

American Renaissance

There is not a truth existing which I fear or would wish unknown to the whole world.

— Thomas Jefferson

Vol. 13 No. 12

December 2002

Twelve Years After

AR's contributions to our movement.

by Samuel Francis

The previous issue marked the twelfth anniversary of the establishment of American Renaissance. In this issue, a long-time friend and contributor to the magazine offers his observations on what AR has—and has not—accomplished.

The mere fact that *American Renaissance* has lasted for all of 12 years is a reason in itself to celebrate. I recall when, in 1989, Jared Taylor first approached me and asked to meet with me in Washington to discuss founding a newsletter that would deal honestly with racial differences and race relations. I was eager to meet with him and sanguine about starting a magazine or newsletter, but I was not especially hopeful that it would last or have much impact without major financial assets.

I cannot say, 12 years later, that it has had tremendous impact, and that in no way suggests a criticism of AR or of Jared Taylor or anyone who has ever written for AR. At the end of 2002, whites in the United States are an even smaller majority than they were in 1990; their racial consciousness has not grown appreciably, and the political and cultural threats to them and their nation and civilization are as powerful today as they were 12 years ago.

The Democratic Party is even more tightly controlled by and dependent on minorities than ever. The Republican Party is even more frightened of racial (and even of simple cultural) honesty than it was in the days of George Bush I. The best racially tinged political issue and the best issue for the Republicans is immigration control, but after winning a governorship and several con-

gressional seats on the issue in California in 1994, the Stupid Party was apparently so frightened of its own success that it completely dropped immigration and is now indistinguishable from the Democrats on this question



Samuel Francis

(except that the Democrats move ever further to the left on it).

The same is true of affirmative action, hate crimes legislation, multiculturalism, and white Southern heritage symbols. When Mississippi voted overwhelmingly to retain its state flag with

The cultural consensus among whites was once so secure that racial consciousness did not need to appeal to race itself very much or very directly.

a Confederate flag design in its corner in 2001, the state Republican Party refused even to take a position. In California last year, Gov. Gray Davis came close to endorsing reparations for slavery, but his Republican opponent refused to take a position on that issue as

well. The Republican Party, far from becoming an ally, even obliquely, of racially threatened whites, has become either useless or an actual enemy.

Yet no racially conscious third party has emerged to fill the void, and virtually no substantial portion of the dwindling white population seems to want or demand one. Pat Buchanan, after three presidential campaigns in which he avoided even indirect racial appeals, has decided that nothing can be done to save the life of the white West. Ross Perot has vanished and never showed any sign of dealing with any racial issue, directly or not. David Duke has retired to self-imposed exile in Russia. The National Alliance's William Pierce is dead. Wilmot Robertson has ceased publishing his racially forthright journal *Instauration*. There is the Council of Conservative Citizens, a growing grassroots organization of racially conscious activists, and there are a few (generally low-subscription) periodicals that deal, more or less gingerly, with race-related issues. But by and large racially conscious whites have little reason to celebrate substantial progress.

To all appearances, then, *American Renaissance* is something of an evolutionary relict, rather like the platypus or the coelacanth. Its continued existence seems not to betoken the arrival of a triumphant new species or some sudden leap forward on the evolutionary ladder but rather a surviving curiosity of natural history, a living fossil that should have vanished long ago but which somehow managed to persist in the strange, deep waters of a primitive ocean. Certainly that is the most charitable view of AR that its enemies on the left like to take.

But it is not an accurate view. What attracted me to Jared Taylor and AR is what seems to attract most of their other readers—not that AR is the last, quaint

Continued on page 3



Letters from Readers

Sir — I enjoyed reading Jared Taylor's reflections in the November issue on publishing AR for the past twelve years. I was especially pleased to learn that he is received more warmly on radio talk shows. As a resident of one of the most liberal cities in America, I almost never hear a white person publicly offer an opinion that deviates from the PC standard on race. The fact that Mr. Taylor receives more calls from supporters is very encouraging.

However it would be nice if that support were translated into action, particularly on immigration. I agree with Mr. Taylor that "immigration is the greatest worldwide threat to our race." I see poll after poll showing that most Americans strongly oppose current immigration levels, yet both major parties seem to want to let in as many immigrants as possible. As we saw on Sept. 11, and most recently in the case of the DC sniper, there are many in this "nation of immigrants" who wish to harm us.

In the Sept. issue, George Halstead outlined three strategies for sending messages to politicians. He should have added a fourth: We need an umbrella organization to bring together all the elements of our movement. After all, if we don't hang together, we will hang separately. Organization and involvement are the only solutions. That's how the anti-white left took over my hometown.

J. Smith, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Sir — Congratulations on your twelfth anniversary and your fight for truth before dogma. One important aspect of the work of American Renais-

sance is keeping the truth alive for those of us who live in Europe and do not enjoy your First Amendment rights. I doubt whether your magazine would have escaped the attentions of the thought police in England during the past twelve years, whilst were yours a publication from the European mainland the likelihood is that the editor would be languishing in prison. We are often reminded that in any discussion of race, "The truth is no defense."

I have long taken the view that your Revolution was merely a progression on the views of our philosophers John Locke and David Hume. Sadly, we in the home country remain subjects rather than citizens. For example, opinion polls show that on both sides of the Atlantic 75 to 80 percent of the public favor capital punishment for brutal murder. In your country even arch-liberals like William Clinton cannot gainsay your wishes, whilst our politicians ignore us in the interest of what they see as humanity. Keep firing on all cylinders.

John Atkinson, England

Sir — When I read the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Taylor's reflections on 12 years of AR I felt as though a great weight had been lifted from my shoulders. It really *does* make no difference what our chances of success may be. Whether we will one day regain our pride as a race or whether we are destined to disappear from history, it does not change our duty or our calling. Racial consciousness and commitment are simply central to *what we are*. Provided we do our best for our people, we can face the future calmly, confident that we have done what faith and loyalty require.

Susan Cort, Birmingham, England

Sir — Thank you for continuing to provide updates on the Wichita Massacre trial. I don't watch cable TV or own a computer, and my local fishwrap never printed word one about this story. If not for AR, I would never have heard of it. I hope those swine fry.

Ken Baker, Martinsburg, W.V.

Sir — America is no longer a nation. We are now a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural country. One possible solution is local pluralism. Pluralism would allow semi-autonomous ethnic communities, such as neighborhoods, developments, villages, suburbs, businesses, and universities to preserve ethnic identity, and practice and develop their cultures. People would simply declare themselves an ethnic community, and those who don't fit in would move off. Integration and assimilation are thus avoided.

While all areas outside the ethnic communities would be open to integration, the important thing is that when people came home from downtown, work, or wherever, it would be to a place where people look alike, speak alike, have the same customs and traditions, have their own schools, stores and media, and live in comfort and security among their own—a homeland once again.

Herbert Metz, North Palm Beach, Fla.
(www.americanpluralismsociety.org)

Sir — So it now turns out (AR, Nov. 2002) that Franz Boas was a fraud. Steven Gould was a fitting disciple. I see. It's about time those fakes were exposed after all the damage they did.

News of this kind is important for two reasons. First, it discredits the lefties who have based their foolish policies on environmentalist rubbish. But just as important, it is a warning to anyone else who might try the same tricks. Beware! Frauds will be exposed.

In fact, fraud is harder than ever to get away with because most social scientists recognize a certain principle, even if they do not endorse it publicly. It is that race and sex differences in outcomes are extremely durable. Anyone who claims to have dramatically narrowed the gaps will face a great deal of professional skepticism. Now, what we need is for policy-makers finally to recover from the 1960s.

Arthur Black, Mobile, Ala.



American Renaissance

Jared Taylor, Editor
Stephen Webster, Assistant Editor
James P. Lubinskas, Contributing Editor
George McDaniel, Web Page Editor

American Renaissance is published monthly by the New Century Foundation. NCF is governed by section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; contributions to it are tax deductible.

Subscriptions to American Renaissance are \$24.00 per year. First-class postage is an additional \$8.00. Subscriptions to Canada (first class) are \$36.00. Subscriptions outside Canada and the U.S. (air mail) are \$40.00. Back issues are \$3.00 each. Foreign subscribers should send U.S. dollars or equivalent in convertible bank notes.

Please make checks payable to: American Renaissance, P.O. Box 527, Oakton, VA 22124. ISSN No. 1086-9905, Telephone: (703) 716-0900, Facsimile: (703) 716-0932, Web Page Address: www.AmRen.com Electronic Mail: AmRen@amren.com

Continued from page 1

representative of a dying breed gnashing its fangs at a world that has passed it by but that it is in fact the harbinger of a new breed. The left senses this truth about AR (and for that matter about the CofCC) when it tells us that such publications and groups are “Klansmen in coats and ties” or “more dangerous” than Timothy McVeigh. Both have succeeded in learning how to discuss, and in teaching others how to discuss, the scientific, social, and political realities of race without reliance on the old rhetoric of what was called “white supremacy” and “hate.” The older rhetoric may have been appropriate for its time, but just as conservatives in the post-World War II era of the 1950s needed to adopt a new rhetoric in place of that of the political right of the pre-Depression and pre-World War II era, so racially conscious whites today need to learn a new rhetoric about race. In so far as *American Renaissance* has accomplished any significant achievement, it is that it has begun to develop and disseminate just such a rhetoric, and it is largely the absence of such a rhetoric in American political culture that makes white racial consciousness so weak.

The older rhetoric of race among racially conscious whites assumed that the political and cultural dominance of whites was secure or at least intact, and that non-white racial consciousness was weak, non-existent, and not a serious political or cultural force. Hence, the older rhetoric could rely on a broad base of agreement among whites—about such matters as the importance and meaning of the U.S. Constitution, the danger of communism, the heroic stature of such figures as Washington and

Jefferson, and a whole universe of assumptions about human nature, human society, science, religion, ethics, and cultural values—assumptions that can no longer be taken for granted. So secure was this cultural consensus among almost all whites that racial consciousness really did not need to appeal to race itself very much or very directly. Today, that shared cultural (and political) fab-



Rhodesian Selous Scout. Was he fighting for his race and civilization or was he fighting communism?

ric is in tatters, and appeals wrapped in it no longer work.

To give an example, I recall in 1978 an occasion when Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith spoke to an audience of congressional staffers in Washington. Talking about the black terrorists led by Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe who then threatened his country, Mr. Smith kept saying to the mainly white audience that the terrorists were “commu-

nists” or “Marxists”—and so they were (at least they mouthed the slogans of Marxism and took weapons from the Soviet and Chinese communists). But using what was by 1978 a Cold War anti-communist rhetoric simply didn’t persuade anyone in Washington anymore except the most right-wing staffers and congressmen, most of whom (even then) regarded “white supremacy” or South African “apartheid” as far more evil and dangerous (or at least as more politically explosive) than communism.

Much the same kind of implausible rhetoric was common among Southern Democrats (and non-Southern conservatives generally) who opposed desegregation in the 1950s and ’60s. Almost all of them appealed to the Constitution, to states’ rights, and to the alleged communist or philo-communist tendencies of the “civil rights movement” and its leaders (much of which was factually correct). In the 1950s and ’60s such rhetoric worked, in the sense that most white Southerners and many white Northerners accepted its premises—if the “civil rights movement” really was influenced by Reds and if what it was demanding really was unconstitutional, then desegregation could wait. By the late 1960s, in large part due to the political and propaganda successes of the “civil rights movement” and its allies and the New Left, such rhetoric no longer worked.

Both Ian Smith and the Southerners might have argued that the civilization that existed in Rhodesia and the American South was unique to whites, that there was no evidence blacks are capable of either creating or sustaining it, that there was considerable evidence, scientific and historical, that they could not, and that “majority rule” in Rhodesia and “integration” in the South was likely to lead to the destruction or serious impairment of the civilization and to physical danger for whites. Even if such arguments had been no more successful in the 1950s or ’60s than those that were actually offered, those who offered them would today at least be able to say that they had been correct. Much of the urban South, at least, has been destroyed by racial integration, and whites in “Zimbabwe” are facing utter economic dispossession and actual genocide by their new black masters. Meanwhile, the communist threat has largely vanished, and the U.S. Constitution is increasingly irrelevant.

More recently, a similar development has occurred with immigration. Not too long ago, an effective argument against immigration was that so many immigrants from such different cultural backgrounds in so short a time would not assimilate to American culture and would “Balkanize” the country. The pro-immigration response was always that the immigrants would assimilate, and various facts (or non-facts) were dredged up to bolster that claim. Today, neo-conservatives still give much the same argument, claiming that the immigrants are all on the path to college educations and middle-class affluence, will become doctors or lawyers or software engineers, and vote Republican. Liberals have long since dropped any such claims, and now generally admit that the

The rhetoric of American Renaissance in a sense does the opposite of what the older racial rhetoric tried to do.

immigrants are not assimilating. They argue that it would be “racist” to insist that they assimilate, and even glory in the “diversity” that mass immigration is importing into our dull and drab civilization. As the perceived legitimacy of the concept of “assimilation” and the very notion of a culturally unified nation dwindles, so does the effectiveness of a rhetoric appealing to it.

What is happening or has happened in almost all these instances is that the common cultural and political framework that enabled racially conscious whites to deflect non-white drives for power has eroded or vanished entirely. Its erosion has come about in large part because of its deliberate subversion by its enemies (not always for racial purposes), while at the same time the emergence of explicitly non-white racial consciousness and the political unity this subversion generates has rendered appeals to traditional white values and institutions ineffective. When blacks themselves regard Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and even Abraham Lincoln as well as all other early American icons as mere bigots, slaveholders, and white supremacists, when they dismiss the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as fraudulent documents that merely empowered racial oppres-

sion, then political dialogue and a shared political culture cease to be possible—unless whites themselves give up these icons as well, which is what seems to be happening. Those who seek to resist or defeat the non-white quest for power have no prospect of success if they appeal to a Constitution that non-whites respect only in so far as it can be exploited for their own purposes. What is happening, in other words, is that all the social, cultural, political, legal, and constitutional (as well as religious, moral, etc.) integument of the white race has been stripped away—delegitimized or “deconstructed.” What remains, of course, is the bare biological reality: race.

For the most part the older rhetoric of “white supremacy” and what was called “hate” never talked about race at all—at least not seriously. It talked about the Constitution, communism, the common cultural framework that most Americans, white and black, Southern and Northern, shared. When it did talk about “race,” the result was often simply a pathetic litany of clichés, racial horror stories, often pseudo-science mixed in with a certain amount of fundamentalist (or pagan) religion, and outright drivel laced with plenty of racial epithets and insults. Not a few racially conscious whites seemed to do and say virtually everything to confirm the claim of their enemies that they really were filled with hatred and engulfed in ignorance. Some—skinheads, “neo-Nazis,” etc.—still do; for them, making themselves as repellent as possible and inciting fear and disgust rather than doing something constructive on behalf of their own race seems to be their chief purpose.

Anyone familiar with *American Renaissance* knows that, whatever its flaws (Jared can tell you I am the world’s greatest expert on its flaws), it avoids this kind of rhetoric entirely. Not only does AR avoid it, neither the publication nor Jared Taylor himself nor anyone who has ever written for it that I know of even has any disposition to use such rhetoric. Nor does AR appeal to states’ rights, the Constitution, or traditional segregationist practices. The rhetoric it has developed is the rhetoric of race itself, of what should be called “racial realism.”

This rhetoric, in the first place, is grounded in a fairly careful scientific view of race—that race is indeed a natu-

ral reality and not just a “social construct,” that it includes not only gross morphological and physiological features but also affects IQ, personality, and behavior, and therefore that race is a socially and historically significant force. More than any other publication in the English-speaking world, AR has actually tried to explain and popularize the earth-shaking discoveries about race by major scientists and thinkers like Arthur Jensen, Philippe Rushton, Michael Levin, Richard Lynn, the late Glayde Whitney, and many others. Similarly, the AR rhetoric of race also makes



Father of his country or wicked white man?

fairly sophisticated use of statistics to support claims about differences in racial achievement and behavior (education, crime, etc.).

But perhaps most significantly, the rhetoric of *American Renaissance* in a sense does the opposite of what the older rhetoric tried to do. Whereas the older rhetoric tried to defend the race in terms of the culture (e.g., desegregation should be opposed because it is unconstitutional, “communistic,” “un-Christian,” or “un-American”), the new racial rhetoric of AR defends the culture in terms of the race (e.g., the Constitution itself, as well the culture and nation, are important achievements of the white race; no other race has created anything similar to them, and there is no prospect of any other race creating them or adapting to them; similar ideas about the racial foundations of white science, religion, and other cultural achievements are common in AR). The meaning of this rhetoric is that in so far as white Americans still care about their culture—the Constitution, religion, science, art, language, literature, aesthetics, social in-

stitutions, and morals—they must care about the race that created them and sustains them and without which they cannot exist. It does not, as far as I can recall, argue that race by itself is sufficient to create and sustain our civilization, but it does insist, clearly and unequivocally, that race is necessary.

Certainly AR is not the only racially conscious publication ever to make such arguments, but it has made them perhaps more consistently, more deeply, and more responsibly than almost any other. And, finally, AR has developed this new rhetoric of race in an entirely civil and indeed humane way, never advocating at any point in its history the

denial of the legitimate rights or humanity of any racial group but always firmly insisting on the rights, dignity, and accomplishments of the white race, on the centrality of the white race to the past and future of the American nation and the Western world, and on the dangers that our race faces from non-white and anti-white inundation, from virulent anti-white ideologies and movements, and from the guilt, fear, greed, corruption, and short-sightedness that today afflict whites themselves and especially their leadership class.

The extent to which *American Renaissance* has succeeded in spreading

this new rhetoric of racial realism to other whites and in igniting and developing a more mature racial consciousness among whites is perhaps less important than the mere fact that the new rhetoric and the consciousness it seeks to communicate and build have begun at all. Sooner or later, regardless of the limitations that restrict the circulation and influence of *American Renaissance*, that new rhetoric and consciousness will spread, through means currently beyond the reach of this newsletter—or else whites and the collective achievement they created that we still call “Western civilization” will disappear. **Ω**

The Global Bell Curve

Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen, *IQ and the Wealth of Nations*, Praeger Publishers
2002, 298 pp., \$64.95.

Uncommon sense on wealth and poverty.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

Why are some countries rich and others poor? Why are some pleasant and well-run while others are pestholes? This question has attracted attention since at least the mid-18th century, when Montesquieu noted in *De L'Esprit des Lois* that rich countries were in the temperate zones and poor countries were in the tropics.

In earlier times it was common for the people of better-favored nations to assume that if a country was poor it was because its inhabitants were inferior. Mid-way through the 20th century, straightforward thinking of this kind fell out of fashion, in favor of complicated economic and even psychological theories of development. *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* marks a return to a simpler, more realistic view: that populations differ in average mental ability, and economic achievement reflects these abilities.

Both authors of this important study are well known to AR. Richard Lynn, Emeritus Professor of Psychology of the University of Ulster, Northern Ireland, has written several books reviewed in AR, including *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations* (April 1997) and *Eugenics: A Reassessment* (November 2001). He has also written for AR, most recently a summary

of his innovative work on racial differences in tendency towards psychopathic personality (July 2002). Tatu Vanhanen is Emeritus Docent of Political Science of the University of Helsinki, Finland. His remarkable book, *Ethnic Conflicts Explained by Ethnic Nepotism*, was reviewed in the June 2002 issue. Both authors are unconstrained by racial taboos, and are therefore able to offer a convincing explanation for national wealth differences.

Previous theories have assumed that all populations are equally intelligent

Previous theories have assumed that all populations are equally intelligent and hard-working, and that it was only a matter of time before all countries grew rich.

and hard-working, and that it was only a matter of time before all countries grew rich. According to “convergence theory,” for example, poor countries needed only to copy the achievements of the West. Since they would not have to bother with the uncertain work of innovation they would soon catch up.

For a long time, Marxists argued that capitalism could enrich some countries only by impoverishing others. The authors quote from a book, *Development and Underdevelopment*, published as recently as 1998: “[T]he gap between

rich and poor ultimately will disappear, but only when the capitalist world system that has been in place since the sixteenth century itself disappears.” Some anti-capitalists endorsed the absurd view that poor countries could develop only by completely cutting themselves off from world trade and world markets.

There have also been theories about the influence of “culture.” Lucky whites got a good one, while blacks got a bad one. The culture argument has proven to be admirably adaptable. Back in the 1950s, when China, Korea, and Taiwan were poor, it was fashionable to blame the stifling effects of Confucianism. Now that these countries are growing rich, it is fashionable to credit the discipline and orderliness of—Confucianism. Some people have also proposed that hot weather slows people down and prevents development, but this theory doesn’t explain why Chinese have been so successful in Singapore and how whites managed to build an industrial economy in South Africa.

One of the better theories of development was that government intervention was the problem, and that free markets would drag the poor out of poverty. Communism proved that regulation hobbles development, but in the poorest countries, what passed for government had no power to regulate anything. Markets were free, but the people were still poor.

In the 1960s and 1970s, newly independent Third-World countries were going to be laboratories for all these