

[ CHAPTER SIXTEEN ]

## Race, Culture, and Child-Rearing Practices



**F**rom Stone Age tools to agriculture to the founding of the world's first city, from the building of the great pyramids to smelting copper, from bronze to iron — human achievement tracked north and northeast from mankind's east African beginnings. Thus, as great empires rose and fell — Mesopotamia, Egypt, China, Greece, Etruria, and Rome, just as in more recent centuries it was evident in Spain and England, and so for Europe, the United States, and Japan — success was predisposed to those groups in each era with decreasing amounts of pigmentation in their skin. For thousands of years, these successes of human achievement and acumen were attributed to “race.”

Man's analysis over time of the cause of lightning and thunder differs little. The work of pagan gods was answer enough for ancient man. While science provides more sophisticated answers for the phenomenon, it does not change the occurrence — it is still lightning and thunder. And there are still differences in levels of achievement among ethnic groups and races, with only trifling changes in mindset and wrong conclusions.

Regardless of the reasons, along each step of civilization's journey north, enclaves of lighter-skinned people were dramatically more successful than their darker-skinned counterparts. Superior and innovative artifacts from different geographic locations in the

same time periods make this statement irrefutable. Nothing changed regardless of ancient or modern explanations.

Among the darkest of the dark-skinned are Negroes. Explanations for their lesser achievements over time are no more logical today than they were hundreds of years ago. When comparing achievement and "race," it would be less harmful to "know" nothing than to "know" something that is false. Of course, so-called reasons abound — Negroes are the descendants of Canaan, the fourth son of Ham, cursed by Noah, father of Ham; their brain matter weighs less or is of a different quality than that of those with lighter skin color; they occupy a later place in evolutionary development; and so forth. Anthropologists contribute greatly to the last supposition. Some pretend that Negroes occupy a later place in evolutionary development, instead of making public that all people were dark in color at the beginning of mankind on earth. They sketch Neanderthal man as brutish in appearance and dark in color, while portraying Cro-Magnon man as modern in mien and light in color. South Africa's Cro-Magnon man is never depicted, since he would have had dark-colored skin. Few anthropologists acknowledge that light-colored skin is merely an environmental adaptation that occurred when the more dominant among dark-colored humans migrated northward less than one million years ago. No anthropologist ever published estimates of the number of generations of black-in-color ancestors in the family trees of all light-in-color people living today.

(Partial enlightenment comes many times from unlikely sources. In 1996, Pope John Paul II proclaimed that the Church accepted the theory of evolution with qualifications. However, the pronouncement did not address whether Adam and Eve were black in color.)

Even recent historical events give the lie to "race" and show also how transparent the use of religious, tribal, or ethnic terms is when substituted for dominance levels. In Ireland, when the non-dominant Irish majority war with the more dominant English-Irish minority, differences are charged to religion, since both groups are Caucasian. When religious lines blur, "ethnic differences" become the catch-all term to encompass the carnage among Caucasians. When the nondominant Rwanda Hutu majority kill

hundreds of thousands of the dominant Tutsi minority, who in turn kill a still larger number of Hutus, the blame is placed on tribal clashes, as all adversaries are Negroes.

“Racism” is the term used worldwide to denote strife between light- and dark-colored people. Bloodbaths among different South African tribes are called tribal conflicts, while an equal slaughter between South African Caucasians and Negroes is ascribed to racism.

Caucasian versus Caucasian: religion, ethnicity, genocide, gangs

Negro versus Negro: tribes, gangs

Caucasian versus Negro: racism

Negro versus Caucasian: antiracism

Individuals and groups with high needs for achievement, the dominant, control those who have less need to achieve, the non-dominant. This holds true without regard to tribes, skin color, religion, or ethnicity. Nature does not deviate: life must breed, and Nature is more interested in the species than the individual. She likes large litters. In humans, the nondominant are prolific breeders while the more dominant are frugal with their issue. Nature makes no distinction among illiterate/literate, disobedient/obedient, lawbreakers/law-abiders, shiftless/industrious, or shades of color. Without fail, Nature rewards prolific human breeders by ensuring that their progeny will be the ultimate inheritors of this world.

Consequently, countries are repeatedly in a stage of flux between the nondominant have-nots and the dominant haves. Even countries with homogeneous color, culture, and religion, which from time to time appear safe within their borders, are not spared this ebb and flow from within and without. Signposts of sovereignty receive little heed when nondominant breeders search for food and shelter or when dominant groups seek conquest.

Differences in achievement among all people of all skin colors — black, white, and shades in between — have nothing to do with “race” and everything to do with child-rearing practices. Politicians knew this but averred that they did not. They played games among themselves. Liberals since 1964 responded to nondominant (low-

achieving) child-rearing practices with programs that ignored the “why” of the problems and addressed only the symptoms. Conservatives, in turn, blamed the liberal social programs as the “why” of the problems. Important liberal and conservative politicians knew better, as each knew how he personally was reared.

Politicians and judges worked hard for years to prevent adoptions by qualified Caucasian parents of Negro and American Indian children. In their view, it was far better to have the children reared in cultural darkness and ignorance than to watch Caucasian parents, whether the mother was dominant or nondominant, rear a higher percentage of them for adult success. The magnitude of the differing degrees of child-rearing practices could give the game away.

Negro leaders strove to preserve and bequeath their positions of power to family members, not increase competition. At the same time, Caucasian Americans’ bigoted fears of a dominant Negro ruling class thwarted any possibility of Caucasian private funding for child-rearing schools designed to produce a Negro elite. Many Caucasians resisted so strongly the idea of intelligent, dominant, successful Negroes that they genuinely preferred to fear ignorant and violent Negro criminals than admit Negroes as equals or, much worse, superiors.

American leaders, including Negro leaders, knew all along that child-rearing practices separated the dominant haves from the nondominant have-nots. They realized that they themselves were among the persons of large account who had mothers who made many demands for early achievement. They saw that those of little account had mothers who made few demands of them for accomplishments while young. It did not escape them that mothers of no-account people made no demands for childhood performance.

The importance of child-rearing practices can be seen in the example of Jews, who have an unbroken four-thousand-year history of success. No other group, race, or civilization comes close. Halacha holds that children of a Jewish mother are Jewish regardless of the father’s religious faith; lineage is traced through the mother. Almost without exception, every Jew attaining by his own efforts money, power, or fame was reared by a dominant mother or maternal grandmother who enforced dominant child-rearing prac-

tices. Many successful Jews, particularly men, take personal credit for their achievements, not according recognition to the role of the child-rearing methods that conditioned them to be achievers.

Dominant women rear dominant daughters as well as dominant sons. Although marriages between dominant and nondominant individuals occur in all cultures, the effects are most noticeable in an extremely intelligent and dominant group such as American Jews. So long as successful Jewish men marry within their religion, they are likely to marry dominant women. The attitudes that lead to success will thus be instilled in the next generation. However, during the past two generations, interfaith marriages between American Jewish men and gentile women increased dramatically. Dominant, aggressive, successful, and therefore prosperous, Jewish men now marry nondominant gentile women, deliberately breaking the marriage laws of Halacha. As a result, their offspring, reared by nondominant mothers with different child-rearing methods, will not achieve the same level of success as did the father. Do they realize this outcome? If so, this is hubris in its keenest form.

The possibility that slavery existed in human prehistory cannot be denied. "Slavery was a universal institution throughout ancient times. It was not even questioned in the Old Testament or in the New Testament," so wrote Isaac Asimov. Jews were slaves. Negroes were taken from Africa against their will and, like the Jews, were spread around the world against their will. Each group took its culture, and thus child-rearing practices, with it. Racial differences do not separate them; it is the profound cultural differences, brought about by child-rearing practices alone, that make them so different.

A culture of ignorance is perpetuated through child-rearing practices regardless of nationality, skin color, or geographic location.

When Negroes arrived unwillingly in America, they brought with them child-rearing practices developed over thousands of years. Child-rearing methods practiced by most of Africa's present Negro population are similar to those currently practiced by many American Negroes. Over the years, the ratio of dominant versus nondominant Negroes has changed little in America from that in

Africa. Regardless of skin color or ethnicity, only the truly ignorant are unaware of their ignorance.

Saying *no* and exacting obedience to *no* are entirely different actions. The preponderance of nondominant mothers cannot bring themselves to actually enforce the limits of *no* with their offspring. These children of nondominant mothers learn that although they are told *no*, they are not required to obey; they may continue their actions without penalty. Many times when such children are punished, sometimes severely, the reasons are capricious, because of the mother's anger or whim, and are unrelated to establishing clear and consistent rules of conduct.

Consequently, demands for preschool excellence in tying shoelaces, distinguishing colors, telling time, reading, writing, proper grammar, good diction, and good manners do not receive the necessary follow-through and so are missing from generation to generation. (Regardless of ethnicity, American adults who achieve these preschool accomplishments may pay vast sums in taxes, but they do not collect welfare.)

Negro adults with outstanding accomplishments are no different from high achievers of other ethnicities: they too stem from more dominant mothers. Dominant Negro mothers produce immensely successful offspring, but they remain a minuscule percentage of Negro female parents. A count of high-level corporate executives, commercial pilots, surgeons, admirals and generals, professors teaching in the hundred highest-rated universities, certified public accountants, and business owners finds less than 2 percent of American Negroes as having dominant mothers who instilled in them needs for high achievement.

Public schoolteachers of my day were so intimidated that they accepted disobedient behavior by Negro youths as a right of the "black culture." Further, juvenile crime became so pervasive that police and judges excepted from prosecution many criminal activities committed by Negro preteens and teens. Lawmakers were far too tolerant of crimes committed by Negro youth. But at some time, someone, to some degree, had to say no and enforce it.

This happened eventually when Negroes committed heinous crimes. Sullen and surprised when arrested, numerous Negro (and Caucasian) criminals blamed the victim for resisting armed rob-

bbery, rape, or even murder. Slain innocent bystanders were dismissed with “they should not have been there, they were unlucky.” Attorneys representing Negro criminals pleaded for not-guilty verdicts, deferred adjudication, probation, community service, or short sentences because the criminal “was the product of a bad environment and had no opportunity to better himself.”

No particular group of individuals has ever been free from discrimination or slavery throughout written history. Further, no descendants of former slaves, regardless of ethnicity, ever reaped financial rewards based solely on having had slave ancestors, and few reparations have ever been paid because of past discrimination. That is, until 1964 in the United States.

Lawmakers from 1964 forward passed law after law to “rectify past discrimination” against American Negroes. In return, Negroes concentrated their votes to reward and retain those politicians. During the race to rectify past discrimination, politicians left no stone unturned in their efforts to create equality. Thus, rectifying past discrimination begot reverse discrimination, which became a way of life. Federal, state, and private-sector affirmative action programs, university enrollment quotas, federal contracts-with-the-government quotas, and doing-business-with-the-state quotas gave Negroes an unfair advantage over other Americans.

“Race norming” is a particularly insidious form of equalization used on employment tests. In *Paved with Good Intentions* Jared Taylor noted that “The technique is simply to give blacks or Hispanics higher marks than whites for the same number of correct answers.” A multitude of Caucasian job seekers competing with Negroes and Hispanics never know why they fail to win federal, state, and even some private-sector jobs. But their eyes and minds confirm that many Negroes and Hispanics, though less qualified, secure the same jobs. This is most evident among Caucasians failing to obtain jobs with the United States Postal Service.

Bestowing unearned largess on the undeserving, whether to a relative or a member of a specific group, may satisfy the bestower, but it fosters resentment in the recipient. The undeserving person welcomes but sees little good in what is received, since the desire for more occupies his mind. In these instances, the good to the beneficiary is wasted, as it only highlights the possibility of more.

Since it is undeserved, so goes the logic, it becomes wrong for the giver to set a limit.

Generations-ago wrongs, real and imagined, were overcompensated by new laws with the full enforcement of the United States government. All segments of American industry along with the federal and state bureaucracies were brought to heel. Correcting social imbalances gave underqualified Negroes little job or educational satisfaction but produced much anger. Since 1964, American Negroes in their anger perceived racism at every turn. Little escaped their attention. The preponderance of Negro and Caucasian marriages occur between Negro men and Caucasian women; few marriages take place between Caucasian men and Negro women. According to Jared Taylor, "In 1988, for example, there were 9,406 reported cases of whites being raped by blacks, whereas there were *fewer than* 10 reported cases of blacks being raped by whites." Although these numbers came from estimates derived from a complex sample survey, Caucasian men do practice racism in their marriages and in their rapes while Negro men do not.

In "righting" these perceived "wrongs," lawmakers shackled the United States. The federal government intimidated and coerced the non-Negro population from 1964 to my time. At the same time, Negroes set records for belligerence and crime. During this period, America's decadent society went to such lengths to embrace free speech that five four-letter words that in earlier times were taboo dropped to two and then none. However, new taboo words surfaced: "shiftless" disappeared from use, and particularly taboo was "nigger" when spoken by anyone except a Negro.

A M E R I C A ' S language is rich, colorful, and regional. Southerners find "youse" as in "youse guys" amusing, and in the South "bogey man" becomes "booger man." Northerners cannot decode the South's use of "yall" as in "yall come," thinking it means "you all." "Yall" is simply a contraction of "all of you," little different than "goodbye," which contracts "God be with you" and the Spanish *adios*, which contracts *Vaya con Dios*.

We share a propensity to add and subtract consonants to and from spoken words. Many people in New York and New Jersey use



the “hard r” in their speech. Idea becomes “idear.” In the South, wash becomes “warsh,” while rinse sounds like “rinch.” Southern Negroes frequently add or subtract the letter “r” when speaking. In food, pork becomes “pok.” With automobile names, Ford sounds like “Foad,” Buick becomes “Burick,” and Dodge is pronounced “Dorge.”

Contractions, expansions, and corruptions of the spoken word go back as far as language itself. In 1619 the first twenty dark-skinned Africans were traded and sold in Virginia; the ship’s manifest described them as “Negars.” *Nigger* appeared thirty-two years earlier in 1587, a benign word when first used, possibly a corruption of either *Negro* or *Nigra*, neither considered an epithet. Negar? Negro? Nigra? Nigger? The latter was easier for many to pronounce. But who first corrupted the word — Caucasians or Negroes?

After 1964 thousands of Caucasians who used the word *nigger* were censured, persecuted, or lost their jobs. Until that year, Americans had a perfect right, and sometimes possibly even a sound reason, to pronounce words in their own way. But Negro appeasement recognized no boundaries. A prominent Caucasian television sportscaster was fired after referring to a Negro athlete as a “little monkey.” And an attempt was made by a Pennsylvania university to expel a Caucasian student for using what was perceived as a racial slur, “water buffaloes,” to describe noisy Negro students.

Corporations were easy prey for avaricious attorneys seeking “racial slurs.” In 1996, a secretly taped conversation by a high-ranking oil company executive brought an end to a festering two-year-old discrimination complaint against the firm. The cowed corporation settled the lawsuit within days for an amount between 290 and 450 thousand gold ounces. The spine of the oil company turned to jelly when the recorded “black jelly beans” and “Nicholas” (sounds like *nigger*) was publicized.

No American English word or term is a safe haven from a racial slur designation. “Insensitive” behavior by ordinary and prominent Caucasians is punished more severely than are many felonies committed by Negroes. In 1988, when a Negro representative in the U.S. Congress accused hundreds of Caucasians of copulating

with their mothers, he drew no denial from those so accused nor censure from anyone. At the same time, in St. Paul, Minnesota, one could legally burn the flag of the United States on the courthouse steps but committed a crime by burning a cross in one's own backyard.

By 1988, federal and state laws had cowed America's law-abiding, non-Negro population. Caucasians developed a fear of Negroes who would have their way and could not be controlled. Concerns for personal safety were justified, as Jared Taylor noted in 1992, "Though they are only 12 percent of the population, blacks commit more than half of all rapes and robberies and 60 percent of the murders in America." In 1995, one in three Negro men in their twenties was on probation, on parole, or incarcerated. This rate was approximately ten times the rate for Caucasian men of the same age.

Politically correct television stations colored, distorted, and shaded reporting and programming to downplay Negro problems. Jared Taylor wrote, "In real life, less than half of the people arrested for murder in the United States are white. In television dramas, 90 percent of the people arrested for murder are white." It was harder to control television news programs that graphically show brutal crimes committed by Negroes.

Relatives of Negro criminals increased exponentially, since few of these felons are orphans. It became nearly impossible to seat a Negro juror in a criminal trial who was not related by blood to someone with a felony conviction. (The prosecution rarely accepts a Caucasian as a juror in a criminal trial who has a blood relative who is a convicted felon.) Eyewitness accounts, deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) evidence, even confessions played little part in many verdicts by juries that were chiefly Negro. Juries that were predominantly Negro, bonded by brotherhood, saw no evil, heard no evil, and spoke no evil when they delivered not-guilty verdicts for Negro defendants. Juries comprised mostly of Negroes slowed the Negro conviction rate in such urban environments as the New York City borough of the Bronx, where juries were more than 80 percent Negro and Hispanic. There, Negro defendants were acquitted in felony cases almost half of the time — nearly three times the national acquittal rate of 17 percent for all races. American laws

were treated at best as incursions into Negro culture, at worst as racism.

The pendulum of justice for Negro criminals swung almost to the same wrongful apex to match the time when all-Caucasian juries refused to convict a Caucasian for bringing harm, even death, to a Negro. Almost nowhere were Negroes allowed to testify against Caucasians. But here the parallel ceases. At all times in American history, Caucasian juries convicted Caucasian criminals for wrongful actions against other Caucasians. Negro juries, however, increasingly freed Negro criminals regardless of whether the crime was committed against Caucasians or Negroes, although in the America of my time most Negro crime was directed against other Negroes.

Of course, the sorry course of political placation has escalated to your time, and the universe of Negro crime has expanded. At your presidency you found Negro criminal activity over ten times worse than when I write. Only you, America's Man on Horseback, can say *no* and mean it. Make lawbreakers of all shades of color into believers in your policies. You collected early payment of many criminals' debt to nature and relocated others to Africa and Siberia. When your *no* is fully believed, the majority of Negroes should become law-abiding citizens, just as they were before 1964.

The usual outcome of problem-solving is to restore to normalcy that which existed before the problem occurred. Your successes to date, however admirable, have only reestablished some peaceful portions of American life considered normal during the 1950s. Your problem-solving, however, does nothing to increase the ambition and intelligence of American Negroes.

Contemporary conservatives blame genes for the lower success levels of Negroes. Their liberal peers choose nutrition, environment, public education, discrimination, and a lack of self-esteem caused by slavery as responsible for the dilemma. Whatever reason, the broad-based lack of achievement and lower acumen remain for the overwhelming majority of Negroes worldwide.

You, America's Man on Horseback, can change dramatically the intellect and achievement of as many Negroes as you wish. Your predecessors also could have altered the equation but chose not to. (The dominant haves in power rarely share control with the non-

dominant have-nots. Power is shared only when sharing serves the purpose of the dominant — for example, when the breeding proclivities of the nondominant produce an overpowering numerical force.)

You inherited a decadent, dissolute, despairing America. You cannot, by edict, change the dominance and nondominance ratios among future American adults regardless of color. Appeals to the small percentage of dominant women to rear more children may go unheeded. A plea to nondominant women to withhold or quit delivering children will be ignored. Enforcement to keep births in check will fail as surely as did China's birthrate policy of 1979.

I appeal to your wisdom, your courage, and your love of the United States, Mr. President. An immense, generations-to-come benefit is yours to pluck from one of America's most serious problems. Turn countless American child tragedies into adult treasures. Initiate child-development schools on a scale the world has never seen. The finished products of the child-development schools will serve our nation greatly in times of peace and war. (Ironically, the output of privately funded Negro child-development schools of the same magnitude might well have halted the nation's decline and thus have prevented America's need for you.) Use to advantage the prolificacy of America's nondominant Negro population to seed this undertaking. Convert those offspring who are unwanted and abandoned into a mighty force of striving men and women of high intelligence to help restore our once-great nation.