Twitter Thread by Curse

Curse
@cursedsalad

1. Is race really a social construct? If the notion of race is abolished, what are the implications? Who benefits? Who doesn't? Let us consider...

2. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find evidence that race exists - it's diligently scrubbed from Wiki, buried in Google's search results, and omitted from textbooks. The defintion of "race" has even been quietly removed from the dictionary. Do you disagree? Too bad.

3. Those that claim race is a social construct typically argue that there is no chromosomal marker for skin color like there is for male (XY) or female (XX) sex determination. And the fact that humans share 99% of their DNA leaves little room for genetic variation.

4. As such, they argue race isn't discrete like sex determination, but is instead a continuous spectrum. This implies that a person who is one race can also share some phenotypic characteristics with another race, qualifying them as partial members of multiple racial groups.

5. The spectrum of people is becoming even more continuous with the relatively recent phenomena of hybridization. Open border immigration policy is increasingly mixing DNA of distinct groups of people that would otherwise only have access to local gene pools.

6. Further, they argue that since humans share 99% of their DNA, the genes responsible for certain morphological characteristics used to classify races are actually present in all humans, but may simply be recessive or dominant (e.g. melanated skin).

7. So this begs the question: since we share 98% of DNA with chimps, why not include them in our big, happy family of homo sapiens? The answer is simple: that 1% difference in DNA, while small, doesn't account for the large difference in morphology, behavior, & biology. But why?

8. Because the mere PRESENCE of genes only tells half the story. Chimps share all but 1% of human DNA but are very different. Corn has twice as much DNA as humans, but is also very different. Genes must not only be present, but also affect development at specific times & places.

9. Further, most of the genes in human cells aren't even active; two people can share identical DNA and have no intersection in active genes. Also, two of the exact same genes can transcribe proteins completely differently. Again, the PRESENCE of genes tells only half the story.

10. Interestingly, humans share 60% of their DNA with bananas, but obviously bananas don't share 60% of human characteristics. Thus, it is logical to conclude that only a small difference in genes can produce disproportionate results.

11. As such, when humans migrated all over the world, they continued to evolve in separate environments. This resulted in genetic differentiation that conferred adaptive advantages and thus, differences to each group.

12. Ultimately, we are not arguing about whether everyone is related, but about how CLOSELY everyone is related. Otherwise, we can make the case that chimps and bananas should be included in our big, diverse family. Thus, humans are distinct both as individuals and as groups.

13. Skin color may be one visual cue for race, but race is much more - it's ancestry, geography, genetics, etc. Every person is the final product of the decisions made by their ancestors over generations. DNA is a chronicle of these decisions & the environment that molded them.

14. Forensically, races are more discrete than the media portrays. While there is no delimiting number of features to qualify one's race, races are easily distinguishable by morphology and biology. Social sciences are also able to reliably associate certain behaviors with race.

15. Nevertheless, scientific facts about race have been stigmatized into oblivion as "politically incorrect." Any scientific discovery must first pass the litmus test of "political correctness" before it's accepted - a clear sign that we have eschewed truth for "what feels good."

16. However, there is something more sinister at work here than making people "feel good" - something that is both practical and pathological about this recent epidemic of political correctness.

17. Political correctness is simply a tool in a larger agenda to unanchor us from the empirical world. Once unanchored, our reality can be relativized: race, sex, nationality, etc. When absolute truth is deconstructed into social phenomena, it's susceptible to social manipulation

18. For example, despite the very indisputable and absolute biological basis of sexual orientation, "gender" has been cleverly foisted on us to relativize the binary nature of sex. What are the consequences of relativizing notions that are supposed to be absolute? There are many:

19. The relativization of race has disproportionately affected Western countries, as white populations have decreased as a result of open border policies. In the meantime, the media assuages consternation with their threadbare mantra "race is a social construct."

20. But relativization has an inherent flaw: hypocrisy. For example, the dogma "race is a social construct" hasn't prevented attacks on white people on the basis of race. Not has it stopped ethnocentric groups like the ADL for advocating on behalf of

Jews.

21. Genetic mutations are what caused distinctions between the races. Genetic mutations are also responsible for autism. However, we don't see the media spamming "autism is a social construct." Hypocrisy.

22. Human racial groups have roughly the same amount of genetic variance as chimps, but humans are relativized into a single race while chimps have several subspecies. Why? Hypocrisy and the false god of political correctness.

23. Further, we treat it as a moral imperative to preserve subspecies of animals like white rhinos, but we don't do the same for white people. Why this hypocrisy? Because "whiteness" has been relativized with "race is a social construct."

24. The Scottish wildcat is the only living cat species indigenous to Scotland. It has become endangered due to hybridization with domestic cats, and as a result, is now protected by law. No such protections are afforded to whites despite their decreasing population. Hypocrisy!

25. Nobody will mourn the extinction of white people like they do Scottish wildcats or white rhinos because white people have already been relativized into nonexistence. Instead, the extinction of whites will be lauded as a victory for diversity, because diversity is "good."

26. But if diversity is good, how is blending everyone into a single race also good? Just more hypocrisy in our politically correct world of relativized identity. But who cares what YOU think? They think it's "beautiful," as long as it's isolated to Western countries.

27. So why did "diversity" become the moral good for humans but not animals? Because diversity, along with race and gender, has been converted into a social phenomenon and is now subject to societal forces. But how did this happen and to what ends?

28. The movement to convert the notion of race into a social phenomenon started in the early 20th century with Jew anthropologist Franz Boas. Boas analyzed 13,000 human skulls and concluded that it's impossible to determine ethnicity or race by cranial shape and size.

29. Boas was later proven wrong - race does determine cranial shape and size. But how did Boas make an egregious error with such a large sample size (13,000 skulls)? Was it really just a simple error as the media portrayed or did Boas have an ulterior motive?

30. To understand Boas' motive, we have to go back to 1907, when President Roosevelt convened a commission named after Vermont Senator, William Dillingham, to advise Congress on the best immigration policy based on several factors including race.

31. The Dillingham Commission's findings were published in a book called The Immigration Problem in 1911. Based on immigrant data surrounding literacy, welfare benefits, crime, etc, the commission concluded that the quality of immigrant was tightly linked to race/ethnicity.

32. This was a problem for Franz Boas' fellow Jews, so he published his "study" in 1912, one year after the Dillingham Commission report, proclaiming that the morphology of new immigrants will instantly transform to resemble America's founding stock, permitting assimilation. Lies

33. Incidentally, the Dillingham Commission report would be the basis for US immigration policy until Jew Congressman Emanuel Celler introduced his 1965 Immigration Act aimed at curbing European immigration to America and abolishing quotas for Jews. But I digress.

34. So now, race has been propagandized into a social phenomenon such that societal forces can relativize and manipulate our perception of it. And any scientist that dares say otherwise is defunded and blacklisted - including the man that discovered DNA. Race is social now, goy.

35. So as a social phenomenon, who exerts the most influence over how we perceive race? It just so happens that the people who steer our societal norms through media, entertainment, and academia also benefit the most from the relativization of race.

36. Like Franz Boas and the rest of the Jewish diaspora that has long tried to relativize race through media and "science," Jews are the single biggest beneficiaries of race becoming a "social construct," as it lowers their risk of losing access to Western countries ■

37. Jews fear that the notion of distinct races provides the pretext for racial favoritism, thus creating a dilemma for the diaspora should ethno-nationalism arise. A relativized notion of race means no racial favoritism because we're all the same.

38. Thus, your desire to have a racial identity is in direct conflict with the Jewish agenda to relativize race by:
- weaponizing political correctness to bully science
- opening borders
- promoting diversity as the moral good

It's an assault on the DNA of Western populations.

39. By converting race into a social phenomenon and then relativizing it, Jews can effectively label any white person that does not welcome the extinction of their DNA as "white supremacists."

40. Jonathan Weisman, the Jewish deputy Washington editor of The New York Times said it best: "It is my view that when borders are blurred and distinctions are diminished, Jews tend to flourish." ■ End.