

SINNERS AND RACISTS

Prof. Dr. Hugo de Garis

profhugodegaris@yahoo.com
<http://profhugodegaris.wordpress.com>

When a religionist accuses an atheist of being a sinner (i.e. of refusing to believe in a god), that accusation is water off a duck's back to the atheist, who simply rejects the accusation as meaningless according to his world view. It would be like asking someone "What are the political opinions of green paint?" To someone who is convinced that paint of any color does not have the intelligence to have political opinions of any kind, this question is meaningless, an unquestion.

Similarly, to an atheist, to be accused of not believing in a god, and then to be criticized for that is as pointless as the atheist accusing the religionist of being an "isscienate" i.e. someone ignorant of science. The religionist probably doesn't care whether he is isscienate or not. He does care about his religious beliefs and usually doesn't want to change them when challenged by atheists.

A century or two back, in western countries, to be labeled a sinner carried weight, because most people in those countries believed in a god who dictated rules of behavior that these people took seriously and punished others who rejected them. People feared to be labeled sinners. Nowadays, particularly in the Scandinavian countries, such a small proportion of people still believe in such ideas, that if some preacher on the street were to confront an average thinking Scandinavian and accuse him of being a “sinner”, then that person would probably think that the religionist was from a bygone age, and treat the accusation with as much credibility as he would the beliefs of a “flat earther” who despite the photos of the earth taken from the moon, still believes the earth is flat.

That belief made some sense several centuries ago, when one looked out to the ocean’s horizon and saw how flat the earth looked, how straight the horizon line looked to the naked eye. But with today’s science, flat earthers have totally lost credibility.

I argue that the same kind of loss of credibility will occur within the next decade or two regarding people who accuse PRers (political realists) of racism. My argument is the following. PCers (political correct people) accept the idea that all races have equal

ability, and that the differences in average IQs across different nations is due to environmental influences, such as malnutrition, poor educational institutions, etc. Hence within the context of such beliefs, to “accuse” some races of being intellectually inferior, is to insult them, to “lie” to them, making them feel inadequate, when the “reality” is that they are just as capable as other races, if only they had equal chances in environmental terms.

That view makes sense, i.e. it is a coherent view, *if* one accepts the premises of the PCers as valid, as true. Unfortunately for PCers, the scientific evidence against such “egalitarian environmentalist” views is piling up so heavily that PC attitudes are becoming increasingly untenable. For example, 100s of scientific studies over the planet have shown the existence of a “world IQ map”. The dumbest people in the world, as judged by their scores on “culture free” IQ tests, are the Australian aborigines, with an average IQ score of 60. Next are the billion black Africans, at 70. At 85 are the native Americans, North African Arabs, Middle Easterners, and Indians. At 100 are the Europeans and Russians. At 105 are the North East Asians (Chinese, Koreans, Japanese). The smartest group in the world are the American Ashkenazy Jews with a score of 115.

Separated identical twin studies have shown that the heritability (i.e. the percentage of the variation of IQ scores from one generation to the next that is due to genes) is high, i.e. 60%-80%. Adopted black children in white middle class homes have IQs that are more similar to their genetic black parents than their adoptive white parents. Grand children with 4 African black grandparents have a given average IQ score. If they have 3 black grand parents and one white grandparent, then their average IQ score is about 7 points higher. If they have 2 black grand parents and 2 white grand parents, their average IQ score is about 15 point higher. If they have 3 white grandparents and 1 black grand parent, their average IQ score is 22 points higher. If the grand children have 4 white grand parents their average IQ scores are 30 points higher. This is pretty spectacular evidence for a strong genetic basis to racial differences in average IQ scores.

So to a PRer (political realist) who studies these racial IQ score differences and comes to the conclusion that they are scientifically well founded, then the accusations of the PCers that the PRers are racist when they claim that certain races are definitely dumber on average than others, become meaningless. The PRers are now turning the tables and starting to accuse the PCers of being isscientate,

i.e ignorant of science, and should make the effort to update their outdated views. In a world that is so dominated by science as is ours, to be accused of being isscienate, is a major insult.

The time is fast approaching when a tipping point will be reached when there are more PRers than PCers, and the PC accusation against the PRers of being “racist PRers” will be met with an equally vitriolic rebuke by the PRers against the PCers of being “isscienate PCers”. To the PRers, the term “racist” will lose its meaning in the same way that the term “sinner” lost its meaning. To scienate PRers, to be accused by the PCers of believing something that to the PRers is simply true, is just silly. It makes no sense. It has become meaningless.