

# Reflections on the Raceless Fantasy of David Reich<sup>1</sup> and the Obvious and Not so Obvious Implications of Defining Race as a Social and Political Construct

© Frank Ellis 2026 All Rights Reserved

*Race, as is now widely acknowledged, is a social and political construct, not a biological or genetic fact. It cannot be used scientifically to account for the wide range of differences among peoples*

Bhikhu Parekh<sup>2</sup>

*Race, the idea that the human species is divided into distinct groups on the basis of inherited physical and behavioural differences. Genetic studies in the late 20th century refuted the existence of biogenetically distinct races, and scholars now argue that “races” are cultural interventions reflecting specific attitudes and beliefs that were imposed on different populations in the wake of western European conquests beginning in the 15th century*

Yasuko I. Takezawa & Pete Wade<sup>3</sup>

*The fuzziness of racial definitions does not negate their utility.*

J. Philippe Rushton and Arthur R. Jensen<sup>4</sup>

*The paradox of the situation is more or less as follows. No sooner had it vindicated itself in the struggle against the diktats of Soviet Lysenkoism, than Russian anthropology now found itself forced to contend with Western-liberal Lysenkoism, mainly in American population genetics, which has also declared that there are no races.*

Vladimir Avdeev<sup>5</sup>

## I. Introduction

## II. Stalinism and the Ideology of Race

## III. Definitions of Race

---

<sup>1</sup> David Reich, *Ancient DNA and The New Science of the Human Past: Who we are and How we got here* (2018), Paperback, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2019

<sup>2</sup> Bhikhu Parekh, *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, Profile Books, London, 2000, p.63

<sup>3</sup> This entry was accompanied by the following: ‘Written by Yasuko I. Takezawa, Peter Wade. All fact-checked by the Editors of *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Last updated: Feb 14, 2025’ (accessed online, 12th March 2025)

<sup>4</sup> J. Philippe Rushton and Arthur R. Jensen ‘Thirty Years of Research on Race Differences in Cognitive Ability’, *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, vol. 11., № 2, 2005, p.237

<sup>5</sup> Vladimir Avdeev, *Rasologiya: Nauka o nasledstvennykh kachestvakh liudei (The Study of Race: The Science of Inherited Human Features)*, Belye al’vy, second edition, Moscow, 2007, p.424

- IV. The Ideology - not the Biology - of Race in the West and some Implications of Race as a Social and Political Construct**
- V. The Genocidal Implications of Race as a Social and Political Construct**
- VI. Race as a Social and Political Construct is entirely Subjective**
- VII. Affirmative Action and Race as a Social and Political Construct**
- VIII. Slaughter, Proto-Genocide and Dispossession as Evolutionary Prime Movers**
- IX. To Run with the Hare and Hunt with the Hounds**
- X. More Contradictions and Confusion**
- XI. Selection Pressures for Higher Intelligence**
- XII. Dire Warnings from Reich**
- XIII. No Rest for the Reichous**
- XIV. The Ideology of Race as a Social and Political Construct and the Implications for Space Travel and Space Exploration**
- XV. Race and Nationalism**
- XVI. Censorship of DNA Research (and Double Standards)**
- XVII. Race as a Social and Political Construct: A View from Germany's Left (Sahra Wagenknecht)**
- XVIII. The UK Equality Act (2010): The Continuing Application of Race as a Social and Political Construct by Obfuscation and Subterfuge**
- XIX. Future Trends: Pharmacological Interventions and Psychiatric Measures to Compel Acceptance of Aliens and Diversity (the National-Socialist and Soviet Legacies)**
- XX. Conclusion**

## **I. Introduction**

In a book that was first published in 2018, *Ancient DNA and The New Science of the Human Past: Who we are and How we got here*, Professor David Reich summarises and explains the astonishing discoveries being made by the study of ancestral DNA. The book is utterly compelling, a tribute, for the most part, to serious and pioneering science. I hope that Reich and his collaborators in universities and research institutes across the world get their Nobel Prize: they deserve it.

Unfortunately, Reich's book is blighted by a series of fatal contradictions. Having cited his own work and that of others that remove all doubt about the overwhelming role of genes, biology and evolution in the shaping of race and racial differences, many of which are easily observable, and do not require access to well equipped laboratories, Reich cannot bring himself explicitly to acknowledge that the assertion - race is a social and political construct - is an ideological obstacle that should suffer the same fate as the Berlin Wall. There are times in this book when one senses that Reich might just submit to the obvious conclusions of his work and unapologetically defect to the open truth but the chains that bind his mind, along with the fear of being ostracised and damned as a heretic, are, for the time being, too powerful.

Throughout his book Reich maintains that ancestral DNA studies amount to a revolution. Ancestral DNA undoubtedly compels us to re-evaluate what we thought we knew about the origins of modern human beings but since the analysis of the new data relies on the long-established and reliable methods of inductive and deductive reasoning, evidence and hypothesis testing, methods which have repeatedly demonstrated their worth, any drastic change which might merit the use of 'revolution' and 'revolutionary' is more applicable to

the physical tools of research (described by Reich in detail) rather than to the fundamental intellectual tools used to evaluate the new data revealed by these tools.

Here, too, we encounter another ideological position, derived from the same laboratory of horrors which instructed us that ‘race is a social and political construct’; specifically that ‘logic’, ‘evidence’, ‘numeracy’ and ‘abstract reasoning’ are the products of ‘white racism’ and ‘white skin privilege’; that they are tools of enslavement and imperialism. So, the traditional methods of scientific inquiry adopted by Reich and his colleagues to analyse the data not only acknowledge their intellectual debt to those before them but also amount to a clear rejection of one of the many anti-intellectual cults which pervade American universities and its educational system.

Further, the tools used by Reich to reveal the data are themselves the end product of human intellectual evolution, a journey which started with an early *Homo* making a spear point or discovering and mastering fire. What Reich offers us is not a ‘revolution’, but rather a refinement, a recalibration of earlier arguments and the work of his predecessors, ancient and more recent, without which, even those whose insights can now be shown to be erroneous, made possible Reich’s insights. If a particular line of research turns out to be a cul-de-sac that is useful. Time spent in reconnaissance is never wasted, an idea to which I shall return later.

## II. Stalinism and the Ideology of Race

The ideologically correct line that race is a social and political construct was first aggressively asserted in the Soviet Union, at a time when the Soviet state entered its Stalinist phase in 1929, and sought to create the new Soviet man, *Homo sovieticus* by ideological means. Up until the early 1930s the emphasis on genes and evolution among Soviet anthropologists and geneticists remained broadly in line with their Western colleagues, but by the end of the decade extreme environmentalism had been imposed.

The new course to be adopted by Soviet anthropologists was set out, among others, by Arkadii Isaakovich Iarko in 1934. Emphasis on archaeology, linguistics and ethnography was condemned as ‘bourgeois’ and ‘idealistic’. To quote Iarko:

The struggle against racial theories requires the existence of completely defined tactics and strategy. Only on the condition that we counter the theses of racism will we be able to advance the concept of historical materialism and only if we transfer the focal point of our criticism from the context of biology to one of sociology will our criticism be effective.<sup>6</sup>

Environment and culture were now decreed supreme, and any acceptance of the role of genes, biology and evolution was condemned as ‘reactionary’, ‘fascism’ or evidence of ‘racism’.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiia*, p.420

<sup>7</sup> Avdeev points out that the term ‘racism’ first appeared in France in 1932 and was intended to be a negative assessment of any research interest in racial differences. ‘From 1945’, notes Avdeev, ‘in the aftermath of the collapse of the Third Reich this word started to be used throughout the world far more aggressively in order to denounce, and to impute malign purposes to, any person able to determine the species of man using those processes used to differentiate between dogs and cats’, *Rasologiia*, p.138

Soviet geneticists and biologists were now expected to believe, or not to dissent from, the claim that plants, animals and human beings could be changed, modified and improved without the operation of natural selection. Enormous ideological and psychological pressure - with barely concealed threats of arrest for non-conformists - was brought to bear on prominent geneticists and anthropologists. The fate of the geneticist, Nikolai Vavilov, who perished in an NKVD prison, is well known. Less well known in the West is what happened to Viktor Bunak. Under pressure, Bunak, in a Galileo moment, disavowed his own work, stating that race was ‘an abstract concept’<sup>8</sup> and further that ‘race is not an absolute category, but a historical category, a certain stage in development. Every epoch has its races in their concrete manifestation’.<sup>9</sup>

Race as a ‘historical category’, something which, according to Bunak, is epoch-specific, means that in any historical period the meaning of race is to be interpreted socially, politically and, above all, ideologically (Marxism-Leninism). As I demonstrate below this has consequences for contemporary claims that race is a social and political construct. Critical to the new meaning of race is that it is located in an evolution-free and gene-free zone.

Others chimed in whether from fear or conviction. N. A. Bobrinskii wrote that in biology ‘appearance does not really exist’, that ‘a scheme, a certain type of individual merely exists in our imagination’.<sup>10</sup> M. A. Gremiatskii asserted that ‘racial categorization is, it goes without saying, a matter of convention’<sup>11</sup>, so anticipating by fifty years provocative claims made by Jared Diamond in 1994, when Diamond would have us believe that race was based on arbitrary criteria which could be changed and adapted to suit our personal wishes. Diamond’s claims were roughly handled - ‘deconstructed’ - and convincingly dismissed by Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele in *RACE: The Reality of Human Differences* (2004).<sup>12</sup>

Two additional considerations follow, however, from the Sarich and Miele analysis. The first consideration is prompted by John R. Baker in *Race* (1974). In *Race*, Baker notes the presence of various goats, sheep, boar, cattle, pigs and fowl in Africa, and identifies *races* of elephants as well.<sup>13</sup> The definition and classification of goats et al is based on biology and genes not any zoological version of social and political construction.<sup>14</sup> And if Reich accepts that species of goats and apes are defined and differentiated by biological and genetic criteria, there can

---

<sup>8</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiia*, p.421

<sup>9</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiia*, p.421

<sup>10</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiia*, p.421

<sup>11</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiia*, p.421

<sup>12</sup> Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele in *RACE: The Reality of Human Differences* (2004), Westview, Colorado and Oxford, 2005, pp.163-166

<sup>13</sup> John R. Baker, *Race*, Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1974, p.376

<sup>14</sup> The g factor is not confined to human beings. It has been demonstrated experimentally that animals - dogs, chickens and chimpanzees - reveal marked differences in their ability to solve problems. See Arthur R. Jensen, *Straight Talk About Mental Tests*, The Free Press, New York, 1981, pp.68-70 and Stanley Coren, *The Intelligence of Dogs: A Guide to th Thoughts, Emotions, and Inner Lives of Our Canine Companions*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 2006. I have spent many hours observing Carrion Crows (*Corvus corone*), Magpies (*Pica pica*), Hooded Crows (*Corvus corone cornix*) and Ravens (*Corvus corax*). Their reputation for intelligence is well deserved, especially that of the Raven.

be no place for his tacit acceptance, or at the very least, something not expressly rejected, that differences between blacks and whites are socially and politically constructed and independent of genes and evolution.

The second consideration arises as follows. If the racial classification of human beings is purely a matter of ‘convention’ (Gremiatskii) or ‘arbitrary’ (Diamond) and humans themselves can select the race with which they wish to identify at any given time - and change it to suit any perceived advantage at any given moment - then this must mean that genes and evolution no longer shape human beings either because they have liberated themselves from, or been liberated from, the constraints of genes and evolution.

In a generally compelling and absorbing book, *How Language Began: The Story of Humanity’s Greatest Invention* (2017), Daniel Everett, who conspicuously avoids any discussion of race and racial differences in the evolution of language and language competence, insists that mankind has left biology, genes and evolution behind: ‘Culture not only is the key to improving the species and the survivability of all, but also has liberated us from the strictly biological’.<sup>15</sup>

The flaw in Everett’s claim stems from the undefined threshold and unexplained distinction he makes between ‘strictly biological’ and ‘biological’. In the absence of any explanation of where the threshold between ‘strictly biological’ and ‘biological’ is located, and when it was crossed, Everett adds nothing to understanding the origins of human beings. When exactly in the last 50,000 years did culture liberate mankind from the ‘strictly biological’? Has natural selection ceased? It is clear enough that Everett has thrown his lot in with the culture-supremacists, but retains ‘strictly biological’ as a backup plan.

If “diversity” actually worked and offered demonstrable and powerful evidence of its being the key to our survivability it would not need to be coercively imposed as a state ideology and sceptics would not be persecuted. Furthermore, most people want to enjoy a quality of life beyond mere ‘survivability’ which explains why Africans, among others, are invading Europe and are being allowed to invade Europe. Among the many cultures and communities that are all to be regarded as of equal worth - there are, after all, no privileged cultures - which specific culture is most likely to ensure our survival? Is it the one whose foundations were laid by dead white European men, favouring evidence, logic and science or one that favours reckless breeding, emotional feelgoodery and the cult (culture) of “diversity”? I wish the Yanomamö, Kalahari Bushmen and Andamanese islanders the very best, but these people will not solve our problems.

The consequences that arise from Everett’s claim of human liberation from biology also bedevil Reich’s analysis. If Reich accepts that the differences among apes and between apes and man are genetic and not socially and politically constructed, but that differences between blacks and whites are socially and politically constructed, then in the transition from apes to humans there must have been a moment or series of moments when genes, biology and evolution ceased to affect humans, and social and political factors replaced biology. Humans would now exist in an evolution-free zone. When did this remarkable development occur? How did *Homo s. sapiens* begin and complete the transition from a world in which he was subjected to evolution and natural selection to a world in which he alone was now able to determine his race

---

<sup>15</sup> Daniel Everett, *How Language Began: The Story of Humanity’s Greatest Invention*, Profile Books, London, 2017, p.120

- and these days his sex - and everything that went with race? Was this the moment when some divine being entered the fray, liberating *Homo s. sapiens* from evolution, genes and biology? Does the race-as-a-social-and-political construct mean the defeat of Darwin, the revenge of theocracy and the creationists? I wonder whether Richard Dawkins is aware of the implications. Less facetiously, Reich's finding 'that in the relatively recent past, human populations were just as different from each other as they are today'<sup>16</sup> confirms what was known. More importantly, if contemporary populations are 'just as different', then the evolutionary forces that created these contemporary, observable and measurable differences did not suddenly cease to function and race cannot be socially and politically constructed. If Reich's book is the story of the *human* past then this excludes race as a social and a political construct in that story: evolution, biology and genes still rule; they make us *human*.

Soviet ideology in the 1930s prepares the ground for Lewontin and Gould. In *Marks i burzhuzaznyi istorizm (Marx and Bourgeois Historicism, 1933)* Soviet philosopher, V. F. Asmus, stated that 'biologism and historicism are incompatible'<sup>17</sup> and in 'Against Ideological Trends in the Study of Race in the USSR', A. I. Iarkho went so far as to claim that human beings were characterised by 'the loss of any specific (racial) instinct'.<sup>18</sup> To these insights Iarkho now claimed that:

The entire history of the species "homo" is an example of the "removal", the elimination of any conformity with the laws of biology. New creations inevitably "remove" the reality of race as a biological force. The productive relations which arise in the process of our becoming human "remove" the reality of race as such.<sup>19</sup>

Iarkho then removed all doubt about the Stalinist direction to be taken by Soviet anthropology in the 1930s:

Soviet racial science is confronted with major tasks. At the present time the first and main task is to expose any attempts whatsoever to apply the laws of biology to society and to uncover the falsehood of socio-anthropological and other imperialist racial theories, and, finally, to create a Marxist theory of the origin of races in the struggle against polygenesis.<sup>20</sup>

To be kept in mind is that the extreme ideological pressure being applied to Soviet scientists to demonstrate their loyalty to the Stalin regime in the 1930s and 1940s was a matter of life and death. In the 1930s, the Soviet Union is defined by the genocide in Ukraine (Holodomor),

---

<sup>16</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.xxviii

<sup>17</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiya*, p.421

<sup>18</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiya*, p.421

<sup>19</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiya*, p.422

<sup>20</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiya*, pp.422-423. Some idea of the break with traditional anthropology and the campaign to discredit biology, genes and evolution is evident from the titles of Soviet publications of the period: A. A. Shiik, *Rasovaia problema i marksizm (The Race Problem and Marxism, 1930)*; G. I. Petrov, *Rasovaia teoriia na sluzhbe u fashizma (Racial Theory working for Fascism, 1934)*; G. A. Shmidt, *Pravda o rasakh i rasizme (The Truth about Races and Races, 1941)*; V. A. Vasilenko, *Rasovye bredni fashistskikh banditov (The Racial Ravings of the German Bandits, 1942)*; and M. A. Moskalev, *Rasovaia Izhenuka fashistskikh razboinikov (The False Racial Science of the Fascist Robbers, 1942)*.

industrialization and the Great Terror (*Ezhovshchina*) in which Stalin sought to destroy all real or imagined opposition to his rule. The second half of the 1930s was a time of mass arrests, mass executions and deportations. Soviet scientists who succumbed to the ideological and physical violence deployed against them publicly to approve lies and nonsense could plead mitigating circumstances. By contrast, well remunerated and tenured faculty in American universities and research institutes who wilfully disseminate lies, who stay silent when colleagues are attacked and vilified for stating the truth or something much closer to it than is acceptable to the cliques that control their institutions, are guilty of appalling cowardice.

### III. Definitions of Race

Over the last eighty years, even longer if we consider the Soviet experience, the vitriolic attacks directed against anthropologists, IQ-researchers and geneticists who accept that there is such a thing as race (and races and sub-races) have taken as their starting point the ideological assumption that there is no such thing as a pure or discrete race and that, therefore, any attempt to examine race and race differences is not being pursued for reasons of scientific interest but for malign purposes, variously cited as ‘racism’, some version of ‘fascism’ or ‘white supremacy’. Plato, who in *The Republic*, envisaged a state divided along strict lines of ability and caste competence, is frequently cited as the chief propagandist and source of the drive to achieve racial discreteness and purity, which, it is claimed, nurtures ‘white supremacy’.

Throughout his book Reich goes to great lengths to disabuse the reader of any kind of racial purity, and that any assertion of, or striving for, purity on the part of whites is especially abominable. Reich claims that his research is fatal to any concept of racial purity:

By demonstrating that the genetic fault lines in West Eurasia between ten thousand and four thousand years ago were entirely different from today’s, the ancient DNA revolution has shown that today’s classifications do not reflect fundamental “pure” units of biology. Instead, today’s divisions are recent phenomena, with their origin in repeating mixtures and migrations. The findings of the ancient DNA revolution suggest that the mixtures will continue. Mixture is fundamental to who we are, and we need to embrace it, not deny that it occurred.<sup>21</sup>

There are enough straw men here to build a giant haystack. Reich states that the ‘ancient DNA revolution has shown that today’s classifications do not reflect fundamental ‘pure’ units of biology’. To begin with, it would be useful to have some names: who are the scholars that maintain that these ‘pure’ units exist? Arthur Jensen and Vincent Sarich, for example, have made it very clear that race as a classification category is akin to a fuzzy set, and the Jensen definition of race is clearly based on that principle. In order to provide a definition of race (not ‘race’) it matters not that ‘today’s divisions are recent phenomena, with their origin in repeating mixtures and migrations’.

Haunted by ‘immutable categories’, Reich once again tries to slay this *bête blanche*:

---

<sup>21</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.97

As recently as 2012, it still seemed reasonable to interpret human genetic data as pointing to immutable categories such as “East Asians”, “Caucasians”, “West Africans”, “Native Americans”, and “Australasians”, with each group having been separated and unmixed for tens of thousands of years .<sup>22</sup>

There are a number of objections here. Firstly, another species of straw man lurks in the undergrowth. Who exactly are the people that claim that these are ‘immutable categories’? Reich notes that scholars in the eighteenth century recognised the ‘physical similarity of West Eurasian populations’.<sup>23</sup> Classification is not based on immutability; classification is always subject to amendment. Reich himself notes that ‘the peoples of West Eurasia - the vast region spanning Europe, the Near East, and much of Central Asia - are genetically highly similar’.<sup>24</sup> There may be no ‘immutable categories’ but Reich’s words, ‘genetically highly similar’ clearly imply a high level of purity. Granted that the new technology for extracting whole genome data that emerged in the 2000s provided ‘a more powerful way to cluster present-day human populations [races?] than physical features’, but the new data do not invalidate the classifications of eighteenth-century scholars, they merely refine these earlier classifications. The discoveries of Kepler, Galileo and Newton were not rendered irrelevant or of mere historical interest by the later insights of Maxwell, Einstein, Schrödinger, Dirac, Heisenberg, Hawkins and Higgs.

These findings pose a problem for Reich, since, in his own words, ‘The whole-genome data at first seem to validate some of the old categories’.<sup>25</sup> He then confirms that applying the standard method to measure genetic similarity reveals the opposite of what he implies with the use of ‘seem’:

Measured in this way, populations within West Eurasia are typically around seven times more similar to one another than West Eurasians are to East Asians. When frequencies of mutations are plotted on a map, West Eurasia appears homogenous, from the Atlantic façade of Europe to the steppes of central Asia. There is a sharp gradient of change in central Asia before another region of homogeneity is reached in East Asia.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.259. Reich refers to a study conducted by Marc Feldman and colleagues. Feldman et al, having analyzed 377 variable positions in the genome, were able ‘to group most people in a worldwide population sample into clusters that correlate strongly to popular categories of race in the United States: “African”, “European”, “East Asian”, “Oceanian”, or “Native American”’, Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.251. Significant for scientific reliability, Feldman et al had replicated the results of Cavalli-Sforza and colleagues noted by Reich in his introduction: ‘When they [Cavalli-Sforza et al] told their computer - which had no knowledge of the population labels - to cluster the individuals into five groups, the results corresponded uncannily well to commonly held intuitions about the deep ancestral divisions among humans (West Eurasians, East Asians, Native Americans, New Guineans, and Africans)’, Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.xviii

<sup>23</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.93

<sup>24</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.93

<sup>25</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.93, emphasis added

<sup>26</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.93

These data objectively validate ‘the old categories’ so there is no place for evasively subjective words such as ‘seem’ which are intended to cast doubt on Reich’s own findings because the findings are not to his liking.

Secondly, the various races that can easily be identified - Feldman’s work is additional confirmation but was not absolutely necessary - arose from evolution (natural selection) working on genetic variation. These processes, having led to today’s races and sub-races, did not suddenly cease to function with the emergence of the races and sub-races we see today. Any claim that today’s races and sub-races are, as Reich imputes to these unnamed researchers, ‘immutable categories’, means that he is accusing these people - whoever they are - of holding a position that has nothing in common with anything discovered by Darwin and Mendel. In other words, these people are, he implies, creationists. I am not aware that researchers and scholars in the fields of educational psychology and psychometrics (IQ), evolutionary biology and racial differences, such as Jensen et al, claim or have ever claimed or implied that evolutionary processes abruptly ceased with the emergence of Caucasoids, Negroids and Mongoloids and are, therefore, targets for claims by Reich that they are propagating the existence of ‘immutable categories’.

In the context of a book which deals with race and matters racial, Reich’s use of ‘population’ or ‘populations’, without any clarification that he is using ‘population’ and ‘populations’ in order to avoid having to use ‘race’ or ‘racial’, is deliberately ambiguous, and misleading. As a statistical concept population is inclusive and intended to include any subject that meets the criteria for inclusion. The person conducting the study decides the criteria (all purchasers of a particular brand of beer or all male residents over the age of 30 in a town). Contra Diamond, the criteria for racial classification are not within the gift of the person studying them. Criteria for inclusion in a particular race are exclusive. Were, however, Reich to admit that he uses ‘population’ or ‘populations’ in order to avoid the use of ‘race’ or ‘races’, he would merely be acknowledging his ideological biases and conceding that ‘race’ and ‘racial’ have not lost their efficacy.

The racial churning and mixing which occurs through conquest and populations interbreeding does not invalidate the notion of race. In *Educability and Group Differences* (1973), Arthur Jensen examined the meaning of race, providing the following explanation:

Biologically speaking, races are subdivisions of a species. In the human species, races are subpopulations characterized by a higher degree of *intra*breeding than *inter*breeding. The greater the geographic or racial isolation of the subpopulations, the higher is their degree of intra breeding and the lower is the degree of interbreeding. The more time that various subpopulations are isolated from each other, the more they will differ in the relative frequencies of genes for various characteristics, so that in many centuries of isolation sufficient differences in various gene frequencies accumulate as to make for pervasive and obvious differences in physical appearance. Social classes within a society are also breeding populations, although the degree of isolation and hence the ratio of intra breeding to interbreeding is much less than is the case for the major racial groups.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Arthur R. Jensen, *Educability and Group Differences*, Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1973, ‘Definitions of Race’, p.130 (pp.130-132), emphasis in the original.

In *The g Factor: The Science of Mental Ability* (1998) Jensen provides another forensic definition of race. I note in passing that there is no mention of Arthur Jensen in Reich's book, a truly staggering, insulting and deliberate omission. Gravity, reflecting telescope and calculus without Sir Isaac Newton? Jensen defines race thus:

That is to say, a race is one of a number of statistically distinguishable groups in which individual membership is not mutually exclusive by any single criterion, and individuals in a given group differ only statistically from one another and from the group's central tendency on each of the many imperfectly correlated genetically characteristics that distinguish between groups as such. The important point is that the *average* difference on all of these characteristics that differ among individuals *within* the group is less than the *average* difference *between* the groups on these genetic characteristics.<sup>28</sup>

What matters is that these divisions today can be identified and defined and that they are consistent with observations made outside of any laboratory. Today's Africans and Europeans do not cease to be Africans and Europeans, as defined, for example, by the application of Jensen's definition of race, merely because today's Africans and Europeans have 'their origin in repeating mixtures and migrations'. Reich states that 'Mixture is fundamental to who we are, and we need to embrace it, not deny that it occurred'. Agreed, but who, today, are these elusive 'mixture-deniers'? This might satisfy the advocates of mass legal and illegal immigration and the gene-biology-evolution deniers who claim that race is a social and political construct but it also clearly ignores the brutal fact in 2026 that there are no suitable areas of the world that are not populated; that millions and millions of Meso-Americans and Africans cannot be permitted to enter, to occupy, and in the future, to overwhelm states which in Europe have had biologically and genetically distinct populations for thousands of years and are quite rightly entitled in 2026 to regard *their* land as *theirs* and to protect this land from the consequence of multi-million waves of immigrant invaders. In the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami, the 'so not-of-our-world'<sup>29</sup> Andamanese islanders let loose arrows at Indian helicopters offering assistance. So why do Western governments not take the necessary measures to prevent the 'so not-of-our-world' legal and illegal immigrants from invading the West from Africa and the Middle East?

Such is Reich's antipathy, real or feigned, to anything to do with race or racial that he uses words such as 'groups' or 'populations'. Any use of race or racial by Reich is barge-poled as 'race' or 'racial' in order to demonstrate what Reich and others consider to be the toxicity of these words.

---

<sup>28</sup> Arthur R. Jensen, *The g Factor: The Science of Mental Ability*, Praeger, Connecticut & London, 1998, p.425, emphasis in the original. Earlier Jensen notes that what is known about human physical characteristics is derived from the work of R. A. Fisher, Sewall Wright, Theodosius Dobzhansky and Ernst Mayr: 'Races are defined in this context as breeding populations that differ from one another in gene frequencies and that vary in a number of intercorrelated visible features that are highly heritable' (Jensen, *The g factor*, p.421)

<sup>29</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.129

Michael Levin recommends abandoning the word “race”, as in race differences, and using wording such as ‘*differences between descendants of Africans and Eurasians.*’ He suggests that ‘Nothing is lost but a word’.<sup>30</sup> I see three objections to what Levin proposes.

Firstly, if the word “race” satisfies its intended purpose - I suggest it does - then there is no good reason at all why it should be replaced with anything else. Secondly, on a purely practical level why would I want to abandon use of “race” and replace it with something as unwieldy and prolix, as ‘*differences between descendants of Africans and Eurasians*’? The word “race” is inextricably linked to genes, biology and evolution, and it is this connection which antagonises the various postmodernists and diversophiles, making the word so objectionable to them, since any talk of race and racial differences makes the connection with genes, evolution and biology salient, immediate and explicit, and it is this connection that the diversophiles want permanently erased and suppressed so that they can impose the unhindered fiction that all and any racial differences are socially and politically constructed. As far as the diversophiles are concerned, public conversations about race must be conducted in ideological code and, ideally, behind closed doors.<sup>31</sup>

The third reason why “race” should be retained is because abandoning words under pressure from some self-entitled logocracy - in the UK, the state-media platform, the BBC, discharges this ideological function - concedes the initiative to those who seek to control and police our use of language. Any substitute word for race can also be subsequently denounced and replaced to suit an evolving ideological agenda.

Reich’s ancestral DNA research reveals or rather confirms that the three main races of Negroid, Caucasoid and Mongoloid and their various sub-races are the product of population and race mixing and interbreeding over time. This is hardly a new insight. It was clear to Darwin and in *TABOO* which was published in 2000, Jon Entine pointed out that ‘human populations are continually sub-dividing, expanding, declining, and disappearing along genetic and cultural tracks’ and that ‘significant if fuzzy anthropometric and physiological differences began to emerge as distant as 100,000 years ago as waves of migrations swept out of Africa to different regions’.<sup>32</sup>

Alert to the inconsistencies and contradictions of race as a social and political construct, John R. Baker also advanced the idea of race as fuzzy sets. To quote Baker:

---

<sup>30</sup> Michael Levin, *Why Race Matters: Race Differences and What They Mean* (1997), with a foreword by Jared Taylor, New Century Foundation, 2005, p.22

<sup>31</sup> Reich and his team have been accused of using euphemisms to obscure the fact they are reverting to earlier categories of race (Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.253). Reich defended himself by asserting that “ancestry” and “race” are not the same thing. (Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.253). If one ‘race’ and one ‘ancestry’ share statistically significant features in common to a higher degree than another ‘race’ and ‘ancestry’, then ‘ancestry’ can function as a code for ‘race’.

<sup>32</sup> Jon Entine, *TABOO: Why Black Athletes Dominate Sports and Why We’re Afraid to Talk About It*, Public Affairs, New York, 2000, p.113. Entine’s title is misleading since black sporting achievement is confined to a very limited range of sports unlike white athletes. For a more detailed and updated analysis see Richard Lynn & Edward Dutton, *Race and Sport: Evolution and Racial Differences in Sporting Ability*, Ulster Institute for Social Research, London, 2015

It is sometimes claimed that the existence of intermediates makes races unreal. It scarcely needs to be pointed out, however, that in other matters no one questions the reality of categories between which intermediates exist. There is every gradation, for instance, between green and blue, but no one denies that these words should be used [...] It is particularly unjustifiable to cite intermediates as contradicting the reality of races, for the existence of intermediates is one of the distinguishing characters of the race: if there are no intermediates, there are no races.<sup>33</sup>

The definition of race provided by Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele in *RACE: The Reality of Human Differences* is also reasonable and consistent with what can be observed and confirmed by statistical analysis:

To summarize, if we employ a straightforward definition of race - for example, a population within a species that can be readily distinguished from other such populations on genetic grounds alone (that is, using only heritable features) - then there can be no doubt of the existence of a substantial number of human races.<sup>34</sup>

An additional observation from Baker is also eminently reasonable:

It is the fact that intermediates *do* occur that defines the race. The definition of any particular race must be inductive in the sense that it gives a general impression of the distinctive characters, without professing to be applicable in detail to every individual.<sup>35</sup>

Baker's observation is in no way rendered redundant by the ancestral data provided by Reich. Nor is there an obvious reason why, had it been possible for Neanderthals and early modern humans to be examined, that definitions of race offered by Baker, Jensen, Lynn, Sarich and Miele would fail. What changes over time is the components in, for example, Jensen's definition - 'the many imperfectly correlated genetically characteristics that distinguish between groups as such' - such that under pressure from evolution, tribal violence, rape, mass slaughter and interbreeding new races are created which may well be different from the founding populations but, as these new races emerge, they, too, can be examined and defined in accordance with the Jensen definition. This is conceded by Reich when he reports that a study of DNA from ancient near Easterners revealed that about 10,000 years ago 'the population structure of West Eurasia was far from the genetic monoculture we observe today'.<sup>36</sup> I am tempted to see the words 'genetic monoculture' as just another device to avoid the use of race or racially homogenous.

In *Race Differences in Intelligence: An Evolutionary Difference* (2006), Richard Lynn provides a definition of race that is broadly consistent with Jensen's:

A simple and straightforward definition of race is that it consists of a group that is recognizably different from other groups. A fuller definition is that a race is a breeding population that is to some degree genetically different from neighboring

---

<sup>33</sup> John R. Baker, *Race*, Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1974, p.100

<sup>34</sup> Sarich and Miele, *RACE*, p. 211

<sup>35</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.99, emphasis in the original

<sup>36</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.95

populations as a result of geographical isolation, cultural factors, and endogamy and which shows observable patterns of genotypic frequency differences for a number of intercorrelated, genetically determined characteristics, compared with other breeding populations. Geographical contact zones between races generally contain racial hybrids, who show intermediate values of gene frequencies from the more central distributions of the breeding groups. These hybrid and mixed race populations are known as *clines*.<sup>37</sup>

An analysis of data, supplied by Reich, which was carried out by Iosif Lazaridis. The data analysis revealed that:

[...] about ten thousand years ago there were at least four major populations in West Eurasia - the farmers of the Fertile Crescent, the farmers of Iran, the hunter-gatherers of central and western Europe, and the hunter-gatherers of eastern Europe. All these populations differed from one another as much as Europeans differ from East Asians today. Scholars interested in trying to create ancestry-based racial classifications, had they lived ten thousand years ago, would have categorized these groups as “races”, even though none of these groups survives in unmixed form today.<sup>38</sup>

This is entirely consistent with Arthur Jensen’s definition of race. The Jensen definition applies to the remote past and present and is just as applicable to the people today who have descended from these earlier populations.

On the matter of race (subspecies) Edward O. Wilson is not entirely consistent. In *Sociobiology* (1975) he defines subspecies (a race) as follows:

A subdivision of a species. Usually defined narrowly as a geographical race: a population or series of populations occupying a discrete range and differing genetically from other geographical races of the same species.<sup>39</sup>

In *Genesis: The Deep Origin of Societies* (2019), Wilson again returns to the question of race:

Are there enough genetic (high heritability) differences among human populations to distinguish races - or, put more technically, subspecies? I bring this subject up because race remains a minefield through which stumble the politically self-serving left and right. The solution to the problem is to walk around the minefield and proceed to rationally more fertile ground.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Richard Lynn, *Race Differences in Intelligence: An Evolutionary Difference*, Washington Summit Publishers, Augusta Georgia, 2006, p.7, emphasis in the original. Chapter 2 of Lynn’s book (pp.7-16) is a very effective rebuttal of race as a social and political construct.

<sup>38</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.95

<sup>39</sup> Edward O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The Abridged Edition* (1975), The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England, 7th edition, 1998, p.323

<sup>40</sup> Edward O. Wilson, *Genesis: The Deep Origin of Societies* (2019), Penguin, UK, 2020, p.20

If race were a small minefield it could easily be bypassed, but would still need to be cleared at some stage. Unfortunately, questions of race in the US are now so ubiquitous, destructive and have infiltrated and poisoned every possible aspect of daily life, especially free speech and academic freedom, that it is simply not possible to bypass race and race differences and proceed as if these differences did not exist or coercively assert the pretence that they are so trivial that they are of no consequence. Such is the damage that has already been inflicted and continues to be inflicted on US society and those of western Europe in the name of the diversity and claims that races do not exist or that they are social and political constructs that this ideological edifice must be confronted full frontal and destroyed and the remnants of the cult exiled to the creationist fringes.

Wilson's assertion that defining the races of mankind is 'almost always arbitrary'<sup>41</sup>, so agreeing with Gremiatskii and Diamond (see above), prompts the question whether the 15,000 known species of ants studied by Wilson in the course of his long and illustrious career have also been arbitrarily defined. If, according to Wilson, race (and race differences) are 'almost always arbitrary' or do not exist then the implications for the cruel and vindictive apparatus of affirmative action (and everything that supports it) are clear enough.

I return to Wilson's definition of subspecies (race). It should be made clear that 'series of populations occupying a discrete range' does not mean that races in order to arise and to survive must be separated by mountain ranges and oceans. Consider here the definition of caste given by Reich when he examines the DNA data from India:

A sociological definition of a caste is a group that interacts economically with people outside it (through specialised economic roles), but segregates itself socially through endogamy (which prevents people from marrying outsiders).<sup>42</sup>

Caste stratification, concludes Reich, led to the creation of Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism.<sup>43</sup> Among Vysya (Andhra Pradesh) endogamy has been strictly practised for thousands of years. Strict endogamy enables groups to survive as a group. As population increases, as groups engage in a demographic arms race, caste and endogamy become even more important to survival and this accounts for an important discovery made by Reich and his colleagues, namely, the fact that 'the degree of genetic differentiation among Indian groups was many times larger than that in Europe'.<sup>44</sup> It also calls into question Reich's claim that in India today, 'No group in India can claim genetic purity'.<sup>45</sup> Reich provides no definition of what he means by 'genetic purity', but I suggest that caste endogamy practised over thousands of years would provide a level of genetic purity unknown in the West and one which would exceed anything ever envisaged by Nazi race ideologues. I cite Baker: 'From the time when such castes originated, the exchange of genes with the rest of the population was at end. A rigidly enforced custom here takes the place of an ocean in isolating a particular class of persons'.<sup>46</sup> Castes in India might well be the closest extant realisation of the stratified racial state which is routinely and incorrectly attributed to Plato.

---

<sup>41</sup> Wilson, *Genesis*, p.20

<sup>42</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.141

<sup>43</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.140

<sup>44</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.143

<sup>45</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.135

<sup>46</sup> Baker, *Race*, p. 80

In passing, and relevant for claims that race is a social and political construct, Reich reports that the Vysya suffer from high rates of muscle paralysis when they are administered muscle relaxants. This reaction 'is due to a recessively acting mutation that occurs at about 20 percent frequency in the Vysya, a far higher rate than in other Indian groups'.<sup>47</sup>

North American Indians (aka 'Native Americans') also provide effective demonstrations of traditional concepts of race, and racial purity. Reich proposes that more than 15,000 years ago a population [race?] lived in northern Eurasia and was not the primary ancestral population of the people living there today. Some of them crossed the Bering land bridge and this was the basis for the Native Americans.<sup>48</sup> To quote Reich: 'We called this proposed new population the "Ancient North Eurasians"'.<sup>49</sup> Note, however, the following concession from Reich:

The Ancient North Eurasians would without a doubt have been called a "race" had they lived today, as we could show that they must have been genetically about as differentiated from all other Eurasian populations who lived at the time as today's "West Eurasians", "Native Americans" and "East Asians" are from one another.<sup>50</sup>

So why does the word race give rise to such visceral fear and terror among people such as Reich who is able to show that that the genetic differentiation of the Ancient North Eurasians would have been so different from all other Eurasian races who lived at the time? Having acknowledged that today's West Eurasians, Native Americans and East Asians are genetically differentiated from one another, and thus satisfy the criteria for racial differentiation and the use of the word race, Reich, by his use of 'West Eurasians', 'Native Americans' and 'East Asians' would have us believe that there is something dubious about using the word race with regard to these people, despite his having shown very clearly that they satisfy the criteria for racial differentiation. Race and population are not always the same. Reich's admission that the term race would be used today supports Jensen's definition of race and would function just as efficiently when applied to Ancient North Eurasians as it does to Africans, Europeans and Japanese.

At any given time it is possible to define races based on what *actually* exists at that time not on what used to exist or what will exist in the millennia to come. We are, of course, intellectually and infotropically driven to excavate the past and to ponder the future, to understand *who we are and how we got here* - and whither we are going - and the racial and genetic material to which Jensen's definition applies is certainly subject to change but not to change that is so rapid that any racial differences that made it possible to identify Caucasoids, Negroids and Mongoloids no longer exist, because those identified as belonging to these three groups have suddenly ceased to exist. Evolutionary and genetic change is a process and that process, as Reich confirms, can now be tracked in ways that cannot be tracked by archaeologists, but ancestral DNA data do not render the concept of race null and void.

#### **IV. The Ideology - not the Biology - of Race in the West and some Implications of Race as a Social and Political Construct**

---

<sup>47</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.147

<sup>48</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.79-80

<sup>49</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.81

<sup>50</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.81

Much of the dissembling and violent mendacity which dominate Western universities, research institutes and which drive government policy on matters of race are derived from the work of Ashley Montague and Franz Boas and supplemented by various schools of relativism and postmodernism.<sup>51</sup> The UN Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice (1978) has also played its part in misleading a global audience. The Declaration contains no definition of race.

To being with, it does not occur to those who exploit the claim that race is a social and political construct, in order to impose diversity, that there is no obvious reason why those who are opposed to mass immigration and diversity-orthodoxy would want their race to be overrun in their ancient homelands by millions of Africans invading western Europe. This is because they regard, I suggest, their own particular racial construct as unique and not for blending with other racial constructs, a process which they consider to be highly undesirable. Regardless whether it is derived from genetic, biological or evolutionary processes and then defined by these criteria or whether it was socially and politically constructed by ideologues, no race willingly agrees to be obliterated or to be 'replaced' or to be 'deconstructed'.

For the people in Western Europe today there is an extraordinarily important and survival-critical lesson to be derived from the fate of the people who built Stonehenge. I cite Reich:

People like those at Stonehenge were building great temples to their gods, and tombs for their dead, and could not have not have known that within a few hundred years their descendants would be gone and their lands overrun. The extraordinary fact that emerges from ancient DNA is that just five thousand years ago, the people who are now the primary ancestors of all extant northern Europeans had not yet arrived.<sup>52</sup>

We know what happened to the megalith builders. And there is a grim warning, since if we do not stop and reverse the immigrant invasion then the process of **our** lands' being overrun, now well underway, will reach its conclusion and we, too, will have been consigned to utter oblivion. There will be no descendants. And will those, who replace us, respect the revered artefacts of the old displaced culture? Will the ancient barrows, windy pits, tumuli, standing stones, way marker crosses and stone circles that are to be found all over Britain survive the demographic collapse of the indigenous white population? Will the existence of Stonehenge be deemed to be blasphemous, just like the ancient Buddha statues in Afghanistan and destroyed? Referring metaphorically to geneticists as 'the barbarians coming late to the study of the human past', Reich warns us that 'it is always a bad idea to ignore barbarians'.<sup>53</sup> Agreed: and this is why on a practical level people in Europe are so opposed to the illegal-legal immigrant barbarian invaders destroying **their** lands. Carleton Putnam dimly perceived the long-term threat when in 1961 he wrote: 'The greatest of human rights is the right of a race to protect itself against genocide, and its culture against deterioration'.<sup>54</sup> Decades later, Frank Salter has also identified the threat posed by diversity-totalitarianism: 'It stands to

---

<sup>51</sup> Sarich and Miele provide an excellent account of how this happened. See *RACE*, chapter 3 'Anthropology as the Science of Race'

<sup>52</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.106-107

<sup>53</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.128

<sup>54</sup> Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason: A Yankee View* (1961), preface by Jared Taylor, New Century Foundation, USA, 2006, p.94

reason that it would be prudent for a population to defend its most precious collective interest - distinctive genes carried by the ethny - with the most powerful means at its disposal'.<sup>55</sup>

If, according to the various cohorts of postmodernists, everything is constructed and can be deconstructed - including the claim that everything is constructed and can be deconstructed - then it is not clear why any myth of white racial purity should be any worse than the myth of the absolute racial equality of blacks and whites, and the claim that race is a social and political construct or the bizarre claims of Afrocentrism. The Navajo myth - I assume that Reich accepts it is a myth - that the tribe was created by 'Changing Woman' is accorded exaggerated respect as if it were true - as are all the myths of those referred to as 'indigenous peoples' - yet white myths and legends are deemed to be breeding grounds for 'racism' and other evils. If 'whiteness' is a social and political construct, then it also remains unclear why, using socially and politically constructed criteria to create some Platonic ideal of 'whiteness', or a vision of an Aryan Übermensch, should be in any way objectionable.

According to Arthur Jensen, 'The root of most wrong conceptions of race is the Platonic view of human races as *distinct types*, that is, discrete, mutually exclusive categories.'<sup>56</sup> This view of Plato, or what is known as Platonic, is not entirely accurate, as can be seen in the allegory of men created and nurtured in the earth in Book 3 of *The Republic*. The rulers are created with gold in their souls, the auxiliaries with silver and farmers and workers with iron and bronze, but it is possible that parents with gold in their souls will have children with silver souls and parents with iron can give birth to children with gold in their souls. Children of the farmers with gold in their souls will be educated and trained as rulers and guardians (Book 3, 414 de, 415). Plato's recognising that parents with gold in their souls will not always give birth to children with gold in their souls anticipates Arthur Jensen's explication of intergenerational inheritance:

Here we see that, genetically speaking, 'like begets like' but also 'like begets unlike'. Any individual in any group in the second generation could have had any origin in the first. There is some probabilistic correlation between the two generations, to be sure, but the important point to notice is that any given individual in the second generation is what he is, genetically speaking, because of what he actually *got*, and not because of *where* he got it.<sup>57</sup>

Plato envisaged, in other words, a system of what today we would call social mobility not a rigid system of caste. Policies based on affirmative action, equal opportunities, diversity, inclusion and equity have created a new caste far more exclusive than anything ever envisaged by Plato. The gatekeepers who control entry to this caste - certainly no intellectual élite - are not the philosopher-rulers of Plato. They are the office managers, administrators, local government officials, civil servants, university faculty and politicians, very much like the old Soviet *nomenklatura*.

---

<sup>55</sup> Frank Salter, *On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity, and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration* (2003) with a new introduction by the author, Transaction Publishers New Brunswick (USA) and London (UK), 2007, p.221. Ethny is defined by Salter as 'A population sharing common descent', p.338

<sup>56</sup> Jensen, *The g factor*, pp.420-421, emphasis in the original

<sup>57</sup> Arthur R. Jensen, *Educability and Group Differences*, Harper and Row, New York, 1973, p.13, emphasis in the original

If genetic and DNA data are then cited to show that absolute racial purity or any degree of purity cannot exist - that Plato was wrong and that the Aryan Übermensch, for example, belongs in the realms of mythology - then use of such data highlights the fundamental and irremediable flaw in claims that race and race differences are social and political constructs. For, an attempt to invalidate race and race differences by an assertion that any concept of race and race differences functions independently of biology and genes but which, nevertheless, relies on biology and genes to make the case against the genetic and evolutionary origins of race merely confirms, by the use of such data and the methods used to derive them, the very thing it seeks to deny. That being so, there can be no logical objections to the use of genetic data to support the claim that blacks and whites are racially and genetically different and that these differences are not socially and politically constructed.

Likewise, if race is a social and political construct, which necessarily excludes any role for genetic interventions, why does the implicit or explicit suggestion of eugenics arouse opposition, real or feigned? It suggests that among those who publicly oppose eugenic interventions are individuals who not only do not believe their ideological claims about the origins of race, but who also grasp the implications of eugenics. If you are a member of a socio-economic stratum that is characterised by above average IQ and you are aware of the potential benefits of gene editing, would you like to see people, say, of average IQ reducing or surpassing the higher IQ advantage of your future progeny by enhancing the IQ of their unborn children? I suggest not. From this I conclude that what really exercises those who claim to be opposed to eugenic interventions, and who reflexively evoke Hitler when the word “eugenics” is uttered, has nothing to do with combating racism and everything to do with their maintaining a unilateral, selfish, intraracial (class) advantage. Parents with higher than average IQ might even feel morally entitled to use gene editing while seeking to deny or discourage its application among those whom they consider to be their intellectual and social inferiors. Affluent whites who avoid and flee “diversity” in their own lives, but who publicly extol it as a blessing for others reveal the same hypocrisy.

If eugenic interventions to raise IQ will be viable at some stage, would the people who now condemn such interventions as “Nazi” be prepared to deny the use of gene-editing technology to raise the IQ of sub-Saharan Africans, especially those in Liberia and Sierra Leone (see below)? Would it be a wise thing to enhance the mean IQ of sub-Saharan Africans and make them more efficient predators? And how will the West react when China, a potential eugenic Sparta, creates and nurtures small populations, to begin with, of high IQ (> 140) citizens and prepares them for research in defence and space programmes? Light skin in India is associated with membership of a higher caste, so if skin colour could be lightened by gene editing this would have the potential to undermine India’s entire caste system, assuming such procedures were not proscribed to prevent just such an outcome.

Race as a social and political construct cannot account for visible racial differences, most obviously skin colour, and to take some differences specific to Africa, the astonishing steatopygia and steatomeria found among Khoisanid females and the genitalia and secondary sexual characteristics of Sanids, described by Baker as ‘the strangest features of Sanid anatomy’.<sup>58</sup> Nor can race as a social and political construct account for many other differences, physiological, mental, intellectual, substantial differences in mean IQ, moral and physical. The relentless accumulation of biological and genetic evidence and data render any claim that race is divorced from genes and biology - or should be - not merely deeply flawed but reveals an imperviousness to evidence associated with a cult. It also demonstrates the

---

<sup>58</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.313

astounding power exercised by mass media in all its manifestations to be able to impose almost unchallenged the complete opposite of what hard evidence and data reveal. This in itself underscores the catastrophic failures of the public educational system and public discourse in both the USA and UK.

There are now well documented examples of people changing their race either to satisfy some emotional or social need or to secure professional and career advancement. I cite the following examples: Rachel Dolezal is white (or was white), born of Czech-German parents, and worked as an official in a branch of the NAACP. She claimed that her father was black. After her pretence was exposed, Dolezal renamed herself as Nkechi Amare Diallo; Anthony Lennon, an Irish film-maker (white parents), claimed to be a 'born again African'; Kelly Kean Sharp (white), a faculty member at Furman University, claimed to be of 'Latina heritage' until her scam was exposed; Raquel Saraswati worked as the chief diversity officer for a Quaker charity in Philadelphia. She claimed to be of Latin, South Asian and Arab descent. Her fraud was exposed by her own mother who pointed out that her daughter was as white as driven snow (I am told the revelations came as an earthquake to the charity); Vianne Timmons is or was the president of the Memorial University of Newfoundland and falsely claimed to have ancestors who were indigenous Indians; Elizabeth Hoover is or was a faculty member of UCLA Berkley and throughout her career has claimed to be of Mohawk descent. It now turns out that her scam was intended to secure preferential treatment; and Andrea Smith, a faculty member at University of California, Riverside, has been forced out for claiming that she was some Cherokee, though the 'forcing out' has been fairly generous. Nor are false claims about one's racial origins an exclusively American problem. Such is the number of students claiming to be members of indigenous tribes and who apply for special treatment that one Australian university - Newcastle University in New South Wales - is now demanding proof of so-called 'indigenous status' (DNA to the rescue?).

These cases of fraud reveal not just the obvious weaknesses in university admissions but the hypocrisy of the universities themselves. Faculty members who assert a claim to be a member of a race for which there is no biological or genetic basis are nevertheless behaving in a way that is entirely consistent with the obligatory position in universities that race is a social and political construct. Judged according to biological and genetic criteria, their claims belong in *Caprice in Wokeland*, but from an ideological perspective they are woke-correct. For her part, Rachel Dolezal (aka Nkechi Amare Diallo) has also done nothing wrong. She has merely demonstrated that in Rachel's world race is a social and political construct, and Rachel can be anything Rachel wants to be.

The shallow but destructive posturing and propagandizing of the social and political construction of race is well illustrated in a hilarious entry taken from the journal of Charles Greville (12th November 1829):

Some Irish had emigrated to some West Indian colony; the negroes soon learnt their brogue, and when another shipload of Irish came soon after, the negroes as they sailed in said, "Ah, Paddy, how are you?". "Oh Christ! said one of them, "what y're become black already!"<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Charles Greville, *Leaves from the Greville Diary: A New and Abridged Edition*, arranged with introduction and notes by Philip Morrell, Eveleigh Nash & Grayson Ltd, London, 1929, p.87

A more consequential variation on this comedy-fraud is evident when Africans are allowed to join the British Army under race-neutral and lax immigration rules, and who then try to sue the UK Ministry of Defence, claiming that British authorities took no account of their race. I cite three examples.

Abdoulie Bojang (from Gambia) joined the British Army. While on an exercise in Banff, Canada, in temperatures down to -30°C he suffered, he alleged, some cold injuries. Solicitors, acting for Bojang, stated that: ‘Service personnel of African and Afro-Caribbean descent, including those of mixed race, are particularly vulnerable in low temperatures’.<sup>60</sup> Gershon Rawlings (from Ghana) succumbed to cold on the Sennybridge training area (Wales) which is well known among British soldiers for its brutal and unforgiving wet-cold weather. Rawlings filed suit, seeking £200,000 compensation from the Ministry of Defence because, he claimed, the UK military took no account of his ethnicity (race).<sup>61</sup> Macmillan Awumee was yet another Ghanaian who for some reason was allowed to serve in the British Army (logistics corps). He tried to sue the British Ministry of Defence to the tune of 1 million pounds, claiming that as a result of his having been exposed to cold weather in the UK, without proper training and equipment, he is now permanently vulnerable to cold weather, and requires financial support to cover his high heating costs. His legal representative stated that his client ‘was especially vulnerable since he is a “black African with an ethnicity known to be more prone to the development of non-freezing cold injuries by exposure to cold, damp or freezing conditions”’.<sup>62</sup>

These three cases highlight the glaring contradiction between the ideological demand that society accept that race is socially and politically constructed and the way people actually behave, what they actually believe and what is scientifically reliable. And if Africans who are allowed to join the British Army and who then claim special treatment when subjected to extreme dry-cold (Canada) or extreme wet-cold (Wales), are indigenous white soldiers to be permitted to refuse to serve in the Middle East, Africa or the jungles of south-east Asia or Central America because of their ‘ethnicity’ (race)? So spare a thought for the magnificent and resourceful Spanish Conquistadores and for Britain’s colonial army and administrators who created empires in South America, Africa and India.

## **V. The Genocidal Implications of Race as a Social and Political Construct**

A state policy which disseminates and enforces assertions that race (and sex) is a social and political construct also promotes a policy with implications which are not immediately obvious. For, if race and race differences are social and political constructs, there is no obvious reason why race and race differences cannot be deconstructed and then reconstructed. The social and political deconstruction of a race can easily and stealthily serve the purposes of population removal and replacement, since if the race in question has been declared to have been socially and politically deconstructed such that it no longer exists biologically as a race or collective whole, but its components still remain separate and isolated, then direct killing of these isolated component human parts or measures taken to promote suicide, psychological, cultural and physical collapse and dispossession among them can serve the purposes of genocide. Moreover, since those constituent parts (individuals) are no longer considered to be members of any recognised group - because that group or race has

---

<sup>60</sup> *Daily Mail*, online 17th April 2016

<sup>61</sup> *Daily Mail*, online 1st October 2016

<sup>62</sup> *Daily Telegraph*, online, 29th November 2022

been permanently deconstructed - one of the key provisions defining genocide is not breached.

Systematic starvation which was used by the Soviet regime to exterminate millions of Ukrainians in the Holodomor, and the series of measures employed by the NS-regime culminating in the mass gassing in *Vernichtungslager* as in the Holocaust will not be necessary since if the will to survive can be weakened through hatred propaganda (inducing ‘deaths of despair’<sup>63</sup>) and other measures) that will suffice. So-called ‘critical race theory’ and its openly declared and disseminated racial hatred of whites, as in ‘white skin privilege’, works alongside claims that race is a social and political construct in order to promote the extermination of whites. It is a variation on Soviet class war which declared whole categories of people who were deemed to be hostile to Soviet power not merely ‘enemies of the people’ (*vragi naroda*) but as ‘former people’ (*byvshie liudi*). These ‘former people’ were then arrested, deported to slave labour camps or shot, depending on the perceived level of threat they posed.

Declaring race to be a social and political construct is literally dehumanising since it removes any role for biology, genes and evolution from consideration of what it means to be human, so severing all modern humans from their deep evolutionary and genetic past, and denies, to borrow from Edward Wilson, ‘The Deep Origin of Societies’. Bearing in mind that to be human is to be a creature of biology and evolution, then the denial of biology and evolution not only denies the evidence of our being created and modified by these forces, but also dehumanises us by removing the ‘human’ component. Without biology, genes and evolution we are no longer ‘human beings’ we are just ‘non-human beings’, ‘former people’, comprising socially and politically constructed components. If, in order to become something we call a human being, this human-being thing and his ancestors had to be subjected to evolution and natural selection, but the entity that has replaced human beings is now no longer subject to those forces because, it is aggressively claimed or implied that biology has been displaced by culture, can people today be said to be alive in any biological meaning of the word? Have human beings undergone a metamorphosis, becoming biologically inert, non-human, mass produced, expendable and easily replaceable?

To begin with, as a way to sow confusion and chaos, it will be left to individuals to determine whether they are male, female, something in between, black or white (pronouns serve this purpose very well) but once the chaos has served its purposes, the definition and construction of a ‘non-human being’ and the constituent parts will not be a matter for us as mere ‘non-human beings’ but will become the sole prerogative of state power and its functionaries or computer programmes. The Nazis extended their racial doctrines to specific groups, declaring Slavs and Jews to be subhuman. Defining race as a social and political construct goes much further - like class war it has universal application - since this doctrine, promulgated as one of racial inclusivity and fraternal love, covertly and insidiously reduces *all* human beings to non-human beings.

For the time being, whites will remain the primary target of claims that race is a social and political construct, but any ideological construct that denies a place for biology, evolution and genes in the creation and understanding of human beings can just as easily be deployed

---

<sup>63</sup> Angus Deaton, ‘Mortality and Morbidity in the 21st Century’, Brookings Panel on Economic Activity (BEPA) Conference Drafts, March 23–24, 2017, Conference Version (March 17th 2017)

against Africans and every other race. Race as a social and political construct undermines any possibility of reparations claims for slavery (see below) but also dehumanises blacks stripping them of their racial identity, something which has obviously not occurred to black racist radicals and demagogues who celebrate the fact that whites are endlessly told that they are mere social and political constructions whose time has passed. If the biological, evolutionary and genetic origins of black racial identity are denied, the suffering and horrors of slavery are also denied, since it was black human beings not socially and politically constructed non-human beings that were enslaved. An appeal to condemn slavery is based on blacks as ‘human beings’ not as ‘non-human beings’. Likewise, we condemn the genocides of the twentieth century not because those who were exterminated were non-human beings but because they were *human* beings.

The most explicit - so far at least - call for the physical liquidation of whites as a race comes with the slogan, the ‘abolition of whiteness’. When I first encountered this wording I immediately recalled Stalin’s order concerning ‘the liquidation of the kulaks as a class’. The liquidation of the kulaks as a class was not meant to be the mere dispossession of the peasantry and its being uprooted and deployed to other parts of the Soviet economy: it was an extermination decree. The same euphemistic language would later be used by Göring in his order to Heydrich in July 1941 to take all necessary measures to implement *die Endlösung der Judenfrage* (The Final Solution of the Jewish Question).

Naturally, the people who propagate the ‘abolition of whiteness’ will claim that this is not anything preparatory to genocide; they will claim that it is their intention to remove a state of mind, a sense of entitlement, which, they claim, is prevalent among whites, and, in any case, we will be assured, deconstruction of white racial identity is a social and political act. Indeed, but the extermination of Armenians, Ukrainian peasants and Jews started as a social and political process (acts) and ended in physical extermination. Aware of Turkish, Soviet, Nazi, Maoist, Cambodian and Rwandan genocidal precedents, assurances that the ‘abolition of whiteness’ does not represent anything sinister are utterly worthless. Slogans such as ‘white skin privilege’ and the ‘abolition of whiteness’ are the stepping stones to genocide, creating a long-term danger. Openly used and largely unchallenged, these slogans, along with the language of racial contempt and hatred, habituate a society over time to see a specific race (whites, especially white men) as not fully human, unworthy of being respected, to be abused in exactly the same way in which Soviet peasants were denounced and demonised as *kulaks* and Jews were portrayed as parasites in NS-Germany.

Genocide by stealth consists of at least three observable components. Firstly, the targeted race is deconstructed, dehumanised and subjected to relentless hatred propaganda. Secondly, overt claims that race is a social and political construct and has nothing to do with genes are accompanied by measures that covertly acknowledge that race is determined by genes and evolution. Interracial breeding (panmixia) and mixed-race marriages are promoted as a social good among whites, almost as a duty. Thirdly, violence against the targeted group is tacitly encouraged such that violence against it cannot be attributed to action or inaction on the part of any government agency. The freedom to loot and to destroy property enjoyed by Black Lives Matter in the US is an obvious example. Outside the US, the targeting of whites, specifically Boers in South Africa, and Uighurs in China, are also examples of genocide by stealth, though in South Africa the façade of any racial equality and brotherhood was torn down soon after 1994, giving way to murderous and genocidal hatred.

I point out that in German - *liquidieren* - and in Russian - *likvidirovat'* - can mean to abolish or to exterminate, which provides convenient cover for the real motive. Once Jews had been deported to slave labour or executed in situ in mobile gassing vans or executed in mass shootings, *Einsatzgruppen* commanders submitted reports in which they declared that their particular operational area was now *judenrein* (literally 'Jew clean') or *judenfrei* ('Jew free'). Malema and other black Nazis clearly look forward to the day when they can declare South Africa to be 'white-free' or 'white-cleansed'.

The "cancelling" of white dissidents because of their views and opinions, is also a euphemism for measures which are evolving to something flagitious. To "cancel" a person is, for the time being, a non-lethal form of liquidation, but this itself is far from inconsequential. Being "cancelled" can lead to loss of employment, vilification, termination of publishing contracts, expulsion from professional associations, penury and family breakup. In the United Kingdom, where the police force is now thoroughly politicised and a willing and eager instrument of political persecution, dissenters from multicultural diversity cannot expect to be treated fairly and impartially, and in the UK, the state-funded media platform, the BBC, will use its propaganda power to vilify any dissenters as well.

Under certain conditions the use of the verb "to cancel" can initiate a process in which whites are subjected to preliminary dehumanisation and demonisation, verbal and propagandistic aggression before they are subjected to measures of *physical* hatred when the totalitarian left judges the time to be opportune. Here are two examples, I could cite many more. Interviewed on Turkish Radio and Television (11th June 2018), Julius Malema told the interviewer 'we've not called for the killing of white people, at least for now. I can't guarantee the future'. Critics of his comments were dismissed by Malema as 'cry babies'. David Johns is the Director of the National Black Justice Coalition and this mystagogue urges blacks "to wage war with whiteness". Are these words to be interpreted literally, as incitement to kill whites, or do they represent some obscure metaphorical code grasped only by blacks? And if the words "to wage war with whiteness" are not intended to be interpreted literally - that is, they are not to be interpreted as a call to rape and kill whites - what exactly do these words mean?

Eventually, large numbers of whites will resign themselves to accept, and even, perversely, to be grateful for, second-class status, submitting to specious altruistic pressure that the world would be a better place without them. The sheer crushing weight, ubiquity and relentlessness of hatred propaganda many times worse in the age of the Internet than anything available to the Soviet, NS and Maoist regimes will work - is already working - its poisonous magic. White children are especially vulnerable to this hatred and anti-white propaganda. Whites will either perish in mass slaughter, the stated genocidal aim of Julius Malema in South Africa, or they will lose the will to live, being reduced to a D<sup>6</sup> minority in their own lands: debased, despised, disenfranchised, dehumanised, dispossessed and disappearing.

## **VI. Race as a Social and Political Construct is entirely Subjective**

The definition of race provided by Arthur Jensen relies on a statistical analysis of objective data. I am not aware of any specific and objectively reliable criteria by means of which it is possible to determine whether a person is socially and politically constructed 'black' or 'white'.

The first point to be made is that social and political criteria in this context are far too subjective, since social and political questions are often the cause of bitter disputes and cannot be resolved with anything like the precision available to the hard sciences. Any definition of 'black' and 'white' which exclusively relies on social and political criteria introduces a huge subjective element the interpretation of which is exacerbated by the fact that social and political attitudes and constructs are not stable over short periods of time never mind over decades. If race is a social and political construct what does it mean to be 'racist' and what is 'racism'? Are these words confined to those who examine racial differences based on genes and evolution?

The other problem arises from the fact that any geneticist or anthropologist or ideologue seeking to define a race is himself a member of some race that has been likewise socially and politically constructed and this means that he will bring the prejudices and biases inherent in his own socially and politically constructed race when determining the social and political construction of a race to which he does not belong. It will not be safe to assume that an anthropologist who is socially and politically constructed as Japanese will produce an identical definition of Japanese racial identity as that produced by an anthropologist who is socially and politically constructed as Ghanaian. Definitions of race based on social and political construction mean, by their very subjective nature, that there can be no objectively agreed definitions of race or anything approaching them. Such an outcome clearly did not occur to Lewontin, Gould and Diamond.

I take it for granted that in post-1994 South Africa and the USA only those who can "think Bantu" (Malema) or subscribe to the slogan that 'it's a black thing and you [white boy] don't understand' will ever be permitted to define 'black' or 'blackness'. But one cannot allow this arbitrary arrogation of the sole right to define 'black' and 'blackness' to escape unchallenged, and then to permit the author to impose these definitions on everybody else. After all, it is the claim of those who maintain they are opposed to racism and colonialism that biological race was a device invented by the European colonial powers to dehumanise Africans, to enslave them and to justify their exploitation. If the colonisers allegedly had these malign and racist motives in classifying Africans as racially inferior, then the accused or those acting on his behalf are entitled to inquire whether the zeal of those dedicated to exposing the allegedly racist foundations of the West is fed by noble motives or whether this zeal obscures something far less noble. They proclaim selflessness and altruism, but are their claims entitled to remain free of scrutiny?

Any black defining 'black', 'blackness' and 'Bantu', and who then seeks to impose this definition must provide satisfactory answers to three questions. Firstly, he must explain how he knows that he is black. A mirror provides no assistance in this endeavour, since skin colour is a product of evolution and genes and can, therefore, form no part of a social and political construction of race. The same applies to all the other well documented and very obvious and visible and non-visible characteristics of 'black' and 'blackness'. A complicating factor for any degree of blackness and any definition arises from the fact that blacks in North America contain a proportion of Caucasoid genes, estimated to be about 25%.<sup>64</sup> So what exactly are the objective, verifiable, non-biological, non-genetic and non-evolutionary racial criteria which determine whether a person is black? Secondly, are these criteria stable, that

---

<sup>64</sup> Jensen, *The g factor*, p.432. Sarich and Miele point out that this 25% admixture was confirmed in 2001, adding that 'genetic differences can be counted in a useful and reliable manner'. *RACE*, p.134.

is, could they have been used to define 'black' and 'blackness' in 3000 BC and can they serve the same purpose in 2026? Thirdly, are whites obliged to accept definitions of 'black' and 'blackness' revealed by some black hierophant as infallible truths, derived from ineffable and superior insight, to which they must submit?

In the absence of any objective data, a consequence of race's being a social and political construct, it will be necessary to apply evidentiary standards normally used in law. In English law the two standards are: on balance of probabilities (civil law) and beyond reasonable doubt (criminal law). In other words, is it the case that assertions that races exist, that they can be defined and that there are racial differences are, on balance of probabilities, more plausible than claims that races and race differences are illusory and are not derived from biology, genes and evolution? Or can assertions that there are races and race differences satisfy the more demanding criminal standard? The United Kingdom Supreme Court (UKSC) recently ruled that a woman is defined by biological sex and that what are referred to as "trans-women" are not women.<sup>65</sup> On its face, this is a welcome decision but it has alarming implications since it provides for judges to make decisions on matters biological and bears more than a passing resemblance to the role of the US Supreme Court in handing down decisions on biology and race. What would be the consequences, had the UKSC decided, in violation of biology, genes and anatomy, that sex is, after all, a social and political construct, as claimed by feminists, and that, therefore, "trans-women" are women? At some stage the UKSC may be called on to define race and the pressure to define race as a social and political construct will be immense.

## VII. Affirmative Action and Race as a Social and Political Construct

Race as a social and political construct poses a serious threat to the entire apparatus of affirmative action, since from the very beginning racial criteria based on biology and genes were the determinants of race and whether an individual could benefit from preferential treatment. In *The Affirmative Action Hoax: Diversity, the Importance of Character and Other Lies* (2005), Steven Farron deals with the question of defining minorities and race (chapter 5). Applicants to universities and those seeking federal employment can gain an advantage by claiming to be a member of a benefitting group, sex or race. Some scholars, cited by Farron, insist that fraudulent applications can only be removed if there is a definition of race. If race is recognised as based on biology and genes then there exists a reliable and objective basis to determine an applicant's race and ancestry and so reduce fraud. If, on the other hand, race is to be defined as a social and political construct the way is clear for all kinds of fraudulent claims to continue to be made since racial identity can be endlessly deconstructed and reconstructed to gain an advantage.

If races do not exist - a position which Reich implies he accepts - even as he adduces more evidence that races do exist, then affirmative action and demands for reparations for slavery are fatally undermined (whether reparations for slavery are reasonable is another matter). The stated aim of affirmative action is to remedy past racial wrongs inflicted on blacks who were deported to the US as slaves. There must be some way to identify claimants. This requires a definition of race (racial) based on genetic ancestry. If, however, races do not exist then no racial wrongs (racism) were committed and the need for remedies does not arise, and

---

<sup>65</sup> See *For Women Scotland (Appellant) v The Scottish Ministers (Respondent)* [2025] UKSC 16, 16. April 2025.

if race is defined as a social and political construct there can be no reliable and objective means to determine any ancestry.

Any black today who claims damages for slavery must be able to demonstrate that his ancestors were slaves. If race is defined as a social and political construct, and taking into account that the social, political and economic structure of the USA in 2026 bears no resemblance to the period when slaves were deported from West Africa to the USA, then there can be no continuity in any definition of race (socially and politically constructed) from, say, 1800 to 2026, about 11 generations, which could demonstrate that any ancestors were slaves. Attempts to apply socially and politically defined constructs of race derived from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in order to solve problems in 2026 are doomed to failure. Taking into account that we have moved in a few decades from “negro”, to “African-American”, “person of color” , “black” and now “Black”, what will be the racial labels and socially and politically constructed definitions of race in 2066 or earlier? By contrast, ancestral DNA, and everything that goes with it, would provide evidence that any ancestors were from west Africa (or not) and were most likely deported as slaves (or not).

Concluding his review of affirmative action in the police and non-university settings, Farron makes an unusual recommendation: ‘The most efficient and fairest way to practice discrimination in hiring and promoting policemen, as in all activities, would be through explicit quotas’.<sup>66</sup> I question whether this would be either efficient or fair. Explicit quotas for blacks who cannot meet the same entry and promotion standards demanded of white police officers will not solve the problem of competence. It would merely be an open - and long overdue and highly desirable admission - that blacks are not as able as whites and would completely undermine any public confidence. It would also amount to a two-tier police service. Would, in such a system, white police officers deserve higher salaries and other benefits? Furthermore, white police officers who were well aware that they had been required to meet higher entry standards than black applicants, and that the promotional threshold was higher for white officers, would resent the presence of less able blacks in their midst. Would black police officers be trusted by white officers? In such circumstances there can be no unit cohesion and good morale both of which are essential for effective operational policing, above all in a crisis (9/11). Explicit quotas must also, yet again, confront the definition of race: is it to be genes and evolution or social and political constructs?

Citing *Regents of University of California v Bakke* (1978), Farron reminds us that Justice Blackmun, arguing for affirmative action, stated that ‘In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way’.<sup>67</sup> Laws which are designed to eradicate racism - or at least that is the claim on which they are drafted - merely create a new category of victims, in this case white male applicants to universities, to note the main class of victim. In *Genesis: The Deep Origin of Societies* (2019), Edward O. Wilson makes the obvious but ignored point that ‘Education, fitted to the needs and potential of all its members, is the key to a healthy society’.<sup>68</sup> Any education system that is structured in order to meet the needs and potential of all members of society does not create a healthy society by admitting poorly qualified blacks to universities, such as Harvard, at the expense of more intellectually able white applicants. I wonder whether Wilson who spent most of his academic career at Harvard

---

<sup>66</sup> Steven Farron, *The Affirmative Action Hoax: Diversity, the Importance of Character and Other Lies* (2005), New Century Foundation, 2010, p.142

<sup>67</sup> Cited in Steven Farron, *The Affirmative Action Hoax*, p.67

<sup>68</sup> Wilson, *Genesis*, p.20

University ever objected to the routine sacrifice of white applicants in the name of affirmative action.

What will not be clear to most people is that affirmative action policies in the US either by deliberate emulation or arising from fortuitous ideological convergence are an almost carbon copy of the policies enforced by the Soviet regime in the 1920s and 1930s. Applicants to universities who were from the incorrect class background - their parents were identified as members of the bourgeoisie - were routinely denied access to universities in favour of applicants defined as members of the working class.

Far more sinister, however, were the implications of the Marxist-Leninist position that all history is the history of class struggle and that peace and prosperity would only be possible with the abolition of the exploiter class and the establishment of a classless society. But since the Marxist-Leninist analysis of class war also determined that the class enemy will not surrender his privileged position he must be exterminated. In other words, the Marxist-Leninist position was that in order to go beyond class and class struggle and achieve a classless society, those identified as the class enemy and blocking the path to the classless utopia had to be physically exterminated in class war. The result was mass terror, executions and genocide. Those who claim to be fighting racism in the West see no contradiction between claims that they are seeking to eradicate racism, and the adoption of policies which racially persecute whites. I would summarise their position as follows: in order to go beyond racial persecution we must racially persecute the racial persecutors (whites), and those who define themselves as striving to build a race-free utopia have also targeted the institution of private property, expropriating the Soviet slogan 'to expropriate the expropriators'.

### **VIII. Slaughter, Proto-Genocide and Dispossession as Evolutionary Prime Movers**

Violence, mass murder, slaughter and proto-genocide were common among early humans. Archaeological and early written records suggest that class war, which is, I maintain, intra-racial struggle and race wars, inter-racial struggle, are nothing new. Yet Reich is often very reluctant openly to concede the role played by violence in human evolution:

We discovered [by the end of 2015] that the population of northern Europe was largely replaced (sic!) by a mass migration from the eastern European steppe after five thousand years ago; that farming developed in the Near East more than ten thousand years ago among multiple highly differentiated human populations that then expanded in all directions and mixed with each other along with the spread of agriculture; and that the first human migrants into the remote Pacific islands beginning around three thousand years ago were not the sole ancestors of the present-day inhabitants.<sup>69</sup>

This marks a recurring pattern, specifically the use of words such as 'replaced' to explain why various groups ceased to exist when they encountered others. The use of 'replaced' obscures the facts of mass slaughter and proto-genocide.<sup>70</sup> Groups of people do not agree to just fade away and become displaced. They vanquish the invaders or they are exterminated and are then replaced. Further, it is often not enough that rivals be killed for practical

---

<sup>69</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.xxv

<sup>70</sup> One exception is an admission that modern humans 'outcompeted or exterminated other humans' during the period after 50,000 years ago. Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.25.

reasons. Killing 'the other' inures for the benefit of the killers in other ways. For example, males of the Amazon tribe, the Yanomamö, gain status by killing members of other tribes. In Africa, the Danakil mutilate male dead and wounded by cutting off penes and scrota, retaining them as trophies. Killing is also celebrated among Western combatants. Pilots record and celebrate the number of enemy planes shot down, recorded as kills in log books, and indicated on their air frames. On the eastern front in WWII, the Red Army deployed thousands of snipers whose kills were celebrated and glorified. The kills of US Marine snipers in Vietnam were also celebrated. Today, the names of Simo Häyhä (Finnish Army), Vasilii Zaitsev (Red Army) and Carlos Norman Hathcock (US Marine Corps) are well known to aficionados of the sniper cult.

Relentless and violent competition for land and resources has also been observed among rival chimpanzee bands in Uganda's Kibale National Park. Gangs of chimpanzees infiltrated the territories of neighbouring bands, killing and driving out any survivors. One explanation proposed to account for such behaviour is that chimpanzees were simply imitating human behaviour. Taking into account that the victors in these chimpanzee raids enhanced their survival and reproductive success, a more plausible explanation, suggests Wilson, is that border war and raiding played a role in group chimpanzee selection and evolved independently of any human behaviour.<sup>71</sup>

This is reasonable enough but it inadvertently raises the question of emulation among humans. For example, why have blacks in Africa and in the USA, who have had every opportunity, over at least three centuries, to observe the processes by means of which whites have built and maintained modern societies, themselves so lamentably failed to emulate white achievements, whereas, by embarrassingly stark contrast, the Chinese, Japanese and Koreans have so conspicuously succeeded, and in very short order? Blacks would benefit from being able to emulate the technological and cultural achievements of Caucasoids and Mongoloids but have demonstrated no ability to do so.

Interactions between Neanderthals and modern humans provide a clue. Gregory Cochran and Henry Harpending point out that although Neanderthals were able to copy certain cultural achievements of modern humans - the authors cite the Châtelperronian toolkit - 'they [Neanderthals] couldn't *become* modern humans, couldn't copy or acquire abilities that were consequences of modern human biology'.<sup>72</sup> If what are referred to as African-Americans, with a 25% admixture of Caucasian genes, are unable to come close to matching white achievements in North America, the outlook for Sub-Saharan Africans and Australian Aborigines is utterly dire. The salience of evolution and genes is evident in athletics. At some stage in the future gene editing might make it possible for European distance runners to outperform Kenyan rivals, but at the present time, training alone will not make it possible for European distance runners to match or to surpass the evolutionarily-determined and genetic superiority enjoyed by Kenya's Kalenjin runners.

About 50,000 years ago there is marked change in what is left behind in artefacts, art and tools. Reich comments on the fate of the Neanderthals:

---

<sup>71</sup> See Wilson, *Genesis*, pp.116-118. In Western societies, gentrification, when affluent incomers buy houses in attractive areas and local people and their children cannot compete with rising prices, is a non-violent form of replacement.

<sup>72</sup> Cochran and Harpending, *The 10,000 Year Explosion*, p.156, emphasis in the original and pp.121-122

The dramatic acceleration of change in the archaeological record after around fifty thousand years ago was also reflected by evidence of population change. The Neanderthals, who had evolved in Europe by about four hundred thousand years ago and are considered “archaic” in the sense that their skeletal shape did not fall within present-day human variation, went extinct in their last holdout of western Europe between about forty-one thousand and thirty-nine thousand years ago, within a few thousand years of the arrival of modern humans.<sup>73</sup>

What is to be understood by ‘went extinct in their last holdout of western Europe’? The Neanderthals did not suddenly decide to become extinct after thousands of years, something rendered them extinct, and the most likely cause of this extermination was the confrontation with modern humans who exterminated the Neanderthals and forced them to the fringes where the survivors finally ceased to exist, despite their best efforts, or were hunted down and killed. To quote Reich:

The natural explanation for all these changes was the spread of an anatomically modern population whose ancestors included “Mitochondrial Eve”, who practiced a sophisticated new culture, and who largely replaced the people who lived in each place before.<sup>74</sup>

This is an evasive and incomplete explanation. Among the components of the ‘sophisticated new culture’ was a new way of waging war - better weapons, coordination through language, planning, tactics and use of terrain (this requires good spatial reasoning) - which made it possible for the ‘anatomically modern population’ to drive out and to exterminate the Neanderthals. And this happened very quickly: Neanderthals in Europe ‘disappeared everywhere within a few thousand years of contact with modern humans’.<sup>75</sup>

These moderns were more intelligent and this imparted a decisive advantage. The Neanderthals did not agree to leave land they had occupied for thousands of years on the arrival of moderns or to be ‘replaced’: they were forced out and exterminated. And had the roles been reversed and the Neanderthals enjoyed the evolutionarily advantage of higher intelligence and language, they, too, would have behaved in the same way. The extermination of the Neanderthals by modern humans is entirely consistent with the way all rival groups behave towards one another when competing for resources. ‘When’, Reich notes, ‘the Bantu first expanded out of west-central Africa several thousand years ago, they had a profound influence on the indigenous rainforest hunter-gatherer populations, they encountered’<sup>76</sup>: undoubtedly the case but were these encounters peaceful or characterised by mass slaughter? Most likely, the hunter-gatherer populations suffered the same fate as the Bergdama, a tribe who lived in South West Africa and who were slaughtered and enslaved by the Hottentots and Ovaherero.<sup>77</sup>

Reich breaks down the first 35,000 years of modern humans in West Eurasia into at least 5 key events. Event 2 involved the spread of hunter-gatherers after the eruption of a volcano

---

<sup>73</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.6

<sup>74</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.6

<sup>75</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.284

<sup>76</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.242

<sup>77</sup> See Baker, *Race*, p.425

close to Naples. A modern human population who made stone tools of a type known as Aurignacian spread across Europe. Reich notes that some of these people ‘went extinct and were replaced by a more homogenous population and culture’.<sup>78</sup> What caused these people to become extinct, famine or war? I cite another observation from Reich:

After around fourteen thousand years ago, a group of hunter-gatherers spread across Europe with ancestry quite different from that of the people associated with the preceding Magdalenian culture, whom they largely displaced.<sup>79</sup>

And how did these newcomers ‘displace’ the others, by mutual agreement or by mass slaughter and enslavement? More examples of Reich’s euphemistic language can be cited: ‘Archaeologists have shown how in the Near East, Neanderthals and modern humans traded places as the dominant human population [race?] at least twice between 130,000 and 50,000 years ago, and it is reasonable to guess that they might have met during this period’.<sup>80</sup> How do two populations, each one striving for dominance, trade places? Is this trading places peaceful and consensual or violent?<sup>81</sup>

In *The Inheritors* (1955), referred to by Reich, William Golding provides a fictional encounter between modern humans and Neanderthals. A staple theme of diversity and postmodernist ideology is ‘the other’, and in anticipation of the postmodernist and diversophile obsession with the same<sup>82</sup>, Golding’s Neanderthals repeatedly characterise the modern humans as ‘the other’ and the ‘new people’, sensing that these ‘new people’ and these ‘others’ are not to be welcomed as something that will enrich their lives but something to be feared since they pose a deadly existential threat. The Neanderthals are now the ‘former people’. For all that, however, Lok, one of Golding’s Neanderthals, is fascinated by the physical appearance and racial differences of the invaders (no race as a social and political construct for him):

The new people did not move like anything he had ever seen before. They were balanced on top of their legs, their wastes were so wasp-thin that when they moved their bodies swayed backwards and forwards. They did not look at the earth but straight ahead.<sup>83</sup>

Lok, observing one of the invaders, whom he names ‘Pine-tree’, characterises him as being ‘comfortable in his own white skin’.<sup>84</sup> So the Neanderthals also identified ‘white-skin privilege’. In 2026, I am fairly confident that copy editors at Faber and Faber - also known

---

<sup>78</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.91

<sup>79</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.92, emphasis added

<sup>80</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p. 41, emphasis added

<sup>81</sup> Reich uses the same evasive language to camouflage the violent history of India - ‘collision of peoples’ (read: war, violence, mass extermination) ‘different ancestries’ (read: racially distinct), and ‘dramatic demographic change’ (read: slaughter and dispossession), concluding in language more suitable to a realtor selling a time share that the centuries of violence were an ‘opportunity for cultural exchange’, Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.126

<sup>82</sup> See Henry Beard and Christopher Cerf, *The Official Politically Correct Dictionary and Handbook*, Grafton, London., 1992, p.44 and p.50

<sup>83</sup> William Golding, *The Inheritors*, Faber and Faber, London, 1955, p.143

<sup>84</sup> Golding, *The Inheritors*, p.143

as ‘sensitivity readers’ - would red line any comments in a manuscript about whites being comfortable in their own skin: skin-guilt and skin-shame would be obligatory.

Repelled and morbidly fascinated in equal measure by the ‘bone skin’, ‘fungoid pallor’ and ‘fungoid whiteness’<sup>85</sup> of the modern humans, the Neanderthals experience a healthy disgust and terror. The disgust and terror are fully reciprocated. Nor is it the case, as Reich maintains, that the modern humans ‘adopt a surviving Neanderthal child’.<sup>86</sup> This is no adoption: the hapless infant is seized and abducted on a whim, as a plaything for a pampered woman, and then demonised by the other moderns as the ‘devil’. The outlook for the abducted Neanderthal child is hardly encouraging: to be enslaved as an adult (the modern humans also have slaves), to be abandoned as one of the ‘devils’ when the freakish novelty wears off or to be put to death, in some gruesome pagan ritual in order to propitiate the gods or merely thrown overboard by its captors as they flee across the sea. In the abduction of this Neanderthal infant I am reminded of Kafka’s short story *Ein Bericht für eine Akademie* (*A Report for an Academy*, 1917) or the real life fate of the Hottentot Venus, who was paraded by an animal showman in Paris and then abandoned.<sup>87</sup>

On its face, *The Inheritors* is an encounter between modern humans and Neanderthals, but I suggest it can also be read much more widely, as an encounter between technologically advanced and less developed peoples, between, say, the Spanish Conquistadores and Incas and Mayans, and, above all, between the European colonial powers and Africa. *The Inheritors* yields the traces of ancestral DNA from Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899): the fear and the disgust aroused by the close encounters with ‘others’. In the *Heart of Darkness*, it finally dawns on Kurtz, Conrad’s would-be saviour of the African savages among whom he lives that his altruism is futile. Thwarted by the irredeemable reality of Africa, Kurtz leaves a hand-written note on his essay, written for the heart-warmingly named *International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs*: ‘Exterminate all the brutes!’<sup>88</sup> The fictional Kurtz is an object lesson for our own time, and a warning. Recalcitrant whites - these primitive deplorables - who refuse to submit to the apparently superior sanctity, humanity and wisdom of the diversophiles can expect no mercy. The pretence of benefaction and charity always succumbs to hatred and violence when its suit is rejected.

Close and permanent encounters between established occupiers and incomers end in violence. ‘How’, asks Reich, ‘was it that the low-population-density shepherds from the steppe were able to displace (sic) the densely settled farmers of central and western Europe?’<sup>89</sup> The clue is to be found in the fact that the incomers, the Yamnaya (sic) and Corded Ware peoples, were ‘strikingly male-centred’ and ‘celebrated violence, as reflected in the great maces (or hammer-axes buried in some graves’.<sup>90</sup> The implications of these discoveries suggest that

---

<sup>85</sup> Golding, *The Inheritors*, p.142 & p.182

<sup>86</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.27

<sup>87</sup> Baker, *Race*, 316

<sup>88</sup> Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness and Other Tales*, Oxford World’s Classics, Oxford University Press, 2008, p.155

<sup>89</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.112

<sup>90</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.110. *Iamnaia kul’tura* takes its name from the custom of burying the dead in shallow pits (*iamy*) under *kurgany* (mounds). In steppe terrain the *kurgany* had practical advantages. They served as navigation aids in a generally featureless landscape and their height (5-10 metres) made them effective observation and sentry posts.

when these mobile steppe dwellers encountered large settled farming communities, they, the people from the steppe, overran the farmers in waves of plunder and violence and totally dispossessed them. Reich suggests two explanations to account for what happened: cutting down forests to make the terrain more like the steppe whence the invaders came; and disease.<sup>91</sup> Disease may well have played a role. If the steppe invaders enjoyed immunity to the diseases they brought with them, this would augment their raiding aggression and impart a significant advantage.<sup>92</sup>

The explanation that low fertility of hybrids may have reduced the level of Neanderthal ancestry, is rejected by Reich:

I wasn't convinced by this argument. Rather than low hybrid fertility, I favored the explanation that there wasn't much interbreeding for social reasons. Even today, many groups [races?] of modern humans keep largely to themselves because of cultural, religious, or caste barriers. Why should it have been any different for modern humans and Neanderthals when they encountered one another?<sup>93</sup>

Citing 'social reasons' is out of place. It might be suitable to explain the complete lack of social cohesion among racial groups, and the ghettos and white flight in the urbanised West today, but it ignores the more effective option of interracial (ethnic if you are squeamish) violence unconstrained by any social institutions. I suggest that the very obvious reason was war and conflict; that these encounters between Neanderthals and modern humans were overwhelmingly violent and resulted in mass slaughter and extermination since both groups were competing for space, water, shelter and game. The presence of too many 'others' posed an existential threat.<sup>94</sup>

Continuing his dual and contradictory approach of providing vast amounts of genetic, biological and evolutionary evidence that clearly demonstrates the reality of race and races, Reich would then have us believe that the same 'cultural, religious, or caste barriers' that function today also functioned to separate Neanderthals and modern humans. By citing 'cultural, religious, or caste barriers' and conspicuously ignoring race, Reich implicitly retreats to the position that race is a social and political construct or is a factor of no consequence and that genes, biology and evolution play no significant consideration in determining the people with whom we would like to copulate.

Then agriculture started to spread:

---

<sup>91</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.113

<sup>92</sup> Gregory Cochran and Henry Harpending persuasively argue that the Old World diseases brought to the Americas by the Spanish as much as weapons and horses were responsible for the collapse of the Aztec and Mayan empires. See *The 10,000 Year Explosion*, pp.158-170.

<sup>93</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.43

<sup>94</sup> Sites excavated in Germany, Talheim (the Talheim Death Pit), Herxheim, Schöneck-Kilianstädten and Schletz-Asparn (Austria), reveal evidence of mass slaughter, torture and cannibalism. See, too, Rick J. Schulting et al, ' "The Darker Angels of our Nature": Early Bronze Age Butchered Human Remains from Charterhouse Warren, Somerset, UK', *Antiquity*, Vol. 99 (403), 2025, pp,101-117.

[...] the farmers of the Near East began migrating and mixing with their neighbors. But instead of one group displacing all the others and pushing them to extinction, as had occurred in some of the previous spreads of hunter-gatherers in Europe, in the Near East all the expanding groups contributed to later populations.<sup>95</sup>

To posit a conflict-free migration of farmers from the Near East must explain, firstly, why farmers, as opposed to nomadic hunter-gatherers, would leave their land in the Near East and migrate to land occupied by others - were they driven out? - and, secondly, why the new arrivals would not be seen as invaders and dealt with accordingly. Reich should also be clear on the matter whether those that migrated were farmers or hunter-gatherers. Domestication may have contributed to the cultural, genetic - and I will use the words that Reich avoids - racial homogeneity in present-day West Eurasia but, knowing what we know about human beings, it is far more likely that this homogeneity was achieved not by cooperation but by self-segregation, and where necessary, invasion, massacres and violent dispossession.

From his unjustifiably optimistic account of what he regards as a revolution in domestication which led to cultural and genetic (and racial) homogenization in present-day West Eurasia, Reich concludes that the homogenizing effects of the industrial and information revolutions are not unique.<sup>96</sup> I leave aside the begged question whether the effects of these two turning points were all homogenizing. In other words, the message from Reich is that the mass multi-million incursions from Africa, Central and South America, the Middle East and India into Europe and the USA are neutral and will in time even be beneficial since, he implies, racial interbreeding will finally remove the biological basis for any kind of racial differentiation and a conflict-free and deracialised Utopia will have arrived. What Reich offers us here is a variation of the Marxist prediction of the conflict-free society which will inevitably ensue with the liquidation of classes.

Racial conflict over time and across global location leaves open the conclusion that what since 1945 has been determined to be genocide is not new and that in order to survive or to achieve a dominant position races and populations will seek to exterminate rivals (however defined).<sup>97</sup> It does not strike me as plausible to accept that the genocidal imperative has ceased to function among human beings in the twenty-first century, whether manifested by stealth or whether it is conducted more openly. I suggest that as global population continues to increase, mass-slaughter events - some of which will satisfy criteria established for genocide - wars and local conflicts will not cease and are likely to become more frequent as competition for living space, water and agricultural land intensifies. Racial, cultural and religious diversity make these problems far worse and intractable. The archaeological legacy and the written historical record suggest that overpopulation, racial and cultural rivalries will continue to be resolved in war and violence, as they always have been.

In *Sociobiology*, Edward O. Wilson identified war as one of the main prehistoric and historical prime movers, a permanent factor in human affairs.<sup>98</sup> In *Genesis: The Deep Origin of Societies*, Wilson returned to the role of war in human evolution, concluding, in a somewhat

---

<sup>95</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.95

<sup>96</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.96

<sup>97</sup> For an explanation of the origins of genocidal behaviour among early hominids and beyond see Wilson, *Sociobiology*, pp.298-299

<sup>98</sup> Wilson, *Sociobiology*, pp.297-299

tautological observation, that ‘Lethal violence during warfare is so common in human societies as to suggest that it is an adaptive instinct of own species’.<sup>99</sup> Azar Gat, the author of a study of aboriginal hunter-gatherers in Australia, cited by Wilson, concluded that ‘deadly human violence, including group fighting, existed at all social levels, in all population densities, in the simplest of social organization, and in all types of environments’.<sup>100</sup>

Gat’s conclusions are verified by the British colonisation of Tasmania: white farmers and settlers were attacked and killed by gangs of Aboriginals. Keith Windschuttle accounts for these attacks as follows:

The reasons why Aboriginal thieves had little compunction about killing anyone they found in their way, like Mary McCasker, was that their own culture had no sanctions against the murder of anyone outside their immediate clan. Internecine warfare was rife in indigenous society and killing others was a common and familiar practice among Aboriginal males. Indeed, as recorded earlier, the stories the Tasmanian Aborigines told around their campfires often recorded their pleasure in the death and pain they could inflict on anyone outside their own group [...] It is clear from the contemporary reports about Aboriginal killings of many white settlers that their murders were incidental accompaniments to robbery. The whites were unarmed and posed no deterrent to the Aborigines’ main objective. They were killed simply because they could be.<sup>101</sup>

Windschuttle provides no unambiguous evidence that white farmers and settlers were tortured or mutilated before or after being murdered by Aboriginal gangs. However, bearing in mind that white farmers were often tortured and mutilated by black terrorist gangs during the Mau Mau emergency in Kenya, and that the torture and mutilation of white farmers by black gangs have been and remain a feature of post-apartheid South Africa, the possibility that Aboriginal bands tortured and mutilated whites cannot be excluded.

Gat’s observations, and the nature and persistence of war over time and location, are inconsistent with Wilson’s assertion that defining races is ‘almost always arbitrary’ (see above). Tribes, groups, races and sub-races or a ‘genetic monoculture’ (Reich) do not engage in raids and war on the flimsy basis that their allegiance to their particular tribe, race or group is arbitrary. Loyalty to their tribe or race or ‘genetic monoculture’, their willingness to kill and to incur the risk of being killed, lies at the very heart of their being. It is, as Wilson acknowledges, ‘an adaptive instinct of our own species’.

In *The 10,000 Year Explosion: How Civilization accelerated Human Evolution* (2009), Gregory Cochran and Henry Harpending have persuasively argued that warfare was the main factor limiting population growth before the large-scale adoption of agriculture, pointing to ‘the abundant evidence of homicide and cannibalism in the archaeological record’.<sup>102</sup> Bushmen rock art demonstrates the salience of war and racial solidarity in the lives of the

---

<sup>99</sup> Wilson, *Genesis*, p.118

<sup>100</sup> Wilson, *Genesis*, p.119

<sup>101</sup> Keith Windschuttle, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History*, Volume One, Van Diemen’s Land, 1803-1847, Macleay Press, Sydney, 2002, p.128. Mrs McCasker was speared to death on her remote farm by Aboriginal marauders in 1831.

<sup>102</sup> Gregory Cochran and Henry Harpending, *The 10,000 Year Explosion: How Civilization accelerated Human Evolution* (2009), Basic Books, New York, 2010, p.103

artists.<sup>103</sup> (the Bantu were not welcome). Without racial prejudice - 'my race is best' - there can be no racial war or conflict, so racial prejudice may also be 'an adaptive instinct of our own species'(Wilson). According to Vladimir Avdeev: 'Racial prejudices are the concentrated evolutionary experience of our ancestors, which by the very fact of your existence indicate the correctness of its survival strategy' and 'If racial prejudices did not exist, then the very races themselves would not have been preserved'.<sup>104</sup>

Experiments in which testees were subjected to brain scans reveal that stereotypes and racial prejudice were common to all testees regardless of their stated positions towards different races. This finding is strong evidence for stereotypes and racial prejudice as aids to survival - they are rational, reasonable and normal - and is also consistent with the behaviour of people who publicly proclaim their commitment to diversity - apparently they regard it is a blessing - but who then avoid it in their private lives (white flight).<sup>105</sup>

Throughout history war has been inextricably linked with slavery. That Africans were brought to the Americas as slaves means, I suggest, that consideration must be given to the possibility that the process of bringing these Africans to the Americas as slaves is part of the natural evolutionary process by means of which populations of people move from one part of the Earth to another or are moved in the case of slaves. This matters since if the deportation of African slaves to the Americas is to be regarded as *sui generis* and outside evolutionary processes and so abominable - such that only the movement of free people to the Americas not slaves is normal - then the whole history of the world will require some re-editing or it will have to be accepted that however abominable slavery appears to modern tastes and notions of human rights, the movement of slaves to where they were required must also be reckoned as natural evolutionary movement no different from those who crossed the Bering Straits in search of land and who did not arrive as slaves.

## **IX. To Run with the Hare and Hunt with the Hounds**

Throughout his book Reich engages in a delicate balancing act. Well aware that the ideological claims that race is a social and political construct are worthless, Reich cannot bring himself to declare them expressly false either from the need to appease his race-denying colleagues or from cynical self interest (research grants).

That Reich is playing a double game emerges very clearly in the abstract summary of chapter 11 ('The Genomics of Race and Identity') in his introduction:

Chapter 11, "The Genomics of Race and Identity," argues that the orthodoxy that has emerged over the last century - the idea that human populations are all too

---

<sup>103</sup> Two recent studies come to similar conclusions on violent interactions between groups. See M. Lahr Mirazón et al, 'Inter-group violence among early Holocene hunter-gatherers of West Turkana, Kenya', *Nature*, 529, 2016, pp.394-398 and Vivien G. Standen et al, 'Violence in fishing, hunting, and gathering societies of the Atacama Desert coast: A long-term Perspective (10,000 BP - AD1450)', *PLOS ONE*, 20th September 2023, pp.1-33, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0290690>. Downloaded 11th October 2024. Judging from the number of listed articles on violence in the bibliography then violence and warfare were common enough among these groups long before the arrival of Columbus and the Europeans.

<sup>104</sup> Avdeev, *Rasologiia*, p.218 & p.219.

<sup>105</sup> See Frank Salter, *On Genetic Interests*, endnote 6, p.249

closely related to each other for there to be substantial average biological differences among them is no longer sustainable, while also showing that racist pictures of the world that have long been offered as alternatives are even more in conflict with the lessons of the genetic data.<sup>106</sup>

Three conclusions follow. Firstly, if there are ‘substantial average biological differences’ among human populations (races), then the essential point that races and racial differences exist and are derived from genes, biology and evolution is conceded at the very start, and a working definition of race exists. Secondly, race and race differences cannot, therefore, be social and political constructs. Thirdly, in the absence of specific examples of ‘racist pictures of the world that have long been offered as alternatives are even more in conflict with the lessons of the genetic data’, then this claim is mere, and still more, conformist piety-posturing. It has long been held - and still is in many quarters - that any interest in race and race differences and any positing that race and race differences are biological in origin were themselves racist and pursued for sinister reasons. That being the case, it is essential that Reich clarifies what **he** means by ‘racist pictures of the world’, citing examples, so that **his** claims can be tested. Further, he states that ‘there are beliefs about the nature of the differences that are grounded in bigotry and have little basis in reality’.<sup>107</sup> That may well be true. So what are these beliefs, what is the basis, however ‘little’, and if there is some basis, why are they dismissed as bigoted?

Genetic factors may play a role in the higher rates of prostate cancer among blacks in the US. Reich duly presented his findings at a conference and explained that it might help ‘to find genetic risk factors for other diseases’. For making this suggestion he was attacked for ‘flirting with racism’ (!)<sup>108</sup> and advised ‘to refer to the populations from which African Americans descend as “cluster A” and “cluster B”’.<sup>109</sup> To the suggestion that he engage in censorship, Reich, with heroic disingenuousness, informs us ‘that it would be dishonest to disguise the model of history that was driving this work’.<sup>110</sup> It would undoubtedly be ‘dishonest’ but then industrial-scale mendacity and vicious persecution of dissenters from racial orthodoxy have been the norm over the last sixty years.

In fact, Reich does himself no favours when he claims that the view among geneticists and anthropologist in universities ‘that there are no differences among human populations that are large enough to support the concept of ‘biological race’ and then maintains that this orthodoxy arose ‘seemingly without questioning’.<sup>111</sup> This position is demonstrably false. The way Arthur Jensen was treated after his major article on IQ, ‘How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?’, was published in the *Harvard Education Review* (1969) and subsequently - Reich avoids the use of ‘IQ’ throughout his book - does not suggest anything close to consensus. It is evidence of physical and ideological persecution of a highly competent and greatly feared dissenter. Before and after Jensen was vilified the ideological position was, and remains that:

---

<sup>106</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.xxx

<sup>107</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA* p.253

<sup>108</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.248

<sup>109</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.248

<sup>110</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.248

<sup>111</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.250

[...] biological differences among human populations are so modest that they should in practice be ignored - and moreover , because the issues are so fraught, that study of biological differences among populations should be avoided if at all possible [...] They [‘some anthropologists and sociologists’] are concerned that work on such differences will be used to validate concepts of race that should be considered discredited.<sup>112</sup>

If ‘biological differences among human populations are so modest that they should in practice be ignored’, it is not at all clear how these questions can be ‘so fraught’, and why the existence of such apparently modest differences arouse such fear and hatred and the desire to vilify and destroy dissenters. I suggest that the differences, especially in mean IQ, are far from modest and it is drawing attention to these differences and their implications that prompts the fear, the rage and the hatred. Any challenge to the claim that race is a social and political construct falls within the realm of social and political policy. Thus, any attempt to silence hostile analysis of this claim is censorship of social and political discourse.

Further, if racial differences are discredited it is not clear how they can be ‘validated’. The words ‘should be considered discredited’ is essential to the imposition of race as a social-and-political construct. But, as is clear enough from the way Jensen et al were treated, the words ‘should be considered discredited’ are not discretionary, a position to be accepted or rejected on the basis of evidence and judgment. These words have nothing to do with evidence. On the contrary, these words amount to an ideological decree and one to be enforced with bureaucratic, quasi-legal, administrative sanctions and threats of physical violence for dissent. There are countless examples of such punitive measures being taken against dissenters in the US and UK. The proposed censorship of anything to do with race proffered by Jacqueline Stevens, even to the extent that these matters are to be banned in private emails, does not suggest that the race-deniers actually believe what they say. Publicly they deny race but they are terrified of research in this field because it is utterly lethal to their multicultural (multiracial) fantasy.<sup>113</sup>

I also have some direct personal experience of being targeted on a number of occasions by university administrators for stating things not to their liking. Here is just one example. In an article, which I submitted to an in-house university publication, the *Leeds Student*, in 2006, but which was *not* published, my then employer, Leeds University (UK) sought my expulsion from the university. In the article - ‘Time to Face the Truth about Multiculturalism’ - I commented on, among other things, the findings of a major research article (2005) authored by J. Philippe Rushton and Arthur R. Jensen, in which they pointed out that the average IQ of sub-Saharan Africa was 70.<sup>114</sup> I then drew certain conclusions for the state and fate of Sub-Saharan Africa, very similar to those expressed by James Watson a year later.

The failed attempt by Leeds University to dismiss me - not for want of trying - is important for two reasons extending beyond my personal travails and discomfort. Firstly, it shows that censorship of ideas was destructive enough in 2006. Twenty years later, it is much worse because university chancellors and administrators have totally capitulated to extremists.

---

<sup>112</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.250, emphasis added

<sup>113</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.250

<sup>114</sup> See J. Philippe Rushton and Arthur R. Jensen, ‘Thirty Years of Research on Race Differences in Cognitive Ability’, *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, vol. 11., № 2, 2005, pp.235-294.

Secondly, it revealed a new line of attack adopted by a British university in censoring ideas its administrators consider to be hostile. Although the article I submitted was clearly intended for publication, and this was agreed with the editors, it was not published. The editors, having received the hard copy, dutifully handed it over to the university administrators who then cited this *unpublished* article as the basis for disciplinary action. That a British university sought to exploit unpublished material in this way set a very ominous precedent regarding intellectual freedom. The university was demanding the right to approve and censor any article either on a computer hard drive or in hard copy on a desk in advance of publication, and, to take disciplinary measures, at its discretion.

## **X. More Contradictions and Confusion**

Nevertheless, in what for him must be something of a Martin Luther moment - I allude to the German theologian (1483-1546) not to the black activist-plagiarist - Reich instructs us as follows:

But whether we like it or not, there is no stopping the genome revolution. The results that it is producing are making it impossible to maintain the orthodoxy established over the last half century, as they are revealing hard evidence of substantial differences across populations [races?].<sup>115</sup>

And the ‘the orthodoxy established over the last half century’ is that race is a social and political construct; and this orthodoxy was neither established by consent, derived from objective data, nor is it upheld by consent derived from same.

In a section headed ‘Real Biological Difference’, Reich confirms the quagmire of contradictions into which he has stumbled:

I have deep sympathy for the concern that genetic discoveries about differences among populations may be misused to justify racism. But it is precisely because of this sympathy that I am worried that people who deny the possibility of substantial biological differences among populations across a range of traits are digging themselves into an indefensible position, one that will not survive the onslaught of science.<sup>116</sup>

Replacing ‘races’ with ‘populations’ changes nothing. If there are no races, differences among what Reich rebrands as ‘populations’, there cannot be racism. Note, too, that the wording ‘substantial biological differences’ represents a marked shift away from, indeed a rejection of, Gould’s assertion that there has not been ‘enough time for the evolution of substantial differences’<sup>117</sup> and though he maintains that the division of *Homo s. sapiens* into races is ‘recent’, he, Gould, unlike Reich accepts that there are races.

Throughout the period of anthropological orthodoxy and its essential claim that race is a social and political construct any interest in race and racial differences which explained them in terms of biology, genes, and evolution or implied that they arose from biology, genes and evolution was unequivocally denounced as racism and incipient Nazism (even a cursory

---

<sup>115</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.251

<sup>116</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.254, (pp.254-258)

<sup>117</sup> See Sarich and Miele, *RACE*, p.169

interest in such matters was suspicious). In light of Reich's point that 'substantial biological differences among populations across a range of traits' exist, and, therefore, that this amounts to the long overdue rejection of ideological assertions that race is a social and political construct, then accusations of racism which were and remain an essential tool of psychological terror should just be dismissed.

In a world where these biological differences must now be accepted what exactly is the nature of the new racism that, based on 'genetic discoveries about differences among populations', which Reich fears 'may be misused to justify racism'? If substantial genetic differences within, between and among populations (races) are robust and demonstrable, then there is no place for accusations that researchers that reveal these differences are racists, unless one believes that the truth is racist. And if the truth is racist, is the truth to be suppressed in order to uphold the myth of the global happy-family?

Before the spread of the Internet it was much easier for the race-deniers and diversophiles in universities to suppress the truth (or something more reliably closer to it). Those, characterised by Reich as the 'genome bloggers', have made it impossible to maintain the censorship on race and race differences:

The genome bloggers' political beliefs are fueled partly by the view that when it comes to discussion about biological differences across populations [races?], the academics are not honoring the spirit of scientific truth-seeking. The genome bloggers take pleasure in pointing out contradictions between the politically correct messages academics often give about the indistinguishability of traits across populations and their papers showing that this is not the way science is heading.<sup>118</sup>

This a welcome admission and one that is long overdue. Reich, having by now undergone some kind of metamorphosis, instructs us that 'The indefensibility of the orthodoxy is obvious at almost every turn'.<sup>119</sup> His immediate target was a one Joseph L. Graves Jr:

He [Graves] argued that in contrast to pigmentation genes, the pattern at genes particularly active in the brain would surely average out over so many locations, with some mutations nudging cognitive and behavioral traits in one direction and some pushing in the other direction. But this argument doesn't work, because in fact, if natural selection has exerted different pressures on two populations since they separated, traits influenced by many mutations are just as capable of achieving large average differences across populations (sic) as traits influenced by few mutations. And indeed, it is already known that traits shaped by many mutations (as is probably the case for behavior and cognition) are at least as important targets of natural selection as traits like skin color that are driven by a small number of mutations.<sup>120</sup>

Without mentioning IQ, Reich states that:

---

<sup>118</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.255

<sup>119</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.255

<sup>120</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.255-256

No one knows how the genetic variations that influence educational attainment in people of European ancestry affect behavior in people of non-European ancestries [races] or in differently structured social systems. That said, it seems likely that if these mutations have an effect on behavior in one population they will do so in others, too, even if the effects differ by social context. And educational attainment as a trait is likely to be only the tip of an iceberg of behavioral traits affected by genetics.<sup>121</sup>

Deconstructing, as one does, Reich's discourse, I will use the forbidden letters. I suggest that bearing in mind that IQ varies in any population (race) and that genes account for a substantial part of IQ variation, then I am minded to interpret Reich's use of 'genetic variations' as a mere euphemism for differences in mean IQ. In that case, it most certainly is known how 'genetic variations' influence education attainment (IQ). Reich states that:

We do not yet have sufficient sample sizes to carry out compelling studies of most cognitive and behavioral traits, but the technology is now available, and once high-quality studies are performed - which they will be somewhere in the world whether we like it or not - any genetic associations they find will be undeniable.<sup>122</sup>

Studies, 'compelling studies', based on 'sufficient sample sizes' have already been carried out. The difference in mean IQ between blacks and whites is well established, clear and robust and supported by a vast amount of literature. IQ not only predicts the number of years in education but results achieved, SES, and much else besides. It is implausible that Reich is not familiar with these basic facts associated with the black-white IQ difference. Without mentioning IQ, Reich concedes that 'educational attainment as a trait is likely to be only the tip of an iceberg of behavioral traits'.<sup>123</sup>

Taking into account these concessions from Reich, his posing the question 'whether traditional social categories of race correspond to meaningful biological categories'<sup>124</sup> is out of place, since it is a nod towards race as a social and political construct. The use of 'traditional' is also jarringly out of place. For thousands of years race and race differences have been apprehended and accepted as something that mattered at a fundamental biological level, even if not fully understood. It is only since the 1930s, running parallel with the huge advances in genetics, paradoxically, that concerted attempts have been made publicly to deny the biological, genetic and evolutionary basis of race, and to impose the ideological construct that race is socially and politically determined. Statistical data adduced by Reich himself defeat this ideological programme, yet he reveals a close affinity with the caste of persons and ideologues identified by Frank Salter:

The intellectual Left has become largely alienated from mankind as an evolved species. It is remarkable that in an age where biological science informs us of the genetic dimension of ethnicity and of the general principles underlying stable

---

<sup>121</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.257

<sup>122</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.260

<sup>123</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.257. Reich provides a damning indictment of race denial (p.258), but the consequences and the warnings were made long before Reich and did not need to be based on the findings of ancestral DNA.

<sup>124</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.259

altruism, leftist intellectuals have no place in their doctrines for genetic interests.<sup>125</sup>

The closer a full or fuller understanding of genes and evolution approaches - and so threatens the pretensions of 'the intellectual Left' to power - the harsher and more desperate the censors and culture-supremacists become.

## **XI. Selection Pressures for Higher Intelligence**

Reich notes that 'genome-wide association studies'<sup>126</sup> are starting to explore cognitive and behavioural traits which he says will help to explain the mystery that puzzled Richard Klein, specifically: 'the great change in human behavior suggested by the archaeological records of the Upper Paleolithic and Later stone Age'.<sup>127</sup> Even if it can be shown, according to Reich, that these genetic changes 'did enable new cognitive capacities, this is a very different scenario from Klein's idea of a genetic switch'.<sup>128</sup> He continues:

Genetic changes in this scenario are not a creative force abruptly enabling modern human behavior, but instead are responsive to nongenetic pressures imposed from the outside. In this scenario, it is not the case that the human population [sic] was unable to adapt because no one carried a mutation that allows a biological capability not previously present. Instead, the genetic formula that may have been necessary to drive the striking advances in human behavior and capacities that occurred during the Upper Paleolithic and Later Stone Ages is not particularly mysterious. The mutations necessary to facilitate modern human behavior were already in place, and many alternative combinations of these mutations could have increased in frequency together due to natural selection in response to changing needs imposed by the development of conceptual language or new environmental conditions. This in turn could have enable further changes in lifestyle and innovation, a self-enforcing cycle.<sup>129</sup>

Restated here is the extreme environmental position that all human beings have the same IQ potential but if the family environment lacks the intellectual stimulation any innate abilities, assuming they are present, will not be realised. Do the nongenetic pressures apply to all members of *Homo* or only to some, such that only specific groups can benefit? The use of 'human population' is misleading since it makes no distinction between specific groups (races) and implies that every group of the 'human population' is the same and benefited or could have benefited.

If a specific group was not subjected to the evolutionary pressure then it cannot adapt. The plausible reason there is a substantial gap between the mean IQ of sub-Saharan Africans and Europeans (circa 2 standard deviations) is because modern Africans and Europeans were *not* subjected to the same selection pressures. In his article on black African IQ, Richard Lynn

---

<sup>125</sup> Salter, *On Genetic Interests*, pp.212-213

<sup>126</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.21

<sup>127</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.21

<sup>128</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.21

<sup>129</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.21

and his co-author, Gerhard Meisenberg, concluded, having reviewed all the available evidence, that the mean IQ of Sub-Saharan Africa is 68.<sup>130</sup>

On the matter of West African genes and how they enhance sprinting ability, Reich suggests that it may be ‘that there is simply more variation in sprinting ability in people of West African ancestry - with more people of both very high and very low abilities’.<sup>131</sup> To this Reich adds the following: ‘Whether or not this explains the dominance of West Africans in sprinting, for many biological traits - including cognitive ones - there is expected to be a higher proportion of sub-Saharan Africans with extreme genetically predicted abilities’.<sup>132</sup>

Bearing in mind that the most recent assessment of mean sub-Saharan Africa IQ is 68 the numbers of very high IQ individuals in sub-Saharan Africa will be exiguous. The low mean IQ of sub-Saharan Africa explains why sub-Saharan Africans have never achieved a technologically sophisticated civilization remotely comparable to anything created in Europe nor have been able to maintain that bequeathed to them by the European colonial powers. The same observation about the state of sub-Saharan Africa was made by Nobel Laureate, James Watson in an interview in the magazine of *The Sunday Times*, 14th October 2007.

In the matter of sport, Reich claims that ‘For a good coach, race is irrelevant’.<sup>133</sup> On the contrary: if, without any prior knowledge of two long distance runners, a coach had to decide between a white runner from Arkansas and a black runner from the Kenyan highlands, the chances are the Kenyan would be a better choice.<sup>134</sup> Likewise, it is a reasonable bet that any cure for malaria will not be found in some witch doctor’s mud hut in Tanzania or Ghana but in a laboratory in Leipzig, Harvard, Wuhan or Cambridge.

The words from ‘The mutations necessary’ to ‘new environmental conditions’ merely restate what must have happened, but without Africans, for example, being exposed to the same environmental conditions, since otherwise the differences in cognitive ability between Africans and Europeans, which clearly exist, and the obvious differences in conceptual language between the two populations (races), which also clearly exist, would not exist. It is the increase in intelligence and use of language which prepared the way for the innovations noted by Klein. Reich’s use of ‘lifestyle’ strikes me as a jarringly inappropriate word to characterise the brutal struggle to survive 50,000 years ago. Only in prosperous and well fed (obese) societies do we find and tolerate ‘lifestyles’ and ‘transgendered beings’.

Selection pressures matter. In considering how Caucasoids and Mongoloids evolved to become more intelligent than blacks, J. Philippe Rushton and Richard Lynn argued that the harsher climates of northern Europe and Eurasia were more cognitively demanding and selected for higher intelligence. Reich notes the effects of climate. Denisovans, it was discovered, were genetically a little closer to New Guineans than to any population from mainland Eurasia from which Reich draws certain conclusions:

---

<sup>130</sup> Richard Lynn and Gerhard Meisenberg, ‘The Average IQ of Sub-Saharan Africans: Comments on Wicherts, Dolan and van der Maas’, *Intelligence*, volume 38, 2010, pp.21-29

<sup>131</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.264

<sup>132</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.265

<sup>133</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.267

<sup>134</sup> For an analysis of the Kenyan (Kalenjin) superiority in distance running and its genetic basis see Sarich and Miele in *RACE* (pp.174-177)

The climate in New Guinea is also largely tropical, which could not be more different from Siberia's bitter winters, and this makes it unlikely that archaic humans adapted to one environment would have flourished in the other.<sup>135</sup>

That different environments produce different selection pressures and, therefore, different evolutionary outcomes - hardly a major revelation in the twenty-first century - supports the explanation put forward by Lynn and Rushton that cold weather and hot weather affect populations in different ways, and as they have also demonstrated, create racial differences in IQ.

Adapting to specific environments can bring about unusual changes. The IQ of Australian Aborigines is some of the lowest ever recorded yet they have been found to have visual acuity and visual memory which are superior to Caucasoids. Richard Lynn hypothesizes that these advantages are evolutionary adaptations to existence and survival in terrain which, in terms of topographical features as aids to navigation, would be sub-optimal for Caucasoids and be regarded as essentially featureless, but which is adequate for Aborigines. Superior visual memory has also been found among Eskimos who live and hunt in *tundra*.<sup>136</sup> I speculate that superior visual memory which is adaptive in the deserts of mainland Australia would be maladaptive in the *taiga* of Siberia and dense jungles of south-east Asia or in densely-populated man-made urban environments, since the effectiveness of superior visual memory as a tool for navigation relies on, and has evolved from, the sparseness of terrain markers not on a super abundance which would overwhelm the capacity of the smaller Aboriginal brain to process the raw topographical data or make it less effective.

The superior visual memory enjoyed by Australian Aborigines, which most likely did evolve as an aid to route-finding in landscapes with very few landmarks to assist navigation, raises the question why these primitive people did not find more advanced and improved solutions to movement across largely featureless terrain. That Australian Aborigines have superior visual memory imparts no knowledge - as far as I am aware - about the geographical range of its effectiveness or about its nocturnal effectiveness. Superior visual memory is effective in a relatively small home range or territory but setting out to explore new remote regions would require not merely effective tools of navigation but some means to record the data, measurements and experiences. Oral traditions have their limits.

In generally featureless or rather monotonously similar terrain Caucasoids created their own landmarks as navigation aids: cairns, stone crosses and standing stones. They also produced maps and written accounts of their expeditions and travels which assisted those who came after them. In the steppe zone people of the *Iamnaia kul'tura* created burial mounds, *kurgany*, which also served as effective way markers. Tumuli in northern Europe served the same dual function. For the ancient Romans and Greeks, Arabs and Chinese the stars and Moon were aids to navigation, on land and on sea, as well as being a source of endless fascination and speculation. In 1603, three years after the execution of Giordano Bruno on orders of the Holy Inquisition for his heretical speculations about extraterrestrial life, Johann Bayer, published his now famous star atlas, *Uranometria*.

---

<sup>135</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.57

<sup>136</sup> Lynn, *Race Differences in Intelligence*, pp.107-114. See, too, Jörg Klekamp et al, 'A Quantitative Study of Australian Aboriginal and Caucasian Brains', *Journal of Anatomy*, February 1987, 150, pp.191-210

Sailing the oceans posed the most severe navigational challenges, giving rise to compasses, study of winds, currents, tides and weather patterns, charts, sextants and, eventually, the famous chronometer invented by John Harrison. So even though Caucasoids demonstrate an inferior level of visual memory compared with Australian Aboriginals, their higher general intelligence confers a decisive advantage and has enabled them to solve very rapidly all known terrestrial navigation challenges. The outstanding Lunar and Mars Reconnaissance Orbiters are just the latest developments in mapping and surveying.

The decisive advantage enjoyed by Caucasoids and Mongoloids is a particular consequence of higher intelligence. All living creatures display infotropism, the need to seek out information about their environments. People who are more intelligent tend to be more curious and inquisitive about their immediate environment - and this is crucial - and way beyond that with which they are familiar. They ask questions and seek answers. They value knowledge for its own sake and it matters not that what they discover about the physical world or what occurs to them from their intellectual peregrinations has no immediate or practical value. The quest is all-important, the benefits, if any, are secondary.

Discoveries which appear to be of little or no obvious value when first made can often turn out to be very valuable at some future date and important in areas with which at first sight, they would have no obvious connection: the use of prime and Fibonacci numbers in encryption is a good example. Another example would be the search for a solution to one problem that unexpectedly solves another. While studying Jupiter's satellites, Ole Rømer discovered the speed of light. Here we can deduce a fundamental principle in intellectual and material progress: the more one knows about the world (our world or other worlds), the more one can know about the world (our world or other worlds). Derived from long military experience, the principle that time spent in reconnaissance is never wasted is directly applicable to all intellectual inquiry whether pursued for immediate and specific purposes or to satisfy curiosity, with unexpected benefits to follow from having made a discovery (e.g., penicillin and the Darwin Tree of Life Project being carried out at the Sanger Institute). By virtue of higher intelligence Europeans have adapted, flourished and succeeded in all global environments.

Lack of curiosity may have played a role in the demise of the Acheulean hominids (*homo erectus*) studied by Shipton and colleagues in Dawadmi, central Arabia. These archaic humans were 'technologically conservative, and used least-effort strategies of resource procurement and tool transport'.<sup>137</sup> What the authors call a 'least-effort strategy' relies on doing what is necessary to satisfy immediate needs but no more. There is no investment of time or effort expended beyond the necessary, thus emerging threats to survival are less likely to be identified and experimentation is largely unknown. Among many of the African tribes studied by Baker a 'least-effort strategy' is also evident. David Livingstone, cited by Baker, recorded that in the catchment area of the River Kasai, a tributary of the Congo, the people enjoy a life 'of glorious ease' [...] Food abounds, and very little labour is required for its cultivation; the soil is so rich that no manure is required'.<sup>138</sup> Something similar among hunter-gatherers has been observed by Cochran and Harpending. The authors note that hunter-gatherers could not accumulate wealth,

---

<sup>137</sup> Ceri Shipton et al, 'Acheulean Technology and Landscape Use at Dawadmi, central Arabia', PLOS, 2018, p.1 (pp.1-36).

<sup>138</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.398, pp.393-400

so if meat was readily available there was no incentive to do more for survival than was necessary. There was no forward planning.<sup>139</sup>

Different evolutionary pressures and their outcomes pose a severe challenge to the position of Steven J. Gould, who, as pointed out by Sarich and Miele<sup>140</sup>, could not bring himself, publicly at any rate, to admit that human brain size had increased as a result of natural selection, and so Gould succumbed to creationism. The Gould view that the human brain exists in or was created in an evolution-free zone asserts, in effect, that the human brain is an 'immutable category', which is the accusation directed by Reich at Jensen and so many others on the existence of race and race differences generally.

If Gould is correct, the implications are as follows:

(i). If the increase in *Homo* brain size was not the result of evolution by means of natural selection then brain size, as can be measured today, emerged *ex nihilo* in a condition of immaculate and immutable perfection from divine or non-divine extra-terrestrial interventions;

(ii). However, the fossil evidence indicates that brain size has increased over a 3 million-year period. Nicholas Wade has also reported (2005), and commented on, research that strongly suggests that the human brain is still evolving.<sup>141</sup> This means, if evolution is discounted as an explanation for this increase, and a single divine or non-divine intervention is cited as the cause, that there must have been multiple divine interventions (miracles) or non-divine saltation events to bring about these increases in brain size over this period;

(iii). Bearing in mind that mean Mongoloid, Caucasoid and Negroid brain sizes differ, respectively, 1364 cm<sup>3</sup>, 1347 cm<sup>3</sup> and 1267 cm<sup>3</sup> (Rushton<sup>142</sup>), then brain size has not increased uniformly and equally among all races. In a study of Caucasian and Australian Aboriginal brains<sup>143</sup> the brain size of Australian Aborigines was found to be as low as 1,199 cm<sup>3</sup>. Baker argues that brains of Australids (Australian Aborigines) are small for reasons which can be explained by natural selection. Essentially:

[...] because they *retain* the size characteristic of a particular stage in human evolution beyond which most other ethnic taxa have evolved. There is no evidence or likelihood that the ancestors of the Australids were at any time civilized, and it is unthinkable that natural selection could have caused the brains of the ancestral Australids to evolve the potentiality to increase in size, during the course of individual development, in response to a stimulating environment that did not exist at the time.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Cochran and Harpending, *The 10,000 Year Explosion*, pp.115-116

<sup>140</sup> Sarich and Miele, *RACE*, p. 214

<sup>141</sup> See Nicholas Wade, 'Researchers Say Human Brain Is Still Evolving', *The New York Times*, 8th September 2005, online and Nicholas Wade, 'Brain May Still Be Evolving, Studies Hint', *The New York Times*, 9th September 2005

<sup>142</sup> J. Philippe Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behaviour: A Life History Perspective*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Special Abridged Edition, Charles Darwin Research Institute, Port Huron, MI, 2000, p.53

<sup>143</sup> Jörg Klekamp et al, 1987, p.200, whereas Baker, citing an earlier study, notes a brain size of 1,290 cm<sup>3</sup>, Baker, *Race*, p.279

<sup>144</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.433, emphasis in the original

Compelling evidence of the primitiveness of Tasmanian aborigines was not merely their inability to make fire when required, which, as Keith Windschuttle notes, was ‘a skill that even Neanderthal Man had mastered’<sup>145</sup> but their basic survival tool kits, which were just enough to ensure a fragile survival;

(iv). If divine or non-divine interventions remain the favoured explanations to account for these differences in brain sizes, then these differences must also be the planned and deliberate intention of these divine or non-divine authors. This would mean, to paraphrase Gould, that unequal brain size, differences in IQ and unequal social, intellectual and economic outcomes (SES) are contingent facts of history at least in our part of the known universe and are divinely approved;

(v). Gould’s appeal to creationism to account for the origins of the human brain and the claim that all brains in all races are equal, while accepting that evolutionary processes applied to other parts of the *Homo* anatomy, means that human beings must have been shaped by two distinct, separate, unrelated and unequal forces: natural selection below the neck and creationism above it. From an Occamist perspective alone, this is highly implausible, and if one discounts divine and non-divine extra-terrestrial interventions, it is also, to cite Arthur Jensen, ‘extremely improbable that the evolution of racial differences since the advent of *Homo sapiens* excluded allelic changes only in those 50,000 genes that are involved with the brain’.<sup>146</sup>

Now to the question of high mean Ashkenazim IQ and how this was acquired. It may well be the case that the explanation put forward by Henry Harpending, Jason Hardy, and Gregory Cochran in an essay published in 2006 to account for the high mean IQ of Ashkenazi Jews is wrong or flawed in some way but that is the nature of scientific explanations: it is an occupational hazard for pioneers. By attacking Harpending, Hardy, Cochran and Wade, and their explanations, Reich diverts attention from the obvious question: what was responsible for the high mean Ashkenazim IQ that has been recorded? Harpending and Cochran return to this question in *The 10,000 Year Explosion* (Chapter 7 ‘Medieval Evolution: How the Ashkenazi Jews Got Their Smarts’). Having dismissed the bottle-neck hypothesis, the authors then seek an answer in natural selection which requires that the population be genetically isolated, a condition that Jews satisfied because of Jewish rules on marriage (endogamy) and the fact that Jews were persecuted.

The Harpending-Cochran position is that Ashkenazim Jews by engaging in trade and finance, especially money lending, benefited - over a long period, about 800 years - from the cognitive demands of these activities. The one element that does not receive sufficient attention in the Harpending-Cochran analysis is language. To function as effective financiers and managers operating across borders would require not just the ability to monitor activity

---

<sup>145</sup> Windschuttle, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History*, p.377. Archaeological evidence suggests that *Homo erectus* was able to make and to control use of fire. On its face, this would suggest that claims this vital skill was beyond Tasmanian Aborigines are implausible. If, however, the absence of compelling evidence for controlled use of fire by Tasmanian Aborigines is to be dismissed as not being compelling evidence for the absence of such a skill, then where is the evidence, compelling or anecdotal, which suggests that Tasmanian Aborigines had mastered the controlled use of fire? Where are the remains of the fires that caused the smoke?

<sup>146</sup> Jensen, *The g factor*, p.433

and to engage in contingency and forward planning but would also require mastery of languages to a high standard, so as to function as effective mediators and deal-makers between, say, Germans and Poles. Mastery of one or more languages to a high standard also dramatically improves cultural understanding thereby raising negotiating effectiveness, and the advantages are even more marked if one party relies on the other for interpreters. Jews were well placed to act as interpreters, a highly g-loaded activity. Furthermore, itinerant Jewish financiers with sufficient mastery of the necessary languages and dealing with people in positions of power and wealth were well placed to gather information which could be vital for Jewish survival. In effect, they acted as intelligence gatherers. The other advantage that accrues from mastery of another language or languages is that it has been shown to improve the executive function of the brain.<sup>147</sup>

Jewish financiers and entrepreneurs pioneered two additional and now standard features of modern finance: levying interest on loans and an awareness that news, information and data are commodities. Charging interest on loans is based on the insight that money loaned is money that cannot be used by the lender over the period of the loan and, therefore, that it is rational to levy payment (interest) for the use of the money loaned. The great insight of Julius Reuter, the founder of the famous agency in London, in 1851 the centre of a global empire, was to grasp that 'News informs, news warns, news motivates'.<sup>148</sup> Reuter's understanding of the power of news, and levying interest on loans by money lenders, are abstract insights into the nature of money and news. To attain these insights required above average cognitive ability.

In contrast to Harpending and Cochran, I suggest that Talmudic analysis has played a major role in selecting for higher IQ, essentially because it would have selected for higher verbal and abstract reasoning. That, as noted by the two authors, Jewish Talmudic analysis has not attracted a great deal of interest beyond the Jewish community misses, I submit, the point, which is that intense analysis of the Talmud, - or Confucius, Plato, Saint Augustine, Marx and Lenin, or any other body of primary source material and its secondary literature - will certainly be of no interest to most people but the benefits derived from such intellectual training are considerable, and readily transferable to law, finance, economics, communications, literature, history, philosophy, science and politics, so providing some additional support for the existence of g. Harpending and Cochran may be wrong on this subject but what they propose is plausible. They deserve respect from Reich not his scorn. I look forward to reading Reich's account of the causes that led to the high mean IQ of Ashkenazim Jews of which he is an obvious beneficiary.

Meanwhile, indirect support for the Harpending and Cochran thesis comes from Gregory Clark who points out that Christians and Jews in Muslim-dominated Egypt and Iran who did not convert to Islam were able to raise their socio-economic and intellectual status by endogamy. To quote Clark: 'Once created, minorities in Islamic societies seem to have maintained their high status over more than a millennium through high rates of marital endogamy'.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> See, among others, Johan Mårtensson et al, 'Growth of language-related brain areas after foreign language learning', *NeuroImage*, 2012; 63 (1), p. 240

<sup>148</sup> Donald Read, *The Power of News: The History of Reuters, 1849-1989*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992, p.1

<sup>149</sup> Gregory Clark, *The Son also Rises: Surnames and the History of Social Mobility*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2014, p.239 (pp.238-239)

The German economist, Thilo Sarrazin, has come to similar conclusions, pointing out that in Muslim countries large Christian or Jewish minorities are overrepresented in trade, science and learning. Sarrazin explains the high socio-economic status of Christians and Jews relative to Muslims as follows:

During the 600 to 1,400 year period of Islamic rule - according to the time frame of the conquest - successive parts of Christian and Jewish populations repeatedly converted to Islam. This raised their civic status and they were spared the poll tax. This tendency to conversion was markedly stronger among the less successful and less educated Christians and Jews. The marriage ban came into effect after conversion, since Muslims were only permitted to marry Muslims. Over the centuries the different rates of conversion, based on social stratification, exerted a positive selection on the remaining Christians and Jews. The share of Christians and Jews in the Islamic world continuously fell back, their average abilities and achievements, however, stood out ever more prominently from the average of the Muslim majority. Both elements - selective conversion and the prohibition of interreligious marriages - had the effect over the centuries of creating an ever stronger genetic differentiation between Muslims and religious minorities. This explains why in all Islamic countries Christians and Jews have, on average, a higher level of educational attainment than Muslims; that in qualified professional fields such as medicine or engineering they are hugely overrepresented and consequently their economic influence is disproportionately high; that led to their being disproportionately driven out or murdered, as with Greeks and Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>150</sup>

If endogamy, a biological and genetic process, has played the key role in creating the superior socio-economic status enjoyed by non-Muslim minorities in Muslim states - and the high IQ of Ashkenazim Jews, as argued by Harpending and Cochran - then Clark's claim that social status 'is inherited as strongly as any biological trait, such as height'<sup>151</sup> eliminates genes as the primary factor in SES. In effect, Clark is arguing that SES is a social and political construct. It is the case that the sons and daughters of parents with high SES derive purely environmental benefits from high parental SES but high parental SES alone will not guarantee high SES for any sons and daughters who lack the necessary IQ to reach high SES independently of their parents. I quote Arthur Jensen:

*SES is an effect of IQ rather than a cause.* If SES were the cause of IQ, the correlation between adults' IQ and their attained SES would not be markedly higher than the correlation between children's IQ and their parents' SES. Further, the IQs of adolescents adopted in infancy are not correlated with the SES of their adoptive parents. Adults' attained SES (and hence their SES as parents) itself has a large genetic component, so there is a genetic correlation between SES and IQ, and this is so within both the white and black populations.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Thilo Sarrazin, *Feindliche Übernahme: Wie der Islam den Fortschritt behindert und die Gesellschaft bedroht (Enemy Takeover: How Islam impedes Progress and Threatens our Society)*, FinanzBuch Verlag, München, 2018, pp.157-158

<sup>151</sup> Clark, *The Son also Rises*, p.9

<sup>152</sup> Jensen, *The g factor*, p.491, emphasis added

If, however, Clark uses social status as a euphemism in order to avoid the use of IQ then the statement that social status is as heritable as height is consistent with what can be established. Both height and IQ are highly heritable. If, though, Clark's use of 'inherited' is intended to exclude any genetic component, then his use of 'inherited' is not only misleading, but also means that social status is not acquired by the effect of IQ but that the role of IQ - if any - is secondary to the operation of the environment created by the parents on the future SES of their progeny.

## **XII. Dire Warnings from Reich**

The amount of space in his book which Reich devotes to attacking implicitly or explicitly any notion that race and race differences exist, in spite of his ancestral DNA findings, suggests to me that the claims he makes are nowhere near as robust as he would have his readers believe. Thus: 'Most of today's populations are not exclusive descendants of the populations that lived in the same locations ten thousand years ago'.<sup>153</sup> This changes nothing about what actually exists today. This is followed by another warning from Reich:

The findings that the nature of human population structure is not what we assumed [who?] should serve as a warning to those who think they know that the true nature of human population differences will correspond to racial stereotypes.<sup>154</sup>

Racial stereotypes are not irrational, superstitious fears: they are based on recorded experiences and observations by different people over a long time. According to Reich:

The real offense of racism, in the end, is to judge individuals by a supposed stereotype of their group (sic) - to ignore the fact that when applied to specific individuals, stereotypes are almost always misleading. Statements such as "You are black, you must be musical" or "You are Jewish, you must be smart" are unquestionably very harmful.<sup>155</sup>

I question whether any black who was told he was 'musical' or whether any Jew who was told he was 'smart' would be offended or whether these comments could possibly be harmful. Reich's use of 'musical' is certainly misleading, definitely obsequious and undoubtedly ingratiating, since there is no black stereotype of blacks' being 'musical' - as in Ludwig van Beethoven, Guido d'Arrezzo, Henry Purcell and Wolfgang Mozart - but there is a well established and observable stereotype of blacks gyrating and writhing to loud noises. And the black saltatorial style is by no means the same as that adopted by whites. I personally find nothing offensive in Reich's use of the 'Hobbits' sobriquet to refer to the tiny hominids who once lived on Flores but then I ask whether Reich, who is ever so tip-toe wary about not telling a black that he has 'musical ability', would ever use any word that is somewhat humorous and could be construed as being even mildly derogatory of blacks: respect for 'Native Americans'<sup>156</sup> and 'ancient bones'<sup>157</sup> but not for the tiny people of the jungle.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.260

<sup>154</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.260

<sup>155</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.266-267

<sup>156</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.161

<sup>157</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.284

To stay with Tolkien, are blacks Orcs? I pose the question because in a discussion with students in the late 1990s on the matter whether *The Lord of the Rings* (1968) could be considered to be an epic novel, students insisted that Tolkien intended that Orcs, for example, be seen as blacks: Tolkien, they concluded, was racist. Onyeka Nubia, a Nigerian member of the faculty at the University of Nottingham (UK) claims that Tolkien demonises “people of colour”. In June 2023, a one Valdo Amissão Mendes Calocane, from Guinea-Bissau, a graduate of Nottingham University, and a “person of colour”, stabbed to death an employee of Nottingham University and two students from the same university. Such murderous and demonic attacks and rapes, perpetrated by “persons of colour”, are now common all over Western Europe.

And if Reich is concerned about stereotypes, perhaps he should have gone out of his way to decompose ‘white skin privilege’. If it is somehow offensive to tell a black that he has ‘musical’ ability, how should any white react to being called a ‘blue-eyed devil’, ‘snow roach’, ‘white bitch’, ‘white mother fucker’, ‘honky’ or ‘redneck’? Any advice David?

Meanwhile, Google AI informs me that the rebranding of a US sports team was necessary because ‘The name [Redskins] became highly controversial due to its offensive nature and derogatory connotations towards Native Americans’. White Americans will be pleased to know that the former UK defence secretary, Ben Wallace, racially abused all 24 individuals in team Trump, castigating them as ‘reckless rednecks’.<sup>159</sup> My direct complaint to the editor of *The Daily Telegraph* ignored, I referred the matter to something called the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO), citing *The Editors’ Codebook: The Handbook to the Editor’s Code of Practice* (2025). I was told that since no individual had been referred to as a ‘redneck’ there was no case to answer, a thoroughly unconvincing response which would not have been forthcoming had team Obama been racially abused, quite apart from the fact that it is, in any case, a clear violation of the Code’s introduction which stipulates that the Code ‘should be honoured not only to the letter, but in its full spirit’ (p.5). I repeatedly pressed IPSO to state whether it considered ‘redneck’ to be a racial slur and so merited sanctions, but IPSO refused to answer this question. To be noted is that IPSO is funded by the media outlets it is supposed to supervise, which does not exactly inspire confidence in its independence. Even less encouraging is that the present chairman of the Editor’s Code of Practice Committee is Chris Evans, the editor of *The Daily Telegraph*.

At one point in his book Reich introduces a new element in the matter of stereotypes. Having warned us of the dangers of stereotypes, he now, with the use of ‘supposed stereotype’, questions whether these stereotypes exist. Reich then tells us that the genome revolution has the power to undermine ‘old stereotypes’.<sup>160</sup> So do these ‘old stereotypes’ exist or do they not? And if they are ‘old stereotypes’ why are they old? Why have they survived as long as they have? These stereotypes - evidence of black priapic rhythm and lower mean intelligence

---

<sup>158</sup> The ‘hobbits’ are just one of five groups, the others being modern humans, Neanderthals, Siberian-Denisovans and Australo-Denisovans, who lived at the same time and who ‘were each separated by hundreds of thousands of years of evolution’ (Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.64). I submit that the existence of these five groups cannot be reconciled with the social and political construction of race.

<sup>159</sup> Ben Wallace, ‘Trump’s Team are behaving like reckless rednecks’, *The Daily Telegraph*, online, 25th March 2025.

<sup>160</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.267

- have survived as long as they have because they have been repeatedly observed. Stereotypes represent something real.

Reich instructs us:

Just as we had an inaccurate picture of early human origins before the ancient DNA revolution unleashed an avalanche of surprises, so we should distrust the instincts that we have about biological differences.<sup>161</sup>

The comparison of ‘an inaccurate picture of early human origins before the ancient DNA revolution’ with ‘instincts’, which Reich has constructed in order to imply that any instinctive response to biological differences is somehow irrational, dismisses a survival mechanism. Instincts are not to be summarily dismissed.

A ‘picture of early human origins before the ancient DNA revolution’ may well be ‘inaccurate’ and may well contain lacunae but it does not at all follow that the entire picture is utterly wrong and no longer of any value. Nor were these anonymous researchers whom Reich dismisses driven by ‘instincts’. Instincts played no part at all in the pioneering work of Charles Darwin, Francis Galton, Charles Spearman, John Baker, Arthur Jensen, Edward O. Wilson, J. Philippe Rushton, Charles Murray, Linda Gottfredson, Richard Herrnstein and Richard Lynn. Nor did I detect any reliance on ‘instincts’ in the work of Michael Levin. In fact, Levin’s *Feminism and Freedom* (1987) and *Why Race Matters: Race Differences and What They Mean* (1997) are master classes in logical analysis. To this roll call of high-quality work must also be added Frank Salter’s, *On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity, and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration* (2003 & 2007).

Nor did the nineteenth-century explorers of sub-Saharan Africa, Henry Fynn, David Livingstone, Francis Galton, J. H. Speke and Samuel Baker and George Schweinfurth, rely on ‘instincts’. These impressive men had no knowledge of ancestral DNA, genes and IQ test data but they very clearly grasped that Africans differed in all kinds of ways from Europeans, physically, mentally and intellectually. In the twenty-first century one does not need to have access to a well equipped laboratory or to possess a doctorate in genetics or evolutionary psychology or to have access to FBI crime data to know that gangs of blacks in US cities and in South Africa are highly likely to be feral, predatory and racially hostile towards whites, and that it is entirely rational to avoid them and the places they are likely to frequent.

But these fiendish stereotypes adapt, they mutate, they survive, they proliferate, they will not go away. Political correctness failed to liquidate them and the spiteful and best efforts of the woking class have all been in vain:

Unfortunately, today there is a new breed of writers and scholars who argue not only that there are average genetic differences, but that they can guess what they are based on traditional racial stereotypes.<sup>162</sup>

Firstly, these writers and scholars are not engaging in guesswork and, secondly, ‘traditional racial stereotypes’ or other stereotypes do not emerge *ex nihilo*. Nicholas Wade is correct on all the essential points. Having taught in American and British universities, I can confirm

---

<sup>161</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.260

<sup>162</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.260

that there was - there is - a virulent politically correct orthodoxy in these institutions, and that university administrators and bureaucracies, often aided and abetted by faculty members, readily deploy administrative and quasi-legal sanctions to dismiss any faculty member who publicly dissented. Reich knows full well that this is the case, so I do not understand why he denies that this persecution exists.

Not only will dissenters be targeted by administrative terror, they will also face the risk of violence from ignorant students and the mob. The despicable way in which Arthur Jensen was treated after the publication of his compelling and influential article in the *Harvard Education Review* (1969) is evidence enough. Why are dissenters from racial orthodoxy, such as Professor Amy Wax, still being hounded and vilified in 2026? Her assertions about black academic performance are reasonable and based on obvious facts: firstly, that black applicants to law schools *are* admitted with lower academic requirements than whites (affirmative action) and, secondly, that black students admitted under the provisions of affirmative action struggle to cope with the demands of law. And regardless of subject this is not exactly a recent discovery. I cite the following from Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987):

Affirmative action now institutionalizes the worst aspects of separatism. The fact is that the average black student's achievements do not equal those of the average white student in the good universities, and everybody knows it. It is also a fact that the university degree of a black student is also tainted, and employers look on it with suspicion, or become guilty accomplices in the toleration of incompetence.<sup>163</sup>

Bloom wrote these lines in 1987. So why has the cruel, vindictive and utterly failed policy known as affirmative action not been abolished?

Reich harbours considerable and unwarranted animus towards Nicholas Wade and James Watson:

Writing now, I shudder to think of Watson, or of Wade, or their forbears, behind my shoulder. The history of science has revealed, again and again, the danger of trusting one's instincts or of being led astray by one's biases - of being too convinced that one knows the truth. From the errors of thinking that the sun revolves around the earth, that the human lineage separated from the great ape lineage tens of millions of years ago, and that present-day human population structure is fifty thousand years old whereas in fact we know it was forged through population mixtures largely over the last five thousand years - from all these errors and more, we should take the cautionary lesson not to trust our gut instincts or the stereotyped expectations we find around us.<sup>164</sup>

In my capacity as their self-appointed defence attorney I respond on behalf of the accused as follows:

---

<sup>163</sup> Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), with a foreword by Saul Bellow, Simon & Schuster, New York & London, Touchstone edition, 1988, p.96

<sup>164</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.263-264

(i). The behind-my-shoulder accusation implies that Watson and Wade are somehow ideological accessories to the genocides of the twentieth century; that they are little better than Lenin, Stalin, Beria, Hitler, Mao and Pol Pot. This is an unforgivable slur;

(ii). The danger ‘of being led astray by one’s biases - of being too convinced that one knows the truth’ is the very essence of the neo-Marxist ideologies, postmodernists and One-Worlders that over the last 60 years have sought to impose, regardless of evidence to the contrary, the assertion that race is a social and political construct. If any person or groups of like-minded persons have succumbed to their biases, these people have, and the consequences have been disastrous. Dissenters are never to be allowed to put their case without being shouted down and threatened with dismissal (and worse). Reich actually provides an example of ‘shouting down’. In response to the hypothesis of Joseph Greenberg, who argued that all Native American languages could be grouped into three families, a one Lyle Campbell stated that the classification was objectionable and ‘should be shouted down’.<sup>165</sup> It turned out that ‘the genetic data provided a large measure of confirmation for Greenberg’s broad picture’.<sup>166</sup> By contrast, Reich ignores the cowardly and despicable treatment of Arthur Jensen. Jensen was targeted and threatened with violence and faced death threats not because his attackers wanted to expose his gut-instinct-driven research which, they claimed, was based on uncritical acceptance of racial stereotypes, but because he was far closer to the truth on the matter of racial differences in IQ, and this was not at all to the liking of those who uncritically accepted - and those who still maintain - that black failure was, and is, due to racism and ‘white skin privilege’;

(iii). In what way does the conviction imputed to Wade by Reich that he, Wade ‘knows the truth about the differences among populations’<sup>167</sup> differ from Reich’s confident - at times - strident claims about the ancestral DNA revolution?;

(iv). That the races and sub-races we observe today were ‘forged through population mixtures largely over the last five thousand years’ does not remove or undermine the main racial divisions of Caucasoid, Negroid and Mongoloid that can be observed;

(v). Reich refers to Wade’s book, *A Troublesome Inheritance: Genes, Race and Human History* (2014) and is compelled to concede that Wade has identified enforcement of ‘an implausible orthodoxy’<sup>168</sup> by what he, Reich, calls an ‘academic community’.

Reich continues:

Wade’s book combines compelling content with parts that are entirely speculative, presenting everything with the same authority and in the same voice, so that naive readers who accept the parts of it that are well argued are tempted to accept the rest. Worse, when compared to Wade’s previous writing, in which the rebels speaking the truth were scholars of creativity and accomplishment, he does not identify any serious scholarship in genetics supporting his speculations. And

---

<sup>165</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, cited p.174

<sup>166</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.175

<sup>167</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.262

<sup>168</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.261

yet by celebrating those who have opposed the flawed orthodoxy, he implies wrongly that their alternative theories must be right.<sup>169</sup>

Attacking Wade because ‘he does not identify any serious scholarship in genetics’ misses the target. Genetics is just one discipline the findings of which can be cited to demonstrate that race and race differences exist and that these differences have real world consequences. Reich has been reluctantly forced to concede this point. At the very start of his book Reich notes that computers used by Cavalli-Sforza clustered populations into the familiar racial groups and the same results were achieved by Marc Feldman. In the field of psychometrics Spearman has demonstrated the existence of *g* (*g* factor) and Jensen’s research has, if not confirmed its existence, forced us to take *g* very seriously. The claim that ‘all people today are capable of mastering conceptual language and innovating their culture in a way that is a hallmark of modern humans’<sup>170</sup> is not consistent with what can be observed within and between populations (races). Within a population there is wide variation in the breadth and depth of vocabulary acquired and considerable differences in the grasp and mastery of conceptual language (abstract nouns and reasoning) both of which are associated with higher levels of *g*.

The mastery and development of language are by no means uniform within and between racial groups. To the examples cited by Baker<sup>171</sup> I can add the following case which is derived from my debriefing of some British overseas aid volunteers who had worked as health advisors in Malawi, as part of an on-going AIDS-prevention campaign. The volunteers explained to the Malawians the importance of using a condom when having sex. The chosen method to illustrate the procedure was to take a banana – to represent the obvious – and the health advisor would then place a condom on the banana. When the volunteers followed up their initial demonstration sometime later they enquired of the Malawians whether they were using the condoms as instructed. The Malawians dutifully replied that they did what they had been instructed to do: *they always placed a condom on a banana before they engaged in sexual intercourse*. The volunteers I debriefed did not see the hilarious side to this response, nor did they grasp what is the more significant aspect. What this incident reveals, I suggest, is that the ability to grasp the *symbolic* function of a banana in the demonstration is either completely absent or too poorly developed, indicating very limited capacity or no capacity for abstract reasoning. To the European mind the banana *obviously* represented the *obvious* but not to these Africans for whom the condom on a banana functioned as a powerful fetish or charm, precluding the need to place a condom on an erect penis because the protective powers of the condom would be, they believed, magically transferred to a penis merely by putting a condom on a banana.

As suggested by Michael Levin, Afrocentrism may also indicate a way of understanding the world which is quite different from Europeans: ‘Afrocentrists speak of a “raid into Africa” in Aristotle’s time to steal African science, but ignorance of the Pythagorean Theorem on the part of modern Africans cannot be explained by the Greeks having made off with it. The currency among blacks of the “stolen heritage” doctrine, with its curious conception of knowledge, is perhaps more evidence of race differences in cognitive functioning’.<sup>172</sup> If the African mind sees knowledge as something tangible and concrete, then, as far as the African

---

<sup>169</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.261

<sup>170</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.17

<sup>171</sup> John Baker, *Race*, pp.500-503

<sup>172</sup> Levin, *Why Race Matters*, p.195

mind is concerned, the belief that knowledge can be physically removed, hidden or stolen is by no means implausible. However, a brain that conceives of knowledge as something exclusively tangible but which is unable to grasp or to manipulate abstract reasoning is a brain that will be unable to progress to, or enjoy, the technological mastery achieved by the West, China and Japan. The only possibility for such a brain to account for knowledge and the creation of complex consumer products is to invoke magic and the supernatural.

(vi). And where is Reich's uncompromising and robust defence of free speech and academic freedom in his book? It is nowhere to be found, a truly unforgivable and damning omission, in view of the state of Western universities.

In attacking Wade, Reich refers to 'the rebels speaking the truth were scholars of creativity and accomplishment'. Just for the record, it would have been very useful had Reich identified 'the rebels speaking the truth'. Who are they? Reich does not summarise Wade's 'speculations' for the benefit of the reader, naive or otherwise, nor the extent to which any scholarship in genetics, which satisfies Reich's definition of 'serious', supports Wade.

'If we can be confident of anything', Reich warns us, 'it is that whatever differences we think we perceive, our expectations are most likely wrong'.<sup>173</sup> Does this apply to Reich and his work or only to Wade, Watson and Harpending? There is more from Reich:

What makes Watson's and Wade's and Harpending's statements racist is the way they jump from the observation that the academic community is denying the possibility of differences that are plausible, to a claim with no scientific evidence<sup>4</sup> that they know what those differences are and also that the differences correspond to long-standing popular stereotypes - a conviction that is essentially guaranteed to be wrong.<sup>174</sup>

In response I make the following points:

(i). Statements by Watson, Wade and Harpending may be wrong, but that does not justify accusations of racism from Reich (racism is neither defined nor explained by Reich). What triggers the reflex response of 'racism' from Reich - and from so many others - is the fear that Watson and others are correct;

(ii). Claims made by Watson, Wade and Harpending that something characterised as an 'academic community' by Reich is denying things it, this 'community', does not like, are true. There is, in any case, no such thing as an 'academic community'. An 'academic community' that responds to dissenters from racial orthodoxy with hatred reveals itself to be a vicious cult. Bearing in mind the way dissenters have been treated over the decades, Reich's use of 'community', as in 'academic community', is wholly out of place. When I hear the words 'academic community', I am reminded not of monks toiling in a scriptorium, Yeshiva students or Socrates and Phaedrus on the banks of the Ilissus discussing the merits of the speech delivered by Lysias. On the contrary: I see before me a large pit full of writhing and hissing snakes;

---

<sup>173</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.264

<sup>174</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.264

(iii). The problem for Reich is not that convictions held by Watson et al are ‘guaranteed to be wrong’, but that they are too close to the truth. This does not sit too comfortably with Reich’s warnings to readers on the dangers ‘of being led astray by one’s biases - of being too convinced that one knows the truth’, whereas Reich has no hesitation in telling the reader that the conviction held by Watson et al ‘is essentially guaranteed to be wrong’.<sup>175</sup> *Ipsa dixit*: Comrade Reich has spoken.

Looking ahead, Reich reveals nauseating cynicism:

So how should we prepare for the likelihood that in the coming years, genetic studies will show that the behavioral or cognitive traits are influenced by genetic variation, and that these traits will differ on average across human populations, both with regard to their average and their variation within populations?<sup>176</sup>

Ignored by Reich is the vast corpus of high-quality research in the public domain, which very clearly demonstrates that IQ and other traits are heavily determined by genes. It is not a matter of preparing for anything in the future; we do not need to wait to see what more will be revealed by genetic studies. The immediate and pressing concern is not the absence of research data which were, in any case, available well before Reich’s laboratory set to work. The real problem is not preparing for anything to be revealed, but the mountains of Lies disseminated by federal agencies, universities, Hollywood, and corporate mass media on the absolute intellectual equality of blacks and whites. When the industrial lying ceases, and when people like Reich cease to obfuscate the data - past and present - and cease their dissembling, and dissenters from Reichian orthodoxy are no longer persecuted, then and only then, can the consequences of genes and the IQ nexus be openly addressed. There are moments in *Who We Are and How We Got Here* when it looks as if Reich is on the threshold of nailing his theses to the doors of Howard University but it never happens. It is so much easier and more comfortable to ignore Jensen et al, and sneer at Watson, Harpending and Wade.

### **XIII. No Rest for the Reichous**

Reich claims to see new dangers:

It would be tempting, in the wake of the genome revolution, to settle on a new comforting platitude, invoking the history of repeated admixture in the human past as an argument for population differences being meaningless. But such a statement is wrongheaded, as if we were to randomly pick two people living in the world today, we would find that many of the population lineages contributing to them have been isolated from each other for long enough that there has been ample opportunity for substantial average biological differences to arise between them. The right way to deal with the inevitable discovery of substantial differences across populations is to realize that their existence should not affect the way we conduct ourselves.<sup>177</sup>

In response I make the following points:

---

<sup>175</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.264

<sup>176</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.265

<sup>177</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.265

(i). Throughout his book, Reich has gone out of his way to dismiss and to ridicule any notion of race because of the huge amount of admixture and interbreeding.<sup>178</sup> He implies that this level of repeated interbreeding renders any notion of race worthless. My ability easily to identify people belonging to the racial categories of Caucasoid, Negroid and Mongoloid is in no way negatively affected by the knowledge that these large racial groups are themselves the product of thousands of years of interbreeding. The definition of race drafted by Arthur Jensen would be just as applicable to the Beaker Folk or to members of the *Iamnaia kul'tura* as it is today to the Caucasoid, Negroid and Mongoloid races. If 'substantial average biological differences' have arisen, as in Reich's example, the chances are that the differences separating these two randomly selected individuals will be shared by others indicating that isolation and evolution have created races and racial differences;

(ii). Reich now warns us at this late stage in his book that all the interbreeding does not mean that 'population differences are meaningless'. This very late intervention must be seen either as a belated recognition of the implications for today's existing racial categories (populations as Reich evasively calls them) and a rejection of his earlier claims that because of all the interbreeding there are no races, or, more likely, it is an example of something more banal: incompetence on the part of Reich and his copy-editrix. It should have been clear to Reich when he initiated his crusade against the existence of races (not so pure, moderately pure or very pure) that millennia of slaughter and copulations would not invalidate the concept of race: they confirm it;

(iii). Reich's words, 'the inevitable discovery of substantial differences across populations', are thoroughly dishonest and amount to an assertion that what he calls the DNA revolution has initiated a *tabula rasa*. The words 'inevitable discovery' imply that substantial racial differences were unknown before the application of the techniques of ancestral-DNA analysis and that, therefore, the work of very large numbers of researchers and scholars in this field are to be dismissed as being of no value. I suggest that what makes the work of Charles Spearman and Arthur Jensen so remarkable is that it is a triumph of theoretical analysis. Whether Reich likes it or not the data emerging from ancestral DNA research do not in any way render the insights of Spearman and Jensen (and others) of no value. Were one to be charitable one could say that Stephen J. Gould and Richard Lewontin were severely in error, yet Reich cannot bring himself to say so in plain English. By contrast, Reich pretends that a titan like Jensen did not exist and insults Wade, Harpending and Watson;

(iv). The Lewontin claim that differences within a race exceed the differences between races, and that this invalidates any concept of race continues to be cited by those eager to deny the biological nature of race and race differences. As recently as March 2021, it was cited in a UK government report, *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities. The Report*<sup>179</sup>, in order

---

<sup>178</sup> 'Admixture has not kept the Ashkenazim from becoming genetically distinct. Even if a population starts out as a mixture of two peoples, as in this case, becoming endogamous (ending intermarriage) and staying so for a long time ensures that the population will become homogenous', Cochran and Harpending, *The 10,000 Year Explosion*, p.205.

<sup>179</sup> *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities. The Report*, 31st March 2021, p.215 The report was commissioned by the Race Disparity Unit of the British government's Cabinet Office, now rebranded as the Race Equality Unit. An obvious riposte to Lewontin is that the huge variation among dogs, snakes and cats does not invalidate canine, serpentine or feline classifications. As regards race and human differences, an analysis by Henry Harpending

to demonstrate that the concept of race has no value. Yet it has obviously not occurred to the 11 authors of this report - only one of whom is white, an interesting disparity itself - that if they are going to use race in the report's title and are then going to dedicate 258 pages to the matter of race and its consequences and liberally use words such as "racist" and "racial" throughout, some definition of race would be rather useful. The authors omit any definition of race in the glossary yet define the nature of a 'post-racial society'. In the absence of any definition of race (racial), a 'post-racial society', defined by the authors as 'A theoretical environment in which the UK is free from racial preference, discrimination, and prejudice'<sup>180</sup>, lacks any substance and escapes scrutiny by its very deliberate vagueness. Those who want to build a 'post-racial society' must have a clear idea of what is meant by race so that they can effectively create a society in which race no longer exists. A definition of race is an essential part of the blueprint for the construction of any 'post-racial society'.

I made repeated attempts to secure a definition of race from the UK Cabinet Office. I was eventually informed by the Public Correspondence Team Cabinet Office that 'ethnicity' was used instead of 'race' because 'surveys usually ask people for their ethnicity and not their race' and that 'using consistent terms helps people to understand our data'. Taking into account that the report is entitled *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities. The Report* and that the title acknowledges 'race' and makes a distinction between 'race' and 'ethnic' then the response from the Cabinet Office is obviously evasive and intended to ignore the distinction and its implications. The point of using 'ethnicity' in surveys instead of 'race' is to play down or to deny any association with genes and biology and to assert the supremacy of culture.

(v). A 'post-racial society' can assume only one of three forms: (i) it is a society based on race as a social and political construct which is a collection of dehumanised beings; (ii) it is a society of racially and immutably mixed and blended individuals which, in order to prevent races re-emerging must be a society of clones - Reich's 'immutable categories' - in which the operation of natural selection based on genetic variation has been permanently suspended, thereby preventing adaptation to future challenges and running the risk of future extinction of all non-human beings; (iii) it is a society in which race is recognised as being the product of genes, biology and evolution and one in which all attempts to suppress or to ignore the reality of race and race differences are finally abandoned. In this iteration it would lead, among other things, to the abolition of racial preferences (quotas) for poorly qualified and less intelligent blacks in UK government agencies and universities, and an end to anti-white propaganda in corporate literature and advertising. Funded by taxation, the UK state media platform, the BBC, would be legally required to meet significantly tougher and objective standards on reporting race, and would no longer be permitted to propagandize diversity unchallenged.

(vi). Reich instructs us that the existence of 'substantial differences across populations' [...] 'should not affect the way we conduct ourselves'. Bearing in mind that not all members of racial groups react the same way to medical treatment, then this knowledge means that we should behave differently to certain races in these circumstances, either by not administering certain drugs or applying race-specific treatments. The current practice of allowing low-IQ blacks to attend universities is another area that mandates different conduct. Affirmative

---

(cited in Sarich and Miele, *RACE*, pp.168-169) effectively demonstrates the flaws in Lewontin's reasoning, as does Arthur Jensen's analysis. See *The g factor*, endnote 4, pp.516-517

<sup>180</sup> *Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities. The Report*, p.241

action has no place in a university (or anywhere else for that matter). The following is what one would have expected from Richard Lewontin. To quote Reich:

For most traits, the degree of variation among individuals is so large that any one person in any population can excel at any trait regardless of his or her population origin, even if particular populations have different average values due to a mixture of genetic and cultural influences.<sup>181</sup>

Black swan events are theoretically possible, however unlikely. That said, I put it to Reich that there is no realistic possibility that a Bushman (Sanid) or Australian aborigine would be able to match the achievements of Plato or Sir Isaac Newton. In any case, Reich misses the point or has chosen to ignore the point, and he does this by obfuscating the significance of the 15%-85% claim made by Lewontin:

For the great majority of traits, there is, as Lewontin said, much more variation within populations, than across populations. This means that individuals with extreme high or low values of the great majority of traits can occur in any population. But it does not preclude the existence of subtler, average differences in traits across populations.<sup>182</sup>

Of course not: but this has never been denied, and is evident in the bimodal distribution of the black and white IQ. Reich merely restates the obvious in a circumlocutory manner in order to obfuscate the obvious. The essential problem in the matter of mean black-white IQ differences is not the complete absence of high-IQ blacks but that there are far fewer high-IQ blacks compared to high-IQ whites. This is clear enough and entirely predictable from the fact that mean black IQ in the US (85) is markedly lower than mean white IQ (100), and in sub-Saharan Africa mean IQ drops to 68 and collapses to 62 among Australian aborigines.<sup>183</sup> There is nothing very subtle about these IQ differences or their consequences.

Global IQ scores and their consequences may in fact be even bleaker still. In *The Intelligence of Nations* (2019), Richard Lynn and David Becker, conducted a comprehensive survey of global IQ. According to their analysis, Japan (106.48), Taiwan (106.47) and Singapore (105.89) are the highest IQ trio, and the nations with the lowest IQs are Liberia (45.07), Sierra Leone (45.07) and Nepal (42.99). Even by the standards of sub-Saharan Africa the IQs of Liberia and Sierra Leone are unusually low and need to be treated with caution, as noted by the authors. The authors also note that the IQ of Nepal is ‘very implausible’ and must also be treated with caution, since the plausible expectation is that the Nepal IQ would be closer to that of India (76.24).<sup>184</sup>

(vii). Reich would have us believe that the findings of ancestral DNA have destroyed claims of ‘biologically based nationalism’.<sup>185</sup> That a race is the product of multiple interbreeding over the millennia does not change the fact that this race, having been created and having

---

<sup>181</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.265-266

<sup>182</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.255, emphasis added

<sup>183</sup> Richard Lynn, *The Global Bell Curve: Race, IQ, and Inequality Worldwide*, Washington Summit Publishers, August, Georgia, 2008, p.61

<sup>184</sup> Richard Lynn and David Becker, *The Intelligence of Nations*, Ulster Institute for Social Research, London, 2019, p.173 & pp.117-118)

<sup>185</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.267

emerged in this manner, now exists, and that it will assert *its* interests and prerogatives at the expense of others: ‘everything changes but nothing changes’ (Heraclitus). The nature of intertribal and intergroup violence that is revealed in the archaeological record cannot be explained without there being tribes and groups with sufficiently powerful survival interests and motivation that, in their eyes, justified the slaughter of outsiders. Reich is very reluctant to concede the nature of this intertribal and interracial violence as a means to explain why some races survived and others perished. Misled by Reich’s unwillingness to accept, and his attempts to undermine, the role played by violence - with a nod and a wink - the naive reader could easily walk away from Reich’s book with the view that the encounters between Neanderthals and modern humans ended peacefully. Interracial violence supports a biological basis for nationalism, and what Marx and Engels considered to be class war is, I suggest, intraracial conflict;

(viii). Further, on the matter of a ‘pure’ race, the very emergence of a race with identifiable traits peculiar to it involves a process of winnowing and purification since in order that these traits emerge - and are observable - other traits must be discarded and deselected. Unlike gold and plutonium which can be purified to an exceptionally high degree, races cannot achieve anything like the same degree of purity (not for the time being). Pure gold is not subject to evolutionary change and survival pressures: human beings are and so a pure race even if achievable could not be permanently maintained since attempts to do would mean that the race would lose the ability to adapt to change. So for a time - evolutionary and biological time - the race will exist and revel in its existence but its time will pass and it will be no more but meanwhile this does not mean there is no ‘biological nationalism’. While a race exists, there is a place for ‘biological nationalism’ - there has to be - since any race which did not regard itself as *primus inter pares* would not assert its interests at the expense other races, and nationalism which is not derived from biology and genes, takes us back to the evolutionary dead end of race as a social and political construct;

(ix). Reich adduces additional evidence that gets in the way of his hostility to any degree of racial purity or statistically demonstrable differences. To quote Reich:

However, in Europe, where we have made most progress in the ancient DNA revolution so far, we know that by four thousand years ago, many populations were already highly similar in their ancestry composition to those of today. For example, in Britain, we know that beginning after forty-five hundred years ago with people who buried their dead in association with wide-mouthed Bell-Beaker pots, ancient Britons harbored a blend of ancestries very similar to that of present-day Britons. Yet it would be a mistake to conclude from this that the people of Britain today are descended without mixture from the “Beaker folk”. In fact, Britain’s population has been transformed by multiple subsequent waves of migration of continental people who were genetically similar to the people associated with Beaker burials.<sup>186</sup>

To reiterate the essential point: these transformations were violent, and if the invasion of Britain was by people ‘who were genetically similar to the people associated with the Beaker burials’ then there are good grounds for racial homogeneity. I cite the following from John Baker in *Race*:

---

<sup>186</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.277-278

It has been stated that the English were ‘a truly multiracial society’ because there were Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Normans, Belgics, and ‘flamboyant Celts’ among their ancestors. The reader should note that all these peoples were not only of one race (Europid) but of one subrace (Nordid). Incidentally it is doubtful whether the Angles and Saxons were different peoples in any sense.

It follows from what has been said that the English are far from being ‘one of the most mongrel strains of the human race’.<sup>187</sup>

(x). Commenting on another study of Britain<sup>188</sup>, Reich noted that:

The study found that the British population was very homogenous by conventional measures. For example, the classic measure of genetic differentiation between two British populations is about one hundred times smaller than the same measurement of population differentiation comparing Europeans to East Asians. Despite the homogeneity, however, the authors were able to cluster the British population into seventeen crisply defined groups by searching for groups in which all pairs of individuals have elevated rates of recently shared genetic ancestors. Plotting the positions onto a map, they observed extraordinary genetic structuring, which has persisted despite the fact that people have moved back and forth continually over the British countryside over the past millennium, a process that would have been expected to homogenize the population.<sup>189</sup>

This lends a great deal of support to Baker (see above) and, in addition, supports the claim that some degree of racial purity or racial distinctiveness exists and is quite normal. In fact, the existence of ‘crisply defined groups’ cannot be reconciled with Reich’s claims that any degree of racial purity does not exist or is some kind of myth cultivated for ideological reasons. Nor are Reich’s claims about any degree of racial purity consistent with his own use of ‘highly divergent populations’<sup>190</sup>, ‘highly divergent peoples’<sup>191</sup>, ‘Africans are more genetically diverse than non-Africans and carry the most deeply diverging lineages’<sup>192</sup> or

---

<sup>187</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.267

<sup>188</sup> See S. Leslie et al., ‘The Fine-Scale Genetic Structure of the British Population’, *Nature* 519, 2015, pp.309-314

<sup>189</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.279 (emphasis added)

<sup>190</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.81

<sup>191</sup> This wording is used by Reich when he mulls over the fate of the people who created the Lapita pottery on the islands of Vanuatu and Tonga approximately 3,000 years ago. DNA analysis revealed very little or no Papuan ‘ancestry’ (genes). The mystery for Reich is how a later wave from the New Guinea region ‘could have so comprehensively replaced the descendants of the original people who made Lapita pottery and yet retained the languages these people probably spoke’[...] ‘This proof of interaction between highly divergent peoples puts the ball back into the court of archaeologists to explain the nature and effects of those migrations’ (Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.201). There is no mystery. I suggest that the case of this ‘interaction between highly divergent peoples’ was resolved in the tried and tested manner: slaughter, cannibalism and dispossession.

<sup>192</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.37

‘genetic monoculture’<sup>193</sup> to describe today’s West Eurasia compared with what existed ten thousand years ago.<sup>194</sup>

Further, parts of Africa, Reich instructs us, reveal ‘regions of genetic homogeneity demarcated by sharp boundaries’.<sup>195</sup> In other words, where for whatever reasons there are people separated from one another and who are characterised by ‘genetic homogeneity’ one finds not merely a higher level of racial purity, since the higher the actual degree of ‘genetic homogeneity’, the less fuzzy will be the boundaries between these separated peoples, but the stronger will be the probability that a genetically distinct group exists, who can properly be characterised as a race.

Africa provides more shocks to claims that race is a social and political construct. To quote Reich: ‘In most parts of the genome, Africans are more genetically diverse than non-Africans and carry the most deeply diverging lineages, as is the case with mitochondrial DNA’.<sup>196</sup> Reich’s reluctance to use the word race does not help him since if it is possible to distinguish between non-Africans and Africans at a genetic level - and at the level of external observable physical differences, skin and eye colour et al - then any objections to the use of the word race cannot be based on any scientific evidence or rigour but are based either on intellectual cowardice or on a position that denies race and racial differences for ideological reasons. Further, it can also be noted, firstly, that the observation made by Reich that ‘Africans are more genetically diverse than non-Africans and carry the most deeply diverging lineages, as is the case with mitochondrial DNA’ is an express and evidence-based rejection of the ideological position that race is a social and political construct and, secondly, is an observation that is entirely consistent with the definition of race provided by Arthur Jensen (see above).

And this process is not confined to Africa:

Thus the extraordinary physical differences among Native American groups today are due to evolution, since splitting from a common ancestral population, not to immigration from different sources in Eurasia. We called this common ancestral population the “First Americans”.<sup>197</sup>

India also has many shocks for the race deniers:

North Sentinel Island is populated by one of the last largely uncontacted Stone Age peoples of the world - a group of several hundred people who are now protected from outside interference by the Indian government, and who are so not-of-our-world that they shot arrows at Indian helicopters sent to offer help after the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004. The Andamanese speak languages that are so different from any others in Eurasia that they have no traceable connections. They also look very different from other humans living nearby, with slighter frames and tightly coiled hair.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>193</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p. 95

<sup>194</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.95

<sup>195</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.224

<sup>196</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.37

<sup>197</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.172

<sup>198</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.128-129, emphasis added

Describing these islanders as ‘so not-of-our-world’ is not exactly the obligatory language of the working class, the feigned warm inclusiveness of the global happy family. On the contrary, Reich’s words exude superiority and exclusiveness. To whose world, in any case, does Reich refer with ‘our world’? Is this the world of very affluent college faculty such as Reich who live in lily-white, diversity-free neighbourhoods but who nevertheless insist that “diversity” is a blessing? Reich’s hypocrisy to one side, the words ‘so not-of-our-world’ are robustly consistent with the hostility towards white men, expressed in ‘the abolition of whiteness’. A white male who has been socially and physically pushed to the margins of society, with the intention that he rot and degrade in isolation or that he be dispossessed and physically liquidated is most certainly ‘so not-of-our-world’, and he is to be constantly told and reminded that he is not welcome in decent society. So does this mark the final and irrevocable abandonment by Reich of all his assertions - hinted at, insinuated, implied or explicit - that race is a social and political construct?

#### **XIV. The Ideology of Race as a Social and Political Construct and the Implications for Space Travel and Space Exploration**

That, as Reich acknowledges, there are on Earth ‘substantial differences across populations’<sup>199</sup> is likely to have serious implications for crew selection in space travel and exploration. The conditions which human beings of all races will experience in space exploration and long-term settlements on the Moon, Mars and beyond will amount to another experiment testing the thesis whether race is a social and political construct, since conditions en route to the Moon and further afield, and in any long-term settlement, will be the same for all crew members of all races (and sexes).

A particularly exhaustive account of the psychological problems experienced by US and Soviet astronauts in, and after return from, space was compiled by Captain Daniel L. Collins (USAF).<sup>200</sup> With long-duration space missions to Mars and prolonged stays on the Moon likely within the next decade, crew selection, cohesion and compatibility are mission-critical. Writing in 1985, Collins noted that ‘Psychological compatibility has been a recurring problem during the short-duration space missions’ but ‘no present attempts are being made to define the desirable personal characteristics of the optimum space crew’.<sup>201</sup>

The problem was known to be serious decades ago. For example, Collins reports that American astronauts and Soviet cosmonauts, all of whom had been subjected to severe and strictly applied selection criteria, frequently manifested ‘poor judgement, belligerence, interpersonal dissension, irritability with ground managers, and gross violations of crew discipline, which could have resulted in tragedy’.<sup>202</sup> So bad, in fact, was the breakdown in interpersonal relations on Apollo 13 that ground controllers considered aborting the mission.

---

<sup>199</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.251 & p.265

<sup>200</sup> Captain Daniel L. Collins (USAF), ‘Psychological Issues Relevant to Astronaut Selection for Long-Duration Space Flight: A Review of the Literature’, This article was first published in 1985 and reprinted in *Journal of Human Performance in Extreme Environments*, volume 7, 1, 2003, pp.43-67.

<sup>201</sup> Collins, ‘Psychological Issues Relevant to Astronaut Selection for Long-Duration Space Flight’, p.44

<sup>202</sup> Collins, ‘Psychological Issues Relevant to Astronaut Selection for Long-Duration Space Flight’, p.44

Then there are problems post-flight, arising from a complete re-evaluation of all spiritual and philosophical values: a cosmically-induced moment of Pauline conversion (or something like it). For a mission that ends with the safe return of the astronauts to Earth, this is merely a deep personal event, but the consequences for all crew members after a long flight to Mars, with months ahead on the planet, followed by a flight home, may be far more serious and unpredictable. It may well prove to be the complete vindication of the thoughts of Hjalmar Söderberg on the insuperable loneliness of the human soul. Only the most self-sufficient would not be crushed and succumb to despair. Would they still regard Earth as ‘home’? Would they prefer to end their lives on the Red Planet rather than return to Sagan’s Pale Blue Dot?

In his analysis of crew selection and questions of cohesion and compatibility Collins does not specifically mention race but, given the salience of cohesion and compatibility, questions of race (and sex) cannot be ignored. For example, Collins reports that in crew selection for the Mercury and Apollo programmes and Space Shuttle the minimum IQ was 132 and the emphasis was on mathematical and spatial reasoning.<sup>203</sup> Taking into account that the mean black IQ is 85 (USA), the implications for Diversity, Inclusion and Equity in crew selection are clear enough. And the implications are not just a matter of IQ. For certain tasks it may be possible to reduce the minimum IQ limit to accommodate blacks, but considerations of temperament and personality differences will remain. If all-white Soviet and American crews have demonstrated severe breakdowns in interpersonal relations in space, it would be folly to assume that racially diverse crews, given the nature of American society, would not manifest the same problems and stresses, possibly violence. Even if any racial problems do not exist in space, news from Earth has the power to cause them. How would black and white crew members on a lunar base have reacted to the news of George Floyd’s death in police custody and the subsequent looting and rioting? Violent dissent along racial lines or unanimous condemnation of the rioters and looters?

Meanwhile, space-medicine research continues. The NASA Twins Study<sup>204</sup> provided valuable data which were derived from the study of male monozygotic twins. One of the twins spent 340 days on board the International Space Station (ISS), while the other remained on Earth. The NASA Twins Study identified 10 bodily functions that were affected by long-term space flight: (i) body mass and nutrition, (ii) telomere length regulation, (iii) maintenance of genome stability, (iv) vascular health, (v) ocular structural adaptations, (vi) transcriptional and metabolic changes, (vii) epigenetic shifts, (viii) lipid level alterations, (ix) microbiome responses, and (x) cognitive function.<sup>205</sup>

‘Continuous high levels of astronaut cognitive performance’, noted the authors of the NASA Twins Study, ‘are critical for mission success.’<sup>206</sup> Worryingly, they also noted that there was

---

<sup>203</sup> Collins, ‘Psychological Issues Relevant to Astronaut Selection for Long-Duration Space Flight’, p.54

<sup>204</sup> Francine E. Garrett-Bakelman et al, ‘The NASA Twins Study: A Multidimensional Analysis of a Year-Long Human Spaceflight’, *Science*, 364, 2019, pp.1-20. The NASA Twins Study may well have been inspired by the earlier research project, the Minnesota Twins Study, which sought to assess the relative impact of genes and environment on twins who were separated from one another at birth or soon after.

<sup>205</sup> NASA Twins Study, p.14

<sup>206</sup> NASA Twins Study, p.12

a reduction in cognitive performance in speed and accuracy which lasted for up to 6 months after the end of the mission.<sup>207</sup> For a flight to Mars and extended exploration time on the planet the implications of this decline in cognitive performance are especially serious, since if the negative effects on cognitive performance arising from a long flight to Mars cannot be mitigated, or ideally eliminated, the astronauts will face the severe challenges of landing and establishing a base for immediate survival at the moment when they may not be functioning at their cognitive best. Does this decline affect all races and sexes equally? Detailed planning will anticipate and overcome some of the likely problems, but space exploration, especially a mission to Mars, is fraught with risk and dangers and not all can be foreseen and countered. In an emergency it will be high cognitive performance and initiative that will save the day.

That there are well documented racial differences in IQ, and in susceptibility to certain medical conditions and differences in responses to treatments on Earth, it is plausible that Caucasoids, Negroids and Mongoloids will react differently to the conditions and stressors of long-term space travel, exploration missions and its specific medical problems (known and unknown). I could find no published material on how space travel will affect different races and women, though in a follow up study to the NASA Twins Study, the authors conceded that ‘there are likely individual differences in susceptibility to space flight environmental stressors’.<sup>208</sup> The authors also considered the relevance of long-term stays on Antarctica for understanding the medical problems of space travel, referring to an Indian study, and noting, somewhat cryptically, that ‘a subset of individuals in these settings appear to be more vulnerable to decrements in aspects of attention, memory, or visuospatial abilities, including those who report depressive symptoms’.<sup>209</sup>

The subset in question was a group of 20 Indian males who were examined to establish the effects of over-wintering in Antarctica. By contrast, the Indian authors were clear enough that race had to be considered:

Psychological research in Antarctica provides insight into how individuals (and groups) function in an extreme and isolated milieu. However, while interpreting and comparing published data, *the racial, psychosocial, educational and cultural differences of expedition teams needs to be considered*.<sup>210</sup>

That Madhumita Premkumar et al have highlighted racial, psychosocial, educational and cultural differences suggests that these differences may have caused problems among the crew members, and that the violent incidents reported in the South African Antarctic station (winter 2025) are not isolated events. Crew compatibility will therefore be a crucial consideration for long-term space travel (Mars and beyond). A racially diverse crew might function reasonably well during short stays on the Moon and provide lots of diversophile

---

<sup>207</sup> NASA Twins Study, p.13

<sup>208</sup> Sheena I. Dev et al, ‘Cognitive Performance in ISS Astronauts on 6-Month Low Earth Orbit Missions’, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 20th November 2024, p.12 (pp.1-14)

<sup>209</sup> Sheena I. Dev et al, *Frontiers in Psychology*, p.2

<sup>210</sup> Madhumita Premkumar et al, ‘Circadian Levels of Serum Melatonin and Cortisol in relation to Changes in Mood, Sleep, and Neurocognitive Performance, Spanning a Year of Residence in Antarctica’, *Neuroscience Journal*, volume 2013, p.2, emphasis added (pp.1-10)

propaganda immediately transmitted back to Earth for consumption on social media but differences in racial physiology and psychology, and conflicts in the depths of space could completely undermine the success of any space expedition and long-term exploration. Spaceships manned by racially homogenous and same-sex crews might be highly desirable, though even were those preconditions satisfied, there is no guarantee that problems among crew members will not arise, and if they do, that they can be resolved.

I take it for granted that NASA and other US agencies are fully cognizant of the potential problem of racial and sex differences, but are, for the time being, remaining silent. Matters of competence can be obfuscated and evaded on Earth, however clumsily, but planning for future space missions must be based on the knowledge that *homo s. sapiens* was created by genes and evolution. In the depths of space any attempt to impose the liberation biology of race (and sex) as a social and political construct will lead to catastrophe.

## **XV. Race and Nationalism**

I now return to the matter of 'biological nationalism'. By its very nature the origins of nationalism are biological. Genes are the foundation on which it is possible for some cultural structure to emerge and that structure - the deeds of men of earlier ages - binds us to our past almost as tightly as to our genes and DNA. This is why the proposal submitted by the British Prime Minister, David Cameron, at the Munich Security Conference in 2011, to create a British national identity open to all cannot solve the problems of a multiracial society, especially the lack of cohesion. National identity is by its nature exclusive and particularist; a national identity that is open to the rest of the world ceases to be a national identity. It is just another experiment in social and political construction. Any nationalism that does not take its origins from biology and race must be based on ideology and politics; nationalism as a social and political construct. The collapse of the Soviet Union shows that Soviet nationalism was artificial, an ideological construct, and was rejected. The same applied to the genocidal disintegration of Yugoslavia.

The neo-Marxists, the postmodernists, the feminists and other haters of the West understand regardless of nonsensical and widely disseminated claims that 'race is a social and political construct' that race is derived from genes, biology and evolution but they also grasp that in order to bring their new-variant totalitarian vision to fruition that they must sever the link between any sense of biologically derived nationalism and the culture that has flowed therefrom. Critical race theory - no Reichian inhibitions about the use of 'race' there - with its hatred and demented assertions of 'white skin privilege' is an all-out assault on whites as a race, a race with exceptional achievements across the entire spectrum of human endeavour. These campaigns of hatred, tolerated and encouraged in US and UK universities, are no different from the demonisation of class enemies and Jews employed in, respectively, the Soviet Union and NS-Germany. Yet I detect not even a whimper of dissent from Reich who is more concerned about the possibility of offending some low-IQ black by telling him that he has 'musical ability'.

Reich harbours a utopian vision:

The genome revolution provides us with a shared history that, if we pay proper attention, should give us an alternative to the evils of racism and nationalism, and make us realize that we are all entitled equally to our human heritage.<sup>211</sup>.

All history is shared among those it has affected (directly and indirectly). Whether all those affected are affected indifferently, equally, beneficially, malignly or catastrophically is another matter. It does not strike me as plausible that encounters between rival populations or emerging races who saw each other as rivals for game, access to mates, shelter and water were resolved without violence. Killing the other in order to survive and prosper is logical. Denouncing racism and nationalism as evils is an attempt to impose a purely cultural construct on something, which all the evidence reveals, some of it adduced by Reich and his colleagues, is in all probability a survival and evolutionarily-determined necessity.

Denouncing racism and nationalism as evils is, in fact, no different from claiming that race is a social and political construct. Reich made it very clear that he rejects any assertion that sex and sex differences are social and political constructs<sup>212</sup>, yet nowhere in *Who We Are and How We Got Here* does he explicitly reject the pernicious New Left fantasy that race and race differences are socially and politically constructed. The burden is on Reich to demonstrate that the definitions and explanations of race provided by Baker, Jensen, Sarich, Rushton and Lynn are wrong. Reich shirks the task. He finds himself between the hammer and the anvil. If he openly and clearly condemns race as a social and political construct he will face ostracism and hatred from less talented and envious researchers in the field, but meanwhile the masses of data confirm that race and race differences arise from genes and evolution. Reich lacks the moral courage to confront the censors and totalitarians that are so powerful in the university.

Further, in light of the way whites, especially males, are demonised and victimised in the US and their history and outstanding achievements are ‘deconstructed’ and denied, Reich’s claim that ‘we are all entitled equally to our human heritage’ is grotesque, a despicable concession to the ideologically-based mendacity which pollutes America.

The dangers of racism are forever present or latent which might just be trying to tell Reich something he does not want to hear:

The study of human variation has not always been a force for good. In Nazi Germany, someone with my expertise at interpreting genetic data would have been tasked with categorizing people by ancestry had that been possible with the science of the 1930s. But in our time, the findings from ancient DNA leave little solace for racist or nationalistic misinterpretation. In this field, the pursuit of truth for its own sake has overwhelmingly had the effect of exploding stereotypes, undercutting prejudice, and highlighting the connections among peoples not previously known to be related.<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.273

<sup>212</sup> To his credit, Reich does not succumb to the ideology of ‘gender’, noting ‘the profound biological differences between the sexes’ (Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.234) and ‘The differences between the sexes are in fact more profound than those that exist among human populations, reflecting more than a hundred million years of evolution and adaptation. Males and females differ by huge tracts of genetic material...’(Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p. 266).

<sup>213</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.286

In response I make the following points:

(i). It is not the study of human racial variation per se that is the problem: it is the application of any discoveries where potential problems begin. Low mean black IQ clearly has implications for admissions to universities and intellectually demanding professions. Studying the nature of disease can just as easily lead to bioweapons as to a cure for all kinds of illnesses;

(ii). Reich claims that ‘in our time, the findings from ancient DNA leave little solace for racist or nationalistic misinterpretation’. A critical weakness in Reich’s book is that in condemning ‘racism’ and ‘nationalism’ he never explains what is meant by these words or, perhaps more importantly, what **he** understands by them. Attacking Wade, Reich states that ‘In a written version of a nod and a wink, Wade is suggesting that popular racist ideas about the differences that exist among populations have something to them’.<sup>214</sup> By failing to set out what he means by ‘racism’ and ‘nationalism’ Reich is nodding and winking back at Wade without considering whether Wade’s ideas do ‘have something to them’;

(iii). Despite Reich’s best efforts the findings of ancient DNA do not invalidate the definitions of race provided by, among others, Arthur Jensen, Vincent Sarich, Richard Lynn and Henry Harpending. That Negroids, Mongoloids and Caucasoids are the product of multiple genetic admixtures, documented by Reich in utterly compelling detail, does not mean that these races have never existed, and with the emergence of data from Reich’s laboratory have somehow ceased to exist. Reich himself confirms that ‘by four thousand years ago, many populations were already highly similar in their ancestry composition to those of today’.<sup>215</sup> The similarities *and* differences remain and they will not be disappearing any time soon;

(iv). Reich states that in Nazi Germany a person with his expertise ‘would have been tasked with categorizing people by ancestry’. Well, I have news for Reich. The Soviet state also classified its citizens according to race and persecuted them according to race.<sup>216</sup> One can understand why researchers whatever their misgivings would have followed the orders of their Nazi and Soviet overseers. Far less clear, however, is the cowardly submission of people such as Reich - and so many others - to the totalitarian decree that race is a social and political construct, while adducing mountains of data to the contrary and, meanwhile, knowing full well that such a claim is grotesque nonsense, and one that was obviously and demonstrably grotesque nonsense long before the start of any ancestral DNA revolution pioneered in laboratories in Harvard and Leipzig;

(v). Reich maintains that in the field of ancestral DNA research ‘the pursuit of truth for its own sake has overwhelmingly had the effect of exploding stereotypes, undercutting prejudice, and highlighting the connections among peoples not previously known to be related’.<sup>217</sup> Does Reich really believe that the imposition of race (and sex) as a social and political construct is any way related to ‘the pursuit of truth for its own sake’? The pursuit of truth for its own sake is to be applauded. It is also something which is unique to the West. It

---

<sup>214</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.262

<sup>215</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.277-278

<sup>216</sup> Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2001

<sup>217</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.286

is certainly possible that ‘the pursuit of truth for its own sake’ - or the emergence of truth despite every effort to censor it - can undermine stereotypes, especially where stereotypes are ideological constructs assembled and disseminated for specific goals and imposed by the threat of administrative, bureaucratic, quasi-legal and social sanctions (the sorts of things that universities inflict on dissenters). However, stereotypes which are derived from many years of observation, often over thousands of years, and the experiences of non-conspiring individuals are not easily undermined and dismissed. I suggest that stereotypes survive because they reflect something real not because they have been constructed for the purpose of suppressing certain groups. Moreover, I suggest that national myths may actually be a form of stereotype, and stereotypes which have persisted over time are not all to be dismissed as self-serving;

(vi). Universities strive at all times to promote and to benefit from the stereotype that they are institutions in which the pursuit of truth is paramount. The way earlier researchers in the field of race and race differences were treated and continue to be treated does not support any stereotype that universities are dedicated to free speech and the pursuit of truth but, on the contrary, supports an empirically robust stereotype that universities are passively and frequently very actively hostile to free speech and the pursuit of truth which contradicts the obligatory belief that race is a social and political construct and the fantasies of multiculturalism. I wonder whether the intellectual cowardice which is so prominent among the ‘academic community’ has some genetic basis.

## **XVI. Censorship of DNA Research (and Double Standards)**

Reich claims that ‘modern studies of DNA variation’<sup>218</sup> have contributed to ‘breaking down fixed ideas of race that have been used to justify discrimination’<sup>219</sup>, though he does not specify the ‘fixed ideas of race that have been used to justify discrimination’. Unfortunately for Reich the Navajo Indians have a very fixed idea about race (**their** race) - no Darwinian monkey-jumbo for them - and they did not want their fixed ideas and myths broken down by meddling geneticists. In the words of the Navajo Nation: ‘Human genome testing is strictly prohibited by the Tribe. Navajos were created by Changing Woman; therefore they know where they came from’.<sup>220</sup> Perhaps Richard Dawkins should not be so harsh on creationists or Mormons.

Nor was everything plain sailing in India. Reich requested permission to test population samples and tested 25 that were as diverse as possible.<sup>221</sup> It was established that all the populations on the mainland ‘had some West Eurasian-related ancestry’<sup>222</sup>, whereas the people on the Little Andaman Island had none.<sup>223</sup> By all accounts the Indian project collaborators had a sense of humour failure when presented with Reich’s findings, implying that the idea of a West Eurasian migration was ‘politically explosive’.<sup>224</sup> ‘At the time’, Reich concludes, ‘I felt that we were being prevented by political considerations from revealing

---

<sup>218</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.163

<sup>219</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.164

<sup>220</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.162

<sup>221</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.129

<sup>222</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.133

<sup>223</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.134

<sup>224</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.134

what we had found'.<sup>225</sup> On the contrary, Reich succumbed to censorship, hoping to curry favour (!) with his Indian hosts. Nor do scientific conclusions have to be 'sensitive to these issues'<sup>226</sup>: publish, damn the censors and be respected, or to cite Arthur Jensen: 'No holds barred' is the formula for scientific inquiry. One does not decree beforehand which phenomena cannot be studied or which questions cannot be answered'.<sup>227</sup>

Applied to Reich, Indian pressure was designed to protect politically, religiously, nationally and culturally significant claims and myths about the origins of India. The way Reich reacted to this Indian censorship is in complete contrast to the way he responds to those allegedly espousing any idea of 'immutable categories' or racial purity in the West. Consider his dismemberment of Gustav Kossinna.<sup>228</sup> Gustav Kossinna was a German philologist and archaeologist, whose work, according to Reich, was used by the NS-regime to justify its campaigns of expansion.<sup>229</sup> Denigrating Kossinna in this way serves no purpose other than to engage in piety posturing and looking-goodery. It is one thing for scholars and scientists wilfully to pervert their findings in order to please their masters or hosts but quite another matter if a scholar's work is appropriated by politicians to serve their purposes, and Reich does not exactly stand up for the pursuit of truth by capitulating to India censorship. Reich also fails to point out that Kossinna died in 1931 and is, therefore, hardly responsible for the way his work was exploited (or was not exploited) by the NS-regime (1933-1945). One aspect of Kossinna's *Siedlungsarchäologie* ('settlement archaeology') remains significant today, the idea that patterns of settlement and artefacts could provide a great deal of information about a particular people and what separated them from others. The point here is that a distinctive people who were the product of natural selection then created a distinctive culture. Without a distinctive people, who themselves were not socially and politically constructed non-human artefacts, there is no distinctive culture. People create culture, though perhaps *Homo* is on the threshold of being surpassed by silicon-based beings.

## **XVII. Race as a Social and Political Construct: A View from Germany's Left (Sahra Wagenknecht)**

Aggressive state-sponsored multiculturalism based on the claim that race is a social and political construct not only does not create or promote social cohesion but severely undermines existing levels of trust and solidarity. The evidence for these claims is ubiquitous in the USA and UK. Reduce human beings to 'non-human beings' and social cohesion is impossible, an ideological façade. Only human beings have the potential socially, freely and voluntarily to cohere with one another and to form societies and countries that can endure. In the absence of high levels of racial and cultural homogeneity that is also a doomed enterprise which can only be imposed by state coercion, which must become totalitarian in order to achieve the final ideological goal of diversity.

Political correctness and wokery are not confined to the Anglophone West. In this section I present the views on race set out by Sahra Wagenknecht, a member of Germany's *die Linke* party, in her book, *Die Selbstgerechten: Mein Gegenprogramm für Gemeinsinn und*

---

<sup>225</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.135

<sup>226</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.135

<sup>227</sup> Jensen, *Educability and Group Differences*, p.15

<sup>228</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, pp.110-112

<sup>229</sup> For his part, Reich is obviously unaware that archaeology was a risky venture in the Soviet state, if the discoveries lent no support to the historical interpretation of the class struggle.

*Zusammenhalt (The Self-Righteous: My Counter Programme for Community and Cohesion, 2021)*. Wagenknecht very ably exposes the hypocrisy of those in Germany who advocate mass immigration, diversity and globalization yet flee the consequences in their own lives. The main weakness in Wagenknecht's otherwise soundly argued book is her inability or wilful refusal to accept that race and race differences matter and that the collapse of social cohesion and solidarity in Germany which she bemoans is a direct consequence of mass legal and illegal immigration from Africa and the Middle East.

The following extract is my translation of a section in her book in which Wagenknecht dismisses any role played by genes in creating stable and cohesive communities:

### **Culture instead of Genes**

National identities and feelings of belonging and community spirit naturally have nothing to do with genes, ties of blood and the origins of communities. On the contrary, most nations are ethnically extremely diverse, mixed and multicoloured. Nations arise through a common culture and language, through shared values, common traditions, myths and stories, but also through a common political history, which in many cases as well can replace the absence of older cultural common affinities.

Switzerland is a fairly good example for the case that a strong common identity can even arise in a country with regional language differences and considerable cultural differences. In this case the common sense of "we" is undoubtedly and, above all, due to the small size of the country and the strong participatory elements in Swiss democracy. A condition of belonging arises precisely and especially then, if every person has the feeling that he, in matters of common interest, is able to take part in the conversation with others, and is able to play his part in shaping it.

That there are people part of whose identity arises from the feeling that they are citizens of *their* country is not some manifestation of reactionary resentment but an irreplaceable resource for community, for the formation of community and social equilibrium. Dictatorships require no cohesion, they are able to dominate completely heterogenous peoples who are not unified by any common tradition or sense of community. The large diverse empires were maintained on a foundation of state violence and were, as was the case with the Habsburg empire, stable for hundreds of years. Even the Soviet Union was able to exist for seventy years because there were no possibilities for democratic formation. When the first free elections were held in the former union republics the Soviet Union dissolved.

It is a serious problem of many African states that even today tribal loyalties dominate and that there is barely any sense of identity based on a unified state or even a common identity. That, naturally, has to do with the fact that these countries unlike most European countries cannot look back to a long shared history and do not rest on common national traditions and narratives but on the outcome of arbitrary borders drawn by the former colonial powers. The absence of any common social identity and cohesion is a well known impediment to development. If, for example, it is not seen as some psychological shortcoming but as something morally necessary, to use public money in the first place, in so

far as one has access to it, to provide for one's kinship group, no functioning state can arise and trust will not extend beyond the limits of the tribe.<sup>230</sup>

This section exposes the great weakness in Wagenknecht's book and why all her plans and proposals for solidarity and social cohesion will fail. The blind spots are genes, evolution and biology - race - and her implied acceptance of the ideological position that race is a social and political construct. This is the same ideological position endlessly propagandised by the very forces - corporations, NGOs, mass media, and academics on the corporate payroll - which she holds responsible for the impoverishment of large numbers of Germans.

National identity and a sense of belonging and community are not things that can be decreed by governments. Governments themselves arise from within a group of people. The people come first, and in order that any government commands the respect and allegiance of a people that government must be *of* the people, *for* the people and not *against* the people. Genes and evolutionary origins matter since culture, folkways and the way-we-do-things are expressions of a specific people with a certain genetic history. In the evolution of England, for example, it matters not that the constituent parts were not absolutely identical. What matters is that various evolutionary and historical forces have created a people with close racial and genetic ties who see themselves as English. In this regard see John R. Baker's rebuttal of the claim that the English are mongrels.<sup>231</sup>

Actively encouraging millions of Africans and Muslims to enter or to allow them to invade Germany is intended to be a direct attack on the racial, cultural and historical essence of Germany. The German political caste facilitates the invasion of millions of Third-World aliens not out of indifference but because it actively seeks the racial, cultural and historical destruction of Germany, and so pursues this policy because the political caste - no élite in the established sense of the word - certainly despises, possibly even hates, the white indigenous population. One conclusion is indisputable and can be observed in all countries under attack from mass legal-illegal immigration: any sense of belonging, unity and cohesion are destroyed, and this is not a recent discovery.

In a paper presented to the Berkeley Club in 1877, on the matter of the 'Chinese Question', a one John Boalt, set out the problem:

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I desire to put in evidence the history of the Chinese in America, and more particularly in California, during the last twenty-five years. We are all tolerably familiar with it, and it seems to me conclusive on two points.

*First*-We cannot and will not assimilate with them. *Second*-They have not the remotest inclination to assimilate with us.

If, then, we cannot live harmoniously together with the Chinese, the conclusion is sound that Chinese immigration should be prevented. Of course, it is understood that my argument is not directed against the coming of a few individuals. It is

---

<sup>230</sup> Sahra Wagenknecht, *Die Selbstgerechten: Mein Gegenprogramm für Gemeinsinn und Zusammenhalt* (2021), mit Vowort zur Taschenbuchausgabe, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 2022, pp.286-287, emphasis in the original

<sup>231</sup> John R. Baker, *Race*, Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1974 p.267

rather against the vast hordes who can be spared there and who are ready to come here. It is not the present thousands of whom we complain. It is the future millions. But I am met here with the argument that the prohibition of any kind of immigration whatsoever is contrary to the immemorial policy of our republic, and in the teeth of the most noble and memorable utterances of our fathers. I take issue on both points. It never was the policy of our republic to welcome to our shores a class of immigrants who could not or would not assimilate with our people, nor was it ever so declared.<sup>232</sup>

In Western Europe, those 'future millions' which Boalt rightly feared and of which Enoch Powell warned in 1968 are already here, and the invaders keep coming because diversity - racial, cultural and religious - is a weapon of war and subversion and is being used as such by western governments.

Switzerland is instructive not because it provides any succour for the diversophiles or Wagenknecht's views but, on the contrary, because it demonstrates that effective participatory democracy requires a high degree of racial (ethnic if you are squeamish) homogeneity and a well defined territory. The influx of millions of Africans and Muslims into Switzerland would destroy the country, and signs are emerging that even the small numbers of immigrants accepted by Switzerland, relative to the UK and Germany, are now causing strains. Riots by immigrants in Lausanne after a 17-year old Congolese died in a police car chase are a warning of much worse to come.

There is no ideological difference between the Soviet policy and those who exploit racial diversity as a weapon to destroy long-existing nation states. Lenin demanded loyalty to the international proletariat, and the globalists demand loyalty to We-Are-the-World. Wagenknecht correctly observes that only force maintained the Soviet state - the same was true of Yugoslavia - and the same forces of physical, legal, propagandistic, psychological and bureaucratic coercion and violence are being brought to bear by the diversity-commissars to impose multiracialism in the USA and western Europe. Even pharmacological intervention is being investigated as means to compel acceptance of aliens and diversity.

The ambitions of the One-Worlders require functioning states - transmission belts to use a term from Marxist-Leninist media theory - that operate as agents of supra-national organisations, such as the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), in order to impose globalisation and the ideological assertion of a global identity. The template is the Communist International (COMINTERN) which was formed to subvert non-communist states. In the context of European nations the nation state is an asset which can be used to resist the totalitarian ambitions of the globalists. That, what typically masquerades as a state in Africa and much of the Middle East but is essentially a collection of tribes with their own loyalty structures and the failings that accompany them, is precisely the nightmare being inflicted on the nation states of western Europe, and this policy is being imposed quite deliberately and in a planned way by the pan-European political caste.

---

<sup>232</sup> 'The Chinese Question. A Paper Read by John H. Boalt Before the Berkeley Club', August 1877, HeinOnline pdf, Berkeley Law Library, p.260 ( pp.253-262), emphasis in the original

Other than to denounce anything to do with genes and biology, Wagenknecht never explains the basis for her belief that Africans who over the millennia have been subjected to evolutionary selection to place tribe before the European concept of state with the baggage of the Rule of Law in England and the much later *Rechtsstaat* in Germany, sound administration and free speech, would just suddenly and inexplicably relinquish loyalty to some tribe merely because they have entered Germany legally or illegally, and then become staunch defenders and advocates of free speech which does not exist in Africa (or in Islam) or the impartial administration of justice.

I suggest that Wagenknecht promotes this race-free utopia because she cannot bring herself publicly to acknowledge the reality of race as something biologically, evolutionarily and genetically determined - or, more likely, is too frightened to do so - or, worse still, because she actually accepts the ideological doctrine that race is a social and political construct.

In a famous speech delivered in April 1968, Enoch Powell, warned of the dire consequences, immediate and long-term, of mass non-white immigration for England. Mass non-white immigration was, he asserted, making the English 'strangers in their own land'. Germans are also becoming 'strangers in their own land'. In 2004, the Blair government (Labour) abandoned all immigration controls in order, as Labours insiders, Mandelson among them, later admitted, to make multiculturalism irreversible in the UK, above all in England. It was this act of national betrayal that contributed to the rise of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) and the vote in 2016 to leave the EU. Meanwhile, the waves of illegal-immigrant invaders continue to sweep across the English Channel.

The threat to England is acute and existential. In a recent speech on immigration (May 2025), the British Prime Minister, Kier Starmer, alluded to Powell's speech, stating that Britain was in danger of becoming an 'island of strangers'. Whether this indicates a serious and permanent change in the position of the British political caste towards legal and illegal immigration or whether it is a tactical ploy to weaken the appeal of Reform UK, the successor party to UKIP, remains to be seen and judged. That, any British politician, never mind the Prime Minister of a socialist party, the same party that in 2004 abandoned all immigration controls to make multiculturalism irreversible, refers to an English patriot who has been vilified for decades, represents a dramatic public shift. For their part, Germans will recall that at the CDU Parteitag (14th December 2015), Angela Merkel stated, at the very moment when the immigrant invasion of Germany reached an undreamt of scale, that 'Multikulti bleibt eine Lebenslüge' ('Multiculturalism remains a sham'). Meanwhile, in both England and Germany the immigrant invasion continues.

### **XVIII. The UK Equality Act (2010): The Continuing Application of Race as a Social and Political Construct by Obfuscation and Subterfuge**

Among some of those who until very recently would have uncritically and aggressively promoted the assertion that race is a social and political construct there is now an uncomfortable awareness that this extreme ideological position is no longer tenable and can no longer be enforced by direct censorship and poses of intellectual and moral superiority. However, those who have pushed this ideological position over decades are not just going to admit that they were wrong. They will now modify the earlier position of race as a social and political construct by implying, or at least by not denying, that some racial differences are genetically determined and so implicitly concede - and without attracting too much attention

they hope - that there is a biological, genetic and evolutionary basis for race while nevertheless continuing to assert the primacy of culture and politics.

There is strong evidence to support the claim that an approach to race and race differences which does not acknowledge the role of biology, genes and evolution in race and race differences, but which does not expressly deny them is a strong component of the UK Equality Act (2010). There are no explicit words stating that race is a social and political construct but it is very clear from the text of the Act itself and the *Explanatory Notes* (2010), accompanying the Act that for the purposes of the Act race is to be interpreted and applied as a social and political construct. This is just one reason why the Act and other UK legal instruments avoid any definition of race. A definition of race that eschewed explicit reference to biology, genes and evolution, among other related words and concepts, and which explicitly defined race in terms of ideology (social and political construction), would be demonstrably defective and exposed to condign ridicule.

In place of any definition of race in section 9 of the Equality Act, it is merely stated that race consists of 'colour', 'nationality' and 'ethnic or national origins'. These undefined categories are introduced with the words 'Race includes' thereby omitting other factors in a definition of race but not explicitly excluding them. By not expressly including biological or genetic factors in any definition of race the drafters of the Act would have us believe that such factors are of little importance in any formulation of race; that race is malleable; that race is socially and politically constructible, deconstructible and reconstructible.

The inclusion of 'colour' is an unavoidable and damaging concession to biology, genes and evolution since an individual's colour (skin) is immediately obvious and is just one very visible identifier of race and racial origin and cannot be ignored, though it will be played down, as if it is of little significance. I cite John Baker:

There is one point I particularly want to take this opportunity of stressing. It is the absurdity (for no weaker term is applicable) of classifying various taxa together as 'coloured'\*, and even suggesting that no other character than the pigmentation of the skin distinguishes one human taxon from another. It is not necessary to repeat here what has already been said with sufficient emphasis on this subject (pp.15-16, 159-60, 181-2, and 307); but it may be remarked that the error stands in relation to physical anthropology as literacy does to the study of literature, and no educated person should be guilty of it.<sup>233</sup>

In fact, 'colour' and 'coloured' create nightmarish contradictions for diversophiles. The author of the *Macpherson Report* casuistically approved the use of 'colour' in his definition of racism, while condemning the use of 'coloured'. He also condemned 'colour-blind policing' because 'A colour blind approach fails to take account of the nature and needs of the person or the people involved, and of the special features which such crimes and their investigation possess'.<sup>234</sup> We are then solemnly warned that the Rule of Law must always prevail:

---

<sup>233</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.534. The asterisk relates to a footnote: 'What is said in this paragraph does not refer to the word 'Coloured' when used as a technical term to distinguish a particular hybrid population in South Africa from the Negrids and Europids of the same country'.

<sup>234</sup> *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Report of an Inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny*, 1999, p.23 (*The Macpherson Report*)

The burden and standard of proof and the legal principles involved govern all cases, and there must never be differential rules or standards applied because of the horrendous nature of a case.<sup>235</sup>

Twenty four pages later, having forgotten or abandoned his dire warning never to renounce tried and tested English legal principles, Macpherson once again condemns colour-blind policing:

“Colour-blind” policing must be outlawed. The police must deliver a service which recognises the different experiences, perceptions and needs of a diverse society.<sup>236</sup>

It has obviously not occurred to Macpherson, who was a senior British judge, that attacking ‘colour-blind policing’ and then advocating special treatment for blacks, followed by a warning that legal standards and principles are not to be compromised, followed by still more advocacy of special treatment for blacks, amount to compelling evidence of his incoherence, his abandonment of the Rule of Law in pursuit of an ideological cause, and a complete lack of balance in relation to the police. The *Macpherson Report* purports to be an examination of a police investigation into the murder of a black teenager in London. Yet the whole tone of the report, its openly expressed hostility to the police, its fawning upon blacks and its recommendations reveal that the real target of the *Macpherson Report* was not the London-based police or what may have been a badly conducted murder investigation but England and her institutions.

Although nationality can have a close, often a very close, association with race it is not the same as race. An African or Pakistani with a British passport is not a racial product of the same biological, evolutionary and genetic forces that created Vikings, Jutes, Anglo-Saxons, Picts, Franks, Celts and Normans. Ethnic does not explicitly deny race (biology, evolution and genes) but implies, and is intended to imply, the primacy of culture ‘rather than descent from common ancestors’.<sup>237</sup> The same is true of ‘national origin’.

Race is considered to be one of a number of protected characteristics in the Equality Act. Section 9 of the Act instructs the uninitiated that, in the matter of race, ‘(2) (a) a reference to a person who has a particular protected characteristic is a reference to a person of a particular racial group’ and (2) (b) ‘a reference to persons who share a protected characteristic is a reference to persons of the same racial group’. I suggest that what emerges here is that any comment made about an individual black will be deemed to apply to all other members belonging to the ‘same racial group’.

Matters now become even more interesting when one considers that: ‘(3) A racial group is a group of persons defined by reference to race; and a reference to a person’s racial group is a reference to a racial group into which the person falls’. Without a clear definition of race the first part of (3) succumbs to circularity. Further, a mere ‘reference to race’ in the document without an accompanying definition of race is of no use: a mere reference to race cannot replace a definition of race. Again, I suggest that any remark about one individual in this undefined racial group will be taken to be a remark about all other members of that undefined racial group.

---

<sup>235</sup> *The Macpherson Report*, p.292, emphasis added

<sup>236</sup> *The Macpherson Report*, p.316

<sup>237</sup> Baker, *Race*, p.4

Yet another problem arises from sub-section 4, viz: '(4) The fact that a racial group comprises two or more distinct racial groups does not prevent it from constituting a particular racial group'. The 'racial group' biologically, genetically and evolutionarily recognised as Sub-Saharan Africans can certainly include 'racial groups' that are genetically different from one another<sup>238</sup> but these Sub-Saharan African groups have far more in common with one another genetically and evolutionarily - therefore satisfying the definition of race provided by Arthur Jensen - than northern Europeans.

If race is defined in terms of biology, genes and evolution, and is not propagandised as a social and political construct, overtly, or covertly as in the Equality Act 2010, then a 'racial group' which emerges from the interbreeding of 'two or more distinct racial groups' has, by a process of racial admixture, become a new racial group. An individual from sub-Saharan Africa, say, a Bushman, who is the product of hundreds of thousands of years of natural selection operating in a climate, quite different from that of northern Europe, may acquire a British passport and, with it, British nationality, but it is a clear violation of what is known about the biological, genetic and evolutionary origins of races to then claim that the political, social and administrative act of granting a British passport to a Bushman has created a new 'racial group' defined as a Bushman with a British passport.

The strident rhetoric and bizarre propaganda claims of race as a social and political construct have, from their inception, proved to be highly vulnerable to biological and genetic realities, but that has not led to the abandonment of policies which continue to be predicated on the same ideological claims that race is a social and political construct. That these policies continue, albeit in camouflaged and less obvious form, confirms, I suggest, their essential ideological basis, divorced that is from biology and genes. The UK Equality Act represents a profound strengthening and embedding of the ideological claim that race and race differences are social and political constructs.

The twentieth-century provides two clear warnings. The small groups of Soviet and National-Socialist zealots that devoted themselves to the genocidal enterprises of intra-racial (class war) and interracial wars relied on an effective stratum of administrators and bureaucrats to prosecute their plans, and there was no shortage of people willing to do their bidding. Physical coercion and terror can compel conformity in totalitarian states, and in very short order. In the UK, France, Sweden, Germany and the USA it takes longer, and because it takes longer and the process which attacks and subverts long-established freedoms - centuries old in the case of England - is stealthy and gradual, the erosion and eventual loss of freedoms generally passes unnoticed among the broad mass of people, unlike, for example, Lenin's dramatic seizure of power in Russia in 1917.

All the evidence suggests that the bureaucratic and administrative strata in the UK and other western states not only do not require to be coerced to implement diversity policies which are manifestly hostile to indigenous (white) populations, but that they zealously pursue the aims of diversity imposed by the political caste (no élite). This highlights an especially disturbing feature: the degree to which local and national bureaucracies and administrations have now internalised - and to that extent normalised, as far as they are concerned - the ideological claims of race (and sex) as social and political constructs and the ongoing process towards the final racial and physical dispossession of the indigenous English population.

---

<sup>238</sup> Baker, *Race*, pp.325-417

## **XIX. Future Trends: Pharmacological Interventions and Psychiatric Measures to Compel Acceptance of Aliens and Diversity (the National-Socialist and Soviet Legacies)**

Pharmacological and psychiatric measures, combined with ideological claims that race is a social and political construct, and reinforced by quasi-legal, administrative, bureaucratic coercion, social media ostracism and psyterror, are another line of attack to undermine resistance to diversity and multiculturalism. In a series of experiments at the university hospital in Bonn, Germany, researchers used a combination of peer pressure and oxytocin to ascertain whether it was possible to make people less resistant to the presence of aliens, to make them more welcoming and more willing to approve of the transfer of assets and public money.<sup>239</sup>

The context for these experiments was the massive influx of aliens into Germany in 2015 and a desperate search for some means to persuade, or to coerce Germans, to accept their racial and cultural replacement by invading aliens. Neither altruism nor xenophobia was defined in this study, since the untested and unchallenged assumption on which these experiments were based - and government policy is also based - is that altruism is so obviously and indisputably a very Good Thing requiring no justification, whereas xenophobia is considered to be so obviously malevolent and should be eradicated. I cite part of the abstract:

We tend to be more altruistic to our own family and friends than to perfect strangers. The recent migration of Middle Eastern refugees into European societies has further magnified the issue, with a large divide in society between people who do and do not support the refugees. “This is partly due to evolution: Only through solidarity and cooperation within one’s own group was it possible to raise children and survive when competing against unknown and rivalling groups for scarce resources in pre-civilized times,” explains Prof. René Hurlemann from the Department of Psychiatry, University of Bonn Medical Center. However, this is diametrically opposed to the parable of the Good Samaritan, which serves as an example of selfless altruism by describing a Samaritan who incurs personal costs to help a stranger in need. “From a neurobiological perspective, the basis of xenophobia and altruism is not yet precisely understood,” says Hurlemann.

An immediate objection is that this is not a ‘migration of Middle Eastern refugees into European societies’ at all: it is an invasion of European states by aliens from backward and failed states which poses an immediate and dire threat to the states being invaded and a long-term threat to the genetic interests and survival of the first-world states under attack from these invaders. Emotional and sentimental appeals to altruism are designed to bypass the question whether any state under all circumstances has a legal or moral obligation to allow itself to be overrun by millions of invading aliens.

In any case, Hurlemann thoroughly distorts the question of altruism. Altruism functions most effectively when it involves the willing transfer of assets to close kith and kin. What Hurlemann calls ‘selfless altruism’ denies and removes the role of any individual decision

---

<sup>239</sup> René Hurlemann et al, ‘Oxytocin-enforced norm compliance reduces xenophobic outgroup rejection’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (PNAS), 29<sup>th</sup> August 2017, volume 114, № 35, pp.9314-9319

making in the transfer process which necessarily involves the ‘self’. An individual who denies his ‘self’ - or whose self is denied by himself in an act of suicidal self-deconstruction or who permits himself to be deconstructed by others - cannot make any decision, either to transfer assets or to deny their transfer. To the extent that governments alone can allow and encourage the mass invasion of immigrants and then allocate billions of dollars, pounds Sterling or Euros in housing and other welfare benefits to aliens, and that these decisions are taken by unaccountable committees, then this may well be described as ‘selfless altruism’. It is also grossly irresponsible and utterly lethal to national cohesion and survival. I suggest that the act of the *good Samaritan* (Luke 10: 30-35) was not an act of ‘selfless altruism’. Rather it was an act of unsolicited goodness provided by one individual for the benefit of another individual, not for the benefit of millions of able-bodied aliens. Hurlemann misrepresents the parable of the good Samaritan, exploiting it as propaganda ploy to justify massive transfers of assets and wealth to immigrants invading Germany in 2015. Transforming the Bible’s *good Samaritan* into a *Good Samaritan*, Hurlemann recruits a lone benefactor to serve as an agent of big government or some NGO. When states engage in such massive transfers of national wealth it is social, racial and cultural engineering, and it is being conducted for malign purposes. This is not altruism.

Hurlemann and colleagues discovered that oxytocin alone could not compel those hostile to aliens to accept their presence, but when doses of oxytocin were combined with peer pressure they became less resistant, and those who had initially favoured the presence of aliens without doses of oxytocin became even more willing to accept aliens after the drug was administered.

In the abstract summary it was also noted that ‘Oxytocin in combination with social norms decreases xenophobia’. Whose ‘social norms’? Those of Hurlemann and his colleagues or Germans who have to endure the consequences of diversity without any consultation and the demand that they not object? What Hurlemann and his colleagues mean by ‘social norms’ is not defined or explained; it is merely assumed that the presence of millions of aliens in Germany is highly and self-evidently desirable and requires no justification. Taking into account the huge numbers of crimes committed in Germany by the alien-invaders since 2015 - rapes, vehicles used to kill and maim people and multiple deaths by stabbings, along with the hostile and aggressive demeanour of aliens, which detracts from the value and enjoyment of public spaces and communal assets - fears about the presence of so many alien invaders in 2015 were - and are in 2026 and beyond - rational, reasonable and fully justified. Further, the claim that being welcoming to alien invaders is the social norm implies that hostility to them and resisting racial and cultural replacement, which are entirely appropriate reactions, is a mental aberration. When an alien from the Middle East stabs Germans to death, Germany’s largely servile mass media refer to the perpetrator as “neuro-divergent”, but when Frau Jedermann states her objections to multiculturalism and expresses her disgust for what happened in Cologne (Köln) on New Year’s Eve 2015 she can expect a visit from Germany’s neo-Stasi.

Hurlemann concedes that hostility to outsiders may have been evolutionarily adaptive in the long distant past - ‘in pre-civilized times’ (abstract) - but implies that today, one assumes, ‘in civilized times’, that hostility to outsiders is maladaptive, uncivilized even immoral. Hurlemann obviously dismisses the way these aliens have behaved in Germany since 2015 and has not bothered to take note of the genocides of the twentieth century and the racial (ethnic if you are too squeamish) differences that characterize so many global conflicts: wars, regional conflicts and tensions between racially and culturally distinctive groups still matter

and may actually be worse than 50,000-20,000 years ago since there are far more people competing for finite resources and space. Xenophobia - *phobos* means fear not hatred - is healthy, normal and reasonable. By contrast, xenophilia and multiculturalism are ideologically-driven experiments that are obviously failing which is why so much effort must be expended to coerce acceptance of a massive and unwanted alien presence.

The following question is posed: ‘How can people who tend to have a xenophobic attitude be motivated to be more altruistic?’ (abstract). An immediate counter would be to ask why people who are quite correctly and rationally concerned about, and fearful of, millions of alien invaders in Germany, should be expected psychologically to disarm an adaptive response to danger. This is not altruism: it is surrender. Following on from this, the wider question is why should Germans or any nation be expected to welcome their physical, racial, genetic, cultural and political dispossession and extinction and, worse still, to collude and to cooperate with a hostile political caste seeking their oblivion? The very fact that Hurlemann and his colleagues propose to use oxytocin - and what else in the future? - to induce ‘the acceptance and integration of migrants (sic!) into Western cultures’ - confirms the totalitarian ethos of diversity and multiculturalism.

The other disturbing aspect to Hurlemann’s experiments with oxytocin concerns where they took place. It has clearly not occurred to Hurlemann and his colleagues that modifying human behaviour temporarily or permanently (extermination) with the use of drugs and chemicals has a troubled history in Germany reaching back at least to the 1930s. In the aftermath of the 1936 Berlin Olympics, during which Benzadrine was used by athletes, Dr Fritz Hauschild, head of pharmacology at the Temmler factor near Berlin, developed and patented Pervitin, a performance-enhancing drug. Dr Otto Ranke, an army physiologist, saw advantages for the Wehrmacht and recommended use of Pervitin to stave off fatigue among soldiers so as to prolong operational deployments. After the war Hauschild took his expertise to the DDR where it was put to use in the industrial-scale doping of athletes. Drugs research was also a vital part of the Nazi T4 euthanasia programme and later developmental trials to find efficient ways to kill large numbers of people using specially adapted vans for gassing, to begin with, and then leading to mass killing in dedicated gas chambers, using Zyklon-B. Joost Meerloo reports that the Nazi occupation regime in the Netherlands ensured that drugs, especially barbiturates, were readily available without prescription in order to create ‘passivity, dependence, and lethargy’ among the population.<sup>240</sup> Hurlemann’s trials with oxytocin fit into a well established German tradition of pharmacological interventions.

In the 1970s it became clear that the Soviet state was also abusing psychiatry to target ideological dissent which was equated with insanity or mental illness. Drugs were used to destroy the minds of dissenters. One of the best known victims was Zhores Medvedev, a biochemist, who was incarcerated in a mental hospital. Zhores Medvedev was already in bad odour with the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) for having written a manuscript attacking Trofim Lysenko and exposing the damage he had inflicted on the study of genetics during the Stalin era.<sup>241</sup>

---

<sup>240</sup> Joost M. Meerloo, *The Rape of the Mind: The Psychology of Thought Control, Menticide, and Brainwashing*, World Publishing Company, New York, 1956, p.37

<sup>241</sup> See Zhores and Roy Medvedev, *A Question of Madness* (1971), Penguin, London, 1974. The use of drugs to destroy dissenters also features in Vladimir Makanin’s *Stol, pokrytyi suknom i s grafynom poseredine* (*Baize-covered Table with a Decanter in the Middle*, 1993

That the Soviet regime incarcerated dissidents in psychiatric wards inspired internal opposition, and once news of these abuses reached the West in the 1970s, these abuses were condemned. In NS-Germany, there was some opposition to the T4 programme. Lothar Kreyszig, a judge, protested the deaths, as did pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, bishop Clemens August von Galen and Franz Büchner, professor of medicine at Freiburg University. But where are the voices in Germany today protesting the use of drugs to change political opinions? Would there be silence if experiments were taking place to make Germans *more* hostile to aliens? Is the diversity construct itself a mental illness that afflicts affluent people who like to consider themselves liberals but sanction behaviour firmly associated with NS-Germany and the Soviet regime?

If governments can propagate, and act on, the ideological construct that race and sex are social and political constructs - public acceptance of this position is obligatory in British universities - why should they not adopt the position that people who resist diversity are mentally ill and seek to “cure” them of their affliction? In the *Macpherson Report* (1999), a coroner, cited in the report, characterised racism as a mental illness: ‘Society must increase its efforts to rid itself of the paranoia of racism and its intolerance’.<sup>242</sup>

Tax avoidance is deemed to be morally dubious, and tax evasion is a crime of greed; whereas diversity-avoidance and diversity-evasion (white flight) are heinous ideological crimes, requiring special treatment. Solicitous incarceration of diversity-resisters would be a logical measure. This is by no means hyperbole. Does the name Jane Elliott ring any bells? Contra Theodor Adorno and his colleagues, the authoritarian personality which they claim to have uncovered in their eponymous study, *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950), is not the problem, if it ever was. The threat now and for the decades ahead arises from the totalitarian personality and a new and virulent form of totalitarianism, the outlines of which were visible in the West in the 1960s. Armed with their ideology of the Universal Good, the diversity-totalitarians realised that sinful whites would not willingly accept multicultural enlightenment and so would have to be psychologically, legally, financially and racially cajoled and beaten into submission.

In a booklet issued by the UK Home Office which is intended to provide guidance on how to identify terrorists, *PREVENT: Handbook for Elected Members*, we are told that the Prevent programme seeks to prevent terrorism by adopting ‘a similar approach to public health models’.<sup>243</sup> Terrorism, it is implied, is a disease and has to be treated as such because: ‘Focusing solely on confronting ideologies alone will not undermine terrorism. Prevent provides holistic support to address some of the personal and social conditions which make vulnerable people receptive to radicalisation’.<sup>244</sup>

In certain cases the Soviet KGB and East German Stasi were quite willing to exploit the same kind of psychological pressure adopted by the likes of Jane Elliott in the US and used in the UK Prevent programme. In a report prepared by Iurii Andropov, head of the KGB (1967-1982), and sent to Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet leader, Andropov summarized KGB operations for the year 1967. One part of the report revealed how the KGB dealt with ideological dissenters. KGB officers did more than arrest and incarcerate them: they sought, if possible, to cure them and restore them to rude ideological health. To cite Andropov:

---

<sup>242</sup> *The Macpherson Report*, p.299

<sup>243</sup> *PREVENT: Handbook for Elected Members*, UK Home Office, p.2

<sup>244</sup> *PREVENT*, p.2

Great importance was attached to measures of a prophylactic nature which were directed at the prevention of crimes of treason. In 1967, 12,115 persons were subjected to prophylactic measures [*bylo profilaktirovano*] by the KGB the majority of whom had permitted, without malice prepense, manifestations of an anti-Soviet and politically harmful nature.<sup>245</sup>

The verb *profilaktirovat* implies that dissent and anti-Soviet crimes were mental illnesses that could be cured by the timely and solicitous intervention of the KGB. Physical liquidation, applied in the Stalin period, always remained a last resort, but the emphasis was now on treating arrestees, including the use of drugs and psychological coercion, to compel conformity.

I suggest that one cause of what government agencies and their state media allies highlight as extreme right-wing terrorism arises from the fact that pointing out the nature of the extremist ideologies of diversity and multiculturalism alone has not led to any government's abandoning these ideologies and, consequently, makes violence and insurgency far more likely. Islamic terrorists and their co-religionists in the UK have no excuse. They were not brought to the UK as slaves; they have been allowed to enter. If they are so disgusted by the Western societies in which they currently reside - and there is much that most certainly is disgusting - they are free to return whence they came and live a purer life, uncontaminated by Europeans. By contrast, an English male who sees his homeland being overrun by people who make no secret of their intention to dispossess the indigenous population and to impose Islamic rule on England, and who is denounced by the state media platform, the BBC for objecting, may well be driven to violence. England is *his* land. Should he be forced to abandon the land of his ancestors in order to accommodate, in all meanings of the word, these unwanted and hostile aliens?

In 2026, and in view of the fact that UK governments since 2004 have encouraged the alien invasion, there is something very misleading and Orwellian about a UK office of state which still calls itself the Home Office and which is required to deal with internal security threats to the UK - our Home and for how much longer? - but which does nothing to PREVENT the invasion of millions of illegal aliens and then persecutes members of the indigenous population who protest this invasion.

The Soviet empire provides yet another lesson for own time and troubles. On 17th June 1953, three months after Stalin's death, workers in East Berlin, goaded and persecuted beyond endurance by the oppressive policies of the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED), rose in protest. The brief rebellion was suppressed by Soviet tanks. In the aftermath, Bertolt Brecht, the affluent Marxist playwright, and supporter of the East German regime, wrote a poem, 'die Lösung' ('The Solution') in which he suggested that if the people do not obey the party, that the party should dissolve the people. This poem has been interpreted as a satirical comment on the behaviour of the SED and its Soviet backers, but any satire cannot be

---

<sup>245</sup> 'Doklad Andropova Brezhnevya № 1025-A/OB "O rezul'tatakh raboty Komiteta Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti pri sovete Ministrov SSSR i ego organov na mestakh za 1967 god", 6 maia 1968, in A. N. Iakovlev, ed. *et al*, *Lubianka: organy VChk-OGPU-NKVD-NKGB-MGB-KGB 1917-1991 spravochnik*, in the series "Demokratiia", *Rossii. XX VEK, Dokumenty*, Mezhdunarodnyi fond, Moscow, 2003, p.719 (pp.714-723)

reconciled with Brecht's support for Stalin's Great Terror and the totalitarian East German state whose people - das Volk - exist to obey the party and to submit to its orders for their own Good.

The aim of the SED and all the other communist states was to deconstruct any nationalist identity or allegiance, deemed especially pressing in the DDR after 12 years of National Socialism, and replace it with loyalty to some abstract idea of internationalism and "we-are-the-world". Ambiguously camouflaged as satire to protect its author's standing as a defender of the working class against "fascism", 'The Solution' is not at all a satire. In the poem Brecht calls on the SED to take all necessary measures to crush any rebellion and to dissolve the latent "fascism" and to remake the people as obedient slaves. I wonder whether I am the sole person who sees a parallel between the title of Brecht's poem and The Final Solution of the Jewish Question, and thus a true expression of what Brecht envisaged for recalcitrant workers. Brecht's Solution to the Workers' Question in 1953 is entirely consistent with what he told Sydney Hook about the Stalin show trials. Talking of Zinoviev and Kamenev, Brecht said that: 'As for them, the more innocent they are, the more they deserve to be shot'. Hook asked him to repeat what he had said and Brecht replied: 'Je mehr unschuldig, desto mehr verdienen sie erschossen zu werden'.<sup>246</sup>

In 2026 Western governments are pursuing a policy which is deliberately intended to dissolve and to deconstruct any sense of national and racial identity among Western European populations. Reich himself contributes to this process by attempting to exploit discoveries made in the study of ancestral DNA to disseminate claims that race has nothing to do with biology, genes and evolution and thus to argue that since race is a cultural and political construct; that there is nothing to be lost by excluding evolution and genes and everything to be gained. Meanwhile, ancestral DNA confirms the biological, genetic and evolutionary origins of race and race differences.

The final aim of this anti-national programme is white (Caucasoid) population replacement and the construction of an international global identity. Pharmacological and more focused propagandistic interventions, far more effective than anything available to the National-Socialist and Soviet regimes, are just some of the latest tools. Since the end of the Cold War in 1991, the whole weight of government (local and national), educational, religious, state media, legal, scientific and corporate, wealth, power and influence has been brought to bear upon resistant populations. One major difference between the Soviet state and the West today is that in the Soviet Union state churches and believers were persecuted for their faith and resisting Marxism-Leninism, whereas in the West the churches are some of the loudest and most strident voices calling for diversity, multiculturalism and population replacement, openly collaborating with the treacherous political castes and state media platforms, such as the BBC.

In 1953, the East German regime used the tanks of the Soviet occupation forces to suppress Germans. Exactly the same policy, without tanks, has been pursued by the German government since 2015. Since 1991, the UK government has pursued a policy of racial and cultural replacement. The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950) came into force in the UK on the 2nd October 2000, preparing the way, in 2004, for the Labour government to abandon all immigration controls in order to make

---

<sup>246</sup> See Sydney Hook, *Out of Step: An Unquiet Life in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, Harper & Row, New York, 1987, p.493

multiculturalism irreversible, and in the knowledge that the formal incorporation of the 1950 Convention into UK law would provide the necessary instrument for human rights' lawyers to prevent expulsion of illegal immigrant invaders. Regardless whether governments use tanks to defeat resistance (warfare) or whether they use laws (lawfare) the aim is the same.

## XX. Conclusion

If race (and sex) were a social and political construct, it would mark a truly astonishing break with anything formulated by Carl Linnaeus, Charles Darwin, Gregor Mendel, Sir Ronald Fisher, James Watson and Francis Crick. It would mean, among other things, liberation - if that is the right word - from our corruptible bodies and the constraints of biology: the deconstruction and defeat of death. Immortality would be within our grasp.

The initial promise, for the time being, is less dramatic: it is to bring about a world in which all race differences cease to exist, a race-free world, which will lead to the eradication of all racial conflict, akin to the classless future promised by Marx and Lenin. Regardless whether it was the Marxist-Leninists seeking to impose a classless world in the twentieth century in the name of the workers, or the diversophiles seeking to impose a race-free world in the twenty-first century the target of these totalitarian ambitions is the same: it is the world described and analysed by Darwin, which, with its messy and unequal outcomes emerging from natural selection, interracial and intraracial competition and genes, thwarts - so far - any expectation of absolute equality and the drive of the diversophile totalitarians to submit the natural world to their will.

The eradication of races and racial differences and the implied promise of some race-free utopia is a war against nature. It is pursued for power, to achieve total dominion over nature and all men, wherever they are, and is no different from the ambitions of Marx and Lenin. Thus, the 'so not-of-our-world'<sup>247</sup> Andamanese islanders who let loose their arrows at Indian helicopters must either be exterminated in accordance with the recommendation of Kurtz or be completely isolated, their very existence denied, so that in the race-free future there will be no memories of the power of evolution and genes. In the present climate of censorship and rewriting novels which are now deemed to be hostile to the diversity agenda, it is not inconceivable that, for example, the title of Darwin's *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859) will be permanently shortened so as to remove any reference to race and struggle.

David Reich's book does, therefore, serve a valuable function, though one clearly not intended by the author. Any attempt to convince the reader that all the interbreeding and racial admixtures mean that race is of no real significance spectacularly fails since the fact that today's races exist because their ancestors endured appalling trials and hardships binds us to them: without them we do not exist, and we are bound to them by biology, genes and evolution, not by a condition of mind coerced and imposed by state and corporate lying or induced by large doses of diversity-oxytocin. With knowledge of biology, genes and evolution, and more to come, we have a good idea of "who we are" and "how we got here". Whither now? Back to the Moon, and then to the summit of Olympus Mons and the canyons and gullies of Valles Marineris and beyond: *ad astra per ardua et mentem*.

---

<sup>247</sup> Reich, *Ancient DNA*, p.129