



# 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

Edward Dutton<sup>1</sup>

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

## Abstract

Kevin MacDonald (1998) has argued that a series of twentieth century ideologies which have challenged European traditions should be understood as part of a Jewish evolutionary strategy to promote Jewish interests in the West, as evidenced by Jewish leadership of and disproportionate involvement in these movements. Cofnas *Human Nature* 29, 134–156 (Cofnas 2018a) has critiqued this model and countered that the evidence can be more parsimoniously explained by the high average intelligence and urban location of Jews in Western countries. This, he avers, should be the 'default hypothesis.' In this response, I argue that it is MacDonald's model that is the more plausible hypothesis due to evidence that people tend to act in their ethnic group interest and that group selectedness among Jews is particularly strong, meaning that they are particularly likely to do so.

**Keywords** MacDonald · Cofnas · Jewish · Evolution · Multi-level selection

## Introduction

Philosopher Nathan Cofnas (Cofnas 2018a) has recently written a thoughtful, important and, above all, brave critique of the argument proposed by psychologist Kevin MacDonald in his book *The Culture of Critique* (MacDonald 1998). As Cofnas explains, MacDonald theorises 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 contentiously, MacDonald further argues that a number of significant intellectual and political movements—such as Boasian anthropology, Freudian psychoanalysis and Multiculturalism—were, either consciously or unconsciously, developed by Jews in order to aid Jewish group interests, undermine the cohesion of gentile host populations and weaken gentile resistance to Jewish dominance (via pathologising anti-Semitism), thereby improving the group competitive

advantage of Jews. Moreover, MacDonald claims that Jews played what Cofnas summarises to be a 'necessary role in the ascendancy of liberalism and multiculturalism in the West.' The word 'necessary,' it should be noted, is MacDonald's.

Cofnas criticises MacDonald's thesis in a number of ways. But perhaps his most fundamental criticism 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 of 112 points (117 points on language), which is almost a standard deviation above that of European Americans (see Lynn 2015). In addition to that, Jews in Western countries have tended to be heavily concentrated in urban areas. For these two reasons, Cofnas argues 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. In exploring this, Cofnas also highlights the way in which MacDonald's thesis seems to be un-falsifiable. For example, rather than accept that a Jewish scholar, such as Richard Herrnstein's, involvement in research which

---

✉ Edward Dutton  
ecdutton@hotmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Ulster Institute for Social Research, London, UK

demonstrates the relatively high average IQ of white people (Herrnstein and Murray 1994) runs counter to his model, MacDonald attempts to argue that this confirms his model. Cofnas also questions whether the ideologies highlighted by MacDonald have in fact been what we might summarise with the popular phrase ‘good for the Jews’ (see Geller 2006).

Cofnas’ critique is important because it is the first time a scholar has seriously examined MacDonald’s theory; a theory which, as Cofnas points out, is extremely popular among the increasingly influential Alt-Right movement. As Cofnas notes, when MacDonald’s book was first published critics such as Steven Pinker argued that it simply did not deserve scholarly attention. Cofnas argues that this can no longer be accepted, so popular is the theory among certain segments of society. Cofnas’ critique is brave precisely because of the theory’s popularity among the Alt-Right. The publication of Cofnas’ critique resulted in a ‘Twitter storm’ and his article soon went viral. He was subjected to ad hominem abuse from advocates of MacDonald’s theory (see Garland 2018). Critics also insisted on asking whether Cofnas was Jewish, which is clearly irrelevant to the objective accuracy or otherwise of his research.

However, I think that it may be possible to salvage MacDonald’s argument from Cofnas’ critique. It is appreciated that Cofnas has highlighted what he claims are issues with MacDonald’s scholarship. It seems to me, therefore, that we need to divorce the theory from how MacDonald has presented it and defended it, and simply look at the theory itself. My argument can be reduced to the following six points: firstly, group selection is a robust model. Secondly, people tend to act in their ethnic interests. Thirdly, Jews are more ‘group selected’ than gentiles. By ‘group selected’ I mean they display the traits that group selection selects for in populations, because they allow them to triumph over their competitors. These are intelligence, general factor of personality (see below) and positive and negative ethnocentrism. Fourthly, MacDonald’s position that Jewish left-wing activism both within and outside the academy during the twentieth century is due to a group evolutionary strategy is therefore the more plausible hypothesis. Fifthly, this activism has indeed been in Jewish group interests. Sixthly, Jewish representation in intellectual movements that are not necessarily ‘good for the Jews’ simply reflects Jewish high intelligence.

### **A Form of Group Selection May Be Argued to Be a Robust Model**

The much criticised concept of group selection can be regarded as central to MacDonald’s theory. MacDonald conceives of a battle between different ‘groups’ which differ in their average (partly genetically based) psychological characteristics. Jews, he maintains, have been group selected in an

evolutionary war with ethnic Europeans, who have forced them into certain professions, persecuted them and subjected them to intermittent pogroms. These events have helped to elevate Jewish intelligence and to channel Jews in a direction of high internal cooperation and high positive and negative ethnocentrism.

The first issue which requires defence is, therefore, the concept of group selection itself, as some researchers dismiss MacDonald’s theory simply due to his use of the concept. I will also note below, however, that it may be possible for Jews to have developed the qualities highlighted by MacDonald through individual selection alone so group selection does not actually have to be accepted for it to be argued that Jews have been selected to have high positive and negative ethnocentrism. However, MacDonald grounds his model in a form of group selection and I would submit that this is defensible in the case of the history of Jew-Gentile interaction.

By ‘group selection’ advocates mean selection for groups that are composed of individuals with certain traits, in other words, ‘trait groups.’ There will be inter-group differences in the group averages of these traits. This will mean that some groups are more successful at passing on their genes than are other groups and the fitness of a group will change according to its composition and the way in which this influences the group average of certain traits. This is because an increase in individuals with certain traits may reduce or increase the group’s average level of, for example, altruism. Broadly, this model of group selection is part of what is known as the multi-level selection model (see Dutton and Woodley of Menie 2018). 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 (see Wilson 2002). There is abundant evidence that people differentially select in favour of their kin, meaning that some people (see Rushton 1995) and some families are more ‘kin selected’ than others. Group selection extends this to the ethnic group, which is generally an extended kinship group (Salter 2007). In much the same way, some people are more ‘group selected’ than others; they are more interested in the good of their ethnic group and are more inclined, for example, to lay down their lives for it: they are more ‘positively ethnocentric’. If one group has a higher percentage of such people than another, it can be argued to be more ‘group selected.’ This, it seems to me, is effectively what MacDonald is arguing.

It should be noted that ‘group selection’ has also been criticised in depth by Pinker (2012). Dutton et al. (2017) have 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. (2017), 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. 2017). Secondly, they 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 being argued that a group will be more likely to survive 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,’ they maintain, ‘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).

Based on this, it seems to me that multi-level selection can be defended against Pinker’s critique. Accordingly, various scholars, such as Lynn (2011) and MacDonald (2004), have argued, either implicitly or explicitly, that Jews have become highly intelligent and positively and negatively ethnocentric due to conflict with gentiles and MacDonald himself argues that anti-Semitism is a product of group selection (MacDonald 2004). An alternative model, advocated by Cochran et al. (2006), is that this has happened due to individual selection. Jews were pushed into highly cognitively demanding jobs in the Middle Ages and those who could not cope either died or became gentile. But it can be responded that ethnic Europeans pushed them into these jobs, so this could be conceived of as group selection in action.

Another possibility is to develop Lynn’s (2011) argument that pogroms against Jews would have elevated Jewish intelligence at the level of individual selection, because more intelligent Jews would have more successfully pre-empted the pogroms and made plans to defend themselves. It could similarly be argued that Jews who were higher in General Factor of Personality (see Van der Linden et al. 2010, and below)—this includes high impulse control and we will see below that Jews are higher than Europeans in it—would also be more likely to escape pogroms. However, it could further be argued that individual Jews would be more likely to pass on their genes if they were particularly loyal to their ethnic community, especially in the context of a community feeling under siege and so strongly policing its members’ loyalty. If they were particularly positively ethnocentric, they would be less likely to be punished for defection and more likely to be assisted in times of crisis. Consequently, there would potentially be individual level selection for Jewish positive ethnocentrism and this selection would be more pronounced than among Europeans due to the many pogroms inflicted upon the Ashkenazi Jews. So, it may be possible to accept MacDonald’s model even if one cannot be

persuaded of the veracity of the multi-level selection model. However, for the reasons I have set out, I believe that multi-level selection model to be persuasive.

## People Tend to Act in Their Ethnic Interests

Related to this, there is direct evidence that people act in their genetic interests beyond merely protecting their immediate kin. They invest in those who are more than less genetically similar to themselves, so helping to maximise their genetic fitness. On average, they are more attracted to people 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 (see Rushton 2005). This can be regarded as simply a matter of kin selection, but there is evidence that this extends to groups. One study examined street beggars in Moscow. Some were ethnic Russians, just like the vast majority of the pedestrians. Others were dressed in the distinctive costume associated with Moldova, where people speak Romanian. Also, some beggars were dressed as dark-skinned Roma. The Russian pedestrians preferred to give money to their fellow Russians, then their fellow Eastern European Moldovans, and finally to the Roma. This was despite the fact that the Roma went beyond mere begging to more persuasive tactics such as singing and dancing, importuning people and sending out groups of children to beg (see Rushton 2005, p.499). Irwin (1987) tested Rushton’s theory through an anthropological study of Inuit tribes in Northern Canada. He calculated coefficients of consanguinity within and between these various tribes. He found that pro-social behaviour, such as wife exchange, and anti-social behaviour, such as the genocidal murder of women and children from another tribe during warfare, paralleled the degree of genetic distance in the expected direction. This makes sense because it has been shown that ethnic groups are ultimately kinship groups, so such behaviour is an extended form of kin selection (Salter 2007). To argue that you accept kin selection but not group selection is an example of dogmatic essentialism. It is rather like saying that you believe in evolution within species but not between species.

Accordingly, there is at least a case for arguing that the concept of ‘group selection’ is a justifiable one and that people do, on average, act in such a way as to favour the interests of their own ethnic group over other groups. It is appreciated that for many evolutionary scientists, even multilevel group selection is regarded as problematic. Indeed, some researchers have argued that there exists something of a ‘prejudice against group selection which is impervious to evidence from laboratory experiments. It is also impervious to evidence from the wild’ (Wilson 2009). But, from the above, I would argue that we cannot dismiss it out of hand. So, MacDonald’s theory has at least a foundation to it. As such, there is a reasonable case

for simply turning Cofnas' model on its head. From the perspective of evolutionary psychology, the most plausible hypothesis is that people will act, on average, in the interests of their ethnic group. And it would follow that the more positively group selected a group was then the more prone its members would be to so-doing.

## Jews Are More Group Selected than Europeans

High intelligence (which we have shown that Ashkenazi Jews have), high general factor of personality (GFP, meaning high in the socially positive aspects of the Big 5; see below) and high positive ethnocentrism tend to be part of a suit of traits among groups, known as a slow life history strategy (LHS) (Rushton 1995). As noted above, the higher a group is in these, the more 'group selected' it is. Slow LHS groups, however, must be distinguished from groups which have high levels of positive and negative ethnocentrism but lack the other psychological traits associated with a slow LHS (see Rushton 2005). A slow LHS develops due to evolution to a stable but harsh environment. This selects for intelligent, cooperative and tightly bonded groups (Figueredo et al. 2011).

As evidence of high group selectedness, Jews are high in what has been termed 'General Factor of Personality.' Proponents of this model argue that just as the different kinds of intelligence can be reduced down to a fundamental 'general factor of intelligence (*g*)' (which essentially relates to the ability to solve problems quickly) (see Lynn and Vanhanen 2012), similarly the Big 5 personality traits (Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Openness-Intellect) can be reduced down to a general factor of personality (GFP). GFP relates to social effectiveness and is a manifestation of low neuroticism and high scores in the other 4 traits (see Van der Linden et al. 2010). It should be noted that criticism has been levelled against the GFP. Bäckström et al. (2009) have suggested that GFP has the potential to slightly oversimplify personality differences. But this is very much a nuance. The GFP construct has been validated in a large meta-analysis (Van der Linden et al. 2010).

Consistent with their being highly group selected, it has been found that Ashkenazi Jews are higher in GFP than Europeans (Dunkel et al. 2015). In addition, there is evidence that Jews are higher in positive ethnocentrism beyond the historical and anecdotal evidence for this which MacDonald (1998) provides. Dunkel and Dutton (2016) drew upon the MIDUS survey of Americans in mid-life to explore in-group favouritism. This was measured by an in-group favouritism scale in which subjects responded to four items: how important is it for you to celebrate or practice on religious holidays with your family, friends or members of your religious community? How closely do you identify with being a member of your

religious group? How much do you prefer to be with other people who are the same religion as you? How important do you think it is for people of your religion to marry other people who are the same religion? Participants responded to each item using a four-point Likert-type scale and the internal consistency of the scale was  $\alpha = .85$ . The items were summed to create a total score. Dunkel and Dutton (2016) compared a number of mainly white religious groups and also Jews. They found that, overall, the more religious a group was, the more group-centric it was. The exception to this was the Jewish sample, who were extremely low in religiousness but extremely high in group centrism, that is positive ethnocentrism. Not only is this consistent with the argument that Jews are more group-selected than whites but it may also imply that this may be for partly genetic reasons, as MacDonald (1998) has argued. So, we can reasonably conclude that Jews are more group selected than Europeans. However, at the present time, the quantitative evidence for higher average Jewish positive ethnocentrism is limited and further quantitative research is needed.

## It Would Therefore Be Reasonable to Regard the Group Evolutionary Strategy Theory as the More Plausible Hypothesis

It can be argued that when somebody engages in fallacious or dogmatic argumentation, it is often because they are emotionally invested in a proposition being, or not being, the case. As such, they are blinded to the logical inconsistency of their position. In this regard, Dutton and Van der Linden (2015) have developed Charlton's (2009) concept of the 'clever silly' academic. Dutton and Van der Linden (2015, p.58) argue that:

'An idea is "clever silly" if it is founded on the acceptance of a dogma which either has strong empirical evidence against it or otherwise by its very nature cannot be disproven but which, nevertheless, allows the advocate to advertise their intelligence by virtue of the idea being highly complex and/or original.'

Building on an idea first proposed by William Hamilton, Woodley and Figueredo (2013) have argued that geniuses can be understood to assist the group to which they belong in passing on its genes. Again, as with group selection, it is appreciated that this is a controversial argument but once it is accepted that multi-level selection does not deserve to be simply dismissed out of hand (not least because a minority in the field advocate it), then this idea also should not be dismissed out of hand. In general, Woodley and Figueredo argue that geniuses operate at the level of the group. They tend to be anti-social, asexual (or little interested in family or friends), but their idea or invention tends to benefit the genetic interests of the group of which they are a part by allowing it to expand



(as in a scientific or military geniuses) or inspiring it (as in a religious genius). These geniuses have a very specific psychological profile: extremely high intelligence combined with moderately low agreeableness and moderately low conscientiousness but moderately high extraversion. This means that they can think in a highly original way (not being bound by the rules) and they do not care if they offend people (which original ideas usually do) and, even if they do care, they are not socially skilled enough to be able to anticipate this. In addition, as relative extraverts, they are partly motivated by the thrill of discovery (see Dutton and Charlton 2015). Dutton and Van der Linden observe that originators of clever-silly ideas tend to have this precise psychological profile and it can be seen from their study that this is true of the ‘Jewish’ originators of Boasian anthropology, Marxism and the assorted other supposedly ‘Jewish’ ideologies which MacDonald discusses.

As such, it is reasonable to conclude that part of the reason why members of a highly group-selected population would be unconsciously motivated to innovate or follow clever silly ideas which helped to undermine the nationalistic tendencies of a rival group would be their own ethnic interest. And that this would be especially true among the innovators—the Jewish geniuses—who came up with ideas in the first place. Of course, this ‘group interest’ would be one of a number of factors including, as Cofnas argues, high intelligence, urban location and (going beyond Cofnas) high Jewish verbal intelligence.<sup>1</sup> Verbal intelligence, specifically, has been shown to predict being attracted to left-wing ideologies (Ludeke et al. 2017). In addition, Cofnas (Cofnas 2018a) has noted many examples of Jews acting against their group interests, such as by promoting multiculturalism within Israel. However, even in a highly ethnocentric group, we would expect a portion to be low in ethnocentrism, just as Europeans, who are less ethnocentric overall, contain a portion who are zealously ethnocentric.

## These Ideologies Have Been ‘Good for the Jews.’

Cofnas has suggested that many of the ‘Jewish’ ideologies highlighted by MacDonald are not in fact ‘good for the Jews.’ For example, Cofnas notes (of Communism) that Jews in Poland were more likely than whites to be killed by the Communist secret police. This, he argues, is consistent with Jews being over-represented among the Communist elite solely because of their high intelligence in comparison to the Polish. But it can be countered that the key point is whether it can be argued, in theory, that an ideology such as Marxism would seem to undermine the traditions (such as religion)

<sup>1</sup> This idea is being developed by Herr Emil Kirkegaard and it was he who suggested it to me.

which have held Western countries together and promoted the qualities of positive and negative ethnocentrism, which it has been shown ultimately lead to groups triumphing in the battle of group selection (see Hammond and Axelrod 2006). It is quite possible for a way of thinking to involve killing a large number of your group members yet that way of thinking ultimately being positive, in some sense, for group interests. For example, it has been argued that the Medieval European practice of executing almost all felons—and thus around 2% of the male population every generation—elevated European GFP (Frost and Harpending 2015), intelligence, and religiousness (Dutton and Madison 2017) and thus group competitive advantage. It has been demonstrated that religiousness is robustly associated with both positive and negative ethnocentrism (Dutton et al. 2016). Marxism helps to undermine this in Western populations, and it follows that this is in the group interests of ethnic minorities within this population. So, even if members of this minority are disproportionately killed, it is still, in the long run, in their group interest.

A similar argument can be propounded with regard to multiculturalism in Western countries. On a certain level, multiculturalism is not ‘good for the Jews’ because there is a pronounced strain of anti-Semitism among Muslim immigrants to Europe. Indeed, a rise in anti-Semitic attacks, committed by Europe’s growing Muslim population, has been documented in a number of European countries (see Enstad 2017). However, it can be responded that the key point is that multiculturalism has helped to undermine Europe’s sense of nationalism, as multicultural societies reduce trust, and thus positive ethnocentrism, even among the indigenous population (see Putnam 2007). They also ensure that Jews are no longer the only visible minority and, as a far more established and Europeanized minority, are less likely to be the target of the natives’ negative ethnocentrism when it does develop, such as during economic crises. Accordingly, though there are downsides, Western multiculturalism is likely, overall, to be ‘good for the Jews.’ If it had not been instituted, then it seems probable that the current, partly economically induced, rise in political nativism in Europe (see Caiani 2017) would involve negative ethnocentrism directed towards the Jews, as the only visible out-group. When this last occurred prior to the development of multiculturalism, in the 1930s, Jewish experiences in Europe were surely rather worse than they currently are due to Europe’s growing Muslim population.

## Jewish Representation in Intellectual Movements that Are Not Necessarily ‘Good for the Jews’ Simply Reflects Their High Intelligence

MacDonald argues that Jews wish to destabilise gentile institutions by showing that all peoples are equal. Cofnas observes

that there are many Jews involved in research that supports hereditarianism regarding group differences in psychology, which undermines what MacDonald regards as the Jewish aim. If we accept that the more plausible hypothesis is that Jews strongly act in their ethnic interests, then this finding can be explained by the very high intelligence of Jewish people. It has been argued that intelligence is negatively associated with many evolved instincts, including ethnocentrism (see Dutton and Van der Linden 2017). So, even despite the relatively highly group-selected nature of Jews, there would be a relatively high raw number of them who would be sufficiently intelligent so as to be able to rise above such biases. And these people, with a concomitant very high level of the trait Intellect (which positively correlates with IQ), would therefore be found in areas of research which were true yet ‘controversial’ (because they questioned received norms) and which were not necessarily in their group interests. Indeed, this ‘raw numbers’ model would potentially even explain why—if it so—Jews may be over-represented in intellectual or political movements which MacDonald would argue would be in opposition to their group interests, though it would be interesting to discern a possible difference in magnitude.

### Limitations to This Defence

So, we can conclude that MacDonald is right about Jews being highly influential in ideologies which help to undermine European ethnocentrism and that it is likely, as Jews are highly positively ethnocentric and otherwise group selected that this is indeed part of a group evolutionary strategy. Cofnas may be correct that Jews are also influential in groups with undermine Jewish ethnocentrism but, as we have discussed, in light of evidence of high Jewish ethnocentrism and of people tending to act in their ethnic interests, this would be most simply explained by intra-group variance and high Jewish average IQ rendering them influential in almost all intellectual movements.

So, to reiterate, the essential argument becomes the following: (1) group selection is acceptable and people generally act in their ethnic group interest, meaning they can be said to be ‘group selected’; (2) Jews are highly group selected, so we would expect them to disproportionately do this; (3) the Jewish ideologues who led these supposedly anti-European intellectual movements are highly group selected; (4) the ideas are ultimately in the Jewish group interest; (5) Jewish representation in race and intelligence research is explicable in terms of the nature of very high intelligence. So, we have a reversal of Cofnas’ model. It might also be added that I would concur with Cofnas that ideologies of the kind examined by MacDonald—which question tradition, religion and so on—generally manifest in all advanced civilizations, even ancient Rome (see Meisenberg 2007), so Jews are not ‘necessary’ to

them. However, it may be that the presence in Western societies of the Jews meant that this process occurred more quickly than it otherwise would have.

But it can be seriously argued is that MacDonald’s model is ‘likely’ true. A further implication of my argument is that we should cautiously assume that people will tend to act in their ethnic group interest. However, there are likely to be inter-group differences in the extent to which this is the case, due to variation in genetic and environmental factors which predict positive and negative ethnocentrism (see Dutton et al. 2016). This assumption is, however, more justifiable with Jews because we have evidence that Jews are particularly high in positive ethnocentrism.<sup>2</sup>

### Conclusion

In conclusion, Cofnas argues, in effect, that the default position should be Jewish high intelligence, and this explanation for Jewish involvement in intellectual movements should be the null hypothesis. I believe the opposite may be true. The default position should be MacDonald’s thesis and it should be treated as the null hypothesis. But it behoves us to be cautious of it, as with any such theory. Those who are so certain of the veracity of a theory that they subject one who tries to calmly critique it to personal abuse should perhaps think about that.

**Acknowledgements** I would like to acknowledge the useful feedback given to me by Mr. Nathan Cofnas on earlier drafts of this article.

### References

- Bäckström, M., Björklund, F., & Larsson, M. (2009). Five-factor inventories have a major general factor related to social desirability which can be reduced by framing items neutrally. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*, 335–344.
- Caiani, M. (2017). Nationalism, populism and the rebirth of statehood in Europe. In A. Grimm (Ed.), *The crisis of the European Union: Challenges, analyses, solutions*. London: Routledge.
- Charlton, B. (2009). Clever sillies: Why high IQ people tend to be deficient in common sense. *Medical Hypotheses*, *73*, 867–870.
- Cochran, G., Hardy, J., & Harpending, H. (2006). Natural history of Ashenazi intelligence. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, *38*, 659–693.

<sup>2</sup> It should also be noted there is on-going, non-peer-reviewed correspondence between MacDonald and Cofnas. Engaging with this in detail would be a substantial aside to the thrust of this article and the authors seem to go back and forth regarding specific narrow points rather than address what I would submit is the fundamental issue of what should be the default hypothesis and why. For example, MacDonald (2018a, b, c) argues that his model cannot be falsified by individual counter-examples, because the central issue relates to overall patterns of Jewish behaviour. He also stresses that there will be inter-generation variation in the patterns of behaviour which are in Jewish group interests. Cofnas (2018b) argues that MacDonald has effectively watered-down his theory in response to Cofnas’ critique and done so without making any new predictions. See also Cofnas (2018c, d).

- Cofnas, N. (2018a). Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy: A critical analysis of Kevin MacDonald's theory. *Human Nature*, 29, 134–156. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-018-9310-x>.
- Cofnas, N. (2018b). Kevin MacDonald's response with my comments. *Preprints*, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323918530\\_Kevin\\_MacDonald%27s\\_Response\\_with\\_Comments\\_by\\_Nathan\\_Cofnas](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323918530_Kevin_MacDonald%27s_Response_with_Comments_by_Nathan_Cofnas)
- Cofnas, N. (2018c). Analyzing 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. (2018d). 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/>
- Dunkel, C., & Dutton, E. (2016). Religiosity as a predictor of ingroup favoritism within and between religious groups. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 98, 311–314.
- Dunkel, C., Reeve, C., Woodley of Menie, M. A., & van der Linden, D. (2015). A comparative study of the general factor of personality in Jewish and non-Jewish Populations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 78, 63–67.
- 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 (in press).
- Dutton, E., Madison, G., & Dunkel, C. (2017). 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*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-017-0133-5>.
- Dutton, E., & Madison, G. (2017). Execution, violent punishment and selection for religiousness in medieval England. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 4, 83–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40806-017-0115-7>.
- Dutton, E., & Van der Linden, D. (2017). Why is intelligence negatively associated with religiousness? *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, 3, 392–403.
- Dutton, E., Madison, G., & Lynn, R. (2016). Demographic, economic, and genetic factors related to national differences in ethnocentric attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 101, 137–143.
- Dutton, E., & Charlton, B. (2015). *The genius famine: Why we need geniuses, why they're dying out and why we must rescue them*. Buckingham: University of Buckingham Press.
- Dutton, E., & Van der Linden, D. (2015). Who are the 'clever sillies'? The intelligence, personality, and motives of clever silly originators and those who follow them. *Intelligence*, 49, 57–65.
- Enstad, J. (2017). *Antisemitic Violence in Europe, 2005-2015 Exposure and Perpetrators in France, UK, Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Russia*. University of Oslo: Center for Studies of the Holocaust and Religious Minorities and Center for Research on Extremism.
- Figueredo, A. J., Andrzejczak, D., Jones, D., Smith-Castro, V., & Montero, E. (2011). Reproductive strategy and ethnic conflict: Slow life history as a protective factor against negative ethnocentrism in two contemporary societies. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary and Cultural Psychology*, 5, 14–31.
- Frost, P., & Harpending, H. (2015). Western Europe, state formation, and genetic pacification. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 13, 147470491501300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491501300114>.
- Garland, B. (2018). ACADEMIC BLOODSPORTS: Slippery Jew Nathan Cofnas vs. The legendary K-mac! Daily Stormer, <https://dailystormer.name/academic-bloodsports-slippery-jew-nathan-cofnas-vs-the-legendary-k-mac/>
- Geller, J. (2006). *Yes, but is it good for the Jews?* (Vol. 1). New York: Bloomsbury.
- Hammond, R., & Axelrod, R. (2006). The evolution of ethnocentric behaviour. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50, 1–11.
- Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: Free Press.
- Irwin, C. (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.
- Ludeke, S., Rasmussen, S., & DeYoung, C. (2017). Verbal ability drives the link between intelligence and ideology in two American community samples. *Intelligence*, 61, 1–6.
- Lynn, R. (2011). *The Chosen People: A Study of Jewish Intelligence and Achievement*. Augusta: Washington Summit.
- Lynn, R. (2015). *Race Differences in Intelligence: An Evolutionary Analysis*. 2nd Edition. Augusta, GA: Washington Summit Publishing.
- Lynn, R., & Vanhanen, T. (2012). *Intelligence: A unifying construct for the social sciences*. London: Ulster Institute for Social Research.
- MacDonald, K. (2018a). Reply to Cofnas. *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/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](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324612032_SECOND_REPLY_TO_NATHAN_COFNAS_REVISION_OF_APRIL_19_2018)
- MacDonald, K. (2018c). 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. (2004). *Separation and its Discontents: Towards an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*. 1st Books.
- MacDonald, K. (1998). *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-century Intellectual and Political movements*. Westport: Praeger.
- Meisenberg, G. (2007). *In God's Image: The Natural History of Intelligence and Ethics*. Kibworth: Book Guild Publishing.
- Pinker, S. (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. (2005). Ethnic nationalism, evolutionary psychology and genetic similarity theory. *Nations and Nationalism*, 11, 489–507.
- Rushton, J. P. (1995). *Race, Evolution, and Behaviour*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Salter, F. (2007). *On genetic interests: Family, Ethnicity and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Van der Linden, D., te Nijenhuis, J., & Bakker, A. (2010). The general factor of personality: A meta-analysis of big five inter-correlations and a criterion related validity study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 315–327.
- Wilson, D.S. (2009). Truth and reconciliation for group selection XV: Group selection in the wild. Evolution for everyone, <http://scienceblogs.com/evolution/2009/11/07/truth-and-reconciliation-for-g-13/>
- Wilson, D. S. (2002). *Darwin's cathedral: Evolution, religion and the nature of society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woodley, M. A., & Figueredo, A. J. (2013). *Historical variability in heritable general intelligence: It's evolutionary origins and socio-cultural consequences*. Buckingham: University of Buckingham press.