

## JEWISH INVOLVEMENT IN SHAPING U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY

*Today, . . . the immigrants—above all the Jewish immigrants—seem more American than [the WASP] does. They are the faces and voices and inflections of thought that seem most familiar to us, literally second nature. [The WASP] is the odd ball, the stranger, the fossil. We glance at him, a bit startled and say to ourselves, “Where did he go?” We remember him: pale, poised, neatly dressed, briskly sure of himself. And we see him as an outsider, an outlander, a reasonably noble breed in the act of vanishing. . . . He has stopped being representative, and we didn’t notice it until this minute. Not so emphatically, anyway.*

*What has happened since World War II is that the American sensibility has become part Jewish, perhaps as much Jewish as it is anything else. . . . The literate American mind has come in some measure to think Jewishly. It has been taught to, and it was ready to. After the entertainers and novelists came the Jewish critics, politicians, theologians. Critics and politicians and theologians are by profession molders; they form ways of seeing.*

— Walter Kerr, 1968, pp. D1, D3

Immigration policy is a paradigmatic example of conflicts of interest between ethnic groups because immigration policy determines the future demographic composition of the nation. Ethnic groups unable to influence immigration policy in their own interests will eventually be displaced by groups able

to accomplish this goal. Immigration policy is thus of fundamental interest to an evolutionist.

This chapter discusses ethnic conflict between Jews and gentiles in the area of immigration policy. Immigration policy is, however, only one aspect of conflicts of interest between Jews and gentiles in the United States. The skirmishes between Jews and the gentile power structure beginning in the late nineteenth century always had strong overtones of anti-Semitism. These battles involved issues of Jewish upward mobility, quotas on Jewish representation in elite universities beginning in the nineteenth century and peaking in the 1920s and 1930s, and the anti-communist crusades in the post-World War II era, as well as the very powerful concern with the cultural influences of the major media, extending from Henry Ford's writings in the 1920s to the Hollywood inquisitions of the McCarthy era and into the contemporary era (SAID, Ch. 2). That anti-Semitism was involved in these issues can be seen by the fact that historians of Judaism (e.g., Sachar, 1992, pp. 620ff) feel compelled to include accounts of these events as important to the history of Jews in the United States, by the anti-Semitic pronouncements of many of the gentile participants, and by the self-conscious understanding of Jewish participants and observers.

The Jewish involvement in influencing immigration policy in the United States is especially noteworthy as an aspect of ethnic conflict. Jewish involvement in influencing immigration policy has had certain unique qualities that have distinguished Jewish interests from the interests of other groups favoring liberal immigration policies. Throughout much of the period from 1881 to 1965, one Jewish interest in liberal immigration policies stemmed from a desire to provide a sanctuary for Jews fleeing from anti-Semitic persecutions in Europe and elsewhere. Anti-Semitic persecutions have been a recurrent phenomenon in the modern world beginning with the Russian pogroms of 1881 and continuing into the post-World War II era in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. As a result, liberal immigration has been a Jewish interest because "survival often dictated that Jews seek refuge in other lands" (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 341). For a similar reason, Jews have consistently advocated an internationalist foreign policy because "an internationally-minded America was likely to be more sensitive to the problems of foreign Jewries" (p. 342).

There is also evidence that Jews, much more than any other European-derived ethnic group in the United States, have viewed liberal immigration policies as a mechanism of ensuring that the United States would be a pluralistic rather than a unitary, homogeneous society (e.g., N. W. Cohen, 1972). Pluralism serves both internal (within-group) and external (between-group) Jewish interests. Pluralism serves internal Jewish interests because it legitimizes the internal Jewish interest in rationalizing and openly advocating an interest in overt rather than semi-cryptic Jewish group commitment and

nonassimilation, what Howard Sachar (1992, p. 427) terms its function in “legitimizing the preservation of a minority culture in the midst of a majority’s host society.” Both Neusner (1993) and Ellman (1987) suggest that the increased sense of ethnic consciousness seen in Jewish circles has been influenced by this general movement within American society toward the legitimization of cultural pluralism and minority group ethnocentrism. This trend toward overt rather than the semi-cryptic forms that have characterized Judaism in twentieth-century Western societies is viewed by many as critical to the continuity of Judaism (e.g., E. Abrams, 1997; Dershowitz, 1997; see SAID, Ch. 8). A 1998 conference of Reform rabbis emphasized that the upsurge in traditionalism is partly the result of the increasing legitimacy of ethnic consciousness in general (Schrader, 1998).

Ethnic and religious pluralism also serves external Jewish interests because Jews become just one of many ethnic groups. This results in the diffusion of political and cultural influence among the various ethnic and religious groups, and it becomes difficult or impossible to develop unified, cohesive groups of gentiles united in their opposition to Judaism. Historically, major anti-Semitic movements have tended to erupt in societies that have been, apart from the Jews, religiously or ethnically homogeneous (see SAID). Conversely, one reason for the relative lack of anti-Semitism in the United States compared to Europe was that “Jews did not stand out as a solitary group of [religious] non-conformists” (Higham, 1984, p. 156). Although ethnic and cultural pluralism are certainly not guaranteed to satisfy Jewish interests (see Ch. 9), it is nonetheless the case that ethnically and religiously pluralistic societies have been perceived by Jews as more likely to satisfy Jewish interests than are societies characterized by ethnic and religious homogeneity among gentiles.

Indeed, at a basic level, the motivation for all of the Jewish intellectual and political activity reviewed throughout this volume is intimately linked to fears of anti-Semitism. Svonkin (1997, pp. 8ff) shows that a sense of “uneasiness” and insecurity pervaded American Jewry in the wake of World War II even in the face of evidence that anti-Semitism had declined to the point that it had become a marginal phenomenon. As a direct result, “The primary objective of the Jewish intergroup relations agencies [i.e., the AJCommittee, the AJCongress, and the ADL] after 1945 was . . . to prevent the emergence of an anti-Semitic reactionary mass movement in the United States” (Svonkin, 1997, p. 8).

Writing in the 1970s, Isaacs (1974, pp. 14ff) describes the pervasive insecurity of American Jews and their hypersensitivity to anything that might be deemed anti-Semitic. Interviewing “noted public men” on the subject of anti-Semitism in the early 1970s, Isaacs asked, “Do you think it could happen here?”

Never was it necessary to define “it.” In almost every case, the reply was approximately the same: “If you know history at all, you have to presume

not that it could happen, but that it probably will,” or “It’s not a matter of if; it’s a matter of when.” (Isaacs, 1974, p. 15)

Isaacs, correctly in my view, attributes the intensity of Jewish involvement in politics to this fear of anti-Semitism. Jewish activism on immigration is merely one aspect of a multipronged movement directed at preventing the development of a mass movement of anti-Semitism in Western societies. Other aspects of this program are briefly reviewed below.

Explicit statements linking immigration policy to a Jewish interest in cultural pluralism can be found among prominent Jewish social scientists and political activists. In his review of Horace Kallen’s (1956) *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea* appearing in *Congress Weekly* (published by the AJCongress), Joseph L. Blau (1958, p. 15) noted that “Kallen’s view is needed to serve the cause of minority groups and minority cultures in this nation without a permanent majority”—the implication being that Kallen’s ideology of multiculturalism opposes the interests of any ethnic group in dominating the United States. The well-known author and prominent Zionist Maurice Samuel (1924/2022, p. 215), writing partly as a negative reaction to the Immigration Act of 1924, wrote:

If, then, the struggle between us [i.e., Jews and gentiles] is ever to be lifted beyond the physical, your democracies will have to alter their demands for racial, spiritual and cultural homogeneity within the State. But it would be foolish to regard this as a possibility, for the tendency of this civilization is in the opposite direction. There is a steady approach toward the identification of government with race, instead of with the political State.

Samuel (1924/2022, pp. 218–220) deplored the Immigration Act of 1924 as violating his conceptualization of the United States as a purely political entity with no ethnic implications:

We have just witnessed, in America, the repetition, in the peculiar form adapted to this country, of the evil farce to which the experience of many centuries has not yet quite accustomed us. If America had any meaning at all, it lay in the peculiar attempt to rise above the trend of our present civilization—the identification of race with State. . . . America was therefore the New World in this vital respect—that the State was purely an ideal, and nationality was identical only with acceptance of the ideal. But it seems now that the entire point of view was a mistaken one, that America was incapable of rising above her origins, and the semblance of an ideal-nationalism was only a stage in the proper development of the universal gentile spirit. . . . To-day, with race triumphant over ideal, anti-Semitism uncovers its fangs, and to the heartless refusal of the most elementary human right, the right of asylum, is added cowardly insult. We are not only

excluded, but we are told, in the unmistakable language of the immigration laws, that we are an “inferior” people. Without the moral courage to stand up squarely to its evil instincts, the country prepared itself, through its journalists, by a long draught of vilification of the Jew, and, when sufficiently inspired by the popular and “scientific” potions, committed the act.

A congruent opinion is expressed by prominent Jewish social scientist and ethnic activist Earl Raab, who remarks very positively on the success of American immigration policy in altering the ethnic composition of the United States since 1965.<sup>143</sup> Raab notes that the Jewish community has taken a leadership role in changing the Northwestern European bias of American immigration policy (1993a), and he has also maintained that one factor inhibiting anti-Semitism in the contemporary United States is that “an increasing ethnic heterogeneity, as a result of immigration, has made it even more difficult for a political party or mass movement of bigotry to develop” (1995, p. 91). Or more colorfully:

The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will be able to prevail in this country.

We [Jews] have been nourishing the American climate of opposition to bigotry for about half a century. That climate has not yet been perfected, but the heterogeneous nature of our population tends to make it irreversible—and makes our constitutional constraints against bigotry more practical than ever. (Raab, 1993b)

Boston *Globe* writer S. I. Rosenbaum claimed in 2019 that the main lesson of “the Holocaust” is “that white supremacy could turn on us at any moment” and that the strategy of appealing to the White majority “has never worked for us. It didn’t protect us in Spain, or England, or France, or Germany. There’s no reason to think it will work now.” The central question of Jewish political engagement in Western societies, Rosenbaum insisted, is “how we survive as a minority population,” where the one great advantage American Jewry enjoys is that “unlike other places where ethno-nationalism has flourished, the U.S. is fast approaching a plurality of minorities.” Presiding over a coalition of non-

---

<sup>143</sup> Raab was associated with the ADL and was executive director emeritus of the Perlmutter Institute for Jewish Advocacy at Brandeis University. He was also a columnist for the San Francisco *Jewish Bulletin*. Among other works, he has co-authored, with Seymour Martin Lipset, *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790–1970* (1970), a volume in a series of books on anti-Semitism in the United States sponsored by the ADL and discussed in Chapter 6. Lipset is regarded as a member of the New York Intellectuals discussed in Chapter 7.

White groups to actively oppose White interests is the new Jewish ethno-political imperative: "If Jews are going to survive in the future, we will have to stand with people of color for our mutual benefit."

The "diversity-as-safety" argument was made by Leonard S. Glickman, president and CEO of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), a Jewish group that has advocated open immigration to the United States for over a century. Glickman stated, "The more diverse American society is the safer [Jews] are" (in Cattán, 2002). At the present time, HIAS is deeply involved in recruiting refugees from Africa to immigrate to the US.

Positive attitudes toward cultural diversity have also appeared in other statements on immigration by Jewish authors and leaders. Charles Silberman (1985, p. 350) notes:

American Jews are committed to cultural tolerance because of their belief—one firmly rooted in history—that Jews are safe only in a society acceptant of a wide range of attitudes and behaviors, as well as a diversity of religious and ethnic groups. It is this belief, for example, not approval of homosexuality, that leads an overwhelming majority of U.S. Jews to endorse "gay rights" and to take a liberal stance on most other so-called "social" issues.<sup>144</sup>

Similarly, in listing the positive benefits of immigration, the director of the Washington Action Office of the Council of Jewish Federations stated that immigration "is about diversity, cultural enrichment and economic opportunity for the immigrants" (in *The Forward*, March 8, 1996, p. 5). And in summarizing Jewish involvement in the 1996 legislative battles over immigration, James Besser (1996) stated, "Jewish groups failed to kill a number of provisions that reflect the kind of political expediency that they regard as a direct attack on American pluralism."

Because liberal immigration policies are a vital Jewish interest, it is not surprising that support for liberal immigration policies spans the Jewish political spectrum. We have seen that Sidney Hook, who along with the other New York Intellectuals may be viewed as an intellectual precursor of neoconservatism, identified democracy with the equality of differences and with the

---

<sup>144</sup> Moreover, a deep concern that an ethnically and culturally homogeneous America would compromise Jewish interests can be seen in Silberman's (1985, pp. 347–348) comments on the attraction of Jews to "the Democratic party . . . with its traditional hospitality to non-WASP ethnic groups. . . . A distinguished economist who strongly disagreed with Mondale's economic policies voted for him nonetheless. 'I watched the conventions on television,' he explained, 'and the Republicans did not look like my kind of people.' That same reaction led many Jews to vote for Carter in 1980 despite their dislike of him; 'I'd rather live in a country governed by the faces I saw at the Democratic convention than by those I saw at the Republican convention,' a well-known author told me."

maximization of cultural diversity (see Ch. 7). Neoconservatives have been strong advocates of liberal immigration policies, and there has been a conflict between predominantly Jewish neoconservatives and predominantly gentile paleoconservatives over the issue of Third World immigration into the United States. Neoconservative Norman Podhoretz reacted very negatively to an article by a paleoconservative concerned that such immigration would eventually lead to the United States being dominated by such immigrants (see Judis, 1990). Other examples are neoconservatives Julian Simon (1990) and Ben Wattenberg (1991), both of whom advocate very high levels of immigration from all parts of the world, so that the United States will become what Wattenberg describes as the world's first "universal nation." Fetzer (1996) reported that Jews remain far more favorable to immigration to the United States than any other ethnic group or religion.

It should be noted as a general point that the effectiveness of Jewish organizations in influencing U.S. immigration policy has been facilitated by certain characteristics of American Jewry that are directly linked with Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy, and particularly an IQ that is at least one standard deviation above the Caucasian mean (PTSDA, Ch. 7). High IQ is associated with success in a broad range of activities in contemporary societies, including especially wealth and social status (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994). As Neuringer (1971/1980, p. 87) notes, Jewish influence on immigration policy was facilitated by Jewish wealth, education, and social status. Reflecting its general disproportionate representation in markers of economic success and political influence, Jewish organizations have been able to have a vastly disproportionate effect on U.S. immigration policy because Jews as a group are highly organized, highly intelligent, politically astute, and able to command a high level of financial, political, and intellectual resources in pursuing their political aims. Similarly, Hollinger (1996, p. 19) notes that Jews were more influential in the decline of a homogeneous Protestant Christian culture in the United States than Catholics because of their greater wealth, social standing, and technical skill in the intellectual arena. In the area of immigration policy, the main Jewish activist organization influencing immigration policy, the AJCommittee, was characterized by "strong leadership [particularly that of Louis Marshall], internal cohesion, well-funded programs, sophisticated lobbying techniques, well-chosen non-Jewish allies, and good timing" (J. Goldstein, 1990, p. 333). Writing in 1996, J. J. Goldberg (pp. 38–39) noted that there were approximately three hundred national Jewish organizations in the United States with a combined budget estimated in the range of six billion dollars—a sum, J. J. Goldberg noted, greater than the gross national product of half the members of the United Nations.

The Jewish effort toward transforming the United States into a pluralistic society has been waged on several fronts. In addition to discussing legislative and lobbying activities related to immigration policy, mention will also be

made of Jewish efforts in influencing the wider cultural context of the post-World War II immigration debates, including the intellectual-academic arena, the area of church-state relationships, and organizing African Americans as a political and cultural force.

### *(1) Intellectual-Academic Efforts*

Hollinger (1996, p. 4) notes “the transformation of the ethnoreligious demography of American academic life by Jews” in the period from the 1930s to the 1960s, as well as the Jewish influence on trends toward the secularization of American society and in advancing an ideal of cosmopolitanism (p. 11). The pace of this influence was very likely influenced by the immigration battles of the 1920s. Hollinger notes (p. 22):

The old Protestant establishment’s influence persisted until the 1960s in large measure because of the Immigration Act of 1924: had massive immigration of Catholics and Jews continued at pre-1924 levels, the course of U.S. history would have been different in many ways, including, one may reasonably speculate, a more rapid diminution of Protestant cultural hegemony. Immigration restriction gave that hegemony a new lease of life.

It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the immigration battles from 1881 to 1965 have been of momentous historical importance in shaping the contours of American culture in the late twentieth century.

Of particular interest here is the ideology that the United States ought to be an ethnically and culturally pluralistic society. Beginning with Horace Kallen, Jewish intellectuals have been at the forefront in developing models of the United States as a culturally and ethnically pluralistic society. Reflecting the utility of cultural pluralism in serving Jewish group interests in maintaining cultural separatism, Kallen personally combined his ideology of cultural pluralism with a deep immersion in Jewish history and literature, a commitment to Zionism, and political activity on behalf of Jews in Eastern Europe (Sachar, 1992, pp. 425ff; Frommer, 1978).

Kallen (1915, 1924) developed a “polycentric” ideal for American ethnic relationships. Kallen defined ethnicity as deriving from one’s biological endowment, implying that Jews should be able to remain a genetically and culturally cohesive group while participating in American democratic institutions. This conception that the United States should be organized as a set of separate ethnic-cultural groups was accompanied by an ideology that relationships between groups would be cooperative and benign: “Kallen lifted his eyes above the strife that swirled around him to an ideal realm where diversity and harmony coexist” (Higham, 1984, p. 209). Similarly in Germany, the Jewish leader



Moritz Lazarus argued in opposition to the views of the German intellectual Heinrich von Treitschke that the continued separateness of diverse ethnic groups contributed to the richness of German culture (Schorsch, 1972, p. 63). Lazarus also developed the doctrine of dual loyalty, which became a cornerstone of the Zionist movement. Already in 1862 Moses Hess had developed the view that Judaism would lead the world to an era of universal harmony in which each ethnic group retained its separate existence but no group controlled any area of land (see SAID, Ch. 5).

Kallen wrote his 1915 article partly in reaction to the ideas of Edward A. Ross (1914). Ross was a Darwinian sociologist who believed that the existence of clearly demarcated groups would tend to result in between-group competition for resources—clearly a perspective that is highly congruent with the theory and data presented in SAID. Higham's comment is interesting because it shows that Kallen's romantic views of group coexistence were massively contradicted by the reality of between-group competition in his own day. Indeed, it is noteworthy that Kallen was a prominent leader of the AJCongress. During the 1920s and 1930s the AJCongress championed group economic and political rights for Jews in Eastern Europe at a time when there was widespread ethnic tensions and persecution of Jews, and despite the fears of many that such activism would merely exacerbate current tensions. The AJCongress demanded that Jews be allowed proportional political representation as well as the ability to organize their own communities and preserve an autonomous Jewish national culture. The treaties with Eastern European countries and Turkey included provisions that the state provide instruction in minority languages and that Jews have the right to refuse to attend courts or other public functions on the Sabbath (Frommer, 1978, p. 162).

Kallen's idea of cultural pluralism as a model for the United States was popularized among gentile intellectuals by John Dewey (Higham, 1984, p. 209), who in turn was promoted by Jewish intellectuals:

If lapsed Congregationalists like Dewey did not need immigrants to inspire them to press against the boundaries of even the most liberal of Protestant sensibilities, Dewey's kind were resoundingly encouraged in that direction by the Jewish intellectuals they encountered in urban academic and literary communities. . . .

One force in this [culture war of the 1940s] was a secular, increasingly Jewish, decidedly left-of-center intelligentsia based largely . . . in the disciplinary communities of philosophy and the social sciences. . . . The presiding spirit was the aging John Dewey himself, still contributing occasional articles and addresses to the cause. (Hollinger, 1996, pp. 24, 160)

The editors of *Partisan Review* (W. Phillips & Rahv, 1946, p. 608), the principal journal of the New York Intellectuals, published work by Dewey and called him “America’s leading philosopher.” Dewey’s student, New York Intellectual Sidney Hook (1987, p. 82), was also unsparing in his praise of Dewey, terming him “the intellectual leader of the liberal community in the United States” and “a sort of intellectual tribune of progressive causes.”

Dewey, as the leading American secularist, was allied with a group of Jewish intellectuals opposed to “specifically Christian formulations of American democracy” (Hollinger, 1996, p. 158). Dewey had close links with the New York Intellectuals, many of whom were Trotskyists, and he headed the Dewey Commission that exonerated Trotsky of charges brought against him in the Moscow Trials of 1936. Dewey was highly influential with the public at large. Henry Steele Commager described Dewey as “the guide, the mentor, and the conscience of the American people; it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that for a generation no issue was clarified until Dewey had spoken” (in Sandel, 1996). Dewey was the foremost advocate of “progressive education” and helped establish the New School for Social Research and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), both essentially Jewish organizations (J. J. Goldberg, 1996, pp. 46, 131). As with several other gentiles discussed in this volume, Dewey, whose “lack of presence as a writer, speaker, or personality makes his popular appeal something of a mystery” (Sandel), thus represented the public face of a movement dominated by Jewish intellectuals.

Kallen’s ideas have been very influential in producing Jewish self-conceptualizations of their status in America. This influence was apparent as early as 1915 among American Zionists, such as Louis D. Brandeis.<sup>145</sup> Brandeis viewed

---

<sup>145</sup> The American Zionist Maurice Samuel, although condemning the Immigration Act of 1924 as racist (see above), had well-developed racist ideas of his own. Samuel wrote a well-known work, *You Gentiles* (1924/2022), that contains a very clear statement of biological differences creating an unbridgeable gulf between Jews and gentiles:

- “Though you and we were to agree on all fundamental principles . . . yet we should remain fundamentally different. The language of our external expression is alike, but the language of our internal meaning is different. . . . Instinct endures for glacial ages; religions revolve with civilizations.” (pp. 28–29)
- “The difference between us is abysmal.” (p. 30)
- “This difference in behavior and reaction springs from something much more earnest and significant than a difference in beliefs: it springs from a difference in our biologic equipment.” (p. 34)
- “These are two ways of life, each utterly alien to the other. Each has its place in the world—but they cannot flourish in the same soil, they cannot remain in contact without antagonism. Though to life itself each way is a perfect utterance, to each other they are enemies.” (pp. 36–37)

The prominent and influential American Jewish pro-immigration activist Louis Marshall also had a strong attachment to Judaism which he viewed as a race. He stated that “As you know, I am not a Zionist, certainly not a Nationalist. I am . . . one who takes a pride in the literature, the history, the traditions, and the spiritual and intellectual contributions which Judaism has made to the world, and as I grow older, the feelings of love and reverence for the

the United States as composed of different nationalities whose free development would “spiritually enrich the United States and would make it a democracy *par excellence*” (Gal, 1989, p. 70). These views became “a hallmark of mainstream American Zionism, secular and religious alike” (p. 70). Cultural pluralism was also a hallmark of the Jewish-dominated intergroup relations movement following World War II, although these intellectuals sometimes couched these ideas in terms of “unity in diversity” or “cultural democracy” in an effort to remove the connotation that the United States should literally be a federation of different national groups as the AJCongress advocated in the case of Eastern Europe and elsewhere (Svonkin, 1997, p. 22). Kallen’s influence extended really to all educated Jews:

Legitimizing the preservation of a minority culture in the midst of a majority’s host society, pluralism functioned as intellectual anchorage for an educated Jewish second generation, sustained its cohesiveness and its most tenacious communal endeavors through the rigors of the Depression and revived anti-semitism, through the shock of Nazism and the Holocaust, until the emergence of Zionism in the post-World War II years swept through American Jewry with a climactic redemptionist fervor of its own. (Sachar, 1992, p. 427)

As David Petegorsky, executive director of the AJCongress, stated in an address to the biennial convention of the AJCongress in 1948:

We are profoundly convinced that Jewish survival will depend on Jewish statehood in Palestine, on the one hand, and on the existence of a creative, conscious and well-adjusted Jewish *community* in this country on the other. Such a creative community can exist only within the framework of a progressive and expanding democratic society, which through its institutions and public policies gives full expression to the concept of cultural pluralism. (in Svonkin, 1997, p. 82; emphasis original)

Besides the ideology of ethnic and cultural pluralism, the ultimate success of Jewish attitudes and lobbying efforts on immigration was also influenced by intellectual movements reviewed in Chapters 2–7. These movements, and particularly the work of Franz Boas, collectively resulted in the decline of evolutionary and biological thinking in the academic world. Although playing virtually no role in the restrictionist position in the congressional debates on immigration (which focused mainly on the fairness of maintaining the ethnic

---

cradle of our race increase in intensity” (in N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 107). The comment is another example of Jewish identification and group commitment increasing with age (see PTSDA, Ch. 7, note 27).

status quo; see below), a component of the intellectual *zeitgeist* of the 1920s was the prevalence of evolutionary theories of race and ethnicity (Singerman, 1986), particularly the theories of Madison Grant. In *The Passing of the Great Race*, Grant (1921) argued that the American colonial stock was derived from superior Nordic racial elements and that immigration of other races would lower the competence level of the society as a whole as well as threaten democratic and republican institutions. Grant's ideas were popularized in the media at the time of the immigration debates (see Divine, 1957, pp. 12ff) and often provoked negative comments in Jewish publications such as *The American Hebrew* (e.g., March 21, 1924, pp. 554, 625).

Grant's letter to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization emphasized the principal argument of the restrictionists, that is, that the use of the 1890 census of the foreign born as the basis of the immigration law was fair to all ethnic groups currently in the country, and that the use of the 1910 census discriminated against the "native Americans whose ancestors were in this country before its independence." He also argued in favor of quotas restricting immigration from Western Hemisphere nations because these countries,

in some cases furnish very undesirable immigrants. The Mexicans who come into the United States are overwhelmingly of Indian blood, and the recent intelligence tests have shown their very low intellectual status. We have already got too many of them in our Southwestern States, and a check should be put on their increase. (*Restriction of Immigration*, 1924, p. 571)

Grant was also concerned about the unassimilability of recent immigrants. He included with his letter a *Chicago Tribune* editorial commenting on a situation in Hamtramck, Michigan, in which recent immigrants were described as demanding "Polish rule," the expulsion of non-Poles, and use of only the Polish language by federal officials. Grant also argued that differential fertility would result in displacement of groups that delayed marriage and had fewer children—a comment that reflects ethnic differences in life history strategy (Rushton, 1995) and clearly indicating a concern that as a result of immigration his ethnic group would be displaced by ethnic groups with a higher rate of natural increase. Reflecting his concerns about immigrants from Mexico. Recent data indicate continuing racial/ethnic differences in fertility, with Hispanic women's fertility higher than Black women's fertility, and both above White women's fertility. Asian-American women have the lowest fertility rate for American women (Migiro, 2020). Moreover, Latino activists have a clearly articulated policy of "reconquering" the United States via immigration and high birth rates (see CCIR, 1997).

In Chapter 2 I showed that Stephen Jay Gould and Leon Kamin have presented a highly exaggerated and largely false account of the role of the IQ debates of the 1920s in passing immigration restriction legislation. It is also very easy to overemphasize the importance of theories of Nordic superiority as an ingredient of popular and congressional restrictionist sentiment. As Singerman (1986, pp. 118–119) points out, “racial anti-Semitism” was employed by only “a handful of writers”; moreover “the Jewish ‘problem’ . . . was a minor preoccupation even among such widely published authors as Madison Grant or T. Lothrop Stoddard, and none of the individuals examined [in Singerman’s review] could be regarded as professional Jew-baiters or full-time propagandists against Jews, domestic or foreign.” As indicated below, arguments related to Nordic superiority, including supposed Nordic intellectual superiority, played remarkably little role in congressional debates over immigration in the 1920s, the common argument of the restrictionists being that immigration policy should reflect equally the interests of all ethnic groups currently in the country. There is even evidence that the Nordic superiority argument had little favor with the public: a member of the Immigration Restriction League stated in 1924 that “the country is somewhat fed up on high-brow Nordic superiority stuff” (in Samelson, 1979, p. 136).

Nevertheless, it is probable that the decline in evolutionary and biological theories of race and ethnicity facilitated the sea change in immigration policy brought about by the 1965 law. As Higham (1984) notes, by the time of the final victory in 1965, which removed national origins and racial ancestry from immigration policy and opened up immigration to all human groups, the Boasian perspective of cultural determinism and anti-biologism had become standard academic wisdom. The result was that “it became intellectually fashionable to discount the very existence of persistent ethnic differences. The whole reaction deprived popular race feelings of a powerful ideological weapon” (pp. 58–59).

Jewish intellectuals were prominently involved in the movement to eradicate the racist ideas of Grant and others (Degler, 1991, pp. 200–201). Indeed, even during the earlier debates leading up to the Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924, restrictionists perceived themselves to be under attack from Jewish intellectuals. In 1918 Prescott F. Hall, secretary of the Immigration Restriction League, wrote to Grant:

What I wanted . . . was the names of a few anthropologists of note who have declared in favor of the inequality of the races. . . . I am up against the Jews all the time in the equality argument and thought perhaps you might be able offhand to name a few (besides [Henry Fairfield] Osborn) whom I could quote in support. (in Samelson, 1975, p. 467)

Grant also believed that Jews were engaged in a campaign to discredit racial research. In the introduction to the 1921 edition of *The Passing of the Great Race*, Grant (pp. xxxi–xxxii) complained:

[I]t is well-nigh impossible to publish in the American newspapers any reflection upon certain religions or races which are hysterically sensitive even when mentioned by name. The underlying idea seems to be that if publication can be suppressed the facts themselves will ultimately disappear. Abroad, conditions are fully as bad, and we have the authority of one of the most eminent anthropologists in France that the collection of anthropological measurements and data among French recruits at the outbreak of the Great War was prevented by Jewish influence, which aimed to suppress any suggestion of racial differentiation in France.

Boas was greatly motivated by the immigration issue as it developed early in the century. Carl Degler (1991, p. 74) notes that Boas's professional correspondence "reveals that an important motive behind his famous head-measuring project in 1910 was his strong personal interest in keeping the United States diverse in population." The study, whose conclusions were placed into the Congressional Record by Representative Emanuel Celler during the debate on immigration restriction (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, pp. 5915–5916), concluded that the environmental differences consequent to immigration caused differences in head shape. (At the time, head shape as determined by the cephalic index was the main measurement used by scientists involved in racial differences research.) The two men thus cooperated on immigration policy. In a letter (May 26th, 1927) Boas tells Celler, "I wish very much that an amendment to allow Hindues to come here could go through," arguing that higher caste Indians are basically European. "The difficulty at present lies with the definition of what is a white person and Caucasian race."

Boas argued that his research showed that all foreign groups living in favorable social circumstances had become assimilated to the United States in the sense that their physical measurements converged on the American type. Although he was considerably more circumspect regarding his conclusions in the body of his report (see also Stocking, 1968, pp. 178–179), Boas (1911, p. 5) stated in his introduction that "all fear of an unfavorable influence of South European immigration upon the body of our people should be dismissed." As a further indication of Boas's ideological commitment to the immigration issue, Degler (1994, p. 75) makes the following comment regarding one of Boas's environmentalist explanations for mental differences between immigrant and native children: "Why Boas chose to advance such an ad hoc interpretation is hard to understand until one recognizes his desire to explain in a favorable way the apparent mental backwardness of the immigrant children."

The ideology of racial equality was an important weapon on behalf of opening immigration up to all human groups. For example, in a 1951 statement to Congress (*Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 391), the AJCongress stated, "The findings of science must force even the most prejudiced among us to accept, as unqualifiedly as we do the law of gravity, that intelligence, morality and character, bear no relationship whatever to geography or place of birth." The statement went on to cite some of Boas's popular writings on the subject as well as the writings of Boas's protégé Ashley Montagu, perhaps the most visible opponent of the concept of race during this period (pp. 402–403). Montagu, whose original name was Israel Ehrenberg, theorized in the period immediately following World War II that humans are innately cooperative, but not innately aggressive, and that there is a universal brotherhood among humans (see Shipman, 1994, pp. 159ff). In 1952 another Boas protégé, Margaret Mead, testified before the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization (PCIN, 1953/1971, p. 92) that "all human beings from all groups of people have the same potentialities. . . . Our best anthropological evidence today suggests that the people of every group have about the same distribution of potentialities." Another witness stated that the executive board of the American Anthropological Association had unanimously endorsed the proposition that "[a]ll scientific evidence indicates that all peoples are inherently capable of acquiring or adapting to our civilization" (p. 93) (see Ch. 2 for a discussion of the success of the political efforts of the Boasians to dominate the American Anthropological Association). By 1965 Senator Jacob Javits (111 Cong. Rec., 1965, p. 24469) could confidently announce to the Senate during the debate on the immigration bill that,

both the dictates of our consciences as well as the precepts of sociologists tell us that immigration, as it exists in the national origins quota system, is wrong and without any basis in reason or fact for we know better than to say that one man is better than another because of the color of his skin.

The intellectual revolution and its translation into public policy had been completed.

## (2) Church-State Relationships

One aspect of the Jewish interest in cultural pluralism in the United States has been that Jews have a perceived interest that the United States not be a homogeneous Christian culture. As Ivers (1995, p. 2) notes, "Jewish civil rights organizations have had an historic role in the postwar development of American church-state law and policy." In this case the main Jewish effort began only after World War II, although Jews opposed linkages between the state and the

Protestant religion much earlier. For example, Jewish publications were unanimous in their opposition to Tennessee's law that resulted in the 1925 Scopes trial in which Darwinism was pitted against religious fundamentalism (Goldfarb, 1984, p. 43).

It matters not whether evolution is or is not true. What matters is that there are certain forces in this country who insist that the Government shall see to it that nothing is taught in this country which will in any way cast a doubt on the *infallibility* of the Bible. There you have the whole issue boiled down. In other words, it is a deliberate *un-American* attempt to unite Church and State. . . . And we go even further than that and assert that it is an attempt to unite *State* with *Protestant Church*. (Joseph, 1925, p. 18; emphasis original)

The Jewish effort in this case was well funded and was the focus of well-organized, highly dedicated Jewish civil service organizations, including the AJCommittee, the AJCongress, and the ADL. It involved keen legal expertise not only in the actual litigation but also in influencing legal opinion via articles in law journals and other forums of intellectual debate, including the popular media. It also involved a highly charismatic and effective leadership, particularly Leo Pfeffer of the AJCongress:

No other lawyer exercised such complete intellectual dominance over a chosen area of law for so extensive a period—as an author, scholar, public citizen, and above all, legal advocate who harnessed his multiple and formidable talents into a single force capable of satisfying all that an institution needs for a successful constitutional reform movement. . . . That Pfeffer, through an enviable combination of skill, determination, and persistence, was able in such a short period of time to make church-state reform the foremost cause with which rival organizations associated the AJCongress illustrates well the impact that individual lawyers endowed with exceptional skills can have on the character and life of the organizations for which they work. . . . As if to confirm the extent to which Pfeffer is associated with post-Everson [i.e., post-1946] constitutional development, even the major critics of the Court's church-state jurisprudence during this period and the modern doctrine of separationism rarely fail to make reference to Pfeffer as the central force responsible for what they lament as the lost meaning of the establishment clause. (Ivers, 1995, pp. 222–224)

Similarly, Jews in nineteenth-century France and Germany attempted to remove education from the control of the Catholic and Lutheran churches respectively, while for many gentiles Christianity was an important part of



national identity (Lindemann, 1997, p. 214). Because of such activities, anti-Semites commonly viewed Jews as destroyers of the social fabric.

(3) *Organization of African Americans and the Intergroup  
Relations Movement in the Post-World War II Era*

Finally, Jews have also been instrumental in organizing African Americans as a political force that served Jewish interests in diluting the political and cultural hegemony of non-Jewish European Americans. Jews played a very prominent role in organizing Blacks beginning with the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1909 and, despite increasing Black anti-Semitism, continuing into the present.

By mid-decade [c. 1915], the NAACP had something of the aspect of an adjunct of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee, with the brothers Joel and Arthur Spingarn serving as board chairman and chief legal counsel, respectively; Herbert Lehman on the executive committee; Lillian Wald and Walter Sachs on the board (though not simultaneously); and Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg as financial angels. By 1920, Herbert Seligman was director of public relations, and Martha Gruening served as his assistant. . . . Small wonder that a bewildered Marcus Garvey stormed out of NAACP headquarters in 1917, muttering that it was a white organization. (D. L. Lewis, 1984, p. 85)

Wealthy Jews were important contributors to the National Urban League as well: "Edwin Seligman's chairmanship, and the presence on the board of Felix Adler, Lillian Wald, Abraham Lefkowitz, and, shortly thereafter, Julius Rosenwald, principal Sears, Roebuck Company stockholder, forecast significant Jewish contributions to the League" (D. L. Lewis, 1984, p. 85). In addition to providing funding and organizational talent (the presidents of the NAACP were Jews until 1975), Jewish legal talent was harnessed on behalf of African American causes. Louis Marshall, a prominent player in the Jewish efforts on immigration (see below), was a principal NAACP attorney during the 1920s. African Americans played little role in these efforts: for example, until 1933 there were no African American lawyers in the NAACP legal department (M. Friedman, 1995, p. 106). Indeed, a theme of revisionist historians reviewed by M. Friedman is that Jews organized African Americans for their own interests rather than the best interests of African Americans. In the post-World War II period the entire gamut of Jewish civil service organizations were involved in Black issues, including the AJCommittee, the AJCongress, and the ADL: "With professionally trained personnel, fully equipped offices, and public relations know-how, they had the resources to make a difference" (M. Friedman, p. 135).

Jews contributed from two-thirds to three-quarters of the money for civil rights groups during the 1960s (J. Kaufman, 1997, p. 110). Jewish groups, particularly the AJCongress, played a leading role in drafting civil rights legislation and pursuing legal challenges related to civil rights issues mainly benefiting Blacks (Svonkin, 1997, pp. 79–112).

Jewish support, legal and monetary, afforded the civil rights movement a string of legal victories. . . . There is little exaggeration in an American Jewish Congress lawyer's claim that "many of these laws were actually written in the offices of Jewish agencies by Jewish staff people, introduced by Jewish legislators and pressured into being by Jewish voters." (D. L. Lewis, 1984, p. 94)

Harold Cruse (1967/1992) presents a particularly trenchant analysis of the Black Jewish coalition that reflects several themes of this volume. First, he notes, "*Jews know exactly what they want in America*" (p. 121; emphasis original). Jews want cultural pluralism because of their long-term policy of non-assimilation and group solidarity. Cruse notes, however, that the Jewish experience in Europe has shown them that "*two can play this game*" (i.e., develop highly nationalistic solidary groups), and "when that happens, woe be to the side that is short on numbers" (p. 122; emphasis original). Cruse is here referring to the possibility of antagonistic group strategies (and, I suppose, the reactive processes) that form the subject matter of SAID (Chs. 3–5). Correspondingly, Cruse observes that Jewish organizations view Anglo-Saxon (read Caucasian) nationalism as their greatest potential threat and that they have tended to support pro-Black integration (i.e., assimilationist, individualist) policies for Blacks in America, presumably because such policies dilute Caucasian power and lessen the possibility of a cohesive, nationalist, anti-Semitic, Caucasian majority. At the same time, Jewish organizations have opposed a Black nationalist position while pursuing an anti-assimilationist, nationalist group strategy for their own group.

Cruse also points out the asymmetry in Black-Jewish relations: while Jews have held prominent roles in Black civil rights organizations and have been actively involved in their funding and in making and implementing their policies, Blacks have been completely excluded from the inner workings and policy-making bodies in Jewish organizations. To a considerable extent, at least until quite recently, the form and goals of the Black movement in the United States should be seen as an instrument of Jewish strategy with very similar goals to those pursued in the arena of immigration legislation.

The Jewish role in African American affairs must, however, be seen as part of the broader role of what participants termed the "intergroup relations movement" that worked to "eliminate prejudice and discrimination against

racial, ethnic, and religious minorities” in the period following World War II (Svonkin, 1997, p. 1). As with the other movements with strong Jewish involvement, Jewish organizations, particularly the AJCommittee, the AJCongress, and the ADL, were the leaders, and these organizations provided the major sources of funding, devised the tactics, and defined the objectives of the movement. As was also the case with the movement to shape immigration policy, its aim was the very self-interested aim of preventing the development of a mass anti-Semitic movement in the United States: Jewish activists “saw their commitment to the intergroup relations movement as a preventive measure designed to make sure ‘it’—the Nazis’ war of extermination against European Jewry—never happened in America” (p. 10).

This was a multifaceted effort, ranging from legal challenges to bias in housing, education, and public employment; legislative proposals and efforts to secure their passage into law in state and national legislative bodies; efforts to shape messages emanating from the media; educational programs for students and teachers; and intellectual efforts to reshape the intellectual discourse of academia. As with Jewish involvement in immigration policy and a great many other instances of Jewish political and intellectual activity in both modern and premodern times (see SAID, Ch. 6), the intergroup relations movement often worked to minimize overt Jewish involvement (e.g., Svonkin, 1997, pp. 45, 51, 65, 71–72).

As in the nineteenth-century attempt to define Jewish interests in terms of German ideals (Ragins, 1980, p. 55; H. D. Schmidt, 1959, p. 46), the rhetoric of the intergroup relations movement stressed that its goals were congruent with American self-conceptualizations, a move that stressed the Enlightenment legacy of individual rights while effectively ignoring the republican strand of American identity as a cohesive, socially homogeneous society and the “ethnocultural” strand emphasizing the importance of Anglo-Saxon ethnicity in the development and preservation of American cultural forms (R. M. Smith, 1988). Liberal cosmopolitanism and individual rights were also conceived as congruent with Jewish ideals originating with the prophets (Svonkin, 1997, pp. 7, 20), a conceptualization that ignores the negative conceptualizations of and discrimination against outgroups and a pronounced tendency toward collectivism that have been central to Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. As Svonkin notes, Jewish rhetoric during this period relied on an illusory view of the Jewish past that was tailor-made to achieve Jewish objectives in the modern world, where the Enlightenment rhetoric of universalism and individual rights retained considerable intellectual prestige.

Of critical importance in rationalizing Jewish interests during this period were the intellectual movements discussed in this volume, particularly Boasian anthropology, psychoanalysis, and the Frankfurt School of Social Research. As also indicated in Chapter 5, Jewish organizations were involved in funding

research in the social sciences (particularly social psychology), and there developed a core of predominantly Jewish academic activists who worked closely with Jewish organizations (Svonkin, 1997, p. 4; see Ch. 5). Boasian anthropology was enlisted in post-World War II propaganda efforts distributed and promoted by the AJCommittee, the AJCongress, and the ADL, as in the film *Brotherhood of Man* (1946), which depicted all human groups as having equal abilities. During the 1930s the AJCommittee financially supported Boas in his research; and in the postwar era, the Boasian ideology that there were no racial differences as well as the Boasian ideology of cultural relativism and the importance of preserving and respecting cultural differences deriving from Horace Kallen were important ingredients of educational programs sponsored by these Jewish activist organizations and widely distributed throughout the American educational system (Svonkin, 1997, pp. 63–64).

By the early 1960s an ADL official estimated that one-third of America's teachers had received ADL educational material based on these ideas (Svonkin, 1997, p. 69). The ADL was also intimately involved in staffing, developing materials, and providing financial assistance for workshops for teachers and school administrators, often with the involvement of social scientists from the academic world—an association that undoubtedly added to the scientific credibility of these exercises. It is ironic, perhaps, that this effort to influence the public school curriculum was carried on by the same groups that were endeavoring to remove overt Christian influences from the public schools.<sup>146</sup>

The ideology of intergroup animosity developed by the intergroup relations movement derived from the *Studies in Prejudice* series described in Chapter 6. It explicitly viewed manifestations of gentile ethnocentrism or discrimination against outgroups as a mental disease and thus literally a public health problem. The assault on intergroup animosity was likened to the medical assault on deadly infectious diseases, and people with the disease were described by activists as “infected” (Svonkin, 1997, pp. 30, 59). A consistent theme of the intellectual rationale for this body of ethnic activism emphasized the benefits to be gained by increased levels of intergroup harmony—an aspect of the idealism inherent in Horace Kallen's conceptualization of multiculturalism—without mentioning that some groups, particularly European-derived, non-Jewish groups, would lose economic and political power and decline in cultural influence (p. 5). Negative attitudes toward groups were viewed not as the result of competing group interests but rather as the result of individual psychopathology (p. 75). Finally, while gentile ethnocentrism was viewed as a

---

<sup>146</sup> The ADL continues to be a major promoter of diversity education through its A World of Difference Institute. From 1985 to 2023 this institute has trained annually tens of thousands of elementary and secondary school teachers in diversity education and conducted workplace diversity training programs for workers and college students in the United States. Similar teacher training programs have also been instituted by the ADL in Germany and Russia.

public health problem, the AJCongress fought against Jewish assimilation. The AJCongress “was explicitly committed to a pluralistic vision that respected group rights and group distinctiveness as a fundamental civil liberty” (p. 81).

#### JEWSH ANTI-RESTRICTIONIST POLITICAL ACTIVITY

##### *Jewish Anti-Restrictionist Activity in the United States Up to 1924*

Jewish involvement in altering the intellectual discussion of race and ethnicity appears to have had long-term repercussions on U.S. immigration policy, but Jewish political involvement was ultimately of much greater significance. Jews have been “the single most persistent pressure group favoring a liberal immigration policy” in the United States in the entire immigration debate beginning in 1881:

In undertaking to sway immigration policy in a liberal direction, Jewish spokespersons and organizations demonstrated a degree of energy unsurpassed by any other interested pressure group. Immigration had constituted a prime object of concern for practically every major Jewish defense and community relations organization. Over the years, their spokespersons had assiduously attended congressional hearings, and the Jewish effort was of the utmost importance in establishing and financing such non-sectarian groups as the National Liberal Immigration League and the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons. (Neuringer, 1971/1980, pp. 392–393)

As recounted by Nathan C. Belth (1979, p. 173) in his history of the ADL:

In Congress, through all the years when the immigration battles were being fought, the names of Jewish legislators were in the forefront of the liberal forces: from Adolph Sabath to Samuel Dickstein and Emanuel Celler in the House and from Herbert H. Lehman to Jacob Javits in the Senate. Each in his time was a leader of the Anti-Defamation League and of major organizations concerned with democratic development.

The Jewish congressmen who are most closely identified with anti-restrictionist efforts in Congress have therefore also been leaders of the group most closely identified with Jewish ethnic political activism and self-defense.

Throughout the almost one hundred years prior to achieving success with the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, Jewish groups opportunistically made alliances with other groups whose interests temporarily converged with Jewish interests (e.g., a constantly changing set of ethnic groups, religious

groups, pro-communists, anti-communists, the foreign policy interests of various presidents, and the political need for presidents to curry favor with groups influential in populous states in order to win national elections). Particularly noteworthy was the support of a liberal immigration policy from industrial interests wanting cheap labor, at least in the period prior to the 1924 temporary triumph of restrictionism. Within this constantly shifting set of alliances, Jewish organizations persistently pursued their goals of maximizing the number of Jewish immigrants and opening up the United States to immigration from all of the peoples of the world. As indicated in the following, the historical record supports the proposition that turning the United States into a multicultural society has been a major Jewish goal beginning in the nineteenth century.

The ultimate Jewish victory on immigration is remarkable because it was waged in different arenas against a potentially very powerful set of opponents. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, leadership of the restrictionists was provided by Eastern patricians such as Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. However, the main political basis of restrictionism from 1910 to 1952 (in addition to the relatively ineffectual labor union interests) derived from "the common people of the South and West" (Higham, 1984, p. 49) and their representatives in Congress. Fundamentally, the clashes between Jews and gentiles in the period between 1900 and 1965 were conflicts between Jews and this geographically centered group. "Jews, as a result of their intellectual energy and economic resources, constituted an advance guard of the new peoples who had no feeling for the traditions of rural America" (pp. 168-169), a theme also apparent in the discussion of the New York Intellectuals in Chapter 7 and in the discussion of Jewish involvement in political radicalism in Chapter 3.

Although often concerned that Jewish immigration would fan the flames of anti-Semitism in America, Jewish leaders fought a long and largely successful delaying action against restrictions on immigration during the period from 1891 to 1924, particularly as they affected the ability of Jews to immigrate. These efforts continued despite the fact that by 1905 there was "a polarity between Jewish and general American opinion on immigration" (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 83). In particular, whereas other religious groups such as Catholics and ethnic groups such as the Irish had divided and ambivalent attitudes toward immigration and were poorly organized and ineffective in influencing immigration policy, and whereas labor unions opposed immigration in their attempt to diminish the supply of cheap labor, Jewish groups engaged in an intensive and sustained effort against attempts to restrict immigration.

As recounted by N. W. Cohen (1972, pp. 40ff), the AJCommittee's efforts in opposition to immigration restriction in the early twentieth century constitute a remarkable example of the ability of Jewish organizations to influence public policy. Of all the groups affected by the immigration legislation of 1907,

Jews had the least to gain in terms of numbers of possible immigrants, but they played by far the largest role in shaping the legislation (p. 41). In the subsequent period leading up to the relatively ineffective restrictionist Immigration Act of 1917, when restrictionists again mounted an effort in Congress, "only the Jewish segment was aroused" (p. 49).

Nevertheless, because of the fear of anti-Semitism, efforts were made to prevent the perception of Jewish involvement in anti-restrictionist campaigns. In 1906 Jewish anti-restrictionist political operatives were instructed to lobby Congress without mentioning their affiliation with the AJCommittee because of "the danger that the Jews may be accused of being organized for a political purpose" (comments of Herbert Friedenwald, AJCommittee secretary; in J. Goldstein, 1990, p. 125). Beginning in the late nineteenth century, anti-restrictionist arguments developed by Jews were typically couched in terms of universalist humanitarian ideals; as part of this universalizing effort, gentiles from old-line Protestant families were recruited to act as window dressing for their efforts, and Jewish groups such as the AJCommittee funded pro-immigration groups composed of non-Jews (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 92).

As was the case in later pro-immigration efforts, much of the activity was behind-the-scenes personal interventions with politicians in order to minimize public perception of the Jewish role and to avoid provoking opposition (N. W. Cohen, 1972, pp. 41–42; J. Goldstein, 1990). Opposing politicians such as Henry Cabot Lodge and organizations such as the Immigration Restriction League were kept under close scrutiny and pressured by lobbyists. Lobbyists in Washington also kept a daily scorecard of voting tendencies as immigration bills wended their way through Congress and engaged in intense and successful efforts to convince Presidents Taft and Wilson to veto restrictive immigration legislation. Catholic prelates were recruited to protest the effects of restrictionist legislation on immigration from Italy and Hungary. When restrictionist arguments appeared in the media, the AJCommittee made sophisticated replies based on scholarly data and typically couched in universalist terms as benefiting the whole society. Articles favorable to immigration were published in national magazines, and letters to the editor were published in newspapers. Efforts were made to minimize the negative perceptions of immigration by distributing Jewish immigrants around the country and by getting Jewish aliens off public support. Legal proceedings were filed to prevent the deportation of Jewish aliens. Eventually mass protest meetings were organized.

Writing in 1914, the sociologist Edward A. Ross believed that liberal immigration policy was exclusively a Jewish issue. Ross quotes (p. 144) the prominent author and Zionist pioneer Israel Zangwill, who articulated the idea that the United States is an ideal place to achieve Jewish interests:

America has ample room for all the six millions of the Pale [i.e., the Pale of Settlement, home to most of Russia's Jews]; any one of her fifty states could absorb them. And next to being in a country of their own, there could be no better fate for them than to be together in a land of civil and religious liberty, of whose Constitution Christianity forms no part and where their collective votes would practically guarantee them against future persecution.

Jews therefore have a powerful interest in immigration policy:

Hence the endeavor of the Jews to control the immigration policy of the United States. Although theirs is but a seventh of our net immigration, they led the fight on the Immigration Commission's bill. The power of the million Jews in the metropolis lined up the Congressional delegation from New York in solid opposition to the literacy test. The systematic campaign in newspapers and magazines to break down all arguments for restriction and to calm nativist fears is waged by and for one race. Hebrew money is behind the National Liberal Immigration League and its numerous publications. From the paper before the commercial body or the scientific association to the heavy treatise produced with the aid of the Baron de Hirsch Fund, the literature that proves the blessings of immigration to all classes in America emanates from subtle Hebrew brains. (Ross, 1914, pp. 144-145)

Ross (1914, p. 150) also reported that immigration officials had,

become very sore over the incessant fire of false accusations to which they are subjected by the Jewish press and societies. United States senators complain that during the close of the struggle over the immigration bill they were overwhelmed with a torrent of crooked statistics and misrepresentations by the Hebrews fighting the literacy test.

Zangwill's views were well known to restrictionists in the debates over the Immigration Act of 1924 (see below). In an address reprinted in *The American Hebrew*, Zangwill (1923, p. 582) noted, "There is only one way to World Peace, and that is the absolute abolition of passports, visas, frontiers, custom houses, and all other devices that make of the population of our planet not a co-operating civilization but a mutual irritation society." His famous play, *The Melting-Pot* (1908/1914), was dedicated to Theodore Roosevelt and depicts Jewish immigrants as eager to assimilate and intermarry. The lead character describes the United States as a crucible in which all the races, including the "black and



yellow" races, are being melted together.<sup>147</sup> However, Zangwill's views on Jewish-gentile intermarriage were ambiguous at best (Biale, 1998, pp. 22–24), and he detested Christian proselytism to Jews. Zangwill was an ardent Zionist and an admirer of his father's religious orthodoxy as a model for the preservation of Judaism. He believed Jews were a morally superior race whose moral vision had shaped Christian and Muslim societies and would eventually reform the world, although Christianity remained morally inferior to Judaism (see Leftwich, 1957, pp. 162ff). Jews would retain their racial purity if they continued to practice their religion: "So long as Judaism flourishes among Jews there is no need to talk of safeguarding race or nationality; both are automatically preserved by the religion" (in p. 161).

Despite deceptive attempts to present the pro-immigration movement as broad-based, Jewish activists were aware of the lack of enthusiasm of other ethnic and religious groups. During the fight over restrictionist legislation at the end of the Taft administration, Herbert Friedenwald, AJCommittee secretary, wrote that it was "very difficult to get any people except the Jews stirred up in this fight" (in J. Goldstein, 1990, p. 203). The AJCommittee contributed heavily to staging anti-restrictionist rallies in major American cities but allowed other ethnic groups to take credit for the events, and it organized groups of non-Jews to influence President Taft to veto restrictionist legislation (pp. 216, 227). During the Wilson administration, Louis Marshall stated, "We are practically the only ones who are fighting [the literacy test]" while a "great proportion" of the people is "indifferent to what is done" (in p. 249).

The forces of immigration restriction were temporarily successful with the Immigration Acts of 1921 and 1924, which passed despite the intense opposition of Jewish groups. Divine (1957, p. 8) notes, "Arrayed against [the restrictionist forces] in 1921 were only the spokespersons for the southeastern European immigrants, mainly Jewish leaders, whose protests were drowned out by the general cry for restriction." Similarly, during the 1924 congressional hearings on immigration, "The most prominent group of witnesses against the bill were representatives of southeastern European immigrants, particularly Jewish leaders" (p. 16).

Jewish opposition to this legislation was motivated as much by their perception that the laws were motivated by anti-Semitism and that they discriminated in favor of Northwestern Europeans as by concern that they would curtail Jewish immigration (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 164)—a view that is implicitly in opposition to the ethnic status quo favoring Northwestern Europeans. Opposition to biasing immigration in favor of Northwestern Europeans remained

---

<sup>147</sup> Although Blacks were included in the crucible described in the play, Zangwill (1908/1914) seems to have had ambiguous attitudes toward Black-White intermarriage. In an afterword he wrote that Blacks on average had lower intellect and ethics but he also looked forward to the time when superior Blacks would marry Whites.

characteristic of Jewish attitudes in the following years, but the opposition of Jewish organizations to any restrictions on immigration based on race or ethnicity can be traced back to the nineteenth century.

Thus in 1882 the Jewish press was unanimous in its condemnation of the Chinese Exclusion Act (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 23), even though this act had no direct bearing on Jewish immigration. In the early twentieth century the AJCommittee at times actively fought against any bill that restricted immigration to White persons or non-Asians, and only refrained from active opposition if it judged that AJCommittee support would threaten the immigration of Jews (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 47; J. Goldstein, 1990, p. 250). In 1920 the Central Conference of American Rabbis passed a resolution urging that "the Nation . . . keep the gates of our beloved Republic open . . . to the oppressed and distressed of all mankind in conformity with its historic role as a haven of refuge for all men and women who pledge allegiance to its laws" (in *The American Hebrew*, October 1st, 1920, p. 594). *The American Hebrew* (February 17th, 1922, p. 373), a publication that represented the German-Jewish establishment of the period, reiterated its long-standing policy that it "has always stood for the admission of worthy immigrants of all classes, irrespective of nationality." And in his testimony at the 1924 hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the AJCommittee's Louis Marshall stated that the bill echoed the sentiments of the Ku Klux Klan; he characterized it as inspired by the racialist theories of Houston Stewart Chamberlain. At a time when the population of the United States was over one hundred million, Marshall stated, "[W]e have room in this country for ten times the population we have"; he advocated admission of all of the peoples of the world without quota limit, excluding only those who "were mentally, morally and physically unfit, who are enemies of organized government, and who are apt to become public charges" (*Restriction of Immigration*, 1924, pp. 309, 303). Similarly, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, representing the AJCongress and a variety of other Jewish organizations at the House hearings, asserted "the right of every man outside of America to be considered fairly and equitably and without discrimination" (p. 341).

By prescribing that immigration be restricted to 3 percent of the foreign born as of the 1890 census, the Immigration Act of 1924 prescribed an ethnic status quo approximating the 1920 census. The House Majority Report emphasized that prior to the legislation, immigration was highly biased in favor of Eastern and Southern Europeans, and that this imbalance had been continued by the Immigration Act of 1921 in which quotas were based on the numbers of foreign born as of the 1910 census. The expressed intention was that the interests of other groups to pursue their ethnic interests by expanding their percentage of the population should be balanced against the ethnic interests of the majority in retaining their ethnic representation in the population.

The Immigration Act of 1921 gave 46 percent of quota immigration to Southern and Eastern Europe even though these areas constituted only 11.7 percent of the U.S. population as of the 1920 census. The Immigration Act of 1924 prescribed that these areas would get 15.3 percent of the quota slots—a figure actually higher than their present representation in the population.

The use of the 1890 census is not discriminatory. It is used in an effort to preserve as nearly as possible, the racial status quo of the United States. It is hoped to guarantee as best we can at this late date, racial homogeneity in the United States. The use of a later census would discriminate against those who founded the Nation and perpetuated its institutions. (H.R. Rep. No. 350, 1924, p. 16)

After three years, quotas were derived from a national origins formula based on 1920 census data for the entire population, not only for the foreign born. No doubt this legislation represented a victory for the Northwestern European peoples of the United States, yet there was no attempt to reverse the trends in the ethnic composition of the country; rather, the efforts aimed to preserve the ethnic status quo.

Although motivated by this desire to preserve the ethnic status quo, these laws may also have been motivated partly by anti-Semitism, since during this period liberal immigration policy was perceived as mainly a Jewish issue (see above). This certainly appears to have been the perception of Jewish observers: for example, prominent Jewish writer Maurice Samuel (1924/2022, p. 217), writing in the immediate aftermath of the Immigration Act of 1924, wrote that “it is chiefly against the Jew that anti-immigration laws are passed here in America as in England and Germany,” and such perceptions continue among historians of the period (e.g., Hertzberg, 1989, p. 239). This perception was not restricted to Jews. In remarks before the Senate, the anti-restrictionist Senator Reed of Missouri noted, “Attacks have likewise been made upon the Jewish people who have crowded to our shores. The spirit of intolerance has been especially active as to them” (60 Cong. Rec., 1921, p. 3463). During World War II, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson stated that it was opposition to unrestricted immigration of Jews that resulted in the restrictive legislation of 1924 (Breitman & Kraut, 1987, p. 87).

Moreover, the House Immigration Committee Majority Report (H.R. Rep. No. 109, 1920) stated that “by far the largest percentage of immigrants [are] peoples of Jewish extraction” (p. 4), and it implied that the majority of the expected new immigrants would be Polish Jews. The report “confirmed the published statement of a commissioner of the Hebrew Sheltering and Aid Society of America made after his personal investigation in Poland, to the effect that

'If there were in existence a ship that could hold 3,000,000 human beings, the 3,000,000 Jews of Poland would board it to escape to America'" (p. 6).

The Majority Report (H.R. Rep. No. 109, 1920, p. 9) also included a report by Wilbur S. Carr, head of the United States Consular Service, which stated that the Polish Jews were,

abnormally twisted because of (a) reaction from war strain; (b) the shock of revolutionary disorders; (c) the dullness and stultification resulting from past years of oppression and abuse. . . . Eighty-five to ninety percent lack any conception of patriotic or national spirit. And the majority of this percentage are unable to acquire it.<sup>148</sup>

The report also noted consular reports that warned that "many Bolshevik sympathizers are in Poland" (H.R. Rep. No. 109, 1920, p. 11). Likewise in the Senate, Senator McKellar cited the report that if there were a ship large enough, three million Poles would immigrate. He also stated:

The Joint Distribution Committee, an American committee doing relief work among the Hebrews in Poland, distributes more than \$1,000,000 per month of American money in that country alone. It is also shown that \$100,000,000 a year is a conservative estimate of money sent to Poland from America through the mails, through the banks, and through the relief societies. This golden stream pouring into Poland from America makes practically every Pole wildly desirous of going to the country from which such marvelous wealth comes. (60 Cong. Rec., 1921, p. 3456)

As a further indication of the salience of Polish-Jewish immigration issues, the letter on alien visas submitted by the State Department in 1921 to Albert Johnson, chairman of the Committee on Migration and Naturalization, devoted over four times as much space to the situation in Poland as it did to any other country. The report emphasized the activities of the Polish Jewish newspaper *Der Emigrant* in promoting immigration to the United States of Polish Jews, as well as the activities of the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Society and wealthy private citizens from the United States in facilitating immigration by providing financial assistance and performing the paperwork. There was indeed a large network of Jewish agents in Eastern Europe who, in violation of U.S. law, "did their best to drum up business by enticing as many emigrants as possible" (Nadell, 1984, p. 56). The report also described the condition of the prospective immigrants in negative terms:

---

<sup>148</sup> See Breitman & Kraut (1987, p. 12) for a discussion of Carr's anti-Semitism; in England many recent Jewish immigrants refused to be conscripted to fight the enemies of the czar during World War I.

At the present time it is only too obvious that they must be subnormal, and their normal state is of very low standard. Six years of war and confusion and famine and pestilence have racked their bodies and twisted their mentality. The elders have deteriorated to a marked degree. Minors have grown into adult years with the entire period lost in their rightful development and too frequently with the acquisition of perverted ideas which have flooded Europe since 1914 [presumably a reference to the radical political ideas that were common in this group; see below]. (61 Cong. Rec., 1921, p. 498)

In addition, the report stated that articles in the Warsaw press had reported that “propaganda favoring unrestricted immigration” is being planned, including celebrations in New York aimed at showing the contributions of immigrants to the development of the United States. The reports for Belgium (whose immigrants originated in Poland and Czechoslovakia) and Romania also highlighted the importance of Jews as prospective immigrants. In response, Representative Isaac Siegel stated that the report was “edited and doctored by certain officials”; he commented that the report did not mention countries with larger numbers of immigrants than Poland. (For example, the report did not mention Italy.) Without explicitly saying so—“I leave it to every man in the House to make his own deductions and his own inferences therefrom” (60 Cong. Rec., 1921, p. 504)—the implication was that the focus on Poland was prompted by anti-Semitism.

The House Majority Report (signed by fifteen of its seventeen members with only Representatives Dickstein and Sabath not signing) also emphasized the Jewish role in defining the intellectual battle in terms of Nordic superiority versus “American ideals” rather than in the terms of an ethnic status quo actually favored by the committee:

The cry of discrimination is, the committee believes, manufactured and built up by special representatives of racial groups, aided by aliens actually living abroad. Members of the committee have taken notice of a report in the *Jewish Tribune* (New York), February 8, 1924, of a farewell dinner to Mr. Israel Zangwill which says:

“Mr. Zangwill spoke chiefly on the immigration question, declaring that if Jews persisted in a strenuous opposition to the restricted immigration there would be no restriction. ‘If you create enough fuss against this Nordic nonsense,’ he said, ‘you will defeat this legislation. You must make a fight against this bill; tell them they are destroying American ideals. Most fortifications are of cardboard, and if you press against them, they give way.’”

The Committee does not feel that the restriction aimed to be accomplished in this bill is directed at the Jews, for they can come within the

quotas from any country in which they were born. The Committee has not dwelt on the desirability of a "Nordic" or any other particular type of immigrant, but has held steadfastly to the purpose of securing a heavy restriction, with the quota so divided that the countries from which the most came in the two decades ahead of the World War might be slowed down in order that the United States might restore its population balance. The continued charge that the Committee has built up a "Nordic" race and devoted its hearing to that end is part of a deliberately manufactured assault for as a matter of fact the committee has done nothing of the kind. (H.R. Rep. No. 350, 1924, p. 16)

Indeed, one is struck in reading the 1924 congressional debates by the rarity with which the issue of Nordic racial superiority is raised by those in favor of the legislation, whereas virtually all the anti-restrictionists raised this issue.<sup>149</sup> After a particularly colorful comment in opposition to the theory of Nordic racial superiority, restrictionist leader Albert Johnson remarked, "I would like very much to say on behalf of the committee that through the strenuous times of the hearings this committee undertook not to discuss the Nordic proposition or racial matters" (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 5911). Earlier, during the hearings on the bill, Johnson remarked in response to the comments of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise representing the AJCongress, "I dislike to be placed continually in the attitude of assuming that there is a race prejudice, when the one thing I have tried to do for 11 years is to free myself from race prejudice, if I had it at all" (*Restriction of Immigration*, 1924, p. 351). Several restrictionists explicitly denounced the theory of Nordic superiority, including Senators Bruce (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 5955) and Jones (p. 6614) and Representatives Bacon (p. 5902), Byrnes (p. 5653), Johnson (p. 5648), McLeod (pp. 5675–5676),

---

<sup>149</sup> For example, in the Senate debates of April 15th to 19th, 1924, Nordic superiority was not mentioned by any of the proponents of the legislation but was mentioned by the following opponents of the legislation: Senators Colt (p. 6542), Reed (p. 6468), and Walsh (p. 6355). In the House debates of April 5th, 8th, and 15th, virtually all the opponents of the legislation raised the racial inferiority issue, including Representatives Celler (pp. 5914–5915), Clancy (p. 5930), Connery (p. 5683), Dickstein (pp. 5655–5656, 5686), Gallivan (p. 5849), Jacobstein (p. 5864), James (p. 5670), Kunz (p. 5896), La Guardia (p. 5657), Mooney (pp. 5909–5910), O'Connell (p. 5836), O'Connor (p. 5648), Oliver (p. 5870), O'Sullivan (p. 5899), Perlman (p. 5651), Sabath (pp. 5651, 5662), and Tague (p. 5873). Several representatives—e.g., Representatives Dickinson (p. 6267), Garber (pp. 5689–5693), and Smith (p. 5705)—contrasted the positive characteristics of the Nordic immigrants with the negative characteristics of more recent immigrants without distinguishing genetic from environmental reasons as possible influences. They, along with several others, noted that recent immigrants had not assimilated and they tended to cluster in urban areas. Representative Allen argued that there is a "necessity for purifying and keeping pure the blood of America" (p. 5693). Representative McSwain, who argued for the need to preserve Nordic hegemony, did so not on the basis of Nordic superiority but on the basis of legitimate ethnic self-interest (pp. 5683–5685; see also comments of Representatives Lea and Miller). Representative Gasque introduced a newspaper article discussing the swamping of the race that had built America (p. 6270).

McReynolds (p. 5855), Michener (p. 5909), Miller (p. 5883), Newton (p. 6240), Rosenbloom (p. 5851), Vaile (p. 5922), Vincent (p. 6266), White (p. 5898), and Wilson (p. 5671).

Indeed, it is noteworthy that there are indications in the congressional debate that representatives from the West Coast were concerned about the competence and competitive threat presented by Japanese immigrants, and their rhetoric suggests they viewed the Japanese as racially equal or superior, not inferior. For example, Senator Jones stated, "We admit that [the Japanese] are as able as we are, that they are as progressive as we are, that they are as honest as we are, that they are as brainy as we are, and that they are equal in all that goes to make a great people and nation" (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 6614); Representative MacLafferty emphasized Japanese domination of certain agricultural markets (p. 5681), and Representative Lea noted their ability to supplant "their American competitor" (p. 5697). Representative Miller described the Japanese as "a relentless and unconquerable competitor of our people wherever he places himself" (p. 5884); see also comments of Representatives Gilbert (p. 6261), Raker (p. 5892), and Free (pp. 5924ff).

Moreover, whereas the issue of Jewish-gentile resource competition was not raised during the congressional debates, quotas on Jewish admissions to Ivy League universities were a highly salient issue among Jews during this period. The quota issue was highly publicized in the Jewish media, which focused on activities of Jewish self-defense organizations such as the ADL (see, e.g., the ADL statement published in *The American Hebrew*, September 29th, 1922, p. 536). Jewish-gentile resource competition may therefore have been on the minds of some legislators. Indeed, President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard was the national vice-president of the Immigration Restriction League as well as a proponent of quotas on Jewish admission to Harvard (Symott, 1986, p. 238), suggesting that resource competition with an intellectually superior Jewish group was an issue for at least some prominent restrictionists.

It is probable that anti-Jewish animosity related to resource competition issues was widespread. Higham (1984, p. 141) writes of "the urgent pressure which the Jews, as an exceptionally ambitious immigrant people, put upon some of the more crowded rungs of the social ladder." Beginning in the nineteenth century, there were fairly high levels of covert and overt anti-Semitism in patrician circles resulting from the very rapid upward mobility of Jews and their competitive drive. Prior to World War I, the reaction of the gentile power structure was to construct social registers and emphasize genealogy as mechanisms of exclusion—"criteria that could not be met by money alone" (pp. 104ff, 127). During this period Edward A. Ross (1914, p. 164) described gentile resentment at "being obliged to engage in a humiliating and undignified scramble in order to keep his trade or his clients against the Jewish invader"—suggesting a rather broad-based concern with Jewish economic competition. Attempts at

exclusion in a wide range of areas increased in the 1920s and reached their peak during the difficult economic situation of the Great Depression (Higham, pp. 131ff).

In the 1924 debates, however, the only congressional comments suggesting a concern with Jewish-gentile resource competition (as well as a concern that Jewish immigrants were alienated from the cultural traditions of America and tended to have a destructive influence) that I have been able to find are the following from Representative Wefald:

I for one am not afraid of the radical ideas that some might bring with them. Ideas you can not keep out anyway, but the leadership of our intellectual life in many of its phases has come into the hands of these clever newcomers who have no sympathy with our old-time American ideals nor with those of northern Europe, who detect our weaknesses and pander to them and get wealthy through the disservices they render us.

Our whole system of amusements has been taken over by men who came here on the crest of the south and east European immigration. They produce our horrible film stories, they compose and dish out to us our jazz music, they write many of the books we read, and edit our magazines and newspapers. (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 6272)

The immigration debate also occurred amid discussion in the Jewish media of Thorstein Veblen's famous essay "The Intellectual Pre-eminence of Jews in Modern Europe" (serialized in *The American Hebrew* beginning September 10th, 1920). In an editorial from July 13th, 1923 (p. 177), *The American Hebrew* noted that Jews were disproportionately represented among the gifted in Lewis Terman's study of gifted children and commented that "this fact must give rise to bitter, though futile, reflection among the so-called Nordics." The editorial also noted that Jews were overrepresented among scholarship winners in competitions sponsored by the state of New York. The editorial pointedly noted that "perhaps the Nordics are too proud to try for these honors. In any event the list of names just announced by the State Department of Education at Albany as winners of these coveted scholarships is not in the least Nordic; it reads like a confirmation roster at a Temple."

There is, in fact, evidence that Jews, like East Asians, have higher IQs than Caucasians (Lynn, 1987; Rushton, 1995; PTSDA, Ch. 7). Indeed, Terman had found that Chinese were equal in IQ to Caucasians—further indication that, as Carl Degler (1991, p. 52) notes, "their [IQ] scores could not have been an excuse for the discrimination" represented by the Immigration Act of 1924. As indicated above, there is considerable evidence from the congressional debates that the exclusion of Asians was motivated at least partly by fears of



competition with a highly talented, intelligent group rather than by feelings of racial superiority.

The most common argument made by those favoring the legislation, and the one reflected in the Majority Report, is the argument that in the interest of fairness to all ethnic groups, the quotas should reflect the relative ethnic composition of the entire country. Restrictionists noted that the census of 1890 was chosen because the percentages of the foreign born of different ethnic groups in that year approximated the general ethnic composition of the entire country in 1920. Senator Reed of Pennsylvania and Representative Rogers of Massachusetts proposed to achieve the same result by directly basing the quotas on the national origins of all people in the country as of the 1920 census, and this was eventually incorporated into law. Representative Rogers argued, "Gentlemen, you can not dissent from this principle, because it is fair. It does not discriminate for anybody and it does not discriminate against anybody" (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 5847). Senator Reed noted, "The purpose, I think, of most of us in changing the quota basis is to cease from discriminating against the native born here and against the group of our citizens who come from northern and western Europe. I think the present system discriminates in favor of southeastern Europe" (p. 6457) (i.e., because 46 percent of the quotas under the Immigration Act of 1921 went to Eastern and Southern Europe when they constituted less than 12 percent of the U.S. population).

As an example illustrating the fundamental argument asserting a legitimate ethnic interest in maintaining an ethnic status quo without claiming racial superiority, consider the following statement from Representative William N. Vaile of Colorado, one of the most prominent restrictionists:

Let me emphasize here that the "restrictionists" of Congress do not claim that the "Nordic" race, or even the Anglo-Saxon race, is the best race in the world. Let us concede, in all fairness, that the Czech is a more sturdy laborer, with a very low percentage of crime and insanity, that the Jew is the best business man in the world, and that the Italian has a spiritual grasp and an artistic sense which have greatly enriched the world and which have, indeed, enriched us, a spiritual exaltation and an artistic creative sense which the Nordic rarely attains. Nordics need not be vain about their own qualifications. It well behooves them to be humble. What we do claim is that the northern European, and particularly Anglo-Saxons, made this country. Oh, yes; the others helped. But that is the full statement of the case. They came to this country because it was already made as an Anglo-Saxon commonwealth. They added to it, they often enriched it, but they did not make it, and they have not yet greatly changed it. We are determined that they shall not. It is a good country. It suits us. And what we assert is that we are not going to surrender it to somebody else or allow other people, no matter what their merits, to make it something

different. If there is any changing to be done, we will do it ourselves. (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 5922)

The debate in the House also illustrated the highly salient role of Jewish legislators in combating restrictionism. Representative Robison singled out Representative Sabath as the leader of anti-restrictionist efforts; he also focused on Representatives Jacobstein, Celler, and Perlman as being opposed to any restrictions on immigration (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, p. 5666). Representative Blanton, complaining of the difficulty of getting restrictionist legislation through Congress, noted, "When at least 65 per cent of the sentiment of this House, in my judgment, is in favor of the exclusion of all foreigners for five years, why do we not put that into law? Has Brother Sabath such a tremendous influence over us that he holds us down on this proposition?" (p. 5685). Representative Sabath responded, "There may be something to that." In addition, the following comments of Representative Leavitt clearly indicate the salience of Jewish congressmen to their opponents during the debate:

The instinct for national and race preservation is not one to be condemned, as has been intimated here. No one should be better able to understand the desire of Americans to keep America American than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath], who is leading the attack on this measure, or the gentlemen from New York, Mr. Dickstein, Mr. Jacobstein, Mr. Celler, and Mr. Perlman. They are of the one great historic people who have maintained the identity of their race throughout the centuries because they believe sincerely that they are a chosen people, with certain ideals to maintain, and knowing that the loss of racial identity means a change of ideals. That fact should make it easy for them and the majority of the most active opponents of this measure in the spoken debate to recognize and sympathize with our viewpoint, which is not so extreme as that of their own race, but only demands that the admixture of other peoples shall be only of such kind and proportions and in such quantities as will not alter racial characteristics more rapidly than there can be assimilation as to ideas of government as well as of blood. (65 Cong. Rec., 1924, pp. 6265-6266)

The view that Jews had a strong tendency to oppose genetic assimilation with surrounding groups was expressed by other observers as well and was a component of contemporary anti-Semitism (see Singerman, 1986, pp. 110-111). Jewish avoidance of exogamy certainly had a basis in reality (PTSDA, Chs. 2-4), and it is worth recalling that there was powerful opposition to intermarriage even among the more liberal segments of early twentieth-century American Judaism and certainly among the less liberal segments represented by the great majority of Orthodox immigrants from Eastern Europe who had come to

constitute the great majority of American Jewry. The prominent nineteenth-century Reform leader David Einhorn, for example, was a lifelong opponent of mixed marriages and refused to officiate at such ceremonies, even when pressed to do so (Meyer, 1989). Einhorn was also a staunch opponent of conversion of gentiles to Judaism because of the effects on the "racial purity" of Judaism (Levenson, 1989, p. 331). The influential Reform intellectual Kaufman Kohler was also an ardent opponent of mixed marriage. In a view that is highly compatible with Horace Kallen's multiculturalism, Kohler (1918/1968, pp. 445–446) concluded that Israel must remain separate and avoid intermarriage until it leads humankind to an era of universal peace and brotherhood among the races. The negative attitude toward intermarriage was confirmed by survey results. A 1912 survey indicated that only seven out of one hundred Reform rabbis had officiated at a mixed marriage, and a 1909 resolution of the chief Reform group, the Central Council of American Rabbis, declared that "mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should be discouraged by the American Rabbinate" (Meyer). Gentile perceptions of Jewish attitudes on intermarriage, therefore, had a strong basis in reality.

Far more important than the Jewish tendency toward endogamy in engendering anti-Jewish animosity during the congressional debates of 1924 were two other prominent themes of this project: Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe were widely perceived as unassimilable and as retaining a separate culture (see SAID, Ch. 2); they were also thought to be disproportionately involved in radical political movements (see Ch. 3).

The perception of radicalism among Jewish immigrants was common in Jewish as well as gentile publications. *The American Hebrew* editorialized, "[W]e must not forget the immigrants from Russia and Austria will be coming from countries infested with Bolshevism, and it will require more than a superficial effort to make good citizens out of them" (in Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 165). The fact that Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe were viewed as "infected with Bolshevism . . . unpatriotic, alien, unassimilable" resulted in a wave of anti-Semitism in the 1920s and contributed to the restrictive immigration legislation of the period (p. 165). In Sorin's (1985, p. 46) study of immigrant Jewish radical activists, over half had been involved in radical politics in Europe before emigrating, and for those emigrating after 1900, the percentage rose to 69 percent. Jewish publications warned of the possibilities of anti-Semitism resulting from the leftism of Jewish immigrants, and the official Jewish community engaged in "a near-desperation . . . effort to portray the Jew as one hundred per cent American" by, for example, organizing patriotic pageants on

national holidays and by attempting to get the immigrants to learn English (Neuringer, p. 167).<sup>150</sup>

The image of the Jew as Communist played an often-overlooked role in the history not only of Jews in America, but of the millions of Jews in Eastern Europe who would have liked to emigrate to the United States after World War I, but who were prevented from doing so by the immigration restrictions enacted in the early 1920s, culminating in the Reed-Johnson Act of 1924. For those restrictions were motivated in part by the identification of Jews with political radicalism. (Muller, 2010, pp. 161-162)

From the standpoint of the immigration debates, it is important to note that in the 1920s a majority of the members of the Socialist Party were immigrants and that an “overwhelming” (Glazer, 1961, pp. 38, 40) percentage of the CPUSA consisted of recent immigrants, a substantial percentage of whom were Jews. As late as June 1933 the national organization of the CPUSA was still 70 percent foreign born (Lyons, 1982, pp. 72-73); in Philadelphia in 1929, fully 90 percent of CPUSA members were foreign born, and 72.2 percent of the CPUSA members in Philadelphia were the children of Jewish immigrants who had come to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (p. 71).

The material in the 2002 edition *CofC* on Jewish activism leading up to the Immigration Act of 1924 has been corroborated by Daniel Okrent in *The Guarded Gate* (2019). The older German-Jewish community, while expressing distaste for their rather unrefined immigrant co-ethnics, was instrumental in keeping America’s open immigration system long after immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe had ceased to be popular in the population at large. Thus Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, leader of the restrictionists, wrote to a friend during the second presidency of Grover Cleveland (1893-1897), “Influences on [Cleveland] were used yesterday which I will explain to you when we meet and which were very hard to overcome”; to another he “said these other forces represented neither corporations or political factions” (p. 72). Okrent notes that they “were almost certainly members of America’s moneyed and influential German Jewish community,” such as Jacob Schiff “who made a personal plea to Grover Cleveland to veto the literacy test” (p. 73). (Prior to

---

<sup>150</sup> Similarly, the immigration of Eastern European Jews into England after 1880 had a transformative effect on the political attitudes of British Jewry in the direction of socialism, trade unionism, and Zionism, often combined with religious orthodoxy and devotion to a highly separatist traditional lifestyle (Alderman, 1983, pp. 47ff). The more established Jewish organizations fought hard to combat the well-founded image of Jewish immigrants as Zionist, religiously orthodox political radicals who refused to be conscripted into the armed forces during World War I in order to fight the enemies of the officially anti-Semitic czarist government (Alderman, 1992, pp. 237ff).

focusing on national origins, immigration restrictionists promoted a literacy test as a means of restricting immigration.)

For a quarter of a century . . . Lodge, the IRL [Immigration Restriction League], and their allies would have to contend with an array of influential organizations dominated by wealthy German Jews. . . . Collectively, they composed a formidable and enduring opposition. . . . The emergence in the 1890s of organized, wealthy, and well-connected Jews working on behalf of the immigrants presented Lodge and his colleagues with an opposition that few Boston Brahmins had encountered. (Okrent, 2019, pp. 72–73)

Likely because of this influence, immigration was not restricted until the 1920s, even though public opinion had turned against it at least by 1905 (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 83). As recounted by N. W. Cohen (1972, pp. 40ff), the AJCommittee's efforts in opposition to immigration restriction in the early twentieth century constitute a remarkable example of the ability of Jewish organizations to influence public policy—despite being composed of only a thin upper crust of the American Jewish community of the period.

#### *Jewish Anti-Restrictionist Activity, 1924–1945*

The saliency of Jewish involvement in U.S. immigration policy continued after the Immigration Act of 1924. Particularly objectionable to Jewish groups was the national origins quota system. For example, a writer for *The Jewish Tribune* stated in 1927, “[W]e . . . regard all measures for regulating immigration according to nationality as illogical, unjust, and un-American” (in Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 205). During the 1930s the most outspoken critic of further restrictions on immigration (motivated now mainly by the economic concerns that immigration would exacerbate the problems brought on by the Great Depression) was Representative Samuel Dickstein, and Dickstein's assumption of the chairmanship of the House Immigration Committee in 1931 marked the end of the ability of restrictionists to enact further reductions in quotas (Divine, 1957, pp. 79–88). Jewish groups were the primary opponents of restriction and the primary supporters of liberalized regulations during the 1930s; their opponents emphasized the economic consequences of immigration during a period of high unemployment (pp. 85–88). Between 1933 and 1938 Representative Dickstein introduced a number of bills aimed at increasing the number of refugees from Nazi Germany and supported mainly by Jewish organizations, but the restrictionists prevailed (p. 93).

During the 1930s concerns about the radicalism and unassimilability of Jewish immigrants as well as the possibility of Nazi subversion were the main

factors influencing the opposition to changing the immigration laws (Breitman & Kraut, 1987). Moreover, "Charges that the Jews in America were more loyal to their tribe than to their country abounded in the United States in the 1930s" (p. 87). There was a clear perception among all parties that the public opposed any changes in immigration policy and was particularly opposed to Jewish immigration. The 1939 hearings on the proposed legislation to admit twenty thousand German refugee children therefore minimized Jewish interest in the legislation. The bill referred to people "of every race and creed suffering from conditions which compel them to seek refuge in other lands" (*Admission of German Refugee Children*, 1939, p. 1). The bill did not mention that Jews would be the main beneficiaries of the legislation, and witnesses in favor of the bill emphasized that only approximately 60 percent of the children would be Jewish. The only person identifying himself as "a member of the Jewish race" who testified in favor of the bill was "one-fourth Catholic and three-quarters Jewish," with Protestant and Catholic nieces and nephews, and from the South, a bastion of anti-immigration sentiment (p. 78).

In contrast, opponents of the bill threatened to publicize the very large percentage of Jews already being admitted under the quota system—presumably an indication of the powerful force of a "virulent and pervasive" anti-Semitism among the American public (Breitman & Kraut, 1987, p. 80). Opponents noted that the immigration permitted by the bill "would be for the most part of the Jewish race," and a witness testified "that the Jewish people will profit most by this legislation goes without saying" (in Divine, 1957, p. 100). The restrictionists argued in economic terms, for example, by frequently citing President Roosevelt's statement in his second inaugural speech, "one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished," and citing large numbers of needy children already in the United States. The main restrictionist concern, though, was that the bill was yet another in a long history of attempts by anti-restrictionists to develop precedents that would eventually undermine the Immigration Act of 1924. For example, Francis Kinnicutt, president of the Allied Patriotic Societies, emphasized that the Immigration Act of 1924 had been based on the idea of proportional representation based on the ethnic composition of the country. The legislation would be a precedent "for similar unscientific and favored-nation legislation in response to the pressure of foreign nationalistic or racial groups, rather than in accordance with the needs and desires of the American people" (*Admission of German Refugee Children*, 1939, p. 140).

Wilbur S. Carr and other State Department officials were important in minimizing the entry of Jewish refugees from Germany during the 1930s. Undersecretary of State William Phillips was an anti-Semite with considerable influence on immigration policy from 1933 to 1936 (Breitman & Kraut, 1987, p. 36). Throughout the period until the end of World War II attempts to promote Jewish immigration, even in the context of knowledge that the Nazis were

persecuting Jews, were largely unsuccessful because of an unyielding Congress and the activities of bureaucrats, especially those in the State Department. (Indeed, the State Department remained a target of Jewish ire at least as late as the 1960s because of its opposition to U.S. support of Israel.) Public discussion in periodicals such as *The Nation* (November 19th, 1938) and *The New Republic* (November 23rd, 1938) charged that restrictionism was motivated by anti-Semitism, whereas opponents of admitting large numbers of Jews argued that admission would result in an increase in anti-Semitism. Henry Pratt Fairchild (1939, p. 344), a restrictionist highly critical of Jews in general (see Fairchild, 1947), emphasized the “powerful current of anti-foreignism and anti-Semitism that is running close to the surface of the American public mind, ready to burst out into violent eruption on relatively slight provocation.” Public opinion remained steadfast against increasing the quotas for European refugees; a 1939 poll in *Fortune* (April 1939) showed that 83 percent answered no to the following question: “If you were a member of Congress would you vote yes or no on a bill to open the doors of the United States to a larger number of European refugees than now admitted under our immigration quotas?” Less than 9 percent replied yes, and the remainder had no opinion.

#### *Jewish Anti-Restrictionist Activity, 1946–1952*

Although Jewish interests were defeated by the Immigration Act of 1924, “the discriminatory character of the Reed-Johnson Act continued to rankle all sectors of American Jewish opinion” (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 196). During this period, an article by Will Maslow (1950) in *Congress Weekly* reiterated the belief that the restrictive immigration laws intentionally targeted Jews:

Only one type of law, immigration legislation which relates to aliens outside the country, is not subject to constitutional guarantees, and even here hostility toward Jewish immigration has had to be disguised in an elaborate quota scheme in which eligibility was based on place of birth rather than religion.

The Jewish concern to alter the ethnic balance of the United States is apparent in the debates over immigration legislation during the post-World War II era. In 1948 the AJCommittee submitted to a Senate subcommittee a statement simultaneously denying the importance of the material interests of the United States and affirming its commitment to immigration of all races:

Americanism is not to be measured by conformity to law, or zeal for education, or literacy, or any of these qualities in which immigrants may excel the native-born. Americanism is the spirit behind the welcome that

America has traditionally extended to people of all races, all religions, all nationalities. (in N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 369)

In 1945 Representative Emanuel Celler introduced a bill ending Chinese exclusion by establishing token quotas for Chinese, and in 1948 the AJCommittee condemned racial quotas on Asians (Divine, 1957, p. 155). In contrast, Jewish groups showed indifference or even hostility toward immigration of non-Jews from Europe (including Southern Europe) in the post-World War II era (Neuringer, 1971/1980, pp. 356, 367-369, 383). Thus Jewish spokespersons did not testify at all during the first set of hearings on emergency legislation to allow immigration of a limited number of German, Italian, Greek, and Dutch immigrants, escapees from communism, and a small number of Poles, Asians, and Arabs. When Jewish spokespersons eventually testified (partly because a few of the escapees from communism were Jews), they took the opportunity to once again focus on their condemnation of the national origins provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924.

Jewish involvement in opposing restrictions during this period was motivated partly by attempts to establish precedents in which the quota system was bypassed and partly by attempts to increase immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe. The Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, which advocated legislation to admit four hundred thousand refugees as nonquota immigrants over a period of four years, maintained a staff of sixty-five people and was funded mainly by the AJCommittee and other Jewish contributors (see 95 Cong. Rec., 1949, pp. 14647-14654; Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 393). Witnesses opposing the legislation complained that the bill was an attempt to subvert the ethnic balance of the United States established by the Immigration Act of 1924 (Divine, 1957, p. 117). In the event, the bill that was reported out of the subcommittee did not satisfy Jewish interests because it established a cutoff date that excluded Jews who had migrated from Eastern Europe after World War II, including Jews fleeing Polish anti-Semitism. The Senate subcommittee "regarded the movement of Jews and other refugees from eastern Europe after 1945 as falling outside the scope of the main problem and implied that this exodus was a planned migration organized by Jewish agencies in the United States and in Europe" (S. Rep. No. 950, 1948, pp. 15-16).

Jewish representatives led the assault on the bill (Divine, 1957, p. 127), with Representative Emanuel Celler calling it "worse than no bill at all. All it does is exclude . . . Jews" (in Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 298; see also Divine, 1957, p. 127). In reluctantly signing the bill, President Truman noted that the 1945 cutoff date "discriminates in callous fashion against displaced persons of the Jewish faith" (*Interpreter Releases* 25, July 21st, 1948, pp. 252-254). In contrast, Senator Chapman Revercomb stated that "there is no distinction, certainly no discrimination, intended between any persons because of their religion or their race,



but there are differences drawn among those persons who are in fact displaced persons and have been in camp longest and have a preference" (94 Cong. Rec., 1948, p. 6793). In his analysis, Divine (1957, p. 143) concludes:

The expressed motive of the restrictionists, to limit the program to those people displaced during the course of the war, appears to be a valid explanation for these provisions. The tendency of Jewish groups to attribute the exclusion of many of their coreligionists to anti-Semitic bias is understandable; however, the extreme charges of discrimination made during the 1948 presidential campaign lead one to suspect that the northern wing of the Democratic party was using this issue to attract votes from members of minority groups. Certainly Truman's assertion that the 1948 law was anti-Catholic, made in the face of Catholic denials, indicates that political expediency had a great deal to do with the emphasis on the discrimination issue.

In the aftermath of this bill, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons released a report claiming the bill was characterized by "hate and racism," and Jewish organizations were unanimous in denouncing the law (Divine, 1957, p. 131). After the 1948 elections resulted in a Democratic Congress and a sympathetic President Truman, Representative Celler introduced a bill without the 1945 cutoff date, but, after passing the House, the bill failed in the Senate because of the opposition of Senator Pat McCarran. McCarran noted that the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons had spent over eight hundred thousand dollars (equivalent to over ten million dollars in 2024) lobbying for the bill, with the result that "there has been disseminated over the length and breadth of this nation a campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood which has misled many public-spirited and well-meaning citizens and organizations" (95 Cong. Rec., 1949, pp. 5042–5043). After defeat, the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons increased expenditures to over one million dollars (nearly thirteen million dollars in 2024) and succeeded in passing a bill, introduced by Representative Celler, with a 1949 cutoff date that did not discriminate against Jews but largely excluded ethnic Germans who had been expelled from Eastern Europe. In an odd twist in the debate, restrictionists now accused the anti-restrictionists of ethnic bias (e.g., Senators Eastland and McCarran, 96 Cong. Rec., 1950, pp. 2737, 4743).

At a time when there were no outbreaks of anti-Semitism in other parts of the world creating an urgent need for Jewish immigration and with the presence of Israel as a safe haven for Jews, Jewish organizations still vigorously objected to the continuation of the national origins provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 in the McCarran-Walter (Immigration and Nationality) Act of 1952 (Neuringer, 1971/1980, pp. 337ff). Indeed, when U.S. District Court of

Appeals Judge Simon H. Rifkind testified on behalf of a wide range of Jewish organizations against the McCarran-Walter bill, he noted emphatically that because of the international situation and particularly the existence of Israel as a safe haven for Jews, Jewish views on immigration legislation were not predicated on the “plight of our co-religionists but rather the impact which immigration and naturalization laws have upon the temper and quality of American life here in the United States” (AJCongress, *Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 565). The argument was couched in terms of “democratic principles and the cause of international amity” (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 368)—the implicit theory being that the principles of democracy required ethnic diversity—a view promulgated by Jewish intellectual activists such as Sidney Hook (1948, 1949; see Ch. 7) at the time—and the theory that the good will of other countries depended on American willingness to accept their citizens as immigrants.

The enactment of [the McCarran-Walter bill] will gravely impair the national effort we are putting forth. For we are engaged in a war for the hearts and minds of men. The free nations of the world look to us for moral and spiritual reinforcement at a time when the faith which moves men is as important as the force they wield. (AJCongress, *Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 566)<sup>151</sup>

The McCarran-Walter bill explicitly included racial ancestry as a criterion in its provision that Orientals would be included in the token Oriental quotas, no matter where they were born. Herbert Lehman, a senator from New York and the most prominent senatorial opponent of immigration restriction during the 1950s (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 351), argued during the debates over the McCarran-Walter bill that immigrants from Jamaica of African descent should be included in the quota for England and stated that the bill would cause resentment among Asians (pp. 346, 356). Representatives Celler and Javits, the leaders of the anti-restrictionists in the House, made similar arguments (98 Cong. Rec., 1952, pp. 4306, 4219). As was also apparent in the battles dating back to the nineteenth century, the opposition to the national origins legislation went beyond its effects on Jewish immigration to advocate immigration of all the racial-ethnic groups of the world.

Reflecting a concern for maintaining the ethnic status quo as well as the salience of Jewish issues during the period, the report of the subcommittee considering the McCarran-Walter immigration bill noted that “the population of the United States has increased three-fold since 1877, while the Jewish population has increased twenty-one-fold during the same period” (S. Rep. No. 1515, 1950, pp. 2–4). The bill also included a provision that naturalized citizens

---

<sup>151</sup> See also statement of Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger, President of the Synagogue Council of America; and the statement of the AJCongress, pp. 560–561.

automatically lost citizenship if they resided abroad continuously for five years. This provision was viewed by Jewish organizations as motivated by anti-Zionist attitudes: "Testimony by Government officials at the hearings . . . made it clear that the provision stemmed from a desire to dissuade naturalized American Jews from subscribing to a deeply held ideal which some officials in contravention of American policy regarded as undesirable" (Will Maslow of the AJCongress, *Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 394).

Reaffirming the logic of the 1920s restrictionists, the subcommittee report emphasized that a purpose of the Immigration Act of 1924 was "the restriction of immigration from southern and eastern Europe in order to preserve a predominance of persons of northwestern European origin in the composition of our total population," but noted that this purpose did not imply "any theory of Nordic supremacy" (S. Rep. No. 1515, 1950, pp. 442, 445–446). The argument was mainly phrased in terms of the "similarity of cultural background" of prospective immigrants, implying the rejection of theories of cultural pluralism (M. T. Bennett, 1966, p. 133). As in 1924, theories of Nordic superiority were rejected, but unlike 1924 there was no mention of the legitimate ethnic self-interest of the Northwestern European peoples, presumably a result of the effectiveness of the Boasian onslaught on this idea.

Without giving credence to any theory of Nordic superiority, the subcommittee believes that the adoption of the national origins formula was a rational and logical method of numerically restricting immigration in such a manner as to best preserve the sociological and cultural balance in the population of the United States. There is no doubt that it favored the peoples of the countries of northern and western Europe over those of southern and eastern Europe, but the subcommittee holds that the peoples who had made the greatest contribution to the development of this country were fully justified in determining that the country was no longer a field for further colonization and, henceforth, further immigration would not only be restricted but directed to admit immigrants considered to be more readily assimilable because of the similarity of their cultural background to those of the principal components of our population. (S. Rep. No. 1515, 1950, p. 455)

It is important to note that Jewish spokespersons differed from other liberal groups in their motives for opposing restrictions on immigration during this period. In the following I emphasize the congressional testimony of Judge Simon H. Rifkind, who represented a very broad range of Jewish agencies in the hearings on the McCarran-Walter bill in 1951 (*Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 562–595).

(1) Immigration should come from all racial-ethnic groups:

We conceive of Americanism as the spirit behind the welcome that America has traditionally extended to people of different races, all religions, all nationalities. Americanism is a tolerant way of life that was devised by men who differed from one another vastly in religion, race background, education, and lineage, and who agreed to forget all these things and ask of a new neighbor not where he comes from but only what he can do and what is his spirit toward his fellow men. (p. 566)

(2) The total number of immigrants should be maximized within very broad economic and political constraints: "The regulation [of immigration] is the regulation of an asset, not of a liability" (p. 567). Rifkind emphasized several times that unused quotas had the effect of restricting total numbers of immigrants, and he viewed this very negatively (e.g., p. 569).

(3) Immigrants should not be viewed as economic assets and imported only to serve the present needs of the United States:

Looking at [selective immigration] from the point of view of the United States, never from the point of view of the immigrant, I say that we should, to some extent, allow for our temporary needs, but not to make our immigration problem an employment instrumentality. I do not think that we are buying economic commodities when we allow immigrants to come in. We are admitting human beings who will found families and raise children, whose children may reach the heights—at least so we hope and pray. For a small segment of the immigrant stream I think we are entitled to say, if we happen to be short of a particular talent, "Let us go out and look for them," if necessary, but let us not make that the all-pervading thought. (p. 570)

The opposition to needed skills as the basis of immigration was consistent with the prolonged Jewish attempt to delay the passage of a literacy test as a criterion for immigration beginning in the late nineteenth century until a literacy test was passed in 1917.

Although Rifkind's testimony was free of the accusation that immigration policy was based on the theory of Nordic superiority, Nordic superiority continued to be a prominent theme of other Jewish groups, particularly the AJCongress, in advocating immigration from all ethnic groups. The statement of the AJCongress focused a great deal of attention on the importance of the theory of Nordic superiority as motivating the Immigration Act of 1924. Contrary to Rifkind's surprising assertion of the traditional American openness to all ethnic groups, it noted the long history of ethnic exclusion that existed before these theories were developed, including the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the gentlemen's agreement with Japan of 1907 limiting immigration of Japanese workers, and the exclusion of other Asians in 1917. The statement

noted that the Immigration Act of 1924 had succeeded in preserving the ethnic balance of the United States as of the 1920 census, but it commented that “the objective is valueless. There is nothing sacrosanct about the composition of the population in 1920. It would be foolish to believe that we reached the peak of ethnic perfection in that year” (*Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 410). Moreover, in an explicit statement of Horace Kallen’s multicultural ideal, the AJCongress statement (p. 404) advocated “the thesis of cultural democracy which would guarantee to all groups ‘majority and minority alike . . . the right to be different and the responsibility to make sure that their differences do not conflict with the welfare of the American people as a whole.’”

During this period *Congress Weekly*, the journal of the AJCongress, regularly denounced the national origins provisions as based on the “myth of the existence of superior and inferior racial stocks” (October 17th, 1955, p. 3) and advocated immigration on the basis of “need and other criteria unrelated to race or national origin” (May 4th, 1953, p. 3). Particularly objectionable from the perspective of the AJCongress was the implication that there should be no change in the ethnic status quo prescribed by the Immigration Act of 1924 (e.g., I. Goldstein, 1952b, p. 6). The national origins formula “is outrageous now . . . when our national experience has confirmed beyond a doubt that our very strength lies in the diversity of our peoples” (I. Goldstein, 1952a, p. 5).

As indicated above, there is some evidence that the Immigration Act of 1924 and the restrictionism of the 1930s was motivated partly by anti-Semitic attitudes. Anti-Semitism and its linkage with anti-communism were also apparent in the immigration arguments during the 1950s preceding and following the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act. Restrictionists often pointed to evidence that over 90 percent of American communists had backgrounds linking them to Eastern Europe. A major thrust of restrictionist efforts was to prevent immigration from this area and to ease deportation procedures to prevent communist subversion. Eastern Europe was also the origin of most Jewish immigration, and Jews were disproportionately represented among American communists, with the result that these issues became linked, and the situation lent itself to broad anti-Jewish theories about the role of Jews in U.S. politics.

For example, John Beaty, author of *Iron Curtain Over America* (1951), was a professor at Southern Methodist University and had served as a colonel in U.S. Military Intelligence in World War II. A strong anti-communist, he noted the great overrepresentation of Jews in subversive activities, a grave concern about Jewish activist organizations during the period (Unz, 2024c; Weingarten, 2008), and their threat to traditional American freedoms because of the dominant role of Jews in the media of the period. He also criticized the Nuremberg Trials as Jewish revenge and opposed the U.S. recognition of Israel because of its effect in alienating other groups in the Middle East.

In Congress, Representative John Rankin, a well-known anti-Semite, without making explicit reference to Jews, stated:

They whine about discrimination. Do you know who is being discriminated against? The white Christian people of America, the ones who created this nation. . . . I am talking about the white Christian people of the North as well as the South. . . .

Communism is racial. A racial minority seized control in Russia and in all her satellite countries, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and many other countries I could name.

They have been run out of practically every country in Europe in the years gone by, and if they keep stirring race trouble in this country and trying to force their communistic program on the Christian people of America, there is no telling what will happen to them here. (98 Cong. Rec., 1952, p. 4320)

During this period mainstream Jewish organizations were deeply concerned to eradicate the stereotype of Jews as communists and to develop an image of Jews as liberal anti-communists (Svonkin, 1997). "The fight against the stereotype of Communist-Jew became a virtual obsession with Jewish leaders and opinion makers throughout America" (A. Liebman, 1979, p. 515).<sup>152</sup> The AJCommittee engaged in intensive efforts to change opinion within the Jewish community by arguing that Jewish interests were more compatible with advocating American democracy than Soviet communism (e.g., emphasizing Soviet anti-Semitism and support of nations opposed to Israel in the period after World War II) (N. W. Cohen, 1972, pp. 347ff).<sup>153</sup> Although the AJCongress acknowledged that communism was a threat, the group adopted an "anti-anti-communist" position that condemned the infringement of civil liberties contained in the anti-communist legislation of the period. It was therefore "at best a reluctant and unenthusiastic participant" (Svonkin, 1997, p. 132) in the Jewish effort to develop a strong public image of anti-communism during this period—a position that reflected the sympathies of many among its predominantly second- and third-generation Eastern European immigrant membership.

---

<sup>152</sup> As an indication of the extent of this stereotype, when the gentile anthropologist Eleanor Leacock was being screened for security clearance by the FBI in 1944, in an effort to document her associations with political radicals her friends were asked whether she associated with Jews (Frank, 1997, p. 738).

<sup>153</sup> Similarly, in England in 1887 the Federation of Minor Synagogues was created by established British Jews to moderate the radicalism of newly arrived immigrants from Eastern Europe. This organization also engaged in deception by deliberately distorting the extent to which the immigrants had radical political attitudes (Alderman, 1983, p. 60).

This radical Jewish subculture and its ties to communism were much in evidence during riots in Peekskill, New York, in 1949. Peekskill was a summer destination for approximately thirty thousand predominantly Jewish professionals associated with socialist, anarchist, and communist colonies originally established in the 1930s. The immediate cause of rioting was a concert given by avowed communist Paul Robeson and sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress, a pro-communist group branded as subversive by the U.S. attorney general. Rioters made anti-Semitic statements at a time when the linkage between Jews and communism was highly salient. The result was an image-management effort on the part of the AJCommittee in which the anti-Semitic angle of the event was minimized—an example of the quarantine method of Jewish political strategizing (see SAID, Ch. 6, n14). This strategy conflicted with other groups, such as the AJCongress and the ACLU, who endorsed a report that attributed the violence to anti-Semitic prejudice and emphasized that the victims had been deprived of their civil liberties because of their communist sympathies.

Particularly worrisome to American Jewish leaders was the arrest and conviction of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg for spying. Leftist supporters of the Rosenbergs, many of whom were Jewish, attempted to portray the event as an instance of anti-Semitism; in the words of one prominent commentator, “The lynchings of these two innocent American Jews, unless stopped by the American people, will serve as a signal for a wave of Hitler-like genocidal attacks against the Jewish people throughout the United States” (in Svonkin, 1997, p. 155). These leftist organizations actively sought to enlist mainstream Jewish opinion on the side of this interpretation (Dawidowicz, 1952). However, in doing so they made the Jewish identities of these individuals and the connection between Judaism and communism even more salient. The official Jewish community went to great lengths to alter the public stereotype of Jewish subversion and disloyalty. Similarly, in its attempt to indict communism, the AJCommittee commented on the trial of Rudolph Slansky and his Jewish colleagues in Czechoslovakia. This trial was part of the anti-Semitic purges of Jewish communist elites in Eastern Europe after World War II, completely analogous to similar events in Poland recounted by Schatz (1991) and discussed in Chapter 3. The AJCommittee stated:

The trial of Rudolph Slansky, renegade Jew, and his colleagues, who betrayed Judaism in serving the Communist cause, should awaken everyone to the fact that anti-Semitism has become an open instrument of Communist policy. It is ironical that these men who deserted Judaism, which is inimical to Communism, are now being used as an excuse for the Communist anti-Semitic campaign. (in Svonkin, 1997, p. 282n114).

Jewish organizations cooperated fully with the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), and defenders of the Rosenbergs and other communists were hounded out of mainstream Jewish organizations where they had previously been welcome. Particularly salient was the fifty-thousand-member Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order (JPFO), a subsidiary of the International Workers Order (IWO), which was listed as a subversive organization by the U.S. attorney general. The AJCommittee prevailed upon local Jewish organizations to expel the JPFO, a move staunchly resisted by the JPFO, and the AJCongress dissolved the affiliate status of the JPFO as well as another communist-dominated organization, the American Jewish Labor Council. Similarly, mainstream Jewish organizations dissociated themselves from the Social Service Employees Union, a Jewish labor union for workers in Jewish organizations. This union had previously been expelled from the Congress of Industrial Organizations because of its communist sympathies.

Jewish organizations successfully obtained a prominent role for Jews in the prosecution of the Rosenbergs, and, after the guilty verdicts, the AJCommittee and the ACLU were active in promoting public support for the verdicts (Ginsberg, 1993, p. 121; Navasky, 1980, pp. 114ff). The periodical *Commentary*, published by the AJCommittee, "was rigorously edited to ensure that nothing that appeared within it could be in any way construed as favorable to Communism" (A. Liebman, 1979, p. 516), and it even went out of its way to print extremely anti-Soviet articles.

Nevertheless, the position of mainstream Jewish organizations such as the AJCommittee, which opposed communism, often coincided with the position of the CPUSA on issues of immigration. For example, both the AJCommittee and the CPUSA condemned the McCarran-Walter Act while, on the other hand, the AJCommittee had a major role in influencing the recommendations of President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization (PCIN) for relaxing the security provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, and these recommendations were warmly greeted by the CPUSA at a time when a prime goal of the security provisions was to exclude communists (M. T. Bennett, 1963, p. 166). (Judge Simon H. Rifkind's remarks at the Joint Hearings on the McCarran-Walter Act—see above—also condemned the security provisions of the bill.) Jews were disproportionately represented on the PCIN as well as in the organizations viewed by Congress as communist front organizations involved in immigration issues. The chairman of the PCIN was Philip B. Perlman, the staff of the commission contained a high percentage of Jews, headed by Harry N. Rosenfield (executive director) and Elliot Shirk (assistant to the executive director), and its report was wholeheartedly endorsed by the AJCongress (see *Congress Weekly*, January 12th, 1952, p. 3). The proceedings were printed as the report *Whom We Shall Welcome* with the cooperation of Representative Emanuel Celler.



In Congress, Senator McCarran accused the PCIN of containing communist sympathizers, and HUAC released a report stating:

[S]ome two dozen Communists and many times that number with records of repeated affiliation with known Communist enterprises testified before the Commission or submitted statements for inclusion in the record of the hearings. . . . Nowhere in either the record of the hearings or in the report is there a single reference to the true background of these persons. (H.R. Rep. No. 1182, 1957, p. 47).

The report referred particularly to communists associated with the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born (ACFPB), headed by Abner Green. Green, who was Jewish, figured very prominently in these hearings, and Jews were generally disproportionately represented among those singled out as officers and sponsors of the ACPFB (H.R. Rep. No. 1182, 1957, pp. 13–21). HUAC provided evidence indicating that the ACPFB had close ties with the CPUSA and noted that twenty-four of the individuals associated with the ACPFB had signed statements incorporated into the printed record of the PCIN.

The AJCommittee was also heavily involved in the deliberations of the PCIN, including providing testimony and distributing data and other material to individuals and organizations testifying before the PCIN (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 371). All its recommendations were incorporated into the final report (p. 371), including a deemphasis on economic skills as criteria for immigration, scrapping the national origins legislation, and opening immigration to all the peoples of the world on a “first come, first served basis,” the only exception being that the report recommended a lower total number of immigrants than recommended by the AJCommittee and other Jewish groups. The AJCommittee thus went beyond merely advocating the principle of immigration from all racial and ethnic groups (token quotas for Asians and Africans had already been included in the McCarran-Walter Act) to attempt to maximize the total number of immigrants from all parts of the world within the current political climate.

Indeed, the PCIN (1953/1971, p. 106) pointedly noted that the Immigration Law of 1924 had succeeded in maintaining the racial status quo and that the main barrier to changing the racial status quo was not the national origins system, because there were already high levels of nonquota immigrants and because the countries of Northern and Western Europe did not fill their quotas. Rather, the report noted that the main barrier to changing the racial status quo was the total number of immigrants. The PCIN (p. 42) thus viewed changing the racial status quo of the United States as a desirable goal, and to that end made a major point of the desirability of increasing the total number of immigrants. As M. T. Bennett (1963, p. 164) notes, in the eyes of the PCIN, the

Immigration Act of 1924 reducing the total number of immigrants “was a very bad thing because of its finding that one race is just as good as another for American citizenship or any other purpose.”

Correspondingly, the defenders of the Immigration Act of 1952 (McCarran-Walter Act) conceptualized the issue as fundamentally one of ethnic warfare. Senator McCarran stated that subverting the national origins system “would, in the course of a generation or so, tend to change the ethnic and cultural composition of this nation” (in M. T. Bennett, 1963, p. 185), and Richard Arens, a congressional staff member who had a prominent role in the hearings on the McCarran-Walter bill as well as in the activities of HUAC, stated:

These are the critics who do not like America as it is and has been. They think our people exist in unfair ethnic proportions. They prefer that we bear a greater resemblance or ethnic relationship to the foreign peoples whom they favor and for whom they are seeking disproportionately greater immigration privileges. (in M. T. Bennett, 1963, p. 186)

As Divine (1957, p. 188) notes, ethnic interests predominated on both sides. The restrictionists were implicitly advocating the ethnic status quo, while the anti-restrictionists were rather more explicit in their desire to alter the ethnic status quo in a manner that conformed to their ethnic interests, although the anti-restrictionist rhetoric was typically phrased in universalistic and moralistic terms.

The salience of Jewish involvement in immigration during this period is also apparent in several other incidents. In 1951 the representative of the AJCongress testified that the retention of the national origins system in any form would be “a political and moral catastrophe” (*Revision of Immigration*, 1951, pp. 336–337). The national origins formula implies that “persons in quest of the opportunity to live in this land are to be judged according to breed like cattle at a country fair and not on the basis of their character fitness or capacity” (*Congress Weekly* 21, 1952, pp. 3–4). Divine (1957, p. 173) characterizes the AJCongress as representing “the more militant wing” of the opposition because of its principled opposition to any form of the national origins formula, whereas other opponents merely wanted to be able to distribute unused quotas to Southern and Eastern Europe.

Representative Francis Walter noted the “propaganda drive that is being engaged in now by certain members of the American Jewish Congress opposed to the Immigration and Nationality Code” (98 Cong. Rec., 1952, p. 2283), noting particularly the activities of Rabbi Israel Goldstein, president of the AJCongress, who had been reported in *The New York Times* as having stated that the immigration and nationality law would place “a legislative seal of inferiority on all persons of other than Anglo-Saxon origin.” Representative Walter then

noted the special role that Jewish organizations had played in attempting to foster family reunion rather than special skills as the basis of U.S. immigration policy. After Representative Jacob Javits stated that opposition to the law was “not confined to the one group the gentleman mentioned” (p. 2284), Walter responded as follows:

I might call your attention to the fact that Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, Commissioner of the Displaced Persons Commission [and also the executive director of the PCIN; see above] and incidentally a brother-in-law of a lawyer who is stirring up all this agitation, in a speech recently said:

“The proposed legislation is America’s Nuremberg trial.

“It is racious (sic) and archaic, based on a theory that people with different styles of noses should be treated differently.”

Representative Walter then noted that the only two organizations hostile to the entire bill were the AJCongress and the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, the latter “represented by an attorney who is also advising and counseling the American Jewish Congress.” (Israel Goldstein, 1952a, himself noted that “at the time of the Joint House-Senate hearings on the McCarran-Walter bill, the American Jewish Congress was the only civic group which dared flatly to oppose the national origins quota formula.”)

Representative Emanuel Celler replied that Representative Walter “should not have overemphasized as he did the people of one particular faith who are opposing the bill” (98 Cong. Rec., 1952, p. 2285)—a declaration that avoids the more accurate idea that Jews are an ethnic group. Representative Walter agreed with Celler’s comments, noting that “there are other very fine Jewish groups who endorse the bill.” Nevertheless, the principal Jewish organizations, including the AJCongress, the AJCommittee, the ADL, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, did indeed oppose the bill (p. 4247), and when Judge Simon H. Rifkind testified against the bill in the joint hearings, he emphasized that he represented a very wide range of Jewish groups, “the entire body of religious opinion and lay opinion within the Jewish group, religiously speaking, from the extreme right and extreme left” (*Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 563). Rifkind represented a long list of national and local Jewish groups, including, in addition to the above, the Synagogue Council of America, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and twenty-seven local Jewish councils throughout the United States. Moreover, the fight against the bill was led by Jewish members of Congress, including especially Celler, Javits, and Lehman, all of whom, as indicated above, were prominent members of the ADL.

Albeit by indirection, Representative Walter was clearly calling attention to the special Jewish role in the immigration conflict of 1952. The special role

of the AJCongress in opposing the McCarran-Walter Act was a source of pride within the group: on the verge of victory in 1965, the *Congress Bi-Weekly* editorialized that it was “a cause of pride” that AJCongress president Rabbi Israel Goldstein had been “singled out by Representative Walter for attack on the floor of the House of Representatives as the prime organizer of the campaign against the measures he co-sponsored” (February 1st, 1965, p. 3).

The perception that Jewish concerns were an important feature of the opposition to the McCarran-Walter Act can also be seen in the following exchange between Representative Celler and Representative Walter. Celler noted, “The national origin theory upon which our immigration law is based . . . [mocks] our protestations based on a question of equality of opportunity for all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed.” Representative Walter replied, “a great menace to America lies in the fact that so many professionals, including professional Jews, are shedding crocodile tears for no reason whatsoever” (99 Cong. Rec., 1953, p. 372). And in a comment referring to the peculiarities of Jewish interests in immigration legislation, Richard Arens noted:

One of the curious things about those who most loudly claim that the 1952 act is “discriminatory” and that it does not make allowance for a sufficient number of alleged refugees, is that they oppose admission of any of the approximately one million Arab refugees in camps where they are living in pitiful circumstances after having been driven out of Israel. (in M. T. Bennett, 1963, p. 181)

The McCarran-Walter Act passed despite President Truman’s veto, and Truman’s “alleged partisanship to Jews was a favorite target of anti-Semites” (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 377). Prior to the veto, Truman was intensively lobbied, “particularly [by] Jewish societies” opposed to the bill; government agencies, meanwhile, including the State Department (despite the anti-restrictionist argument that the bill would have catastrophic effects on U.S. foreign policy) urged Truman to sign the bill (Divine, 1957, p. 184). Moreover, individuals with openly anti-Jewish attitudes, such as John Beaty (1951), often focused on Jewish involvement in the immigration battles during this period.

#### *Jewish Anti-Restrictionist Activity, 1953–1965*

The general subject of CofC is the rise of a new, left-of-center, substantially Jewish elite in the post-World War II era, an elite centered in the media, the academic world, and political culture—the latter influenced not only by media and academic consensus, but also by political donations enabled by increasing Jewish wealth. The demise of the former White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) elite is the theme of Eric Kaufmann’s (2004) *The Rise and*

*Fall of Anglo-America* (critiqued by MacDonald, 2015, basically for inappropriately downplaying Jewish influence). As noted above, Hollinger (1996) notes “the transformation of the ethnoreligious demography of American academic life by Jews” in the period from the 1930s to the 1960s (p. 4), as well as the Jewish influence on trends toward the secularization of American society and in advancing an ideal of cosmopolitanism (p. 11); also that “One force in this [culture war of the 1940s] was a secular, increasingly Jewish, decidedly left-of-center intelligentsia based largely . . . in the disciplinary communities of philosophy and the social sciences” (p. 160). As noted in the Preface, Lipset and Ladd (1971), using survey data of sixty thousand academics from 1969, show that the 1960s were a critical period for the rise of Jewish academics in elite universities who were in general well to the left of non-Jewish professors.

The rise of this new elite implies that analysis cannot be restricted to only one issue, such as immigration policy, without discussing the wider context. Rather, it implies that vital issues of public policy, including immigration, the civil rights of African Americans, women’s rights, religion in the public square (Hollinger’s “secularization of American society”), the legitimacy of White racial identity and interests, cosmopolitanism, foreign policy in the Middle East, and many others will be affected by the attitudes and interests of this new elite. Thus, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 and the civil rights movement cannot be discussed independently of academic and media perspectives on race. CofC discusses the role of Jewish intellectuals in the sea change in academic views related to race (Ch. 2) and this chapter how Boasian ideology had become dominant in the Congressional debates of 1965 on immigration; as noted below, this racial ideology became dominant in the media during this period (Joyce, 2019c)—at a time when all the television networks and Hollywood studios were owned by Jews, and marking a huge shift from the 1920s when restrictionist arguments based on race appeared in prominent magazines and were published by mainstream book publishers. Further, Jewish influence was a major force in the civil rights movement during the critical years of 1954 to 1968 (see below), and in the secularization of American culture: “Jewish civil rights organizations have had an historic role in the postwar development of American church-state law and policy” (Ivers, 1995, p. 2).

The only claim that, if true, would seriously endanger an important aspect of what Nathan Cofnas (2021) labels “the anti-Jewish narrative” is regarding the Jewish role in changing U.S. immigration policy. It’s certainly legitimate for Cofnas to bring up the wider context of Hugh Davis Graham’s (2002/2003) comments on the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, but, as elaborated below, the wider context of the law was critically influenced by other aspects of Jewish activism. Moreover, the bottom line is Graham’s (p. 57) statement:

Most important for the content of immigration reform, 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. . . . Jewish political leaders in New York, most prominently Governor Herbert Lehman, had pioneered in the 1940s in passing state antidiscrimination legislation. Importantly [because of the national origins provisions of the 1924 law giving preference to immigration from northwest Europe], these statutes and executive orders added “national origin” to race, color, and religion as impermissible grounds for discrimination.

Similarly, Otis Graham (2004, p. 67) noted:

The political core of a coalition pressing for a new, more “liberalized” policy regime was composed of ethnic lobbyists . . . claiming to speak for nationalities migrating prior to the National Origins Act of 1924, the most effective being Jews from central and eastern Europe who were deeply concerned with the rise of fascism and anti-semitism on the continent and eternally interested in haven.

Thus any critique of my treatment of immigration must consider whether Jews had important influence on the wider context discussed by Hugh Davis Graham. Cofnas ignores the role of Jewish intellectuals in the sea change in academic views related to race (see Ch. 2) and how Boasian ideology had become dominant in the Congressional immigration debates of 1965 (see below). He also ignores the material on Jewish pro-immigration activism from the 1890s to 1965 (see above), and he ignores my summary of Jewish involvement in the civil rights movement of the 1950s–1960s where Jewish activism was of critical importance (see above). As discussed extensively in Chapter 2, Jews and Jewish organizations led the intellectual effort to deny the importance of racial and ethnic differences in human affairs by dominating the American Anthropological Association since the 1920s. As discussed [above](#), Boasian ideas on race were prominent in the immigration debates between 1945 and 1965.

Finally, as discussed in Chapter 6, Joyce (2019c) describes a campaign centered around Samuel H. Flowerman, Research Director of the AJCommittee and affiliated with the Frankfurt School’s Institute for Social Research, to influence public opinion in the American media after World War II. Flowerman co-edited with Max Horkheimer (director of the Institute for Social Research) the highly influential series *Studies in Prejudice*, published by the AJCommittee. Flowerman brought together a network of Jewish intellectuals and social scientists, many with prominent positions in universities and the media (at a time when the Hollywood studios, all the American television networks, and influential newspapers—e.g., *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*—were owned by Jews). This effort was aimed at dominating American mass

communications in order to “actively reshape ingroup standards—thus re-forming peer group pressures to become antagonistic to ingroup ethnocentrism”; it was “an extensive Jewish joint enterprise in which the unlocking and alteration of White American public opinion was the goal” (p. 11; see, e.g., Flowerman, 1947).

During the post-World War II period, *Congress Weekly* regularly noted the role of Jewish organizations as the vanguard of liberalized immigration laws. In its editorial of February 20th, 1956 (p. 3), for example, it congratulated President Eisenhower for his,

unequivocal opposition to the quota system which, more than any other feature of our immigration policy, has excited the most widespread and most intense aversion among Americans. In advancing this proposal for “new guidelines and standards” in determining admissions, President Eisenhower has courageously taken a stand in advance of even many advocates of a liberal immigration policy and embraced a position which had at first been urged by the American Jewish Congress and other Jewish agencies.

**Organizing Anti-Restriction.** Jews and Jewish organizations organized, led, funded, and performed most of the work of the most important anti-restrictionist organizations active from 1945 to 1965, including the National Liberal Immigration League, the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons, the National Commission on Immigration and Citizenship, the Joint Conference on Alien Legislation, the American Immigration Conference, and the PCIN.

All these groups studied immigration laws, disseminated information to the public, presented testimony to Congress, and planned other appropriate activities. . . . There were no immediate or dramatic results; but [the AJCommittee's] dogged campaign in conjunction with like-minded organizations ultimately prodded the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to action. (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 373)

Regarding the PCIN, established by President Truman, recall that the AJCommittee was also heavily involved in their deliberations, including providing testimony and distributing data and other material to individuals and organizations testifying before the PCIN, with all its recommendations being incorporated into the final report (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 371).

**Recruiting Non-Jews in These Efforts.** Part of this effort was recruiting sympathetic non-Jews, especially prominent non-Jews, to these organizations. Because Jews are a small minority in Western societies, a consistent tactic for the Jewish activist community, beginning at least by the early twentieth century, has been to recruit powerful and influential non-Jews for their efforts

(SAID, Ch. 6; see also here Chs. 3–4). For example, in 1955 the AJCommittee organized a group of influential citizens as the National Commission on Immigration and Citizenship, most of whose members were non-Jews, “in order to give prestige to the campaign” (N. W. Cohen, 1972, p. 373). “To support policy change, American Jewish groups initiated an ambitious campaign to publish and widely distribute books and pamphlets and to recruit prominent politicians favoring robust immigration” (Tichenor, 2002, p. 205). An important part of this effort, according to Tichenor, was to recruit then-Senator and future President John F. Kennedy to attach his name to *A Nation of Immigrants* (1958) and to recruit Senator and future Vice-President and 1968 Democratic presidential candidate Hubert Humphrey for his *Stranger at Our Gate* (1954). Kennedy was recruited by former ADL National Director Ben Epstein (Greenblatt, 2018); the book was published by the ADL which also supplied a historian—Arthur Mann, a doctoral student of Oscar Handlin at Harvard (Ngai, 2013)—for the project (O. Graham, 2004, p. 82), and was ghost-written by Myer Feldman who was influential in the Kennedy/Johnson administration (Tichenor, p. 205).

Nevertheless, despite its clear importance to the activist Jewish community, the most prominent sponsors of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965,

did their best to downplay the law’s importance in public discourse. National policymakers were well aware that the general public was opposed to increases in either the volume or diversity of immigration to the United States. . . . [However,] in truth the policy departures of the mid-1960s dramatically recast immigration patterns and concomitantly the nation. Annual admissions increased sharply in the years after the law’s passage. (Tichenor, 2002, p. 218)

Tichenor notes that chain migration (see below) and the ethnic diversity of the immigrants profoundly changed the United States.

**Rejecting the Ethnic Status Quo Put in Place by the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952.** Even going back to the battle over the Immigration Act of 1924, Jewish activists explicitly opposed an ethnic status quo during Congressional hearings. As stated earlier, at a time when the population of the United States was over one hundred million, Louis Marshall, influential attorney associated with the AJCommittee and leader of the anti-restrictionist lobbying forces, stated, “[W]e have room in this country for ten times the population we have”; he advocated admission of all of the peoples of the world without quota limit, excluding only those who “were mentally, morally and physically unfit, who are enemies of organized government, and who are apt to become public charges” (*Restriction of Immigration*, 1924, pp. 309, 303). Similarly, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, representing the AJCongress and a variety of other Jewish organizations



at the House hearings on the Immigration Act of 1924, asserted “the right of every man outside of America to be considered fairly and equitably and without discrimination” (p. 341).

O. Graham (2004, p. 80) notes that the Jewish lobby on immigration “was aimed not just at open doors for Jews, but also for a diversification of the immigration stream sufficient to eliminate the majority status of western Europeans so that a fascist regime in America would be more unlikely.”

*The fear and insecurity of the American Jewish community after World War II described above was thus the main motivation for the Jewish approach to immigration legislation.*

The motivating role of fear and insecurity on the part of the activist Jewish community was thus unique and differed from other groups and individuals promoting an end to the national origins’ provisions of the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952; such a view entailed changing the ethnic balance of the U.S.

As noted above, Rep. Emanuel Celler was involved in the publication of the report *Whom We Shall Welcome* that viewed changing the ethnic balance of the U.S. as a desirable goal. Cofnas (2021) argues against this by noting:

Even the authors of the legislation were surprised by some of its immediate consequences. According to [H. D.] Graham [2003, pp. 94–95]: “Emanuel Celler himself, disturbed by the steep decline of European immigration, introduced a bill to allow higher immigration from Ireland, Britain, and the Scandinavian countries, which he said had suffered from ‘unintentional discrimination’ as a result of his own law.”

However, given the substance of the PCIN report and Celler’s involvement in its publication, it’s difficult to believe that Celler did not advocate changing the ethnic balance of the U.S. The fact that Celler wanted to increase immigration from parts of Europe is certainly not incompatible with this. It would be far more convincing if Celler had advocated a law explicitly reaffirming the ethnic status quo, as the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952 had done, but, along with all the other major Jewish organizations, he vigorously opposed the ethnic status quo. Getting rid of the national origins formula was a necessary condition for changing the ethnic status quo, as Celler was well aware. All that remained was increasing the absolute numbers of immigrants, as the PCIN advocated, and that is what ultimately happened.

**Chipping Away the Ethnic Status Quo Embedded in the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952.** Regarding the “chipping away” recommended by Handlin and noted by H. D. Graham (2003) as part of the context of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, most of the nonquota immigrants prior to 1965 were refugees from communism. These migrants were overwhelmingly non-Jews from Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia (p. 54), ethnically European groups

that had taken advantage of “the 1920s law [that] gave an ethnically tense country a needed breathing space” (p. 48) to assimilate to American culture. By the 1950s these assimilated European groups were not seen as changing the demographic balance of the country, nor were these refugees from communism leftist radicals—a major concern during the 1920s and 1950s’ McCarthy era, especially regarding Jewish immigrants (Ch. 3 and above). Americans also welcomed them because they were seen as affirming the superiority of American culture to communism during the Cold War; e.g., the torture and persecution of Hungarian Cardinal József Mindszenty (who lived at the American embassy in Budapest for fifteen years prior to being exiled) was very salient to Americans, especially Catholics. (I remember very clearly that the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty was often commented on by the nuns in my Catholic grade school.)

Thus the migration that actually occurred during the 1950s was far from the profile of immigration after 1965. Although such immigration certainly did not reflect attitudes that dominated in the 1920s, the rationale was far from that of post-1965 immigration where essentially no rationale was needed—even needed skills that would benefit the country had a low priority. Indeed, a major chipping-away tactic was to allow family members to immigrate outside of quota limits. Family unification had been central to Jewish efforts on immigration going back to the 1924 debates (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 191), a point emphasized by Rep. Francis Walter, the leader of the restrictionist forces in the House, in the 1952 debates when he noted the special role that Jewish organizations had played in attempting to foster family reunion rather than special skills as the basis of U.S. immigration policy (98 Cong. Rec., 1952, p. 2284).

Commenting on the family unification aspects of the 1961 immigration legislation, M. T. Bennett (1963, p. 244) noted that the “relationship by blood or marriage and the principle of uniting families have become the ‘open Sesame’ to the immigration gates.” Bennett (p. 257) also noted:

The repeated, persistent extension of nonquota status to immigrants from countries with oversubscribed quotas and flatly discriminated against by [the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952] together with administrative waivers of inadmissibility, adjustment of status and private bills, is helping to speed and make apparently inevitable a change in the ethnic face of the nation.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 was tailor-made to increase numbers of immigrants because it allowed “chain migration” of family members (family unification) outside the quota limits. “Family preference was leverage for newcomers and left long-term residents with diminished influence over immigration streams shaping the nation’s future” (O. Graham, 2004, p. 91)

(i.e., because citizens with family going back more than a generation or two—and certainly founding-stock Americans—likely had few close relatives living abroad). Thus, one immigrant could bring in his immediate family and when they became citizens, they could bring in their brothers and sisters outside the quota limit, who could in turn bring in their spouses and children, etc.

**Congressional and Executive Branch Leadership.** Jewish politicians led anti-restrictionist efforts in Congress and were prominent in the executive branch. In Congress, the most noteworthy figures were Rep. Celler (also a leader in the anti-restrictionist forces in the 1924 Congressional debates) and Sens. Jacob Javits and Herbert Lehman, all prominent members of the ADL. After noting the leadership of Jews in Congress, H. D. Graham (2003, p. 57) notes:

[L]ess 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 [who, as noted, was the ghost writer for John F. Kennedy's *A Nation of Immigrants*], assistant secretary of state Abba Schwartz, and deputy attorney general Norbert Schlei in the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

Schlei was the head of the Department of Justice's Office of General Counsel from 1962 to 1966 and the most important figure in drafting the 1965 immigration bill (Saxon, 2003). H. D. Graham (2003, p. 88) also mentions Feldman, Schlei, and Schwarz as important figures involved in immigration-related issues during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

**Jewish Consensus on Immigration Policy.** During this period, anti-restrictionist attitudes were held by the vast majority of the organized Jewish community—"the entire body of religious opinion and lay opinion within the Jewish group, religiously speaking, from the extreme right and extreme left," in the words of Judge Simon Rifkind who testified in Congress representing a long list of national and local Jewish groups in 1948 (*Revision of Immigration*, 1951, p. 562–595). Cofnas (2021, 2023) advocates the "default hypothesis" that because of their intellectual prowess, Jews have always been highly overrepresented on both sides of various issues. This was certainly not true in the case of immigration during the critical period up to 1965 when the national origins provisions of the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952 were overturned—and long thereafter. I have never found any Jewish organization or prominent Jews leading the forces favoring the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952—or those opposed to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 at the time it was enacted. Andrew Joyce (2021a) shows the continuing powerful role of Jews in pro-

immigration activism in the contemporary U.S., joined now by well-organized immigrant groups dedicated to their group interests in liberal immigration policies—interests that ultimately derive from the success of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 in creating a multiethnic, multicultural America.

**Jewish Intellectuals Promoting Immigration.** Further attesting to a Jewish consensus on immigration, prominent Jewish intellectuals, such as Harvard historian and public intellectual Oscar Handlin, published pro-immigration books—e.g., *The Uprooted* (1951/1973)—and articles. Handlin's (1952) article, "The Immigration Fight Has Only Begun," appeared in *Commentary* (published by the AJCommittee) shortly after the Democrat-controlled Congress overrode President Truman's veto of the restrictionist Immigration Act of 1952, and twenty-eight years after Jewish organizations had lost the battle over the Immigration Act of 1924. In a telling comment indicating Jewish leadership of the pro-immigration forces and reflecting the disinterest of other immigrant groups from earlier in the century (Neuringer, 1971/1980, p. 83), Handlin complained about the apathy of other "hyphenated Americans" in joining the immigration battle. "Many groups failed to see the relevance of the McCarran-Walter Bill to their own position." He suggests that these groups ought to act as groups to assert their interests: "The Italian American has the right to be heard on these issues precisely as an Italian American" (emphasis original). The implicit assumption is that the United States ought to be composed of cohesive subgroups with a clear sense of their group interests in opposition to the peoples deriving from Northern and Western Europe or of the United States as a whole—clearly in the interests of Jews as a minority with a strong commitment to their group interests. Also, there is the implication that Italian Americans have an interest in furthering immigration of Africans and Asians and in creating such a multiracial and multicultural society.

Handlin (1952) repeatedly used the term "we"—as in "if we cannot beat [Sen. Pat] McCarran and his cohorts with their own weapons, we can do much to destroy the efficacy of those weapons"—suggesting Handlin's belief in a unified Jewish interest in liberal immigration policy and presaging a prolonged "chipping away" of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 in the ensuing years mentioned by H. D. Graham (2003) as part of the context of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, and noted by Cofnas.

Handlin (1952) attempts to cast the argument in universalist terms as benefiting all Americans and as conforming to American ideals that "all men, being brothers, are equally capable of being Americans." He argues that current immigration law reflects "racist xenophobia" by its token quotas for Asians and its denial of the right of West Indian Blacks to take advantage of British quotas. Handlin ascribes the restrictionist sentiments of Pat McCarran to "the hatred of foreigners that was all about him in his youth and by the dim, recalled fear

that he himself might be counted among them”—a psychoanalytic identification-with-the-aggressor argument (McCarran was of Irish Catholic ancestry).

Handlin's (1952) anti-restrictionist strategy included altering the views of social scientists to the effect “that it was possible and necessary to distinguish among the ‘races’ of immigrants that clamored for admission to the United States.” Handlin's proposal to recruit social scientists in the immigration battles is congruent with the political agenda of the Boasian school of anthropology discussed above and in Chapter 2. As Higham (1984) notes, the ascendancy of such views was an important component of the ultimate victory over restrictionism.

Handlin (1952) presented the following highly tendentious rendering of the logic of preserving the ethnic status quo that underlay the arguments for restriction from 1921 to 1952:

The laws are bad because they rest on the racist assumption that mankind is divided into fixed breeds, biologically and culturally separated from each other, and because, within that framework, they assume that Americans are Anglo-Saxons by origin and ought to remain so. To all other peoples, the laws say that the United States ranks them in terms of their racial proximity to our own “superior” stock; and upon the many, many millions of Americans not descended from the Anglo-Saxons, the laws cast a distinct imputation of inferiority.

Handlin developed this perspective further in a book, *Race and Nationality in American Life*, published in 1957.<sup>154</sup> This book is a compendium of psychoanalytic “explanations” of ethnic and class conflict deriving from *The Authoritarian Personality* studies combined with the Boasian theory that there are no biological differences between the races that influence behavior. There is also a strong strand of the belief that humans can be perfected by changing defective human institutions. Handlin advocates immigration from all areas of the world as a moral imperative. In his discussion of Israel in Chapter XII, however, there is no mention that Israel ought to be similarly inclined to view open immigration from throughout the world as a moral imperative or that Jews should not be concerned with maintaining political control of Israel. Instead, the discussion focuses on the moral compatibility of dual loyalties for American Jews to both the United States and Israel. Handlin's moral blindness regarding Jewish issues can also be seen in Albert Lindemann's (1997, p. xx) comment that

---

<sup>154</sup> Handlin also contributed several articles and reviews to *Partisan Review*, the flagship journal of the New York Intellectuals. Reflecting his deep-seated belief in cultural pluralism, in a 1945 book review he stated, “I simply cannot grasp a conception of ‘Americanism’ that rests on the notion that ‘a social group constitutes a nation insofar as its members are of one mind’” (p. 269).

Handlin's book *Three Hundred Years of Jewish Life in America* failed to mention Jewish slave traders and slave owners "even while mentioning by name the 'great Jewish merchants' who made fortunes in the slave trade."

Handlin (1947) clearly rejected an ethnic status quo, arguing that it was "illusory [to expect] that the composition of American population will remain as it is." And he never addressed the stated justification used by restrictionists in the 1924 debates, describing their attitudes as follows (1951/1973, p. 257):

The hordes of inferior breeds, even then freely pouring into the country in complete disregard for the precepts of the new racial learning [a reference to theories of racial difference common among elites and promulgated in the popular media in the 1920s], would mix promiscuously with the Anglo-Saxon and inevitably produce a deterioration of the species.

Handlin thus ignored the actual argument used by restrictionists during the Congressional debates of 1924: that the national origins formula was fair to all ethnic groups in the country because it created an ethnic status quo, with its implicit and entirely defensible assumption from an evolutionary perspective that different ethnic groups have conflicts of interest regarding immigration (e.g., conflicts between Palestinians and Jews in Israel over a Palestinian right of return).

Handlin was a critical figure in the decades leading up to the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. Ngai (2013, pp. 62, 65) commented on his importance:

Handlin's thinking on immigration policy both reflected and shaped the course of reform in the postwar period. He may be credited with popularizing a new interpretation of American history—one that conceptualized immigration at the heart of American economic and democratic development. In creating this framework for immediate political reform, he founded a normative theory of immigration history—one we popularly know as "a nation of immigrants"—that endured for several generations in both scholarly and popular discourse, and arguably endures into our own time. . . .

His contributions to the long reform effort to repeal the national origin quota system should not be underestimated. His writings, both scholarly and journalistic, provided an episteme for reform, a framework and a logic for critiquing old policy and for defining the contours of a new one. Handlin not only gave Euro-American ethnic groups voice and legitimacy, as *ethnics*. He also gave them a central place in the master narrative of American history and argued that pluralism and group life were pillars of American democracy. The reform agenda was thus not just a matter of immediate political interests; it was also a historical mission in the

perceived telos of American democracy and in the construction of post-World War II Americanism.

Shortly after Handlin's article, William Petersen (1955), also writing in *Commentary*, argued that pro-immigration forces should be explicit in their advocacy of a multicultural society and that the importance of this goal transcended the importance of achieving any self-interested goal of the United States, such as obtaining needed skills or improving foreign relations. In making his case he cited a group of predominantly Jewish social scientists whose works, beginning with Horace Kallen's plea for a multicultural, pluralistic society, "constitute the beginning of a scholarly legitimization of the different immigration policy that will perhaps one day become law" (p. 86), including, besides Kallen, Melville Herskovits (the Boasian anthropologist; see Ch. 2), Geoffrey Gorer, Samuel Lubell, David Riesman (a New York Intellectual; see Ch. 7), Thorsten Sellin, and Milton Konvitz.

These social scientists did indeed contribute to the immigration battles. For example, the following quotation from a scholarly book on immigration policy by Milton Konvitz of Cornell University (published by Cornell University Press) reflects the rejection of national interest as an element of U.S. immigration policy—a hallmark of the Jewish approach to immigration:

To place so much emphasis on technological and vocational qualifications is to remove every vestige of humanitarianism from our immigration policy. We deserve small thanks from those who come here if they are admitted because we find that they are "urgently" needed, by reason of their training and experience, to advance our national interests. This is hardly immigration; it is the importation of special skills or know-how, not greatly different from the importation of coffee or rubber. It is hardly in the spirit of American ideals to disregard a man's character and promise and to look only at his education and the vocational opportunities he had the good fortune to enjoy. (Konvitz, 1953, p. 26)

Notice the reference to "American ideals"—also a tactic used by Zangwill and Handlin—rather than national interests, much less the ethnic interests of White Americans.

Other prominent social scientists who represented the anti-restrictionist perspective in their writings were Richard Hofstadter and Max Lerner. Columbia University historian Hofstadter (1955, p. 34), who did much to create the image of the populists of the West and South as irrational anti-Semites (see Ch. 6), also condemned the populists for their desire "to maintain a homogeneous Yankee civilization." He also linked populism to the immigration issue: in Hofstadter's view, populism was "in considerable part colored by the

reaction to this immigrant stream among the native elements of the population" (p. 11).

In his highly acclaimed *America as a Civilization*, historian Max Lerner, who taught at several universities, including Harvard, provides an explicit link between much of the intellectual tradition covered in previous chapters and the immigration issue. Lerner (1957, p. 502) finds the United States to be a tribalistic nation with a "passionate rejection of the 'outsider,'" and he asserts that "with the passing of the [Immigration Act of 1924] quota laws racism came of age in America" (p. 504). Lerner laments the fact that these "racist" laws are still in place because of popular sentiment, "whatever the intellectuals may think." This is clearly a complaint that when it came to immigration policy, Americans were not following the lead of the predominantly Jewish urbanized intellectual elite represented by Lerner. The comment reflects the anti-democratic, anti-populist element of Jewish intellectual activity discussed in Chapter 7.

Lerner (1957) cites the work of Horace Kallen as providing a model for a multicultural, pluralistic America (p. 93), saying, for example, that he (Lerner) approves of "the existence of ethnic communities within the larger American community, each of them trying to hold on to elements of group identity and in the process enriching the total culture pattern" (p. 506). Correspondingly, while acknowledging that Jews have actively resisted exogamy (p. 510), Lerner sees immigration and interbreeding as having nothing but benign effects (p. 82):

Although some cultural historians maintain that the dilution of native stock is followed by cultural decadence, the example of the Italian city-states, Spain, Holland, Britain, and now Russia and India as well as America indicates that the most vigorous phase may come at the height of the mingling of many stocks. The greater danger lies in closing the gates.

M. Lerner (1957, p. 83) approvingly cites Franz Boas's work on the plasticity of skull size as showing the pervasiveness of environmental influences, and on this basis he asserts that intellectual and biological differences between ethnic groups are entirely the result of environmental differences. Thus (p. 506):

One can understand the fear of the more prolific birth rate of the minorities, but since they are largely the product of lower living standards the strategy of keeping the living standards low by enclosing the minorities in walls of caste would seem self-defeating.

And finally, M. Lerner (1957, p. 509) uses *The Authoritarian Personality* as an analytic tool in understanding ethnic conflict and anti-Semitism.



## CONCLUSION

I conclude that Jews and the organized Jewish community were a necessary condition for passing the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. As has been typical, Jewish activism was aimed at elite institutions and political figures, with change eventually occurring in a top-down manner that did not reflect the attitudes of most Americans. As O. Graham (2004, p. 88) notes:

There was emerging on the immigration question a pattern in public debate that could be found on many issues: elite opinion makers selected a problem and a liberal policy solution, while grassroots opinion, unfocused and marginalized, ran strongly the other way.

Handlin wrote that the McCarran-Walter Act was only a temporary setback, and he was right. Thirty years after the triumph of restrictionism, only Jewish groups remained as persistent and tenacious advocates of a multicultural America. Forty-one years after the 1924 triumph of restrictionism and the national origins provision and only thirteen years after its reaffirmation with the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, Jewish organizations successfully supported ending the geographically based national origins basis of immigration intended to result in an ethnic status quo in what was now a radically altered intellectual and political climate.

The main victory of the restrictionists in 1965 was that Western Hemisphere nations were included in the new quota system, thus ending the possibility of unrestricted immigration from those regions. In speeches before the Senate, Senator Javits (111 Cong. Rec., 1965, p. 24469) bitterly opposed this extension of the quota system, arguing that placing any limits on immigration of all of the people of the Western Hemisphere would have severely negative effects on U.S. foreign policy. In a highly revealing discussion of the bill before the Senate, Senator Sam Ervin (pp. 24446–24451) noted that,

those who disagree with me express no shock that Britain, in the future, can send us 10,000 fewer immigrants than she has sent on an annual average in the past. They are only shocked that British Guyana cannot send us every single citizen of that country who wishes to come.

Clearly the forces of liberal immigration really wanted unlimited immigration into the United States.

The pro-immigrationists in 1965 also failed to prevent a requirement that the secretary of labor certify that there are insufficient Americans able and willing to perform the labor that the aliens intend to perform and that the

employment of such aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American workers. Writing in the *American Jewish Year Book*, Liskofsky (1966, p. 174) noted that pro-immigration groups opposed these regulations but agreed to them in order to get a bill that ended the national origins provisions. After passage “they became intensely concerned. They voiced publicly the fear that the new, administratively cumbersome procedure might easily result in paralyzing most immigration of skilled and unskilled workers as well as of non-preference immigrants.” Reflecting the long Jewish opposition to the idea that immigration policy should be in the national interest, the economic welfare of American citizens was viewed as irrelevant; securing high levels of immigration had become an end in itself.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 is having the effect that it seems reasonable to suppose had been intended by its Jewish advocates all along: the Census Bureau projects that by the year 2050, European-derived peoples will no longer be a majority of the population of the United States. Moreover, multiculturalism has already become a powerful ideological and political reality. Although the proponents of the 1965 legislation continued to insist that the bill would not affect the ethnic balance of the United States or even impact its culture, it is difficult to believe that at least some proponents were unaware of the eventual implications. Opponents, certainly, quite clearly believed the legislation would indeed affect the ethnic balance of the United States. Given their intense involvement in the fine details of immigration legislation, their very negative attitudes toward the Northwestern European bias of pre-1965 U.S. immigration policy, and their very negative attitudes toward the idea of an ethnic status quo embodied, for example, in the PCIN document *Whom We Shall Welcome*, it appears unlikely to suppose that organizations like the AJCommittee and the AJCongress were unaware of the inaccuracy of the projections of the effects of this legislation that were made by its supporters. Given the clearly articulated interests in ending the ethnic status quo evident in the arguments of anti-restrictionists from 1924 through 1965, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 would not have been perceived by its proponents as a victory unless they viewed it as ultimately changing the ethnic status quo. As noted, immediately after passage of the law, there was anxiety among immigration advocates to blunt the restrictive effects of administrative procedures on the number of immigrants. Revealingly, the anti-restrictionists viewed the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 as a victory. After regularly condemning U.S. immigration law and championing the eradication of the national origins formula precisely because it had produced an ethnic status quo, the *Congress Bi-Weekly* ceased publishing articles on this topic.

Moreover, Lawrence Auster (1990, pp. 31ff) shows that the supporters of the legislation repeatedly glossed over the distinction between quota and non-quota immigration and failed to mention the effect that the legislation would

have on nonquota immigration. Projections of the number of new immigrants failed to take account of the well-known and often commented upon fact that the old quotas favoring Western European countries were not being filled. Continuing a tradition of over forty years, pro-immigration rhetoric presented the Immigration Acts of 1924 and 1952 as based on theories of racial superiority and as involving racial discrimination rather than in terms of attempting to maintain an ethnic status quo.

Finally, it is noteworthy that arguments in terms of the morality of immigration for all racial and ethnic groups were common among Jewish activists. Restrictionists were routinely called "racist" and described as not living up to "American ideals"—even though Americans had made it very clear in 1924 and 1952 that they wished to remain a Western European civilization and even though large swaths of Americans remained opposed to transformative immigration long after 1965. This continues into the present, and accounts for the success of Donald Trump's presidential campaigns of 2016 and 2024 at least in part.

These arguments framing what was intended to become massive, transformative immigration as a moral imperative and as reflecting "Jewish values" (MacDonald, 2014) were never regarded by their Jewish advocates as implying that Israel should have an immigration policy open to all the peoples of the world. However, as argued in *Individualism and the Western Liberal Tradition*, this moralistic rhetoric resonates with the individualist peoples of Western Europe where the social glue of these societies is not based on kinship but on establishing moral communities based on individual reputation and trust. Once the mainstream Jewish community had established dominance in the media and academic worlds, Westerners were inundated with messages on the morality of immigration and the evils of racism or any assertion of White identity or interests. Clearly, on the basis of this chapter, this project has been massively successful.

Even in 1952 Senator McCarran was aware of the stakes at risk in immigration policy. In a statement reminiscent of that of Representative William N. Vaile during the debates of the 1920s quoted above, McCarran stated:

I believe that this nation is the last hope of Western civilization and if this oasis of the world shall be overrun, perverted, contaminated or destroyed, then the last flickering light of humanity will be extinguished. I take no issue with those who would praise the contributions which have been made to our society by people of many races, of varied creeds and colors. America is indeed a joining together of many streams which go to form a mighty river which we call the American way. However, we have in the United States today hard-core, indigestible blocs which have not become integrated into the American way of life, but which, on the contrary, are

its deadly enemies. Today, as never before, untold millions are storming our gates for admission and those gates are cracking under the strain. The solution of the problems of Europe and Asia will not come through a transplanting of those problems en masse to the United States. . . . I do not intend to become prophetic, but if the enemies of this legislation succeed in riddling it to pieces, or in amending it beyond recognition, they will have contributed more to promote this nation's downfall than any other group since we achieved our independence as a nation. (Senator Pat McCarran, 99 Cong. Rec., 1953, p. 1518)

#### APPENDIX: JEWISH PRO-IMMIGRATION EFFORTS IN OTHER WESTERN COUNTRIES

The 1998/2002 edition of *CofC* of the section on immigration in other Western countries emphasized several points:

(1) The sea changes in immigration policy occurred at approximately the same time in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Australia (1962–1973).

(2) The changes reflected the attitudes of elites rather than the great mass of citizens. In the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia, public opinion polls of European-derived peoples consistently showed overwhelming rejection of immigration by non-European-derived peoples (Betts, 1988; Brimelow, 1995; F. Hawkins, 1989; Layton-Henry, 1992).

(3) Consistent themes in these changes were that immigration policies were formulated by elites with influence in the media and academia.

(4) Efforts were made by political leaders of all major parties to keep fear of immigration off the political agenda (e.g., Betts; Layton-Henry, p. 82).

(5) Jewish organizations and Jewish individuals were prominently involved in these changes.

These features continue to be found throughout the West, although the ascendancy of Donald Trump has put immigration squarely in the public eye, both in Europe and America. Here I include only a portion of my previous discussion, focusing on Canada and Australia, particularly on Australia because of a recent book by Harry Richardson and Frank Salter (2023), *Anglophobia*.

It is remarkable that the sea change in immigration policy in the Western world occurred at approximately the same time (1962–1973), and in all countries the changes reflected the attitudes of elites rather than the great mass of citizens. In the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia, public opinion polls of European-derived peoples during the period when these laws were passed and long thereafter showed overwhelming rejection of immigration by non-European-derived peoples (Betts, 1988; Brimelow, 1995; F. Hawkins, 1989; Layton-Henry, 1992). A consistent theme has been that immigration policy has

been formulated by elites with control of the media and that efforts have been made by political leaders of all major parties to keep fear of immigration off the political agenda (e.g., Betts; Layton-Henry, p. 82).

For example, in Canada the decision to abandon a "White Canada" policy came from government officials, not from elected politicians. The White Canada policy was effectively killed by regulations announced in 1962, and F. Hawkins (1989, p. 39) comments:

This very important policy change was made not as a result of parliamentary or popular demand, but because some senior officials in Canada, including Dr. [George] Davidson [Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and later a senior administrator at the United Nations], rightly saw that Canada could not operate effectively within the United Nations, or in the multiracial Commonwealth, with the millstone of a racially discriminatory immigration policy round her neck.

In neither Australia nor Canada was there ever any popular sentiment to end the older European bias of immigration policy.

The primary and identical motivation of Canadian and Australian politicians in trying to exclude first the Chinese, then other Asian migrants, and finally all potential non-white immigrants, was the desire to build and preserve societies and political systems in their hard-won, distant lands very like those of the United Kingdom. They also wished to establish without challenge the primary role there of her founding peoples of European origin. . . . Undisputed ownership of these territories of continental size was felt to be confirmed forever, not only by the fact of possession, but by the hardships and dangers endured by the early explorers and settlers; the years of back-breaking work to build the foundations of urban and rural life. . . . The idea that other peoples, who had taken no part in these pioneering efforts, might simply arrive in large numbers to exploit important local resources, or to take advantage of these earlier settlement efforts, was anathema. (F. Hawkins, 1989, pp. 22-23)

Given the elite origins of the non-European immigration policies that emerged throughout the West during this period despite popular opposition, it is of considerable interest that very little publicity was given to certain critical events. In Canada, the Report of the Special Joint Committee of 1975 was a critical event in shaping the non-European immigration policy of the 1978 immigration law, but "sad to say, since the press failed to comment on the report and the electronic media had remained uninvolved, the Canadian public heard little of it" (F. Hawkins, 1989, p. 59-60). Further (p. 63):

Looking back on this national debate on immigration and population which lasted for six months at most, it can be said now that it was a very effective one-time consultation with the immigration world, and with those Canadian institutions and organizations to whom immigration is an important matter. It did not reach "the average Canadian" for one simple reason: The Minister and Cabinet did not trust the average Canadian to respond in a positive way on this issue, and thought this would create more trouble than it was worth. As a result of this view, they did not want to commit the funds to organize extensive public participation, and made only a minimal effort to mobilize the media on behalf of a truly national debate. The principal benefit of this approach was that the badly needed new Immigration Act was on the statute book only a little later than Mr. [Robert] Andras [Minister of Manpower and Immigration] and his colleagues [Hawkins emphasizes Andras's Deputy Minister Alan Gotlieb as the second prime mover of this legislation] originally envisaged. The principal loss was what some would regard as a golden opportunity to bring a great many individual Canadians together, to discuss the future of their vast under-populated land.

Only after the 1978 law was in effect did the government embark on a public information campaign to inform Canadians of their new immigration policy (F. Hawkins, 1989, p. 79). F. Hawkins and Betts (1988) make similar points about the changes in Australian immigration policy. In Australia the impetus for change in immigration policy came from small groups of reformers that began appearing in some Australian universities in the 1960s (F. Hawkins, p. 22). Betts (pp. 99ff) in particular emphasizes the idea that the intellectual, academic, and media elite "trained in the humanities and social sciences" (p. 100) developed a sense of being a member of a morally and intellectually superior ingroup battling against Australian parochial nonintellectuals as an outgroup. As in the United States, there is a perception among Jews that a multicultural society will be a bulwark against anti-Semitism. Miriam Faine, an editorial committee member of the *Australian Jewish Democrat* stated, "The strengthening of multicultural or diverse Australia is also our most effective insurance policy against anti-semitism. The day Australia has a Chinese Australian Governor General I would feel more confident of my freedom to live as a Jewish Australian" (in McCormack, 1994, p. 11).

As in the United States, family unification became a centerpiece of immigration policy in Canada and Australia and led to the "chaining" phenomenon mentioned above as a cornerstone of Jewish immigration in the United States. F. Hawkins (1989, p. 87) shows that in Canada, family reunion was the policy of liberal members of Parliament desiring higher levels of Third World immigration. In Australia, family reunion became increasingly important during the 1980s, which also saw a declining importance of Australian development as a

criterion for immigration policy (p. 150). Reflecting these trends, the Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ) passed a resolution at its December 1st, 1996 meeting to express “its support for the proposition that Australia’s long-term interests are best served by a non-discriminatory immigration policy which adopts a benevolent attitude to refugees and family reunion and gives priority to humanitarian considerations.” *The Australia/Israel Review*, a publication of the ECAJ, consistently editorialized in favor of high levels of immigration of all racial and ethnic groups. It published unflattering portraits of restrictionists (e.g., Kapel, 1997) and, in an effort at punishment and intimidation, published a list of two thousand people associated with Pauline Hanson’s anti-immigration One Nation party (*The Australia/Israel Review*, 1998)

*Anglophobia* (2023) by Harry Richardson and Frank Salter brings Jewish activism in Australia up to date. Section 18C of Australia’s Racial Discrimination Act was amended in 1996 as a result of Chinese and Jewish activism in order to criminalize speech that causes someone to be offended. “Free speech has been the first casualty of multiculturalism” (p. 145)—a statement that is equally true throughout the Western world (see Preface). Originally intended mainly to combat anti-Semitism, Section 18C soon came to be used to prosecute Anglos like Andrew Bolt who criticized White-looking individuals who made dubious claims about their aboriginal ancestry to obtain benefits. “Bolt complained that at his trial he faced a Jewish prosecutor who told the Jewish judge that Bolt was like a neo-Nazi and referred repeatedly to Nazi Germany and the Holocaust” (p. 107). Similarly, when Prof. Andrew Fraser was prosecuted for his views on Black criminality,

the prosecuting team included the president of the NSW Jewish Board of Deputies, the peak Jewish defence agency in New South Wales, that is, the organization that represented many other Jewish organizations. . . . The symbolism could not have been clearer. The leader of a peak Jewish organization joined with other Jewish lawyers to sue an Anglo professor for raising a legitimate concern of ethnic and national welfare. (Richardson & Salter, 2023, p. 110)

The authors also discuss similar phenomena in America, noting the role of Noel Ignatiev in the origins of Critical Race Theory, the ADL’s definition of racism in which the term is only applied to Whites, and the close relationship between the FBI and the ADL, quoting ADL head Jonathan Greenblatt:

We’re working with all the platforms by the way—Google and YouTube and Meta and Twitter and Reddit and Steam and Amazon and all these companies. That’s relevant because we work with Twitter now since it was

founded. We worked with the old regime and [we're] working with the new post-Elon Musk regime. (Richardson & Salter, 2023, p. 116)

(1) The authors note similar phenomena in Sweden and the U.K., and they note that in general the Jewish community has taken a leadership role in promoting multiculturalism and immigration while making alliances with more poorly organized, less motivated ethnic groups.

The examples of Jewish activism against Anglo interests involve an intense level of motivation. . . . In Australia, Jewish organisations sometimes act as de facto peak bodies for the multicultural sector as a whole, rallying, organizing, coordinating, and supporting the actions of other minority advocates. (Richardson & Salter, 2023, p. 117)

This leadership phenomenon also occurs in the U.S., where Jewish organizations have made alliances with non-White ethnic activist organizations. For example, groups such as the AJCommittee, the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington, and Rabbi Marc Schneir's Foundation for Ethnic Understanding have formed coalitions with organizations such as the National Council of La Raza, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Jewish Congressional Delegation, and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus; the meeting was co-sponsored by the World Jewish Congress (MacDonald, 2006).

(2) In attempting to understand Jewish motivation for this, the authors note Jewish self-perceptions of ill treatment in the past (e.g., in the U.S., Jews perceived the Immigration Act of 1924 that lowered immigration and favored Northwest Europeans as hostile to Jewish immigration). However, as anti-Semitism plummeted in the wake of World War II, there was also an often-expressed concern that a homogeneous White society would eventually turn on the Jews, as happened in Germany in the 1930s (see above)—a concern that was central to the Frankfurt School's switch from orthodox Marxism to the theory that White ethnocentrism was the fundamental problem for Jews (Ch. 6). The authors have an extensive discussion of Miriam Faine, a leader of the Jewish community and editor of *The Australian Jewish Democrat*, who wrote in 1992 of the Jewish strategy to import more non-Whites and to encourage them to retain their ethnic identities as a strategy to combat anti-Semitism but also to obtain power over Anglos: "Faine's hate-filled words give us a window into explicit multicultural strategizing. She did not express vague unconscious implicit messages. This was someone intent on group domination and replacement in a very conscious and deliberate targeting of Anglo Australia" (Richardson & Salter, 2023, p. 125). She preferred a Chinese head of state because only then would she feel safe in Australia, which is quite clearly an expression of "a



preference for Anglos to be replaced in positions of power. . . . the disempowerment of white Anglo Australians” (p. 127).

(3) Of course, Jews are not the only longstanding ethnic group in Australia with some animosity to the Anglos. The Irish have a long history of hostility toward Anglos stemming from English colonial rule over Ireland, hostilities which were transported to Australia after Irish immigration. Discussion mainly features one Greg Sheridan, a journalist since the late 1970s for *The Australian*, a Murdoch publication. Like many multiculturalism advocates in the West, he has praised other countries, like India and China, for taking steps to ensure their cultural homogeneity. Influenced by his father, as a child he refused to stand for “God Save the Queen” or any other expression of British sovereignty. However, as in America, where such multicultural activism motivated by Irish hostility toward the British is residual at best, Jewish activism and its organizing influence on other imported minorities are quite clearly much greater than the residual anti-Anglo sentiments of some contemporary Irish-descended Australians. “Examples of Anglophobia can be found among Irish Catholics but that sentiment has not been general or inevitable” (Richardson & Salter, 2023, p. 141). Examples can be found, but the organizational structure, elite overrepresentation, and influence are simply not there.

It seems fair to conclude that Jewish organizations have uniformly advocated high levels of immigration of all racial and ethnic groups into Western societies and have also advocated a multicultural model for these societies.



## CONCLUSION: WHITHER JUDAISM AND THE WEST?

This book documents several influential movements originated and dominated by strongly identified Jews acting according to their perceptions of Jewish interests. However, I don't want to be interpreted as claiming that these Jews acted in a vacuum or that their activism would work in other cultures. They acted in the context of Western individualism. Among all the cultures of the world, Western civilization is uniquely individualist (Henrich, 2020; *Individualism*). My 2019 book, *Individualism and the Western Liberal Tradition*, focuses mainly on the United States (Ch. 6),

where a Puritan-descended elite dominated intellectual discourse and the Ivy League universities, as well as the legal, political, and commercial establishment until the rise of a Jewish elite. This new elite was influential even in the early decades of the twentieth century, but its influence expanded considerably in the post-World War II era and accelerated dramatically after 1965.

Further, in Chapter 8 of *Individualism*:

A fundamental aspect of individualism is that group cohesion is based not on kinship but on reputation—most importantly in recent centuries, a moral reputation as capable, honest, trustworthy and fair. The moral

communities of the West have deep historical roots. . . . Christian Europe, especially in the Middle Ages, had become a moral community based on Christian religious beliefs rather than an ethnic or national identity. Moreover, the medieval moral community created by the Church, the Puritan and Quaker religious leaders of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the liberal intellectuals of the nineteenth century . . . carried on the primeval [prehistoric, genetically influenced] tendency to create moral communities as a source of identity. Moreover, . . . such moral communities have come to define the contemporary culture of the West.

These moral communities are indigenous products of the culture of the West—products of Western culture in the same way that kinship-based clans, cousin marriage and harems of elite males are products of the people of the Middle East.

Whites' greater tendency toward individualism implies that they are less likely than other peoples to make invidious distinctions between ingroups and outgroups and more likely to be open to strangers. European peoples are thus less likely to be anti-Jewish, particularly in an environment where media and the educational system are saturated with messages opposed to anti-Semitism.

As emphasized here, Jewish media and academic influence have been critical to creating what is now essentially an anti-White media and educational environment. One might say that the activist Jewish community came to realize that messages framed as moral imperatives would be able to create an anti-White moral community, and that White people could be effectively shamed into submission with messages framing replacement-level non-White immigration and ethnic and cultural diversity as morally superior policies..

#### ON THE POSSIBILITY OF A NON-JEWISH ELITE IN THE UNITED STATES

The rise of the new Jewish-dominated elite meant that explicit, morally framed messages (i.e., messages designed to appeal to the moral communities of the West) about race (e.g., "there's no such thing as race") and ethnocentrism (e.g., "White ethnocentrism is a sure sign of psychopathology and disturbed parent-child relationships") were being disseminated by the elite media and throughout the educational system—areas with strong Jewish influence (see Preface). In general, these intellectual and political movements with strong Jewish influence have been on the left (including neoconservatism), reflecting the political attitudes of the mainstream Jewish diaspora community in the West—and utterly opposed to the ethnonationalist attitudes that dominate Israel. The fundamental assumptions of these leftist movements, particularly as

they relate to race and ethnicity, permeate intellectual and political discourse among both liberals and conservatives and define a mainstream consensus among elites in academia, the media, business, and government.

Jews ascended to the heights of American society in several stages. In the early twentieth century Henry Ford noted their prominence in a variety of fields and their hostility to Christianity.<sup>155</sup> Jews also had prominent roles in Franklin Roosevelt's presidency (Talmadge, 2025), but it wasn't until after World War II that anti-Jewish attitudes basically disappeared and they really entered the mainstream. Jews then led the 1960s counter-cultural revolution and became a dominant elite in the 1960s (Ch. 3); they were a necessary condition for the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 that eventually radically transformed the country, as well as civil rights legislation and the general ascent of the left to a position of dominance in American culture (Ch. 8). Jewish ascendancy was accompanied by the decline and eventual eclipse of the previously dominant White, Anglo-Saxon Protestant East-Coast establishment (MacDonald, 2015).

The main sources of Jewish power since the 1960s have been: 1) their ownership of media and their creation of media content as writers and producers; 2) their wealth and willingness to contribute to political causes by funding political candidates and establishing nonprofit organizations and lobbying groups able to influence public policy; 3) their domination of academic culture, ultimately due to their influence in elite universities and trickling down to lower-tier universities and eventually the K-12 educational system.

This Jewish power structure is still in place, but there appear to be important changes indicating that Jewish power is not what it once was. Moreover, it's hard to believe that the organized Jewish community is able to retain its position as eternal victims and paragons of tolerance and virtue in view of Israeli actions in Gaza and the support these actions have received from the American Jewish community.

### *Media*

When I was growing up in the 1950s, there were three television networks, all owned by Jews (ABC, CBS, NBC). These networks are still owned by Jews (see Preface). *The New York Times*, often labeled "America's newspaper of record," is still owned by a Jewish family and reflects the mainstream liberal-left Jewish community. However, the influence of these exemplars of the legacy media has declined dramatically.

---

<sup>155</sup> See my discussion of Henry Ford's *The International Jew* published from 1920 to 1922 in MacDonald, 2002a.

If the 2024 election shows anything, it's that the legacy mainstream media is distrusted more than ever and has been effectively replaced among wide swaths of voters, especially young voters, by alternative media, particularly podcasts and social media. Influential podcasters, such as Joe Rogan (a former liberal who supported Trump in 2024), have become increasingly conservative, and Tucker Carlson has pushed the boundaries of conservative thinking, such as with his interviews with historian/blogger Darryl Cooper questioning aspects of the sacrosanct World War II narrative (MacDonald, 2024a) and with Curt Mills touching on neoconservatism—essentially a Jewish intellectual and political movement (Ch. 4)—and America's disastrous wars in the Middle East (MacDonald, 2025). Another former liberal, Elon Musk, has become a prominent supporter of Trump in the election and was active in attempting to end the power of the Democrat-leaning federal bureaucracy.

Trump's Secretary of Defense Pete Hegseth evicted *The New York Times*, National Public Radio, NBC, and Politico from their Pentagon offices to make room for One America News Network, *The New York Post*, Breitbart News Network, and *HuffPost* (which did not ask for representation) (Terkel, 2025). All of the ones replaced are decidedly on the left, while replacements are conservative except *HuffPost*. None can be considered legacy media.

Thomas Edsall (2025) in *The New York Times* has noted that "While both Democrats and Republicans have abandoned newspapers in growing numbers, . . . the drop among Republicans accelerated much faster than it did for Democrats in 2016, the year Trump first ran for president." Legacy newspapers are thus a key source of information for Democrats but not Republicans.

Conservative media is slavishly pro-Israel even as they typically oppose liberal-left domestic political policies favored by the mainstream Jewish community, such as:

1. promoting high levels of legal non-White immigration, enabling illegal immigration, and stopping the deportation of illegals because they see them as future voters for the liberal-left and diluting the power of White Americans or at least adding to the congressional power of blue states that welcome illegals, since all residents, not just citizens, are counted in the U.S. census;
2. promoting so-called hate speech laws and other attempts to rein in free speech on racial/ethnic issues, including especially criticisms of Israel;
3. supporting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion programs and Critical Race Theory that discriminate against and foster hatred against Whites (Sales, 2025a);
4. promoting transgenderism, gay rights, advocating easy access to abortion, etc.

Jews typically vote overwhelmingly Democrat and basically fund the Democratic Party. In the 2024 election, 71 to 79 percent of Jews voted for Harris, thus supporting the liberal-far left policies favored by the Kamala Harris campaign (MacDonald, 2024b). Even though there was some shift to more conservative voting among some groups of Jews, Jews in general are still on the left when it comes to domestic issues compared to White Americans.

Jewish neoconservatives were a longtime fixture in the Republican Party but defected with the rise of Trump because of his professed distaste for foreign wars and likely because of Trump's stated views on immigration and multiculturalism. Predictably, the neoconservatives seamlessly defected to the Democrats where their liberal-left views on domestic policy fit right in, while the Democrat establishment has continued its robust support for Israel and all that that entails (with some dissent among Democrats who disapprove of the Gaza genocide). While in the GOP, these Jewish neocons moved the party to the left on social issues while promoting pro-Israel wars in the Middle East (Ch. 4), and now they support the Ukraine war against Russia. Conservative media by and large support Trump (Thompson, 2025), and are thus anathema to most Jews.

Thus, even though conservative media are obsessively pro-Israel, they tend to oppose the attitudes and policy proposals of the mainstream liberal-left Jewish community on domestic policy.

As noted, the influence of the legacy media, a main power base of the mainstream liberal-left Jewish community, appears to be in terminal decline. Moreover, there is some indication that some legacy media outlets are becoming more conservative. For example, Jeff Bezos changed the editorial stance of *The Washington Post* away from their liberal-left positions to a more libertarian policy and refused to endorse Harris for president (Howard, 2025). Patrick Soon-Shiong, owner of the *Los Angeles Times*, also blocked the paper from endorsing Harris, stating that the paper had become too liberal, resulting in the resignation of the editor and much of the editorial board (Katzenberger, 2024). Neither Bezos nor Soon-Shiong is Jewish.

The rise of alternative media is critical. Under Elon Musk, X is clearly open to conservative views, and even anti-Jewish posts. X has become a right-leaning media outlet that attracts young people and many others who reject the legacy media.

### *Funding the Left*

Jewish financial clout is certainly still in place, but we are seeing the rise of a very wealthy class of non-Jewish billionaires and multi-millionaires, prototypically Elon Musk, who reportedly gave Trump's campaign more than 290 million dollars (D. Wright & Leeds-Matthews, 2025). Wealthy non-Jews are thus

quite willing and able to finance a competitive campaign like Trump's. As of August 14th, 2024 (L. Kamin) according to *Forbes*, of twenty-six billionaire donors to Trump (not including Musk), twenty-two were not Jewish, while four, including Bernard Marcus (who recently died) were Jewish, with only one in the top ten (pro-Israel fanatic Miriam Adelson who donated one hundred million dollars). Overall, Democrats and Democrat-affiliated groups spent 1.8 billion dollars, while Republicans and Republican-affiliated groups spent about 1.4 billion dollars (Kamisar, 2024). The Trump campaign certainly had enough money to run a credible campaign and even win despite the deluge of hate emanating from the legacy media.

Jewish money is thus not necessary to win, especially if the richest man in the world is on board. Assuming Musk gave three hundred million dollars, it was much less than 1 percent of his wealth in 2024; indeed, Musk's activism has resulted in a campaign to destroy Tesla, a main source of his wealth. But the fact remains that Musk could finance a presidential campaign all by himself—two billion dollars would be more than even the Democrats and Democrat-affiliated groups spent on the 2024 presidential campaign, but Musk could easily afford that. As the Jews have always known, money is power.

All this wealth supporting Trump 2.0 was apparent at Trump's inauguration:

Here were America's tech tycoons, members of his court, in a pantheon at his second Inaugural Address, directly across from the former presidents and in front of Trump's presumptive cabinet. Many members of Congress, the actual elected government, were relegated to the cheaper seats.

The men who control Americans' eyeballs and, often, emotions got the choicest seats; several have scarfed up big mansions in Washington to be closer to the Oval.

Elon Musk sat behind the vice president's mother, pumping his arms and giving two thumbs-up when Trump said he'd put an American flag on Mars, where Musk wants to die (just not on impact).

Google's Sundar Pichai was near Don Jr. and next to Jeff Bezos and Lauren Sanchez, who were near Ivanka and Jared. Shou Zi Chew, the TikTok C.E.O., sat next to Tulsi Gabbard, Trump's intended director of national intelligence. Tim Cook of Apple was close to Barron Trump. Sam Altman, the head of OpenAI, was also at the inaugural but—perhaps because of his legal duel with Elon—was in the overflow room with Ron DeSantis, Eric Adams and Conor McGregor. (Dowd, 2025)

Sam Altman is the only one of these moguls who is Jewish. Most of these tycoons were likely just trying to ingratiate themselves with the new administration, but this is a huge change from the 2017 inauguration and suggests



that they are quite comfortable with at least some of the sea changes that Trump is pursuing.

### *Academia*

The university is definitely the hardest nut to crack because hiring is rigorously policed to make sure that new faculty and administrators are on the left. Academics who fail to support the left can expect a lifetime of harassment and hostility, and, if they don't have tenure, they will certainly be fired even if their teaching and scholarship are excellent.

As in other areas, Jews ascended the heights of the academic world after World War II and especially during the 1960s (see Preface). Once they achieved prominence—and always eager as a small minority to make alliances with other groups—they promoted the establishment of academic departments essentially composed of leftist activists, such as gender studies and various ethnic studies departments for Blacks, Latinos, Asians, Jews, etc., thus expanding the liberal arts faculty and creating a critical mass of leftist activists. This structure is still in place.

Since the Israeli war in Gaza, the West Bank, Lebanon, and Syria, beginning in 2023, there have been a great many protests on campus, but Jewish power has put a rather quick end to that:

The policies ranged from banning the erection of tents on campus grounds to limiting the times and places where students are allowed to hold demonstrations. While free speech experts agree that some time, place and manner restrictions are acceptable, they have branded some policy changes unconstitutional. (Alonso, 2024)

At UCLA, pro-Israel thugs were allowed to run amok among protesters while the police stood by:

Even worse scenes took place at UCLA as an encampment of peaceful protesters was violently attacked and beaten by a mob of pro-Israel thugs having no university connection but armed with bars, clubs, and fire-works, resulting in some serious injuries. A professor of history described her outrage as the nearby police stood aside and did nothing while UCLA students were attacked by outsiders, then arrested some 200 of the former. (Unz, 2024a)

Obviously, these restrictions are a far cry from university responses to the Black Lives Matter riots. As Unz (2024a) noted:

I'd think that most of these students were absolutely stunned at such reactions. For decades, they and their predecessors had freely protested on a wide range of political causes without ever encountering even a sliver of such vicious retaliation, let alone an organized campaign that quickly forced the resignation of two of the Ivy League presidents who had allowed their protests. Some of their student organizations were immediately banned and the future careers of the protesters were harshly threatened, but the horrifying images from Gaza continued to reach their smartphones.

Jewish power in academia is alive and well.

The Trump administration is pushing back on the academic left but not against Jewish power in the universities, deporting foreign students and professors involved in anti-Israel protests:

The new attorney general, Pam Bondi, created a task force to prosecute antisemitic acts, including on college campuses. The president's order singles out last year's university protests against Israel's war in Gaza, which it says unleashed a barrage of discrimination against Jewish students. The order targets international students who participated in those protests with deportation. (Westervelt, 2025)

There is also a welcome campaign to end Diversity, Equity and Inclusion programs at universities. It's long been apparent that the only way to rein in the radical left that dominates academia is to cut their funding. Although a Department of Education ruling of February 17th, 2025 fits with color-blind conservative ideology, it does mention discrimination against Whites (and Asians) and specifically targets Critical Race Theory, which is nothing but anti-White hate. As of February 2025, the DOE has cancelled well over one billion dollars from university grants, noting that "Review of the contracts uncovered wasteful and ideologically driven spending not in the interest of students and taxpayers" (R. Quinn, 2025).

Trump's attitude on foreign student protesters will put a further chill into what has already been happening with anti-Israel protests. But fighting DEI at universities will be an uphill struggle against an academic establishment that has devoted huge amounts of money and hired thousands of bureaucrats to administer DEI programs (Bradley-Dorsey, 2021). Moreover, universities will likely find ways to continue DEI programs even if they are legally prohibited, as they have with affirmative action admissions (Poff, 2024).

However, of the three main sources of Jewish power, academic influence is least important. Students will notice that DEI jobs are drying up and notice that spouting and, if these trends continue, living the old leftist political clichés is no longer a good route to social and career success. Women in

particular are likely to shift political preferences when they see a shift in the status hierarchy (Devlin, 2025), but men will also change their attitudes as they try to advance in the new hierarchy.

### *A Non-Jewish Elite?*

Thus there is a real possibility of the rise of an essentially non-Jewish elite centered outside the traditional legacy media and with the financial resources able to mount successful political campaigns and fund compatible NGOs. Whether this could develop into an *anti-Jewish* elite is a completely different question—unlikely for the foreseeable future because of the deep personal ties and business relationships among elite Jews and non-Jews. Nevertheless, as noted, the domestic policies of the Trump administration for the most part depart dramatically from policies long favored by the mainstream liberal-left Jewish community. Already we see numerous Jewish organizations protesting an end to DEI and the deportations of illegal immigrants (Sales, 2025a, 2025b).

Although the present situation is in flux, it is quite possible that in the future the new elite described here could become far more than a possibility. This new elite may realize that Jewish support and Jewish power in American politics are not what they once were and that there is no real need to support the policies favored by the mainstream Jewish community. Indeed, this may have already happened—with the important exception of pro-Israel attitudes that also appeal to some sections of the Republican base (e.g., knee-jerk support of Israel by mainstream conservatives and Evangelicals). Some parts of this new elite may be well aware of the role Jews have played in erecting the multicultural disaster that America has become—a position that was common on the American right for decades, at least from the time of Henry Ford until neoconservatives pushed out traditional conservatives during the Reagan administration and William F. Buckley purged the conservative movement of critics of Jewish influence (MacDonald, 2004b, pp. 16, 26; S. J. Quinn, 2022c). And they may be well aware that the slavish support that America has given Israel has been enormously costly in terms of lives and treasure without really serving American interests.

Musk is a good example. He is increasingly out of step with the liberal-left mainstream in his posts on X. Deborah Lipstadt, a Holocaust activist and United States Special Envoy for Monitoring and Combating Anti-Semitism during the Biden administration, remarked about a Musk post, “The damage was done. The endorsement of the Great Replacement theory was very harmful.” Lipstadt added that she disapproved of what she saw as an attempt to “mitigate” an earlier post by Musk, noting “You can try to mitigate, but once you open the pillow, it’s like chasing the feathers” (in Lapin, 2023).

Musk was replying to a user who wrote, “Jewish communities have been pushing the exact kind of dialectical hatred against whites that they claim to want people to stop using against them. I’m deeply disinterested in giving the tiniest s--- now about western Jewish populations coming to the disturbing realization that those hordes of minorities [they] support flooding their country don’t exactly like them too much.” . . .

Musk responded, “You have said the actual truth.” (Lapin, 2023)

ADL head Jonathan Greenblatt and other Jewish groups, including the American Jewish Committee joined a loud chorus in condemning that post. Later in the same thread, Musk went after the ADL itself, saying the group “push[es] de facto anti-white racism” (in Lapin, 2023). He apologized for a lot of this and made the customary visits to Auschwitz and Israel, but it’s hard to believe that he now rejects these ideas.

Notice that the idea of the Great Replacement is completely off limits for Jewish activists like Lipstadt. They see any claim that the Great Replacement is real as an anti-Jewish conspiracy theory no matter whether Jews are mentioned, no matter what the changing demographics indicate, and no matter what research shows was the very prominent Jewish role in promoting the transformative Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 and their continuing promotion of non-European immigration throughout the West (Ch. 8).

As always, I am an optimist. I think that many of the figures on the right are quite aware of the deleterious effects of Jewish power and influence on formerly dominant White America. And as I noted, it’s hard to believe that Musk now rejects these ideas. He likely just knows better than to continue to utter them in public.

Consider also Vice President J. D. Vance’s speech at the Munich Security Conference in February 2025.<sup>156</sup> The fact that such ideas on immigration and

---

<sup>156</sup> Vice President J. D. Vance’s speech at the 61st Munich Security Conference (February 18th, 2025) was attended by powerful EU leaders and opposed what has been a consensus among European elites on immigration and free speech:

“And of all the pressing challenges that the nations represented here face, I believe there is nothing more urgent than mass migration. Today, almost one in five people living in this country [Germany] moved here from abroad. That is, of course, an all-time high. It’s a similar number, by the way, in the United States, also an all-time high. The number of immigrants who entered the EU from non-EU countries doubled between 2021 and 2022 alone. And of course, it’s gotten much higher since.

“And we know the situation. It didn’t materialize in a vacuum. It’s the result of a series of conscious decisions made by politicians all over the continent, and others across the world, over the span of a decade. . . .

“I believe that dismissing people, dismissing their concerns or worse yet, shutting down media, shutting down elections or shutting people out of the political process protects nothing. In fact, it is the most surefire way to destroy democracy. Speaking up and expressing opinions isn’t election interference. Even when people express views outside your own country, and even when those people are very influential. And trust me, I say this with all humor—

free speech are being articulated at the apex of political power is a most heartening sign and suggests the possibility that a new elite can arise that would challenge Jewish power in America and throughout the West.

#### COSTS OF MULTICULTURALISM

Given the Jewish strategy of promoting multiculturalism and ethnic pluralism, it's relevant to discuss the costs of multiculturalism. First and foremost, multiculturalism in formerly relatively homogeneous White societies lessens the political and cultural power of Whites. We simply cannot wish away the reality that different racial and ethnic groups have different and conflicting interests.

Multiculturalism leads to “ethnic conflict sometimes leading to civil war, a loss of public trust and cooperation, reduced democracy, reduced economic growth, the emergence of ethnic criminal gangs, and psychological and social costs to majorities who become minorities” (Richardson & Salter, 2023, p. 24). The possibility of civil war has been raised by Prof. of War Studies David Betz, who has claimed that British society is “explosively configured” for mass unrest because of unchecked immigration, restrictions on free speech, and continuing lack of social cohesion—a diagnosis he applies also to other Western countries. Multiculturalism is a disaster that is,

leading to a society that [is] ghettoized into competing communities that [have] little relation with each other. . . . [T]he financialization of the economy is essentially running out of rope.<sup>157</sup> [W]e're considerably more fractured as a society. We're considerably more detached from our own history; or certainly from common appreciation of the validity and acceptability of that history. We're in a period of very serious, probably persistent, structural economic decline. (Betz, 2025)

---

if American democracy can survive ten years of Greta Thunberg's scolding you guys can survive a few months of Elon Musk.

“But what no democracy—American, German or European—will survive, is telling millions of voters that their thoughts and concerns, their aspirations, their pleas for relief, are invalid or unworthy of even being considered” (Full transcript in Lu, 2025).

<sup>157</sup> James Petras (2017) has noted the prominent role of Jews in finance and its effect on Jewish power and influence at the expense of the working class: “By the last quarter of the 20th century and especially in the 21st century, deindustrialization and the shift to financialization in the US economy increased the power and privilege of a disproportionate number of multi-billionaire/millionaire Jews. This seismic shift has coincided with the pervasive impoverishment of the marginalized working class in the former ‘rust belt’ and central parts of the country and the incredible concentration of national wealth at the top 1%. This is a demographic shift and ethno-class apartheid of huge, but unstudied, significance.”

Thus a major effect of multiculturalism has been what is often termed “hyper-polarization.” Many commenters on the current scene in America have noted the increased polarization and inability to communicate across the political—increasingly ethnic—divide. Opposing groups have irreconcilable world views and see the other as evil incarnate—highly reminiscent of the millenarian thinking that is a strong trend in American history (see *Individualism*, Ch. 6). As this continues to fester, the conflict is seen by all sides as irreconcilable. This results in an existential clash where fundamental values are at stake. As Hillary Clinton noted, commenting on the poisonous atmosphere of American politics in 2018, civility in American politics could only be restored if her side, the Democrats, won: “You cannot be civil with a political party that wants to destroy what you stand for, what you care about” (in Crowe, 2018).

Thus, the situation in the United States is quite similar to the U.K. as described by Betz and suggests the possibility of a civil war (similar dividing lines are apparent in all Western countries and in many other parts of the world). Indeed, a 2018 *Rasmussen Reports* poll indicated 31 percent of Americans think a civil war is likely soon.

One possibility for a civil war scenario was presented by Michael Vlahos (2018), who notes that civil wars begin when “kinship groups”—a proxy for race-based groups—fractionate into opposing camps:

Just since the 2016 election, we have witnessed a rolling thunder of Blue and Red elite rhetoric—packing the Supreme Court, abolishing the electoral college, repealing the Second Amendment, wholesale state nullification of federal law, shackling of voter rights, and Deep State invocation of the 25th Amendment. These are all potential extremities of action that would not only dismantle our constitutional order, but also skew it to one side’s juridical construct of virtue, thus dissolving any semblance of adherence to law by the other. Over time each party becomes emotionally invested in the lust to dismantle the old and make something new.

Hence, constitutional norms exist only conditionally, until such time as they finally be dismantled, and only as long as a precariously balanced electoral divide holds firm. A big historical tilt in favor of one party over the other would very quickly push the nation into crisis because the party with the new mandate would rush to enact its program. The very threat of such constitutional dismantling would be sure *casus belli*. Such tilts in the 1770s against Britain, and later in the 1850s against the slaveholding party, were the real tipping points. Not only was *Dred Scott v. Sandford* just such a tipping point in 1857, but subconsciously its legacy weighs heavily on Americans today, as they contemplate—often with hysterical passion—the dread consequences of a [Brett] Kavanaugh appointment [to the Supreme Court]. . . .

What is clear is that the two warring parties will accept nothing less from the other than submission, even though the loser will never submit. Moreover, each factional ethos is incapable of empathizing with the other.

In the U.S. the factions tend to be urban/rural and White/non-White, although of course these issues are conflated to some extent. In all Blue states, there is a divide between rural areas and the large urban centers that dominate politically, making a regional partition ineffective without very large population transfers (Badger, 2018).

Because of importing a new, liberal-leaning electorate, the left is poised to be a permanent majority within the present system. The left has shown increasingly authoritarian tendencies, and already there are prominent voices on the left that have proposed toppling much of the Constitutional order (e.g., abolishing the electoral college in favor of a popular vote, ending the practice of having two senators from each state, ending free speech, and an ideology of judicial activism in which the Constitution should be seen as malleable and open to change to accommodate new trends).

The left has shown no tolerance for dissenting voices. Indeed, dissenters are seen as the personification of evil—exactly the same as in the period prior to the Civil War. If indeed the left obtains power, the expectation would be an increase in political repression, the end of First Amendment protections for free speech, more or less official anti-White rhetoric, removal and renaming of historical monuments and place names, and increased levels of indoctrination throughout the educational system. Indeed, on several critical issues the left has changed radically from when it was out of power in the 1950s to when it achieved cultural hegemony in recent times, most particularly on the importance of free speech. Historically, of course, there is ample precedent for what happens when the left attains power, as in the Soviet Union: instituting a permanent regime of the left without the possibility of change in the power structure and suppression and even eradication of dissidents. Given that the left has already made proposals that would eradicate the Constitutional order, such a scenario is not far-fetched.

Similarly, around the world we see societies racked by ethnic and religious conflict. The civil war in Syria pitted Sunnis against Shiites, and within these larger groupings there are particular ethnic groups, such as Alawites, Arabs, Kurds, Druze, and Assyrians. There's also China and the Uyghurs; Israelis and Palestinians; Hindus, Christians, and Muslims in India; and the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda. There have also been battles between Muslim migrant-descended groups versus the police in France and the Black Lives Matter riots in the U.S. in 2020. One would think that the reality of ethnic conflict would be obvious to anyone with or without any training in evolutionary biology, but this has not stopped our pro-multicultural elites from imposing it throughout the West.

Regarding the above-noted loss of public trust, the problem with collectivist, kinship-based cultures is that they do not produce high trust apart from close kin, resulting in much higher levels of corruption because individuals with power have a tendency to help their relatives; in Western cultures people readily trust and cooperate with non-kin on the basis of reputation (e.g., as honest, trustworthy, and competent), not kinship connections (*Individualism*). Other examples of ethnic conflict between Jews and non-Jews have been cited throughout this book, particularly Jews versus non-Jews in communist regimes. The case of Béla Kun's heavily Jewish government in Hungary (in power for 133 days in 1919) is particularly revelatory and reflects much of the discussion in Chapter 3.

Statues of Hungarian kings and national heroes were torn down, the national anthem was banned, and the display of the national colors was made a punishable offense. . . . Radical agitators were dispatched to the countryside, where they ridiculed the institution of the family and threatened to turn churches into movie theatres. . . . Antipathy soon enough focused on the Jews. Young revolutionaries of Jewish origin had been sent to the countryside to administer the newly collectivized agricultural estates; their radicalism was exceeded only by their incompetence, reinforcing peasant anti-Semitism. The Jesuits, for their part, interpreted the revolution as Jewish and anti-Christian in essence. . . . Rumors abounded that the revolutionaries were everywhere desecrating the Host. In Budapest as in the countryside, opposition to the regime, defense of the church, and anti-Semitism went hand in hand. (Muller, 2010, pp. 156–157)

This example of ethnic conflict between Hungarians and Jews has not been forgotten by Hungarians. Zsolt Bayer, co-founder of Hungary's nationalist, anti-immigration Fidesz party (now led by Prime Minister Viktor Orban), wrote:

Why are we surprised that the simple peasant whose determinant experience was that the Jews broke into his village, beat his priest to death, threatened to convert his church into a movie theater—why do we find it shocking that twenty years later he watched without pity as the gendarmes dragged the Jews away from his village? (in Liphshiz, 2017)

Fidesz has not only opposed immigration in opposition to EU policy of distributing migrants among all member states but has also passed laws aimed at curtailing the influence of Western NGOs (Bayer, 2023), with George Soros being a well-publicized target, leading to charges of anti-Semitism.



George Soros and his liberal views have been a perennial target of Orbán's Fidesz party over the past decade. Soros is Jewish and his central role in Fidesz propaganda has led some critics to accuse the party of antisemitism, which it denies.

"Hungarian taxpayers' money is again being used to pay for political propaganda that is deeply tainted by antisemitism," a spokesperson for the Open Society Foundations said.

Orbán said those who have benefited from funds allegedly coming from George Soros and the US Democratic Party should be banned from Hungary. . . .

Orbán signaled earlier this month the crackdown was coming as he praised President Donald Trump's plan to shut down the US Agency for International Development.

In late 2022, USAID launched a program to help strengthen democracy and civil society in central Europe. It included the financing of non-government organizations and independent media in Hungary. (Kasnyik, 2025)

#### CAN WESTERN INDIVIDUALISM SURVIVE THE RISE OF THE JEWS?

The "rise of the Jews"—to use Albert Lindemann's (1997) phrase—has undoubtedly had important effects on contemporary Western societies. A major theme of the previous chapter is that high levels of immigration into Western societies conforms to a perceived Jewish interest in developing nonhomogeneous, culturally and ethnically pluralistic societies. Jewish groups have also been very active in organizing these groups in both the United States and Australia and doubtless other Western countries (Richardson & Salter, 2023; MacDonald, 2023b). It is of interest to consider the possible consequences of such a policy in the long term.

The concluding chapter of the 1998 edition of this book emphasized the divisive and destructive effects of multiculturalism that were already apparent at that time. The utopian theories of multicultural harmony originated by Horace Kallen (see Ch. 8) have given way to mainstream hatred of White America in the legacy media and elite universities; and, with the ongoing Gaza war, there is increasing hostility toward Israel, particularly among post-1965 Muslim immigrants from the Middle East, but also among leftists who see a yawning gap between the lofty moralistic sentiments that have come to define the left versus the reality of Israeli behavior and its support by Israelis, the Israel Lobby, and the vast majority of the organized Jewish community in the diaspora. Given that the Jewish community has long conflated criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism, the organized Jewish community has been activated in

support of Israel by, for example, successfully pressuring authorities to put an end to public anti-Israel protests and penalizing protesters, as noted above.

Thus the increased ethnic conflict predicted in the 1998 chapter has come to pass. The importance of group-based competition cannot be overstated. I believe it is highly unlikely that Western societies based on individualism and democracy can long survive the legitimization of competition between identitarian groups in which group membership is determined by ethnicity. The discussion in SAID (Chs. 3–5) strongly suggests that ultimately group strategies are met by other group strategies, so that societies become organized around cohesive, mutually exclusionary groups. Indeed, the recent multicultural movement may be viewed as tending toward a profoundly non-Western form of social organization that has historically been much more typical of Middle Eastern segmentary societies centered around discrete homogeneous groups. However, unlike in the (utopian) multicultural ideal, in these societies there are pronounced relations of dominance and subordination. Whereas democracy is quite foreign to such societies, Western societies—uniquely among the stratified societies of the world (Henrich, 2020; *Individualism*)—have developed individualistic, democratic, and republican political institutions. Moreover, major examples of Western collectivism, including the rise of the Catholic Church in the late Roman Empire, Iberian Catholicism during the period of the Inquisition, and National Socialism from 1933 to 1945—all reactions to Jewish power (SAID, Chs. 3–5)—have been characterized by intense anti-Semitism.

There is thus a significant possibility that individualistic societies are unlikely to survive the intra-societal, group-based competition that has become increasingly common and intellectually respectable in the United States. I believe the United States is presently heading down a volatile path—a path that leads to ethnic warfare and to the development of collectivist, authoritarian, and racist enclaves. Although ethnocentric beliefs and behavior are viewed as morally and intellectually legitimate only among ethnic minorities in the United States, the theory and the data presented in SAID (Ch. 1) and *Individualism* (Ch. 8) indicate that the development of greater ethnocentrism among European-derived peoples is a likely result of present trends, at least partly fueled by the rise of anti-White hate in elite places dominated since the 1960s by Jews.

One way of analyzing the Frankfurt School and psychoanalysis is that they have attempted with some success to erect, in the terminology of Paul Gottfried (1998) and Christopher Lasch (1991), a “therapeutic state” that pathologizes the ethnocentrism of European-derived peoples as well as their attempts to retain cultural and demographic dominance. However, ethnocentrism on the part of the European-derived majority in the United States is a likely outcome of the increasingly group-structured, contemporary, social and political landscape—likely because evolved psychological mechanisms in humans

appear to function by making ingroup and outgroup membership more salient in situations of group-based resource competition (see *Individualism*, Ch. 8; SAID, Ch. 1). This is occurring in a context in which there is already discrimination against Whites, especially White males, in access to jobs and university admission, a situation that affects young White males the most.

The effort to overcome these evolved inclinations thus necessitates applying to Western societies a massive “therapeutic” intervention in which manifestations of majoritarian ethnocentrism are combated at several levels, but first and foremost by promoting the ideology that such manifestations are an indication of psychopathology (the ideology of the Frankfurt School) and a cause for ostracism, shame, psychiatric intervention, and counseling. As noted in the 1998 Preface:

[O]ne may expect that as ethnic conflict continues to escalate in the United States, increasingly desperate attempts will be made to prop up the ideology of multiculturalism with sophisticated theories of the psychopathology of majority group ethnocentrism, as well as with the erection of police state controls on nonconforming thought and behavior.

This prediction has certainly panned out.

A contemporary example is Critical Race Theory which essentially pathologizes Whites and their culture while blaming them for the problems of other groups. There are now dozens of textbooks and hundreds of university courses focused on the topic. The entire field is united around falsities—mainly that race is a social construct with no biological or evolutionary aspects worth noting and that Whites have been uniquely evil throughout history and are responsible for any invidious comparisons between Whites and other races in, for example, crime statistics or academic performance. This has resulted in widespread removal of standardized tests (although there has been considerable retrenchment as schools have realized the folly of ignoring academic potential), and greater leniency on crime. For example, California’s Racial Justice Act of 2020 allows Black defendants to claim racial discrimination without showing any racial motivation on the part of police or prosecutors, but only that there are racial disparities in such prosecutions (Joyce, 2024b)—which of course may well be influenced by a variety of factors besides racial discrimination, including the often-noted racial differences in proneness to criminality.

I suppose that a major reason why some non-Jewish racial and ethnic groups adopt multiculturalism is that they are not able to compete successfully in an individualistic economic and cultural arena. As a result, multiculturalism has quickly become identified with the idea that each group ought to receive a proportional measure of economic and cultural success (thus the constant

agitating about “equity”). As indicated above, the resulting situation may oppose Jewish interests. Because of their high intelligence, ethnic cohesiveness, and resource-acquisition ability, Jews do not benefit from affirmative action policies and other group-based entitlements commonly advocated by minority groups with low social status. Jews thus come into conflict with other ethnically identified minority groups who use multiculturalism for their own purposes.

Nevertheless, because of their competitive advantage within the White, European-derived group with which they are currently classified, Jews may perceive themselves as benefiting from policies designed to dilute the power of the European-derived Americans on the assumption that they themselves would suffer much less from such policies. Indeed, despite the official opposition to group-based preferences among Jewish organizations, Jews voted for an anti-affirmative action ballot measure in California in markedly lower percentages than did other European-derived groups, and Ron Unz (2018c) has shown that, while the enrollment at elite universities of non-Jewish Whites has declined dramatically, Jewish enrollment has not declined:

I gradually noticed that the huge and continuing increase in the enrollment of non-white and foreign students at our most elite universities had caused a complete collapse in the enrollment of white American Gentiles, but oddly enough, no similar reduction in Jewish numbers. It was well-known that Jewish activists had been the primary force behind the establishment of Affirmative Action and related policies in college admissions, and I began to wonder about their true motivation, whether conscious or unconscious.

Had the goal been the stated one, of providing educational opportunities to previously excluded groups? Or had that merely been the excuse used to advance a policy that eliminated the majority of white Gentiles, their primary ethnic competitors? With the Jewish population numbering merely 2%, there was an obvious limit as to how many elite college slots they themselves could possibly fill, but if enough other groups were also brought in, then Gentile numbers could easily be reduced to low levels, despite the fact that they constituted the bulk of the national population.

Although multiculturalist ideology was invented by Jewish intellectuals to rationalize the continuation of separatism and minority-group ethnocentrism in a modern Western state, several of the recent instantiations of multiculturalism may eventually produce a monster with negative consequences for Judaism. In the 1998 edition I mentioned Irving Louis Horowitz (1993, p. 89) who noted the emergence of anti-Semitism in academic sociology as these departments are increasingly staffed by individuals who are committed to ethnic political agendas and who view Jewish domination of sociology in negative terms.

There is a strong strain of anti-Semitism emanating from some multiculturalist ideologues, especially from Afrocentric ideologues (E. Alexander, 1992), and M. Cohen (1998, p. 45) finds that “multiculturalism is often identified nowadays with a segment of the left that has, to put it bluntly, a Jewish problem.” The Nation of Islam, led by Louis Farrakhan, has adopted overtly anti-Semitic rhetoric. Afrocentrism is often associated with racist ideologies, such as those of Molefi Asante (1987), in which ethnicity is viewed as the morally proper basis of self-identity and self-esteem and in which a close connection exists between ethnicity and culture. Western ideals of objectivity, universalism, individualism, rationality, and the scientific method are rejected because of their ethnic origins. Asante promotes a naive racist theory in which Africans (the “sun people”) are viewed as superior to Europeans (the “ice people”).

#### RECENT EXAMPLES OF SCHOLARSHIP DOCUMENTING JEWISH ETHNIC NETWORKING

A recurring theme in my writing and that of other authors writing for *The Occidental Quarterly* and *The Occidental Observer* has therefore been to document Jewish ethnic networking in efforts to establish Jewish figures in positions of scientific, academic, artistic, or cultural pre-eminence. This volume discusses figures like Boas, Freud, Horkheimer, and Trotsky, and the phenomenon is also apparent with figures in philosophy such as Baruch Spinoza and Isaac La Peyrère, the beneficiaries of the efforts of Richard Popkin to credit them as critically important intellectual influences underlying the Enlightenment (Joyce, 2019a,d); such efforts also occurred in the art world, such as on behalf of Mark Rothko and Gustav Mahler (MacDonald, 2020). These efforts, although not always successful, have taken advantage of centers of Jewish power and influence described throughout this book, such as promotion in the elite media and the academic world. As Andrew Joyce (2019d) notes:

Typically these efforts can be said to begin with the veneration by a group of Jews of a Jewish intellectual or artist, and is followed by the creation of an authoritarian cult-like aura around his or her personality. The process reaches its completion, in some cases after the death of the guru figure, in an aggressive Jewish marketing effort to convince society at large that this figure, together with his or her ideas, is or was of national or international—if not cosmic—significance. It is predominantly by this process that the notion of “Jewish Genius” is perpetuated.

The contrary process also occurs, with Jews tearing down non-Jewish figures, such as Richard Wagner, for being critical of Jews, or aiming their ire at Beethoven in an attempt to take down his towering reputation in order to show

that his music was composed in the cultural context of “White supremacy,” and even claiming that Beethoven was non-White (Sanderson, 2021, 2020). This has sometimes led to anti-Semitism, as for example Heinrich von Treitschke (1881/1958, pp. 2–3) comments:

I refer the reader to *The History of the Jews* by [Jewish nationalist historian Heinrich] Graetz. What a fanatical fury against the “arch enemy” Christianity, what deadly hatred of the purest and most powerful exponents of Germanic character, from Luther to Goethe and Fichte! And what hollow, offensive self-glorification! Here it is proved with continuous satirical invective that the nation of Kant was really educated to humanity by the Jews only, that the language of Lessing and Goethe became sensitive to beauty, spirit, and wit only through Boerne and Heine!

As is clear from the above examples, Jewish ethnic networking and promotion of other Jews is intimately connected to an exaggerated sense of Jewish ethnic pride and a desire to create a positive image of Jews among non-Jews. Andrew Joyce (2019a) provides a telling example:

Norman Lebrecht [2019], the Jewish British commentator on music and cultural affairs, published a piece at *The Spectator* titled “Do Jews Think Differently?,” in which he argues that Jews possess “a common ancestral way of thinking” that has allowed them to “change the world as we know it.” He insists that there exists “a way of thinking that has allowed Jews to see the world from an oblique angle,” and continues: “Do Jews think differently? The moment I asked that question, there could be only one answer. . . . Some dissenting Jew, somewhere, right now, is about to change the way the world revolves.” Lebrecht refers at length to his recently published *Genius & Anxiety: How Jews Changed the World, 1847–1947* (Simon & Schuster, 2019), in the course of which he profiles 36 Jews who he claims are responsible (in a positive sense) for modernity. Lebrecht is a strongly identified Jew who clearly has a high level of self-esteem at the group level. He also has a history of producing texts that have advanced Jewish self-glorification. . . .

Lebrecht’s book is simply part of a steady production of texts in which Jews celebrate themselves, often with extremely tendentious claims and outlandish and misplaced self-congratulation. Lebrecht’s latest text, for example, is almost a reprint of Jacques Picard’s *Makers of Jewish Modernity: Thinkers, Artists, Leaders, and the World They Made* (Princeton, 1998), and this in turn is part of a tradition that includes Heinrich Graetz’s 11-volume *Geschichte der Juden* (1853–1870), Cecil Roth’s *The Jewish Contribution to Civilization* (1938), Fredric Bedoire’s *The Jewish Contribution to Modern Architecture* (2004), and Rebecca Goldstein’s *Betraying Spinoza: The Renegade Jew Who Gave Us Modernity* (2006) (see [Joyce, 2019d] for an

examination of how Spinoza has been a particular focus for Jewish self-glorification).

Another example comes from Brenton Sanderson's (2011b) review of Lebrecht's *Why Mahler? How One Man and Ten Symphonies Changed the World*:

The focus here is on alerting us to fact of Mahler's towering genius, and how this genius was inextricably bound up with his identity as a Jew. Overlaying this, as ever, is the lachrymose vision of Mahler the saintly Jewish victim of gentile injustice. Lebrecht's new book is another reminder of how Jewish intellectuals have used their privileged status as self-appointed gatekeepers of Western culture to advance their group interests through the way they conceptualize the respective artistic achievements of Jews and Europeans. . . . This betokens an acknowledgement of the importance of ethnic role models in the promotion of ethnic pride and group cohesion, and how ethnocentric Jews, like Lebrecht, have hyped ethnic models in order to promote ethnic pride. This form of Jewish intellectual activity is clearly directed at influencing 'social categorization processes in a manner that benefits Jews.'

There is also an element of self-glorification among the promoters, as they bask in the reflected glory of their co-ethnics. Sanderson (2011a) comments on Mark Rothko and the role of Jewish critics in promoting him:

For critics like [Klaus] Ottmann, Rothko's genius is indisputable and he possessed an "extraordinary talent" that enabled him to transfer his metaphysical "impulses to the canvas with a power and magnetism that stuns viewers of his work. . . . In fact Rothko's skill in achieving this result—whether intentional or not—perhaps explains why he was once called "the melancholic rabbi." For prominent Jewish art historian Simon Schama, Rothko's "big vertical canvasses of contrasting bars of colour, panels of colour stacked up on top of each other" qualify Rothko as "a maker of paintings as powerful and complicated as anything by his two gods—Rembrandt and Turner." For the ethnocentric Schama, Rothko's paintings "are equivalent of these old masters. . . . Can art ever be more complete, more powerful? I don't think so."

#### WILL MULTICULTURALISM BACKFIRE ON JEWS?

A major point of this book is that since the Enlightenment Jewish intellectuals have been at the vanguard of secular political movements, such as the movement for cultural pluralism, intended to serve Jewish interests as well as

appeal to segments of the gentile population. Also apparent is the trend for these movements to eventually fractionate, the result of anti-Semitism within the very segment of the gentile population to which the ideology attempts to appeal, and for Jews to abandon these movements and seek to pursue their interests by other means.

Thus it has been noted here that Jews have played a prominent role in the political left in this century. We have also seen that as a result of anti-Semitism among gentiles on the left, including communist governments, eventually Jews either abandoned the left or they developed their own brand of leftism in which leftist universalism was compatible with the primacy of Jewish identity and interests.<sup>158</sup> Thus neoconservative Jews abandoned the left mainly because the Carter administration was critical of Israel and failed to be sufficiently militaristic. The 1998 version of this section highlighted controversy already present in the 1980s in which American leftists were critical of the Israel Lobby. For example, Gore Vidal (1986), a prominent gentile leftist intellectual, was critical of the role of neoconservative Jews in facilitating the U.S. military buildup of the 1980s and allying themselves with conservative political forces to aid Israel—charges that Norman Podhoretz (1986) construed as anti-Semitism because of the implication that American Jews place the interests of Israel above American interests. Vidal also suggests that neoconservatism is motivated by the desire of Jews to make an alliance with gentile elites as a defense against possible anti-Semitic movements emerging during times of economic crisis. The organized Jewish community has been quite aware of the need to have support from both Republicans and Democrats.

Indeed, combatting anti-Semitism on the left has been a major impetus for founding the neoconservative movement (see Ch. 4; Gottfried, 1993, p. 80) and was the final resting point of many of the New York Intellectuals whose intellectual and political evolution was discussed in Chapter 7. As Gottfried points out, the cumulative effect of neoconservatism and its current hegemony over the conservative political movement in the United States (achieved partly by its large influence on the media, think tanks, and non-profits) has been to shift the conservative movement toward the center and, in effect, to define the limits of conservative legitimacy. Clearly, these limits of conservative legitimacy are defined by whether they conflict with specific Jewish group interests in a minimally restrictive immigration policy, support for Israel, ending free speech on ethnically charged issues, and a globalism that exempts

---

<sup>158</sup> Similarly, L. C. Pogrebin (1991) describes her involvement as a major figure in the early feminist movement and her eventual disenchantment resulting from the blatant anti-Semitism of “Third World” women, which was apparent at international conferences, and the lack of zeal on the part of Western feminists in condemning these outbursts. As did many Jewish leftists, Pogrebin eventually developed a hybrid in which feminist ideas were combined with a deep commitment to Jewish culture.



Israeli ethnonationalism and is controlled by financial, academic, and media elites with a strong representation of Jews.

As indicated in William F. Buckley's (1992) *In Search of Anti-Semitism*, however, the alliance between gentile paleoconservatives and Jewish neoconservatives in the United States is fragile, with several accusations of anti-Semitism among the paleoconservatives. This divide has increased massively with the election of Donald Trump. Neoconservatives like Bill Kristol, Max Boot, Jennifer Rubin, Bret Stephens, and many others deserted the Republican Party, likely mainly because of Trump's opposition to foreign wars and his anti-immigration rhetoric. Many decamped to the Democrats whose 2016 candidate, Hillary Clinton, had recruited prominent neocon Robert Kagan as a top foreign policy adviser. Jews continued their strong support for the Democrats in the 2016 and 2020 elections—despite Trump's strong support for Israel and the high-profile presence of his son-in-law, Orthodox Jew and pro-Israel stalwart Jared Kushner who was essentially in charge of Middle East policy.

Jennifer Rubin (2021) is a particularly egregious example of a neocon who is quite open about her hatred toward White America, commenting on a 2021 article reporting data from the U.S. Census Bureau, “a more diverse, more inclusive society. this is fabulous news. now we need to prevent minority White rule.”

Bret Stephens (2016), who moved from *The Wall Street Journal* to *The New York Times* in 2017 and is routinely described as a “conservative,” wrote:

[Trumpism] is a regression to the conservatism of blood and soil, of ethnic polarization and bullying nationalism. Modern conservatives sought to bury this rubbish with a politics that strikes a balance between respect for tradition and faith in the dynamic and culture-shifting possibilities of open markets. When that balance collapses—under a Republican president, no less—it may never again be restored, at least in our lifetimes.

From Robert Kagan (2016), who abandoned the Republicans to be part of Hillary Clinton's foreign policy team:

[Trump's] public discourse consists of attacking or ridiculing a wide range of “others”—Muslims, Hispanics, women, Chinese, Mexicans, Europeans, Arabs, immigrants, refugees—whom he depicts either as threats or as objects of derision. His program, such as it is, consists chiefly of promises to get tough with foreigners and people of nonwhite complexion. He will deport them, bar them, get them to knuckle under, make them pay up or make them shut up.

As anti-Semitism or deviation from Jewish interests develop, Jews begin to abandon the very movements for which they originally provided the intellectual impetus. This phenomenon may also occur in the case of multiculturalism. Indeed, many of the most prominent opponents of multiculturalism are Jewish neoconservatives, as well as organizations which have a large Jewish membership, such as the National Association of Scholars (NAS)—an organization of academics opposed to some of the more egregious excesses of feminism and multiculturalism in academia. It may well be the case, therefore, that the Jewish attempt to link up with secular political ideologies that appeal to gentiles is doomed in the long run.

The case of multiculturalism is particularly problematic as a Jewish strategy. In this case one might say that Jews want to have their cake and eat it too.

Jews are often caught between fervent affirmation of the Enlightenment and criticism of it. Many Jews believe that the replacement of the Enlightenment ideal of universalism with a politics of difference and a fragmented “multiculture” would constitute a threat to Jewish achievement. At the same time, they recognize the dangers of a homogeneous “monoculture” for Jewish particularity. . . . [Jews] seek to rescue the virtues of the Enlightenment from the shards of its failures and salvage an inclusive vision from multiculturalism, where fragmentation and divisiveness now reign. (Biale et al., 1998, p. 7)

Multicultural societies with their consequent fragmentation and chronic ethnic tension are unlikely to meet Jewish needs in the long run, even if they do ultimately accomplish their main goal by subverting the demographic and cultural dominance of the peoples of European origin in lands where they have been dominant. The protests surrounding the Israel-Hamas war have made this obvious.

This in turn suggests a fundamental and irresolvable friction between Judaism and prototypical Western political and social structure. Certainly, the very long history of anti-Semitism in Western societies and its recurrence time and again after periods of latency suggests such a view. The incompatibility of Judaism and Western culture can also be seen in the tendency for individualistic Western cultures to break down Jewish group cohesiveness. As Arthur Ruppin (1934/1973, p. 339) noted in the early twentieth century, all modern manifestations of Judaism, from neo-Orthodoxy to Zionism, are responses to the Enlightenment’s corrosive effects on Judaism—a set of defensive structures erected against “the destructive influence of European civilization.” And at a theoretical level, there is a very clear rationale for supposing that Western individualism is incompatible with the group-based resource

conflict that has been the consistent consequence of the emergence of a powerful Judaism in Western societies (see SAID, Chs. 3–5).

One aspect of this friction is well articulated in Alan Ryan's (1994) discussion of the "latent contradiction" in the politics of Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray, the authors of the highly controversial volume *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. Ryan states:

Herrnstein essentially wants the world in which clever Jewish kids or their equivalent make their way out of their humble backgrounds and end up running Goldman Sachs or the Harvard physics department, while Murray wants the Midwest in which he grew up—a world in which the local mechanic didn't care two cents whether he was or wasn't brighter than the local math teacher. The trouble is that the first world subverts the second, while the second feels claustrophobic to the beneficiaries of the first.<sup>159</sup>

Murray envisions a moderately individualistic social structure, a society that is meritocratic and hierarchical but also cohesive and culturally and ethnically homogeneous. It is a society with harmony among the social classes and with social controls on extreme individualism among the elite.

In recent years there has been an increasing rejection among intellectuals and minority ethnic activists of the idea of creating a melting pot society based on assimilation among ethnic groups. Cultural and ethnic differences are emphasized in these writings, and ethnic assimilation and homogenization are viewed in negative terms. The tone of these writings is reminiscent of the views of many late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Jewish intellectuals who rejected the assimilationist effects of Reform Judaism in favor of Zionism or a return to a more extreme form of cultural separatism such as Conservative, or Orthodox Judaism, often out of a concern that Reform would lead to intermarriage (see SAID, Ch. 5).

The movement toward ethnic separatism is of considerable interest from an evolutionary point of view. Between-group competition and monitoring of outgroups have been a characteristic of Jewish-gentile interactions not only in the West but also in Muslim societies, and there are examples of between-group competition and conflict too numerous to mention in other parts of the world. Historically, ethnic separatism, as seen in the history of Judaism, has

---

<sup>159</sup> Ryan's characterization of Herrnstein is reminiscent of Gal's (1989, p. 138) characterization of Louis Brandeis: "Brandeis worried about opportunity, about preserving a type of society in which ambitious and talented persons could, through hard work and ability, be able to make their fame and fortune." Brandeis, a Zionist leader, was instrumental in originating the use of social science research in litigating social issues, a trend that culminated in the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision (Urofsky, 1989, p. 144). P. C. Roberts and Stratton (1995) detail the unethical behavior of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter (a Brandeis protégé) and Philip Elman (a Justice Department lawyer) in bringing about this decision.

been a divisive force within societies. It has on many occasions unleashed enormous intrasocietal hatred and distrust, ethnically based warfare, expulsions, pogroms, and attempts at genocide. Moreover, there is little reason to suppose that the future will be much different. At the present time there are ethnically based conflicts on every continent, and clearly the establishment of Israel has not ended ethnically based conflict for Jews returning from the diaspora.

Indeed, my review of the research on contact between strongly identified groups in historical societies suggests a general rule that between-group competition and monitoring of ingroup and outgroup success are the norm. These results are highly consistent with the psychological research on social identity processes reviewed in SAID (Ch. 1). From an evolutionary perspective, these results confirm the expectation that ethnic self-interest is indeed important in human affairs, and obviously ethnicity remains a common source of group identity in the contemporary world—least of all among Western peoples because of their individualism (*Individualism*), but common among the non-Western peoples that have been colonizing the West for decades and are an increasingly powerful political force in Western societies. People appear to be aware of group membership and have a general tendency to devalue and compete with outgroups. Individuals are also keenly aware of the relative standing of their own group in terms of resource control and relative reproductive success. They are also willing to take extraordinary steps to achieve and retain economic and political power in defense of these group imperatives.

Given the assumption of ethnic separatism, it is instructive to think of the circumstances that would, from an evolutionary perspective, minimize group conflict. Theorists of cultural pluralism such as Horace Kallen (1924) envision a scenario in which different ethnic groups retain their distinctive identity in the context of a level playing field economically and politically. The difficulty with this scenario from an evolutionary perspective (or even common sense) is that no provision is made for the results of competition for resources and reproductive success within the society. Indeed, the results of ethnic strife were apparent in Kallen's day, but "Kallen lifted his eyes above the strife that swirled around him to an ideal realm where diversity and harmony coexist" (Higham, 1984, p. 209).

In the best of circumstances, one might suppose that interacting ethnic groups would engage in absolute reciprocity with each other, so that there would be no differences in terms of economic exploitation of one ethnic group by the other. Moreover, there would be no differences on any measure of success in society, including social class membership, economic role (e.g., producer versus consumer; creditor versus debtor; manager versus worker), or fertility between the ethnic groups. All groups would have approximately equal numbers and equal political power; or if there were different numbers,

provisions would exist to ensure that minorities would retain equitable representation in terms of the markers of social and reproductive success. Such conditions would minimize hostility between the groups because attributing one's status to the actions of the other groups would be difficult.

Given the existence of ethnic separatism, however, it would still be in the interests of each group to advance its own interests at the expense of the other groups. All things being equal, a given ethnic group would be better off if it ensured that the other groups had fewer resources, lower social status, lower fertility, and proportionately less political power than itself. The hypothesized steady state of equality therefore implies a set of balance-of-power relationships: each side constantly checking to make sure that the other is not cheating; each side constantly looking for ways to dominate and exploit by any means possible; each side willing to compromise only because of the other side's threat of retaliation; each side willing to cooperate at cost only if forced to do so by, for example, the presence of external threat. Clearly, any type of cooperation that involves true altruism toward the other group could not be expected. Historically such altruism toward minority groups has only prevailed in Western countries as a result of the dominance of a moral perspective that can only happen in individualist cultures because ethnic divisions are relatively muted and the social fabric is maintained by adherence to moral beliefs based on religion or disseminated by the media (e.g., *Individualism*, Chs. 7–8).

Thus the ideal situation of absolute equality in resource control and reproductive success would certainly require a great deal of monitoring and undoubtedly be characterized by a great deal of mutual suspicion. In the real world, however, even this rather grim ideal is highly unlikely. In the real world, ethnic groups differ in their talents and abilities (IQ being the most important); they differ in their numbers (critical in a Western-style democracy), fertility, and the extent to which they encourage parenting practices conducive to resource acquisition; they also differ in the resources held at any point in time and in their political power. Equality or proportionate equity would be extremely difficult to attain or to maintain after it has been achieved without extraordinary levels of monitoring and without extremely intense social controls to enforce ethnic quotas on the accumulation of wealth, admission to universities, access to high-status jobs, and so on.

Because ethnic groups have differing talents, abilities, and parenting styles, variable criteria for qualifying for jobs would be required depending on ethnic group membership, requiring affirmative action for underachieving groups and discrimination against high-achieving groups. In the Ashkenazi diaspora in the West, achieving parity between Jews and other ethnic groups would entail a high level of discrimination against individual Jews for admission to universities or access to employment opportunities and even entail a large taxation on Jews to counter the Jewish advantage in the possession of

wealth, since at present Jews are vastly overrepresented among the wealthy and successful in the United States. This would especially be the case if Jews were distinguished as a separate ethnic group from gentile European Americans. Indeed, the final evolution of many of the New York Intellectuals from Trotskyism was to become neoconservatives who have been eloquent opponents of affirmative action and quota mechanisms for distributing resources. Sachar (1992, pp. 818ff) mentions Daniel Bell, Sidney Hook, Irving Howe, Irving Kristol, Nathan Glazer, Charles Krauthammer, Norman Podhoretz, and Earl Raab as opposed to affirmative action, and Jewish organizations (including the ADL, the AJCommittee, and the AJCongress) have taken similar positions in the past, but this has shifted in more recent years, perhaps because Jews have not suffered from affirmative action and quotas for groups like African Americans, as, for example, in admissions to elite universities (Unz, 2018c).

In the real world, therefore, extraordinary efforts would have to be made to attain this steady state of ethnic balance of power and resources. Interestingly, the ideology of Jewish-gentile coexistence has sometimes included the idea that the different ethnic groups develop a similar occupational profile and implicitly control resources in proportion to their numbers. In medieval France, for example, Louis IX's ordinance of 1254 prohibited Jews from engaging in moneylending at interest and encouraged them to live by manual labor or trade (see Richard, 1983/1992, p. 162). The dream of German assimilationists during the nineteenth century was that the occupational profile of Jews after emancipation would mirror that of the gentiles—a "utopian expectation . . . shared by many, Jews and non-Jews alike" (Katz, 1986, p. 67). Efforts were made to decrease the percentage of Jews involved in trade and increase the percentages involved in agriculture and artisanry. In the event, however, the result of emancipation was that Jews were vastly overrepresented among the economic and cultural elite, and this overrepresentation was a critical grievance of German anti-Semitism from 1870 to 1945 (see SAID, Ch. 5).

Similarly, during the 1920s when the United States was attempting to come to grips with Jewish competition at prestigious private universities, plans were proposed in which each ethnic group received a percentage of placements at Harvard reflecting the percentage of racial and national groups in the United States (Sachar, 1992, p. 329). Similar policies—uniformly denounced by Jewish organizations—developed during the same period throughout Central Europe (Hagen, 1996). Such policies certainly reflect the importance of ethnicity in human affairs, but levels of social tension are bound to be chronically high. Moreover, there is a considerable chance of ethnic warfare even if precise parity was achieved through intensive social controls: as indicated above, it is always in the interests of any ethnic group to obtain hegemony over the others.

If one adopts a cultural pluralist model involving free competition for resources and reproductive success, differences between ethnic groups are inevitable; from an evolutionary perspective, there is the very strong prediction that such differences will result in animosity from the losing groups. After emancipation there was a powerful tendency for upward mobility among Jews in Western societies, including a large overrepresentation in the professions as well as in business, politics, and the production of culture. Concomitantly there were outbreaks of anti-Semitism originating often among groups that felt left behind in this resource competition or that felt that the culture being created did not meet their interests. If the history of Judaism tells us anything, it is that self-imposed ethnic separatism tends to lead to resource competition based on group membership and consequent hatred, expulsions, and persecutions. Assuming that ethnic differences in talents and abilities exist, the supposition that ethnic separatism could be a stable situation without ethnic animosity requires either a balance-of-power situation maintained with intense social controls, as described above, or it requires that at least some ethnic groups be unconcerned that they are losing in the competition.

I regard this last possibility as unlikely in the long run. That an ethnic group would be unconcerned with its own eclipse and domination is certainly not expected by an evolutionist or, indeed, by advocates of social justice, whatever their ideology. Nevertheless, this is in fact the implicit morality of the criticism made by several historians of the behavior of the Spanish toward the Jews and Marranos during the Inquisition and the Expulsion, as, for example, in the writings of Ben Zion Netanyahu (1995), who at times seems openly contemptuous of the inability of the Spaniards to compete with the New Christians without resorting to the violence of the Inquisition. From this perspective, the Spaniards should have realized their inferiority and acquiesced in being economically, socially, and politically dominated by another ethnic group. Such a "morality" is unlikely to appeal to the group losing the competition, and from an evolutionary perspective, this is not in the least surprising. Goldwin Smith (1894/1972, p. 261) made a similar point a century ago:

A community has a right to defend its territory and its national integrity against an invader whether his weapon be the sword or foreclosure. In the territories of the Italian Republics the Jews might, so far as we see, have bought land and taken to farming had they pleased. But before this they had thoroughly taken to trade. Under the falling Empire they were the great slave-traders, buying captives from barbarian invaders and probably acting as general brokers of spoils at the same time. They entered England in the train of the Norman conqueror. There was, no doubt, a perpetual struggle between their craft and the brute force of the feudal populations. But what moral prerogative has craft over force? Mr. Arnold White tells

the Russians that, if they would let Jewish intelligence have free course, Jews would soon fill all high employments and places of power to the exclusion of the natives, who now hold them. Russians are bidden to acquiesce and rather to rejoice in this by philosophers, who would perhaps not relish the cup if it were commended to their own lips. The law of evolution, it is said, prescribes the survival of the fittest. To which the Russian boor may reply, that if his force beats the fine intelligence of the Jew the fittest will survive and the law of evolution will be fulfilled. It was force rather than fine intelligence which decided on the field of Zama that the Latin, not the Semite, should rule the ancient and mould the modern world.

Ironically, many intellectuals who absolutely reject evolutionary thinking and any imputation that genetic self-interest might be important in human affairs also favor policies that are rather obviously self-interestedly ethnocentric, and they often condemn the self-interested ethnocentric behavior of other groups, particularly any indication that the European-derived majority in the United States is developing a cohesive group strategy and high levels of ethnocentrism in reaction to the group strategies of others. The ideology of minority group ethnic separatism and the implicit legitimization of group competition for resources, as well as the more modern idea that ethnic group membership should be a criterion for resource acquisition, must be seen for what they are: blueprints for group evolutionary strategies. The history of the Jews must be seen as a rather tragic commentary on the results of such group strategies.

I have suggested that there is a fundamental and irresolvable friction between Judaism and prototypical Western political and social structure. The greatest mistake of the Jewish-dominated intellectual movements described in this volume is that they have attempted to establish the moral superiority of societies that embody a preconceived moral ideal (compatible with the continuation of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy) rather than advocate for social structures based on the ethical possibilities of naturally occurring types.<sup>160</sup> In the twentieth century many millions of people were killed in the attempt to establish Marxist societies based on a theoretical ideal of complete economic and social leveling.

---

<sup>160</sup> G. L. Mosse (1970, p. 174) describes the Jewish-dominated leftist movements of the Weimar period as seeking "actively to make society correspond to a preconceived image of men and the world." And I. L. Horowitz (1993, p. 62) notes of T. W. Adorno that "the more remote real people were from his political dreams, the less regard did he show for the masses as such. . . . [Adorno] sets the stage for a culture of left-wing fascism . . . [that assumes] that what people believe is wrong and that what they ought to believe, as designed by some narrow elite stratum of the cultural apparatus, is essentially right." For their part, the *völkisch* and conservative intellectuals who advocated a society based on hierarchic harmony advocated a return to an idealized version of actually existing historical societies, particularly the Middle Ages.



As an evolutionist, one must ask what the likely genetic consequences of this sea change in American culture are likely to be. An important consequence—and one likely to have been an underlying motivating factor in the countercultural revolution—may well be to facilitate the continued genetic distinctiveness of the Jewish gene pool in the United States. The ideology of multiculturalism may be expected to increasingly compartmentalize groups in American society, with long-term beneficial consequences for the continuation of the essential features of traditional Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. There is increasing consensus among Jewish activists that traditional forms of Judaism are far more effective in ensuring long-term group continuity than semi-assimilationist, semi-cryptic strategies such as Reform Judaism or secular Judaism. Moreover, as discussed in several parts of this book, Jews typically perceive themselves to benefit from a nonhomogeneous culture in which they appear as only one among many ethnic groups where there is no possibility of the development of a homogeneous national culture that might exclude Jews.

In addition, there may well be negative genetic consequences for the European-derived peoples of the United States and especially for the “common people of the South and West” (Higham, 1984, p. 49)—that is, for lower-middle-class Caucasians derived from Northern and Western Europe—whose representatives desperately battled against the present immigration policy. Indeed, we have seen that a prominent theme of the New York Intellectuals as well as *The Authoritarian Personality* studies was the intellectual and moral inferiority of traditional American culture, particularly rural American culture. James Webb (1995) notes that it is the descendants of the WASPs who settled the South and West who,

by and large did the most to lay out the infrastructure of this country, quite often suffering educational and professional regression as they tamed the wilderness, built the towns, roads and schools, and initiated a democratic way of life that later white cultures were able to take advantage of without paying the price of pioneering. Today they have the least, socioeconomically, to show for these contributions. And if one would care to check a map, they are from the areas now evincing the greatest resistance to government practices.

The war goes on, but it is easy to see who is losing.

The demographic rise of the underclass resulting from the triumph of the 1960s countercultural revolution implies that European-derived genes and gene frequencies will become less common compared to those derived from the African and the Latin American gene pools. On the other end of the IQ-reproductive strategy distribution, immigrants from East Asian countries are

outcompeting Whites in gaining admission to universities and in prestigious, high-income jobs. The long-term result will be that the entire White population (not including Jews) is likely to suffer a social status decline as these new immigrants become more numerous. Jews are unlikely to suffer a major decline in social status not only because their mean IQ is well above that of East Asians but also, more importantly, because Jewish IQ is skewed toward excelling in verbal skills. The high IQ of East Asians is skewed toward performance IQ, which makes them powerful competitors in engineering and technology (see PTSDA, Ch. 7; Lynn, 1987). Jews and East Asians are thus likely to occupy different niches in contemporary societies. The United States is well on the road to being dominated by an Asian technocratic elite and a Jewish business, professional, and media elite.

Moreover, the shift to multiculturalism has coincided with an enormous growth of immigration from non-European-derived peoples beginning with the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, which favored immigrants from non-European countries (see Auster, 1990; Brimelow, 1995). Many of these immigrants come from non-Western countries where cultural and genetic segregation are the norm, and within the context of multicultural America, they are encouraged to retain their own languages and religions and identify strongly with their group. As indicated above, the expected result will be between-group resource and reproductive competition and increased vulnerability of democratic and republican political institutions in a context in which long-term projections indicate that European-derived peoples will no longer form a majority of the United States by the middle of this century.

Indeed, one might note that, while the Western Enlightenment has presented Judaism with its greatest challenge in all of its long history, contemporary multiculturalism in the context of high levels of immigration of peoples of all racial and ethnic groups presents the greatest challenge to Western universalism in its history. The historical record indicates that ethnic separatism among European-derived groups has a tendency to collapse within modern Western societies unless active attempts at ethnic and cultural segregation are undertaken, as has occurred among Jews. As expected from a resource-reciprocity point of view (*Individualism*), in the absence of rigid ethnic barriers, marriage in Western individualist societies tends to be importantly influenced by a wide range of phenotypic features of the prospective spouse, including not only genetic commonality but also social status, education, intelligence, personality, common interests, and financial prospects. This individualist pattern of marriage decisions has characterized Western Europe at least since the Middle Ages (e.g., *Individualism*).

The result has been a remarkable degree of ethnic assimilation in the United States among those whose ancestry derives from Europe (Alba, 1985). The long-term result of such processes is genetic homogenization, a sense of

common interest, and the absence of a powerful source of intra-societal division.

To suppose that the conflict over immigration has been merely a conflict over the universalist tendencies of Western culture would, however, be disingenuous. To a great extent the immigration debate in the United States has always had powerful ethnic overtones and continues to do so even after the European-derived peoples of the United States have become assimilated into a Western universalist culture. The present immigration policy essentially places the United States and other Western societies “in play” in an evolutionary sense which does not apply to other nations of the world, where the implicit assumption is that territory is held by its historically dominant people: each racial and ethnic group in the world has an interest in expanding its demographic and political presence in Western societies and can be expected to do so if given the opportunity. Notice that the mainstream American Jewish community (e.g., the ADL; see MacDonald, 2022a) has had no interest in proposing that immigration to Israel should be similarly multiethnic, or that Israel should have an immigration policy that would threaten the hegemony of Jews. I rather doubt that Oscar Handlin (1952, p. 7) would extend his statement advocating immigration from all ethnic groups into the United States by affirming the principle that all men, being brothers, are equally capable of being Israelis. I also doubt that the Synagogue Council of America would characterize Israeli immigration law as “a gratuitous affront to the peoples of many regions of the world” (PCIN, 1953, p. 117). Indeed, the ethnic conflict within Israel indicates a failure to develop a universalist Western culture.

At present the interests of non-European-derived peoples to expand demographically and politically in the United States are widely perceived as a moral imperative, whereas the attempts of European-derived peoples to retain demographic, political, and cultural control is represented as “racist,” immoral, and an indication of psychiatric disorder. From the perspective of these European-derived peoples, the prevailing ethnic morality is altruistic and self-sacrificial. It is unlikely to be viable in the long run, even in an individualistic society, and in the present context of rampant anti-White hatred, it may well lead to victimization of Whites. The viability of a morality of self-sacrifice is especially problematic in the context of a multicultural society in which everyone is conscious of group membership—including Whites.

Consider from an evolutionary perspective the status of the argument that all peoples should be allowed to immigrate to the United States. One might assert that any opposition to such a principle should not interest an evolutionist because human group genetic differences are trivial, so any psychological adaptations that make one resist such a principle are anachronisms without function in the contemporary world (much like one's appendix). A Jew maintaining this argument should, to retain intellectual consistency, agree that the

traditional Jewish concern with endogamy and consanguinity has been irrational. Moreover, such a person should also believe that Jews ought not to attempt to retain political power in Israel because there is no rational reason to suppose that any particular group should have power anywhere. Nor should Jews attempt to influence the political process in the United States in such a manner as to disadvantage another group or benefit their own. And to be logically consistent, one should also apply this argument to all those who promote immigration of their own ethnic groups, the mirror image of group-based opposition to such immigration.

Indeed, if this chain of logic is pursued to its conclusion, it is irrational for anyone to claim any group interests at all. And if one also rejects the notion of individual genetic differences, it is also irrational to attempt to further individual interests, for example, by seeking to immigrate as an individual. Indeed, if one accepts these assumptions, the notion of genetic consequences and thus of the possibility of human evolution past and present becomes irrational; the idea that it is rational is merely an illusion produced perhaps by psychological adaptations that are without any meaningful evolutionary function in the contemporary world. One might note that this ideology is the final conclusion of the anti-evolutionary ideologies reviewed in this volume. These intellectual movements have asserted that scientific research shows that any important ethnic differences or individual differences are the result of environmental variation, and that genetic differences are trivial.

But there is an enormous irony in all of this: if life is truly without any evolutionary meaning, why have advocates propagated these anti-racial, anti-Western ideologies so intensely and with such self-consciously political methods? Why have many of these same people strongly identified with their own ethnic group and its interests, and why have many of them insisted on cultural pluralism and its validation of minority group ethnocentrism as moral absolutes? By their own assumptions, it is just a meaningless game. Nobody should care who wins or loses. Of course, deception and self-deception may be involved. I have noted (see Ch. 6) that a fundamental agenda has been to make the European-derived peoples of the United States view concern about their own demographic and cultural eclipse as irrational and as an indication of psychopathology.

If one accepts that both within-group and between-group genetic variation remains and is non-trivial (i.e., if evolution is an ongoing process), then the principle of relatively unrestricted immigration, at least under the conditions of recent decades in Western societies, clearly involves altruism by some individuals and established groups. Nevertheless, although the success of the intellectual movements reviewed in this volume is an indication that people can be induced to be altruistic toward other groups, I rather doubt such altruism will continue if there are obvious signs that the status and political power

of European-derived groups are decreasing while the power of other groups increases. The prediction, both on theoretical grounds and on the basis of social identity research, is that as other groups become increasingly powerful and salient in a multicultural society, the European-derived peoples of the United States will become increasingly unified; among these peoples, contemporary divisive influences, such as issues related to gender and sexual orientation, social class differences, or religious differences, will be increasingly perceived as unimportant. Eventually these groups will develop a united front and a collectivist political orientation vis-à-vis other ethnic groups. Other groups will be expelled if possible or partitions will be created, and Western societies will undergo another period of medievalism.

#### THE FUNDAMENTAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST BETWEEN JEWS AND NON-JEWS IN THE WEST

Jewish interests in immigration policy are a paradigmatic example of conflicts of interest between Jews and non-Jews over the construction of culture. This conflict of interests extends well beyond immigration policy. There is a growing realization that the countercultural revolution of the 1960s is a watershed event in the history of the United States. Such a conceptualization is compatible with the work of Rogers M. Smith (1988), who shows that until the triumph of the cultural pluralist model with the countercultural revolution of the 1960s, there were three competing models of American identity: the “liberal” individualist legacy of the Enlightenment based on “natural rights”; the “republican” ideal of a cohesive, socially homogeneous society; and the “ethnocultural” strand emphasizing the importance of Anglo-Saxon ethnicity in the development and preservation of American cultural forms.

From the present perspective, no fundamental conflict exists between the latter two sources of American identity; social homogeneity may well be best and most easily achieved with an ethnically homogeneous society of peoples derived from the European cultural area. Indeed, in upholding Chinese exclusion in the nineteenth century, Justice Stephen J. Field noted that the Chinese were unassimilable and would destroy the republican ideal of social homogeneity. As indicated above, the incorporation of non-European peoples, and especially peoples derived from Africa and Muslim countries, into Western cultural forms is profoundly problematic.

As discussed at several points in this volume, the radical individualism embodied in the Enlightenment ideal of individual rights is especially problematic for the long-term stability of Western societies because of the danger of invasion and domination by group strategies such as Judaism and the possibility of the defection of gentile elites from the ideals represented in the other two models of social organization—particularly because these elites, with

substantial Jewish representation, would likely advocate large-scale multiethnic immigration. These developments would thus be likely to destroy the social cohesiveness so central to Western forms of social organization. As R. M. Smith (1988, p. 245) notes, the transformations of American society in the post-Civil War era resulted from the “liberal” cultural ideal “that opposed slavery, favored immigration [from Europe], and encouraged enterprise while protecting property rights” and that posed a severe threat to the collective life at the center of American civilization.

It is this liberal legacy of American civilization that the Jewish intellectual movements reviewed in this volume have exploited in rationalizing unrestricted immigration and the loss of social homogeneity represented by the unifying force of the Christian religion. As Israel Zangwill said in advocating a Jewish strategy for unrestricted immigration, “tell them they are destroying American ideals” (H.R. Rep. No. 350, 1924, p. 16; see Ch. 8). Western peoples are particularly susceptible to morally tinged messaging, since the social glue of Western cultures is that they are moral communities, not kinship-based communities (*Individualism*, Ch. 8). The effect has been to create a new American ideal that is entirely at odds with the historic sources of American identity:

This ideal carries on the cosmopolitanism, tolerance, and respect for human liberty of the older liberal tradition, and so it can properly be termed a modern version of the liberal ideal. It is novel, however, in its rejection of Lockean liberalism’s absolutist natural law elements in favor of modern philosophic pragmatism and cultural relativism. And one of its chief theoretical architects, philosopher Horace Kallen, argued that cultural pluralism better recognizes human sociality, our constitutive attachments to distinctive ethnic, religious, and cultural groups. It therefore envisions America as a “democracy of nationalities, cooperating voluntarily and autonomously through common institutions in the enterprise of self-realization through the perfection of men according to their kind” [Kallen, 1924, p. 124]. Since all groups and individuals should be guaranteed equal opportunities to pursue their own destinies, the nation’s legacy of legal, racial, ethnic and gender discrimination is unacceptable according to the cultural pluralist ideal. At the same time, there must be no effort to transform equality into uniformity, to insist that all fit into a standard “Americanized” mold.

The ideal of democratic cultural pluralism finally came to predominate in American public law in the 1950s and especially the 1960s, finding expression in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the liberalizing 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, in new programs to provide educational curricula more attuned to the nation’s diverse cultural heritage, in bilingual ballots and governmental publications, and in affirmative action measures. (R. M. Smith, 1988, pp. 245–246)

Within this perspective, there is tolerance for different groups, but the result is a tendency to “deprecate the importance or even the existence of a common national identity” (R. M. Smith, 1988, p. 247, discussing Kallen). Kallen, of course, was a very strongly identified Jew and a prominent Zionist (see Ch. 8), and it is not at all surprising that his cultural ideal for the United States represents a non-Western form of social organization that conforms to Jewish interests and compromises the interests of the European-derived peoples of the United States. It is a social form that guarantees the continued existence of Judaism as a social category and as a cohesive ethnic group while at the same time, given the characteristics of Jews, guarantees Jews economic and cultural preeminence. Public policy based on this conceptualization is having the predictable long-term effect of marginalizing both culturally and demographically the European-derived peoples of the United States. Because the European-derived groups are less organized and less cohesive than Jews and because a “therapeutic state” has been erected to counter expressions of European-American ethnocentrism, it raises the distinct possibility that in the long run European Americans will be fragmented, politically powerless, subject to victimization by a hostile majority, and without an effective group identity at all.

The conflict of interest between Jews and gentiles in the construction of culture goes well beyond advocacy of the multicultural ideal. Because they are much more genetically inclined to a high-investment reproductive strategy than are gentiles, Jews are able to maintain their high-investment reproductive strategy even in the absence of traditional Western cultural supports for high-investment parenting (Ch. 5). Compared to gentiles, Jews are therefore much better able to expand their economic and cultural success without these traditional Western cultural supports. As Higham (1984, p. 173) notes, the cultural idealization of an essentially Jewish personal ethic of hedonism, anxiety, and intellectuality came at the expense of the older rural ethic of asceticism and sexual restraint.

Moreover, traditional Western supports for high-investment parenting were embedded in religious ideology and, I suppose, are difficult to achieve in a post-religious environment. Nevertheless, as Podhoretz (1995) notes, it is in fact the case that Jewish intellectuals, Jewish organizations like the AJCongress, and Jewish-funded organizations such as the ACLU have ridiculed Christian religious beliefs, attempted to undermine the public strength of Christianity, and led the fight for lifting restrictions on pornography. Further, we have seen that psychoanalysis as a Jewish-dominated intellectual movement has been a central component of this war on gentile cultural supports for high-investment parenting. Whereas Jews, because of their powerful, genetically influenced propensities for intelligence, high-investment parenting, and certain personality traits (see Preface), have been able to thrive within this

cultural milieu, other sectors of the society have not; the result has been a widening gulf between the cultural success of Jews and gentiles and a disaster for society as a whole.

The countercultural revolution of the 1960s has led to a political revolution that is incompatible with traditional American freedoms. Traditional American freedoms such as freedom of speech enshrined in the First Amendment (deriving from the Enlightenment liberal strand of American identity) have enabled the Jewish activist community to fundamentally transform American society away from the cultural ideals of republicanism and ethnic and cultural homogeneity (particularly the cultural prominence of Christianity). At this time however, since the Jewish community has achieved a prominent place among the American elite, they have used their power in an ongoing effort to restrict free speech, mainly by endorsing “hate speech” laws and censoring social media accounts. These Jewish interests conflict with the possibility of constructing a cohesive society, and in fact the present multicultural political landscape in the U.S. is the most polarized in American history, with the possible exception of the Civil War era.

Given that the popular media and the current intellectual environment of universities thrive on the freedom of elites to produce socially destructive messages, the political movements attempting to restore anything remotely resembling pre-1960s American culture will undoubtedly be forced to restrict some traditional American freedoms (see, e.g., Bork, 1996)—accounting for the liberal-left mantra that the right desires to create an authoritarian state and end democracy (while ignoring the long history of leftist authoritarianism and the present reality of the American left with its efforts to restrict conservative speech and other traditional American freedoms).

The cultural supports of traditional Western societies, embedded in Christianity, have acted as external forces of social control that maximize high-investment parenting among all segments of the population, even those who for genetic or environmental reasons are relatively disinclined to engage in such practices (MacDonald, 1997a,b). Without such cultural controls, it is absolutely predictable that social disorganization will increase and society as a whole will continue to decline.

Nevertheless, the continuity of unique Western forms of social organization will remain a salient concern even if one ignores issues of ethnic competition entirely. I have emphasized that there is an inherent conflict between multiculturalism and Western universalism and individualism. Even if Western universalism were to regain its moral imperative, it remains an open question whether all of humanity is willing or able to participate in this type of culture in an age when Western countries are inundated with people from the rest of the world. Universalism is a European creation, and it is unknown whether such a culture can be continued over a long period of time in a society that is



not predominantly ethnically European. When not explicitly advocating multiculturalism, the rhetoric in favor of immigration has typically assumed a radical environmentalism in which all humans are equally capable of contributing to Western societies, ignoring deeply engrained anti-Western tendencies that occur among all other human groups (Henrich, 2020; *Individualism*) as well as differences in traits that are important for upward social mobility in Western societies, prototypically IQ. Given that a great many human cultures bear a strong resemblance to the collectivist, anti-assimilatory tendencies present in Jewish culture, it is highly likely that many of our present immigrants are similarly unable or unwilling to accept the fundamental premises of a universalistic, culturally homogeneous, individualistic society. Indeed, there is considerable reason to suppose that Western tendencies toward individualism are unique (Henrich, 2020) and based on evolved psychological adaptations (see *Individualism*).

The implication is that Western societies are subject to invasion by non-Western cultures that are able to manipulate Western tendencies toward reciprocity, egalitarianism, and individual rights in a manner that results in maladaptive behavior for the European-derived peoples who remain at the core of all Western societies. Because others' interests and perspectives are viewed as legitimate, Western societies have uniquely developed a highly principled moral and religious discourse, as in the arguments against slavery characteristic of the nineteenth-century abolitionists (see *Individualism*, Ch. 7) and in the tendency for Westerners to value abstract principles of justice as opposed to the interests of one's relatives (leading to a relative lack of corruption in Western societies). Such discourse occurs in the framework of universal moral principles—that is, principles that would be viewed as fair for any rational, disinterested observer. Thus in his highly influential volume, *A Theory of Justice*, John Rawls (1971) argues that justice as objective morality can only occur behind a “veil of ignorance” in which the ethnic status of the contending parties is irrelevant to considerations of justice or morality—a perspective that is quite compatible with Kant's similarly universal categorical imperative.

It is this intellectual tradition that has been effectively manipulated by Jewish intellectual activists, such as Israel Zangwill and Oscar Handlin, who have emphasized that in developing immigration policy, Western principles of morality and fair play make it impossible to discriminate against any ethnic group or any individual. Viewed from the perspective of, say, an African native of Kenya, any policy that discriminates in favor of Northwestern Europe cannot withstand the principle that the policy be acceptable to a rational, disinterested observer, assuming that this rational, disinterested observer does not accept the liberal-left intellectual framework promoted by the Jewish intellectual movements described here. That is, they understand that there are important racial and ethnic genetic differences in IQ, proneness to criminality,

prone to ethical universalism, etc. Because Zangwill and Handlin are not constrained by Western universalism in their attitudes toward their own group, however, they are able to ignore the implications of universalistic thinking for Zionism and other expressions of Jewish particularism embedded in traditional Jewish ethics. Because of its official policy regarding the genetic and cultural background of prospective immigrants, Israel is not similarly subject to invasion by a foreign group strategy.

Indeed, one might note that despite the fact that a prominent theme of anti-Semitism has been to stress negative personality traits of Jews and their willingness to exploit gentiles deriving from traditional Jewish ethics that essentially regards non-Jews as having no moral standing (SAID, Ch. 2), a consistent theme of Jewish intellectual activity since the Enlightenment has been to cast Jewish ethnic interests and Judaism itself as embodying a unique and irreplaceable moral vision (SAID, Chs. 6–8)—terms that emphasize the unique appeal of the rhetoric of the morality of the disinterested observer among Western audiences and that fly in the face of the murderous violence seen among Bolshevik Jews in the early Soviet period (see Ch. 3) and the contemporary genocidal violence directed against the Palestinians in the war in Gaza beginning in 2023.

The result is that whether Western individualistic societies are able to defend the legitimate interests of the European-derived peoples remains questionable. A prominent theme appearing in several places in this volume and in PTSDA (Ch. 8) and SAID (Chs. 3–5) is that individualistic societies are uniquely vulnerable to invasion by cohesive groups such as has been historically represented by Judaism. Significantly, the problem of immigration of non-European peoples is not at all confined to the United States but represents a severe and increasingly contentious problem in the entire Western world and nowhere else: only European-derived peoples have opened their doors to the other peoples of the world and now stand in danger of losing control of territory occupied for hundreds or thousands of years. Western societies have traditions of individualistic humanism, which make immigration restriction difficult. In the nineteenth century, for example, the Supreme Court twice turned down Chinese exclusion acts on the basis that they legislated against a group, not an individual (Petersen, 1955, p. 78). The effort to develop an intellectual basis for immigration restriction was tortuous; by 1920 it was based on the legitimacy of the ethnic interests of Northwestern Europeans and had undertones of racist thinking. Both these ideas were difficult to reconcile with the stated political and humanitarian ideology of a republican and democratic society in which, as Jewish pro-immigration activists such as Israel Zangwill repeatedly emphasized, racial or ethnic group membership had no official intellectual sanction. The replacement of these assertions of ethnic self-interest with an ideology of “assimilability” in the debate over the McCarran-Walter Act was

perceived by its opponents as little more than a smokescreen for "racism." In the end, this intellectual tradition collapsed largely as a result of the onslaught of the intellectual movements reviewed in this volume, and so collapsed a central pillar of the defense of the ethnic interests of European-derived peoples.

The present tendencies lead one to predict that unless the ideology of individualism is abandoned not only by the multicultural minorities (who have been encouraged to affirm their ethnic and religious identities and to pursue their group interests by a generation of American intellectuals) but also by the European-derived peoples of Europe, North America, New Zealand, and Australia, the end result will be a substantial diminution of the genetic, political, and cultural influence of these peoples. It would be an unprecedented unilateral abdication of such power, and certainly an evolutionist would expect no such abdication without at least a phase of resistance by a significant segment of the population. As indicated above, European-derived peoples are expected to ultimately exhibit some of the great flexibility that Jews have shown throughout the ages in advocating particular political forms that best suit their current interests. The prediction is that segments of the European-derived peoples of the world will eventually realize that they have been and are being ill-served both by the ideologies of multiculturalism and de-ethnicized individualism.

If the analysis of anti-Semitism presented in SAID is correct, the expected reaction will emulate aspects of Judaism by adopting group-serving, collectivist ideologies and social organizations. The theoretically underdetermined nature of human group processes (PTSDA, Ch. 1; MacDonald, 1995a) disallows detailed prediction of whether the reactive strategy will be sufficient to stabilize or reverse the present decline of European peoples in the New World and, indeed, in their ancestral homelands: whether the process will degenerate into a self-destructive reactionary movement as occurred with the Spanish Inquisition; or whether it will initiate a moderate and permanent turning away from radical individualism toward a sustainable group strategy, ideally a set of institutions that promote individualism within Western societies but determined to resist the inroads of non-Western peoples by, e.g., erecting strong barriers to immigration and enforcing remigration of non-Whites.

What is certain is that the ancient dialectic between Judaism and the West will continue into the foreseeable future. It will be ironic that, whatever anti-Semitic rhetoric may be adopted by the leaders of these defensive movements, they will be constrained to emulate key elements of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. Such strategic mimicry will, once again, lead to a "Judaization" of Western societies not only in the sense that their social organization will become more group-oriented but also in the sense that they will be more aware of themselves as a positively evaluated ingroup and more aware of other human groups as competing, negatively evaluated outgroups. In this sense,

whether the decline of the European peoples continues unabated or is arrested, it will constitute yet another profound impact of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy on the development of Western societies.





## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abella, I. (1990). *A Coat of Many Colours: Two Centuries of Jewish Life in Canada*. Lester & Orpen Dennys.
- Abella, I., & Troper, H. E. (1981). "The Line Must Be Drawn Somewhere": Canada and Jewish Refugees, 1933–1939. In M. Weinfeld, W. Shaffir, & I. Cotler, (Eds.), *The Canadian Jewish Mosaic*. Wiley.
- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*. Springer-Verlag.
- Abrams, E. (1996, March). Faith & the Holocaust. *Commentary*, 101, 68–69.
- (1997). *Faith or Fear: How Jews Can Survive in Christian America*. Free Press.
- Ackerman, N. W., & Jahoda, M. (1950). *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder*, Publication No. V of The American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series. Harper & Brothers.
- Adams, G. R., Gullotta, T. P., & Adams-Markstrom, C. (1994). *Adolescent Life Experiences* (3rd ed.). Brooks/Cole.
- Adelson, A. (1972). SDS. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Adelson, H. L. (1999, October 1). Another Sewer Rat Appears. *The Jewish Press*.
- ADL. (n.d.). *The National Strategy to Counter Antisemitism Actions*. ADL. Retrieved May 16, 2025, from <https://www.adl.org/US-National-Strategy-antisemitism/actions>.
- (2004, May 14). ADL Urges Senator Hollings to Disavow Statements on Jews and the Iraq War. ADL. <https://archive.ph/s5iIG>.
- (2022). Consolidated Financial Statements and Schedules, December 31, 2021 and 2020. <https://tinyurl.com/bdd8k89v>.
- (2023). Brief for Anti-Defamation League as Amicus Curiae Supporting Respondent, Students for Fair Admissions, Inc., v. President and Fellows of Harvard College, No. 20–1199. (SC 2023). <https://tinyurl.com/cbzubk8p>.
- (2024, April). Countering Antisemitism Act. <https://tinyurl.com/55rw3abe>.

- Admission of German Refugee Children: Joint Hearings Before a U.S. Senate Subcommittee of the Committee on Immigration and a U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 76th Cong., 1st Sess., S.J. Res. 64 and H.J. Res. 168. Joint Resolutions to Authorize the Admission to the United States of a Limited Number of German Refugee Children. (1939).
- Adorno, T. W. (1967). *Prisms* (Samuel and Shierrey Weber, Trans.). MIT Press.
- (1969a). Scientific Experiences of a European Scholar in America. In D. Fleming & B. Bailyn (Eds.), *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960*. Harvard University Press.
- (1969b). Wissenschaftliche Erfahrungen in Amerika. In T. W. Adorno, *Stichworte*. Suhrkamp.
- (1973). *Negative Dialectics* (E. B. Ashton, Trans.). Seabury Press.
- (1974). *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life* (E. F. N. Jephcott, Trans.). Verso. (Original work published 1951.)
- (2002). *Essays in Music*. University of California Press.
- (2006). *Letters to His Parents 1939–1951* (W. Hoban, Trans.; C. Gödde, & H. Lonitz, Eds.). Polity Press.
- (2016, November). Remarks on “The Authoritarian Personality” by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, Sanford. *The Platypus Review*. <https://tinyurl.com/yhcntn2t>. (Original work published 1948).
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*, Publication No. III of The American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series. Harper & Brothers.
- Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (2004). *Briefwechsel 1927–1969: Band II: 1938–1944 Series*. Suhrkamp Verlag AG.
- (2011). *Towards a New Manifesto* (R. Livingstone, Trans.). Verso.
- AEI. (2005, March 19). *Jeane J. Kirkpatrick: Biography*. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. <https://archive.ph/UsIID#selection-839.0-839.20>.
- Agger, B. (1992). *The Discourse of Domination: From the Frankfurt School to Postmodernism*. Northwestern University Press.
- Agus, A. R. E. (1988). *The Binding of Isaac and Messiah: Law, Martyrdom and Deliverance in Early Rabbinic Religiosity*. SUNY Press.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of Attachment*. Erlbaum.
- Alba, R. D. (1985). The Twilight of Ethnicity Among Americans of European Ancestry: The Case of Italians. In R. D. Alba (Ed.), *Ethnicity and Race in the U.S.A.: Toward the Twenty-first Century*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Alba, R. D., & Moore, G. (1982). Ethnicity in the American Elite. *American Sociological Review*, 47(3), 373–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094993>.
- Alcock, J. (1997, June 6). Unpunctuated Equilibrium: Evolutionary Stasis in the Essays of Stephen J. Gould. Paper Presented at the Meetings of the Human Behavior and Evolution Society, Tucson, Arizona.
- Alderman, G. (1983). *The Jewish Community in British Politics*. The Clarendon Press.
- (1989). *London Jewry and London Politics 1889–1986*. Routledge.
- (1992). *Modern British Jewry*. Clarendon Press.
- Alexander, E. (1992). Multiculturalism’s Jewish problem. *Academic Questions*, 5, 63–68.
- Alexander, R. (1979). *Darwinism and Human Affairs*. University of Washington Press.
- Alonso, J. (2024, December 19). Massive Decline in Protests from Spring to Fall. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://tinyurl.com/4vw85f7v>.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. University of Manitoba Press.



- (1988). *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Jossey-Bass.
- (1994). Reducing prejudice in right-wing authoritarians. In M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium, Volume 7*. Erlbaum.
- (1996). *The Authoritarian Specter*. Harvard University Press.
- Alter, R. (1965, September). Sentimentalizing the Jews. *Commentary*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yufr5ak4>.
- Alterman, E. (1992). *Sound and Fury: The Washington Punditocracy and the Collapse of American Politics*. HarperCollins.
- Altshuler, M. (1987). *Soviet Jewry Since the Second World War: Population and Social Structure*. Greenwood Press.
- American Jewish Committee. (1945, November). *Anti-Semitism: A Review and Digest of Selected Publications*. <https://tinyurl.com/ykmmkddm>.
- Amoros, R. (2018, March 19). This Graph Shows Which Political Party Corporate America Loves the Most. *Howmuch.net*. <https://tinyurl.com/3r5faaws>.
- Anderson, M. M. (2001, October 19). German Intellectuals, Jewish Victims: A Politically Correct Solidarity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://archive.ph/X743r>.
- Anderson, W. L. (2001, November 17). The New York Times Missed the Wrong Missed Story. *LeeRockwell*. <https://tinyurl.com/bdep64sf>.
- Andreasen, N. C., Flaum, M., Swayze, V., 2nd, O'Leary, D. S., Alliger, R., Cohen, G., Ehrhardt, J., & Yuh, W. T. (1993). Intelligence and Brain Structure in Normal Individuals. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 150(1), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.150.1.130>.
- Antisemitism Awareness Act. H. R. 6090. 118th Cong. (2023).  
<https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/6090>.
- Archer, J. (1997). Why Do People Love Their Pets? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 18(4), 237–259. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0162-3095\(99\)80001-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0162-3095(99)80001-4).
- Archives of the American Jewish Committee. (1946). <https://tinyurl.com/36ba87e7>.
- Arendt, H. (1968). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
- (1969). Walter Benjamin: 1892–1940. In Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations* (H. Zohn, Trans.) (H. Arendt, Ed.). Schocken Books.
- Arlow, J. A., & Brenner, C. (1988). The Future of Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 57, 1–14.
- Aronson, E. (1992). *The Social Animal* (6th ed.). W. H. Freeman.
- Asante, M. (1987). *The Afrocentric Idea*. Temple University Press.
- Aschheim, S. E. (1982). *Brothers and Strangers: The East European Jew in Germany and German Jewish Consciousness, 1800–1923*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- (1985). “The Jew Within”: The Myth of “Judaization” in Germany. In J. Reinharz & W. Schatzberg (Eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War*. The University Press of New England for Clark University.
- Associated Press. (2001, July 2). Israeli Official Calls Illegal Palestinians ‘Lice.’ *The Washington Post*. <https://tinyurl.com/582rjbc9>.
- Auster, L. (1990). *The Path to National Suicide: An Essay on Immigration and Multiculturalism*. American Immigration Control Foundation.
- Australia/Israel Review, The. (1998, July 8–28). Gotcha. One Nation's Secret Membership List. *The Australia/Israel Review*, 23(9).
- Avineri, S. (2019). *Karl Marx: Philosophy and Revolution*. Yale University Press.
- Bachrach, B. S. (1985). The Jewish community in the Later Roman Empire as seen in the Codex Theodosianus. In J. Neusner, E. S. Frerichs, & C. McCracken-Flesher (Eds.), “To See Ourselves as Others See Us”: Christians, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity (pp. 399–421). Scholars Press.

- Badger, E. (2018, May 22). Rural and Urban Americans, Equally Convinced the Rest of the Country Dislikes Them. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/axmdpaph>.
- Bailey, P. (1961). A Rigged Radio Interview: With Illustrations of Various Ego-ideals. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 4(2), 199–265. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pbm.1961.0034>.
- (1965). *Sigmund the Unserene: A Tragedy in Three Acts*. Charles Thomas.
- Ball, G. W., & Ball, D. B. (1992). *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement with Israel, 1947 to the Present*. Norton.
- Bamford, J. (2004). *A Pretext for War: 9/11, Iraq, and the Abuse of America's Intelligence Agencies*. Doubleday.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Antebi, D. (1992). Beliefs about Negative Intentions of the World: A Study of the Israeli Siege Mentality. *Political Psychology*, 13(4), 633–645. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3791494>.
- Barfield, T. J. (1993). *The Nomadic Alternative*. Prentice Hall.
- Barkan, E. (1992). *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States Between the World Wars*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, P., & Gholson, B. (1984). The History of the Psychology of Learning as a Rational Process: Lakatos Versus Kuhn. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 18, 227–244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2407\(08\)60375-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2407(08)60375-4).
- Baron, S. W. (1975). *The Russian Jew Under Tsars and Soviets* (2nd ed.). MacMillan.
- Batson, C. D., & Burris, C. T. (1994). Personal Religion: Depressant or Stimulant of Prejudice and Discrimination? In M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 7). Erlbaum.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current Patterns of Parental Authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(1, Pt. 2), 1–103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030372>.
- Bayer, L. (2023, November 13). Hungarian Plan to Target Foreign Influence Fuels NGO and Media Fears. *The Guardian*. <https://tinyurl.com/mr3vsa9w>.
- Behars, J. O. (1996). Ritual Deception: A Window to the Hidden Determinants of Human Politics. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 15(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0730938400019559>.
- Beatty, J. (1951). *The Iron Curtain Over America*. Wilkinson Publishing Co.
- Becker, J., & Shane, S. (2016, February 27). Hillary Clinton, 'Smart Power,' and a Dictator's Fall. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/4tn34ssc>.
- Begley, L. (1991). *Wartime Lies*. Knopf.
- Behar, D., Yunusbayev, B., Metspalu, M. et al. (2010). The Genome-wide Structure of the Jewish people. *Nature*, 466, 238–242. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09103>.
- Beinart, P. (1997, August 11/18). New Bedfellows: The New Latino-Jewish Alliance. *The New Republic*, 22–26.
- Beiser, V. (1997, January 23). Slip Sliding Away. *The Jerusalem Report*, 33–35.
- Beitchman, P. (1988). *I Am a Process With No Subject*. University of Florida Press.
- Bell, D. (Ed.). (1955). *The New American Right*. Criterion Books.
- (1961, June). Reflections of Jewish identity. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/2b6u5cgv>.
- Bellow, S. (2000). *Ravelstein*. Viking.
- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991) Childhood Experience, Interpersonal Development, and Reproductive Strategy: An Evolutionary Theory of Socialization. *Child Development*, 62(4), 647–670. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131166>.
- Belth, N. C. (1979). *A Promise to Keep*. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith/Times Books.

- Ben David, N. (2024). Building "Something That Lasts": Jewish Reactions to Persistent Nazi Antisemitism in Norway, 1945–1978. *European Journal of Jewish Studies*, 18(2), 277–300. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1872471x-bja10084>.
- Bendersky, J. (2000). *The "Jewish Threat": Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army*. Basic Books.
- Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of Culture*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Benjamin, W. (1968). *Illuminations* (H. Zohn, Trans). Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Bennett, J. (2024, March 24). Judith Butler Thinks You're Overreacting. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/3x9tf4u4>.
- Bennett, M. T. (1963). *American Immigration Policies: A History*. Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press.
- (1966). The Immigration and Nationality (McCarran-Walter) Act of 1952, as Amended to 1965. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 367(1), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271626636700114>.
- Bennett, W. J. (1994). *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bennington, G. (1993). Derridabase. In G. Bennington, & J. Derrida (Eds.), *Jacques Derrida* (G. Bennington, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Berg, A. S. (1999). *Lindbergh*. Berkley Books. (Original work published 1998).
- Berglund, K. (2012). *The Vexing Case of Igor Shafarevich, a Russian Political Thinker*. Springer.
- Bergman, R., & Mazzetti, M. (2024, May 16). The Unpunished: How Extremists Took Over Israel. *The New York Times Magazine*. <https://tinyurl.com/47wn92wh>.
- Bergmann, M. S. (1995). Antisemitism and the Psychology of Prejudice. In J. A. Chanes (Ed.), *Antisemitism in America Today: Outspoken Experts Explode the Myths*. Birch Lane Press.
- Berlin, I. (1980). *Personal Impressions*. Viking.
- Berman, R. A. (1989). *Modern Culture and Critical Theory: Art, Politics, and the Legacy of the Frankfurt School*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bernal, M. (1987). *Black Athena: The Afro-Asian Roots of Classical Civilization*. Free Association Press.
- Bernheimer, K. (1998). *The 50 Greatest Jewish Movies: A Critic's Ranking of the Very Best*. Birch Lane Press Book.
- Besharov, D. J., & T. S. Sullivan. (1996). One Flesh. *New Democrat*, 8(4), 19–21.
- Besser, J. D. (1996, May 10). Compassion Seems Many Shores Away. *The Detroit Jewish News*. 124–125. <https://digital.bentley.umich.edu/djnews/djn.1996.05.10.001/124>.
- Bettelheim, B., & Janowitz, M. (1950). *Dynamics of Prejudice: A Psychological and Sociological Study of Veterans*, Publication No. IV of the American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series. Harper & Brothers.
- Betts, K. (1988). *Ideology and Immigration: Australia 1976 to 1987*. University of Melbourne Press.
- Betz, D. (Guest). (2025, February 12). The Coming British Civil War (no. 124) [Audio podcast episode]. In *Maiden Mother Matriarch with Louise Perry*. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Gid48FgiHho>.
- Betzig, L. (1986). *Despotism and Differential Reproduction*. Aldine.
- Bhushan, L. I. (1982). Validity of the California F-scale: A Review of Studies. *Indian Psychological Review*, 23(Spec Iss 1), 1–11.
- Biale, D. (1998). The Melting Pot and Beyond: Jews and the Politics of American Identity. In D. Biale, M. Galchinsky, & S. Heschel (Eds.), *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multi-Culturalism*. University of California Press.
- Biale, D., Galchinsky, M., & Heschel, S. (1998). Introduction: The Dialectic of Jewish Enlightenment. In D. Biale, M. Galchinsky, & S. Heschel (Eds.), *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multi-Culturalism*. University of California Press.

- Billig, M. (1976). *Social Psychology and Intergroup Relations*, European Monographs in Social Psychology 9. Academic Press.
- Billings, S. W., Guastello, S. J., & Rieke, M. L. (1993). A Comparative Assessment of the Construct Validity of Three Authoritarianism Measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 27(4), 328–348. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1993.1023>.
- Birnbaum, N. (1956). *The Bridge* (S. Birnbaum, Ed.). Post Publications.
- Biro, M. (2009). *The Dada Cyborg: Visions of the New Human in Weimar Berlin*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Black, E. C. (1988). *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920*. Basil Blackwell.
- BlackRock. (2025, January 15). BlackRock Reports Full Year 2024 Diluted EPS of \$42.01, or \$43.61 as Adjusted; Fourth Quarter 2024 Diluted EPS of \$10.63, or \$11.93 as Adjusted. <https://tinyurl.com/3pkhhe87>.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1967). *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- (1989). *Power and Conflict: Toward a General Theory*. Free Press.
- Blau, J. L. (1958, June 16). Theory of Cultural Pluralism. *Congress Weekly*.
- Boas, F. (1911). *Reports of the Immigration Commission: Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants*. 61st Cong., 2nd Sess., Senate Document 208. Government Printing Office.
- (1921a, February 6, 1921). The Great Melting Pot and Its Problem. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/2y9bvedz>.
- (1921b). The Problem of the American Negro. *Yale Quarterly Review*, 10(2), 384–395.
- (1925, May 27). Letter from Franz Boas to Louis Marshall. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/101699>.
- (1927, May 26). Letter from Franz Boas to Emanuel Celler. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/116198>.
- (1928). Forward to *Coming of Age in Samoa* by Margaret Mead. HarperCollins Perennial Classics.
- (1933, November 24). Letter from Franz Boas to Felix Warburg. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/128585>.
- (1935a, October 31). Letter from Franz Boas to Albert Einstein. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/107687>.
- (1935b, July 15). Letter from Franz Boas to Felix Warburg. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/105193>.
- (1939, October 12). Letter from Franz Boas to Karl Georg Wendinger. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/123759>.
- (1942a, July 28). Letter from Franz Boas to Max Warburg. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/123507>.
- (1942b, September 14). Letter from Franz Boas to Max Warburg. <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/105171>.
- Bodenheimer, A. (2017). Dada Judaism: The Avant-Garde in First World War Zurich. In M. H. Gelber, & S. Sjöberg (Eds.), *Jewish Aspects in Avant-Garde: Between Rebellion and Revelation*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110454956>.
- Boime, A. (2010). Dada's Dark Secret. In R. Washton Long, M. Baigell, & M. Heyd (Eds.), *Jewish Dimensions in Modern Visual Culture: Anti-Semitism, Assimilation, Affirmation* (pp. 90–115). Brandeis University Press.
- Boll, M. (2011). Konzeptionen des Judentums zwischen Säkularisierung und Marxismus: Hannah Arendt und Max Horkheimer. In L. Weissberg (Ed.), *Affinität wider Willen? Hannah Arendt, Theodor W. Adorno und die Frankfurter Schule* (pp. 103–116). Fritz Bauer Institute.

- Bonaparte, M., Freud, A., & Kris, E. (Eds.). (1957). *The Origins of Psychoanalysis: Letters, Drafts, and Notes to Wilhelm Fleiss, 1887–1902* (E. Mosbacher & J. Strachey, Trans.). Doubleday.
- Bonner, J. T. (1988). *The Evolution of Complexity*. Princeton University Press.
- Boot, M. (2018). *Corrosion of Conservatism: Why I Left the Right*. Liveright.
- Borgos, A. (2006). Nők a pszichoanalízisben (Women in Psychoanalysis). *Magyar Lettre International*, 62(Fall). <https://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00012/00046/borgos.html>.
- (2021). *Women in the Budapest School of Psychoanalysis: Girls of Tomorrow*. Routledge.
- Bork, R. H. (1996). *Slouching Towards Gomorrah: Modern Liberalism and the American Decline*. ReganBooks/HarperCollins.
- Borowitz, E. B. (1973). *The Mask Jews Wear: Self-Deceptions of American Jewry*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bourhis, R. Y. (1994). Power, Gender, and Intergroup Discrimination: Some Minimal Group Experiments. In M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 7). Erlbaum.
- Boyd, R., & Richerson, P. J. (1985). *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. University of Chicago Press.
- (1987). The Evolution of Ethnic Markers. *Journal of Cultural Anthropology*, 2(1), 65–79. <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1987.2.1.02a00070>.
- (1992). How Microevolutionary Processes Give Rise to History. In N. H. Nitecki, & D. V. Nitecki (Eds.), *History and Evolution*. SUNY Press.
- Boyle, S. S. (2001). *The Betrayal of Palestine: The Story of George Antonius*. Westview Press.
- Brabant, E., Falzeder, E., Giampieri-Deutsch, P. (Eds.) (1993). *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi Volume 1, 1908–1914*. Harvard University Press.
- Bradley-Dorsey, M. (2021, July 21). The Black Hole of DEI Spending at Public Universities. *Center for the Study of Partisanship and Ideology*. <https://tinyurl.com/y7usws3d>.
- Brandeis, L. D. (1976). Your Loyalty to America Should Lead You to Support the Zionist Cause. In M. Rischin (Ed.), *Immigration and the American Tradition*. Bobbs-Merrill. (Original work published 1915).
- Braungart, R. G. (1979). *Family Status, Socialization, and Student Politics*. University Microfilms International.
- Breitman, R. D., & Kraut, A. M. (1986). Anti-Semitism in the State Department, 1933–44: Four case studies. In D. A. Gerber (Ed.), *Anti-Semitism in American History*. University of Illinois Press.
- (1987). *American Refugee Policy and European Jewry, 1933–1945*. Indiana University Press.
- Brenner, L. (1997, June/July). The Forward is Backward: New York's Unclassifiable Jewish Weekly. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*. <https://tinyurl.com/4ud98m7w>.
- Brewer, M. (1993). Social Identity, Distinctiveness, and In-group Homogeneity. *Social Cognition*, 11(1), 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1993.11.1.150>.
- Brewer, M., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the Contact Hypothesis: Theoretical Perspectives on Desegregation. In N. Miller, & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in Contact: The Psychology of Desegregation*. Academic Press.
- Brewster, L. (2023, September 23). BlackRock Dissolves ESG Funds as Firm Steps Back from Label. *Yahoo! Finance*. <https://tinyurl.com/39swmat5>.
- Brigham, C. C. (1923). *A Study of American Intelligence*. Princeton University Press.
- (1930). Intelligence tests in immigrant groups. *Psychological Review*, 37(2), 158–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0072570>.
- Brimelow, P. (1995). *Alien Nation*. Random House.
- (2007, August 27). Brimelow on Buckley: Making and Breaking the Conservative (And Immigration Reform) Movement. VDARE. <https://tinyurl.com/pwyex8kk>.

- Bristow, E. J. (1983). *Prostitution and Prejudice: The Jewish Fight against White Slavery, 1870–1939*. Oxford University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1970). *Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R.* Russell Sage.
- Brossat, A. & Klingberg, S. (2016). *Revolutionary Yiddishland* (D. Fernbach, Trans.). Verso. (Original work published 1983).
- Brovkin, V. N. (1994). *Behind the Front Lines of the Civil War: Political Parties and Social Movements in Russia, 1918–1922*. Princeton University Press.
- Brown, M. (1987). *Jew or Juif? Jews, French Canadians, and Anglo-Canadians, 1759–1914*. Jewish Publication Society.
- Brown, N. O. (1985). *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytical Meaning of History* (2nd ed.). Wesleyan University Press. (Original work published 1959).
- Brown, P. (1987). Late Antiquity. In P. Veyne (Ed.), *A History of Private Life* (Vol. 1). Harvard University Press.
- Brown, R. (1965). *Social Psychology*. Collier-Macmillan.
- Brownfield, A. C. (2003, May 23). Examining the Role of Israel—and Its American Friends—in Promoting War on Iraq. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/2x8ujc7m>.
- Brundage, J. A. (1975). Concubinage and Marriage in Medieval Canon. *Journal of Medieval History*, 1(1): 1–17.
- (1987). *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. University of Chicago Press.
- Buchanan, P. J. (2003, March 24). Whose War? *The American Conservative*.  
<https://www.theamericanconservative.com/whose-war/>.
- (2004, April 23). Going Back Where They Came From. *Antiwar.com*.  
<http://www.antiwar.com/pat/?articleid=2371>.
- Buckley, W. F. (1992). *In Search of Anti-Semitism*. Continuum.
- Buhle, P. (1991). Jews and American Communism: The Cultural Question. In G. E. Pozzetta (Ed.), *Immigrant Radicals: The View from the Left*. Garland Publishing. (Reprinted from *Radical History Review*, 23, 9–33, 1980).
- Bulik, L. A. (1993). *Mass Culture Criticism and Dissent*. Peter Lang.
- Burgess, R. L., & Molenaar, P. C. M. (1993). Human Behavioral Biology: A Reply to R. Lerner and A. von Eye. *Human Development*, 36, 45–54.
- Burton, M. L., Moore, C. C., Whiting, J. W. M., Romney, K. (1996). Regions Based on Social Structure. *Current Anthropology*, 37(1), 87–123. <https://doi.org/10.1086/204474>.
- Burston, D. (2021). *Anti-Semitism and Analytical Psychology: Jung, Politics and Culture*. Routledge.
- Buss, D. M. (1994). *The Evolution of Desire*. Basic Books.
- (2019). *Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Buss, D. M., Haselton, M., Shackelford, T. K., Bleske, A. L., & Wakefield, J. C. (1998). Adaptations, Exaptations, and Spandrels. *American Psychologist*, 53(5), 533–548.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.5.533>.
- Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519–531. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3207893>.
- (2017). Foreword. In *Jewish Voice for Peace, On Antisemitism: Solidarity and the Struggle for Justice*. Haymarket Books.
- Campbell, D. T. (1986). Science's Social System of Validity—Enhancing Collective Belief Change and the Problems of the Social Sciences. In D. W. Fiske, & R. A. Shweder (Eds.), *Metatheory in Social Science: Pluralisms and Subjectivities*. University of Chicago Press.
- (1987). Evolutionary Epistemology. In G. Radnitzky, & W. W. Bartley (Eds.), *Evolutionary Epistemology, Rationality, and the Sociology of Knowledge*. Open Court.

- (1993). Plausible Coselection of Belief by Referent: All the “Objectivity” That Is Possible. *Perspectives on Science*, 1(1), 88–108.
- Campus Watch. (n.d.). Professors to Avoid. Middle East Forum. <https://tinyurl.com/4a3hus3p>.
- Cantor, N. (1996). *The Jewish Experience: An Illustrated History of Jewish Culture & Society*. Castle Press.
- Caputo, J. D. (1997). *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida: Religion without Religion*. University of Indiana Press.
- Carl, N. (2021, November 24). Did Women in Academia Cause Wokeness? *Noah's Newsletter*. <https://tinyurl.com/bdfwwvxk>.
- Carlebach, J. (1978). *Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Carlson, C. E. (2002). Why Judeo-Christians Support War. *Serendipity*. <https://www.serendipity.li/zionism/carlson01.htm>.
- Carroll, F. M. (1978). *American Opinion and the Irish Question 1910–23: A Study in Opinion and Policy*. St. Martin's Press.
- Carroll, J. (1995). *Evolution and Literary Theory*. University of Missouri Press.
- Carroll, J. B. (1995). Reflections on Stephen Jay Gould's *The Mismeasure of Man* (1981): A Retrospective Review. *Intelligence*, 21(2), 121–134.
- Carter, J. (2006). *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*. Simon & Schuster.
- Cash, W. (1994, October 29). Kings of the Deal. *The Spectator*, 14–16.
- Castro, A. (1954). *The Structure of Spanish History* (E. L. King, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- (1971). *The Spaniards: An Introduction to Their History* (W. F. King & S. Margaretten, Trans.). University of California Press.
- Casualties of the Iraq War. (2025, February 12). In *Wikipedia*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Casualties\\_of\\_the\\_Iraq\\_War#](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Casualties_of_the_Iraq_War#).
- Caton, H. (Ed.). (1990). *The Samoa Reader: Anthropologists Take Stock*. University Press of America.
- Cattan, N. (2002, November 29). Community Questioning ‘Open Door’: Debate Raging on Immigration. *The Forward*.
- CCIR. (1997). *Reconquista! The Takeover of America*. California Coalition for Immigration Reform.
- Ceplair, L. & Englund, S. (1980). *The Inquisition in Hollywood: Politics in the Film Community 1930–1960*. Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Cesarani, D. (1994). *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chafets, Z. (2007, October 14). The SY Empire. *The New York Times Magazine*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/14/magazine/14syrians-t.html>.
- Chamberlain, L. (1995, August 25). Freud and the Eros of the Impossible. *Times Literary Supplement*, 9–10.
- Chase, A. (1977). *The Legacy of Malthus*. Knopf.
- Checinski, M. (1982). *Poland: Communism, Nationalism, Anti-Semitism* (T. Szafar, Trans.). Karz-Chol Publishing.
- Chen, N., & Mossberg, C. (2023, April 8). Former College Swimmer Riley Gaines Claims She Was Assaulted at an Event for Opposing the Inclusion of Trans Women in Women's Sports. *CNN*. <https://tinyurl.com/2tuvtpc5>.
- Chiappe, D., & MacDonald, K. (2005). The Evolution of Domain-General Mechanisms in Intelligence and Learning. *Journal of General Psychology*, 132(1), 5–40. <https://doi.org/10.3200/GENP.132.1.5-40>.
- Chicago Model United Nations (2001, February 13). *United States National Security Background Guide*. University of Chicago. <https://tinyurl.com/3fyh2sen>.

- Chodorow, N. J. (1989). *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory*. Yale University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel and the Palestinians* (2nd ed.). South End Press.
- Christison, K., & Christison, B. (2002, December 13). A Rose by Another Other Name: The Bush Administration's Dual Loyalties. CounterPunch. <https://archive.ph/Uk7vs>.
- Church of England Faith and Order Commission. (2019). *God's Unfailing Word: Theological and Practical Perspectives on Christian-Jewish Relations*. Church House Publishing. <https://tinyurl.com/3vwpc6d8>.
- Churchill, W. (1920, February 8). Zionism Versus Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People. *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, 5.
- Churchland, P. M. (1995). *The Engine of Reason, the Seat of the Soul*. MIT Press.
- Cioffi, F. (1969). Wittgenstein's Freud. In P. Winch (Ed.), *Studies in the Philosophy of Wittgenstein*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1970). Freud and the Idea of a Pseudo-science. In R. Borger & F. Cioffi (Eds.), *Explanation in the Behavioural Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
- (1972). Wollheim on Freud. *Inquiry*, 15(1-4), 171-186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201747208601672>.
- Clarke, R. (2004). *Against All Enemies*. Free Press
- Cleburne, P. (2023, January 31). Israel's Netanyahu to Evict ALL African Illegals. Where is America's Netanyahu? VDARE. <https://tinyurl.com/3tdumwxb>.
- (2024, December 20). Why Did Churchill Have Britain Fight On after Summer 1940? It's Bad News. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/yc3tswxm>.
- Clinton, H. R., & Schwerin, D. (2022, February 25). A State of Emergency for Democracy. *The Atlantic*. <https://tinyurl.com/2erhwvnc>.
- Cockburn, A. (2003). My Life as an Anti-Semite. In A. Cockburn, & J. St. Clair (Eds.), *The Politics of Anti-Semitism*. Counterpunch/AK Press.
- Cofnas, N. (2018). Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy: A Critical Analysis of Kevin MacDonald's Theory. *Human Nature*, 29, 57436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12110-018-9310-x>.
- (2021). The Anti-Jewish Narrative. *Philosophia*, 49: 1329-1344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11406-021-00322-w>.
- (2023). Still No Evidence for a Jewish Group Evolutionary Strategy. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 9, 236-259. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-022-00352-x>.
- Cogley, J. (1972). *Report on Blacklisting* (Vols. 1-2). Arno Press and The New York Times. (Original work published 1956).
- Cohen, B. (2012). Jung's Answer to Jews. *Jung Journal: Culture and Psyche*, 6(1), 56-71. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jung.2012.6.1.56>.
- Cohen, E. A. (1992). A Letter From Eliot A. Cohen. In W. Buckley (Ed.), *In Search of Anti-Semitism*. Continuum.
- (2023, May 19). It's Not Enough for Ukraine to Win. Russia Has to Lose. *The Atlantic*. <https://tinyurl.com/2ky9m967>.
- Cohen, M. (1998). In Defense of Shaatnez: A Politics for Jews in a Multicultural America. In D. Biale, M. Galchinsky, & S. Heschel (Eds.), *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism*. University of California Press.
- Cohen, N. W. (1972). *Not Free to Desist: The American Jewish Committee, 1906-1966*. Jewish Publication Society of America.
- (1999). *Jacob H. Schiff: A Study in American Jewish Leadership*. Brandeis University Press.
- Cohen, P. S. (1980). *Jewish Radicals and Radical Jews*. Academic Press.
- Cohen, S. M. (1986). Vitality and Resilience in the American Jewish family. In S. M. Cohen & P. E. Hyman (Eds.), *The Jewish Family: Myths and Reality*. Holmes & Meier.



- Cohen, S. M., & Liebman, C. S. (1997). American Jewish Liberalism: Unraveling the Strands. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61(3), 405–430. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2749579>.
- Cohn, W. (1958). The Politics of American Jews. In M. Sklare (Ed.), *The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group*. Free Press.
- Collier, G., Minton, H. L., & Reynolds, G. (1991). *Currents of Thought in American Social Psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Cones, J. W. (1997). *What's Really Going on in Hollywood!* Rivas Canyon Press. <https://tinyurl.com/4rrhv87m>.
- Connelly, J. (2012, July 30). Converts Who Changed the Church. *The Forward*. <https://forward.com/opinion/159955/converts-who-changed-the-church/>.
- Cook, J. (2016, May 9). Israel: Will Nazi Comparisons Trigger Soul Searching? *Al Jazeera*. <https://tinyurl.com/2b9bafwa>.
- Cooklin, R., Ravindran, A., & Carney, M. (1983). The Patterns of Mental Disorder in Jewish and Non-Jewish Admissions to a District General Hospital Psychiatric Unit: Is Manic-depressive Illness a Typically Jewish Disorder? *Psychological Medicine*, 13(1), 209–212. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291700050236>.
- Coon, C. S. (1951). *Caravan: The Story of Middle East*. Henry Holt and Company.
- Cooney, T. A. (1986). *The Rise of the New York Intellectuals: Partisan Review and Its Circle*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Cooper, A. M. (1990). The Future of Psychoanalysis: Challenges and Opportunities. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 59(2), 177–196.
- Corbin, A. (1990). Intimate Relations. In M. Perrot (Ed.), *A History of Private Life: IV. From the Fires of the Revolution to the Great War*. Harvard University Press.
- Courtois, S., Werth, N., Panné, J., Paczkowski, A., Bartosek K., & Margolin, J. (1999). *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (J. Murphy & M. Kramer, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Coutouvidis, J., & Reynolds, J. (1986). *Poland, 1939–1947*. Holmes & Meier.
- Crews, F. (1993, November 18). The Unknown Freud. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1993/11/18/the-unknown-freud/>.
- (1994, February 3). The Unknown Freud: An Exchange. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1994/02/03/the-unknown-freud-an-exchange/>.
- Crews, F., et al. (1995). *The Memory Wars: Freud's Legacy in Dispute*. New York Review.
- Crocker, J., Blaine, B., & Luhtanen, R. (1993). Prejudice, Intergroup Behaviour, and Self-Esteem: Enhancement and Protection Motives. In M. A. Hogg, & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent Unobtrusive Studies of Black and White Discrimination and Prejudice: A Literature Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(3), 546–563. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.87.3.546>.
- Crowe, J. (2018, October 9). Hillary Clinton: 'Civility Can Start Again' When Democrats Take Congress. *National Review*. <https://tinyurl.com/5frppcwj>.
- Cruse, H. (1992). Negroes and Jews—The Two Nationalisms and the Bloc(ked) Plurality. In J. Salzman, A. Back, & G. Sullivan Sorin (Eds.), *Bridges and Boundaries: African Americans and American Jews*. George Braziller in association with the Jewish Museum. (Reprinted from *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual* by H. Cruse, 1967, William Morrow.)
- Cuddihy, J. M. (1974). *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Levi-Strauss, and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity*. Basic Books.
- (1978). *No Offense: Civil Religion and Protestant Taste*. Seabury Press.
- Curran, J. (2015). Jay Blumler: A Founding Father of British Media Studies. In S. Coleman (Ed.), *Can the Media Save Democracy? Essays in Honour of Jay G. Blumler*. Palgrave.

- Curtiss, R. H. (2003, April). The Pentagon's Dynamic Duo: Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*. <https://tinyurl.com/tkxzxhsv>.
- Dannhauser, W. J. (1996). Athens and Jerusalem or Jerusalem and Athens? In D. Novak (Ed.), *Leo Strauss and Judaism: Jerusalem and Athens Critically Revisited* (pp. 155–171). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Darnell, R. (2001). *Creative Genealogies: A History of American Anthropology*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. John Murray.
- Davies, N. (1981). *God's Playground: A History of Poland* (Vols. 1–2). Oxford University Press.
- Davis, B. D. (1986). *Storm Over Biology: Essays on Science, Sentiment and Public Policy*. Prometheus Books.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press.
- Dawidowicz, L. S. (1952, July). "Anti-Semitism" and the Rosenberg Case: The Latest Communist Propaganda Trap. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/4wsy7zp5>.
- (1975). *The War Against the Jews, 1933–1945*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- (1976). *A Holocaust Reader*. Behrman.
- Deak, I. (1968). *Weimar Germany's Left-Wing Intellectuals*. University of California Press.
- Decter, M. (1994, September). The ADL vs. the "Religious Right." *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/3cyj2ff>.
- (2003). *Rumsfeld: A Personal Portrait*. Regan Books.
- Degler, C. (1991). *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. Oxford University Press.
- Dennett, D. C. (1993, January 14). 'Confusion Over Evolution': An Exchange. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://tinyurl.com/hvdyapr6>.
- (1995). *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*. Simon & Schuster.
- Deri, F., & Brunswick, D. (1964). Freud's Letters to Ernst Simmel. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 12, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000306516401200106>.
- Derrida, J. (1984). Two Words for Joyce. In D. Attridge, & D. Ferrer (Eds.), *Post-structuralist Joyce: Essays from the French*. Cambridge University Press.
- (1986). *Glas* (J. P. Leavey, Jr., & R. Rand, Trans.). University of Nebraska Press.
- (1993a). *Aporias* (T. Dutoit, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- (1993b). Circumfession. In G. Bennington, & J. Derrida (Eds.), *Jacques Derrida* (G. Bennington, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- (1994). Shibboleth: For Paul Celan. In A. Fioretos (Eds.), *Word Traces: Readings of Paul Celan* (J. Wilner, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- (1995a). Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression. *Diacritics*, 25(2), 9–63.
- (1995b). *Points . . . Interviews, 1974–1994* (P. Kamuf et al., Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Dershowitz, A. (1994, June). The Betrayals of Jonathan Jay Pollard. *Penthouse Magazine*. <https://tinyurl.com/mr49h7dd>.
- (1997). *The Vanishing American Jew: In Search of a Jewish Identity for the Next Century*. Little, Brown and Company.
- (1999, October 1). *The Forward*.
- Deutsch, H. (1940). Freud and His Pupils: A Footnote to the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 9, 184–194.
- Devlin, F. R. (2025, March 25–26). Decadence, the Corruption of Status Hierarchies, & Female Hypergamy a Response to Rob Henderson's Article "All the Single Ladies," Parts 1 and 2. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/4ytum6jb>.
- Diani, M. (1997). Social Movements and Social Capital: A Network Perspective on Movement Outcomes. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 2(2), 129–147.

- Dickerman, L. (2005). Introduction. In L. Dickerman (Ed.), *Dada: Zurich, Berlin, Hannover, Cologne, New York, Paris*. National Gallery of Art.
- Dickemann, M. (1979). Female Infanticide, Reproductive Strategies, and Social Stratification: A Preliminary Model. In N. A. Chagnon & W. Irons (Eds.), *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior*. Duxbury Press.
- Dickstein, M. (1977). *Gates of Eden: American Culture in the Sixties*. Basic Books.
- Diggins, J. P. (2004, June 11). How Reagan Beat the Neocons. *The New York Times*.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/11/opinion/how-reagan-beat-the-neocons.html>.
- Diner, H. R. (1977). *In the Almost Promised Land: American Jews and Blacks, 1915–1935*. Greenwood Press.
- Disraeli, B. (1852). *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography* (2nd ed.). Colburn.
- Divine, R. A. (1957). *American Immigration Policy, 1924–1952*. Yale University Press.
- Dixon, S. (1985). The Marriage Alliance in the Roman Elite. *Journal of Family History*, 10(4), 353–378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/036319908501000402>.
- Dizard, J. (2004, May 4). How Ahmed Chalabi Conned the Neocons. *Salon*.  
[https://www.salon.com/2004/05/04/chalabi\\_4/](https://www.salon.com/2004/05/04/chalabi_4/).
- Doise, W., & Sinclair, A. (1973). The Categorization Process in Intergroup Relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420030204>.
- Dornbusch, S. M., & Gray, K. D. (1988). Single Parent Families. In S. M. Dornbusch & M. Strober (Eds.), *Feminism, Children, and the New Families*. Guilford Press.
- Dosse, F. (1997). *History of Structuralism* (Vols. 1–2) (D. Glassman, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Dowd, M. (2025, January 20). Trump Has Everyone Where He Wants Them. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/4nkjv4ck>.
- Draper, H. (1956). Israel's Arab Minority: The Beginning of a Tragedy. *New International*, 22(2), 86–106. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/draper/1956/xx/tragedy.html>.
- (1957). Israel's Arab Minority: The Great Land Robbery. *New International*, 23(1), 7–30. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/draper/1957/xx/tragedy.html>.
- DreamWorks Pictures. (2024, February 19). In *Wikipedia*.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=DreamWorks\\_Pictures&oldid=1208885597](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=DreamWorks_Pictures&oldid=1208885597).
- Drew, E. (2003, June 12). The Neocons in Power. *The New York Review of Books*.  
[www.nybooks.com/articles/16378](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/16378).
- Drucker, P. (1994). *Max Shachtman and His Left: A Socialist's Odyssey through the "American Century"*. Humanities Press International.
- Drury, S. (1997). *Leo Strauss and the American Right*. St. Martin's Press.
- Duby, G. (1983). *The Knight, the Lady, and the Priest* (B. Bray, Trans.). Penguin Books.
- Dumont, P. (1982). Jewish Communities in Turkey During the Last Decades of the Nineteenth Century in Light of the Archives of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. In B. Braude, & B. Lewis (Eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: The Functioning of a Plural Society*. Holmes & Meier Publishers.
- Dunne, M. P., Martin, N. G., Statham, D. J., Slutske, W. S., Dinwiddie, S. H., Bucholz, K. K., Madden, P.A.F., & Heath, A. C. (1997). Genetic and Environmental Contributions to Variance in Age at First Sexual Intercourse. *Psychological Science*, 8(3), 211–216.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00414.x>.
- Easton, N. J. (2000). *Gang of Five: Leaders at the Center of the Conservative Crusade*. Simon & Schuster.
- Editors of *Fortune*. (1936). *Jews in America*. Random House.
- Edsall, T. B. (2025, January 21). The Right is Winning the Battle for Hearts and Minds. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/zfhxpxv8>.

- Efron, J. M. (1994). *Defenders of the Race: Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. Yale University Press.
- Egan, V., Chiswick, A., Santosh, C., Naidu, K., Rimmington, J. E., & Best, J. J. K. (1994). Size Isn't Everything: A Study of Brain Volume, Intelligence and Auditory Evoked Potentials. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17(3), 357–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90283-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90283-6).
- Ehrman, J. (1995). *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs 1945–1994*. Yale University Press.
- Eickelman, D. F. (1981). *The Middle East: An Anthropological Approach*. Prentice-Hall.
- Eksteins, M. (1975). *The Limits of Reason: The German Democratic Press and the Collapse of Weimar Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Elazar, D. J. (1980). *Community and Polity: Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry*. Jewish Publication Society of America. (Original work published 1976).
- Elder, G. (1974). *Children of the Great Depression*. University of Chicago Press.
- Ellenberger, H. (1970). *The Discovery of the Unconscious*. Basic Books.
- Ellensohn, R. & Putz, K. (2022). Epilogue. In R. Ellensohn, & K. Putz (Eds.), *Gut, dass wir einmal die hot potatoes ausgraben: Briefwechsel mit Theodor W. Adorno, Ernst Bloch, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse und Helmuth Plessner*. C. H. Beck.
- Ellman, Y. (1987). Inter-marriage in the United States: A comparative study of Jews and other ethnic and religious groups. *Jewish Social Studies*, 49, 1–26.
- Elon, A. (2001, November 15). A German Requiem. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2001/11/15/a-german-requiem/>.
- Ephron, D., & T. Lipper. (2002, July 14). Sharansky's Quiet Role. *Newsweek*. <https://www.newsweek.com/sharanskys-quiet-role-147611>.
- Epstein, E. J. (1996). *Dossier: The Secret History of Armand Hammer*. Random House.
- Epstein, J. (1997, March 7). Dress British, Think Yiddish. *Times Literary Supplement*, 6–7.
- Epstein, M. M. (1997). *Dreams of Subversion in Medieval Jewish Art and Literature*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. W. W. Norton.
- Erős, F. (2015). A nemzetpolitikai lélektantól a tudományos fajelméletig. A magyar pszichológia történetének szürke zónája (From the Psychology of National Politics to Scientific Race Theory. The Grey Zone of The History of Hungarian Psychology). *Socio.Hu Társadalomtudományi Szemle (Social Sciences Review)*, 5(2), 67–85. <https://socio.hu/index.php/so/article/view/513>.
- (2018). Some social and political issues related to Ferenczi and the Hungarian school. In A. Dimitrijević, G. Cassullo, & J. Frankel (Eds.), *Ferenczi's Influence on Contemporary Psychoanalytic Traditions: Lines of Development—Evolution of Theory and Practice over the Decades*. Routledge.
- (2019). Sándor Ferenczi, Géza Róheim and the University of Budapest, 1918–19. *Psychoanalysis and History*, 21(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.3366/pah.2019.0279>.
- Esterson, A. (1992). *Seductive Mirage: An Exploration of the Work of Sigmund Freud*. Open Court.
- Evans, M. S. (2007). *Blacklisted by History: The Untold Story of Senator Joe McCarthy and His Fight Against America's Enemies*. Crown Forum.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1990). *The Decline and Fall of the Freudian Empire*. Scott-Townsend Publishers.
- Fahnestock, J. (1993). Tactics of Evaluation in Gould and Lewontin's "The Spandrels of San Marco." In J. Selzer (Ed.), *Understanding Scientific Prose*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Fairchild, H. P. (1939, January 25). Should the Jews come in? *The New Republic*, 97: 344–345.
- (1947). *Race and Nationality as Factors in American Life*. Ronald Press.
- Fancher, R. E. (1985). *The Intelligence Men: Makers of the IQ Controversy*. W. W. Norton.

- Farrall, L. A. (1985). *The Origins of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865–1925*. Garland Publishing.
- Faur, J. (1992). *In the Shadow of History: Jews and Conversos at the Dawn of Modernity*. State University of New York Press.
- Feldman, L. H. (1993). *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton University Press.
- Ferenczi, S., & Dupont, J. (Ed). (1995). *The Clinical Diary of Sándor Ferenczi*. Harvard University Press.
- Ferguson, N. (1999). *The Pity of War*. Basic Books.
- Fetzer, J. S. (1996). Anti-immigration sentiment and nativist political movements in the United States, France and Germany: Marginality or economic self-interest? Paper presented at the 1996 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA, Aug. 29–Sept. 1.
- Fiedler, L. A. (1948). The State of American Writing. *Partisan Review*, 15, 870–875.
- Field, G. G. (1981). *Evangelist of Race: The Germanic Vision of Houston Stewart Chamberlain*. Columbia University Press.
- Findley, P. (1989). *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Hill Books.
- Finkelstein, N. G. (2000). *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. Verso.
- (2001). Preface to the revised paperback edition of *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. Verso.
- Fisher, H. E. (1992). *Anatomy of Love: The Natural History of Monogamy, Adultery, and Divorce*. W. W. Norton.
- Flacks, R. (1967). The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(3), 52–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1967.tb00586.x>.
- Flinn, M. (1997). Culture and the Evolution of Social Learning. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 18(1), 23–67. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(96\)00046-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(96)00046-3).
- Flowerman, S. H. (1947). Mass Propaganda in the War Against Bigotry. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 42: 429–439.
- (1949). The Use of Propaganda to Reduce Prejudice: A Refutation. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 3, 99–108.
- Fölsing, A. (1997). *Albert Einstein: A Biography* (E. Osers, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1993).
- Ford, H. (1920, March 21). The International Jew. *The Dearborn Independent*.
- Foran, C., Talbot, H., & Wilson, K. (2024, May 1). House Passes Antisemitism Bill as Johnson Highlights Campus Protests. CNN. <https://tinyurl.com/3runy8z3>.
- Foundation for Defense of Democracies. (2025, February 3). In Wikipedia. <https://tinyurl.com/349vy66p>.
- Fox, R. (1989). *The Search for Society: Quest for a Biosocial Science and Morality*. Rutgers University Press.
- Foxman, A. (1995). Antisemitism in America: A View From the “Defense” Agencies. In J. A. Chanes (Ed.), *Antisemitism in America Today: Outspoken Experts Explode the Myths*. Birch Lane Press.
- (2003, May 5). Anti-Semitism, Pure and Simple. *Jerusalem Report*. <https://archive.ph/lfDyh>.
- Foxman, A., & Wolf C. (2013). *Viral Hate: Containing Its Spread on the Internet*. St. Martin's Press.
- Francis, S. (1999). *Thinkers of Our Time: James Burnham* (Rev. ed.). Claridge Press. (Original work published 1984).

- (2004). The Neoconservative Subversion. In B. Nelson (Ed.), *Neoconservatism. Occasional Papers of the Conservative Citizens' Foundation*, Issue Number Six (pp. 6–12). Conservative Citizens' Foundation.
- Frank, G. (1997). Jews, Multiculturalism, and Boasian Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 99(4), 731–745. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1997.99.4.731>.
- Frankel, J. (1981). *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, A. (2022, August 11). Canada Outlaws Condoning, Denying, or Downplaying the Holocaust Mythos. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3yyc7a6j>.
- Frederick Kagan. (2024, December 22). In *Wikipedia*.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Frederick\\_Kagan&oldid=1264488189](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Frederick_Kagan&oldid=1264488189).
- Freeman, D. (1983). *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth*. Harvard University Press.
- (1990). Historical Glosses. In H. Caton (Ed.), *The Samoan Reader: Anthropologists Take Stock*. University Press of America.
- (1991). On Franz Boas and the Samoan Researches of Margaret Mead. *Current Anthropology*, 32(3), 322–330. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2743783>.
- Freeman, W. J. (1995). *Societies of Brains*. Erlbaum.
- Freud, S. (1955). *Moses and Monotheism* (K. Jones, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1939).
- (1969). *The Interpretation of Dreams* (J. Strachey, Trans.). Avon Books. (Original work published 1932).
- Frickel, S., & Gross, N. (2005). A General Theory of Scientific/Intellectual Movements. *American Sociological Review*, 70(2), 204–232.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240507000202>.
- Friedman, M. (1995). *What Went Wrong? The Creation and Collapse of the Black-Jewish Alliance*. Free Press.
- Friedman, T. L. (2023, August 15). Lebanon's Nightmare Could Become Israel's Future. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/2kf3bx2c>.
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*. Rinehart.
- Frommer, M. (1978). *The American Jewish Congress: A History, 1914–1950* (Vols. 1–2). Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Frum, D. (2023, March 13). The Iraq War Reconsidered. *The Atlantic*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/49u5b5wh>.
- Frum, D. & R. Perle. (2003). *An End to Evil: How to Win the War on Terror*. Random House.
- Fuchs, L. (1956). *The Political Behavior of American Jews*. Free Press.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (1991). As the Pendulum Swings: Teenage Childbearing and Social Concern. *Family Relations*, 40(2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585470>.
- Furstenberg, F. F., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1989). Teenaged Pregnancy and Childbearing. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 313–320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.2.313>.
- Gabler, N. (1988). *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood*. Crown Publishers.
- Gabler, N. (1995) *Winchell: Gossip, Power, and the Culture of Celebrity*. Vintage. (Original work published 1994).
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The Aversive Form of Racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, Racism, and Discrimination*. Academic Press.
- Gal, A. (1989). Brandeis, Judaism, and Zionism. In N. L. Dawson (Ed.), *Brandeis in America*. University of Kentucky Press.
- Gasman, D. (1971). *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League*. MacDonald.

- Gay, P. (1987). *A Godless Jew: Freud, Atheism, and the Making of Psychoanalysis*. Yale University Press.
- (1988). *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. W. W. Norton.
- Geary, D. C. (2005). *The Origin of Mind: Evolution of Brain, Cognition, and General Intelligence*. American Psychological Association.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- Gelb, S. A. (1986). Henry H. Goddard and the Immigrants, 1910–1917: The Studies and Their Social Context. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 22(4), 324–332.  
[https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6696\(198610\)22:4<324::AID-JHBS2300220404>3.0.CO;2-Y](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6696(198610)22:4<324::AID-JHBS2300220404>3.0.CO;2-Y).
- Gelernter, D. (1997, March). How the Intellectuals Took Over (And What to Do About It). *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/45ujcnk2>.
- Germanistic Society of America. (1910). *The Activities of the Germanistic Society of America, 1904–1910*. <https://archive.org/details/activitiesofgerm00germ/page/n5/mode/2up>.
- (1917). *Annual Report*.  
[https://archive.org/details/ldpd\\_11549851\\_002/page/n3/mode/2up](https://archive.org/details/ldpd_11549851_002/page/n3/mode/2up).
- Gershenhorn, J. (2004). *Melville Herskovits and the Racial Politics of Knowledge*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Gershman, C. (2003, December 27). After the Bombings: My Visit to Turkey and Istanbul's Jewish Community. National Endowment for Democracy. <https://www.ned.org/after-the-bombings/>.
- (2004, January 22). A Democracy Strategy for the Middle East. International Institute. <https://international.ucla.edu/institute/article/6722>.
- Gershon, E., & Liebowitz, J. H. (1975). Sociocultural and Demographic Correlates of Affective Disorders in Jerusalem. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 12(1), 37–50.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956\(75\)90019-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3956(75)90019-9).
- Gerson, M. (Ed.). (1996). *The Essential Neoconservative Reader*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Gigot, F. (1910). Judaism. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Robert Appleton Company.  
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08399a.htm>.
- Gilman, S. L. (1993). *Freud, Race, and Gender*. Princeton University Press.
- Gilson, E. (1962). *The Philosopher and Theology*. Random House.
- Ginsberg, B. (1993). *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gitelman, Z. (1991). The Evolution of Jewish Culture and Identity in the Soviet Union. In Y. Ro'i, & A. Beker (Eds.), *Jewish Culture and Identity in the Soviet Union*. New York University Press.
- Glazer, N. (1954, March). The Study of Man: New Light on “The Authoritarian Personality.” *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/mtb7bb3x>.
- (1961). *The Social Basis of American Communism*. Harcourt Brace.
- (1969). The New Left and the Jews. *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 11(2), 121–132.
- (1987). New Perspectives in American Jewish Sociology. *American Jewish Yearbook*, 87, 3–19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23603942>.
- Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1970). *Beyond the Melting Pot* (2nd ed.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1963).
- Glenn, S. S., & Ellis, J. (1988). Do the Kallikaks Look “Menacing” or “Retarded”? *American Psychologist*, 43(9), 742–743. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.43.9.742>.
- Gless, D. J., & Smith, B. H. (Eds.). (1992). *The Politics of Liberal Education*. Duke University Press.
- Glick, L. B. (1982). Types Distinct From Our Own: Franz Boas on Jewish Identity and Assimilation. *American Anthropologist*, 84(3), 545–565.  
<https://doi.org/10.1525/AA.1982.84.3.02A00020>.

- Goddard, H. H. (1912). *The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness*. Macmillan.
- (1917). The Binet Tests in Relation to Immigration. *Journal of Psycho-Asthenics*, 18, 105–110.
- (1917). Mental Tests and the Immigrant. *Journal of Delinquency*, 2, 243–277.
- Goldberg, J. (2003, March 13). Jews and War. *National Review Online*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/39nwhf3r>.
- Goldberg, J. J. (1996). *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*. Addison-Wesley.
- Goldfarb, S. H. (1984). American Judaism and the Scopes trial. In J. R. Marcus, & A. J. Peck (Eds.), *Studies in the American Jewish Experience II*. University Press of America.
- Goldschmidt, W., & Kunkel, E. J. (1971). The Structure of the Peasant Family. *American Anthropologist*, 73(5), 1058–1076. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1971.73.5.02a00060>.
- Goldstein, A. (1981). Some Demographic Characteristics of Village Jews in Germany: Nonnenweier, 1800–1931. In P. Ritterband (Ed.), *Modern Jewish Fertility* (pp. 112–143). Leide Brill Publishers.
- Goldstein, I. (1952a, November 3). An American Immigration Policy. *Congress Weekly*, 4.
- (1952b, March 17). The Racist Immigration Law. *Congress Weekly*, 19(11), 6–7.
- Goldstein, J. (1975). Ethnic Politics: The American Jewish Committee as Lobbyist, 1915–1917. *American Jewish Historical Quarterly*, 65, 36–58.
- (1990). *The Politics of Ethnic Pressure: The American Jewish Committee Fight against Immigration Restriction, 1906–1917*. Garland Publishing.
- Goldstein, M. (1912). Deutsch-jüdischer Parnass (German-Jewish Parnassus). *Kunstwart*, 25(11), 281–294.
- González, G. (1989). The Intellectual Influence of the Conversos Luis and Antonia Coronel in Sixteenth-Century Spain. In W. D. Phillips & C. R. Phillips (Eds.), *Marginated Groups in Spanish and Portuguese History*. Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies.
- Goodman, P. (1960). *Growing up Absurd: Problems of Youth in the Organized Society*. Random House.
- (1961, March). Pornography, Art, and Censorship. *Commentary*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yfbhhj3f>.
- Goodnick, B. (1993). Jacob Freud's birthday greeting to his son Alexander. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 53(3), 255–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01248336>.
- Gordon, S. (1984). *Hitler, Germans, and the "Jewish Question"*. Princeton University Press.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1994). Egalitarian Fiction and Collective Fraud. *Society*, 31, 53–59.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02693231>.
- Gottfried, P. (1993). *The Conservative Movement* (Rev. ed.). Twayne Publishers.
- (1996). On "Being Jewish." *Rothbard-Rockwell Report*, 7(4), 7–10.  
<https://www.unz.com/print/RothbardRockwellReport-1996apr-00007/>.
- (1998). *After Liberalism*. Princeton University Press.
- (2000, June). A Race Apart. *Chronicles*. <https://tinyurl.com/yycytuefw>.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The Mismeasure of Man*. W. W. Norton.
- (1987). *An Urchin in the Storm: Essays about Books and Ideas*. W. W. Norton.
- (1991, June 13). The Birth of the Two Sex World. *The New York Review of Books*.  
<https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1991/06/13/the-birth-of-the-two-sex-world/>.
- (1992, November 19). The Confusion Over Evolution. *The New York Review of Books*.  
<https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1992/11/19/the-confusion-over-evolution/>.
- (1993). Fulfilling the Spandrels of World and Mind. In J. Selzer (Ed.), *Understanding Scientific Prose*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- (1994a, November 28). Curveball. *The New Yorker*, 139–149.



- (1994b, June 30). How Can Evolutionary Theory Best Offer Insights Into Human Development? Invited Address Presented at the Meetings of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- (1996a, September). The Diet of Worms and the Defenestration of Prague. *Natural History*.
- (1996b, November). The Dodo in the Caucus Race. *Natural History*, 105(11).
- (1996c). *The Mismeasure of Man* (Rev. ed.). W. W. Norton.
- (1997, June 26). Evolution: The Pleasures of Pluralism. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://tinyurl.com/5f2tw29v>.
- (1998, March). The Internal Brand of the Scarlet W. *Natural History*, 107, 22–25, 70–78.
- Gould, S. J., & Lewontin, R. C. (1979). The Spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian Paradigm: A Critique of the Adaptationist Programme. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological Sciences*, 205, 581–598. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1979.0086>.
- Graham, H. D. (2003). *Collision Course: The Strange Coincidence of Affirmative Action and Immigration Policy in America*. Oxford University Press. (Original work published 2002).
- Graham, O. (2004). *Unguarded Gates: A History of America's Immigration Crisis*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Granberry, M. (1994, February 15). Backlash to Teaching Chastity: Course in Public Schools That Proclaims Safe-Sex-Is-No-Sex Draws Fire. Backers Praise Push to Stress Morality Over Biology, But Angry Parents See Dangers in a Program They Call Inaccurate and Unrealistic. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/4ymnyf6z>.
- Grant, M. (1921). *The Passing of the Great Race or the Racial Basis of European History* (4th ed.). Scribner.
- Green, J. C. (2000). Religion and Politics in the 1990s: Confrontations and Coalitions. In M. Silk (Ed.), *Religion and American Politics: The 2000 Election in Context*. The Pew Program on Religion and the News Media, Trinity College.
- Green, S. (2004, February 28). Neo-Cons, Israel and the Bush Administration. *CounterPunch*. <https://tinyurl.com/56e4pd2c>.
- Greenberg, C. (1946). Koestler's New Novel. *Partisan Review*, 13(Nov/Dec), 580–582.
- (1949). The Question of the Pound Award. *Partisan Review*, 16(May), 512–522.
- Greenblatt, J. (2018). Foreword. In J. F. Kennedy, *A Nation of Immigrants*. Harper Perennial.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Schuh, E. S. (1994). An Ethnic Bias in Scientific Citations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(6), 623–639. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420240602>.
- Grollman, E. A. (1965). *Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World*. Bloch.
- Gross, B. (1990). The Case of Philippe Rushton. *Academic Questions*, 3(4), 35–46.
- Gross, N., & Fosse, E. (2012). Why Are Professors Liberal? *Theory and Society*, 41(2), 127–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-012-9163-y>.
- Grosskurth, P. (1991). *The Secret Ring: Freud's Inner Circle and the Politics of Psychoanalysis*. Addison-Wesley.
- Grossman, K., Grossman, K. E., Spangler, G., Suess, G., & Unser, L. (1985). Maternal Sensitivity and Newborns' Orientation Responses as Related to Quality of Attachment in Northern Germany. *Growing Points in Attachment Theory and Research. Monographs for the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50(1/2), 233–275. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3333836>.
- Grünbaum, A. (1984). *The Foundations of Psychoanalysis*. University of California Press.
- Guttman, N. (2004, May 31). Prominent U.S. Jews, Israel Blamed for Start of Iraq War. *Haaretz*. <https://tinyurl.com/5n8kahj8>.
- Guyann, J. (2022, December 19). GOP vs. ESG: Why Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis, Republicans Are Fighting 'Woke' ESG Investing. *USA Today*. <https://tinyurl.com/bddas38z>.

- H.R. Rep. No. 109, 1920.  
 H.R. Rep. No. 1182, 1957.  
 H.R. Rep. No. 350, 1924.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and Human Interests* (J. J. Shapiro, Trans.). Beacon Press.  
 (Original work published 1968).
- Hacker, D. (2010). Heritage: Learning From Our Past. *Social Currents*.  
[https://socialistcurrents.org/?page\\_id=621](https://socialistcurrents.org/?page_id=621).
- Hagen, W. W. (1996). Before the "Final Solution": Toward a Comparative Analysis of Political Anti-Semitism in Interwar Germany and Poland. *Journal of Modern History*, 68:351–381.
- Haidar, E. H., & Kettles, C. E. (2024, January 31). Billionaire Megadonor Ken Griffin Says He Will Stop Donations to Harvard. *The Harvard Crimson*. <https://tinyurl.com/3spk43tn>.
- Haidt, J. (2011, January 27). The Bright Future of Post-Partisan Social Psychology. Talk given at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, TX. <http://people.stern.nyu.edu/jhaidt/postpartisan.html>.
- Hajnal, J. (1965). European Marriage Patterns in Perspective. In D. V. Glass & D. E. C. Eversley (Eds.), *Population in History*. Aldine.
- (1983). Two Kinds of Pre-Industrial Household Formation System. In R. Wall, J. Robin, & P. Laslett (Eds.), *Family Forms in Historic Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hale, N. G. (1995). *The Rise and Crisis of Psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud and the Americans, 1917–1985*. Oxford University Press.
- Haliczer, S. (1989). The Outsiders: Spanish History as a History of Missed Opportunities. In W. D. Phillips, & C. R. Phillips (Eds.), *Marginated Groups in Spanish and Portuguese History*. Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies.
- Halverson, C. F., & Waldrop, M. F. (1970). Maternal Behavior Toward Own and Other Preschool Children. *Developmental Psychology*, 12, 107–112.
- Hamilton, D. (2000, October 3). Keeper of the Flame: A Blacklist Survivor. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2000-oct-03-cl-30614-story.html>.
- Hammer, M. F., Redd, A. J., Wood, E. T., Bonner, M. R., Jarjanazi, H., Karafet, T., Santachiara-Benerecetti, S., Oppenheim, A., Jobling, M. A., Jenkins, T., Ostrer, H., & Bonn  -Tamir, B. (2000). Jewish and Middle Eastern Non-Jewish Populations Share a Common Pool of Y-Chromosome Biallelic Haplotypes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(12), 6769–6774. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.100115997>.
- Hanawalt, B. (1986). *The Ties that Bind: Peasant Families in Medieval England*. Oxford University Press.
- Handlin, O. (1945). Return of the Puritans. *Partisan Review*, 12(2), 268–269.
- (1947, January). Democracy Needs the Open Door. *Commentary*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/2z9msyyz>.
- (1952, July). The Immigration Fight Has Only Begun: Lessons of the McCarran-Walter Setback. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/5n8juh65>.
- (1957). *Race and Nationality in American Life*. Little Brown & Co.
- (1973). *The Uprooted* (2nd ed.). Little Brown & Co. (Original work published 1951).
- Hannan, K. (2000). Review of *The Culture of Critique*. *Nationalities Papers*, 28(4), 741–742.
- Hapgood, N. (1916, April 15). Jews and the Immigration Bill. *Harper's Weekly*, 62.
- Harris, J. F. (1994). *The People Speak! Anti-Semitism and Emancipation in Nineteenth-Century Bavaria*. University of Michigan Press.
- Harris, M. (1968). *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. Thomas Y. Crowell; Harper & Row.
- Harter, S. (1983). Developmental Perspectives on the Self-system. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Socialization, Personality & Social Development* (Vol. 4). Wiley.

- Hartung, J. (1995). Love Thy Neighbor: The Evolution of In-Group Morality. *Skeptic*, 3(4), 86–99.
- Harup, L. (1978). Class, Ethnicity, and the American Jewish Committee. In J. N. Porter (Ed.), *The Sociology of American Jews: A Critical Anthology*. University Press of America. (Original work published 1972).
- Harvey, I., Persaud, R., Ron, M. A., Baker, G., & Murray, R. M. (1994). Volumetric MRI Measurements in Bipolars Compared With Schizophrenics and Healthy Controls. *Psychological Medicine*, 24(3), 689–699. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291700027847>.
- Haslam, M. (1978). *The Real World of the Surrealists*. Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Hawkins, F. (1989). *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*. McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hawkins, R. (2007). "Hitler's Bitterest Foe": Samuel Untermyer and the Boycott of Nazi Germany, 1933–1938. *American Jewish History*, 93(1), 21–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/ajh.2007.0025>.
- Heilbrunn, J. (1995, April 20). His Anti-Semitic Sources. *New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/04/20/his-anti-semitic-sources/>.
- (2008). *They Knew They Were Right: The Rise of the Neocons*. Doubleday.
- Heilman, S. (1992). *Defenders of the Faith: Inside Ultra-Orthodox Judaism*. Schocken Books.
- Held, G. F. (2013, July 23). Léon de Poncins: The Problem with the Jews at the Council. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/bdw5es5a>.
- Heller, M. (1988). *Cogs in the Wheel: The Formation of Soviet Man* (D. Floyd, Trans.). Collins Harvill.
- Heller, M., & Nekrich, A. (1986). *Utopia in Power*. Summit.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The WEIRD People in the World: How the West Became Psychologically Peculiar and Particularly Prosperous*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Henriques, R. (1966). Sir Robert Waley Cohen, 1877–1952: A Biography. Secker & Warburg.
- Henry, W. E., Sims, J. H., & Spray, S. L. (1971). *The Fifth Profession*. Jossey-Bass.
- Herder, J. G. (1969). Yet Another Philosophy of History for the Enlightenment of Mankind. In J. G. Herder on Social and Political Culture (F. M. Barnard, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1774).
- Herlihy, D. (1985). *Medieval Households*. Harvard University Press.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. Free Press.
- Hersh, S. M. (1982, May). Kissinger and Nixon in the White House. *The Atlantic*. <https://tinyurl.com/2p9kcame>.
- (2003, May 4). Selective Intelligence. *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2003/05/12/selective-intelligence>.
- (2004, June 20). Plan B: As June 30th Approaches, Israel Looks to the Kurds. *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2004/06/28/plan-b-2>.
- Herskovits, M. J. (1947). *Man and His Works*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- (1953). *Franz Boas: The Science of Man in the Making*. Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hertzberg, A. (1979). *Being Jewish in America: The Modern Experience*. Schocken Books.
- (1985, November 21). The Triumph of the Jews. *New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1985/11/21/the-triumph-of-the-jews/>.
- (1989). *The Jews in America: Four Centuries of an Uneasy Encounter*. Simon & Schuster.
- (1993a, September 23). 'The Great Hatred.' *New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1993/09/23/the-great-hatred/>.
- (1993b, June 24). Is Anti-Semitism Dying Out? *New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1993/06/24/is-anti-semitism-dying-out/>.

- (1995). How Jews Use Antisemitism. In J. A. Chanes (Ed.), *Antisemitism in America Today: Outspoken Experts Explode the Myths*. Birch Lane Press.
- (2003, August 27). The Price of Not Keeping the Peace. *The New York Times*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/232za5ce>.
- Herz, F. M., & Rosen, E. J. (1982). Jewish Families. In M. McGoldrick, J. K. Pearce, & J. Giordano (Eds.), *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*. The Guilford Press.
- Herzl, T. (1960). *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl* (Vol. 2). Herzl Press and Thomas Yoseloff.
- Higham, J. (1984). *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America* (Rev. ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hilzenrath, D. S. (2004, May 24). The Ultimate Insider: Richard N. Perle's Many Business Ventures Followed His Years as a Defense Official. *The Washington Post*.  
<https://drugaddict.livejournal.com/493567.html>.
- Himmelfarb, G. (1991). A Letter to Robert Conquest. *Academic Questions*, 4(Winter), 44–48.
- (1995). *The De-Moralization of Society: From Victorian Virtues to Modern Values*. Knopf.
- Himmelfarb, M. (1974, August). On Leo Strauss. *Commentary*.  
<https://www.commentary.org/articles/milton-himmelfarb-2/on-leo-strauss/>.
- Himmelstrand, U. (1967). Tribalism, National Rank Equilibrium and Social Structure: A Theoretical Interpretation of Some Sociopolitical Processes in Southern Nigeria. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(2), 81–102.
- Hirsh, M. (2003, June 22). Neocons on the Line. *Newsweek*.  
<https://www.newsweek.com/neocons-line-138091>.
- Hitler, A. (1992). *Mein Kampf* (R. Manheim, Trans.). Pimlico. (Original work published 1943).
- Hodges, W. F., Wechsler, R. C., & Ballantine, C. (1979). Divorce and the Preschool Child: Cumulative Stress. *Journal of Divorce*, 3(1), 55–67.  
[https://doi.org/10.1300/J279v03n01\\_06](https://doi.org/10.1300/J279v03n01_06).
- Hoffman, N. von. (1996, April 14). Was McCarthy Right About the Left? *The Washington Post*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/ztpzssjx>.
- Hofstadter, R. (1955). *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR*. Vintage.
- (1965). *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays*. Knopf.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social Identifications*. Routledge.
- (1993). Toward a Single-process Uncertainty-reduction Model of Social Motivation in Groups. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hollinger, D. A. (1996). *Science, Jews, and Secular Culture: Studies in Mid-Twentieth-Century American Intellectual History*. Princeton University Press.
- Holmes, S. (1993). *The Anatomy of Anti-Liberalism*. Harvard University Press.
- Holt, R. R. (1990, January 12). A Perestroika for Psychoanalysis: Crisis and Renewal. Paper Presented at a Meeting of Section 3, Division 39, New York University. (Cited in Richards, 1990.)
- Hook, S. (1948). Why Democracy Is Better. *Commentary*, 5(March), 195–204.
- (1949). Reflections on the Jewish question. *Partisan Review*, 16(5), 463–482.
- (1987). *Out of Step: An Unquiet Life in the 20th Century*. Harper & Row.
- (1989, October). On Being a Jew. *Commentary*.  
<https://www.commentary.org/articles/sidney-hook-2/on-being-a-jew/>.
- Hopkins, B. (1983). *Death and Renewal*. Harvard University Press.
- Horkheimer, M. (1940, June 18). Letter from Max Horkheimer to Edward S. Greenbaum.  
<https://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/horkheimer/content/pageview/3934265>.
- (1941). Art and Mass Culture. *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, 9(2), 290–304.

- (1945, October 11). Letter from Max Horkheimer to Theodor Adorno. <https://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/horkheimer/content/pageview/6322666>.
- (1946a, March 4). Frame of Reference for the Department of Scientific Research and Program Evaluation. American Jewish Committee. P. 13. <https://tinyurl.com/36ba87e7>.
- (1946b, February 14). Letter from Max Horkheimer to John Slauson. American Jewish Committee. <https://tinyurl.com/36ba87e7>.
- (1947). *The Eclipse of Reason*. Oxford University Press.
- (1974). *Critique of Instrumental Reason* (M. J. O'Connell et al., Trans.). Seabury Press.
- (2007). *A Life in Letters: Selected Correspondence* (M. & E. Jacobson, Eds. & Trans.). University of Nebraska Press.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1990). *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (J. Cumming, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1944).
- Horkheimer, M., & Flowerman, S. H. (1950). Foreword to Studies in Prejudice. In T. W. Adorno et al., *The Authoritarian Personality*. Harper and Brothers.
- Horowitz, D. (1997). *Radical Son: A Journey Through Our Time*. Free Press.
- Horowitz, E. (1998). "The Vengeance of the Jews Was Stronger Than Their Avarice": Modern Historians and the Persian Conquest of Jerusalem in 614. *Jewish Social Studies*, 4(2), 1–39.
- Horowitz, I. L. (1987). Between the Charybdis of Capitalism and the Scylla of Communism: The Emigration of German Social Scientists, 1933–1945. *Social Science History*, 11, 113–138.
- (1993). *The Decomposition of Sociology*. Oxford University Press.
- Horowitz, M., Haynor, A., & Kickham, K. (2018). Sociology's Sacred Victims and the Politics of Knowledge: Moral Foundations Theory and Disciplinary Controversies. *The American Sociologist*, 49, 459–495. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-018-9381-5>.
- Horus. (2024). Champions of Judea: On the Supplanting of Pre-World War II British Foreign Policy. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 24(4), 3–33.
- Howard, A. (2025, February 26). Bezos Remakes Washington Post Opinion Page in Defense of 'Personal Liberties and Free Markets.' Politico. <https://tinyurl.com/3cwkJzes>.
- Howe, I. (1976). *The World of Our Fathers*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- (1978). The East European Jews and American culture. In G. Rosen. (Ed.), *Jewish Life in America*. Institute of Human Relations Press of the American Jewish Committee.
- (1982). *A Margin of Hope: An Intellectual Biography*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hughes, C. (2023, November 11). Britain's Synagogues Have Never Been Fuller. *The Spectator*. <https://archive.ph/fSiZr>.
- Hull, D. L. (1988). *Science as a Process: An Evolutionary Account of the Social and Conceptual Development of Science*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hunt, E. (1995). The Role of Intelligence in Modern Society. *American Scientist*, 83(4), 356–368. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29775483>.
- Hutchinson, E. P. (1981). *Legislative History of American Immigration Policy 1798–1965*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Huxley, J. (1942). Preface to *Racialism against Civilization* by Ignaz Zollschan. The New Europe Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Hyman, H. H., & Sheatsley, P. B. (1954). *The Authoritarian Personality: A Methodological Critique*. In R. Christie & M. Jahoda (Eds.), *Studies in the Scope and Method of The Authoritarian Personality*. Free Press.
- Hyman, P. E. (1989). The Modern Jewish Family: Image and Reality. In D. Kraemer (Ed.), *The Jewish Family*. Oxford University Press.
- IASPS. (1996). *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm*. Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies. [https://www.dougfeith.com/docs/Clean\\_Break.pdf](https://www.dougfeith.com/docs/Clean_Break.pdf).

- Inbar, Y., & Lammers, J. (2012). Political Diversity in Social and Personality Psychology. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, 7(5), 496–503.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612448792>.
- Indybay Collective. (2009, June 25). ADL Fails in Its Defamation Campaign Against UCSB Professor. *Indybay: Palestine*.  
<https://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2009/06/25/18603971.php>.
- International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. (n.d.). Working Definition of Antisemitism. Retrieved January 22, 2025 from,  
<https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/working-definition-antisemitism>.
- Irving, D. (1981). *Uprising!* Hodder and Stoughton.
- (1987). *Churchill's War* (Vol. 1). Veritas Publishing Company.
- Isaacs, S. D. (1974). *Jews and American Politics*. Doubleday.
- Isaacson, W. (2023). *Elon Musk*. Simon & Schuster.
- Itzkoff, S. (1991). *Human Intelligence and National Power: A Political Essay in Sociobiology*. Peter Lang.
- Ivers, G. (1995). *To Build a Wall: American Jews and the Separation of Church and State*. University of Virginia Press.
- Ivry, B. (2010, December 1). Sovereign or Beast? *The Forward*.  
<https://forward.com/culture/133536/sovereign-or-beast/>.
- (2012, May 18). Evolutionary Biology After Auschwitz. *The Forward*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/5ekphfyf>.
- Jackson, J. P., & Weidman, N. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Race, Racism, and Science: Social Impact and Interaction*. Rutgers University Press.
- Jackson, W. A. (1986). Melville Herskovits and the Search for Afro-American Culture. In G. W. Stocking Jr. (Ed.), *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and Others: Essays on Culture and Personality* (pp. 195–226). University of Wisconsin Press.
- Jacobs, J. (2015). *The Frankfurt School, Jewish Lives, and Anti-Semitism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacoby, R. (1995). Marginal Returns: The Trouble With Post-Colonial Theory. *Lingua Franca*, 5(6), 30–37.
- Jaffa, H. (1999). Strauss at One Hundred. In K. L. Deutsch, & J. A. Murley (Eds.), *Leo Strauss, the Straussians, and the American Regime* (pp. 41–48). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Jameson, F. (1990). *Late Marxism: Adorno, or, the Persistence of the Dialectic*. Verso.
- Javits, J. (1951, July 8). Let Us Open Again the Gates. *The New York Times Magazine*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yznr9ky5>.
- (1965). *Congressional Record* 111, 24469.
- Jay, M. (1973). *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*. Little, Brown.
- (1980). The Jews and the Frankfurt School: Critical Theory's Analysis of Anti-Semitism. *New German Critique*, 19(Special Issue 1), 137–149. <https://doi.org/10.2307/487976>.
- (1984). *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. University of California Press.
- Jensen, A. R. (1982). The Debunking of Scientific Fossils and Straw Persons. *Contemporary Education Review*, 1(2), 121–135.
- Jensen, A. R., & Weng, L. J. (1994). What Is a Good g? *Intelligence*, 18(3), 231–258.
- Jefábek, H. (2017). *Paul Lazarsfeld and the Origins of Communications Research*. Routledge.
- Jiménez, J., & Barnes, B. (2023, May 19). What We Know about the DeSantis-Disney Dispute. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/article/disney-florida-desantis.html>.
- Johnson, G. (1986). Kin Selection, Socialization, and Patriotism: An Integrating Theory. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 4(2), 127–154.

- (1995). The Evolutionary Origins of Government and Politics. In J. Losco & A. Somit (Eds.), *Human Nature and Politics*. JAI Press.
- Johnson, H. (1956). Psychoanalysis: Some Critical Comments. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 113(1), 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.113.1.36>.
- Johnson, P. (1988). *A History of the Jews*. Harper Perennial. (Original work published 1987).
- Johnston, L., & Hewstone, M. (1990). Intergroup Contact: Social Identity and Social Cognition. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*. Springer-Verlag.
- Jones, D. B. (1972). Communism and the Movies: A Study of Film Content. In J. Cogley (Ed.), *Report on Blacklisting* (Vol. 1: Movies) (pp. 196–304). Arno Press and The New York Times. (Original work published 1956).
- Jones, E. (1953, 1955, 1957). *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*, Vols 1, 2, & 3. Basic Books.
- (1959). *Free Associations: Memories of a Psycho-Analyst*. Basic Books.
- Jones, N. (1996, October). U.S. Jewish Leaders Decry Clinton Refusal to Free Pollard. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*. <https://tinyurl.com/2yx39eu7>.
- Jordan, W. C. (1989). *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Joseph, C. H. (1925, July 10). Behind This Monkey Business. *The Jewish Criterion*, 66(9), 18. <https://tinyurl.com/yc2pm5m4>.
- Joyce, A. (2009, March 3). Free Speech, Jewish Activism, and the Trial of Jez Turner. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/26ntywha>.
- (2012). Revisiting the Nineteenth-Century Russian Pogroms. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 12(2), 61–87.
- (2013, May 10). Justice Denied: Thoughts on Truth, ‘Canards’ and the Marc Rich Case: Part One of Two. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3vk2e3ca>.
- (2014, December 12). John Hagee: A Profile in Pathological Christian Activism. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/yc4ufv5h>.
- (2019a, October 16). “Do Jews Think Differently?”: Aspects of Jewish Self-Glorification. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/yxyxp4jp>.
- (2019b, December 4). Jews, White Guilt, and the Death of the Church of England. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/433pvxj4>.
- (2019c). “Modify the Standards of the In-Group”: Jews and Mass Communication. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 19(2), 3–20.
- (2019d, May 5). Pariah to Messiah: The Engineered Apotheosis of Baruch Spinoza. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/ycyn253s>.
- (2021a, March 20). The Cofnas Problem. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/ms9fx3v8>.
- (2021b). The Jewish Origins of American Legal Pluralism. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 21(3), 81–93.
- (2021c, July 18). Magnus Hirschfeld’s Racism (1934). *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/m22skxsy>.
- (2022, January 16). Free to Cheat: “Jewish Emancipation” and the Anglo-Jewish Cousinhood, Part 1. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/mr2svfyy>.
- (2024a, June 29). Carl Jung and the Jews. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2024/06/29/carl-jung-and-the-jews/>.
- (2024b, June 18). Jews Are Rewarding Black Criminality. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/yww6n2fh>.
- Judah, J. (2023, July 5). ADL CEO: The British Green Party Looks Like the Next Hub of Antisemitism in UK Politics. *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*. <https://tinyurl.com/yysvdjk3>.

- Judis, J. (1990, September 1). The Conservative Crackup. *The American Prospect*.  
<https://prospect.org/power/conservative-crackup/>.
- Jumonville, N. (1991). *Critical Crossings: The New York Intellectuals in Postwar America*. University of California Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1961). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Collins.
- Jussim, L. (2014). *Social Perception and Social Reality: Why Accuracy Dominates Bias and Self-Fulfilling Prophecy*. Oxford University Press.
- Kadushin, C. (1969). *Why People Go to Psychiatrists*. Atherton.
- (1974). *The American Intellectual Elite*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Kagan, R. (2016, May 18). This Is How Fascism Came to America. *The Washington Post*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/5ehm2f6n>.
- (Guest) (2023, February 24). Russia's Invasion of Ukraine: One Year Later [Audio Podcast Episode with Transcript]. *Free Expression with Gerry Baker*. The Wall Street Journal.  
<https://tinyurl.com/9t2azam8>.
- Kahan, S. (1987). *The Wolf of the Kremlin*. William Morrow & Co.
- Kahan Commission. (1983). *The Beirut Massacre: The Complete Kahan Commission Report*. Karz-Cohl.
- Kahn, L. (1985). Heine's Jewish Writer Friends: Dilemmas of a Generation, 1817–33. In J. Reinharz & W. Schatzberg (Eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War*. University Press of New England for Clark University.
- Kallen, H. M. (1915, February 18, 25). Democracy Versus the Melting Pot. *Nation*, 100, 190–194, 217–220.
- (1924). *Culture and Democracy in the United States*. Boni and Liveright.
- (1933, November 21). Letter from Horace Kallen to Franz Boas.  
<https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/92986>.
- (1956). *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kalman, G. B., Maoz, B., & Yaffe, R. (1970). Demographic Survey of an Open Psychiatric Hospital (In Hebrew). *Briut Ziburi (Public Health)*, 13(67).
- Kamen, A. (2003, September 10). Faith-Based Initiative. *The Washington Post*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/4c2yuefk>.
- Kamin, L. (2024, August 14). Here Are Trump's Top Billionaire Donors. *Forbes*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/5498ekcv>.
- Kamin, L. J. (1974a). *The Science and Politics of I.Q.* Erlbaum.
- (1974b). The Science and Politics of I.Q. *Social Research*, 41(3), 387–425.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11630476/>.
- (1982). Mental Testing and Immigration. *American Psychologist*, 37(1), 97–98.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.1.97b>.
- Kamisar, B. (2024, November 8). The Final Price Tag on 2024 Political Advertising: Almost \$11 Billion. *NBCNews*. <https://tinyurl.com/3me97zzs>.
- Kammer, J. (2010, March 11). Immigration and the SPLC. *Center for Immigration Studies*.  
<https://cis.org/Immigration-and-SPLC>.
- Kampelman, Max M. (n.d.) *Trust the United Nations?* Social Democrats. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from <https://tinyurl.com/376f44uf>.
- Kann, K. (1981). *Joe Rapoport: The Life of a Jewish Radical*. Temple University Press.
- Kantor, K. A. (1982). *Jews on Tin Pan Alley: The Jewish Contribution to American Popular Music, 1830–1940*. KTAV Publishing.
- Kapel, M., (1997, August 29–September 11). Bad Company. *Australia/Israel Review*, 22(12).
- Kaplan, D. M. (1967). Freud and His Own Patients. *Harper's*, 235(December), 105–106.  
<https://harpers.org/archive/1967/12/freud-and-his-own-patients/>.



- Kaplan, L. F. (2003, February 18). Toxic Talk on War. *The Washington Post*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/3236vevc>.
- Karabel, J. (2005). *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Harper.
- Kasnyik, M. (2025, February 19). Orban Orders Media and NGOs Crackdown Over Foreign Funding. *Bloomberg*. <https://tinyurl.com/2wzupuwh>.
- Katz, J. (1983, July). Misreadings of Anti-Semitism. *Commentary*.  
<https://www.commentary.org/articles/jacob-katz/misreadings-of-anti-semitism/>.
- (1985). German Culture and the Jews. In J. Reinharz & W. Schatzberg (Eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War*. University Press of New England for Clark University.
- (1986). *Jewish Emancipation and Self-Emancipation*. Jewish Publication Society of America.
- (1996, February). Leaving the Ghetto. *Commentary*.  
<https://www.commentary.org/articles/jacob-katz/leaving-the-ghetto/>.
- Katzenberger, T. (2024, October 23). LA Times editor resigns after owner blocked presidential endorsement. *Politico*. <https://tinyurl.com/2efvh6h9>.
- Kaufman, J. (1997). Blacks and Jews: The Struggle in the Cities. In J. Salzman, & C. West (Eds.), *Struggles in the Promised Land: Toward a History of Black-Jewish Relations in the United States*. Oxford University Press.
- Kaufman, R. G. (2000). *Henry M. Jackson: A Life In Politics*. University of Washington Press.
- Kaufmann, E. P. (2004). *The Rise and Fall of Anglo-America*. Harvard University Press.
- Kaus, M. (1995). *The End of Equality* (2nd ed.). Basic Books.
- Keegan, J. (1993). *A History of Warfare*. Knopf.
- Keeley, L. H. (1996). *War Before Civilization*. Oxford University Press.
- Kehoe, A. B. (2014). *A Passion for the True and Just: Felix and Lucy Kramer Cohen and the Indian New Deal*. University of Arizona Press.
- Keinon, H. (2020, June 18). Twenty-six Years After His Death . . . the Rebbe's Beat Goes On. *The Jerusalem Post*. <https://tinyurl.com/mrxntyst>.
- Keller, B. (2002, September 22). The Sunshine Warrior. *The New York Times Magazine*.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/22/magazine/the-sunshine-warrior.html>.
- Kellogg, M. (2005). *The Russian Roots of Nazism: White Émigrés and the Making of National Socialism, 1917–1945*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kerr, J. (1992). *A Most Dangerous Method: The Story of Jung, Freud, and Sabina Spielrein*. Knopf.
- Kerr, W. (1968, April 14). Skin Deep Is Not Good Enough. *The New York Times*, D1, D3.
- Kessler, J. (1999). *Poisoning the Web: Hatred Online: An ADL Report on Internet Bigotry, Extremism and Violence, Featuring 10 Frequently Asked Questions About the Law and Hate on the Internet*. Anti-Defamation League.
- Kettler, D., & Lauer, G. (2005). *Exile, Science and Bildung: The Contested Legacies of German Emigre Intellectuals*. Palgrave.
- Keve, T. (2012). *Ferenczi and Ortqvay: Two Boys from Miskolc*. Routledge.
- Kevles, D. (1985). *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*. Knopf.
- Kiell, N. (Ed.). (1988). *Freud Without Hindsight: Reviews of His Work (1893–1939)*. International Press.
- Kierkegaard, E. (2024). The Politics of Sociology. Just Emil Kirkegaard Things.  
<https://www.emilkirkegaard.com/p/the-politics-of-sociology>.
- Kiernan, T. (1986). *Citizen Murdoch*. Dodd, Mead & Company.
- Kilgore, E. (2024, May 2). MTG and Matt Gaetz Manage to Smear Both Jews and Fellow Christians. *Intelligencer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3zycade>.

- Kimball, R. (1995). Farewell to the MLA. *The New Criterion*.  
<https://newcriterion.com/article/farewell-to-the-mla/>.
- Kimberly Kagan. (2024, November 17). In Wikipedia.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kimberly\\_Kagan&oldid=1258021331](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Kimberly_Kagan&oldid=1258021331).
- Kirsch, T. B. (2000). *The Jungians: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*. Routledge.
- (2016). Jung's Relationship with Jews and Judaism. In E. Kiehl, M. Saban, & A. Samuels (Eds.), *Analysis and Activism: Social and Political Contributions of Jungian Psychology*. Routledge.
- Klafter, A. (2020). Anti-Semitism: A Psychoanalytic Perspective. In H. S. Moffic, J. R. Peteet, A. Hankir, & M. V. Seeman (Eds.), *Anti-Semitism and Psychiatry: Recognition, Prevention, and Interventions*. Springer, Cham.
- Klehr, H. (1978). *Communist Cadre: The Social Background of the American Communist Party Elite*. Hoover Institution Press.
- Klehr, H., Haynes, J. E., & Firsov, F. I. (1995). *The Secret World of American Communism* (T. D. Sergay, Trans.). Yale University Press.
- Klein, D. B. (1981). *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement*. Praeger Publishers.
- Klein Halevi, Y. (1996, December 26). Zionism, Phase II. *The Jerusalem Report*, 12–18.
- (2001, February 7). Sharon Has Learned from His Mistakes. *Los Angeles Times*.  
<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2001-feb-07-me-22176-story.html>.
- Kleiner, R. (1988, March 17). Archives to throw new light on Ehrenburg. *Canadian Jewish News*, 9.
- Kline, P., & Cooper, C. (1984). A Factor Analysis of the Authoritarian Personality. *British Journal of Psychology*, 75(2), 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1984.tb01888.x>.
- Kluckhohn, C., and Prufer, O. (1959). Influences During the Formative Years. In M. Goldschmidt (Ed.), *The Anthropology of Franz Boas* (pp. 4–28). American Anthropology Association.
- Knodel, J. (1974). *The Decline in Fertility in Germany, 1871–1979*. Princeton University Press.
- Koestler, A. (1971). *The Case of the Midwife Toad*. Random House.
- (1976). *The Thirteenth Tribe: The Khazar Empire and Its Heritage*. Random House.
- Koffman, D. S. (2019). *The Jews' Indian: Colonialism, Pluralism, and Belonging in America*. Rutgers University Press.
- Kohler, K. (1968). *Jewish Theology*. KTAV Publishing House (Original work published in 1918).
- Konvitz, M. (1953). *Civil Rights in Immigration*. Cornell University Press.
- (1978). The Quest for Equality and the Jewish Experience. In G. Rosen (Ed.), *Jewish Life in America*. Institute of Human Relations Press of the American Jewish Committee.
- Kornberg, R. (1993). *Theodore Herzl: From Assimilation to Zionism*. Indiana University Press.
- Kostyrchenko, G. (1995). *Out of the Red Shadows: Anti-Semitism in Stalin's Russia*. Prometheus Books.
- Kotkin, J. (1993). *Tribes: How Race, Religion and Identity Determine Success in the New Global Economy*. Random House.
- Kovács, M. M. (1994). *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburg to the Holocaust*. Oxford University Press.
- Kramer, H. (1996, September). Reflections on the History of *Partisan Review*. *The New Criterion*. <https://tinyurl.com/2wze9bee>.
- Krauthammer, C. (2002a, June 10). He Tarries: Jewish Messianism and the Oslo Peace [Lecture Transcript]. Lecture given at Bar-Ilan University.  
<https://www.imra.org.il/story.php?id=12456>.
- (2002b, April 29). Please Excuse the Jews for Living. *Jerusalem Post*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/y5776rrs>.

- (2004a). *Democratic Realism: An American Foreign Policy for a Unipolar World*. The AEI Press.
- (2004b, March 5). Gibson's Blood Libel. *The Washington Post*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/4v7dw636>.
- Krispenz, A., & Bertrams, A. (2024). Understanding Left-Wing Authoritarianism: Relations to the Dark Personality Traits, Altruism, and Social Justice Commitment. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 43(3), 2714–2730. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04463-x>.
- Kristol, I. (1983). *Reflections of a Neoconservative*. Basic Books.
- (1984, July). The Political Dilemma of American Jews. *Commentary*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/4fbdf4wb>.
- (2003, August 25). The Neoconservative Persuasion. *The Weekly Standard*, 8(47), 23.
- Krizman, G. (1998, January). 50 Years: SAG Remembers the Blacklist. *National Screen Actor* (Spec Iss). [https://www.cobbles.com/simpp\\_archive/linkbackups/huac\\_blacklist.htm](https://www.cobbles.com/simpp_archive/linkbackups/huac_blacklist.htm).
- Kroeber, A. L. (1943). Franz Boas: The Man. *American Anthropologist*, 45(3, pt. 2).
- (1956). The Place of Franz Boas in Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 58(1), 151–159.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/665731>.
- Kurzweil, E. (1989). *The Freudians: A Comparative Perspective*. Yale University Press.
- Kwiatkowski, K. (2004a, March 10). The New Pentagon Papers. *Salon*.  
[https://www.salon.com/2004/03/10/osp\\_moveon/](https://www.salon.com/2004/03/10/osp_moveon/).
- (2004b, January 19). Open Door Policy. *The American Conservative*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/5n7jvaaj>.
- Lacouture, J. (1995). *Jesuits: A Multibiography* (J. Legatt, Trans.). Counterpoint.
- LaFranco, R. & Peterson-Withorn, C., Eds. (2023). The Forbes 400: The Definitive Ranking of the Wealthiest Americans in 2023. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/forbes-400/>.
- Lakoff, R. T., & Coyne, J. C. (1993). *Father Knows Best: The Use and Abuse of Power in Freud's Case of "Dora"*. Teachers College Press.
- Lamb, B. (1990, June 17). Judith Miller: Author of "One, By One, By One: Facing the Holocaust" [Television Broadcast Transcript]. *Booknotes. C-SPAN*. <https://booknotes.c-span.org/Watch/12729-1>.
- Landau, D. (1993). *Piety and Power: The World of Jewish Fundamentalism*. Hill and Wang.
- Landmann, M. (1984). Critique of Reason: Max Weber to Jürgen Habermas. In J. Marcus, & Z. Tarr (Eds.), *Foundations of the Frankfurt School of Social Research*. Transaction Books.
- Langbert, M., Quain, A. J., & Klein, D. B. (2016). Faculty Voter Registration in Departments of Economics, History, Journalism, Law and Psychology. *Econ Journal Watch*, 13(3), 4122–451.
- Langdon, J. E. (2008). *Caught in the Crossfire: Adrian Scott and the Politics of Americanism in 1940s Hollywood*. Columbia University Press.
- Lapin, A. (2023, November 20). Why ADL Chief Jonathan Greenblatt Is Praising Musk as Advertisers Flee X over Antisemitism. *Jewish Telegraph Agency*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yc6wy25z>.
- Laqueur, W. (1974). *Weimar: A Cultural History 1918–1933*. Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Larsen, R. J., & Diener, E. (1992). Problems and Promises with the Circumplex Model of Emotion. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 13, 25–59.
- Lasch, C. (1991). *The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics*. W. W. Norton.
- Laslett, P. (1983). Family and Household as Work Group and Kin Group: Areas of Traditional Europe Compared. In R. Wall, J. Robin, & P. Laslett (Eds.), *Family Forms in Historic Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Laskin, J. (2007). *Jimmy Carter's War against the Jews*. David Horowitz Freedom Center.

- Laughland, J. (2003, June 30). Flirting with Fascism: Neocon Theorist Michael Ledeen Draws More From Italian Fascism Than From the American Right. *The American Conservative*. <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/flirting-with-fascism/>.
- Layton-Henry, Z. (1992). *The Politics of Immigration: Immigration, "Race" and "Race" Relations in Post-War Britain*. Blackwell.
- Lazarsfeld, P., & Merton, R. K. (1948). The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. In L. Bryson (Ed.), *The Communication of Ideas*, 554–578. University of Illinois Press.
- Le Roy Ladurie, E. (1987). *The French Peasantry 1450–1660* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1977).
- Lebrecht, N. (2019, October 5). Do Jews Think Differently? *The Spectator*. <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/do-jews-think-differently/>.
- Ledeen, M. (2002). *War on the Terror Masters: Why It Happened, Where We Are Now, Why We'll Win*. St. Martin's Press.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1993). Ethnocentric History From Aristobulus to Bernal. *Academic Questions*, 6(2), 12–20.
- Leftwich, J. (1957). *Israel Zangwill*. Thomas Yoseloff.
- Lehrman, D. S. (1970). Semantic and Conceptual Issues in the Nature-nurture Problem. In L. R. Aronson, E. Tobach, D. S. Lehrman, & J. S. Rosenblatt (Eds.), *The Development and Evolution of Behavior*. W. H. Freeman.
- Lenz, F. (1931). The Inheritance of Intellectual Gifts. In E. Baur, E. Fischer, & F. Lenz (Eds.), *Human Heredity* (E. & C. Paul, Trans.). Macmillan.
- Lerer, L., & Medina, J. (2021, May 18). Tensions Among Democrats Grow Over Israel as the Left Defends Palestinians. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/ys5cj53x>.
- Lerner, M. (1957). *America as a Civilization: Life and Thought in the United States Today*. Simon & Schuster.
- Lerner, R., Nagai, A. K., & Rothman, S. (1996). *American Elites*. Yale University Press.
- Lerner, R. M. (1992). *Final Solutions: Biology, Prejudice, and Genocide*. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Lerner, R. M., & von Eye, A. (1992). Sociobiology and Human Development: Arguments and Evidence. *Human Development*, 35(1), 12–33. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000277110>.
- Levav, I., Kohn, R., Golding, J. M., & Weissman, M. M. (1997). Vulnerability of Jews to Affective Disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154(7), 941–947. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.154.7.941>.
- Levenson, A. (1989). Reform Attitudes, in the Past, Toward Inter-marriage. *Judaism*, 38(3), 320–332.
- Levey, G. B. (1996). The Liberalism of American Jews: Has It Been Explained? *British Journal of Political Science*, 26(3), 369–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S000712340000750X>.
- Levin, N. (1977). *While Messiah Tarried: Jewish Socialist Movements, 1871–1917*. Schocken Books.
- (1988). *The Jews in the Soviet Union Since 1917: Paradox of Survival* (Vols. 1–2). New York University Press.
- Levine, D. L. (1994). Without Malice but With Forethought. In K. L. Deutsch, & W. Nicgorski (Eds.), *Leo Strauss: Political Philosopher and Jewish Thinker*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Levins, R., & Lewontin, R. C. (1985). *The Dialectical Biologist*. Harvard University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., & Eribon, D. (1991). *Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss* (P. Wissing, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Levy, R. S. (1975). *The Downfall of the Anti-Semitic Political Parties in Imperial Germany*. Yale University Press.
- Lewin, R. (1992). *Complexity*. MacMillan.

- Lewis, B. (1984). *The Jews of Islam*. Princeton University Press.
- Lewis, D. L. (1984). Shortcuts to the Mainstream: Afro-American and Jewish Notables in the 1920s and 1930s. In J. R. Washington (Ed.), *Jews in Black Perspective: A Dialogue* (pp. 83–97). Fairleigh Dickinson University; Associated University Presses.
- (1992). Parallels and Divergences. In J. Salzman (Ed.), *Bridges and Boundaries: African Americans and American Jews: Strategies of Afro-American and Jewish Elites from 1910 to the Early 1930s* (pp. 17–35). George Braziller.
- Lewis, H. S. (2020). Who's Who in the Age of Boas: The Sponsors of Anthropological Papers Written in Honor of Franz Boas (1906). *Bérose - Encyclopédie internationale des histoires de l'anthropologie*. <https://www.berose.fr/article2087.html?lang=fr>
- Lewis, J. E., DeGusta, D., Meyer, M. R., Monge, J. M., Mann, A. E., Holloway, R. L. (2011). The Mismeasure of Science: Stephen Jay Gould versus Samuel George Morton on Skulls and Bias. *PLOS Biology* 9(6): e1001071. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001071>.
- Lewontin, R. C. (1992, May 28). The Dream of the Human Genome: Doubts About the Human Genome Project. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1992/05/28/the-dream-of-the-human-genome/>.
- (1994a, April 7). Women Versus the Biologists. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1994/04/07/women-versus-the-biologists/>.
- (1994b, July 14). Women Versus the Biologists: An Exchange. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://tinyurl.com/bdfykrp>.
- (1997, October 23). The Confusion Over Cloning. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1997/10/23/the-confusion-over-cloning/>.
- Lewontin, R. C., & Levins, R. (1985). *The Dialectical Biologist*. Harvard University Press.
- Lewontin, R. C., Rose, S. J., & Kamin, L. (1984). *Not in Our Genes: Biology, Ideology, and Human Nature*. Pantheon.
- Lichter, S. R., Lichter, L. S., & Rothman, S. (1983). Hollywood and America: The Odd Couple. *Public Opinion*, 5(Dec./Jan.), 54–58.
- (1986). *The Media Elite: America's New Powerbrokers*. Adler & Adler
- (1994). *Prime Time: How TV Portrays American Culture*. Regnery.
- Liebman, A. (1979). *Jews and the Left*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Liebman, C. (1973). *The Ambivalent American Jew: Politics, Religion, and Family in American Jewish Life*. Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Lilienthal, A. M. (1978). *The Zionist Connection: What Price Peace?* Dodd, Mead.
- Lilla, M. (1995, May 25). The Riddle of Walter Benjamin. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/05/25/the-riddle-of-walter-benjamin/>.
- (1998, June 25). The Politics of Jacques Derrida. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1998/06/25/the-politics-of-jacques-derrida/>.
- Lincoln, W. B. (1989). *Red Victory: A History of the Russian Civil War*. Simon and Schuster.
- Lind, M. (1995a, April 20). On Pat Robertson: His Defenders. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/04/20/on-pat-robertson-his-defenders/>.
- (1995b, February 2). Rev. Robertson's Grand International Conspiracy Theory. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://tinyurl.com/3u4afxmn>.
- (2003, June 30). I Was Smeared. *History News Network*. <http://hnn.us/articles/1530.html>.
- Lindbergh, A. M. (1980). *War Within and Without: Diaries and Letters of Anne Morrow Lindbergh*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Lindbergh, C. A. (1939, November). Aviation, Geography, and Race. *Reader's Digest*, 35, 64–67.
- Lindemann, A. S. (1991). *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank) 1894–1915*. Cambridge University Press.

- (1997). *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liphshiz, C. (2017, November 6). What Was the Jewish Role in the 1917 Russian Revolution: Moscow Museum Gives a Full Picture. *Jewish Telegraph Agency*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/37up5ecw>.
- Lippmann, W. (1922, April 14). Public Opinion and the American Jew. *The American Hebrew*, 575.
- Lipset, S. M. (1971). *Rebellion in the University*. Little, Brown.
- (1988). *Revolution and Counterrevolution: Change and Persistence in Social Structures* (Rev. ed.). Transaction. (Original work published 1968).
- Lipset, S. M., & Ladd, Jr., E. C. (1971). Jewish Academics in the United States: Their Achievements, Culture and Politics. *The American Jewish Yearbook*, 72, 89–112.
- Lipset, S. M., & Raab, E. (1970). *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790–1970*. Harper & Row.
- (1995). *Jews and the New American Scene*. Harvard University Press.
- Liskofsky, S. (1966). United States Immigration Policy. *American Jewish Yearbook*, 67, 164–175.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23604995>.
- Liss, J. E. (1998). Diasporic Identities: The Science and Politics of Race in the Work of Franz Boas and W. E. B. Du Bois, 1894–1919. *Cultural Anthropology*, 13(2), 127–166.
- List of assets owned by the Walt Disney Company. (2024, February 16). In *Wikipedia*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/vdkhbs6>.
- List of assets owned by Warner Bros. Discovery. (2024, February, 19). In *Wikipedia*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/4srcdu4f>.
- Liukkonen, P. (2008). Ben Hecht (1893–1964). Kirjasto. <https://archive.ph/dFXJz>.
- Lobe, J. (2002a, September 12). The Anniversary of a Neo-Imperial Moment. *AlterNet.org*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yvb2wtjk>.
- (2002b, December 19). Bush's Trusty New Mideast Point Man. *Asia Times*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/2emzscm7>.
- (2003a, March 7). All in the Family. *Inter Press Service News Agency*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/772jw77f>.
- (2003b, August 7). Pentagon Office Home to Neo-Con Network. *Antiwar.com*.  
<https://www.antiwar.com/ips/lobe080703.html>.
- (2003c, August 12). What Is a Neo-Conservative Anyway? *Inter Press Service News Agency*. <https://tinyurl.com/2d32zva6>.
- Locke, R. (2002, May 31). Leo Strauss, Conservative Mastermind. *Front Page Magazine*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/3w9cdabs>.
- Loewenberg, P. (1979). Walther Rathenau and the Tensions of Wilhelmine Society. In D. Bronsen (Ed.), *Jews and Germans from 1860 to 1933: The Problematic Symbiosis*. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lowenstein, S. M. (1983). Jewish Residential Concentration in Post-Emancipation Germany. *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 28, 471–495.
- (1992). *The Mechanics of Change: Essays in the Social History of German Jewry*. Scholars Press.
- Lowenthal, L. (1947, August). Heine's Religion: The Messianic Ideals of the Poet. *Commentary*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/bde3pd9e>.
- Lowenthal, L., & Guterman, N. (1970). *Prophets of Deceit: A Study of the Techniques of an American Agitator* (2nd ed.). Pacific Books. (First edition published in 1949 as Publication No. I of the American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series by Harper & Brothers).
- Lu, C. (2025, February 18). The Speech That Stunned Europe. *Foreign Policy*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/586bmjvt>.

- Lynn, R. (1987). The Intelligence of the Mongoloids: A Psychometric, Evolutionary and Neurological Theory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 8(6), 813–844. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(87\)90135-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(87)90135-8).
- (1996). *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations*. Praeger.
- (2011). *The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish Intelligence and Achievement*. Washington Summit Publishers.
- Lyons, P. (1982). *Philadelphia Communists, 1936–1956*. Temple University Press.
- Lytard, J. F. (1984). *The Post-Modern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (G. Bennington, & B. Mussumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the Context of the Family. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology* (Vol. 4: Socialization, Personality, and Social Development). Wiley.
- MacDonald, K. B. (n.d.). *Campaign Against Me by the Southern Poverty Law Center*. Kevin MacDonald. Retrieved January 27, 2025, from <http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/Beirich.htm>.
- (1983). Production, Social Controls and Ideology: Toward a Sociobiology of the Phenotype. *Journal of Social and Biological Structures*, 6(4), 297–317. [https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/S0140-1750\(83\)90101-X](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/S0140-1750(83)90101-X).
- (1986). Civilization and Its Discontents Revisited: Freud as an Evolutionary Biologist. *Journal of Social and Biological Structures*, 9(4), 307–318. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1750\(86\)90177-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1750(86)90177-6).
- (1988a). *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis*. Plenum.
- (Ed.). (1988b). *Sociobiological Perspectives on Human Development*. Springer-Verlag.
- (1989). The Plasticity of Human Social Organization and Behavior: Contextual Variables and Proximal Mechanisms. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 10(1–3), 171–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(89\)90018-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(89)90018-6).
- (1990). Mechanisms of Sexual Egalitarianism in Western Europe. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 11(3), 195–238. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(90\)90010-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(90)90010-4).
- (1991). A Perspective on Darwinian Psychology: Domain-general Mechanisms, Plasticity, and Individual Differences. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 12(6), 449–480. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(91\)90025-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(91)90025-L).
- (1992). Warmth as a Developmental Construct: An Evolutionary Analysis. *Child Development*, 63(4), 753–773. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131231>.
- (1995a). The Establishment and Maintenance of Socially Imposed Monogamy in Western Europe. *Politics and Life Sciences*, 14, 3–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0730938400011679>.
- (1995b). Evolution, the Five Factor Model, and Levels of Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 63(3), 525–567. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1995.tb00505.x>.
- (1995c). Focusing on the Group: Further Issues Related to Western Monogamy. *Politics and Life Sciences*, 14(1), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0730938400011758>.
- (1997a). The Coherence of Individual Development: An Evolutionary Perspective on Children's Internalization of Parental Values. In J. Grusec, & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and Children's Internalization of Values: A Handbook of Contemporary Theory*. Wiley.
- (1997b). Life History Theory and Human Reproductive Behavior: Environmental/Contextual Influences and Heritable Variation. *Human Nature*, 8, 327–359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02913038>.
- (1998). Evolution, Culture, and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(1), 119–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198291007>.

- (2001). An Integrative Perspective on Ethnicity. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 20(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0730938400005189>.
- (2002a). Henry Ford and the Jewish Question. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 2(4), 53–77. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v2n4/TOQv2n4MacDonald.pdf>.
- (2002b). *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism As a Group Evolutionary Strategy*. Bloomington, IN: Writers Club Press, iUniverse. (Original work published 1994).
- (2002c) What Makes Western Culture Unique? *The Occidental Quarterly*, 2(2), 9–38. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v2n2/TOQv2n2MacDonald.pdf>.
- (2003a). Background Traits for Jewish Activism. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 3(2), 5–37. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v3n2/TOQv3n2MacDonald.pdf>.
- (2003b). Understanding Jewish Influence II: Zionism and the Internal Dynamics of Judaism. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 3(3), 15–44. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v3n3/TOQv3n3MacDonald.pdf>.
- (2004a). *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*. 1st Books Library. (Original work published 1998).
- (2004b). Understanding Jewish Influence III: Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 4(2): 7–74. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v4n2/TOQv4n2MacDonald.pdf>.
- (2005a). Personality, Development, and Evolution. In R. Burgess & K. MacDonald (Eds.), *Evolutionary Perspectives on Human Development* (2nd ed.) (pp. 207–242). Sage Publications.
- (2005b). Stalin's Willing Executioners: Jews as a Hostile Elite in the USSR. Review of Yuri Slezkine's *The Jewish Century*. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 5(3), 65–100. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v5n3/53-km-slezkine.pdf>.
- (2006). Jews, Blacks, and Race. In S. Francis (Ed.), *Race and the American Prospect*. The Occidental Press.
- (2007a, January 31). Mid-East Policy—Immigration Policy: Is the Other Boot About to Drop? VDARE. [http://www.vdare.com/macdonald/070131\\_mideast.htm](http://www.vdare.com/macdonald/070131_mideast.htm).
- (2007b). The Israel Lobby: A Case Study of Jewish Influence. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 7(3), 33–58. <https://www.toqonline.com/archives/v7n3/738MacDonald.pdf>.
- (2008a). Effortful Control, Explicit Processing and the Regulation of Human Evolved Predispositions. *Psychological Review*, 115(4), 1012–1031. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013327>.
- (2008b, August 16). The Neocons Versus Russia. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2008/08/16/the-neocons-versus-russia/>.
- (2008c, November 21). Stalinism Lives—in the CSULB Women's Studies Department. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3pwcbbvx>.
- (2009a, December 7). The ADL: Managing White Rage. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2009/12/07/the-adl-managing-white-rage/>.
- (2009b). Evolution, Psychology, and a Conflict Theory of Culture. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 7(2), 208–233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/147470490900700206>.
- (2009c, May 11). The Hate Crimes Prevention Bill: Why Do Jewish Organizations Support It? VDARE. <https://archive.ph/qYxgL>.
- (2009d, April 25). Jane Harman, Haim Saban, and AIPAC: The Disloyalty Issue in Multicultural America. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2009/04/25/macdonald-harman/>.
- (2009e, March 18). Memories of Madison—My Life on the New Left. VDARE. <https://tinyurl.com/5xdxn6ma>.



- (2010a, April). Evolution and a Dual Processing Theory of Culture: Applications to Moral Idealism and Political Philosophy. *Politics and Culture*, 1.  
<http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/MoralDevelopment1.pdf>.
- (2010b). Why Are Professors Liberals? *The Occidental Quarterly*, 10(2), 57–84.  
<http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/LiberalProfessors-2020.pdf>.
- (2012a, July 31). The Role of Jewish Converts to Catholicism in Changing Traditional Catholic Teachings on Jews. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/2w7mdw8v>.
- (2012b). Temperament and Evolution. In M. Zentner & R. L. Shiner (Eds.), *Handbook of Temperament* (pp. 273–296). Guilford Press.
- (2014, April 6). Is Immigration Really a “Jewish Value”? *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2014/04/06/is-immigration-really-a-jewish-value/>.
- (2015). Eric Kaufmann’s *The Rise and Fall of Anglo-America*. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 15(4), 3–42.
- (2016a, March 3). Bill Kristol prefers Hillary to Trump: What happened to all those conservative principles? *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/4kx6va6t>.
- (2016b, March 29). Jewish Fear and Loathing of Donald Trump, #3: Hitler Comparisons Rampant—But Also, Weirdly, Signs of Second Thoughts. VDARE.  
<https://archive.ph/8v2IT>.
- (2019a). *Individualism and the Western Liberal Tradition: Evolutionary Origins, History, and Prospects for the Future*. CreateSpace.
- (2019b). Joe McCarthy and the Jews. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 19(1), 97–105.
- (2019c) Review of Thomas Wheatland’s *The Frankfurt School in Exile*. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 19(2), 97–123.
- (2020). Foreword to *Battle Lines: Essays on Western Culture, Jewish Influence, and Anti-Semitism* by Brenton Sanderson. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 20(4), 103–108.
- (2022a). Failure of the “Default Hypothesis” of Jewish Influence: The Post-World War II Rise of a Substantially Jewish Elite in the United States and Its Influence on Immigration Policy. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 22(3): 3–53.  
<http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/DefaultHypothesis.pdf>.
- (2022b). The “Default Hypothesis” Fails to Explain Jewish Influence. *Philosophia*, 51, 403.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11406-021-00439-y>.
- (2023a, October 8). The Gaza War and Jewish Identity. *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/bdfp99m2>.
- (2023b). Hatred of Anglos as Central to Multiculturalism in Australia: Review of *Anglophobia: The Unrecognized Hatred*. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 23(4), 115–125.
- (2023c). Historical Writing on Judaism and Anti-Semitism; Review of Classic Essays on the Jewish Question, 1850–1945, edited by Thomas Dalton. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 23(2), 85–112.
- (2023d, October 3). Why Are Jews So Influential? *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2023/10/31/why-are-jews-so-influential/>.
- (2023e, November 7). Will the Gaza War Threaten Jewish Power in the U.S. and Their Status as Occupying the Moral High Ground? *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/42ntfz3s>.
- (2024a, September 7). The Carleson-Cooper Podcast: A Major Step Forward. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/25byvbx>.
- (2024b, November 20). Trump 2.0: Harbinger of a New Elite? *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yvt2vsv6>.
- (2025, February 6). Tucker Interviews Curt Mills: Pushing the Envelope on Mainstream Conservative Foreign Policy. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/nk4e97e4>.

- MacDonald, K., & Gottfried, P. (2000, September). On The Culture of Critique. *Chronicles*.  
<https://chroniclesmagazine.org/polemics-exchanges/on-the-culture-of-critique/>.
- MacDonald, K., Patch, E. A., & Figueredo, A. J. (2016). Love, Trust, and Evolution: Nurturance/Love and Trust as Two Independent Attachment Systems Underlying Intimate Relationships. *Psychology*, 7, 238–253.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2016.72026>.
- Macfarlane, A. (1986). *Marriage and Love in England: Modes of Reproduction 1300–1840*. Basil Blackwell.
- Macmillan, M. (1991). *Freud Evaluated: The Completed Arc*. Elsevier North Holland.
- Magnet, M. (1993). *The Dream and the Nightmare: The Sixties' Legacy to the Underclass*. William Morrow.
- Mahler, J. (1996, February 23). A Scientist Puts “Paleo” Back Into Liberalism. *The Forward*.
- Mahler, R. (1985). *Hasidism and the Jewish Enlightenment: Their Confrontation in Galicia and Poland in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Maier, J. B. (1984). Contribution to a Critique of Critical Theory. In J. Marcus, & Z. Tarr (Eds.), *Foundations of the Frankfurt School of Social Research*. Transaction Books.
- Mann, J. (2004). *Rise of the Vulcans*. Viking.
- Mannoni, O. (1971). *Freud* (R. Belice, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and Validation of Ego-Identity Status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(5), 551–558. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281>.
- (1967). Ego-Identity Status: Relationship to Change in Self-Esteem, “General Maladjustment,” and Authoritarianism. *Journal of Personality*, 35(1), 119–133.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1967.tb01419.x>.
- (1980). Identity in Adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. Wiley.
- Marcia, J. E., & Friedman, M. L. (1970). Ego Identity in College Women. *Journal of Personality*, 38(2), 249–263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1970.tb00007.x>.
- Marcus, J. (1983). *Social and Political History of the Jews in Poland, 1919–1939*. Moulton Publishers.
- Marcus, J., & Tarr, Z. (1986). The Judaic Elements in the Teachings of the Frankfurt School. *The Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, 21, 339–353.
- Marcus, J. R. (1993). *United States Jewry 1776–1985* (Vol. 4). Wayne State University Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Beacon Press.
- (1974). *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. Beacon Press. (Original work published 1955).
- Margalit, A. (1993, November 4). Prophets With Honor. *The New York Review of Books*.  
<https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1993/11/04/prophets-with-honor/>.
- Marshall, R. (2004, March 24). Sharon Offers the Palestinians a Prison Camp and Calls It Peace. *Washington Report on Middle Eastern Affairs*. <https://tinyurl.com/34xs9nkm>.
- Martins, H. (2009, October 23). Choosing the Chosen People. *The Daily Princetonian*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/56cptvvx>.
- Marx, K. (1975). On the Jewish Question. In *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Collected Works* (Vol. 3). International Publishers. (Original work published 1843).
- Maslow, W. (1950, March 27). Is American Jewry Secure? *Congress Weekly*, 17(13), 6–9.
- Massing, M. (1987, June 22). Trotsky's Orphans. *The New Republic*, 18–21.
- (2002, March 11). Deal Breakers. *The American Prospect*. <https://tinyurl.com/4277y8y4>.
- Massing, P. W. (1949). *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Publication No. II of The American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series. Harper & Brothers.

- Masson, J. M. (1984). *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- (1990). *Final Analysis: The Making and Unmaking of a Psychoanalyst*. Addison-Wesley.
- Matteson, D. R. (1974). *Alienation Versus Exploration and Commitment: Personality and Family Corollaries of Adolescent Identity Statuses*. Report from the Project for Youth Research, Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen.
- Mayer, A. (1988). *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken? The "Final Solution" in History*. Pantheon Books.
- Mayer, E. (1979). *From Suburb to Shtetl: The Jews of Boro Park*. Temple University Press.
- Maynard Smith, J. (1995, November 30). Genes, Memes, & Minds. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/11/30/genes-memes-minds/>.
- McConnell, S. (1988a, January). Leaving the Party: The Politics of Sterling Hayden. *The New Criterion*. <https://tinyurl.com/mrxa4kvp>.
- (1988b, May 9). The New Battle Over Immigration. *Fortune*. <https://fortune.com/article/the-new-battle-over-immigration-fortune-1988/>.
- McCormack, D. (1992, November). Immigration and Multiculturalism. Paper Presented at the Second Bureau of Immigration Research Outlook Conference, Sydney, Australia.
- (1994). Immigration and Multiculturalism. In J. Bennett (Ed.), *Censorship Immigration and Multiculturalism*. Australian Civil Liberties Union.
- McGrath, W. J. (1974). Freud as Hannibal: The Politics of the Brother Band. *Central European History*, 7, 31–57.
- (1991, December 5). How Jewish Was Freud? *The New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1991/12/05/how-jewish-was-freud/>.
- McGreal, C. (2022, July 19). Pro-Israel Hardliners Spend Millions to Transform Democratic Primaries. *The Guardian*. <https://tinyurl.com/4drcut4v>.
- McLanahan, S., & Booth, K. (1989). Mother-Only Families: Problems, Prospects, and Politics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51(3), 557–580. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352157>.
- Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization*. W. Morrow.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (Guest). (2025, July 10). Prof. John Mearsheimer : Ukraine/Gaza/Iran: Is Peace Possible? [Video]. In *Judge Napolitano – Judging Freedom*. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RFFzClxBmb8&t>.
- Mearsheimer, J. J., & Walt, S. M. (2007). *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Medding, P. Y. (1977). Towards a General Theory of Jewish Political Interests and Behavior. *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 19, 115–144.
- Medved, M. (1992). *Hollywood vs. America: Popular Culture and the War on Traditional Values*. Harper Collins.
- (1996, August 31). Is Hollywood Too Jewish? *Moment*, 21(4), 36–42.
- Mehler, B. (1984a, August 22). Eugenics: Racist Ideology Makes. *Guardian Weekly News*.
- (1984b, Jan./Feb.). The New Eugenics: Academic Racism in the U.S.A. Today. *Israel Horizons*, 25–27.
- Memmi, A. (1966). *The Liberation of the Jew* (J. Hyun, Trans.). The Viking Press.
- Mendes, P. (2014). *Jews and the Left*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Messer, E. (1986). Franz Boas and Kaufmann Kohler: Anthropology and Reform Judaism. *Jewish Social Studies*, 48(2), 127–140.
- Mészáros, J. (2014). *Ferenczi and Beyond: Exile of the Budapest School and Solidarity in the Psychoanalytic Movement During the Nazi Years*. Karnac Books.
- Meyer, M. A. (1989, November 1). Anti-Semitism and Jewish Identity. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/36pc2wva>.

- Michael, J. S. (1988). A New Look at Morton's Craniological Research. *Current Anthropology*, 29(2), 349–354. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2743412>.
- Michaels, R. (1988). The Future of Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 57(2), 167–185. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3375394/>.
- Michels, R. (1915). *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy* (E. & C. Paul, Trans.). Hearst's International Library. (Original work published 1911).
- Miele, F. (1998). The Ionian Instauration. An Interview with E. O. Wilson on His Latest Controversial Book: *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge*. *Skeptic*, 6(1), 76–85.
- (2002). *Intelligence, Race, and Genetics: Conversations with Arthur Jensen*. Westview.
- Migiro, G. (2020, February 13). Fertility Rates In The United States By Ethnicity. *World Atlas*. <https://tinyurl.com/ycyf7zt>.
- Milbank, D. (2002, July 2). A Sound Bite So Good, The President Wishes He Said It. *The Washington Post*. <https://tinyurl.com/mryj66th>.
- Miller, N., Brewer, M., & Edwards, K. (1985). Cooperative Interaction in Desegregated Settings: A Laboratory Analogue. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1985.tb01129.x>.
- Milstein, M. H. (1991, October 27). Strategic Ties or Tentacles? Institute for National Security Affairs. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*. <https://tinyurl.com/52ft59ys>.
- Mintz, J. R. (1992). *Hasidic People: A Place in the New World*. Harvard University Press.
- Miroff, N. (2021, February 14). The Agency Founded Because of 9/11 Is Shifting to Face the Threat of Domestic Terrorism. *The Washington Post*. <https://tinyurl.com/ynxj33nc>.
- Mishkinsky, M. (1968). The Jewish Labor Movement and European Socialism. *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, 11, 284–296.
- Mitchell, D. S. (2007). *Architect of Justice: Felix S. Cohen and the Founding of American Legal Pluralism*. Cornell University Press.
- Moglia, J. (2018, December 9). Quo Vadis Vatican? Jewish Involvement in the Radical Changes of the Second Vatican Council. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3e2wf6dh>.
- Money, J. (1980). *Love, and Love Sickness: The Science of Sex, Gender Differences, and Pair Bonding*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Montgomery, B. (2023, November 16). Elon Musk Agrees with Tweet Accusing Jewish People of “Hatred against Whites.” *The Guardian*. <https://tinyurl.com/n5nsykju>.
- Moore, J. C. (2004, May 27). Not Fit to Print. *Salon*. [https://www.salon.com/2004/05/27/times\\_10/](https://www.salon.com/2004/05/27/times_10/).
- Moore, T. (2021, April 9). Anti-Defamation League Calls for Tucker Carlson to Be Fired. *The Hill*. <https://tinyurl.com/47evrnws>.
- Morris, S. L. (2003, June 27–July 3). Shipwrecked: Swimming with Sharks in a Sea of Arts Funding. *LA Weekly*. <https://tinyurl.com/2ar5nwxv>.
- Morrell, J., & Thackray, A. (1981). *Gentleman of Science*. Oxford University Press.
- Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social Influence and Social Change*. Academic Press.
- Mosse, G. L. (1970). *Germans and Jews: The Right, the Left, and the Search for a “Third Force” in Pre-Nazi Germany*. Howard Fertig.
- (1985). Jewish Emancipation: Between *Bildung* and Respectability. In J. Reinhartz, & W. Schatzberg (Eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War*. University Press of New England for Clark University.
- (1987). *Masses and Man: Nationalist and Fascist Origins of Reality*. Free Press.
- Mosse, W. E. (1987). *Jews in the German Economy: The German-Jewish Economic Élite 1820–1935*. Clarendon Press.
- (1989). *The German-Jewish Economic Élite 1820–1935: A Socio-cultural Profile*. Clarendon Press.

- Mullen, B. (1991). Group Composition, Salience, and Cognitive Representations: The Phenomenology of Being in a Group. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 27(4), 297–323. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(91\)90028-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(91)90028-5).
- Mullen, B., & Hu, L. (1989). Perceptions of In-Group and Out-Group Variability: A Meta-Analytic Integration. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(3), 233–252. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspl003\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspl003_3).
- Muller, J. Z. (2010). *Capitalism and the Jews*. Princeton University Press.
- Mundill, R. R. (1998). *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262–1290*. Cambridge University Press.
- Muravchik, J. (2002). *Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism*. Encounter Books.
- (2003, September). The Neoconservative Cabal. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/5sv7f4cp>.
- Muuss, R. E. H. (1988). *Theories of Adolescence* (5th ed.). Random House.
- Myers, G. (1990). *Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Nadell, P. S. (1984). From Shtetl to Border: Eastern European Jewish Emigrants and the “Agents” System, 1869–1914. In J. R. Marcus & A. J. Peck. Lanham (Eds.), *Studies in the American Jewish Experience II*. University Press of America.
- Nagai, A. K., Lerner, R., & Rothman, S. (1994). *Giving for Social Change: Foundations, Public Policy, and the American Political Agenda*. Praeger.
- Navasky, V. (1980). *Naming Names*. Viking.
- Netanyahu, B. (1966). *The Marranos of Spain*. American Academy for Jewish Research.
- (1995). *The Origins of the Inquisition in 15th-Century Spain*. Random House.
- Neuringer, S. M. (1980). *American Jewry and United States Immigration Policy, 1881–1953*. Adorno Press. (Original work published 1971).
- Neusner, J. (1993). *Conservative, American, and Jewish: I Wouldn't Have It Any Other Way*. Huntingdon House Publishers.
- Ngai, M. M. (2013). Oscar Handlin and Immigration Policy Reform in the 1950s and 1960s. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 32(3), 62–67. <https://doi.org/10.5406/jamerethnhist.32.3.0062>.
- Nolte, E. (1965). *Three Faces of Fascism* (L. Vennowitz, Trans.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Noonan, J. T., Jr. (1967). *Contraception: A History of Its Treatment by the Theologians and Canonists*. New American Library.
- (1973). Marriage in the Middle Ages: 1. Power to Choose. *Viator*, 4, 419–434. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.VIATOR.2.301658>.
- North, G. (2003, June 10). An Introduction to Neoconservatism. [LewRockwell.com](http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north180.html). [www.lewrockwell.com/north/north180.html](http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north180.html).
- Norris, C. (1993). *The Truth about Postmodernism*. Blackwell.
- Norton, A. J., & Miller, L. F. (1992). *Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage in the 1990's*. U.S. Bureau of the Census Current Population Reports Special Studies P23–180.
- Novick, P. (1988). *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge University Press.
- (1999). *The Holocaust in American Life*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Nugent, W. T. K. (1963). *The Tolerant Populists: Kansas Populism and Nativism*. University of Chicago Press.
- NYT Co. (n.d.). New York Times Statement About 1932 Pulitzer Prize Awarded to Walter Duranty. The New York Times Company. Retrieved February 10, 2025, from, <https://tinyurl.com/39vh6tp>.
- NYT Editors. (2004, May 26). The Times and Iraq. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/3auytdw3>.

- Okrent, D. (2004, May 30). Weapons of Mass Destruction? Or Mass Distraction? *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/radcfre5>.
- (2019). *The Guarded Gate: Bigotry, Eugenics and the Law That Kept Two Generations of Jews, Italians, and Other European Immigrants Out of America*. Scribner.
- Orans, M. (1996). *Not Even Wrong: Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans*. Chandler and Sharp Publishers.
- Oren, I. (2003). *Our Enemies and US: America's Rivalries and the Making of Political Science*. Cornell University Press.
- Orgel, S. (1990). The Future of Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 59(1), 1–20.
- Osher, Y., Yaroslavsky, Y., el-Rom, R., & Belmaker, R. H. (2000). Predominant Polarity of Bipolar Patients in Israel. *Biological Psychiatry*, 1(4), 187–189. <https://doi.org/10.3109/15622970009150590>.
- Ostow, M. (1995). *Myth and Madness: The Psychodynamics of Anti-Semitism*. Transaction Press.
- Ostrovsky, V., & Hoy, C. (1990). *By Way of Deception*. St. Martin's Press.
- O'Sullivan, J. (2007, July 30). Getting Immigration Right: How Conservatives Blocked the Open-Borders Establishment. *The American Conservative*. <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/getting-immigration-right/>.
- Ozick, C. (2001, October 28). From Kafka to Babel. *Los Angeles Times Book Review*. <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2001-oct-28-bk-62398-story.html>.
- Panitz, E. (1969). In Defense of the Jewish Immigrant (1891–1924). In A. J. Karp (Ed.), *The Jewish Experience in America* (Vol. 5: At Home in America). KTAV Publishing House.
- Paramount Global. (2024, February 18). In *Wikipedia*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Paramount\\_Global&oldid=1208681007](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Paramount_Global&oldid=1208681007).
- Patai, R., & Patai, J. (1989). *The Myth of the Jewish Race* (Rev. ed.). Wayne State University Press. (Original work published 1975).
- Paul, R. (2003, October 11). National Endowment for Democracy: Paying to Make Enemies for America. *Antiwar.com*. [www.antiwar.com/paul/paul79.html](http://www.antiwar.com/paul/paul79.html).
- Pearl, Jonathon, & Pearl, Judith (1999). *The Chosen Image: Television's Portrayal of Jewish Themes and Characters*. McFarland & Co.
- Pegrum, M. A. (2000). *Challenging Modernity: Dada between Modern and Postmodern*. Berghahn Books.
- Peretz, M. (1997, September 17). The God That Did Not Fail. *The New Republic*. <https://newrepublic.com/article/61283/the-god-did-not-fail>.
- Pérez, J. A., & Mugny, G. (1990). Minority Influence, Manifest Discrimination and Latent Influence. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*. Springer-Verlag.
- Perman, S., Mehta S., & Masunaga, S. (2024, July 24). Hollywood power brokers pushed for Biden to step down. Now they're stepping up for Harris. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/vbeup2v2>.
- Petersen, W. (1955, July). The “Scientific” Basis of Our Immigration Policy. *Commentary*, 20, 77–86.
- Petras, J. (2017, April 17). Judeo-Centrism: Myths and Mania. *The James Petras Website*. <https://petras.lahaine.org/judeo-centrism-myths-and-mania/>.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1958). Personality and Sociocultural Factors in Intergroup Attitudes: A Cross-National Comparison. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(1), 29–42.
- Pew Research Center. (2013, October 1). A Portrait of Jewish Americans [Report]. <https://tinyurl.com/bderc2nf>.
- (2021, May 11). Jewish Americans in 2020. <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2021/05/11/jewish-americans-in-2020/>.

- Philadelphia Anti-Defamation Council, The & The American Jewish Committee. (1941). To *Bigotry No Sanction: A Documented Analysis of Anti-Semitic Propaganda*. The Philadelphia Anti-Defamation Council.
- Phillips, B. A. (2013). New Demographic Perspectives on Studying Inter-marriage in the United States. *Contemporary Jewry*, 33(1-2), 103-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12397-013-9103-9>.
- Phillips, R. (1988). *Putting Asunder: A History of Divorce in Western Society*. Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, W. (1983). *A Partisan View: Five Decades of the Literary Life*. Stein and Day.
- Phillips, W., & Rahv, P. (1946). The "Liberal" Fifth Column: A Discussion. *Partisan Review*, 13(5), 605-621.
- Piccone, P. (1993). Introduction. In A. Arato, & E. Gebhardt (Eds.), *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. Continuum.
- Pilkington, E. (2023, June 6). Harvard Affirmative Action Challenge Partly Based on Holocaust Denier's Work. *The Guardian*. <https://tinyurl.com/364ubrfh>.
- Pincus, W., & D. Priest. (2003, June 4). Some Iraq Analysts Felt Pressure From Cheney Visits. *The Washington Post*. <https://tinyurl.com/yc24nxue>.
- Pinker, S. (1997, October 9). Evolutionary Psychology: An Exchange. *The New York Review of Books*. <https://tinyurl.com/82jv3aum>.
- Pinkus, B. (1988). *The Jews of the Soviet Union: A History of a National Minority*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pipes, D. (2001, November 1). The Danger Within: Militant Islam in America. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/bddc5b8j>.
- (2002). *Militant Islam Reaches America*. W. W. Norton.
- Pipes, R. (1990). *The Russian Revolution*. Knopf.
- (1993). *Russia Under the Bolshevik Regime*. Knopf.
- Plagens, P. (1998, April 12). Nothing If Not Critical. *Los Angeles Times Book Review*, 12.
- Platt, D. (1978). The Hollywood Witchhunt of 1947. In J. N. Porter (Ed.), *The Sociology of American Jews: A Critical Anthology*. University Press of America. (Original work published December 1977 in *Jewish Currents*).
- Plitnick, M. (2023, September 9). How Democrats Learned to Defend Israel's Ethnocracy. *Mondoweiss*. <https://tinyurl.com/y5s5k4pu>.
- PNAC. (1998, January 26). Letter to President Clinton. Project for the New American Century. <https://tinyurl.com/ye86a6wj>.
- (1998b, May 29). Letter to Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. Project for the New American Century. <https://tinyurl.com/bdsa6uxt>.
- (2002, April 3). Letter to President George W. Bush. Project for a New American Century. <https://tinyurl.com/3pdrj4s3>.
- Podhoretz, N. (1961, April). Jewishness & the Younger Intellectuals: Introduction. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/52f6zwzz>.
- (1967). *Making It*. Random House.
- (1978). The Rise and Fall of the American Jewish Novelist. In G. Rosen (Ed.), *Jewish Life in America*. Institute of Human Relations Press of the American Jewish Committee.
- (1979). *Breaking Ranks: A Political Memoir*. Harper & Row.
- (1985, February). The Terrible Question of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/46ftkw4b>.
- (1986, November). The Hate That Dare Not Speak Its Name. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/msurpjyn>.

- (1995, August). In the Matter of Pat Robertson. *Commentary*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/an7hj5bz>.
- (2009). *Why Are Jews Liberals?* Doubleday.
- Poff, J. (2024, September 25). How Universities Are Getting Around the Supreme Court's Affirmative Action Ruling. *Washington Examiner*. <https://tinyurl.com/wzmmwyvx>.
- Pogrebin, L. C. (1991). *Deborah, Golda, and Me*. Crown Books.
- Pollack, L. (1983). *Forgotten Children*. Cambridge University Press.
- Poncins, Vicomte Léon de (1999). *Judaism and the Vatican: An Attempt at Spiritual Subversion*. (T. Tindal-Robertson, Trans.). Christian Book Club of America. (Original work published 1967).
- Poole, R. (2000). Deconstruction. In A. Bullock, & P. Trombley (Eds.), *The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*. HarperCollins.
- Popper, K. R. (1963). *Conjectures and Refutations*. Basic Books.
- (1984). Reason or Revolution? In J. Marcus, & Z. Tarr (Eds.), *Foundations of the Frankfurt School of Social Research*. Transaction Books.
- Porat, D. (Ed.). (1995). *Anti-Semitism Worldwide 1994*. Anti-Defamation League and the World Jewish Congress.
- Porter, R. (1982). Mixed Feelings: The Enlightenment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain. In P. Bouce (Ed.), *Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Manchester University Press.
- Powell, R. A., & Boer, D. P. (1994). Did Freud Mislead Patients to Confabulate Memories of Abuse? *Psychological Reports*, 74(3, Pt 2), 1283–1298.  
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1994.74.3c.1283>.
- Powers, S., Rothman, D. J., & Rothman, S. (1996). *Hollywood's America: Social and Political Themes in Motion Pictures*. Westview Press.
- Pratto, F., Stallworth, L. M., & Sidanius, J. (1997). The Gender Gap: Differences in Political Attitudes and Social Dominance Orientation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(1), 49–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1997.tb01118.x>.
- Prawer, S. S. (1983). *Heine's Jewish Comedy: A Study of His Portraits of Jews and Judaism*. Clarendon Press.
- President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization (PCIN). (1971). *Whom We Shall Welcome*. De Capo Press. (Original work published 1953).
- Pulzer, P. (1964). *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- (1979). Jewish Participation in Wilhelmine Politics. In D. Bronsen (Ed.), *Jews and Germans from 1860 to 1933: The Problematic Symbiosis*. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Quaife, G. R. (1979). *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives: Peasants and Illicit Sex in Early-Seventeenth-Century England*. Croom Helm.
- Quinn, R. (2025, February 17). Education Department Cancels Another \$350 Million in Contracts, Grants. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://tinyurl.com/57ma8xx9>.
- Quinn, S. J. (2021). *Solzhenitsyn and the Right*. Antelope Hill Publishing.
- (2022a). Igor Shafarevich and the Jews. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 22(4), 79–84.
- (2022b). On "Russophobia" and Anti-Semitism. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 22(4), 69–75.
- (2022c, November 8). Punching Back Weakly: William F. Buckley's *In Search of Anti-Semitism*. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3624p3th>.
- Raab, E. (1993a, July 23). Feinstein's Immigration Reform Bill Goes Too Far. *Jewish Bulletin of Northern California*, 142(27), 17. <https://tinyurl.com/vtr3yhnk>.
- (1993b, February 19). Neo-Nazis in Germany, U.S. Aren't the Same. *Jewish Bulletin of Northern California*, 142(7), 23. <https://tinyurl.com/yzvv9sry>.



- (1995). Can Antisemitism Disappear? In J. A. Chanes (Ed.), *Antisemitism in America Today: Outspoken Experts Explode the Myths*. Birch Lane Press.
- (1996). Are American Jews Still Liberals? *Commentary*, 101(2), 43–45.
- Raab, E., & Lipset, S. M. (1959). *Prejudice and Society*. Anti-Defamation League.
- Radosh, R. (2000, October 26). From Walter Duranty to Victor Navasky: The New York Times' Love Affair with Communism. *Front Page Magazine*.
- (2001a). *Commies: A Journey Through the Old Left, the New Left and the Leftover Left*. Encounter Books.
- (2001b, June 5). Should We Ex-Leftists Be Forgiven? *Front Page Magazine*.
- Ragins, S. (1980). *Jewish Responses to Anti-Semitism in Germany, 1870–1914*. Hebrew Union College Press.
- Rahv, P. (1978). Twilight of the Thirties: Passage From an Editorial. In A. Porter, & A. Dvosin (Eds.), *Essays on Literature and Politics 1932–1972*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Raisin, J. S. (1953). *Gentile Reactions to Jewish ideals*. Philosophical Library.
- Rapoport, L. (1990). *Stalin's War Against the Jews: The Doctors' Plot and the Soviet Solution*. Free Press.
- Rasmussen Reports. (2018, June 27). 31% Think a U.S. Civil War Likely Soon. <https://tinyurl.com/2f68v4yk>.
- Rather, L. J. (1986). Disraeli, Freud, and Jewish Conspiracy Theories. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 47(1), 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2709598>.
- (1990). *Reading Wagner: A Study in the History of Ideas*. Louisiana State University Press.
- Ratner, S. (1987). Horace M. Kallen and Cultural Pluralism. In M. R. Konvitz (Ed.), *The Legacy of Horace M. Kallen*. Herzl Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Ray, J. J. (1972). A New Balanced F Scale and Its Relation to Social Class. *Australian Psychologist*, 7(3), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00050067208259935>.
- Raz, N., Torres, I. J., Spencer, W. D., Millman, D., Baertschi, J. C., & Sarpel, G. (1993). Neuroanatomical Correlates of Age-Sensitive and Age-Invariant Cognitive Abilities. *Intelligence*, 17(3), 407–422. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896\(93\)90008-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(93)90008-S).
- Reich, R. (1997). *Locked in the Cabinet*. Scribner.
- Reich, W. (1961). *The Function of the Orgasm: Sex-Economic Problems of Biological Energy* (T. P. White, Trans.). Farrar, Straus & Giroux. (Original work published 1942).
- (1975). *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. Penguin.
- Reichmann, E. (1951). *Hostages of Civilization: The Social Sources of National Socialist Anti-Semitism*. Beacon Press.
- Reiser, M. F. (1989). The Future of Psychoanalysis in Academic Psychiatry: Plain Talk. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 58(2), 185–209.
- Restriction of Immigration: Hearings Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Immigration and Naturalization*, 68th Cong., 1st Sess. (1924).
- Revision of Immigration, Naturalization and Nationality Laws: Joint Hearings Before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary*, 82nd Cong., 1st Sess., on S. 716, H.R. 2379 and H.R. 2816. (1951).
- Reynolds, V. (1991). Socioecology of Religion. In M. Maxwell (Ed.), *The Sociobiological Imagination*. SUNY Press.
- Rice, E. (1990). *Freud and Moses: The Long Journey Home*. SUNY Press.
- Rice, J. L. (1992). *Freud's Russia: National Identity in the Evolution of Psychoanalysis*. Transaction Press.
- Richard, J. (1992). *Saint Louis: Crusader King of France* (S. Lloyd, Ed., abridged) (J. Birrell, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1983).

- Richards, A. D. (1990). The Future of Psychoanalysis: The Past, Present, and Future of Psychoanalytic Theory. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 59(3), 347–369.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21674086.1990.11927276>.
- Richardson, H., & Salter, F. (2023). *Anglophobia: The Unrecognized Hatred*. Social Technologies.
- Richerson, P. J., & Boyd, R. (1995). The Evolution of Human Ultra-sociality. Paper Presented at the Ringberg Symposium on Ideology, Warfare, and Indoctrinability. Ringberg Castle, Germany.
- Richman, J. (2005, August 19). Powerful Gun Lobby Takes Aim with First Jewish Leader. *The Forward*. <https://tinyurl.com/38s2ebz4>.
- Ringer, B. B., & Lawless, E. R. (1989). *Race, Ethnicity and Society*. Routledge.
- Ringer, F. K. (1983). Inflation, Antisemitism and the German Academic Community of the Weimar period. *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 28(1), 3–9.
- Rischin, M. (1978). The Jews and Pluralism: Toward an American Freedom Symphony. In G. Rosen (Ed.), *Jewish Life in America*. Institute of Human Relations Press of the American Jewish Committee.
- Risen, J. (2004, April 28). How Pair's Finding on Terror Led to Clash on Shaping Intelligence. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/mrxy4j3j>.
- Roberts, J. M. (1972). *The Mythology of Secret Societies*. Scribner.
- Roberts, P. C., & Stratton, L. M. (1995). *The New Color Line: How Quotas and Privilege Destroy Democracy*. Regnery Publishing.
- Roberts, P. M. (1984). A Conflict of Loyalties: Kuhn, Loeb and Company and the First World War, 1914–1917. In J. R. Marcus & A. J. Peck (Eds.), *Studies in the American Jewish Experience II*. University Press of America.
- Robertson, P. (1991). *The New World Order*. Word Publishing.
- (1994). *The Collected Works of Pat Robertson*. Inspirational Press.
- Roddy, J., (1966, January 25). How the Jews Changed Catholic Thinking. *Look Magazine*, 30(2).  
<https://www.fisheaters.com/jewsvaticanii.html>.
- Rodríguez-Puértolas, J. (1976). A Comprehensive View of Medieval Spain. In J. Rubia Barcia (Ed.), *Américo Castro and the Meaning of Spanish Civilization*. University of California Press.
- Rogoff, H. (1930). *An East Side Epic: The Life and Work of Meyer London*. Vanguard Press.
- Rolnik, E. J., & Watzman, H. (2012). *Freud in Zion: Psychoanalysis and the Making of Modern Jewish Identity*. Karnac Books.
- Ron, J. (2001, February 5). Is Ariel Sharon Israel's Milosevic? *Los Angeles Times*.  
<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2001-feb-05-me-21284-story.html>.
- Rosen, A. (2024, November 14). Who Won the Jewish Vote? *Tablet*.  
<https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/news/articles/jewish-vote-elections-2024>.
- Rosen, E. J., & Weltman, S. F. (1982). Jewish Families. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giordano, & N. Garcia-Preto (Eds.), *Ethnicity and Family Therapy* (pp. 367–679). The Guilford Press.
- Rosenbaum, S. I. (2019, March 1). A Shocking Number of Jews Have Become Willing Collaborators of White Supremacy. *Boston Globe*. <https://tinyurl.com/bdixe8ts>.
- Rosenberg, M. J. (2019, February 14). This Is How AIPAC Really Works. *The Nation*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/3d4p22de>.
- Rosenblatt, G. (2001, October 25). Will the Jews Be Blamed for Increasing Violence? *Jewish World Review*. <http://www.jewishworldreview.com/1001/be.blamed.html>.
- Rosenblum, J. (2002, July 5). The Power of an Idea. *Jewish Media Resources*.  
[www.jewishmediaresources.com/article/488/](http://www.jewishmediaresources.com/article/488/).
- (2003, June 20). A Vision in Tatters. *Jewish Media Resources*.  
[www.jewishmediaresources.com/article/591/](http://www.jewishmediaresources.com/article/591/).

- Ross, E. A. (1914). *The Old World and the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*. The Century Co.
- Roth, P. (1963, December). Writing About Jews. *Commentary*.  
<https://www.commentary.org/articles/philip-roth/writing-about-jews/>.
- Rothman, S., & Isenberg, P. (1974a, December). Freud and Jewish Marginality. *Encounter*, 43, 46–54.
- (1974b, March). Sigmund Freud and the Politics of Marginality. *Central European History*, 7(1), 58–78. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008938900010475>.
- Rothman, S., & Lichter, S. R. (1996). *Roots of Radicalism: Jews, Christians, and the New Left*. Transaction. (Original work published 1982).
- Rothschild, R. C. (1949). The Use of the Mass Media in Combating Anti-Semitism. American Jewish Committee. <https://tinyurl.com/mwzwt34u>.
- Rouche, M. (1987). The Early Middle Ages in the West. In P. Veyne (Ed.), *A History of Private Life* (Vol. 1). Harvard University Press.
- Rowe, D. C. (1993). *The Limits of Family Influence: Genes, Experience, and Behavior*. Guilford Press.
- Rozenbaum, W. (1973). The Background of the Anti-Zionist Campaign of 1967–1968 in Poland. *Essays in History*, 17, 70–96. <https://doi.org/10.25894/eih.402>.
- (1978). The Anti-Zionist Campaign in Poland, June–December 1967. *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 20(2), 218–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00085006.1978.11091523>.
- Rubinfeld, F. (1997). *Clement Greenberg: A Life*. Scribner.
- Rubenstein, G. (1996). Two Peoples in One Land: A Validation Study of Altemeyer's Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale in the Palestinian and Jewish Societies in Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(2), 216–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022196272005>.
- Rubenstein, J. (1996). *Tangled Loyalties: The Life and Times of Ilya Ehrenburg*. Basic Books.
- (2013). *Leon Trotsky: A Revolutionary's Life*. Yale University Press.
- Rubenstein, W. D. (1982). *The Left, the Right, and the Jews*. Universe Books.
- Rubin, B. (1995a). *Assimilation and Its Discontents*. Times Books/Random House.
- (1995b). American Jews, Israel, and the Psychological Role of Antisemitism. In J. A. Chanes (Ed.), *Antisemitism in America Today: Outspoken Experts Explode the Myths*. Birch Lane Press.
- Rubin, J. [@JRubinBlogger]. (2021, August 12). *a more diverse, more inclusive society. this is fabulous news. now we need to prevent minority White rule.* [Thumbnail with link attached] [Post]. X. <https://x.com/JRubinBlogcxfxger/status/1425899248269266947>.
- Rucker, P. (2014, March 5). Hillary Clinton Says Putin's Actions Are Like What Hitler Did Back in the Thirties. *The Washington Post*. <https://tinyurl.com/ykdutzfr>.
- Rudd, M. (2005) Why Were There So Many Jews in SDS? Or, The Ordeal of Civility. *Fast Capitalism*, 1(2), 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.32855/fcapital.200502.008>.
- Rühle, O. (1935). *Karl Marx: His Life and Work* (E. & C. Paul, Trans.). The Viking Press. (Original work published 1929).
- Ruppín, A. (1913). *The Jews of To-day* (M. Bentwich, Trans.). G. Bell and Sons. (Original work published 1913).
- (1971). *Arthur Ruppín: Memoirs, Diaries, Letters* (A. Bein, Ed.) (K. Gershon, Trans.). Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- (1972). *The Jewish Fate and Future* (E. W. Dickes, Trans.). Greenwood Press. (Original work published 1940).
- (1973). *The Jews in the Modern World*. Arno Press. (Original work published in 1934).
- Ruse, M. (1989). Is the Theory of Punctuated Equilibria a New Paradigm? *Journal of Social and Biological Structures*, 12(2–3), 195–212. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1750\(89\)90045-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1750(89)90045-6).

- Rushton, J. P. (1988). Race Differences in Behavior: A Review and Evolutionary Analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9(6), 1009–1024. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(88\)90135-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(88)90135-3).
- (1989). Genetic Similarity, Human Altruism, and Group Selection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12(3), 503–559. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00057320>.
- (1995). *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life-History Perspective*. Transaction Publishers.
- (1997). Race, Intelligence and the Brain: The Errors and Omissions of the “Revised” Edition of S. J. Gould’s *The Mismeasure of Man*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23(1), 169–180. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(97\)80984-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(97)80984-1).
- Russell, D. A. (1983). Exponential Evolution: Implications for Intelligent Extraterrestrial Life. *Advances in Space Research*, 3(9), 95–103. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-1177\(83\)90045-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-1177(83)90045-5).
- (1989). *The Dinosaurs of North America*. University of Toronto Press.
- Ryan, A. (1994, November 17). Apocalypse Now? (Review of *The Bell Curve*, by R. J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray.) *New York Review of Books*. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1994/11/17/apocalypse-now/>.
- S. Rep. No. 1515. (1950).
- S. Rep. No. 950. (1948).
- Saba, M. P. (1984). *The Armageddon Network*. Amana Books
- Sachar, H. M. (1992). *A History of Jews in America*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sagi, A., Lamb, M. E., Lewkowicz, K. S., Shoham, R., Dvir, R., & Estes, D. (1985). Security of Infant–Mother, –Father, –Metapelet Attachments Among Kibbutz-Reared Israeli Children. In I. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Growing Points in Attachment Theory and Research. Monographs for the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50(1–2), 233–275.
- Saini, A. (2019, May 18). Why Race Science Is on the Rise Again. *The Guardian*. <https://tinyurl.com/yw86mzhu>.
- Sale, K. (1973). SDS. Random House.
- Sales, B. (2025a, February 7). 34 Liberal Jewish Groups Sign a Statement Defending DEI as an ‘Invaluable Tool’. *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*. <https://tinyurl.com/2jxpsnay>.
- (2025b, January 27). Dozens of Jewish Groups Protest Trump’s Plans for Mass Deportation. *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*. <https://tinyurl.com/4yw2trcz>.
- Salter, F. (1998a). A Comparative Analysis of Brainwashing Techniques. In I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt & F. Salter (Eds.), *Ideology, Warfare, and Indoctrinability*. Berghahn Books.
- (1998b). *Ethnic Infrastructures U. S. A.: An Evolutionary Analysis of Ethnic Hierarchy in a Liberal Democracy*. MS in prep., Forschungsstelle Für Humanethologie in der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Andechs, Germany.
- (2000). Is MacDonald a Scholar? Review of *Culture of Critique*. *Human Ethology Bulletin*, 15(3), 16–22. [https://ishe.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/HEB\\_2000\\_15\\_3\\_1-31.pdf](https://ishe.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/HEB_2000_15_3_1-31.pdf).
- (2006). *On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity, and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration*. Routledge.
- Samber, S. (2000, July 26). Cheney Has Earned Jewish Leaders’ Respect. *Jewish World Review*. <http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0700/cheney.jews.html>.
- Samelson, F. (1975). On the Science and Politics of the IQ. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 42(3), 467–488. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41582845>.
- (1979). Putting Psychology on the Map: Ideology and Intelligence Testing. In A. R. Buss (Ed.), *Psychology in Social Context*. Irvington Publishers.
- (1982). H. H. Goddard and the Immigrants. *American Psychologist*, 37, 1291–1292.
- Sammons, J. L. (1979). *Heinrich Heine: A Modern Biography*. Princeton University Press.
- Samuel, M. (with MacDonald, K.). (2022). *You Gentiles*. Antelope Hill Publishing. (Original work published 1924).

- Sandel, M. J. (1996, May 9). Dewey Rides Again. *The New York Review of Books*.  
<https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1996/05/09/dewey-rides-again/>.
- Sanderson, B. (2011a, September 21). Mark Rothko, Abstract Expressionism and the Decline of Western Art. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/yc3s9bef>.
- (2011b, April 13). Why Mahler? Norman Lebrecht and the Construction of Jewish Genius. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/2fyjvndt>.
- (2014, August 8). Australian PM Caves in to Jewish Lobby. *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/4jbhhr2d>.
- (2018). The Genesis of the Radical Left. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 18(2), 69–101.
- (2019). The Alliance of the Jews and the Political Left, 1870–1930. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 19(3), 75–106.
- (2020, December 31). Triggered by Beethoven: The Cultural Politics of Racial Resentment. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/3992r456>.
- (2021, November 6). Evil Genius: Constructing Wagner as Moral Pariah. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/mr3vz594>.
- (2023). Tristian Tzara and the Jewish Roots of Dada. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 23(2), 3–35.
- Sandqvist, T (2006). *Dada East: The Romanians of Cabaret Voltaire*. MIT Press.
- Sarich, V. (1995, February 26). Paper Presented at the Skeptics Society Meetings, at the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA.
- Sarich, V., & Miele, F. (2018). *Race: The Reality of Human Differences*. Routledge.
- Saxon, W. (2003, April 23). Norbert Schlei, 73, Legal Advisor in the Kennedy-Johnson Era. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/4ber7he7>.
- Schapiro, L. (1961). The Role of Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement. *Slavonic and East European Review*, 40, 148–167.
- Schatz, J. (1991). *The Generation: The Rise and Fall of the Jewish Communists of Poland*. University of California Press.
- Schechter, S. (1909 [1961]). *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*. Schocken Books.
- Schiff, J. (1906, February 15). Letter from Jacob Schiff to Franz Boas.  
<https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/122540>.
- Schiller, M. (1996). We Are Not Alone in the World. *Tikkun*, 11(2), 59–60.  
<https://tinyurl.com/2dewurku>.
- Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1947). *The Vital Center: The Politics of Freedom*. Houghton Mifflin
- (1992). *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. W. W. Norton.
- Schmidt, H. D. (1959). Anti-Western and Anti-Jewish Tradition in German Historical Thought. In R. Weltsch (Ed.), *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book: 1959*. East and West Library.
- Schmidt, J. (2007). The Eclipse of Reason and the End of the Frankfurt School in America. *New German Critique*, 34(100), 47–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/0094033X-2006-018>.
- Scholem, G. (1971). *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*. Schocken Books.
- (1976). Walter Benjamin. In W. J. Dannhauser (Ed.), *On Jews and Judaism in Crisis: Selected Essays*. Schocken Books. (Original work published 1965).
- (1979). On the Social Psychology of the Jews in Germany: 1900–1933. In D. Bronsen (Ed.), *Jews and Germans from 1860 to 1933: The Problematic Symbiosis* (pp. 18–20). Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- (1980). *From Berlin to Jerusalem. Memories of My Youth* (H. Zohn, Trans.). Schocken Books.
- Schorsch, I. (1972). *Jewish Reactions to German Anti-Semitism, 1870–1914*. Columbia University Press.
- Schrader, E. (1998, June 20). Reform Jews Seek Revival of Traditions. *Los Angeles Times*.  
<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1998-jun-20-mn-61784-story.html>.

- Schultz, P. W., Stone, W. F., & Christie, R. (1997). Authoritarianism and Mental Rigidity: The Einstellung Problem Revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(1), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167297231001>.
- Schuster, J. K., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Work and Careers*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schwarzschild, S. S. (1979). "Germanism and Judaism"—Hermann Cohen's Normative Paradigm of the German-Jewish Symbiosis. In D. Bronsen (Ed.), *Jews and Germans from 1860 to 1933: The Problematic Symbiosis*. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Scruton, R. (1994). *Modern Philosophy*. Penguin.
- Segerstråle, U. (1986). Colleagues in Conflict: An "In Vivo" Analysis of the Sociobiology Controversy. *Biology and Philosophy*, 1, 53–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00127089>.
- (2000). *Defenders of the Truth: The Sociobiology Debate*. Oxford University Press.
- Selzer, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Understanding Scientific Prose*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sennett, R. (1995). Untitled Letter. *New York Review of Books*, 42(9), 43.
- Shafarevich, I. (1989). Russophobia. *Nash Sovremennik*, 6:167–192. Trans. in JPRS-UPA-90-115 (March 22, 1990):2–37. <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA335121.pdf>.
- Shahak, I. (1994). *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*. Pluto Press.
- Shahak, I., & Mezvinsky, N. (1999). *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*. Pluto Press.
- Shapiro, E. S. (1989). Jewishness and the New York Intellectuals. *Judaism*, 38(3), 282–292.
- (1992). *A Time for Healing: American Jewry since World War II*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shapiro, L. (1961). The Role of the Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement. *Slavonic and East European Studies*, 40(94), 148–167.
- Shavit, A. (1996, May 27). How Easily We Killed Them. *The New York Times*. <https://archive.ph/uTrEk#selection-391.0-391.25>.
- Shaw, S. J. (1991). *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic*. New York University Press.
- Sheehan, M. M. (1978). Choice of Marriage Partner in the Middle Ages: Development and Mode of Application of a Theory of Marriage. *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 1, 1–33.
- Shepherd, N. (1993). *A Price Before Rubies: Jewish Women as Rebels and Radicals*. Harvard University Press.
- Sheppard, R. (1999). *Modernism-Dada-Postmodernism*. Northwestern University Press.
- Shils, E. A. (1956). *The Torment of Secrecy*. Free Press.
- Shipler, D. K. (1981, February 20). Soviet Jews Found to Retain Identity. *The New York Times*. <https://tinyurl.com/35dkbudc>.
- Shipman, P. (1994). *The Evolution of Racism: Human Differences and the Use and Abuse of Science*. Simon & Schuster.
- Short, R. (1994). *Dada and Surrealism*. Laurence King Publishing.
- Silberman, C. E. (1985). *A Certain People: American Jews and Their Lives Today*. Summit Books.
- Silow-Carroll, A. (2023, November 12). American Jews Are Giving Mightily to Israel. Is There Enough Left to Go Around? *Jewish Telegraph Agency*. <https://tinyurl.com/46b3etz7>.
- Simon, J. (1990). *Population Matters: People, Resources, Environment, and Immigration*. Transaction Press.
- Simon Wiesenthal Center. (2003). Buchanan: War in Iraq Fault of Israel and the Jews. Simon Wiesenthal Center. <https://tinyurl.com/3h9vv8b6>.
- Simpson, G. E., & Yinger, J. M. (1965). *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (3rd ed.). Harper & Row.
- Sims, B. (1992). *Workers of the World Undermined: American Labor's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy*. South End Press.

- Singer, D. (1979, July). Living With Inter marriage. *Commentary*.  
<https://www.commentary.org/articles/david-singer-4/living-with-intermarriage/>.
- Singerman, R. (1986). The Jew as Racial Alien. In D. A. Gerber (Ed.), *Anti-Semitism in American History*. University of Illinois Press.
- Sirkin, M. I., & Grellong, B. A. (1988). Cult and Non-Cult Jewish Families: Factors Influencing Conversion. *Cultic Studies Journal*, 5(1), 2–22.
- Sklare, M. (1972). *Conservative Judaism* (2nd ed.). Schocken Books.
- Sklare, M., & Vosk, M. (1957). The Riverton Study: How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors. *American Jewish Committee*. <https://tinyurl.com/bdh7zp8w>.
- Skorecki, K., Selig, S., Blazer, S., Bradman, R., Bradman, N., Waburton, P. J., Ismajłowicz, M., & Hammer, M. F. (1997). Y Chromosomes of Jewish Priests. *Nature*, 385(6611), 32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/385032a0>.
- Sky Group. (2024, February 19). In *Wikipedia*.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sky\\_Group&oldid=1208831488](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sky_Group&oldid=1208831488).
- Slezkine, Y. (2004). *The Jewish Century*. Princeton University Press.
- Smith, G. (1972). *Essays on Questions of the Day* (2nd ed.). Books for Libraries Press. (Original work published 1894).
- Smith, R. M. (1988). The “American Creed” and American Identity: The Limits of Liberal Citizenship in the United States. *Western Political Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 225–251.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/106591298804100202>.
- Smith, M. S. (2023, July 12). How Jeremy Corbyn Was Toppled by the Israel Lobby. *Mondoweiss*. <https://tinyurl.com/58e6379c>.
- Smith, T. W. (1994). *Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America*. American Jewish Committee.
- Smootha, S. (1990). Minority Status in an Ethnic Democracy: The Status of the Arab Minority in Israel. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 13(3), 389–413.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.1990.9993679>.
- Snow, R. L. (2003). *Deadly Cults: The Crimes of True Believers*. Praeger.
- Snyderman, M., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1983). Intelligence Tests and the Immigration Act of 1924. *American Psychologist*, 38(9), 986–995. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.38.9.986>.
- Sobran, J. (1995, September). The Jewish Establishment. *Sobran's*, 2(9), 4–5.  
<http://www.sobran.com/establishment.shtml>.
- (1996a). The Buchanan Frenzy. *Sobran's*, 3(3), 3–4.
- (1996b, June 13). In Our Hands. *The Wanderer*.  
<http://www.sobran.com/columns/2005/050414.shtml>.
- (1999, October 26). Smearing Buchanan. *The Wanderer*.  
<http://www.sobran.com/columns/1999-2001/991026.shtml>.
- Soloveichik, M. Y. (2003, February 1). The Virtue of Hate. *First Things*.  
<https://www.firstthings.com/article/2003/02/the-virtue-of-hate>.
- Solzhenitsyn, A. (2011). *200 Years Together* (Adam's Blog, Trans.). (Original work published 2002). <https://200yearstogether.wordpress.com/>.
- Sorin, G. (1985). *The Prophetic Minority: American Jewish Immigrant Radicals, 1820–1920*. Indiana University Press.
- (1997). *Tradition Transformed: The Jewish Experience in America*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sorkin, D. (1985). The Invisible Community: Emancipation, Secular Culture, and Jewish Identity in the Writings of Berthold Auerbach. In J. Reinhartz & W. Schatzberg (Eds.), *The Jewish Response to German Culture: From the Enlightenment to the Second World War*. University Press of New England for Clark University.
- Southwood, T. R. E. (1977). Habitat, the Templet for Ecological Strategies? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 46(2), 337–66. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3817>.

- (1981). Bionomic Strategies and Population Parameters. In R. M. May (Ed.), *Theoretical Ecology: Principles and Applications*. Sinauer Associates.
- Sparks, C. S., & Jantz, R. L. (2002). A Reassessment of Human Cranial Plasticity: Boas Revisited. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 99(23), 14636–14639. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.222389599>.
- (2003). Changing Times, Changing Faces: Franz Boas's Immigrant Study in Modern Perspective. *American Anthropologist*, 105(2), 333–337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.2003.105.2.333>.
- Spector, B. (1992, September 27) Academy Criticism of a Foreign Associate Stirs Debate Over NAS Role and Policies. *The Scientist*. <https://tinyurl.com/22k67u6e>.
- Spier, E. (1963). Focus: A Footnote to the History of the Thirties. O. Wolff.
- Spruiell, V. (1989). The Future of Psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 58, 1–28.
- Stanovich, K. (1999). *Who is Rational? Studies of Individual Differences in Reasoning*. Erlbaum.
- (2004). *The Robot's Rebellion: Finding Meaning in the Age of Darwin*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Stein, B. (1976). Whatever Happened to Small-town America? *The Public Interest*, 44(Summer), 17–26.
- (1979). *The View from Sunset Boulevard*. Basic Books.
- Stein, G. J. (1987). The Biological Bases of Ethnocentrism, Racism, and Nationalism in National Socialism. In V. Reynolds, V. Falger, & I. Vine (Eds.), *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism*. University of Georgia Press.
- Steinlight, S. (2001). *The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography: Reconsidering a Misguided Immigration Policy*. Center for Immigration Studies.
- (2004, April 1). High Noon to Midnight: Why Current Immigration Policy Dooms American Jewry. Center for Immigration Studies. [www.cis.org/articles/2004/back404.html#Author](http://www.cis.org/articles/2004/back404.html#Author).
- Strauss, L. (1952). *Persecution and the Art of Writing*. Greenwood.
- (1994). Why We Remain Jews: Can Jewish Faith and History Still Speak to Us? In K. L. Deutsch, & W. Nicgorski (Eds.), *Leo Strauss: Political Philosopher and Jewish Thinker* (pp. 43–79). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Reprinted from lecture at the Hillel Foundation, University of Chicago, February 4, 1962.)
- Stephens, B. (2016, May 9). Hillary: The Conservative Hope. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/hillary-the-conservative-hope-1462833870>.
- Stern, F. (1961). *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology*. University of California Press.
- Stern, S. (1950). *The Court Jew: A Contribution to the History of Absolutism in Europe* (R. Weiman, Trans.). The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Stocking, G. W. (1968). *Race, Evolution, and Culture: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Free Press.
- (1989). The Ethnographic Sensibility of the 1920s and the Dualism of the Anthropological Tradition. In G. W. Stocking (Ed.), *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility* (Vol. 6: History of Anthropology) (pp. 208–276). University of Wisconsin Press.
- (1992). *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stone, L. (1977). *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England: 1500–1800*. Harper & Row.
- (1990). *The Road to Divorce*. Oxford University Press.
- Stone, R. (1992). Random Samples. *Science*, 257(5071), 742–743. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1496394>.
- Stove, D. C. (1982). *Popper and After: Four Modern Irrationalists*. Pergamon Press.



- Strosberg, B. B. (2022). Critical Theory and Anti-Semitism: Implications for Politics, Education, and Psychoanalysis. In J. Mills and D. Burston (Eds.), *Critical Theory and Psychoanalysis: From the Frankfurt School to Contemporary Critique*. Routledge.
- Sulloway, F. (1979a). *Freud: Biologist of the Mind*. Basic Books.
- (1979b, August 25). Freud as Conquistador. *The New Republic*, 25–31.
- Svonkin, S. (1997). *Jews Against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties*. Columbia University Press.
- Sykes, B. (2001). *The Seven Daughters of Eve*. Norton.
- Symott, M. G. (1986). Anti-Semitism and American Universities: Did quotas follow the Jews? In D. A. Gerber (Ed.), *Anti-Semitism in American history*. University of Illinois Press.
- Szajkowski, Z. (1967). Paul Nathan, Lucien Wolf, Jacob H. Schiff and the Jewish Revolutionary Movements in Eastern Europe. *Jewish Social Studies*, 29(1), 1–19.
- (1977). Kolchak, Jews and the American Intervention in Northern Russia and Siberia, 1918–1920. S. Frydman.
- Szekacs-Weisz, J., & Keve, T. (Eds.). (2012). *Ferenczi and His World: Rekindling the Spirit of the Budapest School*. Karnac Books.
- TAC. (2004, May 24). Friends of Israel Are Turning Up in the Strangest Places. *The American Conservative*, 19.
- Talmadge, F. (2025). The Jews and the First New Deal, 1933–1934. *The Occidental Quarterly*, 25(1), 61–108.
- Tannenhaus, S. (2003, May 3). Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz Interview with Sam Tannenhaus, *Vanity Fair*. United States Department of Defense News Transcript. <https://archive.ph/PkJ9f>.
- Tarr, Z. (1977). *The Frankfurt School: The Critical Theories of Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno*. John Wiley and Sons.
- Tarcov, N., & Pangle, T. L. (1987). Epilogue: Leo Strauss and the History of Political Philosophy. In L. Strauss, & J. Cropsey (Eds.), *History of Political Philosophy* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, S. J. (1990). *Stalin's Apologist, Walter Duranty: The New York Times's Man in Moscow*. Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, P. (1978). Cultural Diplomacy and the British Council: 1934–1939. *British Journal of International Studies*, 4(3), 244–265.
- Terkel, A. (2025, January 31). Pentagon Removes Major Media Outlets, Including NBC News, in New 'Rotation Program.' NBC News. <https://tinyurl.com/4snsvj69>.
- Treitschke, H. von. (1958). *A Word About Our Jewry* (H. Lederer, Trans.). Reimer. (Original work published 1881).
- Thernstrom, S., & Thernstrom, A. (1997). *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible*. Simon & Schuster.
- Thompson, S. A. (2025, February 5). In the Eyes of Right-Wing Media, Trump Just Keeps on Winning. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/02/05/technology/trump-media-right-wing.htm>.
- Tichenor, D. J. (2002). *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton University Press.
- Tiftt, S. E., & Jones, A. S. (1999). *The Trust: The Private and Powerful Family behind The New York Times*. Little Brown & Co.
- Tobin, G. A. (1988). *Jewish Perceptions of Antisemitism*. Plenum Press.
- Toledano, R. de. (1996, June). Among the Ashkenazim. *Commentary*, 101(6), 48–51.
- Toranska, T. (1987). "Them": Stalin's Polish Puppets (A. Kolakowska, Trans.). Harper & Row.
- Torrey, E. F. (1992). *Freudian Fraud: The Malignant Effect of Freud's Theory on American Thought and Culture*. HarperCollins.

- Triandis, H. C. (1990). *Cross-cultural Studies of Individualism and Collectivism*. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1989: Cross Cultural Perspectives. University of Nebraska Press.
- (1991). Cross-cultural Differences in Assertiveness/Competition vs. Group Loyalty/Cohesiveness. In R. A. Hinde & J. Groebel (Eds.), *Cooperation and Prosocial Behavior*. Cambridge University Press.
- (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Westview Press.
- Trivers, R. (1985). *Social Evolution*. Benjamin Cummings.
- (1991). Deceit and Self-deception: The Relationship Between Communication and Consciousness. In M. Robinson & L. Tiger (Eds.), *Man and Beast Revisited*. Smithsonian Press.
- Tucker, D. M., Vannatta, K., & Rothlind, J. (1990). Arousal and Activation Systems and Primitive Adaptive Controls on Cognitive Priming. In N. L. Stein, B. Leventhal, & T. Trabasso (Eds.), *Psychological and Biological Approaches to Emotion* (pp. 145–166). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Tucker, R. W. (1999, November 1). Alone or With Others: The Temptations of Post-Cold War Power. *Foreign Affairs*. <https://tinyurl.com/mtaayewd>.
- UNESCO. (2002). Toleration and Pluralism: A Comparative Study. UNESCO Evaluation Report Request no. 9926.
- Unger, I., & Unger, D. (2006). *The Guggenheims—A Family History*. Harper Perennial.
- Unz, R. K. (1998, November 16). Some Minorities Are More Minor than Others. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB910996519185599500>.
- (2012, November 28). The Myth of American Meritocracy. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/the-myth-of-american-meritocracy/>.
- (2018a, September 10). American Pravda: 9/11 Conspiracy Theories. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/american-pravda-911-conspiracy-theories/>.
- (2018b, July 16). American Pravda: Oddities of the Jewish Religion. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/american-pravda-oddities-of-the-jewish-religion/>.
- (2018c, October 22). American Pravda: Racial Discrimination at Harvard. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/american-pravda-racial-discrimination-at-harvard/>.
- (2023a, July 3). Affirmative Action and the Jewish Elephant in the Room. *The Unz Review*. <https://tinyurl.com/9rpxx7wr>.
- (2023b, May 1). The Neocons and Their Rise to Power. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/the-neocons-and-their-rise-to-power/>.
- (2024a, May 6). Israel/Gaza: The Masks Come Off in American Society. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/israel-gaza-the-masks-come-off-in-american-society/>.
- (2024b, January 15). Jews and Antisemitism at Harvard University. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/jews-and-antisemitism-at-harvard-university/>.
- (2024c, January 24). Prof. John Beaty and the True Origin of the Jews. *The Unz Review*. <https://www.unz.com/runz/prof-john-beaty-and-the-true-origin-of-the-jews/>.
- Urofsky, M. I. (1989). The Brandeis Agenda. In N. L. Dawson (Ed.), *Brandeis in America*. University of Kentucky Press.
- Vaksberg, A. (1994). *Stalin Against the Jews* (A. W. Bouis, Trans.). Knopf.
- van Valen, L. (1974). Brain Size and Intelligence in Man. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 40(3), 417–424. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330400314>.
- Vann, B. (2003, May 23). The Historical Roots of Neoconservatism: A Reply to a Slandorous Attack on Trotskyism. *World Socialist Web Site*. <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2003/05/shac-m23.html>.
- Veblen, T. (1934). *Essays in Our Changing Order*. Viking Press.

- Vest, J. (2002, August 15). The Men From JINSA and CSP. *The Nation*.  
<https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/men-jinsa-and-csp/>.
- Veyne, P. (1987). The Roman Empire. In P. Veyne (Ed.), *A History of Private Life* (Vol. 1). Harvard University Press.
- Vidal, G. (1986, March 22). The Empire Lovers Strike Back. *The Nation*, 242(11), 350.  
<https://tinyurl.com/3wky75px>.
- Vital, D. (1975). *The Origins of Zionism*. Oxford University Press.
- Vitale, F. (2010). Jacques Derrida and the Politics of Architecture. *Serbian Architectural Journal*, 2(3), 215–226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/SAJ1003215V>.
- Vlahos, M. (2018, October 29). We Were Made for Civil War. *The American Conservative*.  
<https://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/we-were-made-for-civil-war/>.
- Volkogonov, D. (1995). *Lenin: A New Biography* (H. Shukman, Ed. & Trans.). Free Press.
- Wade, N. (2011, June 13). Scientists Measure the Accuracy of a Racism Claim. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/14/science/14skull.html>.
- Wagner, R. (2022). Judaism in Music. In T. Dalton (Ed.), *Classical Essays on the Jewish Question, 1850–1945*. Clemens & Blair. (Original work published 1850 with 1869 supplement).
- Wald, A. L. (1987). *The New York Intellectuals: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930s to the 1980s*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- (2003, June 27). Are Trotskyites Running the Pentagon? *History News Network*.  
<https://www.historynewsnetwork.org/article/are-trotskyites-running-the-pentagon>.
- (2017). Preface to *The New York Intellectuals, Thirtieth Anniversary Edition: The Rise and Decline of the Anti-Stalinist Left from the 1930s to the 1980s*. Project Muse.
- Waldman, P. (2004, February 3). An Historian's Take on Islam Steers U.S. in Terrorism Fight: Bernard Lewis' Blueprint—Sowing Arab Democracy—Is Facing a Test in Iraq. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB107576070484918411>.
- Wall, R. (1983). The Household: Demographic and Economic Changes in England, 1650–1970. In R. Wall, J. Robin, & P. Laslett (Eds.), *Family Forms in Historic Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace-Wells, B. (2010, December 23). Peretz in Exile. *New York*.  
<https://nymag.com/news/features/70310/>.
- Wallerstein, J., & Kelly, J. B. (1980). *Surviving the Breakup*. Basic Books.
- Walzer, M. (1983). *Exodus and Revolution*. Basic Books.
- (1994). Toward a New Realization of Jewishness. *Congress Monthly*, 61(4), 3–6.
- Warburg, F. (1933, October 5). Letter from Felix Warburg to Franz Boas.  
<https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/node/123572>.
- Ward, J. (2023, March 30). How a Judge's Visit to Stanford Has Changed the Debate Over Free Speech on Campus. *Yahoo News*. <https://tinyurl.com/3fmvx6z5>.
- Washburn, K. K. (2009). Felix Cohen, Anti-Semitism, and American Indian Law. *American Indian Law Review*, 33(2), 583–605.  
<https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1133&context=ailr>.
- Watson, J. (2007, October 19). To Question Genetic Intelligence Is Not Racism. *The Independent*. <https://tinyurl.com/msdpr363>.
- Wattenberg, B. (1984). *The Good News Is the Bad News Is Wrong*. AEI Press.
- (1991). *The First Universal Nation: Leading Indicators and Ideas about the Surge of America in the 1990s*. Free Press.
- (2001, March 19). Melt. Melting. Melted. *Jewish World Review*.  
[www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/wattenberg031901.asp](http://www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/wattenberg031901.asp).
- (2002, November 14). Richard Perle: The Making of a Neoconservative [Radio Broadcast Transcript]. PBS. <https://www.pbs.org/thinktank/transcript1017.html>.

- Waxman, C. (1989). The Emancipation, the Enlightenment, and the Demography of American Jewry. *Judaism*, 38(4), 488–501.
- Webb, J. (1995, June 5). In Defense of Joe Six-Pack. *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Webster, R. (1995). *Why Freud Was Wrong: Sin, Science, and Psychoanalysis*. Basic Books.
- Weindling, P. J. (2007). Central Europe Confronts German Racial Hygiene: Friedrich Hertz, Hugo Iltis and Ignaz Zollschan as Critics of Racial Hygiene. In M. Turda & P. J. Weindling (Eds.), *Blood and Homeland: Racism and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940* (pp. 263–280). Central European Press.
- Weinfeld, M. (1993). The Ethnic Sub-Economy: Explication and Analysis of a Case Study of the Jews of Montreal. In R. J. Brym, W. Shaffir, & M. Weinfeld (Eds.), *The Jews in Canada*. Oxford University Press.
- Weingarten, A. (2008). *Jewish Organizations' Response to Communism and to Senator McCarthy*. Vallentine Mitchell.
- Weinstein, A., & Vassiliev, A. (1999). *The Haunted Wood: Soviet Espionage in America—The Stalin Era*. Random House.
- Weiss, P. (2016, April 19). 'Forward' Columnist and Emily's List Leader Relate 'Gigantic,' 'Shocking' Role of Jewish Democratic Donors. *Mondoweiss*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/56r2dwr5>.
- Werth, N. (1999). A State Against Its People: Violence, Repression, and Terror in the Soviet Union. In Courtois, S., Werth, N., Panné, J., Paczkowski, A., Bartosek K., & Margolin, J., *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (J. Murphy & M. Kramer, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Westermarck, G. (1922). *The History of Human Marriage* (5th ed.). Allerton.
- Westervelt, E. (2025, February 6). Trump Executive Order Aims to Deport International Students Who Have Protested Israel. *National Public Radio*.  
<https://tinyurl.com/yhbzfz3>.
- Weyl, N., & Marina, W. (1971). *American Statesmen on Slavery and the Negro*. Arlington House.
- Wheatland, T. (2009). *The Frankfurt School in Exile*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Whitaker, B. (2002, August 19). US Thinktanks Give Lessons in Foreign Policy. *The Guardian*.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/aug/19/worlddispatch>.
- White, E. (2017, November 3). The Hollywood Darling Who Tanked His Career to Combat Anti-Semitism. *The Paris Review*. <https://tinyurl.com/ywk7a4cd>.
- White, L. (1966). The Social Organization of Ethnological Theory. *Rice University Studies: Monographs in Cultural Anthropology*, 52(4), 1–66.
- Whitfield, S. J. (1988). *American Space, Jewish Time*. Archon.
- Wickett, J. C., Vernon, P. A., & Lee, D. H. (1994). In Vivo Brain Size, Head Perimeter, and Intelligence in a Sample of Healthy Adult Females. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16(6), 831–838. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90227-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90227-5).
- Wicks, R. J. (2007). *Modern French Philosophy: From Existentialism to Postmodernism*. Oneworld.
- Wiesel, E. (1985). *Against Silence: The Voice and Vision of Elie Wiesel* (Vol. 1) (I. Abrahamson, Selected and Ed.). Holocaust Library.
- Wiggershaus, R. (1994). *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance* (M. Robertson, Trans.). MIT Press.
- Wilkerson, L. (Guest). (2025, July 9). COL. Lawrence Wilkerson : Does The Deep State Control Trump? In *Judge Napolitano – Judging Freedom*. YouTube.  
<https://www.youtube.com/live/qo9JCvTbu-Q?si=7BGGAvEJgSsIsmVf>.
- Willerman, L., Schultz, R., Rutledge, J. N., & Bigler, E. D. (1991). In vivo Brain Size and Intelligence. *Intelligence*, 15(2), 223–228. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896\(91\)90031-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(91)90031-8).

- Willets, H. (1987). Introduction to T. Trunks, "Them": Stalin's Polish Puppets (A. Kolakowska, Trans.). Harper & Row.
- Williams, G. C. (1985). A Defense of Reductionism in Evolutionary Biology. In R. Dawkins, & M. Ridley (Eds.), *Oxford Surveys in Evolutionary Biology* (Vol. 2) (pp. 1–27). Oxford University Press.
- Williams, O. (2023, May 2). The Extreme Center: How the Neocons Went Woke. *The Occidental Observer*. <https://tinyurl.com/yfphxdm8>.
- Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. Harvard University Press.
- (1994). *Naturalist*. Island Press.
- Wilson, J. C. (2004). *The Politics of Truth: Inside the Lies that Led to War and Betrayed My Wife's CIA Identity—A Diplomat's Memoir*. Carroll & Graf.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1993a, April). The Family-Values Debate. *Commentary*. <https://www.commentary.org/articles/james-wilson/the-family-values-debate/>.
- (1993b). *The Moral Sense*. Free Press.
- Winik, J. (1988). The Neoconservative Reconstruction. *Foreign Policy*, 73, 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1148881>.
- (1997). *On the Brink: The Dramatic Behind the Scenes Saga of the Reagan Era and the Men and Women Who Won the Cold War*. Simon & Schuster.
- Winston, D. (1978). Viet Nam and the Jews. In J. N. Porter (Ed.), *The Sociology of American Jews: A Critical Anthology*. University Press of America.
- Wirth, L. (1956). *The Ghetto*. University of Chicago Press.
- Wisse, R. (1987, November). The New York (Jewish) Intellectuals. *Commentary*. <https://tinyurl.com/y5tvtf8d>.
- Wistrich, R. (1976). *Revolutionary Jews from Marx to Trotsky*. George G. Harrap & Co Ltd.
- Wittels, F. (1924). *Sigmund Freud: His Personality, His Teaching, & His School* (E. & C. Paul, Trans.). George Allen & Unwin.
- Wolf, E. R. (1990). The Anthropology of Liberal Reform. In H. Caton (Ed.), *The Samoa Reader: Anthropologists Take Stock*. University Press of America.
- Wolffsohn, M. (1993). *Eternal Guilt? Forty Years of German-Jewish-Israeli Relations* (D. Bokovoy, Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Wolin, S., & Slusser, R. M. (1957). *The Soviet Secret Police*. Praeger.
- Woocher, J. S. (1986). *Sacred Survival: The Civil Religion of American Jews*. Indiana University Press.
- Wood, J. L. (1974). *The Sources of American Student Activism*. Lexington Books.
- Woodward, B. (2004). *Plan of Attack*. Simon & Schuster.
- Wreszin, M. (1994). *A Rebel in Defense of Tradition: The Life and Politics of Dwight Macdonald*. Basic Books.
- Wright, D., & Leeds-Matthews, A. (2025, February 1). Elon Musk Spent More than \$290 Million on the 2024 Election, Year-End FEC Filings Show. CNN. <https://tinyurl.com/5ecet3he>.
- Wright, R. (1990, January 29). The Intelligence Test. Review of *Wonderful Life*, by Stephen Jay Gould. *The New Republic*, 28.
- (1996, November 28). *Homo deceptus*: Never trust Stephen Jay Gould. *Slate*. <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/1996/11/homo-deceptus.html>.
- Wrigley, E. A., & Schofield, R. (1981). *The Population History of England, 1541–1871*. Harvard University Press.
- Wulfsohn, J. F. (2023, March 13). Republican 2024 Hopefuls Respond to Tucker Carlson About Stance on Russia-Ukraine War. *Fox News*. <https://tinyurl.com/ycy65a47>.
- Wussow, Philipp von. (2014). Horkheimer und Adorno über "jüdische Psychologie." Ein vergessenes Theorieprogramm der 1940er Jahre. *Naharaim*, 8(2), 172–209. <https://doi.org/10.1515/NAHA-2014-0013>.

- Yeats, M. (2024, October 7). The Worldwide Holocaust Tour. *The Occidental Observer*.  
<https://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2024/10/07/the-worldwide-holocaust-tour/>.
- Yerushalmi, Y. H. (1991). *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*. Yale University Press.
- Yinon, O. (1982). *A Strategy for Israel in the 1980s* (I. Shahak, Ed. & Trans.). Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Inc. <https://archive.ph/n6BE6>.
- Yoffe, E. H. (2023, January 9). Primitive, Fanatic and Messianic: The Racist Judaism of Israel's 'Religious' Government. *Haaretz*. <https://tinyurl.com/4t8susw4>.
- Young-Bruehl, E. (1996). *The Anatomy of Prejudices*. Harvard University Press.
- Zacharia, J. (2004, May 29). Jews Fear Being Blamed for Iraq War. *The Jerusalem Post*.
- Zangwill, I. (1923, October 19). *The American Hebrew*, p. 582.
- (1914). *The Melting Pot*. In *The Works of Israel Zangwill* (Vol. 12). AMS Press. (Original work published 1908).
- Zaretsky, E. (1994). The Attack on Freud. *Tikkun*, 9(May/June), 65–70.
- Zaroulis, N., & Sullivan, G. (1984). *Who Spoke Up? American Protest against the War in Vietnam, 1963–1975*. Doubleday.
- Zborowski, M., & Herzog, E. (1952). *Life Is with People: The Jewish Little-Town of Eastern Europe*. International Universities Press.
- Zhitlowski, H. (1972). The Jewish Factor in My Socialism. In I. Howe, & E. Greenberg (Eds.), *Voices from the Yiddish: Essays, Memoirs, Diaries* (L. Dawidowicz, Trans.). University of Michigan Press.
- ZOA. (2002, August 7). ZOA Strongly Praises Defense Secretary Rumsfeld for Distancing Himself From the Term "Occupied Territory." The Zionist Organization of America. <https://tinyurl.com/yz92d8bn>.
- Zuckerman, H. (1996). *The Scientific Elite: Nobel Laureates in the United States*. Transaction. (Original work published 1977).

## INDEX

- 1967 Arab-Israeli War, xxiii, xxxii, xxxiii, lxx, lxxviii, lxxxvi, 104, 133, 148, 149, 150, 190, 231, 261, 292, 350, 456
- Abraham, Karl, 282, 284, 312
- Abrams, Elliott, 217, 221, 231, 232, 249, 251–52, 255, 257, 266, 483
- academia and Jews, xlv–liii, lxi–lxiv; overrepresentation, lxiv–lxv
- Ackerman & Jahoda, 408, 409, 432, 437
- Adler, Alfred, 287, 288, 289, 302, 303, 304
- Adler, Felix, 45, 497
- Adorno, Theodor W., lxxii, 286, 322, 323, 333, 335, 336, 339–50, 356–60, 364–70, 373, 374, 377, 378, 381, 383, 385, 386, 387, 388, 391, 393, 394, 399, 405, 406, 407, 409, 413, 415, 430, 433, 434, 438, 439, 440, 449, 461, 462, 584
- African Americans, liv, lxi, 8, 37, 38, 49, 52, 58, 59, 60, 61, 145, 172, 173, 223, 224, 231, 329, 388, 410, 432, 488, 497–501, 505, 533, 540, 551, 552, 561, 571; Black Lives Matter, lxxxviii, xci, 561, 567; NAACP, xxv, 38, 497
- aggressiveness of Jews, xxviii–xxxiii
- Alcock, John, 78–80
- Alderman, G., 47, 127, 149, 156, 158, 516, 526
- Altemeyer, B., 405, 406, 415, 416, 431, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440
- altruism, 166, 280, 436, 581, 588
- American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), xxv, lxxxviii, 42, 60, 278, 279, 327, 490, 527, 528, 591
- American Jewish Committee, xxxvii, xxxviii, lxxx, 4, 6, 7, 8, 38, 46, 47, 48, 52, 136, 140, 141, 142, 219, 223, 226, 321, 333, 338, 339, 343, 344, 349, 362, 363, 382, 386, 387, 389, 391, 392, 410, 443, 483, 487, 496, 497, 499, 500, 502, 503, 505, 506, 517, 519, 520, 526, 527, 528, 529, 531, 534, 535, 536, 540, 546, 552, 564, 582
- American Jewish Congress, lxxix, 128, 136, 137, 141, 143, 147, 208, 223, 327, 483, 484, 489, 491, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 506, 510, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 530, 531, 532, 535, 536, 546, 582, 591
- anthropology. *See* Boasian anthropology
- anti-biologism, xxxiv, 491
- Anti-Defamation League (ADL), xviii, xxiv, xxv, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxviii, lxxi, lxxx, lxxxv, lxxxvii, lxxxix, xc, xci, 6, 39, 81, 131, 141, 142, 144, 147, 208, 209, 223, 259, 362, 371, 382, 388, 392, 411, 412, 483, 485, 496, 497, 499, 500, 501, 511, 531, 536, 539, 551, 564, 582, 587
- anti-Semitism, 110; and Christianity, liv–lviii, lxxx, lxxxviii, 12, 222, 244, 444, 446, 470, 495–97, 574; and communism, 176–92; and Jewish cultural critique, 14–16, 19; and Jewish involvement in immigration

- policy, 481–86; and Jewish radicalism, 152–53; as concern of Jewish intellectuals, lix, 27, 35, 243, 292, 335, 337, 406, 453, 458; resulting in Jewish identification, 106–8; theories of, xciv, 87, 292–95, 320–24, 364–65, 412, 432
- Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder*. See Ackerman & Jahoda
- Ashkenazi, xvii, xxv, xxvi, xxviii, xxxi, 47, 422, 581
- Australia, lxxix, lxxxvi, 377, 548, 549, 550–53, 569, 595
- Austria, lxxvii, lxxxiv, xci, 14, 111, 153, 177, 274, 312, 515
- Authoritarian Personality* (TAP) studies, lix, 6, 322, 333, 335, 356–76, 405–40, 449, 541, 544, 585
- authoritarianism: as concern of Jewish intellectuals, 320, 323, 347, 376, 382; left-wing, xci, 356; of Jewish intellectual movements, 65, 302, 309, 464–65; of traditional Jewish groups, 375, 435; right-wing, 435. *See also* *Authoritarian Personality* (TAP) studies
- Beauvoir, Simone de, xxxiv
- behaviorism, xxxv, 18, 472
- Bell Curve*, *The*, xv, 71, 75, 328, 329, 487, 579
- Bell, Daniel, 228, 383, 384, 448, 457, 459, 582
- Bellow, Saul, 9, 205, 244–46, 319, 321, 448
- Bendersky, J., xxxvi, xxxix, xl, xlv, lxxx, 121, 136, 174, 175
- Benedict, Ruth, 57, 63, 64, 66, 68, 69, 204
- Ben-Gurion, PM David, xxxii
- Benjamin, Walter, lxxii, 16, 348, 355–56, 356, 401
- Bennett, M. T., 523, 528, 529, 530, 532, 538
- Bennett, William J., 224, 260, 329
- Berman, Jakub, 184–85
- Bierut, Bolesław, 184, 188
- Black. *See* African Americans
- blacklist: by Jews, xviii, xxxi; Hollywood, 138, 139, 380
- BlackRock, xcii, 380, 390
- Boas, Franz, 35–58. *See also* Boasian anthropology; concern with anti-Semitism, 35; German identity, 45; immigration, 8, 494; Jewish identity, 7, 37; links to Jewish activism, 52; on Jewish assimilation, 49; World War I, 47; writing on Jews, 47
- Boasian anthropology, xxv, xxxvi, lvii, lviii, lix, xcv, 5, 6, 18, 19, 31–69, 340, 452, 458, 470; influence on immigration policy, 500, 541
- Bolshevism. *See* communism
- Brandeis, Louis D., 344, 490, 579
- Brimelow, Peter, 227, 548, 586
- Brown, Norman O., 287, 300, 319
- Brown, Roger, 405, 406, 407, 410, 415, 431
- Bryen, Stephen, 230, 240, 241, 256
- Buchanan, Patrick J., xl, xli, 202, 208, 210, 225, 227
- Buckley, William F., 198, 563, 577
- Burnham, James, 214, 215, 462
- Butler, Judith, xxxiv, xxxv, xlv
- Canada, lxxxvi, xci, 40
- cancel culture. *See* censorship
- Caputo, J. D., 395–401
- Carl, Noah, lxii
- Carlson, Tucker, 269, 558
- Carr, Wilbur S., 508, 518
- Castro, A., 13, 22, 23, 180, 472
- Catholics, xlv, xlviii, lxxxiii, 149, 274, 286, 339, 371, 395, 396, 487, 488, 502, 503, 518, 521, 538, 541, 553, 570; Catholic Church, lxviii, 167, 187, 192, 285, 289, 290, 291, 297, 316, 372, 475, 496; Jewish influence on, lxviii–lxix; National Catholic Legion of Decency, lxxx, 380
- Celan, Paul, lxxiii, 400
- Celler, Emanuel, 494, 501, 510, 514, 520, 521, 522, 528, 531, 532, 537, 539
- censorship, lxxxvi–xcii, 163, 334, 345, 357, 377, 380, 388, 436, 592
- Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, 14, 54, 90, 91, 221, 506
- Cheney, Dick, 202, 206, 253, 258–61, 259, 261, 265, 267
- Chomsky, Marvin, lxxx
- Chomsky, Noam, xxxii, xxxiii, 224, 319
- Christianity, xix, xxix, liv–lviii, lv, lxxx, 382, 399, 556, 592. *See also* Catholics. *See also* Zionism: Christian Zionism. *See also* anti-Semitism: Christianity; and collectivism, 371–76; and communism, 109, 155, 568; and ethnocentrism, 410–15; and psychoanalysis, 150, 276, 277, 288, 312, 367, 428, 437, 452; conversion to, xvi, lxvi, 96, 104, 279, 352, 363, 454; in America, xxx, xxxvii, xlv, lxi, 140, 160, 225, 251, 444, 487, 504, 526, 590; Jewish opposition to, 14, 113, 173, 281, 290–95, 327, 340, 364, 366, 370, 490, 557, 591; media portrayal of, lxxxii, lxxxiii, 379; Protestants, xxii, xli, xlv, xlvi, xlviii, l, liii, lxxv–lxxvii, 7, 12, 32, 33, 43, 60, 61, 146, 274, 320, 330, 339, 347, 377, 384, 478, 487, 488, 489, 496, 503, 518, 557; WASP/Protestant elite, xxv, lvi, lx, lxiv, lxxxii, 11, 12, 17, 51, 58, 146, 148, 159, 196, 213, 245, 252, 253, 481, 486, 532, 585
- Churchill, Winston, 120, 174, 211, 212, 213, 235
- church-state relations, Jewish involvement in, xxxiii, lviii, lxvi, xcv, 160, 433, 488, 495–97, 533



- civil liberties as a Jewish interest, xxxiii, lxvi, 143, 433, 526, 527. *See also* American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
- Clemen, Carl Christian, 277
- Clinton: administration, 206, 241, 247, 253, 457; Hillary, 227, 267, 566, 577; President Bill, 232, 247; President Bill and Hillary, xlv
- Cofnas, Nathan, xiv, xvii, lxxxix, xcii, 2, 3, 533, 534, 537, 539, 540
- Cohen, Eliot A., 206, 260
- Cohen, Elliot E., 343, 344, 362, 363, 392, 393, 443, 448, 461, 463
- Cohen, Felix S., 42–43
- Cohen, Hermann, 235, 460, 461
- Cohen, Morris R., 130
- Cohen, N. W., 4, 46, 482, 491, 502, 503, 506, 517, 520, 522, 526, 529, 532, 535, 536
- Cohen, P. S., 162, 164
- Cohen, Robert Waley, 211, 212
- Cohen, S. M., lviii, 328
- Cohn, Roy, 144
- collectivism, xix, 320, 364, 366, 374, 375, 409, 433, 457, 470, 472, 473, 475, 476, 568, 570, 589, 595; of gentiles, 35, 37, 364, 371–76, 373, 570; of Jews, xx, xxi, 22, 64, 179, 214, 305, 311, 316, 317, 321, 364, 373, 374, 375, 376, 457, 463, 465, 470, 476, 499, 593
- Commentary*, xl, 142, 203, 206, 210, 211, 219, 220, 221, 224, 228, 232, 233, 266, 319, 321, 343, 352, 362, 363, 387, 392, 393, 443, 444, 446, 448, 461, 463, 528, 540, 543
- communism. *See also* anti-Semitism: and communism. *See also* Christianity: and communism; Bolshevism, xviii, xxxvi, 100, 110–26, 135–39, 175, 177, 515; Communist Party USA (CPUSA), 106, 126–51, 159, 172, 173, 186, 379, 464, 516, 528, 529; Evseksiya, 98, 99, 104
- conscientiousness, xxvi, lxxv, 112, 300
- Conservative Judaism, 159, 181, 221
- Contemporary Jewish Record*, 443, 444, 445
- Cooney, T. A., lix, 9, 443, 444, 445, 448, 449, 450, 451, 463, 469
- Crews, Frederick, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 302, 305, 310, 318, 319, 324
- Cromwell, 285
- crypto-Judaism, lxvi, 36, 51, 103, 134, 168, 189, 191, 286, 395, 397, 404; conversos, xviii, 12, 13, 22, 23, 180, 371, 460; Marranos, 395, 583; New Christians, xviii, 22, 23, 583
- Cuddihy, John Murray, xxxi, lvi, lxvi, lxvii, 26, 33, 146, 147, 148, 245, 281, 290, 300, 317, 321, 322, 464
- cultural pluralism, as Jewish interest, lxi, lxxx, 5, 16, 34, 43, 49, 58, 160, 356, 362, 373, 382, 397, 460, 481–555, 565–69, 575–89, 590
- Czechoslovakia, 509, 526, 527, 537
- Dada, 401–5
- Darwin, Charles, xxvi, xcv, 32, 68, 86, 91, 277, 301, 308, 471
- Darwinism, xxxv, xlv, xlvii, 1, 31, 32, 79, 86, 91, 340, 496
- Davenport, Charles, 65, 67, 75
- Dawidowicz, Lucy, xxviii, 145, 169, 527
- Dawkins, Richard, 477
- deception, xiv, 4, 18, 24, 32, 62, 104, 108, 123, 137, 166, 168, 170, 172, 183, 185, 186, 192, 197, 206, 236, 238, 284, 290, 298, 334, 372, 394, 418, 438, 439, 440, 461, 479, 505, 526, 588
- deconstructionism, 51, 89, 393–405, 454, 470, 474
- Decter, Midge, 210, 217, 225, 228, 231, 260, 261, 266
- Degler, Carl, xlv, lvii, 8, 31, 32, 34, 35, 44, 51, 52, 56, 63, 73, 75, 85, 89, 493, 494, 512
- Derrida, Jacques, 374, 394–405, 470, 474
- Dershowitz, Alan, xli, 241, 483
- Deutsch, Helene, 277, 307
- Dewey, John, 239, 489, 490
- Dialectic of Enlightenment* (DofE), 364–70
- Dickstein, Rep. Samuel, 73, 501, 509, 510, 514, 517
- Disraeli, Benjamin, 20, 21, 161
- Dissent, 216, 444, 461, 463
- Divine, R. A., 492, 505, 517, 518, 520, 521, 530, 532
- Dorsey, George A., 65
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor, 297
- Durkheim, Émile, 15, 16, 32
- effortful control, lxxv
- Efron, J. M., 48, 63, 157, 451
- Ehrenburg, Ilya, 106, 107
- Einhorn, David, 515
- Einstein, Albert, xv, xvi, 40, 48
- Eisenhower, President Dwight D., 535
- Eisner, Kurt, 153
- Eissler, Kurt, 307
- Elkin, Stanley, 321
- Ellenberger, Henri, 295, 303, 308
- emotional intensity of Jews, xxvi–xxviii
- England, xxxvii, lxxviii, lxix, xcv, 16, 41, 72, 112, 126, 127, 149, 158, 174, 208, 285, 314, 345, 485, 507, 508, 516, 522, 526, 583
- Esterson, A., 298, 305, 308
- ethnic studies, lxi, 561
- ethnocentrism, 375, 394, 428, 434, 436, 437, 439, 454, 468; of gentiles, 340, 341, 344, 345, 348, 382, 408, 452, 500, 556, 570. *See also* Christianity: and ethnocentrism; of Jews, xx–xxiv, lxxiv, 433

- eugenics, 19, 54, 63, 65, 67, 75, 78, 81, 86, 278, 300, 327
- explicit processing, lxxiv, lxxv
- Farrakhan, Louis, 224, 573
- Faur, J., 13, 23
- Fefer, Itsik, 99
- Feith, Douglas, 11, 201, 204, 230, 232, 248, 249, 252–55, 255, 256, 260, 261, 266
- Feldman, Myer, 536, 539
- Ferenczi, Sándor, 274, 275, 276, 278, 284, 287, 306, 307, 309
- Ferkiss, Victor, 383
- Fiedler, Leslie, lxxvii, 9, 322, 383, 448
- Finkelstein, Norman, lxix, lxxiii, lxxiv, lxxxiv
- Ford, Henry, xxx, 378, 482, 557, 563
- Foucault, Michel, xxxiv, 33, 322, 393, 403
- Fox News, lxxix, lxxx, 163, 206, 262, 269
- Foxman, Abraham, lxxi, xci, 208, 209, 210, 259
- France, xlv, xci, 15, 16, 33, 46, 54, 174, 312, 337, 358, 396, 398, 485, 494, 496, 567, 582
- Frank, G., 6, 35, 44, 45, 49, 54, 57, 58, 526
- Frankfurt School, 333–443
- Frankfurter, Felix, xxxix, 43, 579
- Freeman, Derek, 32, 56, 63, 65, 66, 68
- Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, 405, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 430, 432
- Freud, Anna, 277, 301, 307
- Freud, Sigmund, 273–333
- Friedenwald, Herbert, 503, 505
- Frink, Horace, 310
- Fromm, Erich, 289, 320, 334, 335, 351, 352, 353, 354, 356, 357, 360, 361, 374, 376, 385, 391, 461, 462
- fundamentalism, Jewish. *See* Shahak, Israel
- Galton: Sir Francis, xcv, 76; Society, 65
- Gay, Peter, 24, 68, 277–313, 465
- gender identity, xxxiv, 283
- gender studies, xxxiv, lii, lxi, lxii, 561
- genetic similarity theory, 457, 478
- Gilman, S. L., xxvi, 49, 281, 325
- Ginsberg, B., lxxvi, 16, 101, 123, 151, 528
- Glazer, Nathan, 17, 131, 145, 146, 147, 157, 223, 228, 311, 362, 383, 384, 405, 411, 444, 448, 466, 469, 516, 582
- Goddard, Henry H., 72, 73, 74, 77
- Goldberg, Harvey, 150
- Goldberg, J. J., lxvi, 279, 433, 463, 487, 490
- Goldberg, Jonah, 210
- Goldenweiser, Alexander, 38, 44, 57, 58
- Goldman, Emma, 95, 126, 127, 130, 153, 462
- Goldstein, Israel, 525, 530, 531, 532
- Goldstein, J., 467, 487, 503, 505, 506
- Gomułka, Władysław, 187, 190, 191
- Goodman, Paul, 9, 319, 321, 322, 448
- Gottfried, Paul, xlv, 146, 148, 150, 381, 462, 467, 570, 576
- Gottlieb, Gilbert, 80, 86
- Gould, Stephen Jay, 69–95, 493
- Graham, Hugh Davis, 533, 537, 539, 540
- Graham, Otis, 534, 536, 537, 538, 545
- Grant, Madison, 54, 65, 67, 75, 492, 493, 494
- Green, Stephen, 241, 246, 248, 256, 258
- Greenberg, Clement, 443–49
- Greenspan, Alan, 457
- Greenwald, A. G., & Schuh, E. S., lix, 455, 456, 479
- Gross, N. & Fosse, E., xlvii
- Gross, N., & Fosse, E., xlix–lxi
- Grosskurth, P., 282, 284, 288, 301, 305, 306, 307, 309
- Grünberg, Carl, 333, 335, 469
- guru phenomenon, xvii, xxvii, 64, 199, 214, 219, 235, 237, 245, 257, 311, 319, 351, 385, 387, 462, 573
- Gush Emunim, xxxii, xxxiii, lxxxvi, 243
- Haider, Jörg, lxxxiv
- Haidt, Jonathan, xlix, li
- Hale, N. G., 289, 306, 307, 308, 310, 467
- Hall, Prescott F., 493
- Hammer, Armand, 133
- Handlin, Oscar, 383, 384, 536, 537, 540–43, 545, 587, 593
- Hannibal, 285, 289, 290
- Harris, Kamala, 559
- Hawkins, F., 548, 549, 550
- Hegel, G. W. F. (Hegelian), 364, 374, 399, 401, 460
- Heine, Heinrich, 13, 14, 17, 21, 96, 105, 313, 352, 363, 574
- Heller, Joseph, 17, 409
- Herrnstein, Richard J., xv, 81, 579, *See also* *Bell Curve, The*, *See also* Snyderman, M. & Herrnstein, R. J.
- Herskovits, Melville, 40, 44, 50, 57, 58–62, 64, 67, 70, 543
- Hertzberg, Arthur, xxiii, 71, 104, 129, 147, 151, 222, 507
- Herzl, Theodor, xxxii, lvii, 21
- Hess, Moses, 97, 489
- hierarchic harmony, 167, 579, 584
- Higham, John, lix, 59, 384, 406, 458, 483, 488, 489, 493, 502, 511, 512, 541, 580, 585, 591
- high-investment parenting, 157, 315, 316, 317, 326, 327, 328, 381, 421, 422, 426, 428, 430, 437, 591, 592
- Hirsch, Jerry, 70, 81
- Hitler, Adolf, xvi, lxxxiv, lxxxix, 14, 41, 85, 96, 136, 174, 175, 176, 211, 213, 224, 227, 235, 237, 269, 334, 341, 342, 345, 372, 392, 527
- Hoffman, Abbie, 146

- Hoffman, Nicholas von, 134, 135, 146, 384  
Hofstadter, Richard, 134, 135, 319, 383, 384, 469, 543  
Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D., 19, 20, 26, 166, 408  
Hollinger, David A., xlv, xlvii, liv, 10, 31, 37, 69, 209, 468, 487, 488, 489, 490, 533  
Holocaust, xxviii, xxix, xxxi, xxxiii, lv, lxix–lxxiv, lxxiv, lxxvii, lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxiv, lxxxvi, lxxxvii, 11, 70, 72, 74, 75, 83, 86, 106, 132, 136, 137, 163, 171, 175, 195, 207, 222, 243, 244, 245, 248, 252, 340, 362, 388, 400, 405, 470, 485, 491, 551; activist, lxx, lxxi, 405, 563; survivor, lxxxii, 217, 336  
Hook, Sidney, 102, 103, 173, 214, 215, 219, 239, 240, 444, 446, 447, 448, 463, 486, 490, 522, 582  
Horkheimer, Max, 333–443; especially, 336–39  
Horowitz, David, 129, 171, 173, 464  
Horowitz, Irving Louis, 31  
Horowitz, Irving Louis, 32, 123, 180, 373, 458, 460, 477, 572, 584  
hostile elite, Jews as, xxxi, xlvii, 113  
House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), 43, 136, 141, 379, 380, 528, 529, 530  
Howe, Irving, 25, 95, 216, 448, 461, 463, 582  
Hull, D. L., 90, 468, 471, 472  
Human Behavior and Evolution Society, xvi  
Hungary, 107, 111, 137, 151, 153, 155, 174, 175, 177, 178, 180, 188, 274, 275, 276, 278, 503, 568, 569  
Immigration Act of 1917, 503  
Immigration Act of 1921, 493, 505, 506, 507, 513  
Immigration Act of 1924, 8, 42, 48, 49, 74, 75, 225, 484, 488, 490, 493, 504, 505, 506, 507, 512, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 523, 524, 525, 530, 536, 540, 544, 547, 552  
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. *See* McCarran-Walter (Immigration and Nationality) Act of 1952  
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, xxv, lxiii, 200, 382, 501, 533, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 542, 545, 546, 557, 564, 586  
immigration, as Jewish interest, 481–555  
implicit processing, lxxiv  
individualism, xix, xx, lvi, lviii, lxxv, 23, 27, 164, 180, 233, 317, 320, 330, 353, 364, 373, 374, 377, 433, 454, 457, 475, 476, 555, 556, 570, 573, 578, 579, 580, 589, 592, 595  
Inquisition, Spanish, xviii, 22, 180, 181, 306, 395, 472, 473, 570, 583, 595  
intelligence, xlvi, lxxiv, 69–95, 221, 328, 377, 495, 586; (and wealth) of Jews, xxiv–xxvi, 584; testing, 72, 73, 74, 75, 83, 89, 91, 438, 492  
intermarriage, xiv, lxvi, lxx, 2, 36, 46, 48, 49, 51, 88, 100, 111, 129, 221, 251, 252, 410, 411, 422, 504, 505, 514, 515, 579  
IQ. *See* intelligence  
Irving, David, lxxviii, 178, 179, 212  
Isaac, Jules, lxviii, lxix  
Israel Lobby, xxii, xxxi, xxxii, lii, lxxviii, lxxxviii, 2, 199, 209, 224, 253, 569, 576  
Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy, *The*, lii, liii, lxxviii, xciv, 2, 199, 200, 209  
Israel–Hamas (Gaza) War (2023–present), xviii, xxii, xxiii, xxx, liv, lxxiii, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxviii, xc, xcvi, 204, 292, 557, 559, 561, 562, 569, 578  
Javits, Jacob, 495, 501, 522, 531, 539, 545  
Jensen, Arthur, 76, 77, 89, 91, 221, 472  
Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (JAC), 99, 100, 104, 106, 115, 137  
Jewish Institute for National Security of America (JINSA), 200, 201, 208, 217, 218, 240, 249, 251, 256, 259, 263–66  
Johnson, Albert, 508, 510  
Johnson, Paul, xxvii, 1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 24, 116, 266, 295, 409, 434  
Johnson, President Lyndon B., 12, 147, 163; administration, 535, 536, 539  
Jones, Ernest, 281, 283, 284, 306, 307, 309  
Joyce, Andrew, lxviii, lxix, lxxxvi, 42, 43, 154, 211, 253, 303, 330, 386, 533, 534, 539, 571, 573, 574  
Joyce, James, 401  
Jumonville, N., 444, 445, 446, 449, 450, 463, 469  
Jung, C. G., 281–83, 287, 302–6, 309, 312  
Kadushin, Charles, xlix, 9, 311, 318, 455  
Kafka, Franz, lxixiii, 445  
Kaganovich, Lazar, 107, 120, 121, 122, 125  
Kahan Commission, *The*, lxxxv  
Kallen, Horace, 40, 43, 49, 50, 59, 238, 460, 461, 484, 488–91, 500, 515, 525, 543, 544, 569, 580, 590, 591  
Kamenev, Lev, 101, 102, 118  
Kamin, Leon, 70–74, 82, 83, 85, 493  
Katz, J., 36, 325, 364, 582  
Kaufman, R. G., 217, 229, 230, 231, 232  
Kaufmann, Eric P., lii, lx, 532  
Kerr, Walter, lxxvi, 9, 481  
Kirk, Russell, 210, 225, 462  
Kissinger, Henry, lxxviii, 229, 231, 456  
Klehr, H., 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 159, 205  
Klein, D. B., 261, 274, 277, 281, 283, 284, 285, 286, 289, 292, 324, 325, 372  
Klineberg, Otto, 44, 54, 63  
Konvitz, Milton, 543

- Kostyrchenko, G., 99, 108, 109, 111, 122, 123, 176
- Krauthammer, Charles, 232, 241–44, 269, 582
- Kristol, Irving, xcv, 217, 219, 220, 224, 234, 243, 319, 444, 445, 448, 463, 582
- Kristol, William, lxxix, xcv, 198, 206, 226, 227, 234, 236, 242, 247, 251, 259, 260, 262, 267, 268, 269, 577
- Kroeber, Alfred, 35, 44, 57, 65
- Kurzweil, E., 277, 287, 289, 298, 312, 317, 322, 323, 325
- Lacan, Jacques, 33, 322
- Lamarckism, 32, 48, 187, 280, 297, 325, 327
- Landes, Ruth, 57, 58
- Lasch, Christopher, 381, 382, 383, 384, 407, 440, 453, 570
- Laski, Harold, lvii, 347, 349
- Lazarsfeld, Paul, 33, 386–90, 405
- Lazarus, Moritz, 489
- Lear, Norman, lxxx, lxxxi, 17
- Ledeer, Michael, 230, 242, 251, 255, 256–57
- leftist politics, Jewish involvement in, xiv, xlviii, liii, lxii, xci, 19, 58, 59, 71, 83, 95–195, 205, 527, *See also* communism, *See also* New Left
- Lehman, Herbert H., 38, 137, 141, 260, 497, 501, 522, 531, 534, 539
- Lenin, V. I., 99, 100, 115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 162, 321, 357, 469
- Lenz, F., 32
- Lerner, Max, 383, 543, 544
- Lerner, Richard, 81–89
- Levin, N., 19, 98, 126, 128, 161, 169, 170, 181
- Levinson, Daniel J., 405, 408, 409, 410, 412, 413, 414, 428, 429, 432
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 33, 34, 322, 394
- Lewis, Bernard, 12, 157, 230, 257
- Lewis, David L., 38, 49, 61, 497, 498
- Lewontin, Richard, 59, 70, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 473
- Lichter et al., lxxx, 16
- Liebman, Arthur, 19, 98, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 140, 145, 147, 151, 154, 159, 164, 169, 170, 172, 173, 205, 224, 526, 528
- Liebman, Charles S., lvii, lviii, 18, 31, 151, 159, 166, 171, 172, 364, 475
- light of the nations theme of Jewish ideology, 26, 151, 286, 326, 453
- Lindbergh, Anne Morrow, xli–xliii
- Lindbergh, Charles, xxxv–xlv, lvi, 346
- Lindemann, Albert, xxvii, xxviii, 11, 14, 18, 101, 102, 103, 111, 115, 116, 122, 156, 174, 175, 205, 497, 541, 569
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, xlviii, 19, 145, 147, 161, 228, 230, 252, 382, 383, 384, 448, 485, 533
- Lodge, Sen. Henry Cabot, 502, 503, 516, 517
- Louis IX, King, 582
- Lowenthal, Leo, 334, 335, 337, 339, 349, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 363, 387, 392, 416, 462
- Lowie, Robert, 39, 57, 68
- loyalty, Jewish, lxxii, 5, 18, 65, 107, 109, 133, 164, 176, 178, 203, 210, 234, 247, 269, 279, 307, 309, 414, 445, 449, 462, 463, 489
- Luxemburg, Rosa, 95, 103, 104, 150, 182, 462
- Lynn, R., xxiv, 74, 329, 512, 586
- Lyons, P., 130, 133, 171, 173, 516
- Lyotard, Jean-François, 393
- Lysenkoism, 187
- Macdonald, Dwight, 214, 215, 318, 448
- Macfarlane, A., 314, 316
- Mahler, Gustav, 573, 575
- Mailer, Norman, 17, 319, 322, 448
- Marcus, J., 19, 98, 201, 320, 497, 560
- Marcuse, Herbert, lxxii, 150, 287, 294, 300, 319, 320, 321, 322, 350, 351, 352, 355, 357, 360, 376, 385, 461, 462
- Marshall, Louis, 48, 49, 137, 487, 490, 497, 505, 506, 536
- Marx, Karl, lvii, 21, 32, 45, 83, 95, 96, 97, 167, 169, 256, 295, 321, 322, 352, 444, 461, 464, 469
- Marxism, xxxv, xlv, li, 24, 71, 83, 95, 96, 97, 102, 107, 128, 164, 167, 182, 214, 215, 239, 289, 326, 334, 336, 348, 360, 362, 363, 376, 385, 466, 469, 552
- Maslow, Will, 519, 523
- Massing, M., 208, 216, 217, 218, 239
- Massing, Paul W., 15, 335, 434
- Masson, Jeffrey, 304, 307, 310
- Maynard Smith, John, 32, 78, 80
- McCarran, Sen. Pat, 521, 529, 530, 540, 547, 548
- McCarran-Walter (Immigration and Nationality) Act of 1952, 521, 522, 523, 525, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 537, 538, 540, 545, 547, 594
- McCarthy, Joseph, 72, 135, 140–45, 225
- McCarthyism, 125, 136, 139, 140–45, 158, 379, 381, 482, 538
- Mead, Margaret, 31, 51, 52, 55, 57, 62, 63, 64, 66, 68, 69, 204, 392, 438, 495
- media: decline of Jewish influence, 557–59
- media, Jewish involvement in, xxxvii, lxxiv–lxxxvi
- Medved, Michael, lxxvi, lxxxii, lxxxiii
- Mehler, Barry, 81
- Meir, PM Golda, xxxiii, 105, 106, 258
- Menorah Journal, The, 444, 448, 461, 463
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, xxxiv
- messianism, as characteristic of Jewish intellectual movements, 83, 96, 151, 152, 156, 157, 164, 165, 285, 295, 313, 325, 326, 355, 399

- Minc, Hilary, 184  
 Mitscherlich, Alexander, 323  
 Molotov, Vyacheslav, 102, 106  
 monogamy, as Western marriage system, 312–17  
 Montagu, Ashley (Israel Ehrenberg), 44, 62, 495  
 moral communities, xli, xliii, lx, lxxv, 27, 203, 556, 590  
 Morgenthau Plan, xxxix  
 Morgenthau, Henry, Jr., xxxix  
 Morton, Samuel George, 76  
 Mosse, G. L., 14, 17, 36, 150, 151, 460, 584  
 Mosse, W. E., 15, 36, 159, 466  
 Moynihan, Daniel P., 17, 220, 221, 229, 231, 255, 257, 311, 411, 466  
 multiculturalism. *See* cultural pluralism, as Jewish interest  
 Murdoch, Rupert, lxxix, lxxx, 206, 553  
 Murray, Charles, xv, xxxi, lvi, lxvi, 198, 245, 321, 579, *See also* Bell Curve, *The*  
 Napoleon, 285  
 Nathan of Gaza, 295  
 National Socialism, xviii, xxxvi, xxxvii, lxxii, lxxxix, 14, 15, 17, 36, 39, 41, 49, 77, 80, 84, 86, 104, 105, 106, 109, 111, 123, 174, 175, 176, 235, 252, 280, 281, 320, 325, 334, 336, 340, 347, 364, 366, 373, 374, 377, 388, 394, 404, 405, 454, 458, 491, 570  
 nationalism: gentile, xlv, 14, 96, 167, 180, 191, 192, 255, 371, 372, 373, 397, 450, 461, 484, 485, 498, 577; Jewish, 98, 99, 100, 102, 156, 279, 437, 577  
 Nazism. *See* National Socialism  
 neoconservatism, xviii, lix, lxvii, 5, 11, 12, 180, 195–273  
 neo-Orthodox Judaism. *See* Orthodox Judaism  
 Netanyahu, Benjamin, lxxxv, xc, 249  
 Neuringer, S. M., 8, 205, 487, 501, 502, 503, 505, 506, 515, 516, 517, 519, 520, 521, 522, 538, 540  
 new elite, 563–65  
 New Left, 12, 145–51, 154, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 167, 172, 203, 215, 216, 223, 224, 240, 330, 385, 456, 461  
 New York intellectuals, 318  
 New York Intellectuals, xlv, lix, lxi, lxiii, 142, 363, 377, 380, 443–51, 459, 461, 463, 467, 490, 582  
 New York Review of Books (NYRB), *The*, 80, 319, 444  
 New York Times, *The*, xxii, xxxvii, xxxix, lxv, lxxiii, lxxiv, lxxviii, lxxix, lxxxiv, lxxxvi, 45, 50, 100, 148, 206, 207, 222, 239, 247, 269, 386, 388, 530, 534, 557, 558, 577  
 Newhouse, Samuel Irving, xxxviii, lxxviii  
 Niebuhr, Reinhold, xli, lxvi, lxvii, 219  
 Nolte, Ernst, 121, 174, 175  
 Nordic superiority theory, 54, 65, 74, 492–94, 509–14, 523, 524  
 Novick, Peter, lix, lxx, lxxi, lxxii, lxxiii, lxxxi, 136, 383  
 Oedipal complex, 287, 288, 297, 298, 303, 304, 305, 309, 324  
 Orthodox Judaism, xxii, 36, 49, 64, 99, 158, 159, 181, 182, 209, 221, 335, 343, 351, 352, 353, 411, 435, 478, 514, 577, 578, 579  
 Ostjuden, xxxi, xxxii, 157, 351  
 Ozick, Cynthia, lvii, 459  
 Palestine/Palestinians, xxiv, xxv, xxx, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxix, lxxiii, lxxiv, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvi, xcvi, 2, 200, 204, 218, 222, 224, 231, 233, 248, 254, 256, 257, 259, 263, 264, 279, 351, 353, 446, 453, 491, 542, 567  
 Partisan Review, lix, 9, 215, 318, 319, 362, 363, 377, 443, 444, 445, 446, 448, 450, 451, 461, 463, 465, 469, 490, 541  
 Peretz, Martin, lxxviii, 260, 456  
 Perle, Richard, lvii, xcv, 197, 198, 202, 203, 204, 205, 230, 232, 240, 241, 242, 244, 246, 248–51, 251, 253, 255, 256, 257, 259, 260, 266, 269  
 Perlman, Rep. Philip B., 510, 514, 528  
 Phillips, William, 448, 465, 469, 490, 518  
 Pinker, Steven, xvii, 79  
 Pipes, Daniel, 207, 226, 255, 260, 262  
 Pipes, Richard, 82, 100, 122, 123, 153, 177, 228, 230, 232, 262  
 pluralism. *See* cultural pluralism, as Jewish interest  
 Podhoretz, Norman, xl, liv, lv, lvi, lvii, 11, 198, 203, 210, 213, 217, 219, 220, 221, 224, 226, 228, 230, 231, 242, 260, 266, 327, 377, 444, 448, 450, 451, 463, 487, 576, 582, 591  
 Poland, 72, 98, 103, 112, 122, 129, 132, 133, 151, 162, 163, 164, 169, 172, 173, 177, 178, 180, 181–95, 187, 213, 464, 507, 508, 509, 526, 527, 537  
 Pollock, Friedrich, 334, 354, 355  
 postmodernism, 393–405, 452, 471, 475  
 Powell, Colin, 202, 206, 246, 264  
 President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization (PCIN), 495, 528, 529, 531, 535, 537, 546, 587  
 Protocols of the Elders of Zion, *The*, liii, 3, 21, 191  
 Psychoanalytic Quarterly, *The*, 274, 308  
 psychological intensity. *See* emotional intensity of Jews  
 psychological intensity of Jews, lxxxvi, 197, 253

- Raab, Earl, 160, 382, 383, 485, 582  
 racial differences research, xxxiv, xcv, 6, 54,  
 59, 62, 63, 67, 76, 77, 84, 100, 377, 494, 500,  
 542, 571  
 racial purity, of Jews, 48, 87, 281, 505, 515  
 radical politics, Jewish involvement in. *See*  
 Leftist politics  
 Radin, Paul, 38, 39, 40, 41, 57, 65  
 Radosh, Ronald, 138, 139  
 Rahv, Philip, 444, 448, 490  
 Rank, Otto, 284, 286, 302, 303, 305  
 Rankin, Rep. John R., 379, 526  
 Rapoport, Joe, 139, 140  
 Rapoport, L., 101, 115, 120, 137, 151  
 Reform Judaism, lxxix, 35, 44, 45, 147, 159,  
 181, 286, 335, 454, 515, 579, 585  
 Reich, Wilhelm, lvii, 287, 289, 300, 318, 320,  
 321, 360, 464  
 Richardson, Harry & Salter, Frank, 551, 552,  
 553, 565, 569  
 Riesman, David, 383, 384, 448, 543  
 Rifkind, Simon H., 522, 523, 524, 528, 531,  
 539  
 Romania, xxviii, 14, 358, 402, 404, 509  
 Rome, xxviii, xxix, lxxviii, 257, 285, 289, 290,  
 297, 316, 364, 570  
 Rose, Steven, 70, 82, 83, 85, 86  
 Rosenberg, Alfred, 372  
 Rosenberg, Ethel and Julius, 131, 136, 138,  
 141, 143, 527  
 Rosenfeld, Isaac, 9, 321, 448  
 Rosenfield, Harry N., 528, 531, 539  
 Rosenman, Samuel I., xxxix  
 Rosenwald, Julius, 409, 497  
 Ross, Edward A., xxx, 489, 503, 504, 511  
 Roth, Philip, 23, 167  
 Rothman, S. & Isenberg, P., 16, 167, 289, 290,  
 291, 292  
 Rothman, S. & Lichter, S. R., xlviii, liv, 15, 17,  
 31, 70, 95, 98, 101, 130, 134, 135, 145, 146,  
 147, 148, 149, 151, 159, 164, 167, 168, 178, 180,  
 205, 320, 330, 456, 458, 467, 475  
 Rothschilds, 46, 211  
 Rubenstein, J., 100, 101, 106, 123  
 Rubin, Jennifer, 269, 577  
 Rubin, Jerry, 146  
 Rubin, Vitaly, 105  
 Rumsfeld, Donald, 202, 210, 253, 258, 259,  
 260, 261, 266  
 Rupp, Arthur, 64, 221, 464, 578  
 Rushton, J. Philippe, 74, 75, 76, 77, 84, 328,  
 457, 478, 492, 512  
 Russia, xvi, xviii, xxxvi, xxxvii, xlv, lv, lvi, 18,  
 38, 46, 47, 52, 58, 96, 98, 99, 100, 107, 110–  
 26, 134, 143, 154, 157, 158, 162, 174, 175, 176,  
 177, 180, 214, 227, 242, 250, 251, 267, 268,  
 345, 346, 347, 500, 504, 515, 526, 537, 544,  
 559  
 Ryan, Alan, xv, 579  
 Sabbath, Rep. Adolph, 73, 501, 509, 510, 514  
 Sachar, Howard Morley, xxviii, 146, 148, 177,  
 253, 379, 458, 461, 467, 482, 483, 488, 491,  
 582  
 Samelson, F., 72, 73, 74, 75, 493  
 Sammons, J. L., 21, 96, 313  
 Samuel, Maurice, 50, 484, 490, 507  
 Sanford, R. Nevitt, 405, 407, 414  
 Sapir, Edward, 38, 39, 40, 41, 57, 58, 68  
 Schatz, J., 22, 103, 104, 150, 151, 164, 165, 169,  
 173, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189,  
 190, 191, 192, 527  
 Schiff, Jacob, lxxix, 38, 45, 46, 47, 136, 137,  
 154, 207, 467, 497, 516  
 Schlesinger, Arthur M., 219  
 Schneerson, Menachem Mendel (Rebbe),  
 xxi, 64, 464  
 Schneirla, T. C., 80, 86  
 Schofield, R.. *See* Wrigley, E. A., & Schofield,  
 R.  
 Scholem, Gershom, xxi, 156, 334, 352, 459,  
 460  
 Schwartz, Delmore, 9, 448  
 science, use of as ideology, 6, 8, 18, 27, 468,  
 469, 474, 478  
 Scofield, C. I., lxxvii  
 secularization, xlvii, 70, 181, 251, 488, 500,  
 533  
 self-deception, xiv, xvi, 4, 18, 23, 103, 106,  
 108, 110, 126, 133, 166, 168, 170, 171, 172, 182,  
 184, 188, 191, 192, 197, 238, 284, 298, 394,  
 395, 440, 456, 457, 461, 476, 478, 588  
 sex differences, xliii, lxii, 77, 79  
 sexual reform and psychoanalysis, 278, 294  
 sexual repression, as element of  
 psychoanalytic theory, 286, 287, 288, 294,  
 298, 300, 319  
 Shachtman, Max, 196, 213, 214, 215, 216, 219,  
 463  
 Shachtmanite, 215, 216, 217, 228, 239  
 Shafarevich, Igor, 102, 123, 124  
 Shahak, Israel (and Norton Mezvinsky), xxi,  
 xxxiii  
 Shapiro, E. S., 148, 318, 443, 455  
 Shapiro, Karl, 9, 321  
 Sharon, Ariel, lxxxiv, lxxxv, 209, 249, 258  
 Shils, Edward A., 205, 382, 383, 384, 386, 448  
 Shulsky, Abram, 253, 255, 256  
 siege mentality, xxii, xxiv  
 Silberman, Charles E., xxiii, lxiii, lxxvi, 104,  
 159, 160, 486  
 Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC), lxxxix, xci,  
 208, 210

- skepticism, as feature of Jewish intellectual movements, 15, 56, 88, 89, 90, 91, 374, 394, 395, 398, 470, 474
- Smith, Gerald L. K., 144, 379
- Smith, Rogers M., 499, 589, 590, 591
- Snyderman, M. & Herrnstein, R. J., 72, 73, 75
- Sobran, Joseph, xl, 208, 225
- social identity theory, 8, 10, 18, 21, 22, 26, 103, 154, 159, 165, 166, 168, 173, 279, 280, 284, 292, 325, 408, 412, 433, 437, 465
- sociobiology, 70, 71, 78, 81, 82, 83, 86, 87, 89, *See also* Darwinism
- sociology, xlix, lxii, 7, 16, 32, 33, 309, 317, 334, 340, 359, 388, 405, 445, 448, 458, 469, 477, 572
- Sokolnikov, Grigory, 101, 118
- Solzhenitsyn, A., 97, 99, 101, 106, 114, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, 125, 176
- Sorin, G., 98, 126, 127, 130, 157, 515
- Soviet Union. *See* Russia
- Spencer, Herbert, 32
- Spielberg, Steven, lxxvii, lxxx
- Spier, Leslie, 38, 42, 57, 212
- Spinoza, Baruch, 13, 15, 24, 573, 574, 575
- Stalin, Joseph, 99, 101, 102, 105, 107, 111, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 135, 137, 149, 165, 176, 177, 178, 179, 183, 184, 190, 235, 359, 447
- Stimson, Sec. Henry L., 507
- Stocking, George, lvii, 35, 44, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 494
- Stoddard, T. Lothrop, xxxvi, 493
- Stoecker, Adolf, 15, 35
- Strauss, Leo, lix, 180, 195, 198, 199, 205, 234–38, 244, 245, 255, 261, 462, 467
- Studies in Prejudice* series, 333, 344, 356, 362, 363, 366, 370, 371, 376, 382, 386, 407, 408, 416, 431, 432, 434, 437, 500, 534
- Sulloway, Frank, 68, 285, 295, 302, 308, 310, 457
- Sulzberger family, xxxvii, lxxiii, lxxviii, lxxix
- superiority: of gentiles, 112, *See* Nordic superiority theory; of Jews, xxii, xxviii, 117, 129, 150, 164, 173, 189, 198, 221, 280, 281, 284, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 324, 325, 327, 339, 382, 384, 404, 446, 449, 450, 453, 464, 465
- Svonkin, S., 128, 131, 136, 141, 205, 483, 491, 498, 499, 500, 526, 527
- Syrian Jews (SY), xxxi
- Szajkowski, Z., 21, 114, 137, 154, 467
- Tarr, Z., 320, 340, 356, 361, 373
- Taylor, Jared, xc
- Terman, Lewis M., 74, 512
- Tikkun, 318, 444
- Torrey, E. Fuller, 56, 63, 66, 70, 278, 289, 295, 317, 318, 455
- Treitschke, Heinrich von, 14, 35, 489, 574
- Triandis, H. C., xix, 374, 375, 432, 463, 475
- Trilling, Diana, 448
- Trilling, Lionel, lvii, 444, 448, 449, 461, 463
- Trotsky, Leon, xxvii, xxviii, lix, 95, 100, 101, 102, 103, 116, 117, 118, 119, 130, 139, 150, 153, 162, 169, 174, 180, 181, 182, 196, 199, 213, 214, 239, 256, 289, 321, 443, 444, 447, 462, 463, 469, 490, 573
- Trotskyist, 2, 102, 103, 183, 199, 214, 215, 239, 448, 463, 490
- Truman: administration, 219, 253, 539; President Harry S., 132, 231, 451, 520, 521, 528, 532, 535, 540
- Ukraine, xviii, 102, 112, 115, 125, 139, 206, 227, 250, 266, 267, 268, 559
- universalism: and cosmopolitanism, 362, 363; and Jewish intellectual movements, 26, 100, 127, 166–73, 198, 237, 238, 242, 256, 263, 447, 576; combating anti-Semitism, 7, 10, 179; Western, 33, 233, 369, 394, 499, 573, 586, 592, 594
- Untermyer, Samuel, lxvii
- Unz, Ron, lxiv, lxxv, lxxxviii, 196, 223, 258, 268, 525, 561, 572
- Uritsky, Moisei Solomonovich, xxvii, 117, 118
- Vaile, Rep. William N., 511, 513, 547
- Vaksberg, A., 99, 101, 102, 106, 111, 122, 123
- Veblen, Thorstein, 24, 512
- Vidal, Gore, 451, 576
- Wagner, Richard, xviii, 14, 280, 398, 573
- Walter, Rep. Francis, 530–32, 538
- Walzer, Michael, lv, 21, 448
- Warburg family, 136, 137, 467
- Warburg, Felix, 45, 46, 52, 53
- Warburg, Max, 52
- Warburg, Paul, 38, 45, 497
- Washington Post*, The, xxxvii, lxxix, 124, 259, 386, 534, 559
- WASP. *See* Christianity: WASP/Protestant elite
- Wattenberg, Ben, 202, 203, 225, 226, 228, 231, 232, 252, 487
- Weil, Felix, 333, 334, 466
- Weimar Republic/period, 14, 15, 147, 235, 237, 238, 334, 339, 352, 355, 370, 372, 392, 460, 584
- Werth, N., 114, 120, 139
- Western individualism. *See* individualism
- White working class, li, lii, lxi, 98, 146, 173, 376, 565
- White, Leslie, 18, 35, 55, 57, 65, 66
- Wiesel, Elie, lxx, lxxiii
- Wiesenthal, Simon, lxxi, *See also* Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC)

- Wiggershaus, R., 320, 334, 356, 357, 360, 361,  
364, 365, 366, 369, 370, 385, 393, 439, 440,  
462, 466, 467, 469
- Wilson: administration, 505; President  
Woodrow, 70, 503
- Wilson, E. O., liii, 77, 83, 84, 90
- Wilson, J. Q., 313, 329
- Wilson, James Q., 300
- Wise, Rabbi Stephen S., lxxix, 137, 506, 510,  
536
- Wisse, Ruth, 171, 221, 222, 443
- Wittels, Fritz, 286, 299, 302, 306, 308, 313
- Wolfowitz, Paul, lvii, xcv, 205, 206, 230, 232,  
241, 244–48, 248, 251, 255, 256, 257, 259,  
260, 261, 265, 266
- World Jewish Congress, lxxix, 137, 552
- Wrigley, E. A. & Schofield, R., 314
- Yerushalmi, Y. H., 273, 279, 280, 281, 282,  
283, 284, 291, 292, 294, 302, 312, 326, 327
- Zangwill, Israel, 503, 504, 505, 509, 543, 590,  
593, 594
- Zhemchuzhina, Polina, 106
- Zinoviev, Grigory, xxvii, 101, 117, 118, 119, 174,  
175
- Zionism, xxxii, xxxix, 4, 5, 46, 48, 51, 100, 105,  
106, 130, 132, 135, 156, 158, 172, 181, 182,  
189, 191, 216, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223, 249,  
279, 334, 335, 343, 351, 354, 355, 373, 446,  
488, 491, 516, 578, 579, 594; Christian  
Zionism, lxxvii, 229
- Zuckerman, Mortimer B., lxxviii