

The Conservatism of Fools: A Response to John Derbyshire¹

By [Kevin MacDonald](http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/derb.htm)²

March, 2003

This is a response to a review by John Derbyshire of my book, *The Culture of Critique*, that appeared in *The American Conservative*. In an earlier [article](#), Derbyshire described himself as philo-Semite who traces his attitudes on Jews to his pleasant childhood memories of a local Jewish family and "the numberless kindnesses that I have received at the hands of Jews, friendships I treasure and lessons I have learnt. I cherish those recollections."³[HYPERLINK](http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/derb.htm)

I find myself now, in middle age, with complicated and sometimes self-contradictory feelings about the Jews. Those early impressions — culture, wit, intelligence, kindness, and hospitality — are still dominant, and I have read enough to know what a stupendous debt our civilization owes to the Jews. At the same time, there are aspects of distinctly Jewish ways of thinking that I dislike very much. The world-perfecting idealism, for example, that is rooted in the most fundamental premises of Judaism, has, it seems to me, done great harm in the modern age.... I also find the theories of Kevin Macdonald (*The Culture of Critique*) about the partly malign influence of Jews on modern

American culture very persuasive — though this is not an endorsement of Macdonald's theory of "group evolutionary strategies" which I do not understand. And like (I suppose) every other Gentile, I have often been irritated by Jewish sensibilities, and occasionally angered by them.⁴

These earlier comments on *The Culture of Critique* appeared in April, 2001. Derbyshire's evaluation of the book (and its author) has changed a bit, perhaps because the edition reviewed in *The American Conservative* contains a [new preface](#) that tilts the balance in my writing even more on the side of the negative.

For Derbyshire, evaluating Jews is like a business ledger: There are positives and negatives, and for him, the positives vastly outweigh the negatives. However, providing a balance ledger of credits and debits is not a purpose of *The Culture of Critique*. My purpose is to document Jewish intellectual and political movements -- movements led by Jews and motivated by perceptions that these movements would advance Jewish interests. I have tried to document all such movements that I am aware of, but this is not the same as documenting Jewish contributions to civilization or culture. As I note in the [Preface](#), Albert Einstein's work -- obviously an important contribution to physics -- does not qualify as a Jewish intellectual movement because it was not motivated by advancing Jewish interests (even though Einstein was a strongly identified Jew). Similarly, my book has no interest in recording fond memories of

individual Jews that seem to have formed Derbyshire's intellectual outlook.

As a result of his generally positive attitude about Jews and Judaism, Derbyshire is, apart from some minor irritations, quite uncritical about Jewish motives and influence, even when they conflict with the interests of people like himself. He implies that non-Jews should understand Jewish motivation to break down the ethnic homogeneity of their own societies while advancing the interests of Israel as an ethnostate. We non-Jews should understand such Jewish behavior because these outcomes are good for Jews. But, somehow he fails to follow through with this logic, imputing malice to people like me who are concerned about the future of their own people in societies where they are becoming minorities surrounded by groups that, like Jews, harbor deep historically conditioned hatreds toward them. It is quite an extraordinary omission and lapse in consistency by Derbyshire. In the end, the logic is as follows: Jews have made wonderful contributions to civilization. Therefore, non-Jews should welcome Jewish efforts to advance their interests even when they conflict with their own. As Derbyshire himself says in another context, the only thing to say of those who voice such sentiments is what Shakespeare's Bianca would have said: "The more fool they."

Derbyshire lives in a sort of childlike world in which Jewish interests are legitimate and where Jewish attempts to pursue their interests, though they may occasionally be irritating, are not really a cause for

concern much less malice. It doesn't require an evolutionary theory to realize that good, reasonable people can have conflicts of interest, and that the results of conflicts of interest can be devastating to the side that loses. My view is that modern evolutionary theory gives us a powerful way of understanding why this must be so. Anti-Semites have often portrayed Jews as the embodiment of evil. Consistent with evolutionary theory, however, I have documented that Jews tend to be highly intelligent, good parents, and patriots fighting to preserve their people and extend their people's power and influence — sometimes at the expense of the interests of other peoples. Many organized groups of Jews have pursued such conservative goals by resisting other groups and behaving aggressively against them. By the same logic, it is legitimate for non-Jews to defend their own ethnic interests. Is this a formula for perpetual conflict? Hopefully not, but the only hope for a just resolution is to recognize the nature of the situation and agree on terms, not to deny the importance of one's own interests.

Derbyshire's review begins with a chilling account of how critics of Jews simply disappear from sight — their professional horizons diminished if not entirely ended. One thinks of people like Joe Sobran, William Cash,⁵ and a host of politicians who have had the temerity to criticize Israel or American support for Israel, or who have called attention to Jewish power and influence in particular areas. Jewish groups have made any critical discussion of Jewish issues off limits, and that's vitally

important because, yes, Jews are a very powerful group. What Derbyshire refers to as Jewish "world-perfecting idealism" is very much with us and is still wreaking havoc in the modern world, everywhere from the erection of a multi-cultural police state in the United States — the origins of which are the general topic of *The Culture of Critique* — to the current war for the "liberation" and "democratization" of Iraq, a war that is being fomented by Jewish neo-conservative activists based in the Bush administration, congressional lobbying organizations, and the media.⁶ As with other examples of Jewish idealism, the destruction of Iraq is shrouded in a lofty moral idealism aimed ultimately at securing a rather obvious Jewish ethnic goal -- Israeli hegemony throughout the Middle East. That these latest examples of Jewish "world perfecting idealism" also happen to conform rather obviously to Jewish ethnic interests should be of concern to all non-Jews.

Derbyshire dismisses evolutionary psychology as a passing fad, and asks, sarcastically, if in criticizing evolutionary psychology, he is pursuing his own evolutionary goals. Well, maybe. Most of what we humans do is connected only distantly to evolutionary goals. For example, quite a few evolutionary psychologists propose an evolved goal of social status based on commonly accepted standards of scientific evidence,⁷ but we are very flexible in how we achieve such goals. And it does occur to me that writing critiques of evolutionary psychology and dismissing those who criticize Jews might be one way to attain

social status among the predominantly Jewish neo-conservative elite that dominates so much of the conservative media.

Derbyshire complains about my statement that, "The human mind was not designed to seek truth but rather to attain evolutionary goals." I was merely expressing a principle of evolutionary biology that has been of fundamental importance since the revolution inaugurated by G. C. Williams and culminating in E. O. Wilson's synthesis: Organisms are not designed to communicate truthfully with others but to persuade them — to manipulate them to serve their interests. We should expect deception and self-deception to be at the very heart of interactions among organisms. This is the subtext of *The Culture of Critique*: The beguilingly irresistible theories masking an ethnic agenda. I too was once enthralled by psychoanalysis and Marxism.

Derbyshire supposes that the idea of a group evolutionary strategy may be "complete nonsense." Freed of technical jargon, a group evolutionary strategy refers to the ways people structure groups in order to get on in the world — to attain group goals such regulating their own members (e.g., preventing them from defecting, promoting cooperation with ingroup members, promoting eugenic marriages) and dealing with outsiders (e.g., having different ethical standards for ingroup versus outgroup). I discuss how Jews accomplished these tasks in traditional societies in my book, *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy*, and I recently applied this

sort of analysis to several other groups, including the Overseas Chinese, in the paperback version of that book.⁸ There are several other good sources, including David Sloan Wilson's *Darwin's Cathedral*,⁹ where, among other examples, the early Christian Church is described as a non-ethnic form of Judaism that was adaptive at the level of the group in navigating the uncertainties of the ancient world.

My analysis describes the powerful social and psychological forces that have maintained Jewish group loyalty. Derbyshire asks, "From an evolutionary point of view, would not the optimum strategy for almost any European Jew at almost any point from AD 79 to AD 1800 or so have been conversion to Christianity?" But the question is not whether an omniscient Jew in the Middle Ages would choose to remain a Jew, but what forces have kept Jewish groups together over the centuries while other groups have been assimilated or otherwise disappeared. Even if individual Jews would have been better off defecting (some did!), the vast majority did not because of sanctions against relatives who remained Jews, because of powerful, psychologically salient ethnic and kinship ties to other Jews, because of the high level of social and material support available in Jewish communities, because of hostility toward Jews emanating from the wider society, and probably because, despite periodic troubles, Jews were remarkably successful in many times and places, including the medieval period.

Despite Derbyshire's claim, it is simply not the case that

Jews have only been successful since "emancipation." Jews have very frequently achieved powerful positions: ancient Alexandria and the late Roman Empire; parts of Western Europe during the Middle Ages prior to the expulsions of Jews from most of Western Europe; the Turkish Empire after the fall of the Byzantine Christians and many other places where Jews served alien ruling elites, especially in the Muslim world (e.g., Spain after the Muslim conquest); Christian Spain beginning at least by the late 14th century and extending well into the period of the Inquisition; Poland and other areas of Eastern Europe beginning in the early modern period and extending into the 20th century.¹⁰ Perhaps most notably, the elite status of Jews in the Soviet Union had little or nothing to do with the opportunities made available by the Enlightenment, since the Enlightenment had little impact on the Russian Empire.

Group strategies don't need outgroups. The main thing is that there is group-level organization that regulates individual behavior to conform to group goals. Derbyshire mentions Chinese eugenics, but as important as eugenics may be for understanding the Chinese, it does not necessarily imply a group evolutionary strategy. The most obvious explanation is that the emperor wanted the more intelligent people to run the civil service, and, given the Chinese practice of polygyny and the benefits of high social status, this had a eugenic effect. But this can be easily explained by self-interest on the part of everyone involved; no need to

invoke the effects of group structure on individual behavior. On the other hand, in the recent paperback edition of *A People that Shall Dwell Alone*, I argue that the Overseas Chinese qualify as a group strategy because they live as an organized group among outgroups; they have a consciousness of themselves as being of a different ethnic group than their hosts, they are internally organized (but not nearly so tightly as traditional Jewish communities), and they cooperate in economic enterprises.

Derbyshire rejects my argument that without Jewish involvement, the Bolshevik Revolution and its horrific aftermath would not have happened. The percentage of Jews in early Bolshevik Party congresses is irrelevant to this issue. The questions I ask are: Would the Revolution have occurred without the key involvement of a relatively small number of very talented Jews like Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, and Uritsky who played such prominent roles in the Bolshevik Revolution and the early Soviet government? (In the same way, one can reasonably ask whether the neo-conservative revolution in U.S. foreign policy would have happened without the critical contributions of Richard Perle, William Kristol, Paul Wolfowitz, Douglas Feith, Elliott Abrams, and David Wurmser, to name only some of the most prominent Jews involved. Small numbers of highly talented, closely cooperating people can have enormous influence.) Would the Revolution have been sustainable in its early stages without the involvement of large sections of the Jewish community who came to staff the

Soviet bureaucracy, most notably the Secret Police? Were the most powerful non-Jews accurately described as philo-Semites — "Jewified non-Jews," to use Albert S. Lindemann's term?¹¹ Were Jews an elite group in the Soviet Union at least until anti-Jewish attitudes began to be government policy after World War II? Did Jewish Communists and other leftists in the Soviet Union and elsewhere identify as Jews? I see no reason to change my views on these issues as a result of Derbyshire's comments.

Similarly, Derbyshire states that Jews "were not the sole, nor even the prime, movers in [the] downfall" of European dominance in the U.S. without providing a concrete alternative. I have never stated that Jewish intellectual movements and interest groups were the sole force, but I do indeed maintain that they were by far the most important. On the critical topic of immigration, there simply was no other force that energetically pursued the goal of multi-ethnic immigration in the period prior to 1965 apart from Jewish organizations or organizations composed partly of non-Jews that were funded, organized and staffed by Jews.¹² I am scarcely alone in this opinion. Consider these comments of Vanderbilt University historian Hugh Davis Graham:

Most important for the content of immigration reform [i.e., loosening], the driving force at the core of the movement, reaching back to the 1920s, were Jewish organizations long active in opposing racial and ethnic quotas. These included the American

Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and the American Federation of Jews from Eastern Europe. Jewish members of the Congress, particularly representatives from New York and Chicago, had maintained steady but largely ineffective pressure against the national origins quotas since the 1920s.... Following the shock of the Holocaust, Jewish leaders had been especially active in Washington in furthering immigration reform. To the public, the most visible evidence of the immigration reform drive was played by Jewish legislative leaders, such as Representative Celler and Senator Jacob Javits of New York. Less visible, but equally important, were the efforts of key advisers on presidential and agency staffs. These included senior policy advisers such as Julius Edelson and Harry Rosenfield in the Truman administration, Maxwell Rabb in the Eisenhower White House, and presidential aide Myer Feldman, assistant secretary of state Abba Schwartz, and deputy attorney general Norbert Schlei in the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

And beyond the transformations being wrought by the sea change in immigration policy, I think it inconceivable that the current regime of what Derbyshire terms "racial guilt, shame, apology, and recompense, accompanied by heroic efforts at social engineering ('affirmative action')" could have been built without the influence of the intellectual and political

movements described in *The Culture of Critique*. As Derbyshire notes, this regime is inherently far less stable than what went before, and one can only shudder at what the future holds throughout the Western world.

It is always difficult to imagine that 3% of the population could have such enormous influence on culture and public policy, but successful lobbying efforts by small, committed special interests are commonplace in American politics, not only among ethnic lobbies but among business interests, farming groups, unions, professional organizations, and even gun enthusiasts. An obvious example is U.S. policy in the Middle East. Here we have a record of an incredibly effective, well-funded, intensive lobbying effort carried out over several decades. The historical evidence reviewed in Chapter 7 of *The Culture of Critique* shows that Jewish organizations carried out a similar campaign in an effort to alter U.S. immigration laws and that they were by far the most important force in changing these laws, often taking pride in the part they played.

Derbyshire does not think it hypocritical for Jews to promote multiculturalism in the U.S. while wishing to maintain Jewish ethnic dominance in Israel. The hypocrisy comes from the fact that, as I note in Chapter 8 of *The Culture of Critique*, the Jewish advocacy of Israel as a Jewish ethnostate coincided with a major effort by Jewish organizations and Jewish-dominated intellectual and political movements to supplant the prevailing view of the United States as a European Christian civilization with a European ethnic base.

Especially hypocritical is that the disestablishment of the European basis of American identity was performed with appeal to universalist Enlightenment ideals of justice and individual rights, while it pathologized the ethnocultural basis of American civilization that had become an important foundation of American identity by the early decades of the 20th century. Although it is common for defenders of Israel to describe Israel as a democracy based on Western political ideals, I have yet to see any important Jewish organization or intellectual movement pathologize the ethnic basis of Israeli society or challenge the many ways in which Jewish ethnic interests are officially recognized in Israeli law and custom (e.g., the Law of Return). Indeed, the American Jewish community has been complicit in the ongoing ethnic warfare in the Middle East that has resulted in the dispossession, degradation, and large-scale murder of the Palestinians.

Derbyshire accuses me of being one of those who would prefer "a return to the older dispensation" — the older cultural and ethnic mix characteristic of the United States until the changes inaugurated in the last 35 years. I plead guilty to this charge. That regime was stable and it was good for people like me (and Derbyshire), and even for the American Jewish community who saw the modest, low-profile, non-violent character of anti-Jewish attitudes that were fairly common prior to World War II dwindle to irrelevance in the postwar period. Nothing wrong with that.

The dispossession of Europeans is the ultimate defeat —

an evolutionary event of catastrophic proportions for people of European descent. Whatever the contributions of Jewish "entrepreneurs, jurists, philanthropists, entertainers, publishers, and legions upon legions of scholars," they could never make up for this cataclysmic loss and for the political instability and chronic ethnic tensions that have been unleashed by the Jewish intellectual and political movements discussed in *The Culture of Critique*. Further, as *The Culture of Critique* attempts to document, a very high percentage of the Jewish contribution to culture has been used to advance Jewish ethnic interests. The only exceptions are advances in technology and basic science, but does anyone seriously suppose that technological advances like the atomic bomb mentioned by Derbyshire would never have been discovered without Jews? (Germany, certainly, was very close.) It may be that these advances would have taken longer, but there is no question that they would have happened without Jews. After all, with a mean IQ of 100 and far larger numbers, European populations undoubtedly have far more individuals of the requisite IQ to make the stupendous contributions to culture that have occurred in recent centuries.

Western cultures have produced a long list of ethnically European geniuses in every field of science and art, from Plato and Aristotle down to the present. Pity the poor English who expelled the Jews in the Middle Ages and were thus restricted to the meager cultural contributions of Chaucer, Milton, Shakespeare, Newton, and Darwin even as they vastly expanded their numbers

and the territory controlled by their people. Can anyone seriously suppose that the West would be unable to produce a brilliant high culture without Jews or that the Jewish contribution is of irreplaceable value? And recall that my argument in *The Culture of Critique* is that many of the most important Jewish contributions to culture were facilitated not only by high IQ but by closely cooperating, mutually reinforcing groups of Jews who were centered around charismatic leaders and excluded dissenters. In other words, their accomplishments are due in large part to the fundamental cultural forms of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy, not to any inherent worth in what was produced. The sorry records of psychoanalysis, Boasian anthropology, Marxism, and the Frankfurt School are far more a testimony to Jewish identity and group cohesion than they are to anything resembling science.

Derbyshire acknowledges that the Jewish contributions to culture discussed in *The Culture of Critique* have been made with an eye to advancing Jewish ethnic interests. This is certainly a very sizeable portion of the entire Jewish contribution to culture during the period I discuss, but advancing Jewish interests by contributing to culture goes far beyond these movements. As I attempt to show in the [preface](#) to the recent paperback edition of *The Culture of Critique*, Jewish contributions to entertainment and the media have often had the function of promoting positive images of Judaism and multi-culturalism and negative images of Christianity

and European ethnic interests and identification. Derbyshire describes his love of songs like *White Christmas* that have come to define how Christmas is experienced. However, such songs are also part of the *Kulturkampf* in which Christmas has been converted into a secular and commercialized event; as such it represents a kind of cultural subversion. As Philip Roth noted, "God gave Moses the Ten Commandments and then he gave Irving Berlin *Easter Parade* and *White Christmas*, the two holidays that celebrate the divinity of Christ ... and what does Irving Berlin brilliantly do? He de-Christ's them both! Easter turns into a fashion show and Christmas into a holiday about snow."¹³ In recent decades, a major thrust of Jewish influence on culture has been the promotion of the Holocaust as the fundamental moral touchstone and intellectual paradigm of the contemporary Western world. (I recently came across a reference stating that there have been over 170 Holocaust films since 1989.¹⁴)

Jewish entrepreneurs and philanthropists may have indeed contributed to economic growth, but they have also lavishly funded Jewish causes — causes that typically oppose the ethnic interests of European Americans. Jews constitute more than a quarter of the people on the *Forbes Magazine* list of the richest four hundred Americans, 45% of the top 40 richest Americans, and one-third of all American multimillionaires.¹⁵ The beneficiaries of this wealth include 4000 foundations controlled by Jews and 300 national Jewish organizations, the latter with a

combined budget estimated in the range of \$6 billion -- a sum greater than the gross national product of half the members of the United Nations. Jewish entrepreneurs and philanthropists like hedge-fund manager Michael Steinhardt, Charles and Edgar Bronfman (co-chairs of the Seagram Company), bingo parlor magnate Irving Moskowitz (who funds the settler movement in Israel), the notorious Marc Rich (who funds Birthright Israel, a program aimed at raising Jewish consciousness), George Soros (who funds pro-immigration organizations in the United States and in a variety of European countries), film maker Steven Spielberg (head of the Shoah and Righteous Persons foundations), Leslie Wexner (owner of the Limited and Victoria's Secret), Laurence Tisch (chairman of the Loews Corporation), Charles Schusterman (owner of an oil-and-gas business in Tulsa), and Mort Mandel of Cleveland (former distributor of electronics parts) have used their money to advance Jewish causes such as Israel and increasing Jewish consciousness and commitment among Jews.¹⁶ Wealthy Jews are by far the largest contributors to the Democratic Party and are very significant contributors to the Republican party,¹⁷ ensuring that Jewish interests will be heeded throughout the U.S. political spectrum. Whether Jewish success in business has had a measurable effect on economic growth is difficult to know. What we do know is that it has come with an enormous cost to the ethnic interests of European Americans.

In concluding, I call attention to the challenge for

evolutionary psychology in trying to understand the complete lack of ethnic identification of so many elite Europeans such as John Derbyshire. He is only the tip of a massive iceberg. I have sketched a theory of why this might be in the Preface to the paperback edition of *The Culture of Critique*: a relatively weak sense of ethnocentrism resulting from our European evolutionary past combined with the influence of the Jewish intellectual and political movements I describe and its amplification in the media; the powerful opprobrium and, increasingly, police state controls that have become attached to criticism of Jews and Israel; and the heady inducements to conform to the interests and views of a powerful minority. Having read Derbyshire's account of his childhood, one might add to the model two more variables: socialization in a very benign Jewish milieu and deep reverence for the cultural accomplishments of Jews. In the end, Derbyshire is the epitome of that sad and paradoxical figure, the Judaized intellectual discussed in *The Culture of Critique* for whom Jewish attitudes and interests, Jewish likes and dislikes, now constitute the culture of the West, internalized by Jews and non-Jews alike. It is a mindset that is leading Europeans directly to the fate of the Israelites who stray from God's way as described in Deuteronomy (28:62): "And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude."

Endnotes

1. J. Derbyshire, *The Marx of the Anti-Semites*, [The](#)

[American Conservative, March 10, 2003.](#)

2. Please send correspondence to Kevin MacDonald; Information on my books can be obtained [here](#).

3. J. Derbyshire: The Jews and I, [National Review Online, April 10, 2001.](#)

4. *Ibid.* See also Derbyshire's article, "Is Anti-Semitism Dead," [National Review Online, August 21, 2000.](#)

5. Derbyshire (*ibid.*) is critical of the response to the "thoughtful and entirely unthreatening way" in which William Cash described

the dominance of Jews like Steven Spielberg, David Geffen, and Jeffrey Katzenberg in Hollywood. To the amazement of the *Spectator's* editor (who was Dominic Lawson -- Jew!) this innocuous article caused a storm of outrage in the U.S.A. The young author, William Cash, was denounced from the pulpits of political correctness -- that is, from the Op-Ed pages of the Los Angeles Times and the *New York Times*. Prominent American Jews like Leon Wieseltier went into high-hysterical mode, denouncing Cash as the new Julius Streicher and so on. The storm went on for weeks, led by a howling mob of buffoons -- Barbra Streisand, for example -- who had certainly never read, nor probably even heard of the *Spectator* up to that point. (I have been reading it for 30 years, and have also written for it.) It was a display of arrogance, cruelty, ignorance, stupidity, and sheer bad

manners by rich and powerful people towards a harmless, helpless young writer, and the Jews who whipped up this preposterous storm should all be thoroughly ashamed of themselves.

6. The war against Iraq is far too important to avoid a complete public discussion of the motives of all of those who are pushing for this war, including neoconservative Jews intent on furthering Israeli interests in the Middle East. Jews must never be represented as monolithic, but we must have ways of discussing Jewish influence'talking about specific groups of Jews, their Jewish identity, and their actual influence on public affairs, as we do with other ethnic groups. There is no question that neoconservative Jews in the Bush administration are having an enormous influence on public policy and that their motives are to aid Israel. For example, Richard Perle, David Wurmser, and Douglas Feith'all present employees of the U.S. Defense Department'signed the 1996 document '[Securing the Realm](#)' which advocated removing Saddam as a goal of Israeli foreign policy. This document was prepared for an Israeli foreign policy think tank ([Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies](#)) and presented to the Israeli government. Deputy Undersecretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz is a protégé of Perle and has long advocated removing the Iraqi leadership. He has close personal and family ties to Israel (B. Keller, *The Sunshine Warrior. New York Times Magazine*, September 23, 2002). The neoconservative influence is increased because virtually the entire organized Jewish

community (but certainly not all American Jews) has become pro-Likud. The Likud Party, led by Ariel Sharon, is strongly in favor of a U.S.-led war against Iraq. Neoconservatives have ready access to key sectors of the U.S. media (*The Weekly Standard*, *The Wall Street Journal*, Fox News). For example, Bill Kristol is editor of *The Weekly Standard*. He is also a Fox News political analyst, and he is Chairman of the [Project for a New American Century](#). Kristol has a long record of opposing the current Iraqi regime and is an ardent supporter of Israel (see, e.g., the [PNC's letter to President Clinton](#), dated January 26, 1998). See also:

- 1.) [Whose War? by Patrick J. Buchanan](#)
- 2.) [Practice to Deceive by Joshua Marshall](#)
- 3.) [The Men From JINSA and CSP by Jason Vest](#)
- 4.) [Israel's Role: The 'Elephant' They're Talking About By Ami Eden](#)
- 5.) [A Rose By Another Other Name: The Bush Administration's Dual Loyalties, by Kathleen and Bill Christison](#)
- 6.) [The Israel lobby, by Michael Lind](#)

Addendum, April, 2006: In addition to these references, see

[The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy](#), by John Mearsheimer and Steven Walt.

[Understanding Jewish Influence: A Study in Ethnic Activism](#) by Kevin MacDonald

7. E.g., J. Barkow (1989). *Darwin, Sex, and Status: Biological Perspectives on Mind and Culture*. Toronto:

University of Toronto Press; Buss, D. (1999). *Evolutionary Psychology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon; MacDonald, K. B. (1998). Evolution, Culture, and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 29, 119-149.

8. K. MacDonald, [A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy, with Diaspora Peoples.](#) Lincoln, NE: iUniverse Books, 2002. See also my [review of D. S. Wilson's Darwin's Cathedral.](#)

9. D. S. Wilson, *Darwin's Cathedral*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002. See also: Hilton, A. & Obermeyer, G. (1999). Evolutionary strategies of religious groups: Kinship and altruism, cultural segregation and migration in early and modern Anabaptist communities in Europe and America. Paper presented at a conference, sponsored by the Royal Institute for Interfaith Studies (Jordan), on: Migration and Culture Contact: patterns of confrontation and coexistence in a changing world. October 11-15, 1999, The Meridien Hotel, Amman; Miele, F. (2000). To Populate is to Rule: Review of *The Cousins' Wars* by Kevin Phillips. *Population and Environment*. 21 (3) 347-358.

10. See K. MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998. (Available from the [author.](#))

11. A. S. Lindemann, *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*. New York: Cambridge

University Press, 1997, p. 433. Lindemann notes that the top non-Jews in the Bolshevik movement, including Lenin and Dzerzhinsky (Head of the *Cheka* [Secret Police]), might be termed 'jewified non-Jews' -- 'a term, freed of its ugly connotations, [that] might be used to underline an often overlooked point: Even in Russia there were some non-Jews, whether Bolsheviks or not, who respected Jews, praised them abundantly, imitated them, cared about their welfare, and established intimate friendships or romantic liaisons with them.'

12. [Hugh Davis Graham](#), *Collision Course: The Strange Convergence of Affirmative Action and Immigration Policy in America* (New York, Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 56-57).

13. In: J. Rosen. *White Christmas: The Story of a Song*. London: 4th Estate (A Division of HarperCollinsPublishers), 2002, p. 157. Rosen mentions "the sheerchutzpah that compelled a refugee from a pogrom-scourged corner of Siberia ... to write a Christmas anthem that buried all traces of the holiday's Christian origins beneath three feet of driven snow" (pp. 164-165.)

14. Sterritt, D. The one serious subject Hollywood doesn't avoid. *The Christian Science Monitor*, November 22, 2002.

15. Silbiger, S. (2000). *The Jewish Phenomenon : Seven Keys to the Enduring Wealth of a People*. Atlanta, GA: Longstreet Press.

16. Goldberg, J. J. (1996). *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley; M. Massing, Should Jews be parochial? [The American Prospect](#).

17. Lipset, S. M., & Raab, E. (1995). *Jews and the New American Scene*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.