

gret from Sam that he had lost his job, that he was cold-shouldered by former colleagues, that he was badgered and attacked by professional leftist witch-hunters. I don't think Sam ever regretted the path he took. He personified the hero in the terms of the quotation from Amiel I cited above. Sam triumphed over fear of poverty, of suffering, of calumny, of sickness and isolation. He had the last laugh on his enemies and the false colleagues who betrayed him. Despite their efforts, he landed on his feet, and wrote

and spoke more, and more powerfully, than ever.

Sam was admired and loved by a host of friends in a way that none of his detractors will be. He was and is a hero. Sam's life was rich in honor. His life was well spent in dealing with things that matter, that are critical, that mean life or death for our people. Perhaps it is some consolation to reflect that as a well-spent day brings happy sleep, so a life well used like Sam's brings if not a happy death, at least an honorable one.

Alas, Sam was cut off at his prime. We are bereft of his talents just when they are most needed. We honor Sam most by taking up the fallen torch, by rededicating ourselves to the cause for which he sacrificed and to which he dedicated himself. Our people at large may not know the measure of the man they have lost. But we know. And if our people are to survive and have a future, then in that future the name of Sam Francis will always be remembered.

Goodbye, friend. I will miss you. **Ω**

Sam Francis in His Own Words

Why Race Matters

This is an excerpt from the speech Dr. Francis gave at the first AR conference, held in Atlanta in 1994. Although he never received a full explanation of why he was fired from The Washington Times, publicity given to this speech by his detractors was certainly a factor. The original article was published in the September 1994 issue.

A concerted and long-term attack against the civilization of white, European and North American man has been launched, and the attack is not confined to the political, social and cultural institutions that characterize the civilization but extends also to the race that created the civilization and continues to carry and transmit it today. The war against white civilization sometimes (indeed often) invokes liberal ideals as its justification and as its goal, but the likely reality is that the victory of the racial revolution will end merely in the domination or destruction of the white race and its civilization by the non-white peoples—if only for demographic reasons due to non-white immigration and the decline of white birthrates. . . .

In the universalist world-view, there is neither history nor race nor even species, neither specific cultures nor particular peoples nor meaningful boundaries. . . .

In the happyland of universalism, we owe as much to the children of Somalia—indeed, more—than we do to the hapless citizens of Los Angeles. Marines who could not have been sent from Camp Pendleton to Los Angeles during the riots of 1992 and who are not ordered to prevent violation of the Mexi-

can border adjacent to their own installation in southern California are speedily dispatched to Somalia. Even to invoke “our” identity, our interests, our aspirations is to invite accusations of all the “isms” and “phobias” that are deployed to prevent further discussions and to paralyze the formation or the retention of a common consciousness that might at some point swell up into actual resistance to our dispossession. The principal white response to the incipient race war thus far, manifested in neo-conservative critiques of “Political Correctness” and multiculturalism, is merely to regurgitate the formulas of universalism, to invoke the spirit of Martin Luther King, and to repeat the universalist ideals of equality, integration, and assimilation. The characteristic defense of Western civilization by most conservatives today is merely a variation of the liberal universalism that the enemies of the West and whites also invoke. It is to argue that non-whites and non-Westerners ought to value modern Western civilization as in their own best interests. It is to emphasize the liberal “progress” of the modern West through the abolition of slavery, the emancipation of non-whites, the retreat from imperialism, the achievement of higher living standards and political equality, etc. . . .

Instead of invoking a suicidal liberalism and regurgitating the very universalism that has subverted our identity and our sense of solidarity, what we as whites must do is reassert our identity and our solidarity, and we must do so in explicitly racial terms through the articulation of a racial consciousness as whites. The reassertion of our solidarity must be expressed in racial terms for two major reasons. In the first place, the attack upon

us defines itself in racial terms and seeks through the delegitimization of race for whites and the legitimization of race for non-whites the dispersion and destruction of the foundations of our solidarity while at the same time consolidating non-white cohesiveness against whites.

. . .

[A]t a time when the self-declared enemies of the white race define themselves in racial terms, only our own defi-



Race and culture cannot be separated.

nition of ourselves in those terms can meet their challenge. If and when that challenge should triumph and those enemies come to kill us as the Tutsi people have been slaughtered in Rwanda, they will do so not because we are “Westerners” or “Americans” or “Christians” or “conservatives” or “liberals” but because we are white.

Secondly, we need to assert a specifically racial identity because race is real—biological forces, including those

that determine race, are important for social, cultural, and historical events. I do not suggest that race as a biological reality is by itself sufficient to explain the civilization of European man—if race were sufficient, there would be no problem—but race is necessary for it, and it is likely that biological science in the near future will show even more clearly how necessary racial, biological, and genetic explanations are to understanding social and historical events more fully.

The civilization that we as whites created in Europe and America could not have developed apart from the genetic endowments of the creating people, nor is there any reason to believe that the civilization can be successfully transmitted to a different people. If the people or race who created and sustained the civilization of the West should die, then the civilization also will die. A merely cultural consciousness, then, that emphasizes only social and cultural factors as the roots of our civilization is not enough, because a merely cultural consciousness will not by itself conserve the race and people that were necessary for the creation of the culture and who remain necessary for its survival. We need not only to understand the role of race in creating our civilization but also to incorporate that understanding in our defense of our civilization. Until we do so, we can expect only to keep on losing the war we are in. . . .

As long as whites continue to avoid and deny their own racial identity, at a time when almost every other racial and ethnic category is rediscovering and asserting its own, whites will have no chance to resist their dispossession and their eventual possible physical destruction. Before we can seriously discuss any concrete proposals for preserving our culture and its biological and demographic foundations, we have to address and correct the problem we inflict on ourselves, our own lack of a racial consciousness and the absence of a common will to act in accordance with it.

What Benjamin Franklin told his colleagues at the birth of the American Republic remains true today as the Republic, and the race and civilization that gave birth to the Republic, approach their death: If we do not hang together—not only as members of a common nation but also as part of a common race, a common people—then most assuredly we will all hang separately.

Prospects for Racial and Cultural Survival

In the February and March issues of 1995, several writers discussed approaches to ensuring the survival of American whites and their culture. This is excerpted from Dr. Francis's typically pugnacious reply to those who proposed partition of the United States along racial lines.



Ending . . . [the threat] to the white European character of the United States would involve no vast constitutional or political changes, but it would involve an uncompromising assertion of white will and identity. The fundamental problem with whites today will not be solved by giving away any more of what remains of their country and their heritage but by asserting their own will and identity in order to retain the primacy of their heritage in their own country. It is that lack of will and identity, that lack of racial and cultural consciousness, that must be remedied before we resort to any dissolution of the country (or indeed any other resolution of the racial crisis). . . .

The answer is, quite simply, the reconquest of the United States.

Nevertheless, though I am not convinced by their arguments, white separatists are correct that we do face what is probably the most serious and threatening crisis in our racial history, a crisis that, if it is not resolved in our favor, will almost certainly result in the loss of white control of the United States within half a century, the disappearance of white civilization, and eventually in biological extinction. If white separatism is not the answer, what is?

The answer is, quite simply, the reconquest of the United States. This re-

conquest does not involve any restoration of white supremacy in the political and legal sense that obtained under slavery or segregation, and there is no reason why nonwhites who reside in the United States could not enjoy equality of legal rights. But a white reconquest of the United States would mean the supremacy of whites in a cultural sense, or in the sense of what is nowadays called "Eurocentrism." There are essentially three things that whites must do in order to carry out this reconquest of the nation and culture they have almost lost:

(1) Whites must formulate a white racial consciousness that identifies racial and biological endowments as important and relevant to social behavior, and their own racial endowments as essential to the continuing existence of Euro-American civilization. The formation of a white racial consciousness does not mean that whites should think of themselves only as whites, to the exclusion of ethnic, national, religious, regional, class, or other identities, nor that individuality should yield to the collective category of race. It means merely that we recognize racial realities, that we recognize that racial-biological endowments are necessary to certain kinds of human behavior (e.g., the political and civic behavior appropriate to stable self-government, the work habits and lifestyles appropriate to a dynamic economy; the intellectual behavior that is necessary for science and scholarship, etc.) and that because these endowments are largely unique to whites, the behavior they make possible cannot be replicated by most nonwhites.

Nor does the formation of white racial consciousness mean that we should conceive of ourselves only as biological beings to the exclusion of religious or metaphysical identities. Racial consciousness means that we add recognition of biological and racial factors to our traditional concepts of human nature and modify both our biological and non-biological conceptions of what man is, as evidence and reason dictate. It may be true that some traditional religious and metaphysical conceptions would not survive recognition of the scientific realities of race, just as some did not survive earlier scientific discoveries in astronomy, geology, and biology.

But the formation of white racial consciousness does mean that whites would recognize themselves as a race and their racially based behavior as legitimate,