

# ARE WHITES PATHOLOGICAL? YES AND NO

ROBERT S. GRIFFIN

---

In October of 2012, the editor of this journal, Kevin MacDonald, issued a call for papers for inclusion in an upcoming theme issue on White pathology. “Whatever blame for our situation that we place on others,” Professor MacDonald wrote, “the bottom line is that we are allowing the unfolding disaster to happen. It is unprecedented for a civilization to voluntarily cede political and cultural hegemony to others, particularly when so many of these people harbor hatreds and resentments toward our people and our culture.”<sup>1</sup> This writing is my response to that call.

Whether or not the kowtowing going on with Whites at the present time is unprecedented – it very well may be; I don’t know history well enough to make a determination on that – it is certainly a remarkable phenomenon. If it continues, it is social and cultural, and even demographic, suicide. I am pressed to think of another issue facing Whites that demands analysis, understanding, and action more than this one. Pathology, which to me has a disease connotation, doesn’t quite hit the mark for me as a label or metaphor for what’s happening. I am more comfortable with misguided, self-destructive or shortsighted, somewhere in there – I think we are closer to being dumb than sick – but pathology works well enough for my purposes in this writing to employ it along with other descriptors.

Professor MacDonald has himself made significant contributions to this investigation. He has pointed out two contributing factors to White pathology: individualism and the negative impact of Jewish elites:

There are doubtless a great many factors accounting for the general willingness of Whites to allow themselves to be pushed aside and to voluntarily become a minority amid a sea of non-Whites, most of whom hold historical grudges against them. My general view is that these cultural transformations are the result of a complex interaction between preexisting tendencies of Europeans toward individualism interacting with the rise of a Jewish elite hostile to the traditional peoples and culture of Europe.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Kevin MacDonald, “White pathology: Special issue of *The Occidental Quarterly*. *The Occidental Observer*, October 12, 2012.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2012/10/white-pathology/>

<sup>2</sup> Kevin MacDonald, “Whites’ lack of empathy for other Whites,” *The Occidental Observer*, April 28, 2010.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2010/04/kevin-macdonald-whites-lack-of-empathy-for-other-whites/>

Dr. MacDonald has also pointed out how Whites' attraction to moral universalism does them in:

While the West pursues its utopian fantasies with great moral fervor, the rest of the world continues as it has always been – except that they are now colonizing us. . . . Attempts at erecting utopias will ultimately result in huge psychological tension as people are expected to swear allegiance to universalist abstractions even as they see their neighborhoods invaded by non-Whites, even as their jobs are outsourced to foreign countries or taken away by immigrants, and even as they see the political and cultural power of their own group declining – in a word, displacement. In these circumstances, the more selfish and particularist emotions centered around family and ethnic group inevitably bubble to the surface to compete with the universalist abstractions. In the contemporary world these abstractions are being imposed on us by elites – including the Jewish component.<sup>3</sup>

While I hope it is not at the expense of appreciating the significance of collective realities, I must admit I am to a good extent characterized by the individualism that Dr. MacDonald has noted, and, indeed, I have been greatly influenced by Jewish intellectuals and artists, among them ones that inform this paper, the philosopher and novelist Ayn Rand and the developmental psychologist Abraham Maslow.<sup>4</sup> I get ideas wherever I can find them, and I don't *a priori* reject an idea based on the category of person that offers it. I'm not convinced that these tendencies are detrimental to me, but this is not the context to argue that issue, at least directly. Whether on balance they serve me, and others, well or not, I'll attempt here to put my dispositions in these directions to positive use. Namely, I'm going to approach this issue of White pathology – or masochism or stupidity, whatever to call it – from a Rand-influenced individualistic angle, and I'll draw heavily on Maslow's idea of a hierarchy of needs.

Ayn Rand (1906–1983) was a novelist and philosopher who focused on the individual human being rather than the group. She is best known for two novels written in the 1940s and '50s, *The Fountainhead* and *Atlas Shrugged*. The protagonists in the two books, Howard Roark and John Galt respectively, were heroic, self-expressive, prideful, purposeful, independent and productive individualists who forged their way in life amid their inferior opposites. Late in her life, Rand authored a series of essays outlining a philosophy she called Objectivism (she capitalized it) in which she set forth the moral

---

<sup>3</sup> Kevin MacDonald, "David Morris on the pathology of moral universalism," *The Occidental Observer*, July 27, 2010.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2010/07/kevin-macdonald-david-morris-on-the-pathology-of-moral-universalism/>

<sup>4</sup> Rand is best known for two novels published in the 1940s and '50s, *Atlas Shrugged* (New York: Plume Centennial Edition, 1999) and *The Fountainhead* (New York: Plume Reprint Edition, 1994). But for a quick introduction to her ideas I suggest her non-fiction collection, *The Virtue of Selfishness* (New York: Signet, 1964). For Maslow, I suggest *Toward a Psychology of Being* (Radford, VA: Wilder, 2011), originally published in 1954.

justification of a rigorously rational and selfish existence – self-ish, oriented toward self, in service to one’s own wellbeing.

The conventional thinking in White racial thought holds that Randian individualism atomizes White people, separates them from their racial kinsmen, and turns them inward, toward personal, private matters at the expense of a concern for the White race as a whole. Personally, I don’t see individualism and selfishness on the one hand and collectivism and altruism on the other as antithetical opposites. For me, both individual White people and the White race as a totality matter. It’s not one or the other, one above the other. My life counts, as does yours, and so does the life of every other White person, and so too does the White race count. We can concurrently attend to and serve both our own welfare and the welfare of our race. We don’t have to dichotomize these concerns, set them off against one another, value one over the other, do just one or the other. In fact, these perspectives and agendas can complement one another: an individualistic perspective can help us understand and deal with the collective reality, and vice versa; and we are likely to discover that the richer, healthier, more complete, more personally gratifying and happier, our own lives are, the more willing and able we are to serve our race as an entity. People who are active and effective publicly most often have their personal lives together.

I propose that White racial ideologies and philosophies that value and incorporate both collectivism and individualism in a dynamic interplay of the two will contribute to the wellbeing of both White persons and the White race better than if they are grounded in just one or the other orientation. That is, individualism doesn’t necessarily bring down the White race; to the contrary, it holds out the distinct possibility of building it up. Sometimes our adversaries have ideas and ways that we can employ to our advantage and this is one of them.<sup>5</sup>

Abraham Maslow (1908–1970) posited that there is a pattern to human motivations or needs that compel human thought and deed in a particular direction and in a particular order: first, there is the satisfaction of fundamental needs (prominent among them, safety, sustenance, sex, social acceptance and inclusion, and self-esteem); and then, once those needs, or at least desires, are satisfied people pursue a state of self-actualization, where they attempt to realize their full possibilities and, metaphorically, fly like a bird.

Self-actualization gets most of the attention in Maslow’s theory, but I look most closely at the bottom of the pyramid, as it were, at what’s going on with what might be viewed as lower or basic needs. That is because, whether we realize it or not, first and foremost, our first order of business as human beings, and the predominance of our time and energy – for the vast majority of us anyway, and I include myself in this group – is spent taking care of those needs. That is to say, particularly if under fifty years old, if people aren’t achieving a reasonable number of – what to call them – romantic interludes in their lives, getting that accomplished is going to be right up there at the top of today’s to-do list, and as a practical matter that can obscure their attention to the fate of the West.

---

<sup>5</sup> I argue the case for individualism in an article for this journal: “Libertarianism and Racial Nationalism – Or Better, White Racialism,” *The Occidental Quarterly* 16, no. 1 (Spring 2011), 87–103.

Most analyses and proposals around this White pathology issue grow out of what I'll call an aggregate perspective. By aggregate, I mean a focus on, well, the aggregate: on what is going on with Whites in general, as a whole; on what we are like as a collectivity; on what we, all of us together, are doing; on what's going to happen to us now and what it will be like for us up the line. That take on the issue, the approach common in philosophical, ideological, and social science inquiry, is solid, needed, and helpful. Absolutely keep it going. I want to underscore that; I'm not making either-or, better and worse, claims here. Rather, and it's the central point or thesis in this writing, I am pointing out that there is not just one reality about any matter, White pathology or any other. Rather, there are multiple realities that stem from multiple frames of reference, and it is enlightening and empowering to take this fact of life into account when attempting to make sense of any phenomenon and deciding on what to do about it.

While something may be very true about White pathology, something else can also be true, and what is also true may, on the face of it at least, appear contradictory to the first truth. We never will get to the total truth about anything, but the closer we get to it the more we see that what appear conflicting and competing dichotomies are in fact contrasting and complimentary polarities within a larger harmonious whole. What seems to be this *or* that is revealed to be this *and* that. The great Danish physicist Niels Bohr (who had a Jewish mother, by the way) pointed out, "There are two kinds of truth, small truth and great truth. You can recognize a small truth because its opposite is falsehood. The opposite of a great truth is another great truth."

I am not so presumptuous as to believe I'm establishing a great truth in this paper, but I am offering, I believe, a significant and important truth: that White behavior is at the same time both pathological and foolish and highly rational and sensible — that it is say, it is not one or the other, craziness or sanity, but both. And I'm saying that if we are to do something about improving Whites' state of being now and in the future we would do well to take this truth into account.

To get a handle on this truth, this reality, it helps to bring an individualistic, in contrast to aggregate, perspective to bear on the examination of White thought and deed and their consequences. So instead of looking at the White race as a whole and what it's doing, how it's doing, let's look at an individual White person and see where that takes us. (Here comes Rand.)

The individual I have in mind is not a specific person. He is an abstraction, drawn from young people I have encountered (I teach at a university) and from what I've read. Let's call him John Jones. John is characteristic, typical, representative — so even though the focus here is on an individual, there are sociological and psychological generalizations involved in drawing him up. It is just that the object of study in this instance is the individual rather than the aggregate. John Jones is a twenty-two-year-old White gentile and a senior at a university. Even though I'm making him up, let's give him reality; imagine this young White man in our minds' eyes.

What can we say about our Mr. Jones? What's on his mind? What is he trying to get done in his life?

Important in this context is what John Jones *isn't* thinking about, and that's the status and destiny of the White race. Whites may be marching into the sea, but that is not what is occupying John's mind this afternoon between video games and slices of pizza. John couldn't tell you what the word hegemony means, and he has more pressing things on his mind than looking up its meaning in a dictionary. (I'm worried I'm coming off flip and condescending here. I don't mean to be, and I shouldn't be. I spend more than a little of my time on a food-stained leather couch munching on take-out moo goo gai pan in a cardboard box and drinking Caffeine Free Diet Coke and perusing ESPN.com. And truth be told, I was very late in life before I bothered to find out what hegemony means. Who am I to look down my nose at what anybody does with his or her life? If I'm doing that to any extent, please don't let my personal limitations get in the way of your consideration of the basic argument I'm making here.)

If John Jones doesn't care about race, what does he care about? (Here comes Maslow.) John cares about his social life. He is exhibiting himself on his Facebook page and trying to look attractive and cool and collect friends. He is tweeting about what brand of skis he likes and what he's doing for the weekend in 140 characters per tweet, and he's checking his mobile phone every ten minutes. He is working on his abs and his haircut to be attractive to women and doing all he can to ensure himself a reasonable number of romantic interludes. He is trying to feel good about himself, get his self-esteem in good order, see himself as an admirable person, a good guy and not a bad guy. John's not read a book this year that wasn't assigned reading in one of his courses at the university and he doesn't read a daily newspaper or sites like CNN. Occasionally he catches Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert on television and finds them funny, especially Stewart. He's graduating in June and hopes to get a good job. Depending on how the job interviews go, he might wait tables this summer in Colorado. Up the line, he'd like to have a family and live a respectable and happy and peaceful life.

John has been in the hands of the enemies of White people all of his life, many of which, interestingly enough, have been White gentiles like John. If there has ever been anything or anybody bad in the history of life on planet Earth, according to the people who have had his ear and graded his papers – the mass media, politicians, textbooks and teachers – a White like him was likely involved. Slaveowners, Nazis, rural hicks and rednecks? – his people. Who slaughtered the Indians? – there you go. The exploiters of colonial peoples? That's right. Thomas Jefferson? He had a thing going with his slave. Who kept Jackie Robinson out of baseball? Three guesses. The dreaded sexist, autocratic, villainous White male? All he has to do is look in a mirror. Racists and haters? – the referent isn't Jewish and black racism and hate. Homophobes? Who killed Mathew Shepard? John's kind did, that's who. The religious right? Scary wackos. John's Catholic? Pedophile priests, come on. Diversity? For sure, that's not about celebrating or looking out for John and his sort.

Basically, John Jones has succumbed to the conditioning he has undergone. He's bought it. Although, I say basically because within our man John Jones, a residue of his training, is a "F – me? F – *you!*" resentment, anger, and self- and racial/cultural-self-affirmation. This byproduct of John's racial and cultural diminution is a source of hope

to White advocates and activists. If they can tap this felt-even-if-inarticulate, pre-conscious inner reality within John Jones and bring it to the surface and help him put words to it and give it meaning, it has the potential of transforming a domesticated, face-licking lapdog into an unchained and raging Fenris wolf from Norse mythology.

But back to the main point. For all practical purposes John's heart and mind have been had when it comes to race. The mind shaping has worked. John associates his Whiteness with guilt and shame. His racial identity is nothing to bring front and center and be proud of; rather, it is something to atone for. And why should John see things any other way? He couldn't name a White advocate or a White organization if his life depended on it. John Jones knows infinitely more about LeBron James and the Miami Heat than he does about White race realism. Whites have no interests, no need for solidarity, no need for leadership or organization or collective action, no need for self-determination. Every other group on the face of the earth, yes; Whites, no. To go in that direction is to be a racist bad guy and John Jones needs to be a good guy, in his own eyes and in the eyes of others.

In John's mind, for Whites to love their race and to work for its betterment they must feel superior to other races and ethnicities and have hostility toward them and want to lord over them. That's the word that has come through to him, and understandably, since he has gotten it from absolutely every direction, he has internalized it to the point that if someone were to bring up something about the need to take a close look at how White people are doing and what's going to happen to them he'd sincerely reply, "You got to be kidding me." (Though, again, way down inside John there is an organismic referent that, if he put words to it, would say, "Damn right. Let's do just that!" But most likely he will live the rest of his life without ever connecting with that part of his being.)

What does John spend his time doing? Serving his Maslow needs: winning social approval and getting his love life in gear and scoring a good job and feeling good about himself — none of which involve White racial concerns. And the big point here, *it is arguably in his rational self-interest to do just that*. The people in power in America have put a racial game on the table, and it makes abundant sense to play and win it within its rules. To stay within that metaphor, a winning move for individual White people like John Jones is to put down their race or at least lay low and keep their mouths shut, and to defer to minority and Jewish interests and even serve them. If John doesn't do that he pays a big Maslow cost for it: social rejection, a barren love life, feeling like there must be something bad about him, and the unemployment line.

An observer might disparage John as a sell-out to his people, and that's a legitimate enough criticism. But then again, they don't have to live his life. I'm not going to sit here with a secure job as a tenured professor in a university and tell John he should live the life of an unemployed pariah. I'm for all practical purposes an employed pariah. It's not pleasant; however, that said, I personally wouldn't have it any other way. I'm fine with my life. I'm just saying that I'm not about to tell anybody that they are obliged to, say, sign their name to what you are reading right now

And I'm also not about to tell John Jones that he doesn't know what's going on. I'm reminded of the lyrics of the old Bob Dylan song, "Ballad of a Thin Man":

Something is happening here  
But you don't know what it is  
Do you, Mister Jones?

Back to the often-contradictory nature of reality, our Mister Jones both does and doesn't know what is happening here. He does know that crossing the official line on race is going to cost him plenty personally, and that the only life he will ever live is the one he is putting together now, and he realizes that he has just one shot at doing a good job with this process. One false move around race and John can kiss goodbye the bank presidency and the political career and heading up the United Way campaign in his community. And John knows he is afraid, and he knows that his fears around race are well founded. If he doesn't play the racial game that's on the table, to go back to that metaphor, there are people with power over him who will hurt him as much as they possibly can. (I was unaware of White racialism when I was hired, promoted, and tenured at the university. If I were then the way I am now around racial matters, while I'd like to think I'd have found good work to do in my life, it wouldn't have been in a university. I wouldn't have gotten hired in the first place, and if somehow I had been hired I wouldn't have made through the six-year probationary period and attained permanent status, or tenure.)

On the other hand, our Mister Jones doesn't know what is going on. His race is going to hell in a handbasket and he doesn't know it. I have a better handle on that reality than John Jones does. Although that is far from saying I'm clued in and he isn't. I have experienced enough in a long life to realize that, indeed, there is plenty I don't know, including about the status and fate of the White race. Per the Dylan song (yet another Jewish source, now that I think about it), there is something happening here and I don't know what it is. I need constantly to keep that in mind, including when I am writing an article for a theme issue of *The Occidental Quarterly*.

What are the implications of what I have just outlined for those who care about the European heritage, for White people? The following things come to mind. Critique them and add to the list:

*White analysis, advocacy, and action need to be grounded in the multiple realities that comprise total reality.* In this writing, aggregate- and individual-based analyses yield different, and even contradictory, realities about the White circumstance. Another reality to take into account is the moment-to-moment experienced existence of actual White people — you, me, and every other White person alive now, as well as those who have already completed their journeys through life and those not yet born. From that, call it an existential perspective, there are as many White realities as there are, or have been or will be, White people. Living, breathing, mortal White people don't live their lives in the collective or in the abstract. They fashion particular lives within their particular circumstances, and that undertaking turns out well for them or it doesn't. Whether it is immoral or shortsighted, it is understandable that individuals will do what they can, including with respect to racial matters, to ensure that they and their

loved ones do well — gain status and power and material wealth and all that can provide — both now and in the future.

Even as we deal with White concerns from a favored orientation rooted in certain values and truths and leading to certain insights and actions, as we do it we need to keep in mind other orientations and values and truths and where they may lead. The ideal, it seems to me, is to be guided by multiple perspectives, each informing and completing the other, with the hope that the result will be a closer approximation of the great truths Niels Bohr talked about.

Back to our hypothetical (though I believe typical) John Jones: with regard to race, what does he need that those concerned about White people might be able to provide?

*He needs understanding and acceptance.* It's tempting to point a finger at our Mister Jones for not being more racially conscious and active. But if you look at the mind control he has undergone since his earliest years and what he feels pressed to get done in his life and the circumstance prevailing in his world, it really isn't fair to pathologize him for equating being on the side of Whites with signing up to be a practice dummy for bayonet training.

*He needs a positive racial identity.* It's been beaten into John Jones all of his life, especially in the university he has attended, that to be White is something to feel guilt and shame about. That view of Whiteness is absurd — nothing warrants greater self-affirmation and pride than being White. Those who lead Whites to see themselves and their people in such a self-demeaning way are despicable; what they are doing is unconscionable. To denigrate and disparage any young person's racial or ethnic identity and heritage — not just Whites', *anyone's* — deserves disgust and contempt. Why don't Whites, me included, manifest more disgust and contempt? Why are we so polite and nice while people are relieving themselves on us?

John Jones needs to expel his poisonous and debilitating racial self-definition and replace it with one that is healthy and generative. How to help him see the need to do that, and then actually do it, is a major challenge confronting the White racial movement.

In the description of John Jones that started off this discussion, I referred to him as a White gentile, not simply as White. White would have been OK, but it seemed to me that White gentile is more precise. I think of myself as a White gentile, and I'm beginning, with some trepidation I might add, to refer to myself as that publicly. That I tremble when saying what I am underscores the tyrannical and threatening circumstance prevalent in our time. White gentiles are the only group I can think of that can't call themselves what they are. Jews can proudly announce that they are Jews, and I applaud that fact. But if Jews can be Jews to the world why can't I, and John Jones, be gentiles to the world?

Anyway, while I don't want to make a big case of it — White is good enough for me — I do think that one alternative to the racist and dehumanizing "white male" epithet that has been drilled into John Jones and pinned on his shirt for all to see is a self-concept as a proud and honorable White gentile.

For that to take hold . . .



*He needs a positive narrative of his race and culture.* John has had a damning story of his race and his heritage drummed into him. I'm deeply saddened and dismayed to hear White university students sincerely recite the sins committed by people of their kind. I would be equally brought down listening to anything comparable from blacks or Hispanics or Jews or Asians, or anybody – gays, Muslims, low income people, rural people. I don't want to hear blacks putting themselves and their people down, or feeling obliged to step aside in favor of Whites, or serving other groups' interests while paying no attention to their own, or staying silent while others express themselves freely. I don't want to see blacks, or anyone else, unorganized and passive while other groups are organized and active to the hilt. I don't want anyone afraid around matters of race. I don't care only about White people. I care about all people that inhabit this planet.

I'm trying to think of an easier task to take on than creating a positive narrative for Whites. In every area of human existence, Whites have at the very least held their own when compared to other races, other heritages. Philosophy, science, mathematics, the arts, education, business, technology, you name it: I'd be glad to make the case for Whites and let you make the case for some other race.<sup>6</sup> I'm willing to compare the livability of White communities – safety, cleanliness, care for children, political honesty, whatever criteria you want to use – with communities made up of any other group, anywhere in the world. I'll argue that the level of the animosity and racism Whites feel toward other races is no higher than the level of animosity and racism other races feel toward Whites. Yes, the history of White people has had its dirty linen, but so has every other race had its dirty linen. And I'm willing to defend the efforts of Whites to wash their dirty linen, remedy the wrongs some of their brethren have committed, against the efforts of any other race to wash its dirty linen.

It is disingenuous, unfair, cruel, and hurtful to cherry pick the least positive attributes and actions of some White people, and even make things up, and sell the notion to White children that that is who they are. John Jones needs to hear a story of his kind other than the one hammered into him by those harboring barely suppressed seething resentment and hostility toward him and his. That White people should feel bad about their race is a preposterous idea that has to be blown out of the water. And more, we have to get our children out of the clutches of people who bring them down. Enough.

*He needs strategies and tactics.* There John is with his Facebook account and the girlfriend he's either trying to get or hold on to, and he has job applications coming up. Or let's say he's older. There's the job working for Microsoft and the wife and two kids and a mortgage and visiting his aging parents on Sundays after the church services. The grass needs cutting and his son is on a Little League team he's coaching and his daughter is in a ballet recital coming up and he's concerned about her getting bullied in school and through the Internet. His wife is staying late at work a lot and he's starting to get suspicious. And he's wondering if he has diabetes; anyway, he's tired all the time. It's Tuesday evening at 7:30 and he has just finished putting away the dishes after

---

<sup>6</sup> A book that helps make this case is: Charles Murray, *Human Accomplishment: The Pursuit of Excellence in the Arts and Sciences, 800 B. C. to 1950* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2004).

the dinner he cooked (his wife had to work late) and his kids are in their rooms doing homework or something. His race is ceding political and cultural hegemony and that's really bad, and let's say he's up on what's going on.

OK, what exactly is John supposed to do about what's happening to his race? Name it. If he can't think of something to do that he is capable of doing and that suits who he is and fits in with his circumstances in life he'll be left doing nothing and feeling he has let his people down. John needs a list of action possibilities to choose from, and there isn't one at his disposal at the moment, and truth be told, I'm not sitting here with such a list ready to hand out to him. I've come up with the idea of writing this article for a theme issue of *The Occidental Quarterly*, but that's me; what do other people do? John Jones? Anybody? The best I can do at this point is point out the lack of a White racial technology, let's call it that – practical, effective ways of dealing with White racial matters. I wish I were able to do more in this area.

*He needs all of the above in easily digestible form.* John Jones' life is full. He doesn't have a lot of time. He's not a big reader. John moves from this to that to the other; he's a moving target, as it were. The challenge is to get the White racial message through to John Jones clearly and quickly given all that's going on with him. Other interest groups' messages can be transmitted via conventional modes of public discourse – the central mass media (book publishers, journalists, television, film, the music industry, magazines, newspapers), politicians, and schools at all levels. But those trying to get across a positive White racial identity and narrative and strategies can't count on using those vehicles. Social media is a possibility. Another, a book that can be read in a sitting available through the Internet or self-published in print form. Another, a web site directed at these concerns. Though while we're doing things like this, let's not give up on the possibility of finding ways to communicate through mainstream public exchange. Speaking of ceding to our adversaries, let's not cede for all time the right to speak in the public square.

It seems best to keep the White racial message positive. To be for Whites is not at the same time to be against any other race or ethnicity. It is not to believe in racial superiority or domination. The message can, and I believe should, be rooted in core American values and ideals: freedom, equality, fairness, justice, self-determination. Whites want what every other group wants, to be conscious of itself and appreciated for the best of its heritage, to have its voice heard, to choose leaders and spokespeople, to organize and pursue its interests within the political system, and to live its way and shape its own destiny. If doing all that is good for blacks and if it's their right to do that, why in the United States of America isn't it good, and within their rights, for Whites to do that?

The approach I just outlined is a way to go forward, but that is not to say that I think it should be the only way to approach White racial issues. Good lessons on how to proceed can be found in the examples of successful movements in recent decades: namely, the black civil rights movement, the modern women's movement, and the gay rights movement. They each included individuals and groups that operated out of very different conceptions of how to deal with the issues confronting them. There was

Martin Luther King, but there was also Malcolm X. There was Gloria Steinem and the radical feminists. There was Harvey Milk and ACT UP.

I'm offering ideas here congenial to me, but in the larger scheme of things I believe that the best way forward for Whites is *many* ways forward. I favor every racially conscious and committed White person doing what he or she believes in doing and able to do, with nothing out of bounds and nothing too big or too small. Perhaps in John's case, he does something a bit – or a lot – different when raising his children. That's fine. He, and you and I, do something that helps. What that might be is our call.

*He needs support and protection.* John Jones lives with fear around race, and with good reason. And if he becomes racially aware and committed and active he will feel alone with that, and with good reason. There are individuals and organizations that will nail him good if he makes one false move racially: he's a racist, anti-Semite, bigot, hater; stone him. And when they start to work John over – marginalize or isolate him, smear or demonize him, harass him and his children, fire him from his job, whatever it is – he'll be on his own. There'll be no one to come to his aid. No one will have his back. No individuals, no organizations. Unfortunately, I can speak to that reality from experience.

Here again, I can do little more than point out the problem. However it happens, whenever it happens, when one of us is attacked, a whole bunch of us needs to counterattack. And that counterattack can include scorn, contempt, ridicule, and mockery. Politically correct Whites especially take themselves oh-so-seriously and feel assured that whatever they do will be met with fawning approval and respect. We could shake that up. Make them look like ignorant fools, laugh at them, make them into jokes. But that said, here too we all do what we do. Lawyers bring suit, reasonable people reason, organizers organize, speakers speak, those given to outrage rage, protesters protest, and, yes, satirists sneer and make fun. John won't have to do battle alone. Nor will any of the rest of us.

**Robert S. Griffin's writings on race include the book, *The Fame of a Dead Man's Deeds: An Up-Close Portrait of White Nationalist William Pierce.***