

# The Negative Impact of Racial and Ethnic Diversity Upon Societies and Individuals.

[Literature review / study library]

## Contents

Page 1	<b>1) Abstract</b>
Page 2	<b>2) Studies on the Impact of Diversity</b>
Page 2	2A) General Studies on Diversity
Page 4	2B) Trust and Social Cohesion
Page 8	2C) Conflict, Violence, and War
Page 11	2D) Segregation and Fractionalization
Page 12	2E) Work, Innovation, and Economics
Page 17	2F) Health and the Environment
Page 21	2G) Education
Page 24	<b>3) Studies on Ethnocentrism</b>
Page 24	3A) General Studies on Ethnocentrism
Page 36	3B) Ethnocentric Behavior and Politics
Page 41	<b>4) Summary of Findings and Conclusion</b>

## 1) Abstract

This document is a comprehensive index of studies, both historic and contemporary, detailing the negative effects of racial and ethnic diversity. The authors of these studies hold a wide range of political beliefs, though, pro-diversity/globalism, pro-left-wing / liberal are the most common among them. This data statistically validates, beyond all reasonable doubt, the theory that racial and ethnic diversity is overwhelmingly negative. Diversity is colossally detrimental to individuals and society alike, in almost every conceivable way: physical and mental health, social cohesion, violence, trust, criminality, etc. The more diverse a society is, the more pronounced and severe these negative effects are, however, even small amounts of racial or ethnic diversity are enough to cause a quantifiable negative impact. Individuals of every race fare worse within racially and ethnically heterogeneous societies, though racial heterogeneity has a greater negative impact than ethnic heterogeneity (when the ethnically heterogeneous society is mono-racial).

**Note:** For the sake of continuity, within this document “diversity” will always refer to ethnic and racial diversity, unless specified otherwise (for example, age or religious diversity). The main relevant points from each study are highlighted in layman’s terms, with supporting quotes beneath them. All links and sources are accurate and accessible as of June 2019.

## 2) Studies on the Impact of Diversity

---

### 2A) General Studies on Diversity

#### **E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture – Robert D. Putnam (2007)**

1 <https://sci-hub.tw/https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x>

2 <http://archive.vn/6spat>

3 <http://archive.vn/EWuy1>

Diversity reduces social solidarity, general trust, trust in media, trust in local government, trust in political leaders, social capital, voter registration, political efficacy, charity, life satisfaction, happiness, co-operation, number of friendships, workplace effectiveness, general health. Diversity increases social isolation, military desertion rates, workforce turnover.

“Trust(even of one’s own race) is lower, altruism and community cooperation rarer, friends fewer [...] in ethnically diverse neighborhoods residents of all races tend to ‘hunker down’.”

Diversity is inversely correlated to trust levels.

“Inter-racial trust is relatively high in homogeneous South Dakota and relatively low in heterogeneous San Francisco or Los Angeles. The more ethnically diverse the people we live around, the less we trust them. [...] the more we are brought into physical proximity with people of another race or ethnic background, the more we stick to ‘our own’ and the less we trust the ‘other’”

Individuals who live in diverse communities are poorer and less educated than individuals who live in homogeneous communities.

“Moreover, individuals who live in ethnically diverse places are different in many ways from people who live in homogeneous areas. They tend to be poorer, less educated, less likely to own their home, less likely to speak English and so on.”

Less trusting individuals are most likely to tolerate diversity.

“the first whites to flee (or the most reluctant to move in) would be the most trusting, and the last to flee would be the least trusting; or alternatively, that ethnic minorities and

immigrants would selectively choose to move into neighborhoods in which the majority residents are most irascible and misanthropic.”

Asians, Africans, Hispanics all trust their neighbors less than Whites, thus are more adaptive to diverse societies.

*Table 3.*

Diverse communities harbor more criminality.

“Diverse communities tend to be larger, more mobile, less egalitarian, more crime-ridden”

Diversity of any sort makes people more likely to defect and cheat in game-theoretic scenarios.

“Within experimental game settings such as prisoners-dilemma or ultimatum games, players who are more different from one another (regardless of whether or not they actually know one another) are more likely to defect (or ‘cheat’).”

Ending immigration will not end “diversity.”

“because immigrant groups typically have higher fertility rates than native-born groups, ethnic diversity in virtually all of these countries would still increase in the years ahead, even if all new immigration were somehow halted”

### **The (In)compatibility of Diversity and Sense of Community – Zachary P. Neal, Jennifer Watling Neal (2013)**

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20160205043520/https://www.msu.edu/~zpneal/publications/Neal-DiversitySoc.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/Drcva>

3 <http://www.citylab.com/housing/2013/11/paradox-diverse-communities/7614/>

4 <http://archive.vn/XtSEv>

Diversity is incompatible with strong communities.

“Community psychologists are interested in creating contexts that promote both respect for diversity and sense of community. However, recent theoretical and empirical work has uncovered a community-diversity dialectic wherein the contextual conditions that foster respect for diversity often run in opposition to those that foster sense of community. [...] integration provides opportunities for intergroup contact that are necessary to promote respect for diversity but may prevent the formation of dense interpersonal networks that are necessary to promote sense of community.”

Diversity is inversely correlated to social cohesion.

“The most cohesive neighborhoods are almost never the most diverse ones. [...] these findings show it may not be possible to simultaneously create communities that are both fully integrated and fully cohesive, in essence, when it comes to neighborhood desegregation and social cohesion, you can’t have your cake and eat it too.”

These trends are so strong that it is unlikely that policy can change them.

“It’s not that local leaders and policymakers aren’t trying hard enough, rather, we now think it’s because the goals of integration and cohesion are just not compatible with each other.”

States with little diversity have more democracy, less corruption, and less inequality.

Homogeneous polities have less crime, less civil war, and more altruism.

### **Statistical and Perceived Diversity and Their Impacts on Neighborhood Social Cohesion in Germany, France and the Netherlands – Ruud Koopmans, Merlin Schaeffer (2015)**

1 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-015-0863-3>

2 <http://archive.vn/0oQRD>

Immigration-related diversity negatively impacts natives and immigrants alike.

“In line with the majority of previous studies, we find negative effects of statistical ethnic diversity on each of our five measures of neighborhood social cohesion: trust, collective efficacy, connectedness, reported social problems, and overall satisfaction with neighborhood life. With few

exceptions these effects are statistically significant in all three countries and apply to natives and persons of immigrant origin very much alike.”

---

## **2B) Trust and Social Cohesion**

### **Does Ethnic Diversity Have a Negative Effect on Attitudes towards the Community? A Longitudinal Analysis of the Causal Claims within the Ethnic Diversity and Social Cohesion Debate – James Laurence, Lee Bentley (2015)**

1 <http://esr.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/08/20/esr.jcv081.full>

2 <http://archive.vn/EyRQQ>

Community cohesion and individual connection to community is inversely correlated to diversity (1). (A UK-based replication of Putnam’s study).

“the findings suggest that changes in community diversity do lead to changes in attitudes towards the community. However, this effect differs by whether the change in diversity stems from a community increasing in diversity around individuals who do not move (stayers) or individuals moving into more or less diverse communities (movers). Increasing diversity undermines attitudes among stayers. Individuals who move from a

diverse to a homogeneous community report improved attitudes. However, there is no effect among individuals who move from a homogeneous to a diverse community. [...] The most robust test is conducted among stayers. For those who remain in the same area for two or more consecutive waves, increasing community diversity is related to a decline in attachment. Among movers, there is heterogeneity in diversity's effect based on moves into/out of diverse environments. For individuals relocating to less diverse communities, the more homogeneous the destination the more likely their attachment will increase.”

TL;DR: Individuals whose communities become diversified over time lose connection to their communities. Individuals who move into non-diverse communities gain community connection.

### **Ethnic diversity in neighborhoods and individual trust of immigrants and natives: A replication of Putnam (2007) in a West-European country – Bram Lancee, Jaap Dronkers (2008)**

1 <https://www.eui.eu/Documents/RSCAS/Research/MWG/200708/MWG2008-04-16LanceeDronkers.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/TR86N>

Community cohesion and individual connection to community is inversely correlated to diversity (2). (A Netherlands-based replication of Putnam's study).

“we confirm Putnam's claim and find that both for immigrants and native residents 1) neighborhoods' ethnic diversity reduces individual trust in neighborhoods; 2) those with neighbors of a different ethnicity have less trust in neighborhoods and neighbors 3) a substantial part of the effect of neighborhoods' ethnic diversity can be explained by the higher propensity of having neighbors of a different ethnicity. ”

### **Community social and place predictors of sense of community: A multilevel and longitudinal analysis – D. Adam Long, Douglas D. Perkins (2007)**

1 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jcop.20165>

2 <http://archive.vn/S5DEm>

Attachment to location of an individual's community is as important for their levels of happiness as the level of social cohesion within their community.

“Sense of Community (SOC) is intimately related to social capital (neighboring, citizen participation, collective efficacy, informal social control), communitarianism, place attachment, community confidence, and community satisfaction. [...] Being attached to one's community as a place may make feelings of social isolation or difference from one's neighbors all the more stark and disappointing.”

### **Ethnic Diversity and Social Trust: Evidence from the Micro-Context – Peter Thisted Dinesen and Kim Mannemar Sønderskov (2015)**

1

[http://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/130251172/Dinesen\\_S\\_underskov\\_Ethnic\\_Diversity\\_and\\_Social\\_Trust\\_Forthcoming\\_ASR.pdf#page=2](http://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/130251172/Dinesen_S_underskov_Ethnic_Diversity_and_Social_Trust_Forthcoming_ASR.pdf#page=2)

2 [https://web.archive.org/web/20181003222012/http://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/130251172/Dinesen\\_S\\_underskov\\_Ethnic\\_Diversity\\_and\\_Social\\_Trust\\_Forthcoming\\_ASR.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20181003222012/http://curis.ku.dk/ws/files/130251172/Dinesen_S_underskov_Ethnic_Diversity_and_Social_Trust_Forthcoming_ASR.pdf)

Diversity within 80 meters of a person reduces their social trust.

“The results show that ethnic diversity of the micro-context—measured within a radius of 80 meters of a person—has a statistically significant negative impact on social trust, controlling for a large number of potentially confounding variables.”

### **Demographic Structure and the Political Economy of Public Education – James M. Poterba (1996)**

1 <https://www.nber.org/papers/w5677.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/7HNKw>

Diversity reduces social trust.

“an increase in the fraction of elderly residents in a jurisdiction is associated with a significant reduction in per child educational spending. This reduction is particularly large when the elderly residents and school-age population are from different racial groups.”

### **Ethnic Diversity, Trust, and the Mediating Role of Positive and Negative Interethnic Contact: A Priming Experiment – Susanne Veit, Ruud Koopmans (2014)**

1. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261564649\\_Ethnic\\_Diversity\\_Trust\\_and\\_the\\_Mediating\\_Role\\_of\\_Positive\\_and\\_Negative\\_Interethnic\\_Contact\\_A\\_Priming\\_Experiment](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261564649_Ethnic_Diversity_Trust_and_the_Mediating_Role_of_Positive_and_Negative_Interethnic_Contact_A_Priming_Experiment)

2 <http://archive.vn/RTjvm>

Greater diversity causes greater mistrust among communities, both native and immigrant. Close, positive interpersonal experiences with other races or ethnicities can increase trust, but the frequency that these occur is inversely correlated to amount of diversity, thus creating a paradox.

“This study not only shows that the empirically well-established negative relationship between residential diversity and trust in neighbors holds for the case of Germany, but goes beyond existing research by providing experimental evidence on the causal nature of the diversity effect. [...] When people come to perceive their neighborhood in terms

of religious or ethnic differences, something is triggered that makes them less trusting of their neighbors.”

**Ethnic Diversity, Economic and Cultural Contexts, and Social Trust: Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Evidence from European Regions, 2002–2010 – Conrad Ziller (2014)**

1 <https://academic.oup.com/sf/article-abstract/93/3/1211/2332107/Ethnic-Diversity-Economic-and-Cultural-Contexts>

2 <http://archive.vn/rmyv4>

Immigration-related diversity strongly decreases social trust.

“The results show that across European regions, different aspects of immigration-related diversity are negatively related to social trust. In longitudinal perspective, an increase in immigration is related to a decrease in social trust. [...] Immigration growth is particularly strongly associated with a decrease in social trust.”

**Predicting Cross-National Levels of Social Trust: Global Pattern or Nordic Exceptionalism? – Jan Delhey, Kenneth Newton (2005)**

1 <https://academic.oup.com/esr/article-abstract/21/4/311/556895/Predicting-Cross-National-Levels-of-Social-Trust> 2 <http://archive.vn/OUyT2>

Ethnic and religious homogeneity has a direct impact on trust.

“This analysis of variations in the level of generalized social trust (defined here as the belief that others will not deliberately or knowingly do us harm, if they can avoid it, and will look after our interests, if this is possible) in 60 nations of the world shows that trust is an integral part of a tight syndrome of social, political and economic conditions. High trust countries are characterized by ethnic homogeneity, Protestant religious traditions, good government, wealth (gross domestic product per capita), and income equality.”

**Trust in a Time of Increasing Diversity: On the Relationship between Ethnic Heterogeneity and Social Trust in Denmark from 1979 until Today – Peter Thisted Dinesen, Kim Mannemar Sønderskov (2012)**

1 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2012.00289.x/abstract>

2 <http://archive.vn/A3eGF>

Diversity decreases trust on local levels, even if general societal trust has increased in average on a country-wide scale.

“The results show that while trust at the national level has increased to very high levels over this period of increased ethnic diversity in the country, ethnic diversity at the municipality level in fact has a negative impact on social trust when taking into account

the overall national trend and unobserved time-invariant characteristics of the municipalities analyzed.”

**Ethnic Diversity And Its Impact On Community Social Cohesion And Neighborly Exchange Rebecca Wickes, Renee Zahnow, Gentry White, Lorraine Mazerolle (2013)**

1 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/juaf.12015>

2 <http://archive.vn/AaFfB>

Putnam’s “Hunker Down” theory is replicated in Australia, though findings show that immigrant populations are less effected than White Australians.

“Our findings indicate that social cohesion and neighborly exchange are attenuated in ethnically diverse suburbs. However, diversity is less consequential for neighborly exchange among immigrants when compared to the general population. Our results provide at least partial support for Putnam’s thesis.”

**Measuring Trust – Edward L. Glaeser David I. Laibson José A. Scheinkman Christine L. Soutter (2000)**

1 <https://econweb.ucsd.edu/~jandreon/Econ264/papers/Glaeser%20et%20al%20QJE%202000.pdf>

2 <https://web.archive.org/web/20160910133248/https://econweb.ucsd.edu/~jandreon/Econ264/papers/Glaeser%20et%20al%20QJE%202000.pdf>

In an economic “game,” 92% of the cases in which money was “stolen” was between racially diverse (heterogeneous) pairs of participants.

“Most strikingly, 92 percent of the cases where the recipient sent back nothing occurred when the individuals were of different races, while only 59 percent of the pairings were racially diverse”

---

## **2C) Conflict, Violence, and War**

**Good Fences: The Importance of Setting Boundaries for Peaceful Coexistence – Alex Rutherford, Dion Harmon, Justin Werfel, Shlomiya Bar-Yam, Alexander Gard-Murray, Andreas Gros, and Yaneer Bar-Yam (2011)**

1 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.1409>

2 <http://archive.vn/wm73Z>

Strong borders between separate ethnic groups reduces violence between them, meaning that diversity causes fractionalization and conflict.

“Our analysis shows that peace does not depend on integrated coexistence, but rather on well defined topographical and political boundaries separating groups. Mountains and lakes are an important part of the boundaries between sharply defined linguistic areas. Political canton and circle (sub-canton) boundaries often separate religious groups. Where such boundaries do not appear to be sufficient, we find that specific aspects of the population distribution either guarantee sufficient separation or sufficient mixing to inhibit intergroup violence according to the quantitative theory of conflict.”

### **Cowards and Heroes: Group Loyalty in the American Civil War – Dora L. Costa, Matthew E. Kahn (2001)**

1 <https://www.nber.org/papers/w8627.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/GRy3K>

Homogeneous military units have lower desertion rates than diverse units.

“We find that individual and company socio-economic and demographic characteristics, ideology, and morale were important predictors of group loyalty in the Union Army. Company characteristics were more important than ideology or morale. Soldiers in companies that were more homogeneous in ethnicity, occupation, and age were less likely to shirk.”

### **Diversity and Conflict – Cemal Eren Arbatli, Quamrul H. Ashraf, Oded Galor, Marc Klemp (2019)**

1 <https://www.nber.org/papers/w21079.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/Gjqo9>

Over the last half-century, diversity has contributed significantly to frequency of ethnic civil conflict, the intensity of social unrest, growth of unshared policy preferences, and economic inequality.

“This research advances the hypothesis and establishes empirically that interpersonal population diversity has contributed significantly to the emergence, prevalence, recurrence, and severity of intrasocietal conflicts. [...] The findings arguably reflect the adverse effect of population diversity on interpersonal trust, its contribution to divergence in preferences for public goods and redistributive policies, and its impact on the degree of fractionalization and polarization across ethnic, linguistic, and religious groups.”

### **Is Collective Violence Correlated with Social Pluralism? – Rudolph J. Rummel (1997)**

1 [https://www.jstor.org/stable/425106?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/425106?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)

2 <http://archive.vn/j5xPm>

Ethnic pluralism (diversity) is correlated with collective violence.

“The more ethnic groups in a state, the more likely it will have a high rate of guerrilla and revolutionary warfare. And the more religious groups in a society, the more intense the general violence. This is largely moderated by the size of a state. Thus, the larger and older (counting from 1932) a state in addition to the more religious groups, the more the general violence.”

### **Ethnic Conflicts: Their Biological Roots in Ethnic Nepotism. – Tatu Vanhanen (2012)**

1 <https://www.scirp.org/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1251240>

2 <http://archive.vn/3chLU>

Conflict will always arise within diverse societies due to ethnic nepotism.

“Ethnic heterogeneity [diversity] explains 55% of the variation in the scale of ethnic conflicts, and the results of regression analysis disclose that the same relationship more or less applies to all 187 countries. These results led to the conclusion that ethnic nepotism is the common cross-cultural background factor which supports the persistence of ethnic conflicts in the world as long as there are ethnically divided societies.”

### **The Geography of Ethnic Violence – Alex Rutherford, May Lim, Richard Metzler, Dion Harmon, Justin Werfel, Shlomiya Bar-Yam, Alexander Gard-Murray, Andreas Gros, Yaneer Bar-Yam (2015)**

1 [https://web.archive.org/web/20170216222014/http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4939-1705-1\\_12](https://web.archive.org/web/20170216222014/http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4939-1705-1_12)

2 <http://archive.vn/qHVHR>

Segregation decreases violence between ethnic groups.

“Our analysis supports the hypothesis that violence between groups can be inhibited by both physical and political boundaries.”

### **Swiss-ification: Syria's Best Chance for Peace – Yaneer Bar-Yam and Casey Friedman (2013)**

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20170216222018/http://www.necsi.edu/research/social/syria/syria.pdf>

Poorly defined boundaries between ethnically or racially diverse/disparate communities lead to conflict.

“conflict arises when groups are neither well integrated nor well separated. In highly mixed regions, groups either don't develop strong collective identities or don't lay claim to public spaces. [...] Well-separated groups don't engage in conflict. However, partial separation with poorly defined boundaries fosters conflict.”

### **Ethnic Diversity and Trust – Oguzhan C. Dincer (2011)**

1 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1465-7287.2010.00215.x/abstract>

2 <http://archive.vn/DLMf5>

Diversity causes social conflict.

“Using data from U.S. states, I investigate the relationship between ethnic diversity and trust. I find a negative relationship between ethnic polarization and trust [...] The main channel through which ethnic diversity is hypothesized to affect trust is social conflict.”

---

## **2D) Segregation and Fractionalization**

### **Melting pot or salad bowl: the formation of heterogeneous communities – Arun Advani, Bryony Reich (2015)**

1 <http://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/publications/wps/WP201530.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/9utU1>

Minority groups within a diverse population will begin to self-segregate from the majority when they reach a certain population size, moving towards division and away from co-operation.

“We find that a small minority group will adopt majority cultural practices and integrate. In contrast, minority groups above a certain critical mass, may retain diverse practices and may also segregate from the majority. The size of this critical mass depends on the cultural distance between groups, the importance of culture in day to day life, and the costs of forming a social tie.

## **The Most Diverse Cities Are Often The Most Segregated – Nate Silver (2015)**

1 <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-most-diverse-cities-are-often-the-most-segregated/>

2 <http://archive.vn/RQquh>

3 <http://demographics.coopercenter.org/DotMap/>

The most diverse cities are the most segregated.

“It is all too common to live in a city with a wide variety of ethnic and racial groups — including Chicago, New York, and Baltimore — and yet remain isolated from those groups in a racially homogenous neighborhood. [...] the exceptions are cities like Sacramento that have large Hispanic or Asian populations. Cities with substantial black populations tend to be highly segregated. Of the top 100 U.S. cities by population, 35 are at least one-quarter black, and only 6 of those cities have positive integration scores.”

---

## **2E) Work, Innovation, and Economics**

### **Fractionalization – Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat, and Romain Wacziarg (2003)**

1

[https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4553003/alesinassrn\\_fractionalization.pdf?sequence=2](https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4553003/alesinassrn_fractionalization.pdf?sequence=2)

2 <http://archive.vn/NKYEi>

Diversity is correlated with slow economic growth.

“We concluded that ethnic and linguistic diversity fractionalization variables, but not religious ones, are likely to be important determinants of economic success, both in terms of output (GDP growth), the quality of policies, and the quality of institutions.”

### **Ethnic Diversity and Economic Performance – Alesina, Alberto, and Eliana La Ferrara (2005)**

1 [https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4553005/alesinassrn\\_ethnicdiversity.pdf?sequence=2](https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4553005/alesinassrn_ethnicdiversity.pdf?sequence=2)

2 <http://archive.vn/JhBxa>

Diversity is negatively associated with economic growth, even after controlling for wealth over time.

See table 6

### **Demography and Diversity in Organizations: A review of 40 years of research – Katherine Y. Williams, Charles A. O’Reilly (1998)**

1

[https://ils.unc.edu/courses/2013\\_spring/inls285\\_001/materials/Williams.OReilly.1996.Diversity&demography.pdf](https://ils.unc.edu/courses/2013_spring/inls285_001/materials/Williams.OReilly.1996.Diversity&demography.pdf)

2 <http://www.freezepage.com/1560112359MOHHJFIGUV>

A review of 80 studies spanning 40 years concludes that diversity impedes group functioning and is most likely to cause negative effects.

“Simply having more diversity in a group is no guarantee that the group will make better decisions or function effectively. [...] empirical evidence suggests that diversity is most likely to impede group functioning. [...] diversity by itself is more likely to have a negative than positive effects on group performance. [...] There is substantial evidence from both laboratory and field studies conducted over the past four decades that variations in group composition can have important effects on group functioning. These studies show that increased diversity, especially in terms of age, tenure, and ethnicity, typically have negative effects on social integration, communication, and conflict.”

### **Diversity and innovation – Bala Ramasamy, Matthew C. H. Yeung (2016)**

1 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13504851.2015.1130785>

2 <http://archive.vn/ZL0gf>

Ethnic diversity has a negative effect on innovation, “values diversity” has the opposite effect, but only as long as ethnic diversity is low.

“ethnic diversity or fractionalization and values diversity are distinct and while the former has a negative effect on innovation, the latter contributes positively. [...] countries that are ethnically homogenous but diverse in values orientation are the best innovators.”

### **What Makes Teams Work: Group Effectiveness Research from the Shop Floor to the Executive Suite – Susan G. Cohen, Diane E. Bailey (1997)**

1 <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/23/3/239.short?rss=1&ssource=mfc>

2 <http://archive.vn/bs0op>

Ethnically diverse workplaces have lower cohesion, lower satisfaction and higher turnover.

“Group cohesiveness is positively related to performance. Three meta- analyses and several empirical studies found a slight to moderate positive relation- ship between cohesiveness and performance. This is a robust finding in an area that has long been studied.”

### **Imported Inequality? Immigration and Income Inequality in the American States – Ping Xu, James C. Garand, Ling Zhu (2015)**

1 <http://spa.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/09/21/1532440015603814.abstract>

2 <http://archive.vn/9rrdN>

Immigration into the United States has increased income inequality.

“Empirical evidence from both static and dynamic models shows that the foreign-born population has a strong positive effect on state-level income inequality, even when we control for a range of federal and state political and economic contextual variables. We also find that the positive relationship between immigration and state income inequality is driven primarily by low-skill immigrants (rather than high-skill immigrants) [...] immigration—particularly low-skilled immigration—has an important effect on income inequality in the American states.”

### **Effects of Heterogeneity and Homophily on Cooperation – Ozan Aksoy (2015)**

1 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0190272515612403>

2 <http://archive.vn/R2xV7>

Diversity negatively impacts group co-operation.

“The results show that heterogeneity hampers between-group cooperation at the dyadic level. In addition, endogenous sorting mitigates this negative effect of heterogeneity on cooperation.” (Diversity hinders between-group cooperation at both one-on-one and group levels).

Negative impact of diversity upon group co-operation is exacerbated if group participants belong to racial or ethnic groups with negative history or conflict.

“Heterogeneity hampers cooperation at the tetradic level most substantially if there is a commonly known negative history between groups.”

### **Cooperation in Ethnically Diverse Neighborhoods: A Lost-Letter Experiment – Susanne Veit, Ruud Koopmans (2014)**

1. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262387977)

262387977 [Cooperation in Ethnically Diverse Neighborhoods A Lost-](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262387977)

### Letter Experiment

2 <http://archive.vn/7cJ8j>

Diversity reduces neighborhood co-operation.

“We find strong support for the negative effect of ethnic diversity on cooperation. We find no evidence, however, of in-group favoritism. Letters from Turkish or Muslim organizations were as often returned as those from German and Christian organizations, and the ethnic diversity effect was the same for all types of letters.”

### **Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper Number 1959: Fractionalization – Alberto Alesina, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat and Romain Wacziarg (2002)**

1. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=319762](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=319762)

2 <http://archive.vn/ixRgl>

Diversity correlates with low GDP.

“ethnic variable is highly correlated with GDP per capita growth, schooling and telephones per capita [...] Ethnic fractionalization is also closely correlated with GDP per capita and geographic variables, like latitude. More ethnic fragmentation is more common in poorer countries which are closer to the equator.”

Ethnic homogeneity correlates with strong democracy.

“The democracy index is inversely related to ethnic fractionalization (when latitude is not controlled for). This result is consistent with theory and evidence presented in Aghion, Alesina and Trebbi (2002). The idea is that in more fragmented societies a group imposes restrictions on political liberty to impose control on Homogeneous military units have less desertion than diverse units.”

More [ethnic] fractionalization leads to lower quality of government.

“It seems that governments have a much more difficult task achieving consensus for redistribution to the needy in a fractionalized society. [...] conflict among groups brings about more difficult policy and inefficient policymaking.”

### **This model of wealthy suburban living is starting to fray – Antonio Olivo (2016)**

1. [https://web.archive.org/web/20170217110955/https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/virginia-news/this-model-of-wealthy-suburban-living-is-starting-to-fray/2016/04/02/e9ad0ace-f107-11e5-a61f-e9c95c06edca\\_story.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20170217110955/https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/virginia-news/this-model-of-wealthy-suburban-living-is-starting-to-fray/2016/04/02/e9ad0ace-f107-11e5-a61f-e9c95c06edca_story.html)

2 <http://archive.vn/InIoj>

Rapid diversification of a wealthy Virginia county coincides with increasing poverty and decreasing social cohesion.

“For decades, Fairfax County has been a national model for suburban living, a place of good governance and elite schools that educate children from some of the country’s richest neighborhoods. But Virginia’s largest municipality is fraying around the edges. A population that is growing older, poorer and more diverse is sharpening the need for basic services in what is still the nation’s second-wealthiest county, even as a sluggish local economy maintains a chokehold on the revenue stream. Since the 2008 recession, local officials have whittled away at programs to the tune of \$300 million. They now say that there is no fat left to trim. Instead, they are searching for ways to raise taxes, draw new businesses and revitalize worn neighborhoods.”

### **Can Institutions Resolve Ethnic Conflict? – W. Easterly (2001)**

1 [https://sites.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/stm103%20articles/Easterly Institutions Ethnic Conflict.pdf](https://sites.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/stm103%20articles/Easterly%20Institutions%20Ethnic%20Conflict.pdf)

2 <http://archive.vn/XU0rE>

Diversity decreases institution quality. Within a nation with poor institutions, diversity strongly predicts low economic growth.

Easterly’s measurement of institutional quality includes the following: “(a) freedom from government repudiation of contracts, (b) freedom from expropriation, (c) rule of law, and (d) bureaucratic quality into an overall index of institutional quality.” It is highly correlated with other measures of corruption and quality of business environment. Easterly showed that diversity more strongly predicted low economic growth the poorer a nation’s institutions were.

### **Neighborhood Gap for Blacks, Hispanics and Asians in Metropolitan America – John R. Logan (2011)**

1 <https://s4.ad.brown.edu/Projects/Diversity/Data/Report/report0727.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/PCycA>

Segregated minority (non-White) neighborhoods are less affluent than White neighborhoods, with worse infrastructure and lower institution quality.

“Racial segregation itself is the prime predictor of which metropolitan regions are the ones where minorities live in the least desirable neighborhoods. [...] neighborhood poverty is associated with inequalities in public schools, safety, environmental quality, and public health. [...] The average affluent black or Hispanic household lives in a poorer neighborhood than the average lower-income white resident.”

**Team-level predictors of innovation at work: a comprehensive meta-analysis spanning three decades of research. – Hülshager UR, Anderson N, Salgado JF (2009)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19702361>

2 <http://archive.vn/9Purg>

Ethnic diversity does not improve cognitive diversity within groups and interferes with innovative endeavors.

“Unlike job-relevant diversity, background diversity does not evoke cognitive resource diversity. Instead, it may entail a number of consequences that interfere with innovative endeavors. Background diversity may lead to communication problems and difficulties in resolving opposing ideas and reaching consensus within the team. However, the ability to discuss opposing ideas, integrate divergent viewpoints, and reach consensus is vital for the creation and implementation of new ideas. [...] background diversity correlated at  $-.133$  (95% CI:  $-.318;+.052$ ) with innovation.”

---

## **2F) Health and the Environment**

**Ethnic density as a buffer for psychotic experiences: findings from a national survey (EMPIRIC) – Jayati Das-Munshi, Laia Bécaries, Jane E. Boydell, Michael E. Dewey, Craig Morgan, Stephen A. Stansfeld, and Martin J. Prince (2012)**

1 <http://bjp.rcpsych.org/content/201/4/282.full>

2 <http://archive.vn/d7ifS>

Diversity increases psychotic experiences.

“People resident in neighborhoods of higher own-group density experience ‘buffering’ effects from the social risk factors for psychosis.”

A 10% increase in diversity doubles the chance of psychotic episodes.

“For every ten percentage point reduction in own-group density, the relative odds of reporting psychotic experiences increased 1.07 times (95% CI 1.01–1.14,  $P = 0.03$  (trend)) for the total minority ethnic sample.”

Diversity increases social adversity.

“people living in areas of lower own-group density experienced greater social adversity.”

### **Health Advantages of Ethnic Density for African American and Mexican American Elderly Individuals – Kimberly J. Alvarez MPH, and Becca R. Levy PhD (2012)**

1 <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/abs/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300787>

2 <http://archive.vn/K6qjO>

Diversity harms the health of African Americans and Mexican Americans, ethnically homogeneous neighborhoods are beneficial for health.

“ethnic density predicted lower rates of cardiovascular disease and cancer, adjusting for covariates, showing that the health benefits of ethnic density apply to both minority communities.” – Study finds lower rates of heart disease and cancer than for those living in more mixed areas.

### **Environmental Performance in Socially Fragmented Countries – Elissaios Papyrakis (2012)**

1 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10640-012-9619-6>

2 <http://archive.vn/wF2el>

Diversity reduces concern for the environment.

“this is the first study to our knowledge that makes use of a large panel dataset of several environmental indicators to explore links between ethnic/religious diversity and the environment. We find that all indices of social fragmentation are negatively linked to measures of environmental quality”

### **UK life blamed for ethnic schizophrenia – Institute of Psychiatry (via BBC Health News, 2000)**

1 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/807945.stm>

2 <http://archive.vn/z4ANm>

In the UK, African-Caribbean people are six times more likely than whites to be diagnosed as schizophrenic.

“UK life blamed for ethnic schizophrenia. [...] A study by the Institute of Psychiatry has found that poor social conditions are causing black people to develop the symptoms of mental illness. We find that all indices of social fragmentation are negatively linked to measures of environmental quality [...] Researchers from the Institute of Psychiatry investigated whether black people were somehow genetically more prone to schizophrenia. The answer was no.”

## **Schizophrenia in black Caribbeans living in the UK: an exploration of underlying causes of the high incidence rate – Rebecca Pinto, Mark Ashworth, and Roger Jones (2008)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2418996/>

2 <http://archive.vn/ejbmq>

Higher rates of schizophrenia are found among migrants globally, even among White migrants moving to societies of another White ethnic group.

“In 1932, Ødegård found that Norwegians emigrating to the US were twice as likely to be admitted to hospital with first-onset schizophrenia as native-born Americans or Norwegians residing in Norway.<sup>16</sup> Subsequent studies have confirmed the high incidence in migrants, demonstrating an overall relative risk of 2.7 in first-generation migrants and 4.5 in second-generation migrants.”

Minorities living in majority neighborhoods appear to be more susceptible to schizophrenia.

“African-Caribbeans living in predominantly white neighbourhoods have been found to have a higher incidence of schizophrenia.

Second generation immigrants are more likely to suffer schizophrenia than first.

“studies report higher rates in second-generation African-Caribbeans and other migrant groups.”

Low “social capital” is correlated to higher rates of schizophrenia.

“Social capital has variously been described as the investment that people make to life within the local community, or ‘the glue that holds society together’. Measures of social capital (voter turnout) and social cohesion (ethnic fragmentation) have been linked with schizophrenia incidence, and may therefore contribute to the raised rates in black Caribbeans. Evidence is accumulating that the most socially disorganised neighbourhoods, rather than the poorest neighbourhoods, have the highest incidence of schizophrenia, and these may be the areas where black Caribbeans are more likely to live.”

## **Emotional fit with culture: a predictor of individual differences in relational well-being – De Leersnyder J, Mesquita B, Kim H, Eom K, Choi H (2014)**

1 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24364853>

2 <http://archive.vn/Lj5H4>

Emotional connection to majority culture improves well-being.

“Using an implicit measure of cultural fit of emotions, we found across 3 different cultural contexts (United States, Belgium, and Korea) that (1) individuals’ emotional fit

is associated with their level of relational well-being, and that (2) the link between emotional fit and relational well-being is particularly strong when emotional fit is measured for situations pertaining to relationships (rather than for situations that are self-focused). Together, the current studies suggest that people may benefit from emotionally “fitting in” to their culture.”

### **On the picture of depression and suicide in traditional societies – Jacobsson L (1988)**

1 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3067529>

2 <http://archive.vn/zZin4>

Traditional societies have ‘very low’ rates of suicide.

“the incidence of suicide in a society has no clear correlation with the prevalence of mental disorders and no clear correlation with different forms of mental disorders [...] The suicide rate is generally very low in traditional societies.”

### **The decay of Western civilization: Double relaxed Darwinian Selection – Helmuth Nyborg (2015)**

1 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886911001073>

2 <http://archive.vn/rbyWZ>

Immigration, diversity, and other factors will reduce the IQ of White countries, will cause the collapse of Western civilization as we know it.

“The reverse Lynn–Flynn effect has also been observed in Norway (Sundet, Barlaug, & Torjussen, 2004), but continue elsewhere in- and out side Europe. Still worse, the large birth differentials (Table 1) will over time drive the future population expansion, and low-IQ immigrants (IQs < 90) consistently display higher birth rates than better endowed immigrants (IQ > 90). Average population IQ is sure to decline. [...] Gifted immigrant women may lower their fertility when engaged in higher education, but their relatively low number will not affect the overall picture.”

Lower IQ, non-European migrants will outbreed natives within 40 years.

“Sixth, in terms of total population growth, mainly non-Western citizens with IQ 70–85 can be expected to numerically surpass the mainly Western group with IQs 90–104 at about 2065. [...] Gifted immigrant women may lower their fertility when engaged in higher education, but their relatively low number will not affect the overall picture.”

## 2G) Education

### **Immigrants in the classroom and effects on native children – Peter Jensen (2015)**

1 <https://wol.iza.org/articles/immigrants-in-classroom-and-effects-on-native-children>

2 <http://archive.vn/jxzXH>

Diverse classrooms, or presence of immigrant students, harms educational outcomes of native students in most countries, causing higher drop-out rates and increase in exam failure.

“In most countries, a high share of immigrant children in schools leads to lower test scores of native children. [...] A high share of immigrant students can lead to higher dropout rates from high school and lower chances of passing exams.”

Diverse classrooms, or presence of immigrant students, causes higher rates of bullying towards native children and “native flight” from diverse schools.

“Native children tend to experience more incidents of bullying when there are more immigrant children in the same classroom. [...] Native flight from schools that have many immigrant children can amplify negative effects on native children, as native parents move their children to schools with fewer immigrant children.”

### **Race, social networks, and school bullying – Faris, Robert (2019)**

1 <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/concern/dissertations/z890rt42q>

2 <http://archive.vn/OU92w>

Diverse schools significantly increase students’ probability of committing suicide.

“Being bullied decreases popularity and increases depression and the likelihood of suicide attempts. With one exception, the effect of bullying on mental health and school attachment does not vary by race. Minority students who bully others make larger gains in popularity than whites, suggesting one possible explanation for their higher perpetration rates. [...] Racial diversity of the school increases the prevalence of bullying.”

**Ethnicity and bullying involvement in a national UK youth sample. – Tippett N1, Wolke D, Platt L. (2013), and The Roles of Ethnicity and School Context in Predicting Children’s Victimization by Peers – Laura D. Hanish Nancy G. Guerra (2000), and Race, social networks, and school bullying – Faris, Robert (2007)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23849658>

2 <http://archive.vn/LNH4Z>

1 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1005187201519>

2 <http://archive.vn/bq2ul>

1 <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/concern/dissertations/z890rt42q>

2 <http://archive.vn/OU92w>

Non-Whites are significantly more likely to bully Whites than vice versa, are more likely to bully in general, regardless of socio-economic factors, and are significantly less likely to be victims of bullying than Whites.

“Overall, ethnic minority youths were not more likely to be victims; African boys and girls were significantly less likely to be victimised than same sex White youths. Pakistani and Caribbean girls were significantly more likely to have bullied others compared to White girls.”

“Hispanic children had lower victimization scores than did either African-American or White children. These findings, however, were moderated by school context, such that attending ethnically integrated schools was associated with a significantly higher risk of victimization for White children and a slightly lower risk of victimization for African-American children and did not affect the risk of victimization for Hispanic children. In addition, African-American children were less likely than Hispanic and White children to be repeatedly victimized by peers over time.”

“None of the variables mediate the higher perpetration rates of African-Americans and Latinos.”

**School Choice, Universal Vouchers and Native Flight from Local Schools – Beatrice Schindler Rangvid (2009)**

1. <http://emilkirkegaard.dk/en/wp-content/uploads/School-Choice-Universal-Vouchers-and-Native-Flight-from-LocalSchools.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/pzBXp>

Native Danes opt-out of public schools with immigrant populations above 35%.

“The results suggest that, when a rich set of covariates at student, school, and neighbourhood levels is controlled for, up to an immigrant concentration of about 35 per cent in the local school, opting out decisions of Danes are not affected. But, Danes are far more likely to opt out as soon as the concentration exceeds 35 per cent.”

### **School ethnic diversity and White students' civic attitudes in England – Jan Germen Janmaat (2015)**

1 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X14001392>

2 <http://archive.vn/kQKsq>

Diverse schools do not increase positive attitudes towards immigrants among White British students, but do reduce trust in people of one's own age.

“In agreement with contact theory, the paper initially finds a positive relation between diversity and inclusive attitudes on immigrants. However, this link disappears once controls for social background, gender and prior levels of the outcome are included in the model. This indicates that students with particular pre-enrolment characteristics have self-selected in diverse schools and that inclusive attitudes have stabilized before secondary education. Diversity further appears to have a negative impact on trust, irrespective of the number of controls added to the model.”

### **The New White Flight – Suein Hwang (2015) and The New Separate But Equal – James Chen (2005)**

1 <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB113236377590902105>

2 <http://archive.vn/jeTWj>

1 [http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2005/12/the\\_new\\_separate\\_but\\_equal.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2005/12/the_new_separate_but_equal.html)

2 <http://archive.vn/ivrc1>

Asian migration into liberal San Francisco and surrounding suburbs causes White parents to pull children out of public schools.

“in a continuous arc of high—performing public school districts ringing San Francisco Bay, Asian student enrollments have climbed sharply over the past decade as white enrollments plummeted. These include middle—class neighborhoods in cities throughout the most liberal region in the United States. Suburban cities in the area with both rapidly—growing Asian student populations and steadily—diminishing numbers of white students include Alameda, Albany, Fremont (Kerry by 51%) Cupertino, San Jose (Kerry by 29%) and San Mateo (Kerry by 40%).”

### **Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2011 – National Center for Education Statistics (2011)**

1 [https://web.archive.org/web/20120507050045/https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/tables/table\\_07\\_1.asp](https://web.archive.org/web/20120507050045/https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/tables/table_07_1.asp)

2 <http://archive.vn/V8wrU>

1 [https://web.archive.org/web/20130602085456/https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/tables/table\\_06\\_5.asp](https://web.archive.org/web/20130602085456/https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/tables/table_06_5.asp)

2 <http://archive.vn/U5Rrd>

1 [https://web.archive.org/web/20130701115832/http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/figures/figure\\_13\\_2.asp](https://web.archive.org/web/20130701115832/http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2011/figures/figure_13_2.asp)

2 <http://archive.vn/5PcCv>

Diversity within schools increases: racial tensions, verbal abuse of teachers, classroom disorder, student disrespect for teachers, gang activity, cult or extremist groups on campus, quantity of serious violent incidents.

See table, specifically “Percent combined enrollment of X race students”. Serious violent incidents include: rape, robbery, and actual or threatened attack with a weapon. Hierarchy of student races from most to least violent is as follows: Black, Hispanic, White, Asian.

### **In Search of the Key to Closing Achievement Gaps – Michael Hansen (2016)**

1 <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2016-01-08/the-academic-benefit-of-reducing-school-segregation-may-be-overblown>

2 <http://archive.vn/2EONj>

School “integration” (forced proximate diversity) does not close race achievement gaps.

“New research indicates that integrating schools to equalize access to teachers will not significantly close student achievement gaps.”

Despite massive government investment and long-time policy interests, schools are becoming more segregated, not less.

“American schools have had an unremarkable track record in achieving greater levels of school integration, in spite of long-time policy interests to do so. [...] schools did show an increasing trend towards integration in the decades immediately following the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, that trend has reversed over the last 20 years, and schools in many states are now only slightly less segregated than they were before the decision.”

---

## **3) Studies on Ethnocentrism**

---

### **3A) General Studies on Ethnocentrism**

## **Ethnic nationalism, evolutionary psychology and Genetic Similarity Theory – J. Philippe Rushton (2005)**

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20120201083150/https://psychology.uwo.ca/faculty/rushtonpdfs/n&n%202005-1.pdf>

There is extensive that evidence people prefer others who are genetically similar to themselves.

“Altruism toward kin and similar others evolved in order to help replicate shared genes. Since ethnic groups are repositories of shared genes, xenophobia is the ‘dark side’ of human altruism. A review of the literature demonstrates the pull of genetic similarity in dyads such as marriage partners and friendships, and even large groups, both national and international. The evidence that genes incline people to prefer others who are genetically similar to themselves comes from studies of social assortment, differential heritabilities, the comparison of identical and fraternal twins, blood tests, and family bereavements. DNA sequencing studies confirm some origin myths and disconfirm others; they also show that in comparison to the total genetic variance around the world, random co-ethnics are related to each other on the order of first cousins.”

## **The Evolutionary Dominance of Ethnocentric Cooperation – Max Hartshorn, Artem Kaznatcheev, and Thomas Shultz (2013)**

1 <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/16/3/7.html>

2 <http://archive.vn/FzsSD>

Ethnocentrism is biological, genetic in origin, and an evolutionary strategy that dominates all other evolutionary strategies.

“From a random start, ethnocentric strategies dominate other possible strategies (selfish, traitorous, and humanitarian) based on cooperation or non-cooperation with in-group and out-group agents. Here we show that ethnocentrism eventually overcomes its closest competitor, humanitarianism, by exploiting humanitarian cooperation across group boundaries as world population saturates. Selfish and traitorous strategies are self-limiting because such agents do not cooperate with agents sharing the same genes. Traitorous strategies fare even worse than selfish ones because traitors are exploited by ethnocentrics across group boundaries in the same manner as humanitarians are, via unreciprocated cooperation.”

## **The Evolution of Ethnocentric Behavior – Robert Axelrod and Ross A. Hammond (2003)**

1 [http://www-personal.umich.edu/~axe/research/AxHamm\\_Ethno.pdf](http://www-personal.umich.edu/~axe/research/AxHamm_Ethno.pdf)

2 <http://archive.vn/DeaRB>

Ethnocentrism is universal (and likely has an evolutionary origin)

“Ethnocentrism is a nearly universal syndrome of attitudes and behaviors. The attitudes include seeing one’s own group (the in-group) as virtuous and superior and an out-group as contemptible and inferior. The attitudes also include seeing ones own standards of value as universal. The behaviors associated with ethnocentrism are cooperative relations with the in-group and absence of cooperative relations with the out-group. [...] the ability to discriminate can support the evolution of cooperation based on ethnocentric behavior.”

**Kinship and altruism: a cross-cultural experimental study. – Madsen EA1, Tunney RJ, Fieldman G, Plotkin HC, Dunbar RI, Richardson JM, McFarland D (2007)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17456276>

2 <http://archive.vn/TMb2w>

Humans are more altruistic towards individuals to whom they are more closely related

“humans titrate their willingness to incur costs for the direct benefit of others as a direct function of biological relatedness. [...] Irrespective of the intentions that motivate human behaviour, these results demonstrate that humans behave in such a way as to maximize inclusive fitness: they are more willing to benefit closer relatives than more distantly related individuals. Demonstrating the effect in two different cultures (including a population relatively isolated from mainstream contemporary Western economics and culture) suggests that this phenomenon has broad applicability beyond post-industrial European society.”

**Genetic similarity, human altruism, and group selection – J. Philippe Rushton (1989)**

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20110720074046/https://www.psychology.uwo.ca/faculty/rushtonpdfs/Genetic%20Similarity%201989.pdf>

2 <http://archive.vn/TRd6v>

People subconsciously prefer those who are genetically similar to themselves for biological reasons.

“A new theory of attraction and liking based on kin selection suggests that people detect genetic similarity in others in order to give preferential treatment to those who are most similar to themselves. There are many sources of empirical and theoretical support for this view, including (1) the inclusive fitness theory of altruism, (2) kin recognition studies of animals raised apart, (3) assortative mating studies, (4) favoritism in families, (5) selective similarity among friends, and (6) ethnocentrism.”

Assortative Mating and Marital Quality in Newlyweds:A Couple-Centered Approach – Shanhong Luo and Eva C. Klohnen (2005)

1 <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/psp-882304.pdf>

2 <http://www.freezepage.com/1560127240AHTSQGTXGF>

The attraction paradigm – Donn Erwin Byrne (1971)

1 <https://www.worldcat.org/title/attraction-paradigm/oclc/204468>

2 <http://archive.vn/bBJQr>

### **Continuity and change: assortative marriage and the consistency of personality in adulthood. – Caspi A, Herbener ES (1990)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2319443>

2 <http://archive.vn/ay4PK>

Greater genetic similarities between spouses equates to higher marriage satisfaction and lower divorce rates.

“(a) positive associations between similarity and marital quality for personality-related domains but not for attitude-related domains, (b) that similarity on attachment characteristics were most strongly predictive of satisfaction, (c) robust curvilinear effects for husbands but not for wives, (d) that profile similarity remained a significant predictor of marital quality even when spouses’ self-ratings were controlled, and (e) that profile-based similarity indices were better predictors of marital quality than absolute difference scores” (L & K, 2005)

“Consistent with other research, the results point to homogamy as a basic norm in marriage. More important, the results show that marriage to a similar other promotes consistency in the intraindividual organization of personality attributes across middle adulthood. ” (C & H, 1990)

### **The Ethnic Phenomenon – Pierre Van Den Berghe (1987)**

1 <https://www.amazon.com/The-Ethnic-Phenomenon-Pierre-Berghe/dp/0275927091>

2 <http://archive.vn/cfsnc>

Races are extended families, ethnocentrism is genetically rational.

“While social classes are grouped according to common material interests, ethnic groups are organized by real or punitive common descent—ultimately on the basis of common interests. [...] ethnic nepotism is, at its very foundation, biological.”

### **Misunderstandings of Kin Selection and the Delay in Quantifying Ethnic Kinship – Frank Salter, Max Planck Society (2008)**

1 <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.372.1009>

2 <https://web.archive.org/web/20110727061116/http://www.mankindquarterly.org/samples/SalterMQXLVIII-3.pdf>

Kinship between members of an ethnic group is greater than expected.

“Recent population-genetic research has quantified the genetic similarity between random members of an ethnic group as up to three orders of magnitude greater than that computed from genealogies. The kinship between random co-ethnics can exceed that between grandparent and grandchild. Quantifying ethnic kinship, whether within bands, tribes or modern ethnicities, is theoretically significant because it is essential for developing and testing evolutionary theories of ethnic altruism, just as understanding the evolution of nepotism began with the quantification of kinship within families. [Addressing Lewontin’s Fallacy <http://archive.vn/d7uxj%5D>: It is now clear that ethnicities do generally have genetic identities, that despite blurred boundaries they are in fact, not only in myth, descent groups. The significance of ethnic group similarity can only be apprehended through the lens of theory, not through naïve evaluation of data. If the kinship found within extended families is significant, then probably so too is that found between members of ethnic groups.”

### **Friends Have More DNA in Common than Strangers – Jillian Rose Lim (2014)**

1 <https://www.livescience.com/46791-friends-share-genes.html>

2 <http://archive.vn/1vqJ7>

Friends share more common DNA than strangers.

“The study was published today (July 14) in the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. [...] Researchers compared gene variations between nearly 2,000 people who were not biologically related, and found that friends had more gene variations in common than strangers. [...] Why do we make friends? Not only that, we prefer the company of people we resemble.”

Friends are as genetically related to each other as any individual is to their great-great-great-grandfather or fourth cousin.

“After analyzing almost 1.5 million markers of gene variations, the researchers found that pairs of friends had the same level of genetic relation as people did with a fourth cousin, or a great-greatgreat grandfather, which translates to about 1 percent of the human genome. [...] Most people don’t even know who their fourth cousins are, yet we are somehow, among a myriad of possibilities, managing to select as friends the people who resemble our kin.”

### **Race, Religion, and Political Affiliation of Americans’ Core Social Networks – Daniel Cox, Juhem Navarro-Rivera, Robert P. Jones (2016)**

1 <https://www.ppri.org/research/poll-race-religion-politics-americans-social-networks/>

2 <http://archive.vn/szjsj>

Race and ethnicity has a strong influence on friendship groups; the average White American has 91% White friends, the average Black American has 83% Black friends.

“Among white Americans, 91% of people comprising their social networks are also white, while five percent are identified as some other race. Among black Americans, 83% of people in their social networks are composed of people who are also black, while eight percent are white and six percent are some other race.”

### **Race and Social Connections—Friends, Family and Neighborhoods – Kim Parker, Juliana Menasce Horowitz, Rich Morin and Mark Hugo Lopez (2015)**

1 <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/06/11/chapter-5-race-and-social-connections-friends-family-and-neighborhoods/#race-marriage-and-intermarriage>

2 <http://archive.vn/YA3TW>

A supermajority percentage among ethnic/racial groups claim that all of their closest friends belong to their own ethnic group.

“Among adults who are white with no other race in their background, fully 81% say that all or most of their close friends are white. Among single-race blacks, 70% say that all or most of their close friends are black. And among single-race Asians, 54% say all or most of their close friends are Asian.”

### **Best Friends Forever? Race and the Stability of Adolescent Friendships – Jesse Rude, Daniel Hera (2010)**

1 [https://www.jstor.org/stable/40984548?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40984548?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)

2 <http://archive.vn/nLpYd>

Interracial friendships are far more likely to fail relative to monoracial friendships.

“We find the following: First, interracial friendships are less stable than same-race friendships, even after controlling for a variety of contextual and dyadic characteristics, such as school racial composition and friends’ similarities in attitudes and behaviors. Second, measures of dyadic similarity (aside from race) are weak predictors of friendship stability. Third, measures of reciprocity and closeness are strong predictors of friendship stability and appear to dampen the effects of racial difference. These results indicate that race is of continuing significance in structuring the social lives of American adolescents. ”

**Oxytocin promotes human ethnocentrism – Carsten K. W. De Dreu, Lindred L. Greer, Gerben A. Van Kleef, Shaul Shalvi, and Michel J. J. Handgraaf (2011)**

1 <https://www.pnas.org/content/108/4/1262.abstract>

2 <http://archive.vn/cE6GA>

Oxytocin (the ‘love chemical’) promotes ethnocentrism and in-group preference while also promoting out-group derogation and hostility (xenophobia).

“Human ethnocentrism—the tendency to view one’s group as centrally important and superior to other groups—creates intergroup bias that fuels prejudice, xenophobia, and intergroup violence. Grounded in the idea that ethnocentrism also facilitates within-group trust, cooperation, and coordination, we conjecture that ethnocentrism may be modulated by brain oxytocin, a peptide shown to promote cooperation among in-group members. [...] Results show that oxytocin creates intergroup bias because oxytocin motivates in-group favoritism and, to a lesser extent, out-group derogation.”

**Disentangling the ‘New Liberal Dilemma’: On the relation between general welfare redistribution preferences and welfare chauvinism – Tim Reeskens, Wim van Oorschot (2012)**

1 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0020715212451987>

2 <http://archive.vn/muHfF>

Those most in favor of welfare for the needy are the most ethnocentric and xenophobic with regards to immigrant welfare usage.

“those who favor that welfare benefits should in the first place target the neediest, place the highest restrictions on welfare provisions for immigrants. In addition, the relationship between preferences for welfare redistribution and opinions about immigrants’ access to social welfare is moderated by a national context of cultural heterogeneity.”

**J.P. Rushton’s theory of ethnic nepotism – Frank Salter, Henry Harpending (2013)**

1 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886912005569>

2 <http://archive.vn/BxkDw>

Genetic Similarity Theory could explain why diverse groups in close proximity increases both ethnic conflict and ethnic nepotism.

“humans give preferential treatment to others in whom they detect genetic resemblance and that such behavior enhances genetic fitness. [...] Genomics confirms the theory for interactions within populations with sufficient genetic diversity, such as ethnically

mixed societies. GST applied to ethnicity is promising for further research in evolutionary social science because it unifies evolutionary and behavioral mechanisms in a single theory.”

### **The ancestor effect: Thinking about our genetic origin enhances intellectual performance – Peter Fischer, Anne Sauer, Claudia Vogrincic, Silke Weisweiler (2010)**

1 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ejsp.778>

2 <https://web.archive.org/web/20180602192113/https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ejsp.778>

Simply thinking about your ancestors increases intellectual performance. “participants show higher expected (Study 1) and actual intellectual performance (Studies 2–4) when they are reminded about their ancestors.”

### **Robin Dunbar: we can only ever have 150 friends at most – Aleks Krotoski (2010)**

1 <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2010/mar/14/my-bright-idea-robin-dunbar>

2 <http://archive.vn/oL9mV>

3 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunbar%27s\\_number](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunbar%27s_number)

Dunbar’s Number: a biologically-programmed cognitive limit to the number of people (150) an individual can maintain stable social relationships with.

“community sizes were designed for hunter-gatherer- type societies where people weren’t living on top of one another. Your 150 were scattered over a wide area, but everybody shared the same 150. This made for a very densely interconnected community, and this means the community polices itself. You don’t need lawyers and policemen. If you step out of line, granny will wag her finger at you. [...] Our problem now is the sheer density of folk – our networks aren’t compact. You have clumps of friends scattered around the world who don’t know one another: now you don’t have an interwoven network. It leads to a less well integrated society. How to re-create that old sense of community in these new circumstances?”

### **Is Doctor-Patient Race Concordance Associated with Greater Satisfaction with Care? – Thomas A LaVeist (2002)**

1 <https://www.jhsph.edu/news/news-releases/2002/race-concordance.html>

2 <http://archive.vn/EKnFO>

Patients report greater satisfaction when treated by doctors of their own race.

“Study finds more satisfaction in same-race doctor-patient relationships”

**The Predictors of Patient–Physician Race and Ethnic Concordance: A Medical Facility Fixed-Effects Approach – Ana H Traylor, Julie A Schmittiel, Connie S Uratsu, Carol M Mangione, and Usha Subramanian (2010)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2875760/>

2 <http://archive.vn/nDJxA>

Patients choose doctors of their own race 95+% of the time.

“[In a study of 109,745 patients, it was found that] patients who chose their physicians were more likely to have a same race/ethnicity physician [as themselves 95-98% of the time]”

**Patients’ Beliefs About Racism, Preferences for Physician Race, and Satisfaction With Care – Frederick M. Chen, George E. Fryer, Robert L. Phillips, Elisabeth Wilson, Donald E. Pathman (2005)**

1 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1466852/>

2 <http://archive.vn/INGPO>

Patients with racial preferences\* report much higher satisfaction with care when these preferences are matched. \* Which is almost all of them – over 95%

“African Americans who have [racial] preferences are more often satisfied with their care when their own physicians match their preferences.”

**Race, Belonging, and Participation in Religious Congregations – Brandon C. Martinez, Kevin D. Dougherty (2013)**

1 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jssr.12073>

2 <http://archive.vn/oUvfe>

Diverse churches have difficulty maintaining their multiracial composition, regardless of the size of congregation.

“uniting worshippers of different races remains a challenging endeavor. [...] congregations that successfully attract worshippers of different races often have difficulty sustaining their multiracial composition. [...] differences in belonging and participation by racial group persist regardless of group size.”

Churchgoers who belong to the church’s dominant racial group report greater sense of belonging and participation than other races.

“those who are a part of a congregation’s largest racial group possess a stronger sense of belonging and participate at a deeper level than congregants of other races.”

### **Shared ethnicity effects on service encounters: A study across three U.S. subcultures – Detra Y.Montoya, EltenBriggs (2013)**

1 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0148296311002888>

2 <http://archive.vn/tmhOH>

Customers prefer being served by individuals of their own race.

“shared ethnicity affects customers’ expectations of exchanging particularistic resources and receiving preferential treatment benefits. Qualitative data on customer service experiences from three different ethnic subcultures (i.e., Hispanics, Asians, and Caucasians) extend the experimental findings. Under conditions of shared ethnicity, high levels of ethnic identification appear to promote in-group favoritism.”

### **The Benefits of Minority Teachers in the Classroom – Anna Egalite, Brian Kisida (2015)**

1

[https://www.realcleareducation.com/articles/2015/03/06/minority\\_teachers\\_in\\_the\\_classroom\\_1167.html](https://www.realcleareducation.com/articles/2015/03/06/minority_teachers_in_the_classroom_1167.html)

2 <http://archive.vn/TqAGX>

All students benefit by being taught by members of their own race.

“we follow the trajectories of 2.9 million public school students in Florida over a seven-year time period [...] Black, White, and Asian students benefit from being assigned to a teacher that looks like them. Their test scores go up in years when their teacher shares their ethnicity, compared to years when their teacher has a different ethnicity. [...] Elementary-aged Black students seem to particularly benefit from demographically-similar teachers.”

### **Babies Prefer Individuals Who Harm Those That Aren’t Like Them – Kiley Hamlin (2013)**

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20180221165808/https://www.psychologicalscience.org/news/releases/babies-prefer-individuals-who-harm-those-that-arent-like-them.html>

2 <http://archive.vn/98dUn>

Babies prefer individuals who harm those who are not like themselves.

“Infants as young as nine months old prefer individuals who are nice to people like them and mean to people who aren’t like them, according to a new study published in Psychological Science, a journal of the Association for Psychological Science.”

### **Ethnic identity gives teens daily happiness boost – Wake Forest University, via John M. Grohol (2009), and via National Institute of Mental Health via “MadameNoire” (2011)**

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20141011215233/http://psychcentral.com/news/archives/2006-10/wfu-eig102006.html>

2 <http://archive.vn/vUnTL>

1 <http://madamenoire.com/108481/study-finds-that-blacks-with-strong-racial-identity-are-happier/>

2 <http://archive.is/srLPu>

A strong ethnic and racial identity increases an individual’s happiness.

“Ethnic pride can help teenagers maintain happiness when faced with stress, according to a new study [...] The study, involving 415 ninth-graders from Chinese and Mexican backgrounds, shows the protective effects of ethnic identity on daily psychological well-being [...] having positive feelings about one’s ethnic group appeared to provide an extra boost of positivity in individuals’ daily lives”

“For the study, the researchers surveyed black adults in Michigan. The results suggest the more the participants identified with being black – or the more being black was an important part of who they are – the more happy they were with life as a whole”

### **Why Faces of Other Races Look Alike – Remy Melina (2011)**

1 <https://www.livescience.com/14879-faces-races-alike.html>

2 <http://archive.is/HLcsr>

Humans are biologically programmed to forget or not recognize the facial features of “other-race faces.”

“The brain works differently when memorizing the face of a person from one’s own race than when attempting to remember the face of someone of another race, new biological evidence suggests. [...] The well-documented “other-race effect” finds that people are less likely to remember a face from a racial group different from their own.”

### **Racist Babies? Nine-Month-Olds Show Bias When Looking At Faces, Study Shows – Lisa Scott/University of Massachusetts, via Wynne Parry (2012)**

1 [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/04/racist-babies-nine-month-olds-bias-faces\\_n\\_1477937.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/04/racist-babies-nine-month-olds-bias-faces_n_1477937.html)

2 <http://archive.is/PtZh5>

By the age of 9 months, babies are shown to be biased towards their own race.

“by the time they are 9 months old, babies are better able to recognize faces and emotional expressions of people who belong to the group they interact with most, than they are those of people who belong to another race. [...] biases in face recognition and perception begin in preverbal infants, well before concepts about race are formed. It is important for us to understand the nature of these biases in order to reduce or eliminate [the biases]\*”

\* Author’s Note: “We must understand nature in order to undo nature and achieve our ideological goals” appears to be a common belief held by many of the authors of these studies.

### **Child’s Play? 3-Year-Olds Fancy Their Own Ethnic Group – European Journal of Developmental Psychology, via Stephanie Pappas (2011)**

1 <https://www.livescience.com/14837-children-play-ethnicity.html>

2 <https://archive.is/RrSC2>

When given the choice, children naturally play with members of their own race or ethnic group.

“when given the choice, children of the same ethnicity preferred to play with one another rather than with kids from different ethnic groups. Unless a child has the rare genetic disorder Williams syndrome, these preferences emerge by age 3 or so.”

Same-ethnicity pairs also socialize for longer than mixed-ethnicity pairs.

“As it turned out, the kids interacted with one another for longer stints when in the same-ethnicity pairs than when playing with a child of another ethnicity. Same-ethnicity partners spent about 58 percent of their time playing together during their session, compared with 44 percent in mixed-ethnicity pairs.”

### **Intergroup Empathy: How Does Race Affect Empathic Neural Responses? – Joan Y. Chiao, Vani A. Mathur (2010)**

1 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960982210004306>

2 <http://archive.is/AbBMk>

Individuals feel less empathy towards people who are not of their own race.

“The results of all of these studies indicate that empathic neural response is heightened for members of the same race, but not those of other races.”

### **3B) Ethnocentric Behavior and Politics**

#### **The persistence of white ethnicity in New England politics – James G. Gimpel, Wendy K. Tam Cho (2004)**

1 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629804000642>

2 <http://archive.vn/ebcm2>

Ethnicity is a greater predictor of voting behavior than economic status.

“Contrary to earlier predictions, ethnic origin does retain some explanatory power in models of recent voting behavior, and ethnic cleavages have not been entirely replaced by economic divisions in the electorate.”

Ethnic groups do not politically “assimilate” over time.

“the political salience of white ethnicity persists, suggesting that ethnic groups do not simply dealing or politically “assimilate” over time. Some groups maintain a strong identity in spite of upward mobility because movement from city to suburbs is selected not just on housing, income or school characteristics, as is usually the case, but on ethnicity too.”

There is a distinct divide between White (or ‘native’) non-White (immigrant or “minority”) political alignments, with non-Whites (immigrants) leaning “Left” or “Progressive” and Whites (natives) leaning “Right” or “Conservative.”

“Towns with significant concentrations of specific European ancestry groups lean Republican, even after we have accounted for the presence of other sources of political leaning and past voting tendencies, while Democratic attachments are undeniably strong in towns where the newer immigrant groups have settled. The “new ethnicity” (i.e. racial minorities) and the “old ethnicity” (i.e. white ethnics) clearly carry distinct political implications for this region’s presidential politics.

#### **Racial Identity, and Its Hostilities, Are on the Rise in American Politics – Eduardo Porter (2016)**

1 <https://nyti.ms/329tu2z>

2 <http://archive.vn/sjUFL>

As diversity increases, politics becomes more tribalistic.

“In Europe, voters are increasingly drawn to xenophobic politics, driven [...] by fear “based on the instinctive realization that the ‘white man’s world’ is in terminal decline.” [...] Americans are moving in the same direction. Racial identity and its attendant

hostilities appear to be jumping from their longstanding place in the background of American politics to the very center of the stage.”

### **Racialized Politics in the US**

On political issues, the US is divided strictly down racial lines. Non-Whites almost unanimously vote Left-Wing, support larger government, increased restriction on personal freedoms, decreased immigration restrictions, increased government spending, increased state interference in economic matters. Whites vote majority Right-Wing, and consistently either directly oppose these views, or support them to a much lower degree. See sources below:

#### **“Would you like a bigger government?”**

	Smaller	Bigger
Hispanic	73%	23%
African	64%	36%
Asian	55%	36%
European	27%	62%

- 1 <https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans/>
- 2 <http://archive.vn/UeIhh> <https://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/04/04/v-politics-values-and-religion/> <http://archive.vn/hIW9r> <https://www.people-press.org/2015/11/23/2-general-opinions-about-the-federal-government/>
- 3 <http://archive.vn/wLWRO>

#### **“When something is run by the government, it is usually inefficient and wasteful”**

	Agree
Hispanic	49%
African	39%
Asian	55%
European	65%

- 1 <https://www.people-press.org/values-questions/q30k/government-is-usually-inefficient-and-wasteful/#race> <http://archive.vn/QsEKP>

#### **“Government regulation of business usually does more harm than good”.**

	Agree
Hispanic*	49%
African	51%
Asian	55%

European 60%

\*multiple races

1 <https://www.people-press.org/values-questions/q30i/government-regulation-of-business-does-more-harm-than-good/> #race 2 <http://archive.vn/uHfjT>

**“A free market economy needs government regulation in order to best serve the public interest”**

Agree

Hispanic 71%

African 80%

European 58%

1 <https://www.people-press.org/values-questions/q41gg/free-market-economy-needs-government-regulation-to-serve-public-interest/#race>

2 <http://archive.vn/eKA48>

**“The government should help more needy people even if it means going deeper in debt”.**

Agree

Hispanic 66%

African 60%

European 36%

1 <http://www.people-press.org/values-questions/q40f/government-should-help-more-needy-people-even-if-it-means-deeper-debt/#race>

2 <http://archive.vn/M1WEo>

**Asian Americans also support bigger government.** 65% (matches US average, all races) of Asian Americans support raising taxes on high earners in order to reduce the budget. 35% (vs 41% average) of Asian Americans support reducing the budget via spending cuts only.

1 <http://www.naasurvey.com/resources/Home/NAAS12-sep25-issues.pdf>

**Non-Whites are, on average, approximately 20-50% more likely to support socialized health care and health care reform.** Additionally, Whites regard health care reform as damaging.

### Affordable Care Act

	Helped	No Effect	Hurt
Hispanic	27%	45%	16%
African	26%	67%	5%
European	13%	58%	27%

1 <https://news.gallup.com/poll/182318/americans-slightly-positive-toward-affordable-care-act.aspx>

### Obama-Care

	Support
Hispanic	47%
African	77%
European	33%
Avg	41%

1 <https://web.archive.org/web/20140401231548/http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/3-20-14%20Health%20Care%20Release.pdf>

### Healthcare Reform Act (2010)

	Support
African	75%
European	38%

1 <http://polling.reuters.com/#poll/TR8> (link broken, no backup, sorry)

**Immigrant descended or non-native populations overwhelmingly favor a reduction in immigration restrictions** (such as border walls, entry examinations and requirements) **and an increase in immigration**. They are also less likely to assimilate to the host culture (i.e., learn majority language).

1 <https://news.gallup.com/poll/1660/immigration.aspx>

2 <http://archive.vn/RLsc5>

<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/15/americans-views-of-immigrants-marked-by-widening-partisan-generational-divides/> <http://archive.vn/rfu89>

**Non-White populations overwhelmingly support “hate speech”\* restrictions.**

Whites are the only racial group that is majority in favor of free speech.


\*Note that “hate speech” is often defined as speech that is “offensive” to minorities, which generally translates to “any speech that criticizes non-Whites or other ‘minority’ classes as collective units.”

1 <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/11/20/40-of-millennials-ok-with-limiting-speech-offensive-to-minorities> <http://archive.vn/4rY59>  
[https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus\\_uploads/document/a6ywqpe9hl/tabs\\_OPI\\_hate\\_crimes\\_20150511.pdf](https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/a6ywqpe9hl/tabs_OPI_hate_crimes_20150511.pdf)

2 <http://archive.vn/OE9Rm>

**Generally speaking, trends indicate that White Americans dislike big government, welfare states, and excessive state power, while all other races support all of these policies.** This is unsurprising, since [Hispanic and African Americans both make negative financial contributions](#) to the US, meaning that the state is entirely supported by White taxes. US politics can essentially be reduced to Whites going Libertarian mode in an attempt to protect their resources, while non-White races go Communist mode in an attempt to take Whites’ resources. My personal theory is that this is by no means a conscious strategic decision by either side, but instinctual, natural, primally-motivated inter-ethnic conflict.

All theories aside, it should be obvious that a political landscape this divided will not lead to a happy and cohesive society. It should be equally as obvious that increased levels of diversity will simply lead to more division and more political chaos, with greater hostility between competing ethnic groups.



## 4) Summary of Findings and Conclusion

The effects of diversity upon both the individual and society as a whole are overwhelmingly negative. Any amount of racial or ethnic diversity within society causes negative effects, however, the greater the diversity within a society or social group, the more pronounced these effects are. Virtually all measures of civic health are worse in racially and ethnically diverse societies, this includes:

<i>Reduced...</i>	<i>Increased...</i>
Mental health	Criminality
Physical health	Poverty
Community cohesion	Violence
Social trust	Social adversity
Quality of governance	Corruption
Charitable acts	Desertion
Environmental concern	Cheating
Trust in the media	Psychotic experiences
Trust in the government	Instability
Democratic behaviors	Social Isolation
Workplace satisfaction	Inter-racial/ethnic hostility

Many of the studies included in this document provide wildly nonsensical disclaimers, solutions, and conclusions, often citing dubious, transparently biased sources, such as the World Bank Group, or the IMF.

*“Diversity is good for GDP and the economy.”*

As time goes on, it becomes increasingly obvious that...

- 1) Human happiness is not intrinsically linked to GDP.
- 2) As far as politicians and oligarchs are concerned, “good for GDP and the economy” seemingly translates to “good for corporations and banks,” and not “good for the people of the nation.”

*“We must struggle through the horrors of diversity now, as things may work out in the future.”*

What moral authority do these bureaucrats and oligarchs have to intentionally inflict severe suffering upon so many people across the world, just to discover if their quantifiably harmful social experiment will eventually provide the utopian results they claim it will? (Note: As time goes on, it becomes increasingly obvious that their utopian vision was a lie from the start).

*“We simply need to re-define some terminology to superficially erase these problems.”*

This surprisingly common suggestion has a horrendously 1984-esque tone to it. Sweeping a problem under the rug is no solution and is far more likely to exacerbate the problems of diversity, as individuals' understanding of the issue becomes obfuscated and warped.

While the data presented in these studies is undeniably accurate and consistent, almost all of the "solutions" put forward by the authors are, to be frank, utterly ludicrous. There is only one valid solution that will sufficiently solve the problems of "diversity," and that is no diversity at all. Segregation. A total annulment of "multiculturalism" and a return to the natural, tribalistic societies that are deeply ingrained in human behavior. This solution would be best for people of all races and ethnicities, as no race or ethnicity functions better within a racially heterogeneous society than they do in a racially homogeneous society.

Unfortunately, most people are either too politically compromised or too terrified of potential social and economic repercussions to publicly make this argument (they fear being branded a "Nazi," threats to their employment and employability, or losing friends and relatives). Additionally, this solution is in direct opposition to the agenda of the most powerful elites on the planet today, who very much benefit from the havoc and chaos inflicted upon their serfdom via multi-racialism.

A terrible future awaits humanity if we continue on this path, and soon we will reach a tipping point at which that future becomes inevitable and irreversible; if that occurs, never forget who was responsible for this.

