

A Letter to Populists

by C. Wayne Macleod

A common occurrence among wild animals that can travel long distances is migration. The reason is better feeding grounds elsewhere. There is considerable benefit to the species from such treks, and that is the migrations are physically selective. The challenges weed out the weak and infirm, so that the strongest are left for breeding. When humans travelled only on foot, we can imagine the same physical selection occurred, but now that we can jet around the world we might think that natural selection from migration no longer happens. To think that would be a mistake. People who migrate are people who perceive opportunities elsewhere, and have the abilities and preparation to perform in jobs requiring them. Just the migration off farms from labour intensive work to the more cerebral requirements in city office towers probably skews the I.Q. curve in favour of urban over rural populations in developed nations. If a nation is homogenous racially, the skewing is not racially noticeable since both populations are racially the same. But in these days of globalization, migration is international.

The result is places like Silicon Valley where the search for talent is world-wide. We see people in high-paying jobs in industry, academia and government who are obviously not nationals and performing well in those positions. Science and technical journals are filled with names that are difficult to pronounce in our native tongues. It all adds to the absurdity of White "supremacy". Such a time of globalization is also a time of industrial "outsourcing," resulting in millions of national workers facing unemployment and dependancy. Racial problems arise, the national population declines and replaced with immigration, "multiculturalism" becomes the mantra of politicians and policy-setters while nationalists are saddled with historical and racial guilt. We are left with the question of how justified is nationalism and should there be national laws and programs based purely on humanitarianism that ignore the national existence.

First, we should recognize that racial division is a fact of life that is present not only among humans. Its animal origins was demonstrated remarkably in the early 1970's at the San Diego zoo, when an old lion, named Fraser, became acquainted with a half dozen lionesses for breeding. Prior to this the lionesses were first presented with virile young males for that purpose, each of which was surprisingly attacked and mauled by the lionesses. Fraser, despite his age at 17 years (over 80 in human terms), sired 35 cubs. His acceptance was a puzzle, but the reason was frivolously ignored by the media that preferred the "Casanova" aspect of Fraser. The reason was simply that Fraser and the lionesses were of the same race of lion, whereas the young male lions were not. The same racial distinction is made by wild Orcas (killer whales), that divide themselves by diet, one group preferring fish and the other sea mammals. The two do not interbreed and will eventually become different species.

With that thought applied to the whole animal kingdom, we begin to realize that the premise of liberal "multiculturalism" is logically absurd. Regardless of the evident diversity we see in our streets during our present day, which is touted by its proponents to be desirable, in *time* such mixture when different races take up residence *destroys* diversity. We already see that inevitable result with mixed race couples walking our streets. With current rates of non-White immigration into Europe (and Canada, the U. S., etc.) it will not take long for the diversity of our present countries to be gone. We will all be homogenized into 'no-race'. Of course, then *that* will be touted as "progressive". Until that happens, if our liberal leaders truly wanted diversity, the last and least policy they would proclaim is liberal multiculturalism, if for no other reason than its logical inconsistency - it destroys itself.

But the complaint should go far beyond what we see in our streets today. It has to do with the moral premise that nationalist pride is arrogant and callous, even verging on 'evil'. Strangely, not long ago, nationalism was considered virtuous, motivating men to risk their lives in war. Was the change a moral one? Let Nature be the judge. Populists should be interested because they have all had the experience that whenever a discussion of race comes up, their opponents invariably raise the issue of White "supremacy," a 'straw man' argument easily defeated and presented as his/her *forte*. The meaning, of course, is that the populist is a racial narcissist arguing from prejudice, and therefore unable to engage in sensible discussion of the subject. Obviously, this has political consequences for his/her party or movement.

The liberal argument can be circumvented because the shortest glimpse around the world tells us that true diversity does exist, giving us about eight million different varieties of life. The existence of such diversity is not just aesthetically pleasing, it is necessary to make a world. We humans depend even on insects like bees for much of our foods, and on other species for control of pests. A great worry over destruction of the Amazon forest is the loss of possible medicines it might provide. The truth about species variation, somehow forgotten in the anti-populist debacle, is on how they appear: *species variation begins with racial variation*. One species can bifurcate (divide) into two sub-species, or races, due to two populations of the original species being separated for a long period of time. The separation can happen for a number of reasons, usually geographic but also cultural as is happening today with Orcas. Genetic changes occur in the separated populations so that they become recognized as different races. The changes continue until the two racial populations can no longer interbreed. They are then two different species. To be noted is that *without racial variation there could be no species variation*. Also to be noted is that if the two racial populations again interbreed, their two gene pools would be mixed, preventing the species formation.

Species variation is an absolute necessity in Nature, because without that variation there would be fewer avenues to evolve. There would be greater chance of extinction of life generally, because some species survive in a crisis due to diversity - some can handle the crisis better than others. Our own human species is an example; at one time in our evolutionary past our numbers were down to about ten thousand individuals, world-wide. Geneticists see this in our human DNA. We were a threatened species, and other varieties of hominid alive at that time did not survive. If there had been only one species of hominid, we might not be here today. Whatever qualities our primitive ancestors had, it allowed them to survive better than the other hominid versions. But even without the threat of extinction, variation is advantageous for life, because more options give higher probability for evolutionary advancement. Advanced life exists on Earth today, in abundance, because of bifurcation and variation, *which cannot occur if different racial populations genetically mix*. That is what happens under liberal "multiculturalism". It *destroys* human diversity.

Here, then, is the moral reason for populism. It comes from Nature, and does not mean the racialism that would denounce other races, proclaim their "inferiority" or seek their extermination (that again would destroy diversity) but the type of concern exhibited in populism. That is the type we see in the national separatist movements of the world, whether of the Basques, Scots, French Canadians, etc. The populist movements of Europe are on solid moral foundation from the viewpoint of Nature, and for moral judgement there is no better viewpoint. No such defence of populism is offered by Christianity. Taking their cue from that tradition, it is the proponents of liberal "multiculturalism," those who would destroy diversity, that are lacking morality, a point that should be proclaimed loud and clear against the liberal ramparts of Europe.