

THE ETHNIC GAP

WHAT IS THE REAL MESSAGE OF THE 2000 ELECTION?

RICHARD McCULLOCH

In recent elections, including the 2000 presidential election, there has been much discussion of the “gender gap,” in which men are much more likely to vote for Republicans just as women are much more likely to vote for Democrats. In the 2000 election the gender gap was ten points, with 53% of men and 43% of women voting for Bush, while 42% of men and 54% of women voted for Gore. But there is another voting gap which receives little or no discussion, which can be called the “ethnic gap.”

It is taken for granted that certain ethnic groups traditionally bloc vote for the Democratic candidate. For example, blacks and Jews are well known for this practice. It is recognized that they are voting for their ethnic interest, i.e., the interests of their ethnic group as well as the advancement of their own cultural, social or political agenda, which are best served by Democrats. This protocol is accepted as normal, logical, and proper behavior on their part.¹

Although no definition of bloc voting adequately specifies what percentage of the group’s votes must be cast a certain way to constitute a bloc, apparently the percentage must be at least two-to-one (67%) and must also be predictably consistent. In this election Gore received 90% of the black vote and 79% of the Jewish vote. Hispanics are a diverse group, actually an amalgam of several groups, but most are Mexicans, with most of the remainder being Central Americans, and the rest Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other Latinos. The Hispanic group, with the exception of Cuban-Americans, is often considered to vote as a bloc for Democratic candidates. Nationwide Hispanics voted 62% for Gore and 35% for Bush, who—helped by his fluency in Spanish and a half-Hispanic nephew—made inroads among the more Americanized Mexicans in Texas and won a majority of the Cuban vote in Florida.

Several other ethnic or racial minorities also vote heavily Democratic. For example, Amerindians typically give 70% or more of their votes to Democratic presidential candidates, while Asian (including Asian Indian) and Arab-Americans regularly give them 60% or more of their votes. One wonders what is the *common unifying* principle or policy tying these diverse ethnic groups to Democratic candidates. Do they share common economic or foreign policy interests that the Democrats serve, or is there a widespread understanding that the Democrats best serve the general racial or ethnic interests of non-European Americans?

Voting patterns reveal much of this ethnic solidarity. These patterns are drawn predominantly along ethno-racial lines, which reflect racial or ethnic interests rather than lines of economic, social, cultural or other non-racial interests.

ETHNICITY AND THE 2000 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

So where did Bush get his 49 million votes in the last presidential election?

- 1.) Blacks, who are 12.5% of the population but were only about 10% of the voters (due to the younger average age of their population and lower voter participation), gave Bush 9% of their 10.1 million votes, or about 900,000 votes.
- 2.) Hispanics, who are 11% of the population but were only about 7% of the voters (again, due to the younger average age of their population and lower voter participation), gave Bush 35% of their 7.1 million votes, or about 2.5 million votes.²
- 3.) Amerindians, who are 0.5% of the population but were only about 0.3% of the voters, gave Bush about 30% of their 330,000 votes, or about 100,000 votes.
- 4.) Asians and Asian Indians, who are 4% of the population but were only about 2% of the voters, gave Bush 41% of their 2 million votes, or about 820,000 votes.
- 5.) Whites, who are 72% of the population but were 80.7% of the voters, gave Bush 54.8% of their 81.5 million votes, or about 44.7 million votes. (It is reported that the mostly white Republican voting base in California had a record low turnout, contrary to the high turnout that was expected, caused by the TV networks' early call of the battleground states of Florida and Michigan for Gore, which prevented Bush from winning a majority of the national popular vote.) Gore received only 42% of the white vote, a 13% ethnic or racial gap larger than the gender gap, and one that has persisted in varying degrees since 1964, when Lyndon Johnson was the last Democratic presidential candidate to win more white votes than his Republican rival.

By way of clarification, as a racial group whites can be classified into the following categories:

- 1.) Jews, who are 2.5% of the population but were 4% of the voters (due to the older average age of their population and higher voter participation), gave Bush 19% of their 4 million votes, or about 760,000 votes.
- 2.) Arab-Americans, who are 1.5% of the population but were only about 1.2% of the voters, have historically given a large majority of their votes to Democrats (with the exception of their co-ethnic, defeated Michigan Republican Senator Spencer Abraham). For this reason I estimate they gave Bush about 40% of their 1.2 million votes, or about 480,000 votes.
- 3.) Southern European and non-Arab Middle Eastern ethnic groups—including Southern Italian, Greek, and various Southern Balkan ethnic groups, as well as Armenians, Turks, and Iranians—who together are about 5% of the population and were about 5.7% of the voters.³ These ethnic groups have historically supported Democratic candidates, often to the extent of bloc voting. This is still largely true in their ethnic enclaves in the northeastern states and Illinois, as demonstrated in this election, but members of these groups in other areas of the country have increasingly tended to split their vote on non-ethnic lines for both Democratic and Republican candidates. A reasonable estimate is that Bush received about 45% of their vote nationwide, or about 2.57 million of their 5.8 million votes.

4.) A Northern and Central European (NCE) group, consisting of the “Old Americans” (i.e., WASPs) and those other racially similar groups who have largely assimilated into the “Old American” group and its culture. This includes Irish and Eastern European Catholics, in spite of a considerable amount of separate ethnic identification that has historically allied them with the Democratic Party, especially in their ethnic enclaves. Together, they are about 63% of the population but were about 69.8% of the voters (because of their higher average age and voter participation). Based on the above analysis, they gave Bush about 40.9 million of their 70.5 million votes. This means about 58% of Northern and Central Europeans (NCEs) voted for Bush, and they accounted for 83.4% of the total votes he received.⁴

Let’s consider the key ethnic constituencies of the Democratic candidate from the results of the 2000 presidential election. Where did Gore get his 49.2 million votes?

- 1.) Blacks gave Gore 90% of their 10.1 million votes, or about 9.1 million votes.
- 2.) Hispanics gave Gore 62% of their 7.1 million votes, or about 4.4 million votes.
- 3.) Amerindians gave Gore about 70% of their 330,000 votes, or about 230,000 votes.
- 4.) Asians and Asian Indians gave Gore 55% of their 2 million votes, or about 1.1 million votes.
- 5.) Whites gave Gore 42% of their 81.5 million votes, or about 34.3 million votes.

Gore’s white voters can be divided into the following categories:

- 1.) Jews gave Gore 79% of their 4 million votes, or about 3.16 million votes.
- 2.) Arab-Americans gave Gore about 60% of their 1.2 million votes, or about 720,000 votes.
- 3.) Southern Europeans and Middle Easterners gave Gore about 53% of their vote nationwide, or about 3.07 million of their 5.8 million votes.
- 4.) Northern and Central Europeans (NCEs) gave Gore about 27.35 million of their 70.5 million votes. This means about 38.8% of NCEs voted for Gore, and they accounted for about 55.6% of the total votes he received.

If this analysis is correct, and Northern and Central Europeans (NCEs) gave Bush 58% of their vote compared to 39% for Gore, it is a matter that merits extensive discussion and examination. This gap of 19% among NCEs in favor of Bush, when compared with the even larger voting gaps among the black, Hispanic, and Jewish ethnic groups in favor of Gore, clearly indicates that the vote was drawn predominantly along ethno-racial lines.

Yet Bush made no explicit appeal to NCE ethno-racial interests. Far from it he is identified with those Republicans, like Bush’s chief political strategist Karl Rove and former Republican National Committee chairman Richard Bond, who want to racially neutralize the GOP by “reaching out” to non-NCE minorities to increase their presence in the party.⁵ The identification of NCE ethnic interests with the Republican candidate was subtle and implicitly understood, never explicitly mentioned or appealed to or sought. It probably derived largely from the simple comparison of the overwhelmingly

NCE composition of the Republican party with the far more non-NCE composition of the Democratic party. This created the impression, however subtle or symbolic or even subconscious, that the Republicans were the party for NCE ethno-racial interests. This impression even survived the racially neutralizing efforts by Bush and the Republican leadership to be more racially inclusive in a futile appeal to non-NCE voters, particularly by the showcasing of black Republicans such as Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice, and Rep. J.C. Watts. Because of its subtlety and implicitness, and the racial confusion caused by these neutralization efforts, the identification of NCE ethno-racial interests with the Republicans was much less effectively understood than the well-recognized and accepted identification of the Democratic party with black, Jewish, and Hispanic ethnic interests.

Due to NCE demographic decline, in future elections victory for NCE ethnic interests will require even higher proportions of the NCE vote, rising to solid bloc voting levels. To achieve this the appeal to NCE ethnic interests will have to become explicit, well-recognized, and understood. It will, in fact, have to become real and meaningful, not just essentially symbolic and empty of real meaning, like the current identification of NCE interests with Republican candidates. Voting patterns will have to be even more clearly drawn on ethnic lines, reflecting the real divisions of ethnic interests that are currently not recognized, with the voting “ethnic gap” between NCEs and other ethnic groups probably growing larger than it is now. In this election an NCE bloc vote of 72% would have constituted an absolute majority of the 101 million votes cast. If current demographic trends continue, by 2050 NCEs, who are presently 63% of the population and 68% of the eligible voters, will be 43% of the population and 47% of the eligible voters, with 2044 probably being the last election in which NCE voters will constitute a majority of the votes cast.

This of course is part of the long-term plan of the ethnic groups allied with the Democratic Party—to displace the NCE group from its historic majority status by profound demographic changes caused by a combination of non-NCE immigration and high non-NCE birthrates. This goal is defended by the ideology of the “Frankfurt school” of sociology, and is often openly expressed, although frequently with the use of code terms, such as the following quote from Earl Raab of Brandeis University’s Institute of Jewish Advocacy, a prominent Jewish social scientist and ethnic activist, from one of his columns in the San Francisco *Jewish Bulletin* in 1993:

The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will be able to prevail in this country. We [Jews] have been nourishing the American climate of opposition to ethnic bigotry for about half a century. That climate has not yet been perfected, but the heterogeneous nature of our population tends to make it irreversible—and makes our constitutional constraints against bigotry more practical than ever.⁶

If one reads “Nazi-Aryan party” as a code term for any party that openly advocates NCE ethnic interests, and “ethnic bigotry” and “bigotry” as code terms for overtures in support of NCE ethnic interests, the meaning of the above quote as a descrip-

tion of a process of ethnic competition and conflict resulting in NCE displacement and dispossession becomes clear. But has the U.S. really “tipped beyond the point” where NCE ethnic interests could prevail in an election, and thus where the democratic electoral process is no longer a realistic means to promote those interests? This election indicates that the tipping point has not yet passed in an absolute sense, and that this will not likely occur until around 2044, but that the proportion of the NCE vote required to prevail in an election is growing so large that a degree of NCE ethnic solidarity sufficient to produce a true NCE bloc vote will be needed in the very near future.

As stated above, currently an NCE bloc vote of 72% would constitute an absolute majority of the electorate, but if current demographic trends (i.e., large-scale non-NCE immigration and high non-NCE birthrates) continue, by about 2044 NCEs, who were 70% of the voters in this election, will be reduced to about 50% of the total electorate, requiring an NCE bloc vote of 99.5% to constitute an electoral majority. According to demographic projections, the percentage of the NCE vote required to constitute an electoral majority can be expected to increase by about 2.5% per election cycle for the next 44 years (eleven election cycles) until NCEs become a minority of the electorate. Based on this, it can be calculated that the percentage of the NCE vote required to constitute an electoral majority in 2004 will be about 74.5%, in 2008 about 77%, in 2012 about 79.5% (equal to Jewish bloc voting levels), in 2016 about 82%, in 2020 about 84.5%, in 2024 about 87%, in 2028 about 89.5% (equal to Black bloc voting levels), in 2032 about 92%, in 2036 about 94.5%, in 2040 about 97%, and in 2044 about 99.5%. If all immigration were halted—with high non-NCE birthrates becoming the sole cause of NCE demographic and electoral decline—the rate of decline would be reduced by half, and the timetable doubled to about 80 years.

This analysis indicates that the possibility of creating an NCE voting bloc capable of restoring NCE ethnic interests by electoral means is in a race against time. Politically, the first of these interests is the preservation (or restoration) of the NCE ethnic group’s traditional status as a predominant majority of the U.S. population and electorate—and thus its continued possession of the U.S. as its ethno-racial homeland—and its independence or control over its own existence. The anti-NCE coalition understands this, and that is why they promote and support the causes of NCE demographic decline, dispossession and displacement, and even openly celebrate it, as did President Clinton when he expressed his joy that the U.S. would cease to be a majority European nation by 2050, or as Earl Raab does, somewhat gloatingly and somewhat prematurely, as a victory already achieved.

For the NCE ethnic group to achieve bloc voting levels, the various causes and forms of NCE political division should be addressed and reduced as much as possible. In this effort, particular attention should be given to the “gender gap,” as this gap almost certainly affects the NCE group to a far greater degree than any other ethnic group. It is most unlikely that anything close to a 10% voting “gender gap” exists among blacks, Jews, Asians or Hispanics. Therefore it should be sadly accepted that the NCE voting “gender gap” is probably 12-14%, which means that if NCEs gave Bush 58% of their total vote it is likely that NCE men gave him 64-65% of their vote while NCE women gave him 51-52%. Among NCE men it could perhaps be argued that borderline

bloc voting on ethnic lines is already being practiced, although they are very quiet about it, and it is not openly organized or recognized for what it is. If 64% of NCE women could also be brought to vote on the lines of ethnic interests it would probably be enough to win the next several elections, and if NCE ethnic interests were addressed in a meaningful way it could temporarily slow the current rapid decline in the NCE demographic and electoral position, and perhaps even make possible its reversal.

WHITE ETHNIC VOTERS: IDEOLOGICAL LOYALTIES AND DIVIDED INTERESTS

So who are the 39% of Northern and Central Europeans (NCEs) who voted for Gore, and thus on the wrong side of the electoral ethnic gap (i.e., against the interests of their ethno-racial group), and causing the political division within their group - and what can be done to move them to the pro-NCE side of the gap, to the side of NCE ethnic solidarity and unity in support of their ethno-racial interests, to produce a true NCE bloc vote in elections in the near future?

A large number were NCEs with anachronistic or fossilized political loyalties, who haven't gotten the message that things have changed, and the reasons their ancestors supported the Democratic party, whether ideological or ethnic, are no longer valid. They include the following three groups:

1. "*Class warriors*"—The attachment of many "lower income" and "working class" NCEs, including many labor union members, to the Democratic party is an example of anachronistic political loyalties, left over from the class warfare and socialist ideological struggles of the 19th and early 20th centuries, that are no longer relevant or meaningful in terms of either economic or ethnic interest. In the terms of the economic and employment interests of this group, by which it is primarily defined, for the last fifty years there has been very little practical difference between the policies of the Democrats and Republicans. Although the traditional symbolism of the Democratic Party being "the party of the working man" still persists, in practice since the Second World War it has been allied with global capitalist interests and multinational corporations as firmly as the Republicans (as Ralph Nader emphasized as the central point of his third party presidential campaign). The harm done to the American working class of all ethnic groups by huge international trade deficits and the loss of 10 million manufacturing jobs to other countries, institutionalized by such organizations and treaties as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which enjoy the total bipartisan support of the leaderships of both the Democratic and Republican parties, makes the labor policy differences that do exist between the two parties seem trivial by comparison. A Republican leadership that adopted a populist and economic nationalist program could make substantial gains among "working class" NCEs by supporting their economic interests in a much more meaningful way than the current Democratic leadership.
2. "*NCE ethnics*"—The attachment of unassimilated remnants of mostly assimilated NCE ethnic groups such as Irish and Eastern European Catholics to the Democratic Party is another example of anachronistic political loyalties.

These ethnic groups have long provided the base of support for the Kennedy clan and similar Democratic politicians in the northeast, although the Kennedys and their allies have devoted their political efforts almost solely to promoting non-NCE interests and opposing NCE interests. An openly pro-NCE leadership that made NCE ethno-racial interests the primary issue, raising awareness of their larger ethnic identity and interests while stressing the importance of ethnic loyalty and solidarity, could lead many of these wayward NCEs back to their true ethnic allegiances.

3. *“Blue dog democrats,” formerly known as “yellow dog democrats”*—The attachment of politically traditional, die-hard Democratic loyalist Southerners to the Democratic party (the proverbial “yellow dog democrats,” who would vote for anyone—including a yellow dog—who ran on the Democratic ticket) is an example of fossilized political loyalties, as the party they support long ago changed, in terms of their ethnic interests, into the very opposite of the party that originally won the support of their ancestors, and the majority of their ethnic group has already recognized this fact and changed their political loyalties in accordance with their ethno-racial interests. The remnants of this group are gradually following the example of the majority of their fellows who have left the Democratic Party, but a Republican leadership that openly expressed and endorsed their traditional ethnic interests could speed their defection from the party of their ethnic opponents.

Moving beyond the anachronistic or fossilized NCE support for the Democrats, the first group to consider is the 12-14% of NCE women, mentioned above, who formed the “gender gap,” giving Gore 12-14% more support among NCE women than among NCE men, so that 45-46% of NCE women voted for Gore compared to only 32-33% of NCE men. There are possibly a number of subtle psychological gender differences that contribute to this NCE electoral gender gap, some so subtle that it is difficult to address them, but I believe that most of this gap is probably due to very obvious “women’s rights” issues. It is not just a coincidence that the NCE gender gap became significant only after the radicalization of the women’s rights movement into the “women’s liberation” movement in the 1960s.

For over forty years the political “Left,” the ideological core of the Democratic party, from its dominant position in the media and academia, has made concerted efforts to drive a divisive wedge between NCE men and women, and much of this 12-14% NCE gender gap is due to the partial success of these efforts. But of the various “women’s rights” issues, the more personal, less ideological, and less gender-divisive issue of abortion rights is the most prominent. Democrats support a woman’s right to have an abortion if they choose, while Republicans—under pressure from the GOP’s influential “religious right”—adamantly oppose abortion rights, although this opposition is largely symbolic and without practical effect. Some middle-class NCE Republican women support abortion rights but voted for the GOP nominee anyway because they did not really believe that the Republicans would make abortion illegal. Many women, however, really do believe this. In south-east Florida voters were inundated with television ads by Planned Parenthood and other abortion rights groups claiming that Bush would try to make abortion illegal. Several even featured self-described Republican women who said they could not vote for Bush because of this belief.

It is likely that most of the women who comprise the NCE gender gap (i.e., all but the hard-core radical feminists, who are a “special interest group” that is essentially inseparable from the Democratic party) could be won over by a Republican leadership that clearly represented their ethnic interests and enjoyed the support of the great majority of their men if it recognized their right to control their own reproductive lives. It is also possible that the radical feminists have overplayed their hand and gone too far on some issues on which general NCE support is either very “soft” or actually non-existent (e.g., placing women in military combat units where, if there is a war, they will be sent into combat—something every known human society has always avoided for obvious sociobiological reasons), making the Democrats vulnerable to further erosion of NCE support if the Republicans actually challenged them.

Another group of NCEs who voted against the interests of their ethnic group, and should be considered, although they are the least likely to be converted to the pro-NCE side, are those who have a “hard” degree of ideological commitment to anti-NCE policies and values, i.e., policies and values that are harmful to NCE ethno-racial interests. Most NCEs, including supporters of both major parties, have a “soft” degree of commitment to these anti-NCE policies and values as part of a normal and subconscious conformism to the dominant or mainstream anti-NCE culture that surrounds them, which includes the notorious cult of “political correctness” in which the pro-NCE side of any issue is always “politically incorrect.” This “soft” support for policies that are harmful to their ethnic interests is characterized by a lack of awareness or recognition of those interests, or of the harm being done to them by these policies, i.e., by ignorance and lack of harmful intent. It tends to be a minimal, weak, passive, and grudging support, lacking intensity and passion, superficial rather than deep. But those NCEs with a “hard” commitment to the anti-NCE program and its values are active and enthusiastic in their support, filled with passion and intensity, and are also typically much more aware of the harmful consequences of their program on NCE interests. To the extent that they knowingly accept and support this harm to NCE interests, they have harmful intent. Unfortunately, much if not most of the existing NCE political leadership in both parties probably has a “hard” degree of commitment to anti-NCE policies and values, and virtually all the remainder have a “soft” degree to minimally conform to the dominant culture around them.

Most NCEs with a “hard” ideological commitment to anti-NCE policies and values support the Democratic party. This core group includes the more militant or radical promoters of the feminist and homosexual agendas (Gore received a homosexual bloc vote of 70% compared to 25% for Bush). College campuses furnish very strong havens of anti-NCE teaching and activism (often referred to as “idealism”) where pro-NCE ideas are not tolerated and are effectively banned as “politically incorrect.”

AN ETHNIC AGENDA FOR THE NCE RACIAL MAJORITY

What are pro-NCE ideas? Very simply, pro-NCE ideas, values, and beliefs are those that recognize, support, and promote the interests of the NCE ethno-racial group. At present, very few people are aware that the NCE ethno-racial group even has interests, much less what those interests are, as they are not recognized or considered by the

anti-NCE culture, and thus are not addressed in public discussion or debate, but are ignored, evaded, or denied as if they don't exist, permitting them to be routinely and massively harmed and violated with impunity. Only non-NCE interests are recognized or considered as a legitimate matter of concern, so that opposition to a policy that benefits non-NCEs but harms NCEs is defined not as being pro-NCE but as being against non-NCEs, as NCE interests are not considered to be a legitimate matter of concern. This must be changed. NCE interests, and the effect of programs and policies on those interests, must be recognized and discussed as a legitimate matter for concern, contrary to the current practice that condemns such concern as illegitimate and immoral.

What are the interests of the NCE ethno-racial group? The three most important, in order of their importance, are:

1. Its continued existence or preservation.
2. Its independence, sovereignty, self-determination, self-rule or self-government, or its sole control of its own existence free from domination, interference, or control by other ethno-racial groups.
3. Its possession of its own territory or homeland where it can be secure in its continued existence and independence, where it will not be displaced, replaced, or dispossessed by other ethno-racial groups, and where it can govern itself free from domination or influence by other groups.⁷

Given the fact that few people consider the fundamental importance of these primary objectives for their own ethnic survival, most of the pro-NCE political activity that does occur is focused on secondary NCE interests which, although less important than those listed above, are interrelated. Most common are the various efforts to end or reverse the more blatant anti-NCE policies of the dominant anti-NCE coalition, such as "affirmative action" programs (i.e., anti-NCE discrimination) and immigration, which is reducing the traditional NCE majority to a declining minority suffering territorial dispossession by an invasion of non-NCE immigrants. These efforts have consistently enjoyed overwhelming bloc levels of support among NCE voters, but their wishes have been frustrated and denied by the political and judicial maneuverings of the anti-NCE power structure, which have nullified the will of NCE voters, and made them essentially powerless with regard to control over specific issues.

The reassertion of NCE popular sovereignty, of control by the people over specific policies, would require greater NCE unity and solidarity than presently exists. There would be a synergistic effect, or mutually strengthening combined effect, in the interaction between the increasing legitimacy of a pro-NCE position and an increasing degree of NCE unity and solidarity in a single openly pro-NCE party. The more one increased, the more the other would benefit and also tend to increase. A divided NCE electorate, as has traditionally been the case, prevents NCE interests from being recognized or considered as legitimate or important matters of concern. Thus a pro-NCE position on an issue is commonly defined as being "anti-" non-NCE rather than simply pro-NCE, since only the non-NCE interests are recognized as legitimate "issues." All the while

NCE interests are ignored as if they do not exist, so that in effect NCEs have no interests that are recognized as valid or legitimate, and addressed or considered, in the present political culture. A united NCE electorate, in control of a major openly pro-NCE party, could re-assert its sovereignty and rehabilitate the too much and too long maligned, violated, and harmed interests of their own ethno-racial group, restoring them to their central position.

How can the Republican party be transformed into a true NCE political party that actively supports the ethnic and racial interests of their own voter-base? According to “social identity” theory a pro-NCE political party can be expected to develop as a natural reaction to the growing dominance of the anti-NCE coalition and its policies. Given the preponderance of NCE support for the Republicans, it can be assumed that a strong NCE identification with the GOP already exists, making it the clear favorite to develop into the party of and for NCEs and their interests. As Kevin MacDonald explains in *The Culture of Critique*:

The prediction, both on theoretical grounds and on the basis of social identity research, is that as other groups become increasingly powerful and salient in a multicultural society, the European-derived peoples of the United States will become increasingly unified; among these peoples, contemporary divisive influences, such as issues related to gender and sexual orientation, social class differences, or religious differences, will be increasingly perceived as unimportant. Eventually these groups will develop a united front and a collectivist political orientation vis-a-vis the other ethnic groups. Other groups will be expelled if possible or partitions will be created...⁸

The task of transforming the Republican party into the party of and for NCEs and their interests will not be accomplished by its current leadership. Quite the opposite—GOP officials can be expected to vigorously oppose it. So it must be accomplished by other organized groups from within and outside of the party with the goal of attracting NCEs into the party to increase its identification among the ranks of their own racial-ethnic group.

Over the last decade or so the “moderates” who are the current leadership of the Republican party have frequently stressed the necessity of moving their party away from its symbolic identification with NCE ethnic interests in order to attract the growing numbers of ethnic minority voters. This is obviously an effort to close the ethnic gap by racially neutralizing the Republican party, preventing it from developing into an openly pro-NCE party that actually serves, promotes, and identifies with its own ethnic base the way the Democratic party has catered to the interests of ethnic minorities.

The last thing the anti-NCE coalition wants, and fears the most, is the development of a major pro-NCE political party at this stage of the game when it could still make a difference. The big question is whether the GOP could be changed into a truly pro-NCE party, or whether a third party effort is the only realistic option. Increased awareness among NCEs of the electoral gap—in and of itself—could actually increase NCE ethnic consciousness and cause the gap to grow as the GOP is identified, at least symbolically at first, with NCE interests and receives increased NCE support, while the Democrats are explicitly identified as opposed to NCE interests and lose NCE support. Currently,

NCE concerns and interests are not addressed or considered, but are ignored or denied. As an ethnic group, NCEs remain voiceless and defenseless even though other ethnic interests are sought after by both political parties. A major political party that represented, advocated, and defended legitimate NCE rights and interests would radically change this situation.

This would be a disaster for the anti-NCE establishment, which attempts to prevent it by racially neutralizing the Republican party by “broadening its base” to make it more inclusive and “racially diverse,” claiming that the support of the growing non-NCE groups is necessary for the GOP’s survival, i.e., claiming if the party is to be saved it must be racially neutralized and moved away from its identification with the declining NCE ethnic group and moved toward the rising non-NCE ethnic groups. Opposition to this move is described as “undercurrents that threaten the party.” But a political party is not important in itself, nor is its survival, or whatever threatens it. *What is important in itself is a people, whether they be called a race or an ethnic group. It is their survival that is important, and whatever threatens their survival that should be a matter of concern. The concern of NCEs should not be with saving the GOP or any other political party, but with saving their ethno-racial group. A political party is only a means to serve a people’s interests, they are not a means to serve the interests of a political party.* So the GOP, if it fails to develop into a truly pro-NCE party, is expendable, and should then be abandoned by NCEs in favor of a party that serves their ethnic interests. But for the present, as the ethnic gap shows, there is still a possibility that the GOP could be transformed into a truly pro-NCE political vehicle. Again, this is what the anti-NCE coalition, as they look upon the electoral ethnic gap, fears the most, and what a pro-NCE coalition should see as its best hope.

The present GOP leadership, in accord with the anti-NCE policies and goals of the anti-NCE coalition, is making concerted efforts to prevent their party from advancing an agenda that promotes the interests of the party’s racial base. Former Republican House Speaker Newt Gingrich is reported to have told black Democratic congressman Jesse Jackson Jr. that if the Republican party could gain an additional 5% of the black vote (i.e., increase its normal share of the black vote from 10% to 15%) it would “be in power for a millennium.” This statement highlights the anti-NCE bias of the Republican leadership as well as the low quality of their logic and strategic thinking. A 5% shift in the black vote would gain them only 500,000 votes, while a 5% shift in the NCE vote—which is much “softer” in its loyalty to the Democrats and thus easier to shift—would gain the GOP 3.5 million votes. Yet would Gingrich say that a 5% shift in the NCE vote to the GOP would keep it in power for a millennium? He would not, and not because it would not be true (as his even more incorrect statement about the black vote shows), but because he is not nearly as interested in increasing the Republican party’s share of the NCE vote as its share of the black vote in order to make it more racially diverse and thus racially neutral rather than ethnically homogeneous.

The efforts to racially neutralize the Republican party involve minimizing, denying, ignoring, or evading its identification with its own ethnic base. This political strategy has been largely ineffective in winning significantly increased support from non-

NCE voters, but it has probably been very effective in confusing potential NCE supporters, including many of the almost 50% of eligible NCE voters who do not vote. It is likely that it has alienated far more potential NCE supporters, causing many of them to not vote at all, than it has gained non-NCE supporters.

This is not surprising. The ethno-racial interests of the two groups are mutually incompatible and irreconcilable. No party can serve both, and no party tries to serve both. Both parties serve the interests of the non-NCE ethnic groups against the interests of the NCE ethnic group. As the ethnic gap in voting patterns reveals, the Republican party enjoys increased support from NCE voters to the degree that it is perceived to be more favorable, or less unfavorable, to NCE interests compared to the Democratic party. The electoral ethnic gap essentially reflects the perceived gap between the Republicans and Democrats with regard to NCE interests. The greater this perceived "NCE interests gap" grows—and becomes more obvious—the greater the electoral ethnic gap will also tend to grow. The more it is reduced the more the electoral gap will also tend to be reduced. This is the goal of the current power structure, including the current leadership of the GOP—to prevent the creation of a major pro-NCE political vehicle by reducing or even eliminating the electoral ethnic gap between the two major parties. But the rank and file of the Republican party and the NCE electorate still persist in their own disorganized, uncoordinated, and largely unconscious efforts to transform the GOP into a de facto pro-NCE party. One can speculate about the causes of this behavior, but it has so far frustrated and prevented the efforts of the current leadership to eliminate NCE ethno-racial interests and identification as a political force that impedes and threatens their plans.

It should also be considered that a simple majority of NCE electoral support for a party with openly pro-NCE interests, even though not sufficient for an electoral victory, would be sufficient to constitute a moral victory for NCE interests, compelling the public recognition and consideration of NCE interests, and morally discrediting the anti-NCE policies of the current political leadership of both major parties. In this sense, even some degree of electoral decline in a transformed GOP would be worthwhile if the party promoted an openly pro-NCE position.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, in the 2000 election the most important predictor of who voted for Gore and who voted for Bush was not income level, educational level, gender, or socioeconomic class, but ethno-racial classification. In the 1992 election Clinton supporters trumpeted the slogan, "It's the economy, stupid." Actually the real message of every election since 1968, including the 2000 and 1992 elections, is that the primary issue is *race*. It is race that primarily divides the electorate and is the most important determinant of voting patterns, although this fact is largely ignored, evaded, or denied.⁹ To acknowledge it would most likely increase it by making NCEs more consciously aware of *what they seem to recognize subconsciously*, reducing the level of racial confusion that impedes NCE political unity, which is not what the ruling anti-NCE coalition wants.

The long-predicted political Balkanization of the U.S. along ethno-racial lines is already a long-established fact for the major non-NCE ethnic groups. Some of this

ethnic division is presently concealed by regional, cultural, and religious differences. Only the creation of an NCE voting bloc is needed to complete it. NCEs have lagged behind in this process of ethnic competition largely because they have been unaware of it. They have not known, never realized, that they were in a fight, in an ethnic struggle, with the ultimate stakes being nothing less than the continued existence or preservation of their ethno-racial group.

ENDNOTES

1. Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), p. 85.
2. According to an independent analysis by Steve Sailer, national correspondent for United Press International, the total Mexican-American vote in the 2000 presidential election is 3.0%, while the remainder of the non-Mexican Hispanic vote is 2.3%.
3. According to Wilmot Robertson in *The Dispossessed Majority* (1981 edition, Cape Canaveral, FL: Howard Allen, p.64) in 1980 these ethnic groups numbered 10.4 million, or about 4.6% of a then total U.S. population of 226.5 million. They included 7 million Southern Italians (distinguished from the approximately 1.8 million Northern Italians, who are mostly Central European in racial type), 1.4 million Greeks, and 2 million others—including about 400,000 Armenians, 230,000 South Balkan ethnics (Albanians, Romanians, and Bulgars) and 1.37 million non-Arabic “Middle Easterners” (including Turks, Iranians, and Afghans). The estimated increase in these groups to 13.5 million in the year 2000, or about 5% of a total U.S. population of about 270 million, is based primarily on Middle Eastern and South Balkan increases through immigration. Some members of the Southern European ethnic groups are physically within the Northern and Central European (NCE) racial range.
4. The NCE group is not limited to persons of “pure” NCE racial ancestry. It includes persons of partly non-NCE origin whose NCE ancestry is sufficiently dominant that they are physically within the NCE racial range and are racially and culturally identified, both by themselves and others, with the NCE group.
5. The futility of these efforts is underscored in a recent report by the Center for Immigration Studies, “Impossible Dream or Distant Reality?: Republican Efforts to Attract Latino Voters” by James G. Gimpel and Karen Kaufman (August 2001). See <http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back901.html> for full report. In a recent *Washington Post* article Richard Bond claims that “we’ve taken white guys about as far as that group can go. We are in need of diversity, women, Latino, African American, Asian. The degree to which Bush and congressional Republicans can ground the notion of compassionate conservatism to appeal to women, Latinos, African Americans and Asians, that is where the future of the Republican Party is.” See “Census a Clarion Call for Democrats, GOP,” Thomas B. Edsall, *The Washington Post*, July 8, 2001.
6. See Kevin MacDonald, *Culture of Critique*, pp. 194-195 and pp. 246-247; and Peter Brimelow, *Alien Nation* (New York: Random House), 1995, pp.118-119.
7. These are the vital ethnic interests that peoples have fought to protect throughout history—the “freedom” in the classic national sense fought for by the Greeks at Marathon and Salamis, by the Germans at Teutoberger Wald, by the Franks led by Charles Martel at Tours, by the Scots led by William Wallace at Stirling Bridge (his dying word in the film *Braveheart*), and even by the Americans on the many battlefields of the “War of Independence.” These are the national interests—the interests of the “patria”—as opposed to individual interests, that patriots have fought to defend. (The U.S. has broken from this patriotic tradition in its claims to have fought most of its wars primarily to defend individual liberty and individual interests

rather than to protect national freedom and national interests.)

8. Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique*, Praeger 1998, p. 323.

9. See Michael Barone, *The Almanac of American Politics 2002*, Washington, DC: National Journal Group Inc., 2001, pp. 27-28. In the introduction to the latest edition of his political almanac, veteran political analyst Michael Barone puts the 2000 election into perspective and claims that the results represent a political trend that has sharply divided the nation into almost equal halves—what he refers to as the “49% nation.” Although Barone cites several factors that contribute to this divide, he tends to minimize the factor of race and suggests that religion is the major dividing point in the American electorate. His case seems less than air-tight. He mentions the fact that certain religious groups either voted for Bush or Gore, but prefaces this point by noting that it was a majority of *white* Protestants and Catholics who voted for Bush rather than Gore. Whether “observant” or “moralistic” or “agnostic” or “secular,” the racial division among the electorate remains no matter how many ways Barone massages the figures.

*Richard McCulloch is the author of **The Racial Compact** (1994), **The Nordish Quest** (1989), **Destiny of Angels** (1986), and **The Ideal and Destiny** (1982).*
