

The Redhead/Blondhead Survivalist Guide

“Red hair is a National Treasure; it should be valued and celebrated.” – Charlotte Rushton

Introduction

The purpose of this handbook is to introduce the concept of conservation and to establish fundamental principles that assist local organizers in building redhead/blondhead communities and networks. This handbook has been adopted in agreement by redheads and blondheads alike: 1) to spread awareness of the demographic and social problems faced by the redhead/blondhead community; 2) to promote the preservation, sustainability, and growth of the redhead/blondhead population in each community; 3) and to promote the heritage, pride, quality of life, and the networking of redhead/blondhead individuals. From this point on, fair hair will be used synonymously for red and blonde hair.

Who are Fair Haired People?

When the subject of red hair or blonde hair arises, most people envision a person of European or “white” decent. This is because white fair haired people are the most famous and popular. The Western media often broadcasts images of fair haired people across the world. The white fair haired population is overwhelmingly the largest portion of fair haired people in the world (over 90%), but there are also other fair haired populations in the world such as the Melanesians in South East Asia. The fair hair of Melanesians is a result of a different genetic mutation which determines hair color than that of whites. Fair hair in whites is due to a genetic mutation on the MC1R gene, whereas for Melanesians, their fair hair is a result of a genetic mutation on the TYRP1 gene. Fair hair in Melanesia evolved independently from fair hair in Europe.

Since the vast majority of fair haired people are of white European descent, the target audience of this handbook is for the white fair haired audience. This handbook is primarily concerned with, and designed for, the preservation and sustainability of the white fair haired archetype. Fair haired populations of other races or ethnicities are responsible for their own challenges and preservation if such a physical trait is deemed worthy of value in those communities. This handbook assumes that fair hair is a worthy cause to preserve and protect as all biological and human diversity should be a worthy and valuable cause.

The Genetics of Fair Hair

An overwhelming majority of people on the planet have the same hair color and eye color: black hair and brown eyes. Approximately 45% of the European population has black hair. The remaining 55% of European people have a shade of either brown, blond, or red. This high percentage of people with light hair color is exclusively found in Europe and among populations of European ancestry. In this section we will discuss the genetics of fair hair.

Hair Color

There are two types of pigments that give hair its color: eumelanin and pheomelanin. Pheomelanin colors hair orange and yellow. Orange-yellow pheomelanin occurs in red hair. All humans have some pheomelanin in their hair. Eumelanin determines the darkness of hair color. Eumelanin has two subtypes: black and brown. A large amount of brown eumelanin will color the hair brown, and a small amount of brown eumelanin will result in blonde hair. A large amount of black eumelanin will result in black hair, and a small amount of black eumelanin will result in grey hair. Hair color is determined by the relative amounts of the two pigments eumelanin and pheomelanin. Black-brown eumelanin predominates in black and brown hair. Blond hair contains low levels of both eumelanin and pheomelanin pigments. Hair color is a mixture of how much eumelanin and pheomelanin is in your hair. For example, strawberry blonde has a little of each, auburn has more eumelanin and pheomelanin, and a redhead has very little eumelanin and lots of pheomelanin. How does the body decide how much of these melanin's to put in your hair? Genes, of course. The amount of eumelanin in your hair is actually determined by a lot of genes. Humans usually end up with very little pheomelanin because of the product of a gene called MC1R. What MC1R lets happen is the conversion of pheomelanin into eumelanin which makes red hair pretty rare. When someone has both of their MC1R genes mutated, this conversion doesn't happen anymore and you get a buildup of pheomelanin, which results in red hair (as well as fair skin and freckles).

Hair color in general is really complicated and poorly understood with the exception of red hair. Many cases of red hair can be explained by the simple dominant-recessive model described below. The genetics of human hair color are not firmly established, but some researchers have suggested that at least two genes determine whether a person of European descent will have brown, blond, or red hair. Fair hair occurs in people with two copies of a recessive gene on chromosome 16 which causes a mutation on the MC1R protein. Gray hair is due to the fact that the human body produces less black melanin as the body ages. White hair is a matter of no melanin production at all in the hair. People with albinism have white hair due to low amounts of melanin.

Aging is another factor that affects hair color. Children born with fair hair may find that it gradually darkens as they get older. This is due to an increase in melanin production as the body matures with the onset of puberty, but in later years as the body ages, the body will produce less melanin and therefore will contribute to greying hair. This is called achromotrichia. More than 60% of seniors have gray hair.

Theories of Inheritance

A theory of inheritance in biology explains how characteristics or traits from one generation are derived from earlier generations. It involves the passing of traits from ancestors or parents down to their offspring. In humans, hair color and eye color are examples of inherited traits. These traits are determined by genes. When a person is born he or she inherits 23 chromosomes from each of their parents. Typically, humans have 46 chromosomes in every cell of their body. Every human inherits their chromosomes in pairs. Humans have a diploid genome that contains 22 autosomes (pairs of chromosomes) and one allosome (46 chromosomes in total). An allosome is your pair of sex chromosomes. Every person has two copies of every gene

in each autosome and allosome. One gene is contributed from your mother's chromosome and one gene is contributed from your father's chromosome. Although humans have two copies of every gene, each copy may take a different form. These different forms are called alleles. An allele is one of a number of alternative forms of the same gene. Different alleles can result in different observable phenotypic traits, such as hair color or eye color. If both copies of each gene are the same allele, they are considered to be homozygous. If the alleles are different, then the gene pair is considered to be heterozygous. Alleles can be classified as either dominant or recessive. Dominant means that one allele trumps the other. A dominant allele will be expressed when at least one allele of its type is present. A recessive allele will only be expressed when both alleles are of the same type. For example with eye color, the brown allele is dominant over the blue allele. A person will exhibit brown eyes if both alleles are brown or if one allele is brown and the other allele is blue. A person will exhibit blue eyes only if both alleles are blue. The brown version of the gene makes a pigment that turns your eye brown but the blue version does not make a blue pigment. Instead, it makes no pigment and an eye without pigment is blue.

If a trait tends to be directly passed down from one generation to another, then the odds are pretty good that the trait is a dominant one. If a trait skips generations or seems to pop out of nowhere, then the odds are pretty good that the trait is recessive. Genes that are present in the body but do not always get expressed are called recessive genes. The term "expression" here refers to the observance of the gene within the person's phenotype. The gene for blue eyes is recessive because it may not get expressed in the person's observable characteristics. People who have genes that are recessive which do not get expressed are called carriers. Parents who do not express the trait of blue eyes, who have brown eyes, can still have a blue eyed child if they are both carriers of the recessive blue eyed gene. Carriers who do not express the given trait outwardly are called heterozygotes. Both parents must at least be carriers of the recessive trait in order for their child to express the trait. A carrier is said to have the gene but has no physical symptoms of the trait. A child can only express a recessive trait if both parents are carriers of recessive genes.

In many families, a recessive gene or trait can be passed on through generations without ever being known. How genes get passed down is totally random; it's like flipping a coin. Just like it is possible to get three heads in a row when you flip a coin, it is also possible to pass the same gene version three times in a row. In other words, it is possible for heterozygous carrier parents to have all blue eyed kids. It is also possible for heterozygous carrier parents to have children who do not express the given trait but become carriers. Lastly, it is even possible for heterozygous carrier parents to have children that become homozygous dominant. This is because traits are passed down randomly. Such parents may not even pass down their recessive genes to their children; although such a scenario is highly unlikely. These children would no longer be carriers of recessive genes.

If a child's phenotype ends up as a blend of the traits of the two parents', then the gene isn't dominant or recessive, it is called incomplete dominance. If the blue version of the eye color gene made a pigment, then you'd get some mix of brown and blue. Other examples of incomplete dominance include skin color and hair form. There are two "hair type" genes, curly and straight. If you have two copies of the curly version, you will have curly hair, and if you have two copies of the straight version of hair, you will have straight hair. What kind of hair do you

have if you have a copy of each? Kinky hair. Each of these versions contributes something so that you get a mixture of the two.

To clarify how the process of inheritance works with all of these terms which we have just discussed, let's build a simple model called a Punnett Square. Inheritance theories allow scientists to predict the expression of traits based on mathematical probabilities. One simple model used to explain and predict patterns of inheritance in family lines is a Punnett Square. A Punnett Square is a diagrammed table used to determine every possible combination of one maternal allele with one paternal allele for each trait being studied. A Punnett Square aids plant and animal breeders in developing varieties that have desirable qualities. A Punnett Square is a visual representation of Mendelian inheritance. A Punnett Square table gives the correct probability and outcomes of parental genotypes in their offspring when the parents cross or mate together. It assumes that inheriting copies of each parental allele is independent. One of the simplest examples used in a Punnett Square is called a monohybrid cross which can be used with hair color or eye color.

As described above, every person has two copies of every gene in each autosome and allosome. Although humans have two copies of every gene, each copy may take a different form. These different forms are called alleles. If both copies of each gene are the same allele, they are considered to be homozygous. If the alleles are different, then the gene pair is considered to be heterozygous. Alleles can be classified as either recessive or dominant. Now let's examine the outcome of a child's phenotype and genotype. Suppose there are only two types of alleles for hair color: black and red. If both parents have a phenotype of black hair and a genotype of homozygous dominant black alleles, then their child's phenotype will be of black hair and his genotype will be of homozygous dominant black alleles. These parents are non-carrier for recessive red alleles. They do not carry the recessive gene for red hair and therefore it is impossible for them to have a redheaded child. If both parents have a phenotype of red hair and a genotype of homozygous recessive red alleles, then their child's phenotype will be of red hair and his genotype will be of homozygous recessive red alleles. If both parents who are carriers have a phenotype of black hair and a genotype of heterozygous alleles (one dominant black and one recessive red), then their child's phenotype will be undetermined and his genotype could have multiple outcomes. To find out these outcomes and their probabilities we can use a Punnett Square.

Punnett Square Table	Father (Br)	
Mother (Br)	B	r
B	BB	Br
r	Br	rr

In this square (B) stands for the black hair allele and the uppercase stands for a dominant allele; (r) stands for the red hair allele and the lower case stands for a recessive allele. This table gives the genotypic outcomes for a child's alleles whose parents have black hair and have heterozygous alleles and are carriers of recessive red hair genes. This table demonstrates how two black haired parents can give birth to a redheaded child. This square demonstrates that there is only a 1 in 4 chance of producing a redheaded child, as indicated by the (rr) in the far

bottom right corner. It is important to realize that if you have four kids, this doesn't mean that one will be a redhead for sure. It doesn't matter what came before, each child has a 25% chance of becoming a red head. The (BB) and (Bb) allele combinations indicate black hair. There is a 75% chance for this outcome.

The theory of Mendelian inheritance can also explain how two brown haired parents can produce a blond haired child. Suppose that two heterozygous parents have a dominant brown allele and a recessive blonde allele. A child with a brown allele will have brown hair; a child with no brown alleles will be blond. Only with two blond alleles will a child have blond hair.

Hair and Eye color “linkage”

It is an observable fact that there is a correlation between red hair and green eyes and blond hair and blue eyes. Many scientists believe that traits like blonde hair and blue eyes evolved together in isolated populations; as well as for red hair and green eyes. The genes for red hair and green eyes seem to have arisen in the ancient Celtic populations of the British Isles, and blond hair and blue eyes likely arose in northern Europe. The traits that arose in these small populations tend to be transmitted together because they are closely linked on their respective chromosomes. The genes for eye and hair color tend to be linked. When alleles are transmitted together more often than 50% of the time, it usually means that they are on the same chromosome, and when alleles are transmitted together much higher than 50% of the time, it usually means that they are very close to each other on that chromosome. Because these genes are close together on the same chromosome, they tend to be inherited together.

Dial Theory

The two-gene model above does not account for all possible shades of brown, blond, or red hair, nor does it explain why hair color sometimes darkens as a person ages. Several gene pairs control the lightness versus the darkness of hair color in a cumulative effect. A person's genotype for a multifactorial trait can interact with the environment to produce varying phenotypes. The amount of eumelanin and pheomelanin in a person's hair is determined by lots of genes. Eumelanin and pheomelanin genes work in an additive way instead of in a dominant and recessive way. In other words, the more eumelanin genes that are on, the darker your hair will be. Let's imagine (although the real case is probably more complicated) that there are two possibilities for each of these pigments, based on the amount produced of each. Suppose that a person's genes can produce either a high amount of eumelanin or a low amount of eumelanin. Suppose that a person's genes can also produce either a high amount of pheomelanin or a low amount of pheomelanin. As we stated earlier, the amount of eumelanin and pheomelanin in a person's hair is determined by a lot of genes, and genes get passed down randomly. In this example let's represent “on” eumelanin genes with a capital (E), “off” eumelanin genes by a lowercase (e), and pheomelanin genes with a capital (P). We assume that pheomelanin genes are always “on.” Now let's assume that a person inherits a total of 8 genes that determine hair color, and the more of the same allele of a gene one inherits, either eumelanin or pheomelanin, then the more a particular color one's hair will be. In other words, the more of the same allele of a gene one inherits (either eumelanin or pheomelanin) the more eumelanin or pheomelanin is produced.

Using these assumptions, someone with very black hair may have inherited a genotype of EEEEEEEe, and a blondheaded person may have inherited a genotype of Eeeeeeee. A redheaded person may have inherited a genotype of EPPPPPPP, and a brownheaded person may have inherited a genotype of EEEEEPe. In this example a blackheaded person and a blondheaded person does not inherit any pheomelanin genes; only redheaded and brownheaded people inherit pheomelanin genes. In this example eumelanin and pheomelanin genes add up to give hair color. In this example hair color is determined by the amount of genes for, and the production of, either eumelanin or pheomelanin. One could think of the ideas of dominance and recessive as the relative amount of eumelanin or pheomelanin produced. Dominant and recessive doesn't explain everything in genetics. Other examples that do not include dominant and recessive genes are blood type and curly and straight hair.

Demographic Facts

A relatively high frequency of red hair, blonde hair, and hued eyes, is found across Northern Europe. Red hair is commonly found around the North Sea, and blonde hair is typically found around the Baltic Sea. Hued eyes are found all across Northern Europe.

The estimates of people having fair hair vary, depending on the distinction between fair hair and brown hair (another hair color that is common in people of white European decent). Measuring fair hair is not as strait forward as one might think because the boundaries between hair colors are fuzzy. The change from one color to the next is on a continuum similar to that of a light spectrum. In addition, hair color and skin color depend upon the production of melanin. White Europeans produce a lot less melanin than do other races. Aging is another factor that affects hair color.

The above considerations are based only on those people who actually express fair hair traits. Another factor we should consider when calculating the fair haired population is the estimates of carriers; those with recessive or "non-expressed" fair haired genes. Many people are carriers of the recessive genes that cause fair hair, but do not visibly "express" the physical traits of fair hair. We discussed this phenomenon earlier in the genetics section.

As of January 2014, the world population is 7.2 billion. Wikipedia and other sources report that the redhead population makes up about 0.8% (58 million) of the World's population and the blondhead population accounts for approximately 2% (144 million) of the World's population. The brownhead population is approximately 4% (288 million) of the World's population, and another 2% (144 million) of people with black hair, who are non-expressive carriers of fair hair, makes up the total population of people with recessive fair hair genes. Together they make up ~8.8% (634 million) of the World's population.

If the "white" population can be estimated to be approximately 17% (1.2 billion) in 2014, then the redhead population is equivalent to ~4-5% of the white population, and the blondhead population is equivalent to ~10-12% of the white population. Together they make up approximately ~16% of the total white population. The brownhead population can be estimated at about 24% of the white population and the black haired population can be estimated at about 60% of the total white population. Approximately 60% of the "white" population has black hair. The remaining 40% of the white population has a shade of either brown, blond, or red. Of the people who are white and have black hair, approximately 10-12% of this population (~2% of the World population) is heterozygous for fair hair. In other words,

they are carriers of the recessive genes that cause fair hair. This explains why parents with black hair can have children with fair hair. Obviously, the only way to know for sure if people with black hair are carriers or not is to be genetically tested. A rule of thumb that could be used is to know a person's recent ancestry. If a person with black hair came from Northern Europe, his chances of being a carrier is likely high. The remaining ~50% of the white population have black hair and are not carriers for the recessive fair haired genes. (The estimates in this section are the author's calculations. The white population is a liberal figure including the regions of North America, Central America, South America, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, North Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and the "Stan" countries)

According to the IrelandsDNA Company, only 10% of Ireland's population has red hair, but it appears that a staggering 46% are carriers of the redhead variants. For England, the estimate for carriers is only 6%, but this is highly provisional and there are no current figures available for the number of carriers. IrelandsDNA aims to investigate Irish red hair. The largest redheaded population in the world is in the USA, where between 6 million and 18 million have it, and very many more carry the variants. IrelandsDNA aims to establish exactly how many white people carry the variants.

These figures for fair hair are based on rough estimates. These estimates depend on the visible "expression" of fair hair. As we pointed out earlier, the effects of aging can change a person's hair color, also the environment, such as the exposure to sunlight, can affect a person's hair color. These factors complicate the calculation process of the fair haired population. The following are some maps of the fair haired population and related physical traits associated with fair hair:

Red hair: <http://jamesmcinerney.ie/2013/07/the-distribution-of-red-hair-in-europe/>

Blonde hair: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Light_hair_coloration_map.png

Blue eyes: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Light_Eyes_Map.png

Pigmentation: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Map_pigmentation_in_Europe.png

Demographic Challenges

The fair haired population is facing demographic challenges that threaten to reduce their population size in the future. The fair haired population (as with whites in a wider context) is forecasted to decline in both absolute and in percentage terms. Demographic treats to the fair haired population arises primarily on three fronts: the death of the baby boomers, a decline in the fertility rate, and miscegenation. Now let's discuss each of these issues independently.

A baby boomer is a person who was born during a demographic surge that occurred between the years 1944 to 1966, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. This population represents a cohort that is significant on account of its size alone. Almost from the time they were conceived, boomers were dissected, analyzed, and solicited by modern marketers, who reinforced a sense of generational distinctiveness, identifying the large number of babies as an economic boom. The baby boomers make up ~23% of the U.S. population and people over the age 65 make up 13% of the U.S. population (2010). The baby boomer percentage is even higher in Europe: approximately ~27% of the European population and people over the age 65 is approximately 17% of the European population. By 2030, when the first baby boomers reach age 84, the number of people over age 65 will be more than 20% of the U.S. population. More than 35% of the population will be age 50 or older. The baby boomer die off will accelerate

around 2030, and the majority of baby boomers will be dead by 2050. As these “white” baby boomers pass away, a large chunk of the fair haired population can be expected to pass away with them. Therefore, an absolute decline in the fair haired population can be forecasted.

The second important threat facing the fair haired population is that of a decline in the fertility rate. The total fertility replacement rate (TFRR), is a figure for the average number of children that would need to be born per woman to maintain a given population number and assuming that all people live to the end of their life expectancy. This figure is calculated based on life expectancy in developed countries such as the U.S. and Europe. The total fertility rate is a more direct measure of the level of fertility than the crude birth rate, since it considers people’s expected life span. This figure indicates the potential for population change in the country. A rate of 2.1 children per woman is considered the replacement rate for a population resulting in relative stability in terms of total numbers. Rates above two children indicate populations growing in size and whose median age is declining. Rates below two children indicate populations decreasing in size and growing older. “Global fertility rates are in general decline and this trend is most pronounced in developed countries, especially Western Europe, where populations are projected to decline dramatically over the next 50 years” – CIA World Factbook. The U.S. and Europe have an average TFRR of 1.7. A TFRR below the replacement level over a sustained amount of time could have dire consequences. The implication of this figure would result, if taken to the extreme, in the complete extinction or dying out of a population on its own, without any external or environmental factors contributing to their passing. If all humans were under the same conditions, then theoretically the human race could die out on its own.

Females play an important role in the maintenance of a given population size. The TFRR is based on the assumption that women will have an average of exactly one daughter over their lifetimes. In other words, women will have just enough female babies to replace themselves. If there is no mortality of reproductive age females until the end of childbearing, then the TFRR will be very close to 2.1. This figure is higher than the exact replacement rate of 2.0 because it is a natural phenomenon and preference of couples that result in slightly more males born over females in human populations. When the TFRR is below replacement levels, women are not reproducing themselves at a sustainable rate and the pool of reproductive age females shrinks, resulting in a “surplus” of males until age 50. If the fertility rate remains constant, the shrinking pool of females triggers a downward spiral of population decline. Therefore, it is imperative for a sustainable population to have a growing cohort of reproductive age females.

Higher TFRR rates are required in developing third world countries because many of these countries have high mortality rates due to a host of issues. Developing third world country TFRR’s can range from 2.5 to as high as 6.3. Globally the average TFRR is 2.4 children per woman. At this rate, global population growth will tend toward zero.

Some of the factors that contribute to a TFRR below replacement level in developed countries include:

- The economic-demographic paradox
- Women’s reproductive rights, including abortion
- Reproductive technology including, contraception and the birth control pill
- Women in the workforce
- Fear of unwanted children

- Women pursuing college educations
- Postponement of having children until later years when career and education is established
- Inadequate financial and community support
- Lesbianism
- Self-centered lifestyles promoted in the Media
- Rejection of religious or Christian family values
- Sex viewed as an end itself, rather than a means of procreation
- Overall culture promotes the unimportance of children
- A liberal culture promotes the idea of a single and materialistic lifestyle with no room for children
- The stereotype of a welfare queen
- Changing attitudes about sex and relationships
- Low marriage rate and increased co-habitation
- The fair haired population will decline in both absolute and in percentage terms

Now let's discuss the final factor that will contribute to a decline in the fair haired population. Miscegenation is the practice of marriage, sexual relations, and procreation between people of different races. Many developed countries of the Western world have embarked on a set of neo-liberal globalization policies that are bringing foreign peoples from distant parts of the world in contact with "white" populations mainly through trade and immigration policy. North America has seen massive increases of immigration from Central America, South America, and Asia. Europe has also received immigrants on a large scale from the Middle East and Asia. A majority of immigrants are "surplus males" from third world countries. This new immigration policy combined with already established civil rights policies such as desegregation policies, assimilation policies, integration policies, diversity policies, social bridging policies, and multicultural policies, are designed to create the best outcome for a new and progressive melting pot society. These policies were first adopted and "proven" in the country of Brazil to create a unique country of mixed-race people. How does a country which has a single homogeneous population transform its population into a mixed race population? In other words, how can government policy affect how you choose your friends or even your marriage partners?

A well-known fact in sociology is that one of the major predictors for friendship and marriage is proximity. Most people choose friends and mates who live and work nearby or in their communities. Although, the media and the internet are slightly impacting this truth, the fact remains that the vast majority of people still find friends and marriage partners who are in similar social circles. These "social circles" are where government policy seeks to make change. Government policy can affect people's lives at various levels of intrusiveness. With the arrival of new immigrants the government seeks to diversify the native people's public spaces (usually government institutions), business and work spaces, living spaces (such as housing policies), private spaces (rules for private organizations like churches), and personal spaces (an area that currently does not have any rules yet). This policy exists to integrate and assimilate foreign ethnic and national groups to become more Americanized. Actually this policy does not have to be so intrusive as to reach into people's personal space to achieve its goals, because where do most people form friendships and marriage bonds at? The answer is in their work places, neighborhoods, and in their social and private clubs. Therefore, all that the government needs

to do to influence your personal choices and social circles is to forcefully diversify these areas of contact with the new citizens of different ethnicities and nationalities. With this diversification of your social circle, it is inevitable that your choices for friendship or marriage will include minorities and immigrants. If not this generation, then it will certainly become a factor for future generations. This is because the government keeps increasing the rate of immigration each year. Eventually, as the government increases the rate of immigration, the native population will diminish into a tiny minority and a native person's social circle will gradually become filled with non-native peoples. The result can be illustrated by envisioning a jar filled with jelly beans. Imagine a jelly bean jar that has only 10% white jelly beans (representing native individuals) and 90% brown and black jelly beans. Now shake the jar up, and you will notice that the white jelly beans are evenly distributed throughout the jar, without any white jelly beans in close proximity to one another and with each white jelly bean surrounded by brown and black jelly beans. In such a situation, unless the native person is completely anti-social, the native person will inevitably form friendships and marriage partners with immigrant people. Obviously, without a way for these white jelly beans to network, their choice of marriage or mating partner will, with a high probability, be with an immigrant non-white jelly bean. This also means that they will likely have children with these non-white jelly beans who will obviously be children that are non-white. This has the further effect on the overall decline of white jelly beans in the jar. In the next generation white jelly beans will be even less than 10%.

The government can change societal relationships through civil rights laws, equal opportunity laws, employment laws, housing discrimination laws, education quotas, affirmative action, access to credit laws, threats of law suits, and fostering attitudes against racism or xenophobia, and the demand for equality and minority rights. In addition the government promotes the idea of tolerance and the acceptance of diversity. Another policy that the government has in its arsenal is that of minority influence. This policy seeks to aid minorities and immigrants to prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, immigrants will be on equal footing with natives and will be able to intermarry with them. The policy of minority influence is also associated with government assimilation policy, the goal of which is to make both the native group and the immigrant group to become culturally similar. This policy is mainly applied through the media which promotes minority or immigrant groups as cool, fashionable, and trendy. Such an example, in the U.S., is that of "wiggers." Wiggers are white native people who have adopted the "ghetto" lifestyle which includes speaking Ebonics, listening to gangster rap music, hip-hop culture and clothes, and even "gang banging." The result is that the minority group and native group share a common culture and become assimilated together which helps the two groups become familiar with each other, seem less strange, and more trusting. It is hoped that these two groups will form bonds to make society more unified.

In the U.S., this policy is becoming quite effective as interracial relationships and mixed race babies are considerably on the rise. This can be verified in any kindergarten in California and the U.S. southeast. These results have consequences that feedback into the low fertility rate problem we discussed earlier. The white fertility rate is based on how many children a white woman has. It does not consider the race of the child being born. Since many of these women are having mixed race children, the *actual* replacement fertility rate for the white population is

lower than reported. The reason for the forecasted decline in the white fair haired population is twofold. One is the fact that many of the new immigrants that are arriving are not carriers of recessive genes and therefore cannot have children with fair hair, although their children will become carriers if they procreate with a carrier. Second, an interracial union between a black person and a white person will produce offspring that will not be white but will be brown or a lighter shade of black. Therefore, we may see a new and growing population of mixed race and fair haired people. But this is highly unlikely as we discussed in the mechanics of fair hair in the genetics section.

Lastly, the World population of whites is expected to fall from 16.5% to 9.5% between 2010 and 2060. Immigration is an irreversible policy, and third world immigration is expected to continue into the foreseeable future. With this fact, white people are expected to become minorities in their own countries. (BTW did any government authorities ask their citizenship if they would like to become minorities in their own countries?). Fair haired people are already minorities in their own countries and will become an even greater minority and an infrequent sight in the future. The percentage of fair haired people in each country will decline.

The Extinction Hoax

The “extinction hoax” is a popular news story that is promoted in reputable magazines and newspapers which seems to cycle every few years. The story is portrayed as both serious and alarmist. The articles purport that fair hair is likely to die out in the near future. The articles reported the story as fact in the media such as the BBC, the Sunday Times, National Geographic, and the Courier-Mail. Claims that fair hair will disappear have been made in the media since 1865. According to the reports, the World Health Organization and other genetic scientists conducted a study and concluded that the last natural blond is likely to be born in Finland during 2202.

The reports about the WHO study were a hoax, since neither the WHO nor any reputable expert had conducted such a study. Those who commented on this alleged report were asked by the WHO to retract their articles. Other blogs and news sources ran similar stories that attributed the research to the magazine “National Geographic” or the “Oxford Hair Foundation”. However, a “HowStuffWorks.com” article says that the foundation was funded by hair-dye maker Procter & Gamble, and that other experts had dismissed the research as either lacking in evidence or simply bogus. The National Geographic article in fact states “while the fair haired population may decline, the potential for fair hair isn't going away. Fair hair is caused by a relatively rare recessive gene, the expression of which can skip generations. It is not likely to disappear at any time in the foreseeable future.”

In regards to the validity of the claims the articles make, whether a hoax or not, it is important to make a distinction between a fair haired individual and the recessive genes that cause fair hair. But first we must consider which fair haired people the article was referring to. Most likely the article was referring to “white European” fair haired people. There are other, albeit small and insignificant, populations of fair haired people of in the world.

Most experts agree that neither scenario the extinction of people with fair hair, nor the extinction of fair haired genes, is a likely outcome. The only possible way for fair haired genes to disappear completely would be due to some freak disaster that only killed people with fair haired genes; if fair haired genes go extinct, then so do fair haired people. As for the

disappearance of white fair haired people, this is a more likely scenario than the disappearance of fair haired genes. Remember that recessive genes are genes that some people carry but are not expressed in the individual. It is possible, in theory, for visible fair haired people to go extinct. We can prove this with a simple thought experiment. If we drop off the last white person with fair hair in the middle of Africa, his genes will get dispersed into the black African population, but a white fair haired person will likely never be seen alive again. His fair haired genes will not go extinct because they would be carried by people in the African population. The likelihood of a black African couple giving birth to a white fair haired baby is nearly impossible. Since the black African population is over one billion, the chances of two people carrying his fair haired genes meeting and producing a fair haired child is extremely unlikely. And lastly, because black Africans produce high amounts of melanin, even if two black Africans met with recessive fair haired genes, it is extremely unlikely that the child's hair would result in fair hair.

While the fair haired population won't go extinct 100%, they are forecasted to have a sharp decline in their population. How infrequent fair hair appears, how fast its decline, and for how long it will decline depends on many variables. Such a forecast can only be determined by professional demographers. As with the weather, things can change rather quickly in the opposite direction, and forecasts can turn out to be wrong. But such a warning of decline should not be taken lightly, as with anything that has value it should be protected.

Demographic Solutions

Probably the most fundamental goal in combating the demographic challenges which the fair haired population faces is to raise the fertility rate of fair haired people above or at least up to a sustainable rate. This alone is not adequate to increase the fair haired population because the goal is to have fair haired children. Therefore, the solution requires that there be an increase in the fair haired fertility rate of women and, in addition, it requires the procreation with fair haired men. This latter requirement should be a guide because the combination of both a fair haired mother and a fair haired father has the highest probability of success in producing a fair haired child. The solution therefore is twofold: 1) bring together both male and female fair haired singles, 2) encourage procreation between these groups.

The following are some strategies that could be employed to achieve the two goals above:

- 1) Organize locally. Organize fair haired networking groups both online and in person with an informal agenda of match making.
- 2) Make the fair haired population a closed breeding group. Convince every fair haired woman you know to have only fair haired children. In other words, discourage interracial relationships.
- 3) Work around the sea of non-fair haired people the best you can.
- 4) Grow the fair haired/blue eyed population significantly.
- 5) Encourage those who do have children to prefer females over males, since they are the most valuable and to keep the sex ratio equal between boys and girls.
- 6) Teach the importance of fair hair and its heritage.
- 7) Teach the value of procreation.
- 8) Implement efforts to increase the fair haired population size, such as baby contests, a culture of procreation, or even financial incentives if possible. One model of a successful national effort

to reverse population decline was the Nazi Lebensborn program (although this topic maybe a taboo subject).

9) Organize a political activist group and foundation in order to lobby national and international governments for protected status and to ensure the freedom of assembly rights, and some autonomy from state interference. Self-determination is the right of any group with a legitimate purpose through their own sovereignty to freely pursue their own interests without external compulsion or interference which might occur from the state. The principle does not determine whether the outcome is independence, federation, protection, or some form of autonomy. The Welsh people in the U.K. and Native American Indians are examples of groups who have some form of autonomy from the state. The Welsh people have the freedom to teach their language and history in the public schools of Wales.

10) If a fair haired population grows large enough, the group may literally want to start its own community. A template that could be followed is that of Orania in South Africa. Orania is a South African town located in the Northern Cape province. Orania is unique in that the population is entirely white and Afrikaans-speaking. The population is approximately 1,000 and is growing at 9% per year. The aim of the town is to create a stronghold for Afrikaans and the Afrikaner identity by keeping their language and culture alive. Anyone who defines themselves as an Afrikaner and identifies with Afrikaner ethnicity is welcome in Orania. All citizens are part owners in the municipality; they own land, and serve in the city council. In 2004 Orania introduced its own currency, the Ora. Seventy businesses are located in Orania.

11) Participate in International Conventions for fair haired people. Conventions and festivals are large gatherings of people who share a common interest. Roodharigendag (Redhead Days) is a Dutch summer festival that takes place each first weekend of September in the city of Breda, Netherlands. The two day festival is a gathering of 1,000+ people with natural red hair. Activities during the festival are lectures, workshops, and demonstrations which are aimed specifically at red haired people. The festival attracts attendance from 50 countries and is free due to sponsorship of the local government. The International Association of Blondes headquartered in Europe, organizes parades, competitions, Barbie exhibitions, and ballroom events. The Go Blonde Festival is a yearly event held in Latvia. Blonde women dressed in pink go on a parade in Riga to promote economic growth and to cheer people up. It also includes a Marilyn Monroe look-alike contests and a beauty pageant. The Blondicapped is a website that caters to blondes and sells novelty items.

Cultural Challenges

Prejudice is an unfavorable judgment toward a group or individual based on their personal characteristics or group membership. Gingerism is a form of prejudice in which red haired individuals are bullied or harassed. Usually, gingerism occurs during a person's youth at school, but it can also occur as an adult. For example, redheads are often referred to as "carrot tops" in a disparagingly way. Parents often use the phrase "I will beat you like a redheaded step-child" which implies that the child is a bastard and hated. Gingerism has been compared to racism. In May 2009, a British schoolboy committed suicide after being bullied for having red hair. This prejudice has been satirized on a number of TV shows. Schoolchildren have been attacked by fellow pupils who organized "kick a ginger day," which was inspired from an episode of South Park called "Ginger Kids." In September 2011, Cryos International, a sperm bank, announced

that it would no longer accept donations from redheaded men due to a low demand from women seeking artificial insemination.

At one point in the early period of Ancient Rome, blond hair was associated with prostitution. Respectable women only had black hair, never blonde. The blonde stereotype, which is a perception of blond haired women, portrays blondes as either attractive and desirable, such as the “trophy blonde,” or as genteel and unintelligent, such as the “dumb blonde.” Blonde women are perceived as getting by on their looks rather than on intelligence. People tend to presume that blonds are less serious minded and less intelligent than brunettes, as reflected in “blond jokes.” Blond jokes have been criticized as sexist because most jokes about blonds are about females. Blond jokes characterize blond women as ignorant, cluelessness, and promiscuous. Blonde women are reported to have “blonde moments,” in which they do not realize how provocative they dress, are clumsy, do not get jokes, can’t find her own country on a map, and twirls her hair while chewing gum and says “like” more than once in the same sentence.

Forty-nine states in the U.S. have passed anti-bullying laws for schools. The legislation addresses bullying and harassment in schools. A watchdog organization called Bully Police USA advocates for and reports on anti-bullying legislation. The State of New Jersey laws mandate that each school report each case of bullying, and the State will grade each school based on bullying standards, policies, and incidents. Bullies risk suspensions and expulsions if convicted of any type of bullying or minor teasing. To quote legal scholar Jonathan Turley “bullying is no more a natural part of schools than is parental abuse a natural part of growing up.” A UK woman recently won an award from a tribunal after being sexually harassed and received abuse because of her red hair. Various organizations provide resources and support to victims of bullying and harassment.

The fear of confirming derogatory stereotypes can cause emotional anxiety and hinder a person’s professional performance. In order to combat stereotypes, individuals from stigmatized groups should present themselves in ways that counteract the specific stereotype and prejudice associated with their group. Being a non-stereotypical role model helps to create a more positive image of your identity group. For example in the film *Legally Blonde*, Reese Witherspoon countered the “dumb blonde” stereotype by portraying a blonde as very intelligent but underachieving due to society’s low expectations of her.

Is Our Community Racist?

The answer to the above question depends on a person’s definition of racism. In general there are two types of racism: one based on supremacism and the other based on preservation. Most people regard supremacism as a negative and morally unjust form of racism which includes beliefs about the superiority of a certain race, bullying, dominance, and the deportation or the extermination of undesirables. Prejudice is also a component of supremacism. Prejudice involves unfavorable judgments toward people who are different because they are perceived as inferior. Xenophobia, the intolerance toward immigrants, is one example of prejudice. All people should learn how to handle prejudice and deal with it because prejudice will always be around in one form or another as long as there are differences between groups of people.

In regard to preservation, a positive form of racism, the morality of such a program depends upon the cultural values of the nation and the group that implements such a program. Preservation is considered by many groups around the world as their most important goal, for example, the Native Americans in the U.S., the Basques in Spain and France, the Welsh in the U.K., and the Tibetans in China. Preservation may include racial, cultural, national, ethnic, or religious heritage. Many animal species and even historical buildings and landmarks have legislation guarantying certain protections and sustainability. Racists who seek preservation advocate for a peaceful coexistence, segregation, and a separate but equal policy. Preservationists are not any different than any other group who act in their own self-interest; business owner's fight for the survival of their own firms and the protection of their profit, green activists seek the preservation of the environment, conservationists seek to preserve wildlife, the rich fight for tax cuts, religious groups seek special exemption from the government, LGBT activists fight for the right of equal marriage, and black organizations fought for civil rights.

The moral justification of a preservation program for human groups depends upon the power status of such a group. If a certain group has a high and powerful status, such as the wealthy class, their right to preservation may not be justified even though they are the minority group in society. For example, the English Whites in South Africa held enormous economic and political power over the vast majority of non-white citizens of the country. Most whites by birth were given positions of power and privilege. A program of preservation was used to maintain this system of power and privilege. This system of preservation was called Apartheid. The Apartheid system was eventually dissolved largely in part because it was deemed immoral and unjust. The Apartheid system in South Africa officially ended in 1991. Conversely, when a group of people, who have a low status and is considered to be disadvantaged, embark on a program of preservation it is more easily accepted and morally defensible. Such example is the case of Native American Indians in the U.S. The U.S. Native Americans have a significant amount of autonomy from the U.S. Federal Government. Native American tribes have their own sovereignty and control, which allows them to preserve and protect the integrity of their culture and people. For example, some Native American tribes have laws against miscegenation with white and black Americans to preserve their racial integrity. In addition, Native Americans schools can teach their own languages, versions of history, traditions, and religion to their children. This ensures the preservation of cultural heritage. Native American tribes have the right to discriminate on the basis of race and can determine who can and who cannot be tribal members.

A fair haired community should be based on the principle of preservation. The fair haired community does not have any special privileges of political power over the majority of people in any society. The organization of fair haired people is morally justifiable based on the fact that:

- they are a national treasure
- their heritage is valuable
- they have a right as a group to self-preservation and self-responsibility
- they are a minority and their population is dwindling
- they are an integral part of human diversity
- fair haired people contribute to the overall aesthetic and appearance of human diversity

- fair haired people have an intrinsic value in and of themselves that is worth preserving
- fair haired people do not impose any burdens or dangers on society or to themselves as a group
- It is not really necessary to consider the usefulness of fair haired people to society when justifying their preservation because the very presence of fair haired people in the long history of evolution is sufficient enough to warrant their preservation
- Fair haired people should be conserved simply because they exist. A long standing existence in nature is itself worthy to carry the unimpeachable right for continued existence
- Certain ethnicities are seeing drastic population decreases. These decreases are a result of human activity, such as globalization and immigration, and not because of natural processes. This decrease is occurring by the hand of a few national leaders and against the will of many of their citizens. There should now be an obligation to try and protect every race or ethnic group regardless of their benefits to society

All groups are equally important to the world's human diversity. Ethnic diversity enriches activities such as meeting new people and the study of a particular people. A fear of the fair haired community organizing on the basis of supremacy is unwarranted. Given that throughout history, and in modern times, fair haired people have often been victims of prejudice, such experience should give them a well-balanced approach to racism. A fair haired organization may be exclusive, but it would not be supremacist. A fair haired organization will discriminate on the basis of hair color, but only to achieve their goals of preservation and not to disenfranchise anyone else from economic opportunity. Although such an organization would disenfranchise a non-fair haired person from social opportunity, and this may upset some strict egalitarians, as non-fair haired people would not have access to marrying fair haired persons.

In the end, if we dissect the concept of racism we can find that it is a confusion between five ideas: supremacy, prejudice, privilege, discrimination, and preservation. Whether racism is good or bad or not depends on which of these five concepts it is based on. For some, none of these concepts is justifiable.

Fair Haired Organizations and Rights

A Liberal Democracy is a form of government founded on the ideas freedom and equality; especially ideas such as individualism, free and fair elections, freedom of speech and the press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, civil rights, property rights, and free trade. During the Enlightenment, when these ideas were conceived, it appeared that these ideas were harmonious and could easily co-exist. Approximately eighty years after the birth of the liberal experiment in the United States, there appeared to be a conflict between the principles of freedom and equality. The conflict became so stark that it resulted in a Civil War. One hundred years later, there appeared another conflict, this time involving the principles of freedom of assembly and civil rights. These two principles are related to the principles of freedom and equality.

The freedom of assembly is a guaranteed right for members of society to come together and collectively express, promote, pursue, and defend common interests without government interference. This right is guaranteed by all modern liberal democratic legal systems, including the U.S. Bill of Rights, the European Convention of Human Rights, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and is also guaranteed by most international law organizations. Freedom

of assembly organizations may include trade and labor unions, free speech organizations, debating societies, churches, religious organizations, political parties, or any other club such as fraternities and sports clubs. Expressive associations are groups that engage in activities such as petitioning the government for a redress of grievances, freedom of speech and press, and the free exercise of religion.

The original intent of civil and political rights laws were to protect individual freedoms from the infringement of government and private organization, and to ensure one's ability to participate in the civil and political life of the state without repression. Today, the political rights component of these laws remains true to their original purpose. The right to vote has slowly but surely been granted first only to male white citizens who owned property, then this right was extended to all white males, then it was extended to all white females, it was further extended to all American born Africans, and finally to foreigners who became citizens. Political rights enforcement has been active in preventing voter fraud and ensuring that minorities are not prevented from voting.

The role of civil rights laws, on the other hand, has changed its focus from individual freedoms in general, to a new role that 1) ensures the ability of minority and disadvantaged groups to participate in civil society without discrimination. 2) to redress the past injustices in U.S. history. 3) and to promote the value of diversity. The primary goal of civil rights laws now is to protect the rights of minorities and the less advantaged "people of color." Civil rights laws include protection from discrimination on the grounds of race, gender, age, national origin, color, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion, or disability. In addition to laws, there are related policies that are enforced to combat discrimination and to redress past historical injustices such as affirmative action and diversity policies. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) is a Federal law enforcement agency that enforces laws designed to prevent workplace discrimination.

Opponents of the new role and purpose of civil rights laws argue that these laws are not fulfilling their original intent of protecting individual freedoms and the freedom of assembly, and protecting against government infringement on these rights to freedoms. Opponents argue that civil rights laws are now working in the opposite direction and invading their individual freedoms and freedoms of association. The conflict can be stated as such: if citizens have the right to assembly with who they choose, then businesses or other private organizations should be able to hire and fire who they feel is the best fit for their company.

Supporters of the new focus of civil rights laws believe in the value of equality. They believe in the maxim written in the U.S. Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson in 1776 which states: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." Supporters of civil rights laws believe that discrimination based on a person's race, age, sex, gender, etc., is immoral, unjust, leads to disadvantages, and fractures society into different groups.

The conflict between the opponents and supports of civil rights laws result in a political battle along the lines of individual freedoms versus government infringement. At the heart of the problem is the fact that all people have preferences that lead to discrimination. Preferences and discrimination are what form organic associations. The Organic/Progressive debate is concerned with the question of how society is formed. Do progressive top-down (government or institutional) policies form the structure that society takes, or do individuals guided by their

biology and preferences form the structure that society takes? The organic view is that people self-segregate themselves into groups because of the idea that similar like-minded people are attracted to each other. Therefore, society reflects a natural outcome of people’s choices which is partly influenced by biological and cultural differences. Any fragmentation or exclusion found in society is a natural phenomenon. Social progressives believe that if biology is not a significant determinant of people’s choices, then culture and society can, and should, be reshaped in order to improve society according to a more egalitarian vision based on inclusion and wholeness. Social progressives advocate for policies of desegregation, integration, and social bridging. Organicists are on the side of Nature and biology, while progressives are on the side of Nurture and the culture.

To understand the conflict between fragmentation and cohesion more clearly, let’s analyze two formal models of society: The National Community and The Libertarian Community.

Society A: The National Community (ideal/utopia)	Society B: The Libertarian Community
Collectivism	Individualism/Pluralism
Homogeneity	Diversity
Some equality	Inequality
Security	Insecurity
Inclusion	Exclusion
Government activism	Freedom
Cohesion	Fragmentation
Social bridging efforts low	Organic association

In society A above, “The National Community” is assumed to be an ideal or utopian society where everyone looks alike, everyone shares the same culture, people are all distantly related, people assume a sense of collective responsibility, and most of the people in the society are middle class citizens. This system is maintained by government efforts such as cohesion policy. The efforts government expends to maintain this level of cohesion in society is low because this society has some natural advantages such as the fact that all citizens are distantly related and culturally and racially the same. The government only needs to slightly adjust the economy for a more equal distribution of income and the government uses modest efforts to ensure that all people are included. The government promotes the culture; a shared culture; a mono-culture. A mono-culture is preferred to a diverse culture because it is culture that is shared by all, and all can participate in it. This culture fosters the sense of community and responsibility for fellow citizens. This society has no use for desegregation, integration, or social bridging policies. In this society there is very little intrusion into citizen group’s right to freedom of assembly. There may be some equal opportunity laws for a small population of individuals who have found themselves ostracized by the community for one reason or another. In this society, government uses some coercion to get citizens to act collectively and to form a national identity.

In society B above, “The Libertarian Community” is based on the principle of individualism. The ethos of this community is “what is mine is mine, and what is yours is yours.” In other words, there is a high level of economic inequality. This society is also marked with racial

diversity, individual diversity, and multiculturalism. In this pluralistic society there are many religious, ethnic, civic, and political groups that battle with one another. Many people in this society find themselves alienated, insecure, and excluded from the economy as well as the culture(s). Although this society is highly fragmented into disparate groups, citizen's freedom of assembly is unhindered and people form groups through organic association. Preferences and discrimination are what form organic associations.

Now suppose the government changes its moral position of libertarianism to a more equality ethos because of growing discrimination and the number of individuals becoming excluded and estranged from this society. To combat this discrimination the government may enact desegregation, integration, and social bridging policies. In other words, the government will have to infringe upon citizen's freedom of assembly rights. In order to be successful the government will need to change its citizen's personal preferences. The stronger their citizen's personal preferences towards their own groups, the more effort of social bridging policies there will need to be. This will result in intrusions into citizen's rights to freedom of assembly. In other words, the government will have to take away citizen's rights to freedom of assembly and citizens will have fewer rights to freedom of assembly.

Society B above mirrors the real trend in the U.S. with civil rights laws. Today, the trend in the U.S. is for more Federal and state expansion of power with citizens losing their rights to freedom of assembly in the name of combating discrimination and to promote the goal of diversity and integration. Initially, civil rights laws combated discrimination and created diversity in the "public sector" by guaranteeing that all citizens had access to federal and local government services, employment, and the opportunity to make contracts with government departments. It also guaranteed voting rights at all levels of government. After the public sector was completely covered by civil rights laws, government then enacted what is called "public accommodation laws" which combated discrimination and created diversity into the "economic sector." With these laws business were required to hire employees on the basis of "equal opportunity." In addition companies were also required to staff their business according to the demographics of their state or local community. In other words, the organization's staff must mirror the growing diversity of the region. Businesses were also required to be open to the public. In other words, business could not discriminate against any particular customers and were required to provide an equal quality of services to everyone. After public accommodation laws were established the government implemented equal housing laws to combat discrimination and create diversity in housing or in peoples "living spaces" through the Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Act. After housing integration came the more controversial intrusion of civil rights laws into "private organizations." These organizations do not necessarily provide services to the public. Some examples of private organizations include the Boy Scouts of America, Churches, Privately funded schools, non-profit organizations, the NAACP, and LBGT political organizations. Through the U.S. Supreme Court, the IRS, and State Governors, activist government has slowly receded citizen's rights to freedom of assembly in private organizations. In 1976, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that federal law prohibited private schools from discriminating on the basis of race. In 1983, the IRS revoked Bob Jones University religious tax exemption status because the University had imposed a disciplinary rule that prohibited miscegenation. BJU appealed the decision all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court ruled against BJU and BJU had to pay over a million dollars in back taxes. BJU is ineligible for any

further tax exemptions. The U.S. Supreme Court stated that the “government has a fundamental, overriding interest in eradicating racial discrimination in education that outweighs any rights to tax benefits and exercise of religious beliefs.” The government may place limits on the right to freedom of assembly if such limits are designed to further a substantial government interest. In 1984, the U.S. Supreme court, in *Roberts versus U.S. Jaycees*, ruled that associations may not exclude anyone for reasons unrelated to the group’s expression. In 2005, Governor Rod Blagojevich of Illinois signed a bill into law that forces churches to hire gays. Other examples of forced integration include private golf clubs that are required to admit female members. Lastly, the final sphere in which the federal or state government has not intruded into is a citizen’s personal space. A fundamental element of individual freedom is the right to choose who to enter and maintain intimate relationships with; associations such as friendships, sexual relations, marriage, and family.

The government seeks to diversify the native people’s public spaces (usually government institutions), business and work spaces, living spaces (such as housing policies), private spaces (rules for private organizations like churches), and personal spaces (an area that currently does not have any rules yet). As a person’s social spaces become more diversified through government immigration and social bridging policies, so will an individual’s personal relationships and associations resulting in a true melting pot society.

Americans glorify freedom and liberty, but these freedoms are granted by the state. Without strong rights to the freedom of assembly citizens are powerless in the face of the state that grants, and withholds, what it takes to be freedoms. With the government’s desire to diversify private organizations with so many policies, it may be a difficult for fair haired organizations to discriminate on the basis of physical traits. Such organizations are vulnerable to the interests of the state.

A perfect example of government cohesion policy is that of Brazil. *Mestizaje* is a racial ideology which promotes the use of planned miscegenation as a eugenic strategy designed to improve the overall genetic health of the population by increasing the mixed race population through inter breeding with the belief that a mixture of genes is more resistant to disease and creates fit individuals that are capable of surviving in harsh poverty stricken environments. This ideology is opposite from the way eugenic policy was carried out in Europe and North America, where racial "purity" and anti-miscegenation legislation was the eugenic strategy of choice. The ideology of *Mestizaje* came from the long tradition of tolerance of racial mixing that existed in the Spanish colonies. The ideology was also a part of the strategy of forging a national identity to serve as the basis of a modern nation state, and for this reason *mestizaje* also became a way of fusing disparate cultural identities into a single national ethnicity.

A coercive and progressive melting-pot policy was used in South America, especially Brazil, to counter the natural/organic tendency to stay within one’s own similar group, and to break down the barriers to interbreeding in order to form the large hybrid populations that are found in South America. The purpose of melting-pot policies is to prevent fragmentation by fostering cohesion and social bridging. Liberals portray the concept of race as similar to a socially constructed wall that prevents different people from interacting with each other and maintains structured inequality. If we could only break this wall down, then like a damn that has been breached, the different races would rush into each other’s domain eagerly embracing economic and social exchange. But we have already run this experiment when the U.S. government

deemed segregation and miscegenation laws illegal. If people were truly “naturally/organically” eager to embrace one another, all of our spaces would become intermixed *without* forced integration policies in schools, housing, government, business, and work spaces. Our public spaces, our business and work space, our living spaces, and our marriage spaces would “naturally/organically” become mixed. Instead we get white flight subdivision from cities because whites seek ways around the forced desegregation laws. Whites tend to sort themselves out of diverse neighborhoods and form their own communities in the U.S. The result is that these neighborhoods are not any more diversified than they were during segregation. The truth is that either one group or all groups “naturally/organically” prefer to live, work, socialize, and marry those who are similar to themselves.

Biological differences along with personal preferences (discrimination) result in a “natural/organic” process that form separate groups along with the social and economic networks found in society. Liberals spend a lot of political effort through government policy in attempt to tear down these “natural/organic” barriers, which are believed to be artificial or socially constructed by “evil” racists who do not exist. It was not enough for the federal government to declare segregation laws illegal (desegregation), because even when there are no laws preventing groups from intermingling, most people prefer the company of their own group. Unsatisfied with this outcome, the federal government decided to enact forced integration policies (civil rights laws) that would force groups to intermingle.

With the continued immigration policy of third world people into Western developed nations, combined with government efforts to integrate and assimilate these immigrants, the fair haired population will struggle to survive and maintain a stable population.

Conclusion

The purpose of this handbook has been to introduce the concept of conservation and to establish fundamental principles that assist local organizers in building fair haired communities and networks. It has reviewed challenges and opportunities facing local organizers and suggests some promising policy options. This handbook provides guidance for ways to maintain a heritage for fair hair and to secure a sustainable future (population size). It is our intention to bring fair haired people together in a public forum or private group to review this handbook on a monthly basis and to oversee its action.

Local organizations are the engines that make fair haired communities healthier and stronger while enhancing essential services that networks provide. Networking with other fair haired individuals or families can help one develop friendships, opportunities, ideas, and support which ultimately strengthens the fair haired community. The building and maintaining of a local network is vital for fair haired survival.

The basis for local organizations should be that of teamwork and volunteering. Volunteering involves having a group of people who work together towards a common goal with a shared sense of purpose. It is important to realize that everyone in the project can lead in different ways, and each member of the team can set personal recruiting goals. This makes for a stronger team and will ultimately help your organization to meet project goals and objectives.

A few ways to create an awareness of your organization in your local community is to advertise and promote the organization through newspapers, local news, internet, meetup.com, present in front of audiences, and organize festivals or events such as a car wash.

- Written by Gregor Ebner