Jimmy Cantrell

Fire Eater! Writer

Response to a Reader

3 February 2005

Recently I received another letter from a reader who objects to my views of culture and ethnicity that he read in articles at The Patriotist. Below I print his letter in italics (with no other changes made) followed by my response.

> I am an amatuer historian who moved from New Jersey to Georgia 9 years ago. I have had the opportunity to travel extensively through both regions through my business. I am writing to contest the celtic origin of southern people, based on there appearence. There was no doubt alot of celtic blood in the south. My ancestors came from the scottish highlands to georgia and were unquestionably celtic. But if you look at the people you see they are predominantly tall, ash blonde and brown, and light eyed. These are nordic anglo-saxon norse dane or whatever you want to call north german traits. If you go to south boston you will see smaller people with alot of red and black hair, light eyes, and freckles. There is very little doubt in my mind what a celt looks like. The people of the south have alot of scotch-irish blood. The scottish lowlanders had significant saxon blood. Thats why they were sent to Ulster to mix freely with the english puritans. To further dilute the celtic blood they came to Pennsylvania and mixed with the quakers and the pennsylvania dutch. Finally the largest element of the southern gene pool came from the chesapeake. Mainly indentured servants from the cities of central and southern england. I have read the Cracker culture by Grady Mcwhiney and Albions seed. The latter being much more accurate. But faces don't lie. Look at your typical southerner and you'll see a brit with a mixed ancestry leading towards tuetonic. What you all seem to overlook is the native american culture and intermixing that is responsible for alot of what you attribute to the celts.

Your contesting of my views is made up of various small parts that comprise much of the Anglophile sense of culture and ethnic heritage and/or pro-Germanic sense of culture and ethnicity. That worldview may be seen in groups ranging from those who espouse the views of the main writers for The Occidental Quarterly; to those who follow the VDARE.com line on desiring immigration reform to preserve what is left of America's 'Anglo-Protestant core' (which means they retroactively agree with past opponents of immigration from Ireland and central, eastern, and southern Europe and thus openly harbor contempt and worse for most of European Christian heritage); to those who fancy that New England culture was the apex, and even the most conservative part, of American civilization because it was, obviously, the only ethnically pure Anglo-Saxon culture in America; to those who harbor definite Neo-Nazi sympathies; to those who romanticize the British Empire as the bringer of peace through mass slaughter to add to itself. Each of these camps believes that the current morass of multiculturalism can be defeated only by more Anglo-Saxon, or generally Germanic, culture.

“If you knew the Old South, you would know that as Eugene Genovese has observed Southern culture was preponderantly Anglophobic before the conquering Yankee schoolmarm began teaching Southern children to see Anglo-Saxon Puritans as their forefathers.”

I assert the exact opposite: I assert that WASP culture is inherently liberal, which should be a fairly obvious understanding given its genesis. Though it certainly has indispensable roots in the earliest pagan northern Germanic cultures, WASP culture began with the theologically liberal, the novel, reforms of Henry VIII and his violent attacks on traditional culture; and it was set, was formed fully, with the Judaizing liberal theology of the Anglo-Saxons Puritans and their even more militant desire to exterminate all traditional cultures within their reach. At its inception, WASP culture not only was culturally and theologically liberal, but it was extremely violent in its desire to exterminate cultures that offended it by their being more conservative. WASP culture fits to a T the definition of 'creative destruction' to eradicate that which is defined, by self or by WASP views, as medieval or tribal or backward, and that call to use 'creative destruction' is hawked religiously by most of today's Neoconservative Jews, who are culturally liberal or worse.

I avow that all that is not merely connected but is inherent: the self-righteously savagely violent, theologically Judaizing, cultural liberalism of Oliver Cromwell leads inextricably to Lincoln's war on Southern civilians and Radical Reconstruction and right up to today's Neocons, whose idea of Empire is multicultural tolerance and diversity, requiring Affirmative Action preferences given to blacks and some other groups and that any white group that is not firmly in the liberal Anglo-Saxon orbit must be denied a right to have an identity. And that multicultural empire, in which the most conservative white Christian cultures are hated and feared and non-white and non-Christian cultures are celebrated and promoted, can be maintained only by the iron fist of centralized government. If you knew the Old South, you would know that as Eugene Genovese has observed Southern culture was preponderantly Anglophobic before the conquering Yankee schoolmarm began teaching Southern children to see Anglo-Saxon Puritans as their forefathers.

Your first point is that according to your view, many, perhaps most, Southerners are too blonde to be anything but Germanic. That assertion ignores the many Classical accounts of Celts, especially their royalty and the Druid classes (the priestly and intellectual class in the Tripartite Indo-European system), being almost exclusively fair haired and tall by the standards of the Romans, whose best families were producing fair haired children at the end of the Empire. The cultural German has a strong tendency to see the world only through his eyes and to claim as his that which he wants or simply assumes must be his and his only because his eyes tell him that it is what he is like. By that logic the Finns (the most blonde people in the world) would be 'German,' but they are not even Indo-European in language. The second most blonde nation-ethnic group is the Poles, who as Slavs long have been seen by many cultural Germans as inherently inferior and, as Hitler believed, worthy of being nothing more than serfs for Germans.

Do you go to Polish neighborhoods and see the many blondes with blue eyes and begin shouting that you are in the heart of ethnically and culturally pure German territory? That is indeed the culturally Germanic tendency, as can be seen in all the silly continental German and English attempts, which were fairly common in the 19th century until scholarship showed how absurd they were, to claim the early ancient Greeks as Germans because Homer keeps talking about fair hair. That solipsistic childishness is sadly corollary with Afrocentric claims that any mention of dark hair must mean that the people are black Africans.

" More than a few true Southerners know that we do indeed have an Indian ancestor or two, and almost all of us have the sense to know that Southern Indian cultures are preferable to Yankee culture."

I find it interesting that you note red hair, light eyes, and freckles among descendants of Irish Catholics in Boston as somehow being a sign of Celtic. Red hair, which was attested by Homer and by ancient Indian writers as being part of the 'best' families, is a trait that has been attested among Germanic tribes as well as Celtic. It clearly is something that is key to the original Indo-European tribes, a rare recessive trait that was passed among the leadership clans, both those that were in the Priestly class and those that were in the Warrior class. It is possible that red hair was primarily found among Druid families in Celtic lands and that Germans, who entered the historical world having lost their version of that class of tripartite Indo-European society (the German military class absorbed it) feared red hair,

which began both the lower class European negative stereotypes about red heads and the tendency among many early German warrior cults to dye their hair red, especially when they were marauding against Celtic villages. In so doing, they may have been attempting to use magic to acquire the knowledge and culture of the Celtic Druid class that they lacked and understood could be used to defeat their attempts to steal the fruits of a civilization that attracted their savage desires to steal after murdering.

In short, red hair is as fair as is blonde, and freckles indicate the 'whitest' skin exposed to sun. As to height, I would guess that the Scots-Irish of the South would be slightly taller than the Irish Catholics of Boston, but that might be only my having assumed something because of people around me talking. I do know that a few years ago a study of heights of men in Northern Ireland had Protestants being about an eight of an inch taller than Catholics, but that difference is meaningless mathematically even if you could prove that the two groups are genetically different (which you cannot). There are pockets of very short people in Ireland and Wales (who may be primarily descendants of the pre-Celtic, non-Indo-European inhabitants of Britain and Ireland), but you also will find them in eastern England where no Celts remained.

What underlies such claims that Germans are Tall and Celts are Short(er) is the Germanic tendency to equate tall and physically impressive with Noble and Superior. That, of course, causes difficulty when cultural Germans meet non-white peoples who are taller than they are: such as American blacks. Some of those cultural Germans maintain the belief and assume that blacks then are inherently Noble and even Superior, as proven by height. That is one way to understand how so many Anglo-Saxons and continental Germans in America quickly came to be Negrophiles who simultaneously maintained Old World Germanic views that Celts and Slavs are inferior. What makes it doubly funny is that almost all Slavic groups are taller than Germans, and I believe that Finns also are taller than Germans.

If Germans are neither the most fair-haired nor the tallest of Europe's peoples, and Classical writers described the Celts they encountered as being physically almost exactly like the Germans they encountered, then how can alleged height and fair hair, and the lack thereof, distinguish between Germans and Celts?

The claim that Scottish Lowlanders have significant, particularly defining, Anglo-Saxon blood is one that advances a case for a UK run by and for the English, and it lacks evidence in any area. It is believed so readily for two reasons: the English assert it and it seems to explain why the Scots Lowlanders came to act so as to make their nation subordinate to England. We know some ethnic Germans became part of the genetics there, but it was a minority part. In fact, it is fairly obvious that Germanic blood was never more than half, in many areas no more than a quarter, that of the 'Englishmen' of the Celtic fringes of western and northern England. However much Germanic blood was there, it was not culturally defining, which is how we still have Celtic fringes of England centuries after the first attempts to exterminate Celtic languages, identity, and folk cultures. Perhaps the best way to begin to see how far off you are (in some cases, 180 degrees off) is to focus on this sentence of yours:

> "The scottish lowlanders had significant saxon blood. Thats why they were sent to Ulster to mix freely with the english puritans. To further dilute the celtic blood."

Your historical sense here is that the Scots-Irish plantations in Ulster came after the Cromwellian revolution in the 1640s. You believe that Ireland's Ulster province was filled with Anglo-Saxon Puritans and then later many Scots-Irish were brought in, primarily to have any Celtic blood in them diluted. The fact is that the Plantation of Ulster was begun by James VI of Scotland (I of England) and was essentially completed two decades before Cromwell took his troops to Ireland. If James VI created Ulster Plantation in order to get the Scots-Irish to breed with Anglo-Saxon Puritans (his enemies before they were his son's enemies), then he sent them to the wrong place.

The Plantation of Ulster was an attempt to do several things, none of which involved getting Scottish Lowlanders to intermarry with Anglo-Saxon Puritans. James VI was implacably anti-Catholic and also anti-Dissenter. He believed that civil society could be maintained only if the vast majority he ruled, and virtually all those who held any economic or political or cultural power, were members of the State Church: the Anglican Episcopal Church. Because the Catholics in Ireland, Scotland, and the Celtic fringes of England could possibly receive help from the Continent, James VI felt that Catholicism was a bigger threat than were the various Dissenting Protestants, many of whom were not Calvinist and so hated as heretics by the Calvinists, who were divided by ethnicity and nation: Anglo-Saxon and Scottish Lowlander. Ulster's leading families, Catholics, were dispossessed, its clan members made homeless, in order to replant the land with people that James felt would then owe him a huge debt and support his vision of a united kingdom. James chose Scots Lowlanders for two main reasons: 1) they were the group most harmed economically by the centuries of English attempts to disrupt Scotland and take it over again, which meant many were desperately poor and would jump at an offer to be given 50 acres and would kill anyone to keep it and likely would love the government that gave him such wealth (thus, they could be bribed to be willing cannon fodder for London); 2) getting many Dissenting Lowlanders out of Scotland could relieve the political pressure Scottish Calvinists had been putting on Scotland, which pressure could lead to a Scottish civil war which likely would mean the kingdom James ruled would be vulnerable to attack to from Europe.

James VI chose to further dispossess the most vulnerable people he ruled, Irish Catholics, and thereby hope to pacify Scottish Episcopalians (who would be pleased that many Scots Calvinists were out of Scotland), Highland Catholics (who were too strong to attack and who saw Scots Calvinists as wild-eyed radicals), Dissenting Protestants in Scotland, Wales, and England (who would see land being stolen from Catholics and given to Dissenting Protestants as God's Will), and the Church of England ruling class that saw such land redistribution from Catholic to Dissenter as both a bribe to keep Calvinists from igniting a revolution and a way to further destroy the Catholic Church in lands ruled by London. It worked temporarily, but it guaranteed that James's son would face civil war and the kingdom would keep moving ever leftward culturally.

Another way to understand how wrong you are is to note that Country Antrim, which in 1620 and today has the highest percentage of Protestants in Ireland, was not part of the Ulster Plantation. That was because Antrim was already filled with many native Scots, most of them Lowlanders, when James VI inherited the English throne from Elizabeth. While some of them were Catholic, most even then were Episcopalians and some were Calvinists. Yet there was no violence between those Scots and the native Irish. The reason is simple: the Scots in Antrim were not beneficiaries of a government that stole land from people of one religion to give to people of another religion. Antrim Scots bought their land and so were not perceived as thieves, nor did they act to promote a foreign culture (English) because they too were culturally Gaelic Celtic. That is essential to note because you evidently see continuing violence between Northern Irish Protestant and Catholic as meaning the former is Anglo-Saxon while the latter is Celtic.

Perhaps a Southern possibility would help. The Baptists of Tennessee and the Methodists of Kentucky are from the same basic Scots-Irish stock and live the same basic culture. If the Federal Government were to declare that 75 percent of the property owned by Tennessee Baptists, church buildings and schools as well as farms and businesses and houses, was forfeit to Kentucky Methodists, you can bet that that there would be endless friction and that Tennessee Baptists would come to see Kentucky Methodists as savage thieves hiding behind tyrannical government and that Kentucky Methodists would become defensive and begin to imagine how Tennessee Baptists are an inferior culture that must be controlled by the strong arm of centralized government; most Kentucky Methodists would come to believe that there is an ethnic difference between themselves and Tennessee Baptists which explains why Tennessee Baptists are inferior and deserve dispossession.

That is essentially what happened in Ulster. Any person who would look at that Southern scenario I used and conclude that the

Kentucky Methodists and Tennessee Baptists are ethnically and culturally different would be ignorant at best. The same applies to those who continue to assert that the Scots-Irish are not culturally Celtic and instead are a type of Anglo-Saxon, which is 'proven' by Northern Ireland and the conflicts with Irish Catholics. This is the great underlying issue: culture, not blood (though I do recognize that all culture is determined originally by ethnicity). To call Scots-Irish culture Anglo-Saxon is to be utterly ignorant, at the least, or to be making claims about culture for political reasons. James Webb's Born Fighting: How the Scots-Irish Shaped America is yet another study that accepts that Scots-Irish culture is Celtic. Webb rightly sees Scots-Irish identity as being shaped by the forces of history that created in the early Modern era a new Celtic 'tribe' that was bereft of any old Celtic system of clan chieftancy and instead came to be directed by charismatic individuals, which pattern, if you think about it, is something of a return to that which operated in Celtic Britain after the withdrawal of Roman troops (the Arthurian era) and which also may be seen in Irish Fenian tales. Webb directly labels the Scots-Irish as being Celtic and understands that as being primarily about basic cultural characteristics and attitudes but also about primary genetic ancestry.

It is true that the Scots-Irish who stayed in eastern Pennsylvania did interbreed with both the Pennsylvania Dutch and the English, Quakers and Episcopalians. And it is true that such inter-breeding and cultural assimilation by Scots-Irish to Anglo-Germanic Protestant ways did indeed alter their culture. In fact, it killed it. The term WASP derives from study of Philadelphia Protestant hegemony. While the Philly WASP master class, which was thoroughly liberal - including hating the white South as inferior and hating all Catholic ethnic groups as inferior and allying with Jews culturally and politically and using blacks as tools to wage cultural war against both the Scots-Irish South and Catholic groups -, was overwhelmingly Quaker, Unitarian-Universalist, and Episcopalian in church affiliation and featured mostly English surnames, the class also featured many Presbyterians and Methodists and quite a few with Scots-Irish surnames. But that proves one of my major points, not your belief: It proves that when cultural/ethnic Celts, of whatever religion, interbreed with Anglo-Saxons and/or assimilate to WASP culture, their genetic descendants will become cultural liberals.

If you believe that most Southerners genetically come from Anglo-Normans who were in the Chesapeake for a while, you are mistaken. The numbers who never lived in the Chesapeake, those that came south and west after landing in Philadelphia and those that went north after landing at Charleston or Savannah, were larger than those who landed in Baltimore. But even then, your ethnic case is based on the false assumption that those who were in the Colonial Chesapeake were all ethnic Anglo-Saxons. Because Maryland was a haven for Catholics (Lord Baltimore was Catholic), a large percentage of the colony's first settlers were Scottish and Irish and Celtic fringe Catholics. In addition, significant numbers of Scots-Irish entered America at Baltimore. Many of those early Maryland Catholics married Scots-Irish and, lacking Catholic clergy outside of Baltimore, became some form of Protestant. Those marriages united two tribes of Celtic culture and thus did not produce the liberal cesspool that was spawned when Philadelphia Scots-Irish married Anglo-Saxons and assimilated themselves to WASP culture.

Your final sentence is a rather typical WASP charge against Celtic ethnicity and culture: that it is not European. As already noted, well through the 19th century, English scholars were teaching that Celtic languages were not European (which proved that Celts were inherently inferior and required being conquered by the racially superior Anglo-Saxons). As with other cultural liberals, the WASPs being proven wrong on that accord meant to them that they must call for more of the same. It is true that some white Southerners brought Indian wives into their word, just as it is true that a few white Southerners fathered children who remained part of Indian nations, but to argue that the majority white Southern culture is not Celtic in origin but is American Indian is a typically ridiculous WASP way to try to cast aspersion on any form of Celtic heritage. What McWhiney calls Cracker Culture, the Celtic cultural characteristics of the majority of Southerners, is easily seen in Old World Celtic antecedents and is traced through population migration.

What is important to note is that while charges of what we call the Celtic South being actually Red Indian will alternately terrify and titillate Neo-Nazis and Anglo-Saxon race purists and other proponents of Germanic cultures, no true Southerner will react either way. More than a few true Southerners know that we do indeed have an Indian ancestor or two, and almost all of us have the sense to know that Southern Indian cultures are preferable to Yankee culture. I am one of that number; I am proud of my Cherokee ancestry. But I also know that while, as Grady McWhiney has noted, there are affinities between the farming Southern Indians and the early South's Celtic pioneers, those Europeans brought their cultural patterns and attitudes with them and did not take them from Indians any more than they took them from blacks, which is the corresponding charge to yours and is a false charge essential to Afrocentrism, which should help you see how what you advocate actually supports leftist culture.

The Celtic-Southern thesis absolutely terrifies all kinds of Leftists, including the cultural liberals who are today's Neocons, who are fierce Anglophiles as well as fierce philoSemites. It also terrifies those who are not cultural liberals in any sense save that they idealize WASP culture and desperately want more of it. I have learned firsthand that members of both camps, liberals-Neocons and moral-cultural conservative Anglophiles, can and do believe all kinds of nonsense, some of it contradictory, and are willing to stab backs and call in favors to prevent publication and even to ally together in order to try to keep people from learning about the Celtic-Southern thesis and Celtic cultural heritage generally.

Note: *For those who recognize that there is something important in the attempts to recover and study the South's Celtic cultural heritage, my book, which now will be titled Celtic Southern Literature, is scheduled to be released by Pelican Publishing of Louisiana this autumn.*