

## Are White Racial Egalitarians Lying?

Robert S. Griffin

[www.robertsgriffin.com](http://www.robertsgriffin.com)

The lead article in the August 2011 issue of *American Renaissance* by Robert Greenberg, entitled "When Whites Lie to Blacks," decries whites that in our time "contradict plain reality" and expound a "parade of deliberate falsehoods" to and about blacks. Dr. Greenberg pulls not punches: "outrageous fabrications," "deliberate lying." The examples he cites to support his argument deal primarily with explanations for racial disparities between blacks and whites in academic capability and performance that support black-white parity. Whites are lying in these instances, asserts Dr. Greenberg. These people are straight out liars, Melinda Gates included, he writes.

In this same issue of AR, Jared Taylor, in "Response to Dr. Greenberg," while noting that he found the Greenberg essay "witty and insightful" and that he read it "with admiration," nevertheless takes exception with its major premise, that whites who espouse egalitarian line on whites and blacks are out-and-out lying. They are indeed propagating untruths, he agrees with Dr. Greenberg on that point, but that's not the same thing as lying, Mr. Taylor avers. If you believe what you are saying, contends Mr. Taylor, even if it isn't so, and even if it is mystifying to others that you don't see what is right in front your nose, you aren't lying.

If only [Dr. Greenberg] were right. If whites at least accepted facts, they might be willing to think about implications. . . . They spout foolishness because they believe foolishness. And that is why they are willing to destroy their country their own children will inherit.

Personally, I come down on the side of Mr. Taylor on this. To be sure, white lying goes on in this area, it's not totally unheard of, there are white race hustlers, they exist. I assume Mr. Taylor would agree with that. But my experience is that the great majority of whites who proclaim black and white equality on whatever it is really, truly believe what they are saying. The question is, why would somebody believe in, Mr. Taylor's term, foolishness. I'll offer some thoughts on that.

The generalization: To a great extent, what people believe is a function of the ideas that come into their awareness and what satisfies their basic needs. I'll explain.

A first point, what we know, or think we know, about reality comes from mediated rather than direct experience with it. We didn't just see, hear, touch, smell, and taste whatever is was and that's that. Someone, or some group, at some time or another and most likely repeatedly, told us what that reality is, including what to call it, and what it means, its significance. It could have been a teacher, or a book or a television show or a movie or a CD, or a journalist or a politician or an advocate for a cause, or a religious figure, or a family member or a friend. Too, an amorphous and pervasive conventional wisdom has interpreted reality for us, given us a frame of reference for discernment and assessment. Especially if all of that seems to be saying the same thing, most of us are going to buy what has come at us about blacks and whites in this case--who are we to stand up against all of that? Everything in the discourse of our time--the idea flow, the public and personal dialogue--says blacks and whites are equal. Skin color difference, which counts for nothing, yes, but that's it. Given that going on, if there is a one-standard deviation difference in IQ scores of blacks and whites, blacks lower, it should come as no surprise that someone would honestly attribute that fact to an invalid test.

A second point, the late psychologist Abraham Maslow was on to something. Maslow proffered that people have basic personal needs that compel satisfaction before anything else. These needs are survival, shelter, food, water, and clothing; physical and psychological safety and security; love and belonging, friendship, family, and sex; self-respect and approval and respect from others. In the main, people will go along with anything and anybody that satisfies these fundamental needs. Being on the side of racial egalitarianism in our time brings with it significant Maslow payoffs.

Putting these two points together and you have a theory of behavior and thought of sorts. Tell me the ideas that come into people's heads and the Maslow-related rewards and punishments in their contexts and I'm confident that I will be able to predict what they are going to do, at least the vast majority of them, and more, I will predict what they will profess. The human being is a very malleable creature. If it's Germany in the 1930s, they'll be

dedicated National Socialists. If it's China in the 1960s and '70s, they'll be in the Red Guard. If it's America in the '40s and '50s, they'll be rooting out Communists. And if it is America and Europe in our time, they'll be hunting down racists and haters. People say, "I'd never be a Nazi, not me." As Vladimir in the play "Waiting for Godot" replied to Estragon when he said he couldn't go on, "That's what you think."

And here's the kicker: They will be sincere about both what they think and what they do. People are intellectual herd creatures, conformists. They tend truly to believe what people in their world believe, whatever that is. Also, they believe in what they do, whatever that is. Maslow's point, getting the fundamental needs met is top priority; everything else is subordinated to it. If beliefs contradict behavior, people experience that as uncomfortable dissonance. Since Maslow servicing isn't going anywhere, they will change what they can change to get into equilibrium, their beliefs. And they'll do it automatically, with little or no reflection. They work at a university and start out suspecting that the biggest example of racism on campus is the diversity movement. It's in their Maslow interest to play ball with diversity and it's not too long before blatant racial discrimination against white people in school admissions starts looking good to them.

And one last point, these people will protect their congruence of thought and deed. How? Their first tactic, they will simply not attend to anything that threatens it. You have something to say about racial differences that doesn't square with the dogma? They don't hear you. You don't exist. A book gets published in which Arthur R. Jensen, professor emeritus of educational psychology at the University of California at Berkeley, holds that IQ is highly genetic, that race is a biological reality rather than a social construct, that genetic more than cultural differences cause the 15-point IQ difference between blacks and whites in the U.S., and that the failures of compensatory education for disadvantaged children need to include genetic explanations? It didn't happen. If you have ever tried to talk to one of these people about something that in their eyes might put them into tilt and gotten the slight-smile-I'm-not-in-the-room reaction, you know what I'm talking about. That said, if you are too visible or articulate or go on too long, while they are nice people and all, they'll be forced to shut you down: take away your microphone, trash you to people, turn you down for

tenure, relegate you to pariah status, get you fired from your job, somewhere in there. They really believe there has to be the end of you. They aren't lying about that.

Obviously there are exceptions to all of this, and good for them. I'm talking about people in general; and, scary, I think I'm talking about the vast majority of people. This is not the most upbeat view of human nature coming at you, I'll concede that.

With what I've just offered as a backdrop, I'll comment on Dr. Greenberg's first paragraph, which is:

Whites, usually but not always liberals, tell blacks brazen lies. This is not conventional deceit in which liars try to profit from cleverly hoodwinking listeners. Nor are whites cloaking harsh realities with kind euphemisms. Rather the mendacity is so bold and so unconcealed that the usual deterrent to lying--being exposed and punished as a fabricator--does not exist. All this open spewing of falsehoods is all the more remarkable because it occurs in a culture that, at least in principle, cherishes truth.

Now, my comments interspersed in italics.

Whites, usually but not always liberals, tell blacks brazen lies. *Untruths, but not brazen lies.* This is not conventional deceit in which liars try to profit from cleverly hoodwinking listeners. *They aren't trying to be clever or hoodwink anybody; however, even though in all likelihood they are not articulately aware of it, they are trying to profit from what they are doing (enhance their respect for themselves or others' respect for them; gain social approval and acceptance; promote their careers, and so on down the Maslow list.* Nor are whites cloaking harsh realities with kind euphemisms. *They aren't trying to sugar coat anything with euphemisms, because they think everything is hunky-dory, really.* Rather, the mendacity is so bold and so unconcealed that the usual deterrent to lying--being exposed and punished as a fabricator--does not exist. *Who exactly is going to expose them as a fabricator that would make the least bit of difference to their lives? Robert Greenberg? Jared Taylor? Robert S. Griffin? Please.* All this open spewing of falsehoods is all the more remarkable because it occurs in a culture that,

at least in principle, cherishes truth. *As a matter of fact, truth takes a backseat to other values in most every culture. In my world, the university, social justice is a higher priority than truth; in sports, winning is; in business, profit is; in the entertainment industry, celebrity is, and so on.*

To close, I note that *racial realism* and *racial realist* are part of the current white racial discourse. From the perspective of this writing, that's a good thing, because reality is major ally of ours. This focus on what is real, this self-definition, prompts us to stay referenced in the actual, something our adversaries want very much to stay away from; and it encourages those willing to hear our message or be guided by our example to do the same. Taking the time to look hard at whether somebody is lying rather than doing something else is a part of that.