

American Renaissance

There is not a truth existing which I fear or would wish unknown to the whole world.

— Thomas Jefferson

Vol. 12, No. 11

November 2001

Will America Learn its Lessons?

Paying the price for foolish policies.

by Jared Taylor

Early on the morning of Sept. 11 five Middle Eastern men arrived at Boston's Logan airport just before their flight to Los Angeles took off, and bought one-way tickets with cash. This was a set of circumstances that should have resulted in immediate detention but did not. Both in 1999 and in 2000, Arabs who were kept from boarding planes sued airlines for "racial profiling," so at Logan no one dared stop what had every sign of being a hijack gang. The men went on to fly their plane into the World Trade Center in New York.

The events of Sept. 11 are the most spectacular consequence to date of two of the most self-destructive policies the United States has ever pursued: open immigration and the refusal to acknowledge group traits. Those five men should never have been let into the country, and they should have been profiled immediately as potential terrorists. With more than 6,000 Americans dead, billions in property damage, trillions in lost stock values, an airline industry on the brink of collapse, and the economy entering a recession, is there any chance our rulers have learned anything?

Immigration and National Security

One of the most obvious lessons begging to be learned is that diversity is not a strength. Even the most benighted liberals would be hard-pressed to state just

what the United States has gained from seven million Muslims within its borders. And it is the presence of these seven million—many of them Middle Easterners—who gave the terrorists a plausible context here and permitted

foundest sense. And it is clear that many Middle Easterners living in our midst share their convictions, if not (yet) their willingness to die for them.


Although authorities are not certain of the identities of all 19 hijackers, at

least 15 and perhaps all entered the United States legally. They came on tourist, business, and even student visas. Mohammed Atta, the Egyptian said to have been the ring-leader, entered the country from Germany in June, 2000, on a student visa. The Germans already had their eye on him as a possible bomb-thrower, but the INS either didn't know or didn't care. During his years in the West, he adjusted to the point of downing five Stolichnaya vodkas four nights before the attack, but he was still determined to kill as many of us as possible.

Khalid Almidhar and Nawaf Alhazami showed up in San Diego in November 1999. They went in and out of the country at will, and started taking

fly lessons in May, 2000. Hani Hanjour, a Saudi Arabian who probably piloted the plane that hit the Pentagon, had lived in the United States on and off since 1990. In 2000, he got a student visa to study English at a one-month program given by ELS Language Centers in Oakland, California. He used the visa to enter the country but never showed up for class. The ELS people didn't get word from the INS that Mr. Hanjour had even gotten a visa, so they had no idea he was in the country. Even if they had told the INS their "student" was AWOL it would probably have done nothing; once someone is in the country legally, the INS doesn't much care what he does. One year later, this now-

Continued on page 3



them to move from university to flight school to mosque to rent-a-car counter without attracting the slightest attention.

Some had been in the United States for several years, presumably imbibing the vapors that, we are told, can turn

It is clear that many Arabs living in our midst share their convictions if not (yet) their willingness to die for them.

anyone into a happy member of the "first universal nation." They were unaffected. They were true to their blood, true to their religion, true aliens in the pro-



Letters from Readers

Sir — Some people have called the recent terrorist attacks shocking and unexpected. Shocking, yes, but they should not have been unexpected. On the contrary, in recent years it has often been predicted that it was only a matter of time before there was a major terrorist attack within the United States. Furthermore, most of us understood that the perpetrators would probably be Muslim extremists, and most likely Arabs.

We could have avoided the recent attacks (or, at any rate, made them much less likely) by the simple policy of not permitting Arabs, or persons from any other country ruled by Muslim extremists, from entering the United States—not as immigrants, nor as workers, students, or even tourists. Such a policy would not violate either our constitution or international law. All sovereign countries claim the right to decide which foreigners (if any) they will allow into their territory, and such rights are commonly exercised.

Although the danger of permitting Arabs to enter the United States has been evident for decades, we have—for purely ideological reasons—refrained from excluding them. The results of that foolish policy are now plain for all to see. It is true, of course, that most Arabs who wish to enter the US have no intention of committing any terrorist acts here. However, that does not give them any right to enter. Nobody has a right to enter a foreign country without that country's consent. Both legally and morally, we are entitled to refuse entry to any person whom we suspect might be dangerous.

If we really are resolved to prevent future terrorist attacks, we should

promptly change our current policy and: a) deny admission to any Arabs; and b) insist that any such persons—other than US citizens—who are now in this country should leave within three months (or when their visas expire, if that is sooner). Such a change in policy will not by itself prevent all future terrorism; but it will—and at minimum cost—greatly reduce the frequency of such acts, and enhance the effectiveness of any other anti-terrorist policies we adopt.

Michael Hart, Crofton, Md.

Sir — Your “Arguments for Our Side” (June 2001) is an excellent compilation of responses to use in discussions about race. You are right to point out how white America is gradually being overtaken by the sheer numbers of Hispanics, blacks, Asians, etc. The immigration pressure we are experiencing is due to the fact that America is a well-organized society, with a first-rate technical and industrial infrastructure.

If Mexico had a similar organizational structure, it would be as rich as Switzerland, but Mexico lacks the technical skills, industrial base, and moral fiber to develop first-world institutions. Instead it ships its excess population to the United States. How long can this last? One day the Southwestern US will not be able to offer these people anything better than what they have at home.

The only realistic way to decrease further misery is to reduce the number of surplus and unwanted children. Our Christian ethics forbid this, instead requiring that we reach out and help the miserable and deprived across the globe, with the result that they increase in number while our own productive population decreases in both relative and ab-

solute terms. What a prospect for the future of mankind!

Herbert Mataré, Malibu, Calif.

Sir — I greatly admire your passionate and articulate efforts to publicize the importance and reality of race. For the sake of human progress, I hope your courageous work will be appreciated and supported by a growing number of Europeans and European-descended peoples around the world. Most racial realists, including myself—with mortgages to pay, dependents to feed and protect, living from paycheck to paycheck—are afraid to rise up visibly against the juggernaut of PC orthodoxy on race. We work as best as we can to proselytize quietly, and vote intelligently. Like many people, I depend on the Internet to gain access to information that has been mostly suppressed by the mainstream media. That is how I learned about AR. I hope you will continue sending up flares of inspiration to your browbeaten brethren.

A cowed but unbroken European American in North Carolina

We are not particularly courageous. Most people greatly over-estimate the costs of candor and activism. The sky will not fall if you say what you think. Your friends will not look at you with horror. A few people may think worse of you, but others will think better of you. Unless you are a politician, or an associate professor trying to get tenure at a liberal university, you are very unlikely to be fired. It has been one of the great successes of our opponents to terrify our people into silence. Among AR readers who speak their minds freely there are people from virtually every profession, including politician and junior faculty member. If we all were to slink about, afraid to speak up for our people, nothing would be accomplished.

Sir — I very much enjoyed Prof. Griffin's excellent article on racially-conscious child-rearing. I suspect there would be much more of it were it not for the mothers. Women are more conformist than men, and more likely to worry their children won't fit in unless they watch TV and play video games.

I salute the mothers of those children in Prof. Griffin's article!

Charles Hunter, Springfield, Ill.



American Renaissance

Jared Taylor, Editor
Stephen Webster, Assistant Editor
James P. Lubinskas, Contributing Editor
George McDaniel, Web Page Editor

American Renaissance is published monthly by the New Century Foundation. NCF is governed by section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; contributions to it are tax deductible.

Subscriptions to American Renaissance are \$24.00 per year. First-class postage is an additional \$8.00. Subscriptions to Canada (first class) are \$36.00. Subscriptions outside Canada and the U.S. (air mail) are \$40.00. Back issues are \$3.00 each. Foreign subscribers should send U.S. dollars or equivalent in convertible bank notes.

Please make checks payable to: American Renaissance, P.O. Box 527, Oakton, VA 22124. ISSN No. 1086-9905, Telephone: (703) 716-0900, Facsimile: (703) 716-0932, Web Page Address: www.amren.com Electronic Mail: AR@amren.com

Continued from page 1

illegal, overstay alien helped kill Americans.

It is not as if we weren't warned. Eyad Ismoil, the man convicted of driving the truck full of explosives used to bomb the World Trade Center in 1993 was also in the country after overstaying his student visa.

And then there is Zacarias Moussaoui, a Moroccan Frenchman, who was arrested before the attacks, on August 17. He had been nosing around a Minnesota flight school, asking for simulator training on commercial jets. This was an odd request for someone who had

Some of them appear not to have spoken a word of English, but got visas and blended in just fine in multi-culti America.

never even soloed in a single-engine propeller plane. It was odder still that he said he didn't care about taking off or landing; all he wanted to know was how to steer. The flight school people alerted the police, who picked him up on a visa violation. Even before Sept. 11, French authorities told us he was a suspected terrorist, but our security wizards didn't put two and two together.

Some people think Mr. Moussaoui was the "20th hijacker." Three of the flights were commandeered by five men but the fourth—which failed to hit its target and was probably downed when passengers swarmed the hijackers—had only four terrorists on board. Mr. Moussaoui has refused to talk.

Others have refused to talk. Ayub Ali Khan and Mohammed Azmath, both

Muslims from India, got on a cross-country flight from Newark at about the same time the hijackers boarded their flights. After their plane was grounded in St. Louis, they were found with box cutters, hair dye, and \$20,000 in cash. Were they part of a fifth team but got cold feet? Were they on a practice run for a later attack? They won't say.

Ten of the hijackers did not come to America until July, just a few months before the attack. They were the muscle for the assaults, and spent their time lifting weights and practicing knife fighting. Many of them appear not to have spoken a word of English, but got visas and blended in just fine in multi-culti America.

The State Department manual for consular officers says not to issue visas to people who have planned or committed terrorist acts, but "mere membership" in a recognized terrorist group does not automatically disqualify a person, nor does "advocacy of terrorism." As the National Commission on Terrorism reported last year, "In spite of elaborate immigration laws and the efforts of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the United States is, de facto, a country of open borders."

The hijackers therefore got into the country with no trouble at all, and just overstayed their visas. Approximately 40 percent of our estimated 11 million illegals did the same thing: arrived legally and didn't go home. The United States does not have a system for figuring out who hasn't left when he should have. Failure to keep track of foreigners has now proven fatal.

Many of the foreigners who do go back, and who don't kill any of us while they are here, should never have been

let in either. The State Department says Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria and Sudan all sponsor terrorism. Nevertheless, during the five-year period between 1991 and 1996 we let in 10,000 of their nationals on student visas. One of these was an Iraqi who got a Ph.D. in nuclear engineering at Michigan State University and is now the top scientist in the Iraqi nuclear weapons program. Three of the Iranians have also gone home to work on nuclear weapons. What is the use of calling countries "terrorist states" and then teaching their citizens how to make A-bombs? Senator Dianne Feinstein of California argued at first for a six-month moratorium on student visas but later backed off, saying she would be satisfied with better ways to keep track of no-shows and overstays.

The country that sends the largest number of students to the United States is China. There were 54,000 Chinese in American Universities last year, and they were not studying music theory or history of film. The FBI reports that many physics and aeronautics students are outright spies, while others are happy to report back to Beijing on everything they learn. As FBI director Louis Freeh testified back in 1998, "some foreign students are then encouraged to seek employment with U.S. firms to steal proprietary information." In the long run, educating Chinese is far more stupid and dangerous than educating Arabs (see book review, p. 9). China is a huge, racially homogeneous nuclear power with an ancient hunger for hegemony and an abiding hatred of the West (see book review, AR Feb., 2001, p. 7) It has the potential to make Osama bin Laden's efforts against us look like harmless pranks. All our jabber about a "diverse society" and "one world" only makes us vulnerable to people who laugh at foolishness of that kind.

Nests of Support

The FBI is now in the process of trying to root out the network that made the events of Sept. 11 possible. One nest of support may have been in Laurel, Maryland, the home of Moataz Al-Hallak. He is a radical imam who once had a congregation in Arlington, Texas, but moved to Maryland. One of his Texas protégés, Wadih El-Hage, was convicted this year of helping bomb the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The imam was born in Syria, makes fre-

quent trips to Arab countries, and is now a U.S. citizen. At least six of the 19 hijackers spent as much as several weeks just a few miles from Mr. Al-Hallak's home, and the FBI wants to know how friendly they were. How did this America-hater become a U.S. citizen?

Jersey City, New Jersey, is another cozy roost for terrorists. Just across the Hudson River from Manhattan, it has one of the largest Arab populations of



Welcome sight for some "Americans."

any city in America, and was the base for the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center. Sheik Omar Abdel-Rahman, an Egyptian cleric who has a mosque in Jersey City, was convicted in 1995 of masterminding the attack. He was known for Khomeini-style sermons blasting the United States. What was he doing living here, teaching Arabs to hate us? Perhaps it was some of his followers who were detained and questioned after they held roof-top tailgate-style parties where they cheered and whooped as they watched the World Trade Center burn. The FBI is already holding a score of Jersey City Arabs, and is looking into whatever support they may have provided the hijackers.

The hijackers who took off from Dulles Airport took advantage of a different kind of immigrant network that let them get Virginia driver's licenses even though they were not residents. An American applicant has to show a Virginia lease or utility bill in his own name to prove residency, but the state waives that requirement for "refugees." They get by with a notarized residency form cosigned by a state resident, and an iden-

tity form cosigned by a lawyer. There is a brisk trade in bogus forms of this kind, and Herbert Villalobos is being held for dummying up papers for the hijackers. He was probably not in on the plot, but was uncovered only because he served the wrong customers.

In fact, the FBI says it has known for several years about four or five bin Laden groups (al Qaeda cells) operating in the United States. Each cell has fewer than a dozen members, and although authorities have been eyeing them, they came here legally and have not committed any known crimes. The FBI thinks they lie low, gather intelligence, support active terrorists, and wait for a good opportunity to swing into action.

Another purpose of these "sleeper" cells seems to be to make enough money to keep from draining the al Qaeda treasury. "Cells live off the land," says Jonathan Winer, a former State Department security official. "Once they've gotten seed money, they have to be self-sufficient." Some of these groups, which are probably operating in more than a dozen countries around the world, also benefit from a network of wealthy Muslims in the United States, United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia, who feed money to them through Islamic charities. So far, the FBI has found no connection between these cells and the Sept. 11 attacks.

Just as the hijackers looked into flying crop dusters, some of these lurkers got special permits to haul dangerous chemicals. Nabil Almarabh, a former Boston cab driver with ties to Mr. bin Laden, has a Michigan permit to haul hazardous waste, and an investigation found 20 more people who had gotten such permits by fraud. No doubt, the plan was to dump a truck load of dioxins into the water supply somewhere. Such are the charming neighbors our "diverse" society thoughtfully imports for our edification from all over the world.

Most of those who would like to kill us have no doubt kept their thoughts to themselves. Not so Abdou Larabou Moussa, originally from the Muslim country of Niger, who came to work after the attacks, celebrating loudly. He taunted his colleagues at Kay Chemical in Greensboro, North Carolina, and showed up the next day in military fatigues still gloating. "It was incredibly

inappropriate," appears to be the extent of outrage mustered by a company vice president, who nevertheless reports Mr. Moussa has been fired.

Likewise imprudent were three Middle Easterners who were seen cheering and jumping for joy in the Meadowlands area of New Jersey after the attack. They were found to be illegals, and now face deportation.

The British paper *The Guardian* had no trouble tracking down "Americans" who feel the same way. "The only take you can have on it as a Muslim," says 14-year-old Mohamed Aissaoui, in the idiomatic language of the Brooklyn-born. "You're a Muslim first and American second," he explains. "If they [the terrorists] were doing it for a good cause," says this citizen of the United States and fine example of diversity, "then God bless them."

Some apparently peaceable foreigners here legally have decided to go home, now that terror has come to America. "We came here looking for economic security and to build professional careers," says Mariana Bruzzone who moved from Argentina to Miami. Now she and her boyfriend have bought tickets for Buenos Aires. Mahmoud Farahat, an Egyptian who recently graduated from the University of Miami, may also go home. The attack "ends the whole idea of America as a free country, where people from everywhere are supposed to go," he says, as if he should know. Rodolfo Araujo is a Colombian radiologist who has lived in America for 38 years. Now, he has decided to go back to Columbia when he retires—despite a civil war that kills thousands every year. Other fair-weather Americans are no doubt clearing out, too.

In Hong Kong, visa applications have dropped by 70 percent since the bombing; pretending to be an American doesn't seem worth the bother anymore. Not surprisingly, visa requests remain unaffected in the world's most wretched countries. Ghanaians and Chadians still want to come to America despite the killings.

Mexicans appear to be happy to see America bloodied. Ana Maria Salazar is a Mexican-American who was a high-ranking defense official in the Clinton administration and now teaches at the Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico. After the attack, she told her students that if Mexico really wants to be treated as an equal partner it must

stand with America against terror. The students remained silent. But when another professor said the United States was a bully and did not deserve Mexican support, they burst into sustained applause. In September, Australian national radio reported that Mexicans were happily buying up T-shirts that say "Osama bin Laden is my hero," and that rubber masks of the terrorist leader were selling well.

President Vicente Fox has been trying to cut a dashing figure on the world stage, and has been lobbying for a seat on the U.N. Security Council. In keeping with this role, he wants Mexico to give America high-profile support but his countrymen are having none of it. They equate applauding America with subservience. The newspaper *Reforma* drew up a scorecard of how supportive different countries have been of the United States. Mexico tied with China for next-to-last, just ahead of Iraq and Cuba.

There have been few reports on how Mexicans already in the country reacted to the terror, but at least one student at the overwhelmingly-Mexican Century High School in Santa Ana, California, appears mainly to have been bored. "I'm tired of hearing about this already," said Joanna Guadard of the attacks, disappointed that her usual television programs were temporarily off the air.

And, indeed, when the House of Representatives voted after the attacks to authorize use of the military to help stop drugs and terrorists at the border, Hispanics were prominent in the opposition. As Rep. Silvestre Reyes, Democrat of Texas, explained, "We are a country if immigrants, where civil rights are protected, so we must continue to make sure that actions are not taken which are contrary to these principles." Heidi Storsberg, a federal legislator in Mexico City agrees: "We are very worried about the possible militarization of the U.S.-Mexican border and the eventual spread of nationalistic, xenophobic and racist sentiments." Fernando Garcia of the Border Network for Human Rights in El Paso explains that any anti-immigrant sentiment on account of the attacks is just racism.

European Connection

Muslim immigration has made Europe a congenial home for terrorists, just as it has the United States. The German

city of Hamburg is a hotbed of Islamic fundamentalism, and several of our hijackers spent time there. Mohammed Atta studied engineering there in the 1990s, and is reported to have converted to radical Islam during that period. It is now thought likely that the whole Sept. 11 mission was originally planned in Hamburg. German authorities say there are as many as 30 Islamic terrorist cells in the country, and that out of 3.1 million Muslims some 3,250 are "potential extremists."



Has followers throughout Europe.

Since the attack, possible accomplices have been arrested in Holland, Spain, and Belgium. In Madrid, police collared six Algerians with night vision goggles and state-of-the-art forging equipment that could be used to make anything from passports to airplane tickets. One of the men was keeping a diary of his thoughts as an aspiring suicide bomber.

On Sept. 13 in Belgium, police arrested two suspected terrorists, one Tunisian-born, and the other Moroccan. One week later police searched the tiny Egyptian restaurant the two operated in the heart of Brussels' large Muslim district. They found 220 pounds of sulfur and 13 gallons of acetone—the ingredients used in the homemade bombs that destroyed two American embassies in East Africa. Authorities think the materials were to be used to blow up NATO headquarters or perhaps the American embassy in Paris.

Britain, with its large Muslim population and loose border controls, is a Mecca for terrorists. Scotland Yard now believes 11 of the 19 hijackers traveled to England during the year, and that five of them attended an important strategy session there in June. British police say

Lotfi Raissi, an Algerian flight instructor based in London, gave four of the hijackers flying lessons. The United States is seeking his extradition for conspiracy to commit murder.


London-based Islamic leader Sheikh Omar Bakri Mohammed has rejoiced in the attacks and publicly instructed Muslims to kill anyone—including Muslims—who helps non-Muslims in any military action against Muslims. He has even issued a fatwa, or Islamic death order, against Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf because Pakistan has reluctantly agreed to join the "war on terrorism."

Likewise in London, a 24-year-old Muslim named Mohammed Jameel claims to run a military-style training school for militants. He recruits young men at mosques and shows them videos of camps in Afghanistan where men train to fight "un-Islamic" regimes like those of Britain, the United States, and Israel. Mr. Jameel says he has sent hundreds of young British Muslims to fight in Afghanistan and Chechnya.

It is worth noting that the enterprising Mr. Jameel is British born and bred. For many Arabs, an entire lifetime in the West only encourages them to hate us. Raed Hijazi, born and educated in California, is a good example. He became radicalized through contacts at the Islamic Assistance Organization in Sacramento, and traveled to Afghanistan where he trained at al Qaeda bases. Able to move freely around the world on his U.S. passport, he ended up in Amman, Jordan, where he took part in a plot to blow up American and Israeli tourists in a millennium attack that was supposed to kill thousands on Jan. 1, 2000. Today, this U.S. citizen is in a Jordanian prison, after being arrested along with 26 accomplices, and faces a possible death sentence.

Kahlil Deek, also a U.S. citizen, was in on the plot too. His job was to review the targets, including a fully-booked Radisson hotel. The Jordanians nabbed him as well, but are not sure they have completely wiped out this terror cell. There is little doubt there are plenty of "Americans" who feel just as our fellow-citizens Mr. Deek and Mr. Hijazi do, but have not yet gone into action.

So, what is the country going to do about all this? At first the Justice Department asked for authority to lock up foreigners thought to be terrorists, and deport them without presenting evi-



No possible justification for racial profiling.

dence. The law would apply not only to visitors but to legal residents with green cards, and asylees, who can't now be deported. Later, Attorney General John Ashcroft had second thoughts and withdrew this plan. Now he is asking for the right to use foreign intercepts of Americans' communications abroad. At present there are Fourth Amendment limits on wiretaps, and U.S. authorities cannot use evidence from other countries that would be illegal if gathered by American surveillance.

The INS already has the right to lock up illegals indefinitely if there are "extraordinary circumstances," and by October 5, it had rounded up 156 people on immigration charges. It is convenient to be able to hold on to illegals, but illegals shouldn't be here in the first place. In the same period, the Justice Department had arrested more than 400 other people, whom it was holding without bail on minor offenses like traffic violations and misdemeanors. Most of them were not likely to be charged with helping the terrorists, but the FBI wanted to keep them handy. Legal specialists said it was unprecedented that such a large number of people be held in that manner, but judges allow this under special circumstances.

Some people think we need a national ID card. President Bush is reportedly

horrified at the idea, but does not rule it out completely. A number of European countries have them. In France, anyone without a passport or *carte d'identité* can be hauled in for questioning. The British are likely to start issuing them, too. In a poll taken after the Sept. 11 attack, 85 percent of Brits say they like the idea. No fewer than 70 percent of Americans do, too. Chairman Larry Ellison of the database company Oracle says he would donate the software needed for ID cards.

What no one seems to be talking about are the most obvious steps of all: secure the borders, eliminate birth-right citizenship, and kick out anyone who fits the terrorist profile. As things stand today, Osama bin Laden and 12 pregnant wives could sneak across the porous Mexican border and he could become the father of 12 new American citizens. It is hard to think of a system better designed to destroy itself. The other obvious step is to throw out all illegals. We don't even need new laws for that. Another obvious step is to grant visas with much greater care, and to set up a system to track foreigners still here after their visas run out.

If the United States had properly guarded borders and did not hand out citizenship like candy, there would be no need for the inspections, intrusions, delays, eavesdropping, and harassment

officials say are now necessary for our security. Not all that long ago, when Americans were either white or Negro, a Saudi hijacker would have been conspicuous.

The other obvious thing people are talking about, but mostly saying the wrong things, is racial profiling. This should be used routinely both domestically and at our borders. Citizens of the European Union do not need visas to come to America, but there are now millions of Arabs, Pakistanis, Turks, Indians, etc. who are EU citizens. If they show up waving European passports, we should treat them exactly as we would Arabs, Turks, etc. There are phony, white-hating Europeans just as there are phony, white-hating Americans, and it is dangerous to pretend otherwise.

Unfortunately, the perpetrators of the next act of mass terror are probably *already here*. Carrier groups in the Persian Gulf won't stop them. Airport security checks won't stop them either, if they decide to go low-tech and machine-gun Penn Station or Yankee Stadium. It's tough for the ones who mean well, but we should throw out every young foreign man known to be a devout Muslim. Foreigners are in this country at our pleasure, and if they displease us, out they go.

Nothing as sensible as this will happen, of course, until more Americans are dead. Attorney General John Ashcroft has been promising that the war on terrorism will be fought "with a total commitment to protect the rights, the constitutional rights and the privacy of all Americans." This is another way of saying no racial profiling—at least not officially. President Bush went out of his

way to visit an Islamic center just a few days after the attack, and tell us how wonderful Muslims are.

As a practical matter, there will be plenty of racial profiling. Several commercial pilots have already tossed passengers off their planes for no other rea-



son than other passengers thought they looked dangerous. The FBI has asked for the confidential records of thousands of foreign students, particularly those with Middle Eastern names. And now that the word has gone out to companies that haul hazardous materials or dust crops to be on the look out for suspicious characters, does anyone think they are going to give Norwegians or Southerners or Englishmen special scrutiny?

A few days after the attack, the San Jose International Airport piously announced its security measures “will be the same for any human being,” but the murder of 6,000 Americans seems to have knocked a glimmer of good sense into at least a few people. In a Sept. 22 article, the *New York Times* had no trouble finding blacks who said Arabs spook them these days. “Yes, I’d be aware of them, I’d be nervous,” says Ron Arnold, who adds, “I’ve been racially profiled all my life.” Not surprisingly, although blacks have been complaining for years about racial profiling, they are the most eager to profile Middle Easterners. According a Gallup Poll, 71 percent said Arabs—citizens or not—should get greater scrutiny at airports. Only 57 percent of whites thought so, which means 43 percent have been so brainwashed they think we have to be as suspicious of grandmothers as of tough-looking young Arabs.

Needless to say, jumped-up Arab spokesmen have started lecturing us on the deeper meaning of America. Profil-

ing would just not be “what this country is all about,” says Nadeem Salem of the Association of Arab-Americans in Toledo, Ohio. Yaser Bushnaq, president of another Arab group called Solidarity US, says the current investigation is nothing more than harassment of Arabs, and has advised fellow Muslims they have the right to refuse to talk to the FBI.

It is true that there has been some unnecessarily aggressive profiling, but not by the authorities. The best known is the case of Balbir Singh Sodhi, a turbaned Sikh killed by someone who thought he was

shooting an Arab. There have been scattered reports of revenge attacks all around the country: people have tried to set fire to a mosque in Seattle, run over a Pakistani woman in Huntington, New York, and shoot a Moroccan gas station attendant in Palos Heights, Illinois. In London, thugs reportedly stomped on an Afghani taxi driver paralyzing him. There have also been nasty exhortations on the Internet to kill all Muslims.

The boneheads will always be with us, but there are boneheads on both sides. At a private Muslim school in Garden Grove, California, called Orange Crescent, the principal told his students their phone lines are probably being tapped. Teachers encourage the view there is no proof Muslims were involved in the attack. “There are people out there who just hate Muslims,” explains the principal.

And in Saudi Arabia, our ally in the war on terrorism, citizens are doing their own profiling. Anti-white sentiments are palpable, and expatriates are keeping indoors. Those who go out may be spat on or have stones thrown at them. Many white women feel so uncomfortable they are leaving the country. One European reports that where he works, Saudis were so happy the day after the attack, they were hugging and kissing each other.

Lessons, anyone?

The British have promised to streamline extradition proceedings, and have

tumbled to the view they should not grant asylum to anyone suspected or convicted of terrorism. The Dutch, paragons of sheep-to-the-slaughter “multiculturalism,” are beginning to wake up. Agence France Press reported on Oct. 3 that anti-foreigner remarks, which were absolutely taboo before Sept. 11, are now common, and that even a few politicians are openly doubting the success of multi-racialism. In the three weeks after the attack there were 90 reported incidents of mostly verbal abuse of Muslims, an unheard of figure in ordinary times. A poll found that more than two thirds of the Dutch say they think any Muslim who approved of the attacks should be kicked out of the country. “Democratic” Holland will no doubt fail to act on the wishes of its people, but it is encouraging to see a little spine among the supine. Similar sentiments are no doubt sweeping France, Germany, and Italy.

In the United States, there have already been a few small, welcome changes. Less than a week before the attack, George Bush was telling the world the United States has “no more important relationship in the world than the one we have with Mexico.” He doesn’t seem to have much time for his *amigo* Vicente these days, and the chatter about amnesty for Mexican illegals has stopped.

The day before the attack, former President William Clinton was in Australia imparting wisdom to a select group of 35 business leaders. His theme was that Australia must remain open to immigrants and cultivate diversity. “The President believes the world will be a better place if all borders are eliminated,” reported Tom Hogan, president of Vignette Corporation and host of the gathering. Mr. Clinton might not sing the same song today.

Likewise, Jesse Jackson is too busy pretending the Taliban invited him to come mediate the crisis to have gotten very far with what was supposed to be his number one post-Durban conference priority: reparations for slavery. Hillary Clinton is thankfully out of the news, and what were once boomed as burning issues—whether to let people sue HMOs and if old people should get free drugs—have faded into the insignificance they deserve.

The more important lessons, however, are likely to be lost. To the already undecieved, the events of Sept. 11 are

the most powerful and dramatic proofs yet of the bankruptcy of any number of fashionable myths, but the willfully blind will find ways to stay that way.

First, race and nationality are crucially important. Every one of the 19 terrorists was clearly and obviously Middle Eastern. The attackers, and those picked up around the world in the wake of the attack, have been Saudis, Egyptians, Algerians, Tunisians, and Moroccans. All are Muslims. What is more, years of residency in the West, and even European or American citizenship have proven to be no impediment to murderous hatred of America. Mohammed Atta and several others were radicalized *while living in the West*. The attacks have also uncovered American- and British-born Arabs—*citizens*—who hate America just as intensely as Iraqis or Palestinians who live under the threat of American-made bombs. There could be no clearer evidence for the persistence

of racial, ethnic, and religious loyalty. For these people, as for millions of other non-whites who live among whites, the idea of assimilation is a huge joke.

Second, the United States must protect itself against aliens. It is now like a man without a skin, open to infection at any time. And it is the height of folly to pretend that all foreigners are equally likely to want to kill us. So far, the only foreigners who have shown themselves to be intent on murder have been Arabs. Now that American troops are killing Muslims, does anyone believe the revenge killings that will surely come will be the work of Argentines or Australians?

Whatever Ben Wattenberg or William Clinton may say, we live in separate camps divided by race, religion, language, and culture. It is true that we have had our own home-grown mass-murderer, Timothy McVeigh, but he represents a purely domestic, purely Ameri-

can phenomenon. We can be completely confident that people of our own camp—whites—will not slip into our country and try to kill us.

Once again, it will probably take several thousand more dead Americans, killed at the hands of Middle Easterners, before our country officially wakes up to the obvious: that Arabs—like all foreigners—have no right to come here. Once they are here, they do no discernible good and much harm. The obvious response is to keep them out and send home the ones who are here.

Apparently it takes murderous outrage for brainwashed Americans finally to realize “diversity” may not be so grand after all. If, because of these terrible attacks, the country manages to turn a calculating eye on the costs and benefits of playing host to millions of Arabs, the red-ink dead-loss bottom line should raise questions about other groups. What earthly good do Cambodians, Nigerians, Guatemalans, Haitians, and all the rest of them do the country?

In the longer term, what do these attacks say about the presence of Mexicans in our midst? Is it impossible to imagine a sharp diplomatic or economic conflict with Mexico after which we wake up to find millions of “fellow Americans” at our throats? It is probably already too late for the United States to assert robust national interests against Mexico without starting an insurrection. Even without an international crisis, Mexican irredentists and American-born *reconquistadors* are scheming to take over the Southwest. Who is to say their efforts to rid the area of whites will not some day include bombing and mass murder? Mexican terror will be infinitely more difficult to track and contain than Arab terror.

In the nearer term, we could even let this war on terrorism become an occasion to let in even more potential terrorists. Wherever we make war—Vietnam, Iraq, Somalia, the Balkans—we create refugees, and some of them always end up here. What will happen after we have backed the ethnic-Tajik Northern Alliance in a takeover of Afghanistan, and they are later expelled by non-Taliban Pashtuns? As they always do, our defeated “allies” will come knocking at our door. There are already two million Afghan refugees in Pakistan alone. How many of them will eventually contribute to our sacred “diversity”?

Alas, Poor Silvio

On September 25, Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi said the following to Italian journalists: “We should be conscious of the superiority of our civilization, which consists of a value system that has given people widespread prosperity in those countries that embrace it, and guarantees respect for human rights and religion. This respect certainly does not exist in the Islamic countries.”

Alas, poor Silvio! The Islamic world has been awash in outrage and non sequitur. “It means he wants to prepare public opinion for a clash of civilizations, a clash between the West and Islam,” said Mustapha Ramid, a member of the Moroccan parliament. “The savage and fascist face of U.S. and European countries is beginning to emerge after the attacks,” wrote the Turkish paper *Akit*.

Muslims, of course, frequently talk about the “decadent West,” and “infidels,” and show no compunction about making invidious comparisons, so

they are hardly in a position to take offense. Presumably, if Europeans did not think their religion and way of life superior to those of others, they would convert.

But the most contemptible critics are, needless to say, the lickspittle Europeans who have joined the Muslim chorus. Belgian Foreign Minister Louis Michel, who led the hysteria against Austria’s Jörg Haider, said this when told of Mr. Berlusconi’s remarks: “If it is true, it is not acceptable and it is not in line with . . . European values.”



European values? If there are such things as European values, they are presumably different from and better than

Islamic or Santerian or Oriental values. But for Mr. Michel, like for so many Europeans and Americans, the cardinal rule of “European” values is that one must never be proud of or defend Europe. Only through self-abasement, through joy in the face of dispossession by aliens, can one be true to “European values.”



Our rulers do not yet understand what is really at stake when liberal mantras govern race and immigration policy. However, with typical exaggeration,

commentators keep telling us Sept. 11 has “changed everything.” Let us hope that one of the things that begins to change is the suicidal mentality that re-

fuses to admit the persistence of racial and national loyalty in a world in which only whites have stripped themselves of collective defenses. **Ω**

In Defense of Eugenics

Richard Lynn, *Eugenics: A Reassessment*, Praeger Publishers, 2001, \$85.00, 384 pp.

The high-stakes race for a better future.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

Richard Lynn, Professor Emeritus of Psychology at the University of Ulster in Northern Ireland, is one of those rare social scientists who not only understand genetics but are willing to draw conclusions about how biology affects society. This volume builds upon his 1996 *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations* (reviewed in AR, April, 1997), and lays out the clear choice science now sets before all developed nations: whether to let the genetic quality of their populations continue to deteriorate, or use a combination of old and new techniques to improve it. In Prof. Lynn’s view, this is a high-stakes game, in which those who refuse to play will be certain losers. This careful analysis unquestionably establishes the author as the foremost eugenicist of our time.

Eugenics is an exhaustive treatment that includes a history of the movement, its objectives, its successes and failures, moral arguments for and against it, and a bold prediction of how eugenics will dictate the balance of world power in the 21st century. This book will offend many people, but they will find its relentless logic difficult to refute. The age of widespread population engineering is upon us, and to begin with Prof. Lynn’s concluding quotation from Francis Galton, “the nation which first subjects itself to rational eugenical disciplines is bound to inherit the earth.”

Francis Galton

Galton (1822 - 1911) was, of course, the British genius who coined the term “eugenics.” He first introduced it in his 1883 *Inquiries Into Human Fertility*, in which he argued that human abilities are greatly influenced by genetic inheritance, and that when the less able out-

breed the more able, the quality of a population declines. Galton recognized that the winning effects of natural selection had been artificially reversed in the West, so that “the race gradually deteriorates, becoming in each successive generation less fit for a high civilization.”



Richard Lynn.

Galton proposed that the British population be divided into three categories: desirables, undesirables, and passables. Desirables should have incentives to have more children, undesirables should have no children, and passables should be left alone. Galton proposed that the desirables and undesirables each include only about five to ten percent of the population, leaving the great majority passable and therefore untouched. He

“The nation which first subjects itself to rational eugenical disciplines is bound to inherit the earth.”

hoped a program that affected only 20 percent of the population would win broad support. He recognized undesirables would have to be coerced into childlessness, but was not specific about how this should be done.

From Galton’s time until the Second World War, eugenic movements attracted strong support. Bertrand Russell, John Maynard Keynes, Winston Churchill, H.G. Wells, Linus Pauling, Teddy Roosevelt, and Oliver Wendell Holmes were all ardent eugenicists. Margaret Sanger, the early American champion of birth control, clearly saw contraception as a means to keep the lower orders from multiplying. As her British counterpart Mary Stopes put it: “more children from the fit, less from the unfit—that is the chief issue of birth control.”

Prof. Lynn notes that at the height of the eugenics movement, people knew little about the science of genetics, but they understood the importance of breeding. In an early round of the “nature/nurture” debate, Edward Thorndike pointed out in 1913, “There is no more certain and economical a way to improve man’s environment as to improve his nature.”

Previous generations were not squeamish about distinguishing between desirables and undesirables. In his 1916 multi-generation study of the degenerate Jukes family, American scholar A. H. Eastabrook called it “the scum of society . . . inefficient and indolent, unwilling or unable to take advantage of any opportunity which offers itself or is offered to them.” As Prof. Lynn explains, “The Victorians understood with a clarity that became lost in the second half of the twentieth century that rigorous social control was necessary to contain the growth of a subclass of underserving poor.”

The eugenics movement gave rise to one important form of rigorous social control: forcible sterilization. In 1907, Indiana was the first jurisdiction to pass a law “to prevent the procreation of confirmed criminals, idiots, imbeciles, and rapists.” The U.S. Supreme Court upheld laws of this kind in the 1927 decision *Buck v. Bell*, and by 1931, 30 states had eugenic sterilization laws.

Most European countries adopted similar measures, and Nazi Germany was relatively late with its 1933 Eugenic Sterilization Law. Prof. Lynn points out that despite claims to the contrary, the Nazis did not target Jews for eugenic reasons, and sterilized relatively few people. As a percentage of the population, Sweden sterilized twice as many of its citizens as Germany. The Soviet Union, which was going through a Lysenkoist rejection of genetics, was one of the few developed countries that did not require eugenic sterilization, and Japan did not repeal its sterilization law until 1996.

After the war, eugenics was mistakenly associated with Nazism, and lost almost all support. In 1953, Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the structure of DNA, proposed a tax on child-bearing to deter the shiftless, and argued for making prospective parents apply for licenses, but eugenics as an explicit movement was essentially dead in the West.

Eugenics joined “racism” as one of the era’s blackest crimes. The European Parliament passed a resolution saying, “cloning of human beings . . . cannot under any circumstances be justified or tolerated by any society . . . as it permits a eugenic and racist selection of the human race . . .” The French eugenicist Alexis Carrell won the Nobel Prize for medicine in 1912, but frenzied anti-eugenicists removed his name from street signs and from the medical school of the University of Lyon.

Opposition to eugenics drove some people to absurd positions. Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University took the view that there is no such thing as a bad gene. J.D. Smith of the University of South Carolina wrote that genes for mental retardation should be kept in the population because “mental retardation is a human condition worthy of being valued.”

A few people managed to overcome their initial irrationality. Biologist Arthur Kaplan’s first reaction to the news of a sperm bank that sought contributions only from geniuses was that it was “morally pernicious.” He later changed his mind, saying: “We mold and shape our children according to environmental factors. We give them piano lessons and every other type of lesson imaginable. I’m not sure there is anything wrong with using genetics as long as it is not hurting anyone.”

It was Asians, however, who were least diverted from eugenic thinking. China continues to strengthen laws that curtail reproduction by criminals and



\$90,000 an egg?

defectives. In Singapore, Premiere Lee Kuan Yew gave generous tax incentives to better-educated women to have more children, and succeeded in increasing the percentage of births that were to women with secondary education from 36.7 percent to 47.7 percent. The women who get the most education are the more intelligent, and they marry smart men; Prof. Lynn considers the Singapore program a rare and notable success for modern eugenics.

Westerners perhaps overvalue the individual, whereas Asians think certain individual rights must be sacrificed to broader interests, “one of which,” Prof. Lynn writes, “is the right of society to protect itself against the social costs incurred when these [less able] groups have children.” At the same time, Western societies have changed considerably in this respect. It used to be common, for example, to quarantine carriers of infectious diseases, but we now give AIDS carriers complete freedom to infect others.

Prof. Lynn points out there is great irony in frantic opposition to eugenics, *per se*, when many accepted practices in the West are plainly eugenic. In Britain, for example, parents of a retarded woman can have her sterilized, which implicitly recognizes that some people should not have children. Infertile women seeking donor eggs advertise for them at elite universities, and are prepared to pay huge premiums for them,

once again recognizing that some genes are better than others. Prof. Lynn has found offers of eggs from fashion models at \$90,000 each, and reports there are exclusive sperm banks stocked by Harvard and MIT students.

The most common eugenic practice today is “therapeutic abortion.” Amniocentesis is a widely-used procedure that can detect certain chromosomal abnormalities of the fetus. According to a Canadian study, 80 percent of women who learn their fetuses have serious defects abort them.

From 1970 to 1986, German judges gave sex offenders the option of castration rather than jail. During this period only three percent of the castrated men committed more sex crimes while 46 percent of a matched control group became repeat offenders. As an added eugenic bonus, the castrated group had no children.


American welfare reform in the 1990s also had a faint whiff of eugenics. Some states stopped increasing benefits along with the number of children, and the federal government introduced new rules to make it much harder to stay on the dole. As Prof. Lynn points out, taxing the competent to support procreation by the incompetent is flagrantly dysgenic. Some state legislatures floated bills that would have made welfare conditional on using subcutaneous contraceptives like Norplant, but none of these bills succeeded.

Although Prof. Lynn believes that classic, Galton-style eugenics is out of the question in Western democracies, some eugenic policies might be slipped into place under more acceptable colors. He points out that to the extent there are any difficulties at all in getting contraception or abortions, this is dysgenic. More competent people will take the trouble to use contraceptives or get abortions, while the incompetent will not. He therefore favors universal free abortion, and suggests governments should subsidize contraceptive pills and sell them over-the-counter. He would favor offering criminals a choice between castration and prison, and suggests it could be possible to foster a moral climate in which the most talented people could be made to feel it was their duty to have more children.

Anything more explicit probably has no chance. The late Nobel Prize winner William Shockley argued we should pay people with low IQs to be sterilized.

According to his “Bonus 1000” plan, a good incentive would be \$1,000 for every IQ point under 100. Psychologist Raymond Cattell suggested the government should seek out intelligent children and pay their parents to have more. David Lykken of the University of Minnesota has once again floated the idea of licenses for parents. Sociologist Hugh LaFollette points out that couples must meet standards if they want to adopt a child; why not set standards for people who want to make a child?

Prof. Lynn states his own preference: “The ideal for humans would be a contraceptive virus acting for about 10 years



that could be given to 12-year-old boys. When they were aged 22, they could apply for licenses for parenthood. If they failed to obtain these, they could be vasectomized.” Needless to say, ideas like this are going nowhere for now; as Prof. Lynn points out, according to the UN Declaration on Human Rights everyone has an absolute right to as many babies as he can make.

From the outset, Galton recognized that immigration policy can be eugenic or dysgenic, and argued that nations should admit only good prospects. Today, in Europe, almost all immigration takes place according to the 1951 Geneva Convention on Refugees and Asylum Seekers. Prof. Lynn points out that at the time of the convention, almost all refugees were Europeans; now that they are almost all non-white the signatories have every right to reconsider their obligations.

Even if no Western nation is likely to start eugenic programs any time soon, Prof. Lynn explains what they could achieve. The least controversial goal of eugenics is to reduce the frequency of genetic diseases, and Prof. Lynn finds that about a quarter of all hospital beds are occupied by people with these diseases. If they were eliminated, it would save about a quarter of every developed country’s medical budget—a saving of about two percent of GNP. Institutions for people with genetic diseases con-

sume perhaps another 1.5 percent of GNP, and the costs of schizophrenia, depression, and manic-depression taken together add up to another estimated one percent. Eliminating these disorders would be a huge saving and would also spare family members much worry and sorrow.

Prof. Lynn warns, however, that it might be a mistake to eliminate all genes for mental illness, because a certain level of mental instability is associated with creative genius. He notes that writers and artists have two to three times the rate of psychosis and suicide attempts as the rest of us.

Psychopathic personality, on the other hand, should be eliminated completely. About 60 percent of male prison inmates are psychopaths, and they almost always commit the most horrifying crimes. About six percent of men and one percent of women are psychopaths, but in America only about 13 percent of them are in jail, which means 87 percent are on the loose, causing all sorts of damage.

Psychopaths often have a high opinion of themselves. One study of 125 incarcerated teen-age psychopaths found that 78 percent claimed they would be good role-models for children. Psychopaths are well represented in the underclass, but intelligent ones often make good politicians. There is clearly a genetic predisposition to psychopathy, and eliminating the genes would be a great service to society.

The most obvious trait of interest to eugenicists is intelligence. As Prof. Lynn explains, the general level of intelligence is an excellent indicator of quality of life, and there is no reason to believe a country needs low-IQ citizens. In a high-IQ society, many repetitive, unsatisfying jobs can be automated, and those that cannot will be filled, provided the wage is right. Low intelligence is strongly correlated with everything every society is trying to reduce: crime, illegitimacy, and unemployment.

People of the lowest intelligence—the mentally retarded—are a particular cost to society that could be virtually eliminated by eugenics. About 2.2 percent of the babies of normal people are retarded. The figure rises to 17 percent if one parent is retarded, and to 48 percent if both are retarded. Because of the association of low intelligence and crime, prisoners are about four times more likely to be retarded than the rest


of the population. Many retarded men in institutions make crude sexual advances to women, so must be cared for by male staff.

The mildly retarded are usually the naturally-occurring low end of the intelligence bell curve, and for this reason are more likely to be born of low-intelligence parents. People in the lowest 25 percent in income have about half the mildly retarded children. The severely retarded usually suffer from less predictable genetic abnormalities, and can come from all levels of society.

In America, retarded women have slightly higher fertility than normal women. This is because they are ignorant, and because men can easily exploit them. A study of female retardates living in sheltered housing found that only four percent knew semen is necessary for pregnancy. Sixty-one percent had been pregnant, but only 48 percent said they had ever had sexual intercourse.

At the other end of bell curve, Prof. Lynn explains that eugenics can raise the average IQ, but it cannot easily increase the theoretical maximum. This is because the optimum combination of IQ genes—which yields a score of about 200—has already occurred in humans through millions of more or less random combinations. Nevertheless, raising the average would have a dramatic effect on the number of geniuses. An increase in the average to 115 would mean the frequency of IQs over 158 would jump 30 fold, from one in 30,000 to one in 1,000.

Buyer Beware

If this book has a serious defect, it is that it is published by Praeger. Praeger brings out excellent volumes no one else will publish, but prints them in tiny quantities and sells them at staggering prices. It is a good bet most readers of this review have never paid \$85.00 for a book, and certainly will not buy this one at that price—though they might spend \$22.00. Judging from its past record, Praeger will never publish this book as a paperback, and after the initial joke of a print run is exhausted in a year or two, there will be no reprints. Unfortunately, for anyone who wants to buy the most authoritative treatment of eugenics available today (and for not much longer), it is likely to be now or never. 

Such a society would have a huge advantage over any other in terms of productivity and creativity.

Prof. Lynn predicts Western democracies will eventually adopt a new kind of eugenics based on advances in genetic screening. The most promising technique is embryo selection (ES). This involves harvesting a woman's eggs and fertilizing them in vitro with her husband's sperm. As many as 100 fertilized eggs could be screened for genetic qualities, and the most promising one chosen for implantation. Prof. Lynn suggests it will not be long before an embryo check will yield accurate readings for everything from good looks to musical ability. One hundred potential children would have a 30-point range in IQ, split above and below the average of the two parents, so the best choice from this many eggs would guarantee a 15-point improvement over the parents IQs. Even a woman in her 40s has tens of thousands of viable eggs, so harvesting and fertilizing 100 at a time is only a matter of developing the techniques.

Prof. Lynn recognizes that ES will probably be banned in Western countries. The Catholic Church, which teaches that ordinary intercourse is the only proper way to create new life, would lead the opposition, but it would have many allies. Egalitarians would take the confused position that genes don't count for anything, but ES is bad because only the rich could afford it. Prof. Lynn points out that the principle of ES is the same as therapeutic abortion—the undesirables are destroyed—but it should be considered more humane because it would not require a woman who wants a baby to have an abortion.

Banning the procedure will do no good, because at least a few countries are sure to permit it, and wealthy, farsighted couples will pay large sums for it. Europe and America could easily forbid their citizens to patronize foreign ES services, but once the embryos were implanted it would be impossible to know how they got there. "When this procedure becomes widespread," writes Prof. Lynn, "it will become evident that embryo-selected children are virtually always superior to naturally conceived children with respect to their health, intelligence, and personality." "Couples will realize," he adds, "that it is more cost-effective to pay for an embryo-selected child than to pay for a quality

education for a normally conceived child," and predicts that eventually 80 to 90 percent of the babies born in rich countries will be products of ES.

Those that are not selected will be the children of the underclass, and within just a few generations the IQ gap between the two groups could reach 50 points. "Eventually," he writes, "despite strong ideological opposition it would come to be understood that the underclass of the unplanned [conceptions] was primarily a genetic problem and would require genetic interventions."

Prof. Lynn is convinced, however, that an Asian country—most likely China—will soon institute a mandatory ES program for its population, and that the resulting improvement in its gene pool will tip the international balance of power decisively in its favor. Attitudes in China radically differ from those in the West. Chinese law already requires sterilization of mental retardates and those with genetic illnesses. Prenatal testing of fetuses is mandatory, and defectives must be aborted. No one with mental illness, venereal disease, or hepatitis may marry.

In the mid-1990s, a poll-taker asked Chinese and Western doctors the following question: Should there be mandatory sterilization for a single, blind woman on public welfare who has already had three children by three different men, all of whom are absent from the household? Only five percent of Western doctors but 82 percent of Chinese doctors said "yes."

Now that socialism is discredited, Prof. Lynn thinks the Chinese will fill the ideological void with eugenics. He predicts it will become the first, full-fledged eugenic state: all 12-year-old girls will be fitted with contraceptives, only approved couples will be permitted to have children, and ES will be used for all births. Psychopathy and genetic diseases will be eliminated, and IQ will stabilize at the theoretical maximum of about 200 in six or seven generations. Licensing parents will seem just as reasonable as licensing drivers.


Prof. Lynn predicts that in the short run, China's rulers will clone themselves. In most cases this will mean talent and ability are passed on to the next generation, and it will make it easier for the oligarchs to pass on power to people they can trust—their own twins.

Prof. Lynn's best guess at a timetable is that ES will be perfected and in obligatory use in China within ten years. Twenty years later there will be the first generation of ES adults, and 20 years after that, half the working population will have come from selected embryos. In 50 years, therefore, China will be the world's most formidable power.



In the meantime, Prof. Lynn predicts that the United States will have continued to decline because of dysgenic fertility and dysgenic immigration. He says the country may break up into warring ethnic enclaves, but "however the details of the decline of the United States work out, it will forfeit its position as the leading world economic, scientific, and military power, and eventually cease to be a major force in global politics."

He expects Europe to maintain its influence a little longer, because it has fewer non-white immigrants, but it will be no match for a racially homogeneous, eugenically bred China. China will eventually dominate the globe and run it like a colonial empire. In certain provinces, it might impose ES on the natives, but in places like Africa, which do not have the infrastructure for ES, it would be more likely to impose "robust classical eugenics."

What are we to make of these predictions? Geneticists appear to agree that it is only a matter of time before ES is perfected. It is also true that Chinese have a deep racial patriotism that drives their desire for hegemony (see book review, Feb. 2001). This, together with their penchant for ruthless social engineering and appreciation of population genetics, makes Prof. Lynn's predictions entirely believable. *Eugenics* makes a strong case for the view that unless the West has the will to act upon the advice of one of its own 19th century geniuses, whites can well look forward to serfdom under Oriental masters. 

O Tempora, O Mores!

Success in Hamburg

A brand-new anti-immigration party led by a 42-year-old former judge, has won 19 percent of the vote in elections in Hamburg, Germany, and is poised to enter government. On the bench, Ronald Schill was known as “Judge Merciless” because of his long sentences and proposals for alternative punishments: castration of sex offenders, deportation for all foreigners convicted of any crime, and “fewer comforts” for prisoners. He was removed from the bench because of his long sentences, and founded the Party for Law and Order. With his unexpectedly large share of the September 24 vote, he was poised to enter into a coalition with the Christian Democrats and take over as Interior Minister. This would push the leftists out of power in the Hamburg city state for the first time in 44 years. They have welcomed foreigners, who have given Hamburg the largest non-white population of any Germany city.

The handsome, well-spoken Mr. Schill won support by pointing out that foreigners account for the city’s high crime rate. All drug dealers, he said, are “black Africans,” and the prisons are “full of foreigners.” Although non-Germans are only one in five of the population of 1.7 million, they commit half the murders. Mr. Schill undoubtedly got a boost from the discovery that the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks may have been planned in Hamburg.


Many people expect Mr. Schill to parlay his regional success into a national party modeled on Jörg Haider’s Freedom Party in Austria. Polls have repeatedly shown there would be much support for a national anti-immigration party, but there have been only poorly-organized regional parties, often with unsavory ties. Mr. Schill, whose grandfather was a Communist executed by the Nazis, keeps his distance from neo-Nazis.

Mr. Schill’s success already seems to have had an impact at the national level. Leftist Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder had been floating the idea of opening Germany to more immigration. It is now likely that he will quietly set that idea aside. [Steven Erlanger, *The Right Hails*

‘Merciless’ Hero, *Sydney Morning Herald* (Australia), Sept. 25, 2001. Imre Karacs, ‘Far Right’ Celebrate Triumph in Hamburg Poll, *The Independent* (London), Sept. 24, 2001.]

Blinded

On Sept. 15, Kenneth, a 30-year-old clothing store security manager and father of three, was riding the bus to his home in South London, England. The bus was crowded, and on the upper deck where Kenneth (he has not released his last name) sat with a friend, there was just one unoccupied seat, which had a pile of cookies on it. A young Somali man approached the seat, found the cookies, and started swearing and throwing them around. When some of them



hit Kenneth, he asked the man “Why don’t you just brush them on the floor?”

The Somali got very aggressive, but to the applause of fellow passengers, a well-built man stood up between Kenneth and the Somali, who retreated down the stairs with a companion. However, at the next bus stop, the two men returned with another man. The Somali who had been throwing cookies shouted obscenities at Kenneth while the two others kicked him. “I panicked and ran forward with both arms and grabbed two of them and we tumbled down the stairs,” Kenneth recalled from his hospital bed.

By this time the bus had stopped in front of the headquarters of MI6, Britain’s intelligence agency, and security cameras captured the rest of the assault. Two other men joined the three attacking Kenneth, and the *melée* spilled onto the sidewalk. When Kenneth tried to get back on the bus, one of the gang smashed a bottle over his head, and he slumped against a seat.

“Someone came behind me and I felt his hands feeling for my eyes,” says

Kenneth. “He pushed two fingers into both my eyes. I managed to break free from one of his hands and then he suddenly disappeared. I turned around and a woman just started screaming—it was like something in a horror movie. There was a lot of blood but I couldn’t feel anything and thought my right eye was just bruised. I didn’t realize my eye had been yanked out of its socket.” His other eye was damaged as well, leaving him legally blind.

Kenneth has gotten over his initial hatred for his attackers. “It might sound strange but I feel sorry for the people who did this to me,” he says. “They have totally messed up their lives.” Police have arrested one man, but are still seeking the rest of the gang, described as three blacks and two white or Chinese men aged 17 to 20. [Jason Bennetto, ‘I Feel Sorry for Youths Who Blinded Me’ Says Father Attacked on Bus, *The Independent* (London), Sept. 26, 2001.]

Asians vs. Whites

The racial tension in England we have been reporting on for the past several months has produced another casualty. Early on the morning of Sept. 21, following his shift at a pub in downtown Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, 17-year-old Ross Parker was walking home with his 19-year-old girlfriend. A gang of Asians attacked them on a deserted cycle path. The woman escaped and flagged down a passing police car, but by the time officers got to the scene, Mr. Parker was dead from stab wounds. Police arrested 13 Asians (which in England means Indians, Pakistanis, or Bangladeshis), aged 13 to 24, on murder charges. They are not treating Ross Parker’s murder as a hate crime, but local Asians say there is mounting resentment against them. [Youth Murdered in Gang Attack, *Evening Telegraph* (Peterborough), Sept. 21, 2001. Ross’s Family in Appeal For Calm, *Evening Telegraph*, Sept. 25, 2001.]

Blacks vs. Somalis

Roosevelt High School in south Minneapolis has the typical student mix of a modern American public high school:

80 percent non-white. What is not typical is that the single largest ethnic group are Somalis, at 36 percent. Twenty percent are native blacks, 20 percent are white, and the rest are a mix of Asians, Indians and Hispanics.

Principal Mike Huerth is delighted. "We're the city as it's going to be," he says, and calls his 500 Somalis "a gift to the community." American blacks don't always agree. On Sept. 10, a fight broke out between a Somali student and a black former student. Three more Somalis soon joined in, as did a largely black group of football players. In the ensuing brawl, Somalis stabbed a 14-year-old football player in the chest, and stabbed an assistant coach who tried to break up the fight. Minneapolis police say tension between native black and Somali students caused the fight. [Jim Adams, Two Stabbed at Brawl Outside Minneapolis Roosevelt High, Star-Tribune (Minneapolis), Sept. 11, 2001. Doug Grow, In Wake of Roosevelt H.S. Stabbing, a Principal Sees Hope, Star-Tribune, Sept. 16, 2001.]

Blacks vs. Jamaicans

There is also tension in the Bronx between American blacks and Jamaicans. Jamaicans at Evander Childs High School call native blacks Yankees, and American blacks snatch Jamaican flags from students who carry them. Fights



Casus belli.

are common. Last May, during a break between classes, an American black stabbed a Jamaican in the chest, neck and back. As Nicole Brown, a 16-year-old Jamaican explained, "Most Jamaicans don't like the black kids who are here and vice versa. They fight most of the time, but this time it got more physical than usual." [Dexter Filkins, Youth, 17, Arrested in Slashing of Fellow Student in the Bronx, New York Times, May 20, 2001.]

Blacks vs. Whites

Last summer, a gang of blacks prowled the streets of Annapolis, Maryland, to "beat up whites and Mexicans."

On July 19, eight to ten teenagers attacked a Hispanic man, and two days later, blacks fell upon Tracy VanDagna, a 22-year-old white woman. One assailant hit Miss VanDagna in the face with a rock, knocking her to the ground. Then he held her head down by the hair while another kicked her repeatedly in the face. She had a broken nose that had to be fixed with plastic surgery, and needed stitches to close a gash on her hand.

There were four similar attacks in downtown Annapolis during the summer. Police have arrested 17-year-old Tacarra Tyler and have charged two fourteen-year-olds, a boy and a girl, with juvenile offenses in the VanDagna attack. "It appears to be racially motivated," says Officer Eric E. Crane. "Robbery was not the main motive. They had specific targets in mind." He expected further arrests. [Jonathan E. Briggs, Three Teens Held in Attack: Robbery, Hate Crime Alleged in Assault on Downtown Waitress, Baltimore Sun, August 8, 2001.]

Rodney Redux

Notorious black criminal Rodney King was arrested yet again on Sept. 29, this time on suspicion of being under the influence of PCP (again), and for indecent exposure. Visitors to a park in Pomona, California called police after Mr. King jumped up and down on an ice chest and exposed himself. He was taken into custody and transported to a local hospital for drug testing. As we reported last month, Mr. King was picked up Aug. 28 for suspected PCP use, and this most recent arrest came just four days before his arraignment on those charges. [David Bradvica, Daily News (Los Angeles), Sept. 30, 2001.]

A New Kind of Hoax

A few days after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, Ahmad Saad Nasim, a 23-year-old junior at Arizona State University (ASU), reported he was a victim of a hate crime, in which assailants beat him, pelted him with eggs, and shouted "Die, Muslim, die!" He got the usual flood of sympathy.

On Sept. 26, Mr. Nasim was found lying inside a locked lavatory stall in the university's library, trying to fake another hate crime, and confessed to police the first one was a hoax, too. ASU police may charge Mr. Nasim with false

reporting, and the university is considering disciplinary action. His friends just can't understand why Mr. Nasim, whom they describe as passionately committed to multi-culturalism, would do such things.

Phony hate crimes have done nothing to cool ASU's ardor for fighting what they think is the real thing. Noting that his department had two other alleged hate crimes to investigate, University Police Chief John Pickens says, "We're not letting this situation taint our investigation in the other incidents." [Lisa Chiu, Student May Face Charges in Hoax, The Arizona Republic (Phoenix), Oct. 2, 2001. Monica Alonzodunsmoor, ASU Assault Called Hate Crime, The Arizona Republic, Sept. 26, 2001.]

'They Look Very Similar'

It has dawned on the Austrian police that of the estimated 55,000 Chinese immigrants living in the country, only eight have been reported dead in the last ten years, and none from natural causes. All were murdered or died in accidents, and immigration agents learned of the deaths only because police had seen the bodies. Authorities think Chinese are keeping old-age deaths a secret so illegal-alien relatives can take over passports and identities. As a police spokesman explains: "We think Chinese people are using the IDs of their mothers, fathers or relatives because it is sometimes hard to judge if they are really the ones on the photos. They look very similar. Those that have an unlimited permit to stay in Austria could easily pass on their passports to others that don't have a permit."

One clue as to what may be happening was the case of a Chinese woman who was found washed up on the shore of the Adriatic. Investigators were able to learn only that she had for years been working legally in a Chinese restaurant in Linz, Austria. No one ever reported her missing, and her passport and identification papers were never recovered. [Michael Leidig, In Austria, Chinese Migrants Never Say Die, National Post Online, Oct. 5, 2001.]

Blackmailing the White Man

On October 6, Australian patrols intercepted an Indonesian ship bound for

the Australian territory of Christmas Island, bearing 186 people believed to be Iraqis. The Australians boarded the ship, determined that they were asylum-seekers, and ordered them back to Indonesia. As soon as the boarding party left, the crew turned the ship back toward Christmas Island. When the Australians made the ship change course again (authorities will not confirm or deny that they fired warning shots), the Iraqis disabled the ship. The Australians began towing the ship toward Christmas Island for processing, but Prime Minister John Howard ordered it towed back towards Indonesia instead.

At this point the Iraqis started throwing children (in lifejackets) into the water, and some adults jumped in, too, in an attempt to force the Australian crew to change course back towards Australia. The Australians duly rescued 16 adults and children. According to latest reports, the Iraqis were being still being towed towards Indonesia, but authorities there had not said they would be allowed ashore. Australia is in the middle of a political campaign, and all polls show tremendous support for the current policy against admitting any more asylum seekers. [Michelle Grattan and Philip Cornford, Boat People Toss Children Overboard, Sydney Morning Herald (Australia), Oct. 8, 2001.]

Symbol of Oppression

Hundreds of New York firefighters died when the twin towers of the World Trade Center collapsed, and many fire



New York City firemen.

departments around the country began putting American flags on their vehicles in their memory. This did not sit well

with two black Miami-Dade firemen. On Sept. 15, Jim Moore and Terry Williams refused to ride on a fire truck flying a large American flag, which they see as a symbol of oppression. Thomas Steinfatt, a professor specializing in inter-cultural communications at the University of Miami, says their reaction is not uncommon. "Black Americans perceive a lot of areas of discrimination that are not evident to whites," he said. "To some, the flag represents white America, not all of America." In a remarkable act of insensitivity, Fire Chief Dave Paulison made displaying the American flag mandatory on all county fire engines. [Sara Olkon, Adrienne Samuels and Lisa Arthur, It's a Free Country: Rally Round the Flag? Not Always, Miami Herald, Sept. 21, 2001.]

Command Non-performance

In the previous issue, we reported that Kenyan President Daniel Arap Moi has told his people to abstain from sex for two years to prevent the spread of AIDS. King Mswati III of Swaziland has gone even farther—he has ordered a five-year ban on sex for all unmarried girls and women. On Sept. 16, King Mswati revived the Umchwaso Chastity Rule, under which virgins must wear yellow woolen tassels that convey the message, "Don't touch me." Men who violate the rule will have the tassels thrown at them and be fined \$152, or one cow.

Lungile Ndlovo, a spokeswoman for King Mswati, tells the women of Swaziland: "You will be expected to observe a five-year sex ban which means no shaking hands with males, no wearing of pants, and you will be expected to wear woolen tassels wherever you go." Women 19 or older who are already in sexual relationships are exempt from the ban, but must wear black tassels. The chastity rule was established in 1982, but never enforced. An estimated 22 percent of Swaziland's 1.1 million people have AIDS. [King Bans Sex for Young Girls, UPI, Sept. 19, 2001.]

Watch What You Say

In January, officials at Montachusett Regional Vocational School in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, conducted a survey about race relations at the school. They told students the results would be confidential, and they got frank answers.

Some whites said minority students got preferential treatment, and that minorities were responsible for some recent fights. School administrators identified five students who gave these answers, removed them from class, questioned them, and suspended them for three days for "behavior causing a dangerous condition" and making "racist comments." The five are suing the school. ACLU lawyers say they were punished for their beliefs. [Audie N. Cornish, Students Sue School Over Suspension, AP, Aug. 17, 2001.]

Preferences Banned

Like many colleges, the University of Georgia (UGA) awards bonus admissions points to non-whites and men. Three white women denied admission sued, claiming discrimination. On Aug. 27, a three-judge panel of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta ruled unanimously in their favor. This is the second time UGA's admissions policy has been declared unconstitutional. The first federal judge to hear the case described the policy as "naked racial balancing," and declared that student body diversity is not a goal that can withstand the strict scrutiny courts must apply to race-based decision-making. Unlike the lower court, the appeals court did not address the merits of diversity. It focused instead on UGA's point system, which it found violated the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. The state of Georgia has given up sex-preferences, but is expected to appeal the race portion of the ruling.

The appeals court decision is already having an effect. On Aug. 29, the University of Florida announced it will award no more race-based scholarships. [Bill Rankin, Appeals Court Rules UGA's Admission Program Unconstitutional, Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Aug. 27, 2001. Florida Eliminating Scholarships, AP, Aug. 30, 2001.]

Killer Kids

When Africa Evans went to work at a Cincinnati hospital on Aug. 15, she left her eight-year-old daughter in the care of the child's 13-year old cousin and another 11-year-old boy. Some time later, the 13-year-old called 911, saying "She won't wake up." Paramedics found the girl raped and beaten to death. Because of their ages, the boys cannot be

tried as adults, and if convicted, can be imprisoned only until they are 21. Prosecutor Mike Allen believes they are the youngest defendants ever charged with homicide in Hamilton County. [Cincinnati Boys, 13 and 11, Held in Girl's Murder, Reuters, Aug. 17, 2001.]

Browning of England

According to data released by the British Office for National Statistics (ONS), the non-white population of the United Kingdom is growing at 15 times the white rate. The four million non-whites are now seven percent of the British population, and because they are on average more than a decade younger than whites (26 vs. 37) and have much higher birth rates, their numbers will continue to increase.

The ONS study found that during the 1990s, the white population increased by just one percent, while that of immigrant African blacks and their offspring increased by 37 percent. The number of Bangladeshis and Pakistanis grew by 30 and 13 percent respectively. The largest population increase recorded was for people of mixed race, whose number increased by 49 percent. They are also the youngest demographic group, with 58 percent under age 14. Nearly half of all non-whites live in London, where they are more than a quarter of the population. Only 1.7 percent of the people of Scotland are non-white. [Ethnic Birth Rate Climbs, BBC News Online, Sept. 21, 2001]

Population Growth in Britain During the 1990s.

Mixed Race:	49%
Black (African):	37%
Bangladeshi:	30%
Pakistani:	13%
Chinese:	5%
Indian:	4%
White:	1%
Black (Caribbean):	0%

Stamp of Approval

Ten days before the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, the U.S. Postal Service issued a new stamp celebrating Islam. "Eid Greetings," it says, in recognition of the seven million Muslims in America, and reflects the Postal Service's yearning to "reach out to all of our diverse populations." "Eid greet-

ings" refers to the most important Islamic festivals, Eid al-Fitr and Eid al-Adha. Eid al-Fitr is the feast at the end of Ramadan, the month of fasting, and will be celebrated Dec. 16. Seventy-six million Eid stamps have been printed, and are on sale now. [Diana Lynne, New Islamic Stamp On Sale: U.S. Postal Service 'Has No Plans' of Discontinuing 'EID,' WorldNetDaily.com, Sept. 20, 2001.]

The Evil Eye

Monolid is an Asian anti-white quarterly magazine now in its second year of publication. It appears to be published by Asian women whose main beef is that many white men find them sexually attractive. The magazine, which is available in book stores, explains its purpose as follows:



"In a culture that preaches assimilation as the penultimate tool of triumph in a washed-out world, it is a sad thing that few have the courage to speak out against the obvious white aggression which confronts us day to day, and has become a jaded fabric, threatening to pucker up and cover us with animosity, suspicion and unchecked greed. We as Asian Americans are for the first time confronting our large numbers and getting our bearings about us in a post model-minority century, in a momentous time of flowering cultural renaissance, but also a time of ethnic quandaries, color-kinks that posit for us the first time in which we will really have to stand up for our rights, and with an unequivocal certitude, assert our political presence. Our numbers are so huge that already the majority has grown wary of us, sequestering us as spy-engineers and tools they think they can manipulate

Register Now

Registration information for the 2002 AR conference is printed on the inside of the sheet that serves as the envelope for this issue. This new way of delivering AR to you is cheaper than using an envelope, and also lets us print useful information on paper that would otherwise be blank.

See you in February!

with ease. It is a dire challenge that lies before us, one which calls for every Asian American to rise up and grasp their identity with a firm embrace; without consciousness of who we are, we have little hope of overcoming that ugly racism which is accosting us at every moment. Monolid, the Asian eye, or God's eye, which has always watched over all oppressed peoples since the time of Moses, is the eye which never blinks at the complexities arising in troubled times, and draws its strength on the light that has been guiding us in our Culture for thousands of years."

There is much more of this sort of thing at <http://www.monolid.com>.

Unspeakable

A 16-year-old boy in the Northern Province of South Africa has been arrested for raping his 45-year-old mother and 25-year-old sister. He reportedly forced his mother to undress at knife-point, raped her, and then turned on his sister. Fancinah Mabasa, clinical psychologist and lecturer at the University of the North thinks she may know why he did it: "He might also have been involved in a failed relationship with someone who became a parental figure to him. This is someone who might possess some resemblance to the suspect's mother or any family member."

In other developments, a 50-year-old man from the Thohoynadou area was arrested for sodomising his four-year-old daughter. He reportedly had been doing this for several months, and the abuse came to light only when the child's grandmother gave her a bath. [Selby Makgotho, Boy Suspected of Family Rapes Arrested, The Sowetan (Johannesburg), July 26, 2001.] 