

Libertarianism and Racial Nationalism--Or Better, White Racialism  
Robert S. Griffin  
www.robertsgriffin.com

The implications of libertarianism as a philosophy and approach to living for white racial thought and action is an important concern, but thus far it has received little if any concerted attention in white racial discourse. I address this concern here. To orient this exploration, I need first to define some terms: what is libertarianism; and what is racial nationalism, and is racial nationalism the best construct, at least for me, to use in exploring this topic.

### Libertarianism

There are four basic principles of libertarianism:

A focus on the individual

Libertarians are individualists as opposed to collectivists or communitarians. Their focus in the first instance is on the individual living, breathing human being, distinct, different from every other human being--see this person. To libertarians, labels and concepts--racial, ethnic, national, gender, class, old, young, and so on--have reality, they exist, and they are valuable as they point out, describe, and categorize, and provide the bases for analyses, decisions, and actions. But all of them are abstractions, mental constructs, ideas, words and images and associations, and different ontologically, fundamentally, from the concrete particulars that comprise the world, and they should not be ascribed a kind of reality they don't in fact possess.

Libertarians think it is valuable and important to adopt this individual-centered perspective in order to keep their priorities straight. They don't want to proceed as if the whole, whatever it happens to be, becomes the dominant perspective, the people who comprise are likely to be viewed as if they were embodiments of the concept, the category, rather than as the unique individuals they actually are.

One way to understand libertarians it to see them as having a minority whose cause they espouse, and it is the ultimate minority: *the individual human being*. Libertarians don't pick favorites. Black

and white, men and women, old and young, rich and poor, rural and urban, European and Asian and African and North American--to libertarians, every one of them possesses worth equal to those of every other one. An individual's rights aren't subordinate to something higher or grander. When any individual is sacrificed to a concept of the larger good, a greater cause, however compelling the rationale for doing it may be, it gives pause to libertarians. To them, human beings are not numbers or categories or pawns in a chess game. Human beings are sacred, each and every one of them.

### A belief in the right of self-ownership

Human beings' bodies and minds are theirs to do with as they choose, not as somebody or something else chooses. Other individuals don't own you. Your family doesn't own you. Your race or ethnicity doesn't own you. The government doesn't own you. The church doesn't own you. A moral or ethical principle doesn't own you. An idea or cause doesn't own you. *You own you.*

The belief in the right of self-ownership is the foundation of libertarians' fervent *commitment to individual liberty*. While libertarians value political liberty highly, they tend to stress personal liberty, the freedom to think and speak freely, to own property and do with it as one wishes, to produce and engage in commerce without outside interference, and to live one's private life as one chooses.

Along with self-ownership comes *self-responsibility*. You are responsible for the life you own. You are responsible for taking care of yourself, your self. Not somebody else. Not something else. *You.*

You don't have the right to deny others ownership of themselves. You aren't justified in taking something from other people, or forcing them to serve your needs or give you something, or compelling them to stand aside in deference to you or yours. Libertarians believe in voluntary exchange and are very down on the use of force (with getting laws passed that favor you and conning people into doing your bidding considered slick forms of force).

### A belief in spontaneous order

Libertarians acknowledge that individuals do not exist in isolation and that there needs to be regularity and predictability in people's relationships with one another so that they can harmoniously and productively get on with their lives. But rather than have these arrangements dictated by some higher authority, Libertarians believe that people ought to work things out on their own through their voluntary dealings with one another. Libertarians call the outcomes of this process *spontaneous order*.

### Antagonism toward the State

While they harbor distrust of the collective wherever it manifests, libertarians are downright hostile to the State (libertarians tend to capitalize it), the government. They look upon the State as the biggest enemy to the free, voluntarist society they envision. They consider government--especially the federal government--as the most highly organized, relentless aggressor against the individual. And, libertarians contend, it doesn't matter all that much what form the government happens to take--dictatorial, democratic, they are more alike than different. They all want to manage peoples lives and subordinate individuals to what they have going, and over time they all have the marked tendency to want to do more and more of it.

Most libertarians want government, they aren't anarchists, but they want its powers to be very limited. Government would protect citizens from aggression by other countries and from individuals and groups within or beyond our boundaries. It would uphold the agreements people make with others and protect them against fraud. Beyond that, libertarians have a show-me attitude. To the extent possible, they want matters handled by people through voluntary dealings with one another. To libertarians it comes down to who makes the decisions about your life, you or the government. Their answer: you do."

I provide some suggested reading on libertarianism in the endnotes.<sup>1</sup>

### White Racism Rather Than Racial Nationalism

When I hear or read about racial nationalism, or people referring to themselves as racial nationalists, I think "White nationalism," "White nationalist" (with White capitalized to underscore that Jews are

most definitely not included in the concept of White). I think, "Jews bring us down," "blacks and Hispanics are poison in the well." I think, "For the sake of our race and our culture and the quality of our lives, and for our future survival and wellbeing, we need a separate White living space, or homeland, where we can live among our own in our own way, and within a political arrangement grounded in White racial principles."

If I'm on to the connotation of racial nationalism--or White nationalism--to the extent that white concern, commitment, and action is equated with it I see it as too narrow a self-definition. It leaves out a lot of concerned and active white people who are not best categorized as racial nationalists. And too, if racial, or White, nationalism becomes the generic term for the, call it, white movement, it could get across the idea that this outlook, this way of thinking about and engaging racial concerns, is *the* action, and if you want to get on board with us you need to align yourself with it. I view that as problematic, excluding and turning away white people who have much to contribute but who don't subscribe to a racial nationalist perspective. I prefer to view racial nationalism, White nationalism, as a subset of the larger phenomenon of *white racialism*, that is to say, one of a number of possible responses to white racial issues.

### Connections, Implications

I have been strongly influenced by libertarian ideas for twenty years or more, and for the last decade white racial concerns have been a significant part of my life both publicly--writing, university work--and in the way I have conducted my private life. As a way to shed light on the topic of this writing, I will provide examples of how my libertarian outlook has affected my engagement with white racial matters.

I'll begin with my book on white activist William Pierce, *The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds*, published in 2001.<sup>2</sup> What a wonderfully educative and formative experience writing this book was for me. But I couldn't connect personally with Dr. Pierce's total and unquestioning commitment to National Socialism, and I think my libertarian streak was a big part of that. National Socialism is just too collectivist, doctrinaire, top-down authoritarian, and hero-

worshipping for me. All those sincere young men dressed alike marching along with shovels on their shoulders, not to my taste. Do your duty, play your assigned part, bees in beehive, no. Race is everything; it's major, Dr. Pierce helped me see that, but it isn't everything. National Socialism has all the answers; it was well worth my time to study it for the first time, but no, it doesn't have all the answers as far as I'm concerned. There is one good way to think and be; that's not true, there are all sorts of ways. It's all of us against all of them; for the first time I saw things in terms of a collective competition and struggle, but still, I can't bring myself to dehumanize and objectify masses of people enough to go to war, figuratively or literally, against any human aggregate, racial, ethnic, national, or religious. Jews are bad; I came to a realization, for the first time, of Jewish efforts to countermand white gentile cohesiveness and power, but Jews aren't all alike, and if I look at them one by one, the vast majority of them are good people and, on balance, their existence has enriched my life. Hitler was wonderful; it was enlightening for me to study Hitler and his ideas while writing *Fame*, but he had some very bad points, and in any case, he wasn't on a higher plane of existence than I am, and neither was/is anybody else. I'll respect people that deserve it, but I'm not fawning over anybody and I'm not on this earth to be in anybody's entourage, and I talk as well as listen, thank you. Libertarianism argues against equating white racialism with National Socialism (as some white racialists do), or with any other ideology, for that matter.

My second book dealing with race, *One Sheaf, One Vine: Racially Conscious White Americans Talk About Race*, published in 2004, reflects an individualistic, libertarian perspective.<sup>3</sup> The discourse in white racialism tends to be public, impersonal, what's going on in the world, which I think is fine, I'm not making either-or arguments here. *Sheaf* departs from that; in great part it is about the private, the personal. Unlike *Fame*, *Sheaf* is about everyday, anonymous individual white people and how they are doing in their lives and what their racial beliefs and commitments have to do with that. A tacit point of the book is that Pierce counts, public figures count, but so do these people, and really, just as much; we all matter, every one of us. *Sheaf* surfaces personal concerns such as feeling isolated and unsupported as a white person, living with the consequences of

racial discrimination in school admissions and employment because you are white, the fear of losing face with others and being dismissed from your job if you are racially conscious and active in the same way as members of other racial and ethnic groups, and being afraid to walk the streets in one's racially mixed neighborhood. To the question of how the world is doing, *Sheaf* adds the question of how we are doing, including you and I, and what needs to be done to make things better for us as racial beings, and as human beings generally. Libertarianism prompted this focus.

In my third book on race, in 2006, *Living White*,<sup>4</sup> a collection of previously-published short pieces, also focuses on the personal, individual dimension of the white racial issue, as have many of my more recent writings. An example of a more recent writing is "When They Attack," which offers suggestions for how to deal with the assaults leveled against racially committed white people.<sup>5</sup> Another example are the writings dealing with personal health, many of them for my web site.<sup>6</sup> If we are going to fight the battle to support our race we need to get in the best mental and physical health we can, and we need to recognize that we are mortal and that with regard to race and everything else, life comes down to what we are going to do with the time remaining to us on this earth. My writings have connected the very personal, very individual, needs to create love and peace and honor in our lives with racial concerns. Libertarianism has supported all of this.

In 2005, I published a book review in this journal on *The Conservative Bookshelf: Essential Works That Impact Today's Conservative Thinkers* by Chilton Williamson, Jr.<sup>7</sup> Toward the end of the review, I offered these remarks, which I suspect will make more sense in the context of this paper than they did to the readers of the review at that time.

*The Conservative Bookshelf* got me thinking more about where the individual fits into conservatism. Williamson's presentation focused on the collective: religion, culture, ideas, public issues, what it is all about, what we are, what we do, what we should do. Where does that leave me? I ask myself--this mortal, finite, human being sitting here in front of a computer screen? And where does it leave you, the person reading this right now?

It has been important to me to have encountered the writings of people--[libertarians] Frank Chodorov, Murray Rothbard, and Frank Meyer come to mind--who, at least at one point, in the 1950s and '60s, were associated with conservatism but who focused on the individual rather than the collective. These three weren't writing about abstractions—Western man, conservative ideology, God's rules, and the like. They were writing about me, the one trying to put a good life together in Burlington, Vermont. They didn't write about my obligation to align with some pre-ordained plan. They wrote about how free I am, and how capable, to manifest the person I really am beneath all the conditioning I've undergone in my life.

I consider it healthy for me to have engaged both the collective-focused visions of writers [that Williamson discusses] such as William Buckley and the individual-focused visions of these writers I've just mentioned. Meyer wrote about fusing the collective- and individual-centered visions. I prefer to allow them to remain separate and to clash and compete and come together and fall apart within my mind as I confront the choices and take the actions that comprise my life.

Williamson includes the [libertarian] economist Friedrich Hayek and his arguments for a free enterprise economy, which emphasizes personal freedom, and the [libertarian educational and social critic] Albert Jay Nock book has a more iconoclastic approach than the others, but Williamson doesn't include books by the Rothbard-Chodorov-Meyer sort. That's his call, and, indeed, these writers don't fit into the paleoconservative frame of this book. These years, they'd be classified as libertarians; them, not us, to conservatives of whatever stripe. I'm just saying that if all I take in is about the big picture and my duty to carry on this pattern or way or to abide by something or another or defer to whatever or whomever, I feel hemmed in and get edgy. I admire [conservative theorist] Russell Kirk immensely and have profited greatly from his writings. But at the same time I picture him as a pudgy guy in a dark suit with a vest sitting at the head of the dinner table, and that's just not me.

I care about the destiny of the West, I really do, but the truth of it is I spend most of my time thinking about friendship, love, sex, pleasure, honest expression, my mental and physical health, and finding a rewarding way to get through my day-to-day activities. And the truth of it is I'm going to attend to people whose work or life example informs

these concerns. So tonight I'm not going to read *From Union to Empire* [by conservative historian Clyde Wilson]. I'm going to pick up where I left off in a biography of the French film director Francois Truffaut and watch a DVD of his film "Jules and Jim." And, if there's time, I going to start Simone de Beauvoir's account of Sartré's last years, *Adieux*.

All to say, I don't equate white racialism with right-of-center political and social ideologies. I have the concern that the white racial movement has done just that, and in the process limited itself and turned away many people who might have joined the cause. Taking libertarianism into account could help shed light on this issue.

My libertarian impulses support the general conclusion that people come in all shapes and sizes, and that there are many valid ways to be a human being. This general point applies to concepts of masculinity and femininity. I was asked by an editor to write a review a couple of years ago for a newsletter of *The Occidental Quarterly* on the book *Real Men: Ten Courageous Americans To Know and Admire* by R. Cort Kirkland.<sup>8</sup> As it turned out, the review was never published in that venue.<sup>9</sup>

*Real Men* is made up of profiles of ten men from the American past that Kirkland considers to be real men: "I picked the men profiled in these pages by asking two questions: What kind of men do I want my sons to become? What kind of men do I want my daughters to marry?" He notes these ten men possessed "bravery, tenacity, rectitude, loyalty, faith, chivalry, obedience to God and just authority, and devotion to duty." They "embodied the traditional Christian conception of manhood defined in chivalry. They were honorable and honest, generous to varying degrees to foes, and solicitous and protective of women, children and animals. They did not brook insults, and they understood that some things were worth dying for. They had guts."

Indeed, this kind of man sounds admirable. But at the same time, I have the concern that the white racial movement is too locked into a particular conception of what it means to be, well, anything, including a man. This is some of what I wrote in the review, and again I have the sense that it will be more understandable if not acceptable in this context than it was to the editor that rejected it at the time it was written.

As I read Kirkland's profiles, I thought about what all this was saying about my father, slight of build, manicured, deferring, who ten hours a day, six days a week, stood on his feet with his arms raised cutting people's hair, his shoulders throbbing as he got older, and rode the bus home every evening to be with my mother and me. And while there were repeated references to the ideal of a "Christian gentlemen," I couldn't pick up the difference between a Christian gentleman and just a gentleman, and I wondered about what this book was saying about me, a non-Christian.

Kirkland's contrast between rough-and-ready, head-of-the-table real men and today's metrosexual softies plays well, but he offers a simplistic and inaccurate characterization of the manliness of contemporary men based on a few media images. Indeed, boys, and men as well, should consider these ten lives, but not with the uncritical adulation reflected here. Rather, they should carefully analyze and assess these men, and think through how what these men represent fits with who they are and their particular circumstance. And they should take into account the orientation and biases reflected in the list ([fighter pilot POW in Vietnam] Rocky Versace and not anti-war activist Tom Hayden, [pro football coach] Vince Lombardi and not [homosexual] playwright Tennessee Williams).

If we are going to talk about real men, we're going have to talk about real lives, right here and now, yours and mine. You're 34, selling insurance for Aetna, dealing with hate stares from your ex-wife and her new husband when you pick up your daughter on visitation days, a thyroid condition is sapping your energy, and deep in your heart you think Christianity is Semitic voodoo. You're never going to be a Swamp Fox [the nickname of Francis Marion, an army officer during the Revolutionary war and one of the book's real men] or a Christian gentleman. But you can try your best given the hand you've been dealt in life to do the honorable thing, day after day, year after year, win some, lose some, whether or not anybody ever acknowledges it, until the day you die. And if you do that, for my money you are a real man.

The tendency to look at the world through a traditional conservative perspective to the exclusion of other outlooks, and, I offer, to live in a world of abstractions rather than life as actually lived, leads too many white racialists to think that a "ride 'em

cowboy" man is the only way to be a real man. If you try on other perspectives for size, libertarianism being one of them, and get down to earth and look at actual men, it stretches the range of what is worthy and acceptable in healthy ways. One of the problems with white racialism is that it is a turnoff to women. Part of that aversion is their view that the white movement is a bunch of posturing, loud talking men locked into an outdated concept of masculinity and, by extrapolation, femininity, the kind who can be seen drinking alone at the Sheraton. Contemporary women don't want to be the woman these men seem to want, and even more fundamentally, they don't want to be around this kind of man, period. The result is that white racialism is for all practical purposes a stag party. Libertarianism might help free that up.

Another writing I submitted, in 2008, to *The Occidental Quarterly* that was never published is an essay/review of the book *Gay Artists in Modern American Culture: An Imagined Conspiracy* by Michael S. Sherry.<sup>10</sup> The Sherry book was a way for me to address the issue of white racialism's posture toward gays. Basically, I haven't been able to get with the anti-gay sentiment pervading the movement, and I believe my individualistic, libertarian take on things has a lot to do with that. From this writing:

What to the following individuals have in common? Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Franz Schubert, Gustav Mahler, Henry James, George Santayana, Walt Whitman, John Cheever, Oscar Wilde, W.H. Auden, F. O. Matthiessen, Jack Kerouac, Rudolf Nureyev, Tennessee Williams, Gore Vidal, Cole Porter, Ian McClellan, George Frideric Handel, Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky, Samuel Barber, Thornton Wilder, Dirk Bogarde, Edward Albee, Jasper Johns, Paul Bowles, Truman Capote, Montgomery Clift, Eudora Welty, Carson McCullers, Hart Crane, Herman Melville, James Dean, Merce Cunningham, Paul Taylor, John Cage, Ned Rorem, Andy Warhol, Christopher Isherwood, Jean Genet, Johannes Brahms, Van Cliburn, Franco Zeffirelli, Hubert Selby, Anthony Perkins, Robert Mapplethorpe, Terrance McNally, and William Inge.

All of them were or are artists, and as far as I know, they are all white gentiles of European heritage. And all of them are reputed to be other than strictly heterosexual in orientation. (Disclosure: I'm heterosexual).

Increasingly over the last few years, and without doing it

consciously, I have engaged the work of gay artists and attended to their life examples. I feel I have been uplifted by this encounter and that I am better off, both personally and professionally, for the experience. . . . I'll draw from Sherry's book to list five things that draw me to gay art, and discuss their significance with reference to white racialism. . . .

The quality of the art. Look over the names—Michelangelo, da Vinci, Henry James, and on through the list. They represent some great art, and simply, I don't want to die without experiencing at least a fair sampling of it. . . . I don't want any movement I'm associated with denigrating the artistic accomplishments of people because of their sexual orientation and concerns about their political and cultural directions and thereby discouraging people from experiencing them, and I worry that white racialism does that.

The insights I gain from it. Sherry quotes social scientist Donald Webster Cory, who argues that as outsiders gays “see this stream of humanity, its morals and mores, its values and goals, its assumptions and concepts, from without.” Often those on the margin bring a fresh, call it anthropological, perspective to the ways and possibilities of a culture. Tennessee Williams has said that the cruelty and hurt gays experience results in greater sensitivity, and prompts them to look deeper into themselves and the human spirit. In recent months I have been immersed in the films of the Japanese director referred to above, Yasujiro Ozu. And yes, I think I can love my Western heritage and my race without closing myself off to the art and wisdom of other peoples.

The late Revilo P. Oliver, a classics professor at the University of Illinois and a prominent and highly respected defender of the Western heritage and white racist, wrote of the need to be “a man who is willing to learn from the accumulated experience of mankind.” “He must strive,” Oliver asserted, “to observe dispassionately and objectively, and he must reason from his observations with full awareness of the limitations of reason. And he must, above all, have the courage to confront the unpleasant realities of human nature and the world in which we live.” It is not just Western heterosexuals that can help us confront the realities of our nature and the world in which we live.

It brings me back to the reality of my life. Recently, I watched an interview with the French director Bruno Dumont (“Humanite,” “Twenty-nine Palms”) that was on a DVD of one of his films. From Dumont's films, I pick up that he is gay.

The interviewer asked Dumont what matters to him in his life. Dumont answered that making good films matters greatly to him—he gives his all to his work—but still, what matters most of all to him, Dumont said, is his own existence.

In gay art there is an emphasis on the private, the personal, and I have found that to be, for me, a healthy counterbalance to the public, impersonal thrust of the white racial movement. The writings, the discourse generally, in white racialism is predominantly about it, the fate of the West or the white race, immigration, government policy, what they said and did over there, and that is all fine and good. But at the same time, it's rarely if ever about the person expressing whatever it is, or about you and me, how we are doing.

I read the contemporary novelist Chuck Palahniuk (*Fight Club*, *Choke*), whom I presume is gay. Palahniuk reflects a nihilistic perspective (nihilism is very much a part of the Western intellectual tradition). He deals with issues that confront people in their everyday lives like dealing with noise pollution, and the anger we feel about things in our world, and our desire for revenge. Palahniuk attacks rigid emotional restraint and foot-soldier loyalty to work and family and the State and the cause, whatever it happens to be. He writes about the body and sexuality, and about having fun. He writes about pissing in the soup of the big shots, the top dogs, the I'll-do-the-talking guys. Does this, in good part, come out of Palahniuk's sexuality, out of the fact that he has lived in a world that has said "get back," "get down," "not you" to people of his kind? My guess: yes, it does. Is this kind of irreverence a dimension of the Western heritage—yes, it is. . . .

It emphasizes sensitivity and expressiveness. I'm an introspective, artistic type of person and have drawn inspiration from the American painter Robert Henri (1865-1929), whom I believe was gay.<sup>11</sup> Henri exemplified and wrote about the artist's way, as he called it, where one's total life, including his vocation, is conducted artfully, from that impulse; or another way to say it, where one's life is one's art. I find Henri's formulations appealing generally, and that they fit me. . . .

A concern of mine is that white racialism equates acceptability, legitimacy, and morality with normality, with normality defined as being like the person doing the talking. Columnist Joseph Sobran is a superb writer. But still, nobody is above critique and criticism. I worry that some people get a

pass in the white racist movement, and that Sobran is one of them. In a 2003 column, he wrote about his kind of people, those who “aren’t easily bluffed” by gays. “When the abnormal claims to be normal,” Sobran informs us, “their instinct is to respond not with arguments but with jokes (“Did you hear the one about the straight Episcopal bishop?”). Even Stalin couldn’t stamp out gay people. More powerful than armies is a wisecrack whose time has come.” There’s a smugness and nastiness in some spokesmen for whites that is getting old for me. More, if we are perceived as smart-ass bigots we are going to stay on the periphery of American life.

Gay artists promote reflection and self-criticism. Self-analysis and self-criticism are not hallmarks of white racialism. Rather, it is more the idea that we know the truth—there’s no doubt about that. Our task is to get others to see things our way, the right way. Gay lives and creations shake up that certainty. They prompt us to think about the degree to which white racials link the wellbeing of Western culture and white people to certain immutable and unquestioned orthodoxies: with reference to religion, ideology, politics, sexuality and gender relations, art, lifestyle, work and leisure, and schooling. As for the philosophical perspective associated with this journal, is paleoconservatism overly collectivist, authoritarian, male-dominated, closed-minded, exclusionary, and intolerant of anybody who is different from its central spokesmen? The challenge, as I see it, is to calmly and maturely consider this question.

This would not have been written if I hadn't been influenced by libertarian ideas.

As for racial nationalism, or White nationalism (or White Nationalism, sometimes both words are capitalized), don't look for a lot of libertarians among its adherents. Last night in preparation for this writing I read an article by a racial nationalist that discussed what was going to happen "once a White Nationalist regime emerges," and bringing churches "into compliance with the new order."<sup>12</sup> "Regime" and "compliance" talk doesn't ring well with libertarians. A social and political arrangement grounded in freedom resonates better with libertarians than one grounded in race. Freedom includes freedom of conscience, deciding on truth and meaning for yourself and not having the State, or any group or

individual, impose an orthodoxy. It includes freedom of identity, deciding for yourself who you are, and resolving where race fits in to that is a big part of that process. Freedom includes freedom of association, which means white people would be allowed to live and work among their own. This is consistent with the libertarian commitment to spontaneous organization--let people be with whom they want and in the way they want. Libertarians are disposed to favor what the Founders of this country created, a constitutional republic with prescribed and limited government prerogatives. At its core, the America the Founders envisioned is an experiment in human freedom.

Libertarians cherish individual autonomy, integrity and dignity, which very much includes their own. They don't take well to deferring to what their betters have figured out they are supposed to be thinking and doing. Metaphorically, they decide for themselves what musical instruments to play, and they form their own bands, and they decide when and where and how to perform. They will respect you if you deserve it, but they won't look up to you or defer to you. If you come on as a big shot and know-it-all and drone on too long, they'll leave the room. They aren't strongly represented on the planning committees for awards dinners.<sup>13</sup> Libertarians may decide to be racially conscious and active, but it will be on their terms, or terms they work out with you, but it won't be on your terms alone. At least at this point, the racial nationalist orientation and its adherents don't line up well with libertarian ways of conducting life's business.

Libertarians can serve the cause of white racialism. They might be less zealous than some others, and less involved in organizational activity, and they may do things that seem out of alignment with the movement. Libertarian comes as close as any label to characterize me, so I'll use myself as an example. I've criticized paleoconservatism, focused on the personal dimension of white racial concerns, praised "soft" men, written favorably about gays, and walked out of the last conference of a white racial organization I attended and never came back. But still, I'm racially conscious and committed; one doesn't have to be an ex-libertarian to be that. There isn't just one best way to be racially involved. To the extent white racialists hold on to that notion they will remain marginal and ineffectual.

I'll close this writing with an excerpt from a paper I wrote a few weeks ago, *A Needed Paradigm Shift in Education*.<sup>14</sup> The main thrust was not about race, but it included this:

Today's political correctness [in schools and colleges] . . . can be understood as a campaign to diminish the power of white gentiles and keep them self-distaining, deferring, atomized isolated, unorganized, discredited, and disempowered, and with their own cooperation (which has been remarkably well achieved). . . . Instead of looking at political correctness' elements from the perspective of their impact on minorities as we are encouraged to do, assess them from the perspective of their effect on white gentiles; in every instance it is negative. White racism is really about white gentile racism--Jewish racism isn't the referent here. White gentile religion, Christianity is defamed. Racial integration and non-white immigration dilute European (gentile) power and solidarity. Feminism drives a wedge between white gentile women and their men and discourages childbearing (no white gentile population in the world is reproducing itself--literally, white gentiles are on the way to extinction). Multiculturalism de-Europeanizes, "de-WASPs" America. Diversity justifies discrimination against white gentiles in hiring, school admissions, and grants and contracts. This thrust discourages, demonizes, and suppresses positive white gentile consciousness, interests, leadership, organization, and collective action. In schools, white gentile children were taught the sins of their people, slavery, imperialism, the slaughter of the native peoples in America, the Holocaust, and to all but obsessively attend to and serve the interests of other peoples while having no concern for the status and fate of their own. An image that comes to mind: white gentiles cheering on the slaughter of their own in the film "Inglorious Basterds." Imagine a Jewish audience glorying in the depiction of the humiliation and murder of "bad Jews."

This excerpt wasn't so much motivated by white racial concern per se but rather a concern for individual human beings. I don't want to see anybody get messed over, whoever they are, whatever race they are, and I see white people getting messed over and I feel pushed from within me to do something about it, and I'm doing what I can given my capabilities and the possibilities in my current circumstance. Writing those words, I pictured individual white boys

and girls and young men and women in today's schools being used and hurt and kept back and pushed down. That's what went through my mind, and my libertarian bent had a great deal to do with it. And now the libertarian in me says to you: do whatever you do for whatever reasons you do it and I'll do the same, and let's see how things turn out.

## Endnotes

1. See: David Boaz, *Libertarianism: A Primer* (New York: The Free Press, 1997). David Boaz, editor, *The Libertarian Reader: Classic and Contemporary Writings from Lao-tzu to Milton Friedman* (New York: Free Press, 1997). Charles Murray, *What It Means to Be a Libertarian: A Personal Interpretation* (New York: Broadway Books, 1997). You can bet that at some time in their lives, probably in their youth, libertarians have read the writings of novelist Ayn Rand (her first name rhymes with fine). Her two major novels are, Ayn Rand *The Fountainhead* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1943); and Ayn Rand, *Atlas Shrugged* (New York: Random House, 1957). Late in her life, Rand wrote non-fiction to explicate her philosophy of Objectivism (she capitalized it). An example: Ayn Rand, *The Virtue of Selfishness: A New Concept of Egoism* (New York: New American Library, 1964).
2. Robert S. Griffin, *The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds: An Up-Close Portrait of White Nationalist William Pierce* (Bloomington, Indiana: 1stBooks Library, 2001).
3. Robert S. Griffin, *One Sheaf, One Vine: Racially Conscious White Americans Talk About Race* (Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse, 2004).
4. Robert S. Griffin, *Living White: Writings on Race, 2000-2005* (Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse, 2006).
5. See the home page of The Occidental Observer <http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net>
6. [www.robertsgriffin.com](http://www.robertsgriffin.com)
7. The review was published in *The Occidental Quarterly*, vol. 5, no. 2, Summer 2005.
8. R. Cort Kirkland, *Real Men: Ten Courageous Americans To Know and Admire* (Nashville: Cumberland House Publishing, 2006).
9. You can read it in the recent writings section of my web site. See note 6.
10. Michael S. Sherry, *Gay Artists in Modern American Culture: An*

*Imagined Conspiracy* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007). You can read it in the recent writings section of my web site. See note 6.

11. I wrote a thought on Henri for my web site entitled "Living the Artist's Way." See note 6.

12. Greg Johnson, "The Christian Question in White Nationalism," *The Occidental Observer*, May 14, 2010.

13. For an example of a libertarian, see the thought on my web site, "On Steve Ditko." See note 6.

14. It is in the recent writings section of my web site. See note 6.