

CAN AMERICAN RACISM BE ELIMINATED?

MILES D. WOLPIN

In the course of an interview with the *Financial Times* last year, George W. Bush declared his firm commitment to bilingual education and high immigration mainly because he wanted to avoid being perceived as “an extremist.”¹ Invectives such as “racist,” “homophobic,” “sexist,” or “anti-Semite” are commonly employed by the liberal-left to exclude issues from the realm of respectable civic discourse. As the Bush comment illustrates, many neo-conservatives have become intimidated and prefer capitulation rather than accepting a barrage of hostile criticism.

The ubiquitous misuse of “harassment” codes and “civil rights” decrees to suppress speech, and therefore thought, commonly rationalized by the foregoing and related invective (e.g. homophobe, racist, sexist, etc.) reveal that modern liberals are sharply at odds with traditional liberal respect for liberty, diversity of perspective, and aversion to political correctness. John Stuart Mill would *surely* define the neo-totalitarian Orwellian liberalism as more consonant with Soviet-style orthodoxy than with our Western libertarian tradition.²

Indeed there are good reasons for believing that the Marxist-inspired New Left has—to use Gramsci’s phrase—successfully completed an important phase of their “Long March.” The irony of equating liberalism with openness and toleration is that the New Left has transformed and redefined the concept to represent a narrow symbolic hegemony over virtually all realms of civic discourse.³

This is confirmed by the acute fear that paralyzes most publicly active Conservatives. They systematically eschew issue positions (e.g. immigration reform, racial profiling) that evoke leftist charges of “racism.” Similarly, there is a pattern of timid acquiescence in ignoring liberal double standards and hypocrisy on anti-white or anti-male operational policies involving race and gender.⁴

While courage—especially among politicians—is a rarely encountered virtue, the problem may be more complex than it appears. For most “conservatives” are in fact “soft” on globalism.⁵ They have internalized some Left-originated Liberal doctrinal positions. These invariably attenuate “conservative” convictions. “Neo-conservatives” are supremely eclectic and occasionally share a tacit consensus—even internalized racial guilt—with their liberal protagonists!⁶

How can patriotic European-Americans transcend this denouement and its Balkanizing prospects of what Gunner Myrdal once critiqued as “the American dilemma”? Perhaps America will not only have been “the first new nation” dedicated to equality under the law, but also the first where a dominant ethno-racial group renounces equal protection of the laws for itself! Such an egregious, self-destructive, quasi-genocidal outcome is rendered more probable in the absence of what our “first black President” called for: a candid analysis of racial differences and tensions, where racist group preferences, pride, and resentment are only legitimate when articulated by people of color or their ostensible liberal benefactors.

In the sections that follow, we shall construct a typology of racist variants, the historical origins and functionality of this ubiquitous phenomenon, and assess the utopian ideological sources of the modern neo-Marxian racist jihad. Finally, the role of traditional Christian norms and human nature in conditioning an ethno-cultural defensive strategy by patriotic nationalists will be considered. More problematic—given white apathy, denial, and self-absorption—is whether this can be implemented effectively enough to halt the process of incremental European-American subordination and prospective civil war, or even partially self-inflicted genocide.

CAN RACISM BE OPERATIONALIZED?

A frequent claim of neo-conservatives is that the use of such invective by minority spokesmen like Jesse Jackson entails little more than rude or baseless name-calling. Or that liberals are simply endeavoring to expand their power base by playing their “race card.” This is particularly the case when issues involving “disparate impact” or proportional representation appear to contradict their “color blind” societal pretensions.⁷

While as neo-conservatives argue, meritocratic policies (e.g. uniform admission, promotion, or contractual standards) are *not* racially motivated, liberal “affirmative action” racial preferences clearly constitute a variant of racism.⁸ Ironically, Afro-American militants routinely seek to guilt-trip European-Americans by charging that *all* whites are “in their inner core,” or essence, “racist.” And this indictment encompasses the large white “progressive” left-liberal intelligentsia! Although overtly denying this in public (while often confirming it in their personal lifestyles), liberals frequently seek to overcompensate with even stronger non-white preferences and rhetoric. The Clinton/Gore administration epitomized such a reactive dynamic, as did Bush’s cabinet appointments.

The fact that disparate impact policies (e.g. being “tough on crime”) are not necessarily or commonly racially motivated implies nothing about the presence or content of their proponents’ racial sentiments. Aversive attitudes may coexist independently yet may vary in intensity over time. Further, they can differ depending upon the cultural attributes or behavior of particular racial groups.⁹

Thus the most ubiquitous form of racism may be *sentimental* (SR) in nature. Affectively, it is a preference for and proud identity with one's own race. Conversely, SR often is aversive in varying degree toward another race. While a measure of disdain may be common, hatred is not. For some, there are conflicting sentiments—admiration and aversive attitudes toward the “other.”¹⁰ The “mix” may lean far in the direction of positive affect in certain cases.

Aversion or disdain does not inevitably evolve into hatred anymore than admiration is necessarily transformed into love. The existence and intensity of aversive sentiments depend upon such factors as personality, ideology, racial attributes, or repugnant behavior.¹¹ It seldom becomes intense as long as geographic racial separation exists, and is unlikely when patterns of non-coercive association are characterized by mutual respect rather than a sense of inequitable exchange, envy, or revenge.¹² None of these aversive reactions are pathological. At extreme levels they engender civil discord—as in America or Europe—and probable violent conflict. Most of the latter however occurs in societies dominated by non-white peoples. For European-led OECD countries, racial violence has been comparatively rare during the past half century.

Yet SR has been integral to the human condition of all racial and ethnic groups. Diversity is its underlying basis. Thus the invective imputing “racism” to European-Americans is an egregious oxymoron that invidiously purports to distinguish them from blacks or Orientals in this regard. Clearly, ubiquitous SR variation in its affective or aversive manifestations is *normal* for reasons that will be subsequently elaborated.¹³

Related to the foregoing as well as the previously mentioned charge by Afro-American militants that all whites are racist “to the core” is the logical corollary that America is also afflicted with *institutional racism* (IR). What does this mean? That European-American SR permeates all societal institutional areas! If most whites harbor at least some pejorative attitudes toward blacks, we should expect this to be experienced by the latter in education, business, the armed forces, etc. Yet there is no evidence that minority upward mobility has been generally constrained by such IR.

The same may be said with respect to residential separation. This overall pattern commonly provokes “white flight” when blacks begin a serious neighborhood “invasion.” It also applies to ethnic preferences in the case of Hispanics, Asians and European responses to similar Third World “invasions.”

Indeed, blacks themselves manifest identical flight patterns out of neighborhoods being “taken over” by Mexicans in California and elsewhere! Preference to residentially associate with one's own kind while excluding others who differ socially and culturally is a common pattern—exceptions notwithstanding.

There is nothing remarkable in such institutional pervasiveness, nor in its variability—indeed the virtual absence of its manifestation for selected institutions such as sports or entertainment. They may be regarded as exceptions

to the rule. In lesser measure, the same applies to certain churches, many colleges, and much of the public sector, where blacks are over-represented by 50 percent at the Federal level.

While ever-present “institutional racism” is often alleged to excuse black or Hispanic performance shortfalls, Afro-American and liberal fellow travelers generally confuse this variant with punitive racism (PR). The latter involves policies which deliberately impose sanctions or constraints upon a particular race. During the past half-century, these have in most instances been far more moderate in the West than in Third World societies dominated by people of color. They are generally adopted when the integrity or autonomy of a dominant racial group becomes a perceived threat by the activities of another. In some cases, however, PR may occur in the absence of either a threat or even its perception. Such sanctions are most likely to be occasioned by a desire to pre-empt a future threat, exact revenge for past affronts, seize resources that are an object of envy, etc.¹⁴ None of this is necessarily pathological or irrational, even when it results in material harm to the group engaged in PR.

Frequently associated with the foregoing in advanced capitalist societies is another contemporary motivator: ideology. One of the great ironies of the twentieth century is that the most militant Western protagonists of National Socialism have themselves engaged in PR against Germans, other Europeans, and Americans during the past several decades. These minority-supported white anti-fascist or anti-racist liberals (or social democrats) have used judicial and particularly executive decrees to discriminate against their “own” white race. This encompasses not only public or state sector job, contractual, and educational preferences, but equally the progressive infringement (i.e. coerced inclusiveness) of property rights and freedom of association in the private sector.¹⁵

Beyond such “affirmative action,” the left has militantly supported mass Third World immigration to transform their societies. Further, such immigrants in the U.S. are beneficiaries of affirmative action preferences.¹⁶ Self-styled “progressives” in America believe that this “silent invasion” of 1.2 million highly fertile people of color annually will reinforce the constituency for anti-white PR in the short run. By the next century, European-American opponents of open borders argue, the white race itself may be destined for demographic extinction due to repression, coercive emigration, and miscegenation.¹⁷ Such consequences of the de-facto anti-European-American operationalization of liberal-left “multiculturalist” ideology may be viewed as “self-assisted genocide” for what will soon be a mere 10 percent of the world’s population.¹⁸ For this, there are no parallels in recorded history!

ETHNIC VS. RACIAL IDENTITY

The globalist multicultural jihad is not limited to race, domestic preferences, and anti-Western deconstructionist ideology. Indeed the movement’s variegated offensive has targeted national sovereignty (e.g. the Kyoto-UNEP

regimes and proposed International Criminal Court) as well as local particularisms. Yet, like its international communist predecessor, globalism may also shipwreck on the shoals of human nature in decades to come.¹⁹

Man's strongest affinities—community and altruism—began in the evolutionary process with his own kin group. Thus we feel most comfortable with, and are prone to trust, those most like ourselves. This pattern operates at the level of clan, tribe, and post or trans-tribal ethnic community. Within these, particularly the last, we are naturally most intimate and at ease with those who share social and other attributes (gender, class, age, occupation) with ourselves.

Genetic closeness and security or survival needs underlie the historic evolutionary, as well as the historic, role of such affinity groups. Diversity can alternatively threaten and/or reactively reinforce such affinities, but rarely supplant them.²⁰ Thus neo-conservative and self-styled leftist “progressives” alike encounter *enormous* public indifference and growing resistance to their rival globalist agendas. This notwithstanding a massive barrage of quasi-Marxian “inevitability” propaganda designed to demoralize nationalist citizens and counter-elites.

Left globalists have sought to accelerate “progress” by claiming hypocritically that both ethnicity and race are largely artificial (“socially constructed”), while simultaneously pitting their “oppressed” Third World peoples of color against more successful European-led Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. In hypocritically playing this South-North race card, they are also fomenting multicultural subversion from *within* by seeking to maximize a “silent invasion” of Third World migrants despite the opposition of OECD citizens. As a result of demographic shifts, the former are intended to become ethno-culturally dominant in most OECD countries through demographic increase during this century.

Ignoring the disastrous lessons of contemporary Zimbabwe, South Africa, and the fate of other “diverse” nations (among others), these New Left inspired “progressive” subversives in liberal, Green, and social democratic parties blithely assume they will lead the eventual “brown revolution” against both white hegemony and capitalism in the no longer self-confident West. Indeed, the latter has been gravely weakened due to the propensity for concessions by neo-conservative and transnational corporate elites.²¹ Consider such areas as race preferences (“affirmative action”), high immigration to depress wage pressures, and even the Kyoto Protocol!²²

Gradually it is becoming apparent that racial affinity and growing separatist appeal to certain minorities are weakening their American national identity.²³ Historically, this was consequential to the persistence of dual national loyalties.²⁴ In conjunction with leftist anti-Western cultural heritage deconstructionism, such trends constitute a clear and not too distant danger to American unity and integrity—as they will to Canada and several other Western countries.²⁵

Obviously, racial solidarity can reinforce national identity when one or more national protagonists differ racially. But in a multi-racial state, it invariably functions—like ethnic diversity—to attenuate national or civic cohesion. As with tribalism in contemporary Africa and parts of Asia, ethnic and racial diversity—unless coercively suppressed—tend to be associated with high levels of conflict and even civil war.²⁶

If the racial and ethnic polarization of American politics are viewed in the context of a secular decline in Anglo-Saxon norms such as those pertaining to limited government, the rule of law, property rights, liberty of expression as well as thought, individual responsibility, the right to keep or carry arms, and freedom of association or contract, it would seem that the future is less than auspicious. At best there may be a Yugoslav-type scenario by the mid or late twenty-first century. At worst, a South African fate awaits European-Americans.²⁷

PARAMETERS AND LIMITS OF THE UNIVERSALIST CHALLENGE

Not only has race often functioned as a reinforcing component or dimension of ethnicity, both are inherently exclusive or, in the lexicon of sociologists, particularistic. A natural preference for one's own regardless of the existence or degree of aversion to other nationalities and races is a common attitude found among members of all ascriptive groups. Such affect, then, is integral to human nature. Yet it has been denigrated by three major contemporary universalist traditions as "racist" or "ethnocentric," as if such affinities were pathological. Indeed, xenophobia is commonly used as a synonym.²⁸

Foremost among the enemies of Western pride and identity are the neo-Marxian "multicultural" Third Worldists. As noted previously, their anti-white racism results in ethno-social double standards. But this *apparent* particularism is in fact a tactical phase in a struggle for a global Brown Revolution upon behalf of an "exploited" colored humanity. Hence, the long run destiny of European societies is to be leveled down, and subordinated and eventually eliminated through coerced miscegenation—a veritable "final solution" to Western "racism."²⁹

This long-term transformational strategy is the major source of racist "anti-racism" by the ethnocultural left targeting whites in the industrialized OECD countries. Fueled by tax funds, they replace satisfied demands with ever more extreme ones. Their presence is most salient in cultural infrastructures, the media, NGOs, domestic interest groups and left-leaning parties of the West.³⁰ Radical multiculturalism's ascendency marks the triumph of 1960s New Left activists and fellow travelers.³¹ Their immediate goal is to mobilize and forge militant coalitions of "oppressed" Third World peoples within the West and globally by emphasizing "human rights," including "immigrant rights," as well as ecological "injustices."

As mentioned previously, their influence has been facilitated by the acquiescence of other tacitly racist (i.e. anti-white) universalist actors. The latter's motivation, however, is less ideological than institutionally driven.

Because they do not advocate PR, they *appear* more benign and even non-racist when contrasted with the revolutionary left. Yet it is their enormous institutional resources and multicultural policies that structure a very favorable environment for leftist deconstructionism and militant anti-white racism.

This is quite obvious in the case of transnational capital. Once internationalist and now globalist, the elites of major corporate actors have become increasingly anti-particularist, and therefore opposed to the patriotic defense of both nationality as well as racial integrity. Corporate elites financially support “Brown Revolution” advocates and liberal fellow travelers who denounce nationalists seeking to control immigration as “racists,” “xenophobes,” or “extremists” of the “far right.”³² At the same time major corporations also practice internal and support external group preference discrimination against European-Americans. This is rationalized as necessary to enhance short-run bottom line returns domestically and abroad. As implemented, however, such “affirmative action” may be increasing costs and thus reducing competitiveness.³³

Thus, while anti-white and especially white male discrimination cannot be reconciled with efficiency-driven “free market” economic and meritocratic universalist ideology, such racist and sexist bias is regarded as a minor—even temporary—deviation and pragmatic imperative. Hence the adverse effects upon efficiency and costs tend to be ignored. The same may be said of America’s enormous trade imbalance and its effects upon national sovereignty.

Less overt compromise of principle appears to characterize Christian universalism. Certain Protestant evangelicals, and particularly the Roman Catholic hierarchy, are actively proselytizing in Third World countries. For both, Christian identity and inclusiveness supersedes ethno-racial particularisms, as do church interests in minimizing obstacles to expansionism.³⁴

Hence, while not militantly anti-European, the Roman Catholic Church has generally sided with the Third World’s “have nots” and favored both permissive immigration as well as large-scale wealth transfers or “aid” to the South.³⁵ It has also tolerated Marxist-influenced “liberation theology” clerics and organized lay activists. They, in turn, openly constitute a significant and growing segment of the “popular” Church. The latter has actively supported Marxist Third World revolutionaries since the 1960s.

At first glance these three “universalist” forces appear to be not only formidable—which they are—but also irresistible. Yet their ideological impact can be easily overestimated. For all three orientations in varying degree conflict with the consanguinal kinship propensity of human nature.

Because the previously discussed ethno-racial affinities and differences are more than merely “socially constructed” cultural artifacts, their underlying psychological influence cannot be easily eradicated even by sustained “sensitivity” propaganda and coercion. The Bolsheviks initiated such

policies—labeling nationalists “racists”—as early as the 1920s. Can we ignore the the subsequent Soviet debacle and nationalist denouement after seventy years? Or that of Yugoslavia and, in lesser measure, China, India, and Canada? Even in the United States, social and ethnic polarization is intensifying despite decades of “sensitivity” indoctrination and coercive repression.³⁶

When man has been genetically programmed for millennia to accord primacy to one’s kin group, it is fanciful to imagine extirpation of this inbred trait in a matter of decades by environmentally deterministic “social engineers” or universalist ideologies. For most ordinary persons, the effect of such coercive propaganda is “skin-deep.” Only leftist sectors of the alienated, and often hypocritical “progressive” white intelligentsia, internalize, yet do not necessarily live by such norms. Hence their intense distrust for and ubiquitous estrangement from—even their “own”—ordinary people who retain traditional identities and “prejudices.”

Until the mid-twentieth century neither the Roman Catholic Church nor corporate capital overtly opposed Western nationalism. Even so, the Church has not significantly weakened it, while transnational capital’s “free trade” mantra has evoked nationalist reactions (even protectionism) in the OECD area itself, as well as in the Third World. As for the left, virtually all internally supported Communist-led regimes historically assigned priority to their national or state interests. And in the wake of the Eastern Bloc’s collapse, why were so many Communist apparatchiks “reborn” overnight as “nationalists”? Today, both Russia and China are intensely nationalist, as are Japan, most of Latin America, and the Middle East.

Indeed it is *only* in the West that neo-Marxian “multiculturalists” increasingly seek to attenuate nationalist sentiment by denigrating it as “racism” or “xenophobia.” Cuban, Indian, Mexican, Palestinian, or Chinese nationalism, on the other hand, benefits from the usual partisan double standard. This subversive campaign operates as a veritable “fifth column” attempting to ensure de facto open gates and privileged status for the Third World migratory invasion.³⁷

Simultaneously, through radical ecological pressures, allied leftist sectors endeavor to transfer Western wealth to the “oppressed” South under the aegis of UNEP accords.³⁸ The leftist assault upon defensive nationalism in the OECD area is essential for this process as well.³⁹ Unfortunately, neither such “aid,” nor changes in the free trade regime under the WTO, will significantly affect Third World development prospects. For the constraints are primarily endogenous.

CAN EUROPEAN-AMERICAN CIVILIZATION SURVIVE?

Not only are Americans biased against pessimism, but there is also a cultural tendency to be less than candid in certain situations. Increasing numbers on *both* sides of this ethno-cultural conflict actually believe that the West has seen its day.

In the future “the white man’s burden” will be replaced by the “burdened white man”—if he is lucky. Indeed, militant feminists have, for the most part, already accomplished the latter.⁴⁰

Like most non-white cultures and empires, Europeans have harmed others over the centuries. Yet the West’s mixed record on this score was often less brutal and more emancipating than its rivals and predecessors.⁴¹ Furthermore, it is specious to condemn behaviors decades or centuries earlier because they contravene recently legitimized ethical norms. Particularly when the subversive or ulterior motive is to deconstruct—that is morally condemn—our current civilization.⁴²

The latter’s relative successes in both economic and cultural areas are a powerful magnet for peoples of the South.⁴³ But just as, for the most part, they are to blame for the failure of their own societies, so shall we if by default we allow our civilization to rapidly import and be overshadowed by theirs. We can’t be as certain of success as we can of failure if the requisite effort is not made.

Preference for continued European-American leadership is essential for the preservation of those ethno-culturally derived Western traditions, values and institutions, which have been integral to our economic success as a modern “magnet” society. Otherwise we shall suffer the Roman empire’s fate within less than a century. Hence it is essential to respect the natural law of affinity rather than defy it.

European-Americans should not only neutralize the shackles of “reverse discrimination,” but they must remain clearly preponderant in terms of numbers, which now are less than seventy percent. That implies a short run priority for sharply reducing and altering immigration preferences, while extirpating those “diversity” policies that progressively impede assimilation. Perhaps ten to thirteen million illegal aliens and those non-citizen foreign born who impose substantial costs upon citizens should be deported to their countries of origin.

The foregoing normative proposals, like those to follow in our concluding sections, are only intended as illustrative of the *type* of measures now essential to curtail accelerating “multicultural” subversion of the American Constitutional order. For almost seven decades and particularly in recent ones the liberal assault upon traditional values and institutions has made considerable inroads.

The 2000 national electoral “crisis” symbolized our ominous breakdown in respect for our Constitutional heritage. Both the rule of law and “separation of powers” were openly attacked by left-liberal multiculturalists who invoked the neo-totalitarian “will of the people.” In so doing, they mimicked fascists and Communists who have brought death to millions abroad in the name of a mythological Rousseauian “general will.”

Alternately the left is invoking “human rights” and U.N. conventions in its jihad against sovereignty. Yet, in the final analysis, it is national communities and their customs that remain the *primary* if not exclusive

source of their governing norms. Moreover, they may increase and enforce qualifications for citizenship, entry, and exclusion. As in numerous Third World countries today, these may take account of race, religion, and ethnic origin. Globalist “human rights” radicals have not yet supervened sovereignty in this area. With neo-conservative acquiescence, however, they are on the verge of doing so in both America and particularly the European Union.

OPERATIONALIZING THE PARADIGM

Because the foregoing discussion was largely limited to general considerations and trends, it fails to address—even heuristically—many racially specific policy issues. These flow from our major conclusions: 1) racism is natural and ubiquitous; 2) it is militantly promoted by the neo-Marxist “multiculturalists” against European descendants; 3) thus the latter are being increasingly discriminated against by being singled out as present and historic “oppressors;” 4) global capital and universalist churches have acquiesced in this process; 5) unless growing anti-white racism is halted, European descendants face at best a future of massive wealth expropriation, subordinated exploitation, and territorial dispossession, which is already prompting ubiquitous “white flight.”

Before focusing upon specific policy priorities for a defensive movement, two overall identity attributes will be stipulated in the belief that they may enhance both success and the forging of a viable community. Indeed both are interrelated and mutually reinforcing on one hand, while being in accord with human nature or intrinsically valued on the other.

First, the appeal of a racially defensive mobilization can be strengthened by Western ethno-cultural and nationalist symbolic frame of reference. Nothing is sacrificed, since European-American leadership and norms are imbedded in the historical achievements of our country. Furthermore, overtly *patriotic appeals* evoke less hesitant support from Middle Americans in the present conjuncture.⁴⁴

Notwithstanding the universalist institutional pretensions of certain churches, the Christian character of America’s heritage is also integral to our contemporary identity.⁴⁵ Thus, this orientation should be underscored by affirmation of such Christian norms as “mutual respect,” restraint, self control, and even the “Golden Rule.” Like other aspects of our national heritage, the foregoing are being flagrantly profaned by the largely atheistic “multicultural” left.⁴⁶

Surely one dimension of European-American group integrity and self-interest pertains to such Christian ethical idealism. It thus further legitimizes a patriotic national movement and broadens its appeal. Indeed, a dearth of “moral values” is a salient public concern. This focus upon Christian heritage is essential when we consider the array of

antithetical institutional resources dominated by left-liberal secular advocates and pseudo-Christian “liberal” fellow travelers of the “Brown Revolution.”

At a yet more operational level, there are important tactical questions that should not be ignored. Here we conclude with a heuristic effort to address briefly some if not all of these issues. The proffered “answers” here are tentative, and will be ultimately resolved during the mobilization process.

WHEN IS SR DEFENSIBLE?

Always, as it is an inevitable or natural concomitant of “diversity,” and does not necessarily harm others. As long as consanguineous kin or affinity groups, including tribes, distinctive ethnicities, nations, and races exist, affect and aversion will be integral to the human condition. Indeed, they are essential to a sense of particularistic identity and the protective function of such natural groups.⁴⁷

Less “natural” or benign are the consequences of “political correctness” for the relationships of various races and those of mixed stock. People of color may manifest affect or pride on one hand, or articulate condemnations of whites. Caucasians alone are subject to a liberal double standard inhibiting any display of consciousness, let alone pride, or the slightest pejorative views of non-whites.

This intensifies a European-American sense of victimization and concomitant resentment while forcing it underground. As white-only “hate” crimes and gradually thought crimes are increasingly prosecuted, ever more European-Americans will opt to join their “own” militant patriotic movement.

Even in the absence of such a development, white SR can no longer remain tacit or latent. For when this group is systematically denigrated and sanctioned economically over time by those encouraging SR among people of color, it will be unnatural not to react in a similar manner. Thus the real issue pertains to SR’s intensity rather than its mere existence. The former not only engenders zero-sum conflicts, but ultimately provokes a crisis of governance.

IS IR “WORSE” THAN SR?

Given its use by the left as invective to either excuse failure or condemn a Western society, one might falsely assume that IR was somehow an insidious obstacle to mobility for those with talent. In fact, it merely reflects the ubiquity of even mildly aversive SR. In such cases, the latter cannot but be reflected by definition in various societal “institutions.” Such is also the case in Asia and Africa.

Again, this attitudinal variable is normally mild in character. Often it co-exists with generally non-exclusionary employment or educational policies. As with its underlying SR, IR may be intensified by experiencing the negative characteristics or behaviors of another group.⁴⁸ This is particularly true where the latter is on the average less capable in some ways, yet accorded privileged legal status as in “affirmative action” group preferences.⁴⁹

CAN PR BE JUSTIFIED?

Those who seek a “color blind” society contend that such “affirmative action” group preferences are an unwarranted form of PR against European-Americans. Using Christian “Golden Rule” norms, the latter point may be conceded. Indeed, this ethical constraint in conjunction with the Christian norm of “mutual respect” would seem to preclude such overtly discriminatory aggressive policies against whites, and particularly white males.

Nevertheless, “liberal” Protestants and Catholic “liberation theologians” strongly support these and similar aggressive PR measures in the name of Christianity. They appeal not only to such precepts as “it’s better to give than receive” and “turn the other cheek,” but also to the principle of equality. The last, however, pertains to the divine spiritual relationship, while the former imply voluntarism rather than state coercion. They are also generally antithetical to human nature. Only leftist secularization of Christ’s teachings can rationalize contemporary aggressive PR against European-Americans. Indeed, ethno-cultural neo-Marxism is its historical origin.

Yet PR may also operate within defensive relational dynamics. What if a racial or ethnic group’s symbolic identity, freedom of association, affective/aversive expressional liberty, or ability to receive proportionate rewards for its talented contributions to society are threatened? Is there any reason to expect assaults to moderate as whites approach minority status in the coming decades?

European descendants are currently targeted by such threats of varying intensity. These include so-called affirmative action and other sources of privileged status for minorities and immigrants in European countries. This despite the globally attractive attainments of the societies Europeans created, and their decades of generous aid that has been mismanaged or stolen by incompetent and corrupt Third World elites. Even the meager infrastructures of the colonial era have been allowed to deteriorate—particularly in Africa where productive Europeans and Asians have been expelled or expropriated.

Yet in applying defensive PR before it is “too late” in the OECD area, Christian norms admonish avoidance of excess as well as a preference for mild variants. Even then reasonable alternative choices (e.g. neighborhood schools) should be given priority over coercive exclusion. The latter, in turn, should generally be rationalized in non-racial terms (e.g. functional literacy requirements for voting or mass deportation of illegal aliens) whenever possible.⁵⁰

Similarly, civil rights laws should be amended to accord primacy to freedom of association in private sector employment, educational, and residential settings. The converse—coerced inclusion—not only also infringes property rights, but it is a primary catalyst of resentment, conflict and flight. Such incremental socialism in conjunction with coercive Soviet originated political correctness underscore the sub-rosa neo-totalitarianism drive of our so-called “progressives.”

WHAT ABOUT THE “FIFTH COLUMN”

The New Left-originated deconstructionist sector of the intelligentsia is the driving force behind anti-European ideological multiculturalism. Their active supporters deserve the same degree of “tolerance” accorded to conservatives in the institutions they dominate.

As distinguished from unsophisticated yet often well-meaning “fellow travelers,” the “hard core” globalist militants should be stripped of citizenship rights and deported to any Third World country that can be induced to offer them residency. The most recalcitrant elements might be tried under the Smith Act or for treason. Once convicted, they may be sentenced to new patriotic “re-education centers” in central Alaska.⁵¹

THE SYMBOLIC INVERSION OF LEFTIST DEMONIZATION

As implied above, European-American racism is less of a “problem” than is the subversive jihad of our even more racist “multicultural” left. Generic group self-preference is as ingrained in human nature as is selfishness. Although self-control along with avoidance of excess are a realistic legacy of our Classical and Christian Western tradition, utopian leftist efforts to socially reconstruct human nature have both failed repeatedly, and often inflicted enormous suffering. Scores of millions have been killed, imprisoned, or driven into exile during the past century by pseudo-egalitarians.

In some cases, as in the West and particularly America today, “progressives” are actually intensifying the racism of minorities—under the guise of “multiculturalism” or “anti-racism.” Such “social justice” agitation invariably catalyzes an intense reactive racism by Caucasians.

The self-styled “egalitarian” left believes it is using minority constituencies to seize power to create a harmonious oppressionless multi-racial utopia. Yet they will ultimately—as in South Africa today—be devoured and purged by this process as they become expendable to their “Brown Revolution” beneficiaries.

Meanwhile these “liberals” or “progressives” routinely reject tolerance in the name of tolerance, demonize their principled opponents rather than engage in civil discourse, define character as conformity with their biased views, appeal to the law while practicing double standards and disruptive violence, etc. Simultaneously, these liberal bigots project their intense hatred of their “own” country’s heritage, as well as conservative, religious, or nationalist adversaries upon the latter.⁵²

Even “democracy” is transformed into its opposite as they opportunistically seek rule by decree (executive or judicial) to circumvent recalcitrant elected legislatures. It is no wonder that these cosmopolitan reductionists recoil from the patriotism of Middle Americans, whom they disdain as “Bubbas” and “rednecks.” For they alone are morally privileged to be arrogantly racist without being “racist.” This by their self-anointed mission to “liberate” their people of color from “oppression.”

In effect, then, racism is always defensible if it promotes non-white supremacy via political dominance and privileged collective socio-economic status. The latter is, in turn, being effectuated by state regulation, redistributive tax-expenditures, and coercive “civil rights” double standards. Permissive Third World mass immigration progressively strengthens the electoral constituency backing this incremental expropriation of European-Americans. For the latter, however, defensive racism is invariably illegitimate!

As America is gradually denuded of its European and Anglo-Saxon ethno-cultural institutional heritage, the last threads of civility and consensual governance will erode. Urban violence, coercive state intrusiveness, and a deflation of social trust as well as civic decorum will conjoin to incrementally infuse our formal institutions and norms with a Third World content. Beyond that, separatist movements and even civil war may beckon. The longer left-liberal racist double standards are honored, the greater is the probability of such a denouement. This then is the New Millennium’s sequel to Myrdal’s “American dilemma.”

Miles D. Wolpin is Emeritus Professor of Political Science, State University of New York College, Potsdam, NY.

ENDNOTES

1. “Bush: No Friends on the Right” (2001).
2. As implied, doublespeak and operational symbolic inversion already characterized modern liberalism’s repressive tolerance. Some indicative studies of its damage to major institutions include: Bernstein (1994); D’Souza (1992); Gross (1997); Hoff-Sommers (1994); Jatrass (1998); Patai (1998); Satel (2000); Schmidt (1997); Weissberg (1998).
3. During and following the Vietnam War, New Leftists entered such major institutions as the media, academia, mainline churches, organized labor, philanthropics, NGO’s, etc. By the 1990s, they had risen to positions of influence or dominance in these and other institutions that set the radicalized parameters for “liberal” civic discourse. See: Kimball (2000).
4. The latter are rather systematically reported in the following national periodicals: *Middle American News*; *Human Events*; *National Review*; *American Renaissance*; and *The Liberator*. Cf: Collier and Horowitz (1997); Lynch (1992); Taylor (1992); and the sources in note 2.
5. The term neo-conservative is commonly used to distinguish them from the smaller nationalist traditional conservative tendency, which includes some Republicans as well as Pat Buchanan’s followers, the Council of Conservative Citizens, etc. Within the intelligentsia many ex-liberals redefined themselves as neo-conservatives as the New Left began to influence and then penetrate the national Democratic Party from the late 1960s on.
6. This along with an intense desire for social acceptability largely explains both their defensiveness and timidity in resisting virulent liberal attacks involving not only race and gender but also redistributive welfare statism, environmentalism, judicial activism, the erosion of states’ rights in education, law enforcement as well as other areas, etc.

7. Collier and Horowitz (1997). This is a salient complaint frequently encountered in such neo-conservative mainline weeklies as *Insight*, *National Review*, and *The Weekly Standard*. Yet a more traditional conservative nationalist, Sam Francis (2001: 33-34), cogently argues that customary meanings are alien to contemporary usage of “racist” invective by the left. Since it is routinely employed to delegitimize or intimidate opposition to policies that will enhance non-white elite or institutional power, opponents’ reasons and rationales are beside the point. Thus rhetorical demonization has supplanted reasoned civic discourse.

8. Although any policy bias intended to favor or harm one race may be defined as racist, the left (“progressives,” Afro-American elites, liberals, etc.) denies that an “oppressed” race can be “racist.” Preferences or anti-white animus are defined as purely defensive reactions to present or past European-American “oppression.” Upon these dubious empirical and logical premises, an array of racial double standards are morally rationalized. When opportune, the latter are reinforced by a radical substantive reinterpretation of traditional American egalitarian procedural norms. This goal of “equality,” however, is at variance with leftist promoted empirical patterns. Thus, as in federal or state employment, when (inappropriate) demographic proportionality is attained “affirmative action” continues. Hence, in excess of 17 percent of current federal employees are black (“No Shortages,” 2001). Group affinity rather than “equality” or oppression more logically explains such patterns of anti-white liberal racism.

9. This is not to imply that other factors do not influence the intensity of such natural culturally reactive sentiments. The former include changes in socio-economic conditions, affirmative action, discrimination, or reparations, and at times, even geopolitical conflict and involvement abroad. Some of these variables are occasionally addressed in social science literature, but there is a dearth of attention to those mentioned in the text. This is probably due to the virtual monopolization of race relations research by the Frankfurt School-influenced leftist intelligentsia. The latter attribute SR to capitalist patriarchal institutions that socialize males to become fascist-vulnerable authoritarians. Reflecting Freudian influences, this is diagnosed as a form of social pathology. Only radical destruction of such traditional institutions as the family and capitalism (i.e. property rights) can—in conjunction with public school and media indoctrination—attenuate SR (what will be defined as “Sentimental Racism” (SR) below) or “prejudice,” “stereotypes,” “xenophobia,” etc. Using slogans like “diversity” and “social justice,” New Left subversives are currently implementing this program. See: Nelson (2001). Cf: Hawkins (1994); Hoff-Sommers (1994); Kimball (2000); and MacDonald (2000).

10. Actual or culturally transmitted experiences engender such attitudes. They tend to neutralize egalitarian or multiculturalist ideological indoctrination by left dominated media or “educational” institutions including coerced “sensitivity” brainwashing. Put differently, “stereotypes” and “prejudice” are only minimally a function of pathological “social construction.” The same may be said of race itself. Indeed, some cultural attributes may be genetically influenced, according to evolutionary psychology. See: Levin (1997); Pearson (1996); Rushton (1995); Whitney (2001).

11. Although it may be inappropriate to categorize Jews as a “race,” Cuddihy (1997) and MacDonald (2000) cogently argue that ubiquitous anti-Semitism is at least partly attributable to such group characteristics as clannishness and a morally superior attitude. Other attributes might explain European-American aversion to blacks.

12. The left's drive for coerced association and its promotion of a sense of "relative deprivation" among minorities has contributed, along with "affirmative action" discrimination, to an intensification of aversive racial animus in recent years. See: Horowitz (1999).

13. Truly *rare* is its absence, which *is* in need of explanation. Yet even this should *not* be equated with non-violence or peace. Our most sanguinary wars are civil—including those involving the same racial or ethnic groups. Similarly, radical feminists allege that our most violent institution is the largely racially or ethnically homogeneous traditional family. They ignore the fact that women are the most frequent initiators of violence in such settings, just as they (non-married especially) account for most child abuse. Stanley (2001), for example, reports that "A recent bibliography by the Department of Psychology at California State University in Long Beach summarizes the results of 75 scholarly investigations, 79 empirical studies, and 16 reviews and/or analyses, which demonstrate that women are as physically aggressive, or more aggressive, than men in their relationships with their spouses/partners. The aggregate sample size in the 20-plus years of studies in various locations by various social scientists exceeds 60,000 people..."

14. Minority enthusiasm for "reverse discrimination" in America appears to be fueled by such motivations. The short-term threat of urban violence justifies our classifying this as a form of extortion by minority constituency elites. These are reinforced by lesser extortionate threats of demonstrations, boycotts, and regulatory sanctions as well as class-action litigation. See: Oppenheim (2001).

15. Thomas Sowell and Walter Williams argue that affirmative action preferences reduce incentives for minorities to excel while simultaneously stigmatizing those who can succeed in a meritocratic system. Similarly, current PR against Europeans in Zimbabwe and South Africa is seriously affecting the infrastructure and economies of those countries, just as the mass expulsion of Indians adversely affected Kenya and Uganda several decades ago. Ironically these countries have all been seeking unlimited "development" and other "aid" from European donors!

16. Although Adorno and other neo-Marxist Frankfurt School intellectuals claimed that Nazi PR was largely pathological, their social democratic and New Leftist "revisionist" cousins appear to be suffering from quasi-genocidal pathology by actively pursuing a long term policy that is destructive not only of their societies but their own racial group—however defined. Indeed their virulent hatred of nationalists and those who defend the European racial integrity of Western societies is manifested by their promiscuous projection of similar animus upon such protagonists. Cf: note 9.

17. According to Census data, about 70 percent of current population increase is directly attributable to immigration, i.e. the migrants and their offspring. Approximately 90 percent of the latter are of non-European origin, while European-Americans within the U.S. are not even reproducing themselves. This in light of much higher fertility rates of non-European migrants, along with somewhat higher rates by domestic minorities, will result in minority status for European-Americans *before* 2050. See: Burke (2000); Camarota (2001); NPG (2001). Cf: Nelson (1994); Chittum (1996).

18. Similar policies and trends characterize most other European-based OECD Western countries. Recent EU efforts to reduce the illegal alien invasion, which increased by 800 percent during the 1990's alone, have thus far been half-hearted and largely ineffective. Their apparent objective has been to symbolically deflect rising mass support for nationalist parties.

19. Ironically, even some less doctrinaire socialists are beginning to take “human nature” seriously. See: Brociner (2001).
20. Indeed, recent comparative research on citizen “happiness” or “life satisfaction” by Michael Hagerty of the University of California (Davis) concludes that “(f)or the most part, the top rated countries are small and homogeneous.” These include Denmark, Netherlands, Norway, and Luxembourg, in that order. Within the U.S., less diverse “heartland” regions where closer ties with family and friends are more salient rank highest. See: “Who’s Happy?” (2001).
21. This narrow stratum of ideological globalists believes that their objectives require the voluntary and occasionally coerced transfer of sovereign authority from nation states to global institutions. Despite conflicts over global policies, both leftist and neo-conservative tendencies share a conviction that traditional particularistic loyalties are obsolescent and eradicable via environmental manipulation. Thus they are increasingly alienated from and mistrustful of patriotic movements. Indeed, this estrangement from ordinary citizens may eclipse their own mutual antagonism. See: Lasch (1995).
22. Although the latter is publicized as a benign regime to impede “global warming,” its fine print envisages a massive wealth transfer to the Third World, which will adversely affect mass living standards in the U.S. and other OECD countries. See: Wojick (2001).
23. Extreme alienation from Anglo-Saxon institutions and heritage (Fallon, 2001) is particularly salient for blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans. Teenage Latinos, for example, in a recent national survey (“Intelligence Report,” August 2001), articulated exclusive Hispanic identity in 54 percent of the cases and dual American and Hispanic in 37 percent. Already in (Chapman, 2001: 3-4) nearly 100 of America’s largest cities during the 1990’s, minorities became numerically dominant due to “immigration” and separatist white flight. During the same decade, minorities became dominant in California as 30 percent of European-Americans fled or otherwise left the state—one that is foremost among those most heavily impacted by the illegal alien (largely Mexican) invasion. Resistance to assimilation also appears to be growing even among some Asians and especially Muslims who have eclipsed Jews as the third largest minority. On these incipient Balkanization trends, see: Brimelow (1995: 193-99); Fallon (2001: 1, 3-7); Hispanics (2001); “Left Wingers” (2000); Lutton (1997); Payne (1997).
24. Zionist Jews and Japanese were the principal sectors in the past. More recently, Cubans, Chinese, and especially Mexicans have joined them in this respect. Yet the underlying deficiency is the failure to enforce legal proscriptions against dual loyalty. See: Geyer (1996).
25. See: Brimelow (1995); Chang (2000); Fallon (1998); Francis (1997, 1998, 2000); Lamb (1999); Madland (2000); McGrath (2000); Murphey (1993); Nelson (1994, 2000); Schmidt (1999).
26. According to Chittam (1996: 140), this is most probable when the minority component of a society approaches 25 percent. CS: Coleman (1994); Horowitz (2000); Kaplan (1994); Madland (2000); Smith (1999); Snow (1996).
27. The liberal and even for the most part neo-conservative media have been silent on increased anti-European PR during the last several years. Government policies resulting in white fatalities, property extortion, capital flight, and emigration—also affecting some Asians and even some colored—are reported regularly in the *Aida Parker Newsletter* and *American Renaissance*. The latter also systematically reports growing evidence of pervasive racism toward whites including numerous unprosecuted violent black hate crimes. Both tendencies are considerably more advanced in African “multiracial” states such as South Africa and Zimbabwe.

28. Although nominally universalistic, the three traditions tend to be racially selective in their contemporary denigratory bias. This de facto anti-Europeanism renders their ostensible universalism problematic.

29. In Marxist terms, the “oppressed” people of color have “nothing to lose but their chains.” Although a particular group, their emancipatory interests represent universal needs and destiny of humanity. The dual scourges of capitalism and Western imperialism will be swept away as the Brown Revolution unfolds. Thus people of color are romanticized as the Western proletariat had been prior to the Cold War era.

30. These encompass the national Democratic Party in the U.S., various Green and social-democratic or socialist parties, Italy’s Radical Party, Canada’s NDP and some liberals, as well as remnants of Communist parties. In virtually all cases, race has supervened class as the dynamic *primary* overt source of animus and militancy. Thus there has been a dramatic reversal from the primacy accorded by the left to class a half century ago.

31. Militant cadres or core activists who have bored from within since the Vietnam War era, should of course be distinguished from the far more numerous active supporters who in responding to egalitarian slogans are generally ignorant of ulterior social revolutionary objectives. See: Kimball (2000); Francis (2000).

32. See: Yablonski (1999); Oppenheim (2001).

33. Yet like other state regulations promoted by the left, including the Greens, these anti-white discriminatory practices raise costs and erode control over capital (i.e. the means of production). This pattern—frequently to vitiate actual or anticipated extortional charges of “racism,” etc.—may be conceptualized as backdoor incremental socialism. Raimondo (2001) and Oppenheim (2001) elucidate on aspects of this process.

34. Yet even these “universalists” are less than purely so, given the priority accorded to their sectarian denominational interests. Ironically, their allies are Leftist-infiltrated “secular” or “liberal” churches such as the United Church of Christ, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Episcopalians (Anglicans and Lutherans in Europe). Beyond these sectors, there are more broadly socially conservative congregations within the foregoing, as well as evangelicals and other denominations such as the Mormons, Southern Baptists, and especially the Eastern Orthodox, which endorses defensive nationalism. Among the latter there is receptivity to the patriotic movement. See: Childress (2001); Trask (2001).

35. In December 2000, the Pope publicly denounced immigration control movements in Europe as “racist” and “xenophobic.” Cf: Hawkins (1994).

36. Bernstein (1994) describes the operationalization of such indoctrination. Subjection to ideological coercion often generates resentment and merely drives sentiments underground. They are fully aware that their own aversion toward members of “preferred groups” has not inhibited the latter’s upward mobility. The fact that this has often been at their own expense intensifies their alienation. Similarly, their ethno-racial identity is reinforced by liberal emphasis upon (often imaginary) ancestral moral iniquity. Thus, such indoctrination may be ineffectual at best, and socially or sexually counterproductive at worst.

37. Hawkins (1994), Fallon (1998), and Kimball (2000) pinpoint the underlying dynamics of this ethno-cultural revolutionary drive. Cf: Raimondo (2001).

38. The Kyoto Protocol not only imposes a double standard on CO2 emissions that would lower economic well being in the North, but requires the latter to finance the South’s measures to combat “global warming.” See: Wojick (2001).

39. While defined in recent decades as “racism,” the offensive is being reinforced by the U.N.’s High Commission for Human Rights which is sponsoring a series of conferences to pressure (Western) countries to adopt “legislation which outlaws (white) racism,” as well as reparations for colonialism and oppression. See: “U.N. Conference....” (2001).
40. See *The Liberator*, published monthly by the Men’s Defense Association for a plethora of studies and case histories suggesting male subordination and legal disabilities. Radical feminists are a major force behind the multiculturalist drive, and thus tend to soft-pedal “sexism” by colored males or those like Clinton who abet their cause.
41. See: Barzan (2000). Cf: Kaplan (1994).
42. On the parameters of such “deconstructionism,” see: Fallon (1998). While some of this scholarship is corrective, the overwhelming corpus derives from the academic New Left’s disenchantment with traditional American values and institutions. Accuracy in Academia’s monthly *Campus Report* provides a continuous update on manifestations of this ongoing “culture war.” Cf: Ellis (1999), Satel (2000) and Jenkins (2001).
43. This because of a relatively open opportunity structure for all - not withstanding moderate SR among European-Americans. Historically a similar situation existed for Japanese, Chinese, Irish, Jews, and Poles as well as Italians who prospered despite intense aversion and ubiquitous exclusionary practices. These legacies are diametrically at odds with contemporary “civil rights” redistributive collectivism. See: Raimondo (2001).
44. Its power was demonstrated by both JFK and Reagan, as it was more recently by the McCain campaign.
45. Poll data indicates that approximately 85 percent of Americans identify themselves as Christians, while less than 25 percent oppose its symbolic or active role in the public civic institutional sector. In a nominal yet important sense, America remains a predominantly Christian national culture at the outset of the new millennium. Hence the enormous popularity of Bush’s “faith-based initiative.”
46. Thus the “Christian Coalition” and other faith-bound socially conservative denominations (e.g. Southern Baptists, Church of the Latter Day Saints), as well as certain evangelicals, join traditionalists in Roman Catholicism and mainline Protestant churches as a natural constituency. Their egalitarian universalism is generally limited to spiritual relationships between man and God within Christianity.
47. Although clans and tribes in the OECD area were primary performers of this role until the classical era, broader ethnic groups and nation-states have increasingly so functioned since then in the North. Tribalism and clan loyalties remain predominant in much of the Third World. Cf. Pearson (1996).
48. Cuddihy (1987) applies this to high capability differentials. He argues that anti-Semitism is partly a function of Jewish attitudes reflecting a sense of both intellectual and *moral* superiority vis-a-vis gentiles. This is reflected in the context of intense in-group loyalties and refusal to publicly acknowledge such characteristics.
49. See: Sowell (1996).
50. In both the UK and Germany (Karapin, 1999), the effectiveness of immigration control movements was linked to *local* social mobilization, which began to incorporate “normal citizens” despite initial activism by culturally defensive “extremists” who rioted in London and attacked asylum abusers in some German locales. Restraint becomes less probable the longer an effective response is delayed. As preferences assume the character of customary expectations among minorities, the latter are more likely to resort to overt and indiscriminate violence against whites to maintain them.

51. There is ample precedent and even irony. For the Left itself has instituted both employment sanctions and “sensitivity” indoctrination during the past two decades. More recently, it has advocated special penalties for white “hate” crimes and “racism.” The latter is intended to impose thought control by intimidating the expression of politically incorrect views.

52. Thus the *seething virulence* of attacks upon such popular conservatives as Ronald Reagan, Clarence Thomas, Al Rocker, John Ashcroft, and prominent critics of the Clintons.

REFERENCES

Barzun, Jacques. *From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life*, New York: Harper Collins, 2000.

Bernstein, Richard. *The Dictatorship of Virtue*, New York: Knopf, 1994.

Brimelow, Peter. *Alien Nation*, New York: Random House, 1995.

Brociner, Ken. “Utopianism, Human Nature, and the Left,” *Dissent*, Winter 2001: 89-92.

Burke, B. Meredith. “The Coming White Minority,” *The Social Contract*, Summer 1997: 301-304.

_____. “A Faulty Demographic Road Map To the Future,” *The Social Contract*, Spring 2000: 179-84.

“Bush: No Friends on the Right,” *The New American*, January 29, 2001, p. 5.

Camarota, Steven A. “Immigrants in the United States, 2000: A Snapshot of America’s Foreign-Born Population,” *Center for Immigration Studies Backgrounder*, January 2001, Washington, DC, 19pp.

Chang, Maria. “Multiculturalism, Immigration and Aztlan,” *The Social Contract*, Spring 2000: 207-211.

Chapman, Bob. “An International Financial, Economic, Political, and Social Commentary.” *The Toulouse-Lautrec Tables: World Markets Topic du Jour*, December 23, 2000. (www.emetropolecafe.com), pp. 6-7.

_____. “The International Forecaster - May 2001 (1).” *The Toulouse-Lautrec Table: World Markets - Topic du Jour*, May 9, 2001, pp. 3-4, (www.lemetropole1toulouse-lautrec-table.cfm).

Childress, Edwin. “The ‘Sojourner’ Argument.” *The Social Contract*, Spring 2001: 206-9.

Chittum, Thomas W. *Civil War Two: The Coming Breakup of America*. Show Low, AZ: American Eagle Publications, 1996.

Coleman, James S. *Nationalism and Development in Africa*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.

Collier, Peter and David Horowitz, eds. *The Race Card: White Guilt, Black Resentment, and the Assault on Truth and Justice*. Rocklin, CA: Prima Publishing 1997.

Cuddihy, John Murray. “The Elephant and the Angels; or The Incivil Irritations of Jewish Theology.” In *Uncivil Religion: Interreligious Hostility in America*. (Ed.) Robert N. Bellah and Frederick E. Greenspahn. New York: Crossroads, 1987.

D’Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education*, New York: Free Press 1992.

Ellis, John H. *Liberation Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1999.

Fallon, Joseph E. *Deconstructing America: Immigration, Nationality and Statehood*. Washington, DC: Council for Social, Economic Studies, 1998.

_____. “Funding Hate: Foundations and The Radical ‘Hispanic’ Lobby.” *The Social Contract*, Fall 2000: 56-72.

_____. “Pushing Out Whitey.” *American Renaissance*, March 2000, pp. 1; 3-7.

_____. “UK-USA: The British Character of America.” *The Social Contract*, XI: 2 (Winter 2001): 91-94.

- Francis, Samuel. *Middle American Revolution*, Raleigh, NC: Middle American News, 1997.
- _____ "The Other Face of Multiculturalism," *Chronicles*, June 1998, pp. 19-22.
- _____ "The Revolution Two Step," *Chronicles*, July 2000, pp. 32-33.
- _____ "The War on White Heritage," *American Renaissance*, July 2000, pp. 1; 3-6.
- _____ "The New Meaning of Racism." *Chronicles*, June 2001, pp. 33-34.
- Geyer, Georgie Ann. *Americans No More*, New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1996.
- Gross, Martin. *The End of Sanity*, New York: Avon Books, 1997.
- Hawkins, William R. *Supporting Revolution: Open Borders and the Radical Agenda*, American Immigration Control Foundation; Monterey, VA, 1994.
- "Hispanics More Hispanic." 2001. *American Renaissance*, January, p. 15.
- Hoff-Sommers, Christine *Who Stole Feminism?* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- Horowitz, David. *Hating Whitey and Other Progressive Causes*, San Francisco, CA: Spence Publishing, 1999.
- Horowitz, Donald L. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000.
- "Intelligence Report." *The Nationalist Times*, August 2001, pp. 22-28.
- Jatras, James George. "Rainbow Fascism At Home and Abroad," *Chronicles*, June 1998, pp. 19-22.
- Jenkins, Philip. "Empires of Faith: Islam and the Academy," *Chronicles*, September 2001, pp. 17-20.
- Kaplan, Robert. "The Coming Anarchy" *The Atlantic Monthly*, February 1994, pp. 44-76.
- Karapin, Roger. "The Politics of Immigration Control in Britain and Germany," *Comparative Politics*, 31: 4 (July 1999): 423-44.
- Kimball, Roger. *The Long March: How the Cultural Revolution Of the 1960's Changed America*, San Francisco, CA: Encounter Books, 2000.
- Lamb, Kevin. "Assimilation or Colonization?" *The Social Contract*, Fall 1999: 28-31.
- Lasch, Christopher. *The Revolt Of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy*, New York: Norton, 1995.
- Lefkowitz, Jay. "It's The Law, Stupid," *The Weekly Standard*, November 20, 2000, pp. 14-17.
- "Left-wingers and Activists Prepare Suit Seeking 'Reparations' For Slavery." *Middle American News*, December 2000, p. 4.
- Levin, Michael. *Why Race Matters: Race Differences and What They Mean*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.
- Lutton, Wayne. "The Aztlan Myths." *The Social Contract*, Spring 1997: 211-12.
- Lynch, Frederick. *Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action*, New York: Praeger, 1992.
- MacDonald, Kevin. *The Culture of Critique*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.
- McGrath, Roger D. "Letter from California: The Reconquista of California," *Chronicles*, October 2000, pp. 34-38.
- Madland, Lee G. "Immigration, Ethnic Strife, Nations - And America," *The Social Contract*, Spring 2000, pp. 161-77.
- Murphy, Dwight D. "Multiculturalism: Its Implications For a Free Society," In *Will America Drown? Immigration and the Third World Population Explosion*, Humphrey Dalton (Ed.) Washington, DC: Scott-Townsend Publishers, 1993, pp. 76-83.
- NPA "New Census Numbers Show Unprecedented U.S. Population Growth: Most U. S. Growth Caused by Immigration, Census Shows." *Population and Resources Outlook*, February/March 2001, p. 1.
- Nelson, Brent A. *America Balkanized: Immigration's Challenge to Government*, Monterey, VA: The American Immigration Control Foundation, 1994.
- _____ "El Republica del Norte: The Next American Nation," *The Social Contract*, Fall 2000: 42-45.
- _____ "What Was The Frankfurt School?" *Citizens Informer*, January-February 2001, p. 9.
- "No Shortage of Blacks," *American Renaissance*, March 2001, p. 14.

Oppenheim, Noah D. "Follow the Money: The Jesse Jackson Story," *The Weekly Standard*, April 2, 2001, pp. 22-25.

Patai, Daphne. *Heterophobia: Sexual Harassment and the Future of Feminism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Payne, David. "Mexan National Conference," *The Social Contract*, Spring 1997, pp. 210-11.

Pearson, Roger. *Heredity and Humanity: Race, Eugenics and Modern Science*. Washington, DC: Scott-Townsend, 1996.

Raimondo, Justin. "Civil Rights or Property Rights?" *Chronicles*, April 2001, pp. 17-19.

Rushton, J. Philippe. *Race, Evolution and Behavior*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Satel, Sally. *P.C., MD: How Political Correctness Is Corrupting Medicine*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Schmidt, Alvin J. *The Menace of Multiculturalism: Trojan Horse in America*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.

Smith, Joseph Wayne, Graham Lyons and Evonne Moore. *Multiculturalism and National Breakdown in the New World Disorder*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999.

Snow, Donald M. *Uncivil Wars: Security and the New Internal Conflicts*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Renner, 1996.

Sowell, Thomas. "Affirmative Action: A Worldwide Disaster," In *The Essential Neo-Conservative Reader*. Mark Gerson, (ed.) Reading, PA: Addison Wesley, 1996, pp. 236-82.

Stanley, Mel "Vawa," *The Liberator*, January/February 2001, p. 20.

Sunic, Tomislav "Can Europe Learn the Lesson of Yugoslavia?" *American Renaissance*, September 2001, pp. 1-3.

Taylor, Jared *Paved with Good Intentions*, New York: Carroll-Graf Publishers, 1992.

Trask, H. A. Scott "The Christian Doctrine of Nations." *American Renaissance*, July 2001, pp. 1-8.

"UN Conference Wants Nations to Pass Laws against Racism," *Middle American News*, March 2001, p. 5.

Weissberg, Robert *Political Tolerance* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998.

Whitney, Glayde "Revisionism Strikes African Eve," *American Renaissance*, April 2001, pp. 9-10.

"Who's Happy?" *American Renaissance*, March 2001, p. 16.

Wojick, David E. "No: Despite the Overheated Rhetoric, There Is No New Evidence of Warming," *Insight*, March 12, 2001, pp. 41, 43.

Yablonski, Christopher *Patterns of Corporate Philanthropy: The Advocacy Masquerade*. Washington, DC: Capital Research Center, 1999.