

# SEPARATE OR DIE

RICHARD MCCULLOCH

---

Bravo to Sam Dickson for his call at the 2008 American Renaissance Conference for a racial partition of the United States to create our own racial homeland or ethnostate. What he called his “modest proposal” was the boldest proclamation at the conference, in fact bolder than anything I have heard at that forum before. (Michael Hart’s partition plan presented at the 1996 conference was the opposite of bold.<sup>1</sup> It was a surrender, ultimately even of our racial existence, as I will explain below.) I had to catch my breath for a moment, it was so unexpected. As Sam said, every movement, to be a movement, must have a stated and defined goal and destination, saying what it wants, what it is for, what it offers.

From the beginning of my own thinking about our racial problems I believed that complete racial separation by a partition of the country into separate racial states was necessary for our ultimate racial interests. It is the only really effective alternative to our accelerating trajectory, for the last two centuries, toward racial dispossession and destruction. The rate of that acceleration has always surpassed my worst-case projections. I have always believed that an effective opposition movement to that trajectory must offer an alternative, showing what the movement is for, and thus defining the movement, and preventing the opposition from telling the public what our movement is for, and doing the defining for us. I would much prefer we define ourselves, even if it may initially seem rather radical and extreme to those who have not given serious thought to the matter, than be defined by our opponents. If we let them, they always define our solutions and goals as genocidal, so we should not give them that opportunity.

Of course, our opponents’ goals have always been more radical than ours, and they have been careful to never openly espouse and define them to their logical conclusion. At least not yet. And this reveals the point of their great weakness – that they do not yet feel they

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael H. Hart, “Racial Partition of the United States,” in Jared Taylor, ed., *The Real American Dilemma* (Oakton, Va.: New Century Books, 1998), 107–18. Also available online at: <http://www.lrainc.com/swtaboo/tabooos/mhhart01.html>.

can dare to fully reveal their agenda. And this is the great opening and hope for us. After all, most simply stated, what we offer our people is the continued existence of our race, while our opponents offer the destruction of our race.

### JIM FELLER ON RACIAL PARTITION

Our ideas sometimes have unlikely sources. My own thinking on partition plans was given an initial boost by the plan of someone else. Back in 1974, while at the University of Florida, I met a UF Business School professor named Jim Feller at the Gainesville chapter of Mensa. He recognized my name as the author of some student newspaper editorials that he liked, and conversation about them soon led to the discovery that we had both read Wilmot Robertson's recently published *The Dispossessed Majority*. It became our favorite topic at our weekly meetings. At one meeting he showed me something in which he evidently took great pride, unrolling a large poster board with a carefully hand-drawn and colored map of a partition proposal for the United States. I regret to say that I was very critical of his plan, and detailed some of my points of criticism, calling it sophomoric, and said that I could do better. Well, of course, he challenged me to do just that.

A few months after that, I began writing my first book, *The Ideal and Destiny*,<sup>2</sup> which included a partition plan from its inception. My partition proposal underwent a major revision in my third book, *The Nordish Quest*,<sup>3</sup> and as it presently appears on my website<sup>4</sup> has had some additional smaller revisions, all basically prompted by the constant expansion of the nonwhite population in both numbers and variety. Racial groups that were hardly a blip on our demographic radar screen in the 1970s are now large enough to require their own separate ethnostate in any comprehensive partition plan.

In the meantime, Jim Feller's partition map appeared on the cover of the April, 1976 issue of *Instauration* under the heading "The National Premise: Will the US Look Like This in A.D. 2000?" (Obviously, it didn't, and still doesn't.) About a decade later Feller's map received considerable national notoriety after it had been adopted and widely publicized by David Duke. Since my first impression of Feller's plan

---

<sup>2</sup> Richard McCulloch, *The Ideal and Destiny* (Coral Spring, Fl.: Towncourt Enterprises, 1982)

<sup>3</sup> Richard McCulloch, *The Nordish Quest* (Coral Springs, Fl.: Towncourt Enterprises, 1989).

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.racialcompact.com/partitionmap.html>

had not changed, I considered all this notoriety to be something of an embarrassment for the racial separatist movement. But looking back now, after seeing much worse, I have to admit that on the most important points, which I used to take for granted but not anymore, Feller is on the same page with me.

### **PARTITION AND RACIAL SURVIVAL**

The foundation for any partition proposal, and its most important point, is the reason, purpose, or motive for the partition. If this is not right, then it is likely that the partition proposal will be fundamentally flawed at best, and probably downright counterproductive, like a treatment based on the wrong diagnosis. A partition is a very drastic measure and as such can only be justified by some very compelling reason or purpose. The extent of support for partition will logically depend on how compelling that reason or purpose is seen to be. Those who see the reason as very compelling will tend to be more supportive than those who do not, or those who do not see the more compelling reason, but only a less compelling reason. Therefore the most compelling reason for the partition is the one that should receive the greatest emphasis, the one that must be clearly understood and accepted by the greatest possible number of the population. Less compelling, but still valid and legitimate, reasons should also be given, with emphasis in order of their importance, yet without allowing them to distract attention from, or cause any confusion about, the most compelling reason.

The reason, purpose, or motive for partition will not only determine the degree of support for the partition but also the particular form the partition proposal is likely to take. If the only reason given to justify a partition is various black pathologies and inferiorities, from low intelligence to high rates of crime and other social delinquencies, then the partition is likely to be limited to separating blacks only, and perhaps lower class blacks only, from the rest of the population. If the only reason given is that some whites simply do not like to live among blacks or in the same country as blacks, then the partition proposal is likely to be limited to the creation of a black-free state where these particular whites can live.

But if the reason for partition is the very survival of our race, the most supremely compelling reason of all, then a comprehensive plan to achieve complete racial separation is both called for and justified, and the degree of popular support for the partition will be maximized.

The next most compelling reasons would be those of racial independence, freedom, and self-determination, recognizing that a race exists not only biologically in the bodies of its individual members, but as a corporate body or population with its own racially unique traits and characteristics, whose existence and preservation also requires racial separation.

In 1988 I had the opportunity to meet William Gayley Simpson, author of *Which Way Western Man*.<sup>5</sup> At that time he was in his nineties and in declining health. He compensated for his lack of conversational endurance by distilling the essence of his thought into one very terse and pointed message: “Separate or die.” That simple phrase tells us two vitally important things. First, racial separation is necessary for the long-term preservation of our race, the founding and still the majority American racial type. It is a simple matter of either-or—either racial separation or racial death. Second, the alternative to racial destruction, the solution to our racial crisis, is racial separation. Not immigration restrictions, segregation, white supremacism, or other half-measures which have had their innings over the last two centuries, nor anything that need harm other races or violate their legitimate rights and interests, including the most extreme measure of all—genocide. So the solution to our existential crisis is a limited and finite measure, not an unlimited and infinite one, and so one that is easy to define and comprehend its dimensions and means.

#### SAM FRANCIS ON SEPARATISM VERSUS SUPREMACISM

*American Renaissance* published essays about racial separatism by Rabbi Mayer Schiller and myself in the February, 1995 issue.<sup>6</sup> Needless to say, our conceptions of racial separatism were very different. I conceived it as separate racial nations while Rabbi Schiller conceived it in the terms of the traditional Jewish experience as a people that shall dwell alone. The following issue had an essay by Sam Francis—under the heading “Prospects for Racial and Cultural Survival: Separation, as proposed in the previous issue, would not work, but there is a better solution”—advocating a restoration of white supremacism and opposing racial separation as a surrender and a betrayal of our heritage and all our ancestors had worked for and achieved. This essay is included

---

<sup>5</sup> William Gayley Simpson, *Which Way Western Man* (Cooperstown, N.Y.: Yeoman Press, 1978).

<sup>6</sup> *American Renaissance*, vol. 6, no. 2, February 1995.

in a collection of his works titled *Essential Writings on Race*,<sup>7</sup> edited by Jared Taylor. On Jared's invitation I responded in the June, 1995 issue with an essay under the heading "The Preservationist Imperative: Why Separation is Necessary for Survival—A reply to Samuel Francis' essay opposing racial separation."<sup>8</sup>

When Michael Hart presented his partition plan at the second American Renaissance conference the following year I understood how a separation or partition plan could indeed be as Sam Francis envisioned it—a complete surrender of our country and ultimately our race itself, an ignominious retreat for escapists betraying our race to eventual complete dispossession and destruction rather than a victory for preservationists securing our future existence. I had mistakenly assumed that everyone's concept of a partition would be similar to mine, as Feller's was, but Hart made me realize how wrong that assumption was. I had assumed that a partition plan would have preservation as its purpose, and it was a shock to see a plan that made no mention of preservation and was actually anti-preservation in its long-term effects. So now I saw that Sam Francis and I had different conceptions of what a racial partition would be, from its reason to its form, and that we had been debating, or arguing, about two very different things.

By the beginning of the era of *The Occidental Quarterly*, Sam Francis' views on racial separation had shifted significantly from what they had been in 1995. In addressing white activist meetings he openly expressed his support for racial separation in the complete territorial and political sense. I personally was very pleased to note this shift. Unfortunately, as far as I know, Francis never expressed his revised views on separation in writing, so it seems that his 1995 essay, now republished, will remain his final written word on this very important matter. The only written evidence for the shift would perhaps be implicit in his choice of essays for *Race and the American Prospect*.<sup>9</sup> Certainly, I don't think he would have included my essay unless his views had shifted as they did.

### THIRTEEN PRINCIPLES OF RACIAL PARTITION

When my work on a partition proposal began in the mid-1970s it

---

<sup>7</sup> Samuel Francis, *Essential Writings on Race*, ed. Jared Taylor (Oakton, Va.: New Century Books, 2007).

<sup>8</sup> *American Renaissance*, vol. 6, no. 6, June 1995.

<sup>9</sup> Samuel Francis, ed., *Race and the American Prospect* (Mt. Airy, Md.: The Occidental Press, 2006).

was guided by certain principles that were at first assumptive or intuitive, and taken as granted, without need for explanation. But more recent events beginning in the 1990s (such as Michael Hart's anti-preservationist partition plan from the 1996 American Renaissance conference) convinced me this was not the case, and that the principles on which separatist proposals are based, and by which they are judged and measured, need to be clearly stated. So following is a list of my guiding principles for racial separation.

### **1. Maximize Racial Preservation**

My first guiding principle is that a partition plan should save as much of our race as possible, and at the very least a large majority of it. It should, from its inception, be based on this assumption, and so be designed from the start with this goal and not deviate from it. Basically, all members of our race except those married to nonwhites, or who are close blood relatives to nonwhites and wish to remain with them, should be assumed to belong to our nation in the partition plan. Our plan should therefore take no official account, or give any official consideration, for members of our race who have no family connections to other races yet who wish to remain in a multiracial state. This is their individual concern, a personal problem if you will, which they should have to attempt to accommodate and arrange on their own outside of the arrangements of the partition plan, by seeking subsequent entry into whatever multiracial or nonwhite state that will have them. In brief, it is a matter that should be handled at the individual level, not the racial level.

A partition plan that did not save the majority of our race, that did not contain the majority of our race in our own monoracial homeland, would actually ensure the eventual destruction of all of our race, first by accelerating the destruction of the majority of our race that remained mixed with other races, and then allowing the easy destruction of the rump state populated by a minority of our race too small to effectively defend itself against the rising tide of the nonwhite world. It is dangerous to overestimate our abilities or to underestimate our enemies. Custer was neither the first nor the last to make that mistake, and if we do not want our racial homeland to ultimately be a lost cause, the last stand of our race, but rather to ensure our safe and secure existence and the fulfillment of our racial destiny, then it must include the majority of our race, and hopefully the great majority. Anything less would merely divide our race, facilitating its destruction, rather than preserving it.

## **2. Maximize Territorial Retention**

My second principle is that, next to our race itself, our land or territory is our most valuable possession. As such, it should not be surrendered easily. And some parts of our territory, based on factors such as our history and population distribution, are more valuable than other parts. This means that a partition plan should be guided by the principle of retaining as much of our territory—and especially our more valuable territory—as possible, and of parting with as little of it as necessary to achieve the goal of saving our race. In other words, don't give away the farm.

## **3. Create no Multiracial States**

My third guiding principle, based on the above two principles, and in order to save as much of our race and territory as possible, is that the partition plan not include provision for a multiracial successor state that would take a large part of our race and our territory. Such a state is not a legitimate racial entity, but an artificial ideological construct, a so-called "proposition" nation with a creedal rather than racial definition of identity, and therefore should have no standing in a plan for racial partition. As stated in the first principle, any member of our race who is determined to live among other races should have to make their own arrangements. This racial pathology should not be recognized, legitimized, or accommodated by a partition plan to our cost.

## **4. We are the Legitimate Successors of the United States of America**

My fourth principle is that our racial nation, containing the great majority of the founding racial group of the United States, the "Old American Stock" and closely related racial groups who created the country and were still the great majority of the population as late as 1970, would be the recognized successor to, and continuation of, the original United States of America. As the race with the deepest roots and the largest stake in America, the race of the first Americans who once possessed the whole of the country, our interests should be given priority and precedence and the greater existential urgency of our position recognized (i.e., as William Simpson put it, "separate or die"). Among many other things, this means that, to prevent nuclear proliferation, our racial nation would be the sole heir to the existing stock of strategic weapons, as Russia was the sole heir to the strategic weapons of the Soviet Union.

### **5. Secure the Atlantic Seaboard**

My fifth principle is that a partition plan must secure our lines of communication to our ancestral racial homelands and kindred peoples in Europe. This means that our racial nation must include the greater part of the Atlantic seaboard.

### **6. Partition cannot be Voluntary**

My sixth principle is that a racial partition plan cannot be voluntary, requiring the free consent of any individual whose movement would be required for its implementation. Such a plan would be a non-starter. The plan would require the support of most of our race, or at least most of the part that matters, the most intensely committed, determined, and active part, sufficient to compel and enforce its realization. Hopefully it will have more support than that, and every reasonable effort should be made to increase its support and lessen opposition without futile catering to obstructionism. And every reasonable effort should be made to minimize or negate the property losses of those required to move by assigning them property of comparable value in their new homelands. But it will be opposed by many, including many of our own race, and especially many of those who will be required to move.

### **7. Retain the Original Territory of the United States**

My seventh principle, consistent with the second, fourth, and fifth principles, is that our racial nation include the original territory of the United States, being the territory east of the Mississippi except for the Florida peninsula, which belonged to the United States at the beginning of its independence. This is the territory where our history, heritage, roots, and attachments are deepest. It also still contains the majority of our race. It is our most valuable territory. It is our line of communication with our ancestral homelands and kindred peoples in Europe. It is the most essential territory to the nation that constitutes the continuation of the United States. And it is the territory that most of all belongs to the founding racial group, the Old American Stock, whose rights of possession to it take precedence over any other.

### **8. Retain a Transcontinental Link**

My eighth principle is that our nation, as the continuation of the United States, remain a transcontinental nation, as it has been since the 1840s. This, with the continuation of the United States as a Pacific

power, would secure our important line of communications with the countries of our racial kindred in Australia and New Zealand. This would require a broad contiguous band of territory from the Mississippi to the Pacific coast. As the nations of the other races, per principle seven, would also be west of the Mississippi, except perhaps for the Florida peninsula, and as the most logical position for those nations would be in the southern part of that great expanse of territory where their populations are both much more numerous and would be either contiguous or in greater proximity to the nonwhite nation of Mexico rather than to the white nation of Canada in the north, the northern part of that territory would be the logical position for the transcontinental band of our territory.

### **9. Maximize Defensible Borders**

My ninth principle is that borders be as secure as possible, and this consideration should be an important factor in the plan. Borders are more secure when they are based on major geographical barriers or when they are made as short as possible, requiring a minimum of "gerrymandering," or meandering of borders. Major geographical barriers, from the seas that surround islands and peninsulas to the mountain ranges and large rivers that provide strong natural borders in the interior, provide the most secure borders. If such natural borders are absent, or not followed for some other reason, then borders should be kept as short as possible. For this purpose, whatever its size, the ideal shape of a nation is as close to a square, allowing for the shortest possible borders for its area, as geographical and other considerations will allow. That ideal should not be varied from more than is necessary for good reason.

### **10. Retain Control of the Partition Process**

My tenth principle is that we be in control of the process. We want to be the ones doing the partitioning. We want to be in charge. This does not necessarily mean a *diktat* in which others will have no input, but the ultimate and final decision on all matters of importance, on methods of implementation and especially on the actual dispensation of territory, must be ours. To do this we must be in a position of strength.

To be in a position of strength we must make our decisions and act as a race, as a united people, as a corporate body united in purpose behind our legitimate leaders and representatives who act at the racial level in our corporate interest, not as 190 million separate actors oper-

ating at the individual level, each making his own decisions in isolation, without common purpose, direction or leadership, for himself, not for his race. Separation, however necessary for our continued existence, is a giant step, a step so great that it can only be taken as a united people acting as a whole, not as atomized and divided individuals; at the racial level, not the individual level. The implementation should be controlled by our designated leadership, determining our future as a people, a race, at the corporate level, the way such great issues should be determined, not at an individual level, bypassing and essentially denying any role for race or ethnicity in the process, an approach related to the denial of the legitimacy or even the very existence of race itself. Decisions of this scale, determining a matter of the most supreme importance, the independence and very existence of the race itself, are properly made at the highest level, at the level of the race or people itself acting as a corporate body.

It is highly improper and inappropriate for decisions of this scale to be made at the individual level. Any implementation conducted at the individual level could only frustrate and prevent any meaningful or effective effort to achieve real racial preservation and independence. It would be a spoiler plan presumably intended to do just that. Similarly, any attempt to determine the dispensation of territory based on a formula of individual choices, however rationalized, would prevent a clear plan from being worked out in advance and promoted in an orderly way. This would introduce uncertainty into the process, which would be exploited by the other races much to our disadvantage.

It should be assumed that the process will be an adversarial one, with the other races strongly opposed both to the concept of partition itself and to the particulars of our plan. (Although we should make every reasonable effort to lessen and weaken their opposition, such as by giving due consideration to their constructive input.) We should expect them to make every effort by every means available to them to obstruct, impede, undermine, and delay the achievement of our separatist goals, especially by fomenting and exploiting division and disagreement within our ranks.

To avoid the partition degenerating into a drawn-out bargaining process to our disadvantage, and to prevent any division or split in our ranks, which would likely be extremely costly or even fatal to our hopes, we must from the very beginning share a common vision, uniting us in support of a clearly formulated and well-developed plan. We must be in a position to enforce our plan to whatever extent necessary,

and this position must be certain beyond doubt to all concerned from the beginning. A common vision requires our unity, and hopefully we will have the leadership that can provide such a vision and forge such unity.

### **11. Maximize White Support, Minimize White Resistance**

My eleventh principle is that our partition plan, to become our common vision, should be designed to maximize white support and minimize white resistance, to maximize our unity and minimize our division. This does not mean, as many would at first think, that it would then give whites everything and the other races nothing. Quite the contrary, as the nature of our race is such that it, perhaps uniquely, is seriously concerned about fairness. Our plan must be at least within the parameters of what can reasonably be described or defended as a fair dispensation for the other races, while still placing our more vital interests first. As Sam Dickson said in his American Renaissance address, we can afford to be generous.

For example, if the blacks are given a country larger in size than France, and this is pointed out (as I do in my proposal), it is difficult to portray this as unfair in any objective sense. The actual details of any partition plan can be very crucial to this matter, impacting it decisively. Any partition plan that surrendered a core white homeland, with deep white roots and sense of attachment and a large white population, would certainly alienate potential white supporters much more than giving up more recently settled areas of the country where the roots are more shallow, the attachment weaker, and the white population smaller.

There are two rules that should be considered in maximizing white support for our partition plan, and satisfying both requires something of a balancing act.

The first and most important rule is to minimize the number of whites who would be required to move or relocate. This is simple common sense. Make the realization of the partition plan as easy as possible for the greatest number of whites and you lower the bar for their acceptance as much as possible. Make it more difficult by requiring them to move or relocate, with all the disruption and hardship that involves, and the bar of acceptance is raised to a level that only the hard-core of the most determined and committed of our race would be sufficiently motivated to cross it. We want to make it as simple and easy as possible for as many whites as possible to support our partition

plan by lowering the bar for their support as much as possible.

The great majority of white Americans want to live in a large country that includes the great majority of their racial countrymen, that is a recognizable continuation of the country they inherited from their ancestors in both territory and population, the way it should have been and could still be. This is what they are used to, their concept of their country, and it is what they want. They do not want their country to be reduced to a small rump state, remote from its core ancestral lands, and containing only a small minority of their race. They want their country to essentially still be America as conceived by their ancestors. If what they want is consistent with the interests of our race, and this certainly is, then to get their support we should give them what they want. This is leadership made easy.

The second rule for maximizing white support for our partition plan, given the nature of our race and its concern with fairness, is that it be within the parameters of what can reasonably be considered as fair. Fortunately, it is possible to design a partition plan that is consistent with both rules, that would require less than 20 percent of whites to relocate (which percentage could therefore be set as a limit for the number of whites required to relocate) and still provide a very fair, even reasonably generous, territorial dispensation to the other races.

## **12. No Partition of Europe**

My twelfth principle is to pay close attention to Europe. We must be ever mindful of Europe's racial situation, of the influence and effects our partition plans and actions have there, of the possibilities of coordinating our efforts with those of our European kindred, and of our ultimate shared goal of restoring all of Europe to its previous over 10,000-year state as the ancient homeland of our race. The partition solution that is good for America, and perhaps for Canada and Australia, would definitely not be good or right or acceptable for Europe.

Nonwhite states cannot be tolerated on European soil. Every square inch or centimeter has belonged to the indigenous peoples for over 10,000 years and is far too precious to our race and heritage to be surrendered to the non-European races that have invaded in the last sixty years. America has the space that allows us to be generous with territory. Europe has no space that is expendable. The existence of any nonwhite country in Europe's bosom would be a threat to the whole that would ultimately cause the destruction of everything Europe has been in a racial sense, and probably also of the culture that

race created from its unique inner substance.

So in Europe a partition of territory is not an option. Europe belongs to the Europeans, all of it, to them alone and only to them. All nonwhites, almost none of whom have roots in Europe longer than sixty years, and most half that time or less, and so not really worthy of the name, must leave Europe. And if we can, and to the extent we can, we should be ready to help, even by adding the nonwhites of Europe to the nonwhite areas of our own partition plans, in those cases where repatriation, the preferred solution for Europe's nonwhite elements, is not a practical option.

The fate of Europe and the fate of white America are inseparably intertwined. We must win both, or we will lose all. So what we do here, assuming we move first, must be done with full consideration of its effects on our European kin, at least to set a good example they would want to follow, and in the best case scenario to coordinate our efforts to achieve the complete salvation of our entire race with one common effort.

It was America that led the Europeans down the path to multiracialism and its consequent racial destruction with the example it set, although it was their decision to follow our example in the vain belief they could do it better. Perhaps only America is capable of leading the white world off the path of its racial destruction, and making things right again by restoring the white world to the natural monoracial state of existence required for its racial preservation.

### **13. Base Partition on Race Alone**

My thirteenth and final principle is that the partition must be based solely on race. It should not be based on ideological factors. The purpose of the partition is racial preservation through the creation, or restoration, of natural racial nations or ethnostates, not unnatural and artificial "proposition nations" based on belief and adherence to some creedal litmus test or abstract ideology. We must reject a creedal definition of our identity, such as the one that was constructed in the aftermath of the Second World War to justify multiracial states, and assert a clearly and explicitly racial one as the basis of our ethnostate.

This involves an important consideration that must be settled before the partition plans themselves can be formalized – the determination of the racial composition of the different groups which will form the countries resulting from the partition. Most important is the determination of what racial elements are included in our own in-group. In

this I have followed the lead of Wilmot Robertson and based my racial in-group on his Northern European “Majority” and various “Assimilable [European] Minorities.” Others speak in terms of a somewhat broader racial in-group under the term “white,” which in this context is usually defined as including all European racial types.

In both instances, in-group status is determined by birth, by ancestry, by race, not by the ideological beliefs of this generation or even the last several generations. Therefore it includes persons of wide ideological differences and persuasions, even those who are committed to the ideology of multiracialism itself. The partition plan will define them by their race, not their ideology, and include them with their race. If they are incorrigibly opposed to living with their own race, and only their own race, then they would be obliged to make their own arrangements to live with another race or other races outside of the dispensation of the plan.

Those white separatists who would prefer to exclude all white multiracialists from their in-group on ideological grounds should be reminded that the ideological fault of the multiracialists is not in their genes, but in their memes, the system of ideas, beliefs, and values with which they have been surrounded and indoctrinated all their lives in the context of a multiracial environment and culture, much like the Janissaries of the Ottoman Empire. In the context of a natural monoracial environment, which we seek to restore, their ancestors and their genes, the genes that made them, served our race very well for hundreds of generations.

The essence of our tragedy is that very many members of our race who have been turned against their race often carry some of the best genes of our race—the genes of our poets, scientists, scholars, philosophers, statesmen, composers, artists, playwrights, engineers, soldiers, and architects, not to mention many of our greatest beauties. Their genes are our genes, part of our race, including much of the most valuable part of our race.

We should not part with them willingly, much less desire to expel them because of the generations of multiracialist indoctrination and programming to which they have fallen victim. For they are victims, and should be so regarded, and should not be surrendered easily. Many, or even most, have some capacity to love and value their race and support its interests, and many others can be salvaged, or at least their genes can, to serve their race again in future generations. We cannot afford to lose them, or give up on them. They are not expendable.

If they are lost the part of our race that remains will be but a shadow of its former self. If our purpose and goal, our task or mission, is to save and preserve our race, then we must save them too. If we only save the most racially conscious minority of individuals who possess that seemingly all too rare ability to figure racial matters out for themselves, perhaps intuitively or instinctively, or possess a love for their race so strong it gives them a sort of immunity to the racial pathology that afflicts the majority in varying degrees, we will not have accomplished much at all.

We have major divisions that we can do little about, some that are beyond cure. Those whites who have mated with nonwhites, or who have nonwhite children or grandchildren, natural or adopted, have with few exceptions literally joined the other races and abandoned their own, become part of the nonwhite races, and should be counted as such in our partition plan. There are many others, although I believe a small minority, that are pathologically committed to the destruction of their race and the realization of their One Race ideal in which their own race would be lost.

These divisions are given, and we have little control over them. These people are not "in play" in terms of gaining their support for white racial preservation and independence. But we do have control over our partition plan, and we should minimize the creation of new divisions, or the expansion of old ones, that might result from it, to gain the support of the greatest possible number of our race who are "in play" and thus possible to gain, and save.

#### **CRITIQUE OF MICHAEL HART'S PARTITION PLAN**

In light of the principles listed and discussed above, Michael Hart's 1996 partition proposal appears almost as a non-event, as it violates every one except perhaps the ninth. As such it was a non-starter whose shallowness of conception and lack of meaningful purpose could not be hidden under all its superficial detail.

Hart's plan proposes a three-way partition of the United States, into:

1. A Black Separatist State that he calls the BSS
2. A non-black state that he calls the "White Separatist State," or WSS, although the term non-black is more accurate as it would presumably only exclude blacks and any non-black would be able to live there, for as Hart says, "it may well include some Asians and others."
3. A multiracial state that Hart calls "the integrated state, [which] will be a continuation of the present United States of America, but

with a reduced area. All American citizens who do not explicitly choose to become citizens of the BSS or the WSS will remain members of the integrated USA.”

Hart gives four reasons or motives for white separatism:

1. They [whites] are losing their rights.
2. They are losing their personal safety.
3. Their traditions are no longer respected and protected.
4. And, worst of all, if there is no change in immigration policy we will soon be a permanent minority in what used to be our country.<sup>10</sup>

Hart’s first three reasons are individual level concerns, not racial level concerns. They are based on individual interests, not the interests and well-being of the race, such as its independence, its possession of its ancestral lands, and even its continued existence and preservation. For the great majority of whites, they are probably not sufficiently compelling to justify a racial partition of the country, so they would probably not support it, much less participate in it themselves with the effort that it would require.

The fourth reason has historically also not been a compelling reason for whites acting at an individual level to separate, provided they are in control in the context of a white supremacist system as in pre-1994 South Africa, much of Latin America, and many other historical examples, or provided they can relocate to another area of the country where whites are still a majority, as we have seen in the many millions of acts of white flight that have been the individual level response to this issue.

Only when the fourth reason is addressed at the racial level, by a race acting in its interests as a race, as a matter of racial independence and continued existence as a racial population, as a matter of existential urgency, is it seen as sufficiently compelling to be widely accepted as grounds for partition. This Hart does not do. His reasons for partition are kept strictly at the individual level, as his process of partition is decided at the individual level, not the racial level, determined by the choices of voters acting only for themselves, not for their race. So the supreme racial-level issues of racial independence, freedom and self-determination, preservation and continued existence—the only reasons sufficiently compelling to justify the necessity of partition—

---

<sup>10</sup> Hart, “Racial Partition.”

are excluded from his calculations and not even addressed or mentioned.

The result is a partition plan lacking in goal and purpose, and which certainly does not serve the purposes it does not address. This failure to address purpose, reasons, or issues at the racial level carries over to Hart's method of implementation and dispensation of territory, which is also determined and conducted at the individual level, not the racial level, where matters of this scale are properly determined, have historically been determined, and where as a practical matter they can only be determined. This bypassing of the race in favor of an exclusively individualized process replaces unity with atomization, allowing Hart to assume a white defeat at the racial level at the beginning of the process, as part of the conception of his plan at its inception.

Starting with these assumptions, Hart places the White Separatist State in the northwest corner of the country, beginning in the states of Oregon and Washington and expanding from that point based on the number of whites who individually choose to join it.

A plan that requires a majority of whites to relocate is a non-starter. Hart's plan, even with his white separatist state at its maximum extent including the entire northern half of the country west of the Mississippi, would still require about 95 percent of whites to relocate to be part of it. Therefore, I agree with his assumption that only a minority of whites would choose to live in his concept of a white homeland. The figure he gives in his example is 50 million, which was about 26 percent of the 192 million white population in 1996, based on the census bureau definition of white. Personally, I would expect far less than 26 percent of the white population to choose to live in his vision of a white homeland.

The rarely seen irony of Hart's and similar plans is that if 50 million, or even 25 million, whites were sufficiently committed to a racial partition to expend the effort and resources to relocate as these plans require, the same energy and resources, committed to a plan much more favorable to white racial interests, would probably be equally successful, with much more favorable results for our race.

If we can find 25 million whites with this level of commitment to partition, we can probably get our best case partition plan as readily as Hart's near-worst case plan, if not more readily. If we can find 50 million, as in Hart's example, it would be a certainty. In fact, the matter would be definitively settled in short order, a done deal. In other words, if we are going to commit ourselves to realizing a racial

partition, and assuming roughly equal levels of difficulty would be involved in realizing different plans, we should commit ourselves to the plan that is most favorable to our interests.

In his example Hart also assumes that 20 million blacks would choose to live in his Black Separatist State. This was about 61 percent of the black population of 33 million in 1996, in my opinion an even greater overstatement of likely black support than Hart's estimate of white support for his White Separatist State. Hart does not give any reason for assuming that blacks would join their separatist state at more than twice the percentage of whites. This is quite the opposite of my normal assumptions, and might indicate the extent of white rejection that Hart expects for his concept of their homeland.

Hart's multiracial or "integrated state" would include the great majority of the white population, all the territory east of the Mississippi, control of the lines of communication with Europe, and is designated as the continuation of the United States, the country we should want to save for our race almost as much as we want to save our race itself. Here, most of all, Hart shows his hand, when he chooses the remote northwest as the site of the white state and the core eastern part of the country as the site for the multiracialist state. If he sited the white state on the Atlantic coast, where our country began, our roots are deepest, and our numbers greatest, expanding westward from the coast as the numbers that choose to live there increased, mirroring our path of expansion two centuries ago, that would at least incur one point of credibility in his favor, but he does not even allow that. The fact is, it is the Atlantic coast that is not expendable. It is the part of our territory that confers and conveys the greatest degree of popular legitimacy and authority, the territorial core and heartland of our country. That is why it must belong to the state that is the continuation of the United States, and why Hart gives it to the multiracialist state.

Hart's plan is designed to empower individual whites to opt out of the multiracial state, and out of the great majority of their race and its rightful inheritance, and what their race requires for its long-term survival, to form their own homeland or ethnostate which might survive for a few generations while the great majority of their race around the world is destroyed. It would divide our race in two, with the most ethnocentric minority, those who should be racial leaders and loyalists, turning their backs on the great majority of their race, abandoning and betraying it to an accelerated process of destruction while they seek to realize their short-term racial utopia. It would be

an unmitigated disaster for our race.

Hart rationalizes dividing the white population by concern for the desires of white "integrationists." As he says, "Many whites really want to live in an integrated society. They would be horrified at the prospect of living in a white separatist state (which they would regard as 'Fascist')." <sup>11</sup> He does not say just who those many whites are, but I believe he greatly exaggerates their number, the extent and depth of their commitment and dedication to multiracialism and its consequences, and their desire to live in a multiracial society. Certainly this is true of the founding American racial stock and the assimilated white minorities.

I must assume that his phrase "many whites" refers most accurately to unassimilated white minorities who have historically been the leading advocates of multiracialism, and have identified it most closely with their own group interests. If they were included in the white state it might, as Hart says, "necessarily start off with a large disgruntled, embittered minority (consisting of those whites who were opposed to partition), which will cause tremendous internal problems." <sup>12</sup> Nothing new about that. It is something of which we now have more than a century of experience, and have hopefully learned our lessons.

Hart's plan divides the white race on two grounds. The first is the willingness to relocate, to pull up stakes and move away from the familiar surroundings of home, job, and community, with all the cost and effort that requires, and the second is ideology. First, by locating the White Separatist State in the far northwest he ensures that over 95 percent of whites would have to relocate to join it. By separating it from Europe and the core ancestral and historical American homelands, and from being the continuation of America and its position in the world, he ensures that whites would have to give up their heritage and world position to join it.

Both of these give his multiracial state, as the continuation of America with all of its original and most important, developed, and populous territory, a huge advantage from the beginning, while imposing a huge disadvantage on the White Separatist State and the pro-white cause. This effectively ensures that only a small minority of whites, those strongly motivated by their individual-level racial concerns

---

<sup>11</sup> Hart, "Racial Partition."

<sup>12</sup> Hart, "Racial Partition."

rather than the interests of their race as a whole at the racial level, would choose to join his White Separatist State.

So, in terms of white racial interests, it must be regarded as a non-starter—and even as a spoiler plan, to the extent that it distracts attention and diverts support away from alternative plans that really do serve white racial interests, pre-empting them by preventing their consideration, and co-opting sufficient white separatist sentiment, energy, and support as to fatally divide the separatist effort and weaken the prospects for a truly pro-white plan.

Second, by dividing whites on ideological grounds—separatists and preservationists versus multiracialists and amalgamationists—Hart effectively declares his multiracialist state, which he designates as the continuation of the postwar United States, to be a proposition nation, with a creedal or ideologically-constructed definition of identity, membership, and belonging rather than a natural biological or racial definition.

This postwar concept of an ideology-based nation, based on a nationally established ideology or creed, is precisely what the Founding Fathers sought to prevent with the first amendment's prohibition of any government establishment of religion, which is properly interpreted as referring to any creed or ideology, whether religious or secular. The Founding Fathers made it clear, in both their written commentary and all the antebellum legislation and judicial opinion on the matter, that they envisioned America as a racially united but creedally diverse European nation. As late as the 1920s the founding American racial stock was still able to reassert this vision, their vision and the vision of their American forefathers, with the passage of immigration restrictions designed to protect their dominant racial position in the country their ancestors created.

Only in the aftermath of the Second World War, and the manipulation of public opinion to extend the reaction against German nationalism to opposition to the racial interests of the European peoples or whites in general, did the concept of a creedal or "proposition" nation, with membership based on ideology—similar to the Marxist-Leninist conception of citizenship already practiced in the Soviet Union—gain cultural dominance in the West and provide the ideological justification for the rise of multiracialism and the dispossession of the European peoples.

Hart's white separatists, as he envisions them, are not racial preservationists. Their reason, purpose, or motive for separation is not the

preservation of their race, but their personal escape. White preservation is not their concern, nor is it recognized as the reason for partition. The reasons given by Hart for white separatism (loss of rights, concerns for personal safety, respect for tradition, fear of becoming a minority), however valid, are much less compelling than the existential urgency of racial preservation, of Simpson's "separate or die." It is therefore hardly a wonder that Hart assumes the great majority of whites would choose not to be a part of the white separatist state, but prefer to remain in the "integrated" (multiracial) state.

And it is this integrated state that is favored by Hart with retaining the great majority of the population, including the great majority of the white population, by far the greater portion of the territory, including the core areas of the country where whites are most numerous and have the deepest roots and attachments, and the country's national identity. Again, for it bears repeating, as Hart says, "the integrated [multiracial] state will be a continuation of the present United States of America." Indeed, there would be only the merest ripple of change, as the United States rid itself of the disruptive element of ethnocentric and idealistic whites. I think it is safe to assume that Hart's multiracial state would be the sole heir of the US strategic arsenal.

My initial criticism of Hart's partition plan appeared in the August, 1996 issue of *Instauration*. The full text of that criticism follows:

Professor Michael Hart proposed a detailed plan for a racial partition of the United States, which would seem to be consistent with the purpose of the conference, yet I found his vision of a partition to be very discouraging. He hypothesized a separate "white" state confined to the northwest, and thus cut off not only from the midwestern heartland, and the original thirteen states where our country was born, but also, perhaps not coincidentally, from all direct lines of communication with our ancestral homelands in Europe. His scenario assumed that less than one-third of the "whites" would choose to live in the separate "white" state, meaning that over two-thirds of our race would continue to live in the "integrated" (multiracial) state, where they would, it must be logically assumed, ultimately become extinct through replacement and intermixture, so that most of our race would be lost. This consequence, and the grim prospects for the survival of the separate "white" state in those circumstances, or of Europe itself, were not discussed. I put "white" in quotation

marks because Professor Hart made it clear that racial minorities that behaved themselves and had low rates of delinquency, such as Asians, would be welcomed to live in the separate “white” state, as also of course would anyone commonly included in the broadest possible definition of “white.” He himself would live in the separate “white” state, no doubt seeing it as his duty as the apostle to the separatist gentiles to keep a degree of control, or at least surveillance, over us.

I think my disagreement with Professor Hart stems from our different motives and goals. I want to save my race, to secure its preservation and independence—and not just a minority of it, but hopefully all or nearly all of it. For me, the loss of a majority, or even a large minority, of my race would be a catastrophe, which I would strive to the utmost to avoid if at all possible. Since my race is not really his race, and his race does not really share our danger, he is not really motivated by concerns of racial salvation and preservation, but in setting up a limited refuge area where whites who personally wish to escape from certain non-whites, with no real concern for the larger interests of their race as a whole, will be able to do so. What is Professor Hart’s motive or reason for partition? Based on his proposal—his proposed solution to the racial problem—I think we must assume his motive is not racial preservation. It is not a preservationist solution. The best indicator of a person’s perception or understanding of a problem is the solution he proposes for it. By this rule we must assume that Professor Hart does not perceive the racial problem as a matter of racial survival, but as something less, or as something much different, such as the problem that might be posed to the larger multiracial state if enough whites became disaffected with its agenda to seriously threaten it with a more complete partition—one that would be more favorable to the interests of Northern European Americans, the racial group of the “Old Americans” who founded and built the country, who were America and simply the Americans until this century, and whose interests would therefore be most directly concerned with an “American Renaissance.” In such a situation, as distant as it might seem, the multiracial state might move to preserve itself by ceding expendable territory to the more actively disgruntled and disruptive Northern Europeans, removing them before they can attract the support of a majority of their race and possibly

achieve a real American Renaissance.

In all fairness to Professor Hart I must admit that many of the less thoughtful white racial separatists envision the northwest as the site for a separate white nation, with only a small minority of the total white population living within it, that these separatists seem to be little concerned with the fate that befalls the larger part of their race, and that some of them say Asians and Hispanics would be welcomed. So his scenario is not really original. Still, it is a bad idea, a scenario that diverts us from the path that would save our race as a whole, an admission of defeat acceptable only under the most desperate circumstances, where there is virtually no hope of saving the greater part of our race and we accept the risk of staking the hope for our racial future on a small rump state, while the majority of our race is lost and the long-term prospects for the separated remainder do not look promising. At best, his proposal would only temporarily save a minority of our race, and would not really change the larger trend toward its long term destruction, just the minor details within the trend. It seems that racial separatism is not necessarily racial preservationism, and certainly not when it is a half-baked version such as this.

So by 1996 I could understand the objections Sam Francis had raised to separatism, as I think by a few years later he could understand my support for it. Partition is a two-edged sword. It can be used against our interests as well as for them, be bad for us as well as good for us. It is up to us to differentiate clearly between the versions of partition, to evaluate, judge, measure, and choose based on clearly stated principles, knowing what our purpose, motive, and reason for separation is, and crafting and choosing a plan that achieves that purpose. Anything less is a game not worth the candle.

#### **THE NECESSITY OF LEADERSHIP**

There are times when I am surprised to find myself in agreement with something said by someone with whom I have usually been in profound disagreement. Such is the case with this statement of Margaret Mead: "Never doubt that a small group of committed people can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." White preservationists are such a small group of committed people. We believe it is necessary to change the world to preserve our race, which

requires racial separation.

But do we believe this is possible? Often the key to changing the world is to believe it is possible. It seems almost too simple, but when this belief is transmitted to the masses, and they believe it is possible, then the very belief in its possibility becomes self-fulfilling, and it becomes possible. It is the responsibility of the leadership—the most psychologically intense, committed, and dedicated core or cadre of a movement—to sow and nurture and reap the harvest of belief in both the necessity and the possibility of changing the world.

To do this, the leadership itself must believe their goal is necessary and possible, and transmit this belief with all the power and strength of their conviction in the righteousness of their cause. This is how our leadership must address the issue of racial separation and the partition plan we propose to achieve it, as something that is both necessary and possible. What we offer our people is the continued existence of our race. What our opponents offer is the destruction of our race. We should make that clear, so our people know what their choice is and see the necessity of what we offer. Hopefully, they will want what we offer. When they want what we want, everything we want will be possible.

*Richard McCulloch is the author of **The Ideal and Destiny** (Coral Springs, Fl.: Towncourt Enterprises, 1982), **Destiny of Angels** (Coral Springs, Fl.: Towncourt Enterprises, 1986), **The Nordish Quest** (Coral Springs, Fl.: Towncourt Enterprises, 1989), and **The Racial Compact** (Coral Springs, Fl.: Towncourt Enterprises 1994), all available at <http://www.racialcompact.com/Towncourt.html>. His website is [www.racialcompact.com](http://www.racialcompact.com).*