

The Moral Dilemma

Book Review by Michael W. Masters

With great fanfare, the Clinton administration has launched a series of “race conferences” to do what many Americans privately believe to be impossible, namely to bring about harmony among the various factions of America’s Balkanized population. However, rather than fostering a genuine dialog, the administration’s “initiative” quickly revealed itself to be a stage-managed fraud. European-American activists who voiced opinions contrary to the reigning orthodoxy were unceremoniously evicted in Virginia and California. So much for dialog.

Americans grown weary of the circumlocutions and patent falsehoods accompanying this most difficult of subjects may wish to avail themselves of *The Real American Dilemma* edited by Jared Taylor, editor and publisher of *American Renaissance* — “an undeceived journal on race, immigration and the decline of civility.” At its core, the dilemma of race and immigration is a moral one that cannot be papered over by phony, staged events, and it is high time that an element of reality be injected into an often shrill debate. This new book does exactly that.

Taylor himself has had a thing or two to say about race. In addition to publishing *AR*, he has organized two race conferences of his own, the first in Atlanta in 1994 and the second in Louisville in 1996. A third is scheduled for August in Virginia near Washington D.C. *Dilemma* is taken, with one exception, from lectures at the second conference.

Immigration activists will be most interested in articles by Taylor and *The Social Contract*’s own Wayne Lutton, both of whom deal at length with the changes it is bringing. If there is one theme that ties these two articles together, it is the astonishing gap between the public’s opinion about immigration and

the private — and therefore true — beliefs of the great mass of American people.

Dr. Lutton’s article is filled to the brim with his usual assortment of well-researched facts detailing the adverse impact of immigration on jobs, welfare and crime as well as the rise of voodoo, animal sacrifice and other signs of growing dysfunction. Taken together, they paint a distressing picture of a society plunging toward disaster. But perhaps the biggest surprise is Dr. Lutton’s survey of polling data on Americans’ attitudes toward immigration: it is not popular with any demographic group.

The Roper poll released at the end of February, 1996, revealed a consensus against high levels of immigration.



The Real American Dilemma

Jared Taylor, Editor
Oakton, VA: New Century Books
139 pages, paper, \$9.95

- Eighty-three percent of Americans favored a lower level of immigration than the current average of over a million a year.

- Some 70 percent wanted fewer than 300,000 immigrants per year. This view was endorsed by 52 percent of Hispanics, 73 percent of blacks, 72 percent of conservatives, 71 percent of moderates, 66 percent of liberals, 72 percent of Democrats and 70 percent of Republicans.

Taylor finds confirmation of this sentiment from an entirely different direction: the response of Americans of European descent to the changing character of their neighborhoods as immigrants surround and ultimately displace them.

The details of what happens when the population shifts from white to non-white are interesting, but let us set them aside for a moment and consider something else that is profoundly important — something that everyone knows but rarely says — and that is this: Once the number of non-whites in an area reaches a certain level, whites cannot or will not stay. They refuse to be a minority; they move to some other place where they are once again the majority. This is an empirical, utterly dependable fact and everyone — I mean everyone — knows it.

Michael W. Masters writes on issues of history, moral philosophy and politics.

Explaining the Inexplicable

But how do we explain this mind-numbing dichotomy between popular wishes and public policy? Dr. Lutton, who elsewhere has suggested the desire of the rich and powerful for docile, low wage workers as a major force behind immigration, fingers the Western infatuation with human rights. This, he asserts, has been universalized to encompass the whole world.

For several decades, the concepts of consent, sovereignty, and self-determination have been under assault in Western countries. In the U.S., government agencies and the courts have extended privileges formerly reserved to citizens, such as education, health care, and housing assistance, to aliens whose very presence is against the express wishes of the national community. . .

Thanks to the post-World War II emphasis on universal and trans-national rights, distinctions between 'national' and 'alien' are thought to be suspect. The rights of aliens to make claims on the citizens of other countries, stated in terms of 'international human rights,' has played a major role in changing the character of the state and its basis of legitimacy.

The craving of multinational corporations for cheap labor helps explain the push for high levels of immigration. Indeed, the captains of finance and industry are well able to buy politicians to do their bidding — and entire political parties in the case of the Democrats. But it does not explain why the public has acquiesced to these demands. After all, in a democracy, the majority rules, doesn't it?

Well, as Taylor points out, not necessarily. Not if the public can be coerced or misled into ignoring its own vital interests. Force, of course, will do the trick nicely, as it did in Bolshevized Eastern Europe. But in America, force has not been needed. This begs the question: what mechanism has replaced it? Could it be that people have been convinced that to object to their own dispossession is morally wrong?

I think, therefore, that the reason whites are paralyzed in the face of national, cultural and racial dispossession is because they are convinced that it would be immoral to resist. Respect for the

other fellow's point of view requires that we do nothing to prevent the country from turning into a colony of the Third World. It is the same impulse that makes whites want to save the snail darter and the spotted owl, or to protect the ozone layer, or believe so fervently in democracy—it is this impulse that prevents whites from acting in their own legitimate group interests. I believe that this is a perversion of what is in fact one of the hallmarks of Western man—his abiding sense of reciprocity. However, when every other race is conscious of its racial interests and works diligently to advance them, any race that does not has committed unilateral disarmament in a dangerous world."

Taylor voices the bottom line as far as morality

is concerned: "[I]t is legitimate to resist demographic change." Indeed, no putative moral framework is valid that urges us to commit suicide to further the interests of others. Nor must we resort to statistics about crime, welfare, lost jobs and the environment—although they are compelling arguments in their own right. The key is that

all groups have a right to their unique distinctiveness.

What happens when Asians arrive in large numbers? Their effect is different from that of blacks or Hispanics. Some North Asians commit fewer crimes than whites, make more money, and do better in school. . . However—and this is a point I wish to emphasize—it doesn't matter whether Japanese or Chinese build societies that are, in some respects, objectively superior to those of Europeans. It matters only that they are different.

Far from being a moral imperative, immigration is, to the degree that it is destructive of distinct peoples and cultures, a moral evil of epic proportions. Viewed in this light, not only are we not morally obligated to tolerate continued immigration but we are not obligated to live with the consequences of the massive levels of immigration America has experienced since 1965. Those who agree with this viewpoint may wish to study a third essay from *The Real American Dilemma* — Michael Hart's "Racial Partition of the United States."

TEC

**"The craving of
multinational corporations
for cheap labor helps
explain the push for high
levels of immigration."**

In Their Own Words

*Hispanic leaders condemn America;
their quotes assembled by California activists*

Booklet Reviewed by James P. Lubinskas

How do Hispanic activists see the future of the United States? *Reconquista!: The Takeover of America* lets them speak for themselves. It contains pages of quotes from university professors, activists and elected officials that betray an openly racist plan to "reconquer" the Southwestern United States. These leaders understand that demography is destiny and are eager to take power and land from "Anglos." For anyone who doubts that Hispanics are saying these things, or who may simply want to hear the tone in which they discuss *reconquista*, the California Coalition for Immigration Reform (CCIR) offers an audio tape that includes every quotation in the booklet.

Here are excerpts from a few of the quotations.

Professor José Angel Gutierrez of the University of Texas, 1995: "We have an aging white America. They are not making babies. They are dying. It

James Lubinskas is the assistant editor of American Renaissance, published monthly by the New Century Foundation.

is a matter of time. The explosion is in our population. You must believe that you are entitled to govern.... Don't you find it curious that in the midst of all this harassment and repression that there are those who are saying that they are concerned because we're Latinizing Los Angeles? That

**Reconquista!
The Takeover
of America**
Prepared by
California Coalition for
Immigration Reform
(714) 921-7142
P.O. Box 2744-117
Huntington Beach, CA 92649
Booklet: \$7.00
Booklet and audio tape, \$10.00



there's too many Mexicans here? That we're the biggest national security threat to the United States? I love it! *Se estan cagando cabrones de miedo!* (They are sh*** in their pants with fear.) I love it."

Richard Alatorre, Los Angeles City Council, September, 1996: "[T]hey're afraid that we're going to take over the governmental institutions and other institutions. They're right, we will take them over, and we're not going to go away, we are here to stay...."

Art Torres, former California State Senator and current chairman of the California Democratic Party: "Remember, [Proposition] 187 is the last gasp of white America in California. Understand that. And people say to me on the Senate floor when I was in the Senate, 'Why do you fight so hard for affirmative action programs?' And I say, 'Because you're going to need them [when whites become a minority.]" (laughter)

Gloria Molina, Los Angeles County Supervisor, June 1996: "[W]e are politicizing every single one of those new citizens that are becoming citizens of this country.... And our vote is going to be important. But I gotta tell you that a lot of people are saying, 'I'm going to go out there and vote because I want to pay them back.'"

Antonio Villaraigosa, Majority Leader in the California State Assembly, June 1997: "We know the sunny side of midnight has been the election of a Latino speaker [in the state house], was the election of Loretta Sanchez against an arch-conservative, reactionary, hate-mongering politicians like Congressman Dornan."

Mike Hernandez, Los Angeles City Council, June 1996: "*Somos Mexicanos* (we are Mexicans)! Mexico, some of us say, is the