

# Ethnic Genetic Interests

by JWH

## Introduction

“Mainstream” discussions about immigration, race, and the implications of a multiracial society usually consider only secondary questions such as economics, crime, culture, etc. They ignore the ultimate interest of a people: genetic continuity. No rational person would support policies that would, on the one hand, “enrich” their family while, on the other hand, simultaneously replace their family with strangers. And yet we seem to completely ignore the large scale effects of public policies on our greater “extended family”— the racial and ethnic groups to which we belong. Concerned individuals have awaited a comprehensive and honest study of these issues. The wait is over. Dr. Frank Salter has published just such an analysis in the journal *Population and Environment* (Vol. 24, No. 2, November 2002, pages 111-140), entitled: “Estimating Ethnic Genetic Interests: Is it Adaptive to Resist Replacement Migration?” He has then followed this crucially important article with an even more detailed study in the book, “On Genetic Interests,” reprint: Transaction Publishers, 2007. The following summary is based upon Dr. Salter’s work.

## Basic Considerations

Essentially, life as we know it is ultimately about the propagation of distinctive genetic information from one generation to the next. Living organisms can be seen as the vehicles by which this propagation occurs. Family members share many of the same distinctive genetic information, so a person’s fitness is increased by the survival and reproductive success of his or her family. This is true also for population groups, or “ethnies,” a term which can refer to races, ethnic groups, and/or various subgroupings of these. Like families, members of an ethny have more distinctive genetic information in common with each other than they do with people of other populations. Although the genetic relationship of ethny members is more diluted than that of family members, ethnies are larger reservoirs of genetic interests for their members because of their size, which can number in the many millions. Therefore, it can be as adaptive, or more so, to support one’s ethnic or racial group as it would be to support one’s own family.

A defined territory is crucial for the survival of an ethny. In the long run, territory is crucial for survival, and human history is largely a record of groups expanding and contracting, conquering or being conquered, migrating or being displaced by migrants. The loss of territory, whether by military defeat or displacement by migrants, brings ethnic diminishment or destruction - precisely what is happening in the “multicultural” West today. An important part of Dr. Salter’s work is a quantitative analysis of this negative genetic impact.

## Carrying Capacity

Dr. Salter’s analysis is based on two concepts: carrying capacity and genetic kinship. Carrying capacity is the maximum population that can live in a given territory. Although technology and increased economic efficiency can increase carrying capacity, there is a practical limit above which further population growth is not possible. Many ecologists believe we are approaching, or

have surpassed, the practical carrying capacity of the Earth. Even if these ecologists are wrong about the Earth as a whole, it is clear that carrying capacity has already been exceeded in those areas where over-population has badly damaged the environment or depleted natural resources. Immigration undermines the interests of natives even if their territory has not reached its carrying capacity. For example, the carrying capacity of the United States is probably significantly greater than its current population. However, one day its carrying capacity *will* be reached, and if at that point part of the country is filled with the descendants of today's immigrants, natives will have no room into which they can expand. In other words, even if the carrying capacity of the United States is as high as 600 million or more, if that population figure is ever reached, some portion will be the descendants of alien immigrants. The presence of millions of non-whites will make the parts of the United States they occupy unavailable to whites. We may reach carrying capacity later rather than sooner, but since the earth is a "closed system," it will happen eventually. The same principles apply to any other nation, including the nations of Europe, many of which are more densely populated than is the United States.

### **Kinship and Child Equivalents**

It is important to note that Dr. Salter treats the arrival of immigrants, not as a simple addition to the population, but as a one-for-one *displacement* of natives. This is methodologically correct, because when a nation reaches its carrying capacity, it is the presence of immigrants and their descendants that makes it impossible for natives to increase their numbers. What may not appear to be one-for-one displacement today will, in retrospect, be seen to be precisely that. The other concept central to Dr. Salter's paper is genetic kinship. Even though all humans share much genetic information, kinship is a measure of the genetic similarities and differences above and beyond this general genetic sharing.

Dr. Salter expresses the loss of genetic interest in units he calls "child-equivalents." In other words, Dr. Salter is asking: For any given member of the native population, what is the number of lost children that would equal the loss of his or her genetic interests caused by the arrival of a certain number of alien peoples? Note that we are not talking about actual children, but genetic equivalents put into the form of the parent-child relationship. Put differently, the arrival of immigrants from other ethnies will change the genetic character of a population, and make it more alien to every member of the native ethny. The amount of genetic change, from the point of view of any given member of the native group, can be calculated as the equivalent of the number of children *not born* to that person. This is putting a number on the replacement of members of one group by members of another.

Some examples will make this clearer. The data that Dr. Salter used for these calculations derives from genetic assays. Please note that these specific studies are somewhat dated, although the most basic findings have been replicated in more recent research. It is very important to note that these data almost certainly **underestimate** the extent of genetic interests and **underestimate** the genetic damage done by immigration and multiracialism. That is because not only are the original studies somewhat dated and not as detailed as later work, but the findings do not include differences inherent in higher order genetic structure, which also contribute to genetic interests. Dr. Salter begins by considering the English as the native population, and examines the effects of the immigration of 10,000 Danes, an ethny that is genetically very close to the English. Replacing 10,000 Englishmen with 10,000 Danes changes the genetic characteristics of the population so much that the resulting "post-displacement" population differs from the undisturbed population

by the equivalent of an Englishman (or woman) “not having had” 167 children! Again, we are not talking about actual children, but of the genetic equivalent.

### **Effects of Immigration and a Multiracial Society**

Let us consider other examples. What if the immigrants were Bantus - a population very genetically distant from the English - rather than Danes? Here the genetic cost to any given Englishman of the arrival of 10,000 Bantus is the equivalent of 10,854 lost children! Clearly, the extent of the genetic transformation of a population depends on the genetic distance between the native and immigrant populations.

What if the levels of immigration were greater, and more in keeping with the massive displacement of Western peoples we observe today? If 12.5 million Englishmen were replaced by an equal number of Danes, the genetic loss to *each individual Englishman* would be the equivalent of 209,000 children not born; if the immigrants were from India, the loss would be 2.6 million children; if the immigrants were Bantus, 13 million. These figures are not “guesses;” they are objective, mathematical results based on genetic data. As stated above, these figures likely underestimate the real genetic damage. It is also important to stress that this loss is not somehow reduced by being spread over the entire native population. The loss in terms of genetic equivalents reflects the change in population from the point of view of every member of the native populace. Dr. Salter writes: “For a native woman it is equivalent to the loss of *her* children and grandchildren, for a native man it is equivalent to the loss of *his* children and grandchildren, though on a much larger scale” (emphasis in original paper).

To further illustrate these points Salter then determines the number of immigrants of group *y* necessary to reduce the genetic interests of a random member of native group *x* by one child equivalent. For Europeans, an average of only 1.1 African or 1.7 Northeast Asian immigrants is sufficient for the loss of one child equivalent. In other words, using conservative genetic data that likely underestimate these effects, the presence of about one African, or about two Northeast Asians, damages the genetic interests of a typical white (i.e., of European ancestry) person to a degree equivalent to that of losing a child. This is a powerful and personal argument against racially alien immigration and against a multiracial society.

While plunging birthrates may be damaging for European-derived peoples, their replacement by genetically alien immigrants is much worse. A falling birthrate reduces the population but does not transform it, and a future increase in birthrates can always make up for the loss. Once immigrants have established themselves in a territory their genes are a permanent addition. From the standpoint of genetic interests, the idea that “immigration makes up for low native birthrates” is pathological. The assertion that immigrants must be imported for “economic” reasons, or for some other short-sighted rationale, is therefore exposed as incredibly destructive to the interests of the natives. Any consideration of the costs vs. benefits of immigration – or of a multiracial society in general – must absolutely consider the costs incurred at the most basic, most personal, and most fundamental human level. After all, humans are living, breathing organisms – “economic growth” or other issues are important only insofar as they influence real, living humans and human interests. A people do not “benefit” from “X” if “X” results in that people’s displacement and their replacement by others to an extent equivalent to mass murder. Genetically, mass alien immigration is genocide. Similarly, a multicultural, multiracial society that manages the demographic eclipse of its majority population is also practicing genocide.

These are facts which cannot be responsibly evaded.

## **Biopolitics**

This is **not** meant to inspire dislike or anger towards immigrants – or towards any other people. On the contrary, such emotions are self-defeating and counter-productive. After all, these peoples are only taking advantage of the opportunities given to them for a better life and to expand their numbers in other peoples' lands. No, the ultimate causes of Western decline are that the governments and "leaders" of the West are openly and actively betraying the interests of their own peoples, and that the peoples of the West themselves, all too comfortable and unconcerned with their own demise, are seemingly uninterested in defending their interests. Or is it that Westerners are grossly uninformed about where their real interests lie?

Thus, this essay has three basic purposes. First, to introduce the fundamentally important concept of genetic interests – which are ultimate interests – to Western peoples. Second, to explain, succinctly but precisely, what is at stake: the demographic decline of an entire people, with a consequent devastating personal loss for each and every member of that people. Third, to encourage Western peoples, so informed, to engage in legal, peaceful, non-violent, and rational sociopolitical activism to pursue their genetic interests. Which means: to ensure their own survival.

What is required is the practice of *biopolitics* – the fusion of biological, human concerns with political action and public policy initiatives. Westerners need to stop focusing exclusively on secondary issues such as economics and economic growth, "cultural assimilation," employment opportunities, funding for pensions, and a myriad of other concerns which – while certainly important and certainly worthy of interest and consideration – pale in significance compared to the ultimate problem of demographic displacement.

*Survival comes first. All else comes second. Genetic interests come first. Other interests come second. Biopolitics will reorder priorities in the recognition that the well being of the Peoples of the West first requires that these peoples continue to exist. Biopolitics will ensure that they do.*

---

**This essay is adapted from an analysis of Dr. Salter's work that was published in the February 2003 issue of the journal *American Renaissance* (<http://www.amren.com>).**