Jacket

◆ Mexico is retaking the American Southwest, lands which many Mexicans believe are their birthright. America’s claim to the Southwest resulted from the Texas War of Independence and Mexican-American War, whereas Mexico’s “Aztlan Plot” for La Reconquista will result from ethnic, linguistic, and cultural changes. The La Reconquista is a deliberate policy of the Mexican regime.

◆ Pat compares the Mexican immigrant invasion of America—and of Europe from across the Mediterranean—to the barbarian invasions that ended the Roman Empire.

◆ Theodore Roosevelt warned about the Third World dystopia when he said we must never let America become a “polyglot boardinghouse” for the world.

◆ President Bush’s failure to halt the invasion and secure America’s border is a dereliction of constitutional duty that, in other times, would have called forth articles of impeachment.

◆ The Mexican government is deliberately pushing its poor and unemployed into the US and urging them to take US citizenship to advance Mexico’s strategic national interests.

◆ There are more illegal aliens in America today than all the English, Irish, and Jewish immigrants who ever came in the nearly 400 years after Jamestown and Plymouth Rock.

◆ The American Establishment is too paralyzed by ideology and guilt to defend the republic.
How Civilizations Perish

- The first western country to fall was Spain. The Wars of 1914-1945 did it.
- By 1918, the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian empires had collapsed. World War II bled and broke the British and French. One by one, after war’s end, the strategic outposts of the empire—Suez, the Canal Zone, Rhodesia, South Africa, Hong Kong—began to fall. Within three decades, Europe’s headlong retreat from Asia and Africa was complete.
- From 1989 to 1991, the Soviet Empire fell and the Soviet Union split into fifteen pieces, half a dozen of them Muslim nations that had never before existed.
- Now, the African, Asian, Islamic, and Hispanics that the West once ruled are coming to repopulate the mother countries.
- The crisis of Western civilization consists of three imminent and mortal perils:
  1. dying populations,
  2. disintegrating cultures, and
  3. invasions unresisted.
- Eventually Rome’s conquered made their way to the imperial capital and Rome became a polyglot city of all the creeds and cultures of the empire. These aliens had no reverence for Roman gods, no respect for Roman tradition, no love of Roman culture. As Rome had conquered the barbarians, the barbarians conquered Rome. In the 5th century, beginning with Alaric and the Visigoths in 410, the northern tribes, one after another, invaded and sacked Rome. And the Dark Ages descended.
- As Rome declined, so it is similarly with the West. What the Danube and Rhine were to Rome, the Rio Grande and Mediterranean are to America and Europe, the frontiers of a civilization no longer defended.
- “In his Fall of the Roman Empire: A New History of Rome and the Barbarians”, Oxford’s Peter Heather challenges previous historians and attributes the fall of the empire to Rome’s refusal to block a great horde of refugees that arrived at its border late in the fourth century: “In 376 a large band of Gothic refugees arrived at the Empire’s Danube frontier, asking for asylum. In a complete break with established Roman policy, they were allowed in, unsubdued. They revolted, and within two years had defeated and killed the emperor Valens—the one who had received them—along with two-thirds of his army, at the battle of Hadrianople.” At first, “this sudden surge of would-be Gothic immigrants wasn’t seen as a problem at all,” writes Heather. “On the contrary, Valens happily admitted them because he saw in this flood of displaced humanity a great opportunity.” The Roman historian Ammianus wrote of how warmly the Goths were welcomed. They were viewed as young recruits. What Valens had done was the Christian thing to do, but it had never been the Roman thing to do. Valens has his modern counterpart in George W. Bush. In May 2006, Republican senators at Bush’s urging joined Democrats to offer a blanket amnesty to 12 million illegal aliens and permit U.S. businesses to go abroad and bring in foreign workers. Like the emperor Valens, President Bush was hailed for his compassion and vision.
From North Africa and the old French colonies of the sub-Sahara, they cross the Mediterranean. From the mandated lands Europe tore from the Ottomans, an Islamic invasion is changing the character of the Old Continent. The future the militant imams have in mind for Europe is not the same as that dreamed of by the bureaucrats of Brussels.

In 2005, children of Arab and African peoples, that France once ruled, burned and looted the suburbs of Paris and three hundred cities.

In 2005, 750,000 more Russians disappeared from the face of the earth, bringing Russia’s population down to 143 million. Due to an anemic birth rate and early deaths, another 10 million will vanish in the next ten years. Meanwhile, Chinese workers and traders in the thousands annually cross the Amur and Ussuri rivers to work and live, repossessing lands lost to the czars. In the Caucasus and Central Asia, holy warriors take up arms to drive Mother Russia back whence the Cossacks came centuries ago.

In the age of Jackson and Polk, the US tore Florida away from Spain, and Texas, the Southwest, and California away from Mexico. By century’s end, we had annexed Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. In the first half of the 20th century, America invaded Mexico, built the Panama Canal, intervened in the Caribbean and Central America, smashed Japan’s empire, and conquered the Pacific and East Asia.

Now the tape has begun to run in reverse, In 1960, there were perhaps 5 million Asians and Hispanics in the US. Today, there are 57 million. Between 10 percent and 20 percent of all Mexican, Central American, and Caribbean peoples have moved into the US. One to 2 million enter every year and stay, half of them with disdain for America’s borders. The estimated number of Illegal aliens range from 12 to 20 million.

This is not immigration as America knew it, when men and women made a conscious choice to leave their native lands to become Americans. There are 36 million immigrants in the US today; almost as many as came to America between Jamestown in 1607 and the Kennedy election of 1960.

Against the will of a vast majority of Americans, our elites seem to welcome the invasion. From Gibbon to Spengler to Toynbee and the Durants, the symptoms of dying civilizations are well known: the death of faith, the degeneration of morals, contempt for old values, collapse of culture. The two certain signs a dying civilization has begun: a declining population and foreign invasions resisted.

Europe, having embraced what Pope John Paul II called a “culture of death,” is far down the Roman road to ruin. Not one European nation save Muslim Albania has a birth rate among its native-born that will enable it to survive the century in its present form. Birth rates below replacement levels have been the mark of all the great nations of Europe for decades. In many, the population has ceased to grow and begun to die.

Why do we allow our homes to be invaded by strangers who demand they be fed, clothed, housed, and granted the rights of the firstborn? Why does the ruling elite permits it, and then celebrates it as a milestone of moral progress?

The penultimate scene, now underway, is the invasion unresisted. The last scene is the deconstruction of the nations.
The Invasion


♦ Three days later, Gov. Janet Napolitano of AZ declared a state of emergency on her southern border. By March 2006, Napolitano was moving National Guard to the border.

♦ On Sept. 20, 2004, Time magazine described the Mexican border: When the crowds cross the ranches along and near the border, they discard backpacks, empty Gatorade and water bottles and soiled clothes. They turn the land into a vast latrine, leaving behind revolting mounds of personal refuse. Night after night, they cut fences intended to hold in cattle and horses. Cows that eat the bags must often be killed because the plastic becomes lodged between the first and second stomachs. The immigrants steal vehicles and saddles. They poison dogs to quiet them. The illegal traffic is so heavy that some ranchers, because of the disruptions and noise, get very little sleep at night.

♦ Our leaders are so terrified of being called “nativist,” “xenophobic,” or even “racist” that they blind themselves to the rampant criminality along our southern border.

♦ On November 28, 2005, President Bush, speaking in Tucson, conceded that in five years 4.5 million aliens had been caught attempting to break into the US. Among that 4.5 million, Bush admitted, were “more than 350,000 with criminal records.” One in every twelve illegal aliens that the U.S. Border Patrol had apprehended was a criminal.

♦ That is 70,000 felons apprehended each year, 200 felons every single day for five years, trying to break into our country to rob, rape, and murder Americans. How many Americans have been robbed, assaulted, or murdered because the president failed in his duty to defend the borders of the US?

♦ Nearly 8 million foreigners entered during those 5 years; 3.7 million of them illegally. If one in twelve was a criminal, 300,000 felons slipped in during Bush’s tenure.

♦ There are today 36 million foreign-born in the US, almost three times as many people as the 13.5 million here at the peak of the Great Wave in 1910. And it is among these tens of millions of foreign-born that illegal aliens find sanctuary. As James Edwards of the Hudson Institute writes, legal and illegal immigration are two sides of the same coin. If we fail to control the one, we cannot control the other. As a rule, he notes, when legal immigration rises, illegal immigration soars. Mexicans account for perhaps 30 percent of all the foreign-born population in the US today, and more than half are here illegally. And while illegals made up only 21 percent of the foreign-born in 1980, they constitute 28 percent today.7

♦ Between 1830 and 1930, the period of the greatest migration from Europe to the US, Germany sent six million people to the US—more than any other nation.

♦ Italy has contributed more immigrants to the US than any other country except Germany. Over five million Italians came to this country between 1820 and 1963.
There are as many illegal aliens in the US today as all the German and Italian immigrants who ever came, the two largest immigrant groups in our history. Our foreign-born population today is almost equal to the 42 million who came over from 1607 to 1965. The Border Patrol catches as many illegal aliens every month as all the legal immigrants who came to America in the 1820s.

No nation has ever attempted to assimilate 36 million foreigners in a generation. Yet, each year, 1.5 million more are added to the number, half of them illegals, 90 percent of them from Third World countries whose people have never before been assimilated into our population. In the New York and San Francisco metropolitan areas, immigrants account for more than 25% of the population. In the Los Angeles and Miami-Dade metro areas, the respective figures are 32% and 36%.

In January 2005, a Bear Stearns study maintained: “The number of illegal immigrants in the US may be as high as 20 million people.” If near the mark, we have millions more illegal aliens in the US today than the sum total of all the Germans, Italians, Irish, and Jews who ever came to America in the 400 years of our history on this continent.

Congressman J. D. Hayworth: “At minimum, almost 4,500 people cross into Arizona illegally each day without getting caught.”

Illegals have became more aggressive, more brazen, more dangerous. In some cases, instead of asking for food or water, they would kick down doors to get it. Dogs are poisoned or their throats cut; property is damaged and goods are stolen, cars are hijacked and residents threatened.

In 2005, 687 assaults on U.S. Border Patrol agents were recorded, near double the number of the previous year. In the San Diego and Tucson sectors, Border Patrol agents reported being fired upon forty-three times, more than twice the number of shooting incidents as in the previous year.

If we fail to secure our borders, Americans of European descent, by 2050, will be a minority in the very nation their ancestors built.

By 2050, the Hispanic population will have tripled to 102 million, or 24 percent of the nation. Most will be of Mexican ancestry and concentrated in a Southwest that Mexican children are taught was stolen from their country by American aggressors a century and a half ago.

As early as 2010, it is estimated that in the regions surrounding the cities of Miami, Houston, L.A, San Francisco, and Wash., D.C., Americans of European descent will be a minority. In the Washington metro area between 2000 and 2005, the white population grew by 2.5 percent, the black population by 5.3 percent. But the Asian population shot up 21.5 percent and the Hispanic population grew by almost 28%.

In California and Texas, Americans of European descent are already a minority and their share of our population falls every year. Hispanics account for 34 percent of our two most populous states and their numbers are surging. During the 1990s, for the first time since it came into the Union, California’s white population fell by 2 million as its native-born sons and daughters packed and left for Nevada, Idaho, Arizona, and Colorado to live out their lives in places more like the Golden State they grew up in.
Teddy Roosevelt: “The one absolutely certain way of bringing this nation to ruin, of preventing all possibility of its continuing to be a nation at all, would be to permit it to become a tangle of squabbling nationalities.”. To the delight of anti-Americans and the indifference of our elites, we are risking the Balkanization of our nation.

Most of the 36 million foreign-born here came to share in the dream and be part of our national family. They work hard, and many have risked their lives to be here and to work at wages five and ten times what they can earn back home.

That the bodies of 2,881 migrants have been recovered by the Border Patrol since 1998, and many more remain missing, testifies to the determination and desperation of these people. Many have served in the armed forces of the US. Others come to avail themselves and their families of the benefits America provides her poor: free medical care at clinics and emergency rooms, education for their children, subsidized rents and food, welfare cash and earned income tax credits.

But millions bring no allegiance to America and remain loyal to the lands of their birth. And though they occupy more and more rooms in our home, they are not part of our family. Nor do they wish to be.

Some come for malevolent motives—to join gangs that traffic in human beings and narcotics and to make careers robbing, raping, and killing Americans, like the infamous MS-13. Some come with hate in their heart, like the Jamaican Cohn Ferguson, who shot down twenty-five people in a racist rampage against whites on the Long Island Railroad; like Angel Resendez, the rail-riding rapist-killer of nine American women, who slipped back and forth over the border for twenty-three years; like Beltway Sniper John Lee Malvo, who shot a dozen Americans for sport and eluded the death penalty; he was only 17 when he embarked upon his rampage of serial murder.

How many spies and saboteurs have been sent into our country as sleeper agents? How many Al Qaeda are here awaiting orders to bomb subways and malls or assassinate our leaders? We have no idea. Neither does the Department of Homeland Security. Ronald Reagan: a country that can’t control its borders isn’t really a country anymore.

In his address in Tucson, President Bush made a startling admission. For decades, he said, the US has had a separate policy in dealing with non-Mexicans breaking in through the 2,000-mile border with Mexico, a policy of “catch-and-release”: “about four of every five non-Mexican illegal immigrants we catch are released in society and asked to return for a court date. When the date arrives, about 75% of those released don’t show up at court. As a result, last year [2004], only 30,000 of the 160,000 non-Mexicans caught coming across our southwest border were sent home.” “This practice of catch and release has been the government’s policy for decades,” said Bush. “It is an unwise policy and we’re going to end it.”

Is this not an astonishing admission? President Bush was conceding that, in the third year following 9/11, 160,000 border crashers from nations all over the world were turned loose into our society, and only one in five turned up in court. Some 130,000 vanished into our midst.
Further on in his Tucson speech, Bush conceded that our government and laws have been frozen in a pre-9/11 world: Under current law, the federal government is required to release people caught crossing our border illegally if their home countries do not take them back in a set period of time. Those we were forced to release have included murderers, rapists, child molesters, and other violent criminals.

Again, is this not astounding? President Bush was talking about releasing “murderers, rapists, child molesters, and other violent criminals” into our society, because “current law” commands it and the nations whence these criminals come refuse to take them back.

With Bush and his party in power, why had they not changed “current law”? Why had President Bush not picked up a phone and told the leaders of these “home countries” that there will not be another visa issued to their country until they take back every one of their criminal felons who has broken into ours?

Potentially the most dangerous aliens crossing our southern border are “OTMs,” other-than-Mexicans. Terrorists have boasted openly of entering the US through Mexico and a growing number of OTMs caught at the border now come from the Middle East.

In February 2006, Senator Dianne Feinstein confronted national intelligence director John Negroponte on this threat, telling Negroponte she had questioned Admiral James Loy, acting head of the Department of Homeland Security, in 2004 and had since learned that the number of OTM illegal aliens had tripled, from 49,545 caught in 2003 to 155,000 in 2005: Last year, Admiral Loy and I discussed border security, particularly the increasing problem of penetration of other-than-Mexicans across our borders... and I said at that time I felt it was a major gateway for terrorists to access the US. ... Do you have any on-going intelligence efforts to prevent this from happening? Negroponte replied that the tripling of OTMs caught crossing the U.S. border was “an issue that we’re sensitive to.” The U.S. government, he added, is watching the border “very, very carefully.”18 Charles Allen, chief of intelligence at DHS, volunteered that his agency, too, is “very sensitive” to this matter. Negroponte did not deny that in the third and fourth year of the war on terror the number of OTMs from Africa, Asia, and the Middle East caught breaking into our country had tripled.

In 1818, to halt Indian attacks on Americans in South Georgia out of Spanish Florida, James Madison sent Andrew Jackson to eradicate the nests of villainy. Jackson stormed in, killed and routed the renegades, hanged two British spies for abetting the Indians, and put the Spanish governor and his garrison on a boat to Havana. To secure our border, Old Hickory had risked war with two of the world’s greatest empires.

When Pancho Villa crossed the border in 1916, burned Columbus, New Mexico, and murdered U.S. citizens, Wilson sent General Pershing and 12,000 troops 300 miles into Mexico to pursue the terrorist bandit.

In 1954, when Eisenhower discovered a million Mexicans here who did not belong, without apology he ordered them sent home in “Operation Wetback.” They went. Had Vicente Fox’s regime colluded in an invasion of the US, as it has for the last six years, those presidents would have regarded and treated it as an act of war.
George Bush has taken an oath to see to it that the laws of the US are faithfully executed. The immigration laws are clear. Businesses that hire illegal aliens break U.S. law and are subject to sanctions. Yet, as the columnist John O’Sullivan writes, “in the [Clinton] years 1995, 1996 and 1997 there were between 10,000 and 18,000 work-site arrests of illegals annually. In the same years about 1,000 employers were served notices of fines for employing them. Under the Bush administration, work-site arrests fell to 159 in 2004 where there was also the princely total of three notices of intent to fine served on employers.”

Twice, President Bush took an oath to “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the US.” Article IV, Section 4, reads: “The US shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion.”

Yet, with perhaps 4 million illegal aliens having broken in during Bush’s five and a half years in office, and our border states being daily breached by thousands more, can anyone say President Bush has protected the states of this Union against that invasion? In an earlier America, this dereliction of constitutional duty would have called forth articles of impeachment.

Coming to America

No. Virginia has 2 gangs: So. Side Locos, 1,500 members and MS-13, 3,500 members.

MS-13 has roots in Los Angeles but now includes an estimated 100,000 members in 33 states and 6 countries. MS-13’s origins are in the Central American civil wars of the 1980s, when President Reagan assisted El Salvador, then under attack by Cuban-trained, Sandinista-supported Marxist guerrillas of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN). To escape the war, hundreds of thousands of Salvadorans fled to the US, where they were granted asylum. There are now more than 1.1 million here. Salvadoran ambassador Rene Leon estimates that in the D.C. area alone, there are 500,000 Salvadorans, making our nation’s capital a rich recruiting ground for MS-13.

According to Newsweek, MS-13 has 8,000 to 10,000 members in thirty-three states. In Fairfax County, it is credited with 90 percent of all gang-related violence. Although some members were born in America and are citizens, Nicholas Zimmerman of Medill News Service reports that MS-13 is still “composed primarily of illegal immigrants from El Salvador.” And while the contingent in northern Virginia is the largest in the East, MS-13 roams from North Carolina to New England. At a meeting in suburban New York, 360 out of 480 school principals in attendance saw MS-13 as their greatest threat.

It is the story of a policy of “open borders” and virtually unrestricted immigration championed by a political establishment that runs America for its own benefit.

Why is it difficult if not impossible for cities to get control of this growing crime menace of immigrants and illegal aliens? Because many cities, under pressure from the ethnic lobbies, have declared themselves “sanctuary” cities, where police are forbidden to arrest known illegal and criminal aliens.
Adopted in 1979, when Daryl Gates was chief of the LAPD, Special Order 40 prevents police from arresting MS~13 gang members who are in Los Angeles in violation of their deportation orders. New York, Chicago, San Francisco, San Diego, Seattle, Houston, and Austin have all adopted similar “sanctuary” policies, where local police are forbidden to work with federal authorities on immigration violations. “We can’t even talk about it,” a frustrated LAPD captain told Mac Donald. “People are afraid of a backlash from Hispanics.”

a few statistics that indicate the gravity of the threat to our society posed by illegal alien criminals:

- In Los Angeles, 95 percent of all outstanding warrants for homicide, which total 1,200 to 1,500, target illegal aliens.
- Two-thirds of the 17,000 outstanding fugitive felony warrants in Los Angeles are for illegal aliens.
- Some 12,000 of the 20,000-strong 18th Street Gang that operates across Southern California are illegals.
- The 18th Street Gang works with the Mexican Mafia that dominates the California prisons. The historian Roger McGrath considers the gang “the bloodiest criminal organization in Los Angeles.”
- “During the ‘70s and ‘80s, black gangs—essentially the many versions of the Bloods and Crips—ruled the streets of South Central,” McGrath writes. “Police tell me that the black gangs are now on the defensive.”15 The graffiti slogan that is everywhere in L.A., “Crips and Bloods Together!”, is a call for African-American gang solidarity—for survival against the far more numerous Hispanic gangs.
- According to The Washington Times, 80,000 “absconders,” illegal aliens convicted of such felonies as murder, rape, drug dealing, and child molestation, who have served their prison time and been ordered deported, are now loose again on America’s streets.16
- A New Century Foundation study, The Color of Crime, that used FBI and Justice Department crime figures, found that while Hispanics are three times more likely than white Americans to be convicted of serious crimes requiring incarceration, they are nineteen times more likely to belong to criminal street gangs.”17 In an ominous development, Asian youth, who commit crimes at only one-fourth the rate of white Americans, are nine times more likely to belong to a criminal gang. The immigrant youth are being assimilated into the gang culture.
- FAIR reports that criminal aliens account for over 29% of prisoners in Federal Bureau of Prison facilities and a higher share of all federal prison inmates.
- The Beltway sniper, seventeen year old John Lee Malvo, accompanied by surrogate dad John Allen Muhammad, shot 13 people in the DC area. Malvo was an illegal alien release on $1,500 bond by the INS.
- Aliens in the US account for 12% of the population but 30% of the federal prison population.
Today's immigrants, on inspection, however, do not compare with yesterdays. Only 5 million Italian immigrants came, but four times as many Mexicans are already here, with potentially tens of millions more coming. Where the Italians came legally, half of the Mexicans are illegal aliens. Where the Italians came to stay or returned home, Mexicans come and go. Where the Italians wanted to be part of our family, millions of Mexicans are determined to retain their language and loyalty to Mexico. They prefer to remain outsiders. They do not wish to assimilate, and the nation no longer demands that they do so.

More critical, we are in the midst of a savage culture war in which traditionalist values have been losing ground for two generations. Millions of immigrants, but especially their children, who today survive on welfare and are being inculcated with the values of a subculture of gangs, crime, drugs, and violence. The parents may work hard, attend church, and still carry with them the conservative and Catholic values with which they were raised in the Latin America and Mexico of yesterday. But these good people are not changing our culture. Our polluted culture is capturing and changing their children.

African-Americans who go on to college are more fully integrated than ever before into our society, economy, and culture. But the larger number who quit school after twelfth grade, or drop out before they finish high school, end up in disproportionate numbers in jails and prisons. Many are part of another culture altogether, and to that culture many Hispanic young are assimilating. That Hispanic males are nineteen times as likely to join a gang as young white males should tell us which way the wind is blowing.

High among these is the appearance among us of diseases that never before afflicted us and the sudden reappearance of contagious diseases that researchers and doctors eradicated long ago. Malaria, polio, hepatitis, tuberculosis, and such rarities of the Third World as dengue fever, Chagas’ disease, and leprosy are surfacing here. In the states that border Mexico, writes NewsMax.com columnist George Putnam, there is “a steady, silent, pervasive invasion of the US by an unarmed army carrying an assembly line of diseases into the heart of America.”

The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, writes author-columnist Phyllis Schlafly, “reported 38,291 California cases of tuberculosis that included Multiple Drug Resistant Tuberculosis, which is 60 percent fatal and for which treatment costs $200,000 to $1,200,000 per patient. Illegal aliens are also bringing in syphilis and gonorrhea. Bedbugs have invaded the US for the first time in 50 years, with 28 states reporting recent infestations.”

In May 2006, the New York Times reported that one in every seven East Asian immigrants in the city, as many as 100,000 people, is a carrier of hepatitis B—an infection rate thirty-five times that of the general population. Almost all the new measles cases in America are brought in from abroad.

They are not alone! Their bodies may carry Hepatitis A, B, & C, tuberculosis, leprosy and Chagas Disease. Chagas is a nasty parasitic bug common in Latin America where 18 million people are infected and 50,000 deaths occur annually.”
For forty years, only 900 cases of leprosy or Hansen’s disease had been diagnosed in the US; in the first three years of the twenty-first century, 7,000 cases were discovered. Some of the TB diagnosed is now the multi-drug-resistant strain. In 2002, northern Virginia reported a 17 percent surge in tuberculosis cases; in Prince William County, the increase was a staggering 188 percent. In northern Virginia, foreign-born accounted for 92 percent of all cases. Three countries, all of which send immigrants and illegal aliens to America, account for two-thirds of all TB cases: Mexico, Vietnam, and the Philippines.

The New York Academy of Sciences reports that “TB bacteria readily fly through the air, as when an afflicted person coughs. It’s estimated that each victim will infect 10, 20, or more people—in time bomb effect.”

The incidence of TB is ten times as high among immigrants as among our native-born. Among immigrant children it is 100 times as high.

While few illegal aliens carry health insurance, that does not mean they are denied health care. Under the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA), every ER must treat any patient with an “emergency.” This includes pregnant women, brought in to have babies in the US, where the babies become instant citizens and qualify for a lifetime of entitlements. In the Spring 2005 issue of the Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, Dr. Madeleine Cosman reported that “Illegal alien women come to the hospital in labor and drop their little anchors, each of whom pulls its illegal alien mother, father, and siblings, into permanent residency simply by being born within our borders. Anchor babies are citizens, and instantly qualify for public welfare aid: Between 300,000 and 350,000 anchor babies annually become citizens.

One-tenth of all U.S. births are now “anchor babies,” automatic citizens whose parents have immediate claims on federal, state, and local governments. Under EMTALA, any doctor or hospital that refuses to treat an “emergency” case is subject to a $50,000 fine. Between 1994 and 2003, the mandated cost of caring for illegals forced eighty-four of California’s hospitals to shut down.

President Bush, who says illegal aliens “do jobs Americans won’t do,” is echoed by Geraldo Rivera, who says: “In vast sections of the country, there would not be a lawn mowed or a dish washed but for illegal immigrants.” This is pure propaganda, the Myth of the Indispensable Alien, put out by ideologues and ethnic lobbyists, first among whom is Vicente Fox, who said in May 2005, “There is no doubt that Mexicans, filled with dignity, willingness and ability to work are doing jobs that not even blacks want to do there in the US.”

According to John Hostettler and Lamar Smith, the chairman and ex-chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Claims, the economic argument for illegal aliens falls flat on close inspection. In December 2005, they wrote: “Some claim that illegal immigrants are doing jobs that Americans will not do. But when an illegal immigrant finds a job here, that does not mean that no American will take that job. In fact, 79% of all service workers are native-born, as are 68% of all workers in jobs requiring no more than a high-school education.”
Jeffrey Passel, the author of Unauthorized Migrants: Numbers and Characteristics, published by the Pew Hispanic Center, notes that illegal aliens constitute the following percentages of workers in various U.S. industries and occupations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drywall/ceiling tile installers</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping services</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maids and housekeepers</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal slaughter and processing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building cleaning and maintenance</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private household workers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation industry workers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing workers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and extraction workers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation and service workers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In only two of these industries do illegals constitute a fourth of the labor force. In almost all they are only a fifth or less of the labor force. What these numbers fairly shout is that native-born Americans are doing and will do the work illegal immigrants do.

As Mark Krikorian of the Center for Immigration Studies writes:

California tomato farmers testified in the 1960s that “the use of braceros [Mexican guest workers] is absolutely essential to the survival of the tomato industry.” But that labor program was ended anyway, and illegal immigrants did not immediately pick up the slack—so the farmers concluded that their investment in lobbying hadn’t paid off, and instead they invested in harvest machinery. The result: a quadrupling of production over the following 30 years, and a drop in the post-inflation retail price of tomato products.

But the arrival in our country of millions of immigrants every year, especially illegals who work for the wages offered, puts constant downward pressure on American wages. “A study by Harvard economist George Borjas shows that cheap immigrant labor has reduced by 7.4 percent the wages of American workers performing low-skill jobs.” This constitutes an injustice and a betrayal of the workingmen and women of America.

Both columnists Paul Krugman of the New York Times and Robert 3. Samuelson of The Washington Post exposed the fallacies and fraudulence of claims by President Bush that illegal aliens provide a net gain for our economy and “take jobs that Americans won’t do.” Writes Krugman, “[M]any of the worst-off native-born Americans are hurt by immigration—especially immigration from Mexico. Because Mexican immigrants have much less education than the average U.S. worker, they increase the supply of less-skilled labor, driving down the wages of the worst-paid Americans.”
What Krugman is saying is that the mass migration from Mexico is an attack on America’s poor. And he cites the authoritative study by Borjas and Lawrence Katz of Harvard showing that, were it not for immigration from Mexico, U.S. high school dropouts would be earning 8 percent more in wages. To allow mass migration of Third World poor is thus to betray black, Hispanic, and working-class white Americans without high school diplomas. “That’s why it’s intellectually dishonest to say, as President Bush does, that immigrants ‘do jobs Americans will not do.’” Krugman adds that the millions of poor immigrants are also shredding the social safety net, especially in states like California, which are the most generous with their welfare benefits.

Samuelson notes the enormous burden on the U.S. social welfare system as a consequence of our failure to halt the invasion. “Since 1980 the number of Hispanics with incomes below the poverty level (about $19,300 in 2004 for a family of four) has risen 162 percent. Over the same period, the number of non-Hispanic whites in poverty rose 3 percent and the number of blacks 9.5 percent. What we have now—and would with guest-workers—is a conscious policy of creating poverty in the US while relieving it in Mexico.

Cui bono? For whose benefit is this “conscious policy” if not for the workers of the welfare state and the businesses that seek an endless supply of cheap labor to keep costs down and profits up?

What are we doing to our people? What are we doing to the most vulnerable Americans, those 19 million adults who never got a high school degree, more than half of whom have given up looking for work? Among the 7 million of them still in the labor force, 10 percent are unemployed.

Is it any wonder African-Americans, millions of whom are forced to compete with immigrants for jobs, are the most forceful in demanding that the government get control of the border and halt the invasion?

There is another economic argument for open borders. By working at or near the minimum wage, poor immigrants and illegal aliens benefit us all by freeing Americans for more productive labor. Moreover they keep costs down—of having our crops picked, lawns mowed, gas pumped, cars washed, food served, and children monitored. Thus, we have more to spend on consumer goods.

But there is no free lunch, and mass immigration is no free lunch. As Milton Friedman has said, “It’s just obvious that you can’t have free immigration and a welfare state.” Professor Borjas found zero net economic benefit from mass migration from the Third World. The added cost of schooling, health care, welfare, Social Security, and prisons—perhaps $400 billion a year—plus the additional pressure on land, water, and power resources exceeded the taxes immigrants contribute. In 1995, the National Bureau of Economic Research put the net price of immigration at $80.4 billion. Economist Donald Huddle of Rice University estimated that by 2006 the net annual cost of legal and illegal immigration would be $108 billion. What benefit, then, justifies the risks we are taking with the health and safety of our citizens and the social cohesion of our country?
In 1960, America was a nation of 180 million, 89% were of European ancestry, 10% black, with a few million Hispanics and Asians. 97% of us spoke English.

By 2050 it now estimated there will be almost 2.5 times as many people here as in 1962: 420 million. There will be as many Hispanics here—102 million—as there are Mexicans today in Mexico. Hispanics will represent 25% of the population.

According to the Educational Testing Service, 45% of adult Americans cannot read or write at the high school graduate level, “and nearly half of these scored at a literacy level below that of a high school dropout.”

In a survey of twenty countries, the mean literacy test for Americans was 2 points above the mean for all adults. And among the seventeen nations that broke down the test scores between their native-born and immigrants, native-born Americans scored 8 points above the average of the native-born of the other sixteen nations.

U.S. immigrants scored 16 points below the average immigrant in other nations. In short, immigrants are dragging down average U.S. test scores in worldwide competitions. If only native-born Americans were taking these tests, there would be no crisis. The test scores for literacy of native-born Americans run 35 percent higher than the test scores of immigrants.

What makes this a huge and growing problem is that immigration now accounts for virtually all of the national increase in public school enrollment over the last two decades. Immigration is not the only factor behind our weak literacy scores. The literacy gap between native-born whites and Asians and their Black and Hispanic counterparts ranges from 46 points, or 19% on the prose and document literacy tests, to 57 points, or 25% on the quantitative test.

In layman’s language, if whites and Asians are A students, with average grades of 90, blacks and Hispanics are C and D students, with grades between 67 and 72. The ETS was forced to state the politically incorrect, albeit obvious: If we adjust the mean . . scores for U.S. adults under age 65 to exclude all foreign-born adults as well as all native-born Blacks and Hispanics, then the mean prose and quantitative scores of the remaining U.S. adults (Asian and White, native born) would rise to 288, ranking the U.S. second highest—tied with Finland and Norway—on the prose scale and fifth-highest on the quantitative scale. . . . The findings clearly suggest that future gains in the comparative, international literacy standing of U.S. adults will require substantial improvement in the literacy proficiencies of Blacks, Hispanics, and the foreign born from all racial/ethnic groups.
Steve Sailer of the Human Biodiversity Institute has also delved more deeply into the data on school performance. In 2003, Sailer reviewed No Excuses: Closing the Racial Gap in Learning, by Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom. As the Thernstroms starkly summarized, Blacks nearing the end of their high school education perform a little worse than white eighth-graders in both reading and U.S. history, and a lot worse in math and geography. In math and geography, indeed, they know no more than whites in the seventh grade. Hispanics do only a little better than African-Americans. In reading and U.S. history, their NAEP scores in their senior year of high school are a few points above those of whites in eighth grade. In math and geography, they are a few points lower. The Thernstroms found roughly the same disparity between the test scores of Hispanics and whites as between blacks and whites, but say the gap narrows if immigrant children are excluded. Yet U.S.—born Hispanic kids are still three grades behind white students when they graduate from high school. Among third- and fourth-generation Hispanics, test scores are no longer rising. They have plateaued. In these generations, half of all Hispanic children still fail to finish high school. Only 10 percent earn higher than high school diplomas. And even successful Hispanic students leave school years behind in academic achievement.

Two reports from the Department of Education support Sailer and Rubenstein. In the 2002–03 academic year, spending in D.C. schools, which are almost entirely immigrant and African-American, was $16,344 per pupil, highest in the nation after Alaska. But only 12 percent of D.C.’s eighth-grade public school students could read at eighth-grade levels in 2005, and only 7 percent could do eighth-grade math. In South Dakota and Iowa, both of which spend less than half per pupil as D.C., more than a third of eighth-graders read and did math at or above eighth-grade levels.

Harvard’s George Borjas, who was born in Cuba and is today the nation’s foremost expert on immigration and poverty, has spoken of an education crisis: “Mexicans tend to be at a very low level of schooling. A very large proportion have less than 8 years of education, and many have only three or four years. Quite a few actually have zero.”

Yet some immigrant children perform exceedingly well. Though the country was held in colonial captivity by Japan for generations and suffered three years of one of the bloodiest wars of the twentieth century, South Korea “has the second highest IQ in the world.... Its citizens have the longest work-weeks in the world. South Korean students typically score at the top of the world in international achievement tests.” Of 672,000 Koreans in the US, 28% of adults are self-employed, the highest rate by far for any immigrant group.
Two Americas, Separate and Unequal What do these dramatic disparities in educational achievements portend?

♦ As Amy Chua writes in World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability (2002), within societies, economic inequality among racial and ethnic groups leads to turmoil and violence. And there is an absolute correlation between education levels and success in life.

♦ Our two largest minorities, African-Americans and Hispanics, which now number together 79 million or 27 percent of the population, are leaving school with achievement levels three, four, and five grades behind white and Asian students. We are headed toward a society and nation more dangerously polarized than the America of 1960, when minorities made up only 11 percent of a population that was far smaller than today’s or tomorrow’s.

♦ However as their combined share of the U.S. population rises toward 40 percent in 2050, they will use their political clout to demand equality of result: racial and ethnic quotas and affirmative action in all professions. And as African-Americans no longer do the servile work their parents once did, we may expect the children of Hispanics to reject the “jobs no one else wants” that their fathers and mothers do today.

♦ Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., warned in that decade when America’s cities burned: There is nothing more dangerous than to build a society, with a large segment of people in that society, who feel that they have no stake in it; who feel that they have nothing to lose. People who have a stake in their society, protect that society, but when they don’t have it, they unconsciously want to destroy it.

♦ In “Immigrants at Mid-Decade: A Snapshot of America’s Foreign Born Population in 2005,” Steven Camarota of the Center for Immigration Studies alerted America’s future if we do not enforce, and reform, our immigration laws:
  - Of our adult immigrants, 31 percent never finished high school, three and a half times the rate of native-born Americans.
  - The poverty rate for immigrants is 57 percent higher than for native-born Americans. Immigrants and their minor children constitute one in four persons in poverty.
  - Among immigrants, 24 percent receive Medicaid, 29 percent use some form of welfare, 30 percent are eligible for the earned income tax credit. These are near twice the rates of native-born Americans.
  - A third of all immigrants lack health insurance.
  - Immigrant children accounted for nearly 100% of the increase in U.S. public school enrollments in the last twenty years.
  - Immigrant children account for 19 percent of all students in U.S. public schools and 21 percent of children about to enter those schools.

♦ The average immigrant comes to this country much poorer and far less educated than Americans and consumes far more per capita in public services. As Steve Sailer notes,
a National Academy of Sciences study in 1997 found that each immigrant who comes with less than a high school education costs taxpayers $90,000 net over his/her lifetime.

- Those who bring a high school degree cost taxpayers $30,000. But immigrants with a college degree or better brought a net benefit to the U.S. Treasury of $100,000.
- However, not all immigrant groups are equal consumers of public services. Not all come uneducated or unprepared for school. Not all occupy the lower rungs of the social and economic ladder. Consider:
  - Mexicans, Central Americans, and Caribbean peoples use welfare at more than twice the rate of native-born Americans.
  - In 1995, close to half of all Cambodian and Laotian immigrants and a fourth of all Vietnamese were on welfare.
  - More than 50 percent of all immigrants from Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras never finished high school.
  - Only 5 percent or less of immigrants from South Korea, Canada, Russia, Britain, Germany, Iran, and Japan never finished high school.
  - Half of all immigrants from China, Philippines, India, Korea, Russia, Iran, and Japan come to the US with college degrees.
- Some of the disparities among immigrant groups are so stark they dramatize the crisis America faces:
  - Only 2 percent of Italian immigrants are on Medicaid and less than 5 percent of Italians qualify for the earned income tax credit.
  - But 50 percent of the immigrants from the Dominican Republic use Medicaid and 50 percent of the immigrants from Mexico qualify for the EITC.
- The immigrant crisis is clarified when we see that Dominicans here outnumber Italians here by 2 to 1 and Mexicans outnumber Italians 28 to 1.
- The core of the crisis is Mexico. Mexicans here outnumber all other immigrant groups by at least 6 to 1 and outnumber immigrants from Canada 16 to 1.
- In 2006, the U.S/Mexico Border Counties Coalition, consisting of officials of the twenty-four U.S. counties bordering Mexico, reported the findings of a two-year study. If those twenty-four counties were the fifty—first state, that state would be number one in federal crimes, due to drug and illegal immigration arrests, number two in tuberculosis cases, number three in the incidence of hepatitis and concentration of Hispanics. Remove prosperous San Diego County, and that fifty-first state would be number two in unemployment and fifty-first in per capita income and in the percentage of its population that has finished high school. The border region of the US is beginning to look less and less like America and more and more like Mexico.
- What is our future?
Given that our mass immigration is coming first from Mexico, then from Central America and the Caribbean, and that these immigrants’ crime and poverty rates are far higher and their average educational achievement far lower than that of Americans.

More African-American males are incarcerated than in college. In some cities, 40% of them between the ages of 18 and 36 are either in jail, prison, on probation or parole.

As the immigrant poor front Latin America pour in, filling all the new schools we build, imposing a constantly rising tax burden on Middle America, their children will continue to pull down U.S. test scores and stress out teachers trying to bring them up to national standards—a task at which we have never succeeded and at which no one seems to know how to succeed. And our teachers will point with alarm each year to falling national test scores to berate taxpayers for not putting enough money into reducing class sizes and raising teachers’ salaries.

Though America had just ended two of the most prosperous decades in her history, Los Angeles had become a separate nation. During the 1990s, poverty in Los Angeles County did not remain stable or decline, but shot up 28%. By 2000, 1.6 million people in L.A. County lived beneath the poverty line. In Orange County, bastion of Goldwater Republicanism, the poverty rate had soared by 44%. In the Inland Empire of San Bernardino and Riverside counties, on the road to Palm Desert, poverty exploded by 51% and 63%, respectively.

During the Reagan decade, median income in L.A. County rose a smart 21.5%. But in the Clinton decade, median income sank 8%, from $45,600 to $42,200.19 In LA, it fell even further.

During the 1990s, the Latino population of Los Angeles County rose 27 percent, to 4.2 million; the Asian population rose by 26 percent; but the “Anglo” population fell by 18 percent. White folks are fleeing California at the rate of 100,000 a year and the black middle class is following. Columnist Diana West has documented the demographic revolution in L.A.: In 1960 non-Hispanic whites made up 82% of the population of Los Angeles County. Forty years later . . . the white population had dwindled to 31 percent while Hispanics... accounted for 45% of population. This colossal surge has made the Mexican population of Los Angeles second only to that of Mexico City.

Three million people of Mexican ancestry today call L.A. County home and 54% of all its residents speak a language other than English in their homes, up from 45% in 1990.

What has happened to L.A. is happening to California. According to the Los Angeles Times, in the 1990s Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties experienced increases of 36 to 70% in the number of foreign-born. As the state is repopulated, income disparities grow. While the number of Californians earning $150,000 tripled to 642,000 in the 1990s, the share of California’s people mired in poverty rose by 30%.

High among the reasons workers’ wages are stagnant or falling is the loss of industry. In L.A. County, the number of manufacturing jobs fell by 32% in the 1990s, from 861,000 to 587,000. As tax consumers continue to flood in from Mexico, and
taxpayers flee, the state deficit bound. Its bond rating has been dropped by S&P’s to almost junk-bond status, lowest of the 50 states.

♦ An exodus comparable to that out of the Dust Bowl in the 1930s has begun. For the first time since the Spanish came, native-born Californians have begun to depart. Fed up with rising crime rates and rising taxes to subsidize illegal aliens, they are leaving for Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, and Colorado, as the California they grew up in and loved morphs into Mexifornia.

♦ Census 2000 revealed what many sensed: For the first time since statehood in 1849, European Americans had become a minority in the Golden State. Sociologist William Frey documented the outmigration. In the 1990s, the state grew by 3 million, but its white population dropped by almost half a million. L.A. County alone lost 480,000 white folks. The Republican bastion of Orange County lost 6% of its white population.

♦ “We can’t pretend we’re a white middle class state anymore,” said William Fulton, a research fellow at USC’s Southern California Studies Center.24 State Librarian Kevin Starr sees the Hispanicization of California as natural and inevitable: With 100,000 whites leaving California each year, the Asian population soaring 42 percent in a decade, and 43 percent of all Californians under eighteen Hispanic, California is becoming—indeed, has become—a Third World state.

♦ No one knows how this will play out, but California could become an American Quebec, demanding formal recognition of its Hispanic culture and identity, or a giant Ulster. As Sinn Fein demanded and was given special ties to Dublin; Mexicans and Mexican-Americans may demand a special relationship with Mexico, open borders, and a right to representation in the Mexican legislature as well as the U.S. Congress. These items are already on the agendas of Chicano militants and U.S. elites. And with California holding 20% of the electoral votes needed to win the presidency, and Hispanic votes decisive in CA, what party would shut the door to these demands?

♦ As the illegals poured in by the hundreds of thousands yearly in the early 1990s, and the U.S. government refused to halt the invasion, Californians filed petitions with a million signatures to put Proposition 187 on the ballot. Prop 187 would have ended welfare benefits to people who broke our laws, broke into our country, and did not belong here. In a huge turnout that swept Governor Pete Wilson back into office and Republicans into control of both houses of the legislature, 59 percent of California voters supported 187. Repudiated, the open-borders crowd found a federal judge to annul the voters’ victory. Wilson appealed the ruling but, as the case dragged on, a new governor, Gray Davis, refused to pursue the appeal. The welfare benefits continued to flow. Said Esteban “Art” Torres, chairman of the California Democratic Party, “187 was the last gasp of white America in California.”

♦ Hispanic voters rewarded Davis with reelection in 2002, and California’s budget continued to hemorrhage. In 2003, facing a $38 billion deficit and having signed a bill
to grant driver’s licenses to illegal aliens, Davis was recalled and fired by enraged Californians.

Suicide of the GOP

♦ Black support for the GOP, a legacy since Lincoln, had vanished with Johnson’s authorship of and Goldwater’s opposition to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

♦ The white majority of the US, which Bush carried easily, has steadily fallen as a share of the national population from near 90% in 1960 to 67% today—and will fall to less than 50% by 2050.

♦ The fastest growing segments of our population are Hispanics, at 14.4 percent and immigrants, who are now at 12%.

♦ The people who put the GOP in power are not growing in numbers nearly as rapidly as immigrants and people of color who want them out of power.

♦ Since Nixon, the Republican key to success has been two large Democratic blocs: southern white Protestants and northern ethnic Catholics. Nixon sheared these votes off from FDR’s New Deal coalition through appeals to populism, patriotism, and social conservatism.

♦ Now Republicans have moved from the Southern strategy to a Hispanic strategy.

♦ The white vote that carried the party to five victories in six elections is not growing as rapidly as the minority vote. Indeed, it shrinking as a share of the electorate. Third World immigration is drowning the Republican base.

♦ With the Immigration Act of 1965, the nation began to import another electorate. In the 1990s, immigrants and their children accounted for 100 percent of the population growth of California, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and Massachusetts, and half the population growth of Florida, Texas, Michigan, and Maryland. Six of these nine states have become solidly Democratic in presidential elections and Michigan and Florida are trending that way.

♦ Republican elites have, for decades now, supported an open- borders immigration policy. In 1996, Republican altruism was rewarded. Of the seven states containing the largest numbers of foreign-born—California, New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Florida, and Texas—six went for Bill Clinton. In 2000, five went for Al Gore and Florida was dead even. However, of the nine states with the smallest share of immigrants—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wyoming—all went for George W. Bush in 2000 and again in 2004. Of the fifteen states with the smallest shares of immigrants, Bush carried thirteen, losing only Maine and Vermont. But the warning signs are up in the red states.

♦ 25 states more than doubled and nine more than tripled their foreign-born population since 1990.

♦ America is going the same way In 1960, the U.S. population was 89 percent white; by 1990, it was 76%. Today, it is 67%. By 2050, white Americans, the most loyal voting
bloc the Republican Party has, which delivers 90 percent of all GOP votes, will be just another minority because of an immigration policy championed by Republicans. When John Stuart Mill called the Tories “the Stupid Party,” he was not entirely wrong.

♦ In 1980, Hispanics made up 6.4 percent of our population; by 1990, 9 percent. Today, they form 14.4 percent. The Census Bureau estimates that by 2050 the Hispanic population will triple, to 102 million, and constitute 24 percent of our national population. If present geographic distribution holds, the political map of 2050 will find 50 million Hispanics in California and Texas, and another 25 million in New York, Florida, Illinois, Arizona, and New Jersey.

♦ Not only are Hispanics our largest minority now, their birth rate far outstrips that of native Americans. As Steve Sailer writes, while 56 percent of all U.S. births were to white women in 2004, 23 percent were to Hispanics. And while fertility rates among white women are now below replacement levels (2.1 babies per woman) and continue to fall, among Hispanics the birthrate is rising. Among Mexican women who have entered the US illegally, the birthrate is soaring: 3.5 children per woman.9 Says demographer Jeffrey Passel, “The Hispanic fertility rates are ... at the levels of the baby boom era of the 1950s.”10

♦ One in every ten babies born in America is born to an illegal alien. These “anchor babies” are instantly eligible for all the benefits of U.S. citizens, for every one is a citizen at birth. That was not the intent of the Fourteenth Amendment—”All persons born or naturalized in the US and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the US.” But that is the interpretation put on that amendment that our government refuses to correct. Small wonder the maternity wards of the Southwest are jammed with pregnant women who have slipped over the border.

♦ At 43 million, Hispanics outnumber black Americans by 6 million now, but are not so solidly Democratic. Bush lost AfricanAmericans eleven to one in 2000 and nine to one in 2004. But he lost Hispanics by only two to one in 2000 and three to two to 2004. He was fortunate in running against white-bread candidates like Kerry and Gore who lacked the charisma of Clinton.

♦ In 1996, Clinton swept the Latino vote seventy to twenty-one. Among first-time Latino voters, his margin was ninety-one to six. Aware that immigrants can give the Democrats their own lock on the White House, Clinton’s men worked to naturalize them. In the year up to September 30, 1996, the Immigration and Naturalization Service swore in 1,045,000 new Americans so quickly that 80,000 with criminal records—6,300 for serious offenses—became citizens. Through the 1990s, 5.6 million immigrants became American citizens, four times as many as in the 1970s.

♦ From 2000 to 2005, 7.9 million more immigrants arrived, legal and illegal, with Mexicans forming the largest contingent. This set an all-time record. If Republicans believe these millions of largely uneducated, unskilled, and poor people are going to rally to a party that advocates slashing the size of the government, the party is in need of a brain transplant.
California took a third of the new citizens. And as white registration fell in the 1990s, 1 million Latinos registered. At 16 percent of the California electorate, Hispanics helped give Gore and Kerry the state, with more than 1 million votes to spare.

Like African-Americans, Hispanics benefit and believe in government and they vote their interests.

The Asian-Republican Myth. With their solid family values and strong work ethic, they are thought to be natural-born Republicans. Not true. George W. lost the Asian-American vote by a landslide in every survey taken after the 2004 election.

There is an obvious contradiction for Republicans to court the Hispanic vote: small-government philosophy courting a group who believes otherwise.

Illegal immigration would do to the national party what they believe Governor Pete Wilson’s hard line did to the California party. Their fears are reinforced by neoconservatives like William Kristol. In April 2006, Kristol disparaged as “yahoos” four GOP congressmen, including Tom Tancredo of Colorado, chairman of the House Immigration Reform Caucus, who had denounced a Senate-proposed amnesty. Citing the Republican drought in California as proof that any tough stand against illegals is suicidal politics, Kristol wailed: “How many Republicans will have the courage to stand up and prevent the yahoos from driving the party over a cliff?”

The president, Rove, and Kristol have all bought into a media myth.

Riding that illegal alien issue, Wilson, the most unpopular incumbent in California history prior to Gray Davis, came from 20 points down to win reelection with 55% in 1994; gained a majority in both houses of the assembly for the first time in thirty years; and carried four new GOP congressmen in with him. The only statewide race Republicans have won since Wilson was the 2003 victory of Arnold Schwarzenegger, whose strongest issue was Davis’s decision to grant driver’s licenses to illegals. Arnold promised to undo it and swept to victory.

Every GOP senatorial, gubernatorial, or presidential candidate who has run away from the issue of illegal immigration in California has been wiped out. Using this issue Republicans can win Democrat voters.

Democrats have begun to see its potency. After Bush called the Minutemen vigilantes, Bill Richardson called them patriots. A favorite of Hispanics, as his own ancestry is partly Hispanic, Richardson is awake to the potential of the immigration issue, and was the first governor to declare a state of emergency on the Mexican border.

Bush cannot have both ways: Hispanic vote and strong borders.

If the president will act, he may regain the allegiance for his party of enough Reagan Democrats to more than compensate for any Hispanic votes he may lose. Consider:

- Hispanics make up 14.4% of the population, but, as so many are illegal and many do not vote, were only 6% of the electorate in 2004. White voters still constitute more than 80% of the electorate. This means the white vote is 13 times the size of the Hispanic vote. Adding 1% of the white vote is thus worth as many raw votes as gaining 13% of the Hispanic vote.
An increase of only 2% of the white vote adds more GOP votes than a 25% increase in the Hispanic vote.

What these relative numbers shout is that a Republican campaign that comes down hard for border security and enforcing the law on companies that chronically hire illegals can rally far more white voters, and black voters, than any conceivable loss among Hispanics. Indeed, many Hispanics put a commonsense philosophy ahead of identity politics and are demanding the borders be protected. In Arizona, 47 percent of Hispanics voted for Proposition 200 to require proof of citizenship before welfare benefits are handed out. A Pew Foundation poll found that only 7 percent of Hispanics thought there were “too few” immigrants in the US, while 48 percent said there were “too many.” For it is Hispanic citizens whose jobs are threatened and whose wages are suppressed by illegal aliens. It is Hispanic citizens, among whom the illegal aliens live, who pay the greatest costs of the rising crime and delinquency rates.

Anecdotal evidence is coming in that taking a tough stand on illegal immigration is a winner, even among Democrats. In late 2005 in Boston, the legislature, 87 percent Democratic, was about to ram through a veto-proof bill to grant illegal aliens in-state tuition rates at Bay State colleges. Illegal aliens would thus be granted a privilege, worth $9,000 a year, that is denied to U.S. students from neighboring New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, or any other state. In-state tuition for illegal aliens went down to defeat 96 to 57. Someone spoke: consider our progress when Pat Buchanan’s words come out the mouth of Mass. Democrat.

Roots of Paralysis

In June 1992, this writer, after losing primaries for four months, won almost 30% of the vote in the big counties of So. Calif. primary against Pres. George W. Bush by calling for a fence on the border. In 1994, Gov. Pete Wilson wiped out a 20-point deficit to win reelection by a double-digit margin by riding Proposition 187, which called for an end to welfare for illegal aliens, to victory. Proposition 187 carried 59% of the state, and sweeping majorities of Asian- and African- as well as Anglo-American Californians.

According to a 5-6-2005, Zogby Poll, 81% of Americans want local and state police to assist U.S. authorities in enforcing immigration laws; 56% oppose “the Bush administration’s proposal to give millions of illegal aliens guest-worker status and the opportunity to become citizens”; 53% support deployment of troops on the border.

Zogby found the greatest hostility to illegal aliens among African-Americans, Democrats, women, and workers earning less $75,000.

In Nov. 2005, a Rasmussen survey found 60% of the nation supporting a border fence.

With the Constitution, the law, and the politics on the side of doing his duty and securing our broken borders, why doesn’t Bush act? Political correctness, political cowardice, political opportunism, a sense of guilt for America’s sins and twin
ideologies that have a grip on our elites not unlike a religious cult. The dividing line is elites versus the people.

♦ On one side are the elite print media, the courts and a few politicians fronting for employer and ethnic interests; on the other side are the far more numerous and raucous, talk-radio listeners, bloggers and cable news watchers, the ballot propositions and populist state legislators.

♦ Support for open borders in highest today among those who live in neighborhoods where the illegal aliens work but do not live.

♦ TR: There can be no divided allegiance here. We have room for but one flag...We have room for but one language...and we have room for but one sole loyalty.

♦ Bush is carrying out the needs of the transnational corporation that finance his party. K-Street values have replaced American values.

♦ Businesses who use illegal labor are cheating their competitors.

♦ That civil rights leaders and union leaders are silent only tells us that the transnational corporations have gotten to them.

♦ Even Coolidge with his “the business of America is business”, would have put country first; he even said so: “America must be kept American.”

♦ The new slogan for America is if it is good for the GDP, it is good for America. And cheap labor is good for the GDP.

♦ Corporate America believes in socializing costs, while privatizing profits.

♦ Of the 100 largest entities on earth, half are nations, half are corporations. Corporate executives work ceaselessly to erase borders and diminish national sovereignty. Allied with them are thousands of “international civil servants,” in the EU, the UN, the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO, the World Court, the Internat’l Criminal Court, and in thousands of NGOs, nongovernmental org. that consider their mandates to be global.

♦ Backing up the Bush Republicans and Big Business are intellectuals like the late Robert Bartley, for three decades editorial editor of the Wall Street Journal. The neoconservative Bartley was an open-borders, free-trade fanatic. “I think the nation-state is finished,” he reportedly told author Peter Brimelow, as his newspaper campaigned for decades for a constitutional amendment declaring, “There shall be open borders.” When Vicente Fox called for a No. American Union modeled on the European Union, Bartley hailed him as a “visionary” and pledged solidarity: “He [Fox] can rest assured that there is one voice north of the Rio Grande that supports his vision ... this newspaper.” To utopians like Barley and his colleagues at the WSJ, what matters is that you contribute to the GDP.

♦ The Democratic Party sees immigrants, legal and illegal, as future voters. Nor are they mistaken in that hope. For the Third World poor, the vast majority of those coming, depend on the social programs that are the raison d’être of the Democratic Party. The more immigrant poor who come, the larger the Leviathan state, and the greater the number of employees needed to operate and manage it. And there are no more reliable
Democratic constituencies than those who depend on government for their health, education, and welfare, or for their paychecks. Gov’t unions are Democratic unions.

◆ “We’re going to close down LA, Chicago, NY, Tucson, Phoenix, Fresno,” said Jorge Rodriguez, an official of one of the unions of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees on the eve of the May Day general strike and boycott. “We want full amnesty, full legalization for anybody who is here [illegally].” If 12 million illegals are amnestied, it means hundreds of thousands of new jobs for AFSCME and its allied unions to manage the expanded welfare state.

◆ Mainline churches believe that siding with illegal immigrants fulfills the commandments of the Social Gospel. And immigrants fill up the pews emptied of the older Christians who have passed on, or who, fed up with the dilutions of doctrine, have moved on to more orthodox congregations.

◆ The Catholic hierarchy has come out for amnesty for illegal aliens, believing this comports with Christ’s admonition to feed the hungry and harbor the homeless. But Christ’s commands are for us as individuals. They are not met by benedictions over mass demonstrations by illegal aliens marching under foreign flags or press conferences by His Eminence Cardinal Mahony demanding that the faithful finance an endless stream of social welfare benefits for people who have broken into our country, and now demand all the rights and privileges of American citizens.

◆ Unions once opposed mass immigration as undercutting the wages of workers. They now see immigrants in the service and construction industries as replacements for the members lost to out-sourcing and downsizing. By making illegal aliens legal, unions hope to organize them and restore lost union power. Around 2000, an AFL-CIO that had been losing members for decades came out for de facto amnesty.

◆ Internationalists see a fusion of the US, Canada, and Mexico as the logical next step to world government. Transnationals see borders as impediments to the flow of workers and goods. Alienated intellectuals and cultural elites, discontented with America, are committed to open borders to alter forever a country and culture they abhor.

◆ When Susan Sontag said, “The white race is the cancer of human history,” she did not speak for herself alone at a time when it was elite campus fashion to put up posters of Ché Guevara in the dorm and march under Vietcong flags chanting: “Ho, Ho Chi Minh, NLF is going to win!” And when Jesse Jackson leads student demonstrators across Stanford campus chanting, “Hey, Hey, ho, ho, Western Civ has got to go,” he means tossing out more than just required courses on Western Civilization.

◆ Finally, there are those slush funds of sedition, the big foundations, foremost among which is the Ford Foundation, with assets of $11 billion.
Forty years ago, the League of United Latin American Citizens, was a patriotic organization that had as its code: “Respect your citizenship, honor your country…” In 1968, one militant broke away and approached Ford for money for a new Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund. MALDEF was given an initial grant of $2.2 million. It has since raked in $30 million from Ford and tens of millions more from corporations to convert itself into the most powerful lobbying arm in the US for illegal aliens and Mexico’s interests. The National Council of La Raza—the advocacy and lobbying arm of Latino peoples in America—is another beneficiary of the big corporations and big foundations that finance the left in the culture wars.

With the ACLU, MALDEF leads the fight for bilingual education, for granting driver’s licenses and in-state tuition rates to illegal aliens, for opening the border. When voters enact laws in statewide referenda to end social welfare benefits to illegal aliens, MALDEF and the ACLU go judge-shopping together to have the laws overturned. And through the judges and courts, minority rule replaces majority rule in America.

Then there is the new Hispanic media—the purveyors of films, the owners of the Spanish-language radio and TV stations, the publishers of magazines, books, and newspapers for Hispanics. Survival for these media institutions, some of the fastest growing and most politically powerful in the nation, depends on immigrants not converting to the English language.

These, then, are the institutions and elites with the vested interests, economic and ideological, in letting the invasion run on until there is no longer a recognizable nation, but a multilingual, multiracial, multiethnic, multicultural America, the first universal nation of Ben Wattenberg’s utopian dream. And the country we knew will be gone and the warning of T.R. will have proven prophetic. The last best hope of earth will have become “a polyglot boarding house” for the world.

Western society is afflicted with a guilty conscience. For Europeans, the guilt is over centuries of imperial rule. For Americans, it is guilt over our ancestors’ injustices to the Native Americans and two centuries of enslavement of black Americans, followed by a century of segregation.

Our ancestors were not paralyzed by guilt. Confident in their culture and civilization, they believed in their superiority over what Kipling had called the “lesser breeds without the law.” We come from a different people than the people we have become. Five of our first seven presidents were slaveholders. Andrew Jackson, among the fiercest Indian fighters in history, spoke for the Jacksonians when he defended ethnic cleansing: What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms, embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization, and religion?
The Great Emancipator believed in white supremacy and favored repatriation of slaves to the African continent whence their ancestors had come. “The only good Indian is a dead Indian,” said his fiercest general, Sherman, who burned Atlanta, to Sheridan, who burned the Shenandoah. It was Sherman who sent Sheridan to settle accounts with the Plains Indians and urged a “final solution” to the Sioux question: extermination.

In his Winning of the West, young Theodore Roosevelt spoke for his generation of imperialists in terms that are raw, racist, and ruthless. As Peter Brimelow writes, he “presented the settling of the lands beyond the Alleghenies as ‘the crowning and greatest achievement’ of the ‘spread of the English-speaking peoples’ which he saw in explicit terms: it is of incalculable importance that America, Australia, and Siberia should pass out of the hands of their red, black, and yellow aboriginal owners, and become the heritage of the dominant world races.”

Woodrow Wilson was a segregationist, who had D. W. Griffith’s Birth of a Nation shown at the White House. Harry Truman flirted with the Klan. Lyndon Johnson, “the civil rights president,” was given to using the “n” word in front of black men who worked for him.

Today, we find such views repellent. But, if racism means a belief in the superiority of the white race and its inherent right to rule other peoples, American history is full of such men. Indeed, few great men could be found in America or Europe before World War II who did not accept white supremacy as natural. Churchill surely did. In September 1943, at a White House lunch, he said to FDR, “why be apologetic about Anglo-Saxon superiority... they were superior. “

How could Ike send back all illegal aliens in “Operation Wetback” without a second thought while Bush refuses to act? Because Eisenhower’s conscience was untroubled. To the Greatest Generation, America was not a racist country. Those would have been fighting words in 1950.

Growing up in the 1940s and 1950s, we did not feel any need to apologize for America’s past, but took pride in all she had accomplished. African-Americans shared that pride. That there were sins in our past, no one denied. But Americans did not obsess over wrongs done by previous generations, for, compared with all other nations, America merited the gratitude of mankind.

Yet, though the achievements of our civilization in art, architecture, law, literature, technology, science, and governance, and the advance of human freedom and God-given rights eclipse those of any other, there has arisen among our intellectual and cultural elites a contempt for the West. Many see our ancestors as irredeemably racist, imperialist, and genocidal. George Orwell located this selfloathing on the British Left: “England is perhaps the only great country whose intellectuals are ashamed of their nationality. In leftwing circles, it is always felt that there is something slightly disgraceful in being an Englishman and that it is a duty to snigger at every English institution.”
By the late 1960s, the disease had crossed the Atlantic and become an epidemic. Some American writers, scholars, and teachers now spend careers tearing down what our ancestors built up. Their contempt for America, her culture and history, has induced a paralysis that stultifies a resolute defense against enemies who can make out credentials as victims of Western crimes. And as the West is guilty of the most odious of offenses against peoples of color, some among our elite ask: Why should not the West suffer the fate of all evil empires? By the time the coming generation reaches middle age, writes John Derbyshire, “The concept that lay beneath and supported our collective consciousness until recently, the concept that white Europeans, their civilization and their bourgeois culture, were the apex of human achievement, will have been shamed, mocked, and badgered out of existence—along, of course, with the civilization and culture.”

Baby boomers have been indoctrinated to believe America is fatally flawed—racist, sexist, nativist, homophobic. Many were taught to see her history as the shameful past of a brutal country that had enslaved one people and exterminated another. Growing up in the civil rights era, many baby boomers bought into its core doctrine: America must confess her sins, seek absolution, and make eternal restitution.

In public and private schools, colleges and universities, through Hollywood films and Broadway plays, in fiction and nonfiction, magazines and newspapers, TV documentaries and prime-time shows, this message of our oppression of minorities has been drummed into the souls of this generation, many are incapable of mounting a defense when confronted by alleged victims charging America with injustice.

The moral paralysis seems most pronounced among progressives. Though union leaders once damned as “scabs” and “strikebreakers” men who hired out at lower wages to take the jobs of union members, today many are silent or welcoming of illegal aliens who shoulder aside American workers.

Booker T. Washington and A. Philip Randolph demanded that immigration be curbed so black Americans could fill the openings in the booming industrial economy; today’s civil rights “leaders” are mute as these jobs are taken by Third World immigrants.

And how explain the silence of the environmental movement? No portion of the nation is more polluted than the southern border where the armies of the night cross, leaving their garbage and debris. Do the environmentalists believe the anticipated addition of 120 million people to the U.S. population by 2050, mostly Third World poor, can be accomplished without devastating impact on our air, land, and water? This land of ours, writes columnist Chilton Williamson, who moved west to Wyoming, “is going to be overrun and despoiled in 50 or 100 years because of the folly, greed, and dishonesty with which Congress has responded to the immigrant invasion of the last 25 years.”

It is the silence of the progressives that most disgusts Williamson: It is considered “humanitarian” to fret about population growth and its effects on the natural environment at the global (which is to say, at the abstract) level; but “racist,” “xenophobic,” “uncompassionate,” and “un-American” to worry about the population crisis as it immediately affects the US, the only place in the world where we are in a position to be able to do anything about it.
What Changed America? Events of the 20th century were the catalysts that caused the change in attitudes. First came the revelation of Nazi atrocities against minorities, culminating in the Holocaust. Hitler’s crimes arose out of a dark and Darwinian “survival-of-the-fittest” notion of Aryan supremacy and race struggle. The awful consequences of these ideas caused a recoil of disgust in the West. In his seminal work on America’s immigration crisis, Alien Nation (1995), Peter Brimelow rooted the present U.S. immigration policy in our reaction to Hitler’s crimes.

Charles Murray, coauthor of The Bell Curve, who argued that intelligence is in part inherited, that it may be measured by IQ tests, that it correlates with success and failure in school and life, that it is unevenly distributed among racial and ethnic groups, paid a career price for saying in public what few of his colleagues would deny in private.

The new orthodoxy teaches as dogma that race does not matter, that to treat people of different creeds, colors, or cultures differently is immoral in principle and intolerable in practice. The crisis of the new orthodoxy is that it is rooted in an ideology few truly believe. For creed, culture, and ethnicity do matter, immensely. They are not everything, but they are not nothing. They are the forces tearing down empires and tearing apart nations. When we act as if they do not exist, we court disaster, as we did when we marched to Baghdad certain our democratic ideals would be embraced once the tyrant was gone, only to discover that divisions among Kurds, Shia, and Sunni over ethnicity, culture, history, and creed vanquished all our hopes.

Afflicted with guilt, America did the right thing in the 1950s and 1960s: struck down laws that mandated segregation and legislated equality of legal rights. But a guilt-stricken generation went far beyond mandating equal justice under law.

In the name of justice, it established injustice. Quotas instituted to keep Jews out of the Ivy League were reintroduced to assure minorities a predetermined number of seats. When desegregation failed to achieve a level of integration that satisfied judges, children were bused across cities for purposes of racial balance. Property rights and freedom of association were sacrificed to make society conform to the commands of the new moral order. But it was the transference of this idea—that America has sinned unpardonably against equality and must make amends, no matter the cost—to immigration law that may spell the end of the US.

From 1789 to 1960, American leaders were obsessed about who came to this country, what beliefs they brought, what their innate capacity was to become a part of the American people. Alarm about a radical change in our ethnic composition is as American as Ben Franklin. In 1751, Franklin asked aloud: “Why should Pennsylvania, founded by the English, become a Colony of Aliens, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of our Anglifying them. . . ?” He would never find out if his fears were justified. German immigration was halted during the Seven Years’ War.

One reads in the last years of the Great Wave remarks by T.R. and Woodrow Wilson that would today end careers. We may call them bigoted, but they preserved the America we are losing. For there is little evidence that the scores of millions who have come in the last 40 years from Asia, Africa, and Latin America are assimilating as the European immigrants once did. Nor are our elites demanding that they be assimilated.
Yet we are told that there is never again to be a letup, moratorium, time-out, or pause to Americanize those who have come not in the millions but the tens of millions. To their numbers we add more than 1 million every year. Half of them now ignore our laws and come illegally. We do not know how many are coming. We do not know how many are here.

We are conducting an experiment rooted neither in common sense nor the American experience, but in an ideology that declares, against all historical evidence, that people of every country, creed, culture, or civilization are equally and easily assimilable into America, and all have an equal right to come here.

We may call our ancestors racists, as we trumpet our moral superiority. But history may yet mark ours as the generation of fools that threw away the last best hope on earth.

A Grudge Against the Gringo

It began in 1821, when the Spanish authorities ceded a huge tract of Texas land to an enterprising Missourian named Moses Austin to settle three hundred families in the unpopulated province. As the historian Thomas Bailey writes, the triumph of the revolution that same year gave Mexico “an excellent opportunity to cancel the contract, but with the same fatal blindness as their predecessors, they legalized the arrangements.”

Two conditions were imposed on the settlers. They must become Catholic and must swear allegiance to Mexico. Land-hungry Americans began to take up the offer by the thousands.

In 1826, Haden Edwards, a Texas landowner, decided to run all squatters off his property. When the Mexican government sided with the squatters and canceled Edwards’s contract, his brother, Benjamin, leading a party of men, rode into Nacogdoches and, on December 16, under a red-and-white flag inscribed “Independence, Liberty and Justice,” proclaimed the “Republic of Fredonia from ‘the Sabine to the Rio Grande.’” Acting on behalf of the Mexican government, Stephen Austin, at the head of a small army, rode in and snuffed out the “Fredonian Rebellion.”

But, to many in Texas, the land speculator Haden Edwards was a martyr, persecuted by a tyrannical Mexican regime.

By 1829 Mexico tried to cut off further immigration by outlawing slavery in Texas; then, in 1830, a flat prohibition against any more Americans entering the territory.

Eventually, these Texicans demanded representation; they were rebuffed.

In 1835, after the tyrannical General Santa Anna seized power in Mexico City, the Texans—who by now outnumbered the Mexicans ten to one—rebelled and chased the tiny Mexican garrison across the Rio Grande.
Santa Anna led an army to restore his lost province. First, on March 6, 1836, the battle of the Alamo. Then Goliad, where he executed in cold blood more than 300 hundred rebels who did surrender. People fled to the Sabine. Then in April, Santa Anna’s army was caught at siesta. The victory was followed by a massacre that remains the bloodiest in the annals of American arms. Only 9 Texan-Americans killed and 34 wounded; 630 Mexicans killed and 200 wounded or taken prisoner. Under threat of death, Santa Anna signed the Treaty of Velasco. Texas was free and, on his last day in office in 1837, Andrew Jackson. The Mexican Congress repudiated the treaty as having been signed under undress in violation of international law. Considering Texas a renegade province, Mexico City refused to recognize the Lone Star Republic.

Tyler effected the annexation of Texas, robbing Polk of the honor of bringing the Lone Star Republic into the Union.

As Mexico considered Texas a rebellious province, U.S. annexation was tantamount to a declaration of war. The Mexican minister demanded his passports. Diplomatic relations were broken. War loomed.

Moreover, Mexico disputed Texas’s claim to all land north of the Rio Grande and west to El Paso, claiming the border of Texas had always been the Nueces River, 150 miles north of the Rio Grande. This amounted to a Mexican claim to more than half of what is today the state of Texas.

With an army of only 7,000 officers and men scattered in border posts, Polk preferred diplomacy to war and sent John Slidell of Louisiana to negotiate. Slidell was to offer a U.S. assumption of all claims against Mexico, if Mexico would agree to U.S. annexation of Texas to the Rio Grande. Slidell was also empowered to offer $25 million for New Mexico and California and go as high as $40 million. But with anti-Americanism and nationalism rampant in Mexico, the government refused to negotiate. Denied an audience with President Jose Herrera, Slidell wrote Polk: “Be assured that nothing is to be done with these people until they have been chastised.”

“Jimmy” Polk had come to the same conclusion. To back up U.S. claims, he now made the critical move in the crisis. Polk sent Brigadier General Zachary Taylor and 3,500 men, half of the U.S. Army, to the Rio Grande and began to draft a declaration of war. Secretary of State James Buchanan cautioned Polk to wait for an overt act by the Mexican hotheads who, by now, had overthrown Herrera.

Meanwhile, General Pedro de Ampudia had arrived at Matamoros on the opposite bank of the Rio Grande, where he ordered Taylor to withdraw from Mexican land. Taylor’s response was to blockade the river. Mexican soldiers now crossed the river and fired on one of Taylor’s patrols, killing or wounding a dozen.

Two days earlier, Mexico had declared a “defensive war” on the US. James K. Polk had his casus belli.

As he wrote Congress in his request for a declaration of war: “We have tried every effort at reconciliation. The cup of forbearance has been exhausted. After reiterated menaces, Mexico has passed the boundary of the US, has invaded our territory, and shed American blood on the American soil.”
The nation rallied to Polk, and Congress declared war. Though the Mexican forces were six times the size of the U.S. Army and made up of stolid and brave soldiers, these were peasant and Indian conscripts who confronted a U.S. superiority in guns, equipment, officers, training, and motivation. By 1848, John Frémont had occupied Northern California and the Bear Flag Republic had been proclaimed. Taylor’s army had routed Santa Anna at Buena Vista, where his ex-son-in-law, Colonel Jefferson Davis, and his Mississippians heroically broke up a Mexican cavalry charge.

Colonel Stephen Kearny had occupied Santa Fe and marched on to Los Angeles. Winfield Scott, landing at Veracruz, fought six brilliant battles in six months and led his army of 6,000 into Montezuma’s City. For the first time in history, Old Glory flew over a foreign capital. Junior officers Lee, Grant, and McClellan, among others who would become legends in our Civil War, distinguished themselves. But “Sam” Grant openly questioned the morality of the cause. This is an “unholy” war, said Grant, one “of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation.”

Nicholas Trist, a State Department aide sent to conclude the peace, ignored a Polk order to desist and return and negotiated until he brought home the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo whereby Mexico ceded Texas, the entire Southwest, and California to the US. To ease the pain of amputation of 1.2 million square miles, more than half of their country, Congress gave Mexico City $15 million, or $12.50 for each square mile of Mexico. Polk won ratification of Trist’s treaty rather than continue what had become an unpopular and, many now believed, an unjust war. Polk had added a vast territory to the US that rivaled Jefferson’s Louisiana Purchase.

In 1853, to smooth out America’s new border and acquire land for the Southern Pacific Railroad to cross the continent, James Gadsden, an agent of President Franklin Pierce, himself a veteran of the war, offered Mexico $10 million for a Mesilla Valley the size of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island combined. Santa Anna, again in power, accepted. The U.S. Congress, recoiling at the cost of all this empty land, refused a Mexican offer to sell all of Baja California for another $10 million.

Mexican children are today taught that Texas was stolen from them by rapacious Americans when their country was young and weak, and that the war of 1846—48 was a war of Yankee aggression that cost them half their country and inheritance from Spain. These episodes are as important in Mexican history as the Civil War is in ours.

One hundred and fifty years after Chapultepec, the last battle before Mexico City fell to General Scott, President Clinton laid a wreath in honor of “Los Ninos,” the boy heroes of Mexico’s Military College who are said to have leapt to their deaths from Chapultepec Castle on September 13, 1847, rather than surrender. Reputedly, one of the six, Juan Escutia, wrapped himself in the red, white, and green flag of Mexico rather than yield the national colors to the invading Gringos.

Most Americans have never heard of the battle or read much of the war, but the story of “Los Ninos” is required reading in Mexican schools and the names of Juan Escutia and the other five boys are taught to every child. South of the Rio Grande, what to us is the Mexican War is known as the War of the Northern Invasion.
Cinco de Mayo, May 5, 1862, at Puebla, an outnumbered Mexican army defeated a French force of 6,000. Napoleon had said that France was in Mexico to collect debts but many suspected otherwise. The defeated French did not depart and after Napoleon had dispatched 30,000 soldiers, the French captured the capital.

After Appomattox, however, Union veterans began to volunteer to fight alongside the Mexican rebels. Juárez wanted the victorious Union army of 900,000 to intervene, and President Johnson had begun to lean in that direction. At the urging of Grant and Sherman, he sent 50,000 troops to the border under General Philip Sheridan, while Seward sent General John Schofield to Paris with a message for the emperor: “I want you to get your legs under Napoleon’s mahogany and tell him he must get out of Mexico.”

Napoleon got the message. The French troops departed. But Maximilian, the Hapsburg prince Napoleon had put on the throne as emperor of Mexico, refused to leave “my country.” Captured by Juárez, he was put before a firing squad as a lesson to future imperialists.

Maximilian’s fate had been foretold by the former queen of France and grandmother of his ambitious wife, Carlotta. The old lady had warned Maximilian, “They will murder you.”

U.S.-Mexican relations had never been so warm as in that time when Juárez looked to the Union to liberate his country and America was ready to play a decisive role, asking nothing in return.

Juárez died in office. From 1877 to 1911, Mexico was ruled by the hero of Cinco de Mayo, Porfirio Díaz, and prospered as U.S. and foreign companies invested and developed the nation’s resources. But in 1911 the Díaz dictatorship, unable to contain a rising nationalism, collapsed. The old president fled and was succeeded by Francisco Madero, a visionary who in turn was overthrown in 1913 by General Victoriano Huerta, who had Madero and his vice president murdered. Shot while trying to escape was the official report. General Huerta then threw 110 members of the Mexican Chamber of Deputies into prison and installed a dictatorship. New to office, a shocked Woodrow Wilson refused to recognize “a government of butchers.”

Wilson was alarmed: by 1913, 50,000 Americans lived in Mexico, and the US had investments of Si billion, more than all other foreign nations combined. The do-nothing attitude of President William Howard Taft toward Huerta’s coup and murderous regime had enraged U.S. newspapers, including the Hearst press, whose owner, coincidentally, “had inherited a ranch in Mexico larger than Rhode Island.”

Came then the incident that led to two U.S. interventions. On April 9, 1914, U.S. Marines on shore leave in Tampico were roughed up, arrested, and marched through the streets. They had apparently entered a restricted area. Admiral Henry T. Mayo, commander of the American flotilla, demanded and got an immediate apology. But the admiral wanted more, a twenty-one-gun salute to Old Glory. President Wilson backed him up.
Huerta agreed to salute the U.S. flag, if U.S. warships would fire a return twenty-one-gun salute to the Mexican flag. Believing this would constitute recognition of Huerta’s regime, Wilson refused, and when a German ship carrying arms to Huerta was sighted off Veracruz, he ordered the Marines to occupy the port. Nineteen Americans and two hundred Mexicans died in the battle for the city. A British envoy asked Wilson what precisely U.S. policy was. Replied the president, “I am going to teach the South American republics to elect good men.”

By August 1914, when World War I broke out, Huerta had fallen and been replaced by one of his commanders, Venustiano Carranza, who was challenged by a former ally, Doroteo Arango, a horse and cattle thief who had taken the name “Pancho Villa.” To incite a U.S. intervention he hoped would humiliate and topple Carranza, Villa stopped a Mexican train carrying eighteen American college students who had come under a safe-conduct pass to open a mine. In the massacre of San Ysabel, Villa murdered them in cold blood. He then crossed into New Mexico and, on March 15, 1916, burned Columbus and murdered another seventeen Americans. Senator Henry Ashurst of Arizona called for more “grape shot” and less grape juice.

Villa’s provocations succeeded. Wilson sent General Pershing with a U.S. Army that eventually numbered 12,000 men into Mexico and called up virtually the entire U.S. National Guard, 150,000 men, and sent them to patrol the border. Though Pershing drove 300 miles into Mexico, he never captured the elusive Villa. Between 1915 and 1917, seventy U.S. citizens were slain inside Mexico.

Further exacerbating relations, the German foreign minister, Arthur Zimmermann, sent a telegram to Mexico City, intercepted by the British, who delightedly turned it over to the US. Zimmermann urged Mexico, should war break out between the US and Germany, to seize the opportunity to “reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas and Arizona.”

As Henry Kissinger has observed, this was not a brilliant moment in the diplomatic history of the Second Reich. The Zimmermann telegram inflamed U.S. opinion into supporting war on Germany. But before he asked for a declaration of war—Wilson recalled Pershing to lead the U.S. Army in France. Mexico now descended into a long period of anti-Catholic and anti-American revolutionary violence. Not for a generation would the breach with the US be healed.

In 1938, despite FDR’s “Good Neighbor” policy, Mexican president Lazaro Cárdenas nationalized U.S. oil companies, a day still honored in Mexican history. Americans were paid a fraction of what the oil wells were worth. Pemex was born, a state cartel that in the Clinton era would collude with OPEC to run up oil prices to gouge the Americans who had raised $50 billion in 1995 to bail out the bankrupt Zedillo regime in Mexico City.

A Zogby Poll in June 2002 found that when Mexicans were asked, “Do you agree or disagree that the territory of the US Southwest belongs to Mexico?” 58% agreed, 28% disagreed. 14% were unsure.

The trend constitutes a new, larger form of white flight. Unlike in the old version, whites this time are not just fleeing the cities for the suburbs. They are leaving entire metropolitan areas and states—whole regions—for white destinations. And new census estimates indicate that this pattern of flight from big immigration destinations has become even more pronounced in the 90’s.

The U.S. Census of 2000 confirmed the findings of Frey and Tilove.

Aztlan is the mythical land out of which the Aztec people came, a millennium ago, before they began the trek south to establish their empire.

As the historian Robert Ferrell writes, one cannot stress sufficiently the point that Texas and the other northern territories of Mexico [New Mexico and California] were virtually empty lands, lacking Mexican settlers, and because of the distance lacking almost any control from Mexico City.

Mexican establishments in California, like those in Texas, were pitiful in their poverty and unimportance. If in Texas, there were only about three thousand Mexicans of Spanish origin in the 1830’s, there were little more than four thousand in California, a mere handful consisting chiefly of priests and monks about the missions, soldiers employed to keep the Indians submissive, and a few large landowners and cattle raisers. In California, the area of Mexican control never extended north of San Francisco, nor inland beyond the coastal area.

Nevertheless, racial mythology can have consequences. Consider the student organization MEChA, whose UCLA chapter was chaired, a few years back, by Antonio Villaraigosa, who, in 2005, became mayor of Los Angeles by carrying four out of five Hispanic votes. MEChA stands for Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan, the Chicano Student Movement of Aztlan. And what is El Plan de Aztlan for which MEChA exists? In its own words, MEChA aims to reclaim the land of their fathers stolen in the “brutal ‘gringo’ invasion of our territories.” With our heart in our hands and our hands in the soil, we declare the independence of our mestizo nation. We are a bronze people with a bronze culture. Before the world, before all of North America, before all our brothers in the bronze continent, we are a nation, we are a union of free pueblos, we are Aztlan. In El Plan, “Aztlan belongs to those who plant the seeds, water the fields, and gather the crops and not to foreign Europeans. We do not recognize capricious frontiers on the bronze continent.” The MEChA slogan is “Por la Raza todo. Fuera de la Raza nada,” which translates as “For the race, everything. Outside of the race, nothing.”

The MEChA slogan seems a conscious echo of the slogan of Mussolini’s Fascists: “Everything for the state, nothing outside the state.”
Like African-Americans who demand reparations, MEChA demands “restitution” for “past economic slavery, political exploitation, ethnic and cultural psychological destruction and denial of civil and human rights.” “Political Liberation,” asserts MEChA, “can only come through independent action on our part, since the two-party system is the same animal with two heads that feed from the same trough. Where we are a majority we will control; where we are a minority we will represent a pressure group; nationally we represent one party: La Fanzitia de Raza.”

In its constitution, MEChA declares its symbol “shall be the eagle with its wing spread, bearing a macahuittle in one claw and a dynamite stick in the other with the lighted fuse in its beak.”

MEChA is a Chicano version of Aryan Nations, only it claims four hundred campus chapters across the Southwest and as far away as Ann Arbor and Cornell. With its chauvinism about a “mestizo nation,” a “bronze people,” “bronze culture,” “bronze continent,” and “race above all,” it is unabashedly racist. That Villaraigosa could become mayor of Los Angeles without having to repudiate MEChA, that Cruz Bustamante could run for governor of California without having to explain his role in this racist organization at Fresno State, testifies to a truth: America’s media is morally intimidated by a minority that can make out credentials as a victim of past discrimination.

As Michelle Malkin notes, MEChA members “have rioted in Los Angeles [and] editorialized that federal immigration ‘pigs should be killed, every one’ in San Diego ~ Nowhere has their ethnic intimidation been more successful than in academia. After years of disruptive MEChA protests, the University of Texas downgraded Texas Independence Day. In 2000, the university held a “private alumni fund-raising event to milk the holiday for money, while according it virtually no public recognition.”

Aspirit of separatism, nationalism, and irredentism is alive in the barrios. During the Villaraigosa mayoral campaign of 2005, MEChA’s slogan was “Los Angeles Today, Alta California Tomorrow.” Where MEChA seeks the return of the Southwest to Mexico, Charles Truxillo, professor of Chicano Studies at the University of New Mexico, sees a new Aztlan rising with its capital in L.A. and urges Mexicans to seek it by any means necessary. “We’re recolonizing America, so they’re afraid of us. It’s time to take back what is ours,” rants Ricky Sierra of the Chicano National Guard. Jose Angel Gutierrez, a political science professor and director of the Mexican-American Study Center of the University of Texas, told a university crowd: “We have an aging white America. They are not making babies. They are dying. The explosion is in our population. They are shitting in their pants in fear! I love it.”

When 500,000 Hispanics massed in downtown Los Angeles in the spring of 2006 to protest any congressional bill to secure America’s borders or send illegal aliens back, Americans could have seen a close-up of their rising radicalism, had not the Los Angeles Times and local TV covered it up. Slate writer Mickey Kaus, who attended the L.A. demonstration, called the Times’s coverage “propagandistic.” Columnist Malkin wrote on what went largely unreported:
Demonstrators defaced photos of President Bush and urged supporters to “Stop the Nazis!” LA talk show host Tammy Bruce reported that protesters burned American flags and waved placards of the No. American continent with America crossed out.

One of the largest, boldest banners visible from aerial shots of the rally read, “THIS IS STOLEN LAND.” Others blared: “CHICANO POWER” and “BROWN IS BEAUTIFUL.” Thugs with masks flashed gang signs on the steps of L.A. City Hall. . . . Young people raised their fists in defiance, clothed in T-shirts bearing radical left guerrilla Che Guevara’s face and Aztlan emblems.

In Mexico, Albert Tinoco, a reporter on the Televisa network, exulting over the L.A. “megamarcha,” remarked, “With all due respect to Uncle Sam, this shows that L.A. has never stopped being ours.”

One of Mexico’s most respected pundits, Sergio Sarmiento, seeing illegal aliens marching defiantly under Mexican flags through the streets of America’s greatest cities in the scores and hundreds of thousands, wrote that [T]he US now has no way of turning back the clock . . . with 11 million illegal aliens in the country, it is already too late. . . . If it is true, as some have said, that Mexicans have begun the reconquista of the territory that the US took by force from Mexico between 1835 and 1848, they have been able to do this, thanks to the fact that the Americans themselves have permitted it.

Small wonder that La Voz de Aztlan, the radical and racist voice of the Aztlan movement in America, was exultant: “What does the immense success of ‘La Gran Marcha’ mean to Mexicanos and other Latinos? It simply means that we now have the numbers, the political will and the organizational skills to direct our own destinies and not be subservient to the White and Jewish power structures.”

Among the projects La Voz de Aztlan urged this new political force to support was Mayor Villaraigosa’s “bold move to wrestle control of the [Los Angeles Unified School District] from a Jewish dominated school board and a White superintendent that are just fleecing the schools. Mexico’s consul general Jose Pescador Osuna remarked in 1998, “Even though I am saying this part serious, part joking, I think we are practicing La Reconquista in California.”

In 2001, the award-winning novelist Elena Poniatowski, who came to Mexico as a child during World War II, told an audience in Caracas: Mexico is recovering the territories yielded to the US by means of migratory tactics. . . . The common people—the poor, the dirty, the lice-ridden, the cockroaches are advancing on the US, a country that needs to speak Spanish because it has 33.5 million Hispanics who are imposing their culture . . it fills me full of joy because the Hispanics can have an ever-greater influence all the way from Patagonia to Alaska.

When the U.S. soccer team played Mexico in Los Angeles Coliseum a few years back, the crowd showered the U.S. team and its fans with water bombs, beer, bottles, and garbage. “The Star-Spangled Banner” was hooted and jeered. Mexicans bring these attitudes into the country with them, for when the U.S. team played Mexico in Guadalajara in 2004, for a spot in the Olympics, 60,000 Mexican fans chanted: “Osama, Osama,” as Mexico took control of the game.
In early 2006, Zogby International, in conjunction with a Mexican polling firm, did a survey of attitudes of 1,000 Americans and 1,000 Mexicans. Americans viewed Mexicans positively, with 78 percent saying Mexicans were hardworking and 44 percent seeing them as tolerant. Americans hold these positive views because many of us went to Catholic and public schools where Mexican-American kids were not uncommon, and where we have encountered Mexican immigrants we have found them to be a courteous, friendly, hardworking, likable people. The Mexicans hold a markedly different view of us. “Mexicans think Americans are neither hard workers, nor honest,” wrote the Zogby authors: “They see them as racist, intolerant and moderately law-abiding.” Only one in six Mexicans thought Americans are honest and one in four said we were hardworking, while 62 percent said the US is wealthier because we “exploit other people’s wealth.” Three out of every four Mexicans said Americans were racists.

In New Mexico, a state that is 43 percent Hispanic, a resolution was introduced in the legislature in 2001 to rename the state “Nuevo Mexico,” the name it carried before entering the Union. When the bill was defeated in committee, sponsor Representative Miguel Garcia told reporters “covert racism” may have been the reason, the same racism, he said, that was behind originally naming the state New Mexico.

Several years ago, while George Bush was governor, the Texas town of El Cenizo declared Spanish to be its official language, ordered all documents written and town business done in Spanish, and made cooperation with U.S. immigration authorities a firing offense. El Cenizo had de facto seceded from the USA.

Pat enters a discussion about the drug traffic. In short, it is serious. So serious, that even border patrol agents believe Mexican army units and retired military collaborate with drug cartels.

The Aztlan Plot

Aztlan is the mythical land out of which the Aztec people came, a millennium ago, before they began the trek south to establish their empire.

Statistic: 40% of Mexico’s 106 million people earn less than $2 a day whereas the US minimum is $41 a day.

The Mexican regime sees the EU as its model for North America. Vicente Fox envisions a merger of the two nations with US wealth being transferred to Mexico to help the country develop.

Statistic: 46% of Mexicans say they would like to live in the US

NAFTA was a start. US transnationals move to Mexico to shed themselves of high-wage US workers.

The near-term goal of Mexico City is to attain leverage over US policy toward Mexico like the Jewish community has over US policy toward Israel. He claims that Mexican leaders have said as much.
the Zedillo regime changed the Mexican constitution to allow Mexican-Americans to regain Mexican citizenship. The change was completed in 1998.

Third world countries provide incentives for Western companies to transfer factories and technology and to train local workers.

Each of Mexico’s 47 consulates has a mandate to introduce Mexican textbooks into schools with significant Hispanic populations.

The Aztlán Strategy: Gain influence through Mexican-Americans; economic and political merger of the nations in a binational union. And in the nuptial agreement, a commitment to share the wealth and power.

Juan Hernández, head of the government’s Office of Mexicans Living Outside Mexico, is trying to mobilize Mexican-Americans to think Mexico first.

Another reason that Mexico must retain an open border is regime survival. Mexico must send their problems north. Less dissidents, less welfare, less unemployment compensation.

Fox’s government has prepared brochures on how they can evade the Border Patrol, where they can go to pick up documents, how they can sign up for welfare.

In January 2006, Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission (HRC) was caught preparing 70,000 maps for border crossers. A year earlier, Mexico had distributed a “32-page manual in comic book format for easy comprehension, titled The Guide for the Mexican Migrant, with tips on how to cross the border and then evade detection. Even the Bush White House expressed outrage and then the Fox regime stopped issuing the maps.

Mexican consuls campaigned against Propositions 187 and 227 in California.

Mexican agents fought Proposition 200 in Arizona. This legislation sought to require proof of citizenship before becoming eligible for welfare.

Mexican lobbyists work state capitals to have driver’s licenses issued to illegal aliens and illegals made eligible for “in-state” tuition rates at state colleges. In school appearances and public speeches, Mexican consuls urge loyalty to Mexico first and the preservation of Mexican culture. Wherever they encounter U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry, Mexican consuls preach against assimilation and Americanization. And they are succeeding.

Not only does California recognize Cinco de Mayo, which celebrates a small Mexican victory over French troops when 600,000 Americans were dying in our Civil War, but the Golden State has made March 31, the birthday of the Latino leader of the state’s farm workers, Cesar Chavez, a holiday. Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico have done the same. In San Jose, a statue of Thomas Fallon, the Union officer who captured the city in the Mexican War, was set aside as a statue of the Aztec serpent god Quetzacoatl, who is to return and rule, went up in Cesar Chavez Plaza. Governor Davis allocated $400,000 for another statue of Quetzacoatl in Los Angeles.
La Reconquista is not to be accomplished by force of arms, as was the U.S. annexation of the Southwest and California in 1848. It is to be carried out by a nonviolent invasion and cultural transformation of that huge slice of America into a Mexamerican borderland, where the dominant culture is Hispanic and Anglos will feel alienated and begin to emigrate, as, indeed, they already have—back over the mountains their fathers and grandfathers crossed generations ago. Each year now, 250,000 native-born Californians pack up and leave forever in what demographer William Frey calls the “flight from diversity.” Meanwhile, since 2000, a million new illegal aliens, almost all Mexicans, have arrived to make Los Angeles home.

“California is going to be a Hispanic state,” said Mario Obledo, the cofounder of MALDEF, “and anyone who doesn’t like it should leave. They should go back to Europe. In 1998, Obledo was awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Clinton.

From the web: In 1994, California voters approved Proposition 187, which denied education, health benefits and social services to illegal immigrants. In 1996, voters approved Proposition 209, which eliminated state-sponsored racial preferences. Earlier this month, they approved Proposition 227, which eliminates bilingual education for California students.

Novelist and Nobel laureate Gabriel Garcia Marquez: The great power of Latin America is its culture. We do not spend a dime trying to penetrate culturally; yet, we are changing the US…We are changing the language, the food, the music, the way of being. We are changing you into a Latin country.

If Coolidge today declared, “America must remain American,” he would be charged with a hate crime.
What is a Nation?

♦ To be a nation, a people must believe they are a nation and that they share a common ancestry, history and destiny.

A. Rival View

♦ A rival view, advanced by neoconservatives and liberals, maintains that America, unlike Ireland, Italy, or Israel, is not held together by the bonds of history and memory, tradition and custom, language and literature, birth and faith, blood and soil. Rather, America is a creational nation, united by a common commitment of all her citizens to a set of ideas and ideals.

♦ During the battle over Proposition 187 in 1994, when 59% of the California electorate voted to cut off welfare to illegal aliens, Jack Kemp and Bill Bennett, in opposing 187, declared, “The American national identity is based on a creed, on a set of principles and ideas.” Cokie Roberts of NPR and ABC agreed: “We have nothing binding us together as a nation—no common ethnicity, history, religion, or even language—except the Constitution and the institutions it created.” Irving Kristol embraced the Bennett-Kemp view when he strikingly compared the US to the former USSR: “[L]arge nations, whose identity is ideological, like the Soviet Union of yesterday and the US of today, have ideological interests in addition to more material concerns.” To Kristol, America is first and foremost an “ideological” nation.

♦ FDR: Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart. Americanism is not and never was, a matter of race and ancestry. Yet it was FDR was a complete exclusion of Japanese immigrants in 1924 and he readily agreed, as president, to incarcerate 110,000 Japanese, 75,000 of them fellow citizens, because he did not trust Japanese-Americans in a war with Japan.

♦ George W. Bush: American has never been united by blood or birth or soil. We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interest and teach us what it means to be citizens.

B. Arguments Opposing American as a Creedal Nation

♦ Human beings cannot be easily separated from the abiding attachments of the tribe, race, nation, culture, community whence they came.

♦ When traveling aboard, Americans are recognizable by their speech and mannerism, not because they have been interrogated on their beliefs in democracy and free markets.

♦ At the birth of the nation we were 80% of British origin.

♦ John Jay, a coauthor of the Federalist Papers, considered Americans, before the Constitution, to be one united people held together by language, faith, culture and memory.
◆ Buchanan makes a good point when he reminds us that many Americans defended this country never knowing the ideological history. They fought because American was attacked.

◆ Every true nation is the creation of a unique people, separate from all others. Indeed, if America is an ideological nation grounded no deeper than in the sandy soil of abstract ideas, she will not survive the storms of this century any more than the Soviet Union survived the storms of the last. When the regime, party, army, and police that held that ideological nation together lost the will to keep it together, the USSR broke down along the fault lines of nationality, faith, and culture. The true nations—Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Ukraine, Russia—emerged from the rubble. A true nation is held together not by any political creed but by patriotism.

◆ Stalin understood this. In the great crisis of his empire, Hitler’s invasion, Stalin did not call on his subjects to save communism or defend the Soviet Constitution. He called on Russia’s sons to defend the Rodina, Mother Russia, against the Germanic hordes, and suspended his suppression of the Orthodox Church so its bishops and priests could bless “The Great Patriotic War.” Communist to the core, Stalin yet knew that men do not die for secular creeds like Marxism or Leninism, but for the “ashes of their fathers and the temples of their gods.” Hitler and Mussolini succeeded as long as they did because they grounded their Nazi and Fascist ideologies in the deeper soil of nationality and culture.

◆ France considers herself a creedal nation, whose unifying beliefs date to the Enlightenment and Revolution. But when the Revolution tore France to pieces, what held her together through the Napoleonic wars, Sedan, the loss of Alsace, and Verdun, as she divided ever more deeply over ideology and faith, was nationality and culture. Whether monarchical, republican, imperial, or democratic, the French nation and people endure. And if the French cease to be the dominant tribe, adherence to Enlightenment ideas will not save France.

◆ For nowhere on this earth can one find a multicultural, multiethnic, multilingual nation that is not at risk. Democracy is not enough. Equality is not enough. Free markets are not enough—to hold a people together. Without patriotism, a love of country and countrymen not for what they believe or profess but for who they are, “Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold.”

◆ “Nationalism remains, after two centuries, the most vital political emotion in the world,” concedes Schlesinger, “far more vital than social ideologies such as communism or fascism or even democracy.” And inside the nation, “nationalism takes the form of ethnicity and tribalism.”
C. Before the Creed Came the Nation

♦ America is more, much more, than a “proposition nation.” As Samuel Huntington himself has written: America is a founded society created by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century settlers, almost all of whom came from the British Isles. . . . They initially defined America in terms of race, ethnicity, culture, and most importantly religion. Then in the eighteenth century they also had to define America ideologically to justify their independence from their homecountrymen.

♦ The ideology was created by colonial elites to justify the breaking of blood ties with their British brethren. But before the ideology came the country. Before her greatest documents were written, America existed in the hearts of her people. The Constitution did not create the nation; the nation adopted the Constitution. Many of the fathers did indeed believe in universal principles and rights, but all were loyal to a particular nation and to kinfolk with whom they shared ties of blood, soil, and memory.

♦ George Washington had once sought to become an officer in the British army. But by the end of the French and Indian War, he had begun to see the British not as kinsmen but as overlords. In heart and soul, well before the Second Continental Congress, Washington was an American.

♦ After the Boston Tea Party in 1773, Patrick Henry declared to the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia’s Carpenters’ Hall, “The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, and New Yorkers and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American.” That was two years before Jefferson wrote the first draft of the Declaration of Independence. Before the guns fired at Lexington, Henry declared, “The next gale that sweeps the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field!”

♦ “Our brethren.” The nation was forged in the fire of rebellion and war, not from a document, memorable as it was, signed in Philadelphia one year after the rebellion had begun and thousands had perished.

♦ The Declaration stated what was already known: The Americans had become a people. In his first draft, Jefferson had written of “our British brethren,” who have failed to honor “the ties of our common kindred” and proven themselves “deaf to the voice of... consanguinity.” These are matters of blood and kinship. The Native Americans shared our continent but were not our kinsmen. To Jefferson and the signers of ‘76, they were those “merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction, of all Ages, Sexes & Conditions.”

♦ Jefferson charged George III with the crime of having sent out to attack Americans mercenaries who were not “of our common blood.” The blood ties had been dishonored. These “unfeeling brethren” were brothers no longer. The Declaration of Independence provided the words to a decision the heart had already made.
Washington believed that, before immigrants could become Americans, they must embrace our language, customs, and habits, as well as our principles. Assimilation, he wrote, would enable aliens to get rid of foreign and acquire American attachment. In Hamilton’s republic, there was no room for dual loyalty. Madison urged excluding immigrants who were unlikely to “incorporate…into our society.”

Interviewed by a German baron thinking of immigrating to America, John Quincy Adams set down the conditions for newcomers: “They must cast off the European skin, never to resume it. They must look forward to their posterity rather than backward to their ancestors. They must cease to be Englishmen, Dutchmen, Germans, and Irish—and become Americans, a new nationality.

Lincoln, in his cry from the heart to his countrymen in his first inaugural, not to take the path of civil war, appealed to the deeper bonds that existed between patriot-sons whose fathers had fought side by side: I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature. Lincoln’s ultimate appeal, then, is not to principles of democracy, but to “bonds of affection” and “The mystic chords of memory.”

Theodore Roosevelt echoed Adams’s conviction that all immigrants must cast off their old identities and loyalties. He thundered against “hyphenated-Americanism.”

Woodrow Wilson, speaking to naturalized citizens in Philadelphia in 1915, echoed his great rival: “You cannot become thorough Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American.

What then bonds Americans? In a word, patriotism, love of country.

The European core of the country, almost 90% of all Americans as late as 1965, has fallen well below 70% and will be less than half the nation by 2050.

We no longer speak the same language, nor do we insist, as our fathers did, that immigrants learn English. Of the 9 million living in Los Angeles County, 5 million do not speak English at home. Schoolchildren in Chicago are taught in one hundred languages. The fastest growing radio and TV stations in America broadcast in Spanish.

Nor do Americans any longer profess the same faith. We are no longer Protestant, Catholic and Jew, as sociologist Will Herberg described us in 1955. We are Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Orthodox, Mormon, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist, Shintoist, Santeria, New Age, voodoo, agnostic, atheist, humanist, Rastafarian, and Wiccan.

We are yet “attached to the same principles of government.” But this is not enough to hold a nation together. The South was attached to the same principles of government. But that did not prevent the South from fighting four bloody years to be free of a Union headed by Abraham Lincoln.
Robert E. Lee spurned an offer to lead the Union army in putting down secession. When the kinsmen of his native state took up arms against a Union he had served all his life, he led them in battle. Neither the oath he had taken nor the ideals of the Constitution and Declaration could keep Lee loyal to a Union he believed had no right to invade his native state.

If Lee, son of Washington’s friend and comrade in arms, “LightHorse Harry” Lee, could ride across the Long Bridge to Virginia to take up arms against the US, is it not naive to believe that scores of millions of aliens without roots here will put America ahead of the homelands they left behind? How many Americans, forced to work in Mexico, would become loyal Mexicans in a decade rather than remain Americans in exile? Why do we think that Mexicans are any less attached to the land of their birth?

Nor do Americans treasure the history or revere the heroes as we once did. What many still see as a glorious past, others see as shameful history. Columbus, Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Lee, heroes of the old America, are all under attack. To many, the discovery of America by the explorers from Columbus to Captain John Smith, and the winning of the West by pioneers, soldiers, and cowboys are no longer seen as heroic events but as matters of which Western man should be ashamed.

Those who believe that the ideas of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Gettysburg Address—liberty, equality, democracy—constitute an “American Creed” that holds us together as a nation are ignoring or rewriting history. For even the most famous words in those documents, “All men are created equal,” do not mean the same thing to all Americans. They never did.

**D. Were Our Fathers Un-American?**

Jefferson was a slaveholder unto death who wrote, late in life, of an “aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided for the direction of the interests of society. . . .” Madison, the author of the Constitution, headed, until his death, the American Colonization Society, “in the belief that its plan to return slaves to Africa represented the most sensible way out of that long-festering crisis.” At Madison’s death, leadership passed to Henry Clay, who was eulogized in 1852 by Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln celebrated his hero’s lifelong association with the American Colonization Society, proudly quoting Clay’s 1827 address to that society: “There is a moral fitness in the idea of returning to Africa her children, whose ancestors have been torn from her by the ruthless hand of fraud and violence. Transplanted in a foreign land, they will carry back to their native soil the rich fruits of religion, civilization, law and liberty.” Praising Clay’s vision, Lincoln declared: “May it indeed be realized!”

Slavery was a great moral evil and we condemn it. The unequal treatment of our fellow Americans of African descent for a century after Appomattox was a grave injustice and historic wrong. Nonetheless, we cannot deny that the greatest of our forefathers did these things and said these things and approved these things. The point of the recitation is this: If a belief in equality is the sine qua non of being an American in our “creedal nation,” then the authors of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Gettysburg Address do not qualify as Americans.
“Democracy ... wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There is never a democracy that did not commit suicide,” wrote Adams. “A democracy [is] the only pure republic, but impracticable beyond the limits of a town,” added Jefferson.

Madison was more negative. Writing in Federalist No. 10, he declared, “democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention: have ever been incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.” Said Hamilton: “The ancient democracies, in which the people themselves deliberated, never possessed one feature of good government. Their very nature was tyranny.”

So, again, if a commitment to democracy is an indispensable element of the American Creed that unites the nation, the Founding Fathers seem not to qualify as 100 percent American. Their ideas on equality and one-man seem to be decidedly “unAmerican.”

As for the Constitution, it no longer unites us, if ever it did. Indeed, it divides us bitterly. We see that division manifest with each nomination to the Supreme Court. Why does not the organic document of American union unite us? Because we Americans disagree on what it says and means—about homosexuality, abortion, racial quotas, affirmative action, burning Old Glory, prayer in schools, posting the Ten Commandments in the public square, the death penalty, and pornography, among other issues.

Celebrants of the creedal nation seem not to understand that it is the violent disputes over what our creedal documents mean that is the casus belli of the culture war tearing us apart.

E. Creed or Culture

Whether America is a nation like all others, or a different kind of nation, is more than an academic question. For who wins the argument determines America’s destiny. As Huntington points out, “National interest derives from national identity. We have to know who we are before we can know what our interests are.”

Language, faith, culture, and history—and, yes, birth, blood, and soil—produce a people, not an ideology. After the ideologies and creeds that seized Germany, Italy, and Russia by the throat in the twentieth century—Nazism, Fascism, Communism—were all expunged, Germans remained German, Italians remained Italian, and Russians remained Russian. After three decades of Maoist madness, the Chinese remain Chinese.

Democracy is not enough. If the culture dies, the country dies.

Buchanan seems to struggle, almost yielding to embarrassment, as he defines America. All he needed to do was cite the Civil War. When the call to war was sounded, did each side flee to ideology. No, it was Southerner against the Yankees.
In 1994, Sam Francis, of The Washington Times, speaking at a conference on ethnicity and culture, volunteered this thought: “The civilization that we as whites created in Europe and America could not have developed apart from the genetic endowments of the creating people, nor is there any reason to believe that the civilization can be successfully transmitted by a different people.” Had Francis said this of the Chinese, it would have gone unnoted. But he was suggesting Western civilization was superior and that only Europeans could have created it. If Western peoples perish, as they are doing today, Francis was implying, we must expect our civilization to die with us. By claiming the achievements of the West for Europeans, Francis had passed the bounds of tolerance. He was summarily fired.

During the 20th century, the wars of empire and ideology often obscured the deeper and never-ending wars of tribe and culture. When the Sudeten Germans departed Czechoslovakia in 1938, preferring German Nazis to democratic Czechs, the Slovaks seceded six months later, and Hungarians and Poles welcomed military intervention by their kinsmen. Blood proved stronger than democracy. Reunited after WW II, Czechs and Slovaks separated again when free of Soviets. For centuries, they had lived side by side in the Hapsburg Empire, but could not live together in a democracy. It appears a truism: multicultural, multiethnic, multilingual states are held together either by an authoritarian regime or a dominant ethnocultural core, or their breakup is inevitable.

In 1991, the Soviet Union shattered into fifteen nations along the fault lines of race, religion, and ethnicity. Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Kazakhstan were Asian as well as Muslim. Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia rejected not only Communist rule but Russian rule. Russians in Latvia, descendants of those transferred there by Stalin over sixty years ago, are still regarded as intruders. The Caucasus seems about to subdivide into statelets like Chechnya, Dagestan, Abkhazia, and North and South Ossetia, based on ethnicity.

Ukraine, divided into a Russian east, an Orthodox center, and a Catholic west, faces a threat of secession of the Crimea, which Khrushchev in 1954 ceded to Ukraine when it was part of the Soviet Union. The dominant Russian-speaking people of the Crimea charge that a “repressive government in the capital, Kiev, is bent on imposing an [alien] nationalistic identity” upon them. Adds Steven Lee Myers in the New York Times, “stark ethnic and cultural differences . . . continue to haunt Ukraine...”

After Marshal Tito died, Yugoslavia, heir to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes that came out of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, collapsed and disintegrated. Slovenes, who had been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, broke free of Belgrade, followed by Croatians, who were of a different Christian faith than Serbs and had memories of mutual savagery in World War II. Macedonia departed and Montenegro has now seceded. In Bosnia and Kosovo, Serbs violently resisted rule by Muslims or Albanians. These peoples have lived together on the same peninsula since time immemorial and in the same nation for seventy years yet they warred viciously against each other.
Rather than fading away, issues of nationality long considered dead are resurfacing. Scottish nationalists wish to be free of England after three centuries, as the Irish broke free in 1921. The English are replacing the Union Jack with the red St. George’s Cross that was the national flag before union with Scotland and Wales. Corsicans want out of France. Walloons and Flemish yet call for dissolving Belgium. The Northern Alliance has no more given up on separation from Italy than the Québécois have given up the dream of “Québec libre!”

In Alberta and Saskatchewan, independence parties have sprung up and some in British Columbia favor secession. In June 2006, in the U.S. Senate, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act, providing for a race-based government with tribal sovereignty not unlike that enjoyed by the Apache, Sioux, and Navajo, garnered fifty-six votes.

The Israeli historian Martin van Creveld, chronicler of the fall of the nation-state, writes of the forces tearing at the seams of the Third World: “[T]here has hardly been any newly independent country in Asia or Africa that did not undergo some kind of coup, revolution, or internecine conflict between opposing ethnic or religious groups.”

Of India, which the UN population division projects will become the world’s most populous nation, Van Creveld writes: “It has witnessed and is still witnessing ethnic and religious disturbances in such places as Bengal, the Punjab, and Kashmir; some of these are so massive that, had they taken place in a country with fewer than 900,000,000 inhabitants, they would have merited the name of civil war.” In our time, India and Pakistan, Pakistan and Bangladesh, Malaysia and Singapore, Ethiopia and Eritrea have split apart.

In 2006, religious war between Sunni and Shiite threaten Iraq.

In late spring, Turkish-speaking Azeris in northwest Iran rioted over a cartoon insulting to their people. Four were killed and 70 injured. The newspaper was closed and the cartoonist and editor jailed, but that failed to satisfy the Azeris, who demanded that their children henceforth be taught in their own language and that TV channels be provided that would broadcast in Turkish Azeri.

The genocide in Rwanda and Burundi was not ideological but tribal—Tutsi and Hutu share a long and bloody history.
In America, the issues of race and history, language and culture have resurfaced to divide us, as the integrationist ideal of the 1960s has given way to identity politics. The idea that men should be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character has been superseded by a regime of affirmative action, quotas, entitlements, and contract set-asides grounded in race, ethnicity, and gender. Even the Republican Party, last bastion of the meritocracy, has bent the knee to the new dispensation.

Ethnic diversity in the student body and workplace has replaced ability, experience, and excellence as the indispensable feature. Al Gore may have captured the new America with his famous malapropism, when he translated our national slogan, “E pluribus as “Out of one, many.” On college campuses, demands for separate dorms, dining halls, fraternities, sororities, and graduations for African-Americans, Asians, and Hispanics are being met. Segregation is acceptable, so long as one is an Hispanic, African-American, or Asian insisting upon it. As Shelby Steele noted, “Racial identity is simply forbidden to whites.”

Those who believed in the civil rights decade that we would move “beyond race” have been proven wrong. Tragically, we seem to focus more on what divides us by ancestry, rather than what unites us as Americans. In schools, it is common to see black children who do their homework and perform well in class abused for “acting white.” In colleges and universities, there are “speech codes” built around the issues of ethnicity and race, violations of which call forth public anathemas, followed by confession, ritual apologu, and repentance. In the larger society, we have “hate crimes” where an assault, or even an insult that is seen as rooted in racial animosity, brings a more severe or added sentence.

When Hurricane Katrina struck in August 2005 and the Seventeenth Street levee broke, low-lying areas of New Orleans where African-Americans lived were flooded. Instantly, word went out that President Bush had delayed the rescue effect because only black folks were suffering at the Superdome and convention center. White America dismissed the slander. Black America believed it.

Back in 1990, a New York Times poll found that Sixty percent of black respondents thought it true or possibly true that the government was making drugs available in black neighborhoods in order to harm black people. Twenty-nine percent thought it true or probably true that the AIDS virus was invented by racist conspirators to kill blacks.2°

Every four years, our racial divide manifests itself anew as African-Americans—incited by charges that Republicans look with indifference on the burning of black churches, or that George W. Bush did not care about the dragging death of a retarded black man in Texas—vote 90 percent or higher for the Democratic candidate. After Katrina, Bush’s support among blacks in one poll sank to 2 percent.
In 1960, 18 million black Americans, 10 percent of the nation, were not fully integrated into society, but they had been assimilated into our culture. They worshipped the same God, spoke the same language, had endured the same depression and war, watched the same TV shows on the same four channels, laughed at the same comedians, went to the same movies, ate the same foods, read the same newspapers, and went to schools where, even when segregated, we learned the same history and literature and shared the same holidays: Christmas, New Year’s, Washington’s Birthday, Easter, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Columbus Day. Segregation existed, but black folks were as American as apple pie, having lived in this land longer than almost every other group save the Native Americans. We were of two races, but of one nationality: Americans.

That cultural unity, that sense that we were one people, is now gone. The term “Negro” was replaced by “black” to emphasize the racial difference, and has been replaced in turn by “African-American” to emphasize that we are not only of separate races but come from different continents. One recalls the words of Theodore Roosevelt to the Knights of Columbus, a heavily Irish, Italian, and German-American assembly in 1915: There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism. . . a hyphenated American is not an American at all.

The men who do not become Americans and nothing else are hyphenated Americans; and there ought to be no room for them in this country. . . . He has no place here; and the sooner he returns to the land to which he feels his real heart-allegiance, the better it will be for every good American. There is no such thing as a hyphenated American who is a good American. The only man who is a good American is the man who is an American and nothing else.

Were Roosevelt to make such remarks today before an assembly of Hispanic- or African-Americans, he would be shouted down and hounded out of politics for a hate crime.

In the 1960s, black leaders from basketball great Lew Alcindor to boxing legend Cassius Clay, to poet Leroi Jones, to radicals like H. Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael, began to adopt African and Islamic names to stress the degrees of separation from an American Christian mainstream.
The Black-Brown War

♦ But it is in the crime statistics that one sees most starkly the levels of racial animosity in society. In its latest analysis of the Justice Department crime statistics, The Color of Crime: Race, Crime and Justice in America, the New Century Foundation lists the following findings:

♦ Asian-Americans are the most law-abiding group, with a crime rate a fourth that of white Americans. Hispanics have a crime rate three times as high as white Americans, while black crime rates are seven times those of white Americans, and “black imprisonment rates are 33 times higher than the Asian imprisonment rate.”22 More jarring are the statistics on interracial crime. The most common interracial crime is black-on-white. “Blacks are an estimated 39 times more likely to commit a violent crime against a white than vice versa, and 136 times more likely to commit robbery.”23

♦ The LA jail system has 21,000 inmates and 90% of them are African-American and Hispanic.

♦ The Latino share of the population of California shot from 19% in 1980 to 34% today, Blacks fell from 737% to 6.7%. There are fewer than 2.5 million Blacks in all of California but 12 million Hispanics.

♦ In LA, Hispanics are now the accused in 73% of all hate crimes against blacks and blacks are the accused in 80% of hate crimes against Hispanics.

The “No-Whites-Need-Apply” Caucus

♦ In the spring of 2002, a three-day conference was held—no press invited—in Leesburg, VA. Attendance was restricted—by ethnicity and race. This was not a secret conclave of the White Citizens Council, but a joint meeting of the Black, the Hispanic, and the Asian Pacific caucuses of the House of Rep. of the US. The invitation list seemed to have been made up with but one stipulation: No whites need apply.

♦ As described in a front-page story in the New York Times, the goal of the “ni-caucus retreat” was to “create an atmosphere of understanding among groups that have often felt pitted against one another for resources and recognition.”36 But as the caucuses claimed to represent only those of African, Asian, and Hispanic descent, it is not unfair to ask: What were they uniting for, and whom were they uniting against?

♦ The closer one read Lynette Clemetson’s story, the more it appeared the Leesburg summit was not about aiding the poor and powerless against the rich and powerful, but about how people of color can unite to extract power and resources from white America.

♦ Attendees pointed to their common front on the $175 billion farm bill. The Black Caucus had demanded an expansion of the food stamp program and the Hispanic Caucus demanded restoration of food stamps for immigrants. They found common ground. Another “shining example” of collaboration had been in Texas, where Hispanics and blacks joined forces to nominate Hispanic Tony Sanchez for governor and African-American Ron Kirk for the Senate.
Eurabia

France and England

♦ Buchanan writes of France and Britian’s struggles with immigration and assimilation.
♦ Colonial rule was marked by such evils as chattel slavery and the exploitation of African labor in the mines of the Congo and South Africa. But was not the arrival of the West of immense benefit to the colonized peoples? Can Western civilization not claim credit for having advanced all of mankind morally, politically, culturally between 1492 and 1960? Was not Western civilization vastly superior to the indigenous civilizations it encountered and crushed, from the Aztecs and Incas in the Americas to the Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist civilizations from Africa to the Far East? Has not Western Man more to be proud of than ashamed of?
♦ But if Western imperialism was not uniquely exploitative, evil, savage, and shameful, why should the West be made to do eternal penance and pay eternal reparations? Or do we accept the Sontag verdict: “The white race is the cancer of human history”? Most prefer to avoid such questions. But they are not going away. For they are at the heart of the clash of civilizations now underway.
♦ “Historians Upset as France Burnishes Its Colonial Past,” ran one headline during the blazing controversy. In it we see the heart of the conflict. Are Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Syria, Lebanon, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and the Francophone countries of the African subcontinent better off having belonged to the French Empire? Or would these peoples have been better off had the French never come?
♦ There is truth in both renditions of French history. Western rule was not always benign and, in cases like the Belgian Congo, it was brutal and disgraceful. Yet there is no denying that the Americas of the Aztec, Inca, Iroquois, and Apache, the tribalist Africa of the nineteenth century, the India of suttee, benefited from generations and even centuries of Western rule. After all, it was not the indigenous peoples but the West that ended slavery and introduced the ideas and ideals of God-given human rights and rule of, by, and for the people.
♦ But the ultimate issue here is not what foreigners or immigrants think of the history of France. The issue is what the French think, and whether the children of France shall be taught that their nation’s history is glorious or sordid. Leaders of France should decide this, no one else. If immigrants object, let them go home to their own countries and study their own history as their own historians teach it. For if French children are taught to believe France’s past is one long catalogue of crimes and their forbears were little better than Nazis, they will not love France, and France will die. For love of country—patriotism—is the soul of a country; and when the soul departs, the body dies.
♦ Like the Paris riots, the struggle over French history raises grave questions for Europe. How does the presence of 20 million Muslims who come from nations where men believe their grandfathers were exploited and persecuted by Europeans advance the unity and security of Europe? How is Europe made stronger by such “diversity”? 
Yet, while the question is being debated, or ignored, Muslim numbers grow. Not only is their birth rate higher than that of the European native-born, no European nation save Muslim Albania has a birth rate (2.1 children per woman) that will enable it to survive many more generations. Europe is aging, shrinking, and dying. To keep the economies of Europe growing and taxes coming in to fund the promised health care and pensions for the surging numbers of retired and elderly, Europe will need scores of millions of new workers. And Europe can only find them in the Third World, for Western peoples are everywhere dying out.

From 1492 to 1914, Europeans went forth to conquer, colonize, and command the peoples of this earth. Then, between 1914 and 1945, Europe’s imperial powers indulged themselves in two of the bloodiest wars in all history, on their own continent. Comes now the closing chapter: the colonization of the mother countries by the children of the subject peoples that Europe once ruled. “France’s present…is our future,” writes National Review’s John Derbyshire. “Western—let us be blunt about: White European civilization—is on its way out.”

The immigrant share of Spain’s population is up to 8.4%. Spain’s birth rate is among the lowest on earth. The Madrid bombing of March 11, 2004, which killed 190 and wounded 1,800, has influenced Spain’s attitude toward immigration. The ringleader who committed suicide was a Tunisian and 11 of the 15 men charged were Moroccans. Spanish authorities identified the Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group as the focus of their investigation. Buchanan best describes Spain immigration deluge with the words of Manuel Pombo, Spanish ambassador-at-large for humanitarian issues: You put a barrier to the flow of immigrants through the straits [of Gibraltar] and they are going to go to Mauritania and try to get through almost 300 miles of sea in a very, very terrible voyage into the Canary Islands. Not even death will stop them from Europe.

Holland—Awakened by Assassins.

In May 2002, Pim Fortuyn, a flamboyant homosexual and right-wing populist campaigning for prime minister on an anti-immigration platform—he had called Islam a “backward” religion and demanded that Holland’s borders be closed—was shot six times in the head, neck, and chest in the Dutch city of Hilversum. Europe was jolted.

In 2005 came another stunning assassination. Theo van Gogh, forty-seven, the great-great-grand-nephew of the Dutch master, was by all accounts a repulsive, foul-mouthed character. “In writings and speeches he made crude jokes about Jews and riled Muslims with scatological insults,” describing one Muslim leader as the “prophet’s pimp,” wrote the WSJ. In August 2004, “the Michael Moore of Holland” aired on Dutch TV a ten-minute English-language film entitled Submission. The movie, noted the BBC, “caused an uproar.” The outcry centered on the stories of four Muslim women who were beaten, raped and forced into marriage, and were asking for Allah’s help. It becomes apparent that their chadors and gowns are transparent and their half-naked bodies are visible through their dress. On their bodies are written Koranic verses describing the permitted physical punishments for women who “misbehave.” Van Gogh was violently murdered by a Islamic Moroccan.
The great port city of Rotterdam is 40% Muslim. It is estimated that by 2010, Amsterdam and The Hague will have Muslim majorities.

In addition to Van Gogh’s killer and the London bombers, the March 11 Madrid bombers and the ringleaders of the September 11 attacks such as Muhammad Atta were radicalized in Europe.

Germany

Around 1960, the first of what is now a community of 2.6 million Turks began arriving in Germany as “guest workers”—Gastarbeiter—to take the menial jobs Germans were leaving behind as their industrial economy was booming to become the third largest on earth. Half a century later, many Germans believe their parents made a terrible and tragic mistake.

In Kreuzberg, a neighborhood of Berlin known as “Little Istanbul,” a “cultural tug of war is plain to see,” writes Robert Collier of the San Francisco Chronicle. With Islamic fundamentalism rising, Turkish women are returning to their native dress, wearing head scarves and long cloaks.

“People are beginning to get back to nationalism, to Islam, to the worst combination of both,” says Safter Cinar, a secularist and spokesman for the Turkish Union of Berlin. “Young people especially are becoming radical. Many of them are deciding, ‘Okay, if they want us to be foreigners, we will act like foreigners. We don’t like German society.’

Unassimilated, alienated from German culture, second- and third-generation Turks are embracing militant Islam. “There is a new wall rising in the city of Berlin,” noted the German writer Peter Schneider in the NYT Magazine in December 2005. Schneider dates a national awareness of the new wall to the days after the 9/11 massacres.

The two Germanies on opposite sides of the new wall are separated by economics as well as ethnicity and culture. Unemployment is 12% in Germany; among Turks it is 25%. Among Turks in Berlin it is 42%, with 50% of Muslim youth in the city unable to find work.

“About 30% of Turkish students drop out of high school and another 40% graduate in the Hauptschule, or vocational program, which trains them for industrial jobs that are becoming increasingly rare,” writes Collier. Yet still they come to Germany, although, according to ex-interior minister Otto Schily, “70% of the newcomers land on welfare the day of their arrival.”

Alienation, idleness, and boredom have ever been the combustible elements of revolution. Schopenhauer warned us about boredom.

One author offered, the guest workers turned into Turks and the Turks turned into Muslims.

A backlash is developing against the Turks: 74% of Germans, 70% of the French and 80% of the Austrians oppose Turkey’s entry into the EU. Under the EU charter, Turkey’s 70 million Muslims would be free to travel from Bulgaria to the British Isles to settle and work in 25 countries.
Russia

♦ In 1991, the USSR dissolved into 15 nations. And Russia is home to between 14 and 23 million Muslims, most of them concentrated in the south but with a million living in Moscow.

♦ The presence of these Muslims has fomented a nationalist backlash and birthed a new party, Rodina, or the Motherland Party; the nation’s second largest after President Vladimir Putin’s United Russian Party. In November 2005, two weeks before the Moscow City Council elections, Rodina ran an ad featuring a blond Russian woman walking in Moscow, “surrounded by dark-skinned immigrants from ex-Soviet republics. It ends with the slogan, ‘Let’s clean the city of rubbish.’ “

♦ The ad was denounced as racist and a court purged Rodina from the ballot. But a Rodina spokesman noted that the court acted only after polls had shown the party moving into second place.

♦ For ten centuries, Christians and Muslims have lived together in Russia. But with Russian nationalism and Islamic fundamentalism on the rise, tensions are growing. And with the Soviet Empire and the Soviet Union now history, there is no ideology, no empire, no Cold War conflict to hold these peoples together. As ethnic Russians seek community with their own kinsmen and identity in an Orthodox faith, Muslims hear the call of Islam and Islamism. Ethnic and religious clashes across Russia and bloodshed in the Caucasus are the consequence.

♦ Just as Chinese leaders invoke nationalism and racial solidarity to hold their country together and keep its people loyal, Putin plays the patriot card and cracks down on ethnic rebellion and Islamic irredentism. Yet it seems inevitable that the Caucasus will long be a scene of religious and revolutionary violence, disuniting Mother Russia. And as one looks at Russia’s anemic birth rate, dying population, the growing militancy of her Muslim minority, and the encroachment into Siberia by Chinese, one cannot but believe Russia will be a radically reduced nation by 2050.

♦ “Despite calamitous social problems,” notes the conservative British editor Derek Turner, “Russia still clings grimly onto relics of the Soviet Empire in the Caucasus and central Asia—as the people of Beslan were reminded horribly a couple of months ago. The 2002 census figures are mired in controversy, but there are an estimated 176 peoples and nationalities living within Russia. Of the 146 million population [as of 2002], 81.5 percent is regarded as Russian.

♦ In a December 2005 study, Dying Too Young, the World Bank described the demographic “devastation” of a Russia whose population had fallen by 7 percent in fifteen years and is now down to 143 million. According to the UN population survey of 2005, between now and 2030, 32 million Russians and Ukrainians—more than one in four—will vanish from the earth. The Slavic race is dying out. And, lest we forget, Russia guards the eastern frontier of Western civilization.
By the 1990s, parties had sprung up all over Europe to demand an end to the immigration that was changing the face of the Continent: the National Front of Jean-Marie Le Pen; the British National Party; Austria’s Freedom Party; the Flemish Vlaams Bloc of Belgium and Francophone Front National in the Walloon region; Pim Fortuyn List in Holland; the National Alliance in Italy; the Danish People’s Party; the Swiss People’s Party; Norway’s Party of Progress; Sweden’s Democrats; and the Rodina Party in Russia. Some boast a charismatic leader. All have in common populism, nationalism, and opposition to further immigration—and pariah status in the eyes of their national establishments.

Yet, just as the platform of the U.S. Socialist Party of six-time presidential candidate Norman Thomas was plagiarized by New Deal Democrats, major parties of Europe are cribbing stands on immigration and the EU long advocated by the populist parties. But it appears to be too late for Europe.

In researching for Death of the West in 2001, I discovered that not one European nation, save Muslim Albania and perhaps Iceland, had a birth rate, 2.1 children per woman, that could prevent it from dying. In every country, the median age was rising; in half, the native-born population had ceased to grow or begun to die. The 2005 UN population projections reconfirm my research for The Death of the West.

By 2050, it is now estimated, the 7 million people living in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania will have fallen to 5.3 million. Sbvakia will lose 15 percent of its population of 5.4 million. With one of the lowest birth rates in the world—il. child per woman—Ukraine will see its population of 46.5 million sliced to 26 million. Of the 143 million Russians alive, 32 million, a fourth, will vanish. The massacres and starvations of Lenin and Stalin are said to have caused 30 million deaths. Europe is suffering a population collapse unseen since the Black Death of the fourteenth century. “In essence,” writes columnist James Bemis, “Europe is suffering a ‘White Death.’ “

Southern Europe is expected to lose 10 million by 2050, with Italy leading the way as its population plummets from 58 to 50 million. As no “Christian” nation has a birth rate at replacement levels, the reason Western and Southern Europe will not shrink more dramatically is that the dying Europeans will be replaced by Africans, Asians, Arabs, and Muslims.

Given the generous pensions and health care benefits the welfare states of Europe provide to their peoples—whose average age will be fifty by 2050, with a third having reached sixty-five, and 10 percent over eighty—the only way they can be sustained is by a massive influx of new workers, who will pay the taxes and take care of the elderly in their retirement centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and hospices.

Where will the workers come from to do the servile and service labor Europeans will no longer do? The populations of the nations of West Africa will double, from 264 million to 586 million by 2050, while those of the nations of North Africa will increase by over 50 percent.

Islamization of Europe is an unavoidable consequence once Europe ceases to reproduce itself.
The Anglosphere

- Two other continent-sized nations besides America belong to what has come to be called “the Anglosphere”: Canada and Australia. Both, in the 1960s, threw out as discriminatory and racist an immigration policy that had kept their nations European. They threw open their doors, and invited the world in. And the world came.

- The experiment seems to be more troubled in Australia, where one-fourth of the population is foreign-born and most immigrants now come from Third World nations.

- On the heels of the Paris riots came the battle of Cronulla Beach. Some five thousand whites, wrapping themselves in Australian flags and chanting racist slogans, went on a drunken tear, chasing and beating Arab youth for an Arab gang assault on two lifeguards. One Aussie youth had painted on his back: “We grew here, you flew here.”7 In reprisal for Cronulla Beach, Arab youths rode in convoys into the suburbs of Sydney, smashing cars and assaulting whites.

- Behind the violence was seething anger at Lebanese toughs who Aussies claim make a practice of gang-raping girls they regard as “white sluts.” The same charge, writes columnist Mark Steyn, is made against Muslim youth in France: “From opposite ends of the planet there are nevertheless many similarities: non-Muslim women are hectored and insulted both on the streets of Clois-sous-Bois and Brighton-le-Sands. The only difference is that in Oz, the ‘white youths’ decided to have a go back.” Learning of the systematic assaults on these young women, Figaro’s Marie-Esteile Pech investigated. Financial Times columnist Chris Caldweil reported her results. Pech’s interview subjects told her that a girl who wears a dress, or other well-fitting Western clothing is “asking for it.” She often gets it, too. The most alarming stories in Pech’s investigation concerned tournantes, or gang-bangs. Girls who, for whatever reason, lack a father or brother to defend them get loaned out by their boyfriends to fellow gang members.

- This suggests the Aussie rage at the Lebanese Muslims of Sydney is not without warrant. And just as Americans remember the twin towers, Aussies remember the Bali bombing of 2002, where Muslim terrorists targeted a bar favored by vacationing Australians, killing eighty-eight. They reacted as we would to a massacre of college kids on spring break in Cancun.

- Prime Minister John Howard denied the violence revealed widespread racism. Labor Party leader Kim Beazley, insisting that multiculturalism was alive and well, dismissed both the white rampage and Arab response: “This is simply criminal behavior; that’s all there is to it.” Perhaps. But as in Europe, immigration is moving up the charts as a political issue in Australia, returning to the prominence it held when Pauline Hansen’s One Nation, riding the backlash against open immigration, was a national sensation.

- Decades ago, as the Australians were rejecting their traditional “White Australia” immigration policy, Canada was doing the same. Many Canadians consider their new policy a moral and social success. At the time of Stephen Harper’s elevation to prime minister in early 2006, the philosopher John Ralston Saul celebrated open-borders of Canada as the most experimental country in the world on immigration and citizenship...
We accidentally came up with the post-modern idea of a nation-state, with no dominant group or no dominant ideas. . . . The idea is that you could have a nation of minorities, that there would be no idea of a majority—in fact, the idea of a majority would be catastrophic.

In June 2006, Saul’s “experimental country” awakened to the news that seventeen Muslim men had been arrested in a plot to storm Parliament, take hostages, behead Prime Minister Harper—and seize media outlets to demand the release of Taliban POWs. If NATO failed to respond, Canada’s political leaders would be beheaded.

Was Canada really so “catastrophic” a country when almost all Canadians were of European ancestry?

About the new immigration policies the four Anglosphere nations have adopted, opening them up to tens of millions from the Third World, it needs to be said: all were imposed from above by ruling elites. None came of popular demand. All are resented by huge minorities or, as in the US, huge majorities of the people. Who should decide what Western nations will look like at midcentury? Are ethnicity and religion valid considerations in deciding who shall come—and who shall not?

A Nation of Immigrants?

The most emotional and powerful argument for open borders and unrestricted immigration is: America is a nation of immigrants.

Rarely have immigrants constituted 10% of our number.

What is different about today’s immigration?
- far greater numbers
- Most are breaking in.
- most are coming from countries and cultures whose peoples have never before been assimilated into a First World nation.
- our elites want America to become a stew of all the languages, creeds and cultures of the world
- most come to work with no desire to becoming Americans

Who are our fathers? If one excludes the Indians, and the Spanish who arrived in Florida and New Mexico in the 16th century, England’s Lost Colony, and Quebec, the first permanent settlements in North America were Jamestown in 1607 and Plymouth in 1620. These settlers were English, and they would give the nation its language, law, form of government, and traditions of freedom.
As James Edwards, the immigration scholar at the Hudson Institute, notes, even in colonial times laws were passed to keep out undesirables. Among these were “social misfits, convicts, and men driven by desperation...as well as Quakers, Catholics, disease-carriers, and separatists. Especially Catholics, for in the Old World religious conflicts had resulted in “papist” victories that meant the persecution of their Protestant brethren. “In the eyes of America’s predominantly Protestant community, it hardly seemed prudent to have established a society for religious dissenters from the Old World Establishment only to allow a hostile takeover by potential persecutors. Hence, Virginia in 1643 provided for the deportation of Catholic priests within five days of arrival.”

At the time of the Revolution, there were 2.5 million people living in the thirteen colonies, mostly English, Scottish, and Scotch-Irish, with 100,000 emigrants from Germany and a smattering of Dutch, Huguenots, and Jews. In 1775, His Majesty’s government halted all immigration to the colonies. “Between a third and a half of fighting men of the Revolutionary Army were of Scottish and Scotch-Irish descent. Many of those at Valley Forge were German.” (This may explain General Washington’s famous admonition, “Put none but Americans on guard tonight!”)

Of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, 48 were American-born, 8 were British and one was Catholic.

Not until the 1840s did immigration become a burning issue. Crop failures in Germany and Holland in 1846, the potato famine in Ireland from 1845 to 1849, the revolutions of 1848 across Europe, and the repression that followed, sent 1.7 million people—most of them Irish—streaming to our shores.

In 1882, Congress passed the first restrictive immigration law: the Chinese Exclusion Act. It was renewed in 1892 and 1902. Native Chinese were denied U.S. citizenship and many returned home. With their strange language, customs, and dress, Chinese were considered unassimilable and were resented as they were willing to work for “coolie wages.” The ban on Chinese would not be repealed until Chiang Kai-shek became a U.S. ally during World War II. In that 1882 law, the government also “undertook to exclude certain classes of undesirables, such as lunatics, convicts, idiots and persons likely to become public charges. In 1891, certain health standards were added as well as a provision excluding polygamists.”

After the assassination of President McKinley by anarchist Leon Czolgosz, the US in 1903 raised a bar against anyone who advocated the violent overthrow of the government of the US.

In 1897, Congress imposed a literacy test on immigrants, but it was vetoed by President Cleveland. Taft and Wilson vetoed similar bills; but in 1917, with war tension rising, Congress overrode Wilson’s second veto. By now, wrote JFK, “Those who were opposed to all immigration and all ‘foreigners’ were joined by those who believed sincerely, and with some basis in fact, that America’s capacity to absorb immigration was limited.”
The Quota Law of 1921 rolled back immigration to 357,000 a year. Annual quotas were established based on a nationality’s share of the U.S. population in 1910. In 1924, the act was revised, rolling back immigration even further, to 160,000 a year. Annual quotas were reset at 2 percent of the number of foreign-born of any nationality here in the 1890 census.

This meant that English, Scotch-Irish, Irish, and Germans would be most of those coming. In 1929, immigration was cut to 157,000.

FDR: “Californians have properly objected” to Japanese immigrants, wrote FDR, “on the sound basic ground that…the mingling of Asiatic blood with European or American blood produces, in nine cases out of ten, the most unfortunate results.”

Buchanan quotes the NY Times: It is both natural and wise that the American race wishes to preserve its unity and does not wish to see its present blend greatly changed [because it] prefers immigrants who will be easily absorbed and…it strenuously objects to the formation of alien colonies here [and not because it] adheres to silly notions of “superior” and “inferior” races.

As a result of the 1924 act, immigration fell sharply. By the 1930s, it was down to 50,000 a year. During WWII, it was halted, though 400,000 Displaced Persons were brought to the US following the war.

In 1952 came the National Immigration and Nationality Act (McCarran-Walter Act). Racial bar against the naturalization of Japanese, Koreans and other East Asians was removed.

In 1954 Ike with little protest, had ordered all illegal aliens deported from the US in “Operation Wetback.” Although the INS claim of 1.4 million deported seems a wild exaggeration, Operation Wetback was an undeniable success.

JFK on 156,700 per year quota: “There is…a legitimate argument for some limitation upon immigration.”

JFK on Senator Lehman’s figure of 250,000: “most liberal bill offered in recent years.”

Indeed, in his litany of famous immigrants who have contributed mightily to America, JFK does not mention a single African or Asian, or any woman at all. All are males and all were from Europe, except one West Indian: Alexander Hamilton. And JFK assures the nation, “Immigrants would still be given tests for health, intelligence, morality and security.”

“These changes,” Kennedy concludes, “will have little effect on the number of immigrants [156,700] admitted annually.”

Today, people are denounced as racists for promoting ideas identical to JFK’s. The true agenda of the open- borders lobby is to make over the face of America. To realize it, they will call their opponents names that more aptly apply to themselves.

History will record that the Immigration Act of 1965 did more to change America than the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which simply imposed on the South antidiscrimination laws other states had already adopted. But the Immigration Act of 1965 was stealth law, its results the very opposite of what its champion had promised.
Harris Poll in 1965 stated by a majority of two to one that it had not wanted to ease the immigration laws.

The 1965 Celler-Hart bill was the greatest bait-and-switch in history. Americans were promised one result, and got the opposite result that they had been promised would not happen. They were misled. They were deceived. They were swindled. They were told immigration levels would remain roughly the same and the ethnic composition of their country would not change. What they got was a Third World invasion that is converting America into another country.

The effect of the 1965 act was to remove national origins quotas from Europeans and give them to the Third World, then to throw open America’s doors to mass immigration from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In a 1987 interview with the Christian Science Monitor: At what point does cultural, racial diversity become a kind of social anarchy? How do you get national cohesion this way?

Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina openly defended the national quotas of the McCarran-Walter: “The only possible charge of discrimination in the McCarran-Walter Act is that it discriminates in favor of the people who made the greatest contribution to American and this new bill puts them on the same plane as everybody else on earth.”

Arizona Republic on Cesar Chavez: “…was as effective a surrogate for the INS as ever existed.”

Today, liberal Democrats stand beside establishment Republicans like Bush and McCain for open borders and amnesty for 12 million illegal aliens, selling out the vital interests of semiskilled and unskilled Americans—black, Hispanic, and white.

To understand why Americans who never opposed immigration in the past are alarmed to the point of panic, consider the countries of origin, and the total number of immigrants who ever came to America from 1607 to 1958—as reported by JFK:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6,798,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>5,017,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>4,642,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4,693009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>4,280,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3,344,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1,255,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>843,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>698,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>499,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>451,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>411,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>354,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>338,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>159,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>28,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Through those 350 years, JFK writes, America took in 42 million immigrants. Now compare those numbers with today’s.

In 2006, we have as many illegal aliens inside our borders, 12 to 20 million, as all the Germans and Italians, our two largest immigrant groups, who ever came in two centuries. Our illegal population alone exceeds all the Irish, Jewish, and British immigrants who came. Each year, we catch more people breaking in at the border than all the Swedes or Norwegians who came to America in two hundred years. Half a million illegal aliens succeed in breaking in every year, more than all the Greeks or Poles who came legally from the American Revolution to 1960. More Salvadorans are in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area alone than all the Greeks or Poles who ever came to America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As Peter Brimelow wrote in his seminal article in National Review in 1992:

Amazingly, only about 500,000 legal immigrants entered the U.S. in the whole of the 1930s. (In those days there was virtually no illegal immigration.) And only about a million entered in the 1940s—including World War II refugees. By contrast, the U.S. accepted over 1.5 million immigrants, counting only legals, in the single year of 1990 alone. There are almost as many immigrants and their children in the US in 2006—36 million—as all the immigrants who came in 350 previous years of American history. JFK, who thought the 156,700 annual limit on immigrants was fine but the nationalities mix might change a bit, could not comprehend a nation that, for twenty years, has taken in between 1 to 2 million, legal and illegal, every year, 90 percent of them from the Third World. In 1991, according to the final figures, the US took in 1.8 million, twelve times as many people as John E Kennedy thought was an acceptable figure.

Last Chance

Reagan, 1983: This country has lost control of its borders and no country can sustain that kind of position.

A Third World grows by 100 million people every 18 months.

Andrew Jackson, Theodore Roosevelt, or Dwight Eisenhower would have halted this invasion without apology. George Bush has persuaded himself the invasion is benign and the progressive thing to do is to welcome it. On this, there is not a dime’s worth of difference between George Bush and Teddy Kennedy.

Concerned about his legacy, President Bush may yet live to see his name entered into the history of his country as the president who lost the same American Southwest that James K. Polk won.

In almost every opinion survey, majorities of Americans say they want to stop illegal immigration, even if it means troops on the Rio Grande and a barrier fence from Brownsville to San Diego. But the majority no longer rules in America, when its interests collide with the globalist ideology of our transnational elites.
Consider the forces against reform. Corporate America wants an endless supply of cheap labor and the freedom to hire foreign workers and bring them to the US. The major media, the unions, the churches favor amnesty. The Democratic Party sees in mass immigration the future voters who can end Republican hegemony. The GOP is terrified of offending 43 million Hispanics and of a cutoff in campaign cash if it imposes sanctions on corporate scofflaws who regularly hire illegal aliens.

The 36 million foreign-born already here want the guaranteed right to bring in their relatives. The survival of Hispanic media depends on a constant resupply of Spanish speakers. Internationalists see nations as relics of a forgettable past, world government as the future, and want to erase all borders. Critically, Hispanic voters in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, and the swing states of Colorado and Nevada, are approaching numbers where they may be decisive in all future presidential elections.

It is not true that all creeds and cultures are equally assimilable in a First World nation born of England, Christianity, and Western civilization. Race, faith, ethnicity, and history leave genetic fingerprints that can’t be erased. Ignoring this truth, we sent an army to Baghdad to democratize Iraq, only to discover that Iraqis were Shiites, Turkomen, Christians, Kurds, and Sunnis, for whom religion, history, and tribe were important. They wish to be ruled by the majority only when they are the majority.

Race, ethnicity, history, faith matters and nationality matter. Multiculturalist ideology be damned, this is what history teaches. That is why Europeans do not want Turks in the European Union. That is why Serbs will ever resent the loss of Kosovo to Albanians. That is why African tribes still slaughter one another. That is why Israelis do not want a democratic state of Palestinians and Jews from the Jordan to the sea. That is why Muslims fight Christians in Indonesia, Nigeria, and Sudan, Buddhists in Thailand, Hindus in India, Jews in Palestine, Russians in the Caucasus.

Ideology and ignorance of history led Woodrow Wilson to consign millions of Germans to alien rule, leading to Hitler’s Third Reich. Did they not know at Versailles that Germans would want their land and kinsmen back?

The Bush guest worker program will only perpetuate and deepen the crisis. Once amnesty is granted, once all businesses are blanket-pardoned for past illegal hirings and permitted to go abroad to hire more foreign workers, the morale of the resistance will be shattered and the nation will lose control of the border forever.

Current projections are that by 2050, we will have a population of more than 420 million people, with 102 million Hispanics concentrated in the Southwest. African-Americans and Hispanics will be hugely overrepresented among our poor and working classes. Our affluent and professional classes will be dominated by Asians and whites. Our country will look like Latin America, with its chasm between rich and poor. Politically, this will produce a lunge toward statism. Demands for new social spending for health, education, and welfare for the scores of millions of poor and working-class people of color, and for quotas, racial and ethnic set-asides, affirmative action, and proportional representation for all minorities will be irresistible. We will never escape the prison of race. Our politics will be forever poisoned by it.
The Solution

♦ The first imperative is an immediate moratorium on all immigration, such as the one we imposed from 1924 to 1965. That forty-year pause allowed the melting pot to work its magic and create the one people and one nation we were in the Eisenhower-Kennedy era. A breathing space is desperately needed again.

♦ At a ten-year time-out on immigration, reducing it to the levels of the Coolidge-Hoover-FDR-Truman-Eisenhower-Kennedy decades—the levels JFK supported in 1958---will give us time to assimilate and Americanize the millions who have come legally since 1965.

♦ For the 36 million immigrants here now are not only the highest number in any country in history, but, unlike the Great Wave of 1890—1920, almost all come from continents and countries whose peoples have never before been assimilated into a First World nation. Moreover, we no longer seem to possess the moral authority to demand that they assimilate. Our elites have converted to multiculturalism and regard such demands as cultural chauvinism. Middle America no longer seems to care whether the newcomers assimilate or not. Americans seem to be losing interest in an integrated society, so long as they are left alone. But though there is no guarantee we can recreate the sense of national unity and common identity America had in 1960, we cannot succeed if we will not try.

♦ While the moratorium lasts, we should debate and decide whom we wish to come and whether we wish to alter, or preserve, the ethnic-religious composition of America. After all, America belongs to us, not the world.

♦ To discriminate is to choose. All of us discriminate in choosing the people with whom we associate—and with whom we choose to live our lives. There is nothing wrong about giving the decision as to who comes to America, to be our adoptive sons and daughters, to American citizens, the adopting people.

♦ To the father of the Constitution, James Madison, one consideration was paramount in deciding who should come and who should not: “I do not wish that any man should acquire the privilege of citizenship, but such as would be a real addition to the wealth or strength of the US.” If we follow his guidance, preferences should go to individuals who speak our English language, can contribute significantly to our society, have an education, come from countries with a history of assimilation in America, will not become public charges, and wish to become Americans. And as we remain a predominantly Christian country, why should not a preference go to Christians?

♦ After five years of ignoring the border, President Bush declared in Tucson, “we will not be able to effectively enforce our immigration laws until we create a temporary worker program.” This is naked extortion.

♦ The president was saying he cannot do his constitutional duty to protect the country from invasion unless we first agree not to deport the 12 million invaders already here and allow U.S. businesses to go overseas and hire foreign workers for jobs Americans won’t take at the wages offered.
President Bush needs to be told politely but pointedly, “No deal, Mr. President. No amnesty!” His guest worker program is a U.S. Chamber of Commerce—MALDEF scheme that means open borders forever. Though President Bush may declare, “I oppose amnesty!” every time he speaks, his guest worker program is amnesty, both for the illegals and for the businesses that hired them. Under the plan, Bush announced, no one is punished. Those who hired the illegals get blanket pardons. Those who broke in are allowed to stay, work six years, return home on sabbatical, come back to their jobs, and be put on a path to U.S. citizenship. Those who cheated win. That is amnesty.

Amnesties following civil wars are often necessary to heal a nation. But as people go unpunished for crimes committed, amnesties undermine the rule of law.

Bush’s amnesty would make fools of the millions who have waited in line for years for the privilege of coming America. It would demoralize a US Border Patrol whose agents daily risk their lives to defend our borders.

Bush concede in Tuscon that one in 12 aliens caught at the border had a criminal record. Do the math. We have 12 million illegals. Interpolating yields we have 1 million criminals.

Twenty years ago, Ronald Reagan was persuaded to grant amnesty to 3 million illegal aliens. In the White House, this writer supported the decision, just as I had favorably reviewed JFK’s A Nation of Immigrants and editorialized in favor of the Immigration Act of 1965. But following that amnesty, 1.5 million aliens were soon being apprehended every year at the border and half a million were crossing it successfully. This was new, this was different, this was mass lawbreaking, the beginning of what has become an invasion that has left at least 12 million aliens in our midst, with 100,000 more being caught every month at the border, and hundreds of millions of Third World poor waiting and watching to see if the Americans will seal their border, or if the land bridge to the US will remain open.

When Bush first broached his guest worker plan, there was a surge to the southern border. If Congress votes the Bush amnesty, the flood never ends. The world will see America as a morally befuddled and flabby nation that lacks the toughness to order out of its house those who have walked in and demanded all the rights of family.

It needs to be said again: The more than a million people breaching our border every year for decades are not bad people. By and large, they are good people, desperate only to find the good-paying jobs they cannot find in their misgoverned nations back home. Most are hardworking, decent people. But they are not Americans and they do not belong in our home. And if we do not stop this invasion and start repatriating them to the lands whence they came, we will lose our country, and we will be unworthy of our fathers who gave this country to us—and unworthy of our children, for we will have, through our softness, squandered their priceless patrimony.
The Border Fence

♦ The first of six measures is to build a permanent fence along the entire 2,000-mile border with Mexico, defining, sealing, and securing it forever.

♦ Twin fences, fifteen feet high, would enclose a two-lane road to permit the Border Patrol to move in both directions. Motion sensors would be buried in the roadway to detect people who had breached the outer fence. Beyond each fence would be coiled wire eight feet high. Beyond the wire would be ditches to stop the trucks and SUVs of the narcotics traffickers and their renegade Mexican army and police allies. This would halt the mass illegal immigration across our southern border cold. The Border Patrol could handle the rest.

♦ Is this a Berlin Wall, as Mexican politicians wail? That is absurd. The Berlin Wall was a prison wall to lock a captive nation in.

♦ The border fence is not unlike a fence you see around a home, a school or the White House.

♦ The lives of hundreds who perish in the desert regions of our border every year would be spared.

♦ The fence, if constructed correctly, would be a deterrent and our borderland would no longer be a landfill for trash by thousands sneaking across in the dark every night.

♦ There would be two hundred openings for rail and road traffic to facilitate trade, travel, and tourism.

♦ In a Rasmussen telephone survey of 1,500 Americans, a border fence was backed by 60 percent. Support for it should be a condition of support for all candidates for Congress and the White House.

♦ The $8 billion cost would be easily offset by the savings in the cost of welfare, health care, education, and incarceration of illegal aliens. A two-dollar fee to enter the US would finance it.

♦ Once the fence rises, it would be as welcome to Mexicans as to us. The San Diego—Tijuana corridor, where rapes were common, was the main entry to California after dark. But after the 14-mile fence went up under “Operation Gatekeeper” mounted in 1994, the number of illegals caught being smuggled through fell by 98 percent. The smugglers moved to Arizona. Land values rose. As Duncan Hunter, whose San Diego district encompasses the fence, testifies, even the neighborhoods on the Mexican side now accept it. For these people, too, were abused by gangs that congregated, robbed, raped, and murdered. Says Hunter, the fence “brought down the border murders from an average of 10 every year to zero. It brought down the number of drug trucks from 300 a month to zero. It brought down the smuggling of narcotics and people to almost zero.”
As the fence rises, property values of residences and ranches will rise. Parks and Indian reservations will become secure again. The polluted and poisoned environment can be restored. America’s side of the border will be America again, not some dark and bloody ground for drug and human traffickers where even the Border Patrol feels threatened. The fence is no longer an immigration issue. It is a national security and a national survival issue.

“Shameful,” wailed President Vicente Fox when he heard 700 miles of border fence had been approved by the U.S. House.

“Stupid! Underhanded!” yowled Foreign Secretary Luis Ernesto Debrez. “Mexico is not going to bear, it is not going to permit, and it will not allow a stupid thing like this wall!” This fence, roared Debrez, is the product of “a true myopia and blindness of a group of xenophobic persons in the US.”

The Mexican press cast Bush as the villain, writes Iraq war veteran Allan Wall, who lives in Mexico. “The Bush Wall,” “Bush the Rapist,” and “An Out and Out Racist” were the headlines to a few of the editorials.

What hypocrisy. To defend her border with Guatemala, Mexico uses her military, treats illegals as felons, and often brutalizes and imprisons them. Jose Luis Soberanes, president of Mexico’s National Commission on Human Rights, charges that the Mexican government “mistreats ‘indocumentados’ that cross its territory, it keeps them in jails, in overcrowded conditions, many times without food, without medical attention. . . violating their human rights.” Adds Heather Mac Donald, “Mexico’s border police have reportedly engaged in rapes, robberies, and beatings of illegal aliens from Central and South America on their way to the U.S. Yet compared with the extensive immigrant-advocacy network in the US, few pressure groups exist in Mexico to protest such treatment.”

Reporting from Tultitlan, Mexico, in April 2006, AP’s Mark Stevenson seconds Mac Donald, writing of shakedowns and even murder by Mexican police and soldiers. [U]ndocumented Central Americans in Mexico suffer in silence. Considered felons by the government, these migrants fear detention, rape and robbery. Police and soldiers hunt them down at railroads, bus stations and fleabag hotels. Sometimes they are deported; more often officers simply take their money....Maria Elena Gonzales, who lives near the tracks, said women often complain about abusive police: “They force them to strip, supposedly to search them, but the purpose is to sexually abuse them.” Others said they had seen migrants beaten to death by police, their bodies left near the railway tracks to make it look as if they had fallen from a train.’

The Mexican regime that tolerates such abuse slanders as racist and xenophobic an America that, above all nations, has welcomed immigrants.

In a Pew Hispanic Poll, 46 percent of all Mexicans said they would like to live in the US; 20 percent said they were willing to break the law to get in. When Vicente Fox denounces us for securing our border, President Bush should ask him why half his countrymen are ready to leave Mexico to live here. It is not America’s duty to serve as a safety valve for an endless series of failed Mexican regimes.
Anchor Babies

- Under the 14th Amendment, citizenship is granted to “All persons born or naturalized in the US and subject to the jurisdiction thereof.” That amendment overturned the most infamous act of judicial supremacy in U.S. history, the 1857 Dred Scott decision, which declared that the slaves could never be American citizens. The 14th Amendment gave citizenship to all the former slaves liberated by the 13th.

- But that phrase, “subject to the jurisdiction thereof,” is critical. For citizenship was not extended by the Fourteenth Amendment to Indians living on reservations. Not until the end of the Indian wars and acts of Congress in 1887, 1901, and 1924 was U.S. citizenship conferred on the Indians. Nor did the Fourteenth Amendment apply to children of foreign diplomats. Though they might be born in the US, they were not citizens because they were not “subject to the jurisdiction thereof.”

- Yet the White House, the Congress, and the U.S. courts have tolerated the wholesale abuse of the spirit and letter of the Fourteenth Amendment. They have allowed citizenship to be conferred on every child born in the US to an illegal alien. Pregnant women who sneak in or overstay their visas automatically entitle their babies to a lifetime of benefits at the expense of U.S. taxpayers, including twelve years of free schooling. The parents stay to collect the benefits. When the child reaches eighteen, he or she can sponsor relatives coming in.

- How widespread is this racket? Immense, writes Phyllis Schlafly. At least 383,000 babies are born in the US, every year, to illegal immigrants; that’s 10 percent of all U.S. births and about 40 percent of indigent births. The cost to U.S. taxpayers is tremendous, because all those babies, called anchor babies, claim birthright citizenship. Their mothers and other relatives then sign up for a vast stream of taxpayer benefits.

- According to the Center for Immigration Studies, 22 percent of all births in California are to illegal aliens. As these “anchor babies” are citizens at birth, they instantly begin to draw a lifetime of the benefits we provide all American children and their parents. Thus, social welfare costs continue to soar, though our native-born population has been close to stable for years. The remedy to the “anchor baby” racket is simple, but it requires courage from Congress.

- Under Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment, all authority over citizenship and naturalization is given to Congress, not the federal courts. “Congress should end its silence and pass a law stating that a child born to an illegal immigrant is not a U.S. citizen because his parent has not made herself ‘subject to [U.S.] jurisdiction.’

- Such a law would end the rampant abuse of the letter and spirit of the Constitution, remove a primary magnet for women to sneak into the US, and save citizens hundreds of billions of tax dollars over decades.
Chain Migration

- Today, immigrants are allowed to bring family members to the US, including children, spouses, siblings, and parents. These relatives then bring in their relatives in an unending process known as “chain migration.”
- This policy of family reunification makes immigrants—not Americans—the ultimate arbiters of who comes to America. Thus, whole villages from El Salvador are here, while citizens from countries whose kinfolk built America wait in line.
- Immigrants should be permitted to bring wives and minor children only. Other relatives should get in line with those already there. When an immigrant wins a green card, it should entitle him to work, and eventually bring his wife and minor children, not empower him to bring an extended family of dozens to the US. If reuniting with parents, brothers, and sisters is an absolute imperative for a foreign worker, let him go home and visit them as long as he likes.

Ending Dual Citizenship

- How many countries permit citizens to become citizens of foreign nations, swear allegiance to foreign powers, vote in foreign elections, run for office and accept high appointment in foreign regimes, and serve in the armed forces and fight in the wars of foreign nations, even nations hostile to their own? Only one country permits this: the US. So writes Stanley Renshon, the author of The 50 percent American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror.
- The Bible teaches: “No man can two masters.”
- Moreover, the new citizen’s Oath of Renunciation and Allegiance to the US expressly forbids dual citizenship: “I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen . . . and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God.”
- Former editor William Dickinson writes, before 9/11, “college students thought it fashionable to demean nationalistic feelings and seek a broader definition of their duties. ‘I don’t consider myself a citizen of the US,’ one student told me, ‘I consider myself a citizen of the world.’
- Eugene McCarthy once said there were three duties that every male citizen should perform: Pay taxes, vote, and bear arms for the nation. But today, a third of our population pays almost no income taxes. The share of our citizenry that votes is among the lowest of any democracy. Among our eighteen- to twenty-one-year-olds, voting participation is pathetic. As Dickinson adds, the war in Iraq is “waged with money borrowed from future generations. . . . Meantime, troop strength is shakily maintained by volunteers, many of them from disadvantaged backgrounds, and lured by costly bonuses and benefits. Foreign nationals are recruited with promises of fast-track citizenship.”
How many Americans hold dual citizenship? No one knows.

Some 151 nations allow it, many in the hope that their people who migrate to the US will become citizens and advance the interests of the home country in America. One such nation is Mexico, which accounts for 30 percent of all immigrants and perhaps 60 percent of all illegal aliens, and which openly encourages U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry to put Mexico first.

America’s tolerance of dual citizenship may be traced to the Warren Court and its 1967 decision in Afroythn v. Rusk. Beys Afroyim, a 1912 emigrant from Poland, became a naturalized American citizen in 1926. In 1950, he moved to Israel. When he tried to renew his U.S. passport in 1960, Afroyim was refused on the grounds he had voted in Israeli elections in 1951 and forfeited his citizenship. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1940 stipulated that U.S. citizens shall “lose” their citizenship upon voting in any foreign state’s election. Afroyim argued that this provision, though it had been upheld in the 1958 Perez v. Brownell decision, was unconstitutional. The U.S. Appellate Court for the Second Circuit upheld the State Department’s revocation of Afroyim’s citizenship. But the Warren Court, 5—4, declared that Congress lacked the power to revoke Afroyim’s citizenship, that a U.S. citizen must voluntarily relinquish his citizenship in order to lose it. The court further declared that even active-duty service in a foreign army or swearing allegiance to a foreign power was insufficient to deprive a citizen of his U.S. citizenship. Arnaud de Borchgrave claims that “... more than 500,000 Israelis with dual citizenship.” According to Renshon, 40 million U.S. citizens may now be able to claim dual citizenship. Renshon makes a crucial point: Citizenship is not nationality. A man or woman may be a U.S. citizen without truly being an American. While citizenship confers rights and duties, nationality “refers to the emotional ties and core understandings about the world and common experience that binds members of a group together.” “Nationality” writes Renshon, “is the foundation of citizenship.”

If the oath of allegiance is to mean what it says, Congress should enact a law declaring that anyone who votes in a foreign election commits a crime. Anyone who serves in a foreign government or enlists in its armed forces renounces his or her U.S. citizenship and shall henceforth be denied a U.S. passport and the rights of an American. “Citizenship without emotional attachment,” says Renshon, “is the civic equivalent of a one-night stand.”
Remove the Magnets

♦ It is a Republican truism that if you subsidize something, you get more of it; if you tax something, you get less of it.

♦ America runs the largest trade deficits in history because we do not tax imports—they enter duty-free—while exports carry in their price the cost of all the taxes we impose on managers, workers, and companies that remain in the US. By reversing this penalty-reward formula, the US could eliminate its trade deficit in a decade.

♦ We could reduce and eventually eliminate our surplus of illegal and indigent aliens the same way: End the incentives that bring and hold them here, and increase the penalties for hiring and keeping them here.

♦ As immigrants work for less than Americans, they drive down the wages of our working people. And they represent a wealth transfer from the poorest Americans to the richest. Businesses profit from lower labor costs, while the costs of welfare, rent supplements, emergency-room treatment, clinics, Medicaid, food stamps, earned income tax credits, legal services, courts, and prisons, where a disproportionate number of illegal aliens end up, is passed on to taxpayers. Many illegal immigrants work off the books, which makes them even more attractive to unscrupulous employers.

♦ Businesspeople who break the law by hiring illegal aliens for lower wages than U.S. citizens should be punished severely. Instead of providing social welfare to illegal aliens, including free education from preschool through high school, state and federal governments should provide only emergency services.

♦ Why should taxpayers have to subsidize twelve years of education for the children of parents who entered illegally or are breaking our laws by being here? The reason: the Supreme Court. Under Plyler v. Doe, a 5—4 decision in 1982 by Justice William J. Brennan, an appointee Ike called one of his worst mistakes, Texas was ordered to provide illegal aliens the same education as American children. This has proven a magnet for foreigners to come to have their children educated for free, even if they have to break the law to get here or stay here. It is the population explosion among immigrants, legal and illegal, that is the primary and often the only reason new schools must be built and property taxes must go up.

♦ Terminate birthright citizenship to children of illegal aliens.

♦ Permit states, counties, and communities to decide whether they wish to tax themselves to pay for the education of children of illegal aliens.

♦ In enacting a federal law to overturn Plyler v. Doe, Congress should invoke Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution to deny the right of review of the law to all federal courts, including the Supreme Court.

♦ All U.S. businesses should be required to match the Social Security numbers and names of all prospective employees by making a toll-free call to the Social Security Administration, just as retail clerks routinely call to check the credit cards of customers making expensive purchases.
♦ A fine should be imposed for every instance of hiring an illegal. Repeated hirings should bring jail terms. Businesses that hire illegals are triple cheaters. They cheat the government of taxes that must be made up by honest citizens. They cheat the community that has to pay the health, education, and welfare costs of illegal aliens and their children. And they cheat their competitors, who have to pay fair wages and honest taxes and are thus at a disadvantage.

♦ If a business is found to have hired illegals, all tax deductions for the wages of those workers should be disallowed and penalties and interest on the back taxes owed should be imposed. Companies found in chronic violation of U.S. immigration laws should lose their corporate charters.

♦ A national campaign should be undertaken to encourage states to enact versions of California’s Proposition 187, which denied welfare benefits to illegal aliens, and Arizona’s Proposition 200, which requires that, to be eligible for welfare benefits, citizens must provide proof of citizenship, or proof they are in the US legally.

♦ Illegal aliens should be made ineligible for Social Security or the earned income tax credit. The EITC is meant to ensure U.S. workers a living wage, not to be used as a bonus for people who undercut the wages of Americans while breaking our laws.

♦ As Congress has the authority over citizenship under the Constitution, it should assert its right to preempt and override state and local laws during the state of emergency.

♦ America must offer asylum to the persecuted, but we should set a rule. If a refugee from tyranny, say, in Burma, arrives on free soil, say, Thailand, he or she is no longer a refugee entitled to asylum here. We cannot take in every political refugee on earth, for billions of people live in countries we designate as unfree.

♦ The Diversity Lottery which determines the 50,000 immigrants allowed annually should be abolished.

♦ State and local officials, especially law enforcement, should be empowered by the U.S. government to inquire into the immigrant status of every suspect, and to arrest on sight known deportees who have committed felonies by sneaking back into the US.

♦ Cities that enact “sanctuary” polices where police are forbidden to ask a suspect about his or her immigration status—i.e., constrained in enforcing immigration laws—should have their federal funds reduced.

♦ U.S. funding for colleges and universities that grant in-state tuition rates to illegal aliens that they deny to out-of-state Americans should also be reduced.

♦ The OTMs, “other-than-Mexicans,” caught at the border should be held in expanded Depart. of Homeland Security detention facilities and quickly deported. Any nation that refuses to take back citizens who entered our nation illegally should have all visa applications denied until it agrees to take them back. Nations that refuse to accept their own nationals who are illegally in the US should have foreign aid terminated.

♦ Like trade laws, immigration laws should be designed to protect the wages and the living standards of Americans. This means an end to excessive unskilled and semiskilled immigrant labor.
“Massive deportation of the people here is unrealistic. It’s just not going to work,” an embattled President Bush railed in Irvine, California. John McCain repeatedly demands that opponents of his McCain-Kennedy bill explain how they propose to remove 12 million illegal aliens from the US.

We do not need to create a Gestapo or send federal agents to round up and deport illegals. The answer to McCain is attrition through enforcement. Vigorous enforcement of U.S. laws will persuade millions to go home. If they cannot find jobs, if they are denied welfare, food stamps, and rent supplements, if their children are not all educated for free, they will not come, and many will go home, as earlier immigrants did.

In “Attrition Through Enforcement,” Jessica Vaughn of the Center for Immigration Studies demonstrates how, with less than $2 billion worth of tougher enforcement, half the illegal aliens here could be persuaded to return home voluntarily within five years.

Who should be deported at once? Anyone convicted of a felony, all gang members, any illegal alien arrested for drunken driving. Bail should be denied illegals charged with violent crimes. The safety of the people is the highest law. If witnesses to violent crimes in immigrant communities knew criminal predators would not be back on the street in hours, they would be far more willing to testify against them.

If we will secure the border, deport the criminals, sanction employers who hire illegals, deny citizenship and social welfare except emergency aid to illegal aliens, in five to ten years our crisis will be at an end.

Because the world is watching. If we fail to secure our southern border, if we grant a second amnesty, the tipping point will have been passed.

What is required of us is the confidence and courage of our forefathers, who made no apologies for who and what they were as they believed—and rightly so—that theirs was the greatest civilization and culture the world had ever produced, and they meant to preserve and protect it.

It needs to be said again: If we do not solve our civilizational crisis—a disintegrating culture, dying populations, and invasions unresisted—the children born in 2006 will witness in their lifetimes the death of the West.
The one absolutely certain way of bringing this nation to ruin, of preventing all possibility of its continuing to be a nation at all, would be to permit it to become a tangle of squabbling nationalities—Teddy Roosevelt, the Knights of Columbus, 1915

You cannot become thorough Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American.—Woodrow Wilson, Address to New Citizens, 1915

What does it mean that your first act on entering a country—your act on that soil—is the breaking of that country’s laws? Peggy Noonan, 2005

No society has a boundless capacity to accept newcomers, especially when are poor and unskilled. Robert Samuelson, economist and Newsweek columnist, 2005

The American Southwest seems to be slowly returning to the jurisdiction of Mexico without a shot being fired.—Excelsior, 1982, Mexico’s national newspaper

Demographically, socially, and culturally, the reconquista of the Southwest US, is well underway.—Samuel Huntington, Harvard University, 2004