

Can You Marry a Foreigner Yet Still Be Ethnocentric? A Response to Cofnas' Criticisms of Kevin MacDonald's *Culture of Critique*

Edward Dutton

Ulster Institute for Social Research, London

Cofnas (2018b) has critiqued Dutton's (2018) proposition that Jewish involvement in Leftist, Western-tradition/nationalism critiquing movements may partly be attributed to relatively high Jewish ethnocentrism, rather than exclusively to relatively high Jewish intelligence. Here, I present the background to what has become a heated debate, and proceed to show that (1) There is compelling evidence that humans act, even in mundane tasks, in their genetic (and specifically ethnic) interests (2) Jews are relatively high in ethnocentrism and high levels of Jewish exogamous marriage do not undermine this because (a) marriage is an isolated measure of ethnocentrism; (b) Jewish-Gentile marriages are relatively unstable, implying a low level of bonding and so not implying low Jewish ethnocentrism; and (c) high exogamous marriage would be consistent with the kind of majority-embracing group strategy of which MacDonald's (1998) *Culture of Critique* model is a part. Given these empirical observations, I conclude that (3) MacDonald's model is potentially falsifiable and it makes testable predictions. It should now be tested more extensively and systematically.

Key Words: Evolution; Ethnocentrism; Judaism; Marriage; Race

Kevin MacDonald's (1998) book *Culture of Critique* has aroused considerable controversy. MacDonald theorizes that Judaism should be understood as a 'group evolutionary strategy,' which has led to the development of a group which is highly intelligent, extremely conscientious, and high in positive and negative ethnocentrism. Most contentious is MacDonald's claim that a number of significant intellectual and political movements—such as Boasian anthropology, Freudian psychoanalysis, and multiculturalism—were developed by Jews in order to aid Jewish group evolutionary interests, undermine the cohesion of Gentile host populations, and weaken Gentile resistance to Jewish influence. Their doing so would be an expression of an evolved set of cognitive structures that frame human thinking about the in-group and the out-group, cognitive structures which would exist in all human groups to varying degrees. These movements achieved this aim, argues MacDonald, by undermining Western religion and traditions. These movements, however, do not undermine Jewish ethnocentrism, as it is not the society's dominant ideology (meaning it is not subjected to the same scrutiny) and because movements such as multiculturalism specifically promote ethnocentrism among non-White groups within predominantly white societies. Marxism's place in MacDonald's model is questionable, because the Jews involved did not tend to identify as Jewish, including Marx himself. However, it can be argued that dedication to an eternal World Revolution implies a very strong sense of group-centrism and thus draws upon key aspects of ethnocentrism.

This article is a reply to Cofnas (2018b) which is itself a reply to my (Dutton, 2018) article which was itself a reply to Cofnas' (2018a) critique of Kevin MacDonald's (1998) *Culture of Critique*. This article attempts to identify key aspects of MacDonald's argument, and assesses the evidence that relates to them. I will argue that (1) The human species is, at large, evolved to be ethnocentric (cooperative with the in-group, hostile to the out-group), which manifests even in superficially trivial areas of life; (2) Jews exhibit somewhat higher ethnocentrism, according to reliable data, than other Europeans; (3) This fact is not undermined by the high rates of Jewish exogamous marriage that are found in several Jewish populations, particularly in Western societies. This is because marriage is only one aspect of

ethnocentrism and these exogamous marriages are particularly unstable. They do not therefore indicate a high capacity of Jews to bond with Gentiles; (4) Multilevel (group) selection is an acceptable model, from which it follows that (5) Jewish exogamous marriage might be consistent with an evolutionary strategy where a minority integrates with the majority while relatively surreptitiously undermining institutions which help to promote the majority's ethnic interests or sense of ethnocentrism. Thus, there are (6) rational arguments for the notion that Ashkenazi Jews are represented in Leftist movements not just because of their high average IQ but also because of their high ethnocentrism. It must be stressed that when I use the word 'strategy' I am not talking about anything 'intentional.' I am purely using the term in an evolutionary sense of a means of ensuring the maximizing of an organism's, sub-species' or species' genetic interests under conditions of Darwinian selection.

We are at the stage of critiquing the critique of a critique of a critique of *Culture of Critique* because, since the beginning of 2018, there has been an on-going debate with regard to MacDonald's theory. Before we turn to the defense of Dutton (2018), I will provide some background to what is no ordinary academic exchange of ideas.

Kevin MacDonald vs Nathan Cofnas

Kevin MacDonald's theories have gained a considerable following outside of academia, but only in 2018 did anybody, specifically Nathan Cofnas (2018a), present a detailed critique of MacDonald's model in an academic journal: *Human Nature*. Cofnas' most fundamental argument is that the evidence which MacDonald presents can be more parsimoniously explained by what Cofnas terms the 'default hypothesis.' This is that Jews, specifically Ashkenazi Jews in the USA, have an average IQ score of 112 points (117 points on language), which is almost one standard deviation above that of Gentile Americans of European origin (Lynn, 2011).¹ In addition, Jews in Western countries have tended to be heavily concentrated in urban areas. For these two reasons, Cofnas maintains that we would expect Jews to be heavily over-represented in all intellectual and political movements that were not overtly anti-Semitic. Consistent with this model, Cofnas observes that Jews are also heavily over-represented in (non-anti-Semitic) conservative intellectual and political movements of the kind which, following MacDonald's thesis, would actually damage their group interests.

The response to Cofnas' critique has come in three parts. Firstly, there has been a series of online exchanges of papers and comments between Kevin MacDonald and Nathan Cofnas, which continues to date. MacDonald (2018a,b) argued that his model cannot be falsified by individual counter-examples because the central issue relates to overall patterns of behavior among Jewish leaders of Leftist movements. Cofnas (16th April 2018) averred that MacDonald had effectively diluted his theory in response to Cofnas' critique and did so without making any new predictions. The debate continued with MacDonald (2nd May 2018), Cofnas (March 2018) and Cofnas (2nd May 2018). The second response was a critique by Dutton (2018), published in *Evolutionary Psychological Science*. I presented evidence that people tend to act, overall, in their genetic interests, and specifically in the interests of their ethny, in other words in an ethnocentric fashion. Based on research by Dunkel and Dutton (2016), I demonstrated that Jews are more ethnocentric than non-Jewish Europeans. I argued that it followed that ethnocentrism should be understood as part of the reason for Jewish over-representation in movements which help to undermine Western traditions and nationalism. Jewish involvement in supposedly right-wing movements — such as research on race and intelligence — would, thus, be purely a product of their very high IQ, this

¹ Cofnas assumes the veracity of group differences in IQ. Some researchers dispute these, but there is no logical or consistent reason to do so. Group IQ scores robustly correlate in the expected direction with objective measures such as reaction times and encephalization quotient and, as shown recently, polygenic scores for educational attainment (Piffer, 2018); groups' differences in IQ correlate very strongly (0.8) in the expected direction with other measures of cognitive ability such as international school assessment tests, and there is no consistent evidence whatsoever for so-called 'stereotype threat' which is also subject to pronounced publication bias (Dutton & Woodley of Menie, 2018, p.19). Accordingly, Cofnas' assumption is entirely reasonable.

permitting them to better overcome such cognitive biases as ethnocentrism, and so examine situations in a more objective fashion (see Dutton & van der Linden, 2017).

Like Cofnas' original critique, my (Dutton, 2018) rejoinder seemed to arouse considerable ire, with some commentators flabbergasted that it had passed peer-review and been published in a mainstream academic journal at all. The online magazine *UnDark* ran an entire article about the affair (Schulson, 27th June 2018) entitled: 'Kevin MacDonald and the Elevation of Anti-Semitic Pseudoscience' and subtitled 'Why are ostensibly respectable, peer-reviewed journals now publishing discussions of what has long been dismissed as bigoted psychological research?' The article was hardly impartial. The use of the word 'journals', in the plural, implies not just that *Evolutionary Psychological Science* was morally wrong to publish a guarded defense of MacDonald's theory, but that *Human Nature* was morally wrong even to publish Cofnas' critique of it in the first place. Presumably, this was *verboten* because, as the author rhetorically asks, 'Does bigoted academic work like Kevin MacDonald's warrant a fair rebuttal, or does that legitimize it as part of mainstream discourse?' Further testimony to the report's lack of objectivity is the fact that it was illustrated with a cartoon image of a member of the Ku Klux Klan hiding behind a bookshelf. The author, Michael Schulson, implied that if empirical research leads to conclusions that 'mirror' anti-Semitic beliefs it is morally questionable to publish such research. He demanded that the editor of *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, Todd Shackelford, justify publishing Dutton (2018), despite it passing peer review. This Shackelford duly did, but was evidently so flustered by a possible backlash that he seemingly rather forgot that something has either passed peer-review or it hasn't:

'...in a follow-up email, stressed that he has "serious reservations about Dutton's arguments." But he saw it as a serious response to Cofnas' dissection of MacDonald. "I thought Dutton did a very nice job of saying, 'hold on here, maybe we've thrown the baby out with the bathwater'" (Schulson, 27th June 2018).

The fact that Schulson mentioned that Shackelford sent 'a follow-up email' is further evidence of the article's sensationalist and biased angle, because it is a way of making Shackelford appear indecisive and worried. Schulson contacted the well-known psychologist Steven Pinker, who sits on the board of *Evolutionary Psychological Science*. Pinker promptly, 'sent a note to Shackelford (. . .) expressing his disappointment with the decision to publish [Dutton's article].' Shackelford then emailed Schulson again, stating that the journal would invite Cofnas to write a response to my rejoinder. This Cofnas (2018b) promptly did. Cofnas argued that there was only weak evidence that people act in the interests of their ethnicity and that most of the time people do not act in their genetic interests, let alone their ethnic interests. Cofnas maintained that US Jews have the highest intermarriage rate of any religious group in the USA, which he suggested would not be consistent with pronounced Jewish ethnocentrism. When Kevin MacDonald submitted a defense of my model to *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, the journal desk-rejected it, 'saying they didn't want to have any more on this topic' (Kevin MacDonald, personal correspondence, 22nd August 2018). It was, therefore, simply published online (MacDonald, 19th August 2018). This debate as a whole has raised new aspects of this issue, and Cofnas' arguments in particular have inspired further scrutiny into the empirical foundations of MacDonald's theory. The remainder of the present article will therefore present the arguments levelled against Dutton (2018) by Cofnas and develop or rebuff them as merited.

Evidence that People Act in their Ethnic Interests

Cofnas (2018b) disagrees with my argument that the evidence indicates that, overall, people tend to act in their ethnic interests. He provides specific examples of people not acting in their ethnic interests, presenting them as a series of rhetorical questions, such as: 'Was it in the ethnic interests of white Americans to fight a war over the slavery of Africans, which killed 600,000 white people?' These examples are straw man arguments, because I merely maintained that people tend to act in their individual and extended genetic interests, based on studies under controlled conditions (for literature reviews see Rushton, 2005; Salter & Harpending, 2012). This manifests itself in a tendency to invest more in, trust more and cooperate more with people who are, overall, more genetically similar to oneself. Accordingly,

people can operate in their individual, family, kin and ethnic interests, with an ethny being, demonstrably based on genetic data, a genetic extended kinship group (Salter, 2007). As such, it in no way challenges my argument to present some anecdotal examples of what may superficially appear to be non-ethnocentric behavior. Moreover, it is quite possible that some of the examples Cofnas highlights make sense in terms of kin selection.

Many studies have shown that people act in their genetic interests (e.g. Russell et al., 1985 on similarity of married couples; Rushton, 1989a on best friends; Rushton, 1989b on successful adoptions; Littlefield & Rushton, 1986 on bereavement behavior; Penton-Voak et al., 1999 on attractiveness) and specifically their ethnic interests (e.g. Irwin, 1987 regarding Inuit tribes; Aboud, 1988 on children's preference for their own ethnic group; Greenwald & Schuh, 1994 on academic citations; Salter, 2002 regarding beggars being treated differently according to ethnicity; Sanderson & Vanhanen, 2004 on generosity; Putnam, 2007 and Healy, 2007 on trusting behavior; Clark & Tuffin, 2015 on student living arrangements), but Cofnas still asserts that 'it seems a much stronger argument than I provided is needed to establish the principle that "people tend to act in their ethnic interests".' This is not a consistent position. A large number of studies demonstrate that people tend to act in their ethnic interests. Accordingly, this is as convincingly proved as less controversial areas of science the veracity of which few would question. Cofnas also argues:

'Suppose it is true that, as Dutton (. . .) says, "[o]n average [people] are more attracted to [those] who are more genetically similar to themselves, they are more likely to invest more in such people even within families and they are more likely to be friends with such people (. . .). Still, most people seem to be primarily focused on themselves, their family, and their friends. The activities that most people are emotionally involved with—sports, music, films, and the like—have nothing to do with advancing their ethnic interests.'

Cofnas' assertions here, about how 'most people' behave, appeals to anecdote and provides no evidence. Appealing to common experience is, by definition, appeal to anecdote and thus fallacious. If it is countered that Cofnas is appealing to stereotypes and that these tend to have a high degree of empirical accuracy (Jussim, 2012) then I would aver that this counter-argument can be refuted. Even if Cofnas is appealing to stereotypes, my argument in no way implies that all behaviors are ethnocentric acts. Furthermore, cultural artefacts that go under the rubric of entertainment may not be ethny-blind. They may in fact be manifestations and expressions of ethnic preferences or of ethnocentric instincts. Team sports can be understood to be parasitic upon tribal instincts and they often involve supporting a town or national team that are the champions of an ethnic group or subgroup. Under pre-modern conditions, these structures would tend to advance genetic interests, though they may have become maladaptive now because of the extent to which the Industrial Revolution has placed us in a situation to which we are not adapted.

Moreover, Cofnas' arguments touch only on the superficial level of these phenomena. Scientific theories with regard to how organisms act involve digging beneath the surface and developing a theory to explain what is actually happening. Thus, a religious group may assert that their meeting is focused around worshipping the gods, but an anthropological fieldworker may conclude that, to a significant degree, this worship involves competitively signaling religious commitment and playing for status (Lewis, 2003). A mother may tell you that she spans her daughter to make her behave, but a zoologist might observe that she makes her daughter bend over, placing her in a position of submission, presenting her buttocks, just as subordinate primates do to dominant primates (Morris, 1969). Biologist E. O. Wilson (30th March 1979, pp. 51-52) has noted, in his termite fantasy, that if termites could speak they would proclaim certain 'self-evident' truths, sanctified by a system of religion, such as:

' . . . the sanctity of the physiological caste system; the evil of personal reproduction by worker castes; the mystery of deep love for reproductive siblings, which turns to hatred the instant they mate; rejection of the evil of personal rights; the infinite aesthetic pleasures of pheromonal song; the aesthetic pleasure of eating from nestmates' anuses after the shedding of the skin; the joy of

cannibalism and surrender of the body for consumption when sick or injured (it is more blessed to be eaten than to eat) . . .'

But, surely, zoologists should not accept this at face value, but attempt to make sense of it in terms of scientific theories. Accordingly, it is perfectly possible — indeed, probable — that there are evolutionary dimensions to the most quotidian examples of human and animal behavior. If this is dismissed out of hand, then so is much of science.

Furthermore, the examples Cofnas advances — ‘themselves, their family, and their friends’ — involve degrees of genetic difference from self. The ethny is simply a further degree of difference from self along a spectrum of genetic similarity. So, of course, people will generally focus more on ‘themselves, their family, and their friends’ (likely in that order) than their ethny, but that does not mean that they do not focus on the ethny, and we have already noted evidence that they do. Pursuing Cofnas’ logic, one could assert that ‘people mainly focus on themselves’ and insist that it’s unconvincing to argue that they act in the interests of their family. We can observe in everyday life people tending to assort along ethnic lines. If Cofnas wishes to employ appeal to everyday experience, then he should go to a multiracial school, university campus, or jail and note the lines along which the students or inmates tend to assort and some of the empirical studies, already cited, are congruous with this.

Moreover, it is quite possible to argue that being interested, as ‘most people’ are, in ‘sports, music, films, and the like’, can be an expression of ethnocentrism, as can even the most mundane activities. Greenwald and Schuh’s (1994) large scale study of academic social science journals classified citing and cited academics, according to their surnames, as Jewish or non-Jewish. The author’s surname category was associated with a 40% increased likelihood of citing an academic with the same surname category. The authors noted that the overt Leftist bias in social science — part of which involves being strongly anti-racist — adds credence to the view that this was probably an unintended process. Cofnas seems to imply that, in everyday life, advancing one’s genetic interests is not important. But this study, and many others (see Rushton, 2005), show that it is.

Under pre-modern conditions, to which modern-day humans are cognitively adapted in many respects (see Boyer, 2001), fertility was correlated with socioeconomic status (Clark, 2007) and someone helping to promote your career and socioeconomic status would, accordingly, promote your genetic interests. The research on ethnocentrism in academic citations makes sense via this model. Acting in your ethnic interests would almost always have also been in your genetic interests under these intense Darwinian conditions even though this is not always so in an industrial society. Moreover, these instincts cannot be put down simply to specific environmental factors. Twin studies have shown that about 43 percent of individual differences in xenophobia are genetic (Barlow et al., 2016, p. 230), meaning it is approximately as genetic as it is environmental. And, in the ‘unnatural’ conditions of post-Industrial Revolution life, we would expect tribal instincts to be expressed in indirect fashions or even maladaptively. Thus, we can so far conclude that there is considerable evidence that people tend to act in their genetic and indeed ethnic interests and that the arguments that Cofnas has levelled against this proposition are either inconsistent or appeal to a variety of philosophical fallacies.

Jewish Ethnocentrism and Exogamous Marriage

Cofnas (2018b) also highlighted the high rate of marrying-out among American Jews, arguing that it demonstrates that they are low in positive ethnocentrism. He notes that: ‘In fact, *Jews have the highest intermarriage rates of any religious group in the USA.*’ In addition, Cofnas observes that the fact of opposing intermarriage contributes to a high score on the ethnocentrism scale employed in data drawn upon by Dunkel and Dutton (2016). Dunkel and Dutton’s Jewish sample was comprised both of Orthodox and more liberal Jews, and the former would be expected to be higher on ethnocentrism. That said, Cofnas perhaps slightly oversimplifies the situation when he writes: ‘This comment is noteworthy, since it explicitly acknowledges the obvious fact that marrying out into the general population is a sign of being less ethnocentric.’

Each of the measures employed in the MIDUS survey, upon which Dunkel and Dutton (2016) drew, can be regarded an indicator of ethnocentrism. However, it makes little sense to require that all indicators be present before diagnosing an omnibus behavioral tendency. A group can legitimately be regarded as relatively low in ethnocentrism even if it is prone to endogamous marriage, if that group attains low scores on most or all of the other indicators. Similarly, Europeans with low education are relatively high in ethnocentrism, based on their voting preferences and also attitudes (Krieger et al., 1993; Deary et al., 2008), but this group is the most likely to import wives from Southeast Asia (Dutton & Madison, 2017). Accordingly, to demonstrate that Reformed Jews strongly 'marry out' does not, in itself, counter the evidence of high Jewish ethnocentrism presented by Dunkel and Dutton (2016). Indeed, it could even be argued that a high level of exogamous marriage could be part of a group evolutionary strategy, an argument I will develop in the next section.

Multi-Level Selection Theory

Before laying out these arguments, it is however necessary to clarify the concept of 'group selection', which is contested by groups of scholars. Advocates of group selection refer to selection for groups that are composed of individuals that are distinguished from each other by average levels of certain traits. Because there are inter-group differences in the group averages of these traits, some groups are more successful at passing on their genes. Thus, the fitness of a group will be reduced or increased according to its composition and the way in which this influences the group average of traits such as within-group altruism and aggressiveness against out-groups. Broadly, this model of group selection is part of what is known as the Multi-Level Selection model. This refers to the way in which selection can occur at many levels, such as those of the individual, the kinship group, the ethnic group, and even the species (Wilson, 2002).

There is abundant evidence that people differentially select in favor of their kin, meaning that some people (see Rushton, 1995) and some families are more prone than others to aid their kin. Group selection extends this to the ethnic group, which is generally an extended kinship group (Salter, 2007). In much the same way, some people behave more consistently with being 'group selected' than others, being more interested in the good of their ethnic group and more inclined, for example, to lay down their lives for it. Thus a group having a higher percentage of people with these 'positively ethnocentric' traits can be described as more 'group selected', though environmental factors will also play a part in whether, to what extent and in what form ethnocentrism is expressed.

Group selection has also been criticized in depth by Steven Pinker (18th June 2012) in an essay entitled 'The false allure of group selection.' Dutton et al. (2018) observed that Pinker's 'key criticisms are that (1) Group selection deviates from the "random mutation" model inherent in evolution; (2) We are clearly not going to be selected to damage our individual interests, as group selection implies; and (3) Human altruism is self-interested and does not involve the kind of self-sacrifice engaged in by sterile bees.' Each of these points, note Dutton et al. (2018), can be answered. 'Firstly, if the group selection model is building on the individual selection model then it is bound to present a slightly different metaphor. To dismiss it on these grounds seems to betoken a fervent attachment to the original idea' (Dutton et al., 2018), a kind of fallacious appeal to authority or to the *status quo*. In what way does group selection deviate from this 'model'? It can be countered that it does not. Non-random association in forming a group is important to create differences between group averages and is therefore expected to enhance group selection.

Secondly, proponents of group selection argue that the group selection model merely suggests that a group will be more successful if an optimum percentage of its members are inclined to sacrifice themselves for their group. So, it is argued that a group will have higher fitness if there is sufficient genetic diversity, such that an optimum percentage are inclined to damage their individual interests for the sake of the group. In much the same way, a fertile mother who sacrifices her life to save her children is sacrificing her individual interests for those of her kin group; the model is merely extending this to a much larger kin group, the 'ethny'. Thirdly, 'it is clearly the case that a small percentage, in many groups, is

indeed prepared to sacrifice itself for the group' (Dutton et al., 2017), as has been explored in depth elsewhere (e.g. Salter, 2007). It is also worth noting that Pinker entitles his critique of group selection, 'The false allure of group selection', as if those who regard the concept as reasonable have been somehow beguiled and bewitched, thus machinating a 'poisoning of the well'. In effect, the reader will be nudged to believe that those who accept group selection are deceived.

Can a Group Be Ethnocentric and Exogamous?

So, returning to the issue of the Jewish selection strategy, if a group is the minority, then one strategy of survival is indeed extreme endogamy of the kind stereotypically practiced by Orthodox Jews. However, there are other strategies (I do not mean 'conscious strategies' here but 'evolutionary strategies') which may also be useful, depending on a myriad of factors and how they may happen to interact at a particular time. It is possible that an optimum level of exogamy could be just such a strategy. Jews carrying genes that made them highly ethnocentric would, under such conditions, have been more likely to remain Jews while those who were low in ethnocentrism would have defected. With a certain level of attrition in every generation, combined with low-ethnocentrism Gentiles marrying-in, an optimum level of ethnocentrism could be produced. Such a strategy could potentially have a number of interrelated benefits:

(1) It would dilute the gene pool, which would be important if the group had become so endogamous that it was at increased risk from double doses of harmful mutant genes.

(2) When the minority is small, as is the case with Ashkenazi Jews in the USA, it cannot hope to demographically dominate the majority and it can easily be dominated by the majority. Under "natural" conditions, where people raise as many children as their resources permit, an optimum strategy for a minority group to avoid persecution and maximize resources and influence would be to ingratiate itself with the majority population via an optimum level of exogamy. This will likely lead to a positive perception of the ethnic minority as a whole, helping to defuse any hostility or resentment which may be felt towards it, so long as the optimum balance is maintained. The offspring of such Jew-Gentile marriages may even themselves identify as Gentiles. This strategy is favored when the populations are physically so similar that the genetic differences are not visible amongst spouses and their children, and the human capital of the minority population is higher on average. That they generally do better than the average person will make them attractive as spouses and next of kin.

Although the optimum level of endogamy will sometimes not be reached, the strategy has at least protected the core Jewish population from persecution since World War II. As long as the genetic similarity of a "liberal" Jew (or Gentile-identifying offspring of a Jew) with the Orthodox core is greater than his genetic similarity with the Gentiles, exogamy amounts to group selection because it is "his" group that benefits. We can conceive of a process whereby Orthodox Jews have children who become Reformed Jews, who in turn have children who marry exogamously. As such, it is quite possible for high exogamy on the part of Reformed Jews to be a central component to an ethnocentric group "strategy", with the Jewish group as a whole having better survived under conditions of intergroup conflict precisely because it has acted in this way. It must be stressed, once more, that we are not talking about a conscious strategy of some Jews strategically marrying Gentiles because they have calculated that it will aid their ethnic group. We are rather dealing with genetically influenced inclinations and behaviors that have benefitted the group in the past and may still do so today.

This extremely subtle benefit of exogamy acting through group selection compensates for similarly subtle disadvantages. Most obviously, if you are a member of an ethnic minority, such as the Finland-Swedes (the small Swedish-speaking minority in Finland), and you have found yourself sexually attracted to a Finn and married to her, then your offspring are less genetically similar to you than they could be (Rushton, 2005). On the plus side, they will lack harmful double doses of mutant genes but, on the minus side, they carry fewer of your genes than they likely would if they had been fully Finland-Swedish. It has been demonstrated that two random members of an ethnic group will be, on average, more similar to

each other than they will be to a random outsider (Salter, 2007) and that Finns and Finland-Swedes are genetically distinct (Salmela et al., 2011).

In such a context, what actions will maximize your genetic fitness? You can invest in your nieces and nephews, of course, but you can also invest in your ethnic group. However, when your ethnic group is a small minority then acting in an overtly ethnocentric manner — such as some Finland-Swedes tend to — can potentially have negative consequences for the ethny as a whole. The genetic interests of the ethny would be better served if an optimum percentage of its members contribute to undermining the sense of ethnocentrism in the majority population. This would be particularly successful if the pioneers of this subtle Swedish ethnocentric movement were highly integrated Finland-Swedes, who had even wed Finns and raised their offspring as Finns. This system works as long as a core of the group — the protected core, if you like — continue to marry endogamously, just as with the Orthodox Jews.

This model can, likewise, be applied to Jews. Thus, Cofnas is right to point out that the kinds of Jews who pioneered movements which ‘critiqued’ European culture were not overtly Jewish — people like Boas, Freud and Marx. This is what we would expect because if the “group strategy” outlined above was occurring, its critique of the majority would be more persuasive if conducted by Jews who were highly integrated. In other words, there is a more-or-less random generation of a spectrum of endo- and exogamy among minority populations, the way random mutations originate in the genomes of individuals, with selection acting on the groups (rather than individuals) based on this group-level diversity. Only those minority groups with the right mix of endogamy and exogamy or assimilation survived while other minority groups disappeared. Jews, it would seem, have managed to occupy the ‘sweet spot’ where their group could survive while the Manichaeans, for example, disappeared because they had either too much or too little exogamy.

Another point is whether people are self-conscious of acting ethnocentrically. By default, there is no reason why one would be aware of so-being, because the associated behavioral tendencies emerge from instincts or cognitive biases modulating responses to environmental cues. In effect, we can all be likened to cogs in an extremely complex evolutionary engine. So, people like Freud or Marx would be acting, at an instinctive level, in their ethnic interests without being consciously aware of it.² This has numerous precedents in evolution. For example, Woodley and Figueredo (2014) have shown that many scientific geniuses — whose inventions massively benefitted the fitness of their ethny by allowing its population to hugely expand — were themselves childless and were essentially operating at the ethny level of multi-level selection. However, ensconced in their rooms, obsessed with solving a particular problem such as how to make clothes more efficiently, it is unlikely they would have been consciously aware of this.

In much the same way, when we go for a pint with a good friend and introduce him to a girl (with whom he could potentially breed), it does not tend to occur to us that we are promoting our genetic interests; even though it is clear that best friends are more similar genetically than are two random members of the same population (see above). However, it may be that we selected that particular girl due to genetic similarity to ourselves and to the friend; a decision which parallels the dynamics of arranged marriage. Parents will conclude that a certain potential wife simply ‘feels right’ without being conscious of the reasons, which are likely partly to do with genetic similarity (see Rushton, 2005). People will maximize their fitness — at least under conditions of selection — by optimally operating at the individual, kin, group and even species level, with the latter three having no clear, objective divide, but merely being a spectrum of genetic closeness to self. This is germane with regard to Jews because according to Dunkel and Dutton (2016), Jews are, along with Baptists, the most group-centric religious group in the USA. However, Baptists are extremely religious and have relatively low IQ, with both of these factors predicting group-centrism. Despite Jewish very low religiousness and very high IQ, **Jews** are still as group-centric as Baptists.

² It might be argued that Marx was anti-Semitic, but this appears to be a matter of considerable debate among historians of the period (e.g. McLellan, 1973, Ch. 1).

What I have argued so far is that the data Cofnas presents is, in fact, consistent with MacDonald's model. It might be countered that this makes MacDonald's model 'unfalsifiable' but this is not the case. I (Dutton, 2018) argue that (1) People act in their ethnic interests, (2) Jewish attitudes strongly imply that they tend to act somewhat more ethnocentrically than most groups with which they share a society and (3) Jewish involvement in Leftist movements is partly a reflection of a group evolutionary strategy. This compound argument is obviously falsified if any of its propositions are false. What we have shown here is that high exogamous marriage among Jews does not undermine Dutton's argument because (a) marriage choice is only one aspect of ethnocentrism and (b) it could feasibly be part of a broader evolutionary strategy. So, the model can be falsified, but it has not been.

Moreover, the defense presented here does not cause the broader theory to lose its ability to make predictions. You can predict, for example, that small minorities with a high IQ might tend towards this kind of strategy, and that is testable. For example, a similar strategy seems to have been adopted by the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland, as implied elsewhere. They convey themselves as a heroic yet rather comical group, but are strongly over-represented in society-critiquing movements, such as the arts. They are also strongly inclined to 'marry out', though a core group do not (Timchenko, 2011; Finnäs, 2012).

The Unstable Nature of Jewish Exogamous Marriage

There is a second, and related, counterargument to Cofnas' claim that exogamous marriage reflects low ethnocentrism. People typically marry with the intention to bond with and make sacrifices for one's spouse. That is consistent with assortative mating and the general tendency to marry those who are relatively genetically similar to themselves, meaning that bonding with them and helping them is ultimately promoting their genetic interests (Rushton, 2005). But this rule is not always obeyed. Clearly in the case of a 'gold digger' or a 'baby snatcher', bonding and self-sacrifice are unlikely to be germane and the union will often be unstable. It follows that marriage to someone from a different ethnic group is not always an indicator of low ethnocentrism. You could be highly ethnocentric, but marry a woman solely for her looks; a marriage that would likely end in divorce, as we will see below.

If the high frequency of Jewish-Gentile marriages betokens Jewish low ethnocentrism, then we would expect these marriages to involve just as much mutual self-sacrifice and bonding as other marriages and we would, therefore, expect their average divorce rate to be no different from that of other marriages. However, this is not the case. In the USA, the divorce rate in Jewish-Gentile marriages is double the divorce rate in Jewish-Jewish marriages (Wan & Zaretsky, 2004, p. 18). Data from between 1980 and 1990, for example, found that 35% of Reformed Jews in the USA married out, and they had a divorce rate of 11% after 10 years of marriage. However, among Reformed Jews who married-in the divorce rate was just 6%, not much more than half of those who marry out, so a pronounced difference (Chiswick, 1993). If these exogamous marriages betokened the same level of bonding as endogamous marriages, we would expect the divorce rate to be very similar. Interestingly, among marriages between white men and black women in the USA the divorce rate is half that found among white-white marriages, despite the fact that we might expect such a union to involve those who were relatively politically liberal (Bratter, 2008). This means that Jew-Gentile divorce rates cannot simply be put down to the general extent of cultural or genetic differences. So when comparing them to endogamous marriages, these Jewish-Gentile marriages are weaker unions, consistent with the idea that Jews, on average, bond more strongly with other Jews than they do with Gentiles.

In addition, a high percentage of Jewish intermarriages are second marriages, meaning that the Jews who marry Gentiles are likely to have already produced Jewish children. It has been found that 86% of Jewish first marriages are endogamous, but this is true of only 70% of Jewish second marriages (MacDonald, 2004, p. 320). Thus, exogamous marriage cannot be used as an argument for claiming that Jews are low in ethnocentrism, because the couples are ultimately only creating weak and short term bonds, which is what you would expect to happen if a strongly ethnocentric person married someone from a different racial group.

Unfalsifiable Arguments

Finally, Cofnas (2018b) highlights my (Dutton, 2018) attempt to reconcile high Jewish death rates under Soviet Communism with the argument that Jews involved in Marxism were involved in it as part of a group evolutionary strategy. Cofnas avers that this is unacceptable because if hardly any Jews had been killed this would presumably also have been used as an argument for MacDonald's thesis. He is correct that the same evidence cannot be deployed as both proof for and against a proposition, as it renders the proposition unfalsifiable and, therefore, unscientific. But this is not what was proposed. It was suggested in Dutton (2018) that high Jewish death rates under the Soviets were not *necessarily* evidence against MacDonald's thesis. However, as already noted above, Marxism does seem less congruous with MacDonald's model than other *Culture of Critique* ideologies. More broadly, Dutton (2018) maintains that no single piece of evidence can confirm or falsify MacDonald's thesis, at least not as it is formulated in his book. The version of the thesis that is presented in Dutton (2018), at least, is falsified if only one of its propositions can be falsified. Further, the thesis is less persuasive if it can be shown that no other minority comparable to Jews follows a comparable strategy, considering that the Jews can be characterized as a 'middle man minority', (Kugelmas, 1982) meaning that they tend to be wealthy, important to the economy and, while possibly subject to some discrimination, relatively influential. I should emphasize that I am not arguing that most of the dysfunction in modern societies — such as rioting in France and political inertia, at the time of writing, in Britain and the USA — is caused by the Jewish undermining of Gentile traditions. The argument is that a Jewish evolutionary strategy is an aspect of the undermining of certain Western traditions.³

Similarly, the theoretical approach taken to Jewish exogamous marriage in the previous section is not 'unfalsifiable'. I argue that an optimum level of exogamy with the majority race is potentially adaptive as part of a broader evolutionary strategy involving integration with but covert undermining of their ethnocentrism. This is not the same as trying to defend two opposite propositions with the same evidence.

Conclusion

Dutton's (2018) commentary on MacDonald's (1998) theory espoused in *Culture of Critique* stands up robustly to Cofnas' critique. We have seen that:

- (1) There is considerable evidence that people act in their genetic interests at the individual, family, kin and ethnic level, that they do so unconsciously, and that even the most superficially mundane activities can be manifestations of this.
- (2) Dunkel and Dutton (2016) demonstrated that Jews are relatively high in ethnocentrism overall and their low score in a single marker of ethnocentrism in no way undermines that assertion, any more than being low in a single trait of Conscientiousness undermines the assertion that someone is broadly otherwise high in Conscientiousness.
- (3) The highlighted marker of low Jewish ethnocentrism — marrying out — is not always a good indicator of low ethnocentrism, because a portion of the population do not select for genetic similarity, and thus the capacity to bond with someone, but for objects of attraction, such as youth and beauty as a reflection of genetic health. Congruous with this, Jewish marriages to Gentiles are less stable than are Jewish endogamous marriages.
- (4) Jewish out-marriage could anyway be part of a specific group evolutionary strategy of overt ingratiation with Europeans while subtly critiquing the pillars of European ethnocentrism, a hypothesis which permits specific predictions to be tested. Thus, Cofnas' marriage argument can be completely

³ Despite its relatively large Ashkenazi population, the USA has never had a large strongly Leftist political movement, though it might be averred that it has experienced as Gramscian 'March Through the Institutions' (see Gabb, 2007) by leftist ideas, just as Western Europe has.

rebuffed. Moreover, if this hypothesis is correct, we would expect that pioneers of movements that critique European norms would not be overtly or conspicuously Jewish, which Cofnas (2018b) notes is so.

In addition, this study has highlighted a number of problematic arguments presented both by Cofnas and Steven Pinker, in the latter case with reference to multi-level selection; fallacious arguments generally implying emotion are generally a problematic element in scientific discourse. A group evolutionary strategy based on Jews' higher level of ethnocentrism would be consistent with their over-representation in movements which critique and undermine European nationalism. Their average IQ will also be relevant. However, it is reasonable to argue that a group evolutionary strategy is relevant. This is because we all are prone to be ethnocentric, Jews are particularly ethnocentric and they are (or were) highly influential in Leftist movements. And these movements tend to critique Western traditions which elevate ethnocentrism, such as religion (Dutton, in press). This should now be further tested by exploring the activities of groups which have played a similar role to Jews – as a numerically small but highly intelligent and wealthy minority, such as white Zimbabweans or Han Chinese in Southeast Asia, whom one King of Thailand – King Rama IV (1880-1925) - actually termed 'The Jews of the East' (quoted in Lynn, 2008, p. 236)

References

- Aboud, F. (1988). *Children and Prejudice*. London: Blackwell.
- Barlow, F., Sherlock, J. & Zietsch, B. (2016). Is prejudice heritable? Evidence from twin studies. In: C. Cibley & F. Barlow (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyer, P. (2001). *Religion Explained: The Human Instincts that Fashion Gods, Spirits and Ancestors*. London: William Heinemann.
- Bratter, J.L. (2008). "But will it last?": Marital instability among interracial and same-race couples. *Family Relations* 57: 160-171.
- Chiswick, C. (1993). Determinants of religious intermarriage: Are Jews really different? *Papers in Jewish Demography* 1993: 247-257.
- Clark, G. (2007). *A Farewell to Alms: A Brief Economic History of the World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, V. & Tuffin, K. (2015). Choosing housemates and justifying age, gender and ethnic discrimination. *Australian Journal of Psychology* 67: 20-28.
- Cofnas, N. (2018a). Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy: A Critical analysis of Kevin MacDonald's theory. *Human Nature*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-018-9310-x>
- Cofnas, N. (2018b). Is Kevin MacDonald's theory of Judaism "plausible"? A response to Dutton (2018). *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-018-0162-8>
- Cofnas, N. (March 2018). Kevin MacDonald's response with my comments. *Preprints*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323918530_Kevin_MacDonald%27s_Response_with_Comments_by_Nathan_Cofnas
- Cofnas, N. (16th April 2018). Analysing Kevin MacDonald's 'Culture of Critique' and the alt-right's embrace of anti-Jewish ideology. *Genetic Literacy Project*, <https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2018/04/16/analyzing-kevin-macdonalds-culture-of-critique-and-the-alt-rights-embrace-of-anti-jewish-ideology/>

Cofnas, N. (2nd May 2018). Viewpoint: Kevin MacDonald won't accept evidence supporting alternative theories about Jewish influence. *Genetic Literacy Project*, <https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2018/05/02/viewpoint-kevin-macdonald-wont-accept-evidence-supporting-alternative-theories-about-jewish-influence/>

Deary, I., Batty, G. & Gales, C. (2008). Childhood intelligence predicts voter turnout, voter preferences and political involvement in adulthood; the 1970 cohort. *Intelligence* 36: 548-555.

Dunkel, C. & Dutton, E. (2016). Religiosity as a predictor of ingroup favoritism within and between religious groups. *Personality and Individual Differences* 98: 311-314.

Dutton, E. (2018). Jewish group evolutionary strategy is the most plausible hypothesis: A response to Nathan Cofnas' critical analysis of Kevin MacDonald's theory of Jewish involvement in twentieth century ideological movements. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-018-0158-4>

Dutton, E. (in press). *Race Differences in Ethnocentrism*. Budapest: Arktos.

Dutton, E. & Madison, G. (2017). Why do Finnish men marry Thai women but Finnish women marry British men? Cross-national marriages in a modern industrialised society exhibit sex-dimorphic sexual selection according to primordial selection pressures. *Evolutionary Psychological Science* 3: 1-9.

Dutton, E., Madison, G. & Dunkel, C. (2018). The mutant says in his heart, "There is no God": The rejection of collective religiosity centred around the worship of moral gods is associated with high mutational load. *Evolutionary Psychological Science* 4: 233-244.

Dutton, E. & van der Linden, D. (2017). Why is intelligence negatively associated with religiousness? *Evolutionary Psychological Science* 3: 392-403.

Dutton, E. & Woodley of Menie, M.A. (2018). *At Our Wits' End: Why We're Becoming Less Intelligent and what It Means for the Future*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Finnäs, F. (2012). *Finlandssvenkarna 2012: En statistisk rapport* (Finland-Swedes in 2012: A statistical report). Helsingfors: Svenska Finlands Folkting.

Gabb, S. (2007). *Culture Revolution, Culture War: How the Conservatives Lost England and How to Get It Back Again*. London: The Hampden Press.

Greenwald, A.G. & Schuh, E.S. (1994). An ethnic bias in scientific citations. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 24: 623-639.

Healy, E. (2007). Ethnic diversity and social cohesion in Melbourne. *People and Place* 15: 49-64.

Irwin, C.J. (1987). A study in the evolution of ethnocentrism. In: V. Reynolds, V.S.E. Falger & I. Vine (eds.), *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism: Evolutionary Dimensions of Xenophobia, Discrimination, Racism, and Nationalism*. London: Croom Helm.

Jussim, L. (2012). *Social Perception and Social Reality: Why Accuracy Dominates Bias and Self-Fulfilling Prophecy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krieger, N., Rowley, D., Hermann, A. et al. (1993). Racism, sexism, and social class: Implications for studies of health, disease, and well-being. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 9: 82-122.

Kugelmass, J. (1982). *Native Aliens: The Jews of Poland as a Middleman Minority*. New York: New School for Social Research.

Lewis, I.M. (2003). *Ecstatic Religion: A Study of Shamanism and Spirit Possession*. London: Routledge.

- Littlefield, C. & Rushton, J.P. (1986). When a child dies: The sociobiology of bereavement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 797-802.
- Lynn, R. (2008). *The Global Bell Curve: Race, IQ, and Inequality Worldwide*. Augusta, GA: Washington Summit Publishing.
- Lynn, R. (2011). *The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish Intelligence and Achievement*. Augusta, GA: Washington Summit.
- MacDonald, K. (1998). *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- MacDonald, K. (2004). *The Separations and Its Discontents: Towards an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*. New York: 1st Books.
- MacDonald, K. (2018a). Reply to Cofnas. *Preprints*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.35754.31684.
- MacDonald, K. (2018b). Second reply to Nathan Cofnas, revision of April 19 2018. *Preprints*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324612032_SECOND_REPLY_TO_NATHAN_COFNAS_REVISION_OF_APRIL_19_2018
- MacDonald, K. (2nd May 2018). Kevin MacDonald responds to criticism of his theory of Jewish ethnocentrism and influence. *Genetic Literacy Project*, <https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2018/05/02/kevin-macdonald-responds-to-criticism-of-his-theory-of-jewish-ethnocentrism-and-influence/>
- MacDonald, K. (19th August 2018). Reply to Nathan Cofnas's Comments on Edward Dutton. *PrePrints*, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.15491.96803, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327117951_Reply_to_Nathan_Cofnas's_Comments_on_Edward_Dutton
- McLellan, D. (1973). *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought*. London: Macmillan.
- Morris, D. (1969). *The Human Zoo: A Zoologist's Study of the Urban Animal*. New York: Book Company.
- Penton-Voak, I.S., Perret, D. & Pierce, J.W. (1999). Computer graphic studies of the role of facial similarity in judgements of attractiveness. *Current Psychology* 18: 104-117.
- Piffer, D. (2018). Correlation between PGS and environmental variables. *RPubs*, <https://rpubs.com/Daxide/377423>
- Pinker, S. (18th June 2012). The false allure of group selection. *The Edge*, <https://www.edge.org/conversation/the-false-allure-of-group-selection>
- Putnam, R. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30: 137-174.
- Rushton, J.P. (1989a). Genetic similarity in male friendships. *Ethology and Sociobiology* 10: 361-373.
- Rushton, J.P. (1989b). Genetic similarity, human altruism, and group selection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 12: 503-559.
- Rushton, J.P. (1995). *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

- Rushton, J.P. (2005). Ethnic nationalism, evolutionary psychology and Genetic Similarity Theory. *Nations and Nationalism* 11: 489-507.
- Russell, R., Wells, P. & Rushton, J.P. (1985). Evidence for genetic similarity detection in human marriage. *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6: 183-187.
- Salmela, E., Lappalainen, T., Lui, J. et al. (2011). Swedish population substructure revealed by genome-wide single nucleotide polymorphism data. *PLOS ONE*. <http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0016747>
- Salter, F. (2002). *Risky Transactions: Trust, Kinship and Ethnicity*. London: Berghahn.
- Salter, F. (2007). *On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Salter, F. & Harpending, H. (2012). J.P. Rushton's theory of ethnic nepotism. *Personality and Individual Differences* 55: 256-260.
- Sanderson, S.K. & Vanhanen, T. (2004). Reconciling the differences between Sanderson's and Vanhanen's results. In: F. Salter (ed.), *Welfare, Ethnicity, and Altruism. New Data and Evolutionary Theory*. Frank Cass: London.
- Schulson, M. (27th June 2018). Kevin MacDonald and the Elevation of Anti-Semitic Pseudoscience. *Undark*, <https://undark.org/article/kevin-macdonald-anti-semitism-psychology/>
- Timchenko, A. (2011). *The Image of Ethnic Conationals Abroad in the Context of National Identity Construction: The Case Study of Sweden*. Master's Thesis: Tampere University, Finland.
- Wan, E.Y. & Zaretsky, T. (2004). *Jewish-Gentile Couples: Trends, Challenges and Hopes*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.
- Wilson, D.S. (2002). *Darwin's Cathedral: Evolution, Religion and the Nature of Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, E.O. (30th March 1979). *Comparative Social Theory*. The Tanner Lecture on Human Values Delivered at the University of Michigan. In: S.M. McMurrin, 2004. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woodley, M.A. & Figueredo, A.J. (2014). *Historical Variability in Heritable General Intelligence: Its Evolutionary Origins and Sociocultural Consequences*. Buckingham: University of Buckingham Press.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Nathan Cofnas, Kevin MacDonald, Guy Madison, and Gerhard Meisenberg for their comments on earlier drafts of this article.