A Good Christian is Racially Aware

There is no more luxury for whites to flagellate themselves under the false belief that Christianity is anti-racist.

ADAM PIGGOTT
NOV 25, 2025

8 Share

The conservative side of politics has spent the last few weeks losing its collective mind over the awful, awful racism and general badthink of Nick Fuentes, after his interview with Tucker Carlson shone a light on the current thinking of young men of a right wing inclination. Total panic has ensued. The panic has been exponentially increasing in its intensity and volume, as conservative gatekeepers come face to face with the terrible realisation that they are gatekeepers no longer. Their tried and tested strategy of using cancellation on those up and comers hoping to get a spot at the table but not toeing the line or sufficiently sucking up to their betters has suddenly turned into a great big nothing burger.

I won't go into an explanation of how and why conservatism is officially dead, others have done a much better job of that than I ever could be bothered doing. But when arch conservative Rod Dreher admits that it's all over, trust me boys, it's all over.

But that is not the entire story of Fuentes' rolling cataclysmic wave. The Catholic Trads and other general Catholic apologists have all been falling over themselves to publicly proclaim the awful awful racism of Nick Fuentes. One of these is Dr Alan Harrelson, of whom I admit I am somewhat of a fan. Nevertheless, no matter Dr Harrelson's ability to be on target up to this point, in this case he has gone somewhat off the rails.

Dr Harrelson wrote a comment on Substack which he subsequently deleted. (In fact, it seems that he deleted his substack account as well). However, the comment is still up on his Youtube channel which is where I will quote the first half of it, (for posterity, you see.)

> Conservatives are absolutely right in their efforts to marginalize Nicholas Fuentes. I've refrained of talking further about this issue because I can't tolerate the ill mannered behavior of his followers. The conservative movement is right to reject Fuentes, for at least three reasons. First, he is capitalizing on a very real economic problem among young Americans without offering sensible solutions that promote the widespread distribution of private property, the key to genuine liberty. Second, he employs Christianity as a guise to offer transcendent authority for his goals for a white majority America. There is only one human race. There is nothing within the Christian faith or the founding documents of the United States that suggests America must be majority white.

Firstly regarding the economic claim, I am not very familiar at all with Fuentes, and I may be mistaken on this, but I do recollect that he is on the side of making usury illegal. And if that is the case, a big hat tip to him, well done, old bean.

But it's the racial bit of the quote that I'm interested in, surprise, surprise. So let's start with the claim that there is nothing in the founding documents of the United States that suggests America must be majority white. Now, I'm Australian, I never studied American history, whereas Dr Harrelson did his PhD on it if I'm not mistaken. But even I've heard of the 1790 Nationalization Act. You know, the one that states that the only people who can become citizens of the USA were free white men of good character. (By the way, notice the word 'free' in there. Yes, white people were kept as slaves in the USA, also known as indentured servants.)

Anyhoo, it doesn't stop there. Dr Harrelson's comment caused me pain, it caused me great pain, sah. So I dig some digging, and I came up with some stuff, aren't I clever? (Okay, the good men at *The Journal of American Reform* came up with the stuff but if I can find this out surely a man of letters such as Dr Harrelson should have no trouble at all).

> In 1857, the first Catholic Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Roger B. Taney, ruled that negroes, free or enslaved, could not be considered citizens of the United States and therefore did not have the right to sue in federal court …
>
> … It is also important to highlight that the majority opinion, authored by Chief Justice Taney, was deeply concerned—as it should have been—with the intention of the framers of the constitution. The intention of the legislator, or legislature as a moral body, is the *only authentic* rule by which to interpret and implement law. Common sense confirms the same, and it is why the decision in 1857 was correct, notwithstanding the discomfort it brings anti-racists and liberals.

But it is doesn't end there. Look how based Americans were just a century ago:

> In a famous Supreme Court ruling in 1923, "United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind", the highest court in America ruled that the plaintiff, Bhagat Singh Thind, could not become a naturalized U.S. citizen because, as a Punjabi Sikh, he was not a "white person". White, as had always been understood, was a racial identification exclusive to those of *European ancestry* which found its basis in lineage and blood, not merely the color of a man's skin.

There is more but I will leave it there. Much like Australia's *White Australia Policy*, which stood in place until the dark year of 1973, (and was repealed by the minister of immigration at the time who was born in Italy, the lesson being to never let foreigners get their hands on the levers of power), the United States also has a clear and unmistakable history of seeking to guarantee its future wealth for its posterity.

But the part that really interests me is Dr Harrelson's statement that there is nothing in the Christian faith to support the claim that America must be majority white. Nothing. Not one thing. That's a big claim, that's a very high bar. He's not the only one pushing this line. Many Catholics have been doing it for a very long time. Without a doubt it is one of the fruits of Vatican II and you are a very bad person, a very bad racist person indeed if you dare to contradict it, as Nick Fuentes has done. So let's see, shall we? Remember, there is *nothing* to support this claim, so I only need just *one* bit of juicy evidence goodness.

Once again from the good men at the *Journal of American Reform*. In the link they talk about an interview between Kennedy Hall and Tim Flanders, also inspired as a response to Nick Fuentes:

> This is because, as will be outlined by Pope Pius XI, the program of Catholicism is that her universality does not come at the expense of particularity, far from it, rather it *perfects* the natural distinctions and groupings of men. It is a central doctrine of our religion that grace *always* builds upon nature, and there is a *healthy* racism, not only for Black and Asian races, but also for White races, whether they be American, British, Australian or Canadian. Recall that the same Pope, only one year before, had officially taught in his encyclical letter, *Mit Brennender Sorge* (MBS), no. 8, that race was a "fundamental value of the human community", which plays a "necessary and honorable role" in human affairs. The Holy Father, contrasting the Catholic view against certain German racial excesses—that is, taking a good thing too far, raising it above a "standard level" to an "idolatrous level"—spoke plainly about this "healthy racism".

This is what Pope Pius XI write in 1938 on the subject of racism:

> This is the Church's response: this is what the Church considers *true*, proper, healthy racism [ecco che cosa è per la Chiesa il vero, il proprio, il sano razzismo] worthy of individual men in their great collectivity. All in the same way: all the object of the same maternal affection, all called to the same light of truth, of good, of Christian charity; to be all in their own country, in the particular nationalities of each, in their particular race, the propagators of this idea so great and magnificently maternal, human, even before being Christian.

Well, I only needed one but there are a bunch more, many many more. This all stems of course, from the rotten French Revolution, with its godless claims of liberty, equality and fraternity and its invention of the demonic concept of "human rights".

Here is Archbishop Conrad Gröber writing in 1937:

> Since every nation bears the responsibility for its own happy existence and the taking in of completely foreign blood for a historically proven nationality always means a risk, no nation may be denied the right to preserve its previous racial status undisturbed and to provide safeguards for this purpose. The Christian religion only requires that the means employed do not violate moral precepts and natural justice.

In the bible, neighbor refers to a person of your own nation or tribe. When we are urged to love our enemies this means that we want the best for them. In the case of the Muslim siege of Malta, the best for the Muslims was to have their heads cut off and catapulted over the walls like bowling balls as a horrifying example to their compatriots.

Christianity propels us to love and judge every person on the earth as a human being personally created by God. By at a national level, far removed from the personal one, the rulers of nations have the grave responsibility to preserve their nations for their descendants. Modern so called "Trads" who eagerly ape many aspects of the traditional Church, somehow leave the responsibility of passing on a coherent nation to their progeny as being beneath them. Somehow it escapes them that if their own ancestors had possessed such an attitude then they would most certainly not enjoy the nation of their birth and might not even have been born in the first place.

Claiming that Christianity does not permit a nation to actively favor and retain its genetic identity is a scurrilous lie, an insult to all one's ancestors, an immense injustice to one's children and their descendants, and a complete and total act of self-annihilation. And all because these people are scared of being called a racist. Has the history of Christianity ever known such a preponderance of abject moral cowards and sniveling weaklings?

The unfortunate fact is that the majority of whites have been effectively propagandized and brainwashed into putting their own people last because of the Anglo-Saxon propensity to be generous to outsiders. In Australia it is known as giving someone a fair go, a fair go in spite of their race or creed. This racial trait of whites is particular dangerous and devastating to our people because of the tragic and mistaken assumption that the other races to whom we are so generous in our lands, and cities, and towns, and jobs will they themselves be just as generous to us if the situation changes and whites become a racial minority in their own homelands.

But there will be no such generosity on the part of the invaders. They will see us as a conquered people, beaten without a fight, and the reality will become very ugly indeed. But don't my word for it, just talk to any South Africans or Rhodesians, or Haitians for that matter. Oh sorry, the Haitians are all dead.

This has been a long essay but I feel it is worth it, and I hope you have read this far. The pejorative racist must hold no fear for you anymore. It is a spell that needs to be broken, and it must be broken fast. Do not continue to be King Theoden trapped by the demented whispering of Wormtongue. If putting our own people first is racist then racist we must be. But for now I hope that you take at least some measure of comfort in the fact that our forefathers were much better learned than we are today. They knew the right of it. Let their words inspire us to great deeds for the sake of our children.

8 Likes

8 Share

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment…

Top Latest Discussions

Why I am a Sede
Cur Sede sum
NOV 17 • ADAM PIGGOTT

How to Drink Like an Italian
A guide to drinking in Italy
NOV 20 • ADAM PIGGOTT

Devotional versus Transactional Relationships
Relationes Devotionales contra Transactiones
NOV 22 • ADAM PIGGOTT

See all

© 2025 Adam Piggott · Privacy · Terms · Collection notice

Start your Substack Get the app

Substack is the home for great culture

Clear Devotional versus Transactional Relat… Last