

# TAXONOMIC APPROACHES TO RACE

ANDREW HAMILTON

---

“Dr. [J. Craig] Venter and scientists at the National Institutes of Health recently announced that they had put together a draft of the entire sequence of the human genome, and the researchers had unanimously declared, there is only one race—the human race.”

—Natalie Angier<sup>1</sup>

The mawkish sentiment reported by Natalie Angier is incorrect. In biology, race is a synonym for subspecies.<sup>2</sup> In fact there is no “human race” —only the human species (*Homo sapiens*). All human beings belong to a single species because they can interbreed and produce fertile offspring.<sup>3</sup>

## ALL-PERVASIVE RACE DENIAL

Academic, media, and political elites, including anthropologists and geneticists, mouth the dogma that biological race does not exist—race is a “social construct,” nothing more. This absurd proposition is now the *norm*, unthinkingly accepted by scientific elites and masses alike. It dominates standard encyclopedias, best-selling books, televi-

---

<sup>1</sup> “Do Races Differ? Not Really, DNA Shows,” *New York Times*, August 22, 2000. The Jewish Ms. Angier is a Pulitzer Prize-winning science reporter for the *Times*.

<sup>2</sup> Races (subspecies) pervade the plant and animal kingdoms: “‘Races’ of insects (e.g., fruit flies), mice, rats, rabbits, dogs, horses, etc., have developed . . . and if human beings failed to develop races they would constitute the only exception in the whole biological kingdom.” Roger J. Williams, *Free and Unequal: The Biological Basis of Individual Liberty* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1953), 210. Williams was Director of the Biochemical Institute, University of Texas.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Darwin, in Chapter 7, “On the Races of Man” in *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, vol. 1 (London: John Murray, 1871), though ultimately classifying races as interfertile subspecies, devoted nine pages to arguments for full species status, concluding that races were so sharply demarcated that “a naturalist might feel himself fully justified in ranking the races of man as distinct species . . .” (p. 224).

sion programs, and the *ex cathedra* pronouncements of the United Nations and academic associations. Physical anthropology texts, which reflect prevailing viewpoints and inculcate students with the values of the profession, likewise treat race with hostility, and since the late 1970s have rejected its biological basis completely. By 2003, a forensic anthropologist could state that “not one introductory textbook of physical anthropology” presents the race perspective to college students as an alternative to denial.<sup>4</sup>

And yet, it is manifestly obvious to everyone, including race deniers, that race exists.<sup>5</sup> Race—in the traditional, hardcore physical sense and, especially, the biological destruction of the hated white race—is the overriding obsession of intellectuals, social elites, the media, police agencies, and government authorities worldwide, easily surpassing all other concerns.

### WHAT IS RACE?

The fundamental classificatory unit in biology is the species, consisting of interbreeding or potentially interbreeding individuals sharing similar inherited traits. More encompassing categories, such as genus, family, order, and so on are less distinct and subject to greater dispute, as are lower categories, including subspecies and local races. The critical test of a zoological species is the ability of different populations to interbreed and produce fertile offspring. This “biological species concept” is the most widely accepted one.

A race is a recognizably distinct division (subspecies or portion of a subspecies—“subrace,” “local race,” or “breeding population”) of *H. sapiens*, distinguished from other groups by its unique clustering of genetically transmitted anatomical, physiological, psychological, and behavioral traits.<sup>6</sup> Race encompasses the dual attributes of resemblance

---

<sup>4</sup> George W. Gill, “Does Race Exist? A Proponent’s Perspective,” <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/first/gill.html> (accessed March 25, 2008). Gill, a former US Army Combat Ranger, is professor of anthropology at the University of Wyoming and forensic anthropologist for the Wyoming State Crime Laboratory.

<sup>5</sup> “Race was still the unspeakable historical determinant, although the loudest denouncers and deniers of race were, as always, the biggest racists.” Wilmot Robertson, *The Dispossessed Majority*, 3rd rev. ed. (Cape Canaveral, Fla.: Howard Allen, 1981), 554.

<sup>6</sup> “Phenotypic characteristics can be usefully categorized as structural (morphological), functional (physiological), and psychobehavioral.” Richard B. Mazess, “Biological Adaptation: Aptitudes and Acclimatization,” in Elizabeth S. Watts, Francis E.

and common ancestry. Races became differentiated as a result of geographic isolation, culturally erected barriers to gene flow, genetic drift, natural, social, and sexual selection, adaptation, and genetic mutation.

"Race is a biological concept, and races are biological units," anthropologist Stanley Garn observed. "Races, moreover, are natural units and not artificial assemblages created by selecting 'types' out of a population."<sup>7</sup> He added, "Natural populations of man clearly exist below the species level. They need labels, and the labels must distinguish between the large geographical or continental collections and individual population isolates."<sup>8</sup>

### THE SUBSPECIES CONCEPT IN BIOLOGY

It is instructive to contrast race denial in the human realm with the treatment of animal subspecies in law and biology. Although controversy exists among biologists over individual subspecific designations, denial of the category's existence is not the scientific or cultural norm. Endangered species acts of many nations, and international treaties such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), recognize and protect subspecific taxa.<sup>9</sup> The US Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA)<sup>10</sup> protects not only subspecies of plants and animals, but, among vertebrates, subunits called "distinct population segments" (DPSs).<sup>11</sup>

As the US Fish and Wildlife Service, one of two federal agencies charged with administering the act, explains:

Restricting listings to full taxonomic species would render the Act's definition of species, which explicitly includes subspecies and DPSs of vertebrates, superfluous. Clearly, the Act is intended

---

Johnston, Gabriel W. Lasker, eds., *Biosocial Interrelations in Population Adaptation* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 12.

<sup>7</sup> Stanley M. Garn, *Human Races*, 3rd ed. (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971), 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>9</sup> Susan M. Haig et al., "Taxonomic Considerations in Listing Subspecies Under the US Endangered Species Act," *Conservation Biology* 20 (December 2006): 1585.

<sup>10</sup> 16 U.S.C. §1531 *et seq.*

<sup>11</sup> "The Act as amended specifically affords protection to three categories of biological taxa: species, subspecies, and populations." Stephen J. O'Brien and Ernst Mayr, "Bureaucratic Mischief: Recognizing Endangered Species and Subspecies," *Science* 251 (March 8, 1991): 1187.

to authorize listing of some entities that are not accorded the taxonomic rank of species. . . . The Services do not consider it appropriate to require absolute reproductive isolation as a prerequisite to recognizing a distinct population segment. This would be an impracticably stringent standard, and one that would not be satisfied even by some recognized species that are known to sustain a low frequency of interbreeding with related species.<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, one-quarter of all ESA-protected taxa, and over two-thirds of protected mammals, are not species at all, but subspecies or populations (DPSs).

Susan Haig and co-authors found that the conception of subspecies in non-human biology has evolved as follows:

Historically, morphology and geography were used to separate taxa. Subsequently, BSC [biological species concept] stimulated simplifications (i.e., lumping) at the species level and an enthusiasm for the use of subspecies level classifications to describe morphological variation within resulting polytypic species. Currently, taxonomists are struggling with how to incorporate results of modern molecular [genetic] methods into their assessments that are based on various PSCs [phylogenetic species concepts].<sup>13</sup>

The authors argue that although molecular genetics is important in determining subspecies designations, “factors other than genetics need to be considered in understanding relationships below the species level. . . . [H]igher levels of confidence can be obtained in classifications based on the concurrence of multiple morphological, molecular, ecological, behavioral, and/or physiological characters.”<sup>14</sup>

A pioneer of the modern evolutionary synthesis, German-born Jew Ernst Mayr (1904–2005), co-authored an influential paper affecting the interpretation of the Endangered Species Act<sup>15</sup> in which he firmly upheld the equivalence, in categorical terms, of animal subspecies and human races:

---

<sup>12</sup> “Policy Regarding the Recognition of Distinct Vertebrate Population Segments Under the Endangered Species Act,” 61 Fed. Reg. 4722 (February 7, 1996).

<sup>13</sup> Haig et al., “Taxonomic Considerations,” 1587.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 1590–91.

<sup>15</sup> O’Brien and Mayr, “Bureaucratic Mischief.”

Those who subscribe to this opinion [that there are no human races] are obviously ignorant of modern biology. . . . [T]he geographic races of the human race established before the voyages of European discovery and subsequent rise of a global economy agree in most characteristics with the geographic races of animals. Recognizing races is only recognizing a biological fact.<sup>16</sup>

### THE GENETIC BASIS OF CLASSIFICATION

It is helpful to situate the concept of race within the context of what Ukrainian-American geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky (1900–1975) called in his classic *Genetics and the Origin of Species* (1937/1982) the "genetic basis of classification."<sup>17</sup>

For example, Italian-born population geneticist L. L. Cavalli-Sforza (b. 1922), a race denier, asserts:

The concept of race stems from the idea that the human species can be naturally subdivided into biologically distinct groups. In practice, however, scientists have found it impossible to separate humans into clearly defined races. Most scientists today reject the concept of biological race and instead see human biological variation as falling along a continuum.<sup>18</sup>

The continuum of organisms in nature is thus implicitly uniform, without meaningful nodes or clusters of any kind. Dobzhansky *flatly contradicts* this Cavallian assumption:

If we assemble as many individuals living at a given time as we can, we notice at once that the observed variation does not form a single probability distribution or any other kind of continuous distribution. Instead, a multitude of separate, discrete, distributions are found. In other words, the living world is not a single array of individuals in which any two variants are connected by unbroken series of intergrades, but an array of more or

---

<sup>16</sup> Ernst Mayr, "The Biology of Race and the Concept of Equality," *Daedalus* 131 (Winter 2002): 89–94.

<sup>17</sup> Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Genetics and the Origin of Species* (New York: Columbia University Press, Columbia Classics in Evolution Series, 1982), 308. This is a reprint of the 1937 first edition.

<sup>18</sup> L. L. Cavalli-Sforza, "Race," *Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia Standard* (2005).

less distinctly separate arrays, intermediates between which are absent or at least rare. Each array is a cluster of individuals, usually possessing some common characteristics and gravitating to a definite modal point in their variations.<sup>19</sup>

Discontinuous variation in the physical world is a function of discontinuous variation within gametes:

Each race, species, genus, or any other group embraces a certain array of gene combinations attached to an "adaptive peak," or to several neighboring peaks. The fact that one group may be distinguished from the related ones necessarily implies that the gene combinations lying in the field between the peaks are formed only rarely or not at all.<sup>20</sup>

The arrays are complexes of similar gene combinations that enable their possessors to survive in the environments they encounter in nature; in contrast, the "adaptive valleys" between the peaks constitute "discordant gene combinations, most of which would be nearly or completely inviable. A promiscuous formation of gene combinations would give mainly a mass of freaks . . ." <sup>21</sup> Discontinuous variations in nature are "maintained by means of preventing the random interbreeding of the representatives of the now discrete groups," whether the groups in question are races, species, classes, phyla, or any other rank in the taxonomic system. "The development of isolating mechanisms is therefore a *conditio sine qua non* for the emergence of discrete groups of forms in evolution."<sup>22</sup>

#### EARLY TAXONOMIC APPROACHES TO RACE

The modern concept of race developed during the Enlightenment. According to Canadian academic Nicholas Hudson:

In classical and Medieval literature, the major term in ethnographic descriptions was *gens*—a Latin word that is usually translated as "people" or "nation." Significantly, *gens* connotes a com-

---

<sup>19</sup> Dobzhansky, *Genetics and the Origin of Species*, 4.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 308.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 307–308.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 308.

mon ancestry or stock (hence its etymological link with *genero*, to beget or produce), reflecting an ancient way of understanding a nation not as a social or political unit, but as a group of people linked by origin. *Gens* was therefore close in meaning to "race," understood in the traditional sense of "lineage" or "extraction." Yet the belief that humanity is divided into only four or five main "races," as was claimed in the eighteenth century, represented a significant enlargement of the ancient idea of *gens*.<sup>23</sup>

This pre-modern European conception of human groups, assuming Hudson is correct, resembled contemporary second-order classifications such as populations, local races, or subraces rather than first-order groupings like subspecies, geographic, continental, or major races.<sup>24</sup>

#### LINNAEUS

Swedish physician Carolus Linnaeus (Carl von Linné) (1707–1778) was the founder of the binomial system of nomenclature and originator of the modern scientific classification of plants and animals. His system remains the basis of modern taxonomy. His classic *Systema Naturae* (thirteen editions, 1735–1770) listed every species known to him. The first edition was eleven pages in length; the thirteenth contained 3,000 pages. A great deal of revision occurred over this period as the naturalist continually adjusted his classifications to account for new data and changing theoretical perspectives. By convention, modern zoological nomenclature begins with the names given in the tenth edition (1758).<sup>25</sup>

Linnaeus identified man as an animal (controversial at the time), and was the first to classify the species he named *Homo sapiens* with monkeys and apes in the Order "Anthropomorpha," later renamed Primates. Beginning with the very first edition (1735), he divided *Homo sapiens* into four subspecies: *Homo sapiens americanus* (Amerindians); *Homo sapiens europaeus* (Europeans); *Homo sapiens asiaticus*

---

<sup>23</sup> Nicholas Hudson, "From 'Nation' to 'Race': The Origin of Racial Classification in Eighteenth-Century Thought," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29 (Spring 1996): 248.

<sup>24</sup> On this distinction see text accompanying notes 49 to 53 below.

<sup>25</sup> Caroli Linnaei, *Systema naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis*, 10th ed. (Holmiae [Stockholm]: Laurentii Salvii, 1758). Translation: "System of nature through the three kingdoms of nature, according to classes, orders, genera and species, with [generic] characters, [specific] differences, synonyms, places."

(Asians); and *Homo sapiens afer* (Africans). Sixty years later, pioneer racial taxonomist J. F. Blumenbach wrote that it “is one of the merits of the immortal Linnaeus” that “he was the first, as far as I know, to arrange mankind in certain varieties [a zoological synonym for subspecies] according to their external characters . . .”<sup>26</sup>

Importantly, the pioneer classifier did not restrict his racial observations to morphological traits, but evaluated temperament and psychology as well.<sup>27</sup> Jewish anthropologist and race denier Jonathan Marks quotes Linnaeus’s thumbnail racial descriptions as follows: *americanus*: “red, ill-tempered, subjugated. Hair black, straight, thick; Nostrils wide; Face harsh, Beard scanty. Obstinate, contented, free. Paints himself with red lines. Ruled by custom”; *europaeus*: “white, serious, strong. Hair blond, flowing. Eyes blue. Active, very smart, inventive. Covered by tight clothing. Ruled by laws”; *asiaticus*: “yellow, melancholy, greedy. Hair black. Eyes dark. Severe, haughty, desirous. Covered by loose garments. Ruled by opinion”; and “last (and obviously least),” Marks sneers, *afer*: “black, impassive, lazy. Hair kinked. Skin silky. Nose flat. Lips thick. Women with genital flap; breasts large. Crafty, slow, foolish. Anoints himself with grease. Ruled by caprice.”<sup>28</sup>

Predating Darwin, Linnaean classification was a morphologically-based system grounded in resemblance of organisms. Presumed common evolutionary descent, the touchstone of systematics after Darwin, played no role in the scheme. And yet, as Dobzhansky perceived:

The fact is that the classification of organisms that existed before the advent of evolutionary theories has undergone surprisingly little change in the times following it, and whatever changes have been made depended only to a trifling extent on the elucidation of the actual phylogenetic relationships through palaeontological evidence. The phylogenetic interpretation has been

---

<sup>26</sup> J. F. Blumenbach, “Introductory Letter to Sir Joseph Banks” in *On the Natural Varieties of Mankind* (1795) in *The Anthropological Treatises of Johann Friedrich Blumenbach*, ed. and trans. Thomas Bendyshe (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1865), 150.

<sup>27</sup> “Linnaeus was so far from accepting the idea of equality among men that he listed the mental qualities of each race as distinguishing characters, comparable with the physical ones.” John R. Baker, *Race* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 24.

<sup>28</sup> Jonathan Marks, *Human Biodiversity: Genes, Race, and History* (Hawthorne, N.Y.: Aldine, 1995), 50.

simply superimposed on the existing classification; a rejection of the former fails to do any violence to the latter. The subdivisions of the animal and plant kingdoms established by Linnaeus are, with few exceptions, retained in the modern classification, and this despite the enormous number of new forms discovered since then. These new forms were either included in the Linnaean groups, or else new groups were created to accommodate them. There has been no necessity for a basic change in the classification. . . . [T]he only inference that can be drawn from it is that the classification now adopted is not an arbitrary but a natural one, reflecting the objective state of things.<sup>29</sup>

Since Darwin's time, tension has existed between the dual aims of taxonomy: grouping by morphological and genetic similarity on the one hand, and grouping according to hypothesized evolutionary descent (supposed "genealogical" relatedness) on the other. Even with the rise of phenetics, cladistics, and phylogenetics, Linnaean species designations haven't changed much. Most species names, including *Homo sapiens*, have remained the same, just as Dobzhansky described decades prior to the rise of the new systematics.

### THE THREE-RACE MODEL

A well-known rudimentary classification of mankind is the three-race model (recognition of five to seven major races is more typical). Its developer, French naturalist Georges Cuvier (1769–1832), of Protestant descent and schooled in Germany, possessed one of the finest minds in history. He was the first to establish the fact that many past life forms are now extinct, and he is often called the founder of comparative anatomy and vertebrate paleontology. According to the half-English, half-French psychologist J. Philippe Rushton, Cuvier also "may have been the first to formally consider that brain size proportional to body size was the determinant of intelligence across species."<sup>30</sup> As a university professor and government administrator in revolutionary France, Cuvier served under three opposing regimes—

---

<sup>29</sup> Dobzhansky, *Genetics and the Origin of Species*, 305. Cf. Baker, *Race*, 119: "[T]he reality of the taxon as a natural unit impresses itself forcibly on the mind."

<sup>30</sup> J. Philippe Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective*, 3rd ed. (Port Huron, Mich.: Charles Darwin Research Institute, 2000), 36. The 1st (1995) and 2nd (1997) editions were published by Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, N.J.

revolutionary, Napoleonic, and monarchical – yet still died peacefully in his bed, a Baron and a Peer of France.

Under the heading “Varieties of the Human Species” he wrote, “Three races appear very distinct – the *Caucasian* or white, the *Mongolian* or yellow, and the *Ethiopian* or negro.” The Caucasian, “distinguished by the beauty of the oval formed by his head, varying in complexion and the colour of his hair,” created “the most highly civilized nations . . . which have generally held all others in subjection.” The Mongolian, “known by his high cheek bones, flat visage, narrow and oblique eyes, straight black hair, scanty beard and olive complexion,” has always “remained stationary” in civilization, despite establishing great empires in China and Japan and extending his conquests “to this side of the Great Desert.” The Negro race is “marked by a black complexion, crisped or woolly hair, compressed cranium, and a flat nose. The projection of the lower parts of the face, and the thick lips, evidently approximate it to the monkey tribe; the hordes of which it consists have always remained in the most complete state of utter barbarism.” Cuvier’s brief survey of sub-types then shifts unconsciously from race to ethno-linguistic groups – specific tribes, peoples, and nations.<sup>31</sup>

Madison Grant employed the three-race model in 1916, calling Caucasians, Negroids, and Mongoloids “the primary groups or sub-genera of the genus *Homo*.” (The “generic” terminology is indicative either of confusion or a belief that the three major races of man are more distantly related than species, which is untenable.) Interestingly, Grant correctly recognized “the black Melanesians and the Australoids” as “very distinct” from Negroids, and the “Amerinds” as “derivatives” of Mongoloids.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Georges Cuvier, *The Animal Kingdom: Arranged in Conformity with Its Organization*, trans. and abridged H. M’Murtrie (New York: G. & C. & H. Carvill, 1832), 50. Abridged into one volume from the four-volume edition published by Carvill in 1831. In this classic work – in French, *Règne Animal distribué d’après son Organisation pour servir de base à l’Histoire Naturelle des Animaux et d’Introduction à l’Anatomie Comparée*, 4 vols. (Paris: Deterville, 1817) – which dominated natural history in France and England until the 1859 publication of *On the Origin of Species*, Cuvier gathered the results of his researches into the comparative anatomy of living and fossil animals.

<sup>32</sup> Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race, or The Racial Basis of European History* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1916), 29–30. On Grant see Nelson Rosit, “Prescient Patrician,” review of *Patrician Racist: The Evolution of Madison Grant* by Jonathan Spiro in *The Occidental Quarterly* 7 (Summer 2007): 91–100.

A notable recent work utilizing the three-race model is J. Philippe Rushton's masterful *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective*:

For the past twenty years, I have studied the three major races of *Oriental*s (East Asians, Mongoloids), *Whites* (Europeans, Caucasoids), and *Blacks* (Africans, Negroids). An "Oriental" is anyone most of whose ancestors were born in East Asia. A "White" is anyone most of whose ancestors were born in Europe. And a "Black" is anyone most of whose ancestors were born in sub-Saharan Africa. In the main I have not addressed other groups and sub-groups.<sup>33</sup>

Rushton's book is unique in that it measures and compares many psychological and behavioral variables in addition to intelligence, the most-studied psychological trait. Rushton discovered that on over sixty variables Asians and blacks define opposite ends of a spectrum, with Europeans falling in between.<sup>34</sup> Along any single dimension there was great variability within groups, through racial differences between them were not large (typically on the order of 4–34 percent). However, "Although often modest, the mean differences do exist, and they do so in a stubborn and consistent pattern."<sup>35</sup> Rushton holds that

---

<sup>33</sup> Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, P 10. A famous population geneticist likewise acknowledged the three-race model prior to shifting to full-fledged race denial as it became *de rigueur*:

On the most general level . . . geographical and ecological boundaries (which acted as partial barriers to expansion and migration) help to distinguish three major racial groups: Africans, Caucasians, and a highly heterogeneous group that we may call "Easterners." The Easterners include subgroups that were separated in various older classifications, such as American Natives (American Indians) and Orientals (Chinese, Japanese, Koreans).

W. F. Bodmer and L. L. Cavalli-Sforza, *Genetics, Evolution, and Man* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1976).

<sup>34</sup> Asians tend to score higher than blacks and whites on "positive" traits such as intelligence and nonviolence, and blacks lowest, a finding some pro-white observers question. As one academic notes, "The accomplishments of the Greeks and later Europeans in philosophy, science, etc., especially the theoretical branches of learning, has no counterpart in East Asia." E-mail communication with the author, April 22, 2008.

<sup>35</sup> Rushton, *Race, Evolution and Behavior*, xv.

the genetic and environmental contributions to the observed differences are about equal.

The author acknowledges that the three-race model ignores significant intra-population differences:

Of course it is simplified to divide all the world's peoples into just three major races. This ignores "Negritoes" and "Australoids," but also subdivisions within the macro races. Within the Mongoloid population distinctions might be drawn between east Asians like the Sino-Japanese and Koreans, and Amerindians and south Asians like the Filipinos and Malays. Similarly, the classification "Negroid" includes Bantu-speaking Africans, pygmies, Khoisan bushmen, and the socially classifiable blacks in the Americas who are hybridized with whites and Amerindians (in the United States by about 25 percent). Caucasoids include Europeans, Middle Easterners, and members of the Indian subcontinent. It is unclear where still other groups belong. . . .

The histories of global populations are genetically complex and linked by intervening gradients. . . .

Constructs in science are only useful if they have explanatory power. The three macro racial categories show much predictive and construct validity. . . . [R]acial categories better organize disparate data than is possible using only ethnicity, religion, or sociopolitical grouping. . . . The efficient unit of analysis, therefore, is the higher order concept of race, within which cluster the different subdivisions, ethnic groups, and, ultimately, individuals.<sup>36</sup>

Readers of Rushton's marvelous exposition will be astounded that even the taxonomically crude three-race model packs such a powerful empirical punch. Indeed, it is very telling that elites need to marshal opprobrium, media attacks, socially sanctioned domestic terrorism and, ultimately, the police power of the state to punish and marginalize Rushton and intimidate other scientists and writers who come to similar conclusions.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 235–36.

<sup>37</sup> See J. Philippe Rushton, "The New Enemies of Evolutionary Science," *Liberty* (March 1998), 31–35. [http://www.lrainc.com/swtaboo/stalkers/jpr\\_liberty.html](http://www.lrainc.com/swtaboo/stalkers/jpr_liberty.html) (accessed March 26, 2008).

**BLUMENBACH: THE FIVE-RACE MODEL**

The founder of modern anthropology, German medical professor Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840), a pioneer in craniology and comparative anatomy, identified five human races (which he termed "varieties") in his doctoral dissertation at the University of Göttingen, *De generis humani varietate nativae liber*: Caucasian (a term he coined, encompassing Europeans, North Africans, Middle Easterners, and Asian Indians), Mongolian (East Asians), Ethiopian (Africans), American (Amerindians), and Malay (Australoids and the Oceanians then known).<sup>38</sup> (Note that Blumenbach's 1781 five-race model predates Cuvier's 1817 three-race model.) Blumenbach derived his classification from a meticulous comparative analysis of skulls, fetuses, hair, anatomy, drawings, skin and eye color, and the forms and proportions of the face, teeth, ears, breasts, genitals, legs, hands, and feet. He wrote explicitly about gradients between the five varieties, and of racial subunits within them.

In a brief aside on Jews, Blumenbach commented that the Jewish face was an instance of "the unadulterated countenance" of a nation "unaffected by any union with any other nation." Jews "under every climate remain the same as far as the fundamental configuration of the face goes, remarkable for a racial character almost universal, which can be distinguished at the first glance even by those little skilled in physiognomy, although it is difficult to limit or express by words." Blumenbach cited French-Dutch engraver Bernard Picart and American-born expatriate painter Benjamin West, "President of the Royal Academy of Arts, with whom I conversed about the racial face of the Jews," to buttress his observation that the Jewish countenance differed markedly from the facial features of the non-Jews among whom they dwelled.<sup>39</sup>

Blumenbach's five-fold division became popularized by color, a classification used well into the 20th century. The switch to color designations probably occurred through the agency of Johann Friedrich Gmelin (1748–1804), chairman of medicine and chemistry at Göttin-

---

<sup>38</sup> Johann Friedrich Blumenbach *De generis humani varietate nativae liber* (Göttingae [Göttingen]: A. Vandenhoeck, 1775). The first edition lists four races; the second edition of 1781 lists five races; and the third edition of 1795 lists five races, finally given their famous names, above.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 233–34. West, Blumenbach informs us, believed that the Jewish face, "above all others had something particularly goat-like about it . . ."

gen, who in 1788 (between the second and third editions of his colleague's famous work) published the thirteenth edition of Linnaeus's *Systema Naturae* in Leipzig with many additions and alterations.<sup>40</sup> Gmelin added a footnote designating five major races based upon skin color: *Homo albus*, *Homo badius*, *Homo niger*, *Homo cupreus*, and *Homo fuscus*—i.e., White, Yellow, Black, Copper, and Brown.

Lothrop Stoddard in (1920) employed this color schema for the major races.<sup>41</sup> Madison Grant, in *The Conquest of a Continent, or The Expansion of Races in America* (1933), mentioned the color scheme, but relied upon the original five-race model with terminology differing in some respects from Blumenbach's.<sup>42</sup> At any rate, Grant dropped the three-fold division of his earlier book.

### OTHER CLASSIFICATIONS

Numerous racial taxonomies have been proposed in addition to the original three-race and five-race models. Examples from physical anthropology include Carleton Coon's (1904–1981) five "subspecies" (Australoid, Mongoloid, Caucasoid, Congoid [including Pygmies], and Capoid [Hottentots and Bushmen])<sup>43</sup> and John R. Baker's six races (Australasid, Europid, Negrid, Khoisanid [Hottentots and Bushmen], Mongolid, and Indianid [Amerindians])—which he further divided into twenty-six "subraces."<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Caroli Linnaei, *Systema naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species*, 13th ed., ed. J. F. Gmelin (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Beer, 1788).

<sup>41</sup> Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), Chapters 2–5 and Part II. Introduction by Madison Grant.

<sup>42</sup> Madison Grant, *The Conquest of a Continent, or The Expansion of Races in America* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), 26–38.

<sup>43</sup> Carleton Coon, *The Origin of Races* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1962) and *The Living Races of Man* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1965). Coon noted that Canadian-born geneticist R. Ruggles Gates (once married to British feminist Marie Stopes), proposed the identical classification of five major races in his book *Human Ancestry* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), 367, but there called *Homo sapiens* a "superspecies." Under Gates's system, therefore, Coon's subspecies would be species. *The Living Races of Man*, 6, n4.

<sup>44</sup> Baker, *Race*. Baker (1900–1984), an English biologist and cytologist at the University of Oxford, wrote one of the rare post-WW II books about race that included detailed, frank discussions of morphology, cognitive ability, and racial differences in achievement. The same year *Race* appeared, Baker, at the request of Sir Julian Huxley, edited the latter's third and final edition of *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974), Huxley's major contribution to the modern

Another useful system is that of Jewish anthropologist Stanley M. Garn (1922–2007),<sup>45</sup> who co-authored a book with Carleton Coon and Joseph Birdsell.<sup>46</sup> Garn was the brother-in-law of WASP anthropologist and strident race denier C. Loring Brace. Garn's initial division consists of nine "Geographical Races" resulting from isolation due to barriers to migration and gene flow—the Amerindian, Polynesian, Micronesian, Melanesian-Papuan (three distinct Pacific Island races), Australian (aborigines), Asiatic, Indian (India), European, and African. According to Garn, geographical races are not breeding populations but aggregates of "local races" inhabiting continental regions. Thus, geographical races are not themselves prime evolutionary units. Nevertheless, overall resemblances within geographic races are greater than between them because gene exchange and shared selective factors long operated within their respective areas.

"Local races," sandwiched between geographic and "micro-races," correspond to natural breeding populations, and are the true units of evolutionary change. Largely endogamous, the small amount of gene flow that occurred historically came primarily from contiguous, related local races. Although Garn enumerates thirty-two local races in his book, he emphasizes that they actually number in the thousands: "No one can make an exact count . . ." Some are large (Forest Negro, Turkic, North Chinese, Hindu), some isolated (Lapps, Eskimos, Pygmies), some marginal (Ainu, Bushmen, Hottentots), some hybrids of recent origin (American Negroes, South African Cape Coloreds), some ancient and tiny (Samaritans). Finally, "*Micro-races*, though not isolated geographically or by extensive cultural prohibitions, still differ from each other in numerous ways."<sup>47</sup>

---

evolutionary synthesis.

<sup>45</sup> Stanley M. Garn, *Human Races*, 3rd ed. (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971). The first and second editions of this slender book appeared in 1961 and 1965. A companion volume, Stanley M. Garn, ed., *Readings on Race* (1st ed. 1959; 2nd ed. 1968), assembled contributions from a wide variety of authors in the fields of human biology, physiology, ecology, and genetics complementing specific topics discussed in *Human Races*.

<sup>46</sup> Carleton Coon, Joseph Birdsell, and Stanley M. Garn, *Races: A Study of the Problems of Race Formation in Man* (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1950).

<sup>47</sup> Garn, *Human Races*, 25. Though "neat local races" in Europe are hard to come by, some gene frequency differences "are so apparent that we can divide Europe up into a series of local races" (p. 21): Northwest European, Northeast European, East Baltic, Alpine, and Mediterranean (pp. 21, 169–71).

The system of nested hierarchies utilized by Garn and others – an initial division into large, diverse groups known variously as “subspecies,” “major races,” “geographic races,” or “continental races,” followed by subdivision into smaller units such as “mosaics,” “relict enclaves,” and “local races” (Coon),<sup>48</sup> “subraces” (Baker), “local races,” “microraces” (Garn), and “breeding populations” (population genetics) – is characteristic of biological classification generally,<sup>49</sup> as noted by Dobzhansky: “Small clusters are grouped together into larger secondary ones, these into still larger ones, and so on in an hierarchical order. . . . Evidently the hierarchical nature of the observed discontinuity lends itself admirably” to classification. “For the sake of convenience the discrete clusters are designated races, species, genera, fami-

---

<sup>48</sup> By the 1960s the author of *The Races of Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1939), a book considered by some his greatest, appeared to have modified his views of European subraces considerably:

Races like the Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean, East Baltic, and Dinaric, which loom large in the Europe-centered literature of anthropology, are neither subspecies, nor, in a strict sense, local races, although some local races may be defined in these terms. These words have also been used in the sense of *types*, which can be picked out of local populations. . . . [F]rom the taxonomic point of view such types are not races but simply the visible expressions of the genetic variability of the intermarrying groups to which they belong. (Coon, *The Origin of Races*, 19)

In *The Living Races of Man* he wrote, “Despite their linguistic differentiation, which is a product of history, the living Europeans are to a large extent unified racially” (p. 61). See especially “The Living Europeans,” pp. 61–65 and “The Primary Racial Characteristics of the Living Europeans,” pp. 71–72, where he refers to the “races” of Europe only in quotes.

<sup>49</sup> Robert E. Kuttner writes:

As a taxonomic unit, race is used to denote different levels of classification. Some workers restrict the term to the larger geographical unit or subspecies – i.e., Europid, Mongolid, Negrid – whose members possess a large number of traits in common and inhabit or originate from a specific geographic area. Below the level of geographical race, classical morphological anthropologists seek to identify anthropological elements or nuclear racial types defined by centers of concentration of anthropological traits.

Robert E. Kuttner, “Introduction,” in Kuttner, ed., *Race and Modern Science: A Collection of Essays by Biologists, Anthropologists, Sociologists and Psychologists* (New York: Social Science Press, 1967), xviii.

lies, and so forth. . . . [T]he biological classification is simultaneously a man-made system of pigeonholes devised for the pragmatic purpose of recording observations in a convenient manner and an acknowledgment of the fact of organic discontinuity."<sup>50</sup>

Population geneticists Jan Klein and Naoyuki Takahata agree:

There are indeed different levels of grouping within *H. sapiens*, which are the result of population history, genealogical patterns, geography, cultural differentiation, and other factors. Smaller groups can be clustered into larger ones and these into larger ones still, as is apparent from any phylogenetic tree drawn for human populations. . . . [E]ven in Europe, with its long tradition of intermarriages and easy opportunities for mixing, Guido Barbujani and Robert R. Sokal could uncover a patchy distribution of allele frequencies and zones of sharp changes in genetic variation, and attribute them to physical and cultural barriers to gene flow. The hierarchical nature of the groupings, of course, begs for an answer to the question: which of the groups should be called races? It could be: all, none, or any, according to one's preference. The name is not important. What is important is to acknowledge the existence of differentiation and its significance for the reconstruction of human history.<sup>51</sup>

Nicholas Hudson makes a further important point: It was the "pre-occupation with the *continental* division of humanity that restrained [eighteenth-century] authors from identifying" Jews as a distinct race. "Blumenbach and other scientists commented that Jews seemed

---

<sup>50</sup> Dobzhansky, *Genetics and the Origin of Species*, 4–5.

<sup>51</sup> Jan Klein and Naoyuki Takahata, *Where Do We Come From? The Molecular Evidence for Human Descent* (New York: Springer, 2002), 390. For the study referred to see Barbujani and Sokal, "Zones of Sharp Genetic Change in Europe Are Also Linguistic Boundaries," *Proc. Nati. Acad. Sci.* 87 (March 1990): 1816–19:

These findings support a model of genetic differentiation in Europe in which the genetic structure of the population is determined mainly by gene flow and admixture, rather than by adaptation to varying environmental conditions. Of the 33 boundaries, 27 reflect diverse population origins at often distant locations. Language affiliation of European populations plays a major role in maintaining and probably causing genetic differences.

physically distinct from European Christians. But the diffusion of Jews across Europe was inconsistent with a scheme that allowed only a single race per continent. For the time being, Jews remained only a 'nation,' physically influenced by their Middle-Eastern heritage, their distinct customs, and their harsh life in European ghettos."<sup>52</sup>

### POPULATION GENETICS

Until recently, race was the province of physical anthropology. By mid-century, however, German-born Jewish radical Franz Boas (1858–1942)<sup>53</sup>—founder and head for forty years of the powerful, minority-dominated, Left-oriented anthropology department at Columbia University—shifted the focus of anthropology from race to culture.<sup>54</sup> Boas's student, anthropologist and TV celebrity Ashley Montagu (1905–1999) (real name: Israel Ehrenberg), subsequently invented the ideology of race denial,<sup>55</sup> which quickly swept the profession. Gradually, the serious study of race subsided, Jewish anthropologists even relegating peripheral subjects like kinship studies to the "racist" trash bin.<sup>56</sup> In the 1990s, the American Association of Physical Anthropologists (AAPA) and the American Anthropological Association (AAA) issued formal ideological statements in the Soviet manner (still in effect) denouncing the reality of race.<sup>57</sup> The more extreme of the two, the

---

<sup>52</sup> Hudson, "From 'Nation' to 'Race,'" 255.

<sup>53</sup> Congressional investigators linked Boas and his son, Ernst Boas, a professor of medicine, to a long list of Stalin-era Communist front organizations. For an enumeration, see Francis X. Gannon, *Biographical Dictionary of the Left* (Boston: Western Islands, 1973), vol. 4, 258–62.

<sup>54</sup> "Boas almost single-handedly developed in America the concept of culture, which, like a powerful solvent, would in time expunge race from the literature of social science." Carl N. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 71.

<sup>55</sup> E.g., Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942) which appeared in five subsequent editions through 1998, and "The Race Question" (New York: UNESCO, 1950). Like Boas, Montagu was affiliated with numerous Communist organizations.

<sup>56</sup> David M. Schneider (1918–1995), *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984). Schneider's research was funded by the National Science Foundation. Others extended his theories to deny the biogenetic basis of gender and ethnicity as well.

<sup>57</sup> "AAPA Statement on Biological Aspects of Race," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 101 (1996): 569–70 and <http://www.physanth.org/positions/race.html> (revised Feb. 9, 2000) (accessed March 25, 2008); "American Anthropological Association Statement on 'Race,'" May 17, 1998, <http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/racepp.htm> (ac-

AAA's, was written by Audrey Smedley, a black social anthropologist and African American Studies professor.<sup>58</sup>

As a result of such politicization, serious study of race shifted to population genetics, where human groups are viewed as "populations" – dynamic, living entities evolving through time. Race denial is the norm in this field, too.

Psychologist and intelligence expert Arthur R. Jensen (b. 1923) persuasively argues that biological taxonomy and population genetics are:

. . . simply different ways of viewing the concept [of race], and both of them are completely compatible. . . . All [the] different methods of analysis and the different data sets to which they have been applied produce essentially the same picture, which pretty much agrees with the racial classifications of the old-time anthropologists and the man on the street. It is highly unlikely that a "mere cultural construction" would show such consistency across time, characteristics studied, and methodology.<sup>59</sup>

A few population investigators have proposed traditional-style classifications employing genetic methods. An example is Jewish geneticist Neil Risch's five continental races: Africans, Caucasians (Europe, the Middle East, and the Indian subcontinent), East Asians (China, Japan, the Philippines, and Siberia), Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans.<sup>60</sup>

---

cessed March 31, 2008).

<sup>58</sup> Smedley is also the author of the "Race" subsection—an unscientific 100-page anti-white screed—of the "Evolution, Human" entry in the world's leading encyclopedia, *The New Encyclopedia Britannica: Macropædia*, 15th ed. (2005), and the social constructionist *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1999).

<sup>59</sup> Frank Miele, *Intelligence, Race, and Genetics: Conversations with Arthur R. Jensen* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2002), 115, 121. For a detailed discussion, including tables comparing population clusters produced by different investigators and methods, see Chapter 4, "What is Race? Biological Reality or Cultural Construction?," 109–145. Jensen's paternal grandparents were Danes from Copenhagen. His maternal grandfather was German, his maternal grandmother Jewish. "Early on," Miele writes, "Jensen noted how the dour demeanor of his Danish relatives contrasted with the fun-loving atmosphere of his mother's side of the family" (p. 8). Jensen also told Miele, "As to the implied charge of racism or neo-Nazism, I absolutely disavow any association whatsoever. . . . I have always rejected that kind of thinking, ever since I was a child, and so did my parents and all my other relatives" (p. 144).

<sup>60</sup> Neil Risch et al., "Categorization of Humans in Biomedical Research: Genes,

In sharp contrast, L. L. Cavalli-Sforza, the world's leading population geneticist, flatly denies the biological existence of race. He promotes the popular belief that phenotypic variation is a superficial response to climate, and that there are no significant differences "below the surface" (i.e., race is only skin deep) — essentially the centuries-old "burnt by the sun" explanation for races adapted to modern audiences. In cooperation with Jewish academics Marcus Feldman and Walter Bodmer, Cavalli-Sforza in the 1970s vigorously attacked Arthur Jensen and Nobel Prize winner William Shockley for their views of racial differences in intelligence. According to Wilmot Robertson, Bodmer and Cavalli-Sforza even proposed outlawing investigations into black-white IQ differences.

Last but not least, Cavalli-Sforza, who expatiates frequently on the evils of racism, habitually portrays whites, but never non-whites, as racists, as the following quotation illustrates:

At its worst, racism has inspired the abuse and extermination of enormous numbers of people. Recent historical examples included the near-extermination of Native Americans by European settlers of the Americas between the 16th and 20th centuries, the capture and export of Africans for use as slaves in the Americas from the early 17th to the mid-19th century, the extermination of Jews in Europe by German Nazis during World War II (1939–1945), and the system of apartheid perpetrated by Afrikaners

---

Race and Disease," *Genome Biology* 3 (2002): 1–12, <http://genomebiology.com/content/pdf/gb-2002-3-7-comment2007.pdf> (accessed April 22, 2008).

See also Noah Rosenberg et al., "Genetic Structure of Human Populations," *Science* 298 (December 20, 2002): 2381–85, <http://pritch.bsd.uchicago.edu/publications/RosenbergEtAl02.pdf> (accessed April 22, 2008).

"Neil's study was theoretical, and this is the data that backs up what he said," Dr. [Marcus] Feldman said. . . . Even though this split broadly corresponds with popular notions of race, the authors of the *Science* article avoid using the word, referring to the genetic patterning they have found with words like "population structure" and "self-reported population ancestry." But Dr. Feldman said the finding essentially confirmed the popular conception of race.

Nicholas Wade, "Gene Study Identifies 5 Main Human Populations," *New York Times*, December 20, 2002.

against all nonwhite peoples in South Africa.<sup>61</sup>

In countless similar defamations over the years it is impossible to detect anything but authentic, if revolting, anti-white bias on Cavalli-Sforza's part, despite the prominent geneticist's former membership in Mussolini's Fascist Youth and wartime work in Nazi Germany under Russian geneticist Nikolai Timofeeff-Ressovsky (1900–1981).

Despite such demerits, Cavalli-Sforza's academic work is viewed by many scientists, including J. Philippe Rushton, as rich in racial information. Arthur Jensen states:

I have studied the tome by Cavalli-Sforza and his co-authors [*The History and Geography of Human Genes*<sup>62</sup>]. His position on [race] is substantively no different from my own. In fact, his work has shaped my own view of the concept of race as much as, or more than, anything else I've read. The book is a mine of information . . . While the term "race" is assiduously avoided, the authors use the term "population" to mean the same thing . . .<sup>63</sup>

Half-Jewish journalist and human biodiversity advocate Steve Sailer satirically points out, "Basically, all his number-crunching has produced a map that looks about like what you'd get if you gave Jesse Helms a paper napkin and a box of crayons and had him draw a racial map of the world."<sup>64</sup>

Cavalli-Sforza does not practice what John Baker called "political taxonomy." An example of an ideologically-driven political taxonomist is Swedish geneticist Svante Pääbo, director of the Department of Genetics at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig and one of *Time* magazine's "100 most prominent people of the year" in 2007. Pääbo told an interviewer:

---

<sup>61</sup> Cavalli-Sforza, "Race," *Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia* 2005.

<sup>62</sup> Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi, and Alberto Piazza, *The History and Geography of Human Genes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). Unless otherwise noted, citations are to the Abridged Paperback Edition.

<sup>63</sup> Miele, *Intelligence, Race, and Genetics*, 119.

<sup>64</sup> Steve Sailer, "Cavalli-Sforza and the Reality of Race," review of *Genes, Peoples and Languages*, May 25, 2000, [http://www.amazon.com/review/R59GA9XVRGRJN/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/R59GA9XVRGRJN/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm) (accessed March 11, 2008).

[I]t is sad that people interested in population history have gone out and sampled according to preconceived ideas of what groups are there, be those linguistic groups or racial groups, and of course if you sample like that you come up with some differences between groups, and say yes, they are there. Rather than going out and just sampling without regard for anything other than geography.<sup>65</sup>

Cavalli-Sforza's landmark study *The History and Geography of Human Genes* avoids Pääbo-style sampling by carefully targeting "aboriginal populations" – those living in the area of study in A.D. 1492, prior to the beginning of the great European expansions and migrations (pp. 4, 15). This was precisely the method employed by putatively "racist" Yankee anthropologist Carleton Coon half a century ago.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, Cavalli-Sforza's researchers selected only "core" populations for sampling, "because they presumably underwent less admixture" (p. 19). "Populations defined as mixed, without giving details, were systematically excluded. . . . We considered it important to be conservative in this respect . . . We retained populations that had up to 10 percent admixture, rarely more . . ." (p. 22). In the unabridged edition the authors write, "The code we eventually adopted for classifying our populations is geographical-anthropological (physical)-linguistic-ethnographic, the order of the four words reflecting the average importance of each criterion . . ." (p. 23). "Geographical," of course, refers to pre-1492 population distributions.

Despite its undeniable value, population genetics is rife with race-denying pitfalls that muddy the waters of an already abstruse discipline. Due to the esoteric nature of the science it is assumed to be more sophisticated and less subjective and superficial than classical anthropology. Genetic analysis, Cavalli-Sforza assures us, "provides a deeper and more reliable measure of biological differences between people" than "easily visible" physical differences between "human

---

<sup>65</sup> Jane Gitschier, "Imagine: An Interview with Svante Pääbo," *PLoS Genetics* 3 (March 2008): e1000035, <http://www.plosgenetics.org/article/info:doi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pgen.1000035;jsessionid=170C4BA941FCAC7BFE441EA2C303EEE5> (accessed April 22, 2008).

<sup>66</sup> See Map 1, "The Five Subspecies of *Homo Sapiens* in A.D. 1492," in *The Origin of Races*, 6–7. Coon utilized the 1492 cutoff throughout *Origin* and *The Living Races of Man*.

groups."<sup>67</sup> This cunning assertion appeals to our psychological proclivity to believe that a science we don't understand, which requires the mediation of experts for its interpretation, is more "true" than a science that deals with readily observable phenomena.

The upshot is that ludicrous claims by geneticists with an anti-white axe to grind win the unthinking assent of professionals and laymen alike: "Biological race does not exist. It is a social construct invented by whites to harm Jews and people of color." (Even in its own loopy terms this assertion makes no sense.) "Race is not a scientific concept, and it is not a genetic concept." "We can all trace our ancestors back to approximately four groups in Africa, all black." "Members of different races are genetically 99.9 percent the same." "There is more genetic variation within human 'races' than between them." "'Race' may validly be defined as any set of people anywhere sharing a single trait, such as skin color or lactose intolerance." Infallible genetics, we are assured, "proves" such things.

On the contrary: if taken seriously, such propositions mean that genetics is not competent to analyze human variation. As Polish morphologist Jan Czekanowski (1882–1965) retorted long ago:

The assertion that many of the views of morphologists are absurd from the viewpoint of genetics . . . is a concern of the geneticists. The morphological approach merely produces summarized observational facts with the help of mathematical formulas. If the morphological facts are summarized accurately, then the theories of genetics must be adjusted. Theories are adapted to the observational facts, not vice versa. The well-known scorn of the "population geneticists" – so much the worse for the facts – has no place in science . . .<sup>68</sup>

In truth, phenotypic differences are the visible expressions of underlying genetic differences. (Environmental and developmental factors do not alter this reality.) There must be genetic racial differences to code for the phenotypic differences we see. It is therefore extremely unfortunate that the urgently needed "synthesis of the older classical morphological anthropology and the newer population genetics" called for

---

<sup>67</sup> Cavalli-Sforza, "Race," *Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia* 2005.

<sup>68</sup> Jan Czekanowski, "Morphology and the Classification of Race" in Kuttner, ed., *Race and Modern Science*, 64–65.

by Robert Kuttner in 1967 has not occurred.<sup>69</sup>

Finally, an empirical rather than ideological limitation of population genetics is its focus on individual genes and their frequencies—genes that control polymorphisms having simple Mendelian (monogenic) patterns of inheritance.<sup>70</sup> The problem with this is that the observed characteristics that differentiate races from one another are for the most part polygenic in origin—the result of numerous genes working in conjunction, each exerting a small cumulative effect. Examples of such complex traits are cranial variation, skin pigmentation, hair and eye color,<sup>71</sup> teeth and jaws, facial form, nose form, the size and shape of the body and its parts, and stature.

But polygenes and the complex traits they code for are not ordinarily studied by population geneticists, John R. Baker has noted: “[T]he better the evidence of relationship or distinction between ethnic taxa, the less susceptible are the facts to genetic analysis. . . .” “Because polymorphism lends itself so readily to genetical analysis, the geneticist is almost forced to concentrate his attention on genes that are shared between different taxa, and differ from one taxon to another only by their frequency. Thus by concentrating his attention on the genes of polymorphism, he may tend to underestimate the differences between taxa.”<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Kuttner, *Race and Modern Science*, xix.

<sup>70</sup> As Kuttner writes:

Population geneticists define race as a Mendelian or breeding population and concentrate on traits with a known mode of inheritance. While this has greatly advanced our understanding of the dynamic processes of race formation in man, there are apparent limitations in its applications. The anthropological traits whose exact mode of inheritance is known are few.

Classical morphological anthropology, therefore, still has its place in studies of race. . . . The application of newer mathematical techniques, such as multivariate analysis, and the availability of computer facilities enable workers to accommodate a large number of morphological variables in an accurate and objective research program. (*Ibid.*, xviii–xix)

<sup>71</sup> “Variation in human hair and eye color is confined to a relatively small percentage of the human species—the populations of northwestern Europe and their descendants. The rest of the world is almost uniformly dark-haired and dark-eyed. The reason for this pattern of variation is very unclear.” Clifford J. Jolly and Fred Plog, *Physical Anthropology and Archeology*, 4th ed. (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1987), 469.

<sup>72</sup> John R. Baker, *Race*, 190. Though Baker wrote in 1974, the situation is the same today.

Polygenes are likewise responsible for the marked psychological and behavioral differences between races. Arthur Jensen observes:

Given that perhaps as many as 50 percent of the genes in the human genome are involved with the structural and functional aspects of the brain, it would be surprising indeed if populations that differ in a great many visible characteristics and in various genetic polymorphisms did not also differ in some characteristics associated with the brain, the primary organ of behavior. . . . So we shouldn't be surprised if these races, or population clusters if you prefer, differ in a number of behavioral characteristics, including abilities, both physical and mental as well.<sup>73</sup>

But population genetics eschews all of this.

## CONCLUSION

A concept as basic as race would never have become thoroughly muddled and confused had whites retained control of their culture. In the absence of alien casuistry, intellectual thuggery, sinister communal organizations, a controlled media, and a totalitarian government, the hegemonic "race does not exist" doctrine in the service of genocide would have been deemed loathsome. Instead, it is the norm.

In years past, the concept of race was not an issue, thanks to inherited cultural practices that effectively preserved the gene pool of the breeding population. Cultural barriers to mixing successfully preserved the white race genetically and culturally through five centuries of world migrations from 1492 till the mid-1960s. However, old barriers to admixture have now been diabolized, criminalized, and forcibly eradicated by anti-white governments and social institutions.

---

Unfortunately, none of the genes controlling skin color, hair color and texture, or lip and nose shape have been identified. These characters are determined by multiple, interacting genes, so their identification is not easy. But in the near future, the genes will undoubtedly become known and it will then be possible to establish whether there is a correspondence between their distribution and any of the classification schemes that anthropologists have designed for the human species . . . (Klein and Takahata, *Where Do We Come From?*, 385)

<sup>73</sup> Frank Miele, *Intelligence, Race, and Genetics*, 124–25.

The deliberate infliction upon “the earth’s most endangered species, the white race” of conditions calculated to bring about its physical destruction—including, but not limited to, suppression of freedom of speech and association, mass immigration, declining birth rates, violent crime, and enforced admixture—necessitates a thorough reexamination of the biological and epistemological foundations of “race.” Conceptual clarity is now a matter of survival.

*Andrew Hamilton is the pen-name of a widely-published author on the science and politics of race. This is his first appearance in **TOQ**.*