, without meaningful debate or discussion of any kind, replaced by norms and policies genocidal to the populations in question.

A fundamental principle from population genetics sheds some light: "The pattern of phenotypes produced by a given genotype under different environmental conditions" constitutes its norm of reaction. "*A single genotype can produce many different phenotypes, depending upon the environment*"⁶² (emphasis added).

What might be called the "white genotype" expresses itself phenotypically one way in its own social environment, but another way in a Jewish/Communist environment. The phenomenon is analogous to that of plant clones grown at high, medium, or low elevations, or rows of corn stalks planted side-by-side in a field but supplied with dissimilar amounts of water or required nutrients. In both cases, the phenotypes produced by identical genotypes differ dramatically.

It would be foolhardy to dismiss out-of-hand the potential significance of this phenomenon for intraspecific competition. The differences between white behavior and beliefs a century ago and those of today might well be attributable to our population genotype producing strikingly divergent extended phenotypes under European and alien social conditions respectively.

To grasp the potential power of this idea, imaginatively contrast the pre-Columbian equilibrium of the Aztecs, Incas, and Caribbean natives with their respective post-discovery extended phenotypes. The decisive roles of culture clash and group dominance in shifting the phenotypic norm of reaction seems as obvious as do the analogous shifts that occurred in the plant geneticist's cornfield and mountainside experiments. Treating Amerindians as a single population, the degree of contrast between pre- and post-discovery extended phenotypes produced by a single population genotype due exclusively to altered social conditions is nothing short of shocking. The Indians were well-adapted to their initial cultural environment—the one they produced themselves.

The decisive Jewish impact on the populations of the West during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries may well be analogous. Of course, due to a disguised mode of operation and a dearth of empirical data furnished by the media and academia, the precise contours

⁶² Suzuki, Griffiths, Lewontin, *An Introduction to Genetic Analysis*, G-18, 17.

of dominance are *much* harder to discern than in the simple guns, germs, and steel scenario. Nevertheless, the contact may prove every bit as fateful.⁶³

Selection,⁶⁴ one of the four primary evolutionary forces, is “the automatic enrichment of populations in genetic types that produce more descendants, and impoverishment in those that produce fewer.”⁶⁵ At present, whites are producing fewer descendants, non-whites more.

The white race did not founder genetically until its abrupt implosion in the mid-twentieth century. There are many dimensions to the revolutionary disaster that has befallen us in what amounts to the historical blink of an eye. Two of the most momentous are numbered among the four principal forces of evolution: *migration*—specifically, replacement migration⁶⁶—and the resulting *gene exchange* (race-mixing or genetic admixture). The eventual result will be the biological annihilation of the white race globally, although it is possible that demographically and socially inconsequential populations will persist in remote backwaters.

According to Rushton, “*Within the constraints allowed by the total*

⁶³ There is an obvious objection to this thesis. Jews and whites have lived side-by-side for two millennia. Why would things suddenly be so different? My response: “I don’t know—but they are.” If compelled to provide a quick-and-dirty explanation nonetheless, I would speculate (1) explosive pre-World War I demographic growth—an Ashkenazic “population explosion” (2) the rise of the Ashkenazim, a more “virulent” population (as far as whites are concerned) than any of their admittedly formidable predecessors in the same regard. In 1100 AD, 97 percent of world Jewry was Sephardic, 3 percent Ashkenazic; today, Ashkenazim account for 70–90 percent of world Jewry. Although the residuum is still designated “Sephardic,” probably few, if any, actually descend directly from Iberian ancestors. Most are almost certainly Oriental Jews. (3) the early twentieth century attainment of an ill-omened tipping point of some kind, as evidenced by the *twin* demonic triumphs of Communism and Zionism, and the simultaneous accession to power of Jews throughout the rest of the European world as well. *Whatever the reason, something changed.*

⁶⁴ I prefer this more general term because adding the word *natural* conjures up images of the Pleistocene and macroevolution. But culturally mediated historical social environments and microevolution are more relevant to contemporary *racial* problems. As Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele point out, whether natural or artificial (or, we might add, in between), “Selection is selection . . .” *Race: The Reality of Human Differences* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2004), 203.

⁶⁵ Cavalli-Sforza, Menozzi, Piazza, *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, 12. Stephen Jay Gould: “Natural selection is a theory of ‘differential reproductive success . . .’” “The Confusion Over Evolution,” *The New York Review of Books*, November 19, 1992, 47–54.

⁶⁶ American population geneticist Sewall Wright would no doubt have called it “swamping by mass immigration.”

spectrum of cultural alternatives, people create environments maximally compatible with their genotypes"⁶⁷ (emphasis added). Whites have suffered a drastic evolutionary reversal of fortune. They are no longer capable of creating environments maximally compatible with their genotype due to straitjacket-like cultural constraints. Group dominance, culture distortion, and the obliteration of barriers to gene flow help explain why.

Intraspecific competition occurs within a system of choice and constraints. Constraints are imposed from without—by climate, resources, migrations, a hostile culture, the ADL, tyrannical governments, anti-white ideologies, and so forth.

"The environment . . . constantly presents challenges to the species [race]; to these challenges the species [race] may respond either by adaptive modification or extinction."⁶⁸

In the absence of adaptive modification, the looming danger is that our collective fate may be the intended one: extinction.

Andrew Hamilton is the pen name of a widely-published author on the science and politics of race.

⁶⁷ Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, 197–98.

⁶⁸ Theodosius Dobzhansky and Gordon Allen, "Does Natural Selection Continue to Operate in Modern Mankind?," *American Anthropologist*, New Series (August 1956), 591. I have inserted the word "race" in brackets.