

Excerpt from *The Rise of the Alt-Right*:

Chapter 6—Racialism

**Prof. Thomas J. Main, Baruch College, Marxe School of
Public and International Affairs**

**Presentation to the Society for the Study of Africana
Philosophy**

January 21, 2018

Not for Circulation or Citation

Forthcoming: Brookings Institution Press

Spring 2018

Part IV: Alt-Right Ideology

Chapter 6: Racialism

The terms “racism” and “racialism” must be defined from the beginning. In the context of this book I will use the word “racism” as synonymous with “racial prejudice,” which is acceptance of stereotypes, usually negative, about a race and judging members of that race on the basis of those stereotypes rather than as individuals. My grandfather’s habit of saying, “Oh, they really are lazy, aren’t they?” was an expression of racism thus understood.

I appreciate that in other contexts many scholars have usefully defined racism in social structural terms as, for example, “White racial and cultural prejudice and discrimination supported by institutional power and authority, used to the advantage of Whites and the disadvantage of peoples of Color.”¹ So defined only whites can manifest racism. Of course I recognize that generally in past and contemporary American society whites have had the power to act on their racial prejudice while blacks have not. But in the present discussion of the race thinking of the far right, stipulating by definition that only whites can be racist may be seen as “taking sides” and so cause misunderstanding and confusion.² For present purposes then, and without denying the utility of structural definitions of racism or the power advantage of whites in America today, what I will mean by racism is racial prejudice. In that sense, racism can be unintentional or rooted in unconscious emotions and so may not be about consciously articulated ideas at all.

Given how the word racism is often used in America today, it does not convey the radicalism of Alt-Right thought. “Racism” can be applied—sometimes accurately, sometimes not—to garden-variety Republicans and even Democrats. Calling the Alt-Right racist does not go half far enough. Alt-Right race thinking is a matter of consciously articulated ideas integrated into an entire anti-democratic political ideology and is thus more usefully described as *racialism*, which:

- 1) Bases political identity primarily on race and sees political advancement of one’s own race as the main goal of politics. We can call this belief “race consciousness.”
- 2) Goes beyond claiming that the races are different in terms of certain traits and holds that one’s own race (the white race, of course, in this case) is naturally superior *politically and morally* to other races.

A frequent but not universal corollary of the Alt-Right’s racialism is anti-Semitism: whites are morally superior to other races and especially to Jews (the Alt-Right thinks of Jews as a race) who, while possessing certain positive characteristics as high intelligence, are conceived of as an evil enemy of the white race.

These features of the Alt-Right’s racialism are considered below. But first some clarifications are necessary.

Some Alt-Rightists describe themselves as “race realists” and claim that their position amounts to hardly more than the observation that “race is real” and important. Thus Mike Enoch states that one of the major “red pills” of the Alt-Right is “race realism, the reality of racial differences and

the importance of racial differences.”³ *American Renaissance*, in explaining “What We Believe,” offers a similarly bland definition of race realism:

Race is an important aspect of individual and group identity....

Attempts to gloss over the significance of race or even to deny its reality only make problems worse. Progress requires the study of all aspects of race, whether historical, cultural, or biological. This approach is known as race realism.⁴

Critics of the Alt-Right then sometimes respond that race is an “illusion.”⁵ But thus framed the debate is unilluminating. Obviously, race is real in some sense and important in human affairs. The real question is whether race can be defined in objective biological terms or is a social construction. Contributing to this debate is beyond the scope of this book and the competencies of its author. However the question is answered, race will of course be an important feature of social life. It is vital to note, however, that if it should be found that race is somehow an objective biological category, that finding would have no necessary implications for political egalitarianism. Nearly everyone agrees that sex, understood in reproductive terms, and distinguished from sex-role or gender, can be defined in objective biological terms. That sex is an objective, biological reality has no bearing on the political and moral demand that women must be the full political equals of men. In and of itself the claim—which is not accepted by most scientists—that race can be defined biologically implies nothing about whether people of all races are political equals. Authors who denounce biological accounts of race in the belief that the whole liberal democratic project will come crashing down if race has a significant biological component are mistaken.

Establishing the biological nature of race is a necessary *but not sufficient* condition for the rest of the Alt-Right’s racist agenda. Once Alt-Right writers think they have established the biological nature of race the rest of their agenda unfolds rapidly and it turns out that race realism involves the radical rejection of political egalitarianism discussed earlier. Thus one *VDARE* contributor clarifies the term as follows: “...race realism (i.e., genetic differences foreclose the egalitarian ideal)...”⁶ Gregg Johnson’s article, “Why Race is Not a ‘Social Construct,’” for the most part sticks to backing up that specific claim. But the first sentence of his essay lets us know that for the Alt-Right establishing the biological nature of race is merely a prolegomenon to a wider argument: “Race realism is one of the intellectual foundations of White Nationalism.”⁷ In other words, what the Alt-Right calls “race realism” leads, so they think, straight to White Nationalism and so implies for them much more than a particular position on the relatively narrow issue of the exact nature of race. How much more the Alt-Right implies by race realism is illuminated by another contributor to Johnson’s outlet who writes that it “is obvious to race realists... mestizos and negroes aren’t very bright, and they tend to be incompetent at whatever they try to do... *the reality is that black lives don’t really matter that much*. It is the white race that is the indispensable race.”⁸ [Emphasis added.] So when the Alt-Right recommends race realism they want us to swallow the whole bolus of their racialism. We should decline to do so and insist that the nature of race is one issue, and the rest of their unlovely inegalitarian ideology something else entirely.

Johnson is certainly correct when he writes that the biological account of race is essential to White Nationalism or what this book calls racialism. But he is wrong when he writes that “The social construction of race is one of the intellectual foundations of racial egalitarianism.”⁹ As was noted above, if race turns out to have an important biological basis, that would be no more damaging to the political equality of the races than the obvious biological basis of sex (as opposed to sex role or gender) is for the political equality of the sexes.

Another necessary clarification concerns the issue of average differences in intelligence between different races. Alt-Rightists sometimes defend themselves against the charge of being White Supremacists by pointing out that, while they indeed believe that whites on average are more intelligent than blacks, they also believe that Asians on average are more intelligent than whites. Thus in an interview with the *Washington Post*, Jared Taylor defended himself as follows:

No, I'm not a white supremacist...East Asians have higher average IQs, lower crime rates, fewer illegitimate children—they're superior to whites in lots of ways. Do you want to call me a "yellow supremacist"?¹⁰

Here Taylor is misunderstanding or ducking the charge against him. When Alt-Rightists are asked if they are White Supremacists no one wants to know what they think about illegitimacy rates among East Asians. The charge is that they think whites should be *politically* superior to blacks, that they think "all men are created equal" does not extend to blacks, or that their understanding of political egalitarianism is so qualified and vague as to amount to an endorsement white domination. How the races stand in terms of average IQ, crime and illegitimacy rates, or any other demographic traits has *nothing* to do with the question of who, if anyone, should be politically superior to whom. The *Washington Post* reporter gave Taylor an opportunity to assert his commitment to the political equality of all races; quite typically Taylor avoided doing so.

To be fair to Taylor, critics of the Alt-Right also sometimes confuse the issues of political equality and factual equality in terms of important traits, especially intelligence. It can hardly be said often enough that Lincoln, Hayek, Popper, and the liberal democratic tradition generally are entirely correct: political equality of various groups does *not* presuppose or depend upon equality of intelligence or any other measurable characteristic. Alt-Right critics may overlook this point because they correctly perceive that the movement wants to use the putative average differences in intelligence between the races as a stepping stone in its argument for the political inequality of the races. But in this matter as in most others Alt-Right thinking is confused. Establishing factual inequality between groups in some important trait advances the case for political inequality not one inch. To imagine otherwise represents an enormous concession to the Alt-Right and undermines rather than reinforces the argument for liberal democracy.

Again, factual average differences between groups in significant traits, even if they exist and whatever their basis, are irrelevant to liberal democratic political egalitarianism. But do such factual differences rooted in genetic factors--say between blacks and whites in intelligence--exist or not? The most comprehensive overview of scientific knowledge on this matter remains *Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, the 1996 report of a task force established by the Board of Scientific Affairs of the American Psychological Association. The task force was established in the wake of the controversy occasioned by the 1994 publication of *The Bell Curve*, the hotly-contested analysis of intelligence and class in American society by late Richard J. Herrnstein Charles Murray. The charge of the task force was to produce an "authoritative report on these

issues—one that all sides could use as a basis for discussion” and the final report received the unanimous support of the entire task force.¹¹

The APA report notes that African American IQ scores for a long time have averaged about 15 points below the scores of whites. As for the cause of the differential, the report notes that “environmental factors can produce differences of at least this magnitude” and then sums up:

The cause of that differential is not known...it is apparently not due to any simple form of bias in the content or administration of the tests themselves...Several culturally-based explanations of the Black/White IQ differential have been proposed; some are plausible, but so far none has been conclusively supported. There is even less empirical support for a genetic interpretation. In short, no adequate explanation of the differential between the IQ means of Blacks and Whites is presently available.¹²

Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns says little about political issues except with respect to the central point: “The commitment to evaluate people on their own individual merit is central to a democratic society.”¹³

To come within a country lightyear of plausibility, the Alt-Right’s radical racial inegalitarianism would have to rest on a scientific consensus in favor of genetic explanations of black-white IQ differentials more solid than the Rock of Gibraltar. Nothing remotely approaching such a consensus exists. The political consensus in favor of the Declaration’s egalitarianism is vastly stronger. The conviction in favor of political egalitarianism is, as it were, defended by many walls. Among the outer walls are well-grounded doubts about the many supposedly scientific claims the Alt-Right and other inegalitarians build on. Even if racialists definitively resolved all those doubts—and they are very unlikely to anytime in the foreseeable future—they would face the most formidable wall of all: factual equality is simply irrelevant to political equality.

Of course, Alt-Right outlets endlessly cite the handful of respectable and semi-respectable thinkers who believe that racial IQ differentials are grounded in genetics. Charles Murray used to be one of the movement’s favorite authority. But eventually it became clear that Murray’s position, whatever one makes of it, is distinguishable from and offers no support to the Alt-Right’s root and branch rejection of political egalitarianism. In *The Bell Curve*, Murray and his coauthor Herrnstein make a suggestion to the reader:

We are asking that you consider...that the Founders were fully aware of how unequal people are, that they did not try to explain away natural inequalities, and that they nonetheless thought the best way for people to live together was under a system of equal rights.¹⁴

Here Herrnstein and Murray are embracing the political egalitarianism of the American Founding and liberal democracy that the Alt-Right so loudly repudiates. That is quite enough to distinguish Murray from the Alt-Right. However, *The Bell Curve* goes on to argue that genetically-based variations in people’s abilities set a sharp limit on social policies that seek to

reduce inequalities in income, employment, education, and other social outcomes. This argument is highly contestable, to say the least, and criticism of it is entirely legitimate. Murray intends his argument to cut against progressive egalitarian social policy, not against liberal democratic egalitarianism of rights and political status. Of course, whether political status can be entirely divorced from social policy is doubtful. More doubtful still is the idea that progressivism broadly defined has run smack into iron limits set by biological reality. These days the Alt-Right's enthusiasm for Murray has waned. Regarding Murray, Brad Griffin (aka Hunter Wallace) of *Occidental Dissent* writes of Murray that "This is a man who has spent over a year on Twitter counter-signaling President Trump, the Alt-Right and White Nationalists at every opportunity that has presented itself... He is not one of us... we will remember everything he has said about us."¹⁵

We turn now to a discussion of the main features of Alt-Right racialism: race consciousness and the political inequality of the races.

6.1 Race Consciousness

In an interview with me, Greg Johnson, editor of *Counter-Currents Publishing* explained how awareness of race distinguishes the Alt-Right from earlier right-wing tendencies:

GJ: The right wing ideologies that are acceptable—mainstream conservatism, libertarianism—don't work and the reason why they don't work is simple. They ignore demographics, they ignore race and therefore they are not capable of preserving the things that these people really want to preserve and promote because there's an ...intrinsicly European ethnic character to the ideologies and political systems that they want to defend, that they're not as universal and portable and saleable and transmissible as they used to think.... There's an ineluctably ethnic, racial dimension to politics and they realize that the mainstream right is basically moralistically committed to ignoring that...

The mainstream right is destined always to lose ...the things that are most important, namely... a country that values private property and free enterprise and gun rights and religious freedom... because once the people who created that system are being replaced with people who are radically different in both their genetics and culture and history, those things will inevitably disappear. They realize they have to fight. It's not just a cultural war, it's not just an ideological war, it's also a struggle over race and demographics and that's the difference between the Alt-Right and the old right.¹⁶

Jared Taylor also explained race consciousness in an interview with me:

JT: Ultimately...what I care most about is the survival of my people as a distinct people....white people.

TM: That's... race consciousness as a political principle... Whatever race it is you're in, you should grab on to that and make the advancement and the assertion of that race an axiom of your political ideology.

JT: I believe the founders thoroughly believed that.

TM: ...You believe that. Is that correct?

JT: Yes, that racial consciousness is an essential part of group identity and it should be an inevitable part of national identity as well.

TM: And it should be an inevitable part of our political ideology, kind of on a level that these other more traditional concepts are on?

JT: I'm not quite sure. Yes, I would put it right at the center of any kind of understanding of the political order of a healthy nation is the recognition that racial homogeneity is essential to cultural survival and to national integrity.¹⁷

Richard Spencer also insisted on the centrality of race for political identity:

RS: I would also say that most everyone if not everyone of the Alt-Right would agree with the statement that...race is the foundation for identity...It is a genetic reality. Race... matters and [has] deep consequences for society. It's not just like, say, hair color or eye color or like athletic talent. It's much more important in its ramifications....

TM: It seems to me one of the features of Alt-Right thought is that it raises racial consciousness and specifically white racial consciousness, to a political principal... that's on a level with the rule of law and democracy and anything else you want to talk about. Is that where you're going?

RS: Correct.

TM: ...So talk to me about race consciousness and what it means to you and what the implications of it are.

RS: ...Race isn't just some issue. It isn't just some little thing that we might want to pursue here and there. It's this core idea that really informs everything. You know this is how I understand identitarianism:...you have to ask and answer that question "who are you?" before you answer other political questions. So before you start talking about what foreign policy should we have? What's our economic policy? How are we going to regulate the sidewalks this year? Even a question that mundane, literally.

TM: But you ...give a racial answer to that question. ...You say "who am I?": I am not a soul before God, I'm not a utility maximizing individual, I'm not someone who is trying to seek the good. You answer, "Oh, I'm white." And what I don't understand is, why make that move?...

RS: Because nothing else makes sense without race. Race is a grounding for everything.¹⁸

Since race is a grounding for everything, it a grounding even for morality. Thus one author for *The Right Stuff* asserts "Moral value (at least from a social standpoint) is based around someone's solidarity on family and ethnic lines," with the following consequences for political ethics:

We all understand now that tolerance is not a virtue if the thing being tolerated is evil (bad for our people and against the natural order)...Wishful thinkers long for freedom....This is a compromise. Instead, we should long for total victory, where the only freedom is freedom to do good (meaning, what is good for our people).¹⁹

In this formulation, since racial group interest is the decisive consideration in morality, tolerance of, and compromise with, other races is evil, and goal of politics can only be “total victory” for “our people.”

I have interviewed other prominent Alt-Rightists who do not hesitate to draw this conclusion. Here is Mike Enoch, editor of *The Right Stuff*, responding to the question of whether there is in Alt-Right ideology any “natural stopping point” to the drive for total political victory of the white race:

ME: ...[T]he government to me and to us, the Alt-Right I think for the most part, it's representative of a people. So the rights of people that aren't part of that people don't matter. It's not the concern...I want the government to be a white government for white people in a white nation. I don't care about the rights of blacks....

TM: ...[A]ren't you basically giving yourself a blank check for the state to treat its black citizens or members any way they want to?...[T]he white government can say “this is not a government for black people. You black people, we're going to segregate you [or] we decided instead of segregating you we're going to send you [to] the gas chambers, we're going to send you back to Africa”... [T]here is no natural stopping point that I can see in your position.

ME: ...[Y]ou're saying we have to answer morally for advocating for ourselves and our rights, when no other group is asked that question. There is no other race that is asked, “where does it end?”... I'm saying, look I don't care, what we are going to advocate is our rights, our people, and our sovereignty.

Enoch would prefer his country to be racially homogeneous, in which case there would be no occasion for the state to make war against a domestic minority race. But in the case of a multiracial society such as the contemporary United States, he will not rule out such a possibility. Nor is it clear why a homogeneous white ethno-state should not make war against foreign non-white states.

Kevin MacDonald, founder and editor of *Occidental Review*, also embraces the idea of race consciousness as the grounding for politics and morality but in an interview with me came to a rather less horrific conclusion than writers for *The Right Stuff* do:

KM: I'm an evolutionist. So from the evolutionist point of view, any ideology you have whether it's a moral ideology, religious, whatever, ultimately it has to pass the test of satisfying the interests of the people who believe those things. And if it doesn't then it's not adaptive. From my point of view, it's really about advancing white interests and white

identity and obviously any system of government that does not advance those things is not desirable. We have to get a system of government that works for us....

TM: I think we've got ourselves into a problem here because we've got a society which for better or worse is multiracial. So if whites say politics is about advancing the interests of the white race and if blacks say, no politics is all about advancing the interests of the black race, and Asians say the same thing and perhaps Jews do [too]...are all these interests compatible?

KM: No. Definitely not....They're not compatible. They're conflicts of interest, that's life.

TM: So let me see if I understand this: Politics is all about advancing the interests of your race. The interests of your race are not compatible with the interests of other races. So politics is all about conflict between races in which one race strives to advance its interests at the expense of others?

KM: Yeah. I don't really disagree with that....

TM: ...[I]n a multiracial society that seems to suggest that politics is always going to be a struggle between the races.

KM: I don't think you're wrong. When they opened the gates to all these other groups, which you've seen in the last few years, gradually every election cycle we've seen the racialization of politics....American politics has become a racial battleground. That's all we're saying.²⁰

In our interview MacDonald, unlike contributors to *The Right Stuff*, specifically rejected the ideas of unequal rights for, or *de jure* segregation of, minorities in a multiracial society. But he sees such societies as headed for unresolvable racial conflict unless one group establishes dominance. MacDonald outlined to me what such a process could look like:

KM: One way would be to first of all end immigration and then start repatriating people who are, first of all, illegal, but [also] other groups. Encourage them, give them financial incentives to leave...[T]his could be done if we had the political will to do it. Think about it, look what [happened] after World War II in Europe. There was all this ethnic displacement. And you look at what happened with the partition of India. Gigantic population transfers in history. That could happen again.²¹

Reasonable people can differ on the merits of ending immigration and the deportation of illegal immigrants. But it is not comforting that MacDonald sites the displaced persons' crisis of post-war Europe and the partition of India—tragedies in which many thousands of people died or suffered—as precedents for his preferred policy.

In short, an obvious problem with undiluted race consciousness as a political principle is that it acknowledges no internal breaks. By itself, advancement of racial interest rules no abomination beyond the pale. Of course, Alt-Rightists cannot argue that the pursuit of racial interest should be

limited by respect for human rights since, as was noted earlier, they roundly reject such rights as gauzy bunk.

A morality independent of racial interest might set appropriate limits. Thus one writer at *Occidental Dissent* has suggested that “the limitations of traditional Western Christianity,” as it was practiced in the Antebellum South, could “ensure that our ideas do not end in absolute horror and tyranny.” But this is not helpful given that Christianity as it was understood in that setting endorsed slavery.²² Further and more fundamentally, as we have seen, for some prominent Alt-Rightists, morality is *not* independent of racial interest; good and evil are determined entirely by what does and does not advance the interests of one’s race. This position leads straight to a racialized version of “might makes right.” Thus the Alt-Right merely updates and collectivizes ancient Thrasymachian morality: Justice is the advantage of the stronger race, with nothing barred. In our interview, Kevin MacDonald told me, perhaps sincerely, that he wishes blacks well and objects to large-scale immigration partly because it damages blacks’ interests. But if ideology is entirely about advancing white interests, why care about black interests *at all*? One hopes that however absolute the devotion of Alt-Rightists to white racial consciousness, it is in fact tempered with a residual respect for human rights or another principle that sometimes gives them pause. Or perhaps the thought is that even without the limitations set by human rights, the white race will, once guaranteed a super-majority, out of prudential and cost-benefit considerations, not press its advantage against the minority. But if those considerations change, and the majority race finds itself presented with an opportunity for “total victory,” what then?

If we conclude that white race consciousness as expressed by the Alt-Right is pernicious, we must address Enoch’s concern that no other group is asked “where does it end?” That is, generally there is no objection to apparent expressions of race consciousness among blacks, for example. Is “say it loud / I’m black and I’m proud” as objectionable as the “white consciousness” posters distributed by *American Renaissance* that feature images such as Thomas Jefferson exhorting viewers to “Embrace White Identity Today!”? According to Jared Taylor these posters merely “...encourage whites to be proud of their heritage and to stand up for themselves, which is exactly what America promotes for every other racial group.”²³ The claim is that white racial consciousness is no worse than any other form of race consciousness, or, presumably, ethnic or gender consciousness. To respond, as some thinkers do, that all expressions of group consciousness—white identity, black identity, Latino identity, feminist identity—are an anathema is logically consistent but unrealistic in America today. Thus an effective response to race consciousness as the Alt-Right understands it requires some account of how race, ethnic, gender and other differences can find some form of expression without surrendering to the dismal conclusion that politics is no more than endless, unrestrained strife among irreconcilable identity groups.

Why not say, instead, that in a diverse society, the various races, ethnicities, and so on will be considered as different interest groups, with each one jockeying for position within a liberal democratic framework and accommodations being reached through ongoing pluralistic bargaining? This idea is hardly original; it was developed in detail by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan in their seminal account of ethnicity in America, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, first published in 1963. Those authors rejected the idea that national unity required melting down

America's diverse population into a "homogenous end product" of generic Americans. Glazer and Moynihan instead argued that American society could live with ethnic diversity and indeed that "The ethnic pattern was American, more American than the assimilationist."²⁴ This could be accomplished, the authors posited, if America's many diverse groups were thought of as ethnic groups, and ethnic groups were thought of as a type of interest group. This approach involved conceptualizing of blacks as not a racial group but rather an ethnic group. That is, Glazer and Moynihan legitimated *ethnic* identity but not *racial* identity. Black identity could be accepted if it was thought of as an ethnic identity rather than a racial identity. On the other hand, white identity, Glazer and Moynihan correctly stressed, was to be rejected as it was simply a cover for rejection of blacks.²⁵

Unfortunately, Glazer and Moynihan made a bad slip that obscured their important insights. The insistence that blacks were not a racial group at all but an ethnic group, provoked misunderstanding and legitimate anger. The implication seemed to be that the situation of blacks was really no different in kind from that of ethnic groups such as the Irish and Italians whose incorporation into American society was relatively painless. For good reason, blacks objected to the apparent suggestion that their lot was essentially the same as that of white ethnics.

Glazer and Moynihan's point can be salvaged, however if it is recognized that any sense of group awareness—whether we are speaking of ethnic, racial, gender, or whatever type of group—can be accommodated within democratic politics if the group, however distinctive it may be, is thought of as an interest group. Doing so by no means requires arguing that blacks are "really" not a race at all but rather an ethnicity. Of course blacks are a race, and as such they may function as an interest group as unproblematically as do women, manufacturers, gays, conservatives, Latinos, Catholics, etc.

Here we have an answer to the frequent complaint of the Alt-Right that white racial consciousness alone is held to be illegitimate but racial consciousness for blacks and everyone else is accepted. In fact, the form of group consciousness that American society can tolerate and sometimes even celebrate is *interest* group consciousness, not *identity* group consciousness. Interest group consciousness conceives of race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, profession and other characteristics as potentially *contributing to* one's political orientation; sees a particular group as one legitimate interest among others that all seek to advance themselves within the context of a democratic polity; and appreciates that other considerations besides group interest are legitimate guides to political action. Identity group consciousness sees race or some other trait as *overwhelmingly determinative* of political orientation; regards other groups as threats to be overcome or at best neutralized in a no-holds-bared, zero-sum struggle for dominance; and holds that group identity decisively trumps all other political and moral considerations.

Interest group awareness includes garden-variety forms of black, Latino and feminist pride, although more problematic versions can be found. Even Black Lives Matter, so often castigated by the Alt-Right as anti-white, takes care to express its orientation in interest group rather than identity group terms. The movement's website asserts "We are unapologetically Black... To love and desire freedom and justice for ourselves is a necessary prerequisite for wanting the same for others" and so presents itself as one of a plurality of legitimate interests.²⁶

Identity group awareness is exemplified by Alt-Right white consciousness and cannot be squared with liberal democratic politics. Historically, ideologies of white racial consciousness have never expressed themselves as bland interest group politics, but have always been radically corrosive forms of identity politics deployed in defense of slavery, segregation, and now the Alt-Right's political agenda.

Another problem with race consciousness comes when racialists respond to the obvious question: why identify with *one's own* race rather than some other? The obvious racist answer is that one's own race is by nature better endowed in various important ways than other races and should therefore be considered *politically and morally* superior. Thus white consciousness or white identity politics naturally leads to an assertion of white racial superiority. In one form or another this is the next move made by the Alt-Right.

6.2 The Political and Moral Inequality of the Races: The Alt-Right's Defense

We come now to a crucial point. When critics accuse the Alt-Right of believing whites are superior to blacks the evidence adduced is often that Alt-Rightists believe that, based upon presumed and asserted genetic reasons, members of the white race are on average more intelligent and better behaved than blacks. The Alt-Right does indeed hold this position as was discussed in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2 and at least some Alt-Rightists boldly assert that therefore blacks are simply inferior to whites. Here, for example, is a writer who goes by the name of Charles the Hammer denying in *The Right Stuff* that “Even if people aren't equal in capacity, they're still morally equal”:

Once someone can get past the lie that all people have equal capacity for achievement and that putting loads of different ethnic groups in one spot is a good thing, the next big hurdle [to accepting Alt-Right ideology] is coming to grips with the fact that some people are just shitty people....I've more or less come to grips with the fact that a mixed society with anything above 3rd world standards is not possible. Blacks, Latinos, etc. simply are not capable, as groups, of participation in high trust, highly civilized societies that Europeans have created. No amount of “education” or dem [sic] programs can change this.²⁷

This writer, as Leninists used to say, simply “blurts out” his real opinion: the races aren't equal in capacities, therefore neither are they morally equal, therefore some people—nonwhite people—“are just shitty people” ie: inferior as human beings.

But most Alt-Rightists respond that acceptance of the reality and genetic nature of average differences in significant psychological traits is not, in and of itself, racist. Their argument is something like this: Acceptance of the reality of average differences in physical strength between the sexes, and the acknowledgement that those differences are in part based in genetics, is not misogyny, the belief that women are in some overall sense inferior to men. The claim of these more sophisticated Alt-Right apologists is that women are, on average, physically less strong than men, not that men are *better than* women and ought to enjoy a superior *political* status over women. Similarly, Alt-Rightists say their claim is merely that whites are on average more

intelligent than blacks, not that whites are superior in some overall sense, and not that blacks should be politically inferior to whites.

This line of defense is developed by Spencer and a co-author in an article published in *Radix Journal*, which deserves to be quoted at some length:

The reluctance to discuss—or even to admit to—the existence of racial differences is commonly motivated by fear of possible invidious distinctions between “superior” and “inferior” races.

But claims of superiority beg many questions. First, racial differences must relate to some particular trait. West Africans may, indeed, be a “superior” race *when it comes to sprinting*. In reference to other traits, other races may be more gifted. No race is best in everything, and it is meaningless to speak of any race being superior *per se*. Moreover, there is no unequivocal reason to hold that longer legs or lighter skin are more desirable than their opposites. It all depends on context. Ultimately, there is no unequivocal reason to think that the recognition of racial differences in particular traits implies any overall “superiority.”

Second, the existence of racial differences does not logically imply that one race should rule over others or benefit at their expense. No one has ever claimed that the superiority of West Africans at sprinting entitles them to preferential treatment over Whites and Asians. The same goes for all other races and all other traits. This may sound like an elementary point, but much opposition to the open discussion of racial differences is based upon a tacit assumption that recognizing such differences would *ipso facto* justify the mistreatment of one or more races. But this is simply a fallacy.²⁸

In an interview with me, Jared Taylor similarly defended himself against the charge of believing that blacks are inferior to whites. Here are relevant portions of that interview:

JT: I think it is an unfair and loaded term to say that white people are better or black people are better. I think that’s an unfair and that is an emotionally charged way of describing something that should be couched in more precise terms....²⁹

Note that here Taylor does *not* deny that that white people are better; he says only that speaking in such terms is “an unfair and...emotionally charged way of describing something that should be couched in more precise terms....” Shortly this matter will be addressed here with suitable precision. But Taylor continued:

JT: Ultimately, it’s very important that you should realize what I and I believe everyone in the Alt-Right wants for white people. We are perfectly happy to grant to every other group on earth, nobody is trying to deprive anybody else of their rights, nobody is trying to deprive anybody else of their culture. I wish all other groups well. I can like and admire many foreign societies. As you probably know I lived the first 16 years of my life in Japan. I want Japan to stay Japanese. If Japan ceased to be Japanese, which it would cease to be if it filled up with Brazilians, and Algerians and Tahitians and Hattians, that

would be terrible, terrible tragedy. All I'm saying is that we as whites have the right to pursue our destiny as white people, unencumbered by the embrace of people unlike ourselves. It's a matter of survival. It's a matter of pure reciprocity. And it is completely wrong and unfair to think us and only us as somehow bigoted and close-minded because we are earnest about the survival of our people and our culture....Quote that verbatim and you can say anything else about me.³⁰

Note that in this summation of his position, while Taylor claims not to want to deny any group its rights, he fails to specifically acknowledge blacks as political equals.

The question then is this: Some Alt-Rightists perfunctorily acknowledge that a claimed difference in intelligence between blacks and whites “does not *logically imply* that one race should rule over others” [Emphasis added.]. But the issue here is not one of logical implication. It is, rather, whether Alt-Rightists do *in fact* go on to argue that whites should politically dominate blacks. Below it will be shown that Alt-Rightists do indeed go on to argue that these putative differences in intelligence and other traits make whites better at building decent societies than blacks; that white-dominated societies are necessarily better overall than non-white societies; and that for these reasons whites *ought to be politically superior to or dominate over blacks*.

6.2 The Political and Moral Inequality of the Races: The Alt-Right's Record

Michael Levin developed his moral case for white political dominance in his 1997 book, *Why Race Matters*, which was discussed in detail in Chapter 2. Levin's book is relevant here because of its influence on Alt-Right thinkers. Thus in 2005, the New Century Foundation, founded by Taylor, obtained copyright to this book and republished it with a preface in which Taylor expressed “admiration” for the work. *Why Race Matters* is still available for purchase through the *American Renaissance* web site, which describes it as a “masterpiece” and a “classic.”³¹

In *American Renaissance*, Taylor wrote a glowing review of *Why Race Matters* when it was first published. In his review, Taylor gets to the political bottom line of Levin's analysis:

Interestingly, Prof. Levin's exhaustive study of racial differences leads to policies strikingly similar to those of the pre-civil rights era American South. It may be no coincidence that the latest scientific findings support the traditions of whites who lived, for generations, in the most intimate contact with blacks.³²

Thus Taylor's claim, based on Levin's work, is that the latest scientific findings on racial differences “leads to policies strikingly similar to those of the pre-civil rights era American South,” which, of course, were disenfranchisement, segregation, and Jim Crow. In other words, Taylor is doing here *exactly* what he says he will not do. He goes beyond claiming that the races *differ*, on average, with respect to some important trait, to asserting that because of such difference one race must be politically *superior* to the other, as whites were to blacks in the old South. So Taylor's acknowledgement that “We are equal in the sense that all men do have the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” is meant so abstractly as to be compatible, not

only with segregation, but with Levin's explicit "race conscious measures by the state in the exercise of its police power," which Taylor illuminatingly describes as the acknowledgement that:

[D]ifferent punishments may be appropriate for different races. For blacks it should perhaps be swifter and include corporal punishment, especially for men who treat a jail term as a badge of honor and a rite of passage. It might also be sensible to try some black juveniles as adults, since blacks mature more rapidly than whites. Finally, since blacks have frequently shown themselves unable to transcend racial loyalty, they might be excluded from juries in trials that could inflame racial passion.³³

In other words, Taylor claims he does not think whites should be superior to blacks, but does think that corporal punishment for black criminals and lighter punishment for similar white criminals may well be justified in light of the latest scientific findings on race. Suffice it is to say that if members of one race, when they are convicted of a crime, receive a light punishment such as a fine or imprisonment, while similar members of another race receive a harsher punishment, such as twelve strokes with a cat-o-nine-tails well laid on, the first race is politically superior relative to the second. Passages such as this, and there are many of them, dramatically undermine Taylor's impassioned insistence he is not a white supremacist.

In *American Renaissance* over the years Taylor has repeated support for white political domination over blacks. In 1991 he wrote an article entitled "The Racial Revolution," where he argued:

The best way to gauge the extent of the revolution is to compare the present to the past. The contrast is staggering. Practically every historical American figure was by today's standards an unregenerate white supremacist.

Until just a few years ago virtually all Americans believed that race was a profoundly important aspect of individual and national identity. They believed that people of different races differed in temperament and ability, and that whites built societies that were *superior* to those built by non-whites. They were repelled by miscegenation — which they called "amalgamation" — because it would dilute the unique characteristics of whites. They took it for granted that America must be peopled with Europeans, and that American civilization could not continue without whites. Many saw the presence of non-whites in the United States as a terrible burden. [Emphasis added.]³⁴

It must be understood that Taylor is here *lamenting* the "racial revolution" that has undermined "white supremacist" standards in modern America. He concludes his essay by remarking:

However, revolutions that violate the laws of human nature eventually founder. Someday ours will collapse, as biology reasserts itself over sociology, and white racial consciousness reawakens.³⁵

So Taylor endorses the reawakening of "white racial consciousness" and its belief that "whites built societies that were superior to those built by non-whites," and its vision of "non-whites in

the United States as a terrible burden.” All this goes beyond merely claiming that black societies reflect black intellectual endowments. It is a value judgement in favor of white supremacy and against the “terrible burden” of non-whites in the United States.

In a 2005 *American Renaissance* article on the disorders in New Orleans in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Taylor concluded:

To be sure, the story of Hurricane Katrina does have a moral for anyone not deliberately blind. The races are different. Blacks and whites are different. When blacks are left entirely to their own devices, Western Civilization — any kind of civilization — disappears.³⁶

The assertion that blacks and whites are different in important ways is debatable but is in itself not necessarily objectionable. The same could be said of a claim that blacks on their own build civilizations *different from* Western Civilization. Taylor has claimed that his race realism holds only that blacks build societies different from western societies: “people of different races build different societies. Blacks—wherever they are found in large numbers—establish communities with certain characteristics, and whites and others do the same.”³⁷

But that is not what Taylor wrote in his article on post-Katrina New Orleans. He wrote that when blacks are left on their own, not merely Western Civilization but “*any kind of civilization—disappears*” [Emphasis added.]. The word “civilization” clearly expresses a value judgement in favor of that situation as opposed to a lack of civilization. So the moral of this article by Taylor is not just that the races differ, but that blacks are inferior to whites in terms of their capacity for civilization.

In 2013, *American Renaissance* published a review by Taylor entitled “The Long Retreat on Race,” of a biography of James Jackson Kilpatrick, Jr. Taylor accurately describes Kilpatrick as “a hugely popular conservative commentator of the latter part of the 20th century. . . . Before that, however, he was one of the country’s best known segregationists.” From the late 1950s to the early 1980s Kilpatrick went from being a staunch defender of the Jim Crow South to a more mainstream conservative who embraced *Brown* and rejected racism. The questions Taylor wants to answer in his analysis of Kilpatrick’s development are, “How did he make the switch? Did he change his views? Sacrifice his principles?” To illustrate those principles, Taylor quotes without comment from an article that Kilpatrick sent in 1963 to the *Saturday Evening Post*:

The Negro race, as a race, is in fact an inferior race. . . . Within the frame of reference of a Negroid civilization, a mud hut may be a masterpiece But the mud hut ought not to be equated with Monticello. . . . Where is the Negro to be found? . . . He is lying limp in the middle of the sidewalk yelling he is equal. The hell he is equal.³⁸

Here’s what Taylor has to say of Kilpatrick’s transformation from segregationist to *Brown* supporter:

What are those of us who prefer the early James Kilpatrick to make of his career?... If Kilpatrick really did change, then God rest his erring soul. If he trimmed all the way to the grave, he forsook his obligations to the truth and to his people.³⁹

So, Taylor is writing here that he is one of those who “prefer the early James Kilpatrick,” who wrote “The Negro race, as a race, is in fact an inferior race” to the later Kilpatrick who rejected racism. And if Taylor really objects to the idea that blacks are an inferior race, why not say so when he quotes Kilpatrick’s noxious words? What is all this but an endorsement of the idea that blacks are an inferior race?

Taylor returned to the claim that nonwhites are inferior to whites in terms of their capacities for civilization and to build good societies in 2015 when he contributed to his website an “Open Letter to Cuckservatives.” “Cuckservative” is a vulgar and derogatory term that Alt-Rightists including Taylor throw at traditional conservatives. The slur derives from “cuckold” and suggests that traditional conservatives are sexually inadequate. Taylor writes:

You tell yourself that the things you love about America—and I love them, too—are rooted in certain principles. *That is your greatest mistake.* They are rooted in certain people. That is why Germans, Swedes, Irishmen, and Hungarians could come and contribute to the America you love. Do you really believe that a future Afro-Hispanic-Caribbean-Asiatic America will be anything like the America your ancestors built?...Even when they violate your principles, white people build good societies. Even when they abide by your principles, non-whites usually don’t.⁴⁰

Here again Taylor is undermining his claim that race realism claims merely that the races are different. He says clearly that white people build, not merely different societies, but “good societies...nonwhites usually don’t” [Emphasis added.]. So Taylor is making a value judgement against non-whites. Note that he claims this ability to build good societies is dependent specifically upon *race* and not attributable to principles; so, he theorizes, whites have that ability and nonwhites usually don’t. Note further under his theory that it therefore follows that blacks cannot make up this deficit even if they adopt good principles because race is determinative; what you believe or think counts for nothing. The upshot of what Taylor writes here is that whites are superior to blacks, for racial reasons, in the vital ability to build good societies.

What has happened here is that while very superficially giving the appearance of accepting Hayek and Popper’s distinction between factual equality and political equality, and their insistence that factual equality must not trump political equality, the Alt-Right as represented by Taylor and some *VDARE* contributors who take up arguments along these lines, in fact reject such qualified Jeffersonianism completely. It is not that the presumption in favor of political equality is so well grounded that factual differences should be politically irrelevant; rather, the case for crucial factual differences between the races is held to be so absolutely overwhelming that the liberal democratic tradition of America, from the Declaration of Independence through the civil rights era, is to be tossed out and replaced with a neo-segregationism more explicitly based on racial inequality than the pre-scientific variety enforced in the old American South.

Taylor's occasional professions of good will toward non-whites must be acknowledged. And his repeated claims of genetically-based racial difference are not in themselves racist. But the above review of his contributions to *American Renaissance* shows that he repeatedly expressed the idea that blacks are *morally* inferior and *should be* politically inferior to whites. The same could be said of the contributions to most Alt-Right platforms.

6.3 Why Political Egalitarianism Does Not Depend on Factual Equality of Abilities

The entire analysis of Alt-Right racialism presented here has argued, as thinkers in the liberal democratic tradition have since Locke, that people can be equal in terms of the rights they hold even if they are unequal in terms of important traits such as intelligence, temperament, strength, or virtues of whatever kind. But one can ask, *why shouldn't* people who are superior in these factual traits therefore be granted superior political status? And further, why shouldn't we discriminate against entire races on the basis of average traits if doing so apparently allowed us to achieve desirable social outcomes?

Let us begin by looking at this issue on the level of individuals. Obviously, if a polity announces that superiority in terms of certain traits will translate into superiority in political status it will trigger enormous conflict. Which traits will be relevant, how superiority in those terms will be established, who will make that determination, and what political advantages will be doled out, based on what determinations, will become the central issues of political life and dispute over them will be intense. But eventually, perhaps after rivers of blood have been shed, another obvious point will become clear. If it is really true that superior intelligence, say, is a tremendous natural advantage, makes one a better citizen, and brings with it social influence, why bother to make an *official* determination of who is more intelligent than whom? If the intelligent will naturally rise to the top and dominate society, why not simply let that happen and skip the expense, conflict, corrupting influence, and opportunity for mistakes involved with an official determination process? In other words, why not recognize that political equality is entirely compatible with factual inequality⁴¹ and need not undermine whatever claims to power superior merit may have. The American Founders understood this point. Jefferson rightly saw no contradiction in maintaining that all men are created equal and calling for an educational system in Virginia that would identify and cultivate a natural aristocracy of gifted students.

Again, the above case for political egalitarianism among individuals is obvious. Is the case for political egalitarianism among groups, whatever average differences there may be in important traits between those groups, any less obvious? If two individuals, one more intelligent than the other, both have the same rights, stand equal before the law, cast one vote, etc., why should things be any different for two groups of individuals, one on average more intelligent than the other? Here it is assumed for the sake of the argument that this average difference is real and has, all things being equal, a significant impact on important life outcomes for members of these groups. Why cannot it be said that these two groups, by hypothesis factually unequal, are nonetheless created equal in the sense meant by the Declaration, that is, are politically equal?

Again, as we have seen some, but by no means all, Alt-Rightists occasionally claim to acknowledge the political equality of all groups. But we have also seen their claims are perfunctory, inconsistent, vague, and unconvincing. Alt-Rightists who disdain these evasions such as Spencer, Enoch, Anglin, and their intellectual forefather Mike Levin, raise a point that requires a response. The most radical Alt-Rightists are arguing—when they are engaging in real

argument—that certain social benefits can be achieved if average group differences in important traits are taken into account. Here is an example of such an argument from a *VDARE* contributor:

Recognizing that blacks are more violent than whites... is not “racism.” It is accepting reality.

Segregation may well be unjust in some cases. Yet if reasonable authorities conclude, having looked at the data on crime and inter-racial violence, that blacks and whites live better apart, segregation may well be necessary. That is not tantamount to hating blacks because of their disabilities, or suggesting the law should deny them a living, or worse, exterminate them, which would indeed be a terrible sin. Race-realism is not “racism.”⁴²

This passage is extraordinary for several reasons. First of all, it shows that race realism is not simply the claim that race has an important biological element; race realism becomes a justification for segregation, that is, denial of political equality. Second, it justifies segregation based on the average difference in crime rates between blacks and whites. On average, under the *VDARE* contributor’s reasoning, blacks commit more crimes than whites, therefore all blacks—the criminal and innocent alike—must be denied the right to live, work, and associate—that is, to pursue their happiness—as they please. Third, the imagined good of this illiberalism is a vague social benefit: blacks and whites will “live better” in some unspecified way under segregation. The likelihood that blacks will feel they are not living better under this arrangement compared to whites is not considered. That is, the insight obtained after many traumatic decades of segregation—that separate is inherently unequal—is here discarded. Fourth, this return to Jim Crow is to be undertaken merely because “reasonable authorities conclude” it should be so. But who are these authorities? And how could they conclude, merely by looking at some data, that the dearly-bought achievements of desegregation shall be entirely scrapped? Finally, we are asked to believe that none of this amounts to racism: these reasonable authorities do not hate blacks, they merely judge them unfit to live with because they are “more violent,” on average, than whites. And since no one wants to “exterminate them,” no great harm is done, according to *VDARE*’s writer.

Let us put aside, so far as is possible, the blatant unconstitutionality, atavism, and outrageousness of this argument and use it as an opportunity to ask why racial, ethnic, or any other kind of groups should not be denied equal political status if it seems that some social benefit can be achieved by so doing. The simple answer is that judging by group averages is unnecessary because institutions *already exist* for judging people as individuals. America’s independent and professional criminal justice system, which certainly is in need of much improvement, has been built up and is maintained at great cost. If, therefore, crime rates are high, let convicted criminals of whatever race, *be segregated from society* by being placed in prisons. This is not a segregation of all blacks, including the innocent, in official ghettos. Why be especially concerned over inter-racial violence when the police exist to foil violence *of every sort*, whether inter- or intra-racial or whatever? (Of course, responses other than incarceration or policing are appropriate too, as long as they are nondiscriminatory and effective.)

Perhaps it will be claimed that judging people on the basis of race is legitimate only when there is no practical alternative; but the fact of the matter is that there almost always *are* alternatives. Perhaps one can think up head experiments in which minor advantages can be gained from various marginal practices (such as subject profiling) by taking race into account. But such benefits are entirely negated by the political cost of implementing these divisive tactics. Our finite resources will be infinitely better rewarded if we help our mainstream institutions, such as the courts, the market, and the democratic political system, make better judgments about *individuals*.

Moreover, judging people based on group averages rather than as individuals creates massive perverse incentives. If all members of some group--the violent and nonviolent, the innocent and guilty--are segregated or discriminated against, what incentive do the well-behaved group members have to keep up their good work? Unequal status turns such righteous people into chumps; they may as well embrace a life of crime since they get no credit for good behavior anyway. The group in question, which by hypothesis is on average more problematic than the rest of the population, now has an incentive to go over to the dark side 100 percent, which will benefit no one. Political inegalitarianism therefore harms not only those discriminated against, but those doing the discrimination, who end up with a worse problem on their hands than they have when all groups are considered equal.

To put the Alt-Right's racialism in perspective, consider how dramatic average group differences in important personal traits would have to be before anyone would seriously consider judging group members on the basis of those average differences rather than as individuals. The example of a prominent minority group is illuminating. Data clearly show this minority is dramatically more prone to violence and criminal behavior and more likely to be incarcerated and sexually predatory than the general population. Moreover, the case that all this misbehavior is rooted to some degree in genetic factors seems quite strong, with obvious biological differences setting members of this minority off from the rest of the population. Perhaps tellingly, professional sports are dominated by this group. And yet this troublesome group enjoys full political equality with the rest of humanity. For example, it has never been suggested that the notorious habits of these folk have undermined their right to a presumption of innocence, or that in their criminal trials a lower standard of proof for them would be appropriate.

The minority group described here is men who, according to the 2010 census, account for 49.2 percent of the U.S. population.⁴³ Despite its infamous record, the male sex enjoys full political equality with women and yet life goes on and liberal democracy endures. If the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness can be successfully extended to men, then *a fortiori*, political egalitarianism can function in a multi-racial and multi-ethnic society. At least, that seems to be a safe bet, one based on centuries of historical experience, and much safer than scrapping American foundational principles in favor of the Alt-Right's jumble of untried, anti-democratic nostrums.

6.3 Conclusion

This overview of Alt-Right racialism comes to the same conclusions that the review of the movement's illiberalism has. The Alt-Right's racialism is extremely radical and goes far beyond merely politically incorrect opinions about the nature of race, the abilities of minority groups, or the desirability of progressive welfare state programs. The movement is at odds, not just with contemporary civil rights policy, but foundational principles of liberal democracy, especially political egalitarianism. Alt-Right rhetoric on the delicate matter of race is not merely outspoken, blunt, or insensitive. Despite some occasional and vague professions of good will, the movement's discourse on race is generally unnecessarily harsh, deliberately transgressive, coarse, and, quite often, hateful. Moreover, Alt-Right racialism displays the same poverty of thought and lack of reasonableness that the rest of its ideology does. Here again, the revolution in the production of public ideas that occurred in the early 21st century, when it at last gave the Alt-Right a platform it previously lacked, did not produce a happy result.

Robert Nozick's sprawling tome *Philosophical Explanations* contains the following striking observation about racism:

...[A] racist is not simply someone who believes there are or may be racial differences along dimensions of value—whether or not there are is an empirical question. A racist, I am inclined to say, is someone who wants there to be racial differences along dimensions of value and who wants these differences to go in a certain direction...[T]o avoid falling into wanting there to be such racial differences...we might avoid reaching a conclusion or (especially) a stand on the issue.⁴⁴

The Alt-Right perfectly exemplifies Nozick's definition of racism. Alt-Rightists go well beyond believing, on strictly empirical grounds, that there happen to be average differences between the races in important traits such as intelligence. Alt-Right thinkers evince a passionate desire, a will to believe, that such differences not only exist but are fatal to any possibility of political equality. They ignore the fact that the vast majority of qualified researchers believe no such thing and cite repeatedly the handful of marginal figures committed to racial inequality. Far from avoiding hasty conclusions, they sedulously reinforce their racist worldview with a steady stream of filtered information and disinformation. Far from race realism Alt-Rightism is race irrationalism, a socially constructed discourse bubble designed to spare its denizens from serious consideration of the pressing challenges faced by diverse democratic polities.

Notes

¹ Özlem Sensoy and Robin DiAngelo, *Is Everyone Really Equal?: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice Education*, Second Edition (New York: Teachers College Press, 2017) p. 125.

² Interestingly an empirical study of how a multi-racial, nationwide sample of 2,474 respondents evaluated two scenarios of race relations “raises serious questions about the plausibility of a ‘blacks cannot be racists’ perspective being common among African-Americans.” See George

Yancey; “‘Blacks Cannot be Racists’: A Look at How European-Americans, African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans and Asian-Americans Perceive Minority Racism”; *Michigan Sociological Review*; Vol. 19 (Fall 2005), p. 149; <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40969108>.

³ Interview with Mike Enoch, February 22, 2017.

⁴ “About Us”; *American Renaissance*; <https://www.amren.com/about/>; accessed September 21, 2017

⁵ *Race-The Power of an Illusion*; http://www.pbs.org/race/000_About/002_04-about-01-01.htm; Acc. February 16, 2017.

⁶ Anonymous Attorney; “Hillbilly Plight Only Noticed When a Hillbilly from Yale Law Points it Out”; *VDARE*; published January 4, 2017; accessed September 21, 2017; <http://www.vdare.com/posts/hillbilly-plight-only-noticed-when-a-hillbilly-from-yale-law-points-it-out>.

⁷ Greg Johnson; “Why Race is Not a ‘Social Construct’”; *Counter-Currents Publishing*; published July 24, 2015; accessed September 21, 2017; <https://www.counter-currents.com/2015/07/why-race-is-not-a-social-construct/>;

⁸ Quintilian; “The Future Is White”; COUNTER-CURRENTS PUBLISHING; PUBLISHED AUGUST 28, 2017; accessed September 21, 2017; <https://www.counter-currents.com/2017/08/the-future-is-white/>.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Jared Taylor; “Jared Taylor: Donald Trump, White Supremacism, And The Insanity Of The WASHINGTON POST”; posted January 14, 2016; accessed September 22, 2017; <http://www.vdare.com/articles/jared-taylor-donald-trump-white-supremacism-and-the-insanity-of-the-washington-post>.

¹¹ Ulric Neisser et al; “Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns” *American Psychologist*, February 1996; Vol. 51; No. 2; p. 77; accessed January 17, 2018; <http://differentialclub.wdfiles.com/local-files/definitions-structure-and-measurement/Intelligence-Knowns-and-unknowns.pdf>.

¹² Ibid, p. 97.

¹³ Ibid, p. 90.

¹⁴ Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray; *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*; (New York: The Free Press, 1994) p. 530.

¹⁵ Hunter Wallace (aka Brad Griffin); “Snowflakes Shout Down ‘White Supremacist’ Charles Murray At Middlebury College”; *Alt-Right.com*; March 2, 2017 ; accessed January 17, 2018;

<https://altright.com/2017/03/02/snowflakes-shout-down-white-supremacist-charles-murray-at-middlebury-college/>.

¹⁶ Interview with Greg Johnson, October 7, 2016.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Interview with Richard Spencer, September 29, 2016.

¹⁹ Zeiger; “Libertarianism and Marxism: The Twin Offspring of Liberalism”; *The Right Stuff*; November 5, 2015; Accessed February 21, 2017;
<http://therightstuff.biz/2015/11/05/libertarianism-and-marxism-two-sides-of-the-same-coin/>

²⁰ Interview with Kevin MacDonald, February 7, 2017.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Michael Cushman; *Occidental Dissent*; “Mike Enoch Interview With Dr. Thomas Main”; Posted February 23, 2017; Accessed March 12, 2017;
<http://www.occidentaldissent.com/2017/02/23/mike-enoch-interview-with-dr-thomas-main/>

²³ Jared Taylor, “Spread the Message of White Consciousness”; *American Renaissance*; Posted January 26, 2017; Accessed March 14, 2017;
<https://www.amren.com/commentary/2017/01/spread-message-white-consciousness/>. Also see, “Printed Posters”; *American Renaissance*; Accessed March 14, 2017;
<https://www.amren.com/printable-posters/>

²⁴ Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan; *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York*, Second Edition (Cambridge, MA: 1970) p. xxii.

²⁵ Ibid, p. xxxix.

²⁶ Black Lives Matter, “What We Believe,” accessed January 3, 2018,
<https://blacklivesmatter.com/about/what-we-believe/>

²⁷ Charles The Hammer; Psychological Hurdles to the Right; *The Right Stuff*; Posted June 5, 2015; Accessed February 16, 2017;
<http://therightstuff.biz/2015/06/05/psychological-hurdles-to-the-right/>.

²⁸ F. Roger Devlin & Richard B. Spencer, “Race—Stalking the Wild Taboo,” *Radix Journal*,
<http://www.radixjournal.com/the-red-pill/2016/7/6/race>, published July 6, 2016; accessed January 11, 2017.

²⁹ Interview with Jared Taylor, September 27, 2016.

³⁰ Ibid

³¹ <https://store.amren.com/product/books/why-race-matters/>; accessed February 6, 2017.

³² Jared Taylor, “*Why Race Matters: A Philosopher’s Elegant and Compelling Dissection of the Race Problem*,” *American Renaissance*, October, 1997, <http://library.flawlesslogic.com/levin.htm>, accessed January 17, 2017.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Jared Taylor, “The Racial Revolution,” *American Renaissance*, Vol 10, No. 5, May 1999; accessed January 1, 2017. https://www.amren.com/news/2008/09/the_racial_revo/

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Jared Taylor, “Africa in Our Midst,” *American Renaissance*, October 2005, Vol. 16, No. 10, Accessed November 13, 2016, <https://www.amren.com/archives/back-issues/october-2005/>.

³⁷ *American Renaissance*; “Race Realist Jared Taylor Declares the ‘Civil Rights Struggle Was Won Long Ago’” Jamie Hines, Washington Examiner, July 20, 2010; accessed September 22, 2017; https://www.amren.com/news/2010/07/race_realist_ja/.

³⁸ Cited in Jared Taylor, “The Long Retreat on Race,” *American Renaissance*, Posted on August 23, 2013; Accessed February 13, 2017 <https://www.amren.com/features/2013/08/the-long-retreat-on-race/>

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Jared Taylor, “An Open Letter to Cuckservatives,” *American Renaissance*, July 30, 2015, accessed January 10, 2017, <https://www.amren.com/news/2015/07/an-open-letter-to-cuckservatives/>.

⁴¹ Throughout this book, the word “factual,” when used in reference to factual equality or inequality, refers to personal traits or characteristics such as intelligence, temperament, strength, and so forth. Of course, inequalities of social resources such as income, employment, wealth, etc. are matters of fact too. When it is said here that political equality does not depend on factual equality what is meant is that people can be politically equal even if they are unequal in terms of important personal traits. Whether political equality depends on a certain amount of equality of social resources is a separate issue not for the most part taken up in this book.

⁴² Eugene Gant; “On Independence Day, A Catholic Reflects On Race”; *VDARE*; posted July 5, 2017; accessed September 21, 2017; <http://www.vdare.com/articles/on-independence-day-a-catholic-reflects-on-race>.

⁴³ Lindsay M. Howden and Julie A. Meyer; “2010 Census Briefs, Age and Sex Composition: 2010”; United States Census Bureau; C2010BT-03; p. 2; Table 1. Population by Sex and Selected Age Groups: 2000 and 2010; issued May 2011.

⁴⁴ Robert Nozick, *Philosophical Explanations*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1981) p. 325.