

academic world, the bureaucracies, corporate and governmental, the arts, professions, and think tanks, in America there has always been opportunity for those with dreams and drive...In America, character, not IQ, is destiny."

Pat's attitude is that of a true paleo, a right-wing populist; we can let statisticians of various brands: be they hard leftists, liberals, or neocons, worry about how exactly government should allocate our resources, or who exactly should climb high in the ranks of the power elite. Paleo-

are concerned rather about freedom, and about sweeping away the entire power elite structure that is tyrannizing over us all.

All right, then, members of the Smear Bund: *who* are the "racists" now?

So: Why Talk About Race at All?

If, then, the Race Question is really a problem for statisticians and not for paleos, why should we talk about the race matter at all? Why should it be a political concern for us; why not leave the issue entirely to the scientists?

Two reasons we have al-

ready mentioned; to celebrate the victory of freedom of inquiry and of truth for its own sake; and as a bullet through the heart of the egalitarian-socialist project. But there is a third reason as well: as a powerful defense of the results of the free market.

If and when we as populists and libertarians abolish the welfare state in all of its aspects, and property rights and the free market shall be triumphant once more, many individuals and groups will predictably not like the end result. In that case, those ethnic and other groups who might be concentrated in lower-income or less prestigious occupations, guided by their socialistic mentors, will predictably raise the cry that free-market capitalism is evil and "discriminatory" and that therefore collectivism is needed to redress the balance. In that case, the intelligence argument will become useful to defend the market economy and the free society from ignorant or self-serving attacks. In short; racialist science is properly not an act of aggression or a cover for oppression of one group over another, but, on the contrary, an opera-

tion in defense of private property against assaults by aggressors.

In any case, there is cause for jubilation these days, for it looks as if the Left egalitarian blackout-and-smear gang has been dealt a truly lethal blow. ■

St. Hillary and the Religious Left

by M.N.R.

For some time I have been hammering at the theme that the main cultural and political problem of our time is *not* "secular humanism." The problem with making secularism the central focus of opposition is that, by itself, secularism would totally lack the fanaticism, the demonic energy, the continuing and permanent drive to take over and remake the culture and the society, that has marked the Left for two centuries. Logically, one would expect a secular humanist to be a passive skeptic, ready to adapt to almost any existing state of affairs; David Hume, for example, a philosophic disaster but quietly benign in social and political matters, would seem to be typical. Hardly a political and cultural menace.

No: the hallmark and the fanatical drive of the Left for these past centuries has been very different: a sometimes atheized, often Pantheized, the ("New Age") and origi-

It looks as if the Left egalitarian blackout-and-smear gang has been dealt a truly lethal blow.