

ETHNOCENTRISM, ETHNOPREFERENCE, XENOPHOBIA PEACE IN RACE RELATIONS—A NEW UNDERSTANDING¹

ROBERT JOHN

ABSTRACT

Ethnocentrism includes ethnic self-preference or ethnopreference and a negative attitude toward other ethnicities or races. Ethnocentrism has been a factor in human development and ethnic survival, although ethnic groups are not absolutely distinct or exclusive. Since World War II, the culture of European and European-American (Western) peoples has been loaded with media dramatizations associating their ethnocentrism with historical horrors and tragedy. The resulting repression of ethnocentrism and the psychological defense of “reaction formation” have produced distortions of behavior of some Western peoples, against the survival interest of the individual or group. The positive component of ethnocentrism, that we term “ethnopreference,” is neglected, unrecognized, or suppressed.

From this unresolved internalized conflict comes the multiplicity of legislative acts in Europe and North America to favor the “other” over the “self,” the alien over the native son; unprecedented in human history.

Understanding the evolutionary value of ethnopreference, and making it conscious, without negative feelings toward others, resolves internal conflict. Thus, all ethnicities can consciously respect their own and other ethnicities; with conflict reduction. This is the appropriate public therapy for our time.

By utilizing the progressive insights of these evolutionary analyses and clarifying definitions accordingly, it will be possible to reduce confusion on issues of race, ethnicity, and diversity. Understanding of these bases of human behavior can inform the arts, education, politics, and immigration legislation toward policies for optimum quality of life.

Ethnocentrism, among humans, is an ethological norm with comparable across-species behavior. William Sumner defined ethnocentrism in 1906 as “the view of things in which one’s own group is the centre of everything and all others are scaled and rated, in reference to one’s group. Each group thinks that its own folkways are the only right ones. And if it observes that other people have other folkways, these excite its scorn” (Sumner 1907).

1. Based on a presentations to the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Politics and the Life Sciences, Aug. 2002, Montreal, Canada, and the Human Behavior and Evolution Society at Rutgers Univ.

Sociologists may define ethnocentrism as the belief in the inherent superiority of one's own ethnic group or culture, and a tendency to view alien groups or cultures from the perspective of one's own. Most schools of anthropology consider ethnocentrism to be a human universal. Franz Boas wrote in 1945: "History shows us every society as a self-contained group that recognizes mutual obligations but is hostile to outsiders, ready to advance its own interests and disregard those of other groups" (Boas 1945). Political scientist Donald Horowitz related ethnic affiliations to kinship and intergroup relations to the fear of domination. (Horowitz 1985).

J. Philippe Rushton complemented the theories of kin selection and ethnic nepotism with his genetic similarity theory, which proposes that "genetically similar people tend to seek one another out and to provide mutually supportive environments such as marriage, friendship, and social groups. This may represent a biological factor underlying ethnocentrism and group selection." It is clear that the existence of innate genetic similarity detectors would facilitate the formation of ethnic groups and strengthen their cohesiveness (Rushton 1995; on a biological factor, see also Hart 2000).

For economist Tatu Vanhanen, modernization theories predicting the disappearance of ethnic conflicts at higher levels of modernity or socioeconomic development fail to explain the universality of ethnic conflicts, for the simple reason that ethnic conflicts have not disappeared at higher levels of modernity and socioeconomic development (Vanhanen 1999).

Kevin MacDonald's perspective from evolutionary psychology explains acceptance of antiethnoprference movements from differences in perception between individualists and collectivists:

individualists living in the presence of collectivist subcultures will tend to be less predisposed to outgroup hostility and more likely to view any offensive behavior by outgroup members as resulting from transgressions by individuals, rather than being stereotypically true of all-outgroup members. On the other hand, collectivists living in an individualist society will be more likely to view ingroup/outgroup distinctions as extremely salient and to develop stereotypically negative views about outgroups.

"Hyper-collectivism" is a characteristic of Jewish groups (MacDonald 1994).

In fact, each of us is here today because of ethnocentrism.

AN EVOLUTIONARY BEHAVIOR

That ethnocentrism is an across-species, beyond-primate phenomenon, with evolutionary survival value, was suggested by a paper given at a conference at the American Museum of Natural History on "Science and the Concept of Race" chaired by Dr. Ethel Tobach that I attended in 1968. Kilham and Klopfer reported a study using *Gallus domesticus*, the common chicken, producing data summarized as demonstrating, "Preferences for own-kind are immanent but require activation by a particular experience. Programming of perceptual

systems...seems to be an important feature of organisms" (Kilham and Klopfer 1968).¹

Complementary to ethnocentrism are altruism and nepotism, evolutionary repertoires of behavior supporting the survival and reproduction of kin, and the continuation of genetic sequences related to one's own – behavior systems found in many species. For example, researchers in Finland have observed that worker ants give preference to their own kin when caring for eggs and larvae. This also means that the ants must have some way of recognizing how related they are to individuals.

"Whether or not nepotism occurs has been a much debated issue," says Liselotte Sundström at the University of Helsinki. "It requires a very precise ability to recognize your own kin" (Hannonen and Sundström 2003).

"This is a very nice demonstration of a phenomenon which people have been looking for a long time without success. It underscores the importance of kin selection and social selection according to one's relatedness," says Andrew Bourke, an expert on social insects at London's Institute of Zoology.

Allen J. Hart at Amherst and Yale and E. A. Phelps at New York University described response in the human amygdala to the presentation of racial outgroup vs. ingroup faces. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) measures of brain activity were acquired while subjects who identified themselves as white or black viewed photographs of both white and black faces (Hart et al. 2000).²

The results suggest that amygdala responses to human face stimuli are affected by the relationship between the perceived race of the stimulus face and that of the subject. Results were consistent with a role for the amygdala in encoding socially and/or biologically relevant information.

Researchers seeking to study brain responses to face stimuli in human subjects should consider the relationship between the race of subjects and stimuli as a significant potential source of variance. Moreover, these data provide a foundation for future related studies in the neuroscience of social cognition and race.

ETHNOCENTRISM AND CULTURE

Self-interest, family preference, clan – ethnic-national preferences, with individual and group self-esteem, are human behaviors and elements of reproductive success that have genetic survival value. Associated memes³ and cultural systems support differences and differentiation that are part of evolution. Veneration of the family, of ancestors, characterized classical Greece, Rome (Fustel de Coulanges 1999), and China – perhaps every civilization with a lasting legacy. Systems of ingroup loyalty and outgroup suspicion have served an effective evolutionary purpose over the long history of primate and human biological evolution. Human groups that lose their internal sense of identity

and cohesion in respect of other groups eventually cease to exist as discrete realities. Such groups may become absorbed in neighboring populations.

On the other hand, when a distinctive population or gene pool retains its identity and persists in generally practicing endogamous marriage, showing a sense of "brotherhood," the probability of survival as an identifiable biological group is enhanced.

This is evident in self-segregating groups such as the Amish people and Orthodox Jews. They have group strategies that include indoctrination, an important human adaptation that enables the formation of highly cohesive groups. Group strategies are more powerful in competition with individual strategies within a society, as has been the case with Mormonism and Judaism. The success of their strategies could be quantified with their increasing numbers relative to the general white population in the United States.

Indoctrination with defining ideas, customs, and traditions, and allegiance to unique gods, have been important historical factors for group survival. Historian W. H. McNeill has made the case that the Abrahamic religions would not have developed had Hezekiah, king of Judah (ruled ca. 715–687 B.C.), not come to terms with invaders in 701 B.C. and inspired a religious revival of thanks to their god Jahweh for deliverance. The kingdom of Judah would probably have disappeared as did the larger kingdom of Israel a mere twenty-one years earlier. "On that occasion, the exiles from Israel soon lost their separate identity. By accepting commonsense views about the limits of divine power, they abandoned the worship of Jahweh, who had failed to protect them, and became the 'Ten Lost Tribes of biblical history.'" New devotion to Jahweh for deliverance helped some Judeans retain their faith through the subsequent Babylonian captivity (McNeill 2000). Many Old Testament texts reinforce a sanction of ethnocentrism, providing an example of how human group experiences, developing myths, and common religion provide biocultural cohesive force that binds individual humans into coherent groups that function similarly to a single organism—a centrifugal force for power and stability of human groups as unitary evolutionary actors. Religion can reinforce the aspect of "I am" that gives us an assurance of chosenness and self-assurance.

Ethnocentrism is expressed in one of the state of Israel's most fundamental precepts, the "law of return," which created a right of Jews, whatever their national origin, to immigrate freely into the state of Israel, provided they are offspring of a Jewish mother.

Ethnocentrism is simplistically summarized as "ingroup preference/solidarity – outgroup rejection/aversion."

Ethnopreference (note E. O. Wilson's term "genophilia," "the desire to be with people like oneself.") Now that we understand the evolutionary and survival benefits of ethnocentrism, recognizing the positive element of ethnocentrism – in-group community and solidarity – may be made †conscious as ethnopreference. Ethnopreference is without the negative attitudes towards others of

ethnocentrism. Practicing ethnopreference, we can respect our own ethnicity, and enjoy the spectacle of other ethnicities and their cultural expressions. This is the societal therapy for our time.

FROM WESTERN ETHNOCENTRISM TO SELF-DENIAL AND DERACINATION^{2†}

Before World War II, the sun never set on the British empire, or those of other European and American peoples. Colonialism was an extension, or expression, of ethnocentrism. Until the post-World War II period, Western ethnocentrism was a powerful social force supporting imperial political rule and action. During World War II, ethnocentrism was reinforced by nationalism in all countries, even appealed to in the “internationalist” Soviet Union for the Great Patriotic War, the defense of Mother Russia.

Calling the threat of invasion the “Battle of Britain,” Winston Churchill rallied the British people in a broadcast on June 18, 1940: “Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British way of life, and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire.”

German National Socialism attempted to consolidate an ethnocentric foundation for a German nation-state that glorified fraternity (Birken), D/R rather than the Marxist doctrine of class struggle that was dividing the people of other European nation-states. At a symposium in Krefeld, Germany, in 1999, on *Visions of the Future in Germany and America* (Finzsch and Wellenreuther 200 1), Maria Mitchell discussed the Nazi *Volksgemeinschaft* (community of the people) as an “applied utopia.” A nation based on shared “blood and soil” promoted ecological conservation,⁴ families, and more “living space” – *Lebensraum*. As far removed as the German case seems from such American ventures as the Civilian Conservation Corps, Heiko Stoff perceived common ground in an effort to substitute “producerist” for a “consumerist” ideology – the latter associated by the Nazis with Jewish “abstraction” and by some New Dealers with hedonism and an endangered morality of youth (Finzsch and Wellenreuther 2001).

The defining world conflict of the twentieth century was between National Socialist Germany and its allies, on the one hand, and on the other the Marxist Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its international capitalist allies, primarily Britain and the United States of America, with their great financial capitals of London and New York. After Germany quickly conquered most of Europe, its “crusade” against Bolshevism in the East and “plutocracy” in the West almost succeeded.

As in World War I, a propaganda war was conducted by British and American experts at home and abroad to strengthen support for the war and to discredit the enemy. Allied, including Marxist, war propaganda distorted certain belief systems, such as Darwinian social theory and supportive data, to associate them with German National Socialism, using catch phrases such

^{2†} deracinate, v.t. Tear up by the roots, Fr. from *déraciner*.

as “breeding the Superman” to discredit eugenics. After Germany’s defeat, elements of these belief systems continued to be associated with the defeated and discredited, sometimes justifiably, often thanks to the propaganda. In particular, thanks to the oppression they suffered on grounds of “blood” (heredity), for Jews who survived the war, race and eugenics were notions to be discredited, and associated with guilt and extermination.

The victory of the U.S.S.R. and its allies in the war ushered in the shift from nature to nurture, from biology to culture, a shift in which Marxist researchers and publicists played a large role. The mistaken conclusions of egalitarian science have been the basis for huge failures in attempts at social change in the U.S. and other Western countries. Regarding race, for example, the post-World War II declarations on race and racial differences issued by UNESCO in 1951 under the chairmanship of G. F. Debetz of the Moscow Institute of Ethnography, ensured their Marxist ideological correctness. The huge communist-ruled area from the Berlin Wall to China was forced to adopt the Lysenko-environmentalist dogma.

The refugees and emigrants from German rule in 1939 who emigrated to the West overwhelmingly favored views on culture and the life sciences similar to those in the U.S.S.R. (Boyers 1972).⁵

In Western Europe, many journalists and activists skilled in persuasion who had left pre-war Germany because of their politics or race, promoted a “Red shift” in the postwar political climate, in which nationalists were labeled “parties of the far right and everywhere excluded from serious political influence.”⁶ The American general Bedell Smith reported in 1945 that in their occupation zone the Russians had rounded up and shot “all leaders, intellectuals, lawyers, civil officials, scholars.” The American ambassador to Yugoslavia reported mass executions of intellectuals and businessmen. Communist governments in Eastern Europe, headed by dictators who had spent the war in Moscow, executed nationalists or imprisoned them, ending their propagation of offspring and ideas. A list of ideas associated with National Socialism, and therefore assigned negative value, included ethnocentrism, nationalism, economic self-sufficiency, eugenics, heredity, immigration restriction, miscegenation, race differences, and segregation. There has been continual reinforcement of negative associations of these concepts by Marxist and or Western media since the war’s end, although some of these behaviors and memes are part of systems for ethnic/cultural survival.

This “ethical” stigmatization of Western ethnocentric ideas and behaviors has caused a distortion of Western culture, arts, and sciences. To cite one typical instance, the president of the American United Federation of Teachers, in a column titled “Where we stand,” wrote nearly thirty years ago:

In *Roots* and *The Holocaust* we were able to see the powerful educational potential of TV, which lies in its ability (1) to reach an audience of a size unprecedented in history, (2) to give us information and (3) to present subject

matter in a way which affects us emotionally as well as intellectually. Opinion polls taken after these TV programs showed that not only was the public better informed after these presentations, but its attitudes had changed. After *Roots* Americans became a more committed to doing something to make up for past injustice. After the TV *Holocaust* Americans were more sympathetic to helping the survivors of the Holocaust in the state of Israel (*New York Times*, December 10, 1978).

These attitudes have been reinforced in over five hundred anti-Nazi films, nearly two hundred of them dealing with the "Holocaust", and thousands of publications and countless TV presentations, mostly made in Hollywood, as against three anti-Jewish films made by the Nazis made in their film studios over a decade. "Hardly a month goes by without a new TV production, a new film, a new drama, new books, prose or poetry, dealing with the subject, and the flood is increasing rather than abating," declared Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer in 1992 (Cesarani 1994). Or, as the American television news magazine *60 Minutes* (CBS, June 1, 2003) put it: "The Holocaust. It's constantly on television, at the movies, on stage, in countless relics and monuments, in the country's museums and in its schools. It is recalled every year on Nov. 9, the anniversary of Kristallnacht, the 1938 assault on Germany's Jews."

SOCIAL ENGINEERS AGAINST ETHNOPREFERENCE

In the United States, World War II and the postwar occupation and rule of Germany gave status and jobs of influence to Marxist émigrés from there. Armed with their dialectic, language, and other skills, many were employed by the Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the Central Intelligence Agency, for espionage and covert operations. Among the more important Marxist leaders hired were Herbert and Sophie Marcuse, Franz Neumann, and Otto Kirchheimer. They wrote a denazification guide that was issued to American officers serving in occupying Germany for guidelines on identifying and suppressing National Socialist ideas. Another Marxist, Max Horkheimer, was put in charge of the political realignment of the German university system.

Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno, author of *The Authoritarian Personality*, developed the view that it was the unique role of Judaism in world history to vindicate the concept of difference against the assimilating forces thought to represent the essence of Western civilization (MacDonald 1998, 163).

(But westernizing others had been the direction of the Western ethnocentrism of expanding white populations and empires before the world wars. "Internationalism," according to the *Concise Encyclopedia of Russia*, was "officially one of the principles of Communist ideology and practice," as was the eventual "withering away of states" and national frontiers (Utechin 1964). By the end of the twentieth century "globalism" was an American-promoted objective, with the desired result a transnational "pluralist" racial and ethnic

mixture under centralized domination by the White House – and the oligarchy that controlled it.)

The foundation of the state of Israel provided a means of practical protection against Jewish assimilation, but allowed Jewish advocacy on behalf of minority ethnicities elsewhere. With the help of Jack Greenberg as advocate, and Felix Frankfurter as Supreme Court activist, the revolutionary case of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954 ended the legality of separate but equal education for white and black students. In so ruling the Supreme Court declared a practice that had been constitutional for a hundred and seventy years to be unconstitutional. *Brown* was not about equality of education: It decreed that ethnopreference in public schools was illegal, whether the student was black, white, or American Indian. American Indians had fought long and hard for their own schools and values, but witnesses for the plaintiff declared segregation harmful to children. School desegregation, its proponents promised, would result in an inestimable improvement in American education and race relations.⁷

This precedent of using judges rather than the electorate to make policy allowed issues to be moved from legislative bodies to courtrooms. The “activist” Supreme Court under Chief Justice Earl Warren opened a way around democracy. Over a wide range of issues, many relating to ethnopreference, “judges became legislators in response to their ‘public’ – class action attorneys.” The revolution gave public power to private attorneys, who are able to impact citizens’ lives more forcibly than the people’s elected representatives. The revolution is so complete that lawyers are now enculturated with the belief that compassion and justice are achievable only through judicial coercion (Sandler and Schoenbrod 2003). The value of voting has been diminished.

The New Left phenomenon of the sixties and early seventies consisted mainly of student radicals from two groups: self-expressive radicals, of whom many were Jews, and authoritarians, who tended to come from lower-middle class Christian homes. The Jewish radicals, who provided an initial “critical mass” for the New Left, sought radical political action because the dominant culture seemed so strong. Given the social marginality Jews still felt in predominantly Christian Western societies, radical Jews (including notably Cohn-Bendit in France) sought to weaken the culture that rendered them marginal. By contrast, non-Jewish radicals were attracted to radicalism because the “Establishment” seemed weak and vulnerable. Rothman and Lichter (1982) connected these differing behaviors to differential child-rearing practices in Jewish and non-Jewish homes.

GLOBALISM VS. (AMERICAN) ETHNOCENTRISM

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, internationalism, transnational capitalism, and consumerism are promoted as desirable “globalism.” A sales program that induces tribes in tropical Amazonian rainforests to wear a brand of running shoes could bring substantial stock options for its origina-

tor! Transnational capitalism's prime concern is to sell products worldwide, producing them where labor costs are cheapest, with a Wall Street-Hollywood model of acquisition, speculation, and gratification. Globalism of America's "Disneyland-Coca Cola" culture is promoted as desirable and inevitable. Projections on television and computer screens that advertise products while promoting single-market homogenization are designed to make money by stimulating common desires and emotions. Community, ethnic, and national supports are dissolved into in "globalism" as "diversity," with centralized military and political power in Washington, scarcely restrained by enfeebled constitutional "checks and balances."

American nationalism and patriotism were temporarily reinforced and manifested in the U.S. after the attacks on its symbols of financial power and military might on September 11, 2001. American flags soon blossomed everywhere, on buildings, cars, and lapels. Subconsciously for many, individual survival was threatened. Anxiety and group defenses from alleged nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons were able to be mobilized and paranoia cleverly *displaced* psychologically in aid of a "crusade" – the word was used – "to disarm Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction." A majority of American citizens put their trust in an apparently paternal national presidential figure to support an unprovoked aggression against Iraq in 2003.

Were ethnocentric reasons behind the recommendations of the president's most influential advisers on Iraq? "Assertion alleging major Jewish influence in the push towards war involves the role of Jewish neo- or pseudo-conservatives like Paul Wolfowitz, Douglas Feith, and Richard Perle were the strongest advocates for a U.S. invasion of Iraq... Though the assertion that U.S. policy towards Iraq is largely a result of Jewish influence and/or out of concern for Israel's security is a gross exaggeration, it would also be wrong to dismiss the fact that Jewish supporters of the Israeli government were indeed among the more vocal backers of a U.S. invasion" (Zunes 2003). The answer is probably the cooption of nationalism by a combination of special interests – ethnic, economic, and hegemonic.

BRITAIN'S REWARD

The degradation of British nationalism outside of war has come from being shamed by association with ethnocentric colonialism, and – in spite of great sacrifices in World War II – being blamed (along with Protestants and Roman Catholics) for not doing enough to stop the World War II "Holocaust" of Jews. In the United States, slavery and restriction of the civil rights of black people took the place of colonialism in media denigration. Frank Furedi, in an article published in a Marxist journal, asked "Why Auschwitz has become the symbol of the century?," arguing that the Holocaust is the icon of the new therapeutic history" (Furedi (1999).

The contrast between the acceptance of Jewish ethnocentrism and the degradation of nationalism, ethnicity, and ethnocentrism in Great Britain and other white nations is remarkable.⁸ "Wending their way through American courts are lawsuits in which U.S. corporations, and the U.S. government itself, stand accused of 'Holocaust' liability. A case, filed in a federal district court in Washington in March 2001, demanded that the U.S. government pay \$40 billion in damages for failing to bomb the rail lines leading to the Auschwitz concentration camp, a decision that is said to have cost the lives of untold numbers of Jews" (*The Wall Street Journal*, April 11, 2001).

Before World War I, Great Britain had the highest living standard in the world. Together with France, by the end of the two world wars it had expended its remaining assets in America to buy armaments and other supplies, to the profit of America. In spite of having used their patrimony to defeat Nazi Germany (including "offering" Jews a "national home" in Palestine during World War I and securing it against Arab revolts that cost money and lives), rather than Jewry owing Britain a debt of gratitude, the British government has endorsed an annual Holocaust Memorial Day in Britain. "With prayer and repentance," churches in the city of Derby paid the Zionist Federation \$4,300 after renouncing a 700-year-old charter that barred "any Jew or Jewess from ever living" in the city (London, JTA, January 18, 2002). Recent popes have apologized for anti-Jewish elements in the church's history. Queen Elizabeth II has expressed contrition for events in India under the rule of her ancestors.

These are admissions of guilt for acts that the apologists did not commit. They are more than courtesies. They may influence affect, and therefore judgement. For example, may public perception of guilt for colonialism and support for reparations inhibit response to the pressure of postcolonial emigration?

Writing in Britain of "The Truth That Dares Not Whisper Its Name," Lynette Burrows reviewed *The Bell Curve*, a book that suggested racial differences in intelligence. She took the opportunity to condemn efforts to suppress discussion of the issues raised in the book. Most of Europe, she wrote, "...has embarked upon a love affair with multi-racialism that has been at best undemocratic and at worst like colonialism in reverse. Country after country has been settled by millions of foreigners without the acquiescence of the indigenous population." Of the unspoken blackout of free expression on immigration, she further noted, "What is sinister...is the fact that we are not even allowed to discuss the continued settlement of our country by upwards of 50,000 Asians a year, despite the growing signs that they feel their numbers now constitute a nation within a nation" (*London Sunday Telegraph*, October 16, 1994).

I remember the Marxist V. Krishna Menon, later foreign minister of India, saying at my university during World War II that a ruling class never gives up its position without a struggle. On September 3, 2000, the *Guardian* carried an article by Anthony Browne, "UK Whites Will Be Minority by 2100," that noted,

"It would be the first time in history that a major indigenous population has voluntarily become a minority, rather than through war, famine or disease."

THE WAR THAT NEVER ENDS

Following World War II Germany was subjected to years of foreign military occupation, and programs of "re-education" with control of the media, in an environment of semi-starvation deliberately imposed by the Allied occupiers until about end of 1949 (a milder but still coercive occupation by American and Soviet forces continued for decades afterwards).⁹ Over a third of Germany's pre-World War II territory was confiscated by the victors. The entire population of East Prussia, most of Pomerania and Silesia, and the Germans in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia were expelled, some 12 to 15 million people. "What ensued was the largest and most sweeping "ethnic cleansing" in history...About 2.1 million of these died from a combination of war, hunger, cold and disease" (Bell-Fialkoff 1993). Following the reunification of West and "East," at 137, 826 square miles Germany's territory is smaller than that of Montana.

The misery of the genocidal circumstances of the postwar endowed the small and self-serving charities of the Marshall Plan and other U.S. aid schemes with a key symptom of the Stockholm syndrome: "The captive believes his captors have shown compassion."¹⁰ For over half a century the U.S. has been feted by German leaders as a heroic friend. German courts sentence, and an obedient media suppresses, dissident voices. A sense of collective guilt over the "Holocaust" is continually reinforced.¹¹

Temporary "guest workers" in Germany, largely from Turkey, whose president urged them to have larger families, assumed the exalted status of "victims" of German ethnocentrism when their economic utility dwindled.

On September 3, 2000, German Chancellor Schroeder told a group representing millions of ethnic Germans who had been expelled from eastern Europe after World War II that he would continue the policy of not supporting their claims for compensation. "The federal government will not encumber its relations with these countries with political and legal questions that come from the past," Schroeder told the Federation of Expellees at a ceremony marking the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the group's charter. "The former eastern territories belong to our cultural inheritance, but not to our country." The expellees' representative's meek response was to hail Schroeder as the first "chancellor of our Fatherland" ever to address the group's annual ceremony, and to assert that it was "good for Germany that their chapter of history not be ignored as embarrassing or shameful." A miserly, but prized, recognition after half-a-century of neglect!

Schroeder's refusal to support his fellow Germans may be compared with the alacrity with which he and other national leaders accede to pressure from

Jewish groups to obtain monetary recompense for perceived losses stemming from “political and legal questions that come from the past.”

German subservience to the United States and its allies has begun to change, however. On September 12, 1999, the *New York Times* ran an article entitled “The Germans Want Their History Back,” by Roger Cohen, that began:

BUCHENWALD, Germany -- The Buchenwald concentration camp, where the Nazis killed more than 65,000 people, later became one of the holy shrines of the East German Communist state. The camp was a statutory rite of passage for generations of schoolchildren, who learned here how the reactionary Hitler regime slaughtered socialists and Communists.

This version of history was not true. From its establishment in 1937, Buchenwald served to incarcerate leftists, including the Communist leader Ernst Thälmann, who died here in 1944.

The German historian Ernst Nolte, who in 2000 received Konrad Adenauer prize for literature from the Deutschland Stiftung, a conservative foundation, was in the vanguard of change when he said, “We should leave behind the view that the opposite of National Socialist goals is always good and right.” In the plenary hall of the Bundestag, within the former Reichstag, on April 18, 2002, the federal chancellor presented a speech that he described as historic: It was the very first statement of the federal German government on family policy since World War II (and the discredited regime). The government intended to spend four billion euros on full-time childcare and to increase child benefits again.

In 2002 Günter Grass published *Im Krebsgang* (“Crab Walk”) (Göttingen: Steidl), an account of the torpedoing of the passenger ship *Wilhelm Gustloff* toward the end of World War II. On the bitter cold night of January 30, 1945, the former KdF (“Strength through Joy”) cruise liner, designed to carry a maximum of 1,865 people total, was transporting 10,582 refugees, soldiers, sailors, and crew – including scores of sick and injured, as well as women, children and the elderly – farther west in German. All were fleeing from the terrible fate that awaited many of those, Germans and non-Germans alike, in the path of the advancing Red Army. That night it was sunk by the Soviet sub S-13 and disappeared under the icy waters of the Baltic in less than fifty minutes, taking with it as many as 9,343 lives, the most tragic loss in marine history. But how many people knew that before Grass’s book appeared? On January 18, 2003, the *New York Times* published an article titled “The Germans Are Breaking an Old Taboo – Speaking about the Trauma of Carpet Bombing and Ruin after 50 years of Silence”; “Confronting Wartime Pain, Germans Are Breaking an Old Taboo,” “A Nation That Inflicted Suffering Is Healing Its Own.” Still occupied by American Armed Forces under the name of NATO, German chancellor Schroeder was able to say “No” to Anglo-American war against Iraq in 2003.

But severe limitations on oral and literary expression remain in place in Germany. Similar curbs have been adopted in other countries in the Euro-

pean Union, in a cultural climate of increasing fragmentation, or “diversity,” officially termed “cultural enrichment.” Discontent with the suppression of ethnocentrism in Europe since the World War II has been countered by legislation against its expression, thus denying its positive element. This repression of ethnopreference has been supported and psychologically reinforced by major media, and this repression is increasingly has the force of law through coercive legislation.

The new Germany hopes to be viewed as a juridical concept, an enforcer of ‘human rights,’ and a collection of people who are doing penitence for the burden of 20th-century German history. Also reflecting this devaluation of one’s national past, the Commission on the Future of Multiethnic Britain, put in place by the British government, has gone beyond recommending that Britain be called a multi-ethnic, multi-faith society. The Commission strenuously urged the Parliament to shun further references to ‘British,’ because of its connotation to recent exclusivity and imperialism” (Gottfried).

As Winston Churchill sometimes said in his last years, according to his daughter Sarah, “What was it all for?” All that “blood and sweat,” but the survival of what Churchill called “the British race” is more uncertain than before the defeat of Nazi Germany.

ETHNOPREFERENCE FOR THE ETHNIC OTHER

Instead of instituting an equivalent of the First Amendment to the American Constitution, which assures the right of free speech, Allied occupation forces imposed severe limitations on expression in Germany—a parallel to speech restrictions in Nazi Germany. Impressed guilt for the actions of a previous generation inhibited dissent. These limitations have also been adopted in other countries in the European Union. Conforming to legislation adopted by the European Union,¹² German government legislation, the Xenos Program, was instituted in 2002 to identify and treat children “who express xenophobic views and behavior or who are susceptible to this” with an “annual budget of 25 million DM.” They will be subjected to thought and behavior modification techniques.¹³

Programs like Germany’s Xenos program, politically motivated to nullify native resistance to foreign immigrants, “that [target] young people who express xenophobic views and behavior or who are susceptible to this,” may be psychologically dystonic to both natives and immigrants, ignoring the neuroscience of social cognition and race. Where is the pressure for these measures coming from? Not from majority electorates, but from special interest lobbies. These repressive, regressive laws are legislated and dispensed by politicians eager to award symbolic attention and protection to particular interest groups (Jacobs and Potter 1998).

On their part, members of one formerly victimized ethnic group have turned “stumbling blocks into stepping stones,” turning disadvantage into

ethnic advantage, setting an example for other ethnic groups. In an interview reported in *Paris Match* (December 29, 1978), Nahum Goldman, longtime head of the World Jewish Congress, who negotiated the Luxemburg Agreement with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in 1952, said "Since the Second World War and Auschwitz, non-Jews have treated Jews with silk gloves. Without Auschwitz there would be no Jewish state. The two tiers of members of the United Nations voted for partition [of Palestine] because of Auschwitz." The Luxemburg Agreement was without precedent: For the first time, reparations were paid by one political community to another voluntarily. Moreover, neither the Federal Republic of Germany nor Israel had been belligerents. Yet "Adenauer understood better than his domestic critics that financial amends to Israel and World Jewry would not only ease Germany's moral burden but also contribute to Germany's rehabilitation in the community of nations," especially in the United States, where a Jewish boycott of German goods had been started in 1933. By the Luxemburg Treaty, Germany gave Israel financial and technological benefits that were instrumental in changing the miserable economic conditions of Zionist state's early years, and in launching Israel's economy on a path of sustained economic growth (Joffe 1977). Receiving continuous foreign assistance in many forms, Israel became a major military power in the Middle East. With no apologies or reparations to the Palestinians, it has become an important actor on the world stage.

Contrast this with the German government's treatment of its own displaced and dispossessed citizens.

ETHNOPREFERENCE AND IMMIGRATION

There is a high probability that reduced resistance or nonresistance to non-Western immigration into the United States is influenced by charges after World War II that prewar restrictions on immigration were responsible for many Jews losing their lives. This was a tenet of Emanuel Celler, the most powerful representative in the House in 1965, and an opponent of restricting immigration since 1924. Coupled with the spread of the popular *guilt syndrome*, induced guilt for an alleged American failure to rescue Jews over sixty years ago is a likely factor in promoting reluctance to secure America against uninvited immigrants from the Third World.

The immigration policy most Americans want, or wanted, becomes apparent in considering the deception employed by the forces that changed U.S. immigration law in 1965. What were American people told when the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act Amendment was being promoted in their Congress?

The Congressional sponsors of the legislation publicly and repeatedly promised the citizens of the U.S.A. that the immigration bill: (1) would not increase the annual levels of immigration, (2) would not lower the standards

for admission, (3) would not redirect immigration away from Europe, and (4) would not alter the demographic make-up of the United States.

Senator Robert Kennedy declared that “the new immigration act would not have any significant effect on the ethnic composition of the U.S.” His brother, Senator Edward Kennedy, floor manager of the bill in the Senate, assured us that “This bill is not concerned with increasing immigration to this country.” And Emanuel Celler (D-NY), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, also promised that “the effect of the bill would be ‘quite insignificant’ on the U.S. population” and “that the bill would not let in ‘great numbers of immigrants from anywhere,’ including Africa and Asia.”¹⁴

The actual results, including subsequent “reforms,” were stated by President Clinton in his commencement speech to the graduating class of Portland State University, June 13, 1998. President Clinton said that some Americans “are afraid the America they know and love is becoming a foreign land. This reaction may be understandable. But it is wrong.” Clinton said the nation is in the midst of a new wave of immigration that is the largest in a century, and more diverse than any in the nation’s history.

“Today, largely because of immigration,” whites were no longer the majority in Houston or New York City; within five years there would not be a white majority in California, the nation’s most populous state. “And in a little more than 50 years, there will be no majority race in the United States,” Clinton said. “No other nation in history has gone through demographic change of this magnitude, over so short a time.” A largely Caucasian audience clapped vigorously.

Since the 1965 ‘Act Amendments,’ immigration from Europe has accounted for less than 15 percent of all legal immigration. Illegal immigration from non-European countries has been in the tens of millions. This is invasion, but our defenses have been suppressed by imposed psychological standards that favor not simply the immigrant, but the alien.

SUBVERTING MAJORITY AMERICANS’ ETHNOPREFERENCE

The ovation swelled from the capacity audience that had braved 30-below wind chill in downtown St. Paul to witness a live broadcast of “A Prairie Home Companion.” The native son understood that this rousing ovation could not possibly be for him. So he turned to greet African-American actor James Earl Jones, who had just walked out of the wings. “Minnesotans, bless their hearts, are an earnest people,” Mr. Keillor said later. “They believe the harder they clap for James Earl Jones, the more it demonstrates they’re not racists.” The crowd granted him only polite applause, but Mr. Keillor was not surprised. “The only way I could get the kind of welcome James Earl Jones got here in Minnesota,” he said a few days after the show, “was if I was suffering from a well-publicized fatal disease” (*New York Times*, March 27, 1994, H 39).

Does the behavior of the audiences in Oregon and Minnesota depend upon poor self-image, on xenophilia – valuing “the other” more than one’s own? Or is there a psychological defense against facing the prospect of becoming a smaller and smaller minority with concomitant loss of power, an unconscious *denial* of these consequences? Is there a psychological defense that disconnects the perception that a majority is becoming a decreasingly significant minority, or disappearing altogether, from the feeling of a sense of loss, and banishes that emotion from conscious awareness? If I applaud an achievement by someone of a race or ethnicity other than my own more vigorously than a similar achievement by one of my own, may that not be the defense of *reaction formation*? This psychological defense against loss, anger, or aggression might well manifest itself as excessive concern, or unrealistic altruism, for “the other.”

Can the social psychopathology of defenses with internalized conflict, guilt, or poor self-image that the behaviors Keillor’s or the Portland State audiences displayed be a major factor in white suicide? “Increasing social anomie” and loss of attachments were considered possible risk factors in 1989.¹⁵ At the end of the twentieth century, white males accounted for 72 percent of all suicides in the United States. Together, white males and white females accounted for over 90 percent of all suicides (Center for Disease Control, Violence Surveillance Summary Series, no. 2, 1996).

The social and societal value of ethnopreference for social cohesion and support, for example, are disregarded. Dramatizations of the negative component of ethnocentrism receive repetitive print, film, and TV exposure. These include multiple repeated dramatizations and depictions of treatment of Jews in World War II, and of slavery. Visits to “Holocaust” museums and associated studies have been made obligatory parts of many school curricula. A tension of guilt and anxiety are associated with ethnopreference, and emotional expiation “against the self” is sought to relieve stress. To choose an example outside the usual anti-Jewish or antiblack stereotypes – a negative portrayal of a British (white) official in India in some sexually emotionally charged scene showing his prejudice against native peoples has excitement, while a documentary on the incorruptible British Indian Civil Service does not. Emotional exploitation of an ignorant public by an exploitative media is excused as art – artful, it may be.

The effect of this antiethnopreference indoctrination of European-American peoples has been overwhelming for their sense of self-worth. A result has been a general paralysis of will for self-defense. Restriction of immigration of non-Europeans into Europe, the U.S., Australia, New Zealand, and Canada has been almost paralyzed. The 2001 triple attack on America was seen as a direct threat to survival, however, and the threat of “terrorism” has introduced a new factor lacking in the Orwellian messages in which Europeans and North Americans have been steeped to support unlimited immigration. But “terrorism” is also used as an excuse for imposing restrictions upon liberty, and support for formerly un-American activities.

Antisocial behavior by African-American youths may, at least partly, be a result of negative input—repeated dramatizations of racial injustices, for example. The late James Farmer, director of the Congress of Racial Equality, with whom I discussed it, held this view. Obversely, white children have guilt instilled into them in school and church—for slavery, and for the deaths of Jews in concentration camps.

Garrett Hardin, professor emeritus of Human Ecology at the University of California at Santa Barbara, in his 1993 book, *Living within Limits: Ecology, Economics and Population Taboos*, records: “Anyone who tries to comprehend the spirit of our times is soon impressed with the popularity of guilt-mongering—making other people feel guilty about something...” (Hardin 1993).

This sickens the spirit. Do not support it in the classroom, at the box office, with your television.

Guilt is—in a sense—a self-administered punishment. False guilt is unlimited self-punishment. With false guilt—the current Western sickness—comes depression. Attempts at expiation of false guilt do not lift the depression. They become a self-destructive psychopathology.

*And so in the Libyan fable, it is told
That once an eagle, stricken with a dart
Said when he saw the fashion of the shaft
With our own feathers, not by other hands
Are we now stricken!*

—Aeschylus

REDEFINING THE TERMS

Life scientists can clarify and inform public, political, judicial, and scientific discourse on these issues, by using and insisting on agreed definitions.

Racism—the belief in or practice of the subjugation of one race by another—is a definition that reduces sociopolitical confusion.

Trotsky first used the word in French (*racisme*) in 1922. I was told that by Daniel Patrick Moynihan in June 1976, when he was U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Organization. Moynihan had invited me to the mission to discuss the civil war in Lebanon. He had a copy of my book, *The Palestine Diary*, in his hand with a finger marking his place as I came into his office. But the first thing he told me was that he had just “telephoned the Oxford Dictionary” to ask the origin of the word “racism.” He was told to wait while they fetched the person who looked after “R.” That person said it was Trotsky, writing in French, who was the author of the word. The word “racism” is misused, and is very often confused with ethnocentrism.

At the 1977 meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Sir Andrew Huxley, later president of the Royal Society, spoke on the

need for the findings of scientific research to be independent of wishes and fears about their possible applications, a distinction between fact and value. He drew a comparison between the violence of the nineteenth century debate occasioned by the *Origin of Species*, in which his grandfather had played so prominent a part, and the contemporary one on racial difference. He defined racism as the practice of or belief in the subjugation of one race by another (Huxley 1977).

Calling someone “white trash” or “nigger” is not racism. It is rudeness. Acceptance of data or measurements that show statistically significant differences between races is not racism. Neither is the dismissal of the concept or word “race” as a “social construct.”

Phobias are anxiety disorders identified by intense, irrational fears of specific objects, activities, or situations.

Xenophobia should designate an irrational fear of the “foreign.” Instead, it is politically misused as an Orwellian term to pathologize and vilify those who express ethnocentrism, ethnopreference, or oppose alien immigration, for example. Its little noted opposite, *xenophilia*, is an irrational preference for all things foreign or alien.¹⁶

Nationalism

“The most convenient world for multinational giants is one populated by dwarf states or no states at all.” In *The Age of Extremes*, even the Marxist historian Hobsbawm recognizes that globalization deprives states of effective controls (Hobsbawm 1996). The removal of national political boundaries reduces the possibility of control of our communities by electoral vote. The further away the locus of power, the weaker our control over our conditions. The founding concept of the United States of America was the devolution of locus of power to the states, with a few specified exceptions. This maximizes the power of individuals to make their own choices and experiments. What lessons might be learned from a government health service in one state, for example?

Nationalism is an *ideological movement for the attainment and maintenance of autonomy, unity, and identity of a human population, some of whose members conceive it to constitute an actual or potential “nation.”* A “nation” may in turn be defined as a *named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and memories, a mass public culture, a single economy and common rights and duties for all members; a kind of social and cultural community* (Gellner and Smith 1996). States are ideally autonomous public institutions of coercion and extraction within a delineated territory.

Globalism: Centralization of Power

“*Diversity*” is used politically to diffuse ethnopreference. Aggregation and centralization of power – military, judicial, economic – are represented by the centralized media as the best means for ensuring objectives: peace, justice, human rights, and other objectives publicly believed to be desirable. These means may also be advertised as inevitable.¹⁷

A climate of opinion is being created by a collective oligarchy under which some well-meaning people are supporting the means for the implantation of tyranny to ensure "peace, justice, democracy, human rights, victory in the war on terrorism..." Thus well-intentioned people who lack penetration in analysis are ensuring their own and future generations' deprivation of liberty.

CHOOSING OUR FUTURE

Self-understanding and consciousness-raising should encourage the continuation of the spotted owl in primal forests of the American Northwest, of the snail-darter fish, and of indigenous inhabitants of rain forests, and the indigenous inhabitants of Europe or Japan! We must syntonically orient our way of thinking for thousands of species of butterfly to survive, and for many nations and ethnicities, and their cultures, to flourish.

There is more comfort for children and more stability for a society where there is a commonality of ethnicity, culture, and interest. "We all speak from a particular place, out of a particular experience, a particular culture, without being contained by that position... We are all, in that sense, ethnically located and our ethnic identities are crucial to the subjective sense of who we are" (Hutchinson and Smith 1997). Laws depend upon consensus. Institutions that survive and evolve are expressions of a people's history and culture.

Human ecologist Garrett Hardin showed and told us for over thirty years why we must use science rather than manipulated sentimentality in planning public policy. In his book *Living Within Limits* he writes "a dissertation on the laws of nature that must be obeyed (Hardin 1993)."

The formula for survival and progress is simple: Unity within each sovereignty, diversity among sovereignties... The wisdom is very old: Don't put all your eggs in one basket.

Given many sovereign nations, it is possible for humanity to carry out many experiments in population control. Each nation can observe the successes and failures of the others. Experiments that have a good outcome can be copied and perhaps improved upon; unsuccessful experiments can be noted and not repeated. Such learning by trial and error is perilous if the borderless world created by unrestricted migration converts the entire globe into one single hue experiment.

As long as the intelligence of the human species is less than perfect... segmented parochialism is superior to unified cosmopolitanism in disclosing and capitalizing on the diverse possibilities of human nature."

In the year 2000, while the American president was pushing "interdependence" rather than defending American independence, as required by its Constitution, President Jiang Zemin of the Peoples Republic of China, said:

The principle of democracy must be advocated and implemented in handling world affairs, whether in maintaining world peace or promoting common development.

All countries big or small, rich or poor, strong or weak, are equal members of the international community and have the right to take part in and handle world affairs. Matters that fall within the scope of sovereignty of a country should be managed only by the government and people of that country, and [...] world affairs should be handled by the governments and people of all countries through consultation. This is the principle of democracy in handling world affairs. Today, the world's destiny should be in the hands of the people of all countries.

Understanding ethnopreference resolves ambivalence and uncertainty about the utility of self-worth and identity. With this clarity we respect ourselves, and respect and enjoy the wonderful diversity of other peoples and their cultures.

With cybernetics, and information and microchip technology, fewer hands are needed for production of goods of better quality and utility. We do not need immigrants to support our retirement.

French colonialism celebrated Léopold Senghor, a model native of Senegal who was brought to the Sorbonne, became a socialist, and wrote poems in French. Nurture had created a Frenchman! For many Americans in the second half of the twentieth century, making the rest of the world desire American commerce and popular culture was the greatest good. If the natives of the Northern Mariana islands ten thousand miles west of Los Angeles took up baseball and hamburgers and Coca-Cola, they were becoming "civilized" – American!

In this century, some apologize for or try to repair the damage that this ethnocentrism has done. Some try to stop oppressing others with vulgar intrusion. Enlightened by understanding ethnopreference, there follows the protection of indigenous peoples – from corporations seeking new markets, or professors exploiting them for lectures with power-point pictures. There follows the recognition that European, Western, or "white" people are indigenous peoples who need space and protection for their development and evolution. But white people must stop interfering in the affairs of other countries. Their armed forces must go home. And all humans, animals, and plants require planning and protection from overwhelming human population growth, which reduces the quality of life.

In the twenty-first century, the concentration of power by a collective oligarchy claiming to protect us from terrorists or weapons of mass destruction in the hands of others, but working for its special transnational interests, rather than those of our communities, seems the greatest threat to the survival of human diversity.

With new a understanding of the positives in ethnicity; with consciousness, wonder, and respect for human racial or ethnic differences – just as value and

seek to conserve plant and animal species – we can reduce social tensions and conflict.

A contemporary definition of a statesman is one who offers direction for the future that conserves the heritage of his people with a vision of the future. Legislators may become statesmen, and artists become a positive avant-garde, by pointing toward a possible future with a quality of life enhanced by this better understanding of the nature of Nature.

As Sir Francis Bacon put it: *Naturam non vinces nisi parendo* or, “You will not master nature unless you obey it.”

REFERENCES

- Boas, F. (1945). *Race and Democratic Society*. New York: J.J. Augustin. (Republished in New York by Biblio-Moser in 1969.): 28.
- Bell-Fialkoff, A. (1993). A brief history of ethnic cleansing. *Foreign Affairs* (Summer): 115.
- Boyers, R. (1972). *The Legacy of the German Refugee Intellectuals*. New York: Schocken.
- Cesarani, D., ed. (1994). *The Final Solution: Origins and Implementation*. London: Routledge: 305–6.
- Finzsch, N. and H. Wellenreuther, eds. (2001). *Visions of the Future in Germany and America*. New York: Berg.
- Furedi, Frank. (1999). Why Auschwitz has become the symbol of the century. *Living Marxism* 126.
- Fustel de Coulanges, N. (1999). *Family, Kin and City-State: The Racial Underpinning of Ancient Greece and Rome*. Ed. J. Jamieson, Washington, DC: Scott-Townsend.
- Gellner, E. and A. D. Smith. (1996). The nation: real or imagined? *Nations and Nationalism* 2(3):359.
- Hannonen, M. and L. Sundström. (2003). Sociobiology: Worker nepotism among polygynous ants. *Nature* 421(6926):910.
- Hardin, G. (1993). *Living within Limits: Ecology, Economics and Population Taboos*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press: 306.
- Hart, A. J. et al. (2000). Differential response in the human amygdala to racial outgroup vs. ingroup face stimuli. *NeuroReport* 11(11):2351–2355.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1996). *The Age of Extremes*. New York: Vintage.
- Horowitz, Donald L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Huxley, A. (1977). *The Times Higher Education Supplement*. September 2.
- Hutchinson, J. and A.D. Smith. (1996). *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press: 163.
- Jacobs, J. B. and K. Potter. (1998). *Hate Crimes*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Joffe, Josef. (1977). Review of West German Reparations to Israel by Nicholas Balabkins, in *The American Political Science Review* 71(3):1274–5.
- Klerman, G. L. and M. M. Weissman. (1989). Increasing Rates of Depression. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 261:15.
- Kilham, P. and P. H. Klopfer. (1968). The construct race and the innate differential. *Science and the Concept of Race*, ed E. Tobach, et al. New York: Columbia U. Press: 16–25.
- MacDonald, K. (1994). *A People That Shall Dwell Alone*. Westport, CT: Praeger: 229.
- MacDonald, K. (1998). *The Culture of Critique*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 155–93.
- McNeill, W. H. (1999). Infectious alternatives. In *What If? The World's Foremost Military Historians Imagine What Might Have Been*. New York: Putnam.

- Pearson, R. (1991). *Race, Intelligence and Bias in Academe*. Washington, DC: Scott-Townsend.
- Rollins, W. H. (1997). *A Greener Vision of Home: Cultural Politics and Environmental Reform in the German Heimatschutz Movement 1904-1918*. Ann Arbor, MI: U. of Michigan Press.
- Rushton, J. P. (1995). *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, New Brunswick: Transaction: 69.
- Rothman, S. and S. R. Lichter. (1982). *The Roots of Radicalism: Jews, Christians and the New Left*, New York: Oxford Univ. Press: 83.
- Sandler, R. and D. Schoenbrod. (2003). *Democracy by Decree*. New Haven, CT: Yale.
- Sumner, W. (1907). *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals*. Boston: Ginn and Co.
- Utechin, S. V. (1964). *A Concise Encyclopedia of Russia*, New York, Dutton: 236.
- Vanhanen, T., ed. (1999). Ethnic Conflicts Explained by Ethnic Nepotism. In *Biopolitics*, Vol. 7, Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Zunes, S. (2003). Iraq, Israel, and the Jews. *Tikkun* (March-April). (revised Int. Soc. Sci. J., No. 1, Vol. XVII: 157-161, 1965)

*The late Robert John, MD, MRCS (Eng.), former professor of psychiatric education, studied law at the Middle Temple, London's Inns of Court. Dr. John directs the International Council for Human Ecology and Ethnology. He is the author, with Sami Hadawi, of **The Palestine Diary: British, American and United Nations Intervention 1914-1948**, 2 vols. (New York: New World Press, 1970 [second ed. 1973]).*

ENDNOTES

1. "Summary: Naïve [newly hatched] chicks, whether of a yellow or black variety, show no consistent tendency to approach other chicks of the same variety. When communally reared in the light with chicks of their own variety they do develop a preference for their own kind. However, when reared with chicks of the alien variety, no consistent preferences appear. Preferences for own-kind are immanent but require that activation by a particular experience. Programming of perceptual systems so that experience is prerequisite to a response, but with only certain kinds of experience or responses being possible, seems to be an important feature of organisms."
2. Across all subjects, they observed significantly greater blood oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) signal in the amygdala to outgroup vs. ingroup faces, but only during later stimulus presentations. A region of interest (ROI)-based analysis of these voxels revealed a significant interaction between amygdala response to outgroup and ingroup faces over time. Specifically, the greater amygdala activation to outgroup faces during later stimulus presentations was the result of amygdala response habituation to repeated presentations of ingroup faces with sustained responses to outgroup faces. (Voxgram images record and display the data from CT, MR, and PET scans. A single life-sized Voxgram image provides an enhanced display of all the significant patient imaging data.)

3. Richard Dawkins, who coined the word by analogy with “gene” in his book *The Selfish Gene*, defines the meme as simply a unit of intellectual or cultural information that survives long enough to be recognized as such, and which can pass from mind to mind.

4. In 1904 a broad-based “homeland-protection,” or *Heimatschutz*, reform movement had started in Germany for protection of the entire working landscape (Rollins 1997).

5. Exceptions included Hayek, Mises, Possony, and Strausz-Hupé.

6. *N.Y. Times Book Review*, 25 February, 1996, 15 (in a review of S. G. Payne, *A History of Fascism 1914–1945* [Madison: U. of Wisconsin Press, 1996]).

7. Following desegregation “with all deliberate speed,” James S. Coleman, a much quoted educational sociologist of the time, issued a federally financed report in 1966 which held that school integration improved the achievement of underprivileged black children without hindering the performance of their white classmates, provided the classes continue to have more middle-class whites. But in 1978, Mr. Coleman said that subsequent research disproved his earlier findings (*New York Times*, “About Education,” April 7, 1981).

8. Columnist David Aaronovitch wrote ethnocentrically in the editorial pages of the British newspaper *The Independent*, December 27, 2002: “Why do we persist with the morbid attachment to heritage and tradition? I don’t want school Nativity plays...”

9. On Feb 24, 1991, in an article in the *New York Times Book Review*, Stephen E. Ambrose, director of the Eisenhower Center at the University of New Orleans, announced that the Eisenhower Center had assembled an international committee of historians, “to get at the full truth.” The committee found Eisenhower not directly guilty of the starvation policy, finding instead that it was the London-based American-British-Soviet European Advisory Committee (EAC). Gen. Eisenhower was not responsible for the starvation program – it was the EAC. Thus, locus of responsibility was made the issue and Eisenhower seemingly cleared of responsibility for the starvation policy he implemented. Yet criminalizing responsibility for the implementation of “genocidal” policies was a feature of the 1945–1946 Allied tribunal at Nuremberg.

10. The Stockholm Syndrome takes its name from a 1973 bank robbery in Sweden in which four hostages were taken. Six days of captivity had a strange effect on the hostages’ mental health. They resisted their own release, raised money for their captors’ legal defense and refused to testify against them. Rumor has it that one woman hostage, or perhaps two, became romantically involved with the robbers after their ordeal.

The common explanation for this behavior is that it is a survival technique gone too far. The captive becomes so desperate to appease his captors, and therefore preserve his life, that he begins to identify and sympathize with them. He also feels gratitude toward his captors; they have the power of life and death over him and have been kind enough to allow him to live. The following four conditions contribute to the syndrome:

The captive has no hope of escape

The captors have control over whether the captive will live or die

The captive is isolated in such a way that the only perspective available to him is that of his captors

The captive believes his captors have shown compassion

Postwar American aid to Germany was a very small fraction of the value of German foreign assets confiscated, factories removed (mostly to the USSR), vessels of Germany's considerable surface fleet and merchant marine seized, public buildings and shipbuilding facilities blown up (e.g. the Blohm and Voss shipyards in Hamburg), German technology, science, and related expertise appropriated, and German patents violated. German rocket scientists and their technology were transferred to America, an invaluable German investment that launched America's space and cruise missile programs, through "Operation Paperclip" in 1945. Other Germans were put to the same use by the Soviets.

11. "West Berlin, May 6, 1990 (AP) Chancellor Helmut Kohl [who was fifteen when World War II ended], speaking at the opening of a conference of the World Jewish Congress here today, said the location and date of the conference gave it a 'special meaning.'

"'Never may it be forgotten that the genocide of the European Jews was prepared and directed by the National Socialists under the violent leadership from Berlin,' Mr. Kohl said. Congress president Edgar M. Bronfman said a united Germany should teach about its Nazi past to avoid repeating 'the lowest point ever reached in man's inhumanity to man.'"

12. The European Union (EU) Council of Ministers agreed in March 1996 on a "Joint Plan of Action Against Racism and Xenophobia" that would cover a wide range of so-called 'hate crimes.' The Joint Plan, which followed statements on racism and xenophobia made at recent EU summits, provides a framework for addressing differences among criminal law systems within the EU regarding behavior categorized as racist and xenophobic. The EU, the Council of Ministers proclaimed, must recognize the need for international cooperation in order to prevent perpetrators of racist and xenophobic activities from exploiting the differences in laws by moving from one country to another. To that end, the EU states agreed that members who had not done so already would create laws that prohibit incitement, condoning crimes against humanity, dissemination of racist materials and participation in racist or xenophobic activities.

13. For a telling English-language account by the German government of this effort to brainwash German youth to accept non-European immigration, see: www.xenos-de.de/Xenos/Redaktion/Medien/Anlagen/Ergaenzende-Dokumente/german-program-xenos,property=pdf,bereich=xenos,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf

14. "National Quotas for Immigration to End," *Congressional Quarterly Almanac*, 89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965. Vol. 21 (Congressional Quarterly Service, Washington, D.C.), 474, 478, 470.

15. "The cohorts born since World War II have been among the healthiest physically and were raised during a period of economic prosperity in the United States and Western Europe. Nevertheless, they show high rates of alcoholism, substance abuse, depression, and suicide. The environmental risk factors for depression and other mental disorders for this cohort have not been established but probably include (a) demographic shifts, (b) changes in the ratio of males to females in the population, (c) increasing urbanization, (d) greater geographic mobility with results of loss of attachments and face-to-face groups, (e) increasing social anomie, (f) changes in a family structure, (g) alterations in the role of women, especially the increased number of women in the workforce, and age shifts in gender-related occupational patterns" (Klerman and Weissman 1989).

16. Contrast to the above definitions of racism and xenophobia those of a document that proposes criminalizing them prepared by the European Commission: "the belief in race, colour, descent, religion or belief, national or ethnic origin as a factor in determining aversion to individuals or groups" (European Commission, "Proposal for a Council Framework Decision on Combating Racism and Xenophobia," http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2001&nu_doc=664). The EC hopes that virtually every expression of racism and xenophobia, according to its broad definition, including on the Internet, will be outlawed across Europe.

17. French statesman and former president Valéry Giscard d'Estaing challenged the process of European dissolution, pushed by the power of the United States, on November 9, 2002. As head of the Convention on the Future of Europe, he told the newspaper *Le Monde* that those who backed Turkey's candidacy were "the adversaries of the European Union." Alluding to Turkey's Muslim population and high birthrate, Giscard said that the country had "a different culture, a different approach, a different way of life" and that its demographic dynamism would potentially make it the biggest EU member state. "Its capital is not in Europe; 95 percent of its population live outside Europe; it is not a European country," he said.

Admitting Turkey, an official candidate for EU membership since 1999, would go "outside the continent" and prompt demands to admit other Middle Eastern and North African states, starting with Morocco, he said. Asked what the effect would be, he said: "In my opinion, it would be the end of the European Union."

His outspoken comments caused uproar and embarrassment in Brussels and outraged Turkish representatives in the convention, the *Los Angeles Times* reported. One European Parliament member, Swedish Socialist Jan Andersson, called for Giscard's resignation

The European Commission was quick to distance itself from the comments, which heightened controversy within the fifteen-nation bloc over the EU's eventual borders.