

Transcript-The Backlash-Ep41-Demographic Doom, Why The Global Elite Hates Babies

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:00:02] Are we live? You've got to give me like the 'we're there' fine. Welcome to The Backlash, a weekly discussion about the past, present, and future of Western civilization. I am your host, Rebecca Hargraves. I'm joined as always by Mr. Dave Reilly. How you doing great. This is just the first time I'm seeing you today, so oh wow! This is not a pre-recorded show. No, I didn't put a blazer on and take my hair down. Not a prerecorded show.

David J. Reilly

[00:00:28] No, this is happening live.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:00:30] Live.

David J. Reilly

[00:00:31] From New York. Yeah, really. It's Saturday night.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:00:33] No, it's Wednesday. Wednesday night. Oh, it's Wednesday. It's Wednesday evening, totally.

David J. Reilly

[00:00:37] It's Wednesday evening.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:00:38] Welcome, Cameron. Good to see you.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:00:41] Is Dave wearing a slick leather jacket? He sure is. I am.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:00:44] It's getting a little chilly in here. It's actually freezing in here. That's his 'cocaine' jacket.

David J. Reilly

[00:00:48] This is my 'cocaine' jacket. Everybody's got one.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:00:55] You can find us on X at RealBacklash, our website, thebackslash. net. Subscribe, star, follow us, give us some of your monies there. Patreon. com/thebackslash. Send your

super chats, I guess, that will be read live at the end of the show. Yeah, thebackslash.net/superchat.

David J. Reilly

[00:01:14] Here's what we're going to do. We're going to do a Twitter space after the show, and we will be reading your super chats on this Twitter space. So be sure you're following us on Twitter.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:01:24] True, true.

David J. Reilly

[00:01:25] And we might even bring you up.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:01:27] Yeah.

David J. Reilly

[00:01:27] Banter with you a little bit.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:01:28] Yeah, we might do that. That'd be fun. Follow us on our YouTube channel. I think it's at Real Backlash because eventually we're going to start just transferring all the content there, only streaming on our YouTube channel, our Rumble channel, and our Twitter, which is at Real Backlash. Now, the backlash on Rumble is Backlash podcast, right?

David J. Reilly

[00:01:52] Yes. It is Backlash podcast. But if you type in The Backlash on Rumble, we should pop up. Allegedly. Allegedly.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:01:59] Allegedly. I just wrote Bantz in the outline. Do you think that was sufficient banter? I don't know. To move into a sponsor?

David J. Reilly

[00:02:07] I feel like that was very, I don't know. Was it enough? Motivated banter about the show. The show.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:02:16] Okay. I think it was enough.

David J. Reilly

[00:02:17] Okay.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:02:18] Let's do an ad read. Let's do Tallow. Okay.

David J. Reilly

[00:02:21] We can do that. Are you tired of skincare that's packed with chemicals that you can't pronounce? You know, I am. At North Idaho Tallow Company, we keep it simple. Grass-fed tallow, time-tested ingredients, zero junk. Our soaps, balms, and lip balm are packed with bioavailable nutrients that your skin actually needs. No fillers, no endocrine disruptors, just rugged, reliable skincare that works. Ditch the synthetic garbage and switch. To North Idaho Tallow Company, get yours at IdahoTallow.com because it helps support this show. You can even get a three-bar Soap of the Month subscription for just \$27 every month. And your skin will feel unlike it has ever felt before. Not that I would know. But it's very, very good stuff. And they're also trying to go to the Boise Heterosexual Awesomeness Festival. We will be there broadcasting live, hopefully, but you should definitely consider maybe chipping in 10, 20 bucks, maybe a little bit more, because that money is going to go to the Heterosexual Awesomeness 501c3 run by Mike Fitzpatrick at the Old State Saloon to help promote traditional values, traditional families. Great event. It'll be a good time. June 20th and 21st in Boise, Idaho. Yep. So there you go.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:03:45] Let's do Atlas now too.

David J. Reilly

[00:03:47] We're going to do another ad read, right? We're just stacking the deck up front. We're stacking the deck, yeah. No one's going to be fine. I'm unsubscribing from this podcast. All right, atlasbullion.com/ slash backlash is one of the best ways to start stacking your wealth in physical gold and silver as the economic markets continue to get crazier and crazier, as we're going to be talking about at length, I'm assuming, on this show. I haven't looked at the show notes, so I don't know. Oh, come on. I'm assuming we're going to be talking about the impending financial collapse because of the bond market blowing up.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:04:21] No, no, we're not talking about that at all. Did you not?

David J. Reilly

[00:04:23] I did not. No. Okay. So anyway, you can start stacking gold and silver with either a diverse subscription of both gold and silver or just silver or gold with plans starting as low as \$55 a month. You can also roll over your IRA or 401(k). With Atlas Bullion, and maybe even take self-custody of your gold and silver in those platforms so that when the banks collapse, you aren't completely screwed. You'll actually have something that you can use to barter, trade, and preserve your wealth. AtlasBullion.com/ slash backlash.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:04:58] We love Atlas. We do. We love Idaho Tallow, too. Now, you totally blew it

because I wasn't going to talk about any of this financial stuff. Do you want to just, like, give a little intro? I mean, we can start off with a little bit of bond markets.

David J. Reilly

[00:05:11] Well, I mean, it's just crazy. I mean, the bond market, I mean, Cameron knows more about this, but the 30-year bond just hit 5%, which is, like, devastatingly awful. And I don't have anything pulled up because I'm unprepared, as always. But it's not just the American bond market. The Japanese bond market is blowing up. The Chinese bond market, the European, everything is flashing. Hello, financial crisis imminent. So, Cam, what do you have on that front?

Cameron Macgregor

[00:05:42] Look, we've talked about this the last six months, and I don't want to belabor the points that I've made before, but I think we're about to see financial fireworks the likes of which we haven't seen maybe in 100 years. We're basically at the end of a cycle. Currency regimes usually last 80 to 100 years. And needless to say, we print a lot of dollars. We've distorted the economy. We distorted the structure of production. Our banks are insolvent. They're stacked with IOUs, as we know. And I think what's happening is that confidence in the U. S. government, confidence in governments around the world, but especially in the U. S., it's faltering. And that's why yields are rising. That's why interest rates are rising. And just a couple of things, a couple of statistics on this, which are really alarming about. Almost 20% of all tax revenue collected today goes to paying interest payments. Almost 20. And I think we collect about \$5 trillion every year on average in tax revenue. So, about a trillion of that is now going to paying off interest alone. Forget about the rest of the government. And the second piece is about 35%, 40% of government spending goes to the states. So as we start to unwind our debt bubble at the federal level, you're going to start to see state and municipal bankruptcies as well. So it's all coming. I think it's hitting now. I think that's why interest rates are rising. And as I've said before, I cannot imagine Donald Trump and his presidency are going to survive. That's how bad I think it's going to get.

David J. Reilly

[00:07:22] Geez.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:07:24] Wow.

David J. Reilly

[00:07:24] Not looking good.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:07:26] No, but the anticipatory anxiety will be over eventually. True. Because some bad stuff is about to happen. Yeah.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:07:34] Yeah, that's right. And, you know, I know people think I'm sort of putting on rose-colored glasses about this, but I think this is going to save the country. I really do. I think you're going to see a termination point for the crazy wars overseas, the immigration problems, the race problem, the fertility issues, some of which we're going to talk about on the show. Thank you. I think you're going to you're about to see it reverse. Almost 180 degrees as all these problems that have been building and building and building are just sort of popped together. And then we're going to deal with them.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:08:08] Thank you, Cameron, for getting a haircut and for reading the outline. For reading the outline.

David J. Reilly

[00:08:15] I have to make the thumbnails. I got to get all the restream links working together and all this stuff. For heaven's sakes.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:08:21] I'm a busy guy. We do have a lot to discuss today. Our focus is going to be on demographics. We're going to talk remigration. We're going to talk antinatalism, pronatalism, demographic change. It's going to be a great show.

David J. Reilly

[00:08:32] There we go.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:08:33] Great show. Let's first talk about this Remigration Summit. Martin Selner, he works so hard. And, you know, we talk a lot about optics, which is a really annoying right-wing buzzword. That guy has honed it. He has amazing optics. Did you see this picture of all of them, like, in their suits next to each other? Perfectly tailored suits. Everyone's handsome. This chick's stupid hot. I just love what they're doing. They're like, we're going to put together a pro-white movement. We're not going to call it that. And we're going to talk about re-migration. I love that they've branded this word re-migration. I think it was such a good move. So their summit, even though their original venue was canceled, sounds like it was an incredible success. You watched the speech from Eva. Eva... I don't know how to say her name.

David J. Reilly

[00:09:25] Neither do I. How do you say her name?

Cameron Macgregor

[00:09:26] I believe it's pronounced Haagen-Dazs. Eva Haagen-Dazs. This one.

David J. Reilly

[00:09:29] Seriously? Eva Vlardingerbroek. Broke. Eva Vlar.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:09:35] We're sorry, Eva. If you're watching this, we just...

David J. Reilly

[00:09:38] We want to have you on the show. You'll have to teach us how to say your last name, but it'd be great. All we said about her is that she's hot.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:09:44] The Dutch names are a bit tough. It's just terrible.

David J. Reilly

[00:09:46] Did you want to watch any of this speech? I don't have any notes on it. I mean, you should go watch this speech over on her Twitter account. It's 23 minutes and 43 seconds, and it is very convincing.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:09:57] And you can go to the Remigration Summit Twitter account, and they have all, I think, speeches. That's the picture I was talking about. What a great photo. Yeah. Look at that.

David J. Reilly

[00:10:09] Good guys. Good looking guys.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:10:10] Good optics. It did stir up major protests in Milan. We have a video of that. Look at this. They broke out the big house. This is crazy. Yeah.

David J. Reilly

[00:10:38] Make Europe Antifa again? Great. Wow.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:10:48] It seems like the police were really taking care of business there. Would we see that in the United States? Probably not.

David J. Reilly

[00:10:54] Well, we wouldn't see Antifa like that in the United States. I mean, frankly, the European anti-fascists make ours look like little pussies. Yeah. I mean, like, you get a couple of fat trannies together, and then they, like, go out to the park, and they, like, bitch and moan and hold up a sign with their, like, gut hanging out from their pants. That is American Antifa. European Antifa? Like, they will like murder you. They look organized. They will like blow up your car. They will like, they will ruin your life. I mean, European Antifa is, I mean, I believe it's actually intelligence backed. Of course. I think that they've got either the backing of German intelligence or something, but I mean, like they are a serious force to contend

with. And I mean, that's not to, that's not to diminish. Some of the American, you know, protests that have happened, I'm thinking specifically of Portland in 2018. But even then, I mean, the Proud Boys and the Patriot Prayer guys, like, handed their asses to them. And there was, they were outnumbered, you know, 10 to 1. But the European Antifa, like, they mean business. When they go out and protest the G20, the G8 summit, they will pose a significant threat to the city. Yeah. So they, you know, the police roll out. Pretty hard.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:12:07] And then Martin, of course, he's experienced so many slings and arrows during his work, especially with re-migration. So I just want to take a moment to really thank him for what he has done for the movement. I feel like the European right-wing movement is a lot more organized and they look a lot better and a lot more serious than we do.

David J. Reilly

[00:12:27] Yeah. This is Martin's profile. Follow him. Martin underscore Selner on X. He is fantastic. There was a video of him, let me see if I can find it live. Where he did an impromptu meet the press type interview thing. And he's just so good. There's no way around it. I'll keep scrolling and I'll try to find it.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:12:52] Cameron, do you have anything to say about this?

Cameron Macgregor

[00:12:55] Yeah, a couple things. So I have a lot of experience with politics in Europe, and I've met a lot of the nationalist parties, mainly in Central Europe. That's really where they're clustered. I haven't been to England in some time, but I am in touch with folks over there. And what I would say is that the Europeans, and I've said this before on this program, but the Europeans, they understand how to do politics better than we do. A lot of that is because of parliamentarianism. Here, we sort of fall back into the inertia of the Republicans, the Democrats, and we don't really understand what parties are. And actually, Europeans, when they come to the United States, they sort of think that our politics is a marketing scam, which it is. You go to our conferences, it's sort of like going to a Salesforce conference or something like that. There's lots of music. There's big TV screens. There's lots of lights. But there's very little substance. In Europe, it's the opposite. So it's very professional, tends to be professional. People tend to be more professionally dressed, as you saw. Some of that is not optics. Some of that is just culture. People take politics a lot more seriously over there. So what's happened over the last, really, I would say 10 to 20 years, is that people like Martin Selner, who are not activists as much as they are political organizers, they've created new party apparatuses that are actually well organized, that have party platforms, that in some cases, they don't just hold events, but they're actually out there propagandizing to the public. And now it's finally beginning to gain some momentum in part because they're collaborating across countries, especially in Central Europe. So you have right-wing parties in Hungary, you have them in Austria, Austria, of course, has the Freedom Party, you have AFD. In Germany, you have right-wing parties in Poland, and they all sort of know each other and

they collaborate. That's less true in France and even less true in England, where I would say the brunt of damage to the West has been done in Europe. All that being said, where we excel is we understand how to scale via media and economics. So the money is in the United States. The understanding of programs like ours, how to actually build a alternative media platform, the industrial scale of messaging, that's where the United States excels. They excel in terms of the actual platforming of political organization. Blending the two together is crucial to how we win. And that's a project that I've been involved in over the last several years, because that's really the way we've got to start thinking politically. If for no other reason than the forces that are arrayed against people like Martin Selner in Europe are exactly the same as are arrayed against us in the United States. They work through the international institutions. They work through the mainstream parties, et cetera, et cetera. And Antifa, you're right to some degree, Dave, but look, Antifa in the United States, depending on where you are, and I've seen them in New York City, Washington, D. C., you go back to 20'20, a lot of the Antifa organization was extremely professional. They were well-financed, and they were also equipped with pretty violent means. So all that is to say, the key is getting that American finance, because the capital's here, and understanding of industrial scale media and economics with the political know-how and philosophy of what's in Europe. Blending those two things together, that's the key.

David J. Reilly

[00:16:32] Yeah. No, and there's this clip, I finally found it, of Martin speaking outside of the conference, and he talks about exactly this, this kind of like inter-inter uh international inter-country cooperation uh that's going on so let's take a look at this real quick we won't play the whole thing but uh European collaboration is not a luxury, but a necessity.

SPEAKER_2

[00:16:56] And I think back to 1571, Lepanto, or 1683, Vienna. So in tough times in history, Europeans had to stand united and close the ranks. And that's what we're doing right now. So it's a strong sign of unity because you have people here, even nationalists from all kinds of countries. It's a Babylonian mix of languages in there. But all the people shake their hands and do not fight each other, like the liars always say. Respect each other and we work together for a common goal which is re-migration.

SPEAKER_8

[00:17:26] We are from Switzerland and you are a Jungitat member. What is the role of Jungitat? Jungitat is very controversial in Switzerland.

SPEAKER_2

[00:17:33] I'm very controversial in Austria. We are all controversial everywhere and I think that's a good sign because if everybody has the same opinion, very often people are being lied to. Jungitats is a great patriotic identity.

David J. Reilly

[00:17:45] So anyway, he goes on to talk about Jungitats, which is the youth wing of the

German, I believe the German party, and it's actually become kind of pan-European. It's present in most of the countries.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:17:55] Yeah, and just three things before we move off this. The first is that the situation in Europe is explosive. So, in the United States, the racial issues tend to be a bit more dispersed because we're a larger country and the white population has just left a lot of the areas that are unlivable, specifically in a lot of major metropolitan cities. That isn't the case in Europe. People tend to be more clustered in the bigger cities. That's where a lot of the refugees and immigrants have come. And that has caused an explosive situation. So, in Germany, they had a series of killings last December. You guys probably remember that vehicle that was driven down through this Christmas market, injured hundreds of people, killed some people. Similar things are happening in France, in England, and across the continent. Right. So, that's one thing: it's becoming explosive. The second is that it's peculiar to Sellner and company. What happens in Austria tends to migrate north. So, the politics in Austria-as they have historically, the politics in Austria-then affects southern Germany, Bavaria, and then gradually, they move north. And that's exactly what's happening. So, I think you're going to start to see more and more of Selner-like activity in Germany, where there's tremendous resistance to it. And the third piece is, if you're in the United States, you just have to understand, you think we have a censorship problem. It's censorship on steroids in Europe. Talking about the Holocaust in Germany is a jailable offense. And you also have to understand what I said a moment ago regarding the economics of alternative media. There aren't a whole lot of alternative media outfits that are anywhere near the scale of what we have in the United States. It's not even close. So that's why I say if you can give a lot of these parties, these nationalist parties in Central Europe and then spreading to the South and the rest, if you can give them media coverage, they're going to become mainstream and popular. In ways that I think are completely unpredictable to the elites because their messaging is increasingly mainstream. It's just that they have no airwaves. They can't get access to the mainstream media at all. Whereas in the United States, we have access to alternative media, which is scalable, but we have no party apparatus. This is why when people message us on the show, they say, 'Hey, it's great what you're saying. What are you doing about it?' They're frustrated because there's no alternative party. Which is a recurring thing we talk about on the show. We've got to take the alternative media and build new parties, the way the Europeans have. We've got to learn from them and understand the political moment we're in, which means the Republicans, they're irrelevant. The Democrats, they're irrelevant. These are like obsolescent companies. We need new stuff.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:20:44] Yeah, absolutely agree.

David J. Reilly

[00:20:46] No, and to double down on what you're saying, we've got some stuff here from Martin. This was the day before the Remigration Summit. Eight young Germans got banned from leaving Germany. If they try it, they commit a crime. They have to check in at their

daily local police station. If not, they have to pay a fine. The democracy simulation is shutting down. So this was done because a couple of people, a couple of speakers or whatever, they were supposed to speak at the conference. Italy wouldn't stop them from coming into the country. So Germany banned them from leaving and then basically said, 'go check in with the police once a day to make sure that you're still here in the country.'

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:21:24] That's unreal.

David J. Reilly

[00:21:25] The censorship over there is on another level. But at the same time, it's not just the censorship. The rhetoric is also on a completely different level. We do have a small clip of Eva's speech and the audience, excuse me, reaction to it that we can watch here real quick.

SPEAKER_9

[00:21:47] I mean, That's basically all that you need to see is, you know, these migrants are making our life hell.

David J. Reilly

[00:22:07] Yeah. And they're just coming out and saying it, which we're not even seeing over here in America. It's like, wow, what my taxes and blah, blah, blah. You know what I mean? The rhetoric is at a higher level over there. It's definitely more urgent for them.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:22:21] Look, yeah. And just bear in mind, again, you know, demographics in aggregate is quite different than when you look at specific locales. So, for example, I have a good friend who took a trip to Milan. I've not been to Milan yet, but Milan's a beautiful city. It's sort of a medium-sized city in Europe. Obviously, it's an important place in Europe, particularly for the fashion industry and the economy in Northern Italy. But he got up, I want to say it was like 10, earlier than that, I guess 8 or 9 a. m., and went and got coffee. And he walked a few blocks, and he was right near the Duomo in Milan. Again, Milan's just not that big of a city. And he ran smack dab into, he told me, anywhere from 500 to 1,000 migrant men.

SPEAKER_9

[00:23:06] Good Lord.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:23:07] 90% of whom were Muslims. And they were all 20, 25. And in Europe, you will have that experience pretty much wherever you go. If you go to Rome, you'll see Africans everywhere. You go to France, you see the same thing. You go to England, you see Pakistanis everywhere. And you'll see entire communities like that. In the United States, it's just a different landscape.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:23:31] That's absolutely true. And we're still facing this narrative that we need to be replaced by immigrants because of the birth rate. I had no idea that Hillary Clinton came out and said this this week. I had forgotten about her completely. And so when you told me about this, I was like, what? But I think we should watch this entire thing because what she's saying, we have to keep in mind, this is still the messaging of leftists in the United States.

SPEAKER_7

[00:23:56] As I posted the other day, this very blatant effort to basically send a message, most exemplified by Vance and Musk and others, that what we really need from you women are more children. And what that really means is you should go back to doing what you were born to do, which is to produce more children. And they are talking about, you know, cash benefits for the more children you have. This has been tried, by the way, in other countries and it has not worked. Or medals if you have six children while they are contemplating cutting Medicaid while they have no interest in paid family leave or funding quality child care. They're cutting Head Start. I mean, you go down the list of all the programs that support child rearing and the care of children and create some safety net for women who are in the workforce, the formal workforce, as well as raising children. So this is another performance about concerns they allegedly have for family life. But if you had read the Heritage Foundation's Project 2025, despite Trump saying he knew nothing about it, if you had read it, it's all in there. It's all in there. Return to the family, the nuclear family, return to being a Christian nation, return to producing a lot of children, which is sort of odd because the people who produce the most children in our country are immigrants and they want to deport them. So none of this adds up. But one of the reasons why our economy did so much better than comparable uh, advanced economies across the world is because we actually had a replenishment because we had a lot of immigrants legally and undocumented, uh, who, uh, had a, uh, you know, larger than, uh, normal by American standards, uh, family. So this is just another one of their, you know, make America great again by returning to, uh, the, uh, lifestyles and the economic arrangements of not just the 1950s. I mean, let's keep going back as far as we can and, you know, see what happens.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:26:20] What a horrible bitch. Notice that she says it's a replenishment, not a replacement. It's a replenishment and that this is the progressive way forward. We don't want to move back. We don't want to go to the era, you know, to previous eras where women were so oppressed. It's just such asinine.

David J. Reilly

[00:26:36] Messaging, I mean, I even hear her saying things like, 'Women need to go back to what they're born to do.' It's like, no shit, yeah, yes. You are in fact born to make more children, that's the point, that's like what we've been saying for the past eight years. You can't become men. Men can't become women. Men can't get pregnant. Like, what the fuck?

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:27:00] Instead of going back 50 years or, you know, 70 years, whatever she's saying,

let's go back to the beginning so that we can all return to our biological imperatives. Yes, that's exactly it. That's what we need to do. Yes. And we're seeing this antinatalist perspective pop up in the strangest places. I was just glued to this story of the fertility clinic bombing. Were you guys watching this play by play? I could not, I could not believe what how this was happening, because when I heard that he had bombed a fertility clinic, I was thinking like, OK, he is pro-life and he's against IVF because of the destruction of embryos, because I also heard that none of the embryos were harmed. And so I was thinking like, OK, this is some pro-life thing, right? But it turns out it's the exact opposite. This guy, Guy Bartkis, a pro-mortalist. So we'll talk about his manifesto in a minute. I want to read a little bit from this independent article. The man suspected of bombing outside of California fertility clinic expressed nihilistic ideations, and he had a written pro-mortalist manifesto. He was attempting to livestream the bombing on this fertility clinic in Palm Springs. According to reports and a website belonging to him, he described himself as pro-mortalist and believed people did not give consent to exist. And I listened to His audio or the audio, the 30 minute audio of his manifesto, if you want to call it that. I love listening to people's manifestos after they do something very extreme, because I think it gives us insight into who this person was. Were they insane? Is this a one-off thing? Is this representative of a larger movement in society? And these are the first cracks that we're seeing. His manifesto was such Reddit tier neck beard. I listened to the whole thing. I'm like, I wish I hadn't even bothered.

David J. Reilly

[00:28:58] Wanted the 30 minutes back.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:28:59] Yeah, I want that 30 minutes back. So let's actually pull up this tweet if you can. Vampire? Yes. Okay. And we'll listen to this to 136.

SPEAKER_3

[00:29:19] Holy crap, this is the whole thing? Explaining. I've decided to bomb an IVF building or clinic, um, basically it just comes down to I'm angry that I exist, um, and that's uh, you know, nobody got my consent to bring me here and I know what you're gonna say how could we have got your consent because you didn't exist, blah blah blah exactly the point, there's no way you can get consent to bring someone here so don't fucking do it right um if you're gonna try to say something really fucking retarded like well since you don't exist you don't have a consent status and therefore we don't have to get consent. This really isn't any different from saying oh well the girl's unconscious so I can't get her consent to have sex with her so therefore it's okay because I can't. There's no way to even ask for the consent, right? So, I mean, if you actually think that's a good argument against what I've said, right, you're absolutely retarded. Your brain, it's very childish and retarded, right? And before you say, ooh, that's ad hominem, I said the word retard. No, I made an argument, and then I called you a retard, fucker. So it's not ad hominem. It's all like this. Are you kidding me? No, it's all like this. You know, just name calls, and that's it. That's what ad hominem is, fuckhead. All right, are we good?

David J. Reilly

[00:30:38] Yeah, we're good, we're good.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:30:39] The whole thing is like that. Oh, my gosh. Will you pull up this next tweet?

David J. Reilly

[00:30:42] We used to have people like Ted Kaczynski getting published in the Washington Post, and this is what we've been reduced to in this country? The education system is broken.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:30:52] I know, totally. But it's actually a fascinating philosophy, this pro-mortalism. If you can pull up the next one, that one, yeah. So it's this belief of ephialism, which is lifism backwards. I hate all these people. I hate this. And it's spearheaded by Gary Mosher. Mosher, who basically talks about all these things, consent and everything like that, and whether or not what they want to do is send humankind in a trajectory where it dies off slowly, because then people in future will not be born and experience suffering and die.

David J. Reilly

[00:31:40] This sucks.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:31:41] Oh, I know. Dumbest ideology. It's absolutely insane. So he actually talks a little bit about this Mosher character. But in this clip, Mosher is doing an interview. It's from several years ago with a woman who correctly points out that this is going to lead to things just like this fertility bombing. Let's listen to this for about a minute.

SPEAKER_6

[00:32:02] I will say. That I do, sadly, smoke weed that there are a lot of people like say on some of these Facebook groups that are abusing it and are acting very threatening, and I am afraid that there are going to be people that take an anti-natalist ethos approach that are crazy and that are going to perpetuate violence against humans and animals. I mean, I have had to talk people down from just going out and killing random people or hunting animals in some disgusting, violent manner. And so, I mean, I am worried about it. And I'm curious if you're worried about it, too. You can wrap it up. I want anti-natalism and ethelism.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:32:45] And then I have a clip of this guy, this Mosher character, talking a little bit about his philosophy that the bomber had adopted.

SPEAKER_5

[00:32:58] I wanted to talk about the fact that I think life is cruel and that people who

impose it are cruel. They're cruel, sadistic, awful human beings. Pregnant women are a blight. They're a disgusting, awful thing. They shouldn't be cherished. They shouldn't be any of this stuff. What they're doing is incredibly irresponsible. They have no right to think they can control this experiment and everything is going to be just fine. Um, so yes, bringing up these metaphors from Frankenstein, the ones you you did so well in the F list of just illustrating these simple metaphors why I should not have any respect for Dr. Frankenstein's insane uh perception that he's capable of being this um you know benefactor that he's going to do this wonderful thing for something by um you know messing with stuff he doesn't, he hasn't had the competence to mess with; he has no skill and he's going to claim 'I don't trust me, I can drive this plane you know it's like all right uh so it goes on like that.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:34:06] He talks a lot about consent; he's and all of these people are also vegan what the Well, they don't believe it.

David J. Reilly

[00:34:14] I didn't even hear about this. This is like literally the first I'm even hearing about this story.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:34:17] It's crazy. This is nuts. Yeah, it's really wild. So I've spent the last few days like delving into this antinatalist perspective and BBC did an op-ed on it. Just talking about a little bit of the philosophies behind modern antinatalists. So of course, nonviolence and consent.

David J. Reilly

[00:34:39] Yeah, right, nonviolence is they go and they blow up, they blow shit up and kill people. Okay, got it.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:34:44] Put simply, it's the idea that creating or destroying life requires the consent of the person who will be born or die. But the irony of this is that he was trying to destroy all these embryos.

SPEAKER_8

[00:34:57] Yeah.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:34:58] So what, I'm not really sure, it's not about a preservation of life; it's about hastening death. But then they won't get to the question of consent of the people that are being murdered or the people that wouldn't be born.

David J. Reilly

[00:35:12] Right this whole thing is just people who have no... I don't even know where to

begin, um. And of course, I don't even have words; this is so stupid it's so stupid.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:35:24] And then, of course, there's the environmentalist angle, so uh, fueling the antinatalist arguments in recent years is an increasing focus on environment and the potentially devastating effects of climate change. There's a clear overlap between their ideas and environmental activism, which you would see, and also this guy that did the bombing. He was a climate change idiot vegan. I feel that it is selfish to have children at this time, adds Nancy, a vegan plastic-free animal rights enthusiast and yoga instructor from the Philippines. The reality is that children being born into the world are creating more destruction for the environment. So this is actually, I knew that I knew about anti-natalism, but I, I had no familiarity with this pro-mortalism perspective. So then I started getting into the pro. We're pro-death. I know. We're pro-death. But I also have heard insane things from pro-natalists. So I wanted to talk about that a little bit. Have you, are you guys familiar with this? High IQ couple that is trying to have the maximum number of children, but they only do IVF.

David J. Reilly

[00:36:38] Yes. Yeah. Vince has interviewed these guys several times.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:36:41] Oh, really?

David J. Reilly

[00:36:42] Yeah, Vince has had these guys on. I actually kind of like them. I mean, I don't like the IVF stuff, but they seem insane. They seem absolutely insane.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:36:51] But they're interesting. Meet the elite couples breeding to save mankind. Very nice glasses. Those are problem glasses.

David J. Reilly

[00:36:58] Those are very nice glasses.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:37:01] So they have a purely scientific approach to procreation. They grade the embryos. They are trying to utilize science to the maximum degree. It's just eugenics, right? Yes. To create the highest quality embryos to have. The most number of children by having as many babies as possible. And then, of course, I don't want to belabor this too much because we talked about this a lot in the Ashley St. Clair episode. Elon Musk has a similar strategy. I think he's probably worse than these people because at least they're in a paired relationship; they're marrying, at least. So Elon Musk, we see that. And then we talked about this a little bit, but this 26-year-old woman, mother of 22, aims for having 100 children. And she's trying to do all of this for surrogacy. And I saw through surrogacy, I saw a lot of people on the right wing saying like, 'Good for her.' That's so great. That's so great. And I was

appalled by this because fertility, white fertility should not be the highest goal here. There are major problems with the ethics of IVF, with the ethics of surrogacy, and with not having children in an environment with monogamous heterosexual parents. Like we just lambasted Elon Musk for this Ashley St. Clair thing. So I think the pronatalist perspective, which is eugenic, they destroy embryos. I think that this has major problems as well. Procreative protocols, and they're divorcing sex and the creation of life, which is, of course, the problem.

David J. Reilly

[00:38:46] That's why the church condemned it, yes, on both sides. You divorce the marital act from the act of reproducing children, whether it's avoiding having children or making more children, that's a defect, either a defect on the one side with abortion or an excess on the other side with this. Crazy having 100 IVF babies.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:39:07] Right, absolutely. So I think that I thought it would be interesting for us to have a discussion about where we need to be as in the pro-white movement between this anti-natalist perspective, which is clearly affecting society, and this, what I view as insane, eugenic, satanic, pro-natalist perspective that uses IVF to maximize the fertility potential within the white community. I mean, obviously we need to end up somewhere here in the middle. So first let's talk about this pro-mortalism perspective.

David J. Reilly

[00:39:44] Well, tuning into an extremist podcast so that we can find a moderate position on having children.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:39:50] We do. We have to, because I see this on the right all the time. It's like, we need to have the maximum number of white babies no matter what. And I keep thinking like, why should we have to have more children than any family? Wants to have because we're being invaded demographically without our consent. That doesn't seem fair. People are poor. A lot of people don't want to have, you know, tons and tons of children. And I think that that's their right. And I just look at this at this mentality and I'm like, this is also damaging. This is also damaging to be like every person needs to have the maximum number of children. Also, I really believe in the excellence of white people. how much are our numbers really going to affect the outcome and the utility of the pro-white movement? Because we don't need, you know, X number of people. We need the power. And where does that really come from? Does it come from the numbers or does it come from the idea? So that's kind of where I wanted to start. Cameron, what do you think about that? Do you think that fewer white people can still have a maximum impact and really do the re-migration thing? Or do you think that we need to get the numbers up and that's the number one goal?

Cameron Macgregor

[00:41:08] Yeah. So a couple of things. One is if you think that you're going to outbreed the developing world, if that's what you want to call it, that or the global South, you've got

another thing coming. My recommendation to you is to get on a flight and fly down to Latin America, fly to South Asia, fly to the Middle East, and you'll discover immediately. That we have absolutely no chance in the West of outbreeding the global South. That's not going to happen. And there are various reasons for that. And a lot of it has nothing to do with tradition. It has to do with the fact that there is no family planning in many parts of the world. There is simply a reproduction cycle, in part because there is no real self-control on the level that you see in the Western world. In other words, as soon as a female reaches sexual maturity, she has a child and she has multiple children. That tends to lend itself to a dysfunctional family structure. In other words, there is no parental investment and that leads to other social problems. The second thing I would point out is let's go back to what Hillary Clinton said at the beginning. So I don't know if you can bring it up on the screen, Dave, but there was a. A famous scientist, his name was Philippe Rushton, who did a lot of research and work and wrote extensively on racial IQ differences. And then he actually came up with a map showing IQ around the world. And if you bring up that map, you'll basically see where the productive countries are in the world. And they map or correlate strongly with IQ. Now, what you'll also notice. is that the areas that tend to be low IQ tend to have a very high population. And a large distribution in that high population area are people that are young. Now, the reason I mention that is that Hillary Clinton said that it's imperative, and you'll hear people on the right say the same thing. It is imperative that we have a large population of young people because that's bullish for GDP. All right, so. That's not true at all. In fact, population numbers or dynamics don't seem to have anything to do with GDP at all. So you could take a country like Switzerland, for example, which is about 10 million people and compare it to a country like Egypt, which has a population of, I think, almost 100 million. It's like 90 or 100 million. And Switzerland has a higher GDP. OK, the reason for that is because higher IQ populations in the West, East Asia, they tend to be more productive, at a minimum. So importing large numbers of people into the West, which has been an argument made by people both on the right and the left for the last 50 years as conducive to GDP, that's flat out false. The second thing that's interesting about that is that the number one demographic that has suffered economically since the 1970s is men, and specifically white men. In other words, have we really become more productive? Has our GDP really risen since the 1970s? I would argue, actually, no, it hasn't. It's been financialized. Certainly, if you dismiss inflation, yeah, then maybe you could say the nominal rate of growth is high. But if you look per capita, if you look at wage rates, if you look at standard of living, no, we're not growing. And importing mass numbers of low IQ people who have a higher birth rate. That's only made that worse, and it's made it worse in the United States, and it's made it worse in Western Europe as well. No, I think the issue is that what these eugenic couples are promoting on the surface may seem like a good idea, but you have to ask yourself, okay, is that scalable? What they're basically trying to do is solve the birth rate problem in a Petri dish. I just don't think that's scalable at all. And then remember, you need that parental investment as well. So, you have 100 kids, fine. But what's the parental investment that you're going to be able to invest in them as a parental unit of two people? It's just not going to be very high. And that means you could have social dysfunction even if you have high IQ people. So, you need both components. But the key is: having importing large numbers of people with high birth rates isn't the answer. Now, that being

said, and I'll finish my point on this. There was a very good sub-stack. I think it's called the five stages of Western fertility. That was written by Arctotherian, that I would encourage everybody to read and what they basically said is there's two things that are that seem to be conducive to a high birth rate in the Western world over the last 500 years. And that is number one: prosperity, economic prosperity particularly for men; and second, a very high marriage rate. All right now we had both of those in the 1950s in the US, but from the 1970s forward, it's not just that you had the sexual revolution. It's not just that you had birth control, et cetera, et cetera. It's that men, particularly as we deindustrialize, their wealth shrank. And what we know about the female population is if you don't have resources, the likelihood you're going to attract a mate drops significantly. So that's one part. And then the second part is the marital rate has collapsed, right? We've talked about that before. I know, Rebecca, you have a nuanced take on that. The key being you need both components. So you need wealth and then you need a strong regime of marriage that ensures that that wealth attracts female mates. Needless to say, we don't have either one.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:46:51] And Hillary Clinton, this is what leftists do, right? It's like two truths and a lie. What she said about financial incentives increasing the birth rate, that is true. They've been relatively ineffective in terms of just that monetary compensation increasing the birth rate. And I think that Cameron's totally right. We need to fix the societal problems. I can't remember why I read this. I think it was somebody's Substack. But one of the things that we're facing and one of the reasons that the birth rate is so low outside of the things that Cameron talked about is that there isn't a high social status associated with motherhood, and women care about resources; they care about social statuses. So, I hear a lot like, oh, everybody just praises mothers all the time. I do not think that that's true in our society. I think that motherhood is not venerated. And I think that if we gave mothers the highest social status, like made them feel like their contribution was truly valuable, that paired with the resource allocation, that that would truly affect the birth rate. And that's one of the reasons that the monetary compensation is not really working.

David J. Reilly

[00:48:00] Yeah. I mean, one of the charts that I always go back to when we talk about this birth rate thing, I mean, my thesis on this is that the money's broken. The money is, that it's the monetary system that has led to the decline in birth rates. You can look at this Handy Fed chart about the amount of productivity versus the hourly compensation. You can see before Paul Volcker took over the Fed in 1976, productivity was highly correlated with hourly compensation. And then when we went off of the gold standard and Paul Volcker, Margaret Thatcher got in charge of the economic, you know, deal. God, I'm really hitting it out of the park today. You can see that productivity and compensation decoupled. And now we become more and more productive, but we aren't paying the workers. And so, if you're not paying the workers, then they feel like they're drowning. If you feel like you're drowning in a mountain of debt with a car payment, you've got. You know, college debt. You've got a home loan. You've got credit card debt. This all stacks up. You feel hopeless. You feel boxed in. How are you going to have kids? It makes you not want to have kids because you're like, I

can't financially afford this.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:49:10] Right. And what's the number one reason for divorce? It is financial stress on any given family. So if you are putting white families in a situation where. They're poor, and they have to have the maximum number of children, we're going to be dealing with an even worse divorce rate than we're dealing with right now. And it is abysmal. And so I don't think that that's the correct solution. Also, in terms of this IVF thing, you're right. It's not scalable, Cameron, because IVF is prohibitively expensive. It is incredibly expensive to have a surrogate and to have egg retrievals and a transfer. That in and of itself is going to cost \$100,000. Wow. What family is supposed to afford this?

Cameron Macgregor

[00:49:50] Yeah, I mean, the other thing, and I emphasize this all the time, because you have a mentality, and I really think it's become a Western, something that's peculiar to the American mind, the Western mind, that is we tend to think that history moves in one direction. But actually, if you look back the last 1,000 years, 2,000 years, and again, just look at the West, you could look at the whole world. But what you can observe is that fertility is cyclical. So you've got a boom bust, right? I'll give you an example in the Western world. Following World War One, I think at about 1930, Western countries collectively fell below replacement levels. And there were more than a few people at the time that said, this is it. The West is finished. Well, guess what? Following World War Two, it reversed again. OK, we got back above replacement levels. And as we know, there was a baby boom in the United States. So these things are cyclical and they're affected by many different things, exogenous shocks being one of them. And sometimes the collapse of fertility is actually a very good thing. There are more than a few people who believe, for example, that part of the reason the Industrial Revolution happened in the West, happened in England and countries like that, is because of the bubonic plague. And what the bubonic plague did is it basically wiped out the excess labor supply. And all of a sudden you need to get innovation. Because you just don't have the farmhands that you used to have. And then a lot of evidence suggests that the population that was wiped out was largely the underclass, and it was repopulated by a baby boom of the upper class. So we could experience something very similar to that, particularly if we get the reset that Dave was talking about a moment ago financially, and you go from a materialist order all of a sudden to that sort of puritanical order that I've talked about before. So there is, in other words, there's no guarantee whatsoever that these fertility rates are going to stay where they are. I think actually you're going to see a reversal.

David J. Reilly

[00:51:49] Interesting. Yeah. And I think Kevin McDonald talks about this in his book. Is it the culture of critique? or one of them, but he talks about this, the parental investment in children, right? And that actually Jews have used this like consciously where, you know, a couple would have maybe two kids and then deeply invest their time in raising their children. And then their children will have eight, nine kids, much bigger output of, you know, fertility or whatever. And then because those parents can't spend all of that time with those

kids, the grandparents that invested in the kids invest in the grandchildren alongside the parents to kind of support for that, right? Which raises the level of parental and grandparental involvement in their raising. And then those eight kids have two kids each. Right, right. And then the cycle repeats as a way of passing on tradition, as a way of passing on culture.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:52:56] And having intergenerational investment in children is so good for health and it's so good for community building. That's actually very smart.

David J. Reilly

[00:53:06] Yeah, it is. It is. And, you know, it's a strategy. Whether or not people are using, I mean, definitely people, you know, in trailer parks or in the ghetto are obviously not doing that. And you're effectively, whether white or black, you're raising animals. If you're not investing in children, you're not teaching them morality. You're not teaching them why they're here, what they were created for. You're raising an animal.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:53:28] Yeah, that's right. And you shouldn't look specifically at population numbers and think, okay, as I said a moment ago, You know, I think the majority of the population in the Middle East. So you look at countries like Egypt, as I said a moment ago, 60 percent of the population is under 30. And a lot of economists will say, oh, that's great. That means they're going to have a very high GDP. The opposite is the case. That's dysfunctional. You don't want a society that is that is quite that imbalanced. And you also have to understand why that is the case. Right. A lot of that is because you don't have an adequate family structure because you're not delaying gratification. Because you don't have the infrastructure of a modern society. It's not about the numbers. I think this is what Rebecca was getting at a moment ago. It's not about the aggregate numbers. It's about making the numbers that you've got as productive, as maximizing their potential to the degree that you can. That's what creates a functional society. And that's why, for example, the Chinese, in my opinion, have become the most dominant economy in the world because they have a high acute population in a homogeneous society that's reinforced by national institutions. That's the recipe for success. And just as an aside, a lot of people like Peter Zhou, who some of you may know, think China is about to collapse because of their one-child policy. I think it's quite the opposite. The countries that are going to collapse are in the Middle East, they're in South Asia, where they've got a mass excess population of people who are not productive.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:54:58] Yeah. And I can't help but think that a lot of this, especially the pro-mortalism position, that they would be able to square this circle by developing a Christian perspective, right? So one of the things that the shooter, not shooter, the bomber, whatever, one of the things that they talk about is the nature of the world, the nature of suffering. But even in the absence of humans, the natural world, is there anything more cruel in the natural world? Today, I watched a video. I follow an account on Twitter called Nature is Cruel. And I

watched a video of a male hippo just ripping apart a female hippo's baby because he wanted to mate with her. So even in the absence of the horrors of humanity, which I recognize are, you know, it's the most difficult thing that we deal with. In the absence of that, animal life and nature is cruel. It's horrendous. And the way that you explain that is the fall. And without that, I understand how these people get to this pro-mortalism perspective.

David J. Reilly

[00:56:08] I was going to say, this is just what happens when you de-Christianize society on every level. I mean, you no longer have the answers, like the very basic answers. Why are you here? I'm here to know, love, and serve God, to be happy with him in the next. Right. That's the catechism that teaches you why you're here. And theoretically, in society before we became de-Christianized, the whole point of the parents getting together and having the kids was to make kids, to know, love, and serve God, to obey him in this life and to be happy with him in the next. So there was actually a point to life. Because people were intentional with getting married and having kids. It wasn't just because they're like sex brain, porn brain, you know, whatever. You know, there was actually an order to society. The sexual function was properly ordered in its context as created beings. Right. Right. Like when you remove that context, then things like this are inevitable. Right, right. Like this is why we need a Christian society. Totally, totally.

Cameron Macgregor

[00:57:16] Very obvious. You know, this movement, obviously it's macabre and it's logically, I think it's unfounded too for reasons I'll express in just a moment. But the first is that the culture of negation always ends here. It ends in negating life itself, which is basically what these people are arguing. It is, I think, pervasive in our culture today. We don't have culture. We have anti-culture. So we reject beauty. We reject hierarchy. We reject Western culture because it's separate and higher than the rest. So it is only logical that it would end with blowing up fertility clinics, because human beings aren't even worthy of life on this planet. The second piece to this is that a lot of these folks tend to have this Rousseauian view, where somehow in the past, either mankind was uncivilized and he sort of lived in harmony with nature, or there was no humanity at all and everything was great. And as you point out, Rebecca, it's actually quite the opposite. The number one killer threat to humanity for most of human history was nature itself. That's why you had civilization. Civilization created a mechanism by which we could overcome climate, we could overcome shortages. We could overcome the danger of other human beings trying to kill us, presumably human beings that were not as civilized. Civilization was a means of establishing the harmony that they say it undermines, right? It's literally the opposite. And what's interesting is that particularly when it comes to climate issues, the most advanced societies technologically become the most climate conscious, not the other way around. The populations that are living in subsistence, they're not climate conscious at all. And they don't master the technology such to maximize resources for the minimum amount of collateral damage. You're seeing this again in China, India. As they modernize, they need more industry because they get to a certain point where they have to become climate conscious to actually sustain their societies, not the opposite. So they've got it completely wrong. But of course, that makes sense when

you have a culture of negation, of denying everything that's good and beautiful for the reasons Dave mentioned of de-spiritualizing human beings, you end up where? In death.

Rebecca Hargraves

[00:59:35] And I think that we can all agree, based on the outcome in society, that the real death cult is atheism. It's secularism. Because there's no framework for how to deal with the suffering of humanity. This couple that we were just talking about, they actually own a company where you can screen for, invested in by Peter Thiel. I was unaware of this.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:00] Really? These guys?

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:01] A Dialogue, a secretive invite-only social club co-founded by investor Peter Thiel.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:06] Oh, interesting.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:07] But they don't only select their embryos through quality, they also do the most extensive genetic screening that exists where you can pick out traits like IQ, things like that.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:20] That's interesting.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:22] That horrifies me. Not her, not her.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:27] What's the Wikipedia? Let me pull this up.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:29] They're Malcolm James Collins, Simone and Malcolm Collins.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:33] Simone.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:34] I hate to read somebody's Wikipedia, but that's what I'm looking at right now.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:37] Well, I mean, whatever. I mean, this is interesting.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:39] Okay, go to Pronatalism Advocacy.

SPEAKER_8

[01:00:46] Pronate. Am I on a different page or something? No, that's right.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:50] The Collins Promote are prominent in figures in pronatalist movement, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

David J. Reilly

[01:00:55] Billionaires like Elon Musk.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:00:57] Yes. They fear that low fertility rates, especially among people they view as high-achieving, could lead to decline in innovation and societal progress, as well as the extinction of cultures, economic breakdowns, collapsed civilizations, Elon Musk. They use pre-implantation genetic testing to select embryos, which is typical with IVF, but this is atypical. They used genetic screening to promote higher birth rates and advocated for selecting embryos based on perceived desirable traits, such as high IQ. Right. I find this grotesque. Yeah. Because we talk about IQ a lot, but high IQ doesn't necessarily translate into.

David J. Reilly

[01:01:38] It doesn't translate even into being like a normal person. I mean, look at Ted Kaczynski. His IQ is like 178. The guy was a freak.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:01:44] Yes. And if you really have a high IQ and you have no social traits that will help ease you into life and into the workforce, you are going to live a miserable life. In a few episodes ago, we talked about IQ and its correlation to addiction. There's a really high. Likelihood a much higher likelihood that if you have an IQ over 140 that you're going to end up um with we can look at uh at not Peter Hitchens Christopher Hitchens yeah like he died basically of his alcoholism and smoking because he he talked about this he just found being around the average person so intolerable yes that he had to dumb himself down and I think that if you are selecting for extremely high IQ that the jump did that that is just going to translate to innovation. I think that that is a serious jump. I mean, right.

David J. Reilly

[01:02:37] And it also doesn't just because you're high IQ also doesn't mean that you're moral. You could be like a really high IQ bank robber. You could be a really high IQ murderer, you know, but that doesn't mean that you're going to be a really high IQ moral person. That's going to like seek the good of their neighbors, right. Love one another type of type of stuff. You know what I mean?

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:02:54] I mean, we want to go ahead.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:02:56] I'm sorry.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:02:57] We want to avoid dragging down our average IQ through demographic replacement. But in terms of aggregating around the mean of the white IQ, I think that's probably good for society. Go ahead, Cameron.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:03:13] So one way to think about this, and I actually, I sent Dave something about this, I want to say a couple months ago, but Peter Thiel is financing. I think they're called like Freedom Cities. I don't know, Dave, you can look it up or go in the chat. Oh, the aquatic things? Yeah, that's right.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:03:31] Was that called a sea city or something? Peter Thiel is financing aquatic cities?

Cameron Macgregor

[01:03:35] Something like that. Yeah. So one way to think about this is that a lot of the tech elites, the tech bros, as they're called. Who I think are expressing their ignorance about how society actually functions. And it makes sense, right? A lot of them are engineering-centric. And I've worked with a lot of engineers in my day, military, in tech, et cetera. And needless to say, their social skills are not the highest. And they sort of think you can run a society the way you create an operating system in a computer. Needless to say, that's just not an appropriate analogy. Anyway, one way to think about this is that A lot of these people become very enamored of the city-state model versus the nation. Now, we on this platform are proponents of the nation. We think that a nation like Austria or Germany or the United States, that these are real things. And to some degree, that they are metaphysical, spiritual things, right? That there is this thing called America. There is a community. There is a marketplace of human beings that share common values, ethnic heritage, identity, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, right? But they don't think about it like that. Their view is, no, actually humanity really should be a collection of city-states which are not unified based on those principles. Instead, they're unified based on high IQ or engineering prowess, or think about testing into one of these magnet schools, right? So that's their sort of view. The irony being, in my opinion, the most successful city-state in the world, potentially in world history, is Singapore. And what is Singapore? It's an ethno-state. It is a Chinese nationalist state. And don't take my word for it; the founder, Lee Kuan Yew, that's what he said about Singapore. So even in that sort of scaled-down model, you have to have that ethnos, common religion, common cultural framework to make it scalable. The rest of this, I think it's just sort of, it's sort of this accelerationist nonsense that I, I just, I don't think it's going to work, yeah.

David J. Reilly

[01:05:45] Here I've got, I found it, it's called Seasteading. This is what you were, I don't know if you have a point to make about this but I hate this, this is like this. And Peter Thiel, according to what? What did Google just saying? Hold on, get out of here, go away. Uh, yeah. I put it-You know, Peter Thiel invested in the Seasteading Institute, a nonprofit focused on building floating cities as part of his vision for a libertarian utopia on the ocean.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:06:12] The point is that both the libertarian right, so again, these are people like Ayn Rand and the communist left, they believe the same thing. Now they express it differently in terms of how the state plays a role, but their both views are that societies are artificial constructs. And that's what you saw on that page, right? Is that Peter Thiel's financing a venture capital project to create a society. Societies are not artificial constructs. They are a collective of ethnos, of people that share the same religion, the same sort of ethical framework, and they are metaphysical properties. Again, this is what you hear from people who are nationalists like me. That is the distinction between the two of us. That's why I tell people all the time, I'm not a libertarian because basically they think the same thing as the communist left. It doesn't matter who's in your society. The right may say, hey, this is our rubric, and the left may say, this is our rubric. Either way, both agree it's an amorphous mass of nothing. It's an artificial construct, and that's the problem.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:07:18] Yes, and I think that that's an insightful thing to recognize, that the left and the far right have this shared belief that scientism is really going to solve things. And we saw how this played out with COVID. And the problem with this is that it's secular. It's a secular belief system. Communists believe that they can manipulate markets and that they can do all of these things to control human behavior. And libertarians believe basically the same thing, that we can use scientism to manipulate the human experience. But the answer to this, of course, is God and understanding the Christian perspective and also understanding that we have to respect nature and human nature and the way that things come together organically, just like you were talking about with societies. So I think the answer to this, this pro-natalist movement that we're seeing that's based on is really a rejection of this. We need to reject IVF. We need to reject all of these things and understand that large families really should only exist within the framework of a Christian, monogamous, heterosexual marriage. That's the only reason it's going to work out.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:08:34] And to do that, you have to realign the institutions of power with the ethnos, right? That is the solution to that problem. An example of what I'm talking about, if you go back to that Arctotherium substack, which talks about the five stages of fertility, one interesting note in there is that the collapse in the fertility rate in Spain was delayed. It's delayed by like a decade or two decades from the rest of Western Europe. Why? Because of Franco. Because Franco was a fascist and not a communist. So he was pushing back on a lot of the communism that was spreading across the West and was conducive to the sexual

revolution and a lot of these other things that have undermined Western civilization in various ways. The point being, again, if the state, if the institutions of power reinforce the Christian ethos that we're talking about, guess what? You've solved your fertility problem.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:09:33] Yep, absolutely. Yep, I agree. Anything to add, Dave?

David J. Reilly

[01:09:38] Yeah, I mean, nothing other than just like, I mean, like there are certain things that you can do to like boost IQ, right? Breastfeeding, the mother taking good supplements, like during the pregnancy, avoiding stress during the pregnancy.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:09:55] It's like 95% genetic.

David J. Reilly

[01:09:57] But there are still things that can be done, I think. I mean, at least that's what some of the studies are.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:10:02] Don't get malnourished as a child. Right. And it won't lower your IQ. But as far as boosting IQ, I'm not convinced that there's pretty much anything outside of nutrition during pregnancy.

David J. Reilly

[01:10:11] In general speaking, there are things you can do to set your kids up for success. Yeah. Things like take your supplements, eat well, reduce stress, breastfeed your kids, you know, educate them right. Marry a white guy. Bring them to church. But then also even things like we found out that like my wife and I. Like we have compatible blood types, right? Because like imagine if you've got non-compatible blood types and then, you know, the baby being formed in the womb is viewed by the body itself as a foreign entity that it needs to attack. That can lead to complications in pregnancy over and over and over.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:10:47] It's called Rh incompatibility. Right.

David J. Reilly

[01:10:49] And so you want to make sure that you're compatible on multiple levels. I'm not saying that like my wife has never done a genetic test or anything like that. And I'm not saying that you should like base who you get married to on that necessarily at all. I'm just saying that like there are very common sense things that you can, you know, do and reasonable things you can like look into to find out if you are compatible with another person.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:11:11] Okay. Is this eugenics? So I carry the cystic fibrosis gene. 4% of Western Europeans do. And before my husband and I got married, I made him get tested for it because if. We got married, and he also carried this recessive trait. Each child we had would have had a 25% or 50% chance of having cystic fibrosis, which is a huge deal. So before we even got married, I was like, you've got to take this test, and if it's positive, we have to break up.

David J. Reilly

[01:11:40] Well, I think that there's also a distinction between eugenics in that sense, where you're still creating children in the natural way within the family structure. As opposed to like, we're going to have our kids sent off and we're going to cryosleep his jeans. That's totally out of the question. Again, anything that separates the marital act, sex, from the production of children is wrong. It's a sin. And then when it comes to marriage itself, the primary purpose of marriage, at least in the eyes of the Catholic Church, is the procreation and education of children and secondarily the mutual companionship and friendship with the spouses. That's actually secondary in marriage. The primary reason is to propagate the species and to educate them. Right. If you look at the Code of Canon Law of 1913, it's very explicit.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:12:40] But I don't think that any element, it was more of a rhetorical question, I don't think that any element of mate selection can be eugenic.

David J. Reilly

[01:12:46] What do you mean?

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:12:47] I don't think that you can practice.

David J. Reilly

[01:12:48] You shouldn't be like dysgenic. You shouldn't like go out of your way to be like to like find someone that you know.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:12:53] But I think in terms of like the definition of eugenics, it has to do with. I don't know.

David J. Reilly

[01:12:59] And I don't know. I mean, eugenics. Right. That's that comes from good genes. Right. So you're like maybe it is eugenic.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:13:05] I mean, the term the term comes from I believe it comes from Sir Francis Galton.

And he was referring to a movement in which you would sort of have state sponsored mate assortment to produce the most talented, highest IQ person. I do think we all practice eugenics on some level. When we mate select, obviously we want to find somebody that pair bonds with us for various reasons. They share common traits. We also want the most attractive person we can get, et cetera, et cetera. That is a form of eugenics in that sense. This sort of industrial-scale eugenics, as I described it a moment ago, that's something totally different. And I do think it falls apart sort of where you said, Dave, which is you need that parental investment. Right. Because that's what creates the foundation of the society. And what we do know is if you go back thousands of years and you look at basically the nucleus of all of higher civilization, if you destroy the family. Then all of a sudden everything seems to fall apart. Stalin, for example, reversed a lot of the efforts by the communists to break up marriage or rather to collectively raise children because it threatened the survival of the country itself. I mean, the whole society was cratering. So if you destroy that unit and therefore sever that connection with parental investment. Um, even though you're having lots of high-acute children, I just don't, I don't see how you scale a society like that. Right.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:14:37] And we would do so much more for Cameron's definition of eugenics. If we, um, stopped behavior that prevents us from proper mate selection, birth control is a huge problem with this. You can't recognize the pheromones in a man.

David J. Reilly

[01:14:53] And this is exactly what I was going to talk about. I was going to say like, so is it eugenics if, because they've done these studies on people, right? We're like, They'll take a woman, they'll give her like a sweaty shirt that a man wore. They'll have him smell like 20 different shirts. And then the woman will pick which one based on scent that they're more attracted to or whatever. And I remember reading a study, or maybe you sent it to me, or maybe we've talked about this on the show already, where like with men, when they did this, like every single time they would select out for recessive traits that they also had. So like if there was some sort of heritable genetic disease, they did not think that the women with that pheromone were attractive. They selected them out. But then when it came to women, it was completely random. It was a total scattershot. So then they called these women back. I think it was what, 25% of the sample size. And they asked them, are you on birth control? And they said, yes, we are on birth control. So birth control blocked the women. From being able to recognize pheromones, and that's like a lot of the time when you see these people that get divorced-right? Yeah, after birth control, you get married to a woman who's on birth control, and then all of a sudden you decide we're gonna try to have a baby, and then the woman stops taking her birth control and she's like, 'No, I hate my husband' yeah, and then and then they it ends in divorce. Yes, um but I was gonna say, like that's a form-maybe I'm abusing the term here, actually-but I mean, it's like a form of eugenics, right? The body is naturally wired to seek out people of the opposite sex that you are compatible with. Like your senses do this. Your sense of smell does this. You're like women with the wider sets of hips are more attractive to men, women with big breasts, right? Oh, you could nourish my children. This is like at a very kind of primal level or whatever. So, I mean, like you are

selecting for that. So I wouldn't say to go out of your way to select badly. But I think that, like Cameron said, on this, like trying to industrialize this or to have this imposed by the state obviously would become tyranny like in a nanosecond. You know, I mean, like what happens when the state says you can't get married if you don't have your COVID shot. Right. Right. And boom, there it's done. So. So I guess anything.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:17:14] Oh, go ahead, Cameron.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:17:16] Yeah, I was just going to say that part of the issue is, you know. A lot of people think that you go back to the 1960s and then you fast forward. And because we sort of decoupled sex from marriage, because we've got birth control, because we have feminism, et cetera, et cetera, that we created an environment in which sex is a sort of weapon that's used indiscriminately. That's actually not the case. And what's happened is that more and more people are having less and less sex, especially men, because. A lot of these females are using online dating or they're using other online platforms like Instagram to take the sexual discriminators and sort of exaggerate them to an extreme level. So for example, height or income, or maybe even just looks in general, right? So Dataclysm, which was a book written, I want to say about 10 years ago, written by the guy who founded OkCupid. um, shows a chart and this has been this has been talked about a lot but 80% of men, according to most women on the site, were basically ugly. okay so based on looks alone, women were selecting what made they wanted. now you might say, okay, well that's again what's wrong with that because ultimately, you want the most beautiful offspring you can have; you want offspring that um that is affordable. So you want to find a mate that has high income. You want your children to be taller. What's the problem? The problem is that, as you said, Dave, marriage is not just about metrics on a sheet. It's about compatibility. And what we found going back the last hundred years is that the best mechanism to provide the compatibility are what's been called natural networks. So it's basically the social proof that's established by family to family connections, by the church, by the community in a sort of local organic way that says, hey, Sally, have you met Brian? You guys should meet up and get together. That's the way most people have met throughout history, not just in the United States. That's completely broken down. And so, in a sense, what you get is just metric-driven data on these online platforms. And what's happened is. A few men are having a lot of sex and nobody's reproducing. And so, you have a fertility crisis that might, to some degree, be a eugenics experiment gone completely wrong. But it gets us back to the original point, which is that if you don't have that generic sort of marital framework that's enforced by a common culture, common religious order, etc. It just doesn't work. It falls apart.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:19:57] Yes, and I think that miscegenation propaganda has a lot to do with this as well. You're supposed to marry somebody that doesn't look like your brother, but that looks like your cousin. And that's how you decrease mutational load the most. You're not supposed to see somebody that's the entire physical opposite of you and want to procreate with them.

It's actually, from a tribal perspective, it's supposed to repulse you. Yeah. And so, you know, I don't want to get too in the weeds on this, but a lot of mixed race people have terrible mental health conditions. They have physical conditions. They can't be organ recipients. Did you know that? No, yes, yeah. It's a problem. I mean, even your blood typing thing, my daughters both had really bad jaundice after birth. And so I was asking, like doing some research, like how did this happen? And it might just be from my husband and I having incompatible blood types, but it doesn't reach the level of RH incompatibility, right? So there are physical, biological reasons that you're supposed to choose somebody that is like you. And is that eugenics? I think colloquially, probably not. When you say eugenics, people think of it as a much more proactive government-sponsored thing.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:21:12] I mean, definitionally, I think probably that pro-mating strategies are or eugenics um but I don't know I don't think that that's how people the other the other component that's kind of interesting here too is that and this is talked a lot about in the memesphere but there's sort of a glitch a glitch in the matrix if you will in terms of how women seek men um and that's basically uh what what we call what Shakespeare used to call wooing I guess today you might call it your charm charisma riz whatever as a man. But women tend to find men that are dark triads to be extremely attractive. And dark triad, for people who don't know, is Machiavellianism, it's psychopathy, and it's sociopathy. And these are three personality types that are destructive. You don't want to befriend them. But in a world where social proof doesn't exist anymore based on those natural networks that we talked about a minute ago, in other words, dad says, hey, have you met Brian down the street? He's a solid guy, et cetera, et cetera. That world's gone. So now it's just either these metrics on a screen in online dating or it's men that are dark triads that can go into a coffee shop or they can go into a bar. And by virtue of having these particularly dark traits, guess what? They get in the door. And most men on that basis have absolutely no chance. And so again, the sexual pyramid's completely inverted and the fertility rate collapses.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:22:46] Right, right, definitely.

David J. Reilly

[01:22:48] Have I ever talked about how I met my wife on the show? Because it's so funny hearing Cameron talk about this because this is-There was social proof. It was a social proof thing. I had met a young lady at a Catholic conference in like 2015, 2016. We'd been friends. And then I got a job that, you know, I was driving all over the country. Um, after the whole debacle with the radio station where we got, you know, boycotted by Antifa, there were like bomb threats. I had to resign. And, uh, so it was kind of like hiding out in St. Mary's, Kansas, uh, driving and the Northwest route opened up. And I thought back to that friend that I had made at that conference. And she was like, oh yeah, I used to live in North Idaho. So I called her up as I was on my first trip up to the Northwest.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:23:30] You want to hang out?

David J. Reilly

[01:23:31] I was like, Hey, I remember you talking about that place in North Idaho. Uh, can we get a group of people together at the bar? And she's like, well, I'm not there anymore, but my friend so-and-so is. So then I called the friend and I'm like, hi, you don't know me, but our mutual friend so-and-so told me to call you. And she's like, well, I'm not there anymore either. I'm in Whitefish, Montana. Call my sister. And so then I called, I can say her name because she isn't even her anymore, really, Rose. I called our friend Rose and was like, so you don't know me at all. I'm a friend of your sister's friend. We met at a conference three years ago. Let's get together at the bar. And she's like, okay. And she got like 20 people together. My wife was one of the 20 people. And she friend-zoned my wife, originally. The way it should be. Yeah. And then two years later, we had gone on three dates. And I asked her to marry me on the third date.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:24:20] You're lucky that Rose was amenable to this. Yeah.

David J. Reilly

[01:24:24] Rose was awesome, she still is; she's a nun now, we love Rose, she's you know off in France, like behind a grill uh so she's completely sequestered, she won't social proof, she won't get upset at me for talking about this because she doesn't have internet what a sweet story, yeah that was a that was a real social proof thing I like. Met her through the church network, Interesting. I met my husband on Match. com. That does not happen. I don't know anybody else. Even you. You met on Match. com. I think Vince met his wife organically as well. There is so little of that anymore.

Cameron Macgregor

[01:25:01] That's obviously because Vince is dark triad. Totally. Just to be clear, I got the dark triad wrong. It is an important concept. If you're not familiar with it, particularly if you're a woman listening to this, you should pay attention. It's narcissism. It's a psychopathy and it's Machiavellianism and just go in reverse order. Machiavellianism is using people as a means to an end. Psychopathy is lacking empathy and narcissism is self-absorption. Okay. And yes, a lot of these men who exhibit these traits tend to be extremely attractive to the opposite sex. And in our day and age, because of the breakdown, the lack of social proof that Dave talked about, because those networks don't exist anymore. Well, guess what? These are the guys that are dominant in the sexual marketplace that's commanded by females, right? So it is a problematic environment to be sure, but it can be flipped if the social proof imposed by social sanctions or the state institutions, whatever. If that kicks into gear, all of a sudden women change their behavior. They're very impressionable, in other words.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:26:12] Oh, yeah, totally. That's interesting.

David J. Reilly

[01:26:14] I'd never heard of this dark triad thing until Jordan Peterson came out with his dark quadrad. Machiavellianism, narcissism, psychopathy, and anti-Semitism. And it's like, what is this? This is not a real thing. What are you talking about? Looking at the world and accurately judging that it appears that there's a small group of people with an outsized influence on our government. Hello? Anyway, sorry, that was a brief aside. I don't think we talked about the Jews enough this episode.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:26:42] But we did the last episode. Oh, okay. Two days ago.

David J. Reilly

[01:26:46] Wow, that seems like such a long time ago. All right, all right.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:26:50] We got to wrap it up. Last chance to send your super chats to thebacklash.net/super-chat. As Dave mentioned, we are going to do a Twitter space where we address all those. Yeah, let's do Antelope Hill.

David J. Reilly

[01:27:01] Yeah, let's do Antelope Hill.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:27:03] I want to hear their new ad read again. It's way good.

David J. Reilly

[01:27:06] It is good. I'm going to have to get used to it. I had like just finished kind of like. Getting the last ad read to the point where I was like really comfortable with it.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:27:15] Did I just say it's way good? We gotta close up.

David J. Reilly

[01:27:17] Yeah, it's time. We all need some caffeine, I think. Antelope Hill Publishing is fighting to keep history alive against the regime of anti-white censorship and to publish a new generation of dissident, radical, and right-wing researchers, philosophers, polemicists, and writers. They have an eclectic catalog that includes veteran right-wing authors and academics like Kerry Bolton, Dr. Ricardo Duquesne, Paul Kersey, as well as newer figures like Lord Miles Routledge from Afghanistan. He's not from Afghanistan. He's from England, but he's in Afghanistan living with the Taliban. Josh Neal and Christian Secor, in addition to a long list of original translations of modern reprints and otherwise inaccessible historical works. back to the original, historical works such as Fascist Italy, National Socialist Germany, and even Medieval Europe. Their original works include groundbreaking investigations into

the causes and funding behind transgenderism and the opioid crisis, books on Christian nationalism and American folktales. Additionally, Antelope Hill contributes to the regeneration of our culture and rebirth of our family values through their top-quality fiction, including books like *Let Them Look West* by Marty Phillips, or *Worlds Separated*, and a collection of beautifully illustrated and wholesome children's books, like this one, *The Great Napoleon for Children*. Whatever your interest is, you're bound to find books that you like at Antelope Hill, all professionally published and with cover art that will grace your bookshelves. Help us and help our people by checking out companies that share our values and work to preserve the birthright of our history. Visit Antelope Hill Publishing today, thank you, Antelope Hill, Idaho, Tallow Atlas, Bullion.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:29:04] We really appreciate it, thank you Cameron. Thank you!

David J. Reilly

[01:29:09] I've also got to read these really quickly, okay. These are basically like the best uh the best super chats we're going to be getting on air, uh so over the past couple of days we had somebody that visited on our website, I'll show you, I'll show you where it is, uh if you go to the backlash. net under support the show there is an Amazon wishlist that we have which includes a bunch of gear and stuff that will be extremely helpful for us. Hard drives, extra TV screens or whatever, lights, switchers, whatever. And this is all stuff that we can use to help make the production quality even better than it already is. But anyway, we had somebody that bought like several thousand dollars worth of stuff. And so they have a couple of notes here. Let's see here. I am donating; we already read like a stack of them the last Wednesday episode, so if you want to know all of these together, you can do that, whatever. I am donating a few hundred dollars worth of items to the show. I request only that you purchase \$20 worth of J-Proof and say so on the show and hold for no less than a few months. Call it a stupid speculation if desired.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:30:14] We're going to do that.

David J. Reilly

[01:30:15] Obviously, I can't actually tell you what to do or force you to do anything on your show, and I'm quite pleased with what you all are doing, hence all of this support. I just want you on board J-Proof with us. Then each week you can touch on J-Proof when you touch on Bitcoin and say, well, J-Proof is proving my point by rugged. Or if it's up, say, well, against all expectations, it's up or it's steady. Fun for all from Jason.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:30:38] Thank you so much, Jason. We really appreciate it.

David J. Reilly

[01:30:40] We're going to figure out how to buy Jproof, I guess. And then we're going to do

this because you've been so generous to the show. Absolutely.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:30:48] We have a show on Monday.

David J. Reilly

[01:30:49] We do have a show on Monday. Who's coming on on Monday?

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:30:52] We will see you guys on Monday. Remember to subscribe to our YouTube channel at Real Backlash. Subscribe to our— Pete Quinones. Oh, Pete Quinones is coming up on Monday. That's going to be such a fantastic discussion. We love Pete. Subscribe to our Rumble at Backlash Podcast. We're on X at Real Backlash. Thank you so much for joining us, and we will see you on Monday.

David J. Reilly

[01:31:16] Thank you. Oh, and tune into our Twitter space, which we'll be doing right now. We'll be doing a Twitter space right now.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:31:21] Totally, right now.

David J. Reilly

[01:31:22] So, see you.

Rebecca Hargraves

[01:31:23] Bye-bye.

David J. Reilly

[01:31:25] Oh, I'm going to be late.