



The Black Lives Matter thugs, Antifa marauders, and establishment bad-mouthers didn't spring up from nowhere. What we are so painfully experiencing is a continuation, and escalation, of what's been going on for decades. In 2009, eleven years ago—and it could have been written years before that—with a focus on elementary and secondary schooling, I wrote this (I've added some present-day parenthetical inserts):<sup>1</sup>

We need to put forth a positive narrative of the white race to counter the negative one being imposed on our children. The late scholar Neil Postman wrote that a narrative

**tells of origins and envisions a future; it is a story that constructs ideals, prescribes rules of conduct, provides a source of authority, and, above all, gives a sense of continuity and purpose.**<sup>2</sup>

The narrative, the story, of whites being preached to our children these years is one in which the themes are not the truly remarkable accomplishments of whites but rather repression and injustice: racism, sexism, economic and political exploitation, arrogance, and exclusion. The late critic and novelist Susan Sontag, honored far and wide and a regular on the commencement speech circuit, proclaimed, “The white race is the cancer of human history.” Especially villainous in the story are white men, or, in the parlance of the day, white males—insensitive, boorish, authoritarian, violent.

The challenge facing humankind, the current narrative has it, is to put whites in their proper place, which, depending on the version of story being told, is either on a par and mixed in with everybody else or chastened and deferential at the back of the line. Absurdly, whites are being charged with bringing themselves down; and even more absurdly, many are taking on the task. Is there any other group of people—blacks, Jews, anybody—you could con into self-abnegation and turning on their kinsmen?

White young people are taught the contradictory beliefs that 1) race doesn't exist—it is a social fiction, 2) race does exist but doesn't matter, and 3) race exists and matters, and for them their race is something to feel guilty about and atone. Decades of teaching college students and I never heard one of them point out the irrationality of that package of assertions. Though I don't want to conclude that it got by all of them; white students know to keep their mouths shut, even with someone like me who has the appearance at least of being on their side. In any case, they got the basic idea, and I believe great numbers took it to heart: they have no business feeling one iota of positive connection with their race, their European heritage, or one another.

What's going on in our schools is nothing less than a subtle genocidal attack against a race of people. The first step in this pogrom is to get white children and only them—no one else is taught this—to reject, even disdain, their racial identity.

Prominent [educator Herbert Kohl](#) reflects widely held views in the field of education when he writes about a university class he instructed in which he sought to “level the playing field” by teaching white students that their culture is “no more permanent or special than other cultures.”<sup>3</sup>

Kohl says he discouraged whites from seeing themselves as separate and distinct or feeling pride in being white. His lessons—coming after years of similar ones in many other classrooms and in countless movie theaters and on countless television screens—bore fruit: he reports with obvious satisfaction that his white students said they “hated being called white” and were “annoyed” and “angry” that they are white. Kohl is Jewish; would he have been as proud of getting Jewish students to say they were annoyed and angry that they are Jewish?

White students need to hear another story, another narrative, about their race. They need to hear of their adventurous and visionary and daring and spiritual ancestors—farmers, warriors, philosophers,

poets, scientists, architects, civilization builders. To be sure, white history isn't an unblemished record, but the main thrust of the white race isn't the tale of oppression being imposed on us.

Last weekend, I was sitting with a friend at the lake front in Burlington, Vermont. There were hundreds of people around where we were—parents and children, young couples, older people. There was a gentility, a peaceful flow, a grace, to the people and the setting. It was safe where we were. I remarked to my friend how impressed I was with the architecture in the lake front area and in the downtown stores and offices just behind us, and how everything was kept up so well. After a time of silence, she said, “You know what I'm thinking? Everybody here is white. This is what they built, this is what they created; this is how they live when they are among their own.”

Young white people—all white people—have a right to acknowledge the worth as their race, and to be proud of it, and to feel connected to it, and to feel responsible for continuing and extending its best aspects. A white narrative needs to include the reality that this way of life is threatened. There are fewer and fewer Burlingtons now days (and how long will Burlington be Burlington?) and more and more Detroits and Londons and Cincinnati's. My hometown of Minneapolis, a lovely, safe city of lakes when I was growing up, has gone through drastic demographic changes and, predictably, much of it isn't lovely and safe any longer. It has come to be called—I find this so sad—“Murderapolis.” [Unemployed, ex-con, drug-using, bad-check-passing, arrest-resisting, and future-mural-idol George Floyd graced the city with his presence after leaving his young daughter and her mother in Houston.] It goes unreported, but white people everywhere are under siege and fleeing—it's disdainfully called “white flight” by people who live in gated communities.

My book *One Sheaf, One Vine* is made up of the personal statements about race from seventeen everyday white Americans, who if it hadn't been for my book would be publicly silent [just as, to a

remarkable degree, everyday white Americans have been publicly silent throughout this recent post-Floyd rampage].<sup>4</sup> Those who control the public discourse don't want us to hear from them, and anyone, like me, who makes them visible is subject to attack. Hear from two of the white people who speak out in my book:

The first is a forty-year-old man from the northeastern part of the United States.

**People who think of themselves as enlightened and on the moral high ground in matters of race write off people like me as ignorant racists. Unlike them, so it goes, we pre-judge people. If only we were exposed to racial and ethnic diversity we would learn to value different kinds of people—etcetera, etcetera, you've heard the line. You'll notice that most of these people doing the pontificating and finger pointing about racial equality and harmony and the virtues of integration and multi-racialism do it from the far distance of the leafy suburbs or a university campus somewhere. The fact of the matter is that, unlike practically all of them, I have lived up close with the reality of race in America. And regardless of what they might like to think, I am not stupid or unenlightened or their moral inferior. Those who look down their noses at people like me should come live for a year or two or three where my family and millions of other white families live. Let their children grow up and go to school in this pigsty and be threatened and attacked and robbed and raped. Then they can talk.**

The second is a twenty-eight-year-old woman who is leaving southern California for Washington State or Oregon, or perhaps

Canada, she's not sure, in the face of the non-white infusion of the area in which she lives:

**I just want to live a normal life, preferably with a family, but if I can't have that, a life with good friends in a community where I feel safe and I'm free to walk down the street without looking over my shoulder. I want to be able to express pride in my people and admiration for our white ancestors and continue their traditions without minority harassment and interference. When I am really old, I want to live in peace instead of like the old people in the neighborhood where I live who are eighty-ninety years old without the energy or the money to escape.**

This is going on, and our children are hearing their race and heritage denigrated in schools, and they are being deluged with crude and vulgar messages and images from the lowest rung of black culture, and they are the victims of racial discrimination when they apply for college or a job, and demographically their race is steadily disappearing from the face of the earth.

I received an e-mail yesterday from a father who told me that his daughter, who had worked incredibly hard in school and had graduated at the top of her high school class, had been rejected by all the Ivy League schools she had applied to while many of her black classmates with far lower academic achievements and test scores had been admitted. He said his daughter "cried and cried."

After reading what this father wrote, I cried and cried. A new narrative should include this white girl, along the invitation to white people to expel their sense of isolation, their feeling of separation from one another, their atomization, and join with their racial kinsmen to put a stop to this injustice and cruelty. Doing that isn't about being against anyone or hurting anyone. Rather, it is about

racial self-love and self-preservation and self-determination, which are the rights of every race of people.

• • •

The campaign against whites sets up a demonic category—white—and puts every last white person in it, whether they be from Silicon Valley or rural West Virginia, are a janitor or corporate head, old or young, liberal or conservative, or from the distant past or alive now. They are all the same, and they are all bad, bad, bad.

What does that accomplish?

It replaces reality with a narrative. What white people actually did, or do, or are—the incredible complexity of that—becomes a simple, and negative, story. Now, the basis of truth isn't facts or logical inference; it is the story. All you need to keep the story going is a single instance that seems to affirm it. A police-related death in Minneapolis—ah yes, the story is true.

It makes the grievances of blacks, thirteen percent of America's population, *the* national agenda. It makes a group of people all-important who on their merits deserve little or no attention until they get their acts together. It gives people unearned respect. It relieves blacks of personal responsibility, a basic tenant of this culture and society,

And frighteningly, ominously, as it did with the Jews and the Albanians, it sets whites up for being debased, abused, taken down, robbed, assaulted, and killed. Narratives are deadly serious business.

• • •

Part of exploiting, injuring, and displacing people is to keep them from thinking about what you don't want them thinking about. Stories keep concerns, questions, issues, and possibilities out of

peoples' minds. To illustrate, here are a couple of white people who at one time were prominent in American life who have been excised from the past—David Starr Jordan and Lyrl Clark Van Hyning. Those currently in power don't want us to know about Dr. Jordan and Ms. Van Hyning because if we did, we might be prompted to think about things they don't want us getting into. As you read through these accounts of the lives of these two people, think about what that might be.

• • •

David Starr Jordan (1851–1931) was a distinguished naturalist and social philosopher, published poet, and the first president of Stanford University. He was described by his biographer as "one of the most versatile men America has produced, winning distinction not only as an educator, philosopher, and scientist but also as an explorer, crusader for peace, advisor to presidents, and statesman."<sup>5</sup>

Jordan was openly and proudly racially conscious. He used the term "Aryan" and asserted that the "whole body of the 'blond race'" constituted a brotherhood. He held that race was "the blood of a nation" and the primary determinant in its history.

Jordan's believed white racial superiority to be the observation of every intelligent person. Jordan asserted that northern European peoples have the highest level of the qualities needed to produce a superior society and culture. Very important to Jordan, Nordics *didn't* have what was most detrimental to civilization building: a high percentage of dissolute and disorganized. He cautioned that even the most favorable surroundings "can never change a bad breed into a good one."

Jordan saw America as a Nordic nation: "Its freedom was won and its integrity maintained by Nordic methods," he wrote. "Who gave them this chance?" he asked. "Did they not take it for themselves? They have had liberty, education, and self-government because they wanted these things and wanted them badly enough to put forth the effort to get them."

Jordan despaired of the introduction of Africans into the country and the prospect of racial intermixing. He decried the immigration of "weaker groups" being fostered during his time by industrialists in search of cheap labor.

He prophesized that unless Jewish power in the world was held in check the result would be "nothing less than Armageddon."

Jordan opposed war as an instrument of public policy. He pointed out that in the American Civil War half of the best young men in the South were killed or died of disease, and that forty percent of them did not leave descendants. Jordan noted that wars breed hatred, resentment, grievance, and the desire for revenge, which lead to future wars and even more slaughter and devastation. He repudiated the contention you must fight fire with fire. "Fire will not put out fire," he warned.

Along with many prominent people of his time—among them, John Harvey Kellogg of breakfast cereal fame, naturalist Luther Burbank, and Harvard president, Charles Eliot—Jordan was a eugenicist. "A race of men or a herd of cattle are governed by the same laws of selection," he wrote. He condemned social policies impelled by paternalism and charity that result in racial deterioration by encouraging "weakness to mate with weakness."

• • •

Lyrl Clark Van Hyning (1892–1973) was a leader of a women's movement in the late 1930s and early '40s that centered its efforts on opposing America's involvement in the war in Europe.<sup>6</sup> At its peak, the confederation of women's groups that conducted this campaign had six million members. Although Van Hyning saw herself as a champion of women, she stood in stark contrast to today's feminists. Her politics were right-of-center. She was highly nationalistic, patriotic, anti-communist, and critical of Jewish influence, and pro-free-enterprise. Her orientation was, in the first instance, maternal: she saw herself as a mother and approached things from that perspective. Only mothers, she believed, could

save their sons from the war that was impending and then waged. She upheld the traditional family, which included a strong and vital patriarchal presence. She didn't set herself off against men: her husband and son and other men, weren't "them" to her but rather "us." She didn't portray men as competitors or adversaries, or see them as needing to be held in check or reconditioned. Last, she was a strong Christian. A few weeks before the invasion of Europe that everyone knew was coming soon, she declared: "Those boys who will be forced to throw their young flesh against the impregnable wall of steel are the same babies mothers cherished and comforted and brought to manhood. Mother's kiss healed all hurts of childhood. But on invasion day no kiss can heal the terrible hurts and mother won't be there. Mothers have betrayed their sons to the butchers."

• • •

What might these two lives bring up among white people, particularly young whites, that those in power want to suppress?

- The possibility of white racial consciousness and commitment. That's for other people—in fact, all other people—but not for whites.
- The possibility that, in fact, there are qualitative differences among the races. What if instead of looking down our noses and blotting out figures like Thomas Jefferson, Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson as ignorant racists, case closed, we said, "We would do well to look into why people as capable and accomplished as these men thought about race at they did."
- That America was founded as a Nordic nation and would have been better off staying that way. And that now, Nordic people should have the right to live their way among their own.

- That everybody who is concerned about the Jewish impact on America isn't a lunatic bent on exterminating them. That there is the possibility of considering this issue rationally, dispassionately, and objectively.
- That woman's issues are not the sole province of the political left and its perspective. There was a women's movement—with six million members!—that demonstrated that.
- That war isn't simply a necessary evil, including the beloved World War II, which resulted in 50 million deaths in Europe alone. Those in power back then loved it when Iowa farm boys set down their plows and sailed across the ocean to anonymously kill European boys who looked just like them. And they loved it that the boys' mothers went along with it. As a very small child in the early '40s, I remember seeing small stars on pieces of cloth tacked on to front doors of houses. I have since learned that a blue star represented a family member in the military and a gold star a family member who had been killed in the war. The Sullivan family made the news for having five gold stars for the five Sullivan brothers who lost their lives in the war. I don't know how the mother of the Sullivan boys thought about the war, but Lyrl Clark Van Hyning, the mother of a boy, wasn't having any part of that government program of destruction and slaughter. The thought of Lyrl Clark Van Hyning's example crossing the minds of mothers sends shivers down the spine of those who want a ready supply of young bodies for the next killing spree in the Middle East.

• • •

What can be done to compete with the prevailing negative narrative about white people? I'll offer some thoughts in response to that question.

To begin, a sobering reality. The wicked-whites story tellers dominate the main stage in America (and throughout the West, but America is the focus of this writing). With very few exceptions—Pat Buchanan? Tucker Carlson? who else?—everybody doing the

talking, broadly defined, front and center in this country is to one extent or another pushing the negative narrative about whites. I'm referring to mainstream news and entertainment personalities, educators at all levels, politicians in the middle of the spectrum (which means both the Democrats and Republicans), the clergy, the publishing industry, and every reputable interest group. All of them are shooting paint balls at whites—splat! Unless it can be done very discretely, breaking into that that action—at least in the short run—looks really tough to me.

As I wrote the “Unless it can be done very discretely” lead-in to the last sentence, I thought of something William Pierce, a prominent white advocate who was shut out of mainstream discourse, said to me. “How does Tom Wolfe [the novelist, *The Bonfire of the Vanities*, *A Man in Full*, *Back to Blood*] get away with it? He's worse [more pro-white] than I am.” I was writing a book about Pierce and didn't think it was my place to say it, but I thought, “Because Wolfe's slicker than you are. If you are going to be heard by anybody besides fringe types, you are going to have to be really slick like Wolfe.”

In this same sentence, note the other qualifying phrase: *at least in the short run.*” That underscores that there is a long run, and that it is a very important reality to take into account.

Decades ago—forty, even fifty, years ago—young people on the political left who wanted to change this country in directions they favored took it upon themselves to get in positions where they'd be able to do it. I'm thinking of Bill and Hillary Clinton and student activist Todd Gitlin and scholar Stephen Jay Gould and filmmaker Steven Spielberg and countless others like them who over time—it took the span of their careers—gained control of the core institutions in American life: politics, universities, the media, publishing. They ran for public office. They became university professors. They shaped the news and commentary in both print and electronic media. They created and produced television shows and movies and published books and magazines.

They came to control entry into their fields. Don't expect to get hired as a university professor unless these people, or those they brought on board, approve of your ideas (at least what they know about them—back to the need to be slick). Don't expect to make a movie or television show they don't like, or get a book or article in print if it runs up against their commitments (I can speak from personal experience about this one).

Decade after decade, they indoctrinated and politicized the young people who enrolled in their classes and watched their shows and listened to their speeches (re: Bernie Sanders), until it came to a point that Teddy Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson became villains in society's drama.

It should be noted that not every one of these left-leaning young people of the '60s and '70s stayed left throughout the course of their career. I'm thinking in particular of one young person from Wisconsin who forty years ago embarked on an academic career who didn't.

Some context before continuing with his story: Books by university faculty rarely make any difference to anybody but the person who writes one—namely, they pave the way to his permanent status in the university (tenure) and promotion up the ranks to full professor. The book gets published, university libraries buy a copy for their collection (the profit to the publisher), the author's mother buys one (and puts in her bookcase unread), and that's it. You could put twenty-dollar bills in academic books and be very sure you'd be able to retrieve them from the pristine books five years later.

Every once in a great while, however, there's an exception to that pattern. A prime example, in the 1980s, a book about university education, *Closing of the American Mind*, by a philosophy professor at the University of Chicago, Allan Bloom, became a surprise best-seller. Stephen Jay Gould, mentioned above, a university professor who argued (he has passed on) a nurture-over-nature take on human evolution, wrote books that were read by the general public.

Back to the story of the young left-leaning person from Wisconsin. He got his Ph.D in psychology and embarked on a career as a professor at the California State University, Long Beach, rising to the highest rank of full professor. Between 1994 and 1998, he wrote three books about the impact throughout history of Jewish individuals and organizations on gentile life.<sup>7</sup> The experience of writing the books changed his outlook; he shifted to the right politically. His three books had the formidable look of the usual academic book: lots of pages, small print, and voluminous footnotes. It would have been understandable if his mother had bought the first one and taken a pass on the last two.

But the darnedest thing happened: the three books hit big, especially the last one, *The Culture or Critique*. All three asserted that Jews have been adversarial and detrimental to gentile cultures, societies, and political arrangements. That message ran head on into the party line of the academics who do the talking about Jews, and they were highly put out and let that be known. His university colleagues came after him as an anti-Semite, which he wasn't. Witch hunters from the Jewish-dominated Southern Poverty Law Center descended on his campus. If his adversaries had had their way, he would have been fired from the university.

I'm reminded of how this same kind of thing went on from the opposite angle in German universities in the '30s dominated by National Socialist ideology, and how German academics in fear of losing their jobs—including the great philosopher Martin Heidegger—caved and told the inquisitors what they wanted to hear.<sup>8</sup> But to his great credit, this quiet, proud man from Wisconsin didn't cave: he stood tall and strong, and the notoriety of the attacks against him encouraged still more people, including me, to read his books.

Many of the readers of *The Occidental Observer* know I'm referring to its founder and editor, Kevin Macdonald. Kevin's trilogy, as well as his books and articles since, and his editorial work—imagine

keeping this complex site going day after day, week after week, month after month—have made the world a different place than it would have been if he hadn't embarked on his life-long journey so many years ago.

The point here is that if you are young, you can choose to do the same kind of thing Kevin did. The same *kind of thing*, not the same thing. Kevin is Kevin and you are you. He lived in his time; you will live in yours. But you can be inspired by Kevin—and yes, by the Clintons and Todd Gitlin and Stephen Jay Gould and all the rest of the people who changed the world, including the narrative about white people (unfortunately, they took it in a negative direction).

As the ancient Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu put it, the journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. The challenge is to comprehend how today's small step will someday get you a thousand miles. And keep in mind the destination doesn't have to be a university professorship or a powerful political or media slot. Any reputable position on the inside in public life—a doctor, a business owner, a skilled tradesman—can be the base for influencing the thoughts and actions that define your time and set the stage for the times ahead. The school board takes you more seriously, you have money to give to political campaigns—little things add up.

• • •

That's the long range. What can be done in the short range—today, tomorrow, this year—to change the anti-white narrative? Two things come to mind:

First, *don't yourself get sucked into the negative story about whites*. Earlier, I alluded to the problem of white people—particularly young—buying the villainy attributed to their race. It's understandable because it is the only story they hear, and they hear it over and over and over and over again from grade school through graduate school and beyond. I worked in a university and know how relentless the indoctrination is—every class in the social sciences,

humanities, education, and social services—bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. It stands to reason that many if not most students would take it in as gospel truth.

Practice critically analyzing the stories coming at you. In my last post on this site, I referred to developing what the novelist Ernest Hemingway called “a built-in, shockproof, shit detector.” Put a shit detector filter between you and the racial vitriol.

How do you do that? By doing two things they don’t want you to do:

Look hard at the facts, or lack of them, behind the story. What are three concrete examples of systemic racism? Name them. Did that knee on Floyd’s neck really asphyxiate him? Why haven’t they demonstrated with a volunteer that it cuts off air supply?

Employ reason and logic. Why is it you can predict with a very high level of certainty, anywhere in the world, what a place will be like if there is a critical mass of blacks there—a school, a community, a business, anything?

Come up with your own, positive, story to compete with the horror story you’re being told: “My people are artists and poets and pioneers and architects and composers and filmmakers and novelists and philosophers and scientists and business owners and internet designers and farmers and construction workers and mountain climbers and Little League coaches and loyal and loving parents and spouses, and I’m a good person and so are my parents and grandparents.”

And second, *become a regular consumer of a positive white narrative*. There was a time, and not all that long ago, when pro-white voices couldn’t be heard at all. There were only the three television networks—CBS, NBC, and ABC—and eight Hollywood movie studios, and a few New York publishing houses, and all of them were antagonistic toward white people. Now there is the internet, independent filmmaking, cable, and social media, and

white advocates are readily accessible, and many of them are top of the line.

Here are some internet examples of special note. I'm not a social media and podcast person, and I'm sure there are equally impressive things going on in those areas:

- Kevin and this site. Among TOO's fine contributors is Andrew Joyce, nobody better.
- Jared Taylor, a marvelous thinker and writer, and his American Renaissance site and the writers on his staff, including Gregory Hood. Jared has been at it for twenty years, an inspiration to us all.
- Greg Johnson, dedicated, and courageous—he's taken shots—and his site Counter-Currents.
- Peter Brimelow and his VDARE.com site. Peter has been at it for many years and prevailed amid numerous attempts to discredit and silence him, including one that's going on now.
- The Taki's Magazine site has first rate contributors, including Steve Sailer and Jim Goad. Goad is arguably the best prose stylist of any social/political commentator in America.
- Ron Unz at his Unz Review is doing great work.
- Andrew Anglin on his site The Daily Stormer crosses the line at times, but he is an exceedingly bright, perceptive, and entertaining young writer. Old as I am, I'm not in his target audience, but I'm a regular with him and better for it.

The quality of writing in this list is so high, the arguments so compelling, I have to believe that it is having, or in the near future will have, a significant impact on the dialogue and debate in this country. And to think that little of it existed just a few years ago. It is a very encouraging phenomenon.

Ideally, every white person would know about the sites and people I've just listed, as well as, I'm sure, others I'm not familiar with. Absolutely, the most informed, persuasive, and articulate voices are

on our side. Those skilled in getting the word out about their existence—through social media, however it is done, it's not a skill I possess—would do a great service if they took on that challenge.

I'd like to think that in the coming years the Republican Party in particular will pick up on the white advocacy message and popularize it. And that whites will leave the Democratic Party that despises them and join up with the Republicans. With all the talk of whites becoming a minority in this country, whites will continue to be by far the largest voting bloc, and frankly, the most capable. Coalesced, whites can be the dominant political force in the coming years.

The challenge for white advocates is to present their case in a way that mainstream politicians, academics, and others can make use of it without being shot down as white supremacists, neo-Nazis, and the rest of the litany of epithets. As I see it, the argument for white interests should not be framed in radical, extremist, rhetoric and imagery, as historically it has been. The argument for white people can, and should, be grounded in the core values, ideals, of America—freedom, fairness, and self-determination. There's nothing inherently extremist about white advocacy.

• • •

What can be done to counteract the negative racial message young people are getting from the schools and media? They need to hear the other side. One possibility is an internet site aimed at and operated by young white people that offers a counterbalance to the current indoctrination. I'm hopeful that it will appeal to whites from all social backgrounds.

That theme with me, the site I have in mind would *not* be a neo-Nazi repository. Selling Hitler and Himmler to the masses and equating white concerns with National Socialism in particular and the far right in general has a long and painful history of setting us up to be written off as wacko losers and cancelled hard and fast. White advocacy should be positioned as a centrist effort and presented as

non-controversially as possible. That is what is going to appeal to the most people, make entry into the mainstream of American life an easier row to hoe, and make us a more elusive target.

What's the content of the kind of site I'm talking about? I'm thinking of short biographies—Mozart, Lindbergh, Knut Hamsun, Rudyard Kipling. Accounts of events—the Alamo, Charles Martel, the Vikings. Excerpts from great fiction and nonfiction. Critiques of the diversity and multicultural propaganda. People to network with. Self-strengthening tips. Videos. Podcasts. Events. Suggestions of good books to read. Discussion forums. People of all ages could submit things to be approved by the young people who operate the site.

There will be the challenge to get the word out to every white high school and college student, that this site (or whatever it turns out to be) exists. But I am sure there are people who know how to do that effectively.

• • •

I've been attending to the nature and fate of white people for nearly twenty-five years. I've come to the conclusion that when all is said and done, white people come out on top. And that goes for those from working class backgrounds, who these days are having some issues with despair and drugs; I have faith that they'll come through, especially if they can be given a way to ascribe a positive meaning to their lives.

I go back to the years of the Black Panthers in the 1960s. They were much like today's Black Lives Matter activists—good at calling attention to themselves, posturing, threatening, media darlings. The problem for the Panthers, and I suspect it is true of the Black Lives Matters bunch, is they were incompetent (which is perhaps why they were so enamored with socialism, as is BLM). The Panthers were good at finger-pointing, but very bad at making anything productive happen. Businesses they set up failed. They failed in their personal lives.

The Antifa crowd is no better. Pull back the curtain and they are Wizards of Oz. I've read dire warnings that they are going to take their looting and burning act to the suburbs—oh, the menace! I publicly invite them to try that stunt. Those people in the suburbs are armed and bad-asses. The Antifa will scurry back to the basements of their parents' houses and not come out for days except to reheat some chili.

The true story favors us, and we're up against screw-ups and fakes. We've got work to do, but we'll be fine.

### Endnotes

1. Robert S. Griffin, "A Message in the In-Box," 2009, in the writings section of [www.robertsgriffin.com](http://www.robertsgriffin.com).
2. Neil Postman, *The End of Education* (Vintage, 1996) pp. 5-6.
3. See, Herbert Kohl, *The Discipline of Hope*, (Simon & Schuster) pp. 319-20.
4. Robert Griffin, *One Sheaf, One Vine* (1stBooks Library, 2004).
5. Edward McNeil Burns, *David Starr Jordan: Prophet of Freedom* (Stanford University Press, 1953).
6. See, Glen Jeansonne, *Women of the Far Right: The Mothers' Movement and World War II* (University of Chicago Press, 1997).
7. The three Kevin McDonald books, all published by Praeger: *A People That Dwell Alone* (1994); *Separation and Its Discontents* (1998); and *The Culture of Critique* (1998).
8. See, Adam Knowles, *Heidegger's Fascist Affinities: A Politics of Silence* (Stanford University Press, 2019.)

