

SUICIDE OF A SUPERPOWER

WILL AMERICA SURVIVE TO 2025?


PATRICK J. BUCHANAN



SUICIDE
of a
SUPERPOWER

Will America Survive to 2025?

PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Thomas Dunne Books
St. Martin's Press  New York

To the Old Right

Acknowledgments

For her perseverance in getting me to complete this book, and for coming to see me in the Reagan White House to persuade me to start writing books, my eternal gratitude goes to Fredi Friedman, editor, counselor, agent, friend. To Tom Dunne, my thanks for going ahead with it. Special thanks to Marcus Epstein for the invaluable assistance and untold hours he devoted to researching ideas, issues, and anecdotes. Also, thanks to Michael Rubin for helping match footnotes to text.

—Pat Buchanan, June 2011

Contents

Title Page

Dedication

Acknowledgments

Preface

Introduction: Disintegrating Nation

1. The Passing of a Superpower
2. The Death of Christian America
3. The Crisis of Catholicism
4. The End of White America
5. Demographic Winter
6. Equality or Freedom?
7. The Diversity Cult
8. The Triumph of Tribalism
9. “The White Party”
10. The Long Retreat
11. The Last Chance

Notes

Index

Also by Patrick J. Buchanan

About the Author

Copyright Page

Preface

“What happened to the country we grew up in?”

Like *Death of the West*, a decade ago, this book seeks to answer that question. But *Suicide of a Superpower* is being published in another time in another America. When *Death of the West* came out on New Year's, 2002, the nation was united and resolved. America had just swept to a bloodless victory over the Taliban and a triumphant George W. Bush had the approval of nine in ten of his countrymen. In his State of the Union address that same month, the president informed the “axis-of-evil” nations we were coming for them, and, in his second inaugural address, he would call Americans to a great crusade to “end tyranny in our world.” Hubristic times.

This book is published after ten years of war in Afghanistan, eight in Iraq, the worst recession and debt crisis America has faced since the 1930s, with the nation divided and seemingly everywhere in retreat. We have entered an era of austerity and retrenchment unlike any this generation has ever known. But not only is it in the realm of economics and politics that America appears in a downward spiral. Socially, culturally, morally, America has taken on the aspect of a decadent society and a declining nation.

When the faith dies, the culture dies, the civilization dies, the people die. That is the progression. And as the faith that gave birth to the West is dying in the West, peoples of European descent from the steppes of Russia to the coast of California have begun to die out, as the Third World treks north to claim the estate. The last decade provided corroborating if not conclusive proof that we are in the Indian summer of our civilization. Historian Arnold Toynbee wrote, “Civilizations die from suicide, not by murder.” And so it is. We are the Prodigal Sons who squandered their inheritance; but, unlike the Prodigal Son, we can't go home again.

DEMOGRAPHIC WINTER

*Russia is disappearing. So is Japan. Europe is next to go.*¹

—JOHN FEFFER, 2010

Epoch Times

*Within a hundred years... God will come down to earth with his big ring of keys, and will say to humanity: "Gentlemen, it is closing time."*²

—PIERRE EUGÈNE MARCELLIN BERTHELOT (1827–1907),

French statesman

Demography is destiny.

Auguste Comte, the philosopher and mathematician known as the father of sociology, is said to have coined the cliché. Yet there is truth in it. Europeans crossing the Atlantic in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries sealed the fate of Native Americans. That a defeated Germany's population was surging while that of France was stagnant was a justifiable cause of grave apprehension in a Quay d'Orsay that had pushed the Allies into imposing the vindictive peace of Versailles, that dishonored, dismembered, and divided the defeated Germany of November 1918.

Yet demography is not always destiny, for all human capital is not created equal. In making history it has often been the quality of a people that mattered most. Consider what a handful of Greeks in fifth-century Athens created, what three hundred Spartans at Thermopylae prevented, what a Galilean carpenter's son and a dozen disciples gave the world. Consider what a few score men in Philadelphia in 1776 and 1787 achieved. By 1815, an island of eight million off the coast of Europe had seen off Napoleon, gained mastery of the world's oceans, and created an empire that would encompass a fourth of mankind. Consider what a dozen Bolshevik gunmen began when they stormed the Winter Palace and ran off a panicked ruling council.

But demography has taken on even greater importance in our time. Why?

First, because democracy is the religion of the West. In the American creed, political legitimacy comes solely from the consent of the governed, each of whom has the same single vote. Democracy is a force multiplier of demography. Numbers eventually equal power.

Second, with the surge of ethnonationalism worldwide, and of identity politics in America, demography will increasingly dictate the division and distribution of society's wealth and rewards. A third and related reason is egalitarianism, the ideology that holds that all ethnic groups are equal and where inequality exists institutional racism is the probable cause.

As the West worships at the altar of democracy, is deeply egalitarian, and has thrown open its doors to a Third World in which ethnonationalism is embedded, it is the West whose destiny will ultimately be determined by demography. What is that destiny? Consider the latest statistics from the Population Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs:

Between now and 2050,

- One in every six East Europeans, 50 million people, will vanish.
- Germany, Russia, Belarus, Poland, and Ukraine will lose 53 million people.
- Where, at liberation in 1990 Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia had 8 million people, 2.3 million of them will have disappeared by 2050.
- Between liberation in 1990 and 2050, the former captive nations of Romania and Bulgaria will have lost between them 10 million people.
- Europeans and North Americans who accounted for 28 percent of world population in 1950 will have fallen to 12 percent in 2050 and be among the oldest people on earth with a median age close to 50.

Not one nation of Europe or North America, save Iceland, has a birth rate sufficient to replace its population. All have been below zero population growth (2.1 children per woman) for decades. Who inherits the Western estate? Between now and 2050, Africa's population will double to 2 billion, and Latin America and Asia will add another 1.25 billion people. By 2050, the populations of

Afghanistan, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, and Uganda will have tripled since Y2K, with Niger's population quintupling from 11 million to 58 million.³

In a 2010 essay in *Foreign Affairs*, "The Population Bomb: The Four Megatrends That Will Change the World," Jack Goldstone documents how Western peoples, whose empires ruled mankind on the eve of the Great War, are aging, dying, and sinking toward insignificance:

In 1913, Europe had more people than China, and the proportion of the world's population living in Europe and the former European colonies of North America had risen to over 33 percent....

By 2003, the combined populations of Europe, the United States, and Canada accounted for just 17 percent of the global population. In 2050, this figure is expected to be just 12 percent—far less than it was in 1700.⁴

Our own and our parents' generations have witnessed an epochal event: the fall of Christendom. From the close of the Edwardian era, with the death of Edward VII in 1910, in a single century, it all happened. The great European powers fought two great wars. All lost their empires. All saw their armies and navies melt away. All lost their Christian faith. All saw their birth rates plummet. All have seen their populations begin to age and shrink. All are undergoing invasions from formerly subject peoples coming to the mother country to dispossess their grandchildren. All of their welfare states face retrenchment even as they face tribal decline and death.

Reflecting on the fate of Rome, Charles Darwin's grandson bemoaned a pattern he saw through history: "Must civilization always lead to the limitation of families and consequent decay and then replacement from barbaric sources, which in turn will go through the same experience?"⁵

So wrote Phillip Longman, author of *The Empty Cradle*. And who will replace the unborn children of the West? We are witness to the unfolding of a brazen

prophecy of Algerian president Houari Boumedienne before the United Nations in 1974.

One day millions of men will leave the Southern Hemisphere of this planet to burst into the northern one. But not as friends. Because they will burst in to conquer, and they will conquer by populating it with their children. Victory will come to us from the wombs of our women.⁶

The conquest of Europe by peoples of color from the old colonies is well advanced. The numbers of those lined up waiting to come, and of those lined up behind them, stagger the mind.

By midcentury, the ten most populous nations will be, in order: India, China, the United States, Indonesia, Pakistan, Nigeria, Brazil, Bangladesh, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Ethiopia.⁷ Five are in Asia, three in sub-Saharan Africa, and one in Latin America. The United States will be the only First World nation on the list. But, by 2050, America will be more of a Third World than a Western nation, as 54 percent of the 435 million people in the United States, according to the UN's 2006 *Population Prospects*, will trace their roots to Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Incontrovertible realities emerge from the thousand pages of text and numbers in that UN report.

Peoples of European descent are not only in a relative but a real decline. They are aging, dying, disappearing. This is the existential crisis of the West. And among the peoples of color who will replace them, the poorest in the least developed nations are reproducing fastest. For the most productive peoples in Asia, too, like the Japanese and South Koreans, are also beginning to age and die.

In 2007, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which includes the major economic powers, voiced alarm at the sinking birth rates in the most advanced nations.

Birth rates have declined sharply in most OECD countries, to just 1.6

children per woman—well below the average of 2.1 children per woman needed just to maintain current population levels.

The most direct consequence of low birth rates is a “vicious circle” of decreasing population: fewer children today imply fewer women of childbearing age twenty years from now, so the cumulative momentum of current low birth rates will be difficult to reverse.

The effect on society is significant. There will be fewer young adults to care for elderly family members, pensions and healthcare will take up an increasing share of public spending, the workforce will be older and less adaptable, and domestic savings may shrink.⁸

“Today, close to half of all children in most OECD countries grow up without siblings.”⁹ The OECD said birthrates had fallen in Japan and some Eastern and Southern European countries to 1.3 children per woman. This is not two-thirds of what is needed to replace an existing population. The brief concludes ominously: “In purely biological terms, it may still be possible to return to previous levels [of births] but the pace of such a recovery would be unprecedented in human history.”¹⁰

The OECD is saying the death of Europe appears irreversible and imminent.

Already, in Portugal, Ireland, Greece, and Spain deficits and national debt far in excess of EU limits threaten to sink the European monetary union. These deficits are traceable to fewer and fewer young workers available to carry the load of pensions and health care for retiring and retired seniors. The riots that tore through Greece, France, and the UK in 2010 are rooted in the demographic crisis of the West and are harbingers of what is to come.

AGING TIGERS, SETTING SUN

Not only do the nations of Europe and North America have birth rates that portend extinction of the native born, two of the most dynamic nations of Asia are on the path to national suicide. Japan, its population peaking at 128 million in 2010, will lose 25 million people by 2050.¹¹ A fifth of her population will disappear and one in six Japanese will be over 80. Japan’s median age will rise

from 45 to 55. And these projections assume a rise in the fertility of Japanese women that is nowhere in sight.

In March 2010 came more grim news. *Marketwatch* reported the birth rate in Tokyo had fallen to 1.09 children per woman and if “current trends continued, Japan’s population will fall to 95 million by 2050, from about 127 million now,” a loss of 32 million people. At this rate, a fourth of the nation will vanish in four decades.¹² “With as much as 40 percent of its population over 65 years of age,” wrote Joel Kotkin, of *Forbes*, “no matter how innovative the workforce, *Dai Nippon* will simply be too *old* to compete.”¹³

Noting that births in Japan in 2008 were 40 percent below what they were in 1948, Nicholas Eberstadt writes, in *Foreign Affairs*, that “fertility, migration and mortality trends are propelling Japan into ... a degree of aging thus far contemplated only in science fiction.”¹⁴

In December 2010, Agence France-Press, citing the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, reported: “On current trends, Japan’s population of 127 million will by 2055 shrivel to 90 million.”¹⁵ Recognizing the gravity of the demographic crisis, the Democratic Party of Japan, which was swept into power in 2009, planned \$3,000 allowances per child and assistance with child care for families with grade-school children. The need seems desperate. In a 2010 *Washington Post* story on the decline in Japanese students attending U.S. universities, Blaine Harden wrote, “The number of children [in Japan] under the age of 15 has fallen for 28 consecutive years. The size of the nation’s high school graduating class has shrunk by 35 percent in two decades.”¹⁶

In 2010, China overtook Japan as the world’s second largest economy, a ranking Japan had held since surpassing Germany forty years ago. The *New York Times* concludes:

China’s rise could accelerate Japan’s economic decline as it captures Japanese export markets, and as Japan’s crushing national debt increases and its aging population grows less and less productive—producing a downward spiral.

“It’s beyond my imagination how far Japan will fall in the world

economy in 10, 20 years,” said Hideo Kumano, economist at the Dai-ichi Life Research Institute in Tokyo.¹⁷

Japan’s fertility level has been below replacement levels since the 1970s. By 2050, it will have been below zero population growth for eighty years. If the birthrate does not rise, Japan’s population at century’s end will be 20 percent of what it is today.

The aging of Japan, the oldest nation on earth, seems reflected in its economic performance. In the 1960s, Japan’s economy grew by 10 percent a year; in the 1970s by 5 percent a year; in the 1980s by 4 percent, still a healthy growth rate. But in the 1990s, the “lost decade,” Japan’s GDP grew by 1.8 percent a year.¹⁸ In the twenty-first century, Japan has failed to maintain even this anemic growth rate and, due to the vast public works spending in the 1990s, now faces a national debt 200 percent of her GDP.

In 1988, eight of the ten largest companies in the world in capitalization were Japanese, led by Nippon Telegraph & Telephone. Today, Japan does not have a single company in the top twenty, and it has only six in the top 100. “China has also surpassed Japan in having the biggest trade surplus and foreign currency reserves,” writes Tabuchi, “as well as the highest steel production. And next year China could overtake Japan as the largest automobile producer.”¹⁹ China already has.

South Korea’s population is projected to reach 49.5 million in 2025 but will recede to 44 million by 2050, a loss of 10 percent in twenty-five years.²⁰ Few nations suffer losses like that in wars. In the Civil War, North and South lost 620,000, 2 percent of the population.

In 2050, the median age of South Koreans will have risen from thirty-eight today to fifty-four and a third of all South Koreans will be over sixty-five, an immense burden of retirees for the working population to carry.²¹ “Korea may lose out in the global economic competition due to a lack of manpower,” Health Minister Jeon Jae-hee told the *Korea Times*. “It is actually the most urgent and important issue the country is facing.”²²

Technologically, Japan is among the world’s most advanced nations. South Korea is the largest and strongest of the Asian tigers. It is impossible to believe

either can maintain its dynamism when, together, they will lose thirty million people and add a decade to their median age. By 2050, 40 percent of all South Koreans and Japanese will be over sixty years of age.²³

Both nations appear prepared to accept their fate, a dying population and declining nation, rather than adopt the American solution: replacement of her departing native born with millions of immigrants.

Another tiger, Singapore, is advancing toward the same end with a birth rate only 60 percent of what is needed to replace the population. As we approach midcentury, Singapore's median age will rise from forty today to fifty-four, almost 40 percent of the population will be over sixty, and there will be twice as many deaths each year as births by 2040. So worried is Singapore over its birth dearth it is offering mothers a "birth bonus" of \$3,000 for the first and second child and \$4,000 for the third and fourth, plus paid maternity leave.²⁴

Free Asia, an economic miracle of the twentieth century, seems content to enjoy the good life and then pass away. At the end of 2010, AFP reported that the birth rate in Singapore had fallen to 1.2 children per women, while in South Korea it had fallen to 1.1, and on Taiwan to 1.03.²⁵

VANISHING VOLK

For no country has demography had a greater bearing on destiny than Germany.

Indeed, behind the two wars that tore Europe apart lay a British fear that Germany, after crushing France in 1870, had grown too populous and powerful. Balance-of-power politics dictated Britain's moving closer to colonial rivals Russia and France. Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli recognized the earth-shaking importance of the Franco-Prussian War and of Bismarck's having united the German states and peoples under a Prussian king:

The war represents the German revolution, a greater political event than the French revolution of the last century.... There is not a diplomatic tradition, which has not been swept away. You have a new world.... The balance of power has been entirely destroyed.²⁶

For ten years, 1914–1918 and 1939–1945, Britons and Germans fought. By 1945, Germany was finished as a military power and Britain was finished as a world power. Now the Germans have begun to disappear. “Since 1972, Germany has not seen a single year where the number of newborns exceeded the number of deaths,” writes Reiner Klingholz, of Berlin’s Institute for Population and Development.²⁷

The creeping population-shrinking process was only masked by high immigration that could camouflage the natural losses—at least until 2003. Since then, the overall population of Germany has declined; the Federal Statistics Office expects that the nation will have around eight million fewer inhabitants by midcentury—that is the equivalent of losing the population of Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Cologne and Frankfurt combined.²⁸

What Klingholz is saying bears repeating: Germans have been dying out for forty years and this has been covered up by counting Turks, East Europeans, and Arabs as Germans. Now, not even immigrants from the Muslim lands, Eastern Europe, and the Third World can mask the reality.

Astonishing. Not long after World War II, West Germany boasted the world’s second largest economy. Now a united Germany is on schedule to become a retirement center, nursing home, and cemetery for the Germanic peoples, whose origins date back to before the birth of Christ.

Today, 20 percent of Germany’s population is older than 65, and 5 percent are older than 80. In 2050, the 65-plus age group will make up 32 percent and the 80-plus group 14 percent.... By midcentury one out of seven Germans will be older than 80. The figures are similar in Spain and Italy.²⁹

In Austria, where the fertility rate is down to 1.4 births per woman, eighty-five-year-old Carl Djerassi, who contributed a key discovery that made the birth control pill possible, calls Europe’s demographic decline a “horror scenario,” a

“catastrophe.” There is “no connection at all between sexuality and reproduction.”³⁰ Donald Rumsfeld was on to something when he called it “old Europe.”

Of Southern Europe, where the fertility rate among the Catholic native-born has fallen to two-thirds of what is required to keep those nations alive, Carl Haub of the Population Reference Bureau says:

[Y]ou can't go on forever with a total fertility rate of 1.2 [children per woman]. If you compare the size of the 0–4 and 29–34 age groups in Spain and Italy right now, you see the younger is almost half the size of the older. You can't keep going with a completely upside-down age distribution, with the pyramid standing on its point. You can't have a country where everybody lives in a nursing home.³¹

As Longman writes, “This isn't just a numbers game.”

As the darkest recent chapters of European history suggest, the point of transition from growth to demographic decline can be an unsettling and dangerous one. Fascist ideology in Europe was deeply informed by Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West*, Lothrop Stoddard's *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy*, and the writings of other eugenicists obsessed with the demographic decline of “Aryans.”³²

Today, a new generation of Europeans that feels besieged by Muslim immigration has begun to shift allegiance from working class and conservative parties to anti-Islamic and anti-immigration parties that are flourishing now in virtually every country. In some they already share power and the mainstream parties have begun to submit to their demands

“THERE'LL ALWAYS BE AN ENGLAND”

The United Kingdom appears to be the great exception to the shrinking of

European populations. In its 2006 Population Projections, the UN predicted that the UK would, by 2050, add the 8.5 million people that Germany would lose. The 2008 revision pushed Britain's population projection at midcentury to 72.4 million, an increase of 10 million people in forty years.³³

Yet one must look more closely at these numbers. Fertility in Britain has been below replacement level since the early 1970s. Even the revised 2008 figures say British fertility will remain 15 percent below zero population growth through 2050. Then, there are those reports of native-born Britons in the scores and even hundreds of thousands emigrating annually.

How can a nation add 10 million people when its women are not having enough babies to replace the existing population and its native born are departing? The answer is immigration. The Caribbean, African, Arab, and Asian population of Britain is keeping the birthrate up and new immigrants are assuring that the population grows by at least 8.5 million and perhaps 12 million as Germany's declines. Britain is growing and changing its complexion.

"A Fifth of Europe Will Be Muslim by 2050," ran an August 2009 headline in the *Telegraph*.³⁴ In a related article cited by Cal Thomas, "Muslim Europe: The Demographic Time Bomb Transforming Our Continent," the *Telegraph* wrote that "Britain and the rest of the European Union are ignoring a time bomb: a recent rush into the EU by migrants, including millions of Muslims, will change the continent beyond recognition over the next two decades, and almost no policy makers are talking about it."³⁵

Oxford demographer David Coleman adds that Britain's nonwhite population is on course "to grow from 9 percent at the last census in 2001, to 29 percent by 2051."³⁶ That means 21 million of the 72 million British subjects in 2050 will trace their ancestry to Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, or the Caribbean, a demographic transformation of a country that has never assimilated a large number of immigrants. In late 2010, Coleman updated his projections. Britons—English, Welsh, Irish, and Scots—will be a minority by 2066 and immigrants will "transform" Britain. "The transition to a 'majority-minority' population, whenever it happens, would represent an enormous change to national identity—cultural, political, economic and religious."³⁷ That date, 2066, is the millennial year of the Norman Conquest.

Who are the newcomers to the old continent?

In *Reflections on the Revolution in Europe: Immigration, Islam and the West*, Chris Caldwell writes that conspicuous among the more than 15 million Muslims in Western Europe are “militants, freeloaders and opportunists.”³⁸ Fouad Ajami describes them:

The militants took the liberties of Europe as a sign of moral and political abdication. They included “activists” now dreaming of imposing the Shariah on Denmark and Britain. There were also warriors of the faith, in storefront mosques in Amsterdam and London, openly sympathizing with the enemies of the West. And there were second-generation immigrants who owed no allegiance to the societies of Europe.³⁹

In a stunning revelation in 2009, Andrew Neather, speechwriter and adviser to Tony Blair and Home Secretary Jack Straw, revealed that Blair’s Labor government had thrown open Britain’s doors to mass immigration to socially engineer a “truly multicultural” country and “rub the Right’s nose in diversity.”⁴⁰ The government did not reveal what it was about, said Neather, as that might have driven Labor’s “core working-class vote” to the British National Party of Nick Griffin.

“[T]he truth is out and it’s dynamite,” said Sir Andrew Green, the chairman of the think tank Migrationwatch. “Many have long suspected that mass immigration under Labor was not just a cock up but a conspiracy. They were right.”⁴¹ Under a clandestine Labor policy to alter the racial balance and change the face of Britain, three million immigrants, 5 percent of Britain’s entire population, came in from the Third World, said Green.

Is it not treason to bring in foreigners, deceitfully, to swamp a people and dispossess them of their culture and country? What is the difference between what Labor stands accused of doing and what Stalin did in the Baltic republics in the 1940s—and what China is doing today in Tibet?

According to the *London Times*, from 2004 to 2008 the Muslim population surged by 500,000 to 2,422,000, and was growing at ten times the rate of the

native-born population due to higher birthrates, immigration, and conversions. And more and more of these Muslims are asserting their Islamic identity as they see their brothers fighting the West in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Hindus in Britain tripled to 1.5 million in the first seven years of the century. The “Black British” from the Caribbean and sub-Sahara have risen to 1.45 million.⁴² Although Hindus and Muslims and the black British are spread throughout the realm, they are heavily concentrated in what has come to be called Londonistan.

Some of the estimated one million Poles who migrated to Britain after Warsaw entered the EU have left for home where the wages were rising, as Britain entered the financial crisis and David Cameron’s era of austerity.⁴³

THE LOST TRIBES OF ISRAEL

“In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, for they are no more,” wrote the evangelist Matthew.

As their nation enters its sixty-fourth year, Israelis can look back with pride. Israel is a democracy with the highest standard of living in the Middle East. Her high-tech industries are in the first rank. From a nation of fewer than a million in 1948, her population has grown to 7 million. In seven wars—the 1948 War of Independence, the Sinai invasion of 1956, the Six-Day War of 1967, the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the Lebanon wars of 1982 and 2006, and the Gaza War—Israel has prevailed.

Israel has revived Hebrew, created a currency, immersed her children in the history, ancient and modern, of the Jewish people, and established a national homeland for Jews, millions of whom have come to settle. The nation is home to the largest concentration of Jews anywhere on earth.

Yet, Israeli realists must look forward with foreboding. For Israel became home to the largest Jewish population only because the number of American Jews plummeted in the 1990s from 5.5 to 5.2 million. Six percent of the U.S. Jewish population, 300,000 Jews, vanished in a decade. By 2050, the U.S. Jewish population will shrink another 50 percent to 2.5 million.⁴⁴ American Jews appear to be an endangered species.

Why is this happening? It is a result of the collective decision of Jews themselves. From Betty Friedan to Gloria Steinem in the 1970s to Ruth Bader Ginsburg today, Jewish women have led the battle for abortion rights. The community followed. A survey in 2000 by the Center for Jewish Community Studies in Baltimore found 88 percent of the Jewish public agreeing that “Abortion should be generally available to those who want it.”⁴⁵

As Jews were 2 to 3 percent of the U.S. population from *Roe v. Wade* to 2010, how many of the fifty million abortions since 1973 were performed on Jewish girls or women? How many Jewish children were never conceived because of birth control?

In Philip Roth’s *The Counterlife*, a militant Israeli character says, “what Hitler couldn’t achieve at Auschwitz, American Jews are doing to themselves in the bedroom.”⁴⁶

Stephen Steinlight, former director of National Affairs at the American Jewish Committee, sees in U.S. population numbers existential peril for Israel.

Far more potentially perilous, does it matter to Jews—and for American support for Israel when the Jewish State arguably faces existential peril—that Islam is the fastest growing religion in the United States? That undoubtedly at some point in the next 20 years Muslims will outnumber Jews, and that Muslims with an “Islamic agenda” are growing active politically through a widespread network of national organizations? That this is occurring at a time when the religion of Islam is being supplanted in many of the Islamic immigrant sending countries by the totalitarian ideology of Islamism of which vehement anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism form central tenets?⁴⁷

“Will our status suffer,” Steinlight asks, “when the Judeo-Christian cultural construct yields, first, to a Judeo-Christian-Muslim one, and then to an even more expansive sense of national religious identity?”⁴⁸ To listen to President Obama is to understand that post-Christian America has already arrived at that “more expansive sense of national religious identity.”

ISRAEL'S EXISTENTIAL CRISIS

If demography is destiny, Israel's future appears grim. Her population of 7.5 million is 80 percent Jewish. But the Arab minority is growing faster, except for the ultra-Orthodox Jewish, known in Hebrew as "haredim," for whom eight children to a family is not unusual. Indeed, according to the Taub Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel, if present trends continue, by 2040, 78 percent of all primary school children in Israel will be either ultra-Orthodox or Arab.⁴⁹

A point of an earlier chapter, that the more religious the community the larger the families and the more secular and agnostic a people the fewer the children, is underscored by Eric Kaufmann in *Shall the Religious Inherit the Earth?* According to Kaufmann, "Ultra-Orthodox Jews, whether in Israel, Europe or North America, have a two or threefold fertility advantage over their liberal-Jewish counterparts. Their eventual achievement of majority status within worldwide Jewry in the twenty-first century seems certain."⁵⁰

An Israeli blogger writes that in Israel nearly 30 percent of all children one to four years old are Arab. And many Israelis, adds John Mearsheimer, now choose to live outside the country.

There are somewhere between 700,000 and 1 million Israeli Jews living outside the country, many of whom are unlikely to return. Since 2007, emigration has been outpacing immigration in Israel. According to scholars John Mueller and Ian Lustick, "a recent survey indicates that only 69 percent of Jewish Israelis say they want to stay in the country, and a 2007 poll finds that one-quarter of Israelis are considering leaving, including almost half of all young people."⁵¹

Housing minister Ariel Atias warns of a migration of the growing Arab population into Jewish sectors of Israel:

I see [it] as a national duty to prevent the spread of a population that, to say the least, does not love the state of Israel.... If we go on like we have until now, we will lose the Galilee. Populations that should not

mix are spreading there. I don't think it is appropriate [for them] to live together.⁵²

“The mayor of Acre visited me yesterday for three hours and asked me how his town could be saved,” Atias said, “He told me that Arabs are living in Jewish buildings and running them out.” Atias urged that land be sold to Jews and Arabs separately, “to create segregation ... between Jews and Arabs but also between other sectors, such as ultra-Orthodox and secular Jews.”⁵³

Not any Iranian weapon of mass destruction but demography is the existential crisis of the Jewish nation. According to UN figures, Israel's population will exceed 10 million by 2050. But the Arab share will be almost 30 percent. Palestinians in the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and Gaza, 4.4 million today, will then number more than 10 million. Jordan's population, 60 percent of which is Palestinian, will also double to 10 million.

By midcentury, then, Palestinians west of the Jordan River will outnumber Jews two to one. Add Palestinians in Jordan, it is three to one. And that does not count Palestinians in Egypt, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and the Gulf states, whose numbers will also double by 2050. Palestinians today have one of the highest fertility rates on earth, 5 children per woman, though an Israeli source says that in Israel it has fallen to 3.9 and, without the Bedouins of the Negev, 3.2 children per woman.⁵⁴ Only Orthodox Jews in Israel, of whom there are some 800,000, exceed that.

If Israel is to remain a Jewish state, a Palestinian state seems a national imperative. Yitzhak Rabin came to recognize this, but was assassinated. Ehud Barak came to recognize this and sought to bring it about. In his last days in office, Ehud Olmert warned, “if the two-state solution collapses,” Israel will “face a South African-style struggle.”⁵⁵

Three months before he launched the Gaza war, Olmert told two journalists that peace would require a return of the Golan Heights to Syria, the surrender of almost the entire West Bank, and the return of East Jerusalem to the Palestinians.

In the end, we will have to withdraw from the lion's share of the territories, and for the territories we leave in our hands, we will have to

give compensation in the form of territories within the State of Israel at a ratio that is more or less 1:1.... Whoever wants to hold on to all of [Jerusalem] will have to bring 270,000 Arabs inside the fences of sovereign Israel. It won't work.⁵⁶

Absent a Palestinian state, Israel has three options. First, annex the West Bank, the one-state solution. This would bring 2.4 million Palestinians into Israel, giving her a population 40 percent Arab. With their birth rate, the Palestinians would soon outnumber the Jews and vote to abolish the Jewish state—the end of the Zionist dream. Second is the Kahane solution. The late Rabbi Meir Kahane, assassinated in New York, urged the expulsion of all Palestinians from Judea and Samaria. But such ethnic cleansing would mean war with the Arabs, the isolation of Israel, and the alienation of the United States. The third option is no annexation, no Palestinian state, no expulsions—but permanent Israeli control of the West Bank and Gaza. This would entail making Gaza a penal colony of 1.5 million with no way out by land, sea, or air, save by leave of the Israeli Defense Force. On the West Bank, it would mean confinement of a burgeoning population of millions in enclaves wedged between the Israeli wall and the Jordan River, dotted by checkpoints and bisected by roads set aside for the exclusive use of Israelis. Travel in and out of the West Bank would be by sufferance of the IDF.

In January 2010, Defense Minister Barak implied that Prime Minister Netanyahu was leading Israel toward such a future, and that the Jewish people could not live with it.

The lack of defined boundaries within Israel, and not an Iranian bomb, is the greatest threat to our future.... It must be understood that if between the Jordan and the [Mediterranean] sea there is only one political entity, called Israel, it will by necessity either not be Jewish or not democratic and we will turn into an apartheid state.⁵⁷

Olmert echoed Barak: “As soon as that happens, the state of Israel is finished.”⁵⁸

THE NEIGHBORS

This is not the only demographic crisis Israel faces. According to UN population projections, by 2050, Syria's population of 22 million will increase to 37 million. Saudi Arabia's 26 million will increase to 44 million. Egypt will grow by 46 million to 130 million. The Islamic Republic of Iran, with a population of 75 million today, is expected to grow to 97 million by midcentury. And from Hamas in the south to Hezbollah in the north to the Muslim Brotherhood in the west, the Islamic faith of Israel's neighbors grows in militancy. If the threat within comes from a surging Palestinian population, the external threat comes from Israel's neighbors. To assess the magnitude of the problem, compare the population of Israel and the nations with which she went to war in 1967—to their projected populations in 2050.

Populations		
Nation	1967 (Millions)	2050 (Millions)
Israel	2.7	10.5
Jordan	1.3	10.1
Syria	5.6	37.0
Saudi Arabia	5.0	44.0
Egypt		
	33.0	130.0

To this correlation of forces, add again this fact: Palestinians west of the Jordan today almost equal in number the Jewish population of Israel.

The Israeli right, led by Netanyahu's Likud Party and the Israel Our Home Party of Avigdor Lieberman, says it will never permit a Palestinian capital in Jerusalem, never negotiate with Hamas, and never accept a Palestinian state led by Hamas. Nor will it agree to a Palestinian state that does not give up the right of return, recognize Israel as a Jewish state forever, and accept severe limitations on its sovereignty. Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz adds that any

acceptance of a right of return for Palestinian Arabs to the lands from which their fathers and grandfathers were driven or fled, “would achieve demographically what the Arab nations have been unable to achieve militarily—destruction of the Jewish state.” Israelis, says Dershowitz, need to “protect Israel against demographic annihilation.”⁵⁹

This means no Palestinian state. For no Arab leader could recognize a Palestine that gave up the right of return and agreed to cede all of Jerusalem to Israel forever, and survive. Behind Israel’s stand lies an assumption not self-evidently true: time is on Israel’s side. If demography is destiny, it transparently is not, for the Islamic world is exploding with new life.

Consider. In 1950, Goldstone writes, the populations of Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Turkey added up to 242 million. Last year, these six most populous Muslim nations had a combined population of 885 million. The six are expected to add 475 million people by 2050 for a total of 1.36 billion, almost all of whom will be Muslim and poor. “Worldwide,” writes Goldstone, “of the 48 fastest growing countries today—those with annual population growth of 2 percent or more—28 are majority Muslim or have Muslim minorities of 33 percent or more.”⁶⁰

OLD MOTHER RUSSIA

With the collapse of the empire and breakup of the Soviet Union, Russia seems to have lost the will to live. In an historic development, Russia’s population has fallen from 148 million in 1991 to 140 million today and is projected to plunge to 116 million by 2050, a loss of 32 million Russians in six decades.⁶¹ If these projections hold, six decades of freedom will have resulted in the disappearance of more Russians than seventy years of Bolshevism, from the October Revolution through the civil war of 1919–1920, to the starvation of the Kulaks, the Great Terror of the 1930s, the gulag, and all the dead of the Great Patriotic War with Nazi Germany from 1941 to 1945.

Of all the numbers in UN world population projections, the figures on Russia are the most depressing. Her fertility rate is two-thirds of what is needed to replace her people. Every year, for every thousand Russians, there are 11 births

and 15 deaths. In 2007, the UN projected that Russia's population shrinkage would average 750,000 annually for the next forty years. And no end is in sight.

The revised figures of 2008 offered a more optimistic assessment. The fertility rate of Russian women will rise to three-fourths of what is needed to maintain zero population growth. However, the OECD, as of 2009, projects a Russian population under 108 million in 2050.⁶² Martin Walker graphically describes what is happening to the late superpower and largest country on earth:

In Russia, the effects of declining fertility are amplified by a phenomenon so extreme that it has given rise to an ominous new term—hypermortality. As a result of the rampant spread of maladies such as HIV/AIDS and alcoholism and the deterioration of the Russian health care system, says a 2008 report by the UN Development Program, “mortality in Russia is 3–5 times higher for men and twice as high for women” than in other countries at a comparable stage of development. The report ... predicts that within little more than a decade the working-age population will be shrinking by up to one million people annually. Russia is suffering a demographic decline on a scale that is normally associated with the effects of a major war.⁶³

In “Drunken Nation: Russia's Depopulation Bomb,” Nicholas Eberstadt, of the American Enterprise Institute, writes:

A specter is haunting Russia today. It is not the specter of Communism—that ghost has been chained in the attic of the past—but rather of depopulation—a relentless, unremitting, and perhaps unstoppable depopulation.... as Russians practice what amounts to an ethnic self-cleansing.⁶⁴

Marxist theory famously envisioned the “withering away” of the state. But, writes Eberstadt, “Russia has seen a pervasive and profound change in childbearing patterns and living arrangements—what might be described as a ‘withering away’ of the family itself.”⁶⁵

The death rate in Russia, especially among men, is now at levels found only in less-developed countries of the Third World. “History,” writes Eberstadt, “offers no examples of a society that has demonstrated sustained material advance in the face of long-term population decline.”⁶⁶

One effect of Russia’s vanishing population will be a constrained foreign policy. As former ambassador Richard Fairbanks wrote in the aftermath of the Russia-Georgia clash of 2008:

Russia’s incursion into Georgia understandably evokes Cold War-era fears of a resurgent post-Soviet imperialism. But such concerns overlook a fundamental constraint. Russia is fast running out of young men.

Between 2010 and 2025, Russia’s pool of potential military recruits, aged 20–29, will decline by 44 percent, according to the United Nations. This forecast is not subject to meaningful revision; it has been “written in stone” by births that have already occurred.⁶⁷

Defense consultant William Hawkins echoes Fairbanks. Citing the National Intelligence Council’s *Global Trends 2025*, Hawkins writes, “The loss of the Near Abroad and demographic declines within Russia itself have reduced its population base. By 2017, the NIC notes, ‘Russia is likely to have only 650,000 18-year-old males from which to maintain an army that today relies on 750,000 recruits.’”⁶⁸

Like the Aral Sea, the fourth largest lake in the world in 1960, which has lost 60 percent of its acreage and 80 percent of its volume, Russia’s evaporating pool of young men will constrain Moscow’s military. And there will be deficiencies across the Russian economy as the number of workers entering the labor force declines year after year. Ex-CIA director Michael Hayden believes Russia will have to import workers from the Caucasus, Central Asia, and China, exacerbating ethnic and religious tensions in a country with a history of xenophobia.⁶⁹

Russia confronts yet another crisis in the rapid growth in her Muslim population, especially in Chechnya, Dagestan, and Ingushetia in the North

Caucasus, where secessionist sentiment is strong. Grozny, capital of Chechnya, was leveled in the second Chechen war when Vladimir Putin restored the rebellious province at a heavy cost in blood.

Since 1989, Russia's Muslim population has risen 40 percent to 25 million, as Muslims, with high birth rates, pour in from the former Soviet republics. By 2020, Muslims are expected to be one-fifth of the nation. Arab news network Al Jazeera is projecting that, by 2040, half the people living in Russia will be followers of the Prophet. Adds *Foreign Policy*, "Throw into the mix anger about the ongoing Muslim insurgency in Chechnya and smoldering resentment about the demise of the Soviet Union, and you have a potent recipe for an ugly nationalist movement—or something worse."⁷⁰

Mother Russia is dying and the geostrategic consequences will be earth-shaking. By 2050, Russia may still control twice the landmass of China, but with less than a tenth of China's population. In the Far East, six million Russians are outnumbered two hundred to one by Chinese.⁷¹ These aging Russians sit on Earth's last great storehouse of oil, gas, timber, gold, coal, furs, and natural resources, which a huge and hungry China needs. In "Rivalries of the Bear and Dragon," the *Financial Times* writes that Russia is "paranoid about the thinly populated eastern third of its landmass."⁷² And understandably so. Arnon Gutfeld of Tel Aviv University "predicts that by 2050 Russia will have insufficient human resources to control the territory it occupies."⁷³ Russia faces, says Putin, "the serious threat of turning into a decaying nation."⁷⁴

Although Moscow is aligned with Beijing in the Shanghai Cooperation Committee, created to push the United States out of Central Asia, America is no threat to Mother Russia. Americans prefer to buy what the Chinese may one day be prepared to take.

With the populations aging and dying in Eastern and Southern Europe, there has been no shortage of ideas for dealing with the existential crisis of the West. Yet some environmentalists are imploring Europe not to interfere, not to grant incentives for families to have more than two children. "Women bearing children in an industrialized world ... have an enormous impact on global warming," writes John Feffer, of *Foreign Policy in Focus*. "American women having babies generate seven times the carbon output of Chinese women having

babies.”⁷⁵ Feffer believes Western nations should not seek to raise birth rates but should open their doors to the people the Third World produces in abundance, who have tiny carbon footprints. In what is surely an understatement, Feffer argues, “It won’t be easy to persuade Russians to welcome large numbers of Chinese into Siberia or Italy to embrace more Nigerians.”⁷⁶ His solution—a world migration summit.

President Obama, the son of an immigrant, should spearhead the initiative. By pushing for a migration summit he can demonstrate that the United States is finally ready to play well with others. Such a Statue of Liberty play would be a fitting way for the president to spend the political capital of the Nobel Prize and secure his legacy as a global leader.⁷⁷

It would also be a fitting way to expedite Obama’s early return to Illinois.

SECOND THOUGHTS IN SHANGHAI

In December 2009, the *Washington Post* reported on a population crisis in a country where few would expect it—the world’s most populous nation, China, with 1.3 billion people.

“More than 30 years after China’s one-child policy was introduced, creating two generations of notoriously chubby, spoiled only children affectionately nicknamed ‘little emperors,’” wrote Ariana Eunjung Cha from Shanghai, “a population crisis is looming in the country.”⁷⁸

The average birthrate has plummeted to 1.8 children per couple as compared with six when the policy went into effect, according to the UN Population Division, while the number of residents 60 and older is predicted to explode from 16.7 percent of the population in 2020 to 31.1 percent by 2050.⁷⁹

Using UN projections of a Chinese population of 1.4 billion by 2050, this

translates into 440 million people in China over age sixty, an immense burden of retired, elderly, and aging for the labor force to carry and the country to care for. Shanghai is already approaching that point, with more than 20 percent of its population over sixty, while the birthrate is below one child per couple, one of the lowest anywhere on earth. Due to Beijing's one-couple, one-child policy, which has led to tens of millions of aborted baby girls, 12 to 15 percent of young Chinese men will be unable to find wives. As single males are responsible for most of society's violence, the presence of tens of millions of young single Chinese men portends a time of trouble in the Middle Kingdom. Peter Hitchens toured China to assess the impact of the draconian policy he calls "gendercide" for its systematic extermination of baby girls.

By the year 2020, there will be 30 million more men than women of marriageable age in the giant empire.... Nothing like this has ever happened to any civilization before.... [S]peculation is now seething about what might happen: a war to cull the surplus males, a rise in crime, a huge expansion in the prostitution that is already a major industry in every Chinese city, a rise in homosexuality.⁸⁰

China is fortunate its one-couple, one-child policy, written into its constitution in 1978, was never an inescapable mandate. For it would have produced, in two generations, a nation with one grandchild in the labor force for every four grandparents. Already, writes Longman, China is "rapidly evolving into what demographers call a '4-2-1' society, in which one child becomes responsible for supporting two parents and four grandparents."⁸¹

Eberstadt points to another consequence of this birth dearth. China's "key manpower pool" of young workers aged fifteen to twenty-nine is expected to fall by 100 million, or about 30 percent, by 2030.⁸²

Yet, psychologically, it may not be easy to wean Chinese couples off the one-child policy. The *Post* quoted a woman from China's human resources administration, herself an only child. "We were at the center of our families and used to everyone taking care of us. We are not used to taking care of and really do not want to take care of others."⁸³

Across the Taiwan strait, the fertility rate has sunk to one child per woman and the government is offering a \$31,250 prize for the Taiwanese citizen who comes up with the best slogan to make people want babies.⁸⁴

WHY THE WEST IS DYING

The reason the West is dying is simple: children are no longer so desirable. The child-centered society has been succeeded by the self-centered society. The purpose of life is the pursuit of pleasure, not the sacrifices required in the raising of children.

Freed from the moral constraints of Christianity, European and American young wish to enjoy the benefits of matrimony without the burdens. Society and science have accommodated them with contraceptives, the pill, the patch, sterilizations and abortion on request. And the social sanctions against sexual indulgence and the single life have largely disappeared.

Children are also less desirable because they are more expensive. In the first half of the twentieth century, one in five or one in ten children went to college. Young men left home in their late teens, married, and created their own families. Girls married young. Today, if parents wish to provide their children access to the good life, they must subsidize sixteen and often nineteen years of education for each child, the cost of which has soared into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, far beyond the means of most of the middle class.

Women are putting off having children to enter a labor market where their talents are rewarded and their social and economic independence can be won. Why get married and have babies and be tied down for years and fall behind? If one wishes to know the experience of motherhood, it can be had with a single child.

For those educated women who want the good life, a law degree or a doctorate is the way, not a husband and two kids. Many families can no longer get by on one salary. But when the wife goes to work, she often never goes home again. What was glamorous yesterday, the big two-parent family, is no longer so. The Huxstables of *The Cosby Show* and *The Brady Bunch* long ago gave way to *Sex and the City*.

For two generations, the West has known the sweet life. Now the bill comes due. With a shrinking pool of young workers due to the birth control practiced by and abortions submitted to by baby boomers and the follow-on generation, Europe no longer has the tax revenue to sustain the welfare states to assure the sweet life. A time of austerity is at hand. And from the riots across France to the anarchist attack on Tory Party headquarters in London to the garbage left piled and stinking on the streets of Marseille and Naples in the fall of 2010, Europe is not going gentle into that good night. But go she shall.

Yet some see the bright side. There is a growing school of thought that the fewer children one has, the better a global citizen one is, especially in America, where the per capita carbon footprint on Mother Earth is so high. Says Andrew Revkin of the *New York Times*, “Probably the single most concrete and substantive thing an American, young American, could do to lower our carbon footprint is not turning off the lights or driving a Prius, it’s having fewer kids.”⁸⁵

The logic of Revkin’s argument is irrefutable. By having one child, which means a more rapid death and disappearance of Western man, Western man thereby serves mankind. Greater love than this hath no man.

EQUALITY OR FREEDOM?

*Equality of condition is incompatible with civilization.*¹

—JAMES FENIMORE COOPER

*Utopias of equality are biologically doomed.*²

—WILL AND ARIEL DURANT, 1968

*Inequality ... is rooted in the biological nature of man.*³

—MURRAY ROTHBARD, 1973

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,” wrote Jefferson, in one of the most quoted sentences in the English language. On the Gettysburg battlefield in 1863, Lincoln hearkened back to Jefferson’s words: “Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.” In our civil religion this is sacred text.

Barack Obama invoked the creed in his inaugural: “The time has come ... to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea, passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.”⁴

Americans are taught that, unlike blood-and-soil nations, ours is a “propositional nation,” an “ideological nation,” built upon ideas.⁵ What makes us exceptional, what gives purpose to our national existence is that America has been dedicated from birth to the advancement of equality and democracy for ourselves and all mankind. From 1776 on, said Lincoln, we have been “dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.”

So our children are taught. To question the belief that America is and has always been about equality, democracy, and diversity is to mark oneself down as almost un-American. Yet this rendition of American history is a myth as great as

that of the *Aeneid*, where the surviving hero of the sack of Troy sails the Mediterranean in exile to become founding father of Rome.

Today's egalitarian drive to make us all equal is no fulfillment of the vision of the Founding Fathers. Indeed, it is the thesis of this chapter that America is embarked on an ideological crusade to achieve a utopian goal, that we will inevitably fail, and that, in the process, we shall ruin our country.

WHAT THE FATHERS BELIEVED

The Founding Fathers did not believe in democracy. They did not believe in diversity. They did not believe in equality. From what Jefferson wrote and the fathers signed it is clear that the only equality to which they subscribed, as an ideal and an aspiration, was an equality of God-given rights. “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

Governments, wrote Jefferson, are formed to secure these rights, and when they fail to do so, they render themselves illegitimate, and the people have a right to rise up, overthrow those governments, and institute a new government based upon the consent of the people.

[T]o secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government.

This is the idea that has inspired mankind.

To extract “all men are created equal” from the context in which it was written and assert it as an endorsement of an egalitarian society is to distort what Jefferson wrote and what the men of Philadelphia believed. Lest we forget, this was a declaration of *independence*! And in its closing words the Founding Fathers tell the world what they and the war are truly all about:

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress Assembled ... do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the

British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved.

What made these men heroes was not Jefferson's phrase about an equality of rights but his blazing indictment of the king as a tyrant on the order of Ivan the Terrible and his assertion that Americans no longer owed him allegiance. The men of '76 put their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor on the line to overthrow British rule. Many would pay with their fortunes and lives for this act of treason.

From birth, America was the Party of Liberty. *Egalité*, on the other hand, was what the French Revolution claimed to be about. No American war was fought for egalitarian ends, postwar propaganda notwithstanding.

The War of 1812 was waged against the mother of parliaments in de facto alliance with the greatest despot of the age, Napoleon Bonaparte. It was about vindicating the rights of our citizens and seizing Canada. The Texas war of 1835–1836 was fought for independence from an autocratic and Catholic Mexico. How could it have been about equality when the Lone Star Republic that emerged from that war became the second slave nation in North America?

No one would suggest the Indian wars were about equality. They were about conquest and subjugation. As we shall see from Lincoln's own words, the Civil War was about restoring the Union. The Spanish-American War was fought to avenge the sinking of the *Maine* and drive the Spanish out of Cuba. It ended with our annexation of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines. In the Philippines we conducted the most unjust war in American history to deny Filipinos, who had trusted us, their right to be free and independent.

World War I was not fought "to make the world safe for democracy" but to crush the kaiser's Germany. We did not declare war until German U-boats began to sink our merchant ships carrying war materiel to Britain, and America, herself by then an empire, fought as an "associated power" beside five empires: the British, French, Russian, Japanese, and Italian. At war's end, the German and Ottoman empires and their millions of subjects were divided up among the victorious imperial powers—with Woodrow Wilson's blessing.

As for World War II, how could we have been fighting for democracy when we did not go to war until Japan attacked us and Hitler declared war on us? Our

ally who did most of the fighting and dying was the Soviet Union of Stalin, Hitler's partner in starting the war and a monstrous tyrant whose victims before the war began outnumbered Hitler's one thousand to one. Were Hamburg, Dresden, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki about bringing democracy to Germany or Japan, or annihilating the Third Reich and the Empire of Japan?

WAS AMERICA ABOUT EQUALITY?

The Constitution and Bill of Rights are the foundational documents of the republic and the organic documents of American union. And the word "equality" does not appear in either. Nor does the word "democracy." Can these be the ends for which the United States was established if they are not even mentioned in the nation's founding documents?

To determine if Jefferson believed in equality, let us set his words alongside the views he expressed and the life he led. Could this young Virginian truly believe all men are created equal when he presided over a plantation of slaves whom, with the exception of the Hemings family, he did not even free on his death half a century later?

In the bill of indictment against George III, Jefferson wrote: "He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions."

Did Jefferson believe that Native Americans, these "merciless Indian Savages," were equal to his countrymen, or should be made equal? Not until the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 were Native Americans made full citizens. Not until this writer was in college did Indians in all states get the right to vote.

In that same indictment of George III, Jefferson describes the soldiers the king has sent across the ocean to put down the rebellion: "He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation, and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation." Clearly, Jefferson believed that English soldiers were superior to "foreign Mercenaries" and the King of England, as "Head of a

civilized nation,” ought not to behave like some barbarian ruler of ages past.

Among the evils the king visited upon his people was capturing colonists and impressing them into military service to fight fellow Americans and “become the executioners of their friends and Brethren.”

“Brethren” appears repeatedly in Jefferson’s declaration. For one of the great offenses of the king was that he was doing all this not to foreigners or “merciless Indian Savages” but to people of a common blood. Again and again, Jefferson invoked the ties of kinship and blood. “Nor have We been wanting in attention to our British brethren.” We have “conjured them by the ties of our common kindred,” but they “have been deaf to the voice ... of consanguinity.” Hence, Jefferson writes, we must sever our bonds. No longer are the British brethren. “We must ... hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.”

Jefferson was saying that that the coming separation from England would not be simply a political separation. It would be the sundering of a nation, the dissolution of a people who belong together, as they are “brethren.” In author Kevin Phillips’s phrase, the Revolution was a “Cousins’ War.”⁶

In *Notes on the State of Virginia*, often cited as an illustration of his opposition to slavery, Jefferson wrote of the men and women who worked his plantation:

Comparing them by their faculties of memory, reason and imagination, it appears to me, that in memory they are equal to the whites; in reason much inferior; as I think one could scarcely be found capable of tracing and comprehending the investigations of Euclid; and that in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous.⁷

Can one read a brutal passage like this and still maintain that Thomas Jefferson believed as literal truth that “all men are created equal”?

In 1813, Jefferson wrote John Adams, once his rival, now his friend:

I agree with you that there is a natural aristocracy among men. The grounds of this are virtue and talents.... The natural aristocracy I

consider as the most precious gift of nature for the instruction, the trusts, and government of society. And indeed it would have been inconsistent in creation to have formed man for the social state, and not to have provided virtue and wisdom enough to manage the concerns of the society. May we not even say that that form of government is the best which provides the most effectually for a pure selection of these natural *aristoi* into the offices of government?⁸

Jefferson is saying that he agrees with Adams that nature did not make all men equal. Nature made us unequal. And we should be thankful for that “precious gift” of a “natural aristocracy” of virtue and talent that “creation” has provided for us. For the *aristoi*, the best, have been conferred upon us by nature to lead and instruct us. Not only are some individuals superior, there are superior peoples. “The yeomanry of the United States are not the canaille of Paris,” Jefferson wrote to Lafayette in 1815.⁹

Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers saw themselves as belonging to an aristocratic elite in whose custody the republic was best entrusted. Jefferson never recanted these views. In his autobiography, written forty-five years after the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson was still writing of “the aristocracy of virtue and talent which nature has wisely provided for the direction of the interests of society.”¹⁰

On Jefferson and equality, Bertrand Russell observed: “In America everybody is of the opinion that he has no social superiors, since all men are equal, but he does not admit that he has no social inferiors, for, from the time of Jefferson onward, the doctrine that all men are equal applies only upwards, not downwards.”¹¹

THE SILENCE OF MR. MADISON

Remarkably, the Constitution not only does not mandate equality, it does not mention equality. Writes Yale professor Willmoore Kendall, a mentor of William F. Buckley Jr.:

The Framers ... did not so much as mention the topic of equality in the new instrument of government—not even in the Preamble, where, remember, they pause to list the purposes (a more perfect union, the blessings of liberty, justice, etc.) for which We the people ordain and establish the Constitution, and, where, if nowhere else, one might expect them to recall that first proposition of the Declaration, under which and for which, remember, they had just fought a great war.¹²

In the Constitution James Madison largely drafted in Philadelphia in 1787, there is no reference whatsoever to the most famous words of the Declaration of Independence that his Virginia neighbor had written in Philadelphia in 1776. Nor is equality mentioned anywhere in *The Federalist Papers* of which Madison was principal author. Nor is equality mentioned in the Bill of Rights, the ten amendments to the Constitution Madison introduced in the first Congress, although the Virginia Declaration of Rights, in which Madison surely had a hand, “begins with at least a courtly bow to equality.” Writes Kendall, “Publius ... has a way, if I may put it so, of clamming up whenever (as does sometimes happen) the topic of equality heaves into sight.”¹³

Publius was the pen name shared by Madison, Hamilton, and John Jay in *The Federalist Papers*. How can America have been dedicated from birth to the equality of all men when her birth certificate, the Constitution, does not mention equality, five of her first seven presidents, Madison included, were slaveholders, and the Supreme Court, seven decades after the Constitution was ratified, declared that slaves could never be citizens?

“WE CAN NOT ... MAKE THEM EQUALS”

What of Lincoln? Did the author of the Emancipation Proclamation believe in the equality of all men?

The Lincoln Americans know, the father figure with the wise and wonderful wit who came out of Illinois to free the slaves, who would have marched with Martin Luther King—this Lincoln would be unrecognizable to his contemporaries. While as early as 1854 Lincoln condemned slavery as a

“monstrous injustice” and bravely took the anti-slavery side in his debates with Stephen Douglas, here is the Republican Senate candidate on the stump, in Charleston, Illinois, on September 18, 1858, after having been baited by the “Little Giant” on where he stood on social and political equality:

I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races,—that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races from living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.¹⁴

For a candidate to make such a white-supremacist statement today would mean the end of his career. Four years earlier, at Peoria on October 16, 1854, Lincoln confessed his ambivalence as to what should be done with the freedmen, were slavery to be abolished:

If all earthly power were given me, I should not know what to do, as to the existing institution. My first impulse would be to free all the slaves, and send them to Liberia,—to their own native land.... [But] Free them, and make them politically and socially, our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not.... A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded, can not be safely disregarded. We can not, then, make them equals.¹⁵

Lincoln is saying that a belief in white supremacy is a “universal feeling” of the “great mass of white people” in America. And he shares it. He believed in

freedom for all, but not equality for all, other than that black and white share a common humanity and have an equal right to be free. After his assertion “We can not ... make them equals,” Lincoln continued:

I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas, he is not my equal in many respects,—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual achievements. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.¹⁶

Eloquent, and, in its time, heroic.

At the time of the Dred Scott decision in 1857, which he deplored, Lincoln explained his views as to what the Founding Fathers meant with those famous words in Philadelphia:

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness, in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal in “certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” This they said, and this They meant.¹⁷

What Lincoln is saying is this: Negroes have the same God-given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as white men and the declaration of 1776 is a promissory note they shall one day enjoy those same rights. But while all men are equal in God-given rights, they are not equal in God-given talents.

A man must be measured against his time. “[J]udge not that ye be not

judged!” said Lincoln in his Second Inaugural. His position on slavery, that it was evil and he would have no part in it, was that of a principled politician of courage. His views on equality were the views of his countrymen.

But if Lincoln did not go to war to make men equal, did he go to war to “make men free”? No. Lincoln went to war to restore the Union after the flag was fired on at Fort Sumter. In his first inaugural address, on March 4, 1861, he offered the seven seceded states the assistance of the federal government in running down fugitive slaves and endorsed an amendment to the Constitution to make slavery permanent in all 15 states where it existed. As he wrote Horace Greeley on August 22, 1862, “My paramount object in this struggle *is* to save the Union and is *not* either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing *any* slave I would do it....”¹⁸

Nevertheless, on January 1, 1863, in his Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln declared free slaves in rebel-held territory, and supported a constitutional amendment to free all slaves. And in his second inaugural, a month before his death in April 1865, Lincoln declared,

Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled up by the bond-man’s two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, “the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether.”

Lincoln’s second inaugural could have been written by John Brown. Lincoln is saying that we Americans are being punished by God for having enslaved these people for two and half centuries and having failed to live up to the meaning of our creed. He is declaring the six hundred thousand American dead already piled up as God’s righteous retribution upon us as a people.

Yet the Second Inaugural is not about the equality of all men. It is about the equal right of all to be free, about an end to slavery. Not for ninety years after the Declaration of Independence did the idea of equality—missing from the

Constitution, the Bill of Rights, *The Federalist Papers*, and from national policy —appear. And then it was in the Fourteenth Amendment and was restricted to the “equal protection of the laws.”

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

EQUALITY—THEN AND NOW

The Fourteenth Amendment did not mandate or mention social, political, or economic equality. The Congress that approved it in 1866 had established and segregated the Washington, D.C., public schools.¹⁹ Twenty-four of the thirty-seven existing states at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was proposed segregated their schools.²⁰ In the 1875 Civil Rights Act, the issue of segregation in D.C. and the states did not even come up.²¹ In *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), segregation was upheld by the Supreme Court as consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment.

In Washington, D.C., the public schools were segregated until *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), which overturned *Plessy*. But *Brown* was not based on the Constitution. It was based on sociology. The headline on James Reston’s story in the *New York Times* on May 13, 1954, read: “A Sociological Decision: Court Founded Its Segregation Ruling on Hearts and Minds Rather than Laws.”²²

Not until the 1960s did courts begin to use the Fourteenth Amendment to impose a concept of equality that the authors of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, *The Federalist Papers*, and the Gettysburg Address never believed in. Before the 1960s, equality meant every citizen enjoyed the same constitutional rights and the equal protection of existing laws. Nothing in the Constitution or federal law mandated social, racial, or gender equality. While the nation by the 1960s supported federal action to end segregation where it still existed, it was understood that inequalities of incomes

and rewards were the inevitable concomitant of a competitive and free society.

1963: “LET FREEDOM RING”

In August 1963 at the Lincoln Memorial in the centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, Martin Luther King rose to deliver one of the memorable addresses of American history. His theme, however, was not equality. He mentioned it but twice, first together with freedom and next when he quoted Jefferson: “I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed, ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.’” The goal of the famous March on Washington was “Jobs and Freedom” and the theme of King’s speech was declared in his opening line: “I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.”²³ Freedom is mentioned a dozen times by King and repeated another ten times in his closing refrain, “Let freedom ring.”

What freedoms did King demand? Freedom from the “manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination” and freedom from “a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity.”²⁴

1965: “FREEDOM IS NOT ENOUGH”

In the Senate debate over the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Hubert Humphrey assured the nation that the law being enacted “does not require an employer to achieve any kind of racial balance in his work force by giving any kind of preferential treatment to any individual or group.”²⁵

Not until 1965 did the goal of the civil rights movement shift from an end to segregation to social and economic equality. The great leap forward came at Howard University in the 1965 commencement address, when the freedom King had spoken of was superseded and replaced by “equality as a fact and equality as a result.”²⁶

President Lyndon Johnson began that address by describing freedom as but the first stage of “the revolution”: “Freedom is the right to share, share fully and

equally, in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.”²⁷

While the “beginning is freedom,” said Johnson, “freedom is not enough.... it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates.”²⁸

This is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity. We seek not ... just equality as a right and a theory but equality as a fact and equality as a result....

[E]qual opportunity is essential, but not enough, not enough. Men and women of all races are born with the same range of abilities. But ability is not just the product of birth. Ability is stretched or stunted by the family that you live with, and the neighborhood you live in—by the school you go to and the poverty or the richness of your surroundings. It is the product of a hundred unseen forces playing upon the little infant, the child, and finally the man.²⁹

Law professor William Quirk wrote of Johnson’s shift of national goals—from no discrimination based on race to full equality of results based on race: “The people never agreed to that. Every poll ever taken shows that 80 percent of the people do not agree with that. Nothing in the Constitution said that. None of the statutes the Congress has passed said anything like that.”³⁰ Johnson had committed the nation to a concept of equality American novelist James Fenimore Cooper called an impossibility in civilized society:

Equality in a social sense may be divided into that of condition and that of right. Equality of condition is incompatible with civilization and is found only to exist in those communities that are but slightly removed from the savage state. In practice, it can only mean a common misery.³¹

Johnson's equality of result would soon be expanded to include men and women and Anglos and Hispanics. In *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* (1978), the Supreme Court declared that racial discrimination against whites to advance equality in America was now constitutional and moral. Said Justice Harry Blackmun: "In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way. And in order to treat some persons equally, we must treat them differently. We cannot—we dare not—let the Equal Protection Clause perpetuate racial supremacy."³²

Blackmun was saying that if free and fair competition in our society repeatedly yields unequal results and rewards because one group has been crippled by history, the state must step in to assure an equality of prizes. Yet this concept of equality had no basis in the Constitution, the Fourteenth Amendment as written and intended, or in the civil rights laws of the 1960s to which Congress and the country assented. This idea of equality is rooted in an egalitarian ideology that is the antithesis of what the Founding Fathers and every president before Lyndon Johnson believed—if Johnson believed what he was saying.

Those who would change society begin by changing the meaning of words. At Howard University, LBJ changed the meaning of equality from the attainable—an end to segregation and a legislated equality of rights for African Americans—to the impossible: a socialist utopia. For where outside of socialist ideology is it dogma that "Men and women of all races are born with the same range of abilities." It is more true to say that no two men or women were ever born equal. Talents are unequally distributed not only within ethnic groups but within families. To impose an equality of rewards for unequal accomplishments is to nullify one of the goals of our Constitution—"to establish justice." It is to replace justice with injustice.

The only way to achieve equality when a free market, free associations, and free competition fail to deliver it is to use state power to forcibly bring about parities of income, influence, rewards, and riches. This is socialism.

At Howard, LBJ declared that the promise of America's Revolution was insufficient for his revolution. Noting the disproportionate levels of poverty and income in America, he declared:

These differences are not [the result of] racial differences. They are solely and simply the consequences of ancient brutality, past injustice, and present prejudice.... For the Negro they are a constant reminder of prejudice. For the white they are a constant reminder of guilt. But they must be faced and they must be dealt with and they must be overcome, if we are ever to reach the time when the only difference between Negroes and whites is the color of their skin.³³

Did Lyndon Johnson truly believe that all racial inequalities are due “solely and simply” to racism, that if the prejudice of white America is “overcome,” then “equality as a fact and equality as a result” will magically appear, and “the only difference between Negroes and whites” will be “the color of their skin”?

Where is the empirical evidence for this assertion? There is none. This is pure egalitarian ideology. As Murray Rothbard wrote, “Since egalitarians start with the *a priori* axiom that all people and hence all groups of people, are ... equal, it then follows for them that any and all group differences in status, prestige, or authority in society *must* be the result of unjust ‘oppression’ and irrational ‘discrimination.’”³⁴

The proof of LBJ’s “a priori axiom” is nonexistent. Indeed, LBJ’s speech contradicts itself. He says that unemployment for blacks and whites was the same in 1930, but black unemployment is now twice that of whites. He says that black teenage unemployment was less than that of whites in 1948, but has since tripled to 23 percent. He says that income disparity widened during the 1950s. In short, in the decades when segregation was dying out, blacks were falling further behind. How can improving white attitudes toward black Americans be the cause of worsening conditions in black America?

Aristotle said, “Democracy ... arises out of the notion that those who are equal in any respect are equal in all respects.” The Founding Fathers and Lincoln disbelieved in this “notion” of equality. LBJ embraced it. And ever since, we have been trying to create an egalitarian society based on that false notion. We will not succeed. The republic will die before we do.

“INEQUALITY IS NATURAL”

Historians Will and Ariel Durant, authors of an eleven-volume series of monumental books written over four decades, *The Story of Civilization*, arrived at the opposite conclusion.

In *The Lessons of History*, the Durants conclude: “Nature ... has not read very carefully the American Declaration of Independence or the French Revolutionary Declaration of the Rights of Man.”³⁵

[W]e are all born unfree and unequal: subject to our physical and psychological heredity, and to the customs and traditions of our group; diversely endowed in health and strength, in mental capacity and qualities of character. Nature loves differences as the necessary material of selection and evolution; identical twins differ in a hundred ways, and no two peas are alike.³⁶

Inequality “is not only natural and inborn, it grows with the complexity of civilization.”³⁷ In refutation of everything LBJ said at Howard, the Durants declare:

Nature smiles at the union of freedom and equality in our utopias. For freedom and equality are sworn and everlasting enemies, and when one prevails the other dies. Leave men free, and their natural inequalities will multiply almost geometrically, as in England and America in the nineteenth century under *laissez-faire*. To check the growth of inequality, liberty must be sacrificed, as in Russia after 1917.³⁸

Again, “To check the growth of inequality, liberty must be sacrificed.”

That is the point of this chapter. Where equality is enthroned, freedom is extinguished. The rise of the egalitarian society means the death of the free society. “Liberty by its very nature ... is inegalitarian,” writes Jude Dougherty, dean emeritus of the School of Philosophy at Catholic University: “Men differ in

strength, intelligence, ambition, courage, perseverance and all else that makes for success. There is no method to make men both free and equal.”³⁹

When we consider the revolutions dedicated to equality—the French Revolution of Marat and Robespierre, the Russian Revolution of Lenin and Trotsky, the Chinese Revolution of Mao, the Cuban Revolution of Castro and Che Guevara—are the Durants not right? Is Dougherty not right?

The contention that men and women are equal is found in feminist ideology not human nature. Men are bigger, stronger, more aggressive. That is why men commit crimes and are imprisoned at a rate of ten to one over women.⁴⁰ That is why men fight wars, lead armies, and build empires. Men’s intelligence levels range higher and lower than those of women. Men reach heights of achievement in mathematics, science, and philosophy few women attain. Men also reach greater depths of depravity. In sports, where Americans demand the best, men and women compete separately.

The first article of France’s Declaration of Human Rights echoes Jefferson and Rousseau: “Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good.” But are infants born free? And who decides what is the “general good”? As for equality of rights, yes, but children are not all born equal in the ability to learn. Half are below average. Two months into first grade, children know they are not equal. Some are bright, others slow. Some are athletic, others are not. Some can sing, others cannot. Some girls are pretty, others plain. “So far is it from being true that men are naturally equal that no two people can be half an hour together but one acquires an evident superiority over the other,” said Samuel Johnson.⁴¹

In the Old and New Testament are all people equal? Jews were the Chosen People to whom God promised the messiah. The Son of God, his mother, and the twelve apostles were Jews. Among his disciples, Christ preferred John, elevated Peter to be the rock upon which he would build his church, and condemned Judas. In the parable of the talents, the servants are unequally endowed and each is expected to produce consistent with his talents. If Christ taught that some are more gifted than others, the egalitarianism espoused at Howard is in conflict with our Christian faith. Paul affirmed it in his letter to the Romans: “We have gifts differing according to the grace that has been given us.”

THE DODO

Observing the contortions ideologues go through to ensure equality of result, one is reminded of the “Caucus-race” in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*. Everyone “began running when they liked, and left off when they liked,” and “when they had been running half an hour or so ... the Dodo suddenly called out ‘The race is over!’ and they all crowded round it, panting, and asking, ‘But who has won?’

“At last the Dodo said, ‘*everybody* has won, and all must have prizes.’”⁴²

The ideologue begins with an idea—all are equal and should have equal shares of the good things in life—then proceeds to try to force society to conform to this ideal. “The ideologue,” wrote Russell Kirk, “thinks of politics as a revolutionary instrument for transforming society and even transforming human nature. In the march toward Utopia, the ideologue is merciless.”⁴³

To the ideologue, adds Professor Gillis Harp, of Grove City College, “Facts don’t matter and character assassination is permissible.”⁴⁴ The rampant use today in public discourse of terms of anathema and abuse such as “racist,” “sexist,” and “homophobe” testifies to how intolerant the egalitarian is toward those who disbelieve in the core doctrine of his faith.

“Utopias of equality are biologically doomed,” said the Durants.⁴⁵ “You may drive out Nature with a pitchfork,” said the Roman poet Horace, “yet she will always hasten back.” Whether it be in sports, the arts, music, education, or politics, free and fair competition allows a natural aristocracy to assert and distinguish itself. Freedom produces a hierarchy based on intelligence, talent, and perseverance. The African American leader W. E. B. Du Bois wrote, in a 1903 essay, that the highest priority of his people should be to elevate and educate that natural aristocracy, “The Talented Tenth” of black America.

The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination

and death of the Worst, in their own and other races.⁴⁶

A nation dedicated to the proposition that all are equal and entitled to equal rewards must end up constantly discriminating against its talented tenth, for that is the only way a free society can guarantee social and economic equality. And consider the costs incurred, the injustices done, the freedoms curtailed—all in the name of equality.

- Hundreds of thousands of children have been ordered bused out of their neighborhoods to inferior and often dangerous schools, igniting racial conflict, causing white flight, abandonment of urban schools, and the ruin of public education—a crown jewel of American civilization.
- The right of businesses to hire and promote based on ability and performance has been subjected for decades to policing by tens of thousands of government agents. If a labor force does not reflect gender equality or the racial composition of the community, the company may be prosecuted.
- Governments impose de facto race and gender quotas that add hugely to the cost of doing business. Scores of billions have been siphoned off from companies in class action law suits brought for alleged discrimination in one of the more lucrative rackets in American history.
- The top 1 percent of wage and salary earners now carries 40 percent of the entire income tax load while the bottom 50 percent carry none of it. Was it not the Communist Manifesto that called for a “heavy progressive or graduated income tax”?
- In a nation once renowned for its freedom of speech, censorship is spreading with speech codes on campuses and hate crimes laws that punish speech offensive to the egalitarian dogma that all races, all ethnic groups, and all sexual orientations are to be equally respected.
- To assure equality of all religions, Christianity, our cradle faith, has been purged from the nation’s public schools and public square and

treated as just another religion.

- Universities are now required by Title IX to equalize expenditures on men's and women's sports, leading to the elimination of men's sports teams and the creation of women's teams for which there is little or no demand.
- Almost all men's colleges have been forced to admit women.
- VMI and the Citadel were forced to admit female cadets although the schools, the alumni, and the mothers, wives, and sisters of VMI and Citadel cadets and graduates protested this judicially mandated end to their 150-year-old tradition.
- Men have been discriminated against so relentlessly that women with jobs now outnumber them, and men sustained 70 to 80 percent of all job losses in the Great Recession.⁴⁷
- Southern states must still appeal to Justice Department bureaucrats for permission to make minor changes in election laws.
- Dunbar High, perhaps the finest elite black high school in America, which produced generals and senators and sent a higher share of its graduates to college than any Washington, D.C., institution, was converted in the name of equality into a neighborhood school and became one of the most troubled schools in the city.
- In *Baker v. Carr* (1962), the Supreme Court forbade all states from modeling their legislatures on Congress and mandated that all states be apportioned on population alone. Purpose: impose one-man, one-vote democracy, which our fathers rejected when they gave Delaware and Rhode Island the same number of senators as Massachusetts and Virginia.
- In the name of equality, the Supreme Court has declared the practice of homosexuality to be a constitutional right.
- Vaughn Walker, a gay federal judge in San Francisco, has ruled that same-sex marriage is guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Can anyone believe this absurd notion of equality was intended by or written into the Constitution by the Congress that produced the 14th Amendment?

- Although gay marriage has been rejected in thirty-one states in referenda, judges continue to declare that such unions be treated as marriages. An idea of equality rejected democratically by voters is being imposed dictatorially.
- In December 2010, a repudiated liberal Congress imposed its San Francisco values on the armed forces by ordering homosexuals admitted to all branches of the service. Indoctrination of recruits, soldiers, and officers into an acceptance of the gay life style will transfer authority over the military, the most respected institution in America, to agents of a deeply resented and widely detested managerial state.
- To bring black and Hispanic home ownership to parity with that of whites, George W. Bush pushed banks into making millions of sub-prime mortgages, defaults on which may yet bring down our free-enterprise system. Egalitarianism may prove to be the murder weapon of American capitalism.
- In the name of equality for all the world's peoples, the Immigration Act of 1965 threw open the nation's doors converting America into what Theodore Roosevelt called a "polyglot boarding house" for the world.

When one considers the scores of thousands of bureaucrats in federal, state, and local government, at colleges and in corporations, all working to insure proportional representation of races, ethnic groups, and genders, we begin to see how equality and freedom are at war and why America is a failing nation.

The pursuit of race, gender, ethnic, and economic equality is utopian. Imagine that a regime committed to absolute equality confiscated all the property and wealth of the nation and redistributed it in equal portions. How long would it be before the more able and aggressive citizens would repossess that wealth? Confiscation and redistribution would have to begin anew.

"An egalitarian society," wrote Rothbard, "can only hope to achieve its goals by totalitarian methods of coercion; and, even here, we all believe and hope the human spirit of individual man will rise up and thwart any such attempts to

achieve an ant-heap world.”⁴⁸

No two men were more unlike than Rothbard and George Kennan. Here they agreed. “I am anything but an egalitarian,” Kennan told Eric Sevareid. “I am very much opposed to egalitarian tendencies of all sorts.”⁴⁹ Biographer Leo Congdon says that Kennan “viewed the passion for equality as the product of envy and resentment.”⁵⁰

Yet even professed conservatives have succumbed to the siren’s call of egalitarianism. When Californians voted in Proposition 8 to restrict marriage to a man and a woman, former solicitor general Ted Olson said the voters had violated the equal protection clause of the Constitution. “The Constitution of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and Abraham Lincoln does not permit” denying homosexuals the right to marry.⁵¹

Is Olson aware that the Constitution of Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln did not contain the words “equal” or “equality” or have an equal protection clause? All three presidents were dead before the Fourteenth Amendment was added. Is Olson aware that Jefferson equated homosexuality with rape and believed homosexuals should be castrated and lesbians punished by “cutting thro’ the cartilage of her nose a hole of one half inch diameter at the least”?⁵²

This is no endorsement of Jefferson’s proposal, but it is further proof that the egalitarian extremism of the late twentieth and the early twenty-first centuries is rooted not in the history of this republic but in the ideology of modern man.

EQUALIZING TEST SCORES

Nowhere has the egalitarian impulse proven more costly or failed more dismally than in the drive to close the racial gap in test scores. And it is not as though we were not warned.

In 1966, a year after LBJ enacted his Elementary and Secondary Education Act, moving the federal government massively into the state and local province of public education, came the famous Coleman Report of 1966. In a review of the performance of two-thirds of a million children, writes Charles Murray, the Harvard-and MIT-trained social scientist:

To everyone's shock, the Coleman Report ... found that the quality of schools explains almost nothing about differences in academic achievement. Measures such as the credentials of the teachers, the curriculum, the extensiveness and newness of physical facilities, money spent per student—none of the things that people assumed were important in explaining educational achievement were important in fact. Family background was far and away the most important factor in determining student achievement.⁵³

Nature and nurture, heredity and home environment, brains and motivation, the study found, these are the primary determinants of pupil performance.

In 1971, the *Atlantic Monthly* ran a cover article by Harvard's Richard Herrnstein. His thesis was that even if we are able to equalize the home and school environment of all children, natural academic ability will enable some children to outperform others. No matter how much money is invested in reducing class size and enhancing teacher training, an "hereditary meritocracy" will arise in a public school system where expenditures are equal.⁵⁴

Coleman and Herrnstein were teaching predestination in education. They were implying that the national effort just launched to raise the test scores of minority children to parity with the scores of white children was an experiment noble in purpose but doomed to fail. But pessimism about the ability of

government to succeed in its ambitions was not in vogue when government was being hailed as architect and builder of the Great Society.

America plunged forward. U.S. and state governments and local school districts began the most massive investment in education in all of history. Expenditures per pupil doubled and tripled. Head Start, a preschool program for low-income children established in 1965, was lavishly funded. Perhaps \$200 billion was poured into Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provided additional funds to schools based on their population of low-income students.

What were the results? Writes Murray, “no evaluation from Title I from the 1970s onward has found credible evidence of a significant positive impact on student achievement.... A 2001 study by the Department of Education revealed that the gap widened rather than diminished.”

George W. Bush attacked the disparity between majority and minority school achievement anew with his No Child Left Behind law. The Department of Education budget doubled again. What was accomplished? Judging by test scores, writes Murray, “NCLB has done nothing to raise reading skills despite the enormous effort that has been expended.”

The notion that we know how to make more than modest improvements in [children’s] math and reading performance has no factual basis ... even the best schools under the best conditions cannot overcome the limits of achievement set by the limits on academic ability.⁵⁵

Heather Mac Donald, of the Manhattan Institute, provides corroborating evidence. “On the 2006 SAT, the average score in the critical-reading section was 434 for blacks, 527 for whites, and 510 for Asians; in the math section 429 for blacks, 536 for whites, and 587 for Asians.”⁵⁶

In a 2005 ranking of fifty states and Washington, D.C., by how much each spent per pupil, New York ranked first, D.C. third.⁵⁷ The fruits of this investment of tax dollars: in some D.C. high schools, half of all minority students drop out. Of those who graduate, half are reading and doing math at seventh-, eighth-, or

ninth-grade levels. Near the top of the nation in tax dollars spent per pupil, Washington, D.C., is at the bottom in academic achievement.

In 2007, the U.S. graduation rate for high school students fell for the second straight year to 69 percent.⁵⁸ Forty-six percent of blacks, 44 percent of Hispanics, and 49 percent of Native American students failed to earn a diploma in four years. Back in 1969, 77 percent of high school students earned their diplomas in four years. America is not treading water. America is sinking.

In 2009 came a report from New York that made D.C. schools look like MIT. Some two hundred students in their first math class at City University of New York were tested on basic skills. Two-thirds of these college freshmen could not convert a decimal into a fraction. Ninety percent could not do simple algebra.⁵⁹

Hailing his schools chancellor Joel Klein, Mayor Michael Bloomberg boasted in 2009, “We are closing the shameful achievement gap faster than ever.” When the 2010 state test scores came in, however, the achievement gap was back. “Among the students in the city’s third through eighth grades,” wrote the *Times*, “33 percent of black students and 34 percent of Hispanic students are now proficient [in English], compared with 64 percent among whites and Asians.” School officials now acknowledge “a test score bubble.”⁶⁰

When Klein stepped down, the *Daily News* summed up his record: “Test scores went up steadily until last year, when they plunged to abysmal levels when exams got tougher.”⁶¹ As Klein was resigning, the Council of the Great City Schools issued a report containing what it described as “jaw-dropping data.” The *New York Times* story began:

An achievement gap separating black from white students has long been documented—a social divide extremely vexing to policy makers and the target of one blast of school reform after another.

But a new report focusing on black males suggests that the picture is even bleaker than generally known.⁶²

Using the highly respected National Assessment for Educational Progress tests, the council found that poor white boys eligible for free meals at school performed as well in math and reading as black boys from middle class and

affluent neighborhoods. Said Ronald Ferguson, director of the Achievement Gap Initiative at Harvard:

There's accumulating evidence that there are racial differences in what kids experience before the first day of kindergarten.... They have to do with a lot of sociological and historical forces. In order to address those, we have to be able to have conversations that people are unwilling to have.⁶³

The council report naturally urged Congress to “appropriate more money for schools.”⁶⁴ Yet there are people willing to have those “conversations.” One is Robert Weissberg, professor of political science emeritus at the University of Illinois and author of *Bad Students, Not Bad Schools*, who agrees with Charles Murray that “the ‘democratization’ of schooling—a diploma for nearly everyone—that brings those into the classroom who can barely master the material and, critically, to insist that these youngsters can be proficient is romantic foolishness.”⁶⁵ The beginning of real school reform is not to babysit indolent or unruly students but to get them out of the schools.

If one single genuine “magic bullet” cure for America’s education decline exists, it would be to eliminate the bottom quarter of those past 8th grade. Unfortunately, the “democratization” of education seems to be irresistible as educational reformers increasingly call for enrolling semiliterates in college as if a degree itself certifies proficiency.⁶⁶

Weissberg believes we should push students to the limits of their ability, then push them again, and, when they have ceased to learn, push them out the door and accept the reality that all are not equal in their aptitude for and attitude about academic learning. This used to be called common sense.

THE GLOBAL GAP IN TEST SCORES

“That speaks about who is going to be leading tomorrow,” said Angel Gurria,

secretary-general of the Paris-based Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which, every three years, holds its Program for International Student Assessment tests of the reading, math, and science skills of fifteen year olds worldwide.⁶⁷ Gurria was referring to the results of the 2009 Program for International Student Assessment tests. Sixty-five nations competed. Chinese students swept the board. The schools of Shanghai finished first in math, reading, and science. Hong Kong was third in math and science. Singapore, a city-state dominated by overseas Chinese, was second in math and fourth in science.

And the United States? America ranked seventeenth in reading, twenty-third in science, thirty-first in math. “This is an absolute wake-up call for America,” said Education Secretary Arne Duncan. “We have to face the brutal truth. We have to get much more serious about investment in education.”⁶⁸

Yet a closer look at the PISA scores reveals some unacknowledged truths. While Northeast Asians are turning in the top scores, followed by Europeans, Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders, looking down the list of the top thirty nations, one finds not a single Latin American nation, not a single African nation, not a single Muslim nation, not a single South Asian or Southeast Asian nation (save Singapore), not a single nation of the former Soviet Union except Latvia and Estonia. Among the OECD’s thirty-four members, the most developed nations on earth, Mexico, the principal feeder nation for U.S. schools, came in dead last in reading.

Steve Sailer got the full list of sixty-five nations, broke down the U.S. reading scores by ethnicity, and measured American students against the continents and the countries from which their families originated. What he found was startling. Asian American students outperformed all Asian students except those from Shanghai. White Americans outperformed the students from all thirty-seven predominantly white nations except Finland. U.S. Hispanics outperformed the students of all eight Latin American countries that participated. African American kids outperformed the only black country to participate, Trinidad and Tobago, by 25 points.⁶⁹

America’s schools are not all abject failures. They are successfully educating immigrants and their descendants to outperform the kinfolk their parents or

ancestors left behind when they came to America. What America's schools are failing at, despite the trillions poured into schools since the 1965 Primary and Secondary Education Act, is closing the racial divide. We do not know how to close test-score gaps in reading, science, and math between Anglo and Asian students on one hand and black and Hispanic students on the other. And, judging from the PISA tests, neither does the world.

The gap between the test scores of East Asian and European nations and Latin American and African nations mirrors the gap between Asian and Anglo students in the United States and black and Hispanic students in the United States.

As the Heritage Foundation reported after analyzing the PISA reading test results, "If white American students were counted as a separate group, their PISA reading scores would rank them third in the world. Hispanics and black Americans, however, would score 31st and 33rd respectively."⁷⁰

"America's educational woes reflect our demographic mix of students," writes Weissberg:

Today's schools are filled with millions of youngsters, many of whom are Hispanic immigrants struggling with English plus millions of others of mediocre intellectual ability disdaining academic achievement.... To be grossly politically incorrect most of America's educational woes vanish if these indifferent, troublesome students left when they had absorbed as much as they were going to learn and were replaced by learning-hungry students from Korea, Japan, India, Russia, Africa, and the Caribbean.⁷¹

Education reformer Michelle Rhee asserts that, "It is abundantly clear from the research that the most important school factor in determining a child's success is the quality of the teacher in the front of the classroom."⁷²

But is this really "abundantly clear"? With the Coleman Report and Charles Murray, Weissberg dissents, arguing that 80 percent of a child's success depends on the cognitive ability and disposition he or she brings to class, not on textbooks or "the teacher in front of the classroom." If brains and a desire to

learn are absent, no amount of spending on schools, teacher salaries, educational consultants, or new texts will matter.

Even if we could equalize the home environment, and the school environment, for all children, we would still not get equal test scores. As *Discover* magazine science blogger Razib Khan writes, “When you remove the environmental variance, the cognitive variance remains.”⁷³

BURNING HERETICS

A refusal to accept what human experience teaches is the mark of the ideologue. At a January 2005 academic conclave, Harvard President Larry Summers was asked why there were so few women receiving tenure in mathematics and the hard sciences. Summers volunteered that it might be due to unequal abilities of men and women. “In the special case of science and engineering, there are issues of intrinsic aptitude, and particularly of the variability of aptitude,” said Summers, wading out into treacherous waters. These may cause “the different availability of aptitude at the high end.”⁷⁴

“I felt I was going to be sick,” said MIT biology professor Nancy Hopkins. “My heart was pounding and my breath was shallow.... I just couldn’t breathe because this kind of bias makes me physically ill.” Had she not fled the room, said Hopkins, “I would’ve either blacked out or thrown up.”⁷⁵

A year later, Summers was subjected to a “lack-of-confidence” and censure vote by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences—and was gone. Egalitarianism is an ideology not terribly tolerant of dissent.

A year after Summers’s departure, Dr. James Watson, winner, with Dr. Francis Crick, of the 1962 Nobel Prize for their discovery of the double-helix structure of DNA, volunteered to the *Sunday Times* that he was “inherently gloomy about the prospect of Africa,” as “all our social policies are based on the fact that their intelligence is the same as ours—whereas all the testing says not really.”⁷⁶

Watson’s 2007 autobiography, *Avoid Boring People: Lessons from a Life in Science*, was then found to contain this heresy:

There is no firm reason to anticipate that the intellectual capacities of peoples geographically separated in their evolution should prove to have evolved identically. Our wanting to reserve equal powers of reason as some universal heritage of humanity will not be enough to make it so.⁷⁷

Watson's address to London's Science Museum was immediately canceled, as was his book tour. And he was compelled to resign as the director of Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, where he had served for forty years.

"I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it," said Voltaire to Rousseau. "Error of opinion may be tolerated where truth is free to combat it," said Jefferson. What does it say about twenty-first-century liberalism, and what does it say about twenty-first-century America, that one of her greatest scientists can be flogged, fired, and forced to recant beliefs he has formed from a lifetime of study and experience?

In *Human Accomplishment: The Pursuit of Excellence in the Arts and Sciences, 800 B.C. to 1950*, Murray looked at four thousand significant figures and the world's greatest achievements in science, art, music, philosophy, and mathematics. He concluded that 97 percent of the most significant figures and 97 percent of the greatest achievements in astronomy, biology, earth sciences, physics, mathematics, medicine, and technology came from Europe or North America. An astonishing record for one civilization. Women were credited with 0 percent of the achievements in philosophy, 1.7 percent in the sciences, 2.3 percent of the greatest Western art, 4.4 percent of great Western literature, and two-tenths of 1 percent of great Western music.⁷⁶

It is a time for truth. As most kids do not have the athletic ability to play high school sports, or the musical ability to play in the band, or the verbal ability to excel in debate, not every child has the academic ability to do high school work. No two children are created equal, not even identical twins. The family is the incubator of inequality and God its author. Given equal opportunities, the gifted will rise and the less talented, athletically, artistically, academically, will trail. Yet for forty years, writes Charles Murray, "American leaders have been unwilling to discuss the underlying differences in academic ability that children bring to the classroom."⁷⁹

In "The Inequality Taboo," an essay in the September 2005 issue of *Commentary*, Murray writes that the mistaken assumption behind affirmative action is that if all socially imposed impediments to equality were removed, true equality would exist.

Affirmative action ... assumes there are no innate differences between any of the groups it seeks to help and everyone else. The assumption of no innate differences among groups suffuses American social policy. That assumption is wrong.

When the outcomes that these policies are supposed to produce fail to occur, with one group falling short, the fault for the discrepancy has been assigned to society. It continues to be assumed that better programs, better regulations, or the right court decisions can make the differences go away. That assumption is also wrong.⁸⁰

Watching America's exertions to achieve an unattainable equality—through affirmative action, quotas, set asides, progressive taxes, and a mammoth welfare state—brings to mind Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The BirthMark." In that short story, the scientist Aylmer, passionately in love with his beautiful young wife, Georgiana, becomes obsessed with a small red birthmark on her cheek in the shape of a hand. Coming to hate the birthmark, Aylmer conducts a dangerous surgery to remove it—to make his wife perfect. He removes the imperfection, and his wife dies. Our pursuit of the perfect, an ideal nation where at last all are equal, is killing the country.

EQUALITY AS POLITICAL WEAPON

In revolutions where equality is the enthroned idol—in the French, Russian, Chinese, and Cuban revolutions—the dispossession of the old regime was often a merciless affair. Political and propertied classes, priests and poets, were sent to the guillotine, the Lubianka, the gallows, the firing squad, or the labor camp. And as the old order went off to jails, exile, and graves, the revolutionary elite, uglier and more brutal than those they displaced, moved into the palaces, mansions, and dachas.

George Orwell's *Animal Farm* got it right. The revolution rises on the slogan, "All animals are equal." But once power is attained, the pigs move up into the farmhouse and the slogan is amended to read, "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." The revolution to establish equality for all invariably ends up establishing the dictatorship of the few.

"Every revolution must have its myth," writes Duncan Williams, British professor of literature, "and the most persistent of these, and the one which, contrary to all human experience, has gained the most 'romantic' adherence over the past century and a half is the belief in the 'equality of man.'" From her life's work as an anthropologist, Margaret Mead concluded that this belief in equality is rooted in myths and dreams: "The assumption that men were created equal, with an equal ability to make an effort and win an earthly reward, although denied every day by experience, is maintained every day by our folk-lore and our day dreams." "In the realm of sport this belief seems curiously absent," writes Williams. "No man in his senses would dare to presume that he has, on the grounds of equality, an inalienable right to represent his country in the Olympic games, any more than a boy would imagine he can automatically claim a place in his school football team."⁸¹ Sports are too important to Americans to indulge such myths as the equality of all men.

Over the past half-century, we have plunged trillions of dollars into public education, a large share of which has gone toward efforts to close racial gaps. But we have never come close to achieving equality in test scores. We have created a mammoth welfare state, but the percentage below the poverty line

stopped dropping four decades ago. We have exempted half the nation from income taxes and laid three-fourths of the burden on the talented tenth. But we have never created equality of wealth and never will as long as we are a free people. Indeed, the more we become an economy based on knowledge, not manual labor, the wider the inequalities become. To create the egalitarian society that exists only in the minds of ideologues we are killing the wonderful country we inherited from the Greatest Generation.

For decades, we have maintained standing armies of bureaucrats whose pay and benefits far exceed those of the taxpayers who subsidize and sustain them. Eventually one realizes that this transfer of wealth and power from one class to another is really what the “equality” game is all about:

The doctrine of equality is unimportant, because no one save perhaps Pol Pot and Ben Wattenberg really believes in it, and no one, least of all those who profess it most loudly, is seriously motivated by it.... The real meaning of the doctrine of equality is that it serves as a political weapon.⁸²

So wrote author and essayist Sam Francis. A century and a half earlier, Tocqueville had seen through egalitarianism—to the drive for power that lay behind it.

[T]he sole condition which is required in order to succeed in centralizing the supreme power in a democratic community, is to love equality, or to get men to believe you love it. Thus the science of despotism, which was once so complex, is simplified, and reduced ... to a single principle.⁸³

Bertrand de Jouvenel, who lived through the Nazi occupation, echoed Tocqueville: “It is in the pursuit of Utopia that the aggrandizers of state power find their most effective ally. Only an immensely powerful apparatus can do all that the preachers of panacea government promise.”⁸⁴

Long before him, the Italian philosopher Vilfredo Pareto wrote that equality

“is related to the direct interests of individuals who are bent on escaping certain inequalities not in their favor, and setting up new inequalities that will be in their favor, this latter being their chief concern.”⁸⁵

Cui bono?—Who benefits?—is ever the relevant question. When a new class advances preaching the gospel of equality, who gets the power?

THE TRIUMPH OF TRIBALISM

*Wars between nations have given way to wars within nations.*¹

—BARACK OBAMA, 2009

Nobel Prize Address

*Ethnic ... rivalry is as old as sin, and as inextinguishable.*²

—SIR CHRISTOPHER MEYER, 2008

British Diplomat

*Ethnic and racial conflict, it seems evident, will now replace the conflict of ideologies as the explosive issue of our times.*³

—ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, 1991

*[N]ationalism is not resurgent; it never died. Neither did racism. They are the most powerful movements in the world today.*⁴

—ISAIAH BERLIN, 1991

A 2008 cover article in *Foreign Affairs* by Jerry Z. Muller, “Us and Them: The Enduring Power of Ethnic Nationalism,” argues that the relentless tug of tribal ties of blood and kinship will imperil the unity and survival of all of the multiethnic nations in the twenty-first century.

Americans generally belittle the role of ethnic nationalism in politics. But ... it corresponds to some enduring propensities of the human spirit, it is galvanized by modernization, and in one form or another, it will drive global politics for generations to come. Once ethnic nationalism has captured the imagination of groups in a multiethnic society, ethnic disaggregation or partition is often the least bad answer.⁵

Muller maintains that the drive of ethnic groups to separate and create nation-states in which their own unique culture, language, and faith are predominant and their own kind rule is among the most powerful drives of man. Remorseless and often irresistible, ethnonationalism caused the world wars and tore apart the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, he argues. And the wisest policy for the United States may be to get out of its way.

The West, Muller contends, has misread and mistaught itself its own history. A familiar and influential narrative of twentieth-century European history argues that nationalism twice led to war, in 1914 and then again in 1939. Thereafter, the story goes, Europeans concluded that nationalism was a danger and abandoned it. In the postwar era, Western Europeans enmeshed themselves in a web of transnational institutions, culminating in the European Union.⁶

This is not how it happened, writes Muller:

The creation of ethnonational states across Europe, a consequence of two world wars and ethnic cleansing, was a precondition of stability, unity and peace. With no ethnic rivals inside their national homes, European peoples had what they had fought for, and were now prepared to live in peace with their neighbors.

As a result of this massive process of ethnic unmixing, the ethnonationalist ideal was largely realized: for the most part, each nation in Europe had its own state, and each state was made up almost exclusively of a single ethnic nationality. During the Cold War, the few exceptions to this rule included Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia. But these countries' subsequent fate only demonstrated the ongoing vitality of ethnonationalism.⁷

Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia were dictatorships, held together by monolithic Communist parties. Had they not been police states, all would have disintegrated long before they did.

Muller holds that what happened in Europe in the twentieth century, the breakup of empires and nations into their ethnic components, is happening in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. The will to secede and establish one's own

national home, like the will of a son to leave his father's house and start his own family, is more powerful than any ideology, be it communism, socialism, fascism—or democracy.

[E]thnonationalism has played a more profound role in modern history than is commonly understood, and the processes that led to the dominance of the ethnonational state and the separation of ethnic groups in Europe are likely to reoccur elsewhere. In areas where that separation has not yet occurred, politics is apt to remain ugly.⁸

The ethnic violence rampant in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa is a reenactment of what Europe went through, a sorting out of tribes.

Muller's contention that ethnonationalism is embedded in human nature and ethnic homogeneity may be a precondition of liberal democracy and peace echoes Robert Putnam. And if these men are right, the more multiethnic and multiracial we make America, the closer we advance to the *bellum omnium contra omnes*, the war of all against all. In *Pandaemonium*, published in 1993, Senator Moynihan noted the remarkable blindness of foreign policy scholars to the power of ethnonationalism in our time:

There are today just eight states on earth which both existed in 1914 and have not had their form of government changed by violence since then. These are the United Kingdom, four present or former members of the Commonwealth, the United States, Sweden and Switzerland. Of the remaining 170 or so contemporary states, some are too recently created to have known much recent turmoil, but for the greater number that have gone, by far the most frequent factor involved has been ethnic conflict.⁹

“Yet it is possible,” Moynihan marveled, “to have studied international relations through the whole of the twentieth century and hardly to have noticed this.”¹⁰ Since *Pandaemonium* appeared, the United Kingdom, the United States, Sweden, and Switzerland have been torn by racial or religious divisions. And a

look back to the last century confirms Muller's thesis.

THE BALKAN WARS

The twentieth century opened during the longest European war since Napoleon. It was fought in Africa, where the Dutch-speaking Boer republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State were fighting to maintain their identity and independence. Not until Lord Kitchener set up his concentration camps for Boer women and children, to deprive Louis Botha's guerrillas of the support of their people, did the Boers yield in 1902.

Three years later, Norway, which had been detached from Denmark and ceded to Sweden when the Danes chose the wrong side in Napoleon's wars, broke free. The Norwegians were prepared to fight for independence, as were some Swedes to deny it to them. But statesmanship prevailed and the Norwegians departed to establish their own ethnonational home.

What happened in the Balkans, however, was anything but peaceful.

In the 1820s, the Greeks had broken free of the Ottoman Turks in a war of liberation to establish a nation of, by, and for Greeks alone. Of that struggle, Lord Byron, who perished in it, wrote:

*The mountains look on Marathon—
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dream'd that Greece might still be free;
For standing on the Persians' grave,
I could not deem myself a slave.*¹¹

By the twentieth century, Serbia, too, had her independence.

But the Balkans, which Bismarck dismissed as "not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier," were a boiling cauldron of ethnic discontent and conflict between The Habsburg, Romanov, and Ottoman empires. They were the "powder-keg" of Europe. Indeed, Bismarck had warned that when the Great War came, it would likely come "out of some damn fool thing in the Balkans."

In 1908, with Emperor Franz Josef in the sixtieth year of his reign, Austria annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina in violation of the 1878 Treaty of Berlin. With Russia reeling from her defeat by Japan and the revolution of 1905, Czar Nicholas II did nothing. For Vienna had the backing of the mightiest power in Europe, the Second Reich of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

By 1912, however, under Russian auspices, a Balkan League had been formed that included Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro. Its goal: tear Macedonia away from an Ottoman Empire preoccupied by a war with Italy over what is today Libya.

On October 8, Montenegro declared war and was joined, ten days later, by her allies. With the league marshaling 750,000 soldiers, the Turks were routed on every front. The Bulgarians crushed them in Thrace and drove to the outskirts of Constantinople. Serbs and Montenegrins seized Skopje, the capital of Macedonia. Greeks occupied Thessalonika. Albania, Macedonia, and Thrace, the three European provinces of the Ottoman Empire, had been lost. On December 3, the Turks agreed to an armistice.

On January 13, 1913, however, after “The Young Turks” effected a coup in Constantinople, war resumed. Again, the Balkan League triumphed. On May 30, 1913, at the London Conference, Albania was declared independent at the insistence of the Great Powers, but Macedonia was divided among the victorious Balkan allies.

The First Balkan War was an ethnonational war of race, tribe, and religion. Christian Slavs had united to expel Muslim Turks from a peninsula whose peoples detested them for their centuries of harsh rule.

In mid-1913, the Second Balkan War erupted over Macedonia. The Bulgarians felt cheated of their fair share and laid claim to Salonika. Greece and Serbia, forced to yield their shares of Albania at the London Conference, formed an alliance. The Second Balkan War lasted from June 16 to July 18.

The Bulgarians were routed, as Romanians and Turks joined Greece and Serbia to strip Sofia of all her gains in the First Balkan War. Bulgaria lost Southern Dobruja to Romania, Eastern Thrace to the Turks. Greece and Serbia divided Macedonia, creating an ethnonational quarrel that endures and bedevils NATO. Athens refuses to recognize Macedonia, except as FYROM, the Former

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. To Greeks the name and land of Philip of Macedon and his son Alexander the Great belong exclusively to Greece.

SARAJEVO, 1914

After her victories in the First and Second Balkan Wars, Serbia was aflame with nationalism, determined to bring all Serbs into a national home, including those living under Austrian rule in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This was impossible—without a war with the Habsburg Empire. On June 28, 1914 in Sarajevo, the Bosnian capital, Serb nationalist Gavrilo Princip, dispatched from Belgrade by elements in the security services, shot and killed the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, and his wife. That act of ethnonational terror eliminated a reformer who had meant to redress the grievances of his Slav subjects when he took the throne of Franz Josef, now in the sixty-sixth year of his reign. Ferdinand had intended to grant the Slavs autonomy and equality with Austrians and Hungarians. His assassination succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of the secret Black Hand society plotters in Belgrade.

Austria issued an ultimatum to Serbia. When her ten demands were not met in full, Vienna declared war and shelled Belgrade from across the Danube. Czar Nicholas mobilized his armies in support of Russia's little Slav brothers. The Kaiser ordered mobilization to counter the Russians. When Russia's ally, France, refused to declare neutrality, Germany declared war. And when the German army crossed into Belgium, the British cabinet reversed itself to back war for Belgium and France.

None were more stunned than the Marxists who had predicted that the working-class sons of Europe would never take up arms to kill one another for their rulers. The proletariat, they believed, would stand as one against a capitalists' war. Many Marxists never recovered the faith they lost when the party in which they had invested their greatest hopes, the German Social Democrats, voted to a man for the kaiser's war credits. The call of socialist solidarity was drowned out by the call of tribe and blood. In London, Paris, St. Petersburg, and Berlin, boys and men were cheered wildly as they marched off to kill their Christian neighbors.

The Italian Socialist Party leadership denounced its sister parties in Germany and Europe, which had backed the war, and, in a 12–1 vote, passed a resolution declaring, “We will be faithful to our flag; and on this flag is written: Proletarians of all the world unite!” The sole dissenter was Benito Mussolini.¹²

After four years, nine million soldiers had perished and four empires had fallen. Ethnonationalism had plunged the continent and the world into the worst war in history.

PARIS, 1919

When Lenin came to power in 1917, he began to publish the secret treaties in the Romanov archives, revealing how, at war’s end, the Allies—Britain, France, Russia, Italy, Romania, and Japan—had planned to carve up the world. The Great War seemed suddenly to be naught but an amoral imperial struggle for land and loot.

To counter this depiction of why millions of young men had been sent to early graves, President Wilson, whose nation had entered the war in April 1917 “to make the world safe for democracy,” issued his Fourteen Points. Here, Wilson told the world, is what we Americans are fighting for. At the heart of his vision was the idea of self-determination. On February 1, 1918, Wilson laid down his preconditions for a just and lasting peace:

There shall be no annexations.... People are not to be handed about from one sovereignty to another by an international conference.... “Self-determination” is not a mere phrase.... Every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the population concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival States.¹³

Before the peace conference opened, however, U.S. Secretary of State Robert Lansing had confided to his diary his alarm at the explosive potential of Wilson’s words:

The more I think about the president's declaration as to the right of "self-determination," the more convinced I am of the dangers of putting such ideas in the minds of certain races....

The phrase [self-determination] is simply loaded with dynamite. It will raise hopes which can never be realized. It will, I fear, cost thousands of lives.... What a calamity that the phrase was ever uttered! What misery it will cause!¹⁴

What came out of the Paris peace conference, that "riot in a parrot house," in British diplomat Harold Nicholson's phrase, justified Lansing's fears and spat upon Wilson's hopes. Wilson's fears had been realized. The Hohenzollern, Habsburg, and Ottoman empires were demolished, but the nations birthed through the treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, Trianon, Neuilly, and Sèvres were insults to Wilson's ideals.

After accepting an armistice based on Wilson's Fourteen Points, Germany lost Northern Schleswig to Denmark through plebiscite, and Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium for the damage done during the German occupation. Alsace and Lorraine went to France, as this was No. 8 of Wilson's points. The Saar was torn from Germany, along with its people, who were to be granted a vote in fifteen years on whether they wished to return. A long slice of Germany, from Silesia to the sea, cutting her in two and separating East Prussia from Berlin, was ceded to Poland. Danzig, an East Prussian town and Hanseatic League port, was put under Warsaw's control to give Poland an outlet to the sea. Memel would be seized by Lithuania.

Versailles stripped Germany of one-tenth of her people and an eighth of her territory. By 1920, Germans chafed under the rule of Danes, Belgians, French, Italians, Czechs, Poles, and, soon, Lithuanians. The Allies had produced a peace to end all peace. Germany had proven herself the most powerful nation in Europe, having defeated Russia, Romania, and Italy, and fought Britain and France to a draw for four years, with not one foreign soldier on German soil. When Germany got back on her feet, she would come looking for those she had lost.

Ethnonationalism, the demand that lost German lands and peoples be

restored, became an almost universally supported plank in the platform of the new National Socialist Party.

After Germany mounted the scaffold came the turn of the Habsburg Empire. Under the treaties of St. Germain and Trianon, that ancient empire was dissolved. Northern provinces went to Poland. Czechoslovakia, which had emerged in 1918 under Thomas Masaryk, a great favorite at Paris, was granted custody of 3.5 million ethnic Germans, 2.5 million Slovaks, 800,000 Hungarians, 500,000 Ruthenians, and 150,000 Poles. All resented being forced to live in a nation dominated by 7 million Czechs.

Whether to force 3 million Germans under a Czech rule most of them despised was fiercely debated at Paris. The U.S. delegation's Archibald Coolidge called it a grave mistake. South Africa's Jan Smuts warned that the Czech lust for Hungarian and German land could bring disastrous results: "With some millions of Germans already included in Bohemia in the north, the further inclusion of some 400,000 or 500,000 Magyars in the south would be a very serious matter for the young state, besides the grave violation of the principles of nationality involved."¹⁵ The "millions of Germans" in Bohemia to whom Smuts referred lived in a place the world would come to know as the Sudetenland.

The Allies did not heed Smuts. They listened to Eduard Benes, the Czech foreign minister who promised to model Czechoslovakia on the Swiss federation, where minorities would enjoy equal standing and large measures of autonomy. On the eve of Munich, Lloyd George would accuse Benes of having lied to the Allies at Paris.

South Tyrol, with 250,000 Tyroleans, Austrian for six centuries, was ceded to Italy as war booty for switching sides and joining the Allies in 1915. Vienna, seat of one of the great empires of Christendom, became the capital of a tiny landlocked country of fewer than 7 million.

Hungary was reduced from an imperial domain of 125,000 square miles to a nation of 36,000. Nearly half the Magyar population had been transferred to foreign rule. Transylvania and its 2 million Hungarians was given to Romania for joining the Allies. Slovakia, which a largely Catholic Hungary had ruled for centuries, was given to the Czechs, along with its 800,000 Hungarians. Other Hungarian lands went to the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. When

Romania invaded to overthrow the Hungarian Soviet Republic of Bela Kun, which had seized power and instituted a Red Terror, Admiral Miklós Horthy led a National Army into Budapest and promised to restore all lost Magyar lands and peoples. His determination would propel the admiral into partnership with Hitler.

What made Versailles a calamity was not only the injustice of forcing millions of Hungarians and Germans under alien rule, nor the hypocrisy of the Allies, who had professed their devotion to self-determination, but what Smuts had called “the grave violation of the principles of nationality.” The Allies had signed birth certificates for nations that were as multiethnic and multilingual as the demolished Habsburg Empire, but wholly lacked that empire’s lineage and legitimacy.

The new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes contained Bosnian Muslims, Albanians, Macedonians, Montenegrins, Hungarians, and Bulgarians. Poland ruled millions of Germans, Ukrainians, White Russians, Jews, and Lithuanians. Romania contained millions of Hungarians and Bulgarians. These minorities ruled by Belgrade, Prague, Warsaw, and Bucharest had been consigned to those capitals against their will and in violation of Wilson’s promise that self-determination would be the basis of the peace. Believing they had been betrayed and subjugated, they seethed with a resentment that would explode in a second European war in which the butcher’s bill would dwarf that of the Great War.

“THE NATURAL MAP OF THE WORLD”

In his 1920 *Outline of History*, H. G. Wells bewailed the folly of herding ethnic groups into artificial states: “There is a natural and necessary political map of the world which transcends these things,” Wells wrote.

There is a best way possible of dividing any part of the world into administrative areas and a best possible kind of government for every area, having regard to the speech and race of its inhabitants, and it is our common concern to secure these divisions and establish those

forms of government quite irrespective of diplomacies and flags, “claims” and melodramatic “loyalties,” and the existing political map of the world.¹⁶

Democracy notwithstanding, wrote Wells, “The natural political map of the world insists upon itself. It heaves and frets beneath the artificial political map like some misfitted giant.”¹⁷ Wells understood that not parchment, but language, literature, blood, soil, history, and faith make a nation; that a nation is an organic living thing, not some fabricated construct. As for the multicultural, multilingual, multiethnic nations crafted in Paris by presidents and prime ministers, they were artificial nations, ever at risk of falling apart.

It is extraordinarily inconvenient to administer together the affairs of peoples speaking different languages and so reading different literatures and having different general ideas, especially if those differences are exacerbated by religious disputes. Only some strong mutual interests, such as the common defensive needs of the Swiss mountaineers, can justify a close linking of peoples of different languages and faiths.¹⁸

Now that the natural nations of Europe had seen millions of their kinsmen consigned to the rule of alien ethnicities whom they detested, Wells sensed what was coming.

THE IRISH REBELLION

When Disraeli observed, “All is race. There is no other truth,” he meant what Churchill meant when he spoke of “this island race,” a unique people, separate from all others, united by borders, language, culture, history, and blood.¹⁹ Disraeli saw the Irish, though part of Britain, as a breed apart: “This wild, reckless, indolent, uncertain and superstitious race have no sympathy with the English character. Their ideal of human felicity is an alternation of clannish broils and coarse idolatry [i.e., Catholicism]. Their history describes an unbroken

circle of bigotry and blood.”²⁰ The Duke of Wellington was of similar mind. Reminded that he had been born in Dublin, the Iron Duke retorted, “Being born in a stable does not make one a horse.”²¹ A contemporary of Wellington and Disraeli, Thomas Carlyle regarded the Irish as “human swinery.”²²

The Irish saw themselves as a people apart, even when they fought alongside Englishmen and Scots. In “An Irish Airman Foresees His Death,” Yeats spoke for his people:

*I know that I shall meet my fate
Somewhere among the clouds above;
Those that I fight I do not hate,
Those that I guard I do not love;
My country is Kiltartan Cross,
My countrymen Kiltartan’s poor,
No likely end could bring them loss
Or leave them happier than before.*²³

England’s cause was not Ireland’s cause. England’s enemies were not Ireland’s enemies. No sooner had the Great War ended than the Troubles began. Fresh in memory was the Easter Rising of 1916, when 2000 rebels, in that year of the Somme Offensive, seized the General Post Office in Dublin to stoke a rebellion. While a botched affair that initially earned its leaders ridicule and contempt, the British immediately villainized themselves—by arresting thousands more than had participated in the rising and sending fifteen of the leaders before firing squads, creating a fatal breach between British and Irish. Wrote Yeats, in “Easter 1916”:

*I write it out in a verse—
MacDonagh and MacBride
And Connolly and Pearse
Now and in time to be,
Wherever green is worn,
Are changed, changed utterly:*

*A terrible beauty is born.*²⁴

Changed they were, from blunderers who had committed an act of wartime treason into martyrs of Irish independence. In 1918, needing fresh troops after the losses halting Ludendorff's offensive, Lloyd George decided to conscript the Irish. That was the end of the Irish Parliamentary Party of John Redmond, who had lost a son in the war. Sinn Féin now spoke for Ireland.

In 1919, a guerrilla war began with the killing of constables and Irish collaborators of the British government. London sent in veterans of the Western Front, the Black and Tans. From 1919 to 1921, hundreds died on each side until rebel commander Michael Collins went to London to negotiate peace with Churchill. An Irish Free State was created, but six northern counties of Ulster remained with the United Kingdom. The treaty Collins brought home ignited a civil war that ended only with his assassination.

Few better examples exist of the power of ethnonationalism. Here were British subjects, citizens of a free nation who enjoyed all the rights of Englishmen, who were represented in Parliament, who belonged to the greatest empire since Rome at the apogee of her power and glory and in the hour of her greatest triumph. Yet they wished to be free of her, and were willing to fight and die to have Ireland, an impoverished land of a few million, take her place alongside the nations of the world. What caused the Irish to prefer separation to union?

Ethnonationalism. Though they had lived alongside the English for centuries, the Irish saw themselves as the English saw them: as separate. They were Celts, not Anglo-Saxons, Church of Rome, not Church of England. Gaelic was their language, not English. The history on which they brooded was not the history of England or the empire but a centuries-long catalog of crimes against the Irish—from Drogheda and Wexford to the Penal Laws and the Potato Famine to the executions of the Easter Rising. Long after their war for independence had been won, hatred of England was a defining feature of diaspora Irish, a part of their DNA.

When, in 1939, Britain declared war against Hitler's Germany, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia declared war in solidarity with the Mother

Country. Ireland proclaimed a neutrality that she maintained through Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, and America's entry—indeed, to the end of the war.

England's war was not Ireland's war.

THE YOUNG TURKS

Unlike the secession of Norway from Sweden in 1905, many new ethno-states of the twentieth century were birthed in blood.

In the first decade of the century the Ottoman Empire, the “Sick Man of Europe,” in the cruel depiction attributed to Czar Nicholas I, had begun to die, and Western powers and former subject nations had begun to bite off provinces. In 1908, “Young Turks” first executed a coup in Salonika. From 1911 to 1918, Enver Bey, the future Enver Pasha, ran a virtual military dictatorship. His goal was to “Turkify” the empire by forcing subjects to use the Turkish language, accept national education, and have their sons serve in a national army. As there were millions of Christian Slavs, Greeks, and Armenians (as well as Muslim Arabs and Kurds) in the empire that stretched from the Maghreb to Mesopotamia, Turkification was resisted. In 1914, Turkey cast its lot with the Central Powers and won a legendary victory at Gallipoli after repelling a British-French fleet in the Dardanelles. That Allied naval disaster cost First Lord Winston Churchill his post. In that same year, 1915, the Turks, enraged at Armenians fighting alongside an invading Russian army, perpetrated a series of massacres and expulsions of their Armenian subjects that may have cost as many as 1.5 million lives. Armenians and others regard what the Turks did as genocide.

In 1918 the Turks went down to defeat, and the Treaty of Sèvres, imposed in Paris in 1920, marked the end of the empire. Under the secret Sykes-Picot agreement, Palestine, Transjordan, and Mesopotamia went to the British, and Syria and Lebanon to France. Arabs were denied the independence promised by Lawrence of Arabia. Three of the victorious Allies, France, Italy, and Britain, occupied parts of Turkey, while Greeks controlled western Anatolia almost to Ankara. Offered a mandate over Constantinople, in which Wilson was interested, the Americans wisely declined. The United States had never declared

war on Turkey.

Came now the hour of Ataturk.

His army first forced out the French and Italians, then drove the Greeks out of Anatolia, slaughtering thousands in Smyrna, then confronted the British at Chanak. The British stood down and sailed away. By the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, ethnic cleansing was legitimized. Some 1.4 million Greeks were forced to leave Turkey and 400,000 Turks were forced out of lands that now belonged to Greece.

The caliph was put on the Orient Express. Mehmet VI, the last sultan of the Ottoman Empire, left Constantinople on a British warship. Under the hero of Gallipoli, the Republic of Turkey was born as a secular nation, its institutions modeled on the West. Save for the Kurds, whose ethnonational drive for a home of their own would bedevil her to this day, Turkey was a land of, by, and for Turks alone. Out of the carcass of the Ottoman Empire had come the first modern ethnonational state in the Middle East.

The tribal conflict between Greek and Turk endures on the island of Cyprus. The Turks invaded in 1974 to prevent annexation by Greece and a Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus remains a headache for NATO.

“EIN VOLK”

That Hitler was the personification of the German race was dogma in his party. And it was the treaties of Versailles and St. Germain that forced millions of Germans under alien rule that provided Hitler with the program he rode to power. To understand the rage in the German soul Hitler stoked, one must understand the history of the Great War, from the German point of view. By spring 1918, Germany was victorious on three fronts. Romania had been routed in 1916. The royal family had fled. The Italians had been broken at Caporetto in 1917. The Russians had thrown down their rifles, the czar had abdicated, and the Bolsheviks had signed away Russia's European empire at Brest-Litovsk by March 1918. By spring, Ludendorff was back on the Marne. Had it not been for the Americans pouring into Allied lines at the rate of 250,000 soldiers a month, Germany might have won an armistice that would have left her undefeated on

the Western Front and triumphant in the east.

The dramatic reversal of 1918—the shock of defeat for the Germans—was tremendous. Then, after they had accepted an armistice on Wilson’s Fourteen Points, laid down their arms, and delivered the High Seas Fleet to Scapa Flow, the Allies proceeded to divide and dismember Germany.

By declaring the kaiser a war criminal, tearing off German provinces, disarming them and leaving them naked to their enemies, making them wage slaves of the victorious powers, forcing Germany to accept sole moral responsibility for causing the war and the damage done, then starving them until their leaders signed the treaty, the Allies stoked the ethnonationalism of Germans more than Bismarck had with his victory over Napoleon III. As all Germans from Prussia to Bavaria had fought and bled together and suffered together on the home front, so all believed that they had been lied to and betrayed by Wilson and the Allies and that the lands and people taken from them must be restored. In his pledge to bring all lost Germans home to the Reich, Hitler had the support of Germans everywhere.

“Nationalism is an infantile disease,” said Einstein. “It is the measles of mankind.”²⁵ But in Germany in 1933, it was a rather more serious malady, from which Dr. Einstein would flee to America.

In 1935, the Saar, severed at Paris but promised a plebiscite to decide whether to remain outside Germany, voted by 90 percent to return. Catholic and socialist, Saarlanders preferred a Nazi regime that crushed unions and persecuted the Church to life apart from their kinsmen. Such is the power of ethnonationalism.

When, in March 1936, German troops marched into the demilitarized Rhineland for the first time since 1918, there was wild rejoicing. Anschluss, the invasion and incorporation of Austria into the Reich, undertaken by Hitler to prevent a plebiscite on the permanent separation of his birth country, was celebrated in both nations. Many Austrians, who shared a culture with Germany, willingly exchanged nationhood and independence for a new life inside the new Reich.

The Czech crisis of 1938 that led to Munich and the Danzig crisis of 1939 that provoked Hitler’s attack on Poland, came out of ethnonational demands.

Hitler, an Austrian who grew up in Linz near the Czech border when Czechs

were ruled from Vienna, was determined to bring the Germans of Bohemia and Moravia out from under Prague and back under German rule, where the Sudetenlanders wished to be. At Munich, the British and French acceded to Hitler's demand.

Poles and Hungarians then seized the Czech lands where their kinfolk lived. Slovaks, too, struggled to break free of Czech rule and create a nation. Ethnonationalism tore Czechoslovakia apart. This caused a panicked British government to extend a war guarantee to Poland, then involved in a dispute with Berlin over return of 350,000 Danzigers to a Fatherland from which they, too, had been severed against their will at Paris. Poland's refusal to discuss Danzig provoked Hitler into invading the country on September 1, 1939.

Both world wars came out of ethnonational quarrels the great powers created or ignored. World War II is depicted as the Good War in which democracy triumphed over fascism. But the crises that caused the war were rooted in ethnic conflict, not ideology. German, Slovakian, Polish, Hungarian, and Ruthenian ethnonationalism tore Czechoslovakia to pieces in 1938 and 1939. German ethnonationalism in Danzig that Poland refused to address caused Hitler to destroy Poland, not the Polish form of government, to which Hitler had no objection.

THE GREAT TRIBAL WAR

Obsessed with race, Hitler wanted all Jews out of the Reich. But on ideology, he was pragmatic and flexible. While preferring nationalist allies like Franco's Spain, Mussolini's Italy, Horthy's Hungary, Tiso's Slovakia, and Pilsudski's Poland, he partnered with Stalin and the Bolsheviks to retrieve what belonged to Germany, and admired the British, democratic at home and imperialist abroad. Britain was to Hitler the ideal ally.

Churchill loved the empire as much as he loathed many of its subjects, especially Indians. Historian Andrew Roberts writes that his views were not only "more profoundly racist than most," they influenced his conduct as a statesman:

Churchill's racial assumptions occupied a prime place both in his

political philosophy and in his views on international relations. He was a convinced white—not to say Anglo-Saxon—supremacist and thought in terms of race to a degree that was remarkable even by the standards of his own time. He spoke of certain races with a virulent Anglo-Saxon triumphalism which was wholly lacking in other twentieth-century prime ministers, and in a way which even as early as the 1920s shocked some Cabinet colleagues.²⁶

Stalin, born Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili in Gori, Georgia, put ideology on the shelf when Russia was invaded. He let Orthodox priests and bishops out of prison and called on Russia's sons to defend the Rodina from rape by Teutonic hordes who were the Mongols of modernity. The Great Patriotic War was a race war. German treatment of Jews and Untermenschen, Russian treatment of Magyar and German women, testify to tribal war. Here is a sampling from Stalin's propagandist, Ilya Ehrenburg, when Germans occupied great swaths of Russian soil in 1942. It was titled "Kill."

Germans are not human beings. Henceforth the word German means to us the most terrible curse. From now on the word German will trigger your rifle. We shall not speak any more. We shall not get excited. We shall kill. If you have not killed at least one German a day, you have wasted that day.... If you leave a German alive, the German will hang a Russian and rape a Russian woman. If you kill one German, kill another—there is nothing more amusing for us than a heap of German corpses.... Kill the German—this is your old mother's prayer. Kill the German—this is what your children beseech you to do. Kill the German—this is the cry of your Russian earth. Do not waver. Do not let up. Kill.²⁷

Japan's war in Asia was a race war. In Nanking, Japanese soldiers bayoneted Chinese babies for sport, their mothers and fathers for practice. Korean girls and women were conscripted as sex slaves for Japanese troops. America's war of revenge against Japan was a race war. Newsreels, movies, magazines, comic

books, headlines treated “Japs” as a repulsive race whose extermination would benefit mankind. General Curtis LeMay boasted, of his B-29 saturation bombing of the Japanese capital, “We scorched and boiled and baked to death more people in Tokyo that night of March 9–10 than went up in vapour in Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined.”²⁸

Only well after the war was over was it rebranded a war to bring the blessings of democracy to Germany and Japan.

The war brought death to millions but produced a new Europe. After the ethnic cleansing of fifteen million Germans from Prussia, Brandenburg, Pomerania, Silesia, Moravia, Bohemia, and the Balkans, an exodus two hundred times as large as the Trail of Tears under Andrew Jackson, Europe from Eire to the Elbe consisted of almost all homogeneous states. The Germans were in Germany, the French in France, the Italians in Italy, the Irish in Ireland.

But among the subjects of Europe’s surviving empires came now an explosion of ethnonationalism. The India of Gandhi gained independence in 1947. East and West Pakistan seceded. A religious and ethnic war costing millions of lives followed. In May 1948, the Jews declared independence. Arabs went to war to eradicate the “Zionist entity” while Arab civilians in the war zone fled to UN camps where they would live for generations as a new nation, Palestine, was conceived in their hearts.

In 1946, Vietnamese who had chafed under colonial rule and suffered under Japanese occupation rose up to resist the return of the French. “We have a secret weapon,” said Ho Chi Minh, “it is called Nationalism.”²⁹

Four decades later, when the Berlin Wall fell, ethnonationalism went about its work, tearing apart the Soviet Empire and then the Soviet Union—into fifteen nations. Czechoslovakia split in two as in March 1939. Yugoslavia, born at Paris in 1919, disappeared from the map as Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Kosovo sprang to life. The secessions of Croatia and Bosnia were fiercely resisted. Thousands died. Kosovo, the cradle of Serbia, was torn loose only after seventy-eight days of U.S. bombing.

“Once the iron fists of the former Soviet Union and Tito’s Yugoslavia had been removed,” said Christopher Meyer, “nationalist and ethnic tensions broke surface with the murderous velocity of the long suppressed.”³⁰

Spain, Greece, Slovakia, Romania, and Cyprus all refuse to establish diplomatic relations with Kosovo. All fear providing an impetus to secession-minded minorities at home.

What the disintegration of the USSR and Yugoslavia into twenty-two nations reveals is this: absent an authoritarian regime or dominant ethnocultural core, all multiracial, multiethnic, and multilingual nations are ever at risk of disintegration. A corollary: as autocracies give way to democracy, new nations will break out of the old, and the more divided and discordant the world will become. A UN that began with 52 member nations now has 193 and counting. Balkanization, that often bloody breakdown and breakup of nations along racial, tribal, religious, and cultural fault lines, may be the defining force of our time.

THE LAST EUROPEAN EMPIRE

What happened to the Soviet Union—that so few foresaw?

Marxism-Leninism, the ideology imposed on the Russian Empire in 1917 that set out to conquer the world, died in the soul of Soviet man. By the later years of the Cold War, few still believed in its tenets or the inevitability of its triumph. The church militant, the party of Lenin and Stalin, built on the now-moribund faith, had come to be seen less as a spear point of revolution to create paradise on earth than as a monolith to preserve the power and privileges of a corrupt *nomenklatura*.

With the collapse of the Soviet Empire and the end of the Cold War, the Soviet state lost its reason for being. And as the party lost the loyalty of the people, the instruments of state security, the Red Army and KGB, were left to hold the USSR together. They no longer had the will. Ethnonationalism outlasted Marxist ideology—and proceeded to tear apart the prison-house of nations. To his eternal credit, Mikhail Gorbachev let it happen. The old nations, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, broke free first. Then came Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova. Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan in the Caucasus followed. In Central Asia, five nations were born: Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan.

Yet this was but the end of the beginning. Minorities inside the new nations

now wanted their place in the sun and the Caucasus would take on the aspect of the early twentieth-century Balkans.

Transnistria fought its way free of Moldova. Nagorno-Karabakh, an Armenian enclave inside Azerbaijan, declared independence, producing war between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Chechnya sought to break free of Russia. Moscow would fight two wars to hold on, in which half a million perished and Grozny, the Chechen capital, would be reduced to Berlin 1945. South Ossetia and Abkhazia broke from Georgia. In 2008, a Georgian invasion of South Ossetia was swiftly routed by Russia, which has now recognized the breakaway provinces as independent states.

In 2009, Dagestan's interior minister was assassinated. Ingush President Yunus-Bek Yevkurov was almost killed by a suicide bomber who swerved into his motorcade with a Toyota Camry loaded with explosives.³¹ Maksharip Aushev, an opposition leader in Ingushetia, was murdered by assassins who sprayed his vehicle with automatic gunfire.³²

By 2010, attacks and assassinations were occurring almost daily in Ingushetia, Dagestan, and Chechnya and President Medvedev declared the North Caucasus Russia's greatest domestic crisis. In March 2010, forty people were killed in twin suicide blasts in the Moscow subway, with one bomb exploding at Lubyanka station. The bombers were women reportedly trained and dispatched by Caucasus Emirate, a militant Islamic group that demands secession of the North Caucasus and creation of a caliphate.³³ At summer's end, a suicide car bomber hit the main entrance of a mall in North Ossetia's capital, killing 16 and wounding 133.³⁴ "Russia's Muslim North Caucasus," writes Leon Aron, director of Russian studies at AEI,

is today barely governable, mired in poverty and unemployment, and swept up in relentless fundamentalist Islamic terrorism. Nary a day passes, especially in Dagestan and Ingushetia, without an official—a police officer, judge, prosecutor, local functionary—being killed by terrorist attacks.³⁵

In January 2011, a suicide bomber walked into the international arrivals hall of

Moscow's Domodedovo International Airport and detonated his explosives, killing 36 and injuring 180. Rebel leader Doku Umarov, in a video, claimed that he ordered the attack as a blow in a "total war" against Russia for an independent Islamist nation in the Caucasus and called on Muslims in the Volga regions of Tartarstan and Bashkortostan to join the insurgency.³⁶ Vladimir Putin pledged, "Revenge is inevitable."³⁷ Wrote Elena Milashina, of *Novaya Gazeta*, "The entire North Caucasus region is on fire, and suicide bombers pay a leading role on this gruesome stage."³⁸

Putin is not a man easily intimidated, as the last Chechen war demonstrated. Still, it is hard to see how Russia, its population shrinking by half a million to a million people a year, can hold on to a region where the disposition to kill and the willingness to die is so deeply rooted. Almost two hundred years ago, Pushkin wrote, "Cossack! Do not sleep.... In the gloomy dark, the Chechen roams beyond the river."³⁹

Charles King, author of *Extreme Politics: Nationalism, Violence and the End of Eastern Europe*, writes that failure to cope with ethnic terror in the Caucasus could lead to a rightist uprising in Russia.

If the Kremlin cannot contain the cycle of attacks and counterattacks, then Russian nationalist groups—many of which spew chauvinistic rhetoric demonizing Russia's non-Christian minorities—could gain traction in Russian politics. Such groups have already been involved in mob attacks and killings of Muslim migrants from the Caucasus and Central Asia. The possibility of street violence is very real and potentially destabilizing.⁴⁰

Adds King, "Muslims make up as much as 15 percent of Russia's population, with more than two million living in Moscow alone."

And the mixture is explosive. In December 2010, the killing of a 28-year-old Russian fan of the Spartak soccer team in a midnight brawl with young men from the Caucasus led to a huge demonstration outside Red Square. "Russia for the Russians!" they chanted, "Moscow for the Muscovites!" Many gave the Nazi salute. When the crowd dispersed, mobs assaulted police and the Moscow

subway witnessed “a wave of beatings and stabbings of people from the Caucasus or Central Asia.”⁴¹

In the southern city of Rostov, where a Russian student was killed by an Ingush classmate, another demonstration was held. There the chants were “Rostov is a Russian town” and “All for one and one for all.”

Archpriest Vsevolod Chaplin, of the Russian Orthodox Church, said if authorities did not act, “massive ethnic clashes may break out.”⁴² President Medvedev decried the “pogroms,” warning, “Ethnic violence threatens the stability of the state.”⁴³ Wrote the *Financial Times*:

Russia’s ultra-right has for two decades been little more than a curiosity: fodder for hand-wringing academics writing about “Weimar Russia.” But in the wake of the biggest ethnic riots Russia has seen since the Soviet Union’s fall, this formerly marginal if violent movement has arisen as a fearsome new political power.⁴⁴

In Kyrgyzstan in 2010, the April overthrow of President Kurmanbek Bakiyev ignited violence that took hundreds of lives and imperiled the U.S. lease on Manas air base outside Bishkek, a vital link to Afghanistan. In June, thousands were killed and wounded in massacres of Uzbeks in the southern cities of Osh and Jalal-Abad. Hundreds of thousands fled into Uzbekistan. An ethnic war that tears Kyrgyzstan apart remains a distinct possibility.⁴⁵ Time is not on the side of the multinational nation.

TRIBALISM RETURNS TO EUROPE

Lately, the West has witnessed a revival of something it thought it had outgrown: ethnonationalism in Old Europe where it now manifests itself in secessionism. Three hundred years after the Act of Union, Scots seek what their Celt cousins won under Michael Collins: separation and independence. Many English would be happy to see them go.⁴⁶

Separatism is alive in the Basque country, Catalonia, and Flanders. Turks and Greeks segregate on Cyprus. The Northern League seeks secession from Rome,

Naples, and Sicily. Corsica has sought independence from France. The Srpska Republic may break from Bosnia to join its Serb brethren. Serbs in northern Kosovo are unlikely to remain in an Albanian Muslim nation. What is causing this?

An end to the Days of Hope and Glory has made the subjects of Elizabeth II less proud of being British than of being Scottish, Welsh, English, or Scots-Irish. With the EU evolving into a super-state no one loves, and with nations surrendering their sovereignty to Brussels, people are transferring their love and loyalty back to the homelands whence their people came. And a new factor is fueling secession in Europe's financial crisis: a sense that one's own are being exploited by neighbors who do not work as hard. In the small town of Arenys de Mar in October 2009, 96 percent of those who came out for a referendum voted for Catalonia's secession. "It's brutal," said the mayor. The rest of Spain is "bleeding us.... Now it's not about language and literature.... For the first time in history, the independence movement is coming via the people's purses."⁴⁷

In July 2010, a million Catalans gathered in the streets of Barcelona "to demand greater regional autonomy and to protest a recent court ruling forbidding the prosperous region from calling itself a nation."⁴⁸

Europe's debt crisis has breathed new life into the secessionist Northern League of Umberto Bossi, who sees autonomy first, then independence for Padania, the five regions of Italy centered on Piedmont, Lombardy, Veneto, and Trentino-Alto Adige (the old South Tyrol).

Mr. Bossi's central claim is that natives of Padania, an ambiguous area around the Po River that includes the cities of Milan, Turin, and Venice, descend from the northern Celtic tribes. The Celts, Mr. Bossi regularly reminds his fans, were a hard-working people unlike the Romans, warriors whose productivity was based on slave workers. His supporters often show up at rallies with Celtic-inspired swords and horned helmets.⁴⁹

Bossi sees himself as a latter-day "Braveheart."

The greatest cause of alienation from Europe's governments is the mass immigration that stirs the ethnic consciousness of the native-born who are turning to populist parties. "Radical anti-immigration parties are gaining ground across the continent," the *Financial Times* warned in 2010, alerting politicians

that “ignoring the warnings sent by the rising far-right would be far more dangerous” than addressing their concerns.⁵⁰

The latest evidence came in last week’s Italian regional elections, where the xenophobic Northern League won 13 percent of the vote. In France, the far-right National Front has also made a comeback in recent regional elections—polling well over 20 percent of the vote in parts of the country. The British National Party may do well in next month’s general elections. And anti-immigrant themes will also play a big role in the June election in the Netherlands.⁵¹

Alarmed at the threat to their ethnic identity, the anti-immigration parties are striding toward respectability and power. Austrian nationalists scored a triumph in 2008 when the Freedom Party and Alliance for Austria’s Future together won 29 percent of the vote. In 2010, two weeks after doubling its vote in Styria, the Freedom Party under Heinz-Christian Strache, its leader since Jörg Haider’s death, won 26 percent of the vote in Vienna’s municipal elections, almost doubling its strength there. Strache is talked of as a future chancellor of Austria. Who is he, and what does he stand for?

His Freedom Party is anti-EU and anti-foreigner. During their [2008] campaign, senior party members complained that immigration had brought an end to the good old days when Austrians ate Wiener schnitzel and sausages instead of “kebabs, falafel and couscous, or whatever that stuff is called.” At rallies, Mr Strache pledged to set up a government ministry with the sole task of deporting unwanted foreigners.⁵²

The National Front of Jean-Marie Le Pen humiliated Paris in 2009, winning more than half the vote in a suburb of Marseilles. The Swiss People’s Party of Christoph Blocher, largest in Bern, was behind the referendum to change the constitution to outlaw new minarets and wearing of burkas. Fifty-eight percent of the Swiss voted with Blocher. “More than half the voters in the five biggest

European economies believe women should be banned from wearing the burka.”⁵³ When the center-right Fidesz Party ousted the socialists in 2010 in Hungary, the shocker to the *FT* was that the Jobbik Party of “rightwing extremists,” which “sits squarely in Europe’s most repulsive arch-nationalist tradition and which blames Jews and Roma for the hardships of other Hungarians,” pulled 17 percent and entered parliament for the first time.⁵⁴

In a *Washington Post* essay on a dying EU, Charles Kupchan, of the Council on Foreign Relations, wrote,

Elsewhere [in Europe], rightwing populism is on the upswing—a product, primarily, of a backlash against immigrants. This hard-edged nationalism aims not only at minorities, but also at the loss of autonomy that accompanies political union.... Hungary’s Jobbik Party, which borders on xenophobic, won 47 seats in elections this year—up from none in 2006.⁵⁵

Three weeks after Kupchan wrote, the anti-immigration Sweden Democrats captured 6 percent of the vote and entered parliament for the first time with 20 seats, joining rightwing folk parties in Norway and Denmark. In April, 2011, the True Finns, nationalist, Euroskeptic, and anti-immigration, stunned Europe by capturing 19 percent of the vote and raising their representation in the 200-seat parliament from 5 to 39.

Nick Griffin, of the British National Party, who wants to “take back Britain” by providing incentives to nonwhite immigrants to go back home, appeared on the BBC’s late-night *Question Time*. As John Burns of the *New York Times* wrote, the show normally attracts “a modest pre-bedtime audience.”⁵⁶ Griffin drew 8.2 million viewers, on a par with World Cup games, as demonstrators excoriated the BBC for giving him a forum.

Censorship is grounded in fear. And the European establishment has begun to betray its fear of the ethnonational parties. Vlaams Blok, the most popular party in Flanders in 2004, was banned by the courts for portraying some immigrants as “criminals who take bread from the mouths of Flemish workers.”⁵⁷ Vlaams Blok disappeared, and Vlaams Belang was born.

Griffin was prosecuted for inciting racial hatred for calling Islam a “wicked and vicious faith.”⁵⁸ The Austrian Freedom Party’s Susanne Winter was given a three-month suspended sentence and a 24,000 euro fine “for incitement to hatred and degradation of religious doctrines.” Observing that one of the Prophet’s wives was only nine, Winter called Muhammad a pedophile and warned that Europe faces a “Muslim immigration tsunami.”⁵⁹

Geert Wilders, a rising figure in Dutch politics and a member of the European Parliament, was charged with hate speech for equating Islam and Nazism.⁶⁰ In June 2010, his Freedom Party became the third strongest, surpassing the ruling Christian Democrats, who lost half their parliamentary strength. “More security, less crime, less immigration, less Islam—that is what the Netherlands has chosen,” said Wilders.⁶¹ A prominent Australian Muslim cleric, Feiz Muhammad, called for the beheading of Wilders, “this Satan, this devil.”⁶²

That same June 2010, the disastrous performance of Les Bleus, the French soccer team in the World Cup that failed to win a single match, ignited a raucous, racially tinged debate that “focused on lack of patriotism, shared values and national honor on a team with many members who are black or brown and descended from immigrants.” President Sarkozy, who called Les Bleus’ performance on and off the field a “disaster,” was echoed by his education minister, Luc Chatel, who denounced its Senegal-born leader. “A captain of the French team who does not sing ‘the Marseillaise’ shocks me.... When one wears the jersey, one should be proud to wear the colors.”⁶³

The 1998 French team that won the World Cup had been praised for its multiracial character—black, white, and Arab—and seen as a symbol of a new diverse France. But the 2010 team, thirteen of whose twenty-two players were men of color, was denounced by French leaders and legislators as “scum,” “little troublemakers,” “guys with chickpeas in their heads instead of a brain,” and “a gang of hooligans.” The Algerian-born minister for the banlieues criticized Sarkozy for emphasizing “national identity” and warned that the “tendency to ethnicize” the attacks on Les Bleus was “building a highway for the National Front” of Le Pen.⁶⁴

That same summer of 2010 saw North African youth go on a rampage in Grenoble, causing President Sarkozy to declare that France was “seeing the

consequences of 50 years of insufficiently controlled immigration, which have ended up in the failure of integration.” Sarkozy proposed a law to strip North Africans of citizenship if they attack police officers. Critics saw the French president as “pandering to racists and xenophobes” to win back support he was bleeding to Le Pen’s National Front. Said former socialist prime minister Michel Rocard of the new Sarkozy hard line, “We haven’t seen this sort of thing since the Nazis.”⁶⁵ Such charges did not deter Sarkozy, his eye on 2012, from deporting 18,000 Roma Gypsies, despite their EU citizenship and their right to travel the continent.

When EU Justice commissioner Viviane Reding compared the Sarkozy expulsion of Gypsies to Vichy’s expulsions of Jews, Sarkozy exploded: “The comparison with the second world war and what happened in our country—it is an insult. It is a wound. It is a humiliation. It is an outrage.”⁶⁶ He vowed to continue breaking up the illegal camps and deporting the Roma.

Yet, by spring 2011, in a poll of voter sentiment in the presidential election of 2012, Sarkozy was running behind Marine Le Pen, who had taken over the National Front from her father in January.⁶⁷

Italy, with 800,000 Romanians, most of them new arrivals since 2007 and many of them Gypsies, is following France’s lead. Milan is dismantling its authorized Triboniano camp as a den of thieves, said the *Washington Post*, and “bulldozing hundreds of small impromptu camps inhabited by newer arrivals and issuing mass eviction notices to Roma families.” “Our final goal is to have zero Gypsy camps in Milan,” said vice mayor Riccardo de Corato, “These are dark-skinned people, not Europeans like you and me... They prostitute their wives and children.”⁶⁸

Germany, too, in the summer of 2010, played host to an ethnic row. In *Germany Does Away with Itself*, Thilo Sarrazin claimed his nation was being “dumbed down” by Turks and Kurds with higher birthrates but lower intelligence than Germans and Jews. “Hereditary factors” play a role in the disparity, wrote Sarrazin.⁶⁹ His book sold 300,000 copies in seven weeks. By early 2011, it had sold 1.2 million. Polls found 31 percent of Germans agreed that Germans are “becoming dumber,” while 62 percent called Sarrazin’s comments justified. Merkel denounced him, but half of Germany opposed the

move to oust Sarrazin from the Social Democratic Party.

A few years ago, Sarrazin's book would not have been published. Now, concedes a *New York Times* headline, "Long Dormant After Wartime, German Pride Begins to Blink and Stir."⁷⁰

In ways large and small, Germany is flexing its muscles and reasserting a long-repressed national pride.... There are fears of emerging (or resurgent) chauvinism, seen recently in broadsides against Muslims by Thilo Sarrazin, who is stepping down from the board of the German Central Bank, after publishing a divisive best seller saying that Muslim immigrants are draining the social-welfare state and reproducing faster than ethnic Germans.⁷¹

A month after the Sarrazin affair, Merkel told young CDU members in Potsdam that Germany's attempt to build a multicultural society where Turks, Arabs, and Germans live side by side had "utterly failed." Thirty percent of Germans said in a survey that their country was now "overrun by foreigners," while an equal number believe the foreigners had come for the social benefits.⁷² Within a few months of Merkel's repudiation of multiculturalism, David Cameron had seen the light, declaring "state multiculturalism" a failure.⁷³ He was instantly parroted by Sarkozy.

After New Year's Day, 2011, Greek Interior Minister Christian Papoutsis announced the building of a 128-mile wall on the Turkish border after more than 100,000 people had crossed over in 2010. Greece has become the main entry point into the EU for Asian and African migrants. "The Greek public has reached its limits in taking in illegal immigrants.... Greece can't take it anymore," said Papoutsis.⁷⁴

Ethnonationalism within nations manifests itself in tribalism. Belgium, created by the Great Powers in 1831, is likely the next nation in Europe to split—into a Dutch-speaking Flanders tied to Holland by language and culture and a French-speaking Wallonia.

Flanders is conservative, capitalist, wealthy. Wallonia is poor, socialist, statist. Flanders's 60 percent of the population generates 70 percent of GDP and

80 percent of the exports. The Flemish grow weary of seeing their taxes—the top rate is 50 percent—going to sustain Wallonia where unemployment is three times as high. Flanders also seethes over a government decision to bring in French-speaking North Africans to give Walloons control of Brussels. The capital, though in Flanders, now has a French-speaking majority. By one poll, 43 percent of Flemish wish to secede.

“The enmity is everywhere,” writes the *New York Times* of this last binational and bilingual country in Western Europe, save Switzerland.⁷⁵ Belgium, writes Muller, is “close to breaking up.”⁷⁶ Bismarck was right, after all: “Whoever speaks of ‘Europe’ is wrong. It is a geographical expression.”⁷⁷

The disintegration of the nations of Old Europe will likely be a nonviolent affair. Aging countries of an old and dying continent are not going to fight to prevent people from going their separate ways. But nonviolence is not likely to be the way the Asian and African nations come apart.

SECESSIONISTS IN THE MIDDLE KINGDOM

So grave was the crisis that Hu Jintao canceled his meeting with President Obama, broke off from the G8, and flew home. Hundreds had been killed and over a thousand injured, mostly Han Chinese, in ethnic street battles with Uighurs in Xinjiang, the huge oil-rich western province that extends deep into Central Asia. The Uighurs are a Turkic-speaking Muslim people who seek to create a new nation: East Turkestan. The surge of Chinese troops into Xinjiang bespoke Beijing’s fear that what happened to the Soviet Union could happen here. Unlike Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, the Chinese, as they have demonstrated in Tiananmen Square and Tibet, will not blanch at bloodletting to crush secession.

China’s anti-Uighur policy, writes Carl Gershman, president of the National Endowment for Democracy, “encourages Han Chinese settlement and employment in the western Xinjiang region while jobless Uighurs, especially young women, are recruited to work in factories in eastern China. The focus on women is not accidental.” Said exiled Uighur leader Rebiya Kadeer, “We believe it is part of the authorities’ effort to threaten our continuity as a people,”

as the Chinese “are taking these women out of their communities at the time they would be getting married and starting families.”⁷⁸

Beijing has sought to ensure permanent possession of Inner Mongolia, Manchuria, Xinjiang, and Tibet by swamping the indigenous populations with Chinese settlers. This was Stalin’s way in the Baltic states: flood them with Russians and drown their culture, language, and identity. In July 2010, a front-page story in the *New York Times*, datelined Lhasa, Tibet, began:

They come by the new high-altitude trains, four a day, cruising 1,200 miles past snow-capped mountains. And they come by military truck convoy, lumbering across the roof of the world.

Han Chinese workers, investors, merchants, teachers and soldiers are pouring into remote Tibet. After the violence that ravaged this region in 2008, China’s aim is to make Tibet wealthier—and more Chinese.⁷⁹

Beijing’s need to emphasize ethnic solidarity has been made more acute by the death of Maoism. Under the Great Helmsman, China had proclaimed herself vanguard of the world Communist revolution—the land of the true believers. Unlike the Soviet Union of Khrushchev and Brezhnev that had lost the faith, China had an ideological identity. Today, China has no ideology to hold the nation together. On the sixtieth anniversary of the revolution, Professor Zhang Ming of Renmin University in Beijing told the *New York Times*, “There is no ideology in China anymore.”

The government has no ideology. The people have no ideology. The reason the government is in power is because they can say, “I can make your lives better every day. I can give you stability. And I have the power.” As long as they can make people’s lives better, it’s O.K. But what happens on the day when they no longer can?⁸⁰

Excellent question.

What the Chinese do have is five thousand years of history and pride in their

rise from European and Japanese subjugation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to world power in the twenty-first. Most critically, though there is no one language, 90 percent of her people are Han Chinese—but 100 million are not.

What holds China together if a time of troubles begins?

On the sixtieth anniversary of Mao's triumph, Michael Wines wrote that in China, "Patriotism is a staple of the education system, and citizens are exhorted to equate the state and the homeland.... [but] none of the Chinese narrative bears on the communists and their government."⁸¹

[T]he official ideology of socialism and the revolutionary struggle against capitalist roaders, though still taught in universities and factory halls, is treated as dull propaganda by all except a dwindling number of true believers.

Historians and sociologists say that socialist ideology once was a bedrock of Chinese patriotism and support of the government. Paradoxically, it was killed by the reform and the opening of China that began thirty years ago and brought the economic miracle of today.⁸²

China's Communist rulers face an inevitable crisis of legitimacy.

By abandoning Maoism and revolution, the party built a mighty nation, but destroyed the rationale for its monopoly of power. As long as China succeeds, the Communists can say: our party is indispensable. But what does the party fall back on should China begin to fail? How do they answer if the people say, "China is failing. It is time for you to move on and for us to find new leaders with new ideas, and try a new road"? What is the justification for a Communist Party retaining absolute power if that party no longer delivers the capitalist goods the Chinese people have come to expect?

Patriotism is said to be the last refuge of the scoundrel. Patriotism and the race card may be the last refuge of the Chinese Communists. This could mean trouble for the Taiwanese and the ethnic neighbors with whom Beijing has border and territorial quarrels: Russia, Japan, India, and the other claimants to

the Paracel and Spratly Islands in the South China Sea.

Yet, the contrast between a serious China and an insouciant America on this issue of national identity is startling. Beijing floods its borderlands with Chinese and smothers religious and ethnic diversity to keep China whole and one. America, declaring, “Our diversity is our strength!” invites in the world to swamp her native-born. China sees ethnonationalism among its unhappy minorities as an existential threat. The U.S. elite regard ethnicity as the obsession of the underclass.

THE GLOBAL BALKANS

Ethnonationalism is on the boil across what Zbigniew Brzezinski calls the global Balkans. And India, the other emergent great power in Asia, is even more vulnerable than China, as she is more diverse. In Kashmir, India’s Muslim-majority state, a separatist movement is entrenched and the summer of 2010 saw some of the worst violence in years. Since independence in 1947, India has fought three wars with Pakistan, with Kashmir always at issue. New Delhi is also erecting a 2,500-mile fence around Bangladesh to keep arms smugglers and Muslim extremists out.⁸³ Though a Hindu nation, India is also the world’s third largest Muslim nation with an estimated 150 million believers. In recent decades a rising Muslim militancy has called into being a Hindu party, the BJP, which is now India’s second largest.

But India’s troubles only begin in Kashmir. The Tamils in the south still seethe over their kinsmen’s failure to carve a nation out of Sri Lanka, apart from the Sinhalese. Tens of thousands died in that island’s civil war that ended in May 2009. Delhi intervened in 1987 in what came to be called India’s Vietnam.

Nagaland, one of India’s smallest states, the size of Connecticut and Rhode Island, borders Burma and, with a Christian population, has hosted an independence movement since 1947. Perhaps the most powerful forces that threaten India’s stability and unity are the Maoist Naxalites who have battled New Delhi since 1967 and boast ten to twenty thousand fighters. In a recent ambush, 76 Indian soldiers were massacred. In May 2010, a high-speed train was derailed when Maoists cut out a foot of track. Eighty-one civilians were

killed, more than 200 wounded. Naxalites are our “first enemy,” says Home Secretary G. K. Pillai.⁸⁴ Prime Minister Manmohan Singh told police chiefs in Delhi the violence is increasing in the Naxalite war that has already taken 6,000 lives and the Maoists are winning the struggle to carve out a Communist state: “I have consistently held that in many ways, left-wing extremism poses perhaps the gravest internal security threat our country faces.”⁸⁵

Other secessionists are battling to break apart India’s twenty-eight states. The strongest is the drive to separate Talangana from Andhra Pradesh. Hunger strikes by Talangana leaders and suicides by students have brought the cause to the attention of the world and put it on the docket of the Congress Party.

Given the tension between Muslim and Hindu, the language and cultural differences, the disparities of wealth between middle and upper classes and the dirt-poor hundreds of millions, India is a prime candidate for ethnonational insurrections throughout the twenty-first century.

In Burma, the junta has deployed thousands of troops to the north to put down Kokang, Wa, and Kachin rebels. The Kokang, many of whom are ethnic Chinese, have fled in the tens of thousands to China’s Yunnan.⁸⁶ In the east, the Karen have conducted the world’s longest-running insurgency, since Burma became a nation in 1948. With the release of Nobel laureate and pro-democracy heroine Aung San Suu Kyi from house arrest, a question arises: Would a democratic Burma suppress the rebels to hold Burma together as the junta has done?

Ethnic minorities make up 40 percent of the population and the tribes have resisted domination since Britain gave Burma its independence. “Social conflict based on ethnicity has been at the heart of Burma’s political failure for decades,” says Andrew Heyn, the British ambassador in Rangoon.⁸⁷

In Thailand, Malays have attacked Buddhist monks and temples and officials of the government. Their goal: an Islamic Malay nation wedged between Thailand and Malaysia. “Terrorist attacks in the villages of southern Thailand have reached an all-time high, as schools become breeding grounds for young fighters,” reports the *Washington Times*. “Thailand Muslims reject anything modern and forms of entertainment, including televisions, except to watch soccer matches,” said a counselor at the Thai embassy.⁸⁸

On December 31, 2009, after a court ruling in Malaysia granted Christians the right to use the name Allah when speaking of God, seven churches were firebombed. As religion correlates with race in Malaysia—the constitution equates Muslim and Malay—critics charged the regime with exploiting a religious clash to incite race resentment. The Chinese and Indian minorities are Buddhist, Hindu, and Christian.⁸⁹

Jacqueline Ann Surin, editor of a Malaysian news site, told the *New York Times*, “Malaysia is peculiar in that we have race-based politics and over the past decade or so we have seen an escalation of the notion that Malay Malaysians are superior.... So it’s a logical progression that if the Malay is considered superior by the state to all others in Malaysia, then Islam will also be deemed superior to other religions.”⁹⁰

In Mindanao, a Moro separatist movement has been fighting on and off for the half millennium since the Spanish conquered the Philippines and Catholicism became the national faith. Their religion and their resistance have created a new people. “We don’t believe we are Filipinos,” says Kim Bagundang, of the Linguasan Youth Association. “That’s the essential problem.” The Moros seek to have the Muslim lands of Mindanao declared an “ancestral domain” where they will rule and their Islamic faith and culture will be dominant.⁹¹

In Central Mindanao in late 2009, a convoy of 57 journalists and lawyers and the wife and relatives of a local vice mayor was intercepted by 100 armed men.⁹² The women were raped, the entire party murdered, with many mutilated in what is called the Maguindanao massacre. The atrocity was “unequaled in recent history,” said an adviser to President Arroyo. “The Muslim insurgency has killed about 120,000 people since the 1970s,” the *Washington Post* reported, an astonishingly high figure.⁹³ On accepting his Nobel peace prize, Barack Obama recognized the new reality that many statesmen yet fail to see:

[The] old architecture is buckling under the weight of new threats.... wars between nations have increasingly given way to wars within nations. The resurgence of ethnic or sectarian conflicts, the growth of secessionist movements, insurgencies and failed states ... have increasingly trapped civilians in unending chaos.⁹⁴

“It is useless to say that nationalism and ethnic tribalism have no place in the international relations of the 21st century,” says the British diplomat Sir Christopher Meyer. “If anything the spread of Western-style democracy has amplified their appeal and resonance.”⁹⁵

“OUR GREATEST ENEMY IS ETHNIC NATIONALISM”

In the fall of 2009, Jundallah (God’s Brigade) of Sistan-Baluchistan carried out a spectacular act of terror, killing forty Iranians including a brigadier general of the Revolutionary Guard. Tehran accused the United States of fomenting ethnic separatism to break up the country or bring about regime change. A million Baluch live in Iran where Arabs, Azeris, Kurds, and other minorities constitute half the population, with Persians the other half.

There are five million Baluch in Pakistan where the oil-and gas-rich province of Baluchistan is 40 percent of the national territory. Baluchi grievances against the army and regime are mounting. “Baluch nationalism is more broad-based, is a more serious phenomenon than at any time in the past,” says Selig Harrison, of the Center for International Policy, an authority on the Baluch, who seek to carve a new nation out of Pakistan and Iran.⁹⁶

Iraq is Sunni, Shia, and Christian; Arab, Kurd, and Turkomen. No one rules out a return to sectarian or civil war when the Americans depart, or an Arab-Kurd clash over Kirkuk. Kurds in Turkey’s south and east number, by some counts, 20 to 25 million. This Kurdish enclave looks over the border to Iraqi Kurdistan with its population of five million as model and magnet. In July 2010, the president of Iraq’s Kurdish region, Massoud Barzani, told an Egyptian television station, “The Kurdish nation ... should have its own state like the Turkish, Persian and Arab nations. We are not claiming we are stronger than them, but we have nothing less than those nations.”⁹⁷ Were one to wager on new nations being born, Kurdistan, Baluchistan, Palestine, and Pashtunistan would be among the favorites.

The Pashtun, from whom many of the Taliban came, are the largest Afghan tribe, occupying the nation’s south and east, while the Hazara are in the central mountains. Tajiks and Uzbeks made up most of the Northern Alliance the

Americans conscripted to take down the Taliban. There may be 35 to 40 million Pashtun, a population larger than that of many European nations. Most live in Pakistan, where they give sanctuary to their Afghan cousins. That Tajiks are coming to dominate the army is certain to deepen Pashtun resistance to the American-backed regime of President Hamid Karzai.

“Ethnic chauvinism, which has long bedeviled this fiercely tribal country and fueled a destructive civil war in the 1990s, is erupting again,” wrote *Washington Post* foreign correspondent Pamela Constable from Kabul on Christmas Eve 2010.⁹⁸

In the 2010 elections, the Hazara, a repressed Shia minority, converted themselves into a tribal party and won every seat in the province of Ghazni. The majority Pashtun, divided in their loyalties between Karzai and the Taliban, threatened with reprisals if they voted, stayed home. The Hazara came out and won 50 of 249 seats in the lower house of parliament. But they are understandably nervous over their success. “This is a multiethnic country, and all groups need to be represented,” said Dr. Amin Ahmadi, dean of two small Hazara Shiite colleges in Kabul. “Our greatest enemy is ethnic nationalism.”⁹⁹

THE ENDURING TRIBALISM OF AFRICA

Nigeria’s civil war, where a million perished, was an ethnonational war of secession by the Ibo. When, after years of civil war, Rhodesia became Zimbabwe, the Mashona of Robert Mugabe proceeded to massacre 7,000 Matabele of rival Joshua Nkomo’s tribe to teach him a lesson. In Rwanda, Hutu massacred Tutsi. After the 2008 elections in Kenya, the Kikuyu of Mau Mau chief and founding father Jomo Kenyatta were ethnically cleansed by the Luo.

“More than 2,000 people have been killed this year in ethnically driven battles” in southern Sudan, reported the *New York Times* in 2009. The massacres were the work of Nuer warriors against Dinka villagers in Jonglei state.¹⁰⁰ The Muslim north may have been stirring up tribal war to divide the Christian and animist south before the 2011 election to determine whether the south would secede. Between north and south, the conflict is religious and racial. Within the south it is tribal.

In January 2011, the south voted 99–1 to secede and create the Republic of South Sudan, a decision described by one Cairo press observer as a “dangerous precedent in an Arab world looking increasingly fractured along sectarian and ethnic lines.” Salama Ahmed Salama, of al-Shorouk, dissented: “The lesson we must all learn is that secession ... can be the road to safety when union becomes a heavy and unbearable burden on people.”¹⁰¹

Across the Red Sea, war-torn Yemen, with Sanhan, Mareb, and Jahm among the dominant tribes, is in danger of splitting apart. In the oil-rich but poor and populous south, which includes the old British colony of Aden that became a Marxist state before uniting with the north in 1990, a secessionist movement is building. A north-south civil war was fought in 1994. The forces pulling Yemen apart are religious—the Houthi rebels in the north are Shia—and tribal. Says Gregory Johnson, of Princeton:

Secession is a major problem for Yemen ... the government’s inability to put down the rebellion in the north has certainly emboldened calls for secession in the south. If the Yemeni state falls apart, I do not believe it will separate into two pieces along the pre-unification lines prior to 1990. It will be much messier and much more chaotic than a simple bifurcation would suggest.¹⁰²

A fractured Yemen that shares a border with Saudi Arabia would be perilous for Riyadh and create new opportunities for al-Qaeda, which already has a presence there and across the Red Sea in Somalia.

In Lebanon, the divisions are ideological, religious, and ethnic: Falange and Hezbollah, Muslim and Christian, Sunni and Shia, Arab and Druze. According to scholar Donald L. Horowitz:

Connections among Biafra, Bangladesh, and Burundi, Beirut, Brussels, and Belfast were at first hesitantly made—isn’t one “tribal,” another “linguistic,” another “religious”?—but that is true no longer. Ethnicity has fought and bled and burned its way into public and scholarly consciousness.¹⁰³

The point is crucial. As Catholicism was integral to Irish identity in the 1919–1921 rising and to Polish identity in resistance to Communism, religion has become a feature of sacred identity.

Two days after the fall of Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak, Colonel Muammar Khadafi in Libya, suddenly threatened himself, sought to redirect Arab rage against the West by melding religious and racial identity. On the birthday of the Prophet, he issued a call to Muslim countries to join forces, saying the world was divided into white, denoting America, Europe, and Israel, and green, for the Muslim world.

“The white colour has decided to get rid of the green colour,” said Khadafi. “These [Muslim] countries should be united against the white colour because all of these white countries are the enemies of Islam.”¹⁰⁴

When a rebellion erupted to depose him, and America intervened to prevent what Obama said was an imminent massacre in Benghazi, Khadafi instantly played the tribal card, declaring “colonialist crusaders,” i.e., white Christians, are coming again to conquer our Arab and Muslim land.

Under Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan and his Justice and Development Party, Turkey is shedding a secular identity formalized by the founding father of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, in 1923, and reassuming its religious identity as an Islamic nation that belongs with the Islamic world as much or more than it does with the West. Their Islamic identity has also made of Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon far more formidable foes of Israel than Yasser Arafat’s secular PLO ever was.

Israel is a nation where constant conflict rages between democratist ideology, Zionist ethnonationalism, and religious fundamentalism. Netanyahu and Likud insist that, as a precondition for a Palestinian state, the Palestinians must recognize Israel as a “Jewish state” whose character must forever remain Jewish. This will not be easy to sustain, as the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics has identified 2014 as the year when Arabs west of the Jordan—in Israel, Jerusalem, Gaza, and the West Bank—at 6.1 million, equal and begin to outnumber the Jewish population.¹⁰⁵

The goal of Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman and his nationalist party, Yisrael Beiteinu, is “ethnic cleansing,” writes the *American Prospect*: “[A]s the

creepy name (which translates into ‘Our Home Is Israel’) suggests, Yisrael Beiteinu believes the million-plus Arab citizens of Israel must be expelled.”¹⁰⁶ Lieberman’s politics are described by the former editor of the *New Republic*, Peter Beinart:

In his youth, he briefly joined Meir Kahane’s now banned Kach Party, which ... advocated the expulsion of Arabs from Israeli soil. Now Lieberman’s position might be called “pre-expulsion.” He wants to revoke the citizenship of Israeli Arabs who won’t swear a loyalty oath to the Jewish state.... He said Arab Knesset members who met with representatives of Hamas should be executed. He wants to jail Arabs who publicly mourn on Israeli Independence Day, and he hopes to permanently deny citizenship to Arabs from other countries who marry Arab citizens of Israel.¹⁰⁷

What is Avigdor Lieberman but an ethnonationalist?

Israel’s demand that she be formally recognized as a “Jewish state,” even by her own non-Jewish citizens, represents a claim that Israel is an ethnonational state of, by, and for Jews. Former Israeli ambassador to the United States David Ivry, who claims he persuaded an aide to Secretary of State Colin Powell to insert the phrase “Jewish state” for the first time in a major U.S. address on the Middle East, defines its ethnonational meaning precisely and coldly: “The Palestinians should have no right of return; only Jewish refugees can ever come back.”¹⁰⁸

THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ REVOLT

Evo Morales was elected president in 2005 determined to redistribute Bolivian wealth to his own Aymara tribe and the “indigenous peoples” he claims were robbed by white men who came after Columbus. With Hugo Chávez, Morales is goading the Indians to take back what was allegedly stolen from them. And he has met with no small success.

“Vote Reflects Racial Divide,” ran the banner over a story datelined Santa

Cruz that began, “The Bolivian vote to approve a new constitution backed by Leftist President Evo Morales reflected racial divisions between the nation’s Indian majority and those with European ancestry.”

While the predominantly white and mestizo provinces voted against Morales’s constitution, it won huge majorities among the Indian tribes of the western highlands. For the new constitution is about group rights. By Article 190, Bolivia’s thirty-six Indian areas are authorized to “exercise their jurisdictional functions through their own principles, values, cultures, norms and procedures.” Tribal law is to become provincial law and, one day, national law. Pizarro’s triumph over the Incas is to be overturned. Governor Mario Cossío of Tarija province, which voted no, says the new constitution will create a “totalitarian regime” run by an “ethnically based bureaucracy.”¹⁰⁹ Opponents, reports the *Economist*, say the “community justice” provisions of the constitution “will politicize justice ... and legitimize mob justice in the form of lynchings and stonings, which have become more common over the past two years.”¹¹⁰

Morales replies: “Original Bolivians who have been here for a thousand years are many but poor. Recently arrived Bolivians are few but rich.”¹¹¹

Josh Partlow, of the *Washington Post*, writes that the dividing line in Bolivia “transcends economics and has laid bare cultural and geographic differences as well. People from the Andean highlands, with its indigenous majority, often accuse those of Spanish descent in the lowlands [of Santa Cruz] of having a racist agenda.”¹¹²

“Everything looks bad to the people who used to be in power,” said Felipe Montevilla, 55, a man of the Aymara ethnic group who attended a Morales rally in the town of Viacha, on the high plateau above the national capital, La Paz. “For 500 years, they never had to tip their hat to an indigenous man. This problem is primarily racist,” Montevilla said.¹¹³

Morales is using principles and procedures invented by white men—universal franchise and majority rule—to dispossess white men. He is using democratic

means for tribal ends, imposing Indian law where Indians are the majority. The nineteenth-century French rightist Louis Veillot explained how anti-democrats would dispossess the democrats: “When I am the weaker I ask you for my freedom because that is your principle; but when I am the stronger I take away your freedom because that is my principle.”¹¹⁴

Upon what ground do democratists stand to tell Morales he cannot use democracy to dispossess the European minority and empower his own race? What does the future hold for the West when people of European descent become a minority in nations they created, and people of color decide to vote themselves proportionate or larger shares of the national wealth?

In 2009, Morales was reelected in a landslide. Nor is Bolivia alone among nations where ethnicity and democracy are coming together to overturn the verdicts of free markets.

“WORLD ON FIRE”

Our situation may be about to become even more grim.

How much more is told in *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. Amy Chua’s book is about those “ethnic minorities who ... tend under market conditions to dominate economically, often to a startling extent, the ‘indigenous’ majorities around them.”¹¹⁵

Examples are the overseas Chinese, the Indians of East Africa, whites in south Africa, and Europeans in the Andean countries. Chua, whose aunt was a Chinese national whose throat was cut by a Filipino chauffeur resentful of her wealth, argues that while free markets often concentrate a nation’s wealth among ethnic minorities, democracy gives power to impoverished ethnic majorities. This has proven a combustible and lethal cocktail.

In these circumstances, the pursuit of free-market democracy becomes an engine of potentially catastrophic ethnonationalism, pitting a frustrated “indigenous” majority, easily aroused by opportunistic vote-seeking politicians, against a resented wealthy ethnic minority. This

confrontation is playing out in country after country, from Indonesia to Sierra Leone, from Zimbabwe to Venezuela, from Russia to the Middle East.¹¹⁶

*

In 1965, as recounted in the Mel Gibson film *The Year of Living Dangerously*, Indonesian mobs massacred hundreds of thousands of Chinese, the market-dominant minority. Chua describes what happened in 1998, when Suharto, Sukarno's successor, who had protected the 3 percent of Chinese who controlled much of the nation's wealth, was in turn ousted:

Indonesians were euphoric. After the words "free and fair elections" hit the U.S. headlines, Americans were euphoric. Democratic elections, it was thought, would finally bring to Indonesia the kind of peace and legitimacy perfect for sustaining free markets....

That's not what happened in Indonesia. The fall of Suharto's autocracy was accompanied by an eruption of ferocious anti-Chinese violence in which delirious, mass-supported Muslim mobs burned, looted and killed anything Chinese, ultimately leaving two thousand people dead.¹¹⁷

Across the Malacca Strait a similar script was played out.

In May 1969, riots in Malaysia brought death to hundreds of Chinese, the rape of their women, suspension of parliament and erection of a system of race preferences. As Malays, *bumiputra*, sons of the soil, were 62 percent of the population but had only 2 percent of the wealth, the government "adopted sweeping ethnic quotas on corporate equity ownership, university admissions, government licensing, and commercial employment.... It also initiated large scale purchases of corporate assets on behalf of the Malay majority."¹¹⁸

Chinese companies were forced to set aside 30 percent of equity for Malays, but given no choice as to who their new partners would be. Firms seeking to list on the stock exchange were required to have 30 percent *bumiputra* ownership. Not until 2009 did Malaysia's ruling coalition, facing recession, rising Chinese

and Indian protests, and competition for foreign investment, relent and roll back the 30 percent rule.¹¹⁹

Third World nationalizations in the postcolonial era, writes Chua, by and large did not seek to abolish private property but to transfer it from the market-dominant minority to the largest and most powerful tribe or ethnic group:

In Uganda ... the politically dominant groups of the north have repeatedly subjected the economically powerful Baganda of the south to bloody purges. In Nigeria in 1966, tens of thousands of Ibo were slaughtered indiscriminately by furious mobs. In Ethiopia, the relatively prosperous Eritreans were recently expelled en masse.... [I]n Rwanda, the genocidal massacre of the Tutsi minority is inextricably connected with their historic economic dominance.¹²⁰

In 1972, Idi Amin gave the 75,000 Indians who ran small businesses ninety days to get out of Uganda. Their property was confiscated and turned over to Africans.

At “liberation” in 1979, the whites of Zimbabwe controlled most of the wealth. In three decades they have been picked clean. In a 2010 essay on “The White Tribes,” Joshua Hammer writes, “But nowhere was white flight more dramatic than in Zimbabwe, where the white population dropped from a peak of around 296,000 in 1975 (five percent of the population) to 120,000 in 1999 to just 30,000 today.”¹²¹

Mugabe has now gone after the last four thousand white-owned farms that account for almost all of Zimbabwe’s exports—to hand them to loyalists. Zimbabwe is now a basket case, its starving people fleeing to a South Africa that has started down the same path.

On April 3, 2010, Eugène Terre’Blanche, a white nationalist and last-ditch defender of apartheid, was hacked to death by two black employees on his farm. The murder came, wrote the *Financial Times*, as “Julius Malema, the demagogic leader of the ruling African National Congress’s powerful youth wing, has been touring the country calling for nationalization of private businesses and singing the Apartheid-era song containing the lyrics ‘Kill the Boer.’”¹²² Since the end of

apartheid, agricultural unions claim three thousand white farmers have been killed.¹²³ Half the white population has left the country.

Though a South African court declared “Kill the Boer” hate speech, Malema continued to sing it and traveled to Zimbabwe to hail Mugabe for his violent seizures of white-owned farms. The *FT* urged President Jacob Zuma to steal the thunder of his ANC youth leader with a more rapid redistribution of white-owned land to black South Africans. Since the end of apartheid, fifteen million acres of farmland have been transferred to black owners.¹²⁴

South Africa’s regime, writes Robert Guest of the *Economist*, wants “about 25% of most industries to be in black hands by 2010. The new black capitalists are supposed to pay a ‘market’ price for their acquisitions, but they don’t have the money, so they don’t.”

Instead, the focus is on redistribution. And not the conventional sort, from rich to poor, but from white to black, which is not the same. South Africa has embarked on probably the most extreme affirmative action program anywhere. Private companies above a certain size are obliged to try to make their workforces “demographically representative” (75 percent black, 50 percent female, etc.) from factory floor to boardroom.¹²⁵

Under the Employment Equity Act and Black Economic Empowerment Act, companies are required to discriminate in hiring against white males in favor of white women, persons of color, people with disabilities, and those from rural areas. The government employment act establishes a quota of 80% of all new jobs for blacks.¹²⁶

A racial-ethnic spoils system may be the future in the Third World, leading, as in Africa, to dispossession and departure of whites and Indians whose ancestors were brought there by the British to help run the empire, and were abandoned when the British departed. In Australia, an open-borders policy that has brought millions in from Asia, writes ethologist Frank Salter, has begun to threaten social cohesion and national unity:

Ethnic stratification is taking place.... Anglo Australians ... are presently being displaced disproportionately in the professions and in senior managerial positions by Asian immigrants and their children. The situation is dramatic at selective schools which are the high road to university and the professions. Ethnocentrism is not a White disorder and evidence is emerging that immigrant communities harbour invidious attitudes towards Anglo Australians, disparaging their culture and the legitimacy of their central place in national identity.¹²⁷

Nor are Americans strangers to race violence over who has what.

Korean grocers are a visible presence in black communities and the Korean aptitude for entrepreneurship is legendary. A 2002 census report found 95,000 black-owned businesses in America to 57,000 Korean-owned businesses, though blacks outnumber Korean Americans twenty-five to one.¹²⁸ Thus, a Korean American is fifteen times as likely to own a business with employees as an African American. Of all Asian ethnic groups, Koreans have the highest rate of business ownership. Nor has this gone unnoticed. In his 1991 rap song, Ice Cube reminded Korean shopkeepers who was boss in the 'hood.

*So pay respect to the black fist
or we'll burn your store, right down to a crisp....
Cause you can't turn the ghetto—into Black Korea.*¹²⁹

The following April, in the worst race violence in twentieth-century America, mobs poured out of South Central to attack Koreatown.

Three years later, after protests at Jewish-owned Freddy's Fashion Mart in Harlem featuring chants of "Burn down the Jew store," a berserk African American burst in and shot four employees, then set fire to the store, killing seven in all.

How deep does the resentment run?

In 2006, Andrew Young, former UN ambassador and former Atlanta mayor, was asked if he thought it right that Walmart, whose spokesman he was, was

killing mom-and-pop stores in the African American community. An agitated Young fired back.

Well, I think they should; they ran the “mom-and-pop” stores out of my neighborhood.... But you see those are the people who have been overcharging us—selling us stale bread and bad meat and wilted vegetables. And they sold out and moved to Florida. I think they’ve ripped off our communities enough. First it was Jews, then it was Koreans, now it’s Arabs; very few black people own these stores.¹³⁰

The Korean presence in the black community seems ever on the mind, especially the Korean monopoly of the “black hair” market.

“Whether you’re in the suburbs of Houston or on MLK Boulevard in Anytown, USA,” writes R. Asmerom, in the *Atlanta Post*, “that image of the few Koreans in the neighborhoods only existing behind the cash register of liquor, beauty supply and other retail shops is still perplexing.” Asmerom reported that in September 2010, “[T]here are over 9,000 Korean-owned beauty supply stores serving a billion dollar market for Black hair.” The Korean “concentration in these businesses promoted a shroud of secrecy and protectiveness” that “fueled part of the tension between Korean business owners and the urban African-American community which famously erupted during the 1992 Los Angeles riots.”¹³¹

Asians and whites are America’s market-dominant majority. In half a century, they will become the minority. Already, they are shrinking minorities in major cities. By Chua’s thesis, racial and ethnic majorities will use electoral power to elevate politicians to expropriate the wealth of the minority as is happening with ever-heavier taxes on the upper middle class and wealthy, Asian and white, in California.

The Obama Democrats, who campaigned for abolishing “tax cuts for the rich,” individuals earning \$200,000 and families earning \$250,000, may be a harbinger of what is to come with the rise of Third World America.

“WHITE PEOPLE WITH BLUE EYES”

Chua exposes a fatal flaw of democracy in multiethnic nations.

Free markets concentrate wealth in the hands of a market-capable ethnic minority. Democracy empowers the ethnic majority. When the latter begin to demand a larger share of the wealth, demagogues arise to meet those demands. Hugo Chávez, Evo Morales, Ollanta Humala, Daniel Ortega all profess to speak for the indigenous Indians they claim were robbed by the Portuguese, Spanish, and other Europeans who came after Columbus.

In the United States, MEChA, the “Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán,” or “Chicano Student Movement of Aztlán,” which is present on hundreds of campuses and in the barrios of the Southwest, is a replica of these indigenous peoples’ movements in Latin America. In *World on Fire*, Chua writes of how Hugo Chavez vaulted to power in one of the wealthiest nations of South America.

Chavez swept to his landslide victory on a wave of explicit ethnically based populism. Demanding “a social revolution,” Chavez aroused to impassioned political consciousness Venezuela’s brown-skinned pardos, who make up 80 percent of the population, who are largely destitute, and, who, like “The Indian from Barinas”—as Chavez refers to himself—have “thick mouths” and “Chinese-looking eyes.” “He is one of us,” wept cheering, growth-stunted washerwomen, maids, and peasants. “We’ve never had another president like that before.”¹³²

Two hundred years after Spanish America broke free of Madrid, a deep division between the Spanish and white and the Indian and African, on the lines of race, class, and income, endures. In Colombia that division is on display every November in rival beauty contests.

At the Naval Museum in Cartagena in 2010, writes the *New York Times*, “light-skinned daughters of prominent families” competed for the title of Miss Colombia and “sashayed about flashing perfect smiles and impossibly high cheekbones.”¹³³

A few miles away in a slum called Boston, another beauty contest was being held to crown Miss Independence, queen of the slums. As Colombia has the largest black population of any Spanish-speaking nation, the new Miss Independence was the dark-skinned daughter of a maid who earned six dollars a day cleaning houses of the Cartagena rich. Only once in the seventy-six-year history of the Miss Colombia pageant has an Afro-Colombian candidate won.¹³⁴

Clashes along these same dividing lines—race, class, income—may decide the future of all of Latin America, and not only Latin America.

During the financial crisis, President Lula da Silva, speaking at a press conference with Gordon Brown, stoked the racial resentment of black and brown against the market-dominant minority of the Global Economy:

This crisis was caused by the irrational behavior of white people with blue eyes, who before the crisis appeared to know everything and now demonstrate that they know nothing.... I do not know any black or indigenous bankers so I can only say [it is wrong] that this part of mankind which is victimized more than any other should pay for the crisis.¹³⁵

When riots broke out in Jamaica in May 2010, Orlando Patterson wrote, echoing Chua, “The violence tearing apart Jamaica, a democratic state, raises serious questions ... [about] the link between violence and democracy itself.”¹³⁶

In diverse democracies, the temptation of leaders to exploit ethnic identity for political ends is an all too frequent source of major conflict, sometimes culminating in oppression of minorities and even genocide. We saw this happen in Rwanda in 1994 and the former Yugoslav states in the 1990s. Dennis Austin, who has studied political strife in India and Sri Lanka, has concluded that in such societies, “democracy is itself a spur to violence,” adding “depth to the sense of division.”¹³⁷

In the spring 2010 violence in Kyrgyzstan that toppled the president and

triggered the ethnic cleansing and killing of Uzbeks, Kyrgyz set out to pillage a Chinese-owned mall. “Armed with iron bars and clubs,” reported the *Washington Post*, “the mob stormed into the Guoying center in the middle of the night, looting, smashing and then burning the best-known emblem of China’s economic presence here in the capital.”¹³⁸

Ethnonationalism and populism seem everywhere on the rise, with animosity toward “overseas Chinese” spreading across the Third World where they have settled and succeeded. “It is getting very difficult to be Chinese here,” said the leader of a trade group in Bishkek.¹³⁹ Race resentment and ethnic envy have produced many horrors of our world, but only a fool will deny their power or try to define them out of existence. They are real and we must live with them.

What Amy Chua implies in *World on Fire* bears repeating.

America’s crusade for global democracy may, if successful, ensure endless ethnic warfare. For free markets enrich the economically able, the winners in society—Chinese, Indians, Ibo, Tutsis, whites—while democracy empowers the ethnic majority, the losers. Rulers, dependent on the majority, like Mugabe on his Shona, will then use the law or vigilante justice to reward the people on whom they depend for power, by stripping the minority of its wealth and condoning the humiliation of and violence against that minority. Again and again and again it has happened.

Consider Chua’s law on a global scale. The market dominant minority for five hundred years has been Europeans, now down to a sixth of the world’s population and fated to be a tenth or less in 2060. The world’s majority will be African, Arab, Latin, Asian. Yet, these billions of people have only a fraction of the world’s wealth. Is it not inevitable that there will arise an irresistible worldwide clamor that the few who have so much transfer more of what they have to those who have so little?

Why would Western nations further empower, though transnational institutions, a world majority that believes we are rich because they are poor? Chávez is the hero type of Frantz Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth*. As Chua writes, “Like Bolivia’s Amerindian rebel leader Mallku and Ecuador’s Villavicencio, Chavez generated mass support by attacking Venezuela’s ‘rotten’ white elites.”¹⁴⁰ Is Hugo Chavez a harbinger of what is to come?

An alarmed Russian ambassador to NATO, Dmitry Rogozin, thinks so, and has implored the white nations to unite or fall one by one:

There is an enormous distance between Europe and the Third World. There is a new civilization emerging in the Third World that thinks that the white, northern hemisphere has always oppressed it and must therefore fall at its feet now. This is very serious. If the northern civilization wants to protect itself, it must be united: America, the European Union, and Russia. If they are not together they will be defeated one by one.¹⁴¹

CURSE OR BLESSING

Is ethnonationalism a genetic disease of mankind that all good men should quarantine wherever it breaks out? Or is this drive of awakened peoples to create nations of their own where their own kind come first a force of nature that must be accommodated if we are ever to know peace? To many who lived through the twentieth century, the poisonous fruit of ethnonationalism, the horrors it produced from Nanking to Auschwitz to Rwanda, answer the question with finality: ethnonationalism is a beast that must be chained. Yet ethnonationalism liberated the captive nations and brought down the “evil empire.” And with the rise of Solidarity and its crushing by General Wojciech Jaruzelski on Moscow’s orders, America’s cry was “Let Poland be Poland!” Ethnonationalism gave birth to scores of African and Asian nations that came out of the old European empires. Many are prosperous and peaceful.

America was herself a product of ethnonationalism, the awakening consciousness of the colonists that while we were the children of Europeans we were also a new people, unique, separate, and identifiable: Americans.

Ethnonationalism was behind the pogroms of Europe but created the nation of Israel. Ethnonationalism led to the exodus of six hundred thousand Arabs from their homes in Palestine, the Nakba, or catastrophe, of 1948, but it also birthed in the refugee camps and two intifadas a new people. Palestinians will, God willing, soon have a nation of their own.

If ethnonationalism has been behind terrible crimes, have not great crimes been committed in the name of religion? Do we therefore decry all religions? “Nations are the wealth of humanity, its generalized personalities. The very least of them wears its own special colors, and bears within itself a special facet of divine intention,” said Solzhenitsyn.¹⁴²

We may deny the existence of ethnonationalism, detest it, condemn it. But this creator and destroyer of empires and nations is a force infinitely more powerful than globalism, for it engages the heart. Men will die for it.

Religion, race, culture, and tribe are the four horsemen of the coming apocalypse. But let us give the last word to Professor Jerry Muller: “Americans ... find ethnonationalism discomfiting both intellectually and morally. Social scientists go to great lengths to demonstrate that it is a product not of nature but of culture.... But none of this will make ethnonationalism go away.”¹⁴³

“THE WHITE PARTY”

*The face of America is changing. It's not Joe the Plumber.*¹

—SOLEDAD O'BRIEN, NOV. 4, 2008

CNN Anchor

*The Republican Party is becoming the monochromatic party.*²

—GLORIA BORGER, NOV. 4, 2008

CNN Commentator

*If you look at folks of color ... they're more successful in the Democratic Party than they are in the white, excuse me, in the Republican Party.*³

—HOWARD DEAN, AUGUST 2008

A gaffe, said Michael Kinsley, is when a politician blurts out an impermissible truth, then hastily recants lest he cripple his career.

In the quotation above, Howard Dean committed a gaffe. He told an inconvenient truth. For the Republican Party may be fairly described as the white party, though this was not always true. Before the New Deal, the Democrats were the white party, as they had almost zero black support, having been the party of secession and segregation while Republicans were the party of Lincoln and emancipation. In the Depression year of 1932, a majority of black Americans voted for Hoover and against FDR.

Franklin Roosevelt swiftly ended that tradition in the North, where his New Deal drew support from black voters, even as his Dixiecrat allies continued to deny African Americans the right to vote in the eleven states of the old Confederacy.

How did presidential nominees like Al Smith and FDR of New York and Adlai Stevenson of Illinois sustain the alliance of northern liberals and Southern segregationists? By balancing progressive candidates with Southern or border-state segregationists on every national ticket between 1928 and 1960, except 1940. Those vice presidential nominees were Joe Robinson, of Arkansas, in 1928; John Nance Garner, of Texas, in 1932 and 1936; Harry Truman, of Missouri, who had flirted with the Klan, in 1944; Alben Barkley, of Kentucky, in 1948; John Sparkman, of Alabama, in 1952, who would sign the Southern Manifesto denouncing the *Brown* decision; and Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, in 1956.

Before offering the vice presidency to Henry Wallace in 1940 as a replacement for “Cactus Jack” Garner, FDR sounded out Senator James Byrnes of South Carolina. “Jimmy” Byrnes, a protégé of “Pitchfork” Ben Tillman, was a white supremacist. “This is a white man’s country and will always remain a white man’s country,” he once declared.⁴

Byrnes, regarded as a Southern moderate, had led the Senate battle against the anti-lynching law and helped filibuster it to death in 1938. Offered the vice

presidency in 1940, he turned it down, fearing his record on race would hurt FDR in the North. Had Byrnes accepted the vice presidency, he would almost surely have become president when FDR died in 1945, giving America a white supremacist to lead her into a postcolonial era.⁵ On his accession to the presidency, Truman, who also admired Byrnes, named him secretary of state.

Democratic presidents also rewarded their segregationist allies with Supreme Court seats. Wilson named the anti-Semite James C. McReynolds to the Court in 1914. The 1924 official photograph of the Court was never taken, as McReynolds refused to sit beside Jewish Justice Louis Brandeis.⁶

FDR named former Klansman Hugo Black of Alabama to the Court in 1937. As a lawyer, Black had won an acquittal for a Methodist pastor and Klansman who admitted to murdering the Catholic priest who presided at his daughter's wedding to a Puerto Rican.⁷ Black's law partner was a Cyclops of the Birmingham Klavern. His senate campaign manager was the Grand Dragon of the Alabama Klan. After election to the Senate, Black, who had marched and spoken in robes, hood, and mask, accepted a lifetime membership in the Klan. As Black tells it, FDR was fully aware of his Klan associations.⁸

When McReynolds stepped down in 1941, FDR replaced him with Byrnes. Despite NAACP protests, Byrnes was confirmed by a Democratic Senate, eight minutes after his nomination was submitted. This is the buried past of the Democratic Party of which Bruce Bartlett has written.

For almost a century, since Roger Taney, there had been a tradition of one Catholic Justice on the court. When Justice Frank Murphy died in 1949, Truman terminated that tradition. Eisenhower restored it with William Brennan.

In the two presidential campaigns of Wilson and the four of FDR, Democrats swept every Confederate state all six times. The Democratic candidate in 1924, John W. Davis, carried every Confederate state and, with the exception of Oklahoma, only Confederate states. Truman took seven Southern states to Strom Thurmond's four. Dewey got none. In 1952 and 1956 most of the electoral votes Adlai Stevenson got came from the most segregated states of the South. Only when Nixon swept the South in his forty-nine-state landslide of 1972 did a "Southern Strategy" become the mark of the beast.

Among the two dozen senators to sign the 1956 Southern Manifesto, which

urged resistance to the *Brown* decision, were such grandees as John Sparkman, Walter George, Richard Russell, John Stennis, Sam Ervin, Strom Thurmond, Harry Byrd, John McClellan, Russell Long, Jim Eastland, J. William Fulbright, and George Smathers, a carousing buddy of JFK. All were Democrats. House Democrats who signed the manifesto and would play major roles in national politics included Wilbur Mills, Carl Vinson, Hale Boggs, and Mendel Rivers. In all, ninety-nine Democrats signed the Dixie Manifesto, but only two Republicans.

With the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the nomination of conservative Barry Goldwater, black allegiance to the party of Lincoln ended. Although a majority of votes against the bill were cast by Southern Democrats, Goldwater voted with them. He had been a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), had contributed to its campaign to desegregate Phoenix schools, and had desegregated his own department store and the Arizona Air National Guard when he was chief of staff. But Goldwater was a constitutionalist who believed desegregating public accommodations was a state, not a federal, responsibility.

Nevertheless, perceived as hostile to black aspirations, Goldwater lost the African American vote to Lyndon Johnson by sixteen to one, and Republicans have never since found the favor with African Americans that they had in national elections for the century after Lincoln.

Half a century ago, however, the black vote was not as significant as today. Blacks could not vote in any numbers in the South. Democrats ruled Dixie as a fiefdom and used a variety of ruses to prevent African Americans from going to the polls. Northern blacks did not register or vote to the same extent as whites. And when they did, they gave the party of Lincoln one vote for every two they delivered to the party of FDR. Eisenhower got 39 percent of the black vote in 1956. Running against John F. Kennedy, Richard Nixon won 32 percent. Goldwater's share of the African American vote was only 6 percent.⁹

With the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the mass registration of African Americans began. And with the Immigration Act of 1965, which led to tens of millions coming from the Third World, the ethnic and racial composition of the American electorate was changed forever.

THE GOP'S EXISTENTIAL CRISIS

America is a different country from the one many of us grew up in. In thirty years, Americans of European descent, whose forebears founded the republic and restricted citizenship to “free white persons” of “high moral character,” will be a minority. Hispanics will outnumber blacks two to one. America will have become a nation unrecognizable to our parents. Consider how dramatic the change has been.

In 1960, whites comprised 89 percent of a population of 160 million. They now comprise 64 percent of a population of 310 million. In 2041, they will represent less than 50 percent of a population of 438 million and a much smaller share of the young. No nation has undergone so radical a transformation in so short a time. And these numbers portend an existential crisis for the GOP.

Three political events have contributed to the crisis. The first was the ratification, in March 1961, of the Twenty-third Amendment, granting Washingtonians the right to vote and the District of Columbia the same three votes in the Electoral College as Alaska, Montana, Wyoming, North and South Dakota, Delaware, and Vermont. The District of Columbia is not a state, has no senators, and is one-twentieth of the size of Rhode Island. By population (600,000), D.C. is outranked by twenty-six other U.S. cities. By land area, D.C.'s sixty-eight square miles is exceeded by that of 150 other U.S. cities.

With this amendment the Democratic Congress elected in 1958 added three electoral votes to their party's total in every future presidential contest, for D.C. has never voted Republican. Also, in treating D.C. like a state, Congress opened the door to the possibility of statehood and electoral votes for Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. The drive to make Puerto Rico the fifty-first state, which would add six new members to the House and two U.S. senators and would make America a bilingual nation, is steadily advancing, with Republican support.

Washington, D.C., votes for the Democrats in every election, municipal or national, as Washington depends on government for survival. And as more Americans come to depend on government for their health, education, and incomes, more and more will vote for that same Party of Government.

The second event was the Immigration Act of 1965, which brought in scores of millions from the Third World to break a Republican lock on the presidency that Nixon and Reagan had given the party for a quarter century. Third was the decision of a Democratic Congress and President Nixon to impose the eighteen-year-old vote on the states.

In extending the 1965 Voting Rights Act, Congress in 1970 added a rider declaring that eighteen-year-olds had the right to vote in federal elections. This was blatantly unconstitutional, as it had required one constitutional amendment, the fifteenth, to guarantee former slaves the right to vote, and another, the nineteenth, to guarantee women the right to vote.

As a special assistant, this writer urged President Nixon to veto the bill. For presidents take an oath to defend the Constitution, and Nixon himself believed the eighteen-year-old vote could not be accomplished by statute. As Nixon wrote:

As passed, the bill contained a “rider” which I believe to be unconstitutional: a provision lowering the voting age to 18 in Federal, State and local elections. Although I strongly favor the 18-year-old vote, I believe—along with most of the Nation’s leading constitutional scholars—that Congress has no power to enact it by simple statute, but rather it requires a constitutional amendment.¹⁰

Nixon should have vetoed the bill. Instead, declaring that he had “misgivings,” he signed it and directed Attorney General John Mitchell to seek an expedited review. The Supreme Court ruled swiftly. The rider was unconstitutional. But by now state legislators and governors, assuming the eighteen-year-old vote was inevitable with Nixon backing it, rushed to support a constitutional amendment so as not to offend the young people likely to vote in 1972. Thus was the Twenty-sixth Amendment approved by the requisite thirty-eight states in July 1971, adding millions of eighteen-, nineteen-, and twenty-year-olds to the electorate forever.

To understand the existential crisis of the GOP, brought on by these reforms, let us look back to the voting results of the 2008 presidential election.

A CORONER'S REPORT ON THE MCCAIN CAMPAIGN

To study the exit polls from the McCain-Obama race is to see stark and clear what a coroner might declare to be the cause of death of the Grand Old Party.

An April 2009 analysis of Census Bureau data by the Pew Research Center reveals that white voters made up 76 percent of the electorate in 2008. (In 1960, they had comprised 94 percent.)¹¹ African Americans comprised 12 percent of all voters in 2008; Hispanics, 7.4 percent; and Asians, 2.5 percent.

According to the exit polls from November, McCain got 55 percent of the white vote, 31 percent of the Hispanic vote, and 4 percent of the black vote, the same share of the black vote David Duke got when he ran for governor of Louisiana.

But if black America has become a bloc vote in presidential years, white America is a house divided. In Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, McCain won 85 percent of the white vote. In Washington, D.C., McCain lost 85 percent of the white vote. In August 2008, 8 percent of white voters said race was the most important factor in the upcoming election, and 13 percent cited race as one of several important factors. More than one-third of the whites who said the race of the candidate was important said they were voting for Obama.¹² Obama almost surely got millions of white votes *because* he is African American.

As for the black vote in 2008, the *New Yorker* writes:

Judging from exit polls, black voters made up about 1.1 per cent of the McCain electorate, which is lower than the historical average, but not by much. (In 1984, when President Reagan was reelected in a landslide, black voters accounted for only about 1.5 per cent of his total.) American politics has been segregated for decades; the election of a black President only made that segregation more obvious.¹³

By religious affiliation, Protestants accounted for 54 percent of the electorate; Catholics, 27 percent; and Jews, 2 percent. McCain won 54 percent of the Protestant vote, 45 percent of the Catholic vote, and 21 percent of the Jewish vote. Using basic arithmetic, one finds that 64 percent of McCain's voters were

Protestant and 27 percent Catholic. Thus, 91 percent of McCain voters were Christian, and 91 percent were white. White Christians are the Republican base.

Black Americans made up 1 percent of McCain's vote, Jews less than 1 percent. Although few senators have been more pro-Israel than McCain, who wanted to put Senator Joe Lieberman, a Jewish independent Democrat, on his ticket, he lost the Jewish vote by a staggering 57 points. Norman Podhoretz explains:

[F]or most American Jews.... liberalism has become more than a political outlook. It has for all practical purposes superseded Judaism and become a religion in its own right. And to the dogmas and commandments of this religion they give the kind of steadfast devotion their forefathers gave to the religion of the Hebrew Bible. For many, moving to the right is invested with much the same horror their forefathers felt about conversion to Christianity.¹⁴

Republican courtship of the Jewish vote has failed. And given its shrinking share of the national vote, this seems barren terrain, though the Obama collisions with Netanyahu and his Likud party suggest the GOP should not write off the Jewish vote (critical in Florida) in 2012. But so long as Obama is the voice and face of his party, the African American vote, six to seven times as large as the Jewish vote, is gone. This is not an argument for writing off any voters. But it does tell Republicans where the fish are not biting.

Consider younger voters. McCain lost voters aged eighteen to twenty-nine by a margin of 66 to 32 percent. George W. Bush also lost this age group twice, but by smaller margins. Yet, for the third straight presidential election, the GOP lost young voters. What makes this worrisome for the party is that lifetime voting habits are formed in a voter's first few elections.

Nor can one ignore the ethnic and religious factors among the young. As Chuck Todd and Sheldon Gawiser write, in *How Barack Obama Won*:

Young voters are more diverse racially and ethnically than older voters and are growing more so over time. Just 62% of voters under 30 are

white, while 18% are black and 14% Hispanic. Four years ago, this age group was 68% white; in 2000, nearly three-quarters, 74%, were white. They are also more secular in their religious orientation and fewer report regular attendance at worship services, and secular voters tend to vote Democratic.¹⁵

One thus returns to the criticality of the white vote to the GOP, and the approaching and perhaps terminal crisis caused by its support for an open-borders immigration policy that is shrinking the party's base into America's newest minority. As Thomas Edsall writes, in the *Huffington Post*,

The trend is striking. In 1976, 89 percent of the electorate was white. That number fell ... to 88 percent in 1980, 86 percent in 1984, 85 percent in 1988, 83 percent in 1996, 81 percent in 2000, 77 percent in 2004, and 74 percent last year. The only exception was 1992, when the presence of independent candidate Ross Perot drove the white percentage of the electorate up to 87 percent.¹⁶

Republican analyst Bill Greener wrote, after the 2008 election:

In 1976, 90 percent of the votes cast in the presidential election came from non-Hispanic whites. In 2008, John McCain won this vote by a 56–43 margin. Had John McCain run in 1976 instead of 2008, not only would he have won, he would have won the popular vote before a single nonwhite vote was cast.¹⁷

Greener drives the point home:

So, despite all the chatter about the impact of Sarah Palin, despite the unpopularity of President Bush, despite the difficulty of the same party winning a third consecutive national election, despite the charisma of Barack Obama (and the love shown to him by the mainstream media), despite the financial meltdown of September, despite any other factor

anyone can cite, if John McCain had been the candidate at a time when non-Hispanic whites were the overwhelming majority of the voters, he would be president now.¹⁸

The message bears repeating. White Americans, who provide nine out of ten Republican votes every presidential year, have fallen to less than two-thirds of the U.S. population and three-fourths of the electorate. Meanwhile, the number of people of color is growing, both as a share of the population and as a share of the electorate. And in presidential elections, people of color vote Democratic—in landslides. Asians vote 60 percent Democratic, Hispanics 60–70 percent, and African Americans 90–95 percent.

Despite the Republican sweep in 2010, the “number of House districts where minorities constitute at least 30 percent of the population has roughly doubled, from one-fourth in the 1990s to one-half now.”¹⁹ This means more and more congressional districts are moving to where they will be safely Democratic, even in Republican-wave elections like 2010.

Through its support of mass immigration, its paralysis in preventing twelve to twenty million illegal aliens from entering and staying in this country, and its failure to address the “anchor-baby” issue, the Republican Party has birthed a new electorate that will send the party the way of the Whigs. After Bush’s defeat of John Kerry, Michael Moore consoled liberals:

... 88% of Bush’s support came from white voters. In 50 years, America will no longer have a white majority. Hey, 50 years isn’t such a long time! If you’re ten years old and reading this, your golden years will be truly golden and you will be well cared for in your old age.²⁰

“The demographic that Palin attracts is in decline,” writes Frank Rich. “That demographic is white and nonurban.”²¹

While he relishes the decline of the Sarah Palin demographic, Rich is not wrong. Political scientist Alan Abramowitz projects that minorities will make up 34 percent of the electorate in 2020.²² Whites will comprise 66 percent. A GOP presidential candidate could then win the same 60 percent of the white vote the

GOP won in 2010 and still be 10 points away from a tie in the popular vote.

INDIAN SUMMER OF THE GOP?

On November 2, 2010, the Republican Party swept to its greatest off-year triumph since before World War II, picking up 5 governorships, 6 Senate seats, 63 House seats, and 680 state legislators. As of January 2009, few predicted such a comeback, though some of us said that Obama, like Hoover, would be blamed for the tough times ahead, even though a major recession had been baked into the cake, before he arrived. Many analysts were writing the GOP's obituary. James Carville's 2009 book was titled *40 More Years: How the Democrats Will Rule the Next Generation*.

The issues that caused the defection from the Democrats are not in dispute. They include the 9.5 percent unemployment for fourteen months before the election; the failure of the \$787 billion stimulus to stop the hemorrhaging of jobs; fear of deficits of 10 percent of GDP and a national debt surging to a hundred percent of GDP; the public's rejection of Obamacare; the belief that the federal government is seizing too much power; the sinking popularity of the president; Nancy Pelosi; Harry Reid; and the rise of the Tea Party—not necessarily in that order.

But the real story of the 2010 election is about who stayed home and who came out to vote. The Republican Party rolled to the most stunning off-year election victory in living memory because white America came out to vote and minorities and the young stayed home.

According to a *New York Times* postelection analysis, the white vote rose from 75 percent of the electorate in the McCain-Obama race of 2008 to 78 percent in 2010, and the Republican share rose from 55 percent in 2008 to 62 percent. In the South, the Republican share of the white vote rose to 73 percent, inundating Blue Dog veterans like John Spratt of South Carolina and Gene Taylor of Mississippi.²³

In the Deep South, where segregation endured the longest, segregation has returned, this time to politics. "Of the nine Democratic representatives that remain from states of the Deep South, only one, John Barrow of Georgia, is

white. Of the 28 Republicans, only one, the newly elected Tim Scott of South Carolina, is black.”²⁴

Says Dave “Mudcat” Saunders, a strategist to Southern Democrats, “Right now in most of Dixie it is culturally unacceptable to be a Democrat. It’s a damn shame, but that’s the way it is.”²⁵

In “White Flight,” his analysis of the 2010 congressional election, Ron Brownstein of *National Journal* put the Republican share of the white vote at 60 percent and the Democratic share at 37 percent, but he notes that the alienation of white America from Obama and his policies is even more pronounced:

Exactly 75 percent of minority voters said they approved [of Obama’s performance]; only 22 percent said they disapproved. Among white voters, just 35 percent approved of the president’s performance, while 65 percent disapproved; a head-turning 49 percent of whites said they *strongly* disapproved. (Those whites voted Republican last fall by a ratio of 18-to-1.)²⁶

Republicans again lost the youth vote, 18–29, by a margin of 56–42 percent, but this was a far better showing than John McCain’s, who lost them by more than two to one. Republicans won all other age groups, including seniors by 20 points. However, Democrats carried 73 percent of nonwhites, including Asians, Hispanics, and African Americans.²⁷

Catholics and Protestants were 89 percent of the electorate and the GOP won 55 percent of the Catholics and 61 percent of the Protestants. Once again, the Republican vote was over 90 percent Christian and over 90 percent white.

The crisis of the GOP can be stated simply: due to immigration and higher birthrates among people of color, America is becoming less white and less Christian—and, therefore, inevitably, less Republican.

The Democratic base is growing, and the Republican base is dying.

THE DEMOCRATIC BASE

In the early aftermath of Obama's victory, Brownstein saw GOP hopes of recapturing the White House fading like the Cheshire Cat in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. And his case was rooted in recent political history:

In the five presidential elections beginning with Clinton's victory in 1992, and ending with Obama's in 2008, eighteen states and the District of Columbia, with 248 electoral votes, voted Democratic all five times. In not one of the eighteen states or D.C. did McCain come within 10 points of Obama. In New York, Illinois and California, McCain did not come within 20 points.²⁸

The eighteen states include all of New England except New Hampshire; New York and New Jersey; the mid-Atlantic states of Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland; four major midwestern states—Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; the three Pacific coast states of California, Oregon, and Washington; and Hawaii. Moreover, Iowa, New Hampshire, and New Mexico have gone Democratic in four of the last five presidential contests.

Even after 2010, there are only two Republican congressmen in all of New England, both from New Hampshire.

In Massachusetts one sees a Republican party on the way to extinction. Every statewide elected official except Senator Scott Brown is a Democrat, as are all the congressmen. There are four Republicans among 40 state senators and 30 Republicans in the 160-member state assembly. Not since the 1950s has the GOP controlled either house. "Uniquely among the 50 states," writes analyst Jon Keller, in *The Bluest State*, "Massachusetts over the past few decades has been a Democrats' Burger King: They always have it their way."²⁹

Consider the nation's most populous state, with one-fifth of the electoral votes needed to win the presidency. California went for Nixon in all five elections in which he was on the national ticket, and for Reagan all four times he ran. Now, not only has California gone Democratic in five straight presidential elections, McCain's share of the state vote fell below Goldwater's. In 2010, Meg Whitman and Carly Fiorina, despite well-funded campaigns, lost by 10 points or more to Jerry Brown and Barbara Boxer. Brown, who won the governorship, and

Boxer, who won the Senate seat, had been around for decades. While Democrats were shedding sixty-three U.S. House seats, in California they did not lose a single one and added to their strength in Sacramento, where Democrats control both houses of the legislature. California has added ten million people since 1988, but Republican registration is below what it was in 1988. The GOP does not hold one statewide office. As the *L.A. Times* wrote, in an autopsy of the Republican defeat, “the party’s white and conservative voter base is giving way to the state’s nonwhite and nonpartisan population.”³⁰

Adds Michael Blood, of the Associated Press, “[T]he party of Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan is slowly sinking in the West.”³¹

High among the reasons the GOP has lost California is, again, immigration and the socioeconomic and ethnic character of the immigrants. Nearly 90 percent now come from the Third World and are mostly poor or working class. They rely on government for help with health care, housing, education, incomes. “If there is one group you could say that does not share the Republican small-government philosophy, it’s Latinos,” says Antonio Gonzalez, president of the Southwest Voter Registration Education Project. “We are Big-Government, government-safety-net, activist-government [voters].”³²

Indeed, in “Demographic Change and the Future of the Parties,” written for the Center for American Progress, Ruy Teixeira comes to a conclusion that will be impossible for the party of Reagan to accept:

These data suggest that there is really only one way for the GOP to effectively compete for minority voters, and it’s a way that Republicans have rejected so far. The party must, quite simply, become less conservative. They will have to jettison their bitter hostility to active government, spending on social services, and immigration reform and develop their own approach in these areas that minorities might find appealing.³³

If a historian were to write *The Decline and Fall of the House of Reagan*, he could find no better place to study than Orange County, birthplace of Richard Nixon, home of John Wayne, Goldwater country, and a bastion of the John Birch

Society. In this Alcázar of the old Right, Reagan thumped Carter three to one. Yet, Obama ran McCain close to a dead heat, for the Orange County of yesterday is gone. Republican registration has fallen to 43 percent. Forty-five percent of residents speak a language other than English in their homes. Writes Adam Nagourney, of the *New York Times*:

Whites make up only 45 percent of the population; this county is teeming with Hispanics as well as Vietnamese, Korean, and Chinese families. Its percentage of foreign-born residents jumped to 30 percent in 2009 from 6 percent in 1970, and visits to some of its corners can seem like a trip to a foreign land.³⁴

In 2010, Loretta Sanchez, who captured the Orange County seat of Bob Dornan in 1996 in a photo finish in which illegal aliens allegedly provided her margin of victory, raised the specter of Hispanics in peril of losing a seat to a rival ethnic group. Sanchez told Jorge Ramos on Univision's *Al Punto* program, "The Vietnamese [are] trying to take away this seat ... from us and give it to this Van Tran, who's very anti-immigrant and very anti-Latino."³⁵

The old ideological politics of Orange County has given way to a new tribal politics. The county was once a microcosm of and metaphor for Middle America. But immigration has changed its character forever. The new Hispanic poor and working class depend on government and vote for government. Vietnamese, Koreans, and Chinese no longer see the Republican Party as their natural home, as the Cold War anticommunism of the GOP has become irrelevant in the new century. A loss of manufacturing and outsourcing of jobs have changed Orange County from a middle-class bastion into a place where the disparities of wealth have visibly widened.

"[T]he political texture of this county, which is larger in population than Nevada or Iowa," writes Nagourney, "is changing, and many officials say it is only a matter of time before many Republican office-holders get swept out with the tide."³⁶ As Orange County goes, so goes California, and as California goes, so goes America.

Another cause of the approaching Republican crisis is the division of the

nation into taxpayers and tax consumers. Since Reagan, tax cuts have dropped one-third of all wage earners off the tax rolls. When tax credits are factored in, 47 percent of U.S. workers pay no U.S. income tax. A study by the Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation found that, in 2009, fully 51 percent of all households owed no federal income tax. If one pays no federal income tax, yet reaps a bonanza of federal benefits, it makes sense to vote for the party of government and against a party that would cut the government. Two centuries ago, John C. Calhoun, who studied the failings and failures of democracies, precisely described our present condition:

The necessary result, then, of the unequal fiscal action of the government is, to divide the community into two great classes; one consisting of those who, in reality, pay the taxes, and ... bear exclusively the burthen of supporting the government; and the other, of those who are the recipients of their proceeds, through disbursements, and who are, in fact, supported by the government; or, in fewer words, to divide it into taxpayers and tax-consumers.³⁷

Calhoun's division of the nation describes the America of today. Were the taxing power to be exploited, he warned, "for the purpose of aggrandizing and building up one portion of the community at the expense of the other.... it must give rise to two parties and to violent conflicts and struggles between them, to obtain the control of the government."³⁸

Calhoun was forecasting the Tea Party revolution. We are today engaged in his "conflicts and struggles," a synonym for class warfare. For the vast majority of the 4.4 million on welfare, the 22 million on government payrolls, the 23 million receiving EITC checks, the 44 million on food stamps, the 50 million on Medicaid, the 70 million wage earners who pay no income tax, the Democratic Party is their party.

We are approaching the tipping point where there will be more tax consumers than there are taxpayers. Reports the *Wall Street Journal*:

Nearly half of all Americans now live in a household in which

someone receives government benefits, more than at any time in history [while] the fraction of American households not paying federal income taxes has also grown—to an estimated 45% in 2010, from 39% five years ago.³⁹

Thirteen percent of U.S. households do not even pay Social Security taxes.⁴⁰ Why should scores of millions of people who pay no taxes but partake of a cornucopia of benefits vote for a party committed to cutting benefits? H. L. Mencken's quip in the 1930s about the New Deal has become reality in the twenty-first century. America has indeed been divided "into those who work for a living and those who vote for a living."⁴¹

The Republican lock on the presidency, crafted by Nixon and patented by Reagan, has been picked. Will 2010 prove to be the Indian summer of the Republican Party before an endless winter sets in?

THE AUDACITY OF HOPE

Consider again the numbers cited above, which raise insistent questions that the Republicans of this generation refuse to address. In 2008, black and Jewish voters each gave McCain just one percent of his vote. Why then the GOP obsession with African American voters who went 24–1 for Obama, but are outnumbered by white voters 6–1? Why does the GOP spend so much time courting Jewish voters, who are outnumbered by Catholic voters 13–1 and by Protestant voters 25–1? And Jews are more deeply dyed-in-the-wool Democrats than are Catholics or Protestants. Even Ronald Reagan never came close to carrying the Jewish vote.

You go hunting where the ducks are, said Barry Goldwater. As whites remain three-fourths of the electorate and Christians four-fifths, this is where the GOP will find victory or defeat. If Republicans can raise their 2012 nominee's share of the Catholic vote from 45 to 52 percent—what Bush won against Kerry and the party won again in 2010—that seven-point gain would add more votes than would going from 20 percent of the Jewish vote to 100 percent.

Which of these two feats is easier for the party to accomplish?

Not only is the Catholic vote 13.5 times the Jewish vote, it is more receptive to the Republican stance on moral and social issues—for prayer in school and right-to-life on abortion, and against embryonic stem-cell research, euthanasia, same-sex marriage, and affirmative action.

Consider again the black vote. By one estimate, Nixon, running in 1972 against a South Dakota liberal who lacked Hubert Humphrey's heroic standing in black America, won 18 percent of the black vote. In 2010, McCain got 4 percent. For a half-century, 18 percent and 4 percent have been the high and low water marks for the GOP with black voters. In 2012, with Obama running, the GOP figure will likely remain close to that 4 percent.

But if the Republican candidate can raise the GOP share of the white vote from McCain's 55 percent to the 58 percent Bush got in 2004, that would have the same impact on GOP vote totals as raising the party's share of the African American vote from 4 percent to 21 percent.

And if the GOP can simply win again in 2012 the same 60–62 percent of the white vote the party won in 2010, a presidential victory is almost assured.

Demographer William H. Frey, of the Brookings Institution, emphasizes this crucial point:

While the significance of minority votes for Obama is clearly key, it cannot be overlooked that reduced white support for a Republican candidate allowed minorities to tip the balance in many slow-growing “purple” states.

The question I would ask is if a continuing stagnating economy could change that.⁴²

What these numbers and Frey’s point demonstrate is that McCain, who refused to focus on issues of concern to Christians, such as same-sex marriage and right to life, and issues of concern to the white working and middle class, such as affirmative action, illegal immigration, NAFTA, and the racist rants of Rev. Wright, forfeited his chance to be president. Only once during the election did McCain move into the lead. That was for the two weeks after he chose Sarah Palin, a charismatic Christian with immense appeal to Evangelicals and Nashville-NASCAR “real Americans.”

Frank Rich, though socially and culturally repulsed by Palin and those for whom she speaks, recognized her appeal to the forgotten Americans.

[Palin] stands for a genuine movement: a dwindling white nonurban America that is aflame with grievances and awash in self-pity as the country hurtles into the 21st century and leaves it behind.... The real wave she’s riding is a loud, resonant surge of resentment and victimization.⁴³

Rich is talking of those “bitter” folks, clinging to their Bibles, bigotries, and guns, Obama spoke of at that closed-door fund-raiser in San Francisco, where he explained why white Pennsylvanians were not rallying to him. The resentment to which Palin appeals, writes Rich, as he sketched his caricature of Middle

America, “is in part about race”:

When Palin referred to Alaska as “a microcosm of America” during the 2008 campaign, it was in defiance of the statistical reality that her state’s tiny black and Hispanic populations are unrepresentative of her nation. She stood for the “real America,” she insisted, and the identity of the unreal America didn’t have to be stated explicitly for audiences to catch her drift.⁴⁴

There is some truth in what Rich writes. In the fortnight following Palin’s selection, McCain vaulted from eight points down to four points up for the first time in the election year. Those “bitter” folks of Obama’s derisive depiction, who gave Hillary her crushing victories in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky, had suddenly swung over to John McCain.

What the above points to is a strategy from which Republicans will recoil, a strategy to increase the GOP share of the white Christian vote and increase the turnout of that vote by specific appeals to social, cultural, and moral issues, and for equal justice for the emerging white minority. If the GOP is not the party of New Haven firefighter Frank Ricci and Cambridge cop James Crowley, it has no future. And although Howard Dean disparages the Republicans as the “white party,” why should Republicans be ashamed to represent the progeny of the men who founded, built, and defended America since her birth as a nation?

In 2009, Virginia and New Jersey showed the way. In Virginia, the GOP candidate for governor, Bob McDonnell, got 9 percent of the black vote to McCain’s 8 percent. No gain. But the white share of the electorate rose from 70 percent in 2008 to 78 percent in 2009, and McDonnell won 67 percent of that vote to McCain’s 60. Thus did McDonnell turn McCain’s 6-point defeat in the Old Dominion into a 17-point Republican landslide.

In New Jersey, Republican Chris Christie got 9 percent of the black vote to McCain’s 8 percent. But Christie took 59 percent of the white vote to McCain’s 50 percent, and won the governorship.

In January 2010, Scott Brown pulled off the upset of the century, capturing a Senate seat held for almost sixty years by John F. Kennedy and his brother

Edward. How did Brown turn Obama's 26-point victory over McCain into a 6-point victory over Attorney General Martha Coakley? By sweeping the white vote as massively as had Obama.

In the 2008 election, 79 percent of Massachusetts voters were white. Obama carried them by 20 points. While there were no exit polls from the Brown-Coakley race, analysts believe the white vote was over 80 percent and Brown carried two-thirds of it. For the independents in the Bay State who went overwhelmingly for Brown are largely white folks who have left the Democratic Party, while blacks and Hispanics have stayed loyal. Brown won a huge majority of those independents.

Moreover, the clash between Sergeant Crowley and Professor Gates took place in Cambridge. And when Obama rushed to judgment to charge Crowley with having "acted stupidly," his support sagged in white America but sank in the Bay State, where Governor Deval Patrick joined Obama in piling on the Cambridge cop.⁴⁵

The McDonnell, Christie, and Brown campaigns have shown a light on the path to victory over Obama in 2012. The Republican road to recapture of the White House lies in increasing white turnout and raising the party's share of that turnout—three-fourths of the entire electorate—from McCain's 55 percent closer to the two-thirds won by Nixon and Reagan.

In the final analysis, however, a serenely confident Bill Clinton was probably right. Asked by David Gregory on *Meet the Press* if the "vast right-wing conspiracy" Hillary had identified was "still there," Clinton replied, "Oh, you bet. Sure it is. It's not as strong as it was because America has changed demographically."⁴⁶

WHAT PANDERING PRODUCED

At the 1988 convention that nominated him, Vice President George H. W. Bush promised a “kinder and gentler” administration, which caused conservatives to ask, “kinder and gentler than whom?” The campaign Bush was conducting, however, as he spoke that August night, was anything but kind and gentle.

Far behind after the Democratic convention in late July, Bush and campaign chief Lee Atwater turned a 17-point deficit on August 1 into an 8-point lead by Labor Day that Bush never lost. How did they effect a 25-point turnaround in five weeks? They eviscerated Michael Dukakis on social and cultural issues: specifically, Dukakis’s veto of a bill that mandated recitation of the pledge of allegiance in schools, his opposition to the death penalty, his pride in being “a card-carrying member of the ACLU,” and his weekend furloughs for convicts and killers like Willie Horton.

After the Houston convention of 1992, however, President Bush—Lee Atwater having passed away—recoiled from social and cultural issues and sought to win on foreign policy and the economy, where his approval rating was only 16 percent. The social issues could have derailed Clinton, which is why James Carville told the War Room to stay laser-focused: “It’s the economy, stupid!” Bush and James Baker seemed to think social and cultural issues beneath the dignity of a president. So it was that George H. W. Bush ceased to be president.

Under Bush II, the GOP sought to broaden its base by pandering to liberal minorities at the expense of its base. In July 2005, Ken Mehlman, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, traveled to the NAACP convention in Milwaukee to apologize for a Southern Strategy that from 1968 to 1988 produced five GOP victories in six presidential elections and two forty-nine-state landslides. “Some Republicans gave up on winning the African American vote, looking the other way or trying to benefit politically from racial polarization,” said Mehlman. “I am here today as the Republican chairman to tell you we were wrong.”⁴⁷ White House Press Secretary Scott McClellan seconded Mehlman.

Yet Bush was even then boycotting the NAACP convention for the fifth year.

And understandably so. For the NAACP had run ads in 2000 implying that Bush had been indifferent to the dragging death of James Byrd, a disabled black man in Waco, Texas. NAACP chairman Julian Bond had compared his cabinet choices to mullahs. President Bush, said Bond, had “selected nominees from the Taliban wing of American politics, appeased the wretched appetites of the extreme right wing and chose Cabinet officials whose devotion to the Confederacy is nearly canine in its uncritical affection.”⁴⁸

A month after Mehlman’s apology, Katrina struck, and some in the black community charged that Bush had failed to act swiftly to rescue New Orleans because most of the victims were black. Bush had won 9 percent of the black vote in 2000 and 11 percent in 2004. He saw his approval among African Americans plunge to 2 percent.

Mehlman would lead the GOP into 2006, where the party would lose both houses of Congress. He resigned and went to work for Henry Kravis on Wall Street. How did his outreach effort succeed? In 2008, McCain would lose the African American vote 24–1. In 2010, Ken Mehlman came out of the closet and went to work in support of same-sex marriage.

“ILLIBERAL DEMOCRATS”

“I have a much broader base to build a winning coalition on,” Hillary Clinton boasted to *USA Today* in May 2008, speaking of her stronger appeal to white voters. She cited an AP article, which, in her words,

found how Sen. Obama’s support among working, hard-working Americans, white Americans, is weakening again, and how whites in both states who had not completed college were supporting me.... These are the people you have to win if you’re a Democrat in sufficient numbers to actually win the election. Everybody knows that.⁴⁹

The Democratic Party can’t win with just “eggheads and African-Americans,” Paul Begala added helpfully.⁵⁰

What Hillary and Begala were saying was politically incorrect but palpably true. She was describing “Reagan Democrats,” white folks who would give her 10-point victories in Ohio and Pennsylvania and 41-and 35-point victories in West Virginia and Kentucky. Obama’s success in bringing them home in November cost John McCain the election.

Who are these Democrats, half of whom had said in exit polls from North Carolina and Indiana that if Hillary lost the nomination they would stay home or vote for McCain? In his derisive way, Frank Rich described them:

a constituency that feels disenfranchised—by the powerful and well-educated who gamed the housing bubble, by a news media it keeps being told is hateful, by the immigrants who have taken some of their jobs, by the African-American who has ended a white monopoly on the White House. Palin is their born avatar. She puts a happy, sexy face on ugly emotions, and she can solidify her followers’ hold on a G.O.P. that has no leaders with the guts or alternative vision to stand up to them or to her.⁵¹

They are working class and middle class, Protestant and Catholic, small-town and rural, often unionized, middle-aged and seniors, surviving on less than \$50,000 a year. In the forty years from 1968 to 2008, two Democrats won the presidency. Both did so only after connecting with these folks.

In 1976, Carter ran as an Annapolis graduate, Navy submariner, nuclear engineer, born-again Baptist Sunday-school preacher, and peanut farmer from Plains, Georgia, who wished to preserve the “ethnic purity” of northern neighborhoods. In 1992, Bill Clinton ran as a death-penalty Democrat from Hope, Arkansas, who had the nerve to diss Sister Souljah right in front of Jesse Jackson.

The morning after the 2006 Democratic capture of both houses of Congress, Jacob Weisberg identified the new breed of Democrat that was now the decisive swing vote on Capitol Hill as “economic nationalists” and “illiberal Democrats”:

Most of those who reclaimed Republican seats ran hard against free

trade, globalization, and any sort of moderate immigration policy. That these Democrats won makes it likely that others will take up their reactionary call. Some of the newcomers may even be foolish enough to try to govern on the basis of their misguided theory.⁵²

After losing the Pennsylvania primary, Obama, to appeal to these people, reinvented himself as a proud patriot whose grandfather fought in Patton's army, who enjoyed a bottle of Bud like the next guy, a kid raised in poverty by a single mom who had turned his back on Wall Street to fight for steelworkers laid off when the mills closed in south Chicago.

McCain, a POW and war hero, was a natural for middle Pennsylvania and middle Ohio. But on the populist issues, the outsourcing of American jobs and the invasion of illegals from Mexico, he stood with the *Wall Street Journal*, the K Street lobbyists, and corporate America—for NAFTA and for amnesty.

Like Bush I in 1992, McCain recoiled from cultural and social issues. He denounced Tarheel Republicans for linking Obama to the Reverend Wright. He berated a conservative talk show host who mocked Barack's middle name. He went to Canada to swear allegiance to NAFTA. The mainstream media applauded, but, before Palin arrived, the Republican base was sullen and the Reagan Democrats were silent.

McCain's diffidence on right to life, affirmative action, and gay rights, his embrace of amnesty and NAFTA, explain the enthusiasm gap. On election day, twice as many voters were excited about the prospect of an Obama presidency as were about a McCain presidency.

McCain would learn his lesson. In 2010, when challenged by former congressman J. D. Hayworth in a GOP primary, McCain ceased to be the maverick beloved of the national press and did a passable imitation of Tom Tancredo. He ran a tough-talking television advertisement charging that illegal aliens were responsible for "home invasions [and] murders." The ad ended with McCain walking the border with a sheriff and demanding, "Complete the danged fence!"

COMEBACK ROAD

For conservatives, *How Barack Obama Won* reads like something out of Edgar Allan Poe's tales of the macabre. Yet, on closer reading, one can discern the Republican path to victory in 2012, even as the light shone upon that path in 2010.

First, the bad news.

Obama raised the black vote to 13 percent of the national vote, then carried it 95–4 percent. The Republican share of the Hispanic vote—9 percent of the electorate in exit polls, 7.4 percent in census figures—fell from Bush's 40 percent in 2004 to 32 percent for McCain. Young voters aged eighteen to twenty-nine went for Obama by a margin of 66–31 percent. Obama ran stronger among white voters with a college education than Kerry or Gore.

Put starkly, the voting groups that are expanding as a share of the electorate—Hispanics, Asians, African Americans, and whites with college degrees—were all trending ever more Democratic in 2008. The voters most loyal to the GOP—white folks without college degrees and religious conservatives—were shrinking as a share of the electorate.

Where were the signs of hope?

First, in 2008, 75 percent of voters thought the country was headed in the wrong direction. Obama won these voters 62–36 percent. But if the country is seen as headed in the wrong direction in 2012, as most Americans believe today, this will cast a cloud over Obama's candidacy. McCain's albatross in 2008 would become Obama's in 2012.

Second, only 27 percent of voters in 2008 approved of Bush's performance by election day. Only Truman, as a sitting president in an election year, had a lower rating, 22 percent in 1952. That year, Democrats lost the White House and both houses of Congress.

Todd's point is dramatic: "With the single exception of Missouri, which barely went for McCain, Obama won every state where Bush's approval rating was below 35% in the exit polls, and he lost every state where Bush's approval was above 35%."⁵³

Obama rode Bush's coattails to victory. Had Bush been at 35 or 40 percent on election day, McCain might have won. In 2012, Obama will not have George Bush to kick around anymore.

Third, on election day, 93 percent rated the economy as not so good or poor. The GOP will not have to wear those concrete boots in 2012. Obama will, as he wore them in the 2010 wipeout.

Fourth, on candidates' qualities, the situation looks even rosier for Republicans. In 2008, no less than 34 percent of the electorate said the most important consideration in a candidate was that he be for "change." Not only was Obama the "change candidate," he patented the issue and carried this third of the nation looking for change by an astounding 89–9 percent. But in 2012, Obama will be the candidate of continuity, the incumbent. The candidate of change will be his Republican opponent.

Fifth, the second most critical consideration of voters in choosing a president was "values." Thirty percent of the electorate put values first. Among that 30 percent, McCain won 65–32.

Values issues are the GOP's ace in the hole.

What that two to one McCain advantage argues is that the neoconservatives instructing the GOP to dump values issues should themselves be dumped.

Traditional values are a powerful magnet for the most Democratic of minorities. African Americans gave McCain 5 percent of their votes in California, but gave Proposition 8, the proposal to outlaw gay marriage, 70 percent of their votes. "[N]o ethnic group anywhere," said the *Washington Post*, "rejected the sanctioning of same-sex unions as emphatically as the state's black voters."⁵⁴ California Hispanics gave McCain 23 percent of their votes, but gave 53 percent of their votes to Proposition 8. Why would the GOP throw away these cards?

McCain lost Colorado by 10 points. But the Colorado Civil Rights Initiative, which would have outlawed race and gender preferences, lost in a dead heat. In Michigan, California, Washington, and Nebraska, the ban on affirmative action has won a huge majority of whites and a larger share of black, Hispanic, and Asian voters than did John McCain. If the conservative side of these issues is more popular than the GOP, why would the GOP abandon them?

THE SOCIAL ISSUES

Those who urge Republicans to call a truce in the culture wars are uneasy with social issues and prefer to pound the table for lower taxes and less spending, common ground upon which all Republicans can stand.

But if Republicans are conservatives, what do they wish to conserve, if not the lives of unborn children and matrimony as ordained by God? The traditional family is the cinder block of a good society. When it crumbles, society crumbles. Can we not see the consequences of the collapse of traditional morality and marriage in a country where 41 percent of all children are born out of wedlock?

Where is the evidence that the social issues are losing issues?

- A CBS poll in April 2008 found that when asked, “Would you like to see religious and spiritual values have more influence in the schools than they do now, less influence, or about the same influence?” 49 percent called for more influence, and only 16 percent said less influence.⁵⁵
- In a 2005 Pew poll, two-thirds of Americans felt liberals have “gone too far in trying to keep religion out of schools and government.” By 75 to 21, blacks agreed. Independents, 2 to 1, endorsed the proposition that liberals have gone too far in de-Christianizing America.⁵⁶ Is this not ground to stand on to drive a wedge between liberals and black folks whose religious affiliation rate is higher than that of any ethnic group?
- Fully 64 percent of Americans believed that creationism should be taught alongside evolution. Only 26 percent disagreed. Thirty-eight percent went so far as to say that the theory of evolution should be tossed out of the classroom and only creationism taught to children.⁵⁷
- A Pew Research Center poll in 2006 saw some attrition, but, by 58 to 35 percent, Americans still favored the teaching of both creationism and evolution.⁵⁸

A majority of Americans gave public schools poor to failing grades in how they deal with the issues of evolution, religion, and homosexuality.⁵⁹

What do these numbers shout out?

America remains a predominantly Christian country. Those three Iowa Supreme Court judges who ruled that the state constitution requires recognition of same-sex marriages were denied retention. They were fired by the people of Iowa. In Oklahoma, a proposition to prohibit use of Sharia law in state courts passed with 70 percent of the vote.

Social and moral conservatism has a greater appeal to the American people than does the Republican Party. Why would Republicans abandon a host of issues that are far more popular than they are?

HISPANICS AND IMMIGRATION

In early 2000, veteran GOP strategist Lance Tarrance addressed the Republican National Committee. “For the last three decades we’ve had a Southern strategy,” said Tarrance. “The next goal is to move to a Hispanic strategy for the next three decades.”⁶⁰

With Hispanics expected to double their share of the population to close to 30 percent by mid-century, Tarrance would seem to have a point. And Bush and Rove pursued an Hispanic strategy. The focus of their effort was on amnesty for the 12 to 20 million illegals in the country, though there was no evidence this is Hispanics’ highest priority. Amnesty, however, is a voting issue for tens of millions of Americans, the vast majority of whom oppose it.

After the Republican rout of 2006, Bush shifted this Hispanic strategy into high gear. To succeed Mehlman as party chairman he chose Senator Mel Martinez, who began his tenure with a press conference in Spanish and English. In 2007, McCain took the lead on Capitol Hill for the Bush-Kennedy bill providing a path to citizenship for illegals. This was to be his road to the Hispanic vote, and the White House.

However, an uproar ensued, magnified by cable TV, talk radio, the Web, and syndicated columns. And though it had the support of the political, corporate, and media establishments, the Bush-Kennedy-McCain immigration reform bill, amnesty by any other name, was stopped cold.

McCain had almost derailed his presidential campaign. In that same election cycle, Hillary Clinton had to withdraw her support of Governor Eliot Spitzer’s plan to give driver’s licenses to illegals and Spitzer had to abandon the idea when 70 percent of New Yorkers opposed it. By the primaries, every Republican candidate was sounding like Tom Tancredo.

What did the Bush-McCain leadership in pushing a path to citizenship for illegal aliens avail them or their party? McCain lost the Hispanic vote by a margin of 67 to 32 percent. By 2009, Rove was doing commentary on Fox News. And Martinez had resigned his chairmanship, quit the Senate, and was berating his party.

[T]he very divisive rhetoric of the immigration debate set a very bad tone for our brand as Republicans.... there were voices within our party, frankly, which if they continue with that kind of rhetoric, anti-Hispanic rhetoric, that so much of it was heard, we're going to be relegated to minority status.⁶¹

On the issue of immigration, what do the polls, political experience, and public referenda teach us? Consider the following:

- California's Proposition 187 in 1994, designed to prohibit social welfare for illegal aliens, was supported by 64 percent of whites, 57 percent of Asian Americans, 56 percent of African Americans, and 31 percent of Hispanics. Governor Pete Wilson, behind by 20, rode Prop 187 to a 10-point victory.
- In Arizona in 2004, Proposition 200, mandating a cutoff in social services to illegal aliens, won in a landslide, despite the opposition of McCain and the GOP congressional delegation. Fully 47 percent of Hispanics voted for Prop 200.
- According to a 2010 Rasmussen Poll, Americans by 87 to 9 percent believe English should be the official language of the United States.⁶² According to a Zogby poll, 71 percent of Hispanics agree.⁶³ In Missouri a proposition mandating that all state agencies use English passed by nearly 7 to 1.
- A Rasmussen poll found that 77 percent of all Americans oppose giving driver's licenses to illegals and 66 percent think it "very important" that the government secure the border and halt illegal immigration.⁶⁴
- In 2011, three Rasmussen polls were conducted. Results: 61 percent favor having their state adopt a version of Arizona's law requiring police to ID any suspect they think may be here illegally; 61 percent oppose granting automatic citizenship to children born to illegal aliens; and 82 percent believe businesses should have to use the federal E-Verify system to determine the immigration status of new

employees.

Washington views the immigration issue as finding a way to bring illegal aliens “out of the shadows.” America sees the issue as securing the border and sending illegals back home.

As Obama prepared to take the oath, the Pew Hispanic Center reported that only 31 percent of Hispanics rated immigration as an “extremely important” issue for the new president to address, while 57 percent said the economy was extremely important.⁶⁵ Immigration was listed as the sixth most important issue by Hispanic voters.

Immigration is also an issue on which the GOP is more in tune with African Americans. Some 56 percent of black Californians voted for Prop 187. A 2006 Field Poll found 59 percent would punish employers who hire illegals; 66 percent supported building a wall on the border; and only one in four favored letting illegals have driver’s licenses.⁶⁶

“Amnesty for illegal workers is not just a slap in the face to black Americans,” argues T. Willard Fair, president of the Urban League of Greater Miami. “It’s an economic disaster. I see ... the adverse impact that [illegal immigration] has on the political empowerment of African Americans, and the impact it has on the job market.”⁶⁷

Few Republicans better exemplify the power of the issue than Lou Barletta, mayor of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, a state McCain lost by 10 points, though he invested more money and time there than in any other state.

After imposing a tough local ordinance on illegal immigrants in his hamlet of 23,000, which had been overrun, Barletta was so popular he won the GOP primary with 94 percent and the Democratic primary as a write-in, with 63 percent. In 2008, Barletta challenged eleven-term incumbent Paul Kanjorski in the Eleventh Congressional District, which Gore and Kerry won by wide margins and Kanjorski won with 73 percent in 2006. While Obama was carrying Pennsylvania by 10 points, Barletta came within 3 points of unseating Kanjorski, who revised his stance on immigration and came out sounding like a Minuteman to win. In November 2010, Lou Barletta routed Kanjorski to become the new congressman in the Eleventh C.D.

WINNING THE YOUNG

When Michael Steele was elected RNC chair to succeed Martinez, he said he would bring the traditional values party into untraditional precincts. “We want to convey that the modern-day GOP looks like the conservative party that stands on principles. But we want to apply them to urban-suburban hip-hop settings.”⁶⁸

To whom Steele was appealing here was uncertain, as two thirds of African Americans regard rappers as poor role models. But there are two issues, critical to the Republican base, with which the young of the nation agree with the GOP: immigration and affirmative action.

In 2010, Harvard University’s Institute of Politics conducted its 17th Biennial Youth Survey on Politics and Public Service. On the proposition “Qualified Minorities should be given special preferences in colleges and hiring,” 14 percent of young people agreed, and 57 percent disagreed. Asked if immigration had done more good than harm, 23 percent of the young said it had been beneficial, 34 percent said harmful.⁶⁹

Should illegal immigrants get driver’s licenses? Only 24 percent of the young agreed, while 58 percent disagreed. “Should illegal immigrants get financial aid at state universities?” Of the young responding, 29% said yes; 50 percent said no aid.⁷⁰

Despite the cult of diversity in which they are immersed from day care center days to college dorm, American’s young yet believe in equal justice for all and special privilege for none.

BALKANIZATION OF BARACK’S PARTY

The Democratic Party has been described as a gathering of warring tribes that have come together in the anticipation of common plunder. While the party has, since FDR, claimed the allegiance of more Americans than the GOP, it is an unstable coalition. In Steve Sailer’s phrase, it is the party of the four races—blacks, whites, Asians, and Hispanics—led by an African American, as vulnerable to being pulled apart at its ethnic and ideological seams as was the

New Deal coalition that was shredded by Richard Nixon.

Obama emerged from 2008 with 45 percent of the white vote, 64 percent of the Asian vote, 68 percent of the Hispanic vote, 95 percent of the African American vote. But by fall 2010, his support among whites had plunged to 37 percent, and white Americans had become the most energized of all anti-Obama voters.

Other fissures and fractures have become visible. The Florida Senate race between GOP Governor Charlie Crist and Tea Party favorite Marco Rubio, which “evolved into a battle ... tearing apart Democrats,” exposed one division. Democrats had nominated Kendrick Meek, the only black candidate with a chance of winning a Senate seat. Al Gore, Bill Clinton, and Obama all went to Florida to campaign for Meek. But Meek’s ex-House colleague Robert Wexler, who represented Palm Beach County while Meek represented Broward, “all but ordered the state’s many Jewish voters to back Crist.”⁷¹

With Meek lacking the solid support of his own party, Bill Clinton eventually urged him to drop out in favor of Crist. Meek refused and ran third. The Senate Democratic caucus now contains twelve Jewish senators, but not one African American.

Tensions have also arisen over campaign contributions from wealthy Jewish Democrats that have helped to defeat members of the Black Caucus deemed hostile to Israel. In 2011, when Bill Clinton went to Chicago to campaign for Rahm Emanuel, who was running for mayor, the ex-president had the race card played against him, again, as he had had in the 2008 primaries. Former U.S. Senator Carol Moseley Braun, an African American running against Rahm, called Clinton’s endorsement of Rahm a “betrayal” of blacks.

President Bill Clinton does not live or vote in Chicago. He’s an outsider parachuting in to support another outsider. For him to come on the day following Dr. Martin Luther King’s birthday to insert himself in the middle of a mayoral race, when the majority of the population and mayoral candidates are African American and Latino, is a betrayal of the people who were most loyal to him.⁷²

Translation: Cities where people of color are the majority should be run by people of color. Representative Danny Davis, another African American in the race, agreed emphatically.

The African American community has enjoyed a long and fruitful relationship with the Clintons, however it appears as though some of that relationship may be fractured and perhaps even broken should former President Clinton come to town and participate overtly in efforts to thwart the legitimate political aspirations of Chicago's Black community.⁷³

In short, the mayor of Chicago should be a black man or woman, not a white like Rahm Emanuel, and Clinton is thus depriving the black people of Chicago of what rightly belongs to them by virtue of their numbers.

Muslim Americans and Arab Americans, both now part of the Democratic coalition, are also growing in number and side with the Palestinians. But these are not the only fissures in the Obama coalition. There is a chasm between blacks and gays. Prop. 8, the California initiative to outlaw same-sex marriage, won 70 percent of African American voters. Black preachers implored their congregations to vote to ban as an "abomination" what gays, lesbians, and liberals regard as the civil rights cause of the new century. On social issues like abortion, Hispanics and blacks often vote against white liberals.

The forty million African Americans and fifty million Hispanics, living side by side in urban America, often clash over spoils and turf. In New Orleans, after the damage caused by Katrina, black resentment at Mexican workers coming to take jobs rebuilding the city spilled out into public acrimony. In California, black and Hispanic gangs are waging a civil war. Black-white prison violence has been eclipsed by black-Hispanic violence.

On referenda to cut off social services to illegal aliens and keep them from getting driver's licenses, blacks vote like Republicans. Having been displaced as America's largest minority, blacks see Hispanics as rivals for the benefits of affirmative action, which was first established to undo the consequences of slavery and segregation, from which few Hispanics ever suffered.

When it comes to race preferences in hiring, promotions, and college admissions, Asians are often classified with whites and are increasingly the victims of reverse discrimination. Their interest in ending affirmative action may one day drive Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Indian Americans out of Jesse Jackson's Rainbow Coalition.

When black Mayor Adrian Fenty picked Korean American Michelle Rhee to shape up D.C.'s failing public schools, and Rhee fired scores of black teachers, the black wards east of the Anacostia River cut Fenty dead.

As the Party of Government, Democrats find common ground on growing the government and redistributing the wealth of the private sector to the public sector, from those who have to those who have not. When the pie is expanding, everyone can have a larger slice.

The crisis of the Democratic Party is that while it prospers by expanding government, we have entered an era when millions detest government, and America's fiscal crisis mandates that we cut government. In brief, as America enters this era of austerity, the compelling U.S. national interest in reducing the size of government will clash repeatedly with the vital interests of the Democratic Party.

The question now is not who gets what, but who gets cut. The tribes that make up the Democratic coalition could be at war with each other over who gets cut. Successful politics is about addition, not subtraction. But in the coming age of a Balkanized America, politics will also be about division.

THE NATIONAL QUESTION

On the national question, Americans are united.

There still exists in their hearts the will to remain one nation under God and one people united by history, heritage, and language, committed to the proposition that in America men and women are to be judged “not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.” Americans still believe that we are all equal in rights, not because of where we came from but because of who we are: Americans.

In all thirty-one states where referenda have been held, traditional marriage has been affirmed, and same-sex marriage has been rejected. In every state but one where Ward Connerly’s “civil rights initiative” that outlaws race, ethnic, and gender preferences has been put on the ballot, it has won. In every state where making English our official language has been put to the voters, they have said yes. In almost every state, county, and municipality where restrictions on public benefits for illegal aliens have been put to the vote, they have been endorsed by wide majorities. The agenda of the Left—de-Christianizing America, multiculturalism, racial preferences, and unrestricted immigration—has been imposed from above and resisted by a people who do not understand the strength that is theirs if they will but unite and fight.

Notes

Introduction: Disintegrating Nation

1. Kahlil Gibran, *The Garden of the Prophet* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1933).
2. Lee Congdon, *George Kennan: A Writing Life* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2008), 154.
3. David Ignatius, "An Old-School Trick: Put Country First," *Washington Post*, Sept. 16, 2010.
4. Joe Stumpe and Monica Davey, "Abortion Doctor Shot to Death in Kansas Church," *New York Times*, June 1, 2009; Mark Guarino, "Killing of Anti-Abortion Protester Has Both Sides Questioning Violence," *Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 12, 2009.
5. William McGurn, "Harry Reid's 'Evil' Moment," *Wall Street Journal*, Aug. 18, 2009.
6. Dana Milbank, "The High Ground Feels a Little Lonely," *Washington Post*, Sept. 16, 2009.
7. Rich Benjamin, "Inside the Mind of Joe Wilson," *Salon.com*, Sept. 11, 2009.
8. Greg Bluestein, "Carter Sees Racism in Wilson's Outburst," *New York Times*, Sept. 16, 2009.
9. Ewen MacAskill, "Jimmy Carter: Animosity Towards Barack Obama Is Due to Racism," *The Guardian*, Sept. 16, 2009.
10. "MTV Awards: West Disrupts Swift's Speech; Tribute to MJ," *cnn.com*, Sept. 14, 2009.
11. Ronald Brownstein, "The New Color Line," *National Journal*, Oct. 10, 2009.
12. "Vast Majority Believes America Today Is Deeply Divided (10/30–11/4)," USA Network Poll, Dec. 1, 2009.
13. Ross Douthat, "Scenes from a Marriage," *New York Times*, Jan. 16, 2011.
14. Ignatius, "An Old-School Trick."
15. Gus Lubin, "Jimmy Carter Says US Is More Polarized Now Than During Civil War," *Business Insider*, Sept. 21, 2010.
16. "Jerry Brown: California, Country Facing Regime Crisis Similar to the Civil War," CBS, April 10, 2011.
17. Fred Barnes, "The Republicans' Best Weapon," *Weekly Standard*, Feb. 2, 2009.
18. "Obama: Critics Talk About Me 'Like a Dog,'" Daily Intel, *New York* magazine, Sept. 6, 2010.
19. Theodore Roosevelt, Before Knights of Columbus, New York City, Oct. 12, 1915, quoteland.com/author/Theodore-Roosevelt-Quotes/120/?p=2.
20. Charles K. Rowley, "Adam Smith Would Not Be Optimistic in Today's Economic World," *Daily Telegraph*, Sept. 6, 2009.

1. The Passing of a Superpower

1. Robert A. Pape, "First Draft of History: Empire Falls," *National Interest*, Jan./Feb. 2009, 21.
2. Leslie H. Gelb, "Necessity, Choice and Common Sense: A Policy for a Bewildering World," *Foreign*

Affairs, May/June 2009, 56.

3. Ben Geman, "Obama Defends Escalation of Afghan War in Address to 2010 West Point Class," *The Hill*, May 22, 2010.
4. Michael Settle, "If Money Isn't Loosened Up, This Sucker Is Going to Go Down," *Herald Scotland*, Dec. 30, 2009.
5. Lawrence Kudlow, "Bush Boom Continues," *Human Events*, Dec. 11, 2007.
6. "'We're Greece' in a Few Years: Sen. Gregg," cnbc.com, Nov. 3, 2010.
7. David Malpass, "Near Zero Rates Are Hurting the Economy," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 4, 2009.
8. Gelb, "Necessity, Choice and Common Sense," 58.
9. Pape, "First Draft of History," 21.
10. *Ibid.*, 27.
11. Neil Irwin, "Aughts Were a Lost Decade for U.S. Economy, Workers," *Washington Post*, Jan. 2, 2010.
12. Harold Meyerson, "Why Germany and China Are Winning," *Washington Post*, July 1, 2010.
13. Patrick J. Buchanan, "The Metrics of National Decline," Feb. 17, 2009, msnbc.com (Source: Charles W. McMillion, MBG Information Services).
14. "Fox News Poll: 57% Think Next Generation Will Be Worse Off," foxnews.com, Apr. 9, 2010.
15. David M. Dickson, "Volcker Blames Recession on Trade Imbalances," *Washington Times*, Feb. 5, 2009.
16. Buchanan, "The Metrics of National Decline."
17. Mark Drajem, "China's Trade Gap with U.S. Climbs to Record, Fueling Yuan Tension," bloomberg.com, Oct. 14, 2010.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. "Persons Obtaining Legal Permanent Resident Status: Fiscal Years 1820–2009," Department of Homeland Security, dhs.gov; "Persons Obtaining Legal Permanent Resident Status by Gender, Age, Marital Status and Occupation: Fiscal Year 2009," Department of Homeland Security, dhs.gov.
21. "New Data Shows China Responsible for 78.5 Percent of U.S. Trade Deficit in Manufactured Goods in 2009; Figure Up from 27.3 Percent in 2001," press statement, American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, Washington, DC, Aug. 18, 2009.
22. Senator Fritz Hollings, "Fifth Column: The Enemy Within the Trade War," huffingtonpost.com, Oct. 16, 2009.
23. Charles W. McMillion, "Globalization and America's Lost Decade," MBG Information Services, March 2010, 1, 40; "Lost Manufacturing Jobs in Decade," MBG Information Services, Jan. 2011, mbginfovc.com.
24. James R. Hagerty, "U.S. Factories Buck Decline," *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 19, 2011.
25. Stephen Moore, "We've Become a Nation of Takers, Not Makers," *Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 1, 2011.
26. Warren E. Buffett and Carol Loomis, "America's Growing Trade Deficit Is Selling the Nation Out from Under Us. Here's a Way to Fix the Problem and We Need to Do It Now," *Fortune*, Nov. 10, 2003, cnnmoney.com.
27. David S. Heidler and Jeanne T. Heidler, *Henry Clay: The Essential American* (New York: Random House, 2010), 240.
28. Dan Molinski and John Lyons, "China's \$20 Billion Bolsters Chavez," *Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 18, 2010.
29. John Pomfret, "More Political Ads Portray China as Benefiting from Weak U.S. Economy," *Washington Post*, Oct. 28, 2010.
30. Peter Whoriskey, "As Cheaper Chinese Tires Roll In, Obama Faces an Early Trade Test," *Washington Post*, Sept. 8, 2009.

31. Larry Elder, "The Soft Bigotry of President Bush," *Jewish World Review*, July 4, 2002.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Betty Liu and Matthew Leising, "U.S. to Lose \$400 Billion on Fannie, Freddie, Wallison Says," bloomberg.com, Dec. 31, 2009.
35. John Weicher, "Closing the Gap: The Quiet Success of the Bush Administration's Push for Minority Homeownership," *Weekly Standard*, Oct. 11, 2006.
36. Karen Kwiatkowski, "An American Tale," lewrockwell.com, Dec. 16, 2003.
37. "The Coming Debt Panic," *Washington Post*, Dec. 14, 2009.
38. David M. Walker, Rosenthal Lecture, Institute of Medicine, Nov. 9, 2009, pgpf.org; Dennis Cauchon, "U.S. Owes \$62 Trillion," *USA Today*, June 7, 2011.
39. Ben Pershing, "Democrats Clear Spending Bill in Senate," *Washington Post*, Dec. 14, 2009.
40. Patrick J. Buchanan, "Fat City," townhall.com, Dec. 15, 2009.
41. Pershing, "Democrats Clear Spending Bill."
42. Jeff Zeleny, "Obama Weighs Quick Undoing of Bush Policy," *New York Times*, Nov. 9, 2008.
43. "FY10 Omnibus Disclosed Earmark Numbers," Taxpayers for Common Sense, Dec. 10, 2009, taxpayer.net.
44. Andrew G. Biggs and Jason Richwine, "Those Underpaid Government Workers," *American Spectator*, September 2010, 14.
45. Ibid.
46. Dennis Cauchon, "For Feds, More Get 6-Figure Salaries," *USA Today*, Dec. 11, 2009.
47. Ibid.
48. Dennis Cauchon, "More Fed Workers Pay Tops \$150K: Number Doubled Under Obama," *USA Today*, Nov. 10, 2010.
49. Lena H. Sun, "D.C. Area Tops in Well-being Survey," *Washington Post*, Nov. 10, 2010.
50. Dennis Cauchon, "Federal Pay Tops Private Workers: Compensation Gap Doubled in Decade," *USA Today*, Aug. 10, 2010.
51. Dennis Cauchon, "Obama's Pay Freeze for Federal Workers Only Limits Raises," *USA Today*, Dec. 1, 2010.
52. Gareth Garrett, *The People's Pottage* (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Printers, 1958), 1.
53. Andy Soltis, "Tax Refugees Staging Escape from New York," *New York Post*, Oct. 27, 2009.
54. Kenneth Lovett, "New Yorkers Under 30 Plan to Flee City; Cite High Taxes, Few Jobs as Reasons," nydailynews.com, May 13, 2011.
55. Gerald Prante, "Summary of Latest Federal Income Tax Data," Tax Foundation, July 30, 2009, taxfoundation.org.
56. "Policy Basics: The Earned Income Tax Credit," Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Dec. 4, 2009, cbpp.org.
57. Edwin S. Rubenstein, "The Earned Income Tax Credit and Illegal Immigration: A Study in Fraud, Abuse and Liberal Activism," *Social Contract*, Spring 2009, 3.
58. Stephen Ohlemacher, "Nearly Half of U.S. Households Escape Fed Income Tax," Associated Press, April 7, 2010, finance.yahoo.com.
59. John D. McKinnon, "High-Earning Households Pay Growing Share of Taxes," wsj.com, May 3, 2011.
60. Barack Obama, Reclaiming the American Dream Speech, Bettendorf [IA], Nov. 7, 2007, "Barack Obama and Joe Biden: Making College Affordable for Everyone," barackobama.com.
61. Lawrence W. Reed, "A Subtle Destroyer," Mackinac Center for Public Policy, April 8, 2005, mackinac.org.
62. "Food Stamp Rolls Continue to Rise," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 8, 2010.

63. Anemona Hartocollis, "New York Asks to Bar Use of Food Stamps to Buy Sodas," *New York Times*, Oct. 6, 2010.
64. Christine Armario and Dorie Turner, "Nearly 1 in 4 Fails Military Entrance Exam," *Washington Examiner*, Dec. 22, 2010.
65. John Maynard Keynes, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (London: Macmillan, 1919), 220.
66. "Cheap Cigarettes from Cigarettes Below Cost," cigarettes-below-cost.com.
67. Thomas E. Woods, *Meltdown: A Free-Market Look at Why the Stock Market Collapsed, the Economy Tanked, and Government Bailouts Will Make Things Worse* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2009), 1.
68. Lawrence W. Reed, "The Greatest Spending Administration in All of History," Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Jan. 1, 1998, mackinac.org.
69. Paul Krugman, "Franklin Delano Obama," *New York Times*, Nov. 10, 2008.
70. Woods, *Meltdown*, 103.
71. Robert Dell, "What Fiscal Pain? Budget-Cutting Misery Is More Imagined Than Real," *Washington Times*, Apr. 29, 2011.
72. Woods, *Meltdown*, 26.
73. Thomas Jefferson, Kentucky Resolutions, 1798, etext.virginia.edu.
74. Ernest Hemingway quotes, thinkexist.com; "Hemingway on the Costs of War," Ludwig von Mises Institute, blog.mises.org.
75. Elizabeth MacDonald, "Bernanke Re-ignites Inflation-Deflation Debate," foxbusiness.com, Oct. 15, 2010.
76. Brady Dennis, "In Capitol Hill Hearing, Bankers Remain Torn on Their Role in Crisis," *Washington Post*, Jan. 14, 2010.
77. Jackie Calmes, "Party Gridlock in Washington Feeds Fear of a Debt Crisis," *New York Times*, Feb. 16, 2010.
78. John Adams quotes, brainyquote.com.
79. "Quotes on Liberty and Virtue," compiled and edited by J. David Gowdy, president, The Washington, Jefferson and Madison Institute, liberty1.org/virtue.
80. Tom Piatak, "The Necessity of Christianity," *Chronicles*, October 2009, 39; George Washington, Farewell Address, Rediscovering George Washington, Claremont Institute, 2002.
81. Piatak, "The Necessity of Christianity," 40.
82. "Quotes on Liberty and Virtue."

2. The Death of Christian America

1. James C. Russell, *Breach of Faith: American Churches and the Immigration Crisis* (Raleigh, NC: Representative Government Press, 2004), 10.
2. Carl Pearlston, "Is America a Christian Nation?" Catholic Education Resource Center, catholiceducation.org.
3. Toby Harnden, "Barack Obama in Turkey: U.S. 'Will Never Be at War with Islam,'" *Telegraph*, April 6, 2009.
4. Rick Warren's Inaugural Invocation, christianitytoday.com, Jan. 20, 2009.
5. President Barack Obama's Inaugural Address, The White House Blog, Jan. 21, 2010, whitehouse.gov.
6. *Church of the Holy Trinity v. the United States*, 143 U.S. 457, 1892, wikipedia.org.
7. "Rev. Joseph Lowery Delivers Benediction at Inaugural Ceremony," CNN, Jan. 20, 2009, politicalticker.blog.cnn.com.
8. "Harmonies of Liberty," Rev. Dr. Sharon E. Watkins, National Prayer Service, Jan. 21, 2009,

nationalcathedral.org.

9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Julia Dunn, "Obama to Be Prayer Day No-Show," *Washington Times*, May 6, 2009.
12. "Obama Ends Bush-Era National Prayer Day at the White House," Top of the Ticket: Politics Coast to Coast with the *L.A. Times*, May 7, 2009, latimesblogs.latimes.com.
13. Terence P. Jeffrey, "Belief That Religion Is Losing Its Influence on American Life Hit 50-Year Peak After Inauguration of Obama, Says Gallup Data," Conservative News Service, Dec. 29, 2010, cnsnews.com.
14. Summary of Key Findings, U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, 2008.
15. Michelle Boorstein, "15 Percent of Americans Have No Religion," *Washington Post*, March 9, 2009.
16. Ibid.
17. Robert D. Putnam and David E. Campbell, "Walking Away from Church," *Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 19, 2010.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.; Barry A. Kosmin and Ariela Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*, News, Office of Communications, Trinity College, Hartford, CT; Rachel Zoll, "More Americans Say They Have No Religion," AP, March 9, 2009.
20. Kosmin and Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*.
21. Jon Meacham, "The End of Christian America," *Newsweek*, April 13, 2009.
22. Putnam and Campbell, "Walking Away from Church."
23. U.S. Religious Landscape Survey; Timothy Samuel Shah, "Born Again in the U.S.A.: The Enduring Power of American Evangelicalism," *Foreign Affairs*, Sept./Oct. 2009, 143.
24. Boorstein, "15 Percent"; Zoll, "More Americans."
25. Ibid.; Kosmin and Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*.
26. Steven Waldman, "Fastest Growing Religion = No Religion (New Religious Identification Survey)," beliefnet.com, March 9, 2009.
27. "Catholics on the Move, Non-religious on the Rise," Trinity News, March 9, 2009, trincoll.edu.
28. "Abortion a More Powerful Issue for Women," Pew Research Center for People and the Press, April 23, 2004, people-press.org.
29. Kosmin and Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*.
30. Michael Felsen, "Obama's Faith in 'Non-Believers,'" *The Forward*, Feb. 27, 2009.
31. "Faith on the Hill: The Religious Affiliations of Members of Congress," *Congressional Quarterly*, Dec. 19, 2008.
32. Kosmin and Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*.
33. U.S. Religious Landscape Survey.
34. Eric Kaufmann, "Breeding for God," *Prospect*, November 2006, prospectmagazine.co.uk.
35. Kosmin and Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey 2008*; "Catholics on the Move."
36. "Remarks by the President on a New Beginning," White House, Office of the Press Secretary, June 4, 2009, whitehouse.gov.
37. William Wan, "Abundant Faith, Shrinking Space," *Washington Post*, Aug. 22, 2009.
38. Carl Bialik, "Estimates of Religious Populations Require a Bit of Faith," *Wall Street Journal*, Aug. 14–15, 2010.
39. U.S. Religious Landscape Survey.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.

42. Michael Spencer, "The Coming Evangelical Collapse," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 10, 2009.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge, "God Still Isn't Dead," *Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 7, 2009.
47. Ibid.
48. Russell D. Moore, "Where Have All the Presbyterians Gone?" *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 4, 2011.
49. Spencer, "The Coming Evangelical Collapse."
50. Shah, "Born Again in the U.S.A.," 144–45.
51. "National Statistics on Belonging and Belief," ARIS, 2008.
52. Harold Meyerson, "Episcopalians Against Equality," *Washington Post*, Dec. 20, 2006.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid.
55. Gillian Gaynair, "D.C. Board Rejects Gay Marriage Referendum Effort," *Chicago Tribune*, June 15, 2009.
56. Scott Lamb, "The Decline and Fall of Christian America (Jon Meacham)," *St. Louis Today*, special to the *Post-Dispatch*, April 8, 2009, interact.stltoday.com.
57. Julia Duin, "Catholics, Southern Baptists Losing Members," *Washington Times*, Feb. 25, 2009.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. John Allen, "Religion in Europe: Christianity on the Defensive/Christianity Under Siege," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 13, 2008.
61. Ibid.
62. William Murchison, "Mainline Marital Melange," *Chronicles*, April 17, 2009, chroniclesmagazine.org.
63. Ibid.
64. Julia Duin, "Lutherans Second Church to Split Over Gays," *Washington Times*, Nov. 19, 2009.
65. Laurie Goodstein, "First Openly Gay Episcopal Bishop to Retire in 2013," *New York Times*, Nov. 7, 2010.
66. Edward Short, "Winston Churchill and the Old Cause," *Crisis*, Dec. 2005, 27.
67. Eugene G. Windchy, *The End of Darwinism: And How a Flawed and Disastrous Theory Was Stolen and Sold* (Arlington, VA: Eugene Windchy, 2009), 168.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., 40.
70. Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970), 96.
71. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Los Angeles: Hurst & Blackett, 1939), 225.
72. Ibid.
73. Hilaire Belloc, *The Great Heresies* (Salem, NH: Ayer Company, 1985), 10.
74. Ibid.
75. Meacham, "End of Christian America."
76. Sharon Jayson, "CDC Study: Birthrates Decline Overall," *USA Today*, Dec. 22, 2010; Rob Stein and Donna St. George, "Number of Unwed Mothers Has Risen Sharply in U.S.," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2009.
77. Heather Mac Donald, "Nation of Cowards," *City Journal*, Feb. 19, 2008, city-journal.org; Brady Hamilton, Steven Malanga, "Bad Choices, Not a Bad Economy, Are to Blame," *Chicago Sun-Times*, Feb. 4, 2007, manhattan-institute.org; Walter Williams, "Victimhood: Rhetoric or Reality," *Jewish World Review*, June 8, 2005.
78. South Dakota E-Labor Bulletin, Labor Information Center, South Dakota Department of Labor, Dec.

2007.

79. "Suicides in the U.S.: Statistics and Prevention," National Institute of Mental Health, nimh.nih.gov.
80. William Bennett, *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 22.
81. "Public Safety, Public Spending: Forecasting America's Prison Population 2007–2011," Pew Charitable Trusts, Feb. 14, 2007.
82. Jeffrey Kuhner, "Hollywood's Culture of Death," *Washington Times*, Feb. 22, 2009.
83. *Ibid.*
84. Duncan Williams, *Trousered Apes: Sick Literature in a Sick Society* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1991), 152; Philip Yancey, "T. S. Eliot's Christian Society: Still Relevant Today?" *Christian Century*, Nov. 19, 1986, religion-online.org.
85. Tom Wolfe, "The Meaning of Freedom," *Parameters*, March 1988, 14.
86. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Harvard Address, June 8, 1978, columbia.edu/cu.
87. Angus MacDonald, "Our Christian Faith," *St. Croix Review*, December 2010, p. 2; George Grant, "Election Day Meditations," *Grantian Florilegium*, Aug. 3, 2006.
88. Piatak, "The Necessity of Christianity," 41.
89. *Ibid.*, 42.
90. *Ibid.*
91. *Ibid.*
92. Tom Piatak, "Decline and Fall," *Chronicles*, August 2009, 30.
93. *Ibid.*
94. *Ibid.*
95. John Xiros Cooper, *T. S. Eliot and the Ideology of the Four Quartets* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 127.
96. Williams, *Trousered Apes*, 152; Edmund Burke, "Letter to a Member of the National Assembly," 1791, *The Works of the Right Honorable Edmund Burke* (1899), vol. 4, 51–52, bartleby.com.
97. Dermot Quinn, "Dawson's Creed," *The American Conservative*, Feb. 2010, 19.
98. "Giorgio Vasari—Founder of the History of Art," *Info Barrel*, Apr. 6, 2009, info Barrel.com.
99. Francis Fukuyama, "A Philosophy in Context," *New York Times Book Review*, May 9, 2010, 12.
100. *Ibid.*
101. Naomi Schaefer Riley, "The Fate of the Spirit: The Wobbly Religious Lives of Young People Emerging into Adulthood," *Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 2, 2009.
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Ibid.*
104. Russell Kirk, "Civilization Without Religion?" American Orthodox Institute, Sept. 12, 2009, aoi.usa.org.
105. Christopher Dawson, *Progress and Religion: An Historical Enquiry* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1934), 232–33.
106. U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, 128, 136.
107. Matthew Arnold, "Dover Beach," 1867, eecs.harvard.edu.
108. Jude Dougherty, "National Identity," *Nationale und kulturelle Identität im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, ed. Anton Rauscher, vol. 18 of the series *Soziale Orientierung* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2006), 13.
109. James K. Robinson and Walter K. Rideout, *A College Book of Modern Verse* (Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, 1960), 65.
110. Hilaire Belloc, *Europe and the Faith* (New York: CosmoClassics, 2007), 184.
111. Belloc, *The Great Heresies*, 132.
112. Archbishop Charles Chaput, "Living Within the Truth," *Catalyst*, Jan.–Feb. 2011, 8.

113. Denis Diderot quotes, thinkexist.com.
114. Will Durant, *The Story of Philosophy* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1961), 236.
115. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Men Have Forgotten God," Templeton Address, 1983, Orthodox America, roca.org/OA.
116. Ibid.
117. Ibid.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid.
120. Ibid.
121. Shah, "Born Again in the U.S.A.," 139.
122. Geoffrey Wheatcroft, "Continental Drifts," *The National Interest*, March/April 2009, 39.
123. Ibid., 46.
124. Stephen Adams, "Pope's Good Friday Message Warns of a Drift into a 'Desert of Godlessness,'" *Telegraph*, April 10, 2009.
125. Chris Caldwell, "Born Again Anti-Catholicism," *Financial Times*, Sept. 17, 2010.
126. Ibid.
127. Mark Tidd, "Idolatry and the Battle for the Heart," *Reformed Worship*, Dec. 1995, reformedworship.org.
128. Meacham, "The End of Christian America."
129. Stephen Beale, "T. S. Eliot and the Idea of a Christian Society," May 4, 2009, [thebrownspectator](http://thebrownspectator.com).
130. Wayne Allensworth, "Who Won the Cold War?" *Chronicles*, July 2010, 24.
131. Ibid., 25.
132. Psalm 96: 5, The Holy Bible, Douay-Rheims Version (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishers, 1999), 621.
133. Quinn, "Dawson's Creed," 20.
134. David Priestland, *The Red Flag: A History of Communism* (New York: Grove Press, 2010), cited by Allensworth, "Who Won the Cold War?" 25.
135. Robert Nisbet, *Prejudices: A Philosophical Dictionary* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 101.
136. Belloc, *The Great Heresies*, 132.
137. Ron Dreher, "Bill Maher and the Gods That Failed," CrunchyCon: Conservative Politics and Religion with Ron Dreher, *Episcopalian*, Feb. 23, 2009, episcopalian.worldpress.com.
138. Ibid.
139. Ibid.
140. Ibid.
141. Belloc, *The Great Heresies*, 127.
142. Ibid., 132–33.
143. Ibid., 93.
144. Fouad Ajami, "From Berlin to Baghdad," *Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 9, 2009.
145. "1.5 Billion Muslims in World," *Gulf Daily News*, Oct. 9, 2009.
146. Adrian Michaels, "A Fifth of European Union Will Be Muslim by 2050," *Telegraph*, Aug. 8, 2009.
147. "An Analysis of the World Muslim Population by Country/Region," CIA World Factbook, 2009, factbook.net.
148. Belloc, *The Great Heresies*, 128.
149. Kuhner, "Hollywood's Culture of Death."
150. Williams, *Trousered Apes*, 9.
151. "Afghan Christian Convert Flees to Italy," AP, March 29, 2006, foxnews.com.

152. Patrick Goodenough, “Swiss Vote to Ban Minarets Viewed by Some as Human Rights Violation, by Others as Catalyst for Muslim Assimilation,” cnsnews.com, Nov. 30, 2009.
153. James Joyner, “French Burqa Ban Widely Supported in Europe,” Atlantic Council, March 1, 2010, acus.org.
154. “Sharia Law for UK Is ‘Unavoidable,’” BBC News, Feb. 7, 2008.
155. Ibid.
156. Ibid.
157. Paul Belien, “Islamic Immigration and Murder Among the Tulips,” vdare.com, Nov. 3, 2004.
158. Ibid.
159. “John Paul II in His Own Words,” BBC News, Oct. 14, 2003, news.bbc.co.uk.
160. State of the World Report, 2005–2006, Human Life International.
161. Dale Hurd, “Europe Forsakes Christianity for Islam,” CBN News, Sept. 5, 2006, propheticnews.net.
162. Allen, “Religion in Europe.”
163. Hurd, “Europe Forsakes Christianity for Islam.”
164. Fr. John McCloskey, “The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order,” *L’Osservatore Romano*, English edition, July 27, 1997, CatholiCity.com.
165. Ibid.
166. Ibid.

3. The Crisis of Catholicism

1. Kenneth C. Jones, *Index of Leading Catholic Indicators: The Church Since Vatican II* (St. Louis: Oriens Publishing, 2003), 7.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 7–11.
4. Laurie Goodstein, “U.S. Nuns Facing Vatican Scrutiny,” *New York Times*, July 2, 2009.
5. Dale McDonald and Margaret M. Schultz, “United States Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools 2009–2010,” National Catholic Education Association.
6. Fr. Joseph A. Sirba, “U.S. Catholics Leaving the Church in Droves: What Can Be Done?” AD2000, May 2009, 8, ad2000.com.au.
7. Ibid.; “FACTBOX: America’s Roman Catholic Population,” Reuters.com, April 10, 2008.
8. Fr. Joseph A. Sirba, “The U.S. Religious Landscape Survey,” *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*, January 2009, 21.
9. Ibid.
10. “A Portrait of American Catholics on the Eve of Pope Benedict’s Visit,” Pew Research Center Publications, March 27, 2008, pewresearch.org.
11. “Gomez Vows to Be an Advocate for L.A.’s Immigrants, the Less Fortunate,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 6, 2010, latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/jose-gomez.
12. “The Ethnic Church,” *Changing Faiths: Latinos and the Transformation of American Religion*, Pew Hispanic Center and Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, April 25, 2007, 50.
13. Jones, *Index of Leading Catholic Indicators*, 71.
14. Ibid., 9; Nancy Frazier O’Brien, “Survey Assesses Catholic Beliefs on Mass, Sacraments,” Catholic News Service, April 11, 2008, catholicnews.com.
15. Jones, *Index of Leading Catholic Indicators*, 10.
16. Ibid.
17. O’Brien, “Survey Assesses Catholic Beliefs”; “Catholics Approve of Pope Benedict, but Don’t Attend

- Mass,” Catholic News Agency, April 17, 2008, catholicnewsagency.com; “Sacraments Today: Belief and Practice Among U.S. Catholics,” Feb. 2008, cara.georgetown.edu.
18. O’Brien, “Survey Assesses Catholic Beliefs.”
 19. Jones, *Index of Leading Catholic Indicators*, 10; Peter Steinfels, “Future of Faith Worries Catholic Leaders,” *New York Times*, June 1, 1994.
 20. Malachi Martin, *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987), 321; Russell, *Breach of Faith*, 45.
 21. F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957), 22.
 22. Matthew 18:6, King James Bible.
 23. “Archbishop Chaput Hits Catholics’ Complacency,” *Wanderer*, April 2, 2009, 7; “Catholic ‘Complacency’ Shares Blame for Country’s,” catholicnewsagency.com.
 24. “Faith on the Hill: The Religious Affiliations of Members of Congress,” Dec. 19, 2008, pewforum.org.
 25. Lance Morrow, “The Rise and Fall of Anti-Catholicism,” *Time*, Oct. 15, 1979.
 26. Archbishop Timothy M. Dolan, “Foul Ball: Anti-Catholicism Is the Nation’s Other Pastime,” foxnews.com, Oct. 30, 2009.
 27. “The Arts,” Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, 2007, catholic-league.ws.
 28. *Ibid.*; Amy S. Clark, “Holy Week Angst over Naked Chocolate Jesus,” AP, cbsnews.com, March 29, 2007.
 29. Bill Donahue, “Virgin Mary Defiled on ‘South Park,’” *Free Republic*, Dec. 8, 2005.
 30. “Larry David Blasted for ‘Curb’ Episode Where He Urinates on Jesus Painting,” foxnews.com, Oct. 28, 2009.
 31. *Ibid.*
 32. *Ibid.*
 33. “Colorado Museum Under Fire; Vile Jesus Art Smashed,” *Catalyst*, November 2010, 1.
 34. David Itzkoff, “‘South Park’ Episode Altered After Muslim Group’s Warning,” *New York Times*, April 23, 2010.
 35. Morrow, “Rise and Fall of Anti-Catholicism.”
 36. Tamara Barak Aparton, “Church Defaced by ‘Hate Crime,’” *San Francisco Examiner*, Jan. 5, 2009.
 37. Ben Child, “Emmerich Reveals Fear of Fatwa Axed 2012 Scene,” *Guardian*, Nov. 3, 2009.
 38. Penny Starr, “Smithsonian Christmas-Season Exhibit Features Ant-Covered Jesus, Naked Brothers Kissing, Genitalia, and Ellen DeGeneres Grabbing Her Breasts,” cnsnews.com, Nov. 29, 2010.
 39. *Ibid.*
 40. Dolan, “Foul Ball.”
 41. Kathleen Gilbert, “Notre Dame Faces Groundswell of Outrage After Announcing Plan to Honor Obama,” lifesitenews.com, March 23, 2009; Ralph McNerny, “Is Obama Worth a Mass?” assentingcatholic.blogspot.com, March 24, 2009.
 42. *Ibid.*
 43. Gilbert, “Notre Dame.”
 44. “Bishop to Skip Notre Dame Graduation over Obama’s Views,” cnnpolitics.com, May 14, 2009.
 45. “Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI,” Catholic University of America, April 17, 2008.
 46. Chaz Muth, “Despite Criticism, Notre Dame Firm on Obama as Commencement Speaker,” Catholic News Service, March 24, 2009.
 47. Julia Duin, “Notre Dame Feels Heat Again: Funding of Gay March Attendees Is at Issue,” *Washington Times*, Oct. 16, 2009.
 48. “Jesuit Universities Criticized for ‘Obscene’ Events Promoting Sexual Ideologies,” Catholic News Agency, March 2, 2009.
 49. *Ibid.*

50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Joseph Bottum, "Bottum: Georgetown Catholic Again?" firstthings.com, Aug. 28, 2006.
53. "Georgetown Jesuit: 'Our Job Is Not to Bring People to God,'" Campus Notes, Cardinal Newman Society, February 2011, 4.
54. Irving Kristol, "Family Values: Not a Political Issue," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 7, 1992.
55. T. S. Eliot, *Christianity and Culture: The Idea of a Christian Society and Notes Toward the Definition of Culture* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968), 200.
56. "Jesuit Universities Criticized."
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid.
59. Stephen Adams, "Pope's Good Friday Message Warns of Drift into a 'Desert of Godlessness,'" *Telegraph*, April 11, 2009.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Dan Bilefsky, "Uphill Fight for Pope Among Secular Czechs," *New York Times*, Sept. 27, 2009.
63. Ibid.
64. Jason Palmer, "Religion May Become Extinct in Nine Nations, Study Says," BBC News, March 22, 2011.
65. Jonathan Capehart, "Catholics Lead the Way on Same-Sex Marriage," PostPartisan, March 21, 2011.
66. Richard Owen, "Dismay as Pope Welcomes Back Holocaust Bishop Richard Williamson," *London Times*, Jan. 26, 2009.
67. "Pope in Bid to Dampen Bishop Row," *BBC News*, Jan. 29, 2009.
68. Peter Steinfelds, "The Holocaust Furor and the U.S. Bishops," *New York Times*, Jan. 31, 2009.
69. "Calls for Pope to Step Down over Holocaust Denier," Agence France Presse, Feb. 2, 2009, google.com.
70. Richard Owen, "Angela Merkel Rebukes Pope in Holocaust," *London Times*, Feb. 4, 2009.
71. Julia Duin, "Cardinal Sees Duty to Play Role in Health Care Debate," *Washington Times*, Nov. 17, 2001.
72. Ray Henry, "Patrick Kennedy Banned from Receiving Communion by Bishop Thomas Tobin," huffingtonpost.com, Nov. 23, 2009.
73. Ray Henry, "Cleric to Kennedy: Forgo Communion," *Washington Times*, Nov. 23, 2009; Bishop Thomas J. Tobin, "Letter to Congressman Patrick Kennedy," Nov. 12, 2009, thericatholic.com.
74. Dolan, "Foul Ball."
75. Ibid.; Dan Mangan, "Archbishop's Blog Slams Gray Lady's," *New York Post*, Nov. 3, 2009.
76. Julia Duin, "Archbishop Rips Sebelius Appointment," *Washington Times*, May 9, 2009.
77. Laurie Goodstein, "Catholic Bishops Pick New Yorker as Their Leader," *New York Times*, Nov. 17, 2010.
78. Russell Shaw, "Notre Dame and the Americanist Impulse," *Arlington Catholic Herald*, April 16–22, 2009, 10.
79. Laurie Goodstein, "Christian Leaders Unite on Political Issues," *New York Times*, Nov. 20, 2009.
80. Ibid.
81. John S. Reist, Jr., "Vile Bodies," *The University Bookman*, Spring 2003, 28.
82. Hilaire Belloc, *Europe and the Faith* (New York: Cosimo, 2007), 20.
83. Aamir Latif, "Pakistan Christians, Muslims United Against Violence," islamonline.net, Aug. 4, 2009.
84. Michael Gerson, "A Blow to Religious Freedom," *Washington Post*, March 8, 2011, p. A15; Matthew Green, "Anger and Grief as Pakistan's Christians Fear for Future," *Financial Times*, March 5–6, 2011,

4.

85. Rhys Blakely, "Christians in India Face Prospect of More Attacks by Extremists," timesonline.co.uk, Sept. 11, 2008.
86. Alex Crawford, "Orgy of Violence Against Christians," Sky News, Oct. 15, 2008.
87. Ibid.
88. Tom A. Peter, "Three Malaysia Churches Firebombed as 'Allah' Use Tension Mounts," *Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 8, 2010.
89. "Bishops: Middle East May Soon Be Empty of Christians," *Catholic Herald* (UK), March 6, 2009, catholicherald.co.uk
90. "Christians and Muslims in Egypt Trade Attacks After Fatal Shootings," *New York Times International*, Jan. 10, 2010; "Egypt Clashes After Copt Killings," BBC News, Jan. 7, 2010.
91. Ernesto Londono and Aziz Alwan, "Iraqi Worshipers, Troops Killed in Church Takeover," *Washington Post*, Nov. 1, 2010; "Priests Among 58 Killed During Terror Siege at Iraqi Church," *USA Today*, Nov. 2, 2010; Anthony Shadid, "Deadly Attack on a Catholic Church in Baghdad Is Seen as a Strike at Iraq's Core," *New York Times*, Nov. 2, 2010.
92. Anwar Faruqi, "Fearful Iraqi Christians Face Fresh Qaeda Threats," Agence France Presse, Nov. 3, 2010, yahoo.com.
93. Steven Lee Myers, "More Christians Flee Iraq After New Violence," *New York Times*, Dec. 12, 2010.
94. Kareem Fahim and Liam Stack, "Fatal Bomb Hits Church in Egypt," *New York Times*, Jan. 2, 2011.
95. Diane Macedo, "Thousands of Christians Displaced in Ethiopia After Muslim Extremists Torch Churches, Homes," foxnews.com, March 24, 2011.
96. Paul Marshall, "God Looked East: The Disappearance of Christianity in Its Homeland," *Weekly Standard*, April 13, 2009, 36.
97. "Christians in Middle East Are Ignored, Vatican Claims," *Telegraph*, June 6, 2010; Ed West, "Time to Stop the Christian Exodus from the Middle East, Says Vatican," *Catholic Herald*, June 11, 2010, catholicherald.co.uk.
98. Robert Fisk, "Exodus: The Changing Map of the Middle East," *The Independent*, Oct. 26, 2010.
99. Doug Bandow, "Whoever Loses His Life for My Sake..." *Townhall Magazine*, April 2010, cato.org.
100. Marshall, "God Looked East," 36.
101. *Catholic Eye*, Nov. 30, 2009, 2.
102. Philip Jenkins, "Passions of Pope Victor," review of John L. Allen's *The Future Church: How Ten Trends Are Revolutionizing the Catholic Church* (2009), *The National Interest*, Jan./Feb. 2010, 65.
103. Ibid.
104. Ibid., 71.
105. Ibid., 72.
106. William Wan, "Enrollment of Muslim Students Is Growing at Catholic Colleges in U.S.," *Washington Post*, Dec. 20, 2010.
107. Ibid.

4. The End of White America

1. John Hope Franklin, Speech to a Freshman Symposium, Duke University, *Duke University Alumni Magazine*.
2. Joe Klein, "Obama's Victory Ushers in a New America," *Time*, Nov. 5, 2008.
3. Gary Younge, "Obama and the Decline of White America," *The Nation*, Oct. 9, 2009.
4. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?" *Atlantic Monthly*, Jan./Feb. 2009.

5. Ibid.
6. Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race* (New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2003), p. 6.
7. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?"
8. "Lothrop Stoddard: Biography," wikipedia.com.
9. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?"
10. Sam Roberts, "A Generation Away, Minorities May Become the Majority in U.S.," *New York Times*, Aug. 14, 2008; Paul Overberg and Emily Bazar, "America's Face Evolves, Blurs, Ages," *USA Today*, Aug. 14, 2008.
11. Sabrina Tavernise, "Numbers of Children of Whites Falling Fast," *New York Times*, Apr. 6, 2011.
12. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?"
13. Ibid.
14. "Larry King Live," cnn.com, Jan. 21, 2009, 14; "Larry King on Barack Obama: 'Black Is In ... My Eight-Year-Old Son Wishes He Were Black,'" *Telegraph*, Jan. 22, 2009.
15. Timothy Homan, "Diversity on Rise in U.S.," *Charleston Daily Mail*, Dec. 23, 2010.
16. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?"
17. Ibid.
18. Rich Benjamin, "Inside the Mind of Joe Wilson," salon.com, Sept. 11, 2009.
19. Frank Rich, "Small Beer, Big Hangover," *New York Times*, Aug. 2, 2009.
20. Frank Rich, "The Rage Is Not About Health Care," *New York Times*, March 28, 2010.
21. Tim Wise, "The Last Gasp of Aging White Power: But Time Is Not on Your Side," AlterNet, Nov. 5, 2010.
22. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?" Hsu quotes from Baldwin's "Down at the Cross," published in *The Fire Next Time* (NY: Dial Press, 1963).
23. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?"
24. Ibid.
25. Mark J. Perry, "The Great Man-Cession of 2008–2009 Continues," *Carpe Diem*, June 5, 2009, mjperry.blogspot.com.
26. Jeffrey Passel, "A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States," Pew Hispanic Center, April 14, 2009, pewresearch.org.
27. Shankar Vedantam, "Report Points to Faster Recovery in Jobs for Immigrants," *Washington Post*, Oct. 30, 2010.
28. Ibid.
29. Passel, "Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants."
30. David Paul Kuhn, "Revenge of the White Men," *Los Angeles Times*, March 22, 2010.
31. "Rightward, March," *New York Times*, Nov. 7, 2010.
32. Jon Cohen and Dan Balz, "Non-College Whites Gloomy About Economy," *Washington Post*, Feb. 22, 2011.
33. Kelefa Sanneh, "Beyond the Pale," *New Yorker*, April 12, 2010.
34. Ibid.
35. "What They're Saying About the 8/28 Rally," dailycaller.com, Aug. 29, 2010; Nathan Burchfiel, "Overwhelmingly White Media Criticize Conservative Rallies as 'Overwhelmingly White,'" newsbusters.org, Aug. 31, 2010.
36. Ibid.
37. Shelby Steele, "Yo, Howard! Why Did Dean Have to Embrace the Confederate Flag?" *Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 13, 2003.
38. Garance Franke-Ruta, "9/12: Race, the Tea Party Protesters and a Battle of Interpretations," *Washington*

Post, Sept. 13, 2009.

39. Ibid.
40. "NAACP Delegates Unanimously Pass Tea Party Amendment," NAACP, July 13, 2010, naacp.org.
41. Conor Dougherty, "Nonwhites to Be Majority in U.S. by 2042," *Wall Street Journal*, Aug. 14, 2008; Emily Bazar and Paul Overberg, "Census Projects More Diversity in Workforce," *USA Today*, Aug. 14, 2008.
42. Sudeep Reddy, "Latinos Fuel Growth in Decade," *Wall Street Journal*, March 25, 2011, 2.
43. Ibid.
44. "Texas Demographer: 'It's Basically Over for Anglos,'" Texas Politics, Feb. 24, 2011.
45. Ibid.
46. Suzanne Gamboa, "Almost 1 of 2 Americans Was Latino," Yahoo! News, April 7, 2009; Juan Castillo, "Nearly Half of New Citizens Were Hispanic," *Somos Austin*, April 7, 2009, statesman.com.
47. Sabrina Tavernise, "Number of White Children Falling Fast," *New York Times*, Apr. 6, 2011, A14.
48. Roberts, "A Generation Away, Minorities May Become the Majority"; Hope Yen, "White Americans' Majority to End by Mid-Century," Associated Press, Dec. 16, 2009. google.com.
49. Michael Gerson, "The GOP's Harsh Immigration Stance Will Cost It," *Washington Post*, May 14, 2010, p. A17.
50. "Hispanics Now Majority in Texas Public Schools," AP, March 23, 2011.
51. "Hispanics, Asians," *Migration News*, September 1998, vol. 5, no. 9, migration.ucdavis.edu; Patrick J. Buchanan, "Who Voted for Clinton's Revolution?" July 1, 1997, buchanan.org.
52. Hua Hsu, "The End of White America?"; "President Clinton's Speech on Diversity," Portland State University, June 13, 1998, *Social Contract*, Summer 1998.
53. Susan Sontag, *Partisan Review*, Winter 1967, 57.
54. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Disuniting of America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1992), 47–48.
55. Anthony Pagden, "Of Skulls and Buttocks," *The National Interest*, March/April 2010, 95.
56. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Benziger Bros. ed., 1947. <http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa>. Second Part, q. 27, a. 3.
57. Steve Sailer, "Demography Is Destiny, and Our Destiny (Courtesy of Immigration Policy) Is Disastrous," vdare.com, March 22, 2009.
58. Heather Mac Donald, "The Hispanic Family: The Case for National Action," *National Review*, April 14, 2008.
59. William Bennett, *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 48.
60. Ann Coulter, "Murder Spree by People Who Refuse to Ask for Directions," *Human Events*, Jan. 14, 2009.
61. Leila Darabi, "Despite Being Largely Illegal, Abortion in Mexico Is Far More Prevalent Than in the United States," News Release, Guttmacher Institute, Feb. 2, 2009.
62. Mac Donald, "The Hispanic Family."
63. Steve Sailer, "Diversity Is Strength! It's Also ... 2006's Demographic Death Spiral," vdare.com, Dec. 9, 2007.
64. Miriam Jordan, "Latino Aging Stumps Experts," *Wall Street Journal*, Oct. 16, 2010.
65. Ruy Teixeira, "Demographic Change and the Future of the Parties," Center for American Progress, June 2010, 8.
66. Patrick J. Buchanan, "Buenas Noches, America!" *American Cause*, Sept. 7, 2007.
67. John Fonte, "Dual Allegiance: A Challenge to Immigration Reform and Patriotic Assimilation," Center for Immigration Studies, November 2005, cis.org.
68. Ibid.
69. Buchanan, "Buenas Noches."

70. Ibid.
71. Schlesinger, *The Disuniting of America*, 16.
72. Mark Krikorian, "Mexico First?" *National Review*, Jan. 28, 2008.
73. Fonte, "Dual Allegiance," 14.
74. Steven A. Camarota, "Public Opinion in Mexico on U.S. Immigration," Background, Center for Immigration Studies, October 2009, 1.
75. Buchanan, "Buenas Noches."
76. Ibid.
77. Fonte, "Dual Allegiance."
78. Steven A. Camarota, "100 Million More: Projecting the Impact of Immigration on the U.S. Population, 2007–2060," Center for Immigration Studies, August 2007, 1.
79. Ewen MacAskill, "Mexico's Felipe Calderon Says Arizona Laws Breed Hate and Intolerance," *Guardian*, April 27, 2010.
80. "White House, Democrats Applaud Mexican President Slamming Arizona Law," foxnews.com, May 20, 2010.
81. Joel Gerstein, "DOJ Sues over Arizona Immigration Law," *Politico*, July 8, 2010.
82. Jon Dougherty, "Mexicans: Southwest U.S. Is Ours," *WorldNetDaily*, June 13, 2002.
83. "Between Two Worlds: How Young Latinos Come of Age in America," Pew Hispanic Center, Dec. 11, 2009, 22.
84. John Judis, "End State: Is California Finished?" *The New Republic*, Nov. 4, 2009, 16, 22.
85. Ibid.
86. Will Kane, "Latino Kids Now Majority in State's Public Schools," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Nov. 13, 2010.
87. Sailer, "Demography Is Destiny."
88. Michael R. Blood, "Californians Looking for the Exit," *Arizona Republic*, Feb. 1, 2009, 4.
89. "California Sales Tax Rate Increase," California Business Law Blog: Law Office of Jonas M. Grant, April 9, 2009.
90. Robert Samuelson, "California's Reckoning—and Ours," *Washington Post*, Aug. 2, 2009.
91. David Brooks, "Tom Joad Gave Up," *New York Times*, Sept. 28, 2010.
92. "Best and Worst States for Business in 2010," *Chief Executive*, May/June 2010.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid.
95. "No Gold in State: Voters Reject a Ballot They Could Not Comprehend," *The Economist*, May 21, 2009.
96. Terry Jeffrey, "Government Killed California," cnsnews.com, Dec. 29, 2010.
97. Passel, "Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants"; Sam Roberts, "Census Finds Rise in Foreign Workers," *New York Times*, Dec. 8, 2009.
98. Jack Martin and Eric A. Ruark, "The Fiscal Burden of Illegal Immigration on United States Taxpayers," Federation for American Immigration Reform, July 2010, fairus.org.
99. "Chicano Nationalism, Revanchism and the Aztlan Myth," Federation for American Immigration Reform, Jan. 2005, fairus.org; James Lubinskas, "Expressions of Ethnic Animosity," frontpagemagazine.com, Nov. 24, 1999.
100. Ibid.
101. Meredith May, "Hispanics Expected to be State's Majority by 2042," *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 10, 2007.
102. Sailer, "Demography Is Destiny."
103. Jennifer Smith Richards, "Reading Rate Dismal," *Columbus Dispatch*, Jan. 9, 2009.

104. Will Kane, "Latino Kids Now Majority in State's Public Schools," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Nov. 13, 2010.
105. Solomon Moore, "Hundreds Hurt in California Prison Riot," *New York Times*, Aug. 10, 2009.
106. Lee Baca, "In L.A., Race Kills," *Los Angeles Times*, June 12, 2008.
107. "Hate Crime Report 2008," Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, Nov. 2009, 19.
108. Erik Eckholm, "Gang Violence Grows on an Indian Reservation," *New York Times*, Dec. 14, 2009.
109. Ibid.
110. Jim Rutenberg, "Black Radio on Obama Is Left's Answer to Limbaugh," *New York Times*, July 27, 2008.
111. Ibid.
112. Jesse Washington, "Can Minority Journalists Resist Applauding Obama?" realclearpolitics.com, July 26, 2008.
113. "Aim of New UNITY Initiative Is More Diversity in Top Media Management," press release, UNITY: Journalists of Color, July 22, 2008, unityjournalists.org.
114. Ibid.
115. Ibid.
116. Amanda Carpenter, "'Diversity Czar' Takes Heat over Remarks," *Washington Times*, Sept. 23, 2009.
117. Ibid.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid.
120. "House Apologizes for Slavery and Jim Crow: Resolution Does Not Mention Reparations, Commits to Rectifying Misdeed," AP, msnbc.msn.com, July 29, 2008.
121. Josephine Hearn, "Black Caucus: Whites Not Allowed," *Politico*, Jan. 22, 2007, dyn.politico.com.
122. Ben Pershing, "Tennessee Primary Gets Nasty," Capitol Briefing, *Washington Post*, Aug. 7, 2008; Darryl Fears, "Tennessee Defies Cliches on Race and Politics," *Washington Post*, Aug. 10, 2008.
123. Adam Nossiter, "Race Takes Central Role in a Memphis Primary," *New York Times*, Aug. 7, 2008.
124. Ibid.
125. "False Allegations of White Racism Are Widespread While Black Racism Is Tolerated: It's Time to End the Double Standard," *Lincoln Review*, vol. 13, no. 5, Sept.–Oct. 2009, 2.
126. Amos Maki, "Memphis Mayor Willie Herenton Forming Committee to Study Run for Congress," *Memphis Commercial-Appeal*, April 21, 2009.
127. Woody Baird, "White U.S. Rep. in Black Tenn. District Faces Fight," Associated Press, June 18, 2009, breitbart.com.
128. Robbie Brown, "Ex-Mayor of Memphis Starts Bid for Congress, Invoking Race in Campaign," *New York Times*, Sept. 14, 2009.
129. Ibid.; "False Allegations," *Lincoln Review*.
130. Hearn, "Black Caucus."
131. David Knowles, "John Lewis Switches to Obama," politicsdaily.com, Feb. 27, 2008; "Congressman John Lewis," Southern Freedom Fighter Museum, May 21, 2008, southernfreedomfighter.blogspot.com.
132. Michael Saul, "Geraldine Ferraro Resigns Clinton Post Amidst Furor over Obama Comments," *New York Daily News*, March 12, 2008.
133. Orlando Patterson, "The Red Phone in Black and White," *New York Times*, Mar. 11, 2008.
134. Mike Allen and Jonathan Martin, "Powell Endorses Obama," *Politico*, Oct. 19, 2008, dyn.politico.com; Lynn Sweet, "Colin Powell Endorses Barack Obama on NBC's 'Meet the Press.' Turned Off by McCain's Focus on Ayers," *Chicago Sun-Times*, Oct. 19, 2008.
135. Peter Wallsten, "Wall Divides Republican Party Factions," *Seattle Times*, June 3, 2007.

136. Sailer, "Diversity Is Strength!"
137. Charlie Savage, "Videos Shed New Light on Sotomayor's Positions," *New York Times*, June 11, 2009.
138. David D. Kirkpatrick, "Sotomayor's Focus on Race Issues May Be Hurdle," *New York Times*, May 30, 2009.
139. "The Franchise for Felons," *Washington Times*, May 29, 2009.
140. Charlie Savage, "A Judge's View of Judging Is on the Record," *New York Times*, May 15, 2009.
141. Ibid.
142. Edward A. Adams, "Race and Gender of Judges Make Enormous Differences in Rulings, Studies Find," *ABA Journal*, Feb. 6, 2010.
143. "Aloha, Segregation," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 17, 2009.
144. "Sen. Akaka on Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act," Feb. 23, 2010, allamericanpatriots.com
145. "Britain Nixes Iroquois Team's Passports," AP, *Washington Times*, July 15, 2010.
146. Paul Krugman, "The Town Hall Mob," *New York Times*, Aug. 6, 2009.
147. Ibid.
148. Mark Finkelstein, "Cynthia Tucker: 45–65% of TownHall Protesters Are Racists," NewsBusters.org, Aug. 7, 2009.
149. Susan Davis, "WSJ/NBC News Poll: Tea Party Tops Democrats and Republicans," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 16, 2009.
150. David Zincenko, "Decline of the American Male," *USA Today*, June 17, 2009.
151. Edwin S. Rubenstein, "July Jobs: Americans Are the Biggest—and Only—Losers. Moratorium Now!" vdare.com, Aug. 6, 2010.
152. Edwin S. Rubenstein, "July Jobs: Displacement Returns with a Vengeance," vdare.com, Aug. 7, 2009.

5. Demographic Winter

1. John Feffer, "New Neighbors, New Economy," *Epoch Times*, Nov. 17, 2009; "A Migration Summit to Address Shrinking Birth Rates," huffingtonpost.com, Nov. 10, 2009.
2. Pierre Eugène Marcelin Berthelot, *Dictionary of Science Quotations*, quoted in R. Desper, *The Human Side of Scientists*, 1975.
3. Comprehensive Tables, *World Population Statistics: The 2008 Revision*, vol. 1 (New York: United Nations, 2009), 86, 142, 248, 390, 406, 476, 228, 306, 316, 162, 404, 84, 102, 48, 62, 114, 166, 210, 264, 312, 368, 474.
4. Jack Goldstone, "The New Population Bomb: The Four Megatrends That Will Change the World," *Foreign Affairs*, Jan./Feb. 2010, 32–33.
5. Phillip Longman, "Think Again: Global Aging," *Foreign Policy*, November 2010, 54.
6. Edward Bernard Glick, "Who Will Be on Top at the End of the Century?" *American Thinker*, Dec. 27, 2010.
7. Comprehensive Tables, *World Population Statistics: The 2006 Revision*, vol. 1 (New York: United Nations, 2007), 5.
8. "Can Policies Boost Birth Rates?" policy brief, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, November 2007, 1.
9. Ibid., 2.
10. Ibid.
11. *World Population Statistics: The 2008 Revision*, 292.
12. Lisa Twaronit, "Japan's Low Birth Rate Poses Demographic Dilemma," MarketWatch, March 18, 2010.

13. Joel Kotkin, "The Kid Issue," forbes.com, Sept. 8, 2009.
14. Nicholas Eberstadt, "The Demographic Future: What Population Growth—and Decline—Means for the Global Economy," *Foreign Affairs*, Nov.–Dec. 2010, 61.
15. Frank Zeller, "Baby Shortage Is an Economic Time Bomb," *Vancouver Sun*, Dec. 29, 2010.
16. Blaine Harden, "For Young Japanese, U.S. Degrees Lose Lure," *Washington Post*, April 11, 2010.
17. Hiroko Tabuchi, "China's Day Arriving Sooner than Japan Expected," *New York Times*, Oct. 2, 2009.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. *World Population Statistics: The 2008 Revision*, 398.
21. Ibid.
22. "S. Korea Urges Lights Out to Boost Birthrate," AFP, Jan. 20, 2008, breitbart.com.
23. Goldstone, "The New Population Bomb," 34.
24. Longman, "Think Again," 55.
25. Zeller, "Baby Shortage Is an Economic Time Bomb."
26. Henry A. Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 134.
27. Reiner Klingholz, "Europe's Real Demographic Challenge," *Policy Review*, Oct.–Nov. 2009, 63.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., 66.
30. "Birth Control Pill Inventor Laments Demographic 'Catastrophe,'" catholicnewsagency.com, Jan. 11, 2009.
31. Russell Shorto, "No Babies," *New York Times Magazine*, June 29, 2008, 71.
32. Longman, "Think Again," 58.
33. *World Population Statistics: The 2008 Revision*, 480.
34. Cal Thomas, "Invasion by Immigration," Tribune Media Services, Aug. 12, 2009, calthomas.com.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Graeme Wilson, "White Britons a Minority by 2066," *The Sun*, Nov. 18, 2010; "White Britons a Minority by 2066," *The Independent*, Nov. 18, 2010, belfasttelegraph.co.uk.
38. Fouad Ajami, "Strangers in the Land," *New York Times Book Review*, Aug. 2, 2009, 7.
39. Ibid.
40. Tom Whitehead, "Labor Wanted Mass Immigration to Make UK More Multicultural, Says Former Adviser," *Telegraph*, Oct. 23, 2009.
41. Ibid.
42. Richard Kerbaj, "Muslin Population 'Rising 10 Times Faster Than Rest of Population,'" *London Times*, Jan. 30, 2009; "Hinduism in the United Kingdom" and "Black British," wikipedia.com.
43. Alexi Mostrous and Christine Seib, "Tide Turns as Poles End Great Migration," *Sunday Times*, Feb. 16, 2008.
44. Charles Krauthammer, "Never Again?" *Washington Post*, May 5, 2006.
45. Leon Cohen, "Jewish Pro-Life Activist Medved Says Children Are 'A Gift, Not a Choice,'" *Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle*, May 7, 2004, jewishchronicle.org.
46. Philip Roth, *The Counterlife* (New York: Farrar, Straus, 1986), 103.
47. Stephen Steinlight, "The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography: Reconsidering a Misguided Immigration Policy," Center for Immigration Studies, October 2001.
48. Ibid.
49. Isabel Kershner, "Some Israelis Question Benefits for Ultra-Religious," *New York Times*, Dec. 28, 2010.
50. "Shall the Religious Inherit the Earth?: Demography and Politics in the Twenty-first Century," Introduction, Eric Kaufmann, Belfer Center, Harvard University/Birkbeck College, University of

London, p. 7.

51. John Mearsheimer, "Saving Israel from Itself," *American Conservative*, May 18, 2009.
52. Guy Lieberman, "Housing Minister: Spread of Arab Population Must Be Stopped," haaretz.com, Feb. 7, 2009.
53. Ibid.
54. Yair Lapid, "What Demographic Problem?" YNET, July 7, 2009, ynetnews.com.
55. Mearsheimer, "Saving Israel from Itself."
56. Rory McCarthy, "Olmert: Israel Must Hand Back Land for Peace with Palestinians and Syria," *Guardian*, Sept. 29, 2008.
57. John Lynn, "Ehud Barak Defies Benjamin Netanyahu on Threat to Israel," *The Australian*, Jan. 28, 2010.
58. John Mearsheimer, "Sinking Ship," *The American Conservative*, Aug. 2010, 11.
59. Alan Dershowitz, "Palestinians and the 'Right of Return,'" *Christian Science Monitor*, April 16, 2007.
60. Goldstone, "The New Population Bomb," 37.
61. *World Population Statistics: The 2008 Revision*, 406.
62. Casimir Dadak, "A New 'Cold War'?" *Independent Review*, Summer 2010, 95.
63. Martin Walker, "The World's New Numbers," *Wilson Quarterly*, Spring 2009.
64. Nicholas Eberstadt, "Drunken Nation: Russia's Depopulation Bomb," *World Affairs*, Spring 2009.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid.
67. Richard Fairbanks and Paul Hewitt, "Demography vs. an Imperial Impulse," *Washington Times*, Sept. 17, 2008.
68. William Hawkins, "U.S. Need Not Decline," *Washington Times*, Dec. 4, 2008.
69. Bill Gertz, "Hayden Warns of Russian Unrest," *Washington Times*, May 1, 2008.
70. "Russia's Exploding Muslim Population," foreignpolicy.com, Jan. 16, 2007.
71. Clifford J. Levy, "Its Population Falling, Russia Beckons Its Children Home," *New York Times*, March 22, 2009.
72. "Rivalries of the Bear and Dragon," *Financial Times*, Oct. 15, 2009, 10.
73. Dadak, "A New 'Cold War'?" 95.
74. Kotkin, "The Kid Issue."
75. Feffer, "New Neighbors, New Economy."
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Ariana Eunjung Cha, "In Aging China, a Change of Course," *Washington Post*, Dec. 12, 2009.
79. Ibid.
80. Peter Hitchens, "Gendercide: China's Shameful Massacre of Unborn Girls Means There Will Soon Be 30M More Men Than Women," *Daily Mail*, April 10, 2010, dailymail.co.uk.
81. Longman, "Think Again," 55.
82. Eberstadt, "Demographic Future," 57.
83. Cha, "In Aging China, a Change of Course."
84. "Taiwan Seeks Baby-Boosting Slogan," BBC News, March 16, 2010.
85. Edwin Mora, "NYT Environment Reporter Floats Idea: Give Carbon Credits to Couples That Limit Themselves to One Child," cnsnews.com, Oct. 19, 2009.

6. Equality vs. Freedom?

1. James Fenimore Cooper, *On the Disadvantages of a Monarchy*, wikiquote.org.

2. Will and Ariel Durant, *The Lessons of History* (New York: MJF Books, 1968), 20.
3. Murray Rothbard, "Egalitarianism as a Revolt Against Nature," *Modern Age*, Fall 1973, lewrockwell.com.
4. President Barack Obama, Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 2009, abcnews.go.com.
5. Irving Kristol, "The Neoconservative Persuasion," *Weekly Standard*, Aug. 25, 2003.
6. Kevin Phillips, *The Cousins' War: Religion, Politics, Civil Warfare, and the Triumph of Anglo-America* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).
7. "An Excerpt of Query XIV from the Notes on the State of Virginia (1781)," *The Atlantic*, October 1996.
8. Thomas Jefferson, "Letter to John Adams, Oct. 28, 1813," The Founders Constitution, press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders.
9. Thomas Jefferson, "Letter to Lafayette, Feb. 14, 1815," etext.virginia.edu.
10. Thomas Jefferson, *Autobiography*, 1821, etext.virginia.edu.
11. Bertrand Russell, famous-proverbs.com.
12. Willmoore Kendall, *Contra Mundum* (New York: Arlington House, 1971), 351–52.
13. *Ibid.*, 352.
14. Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, vol. 3 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1953), 145–46.
15. Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, vol. 2 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1953), 255–56.
16. *Ibid.*
17. "Abraham Lincoln's Speech on the Dred Scott Decision," June 26, 1857, The Freeman Institute, freemaninstitute.com/lincoln.htm.
18. Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, vol. 5 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1953), 388.
19. Kendall, *Contra Mundum*, 354.
20. Thomas E. Woods Jr. and Kevin Gutzman, "Brown vs Board vs the U.S. Constitution," vdare.com, July 25, 2008.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*
23. Martin Luther King, "I Have a Dream," Washington, D.C., Aug. 28, 1963, americanrhetoric.com.
24. *Ibid.*
25. "Moving Toward a Genuinely Color-Blind Society," *Lincoln Review Letter Digest*, May–June 2009, 2.
26. Lyndon B. Johnson, "To Fulfill These Rights," Commencement Address at Howard University, June 4, 1965, lbjlib.utexas.edu.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. William J. Quirk and Randall J. Bridwell, *Judicial Dictatorship* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1995), 21.
31. James Fenimore Cooper, *On the Disadvantages of a Monarchy*.
32. Quirk and Bridwell, *Judicial Dictatorship*, 23.
33. Lyndon B. Johnson, "To Fulfill These Rights."
34. Rothbard, "Egalitarianism as a Revolt Against Nature."
35. Will and Ariel Durant, *Lessons of History*, 19.
36. *Ibid.*, 19–20.
37. *Ibid.*, 20.
38. *Ibid.*

39. Jude P. Dougherty, "Two Treatises on the Acquisition and Use of Power," *Modern Age*, Spring 2010, 110–11.
40. Pierre Thomas and Jason Ryan, "U.S. Prison Population Hits All-Time High: 2.3 Million Incarcerated," ABC News, June 6, 2008.
41. Duncan Williams, *Trousered Apes: Sick Literature in a Sick Society* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1991), 131.
42. Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (New York: Avenel Books, Crown Publishing), 33, 34.
43. Gillis J. Harp, "Are We All Ideologues Now?" *St. Croix Review*, Oct. 2010, 56.
44. Ibid.
45. Will and Ariel Durant, *Lessons of History*, 20.
46. W. E. B. DuBois, "The Talented Tenth," September 1903, teachingamericanhistory.org.
47. Sarah O'Connor, "Men Bear the Brunt of US Jobs Lost," *Financial Times*, April 19, 2009; Gabriella Boston, "Recession Slams Blue-Collar Workers," *Washington Times*, March 26, 2009; Mark J. Perry, "The Man-Cession Continues," *Carpe Diem*, March 9, 2009; Catherine Rampell, "As Layoffs Surge, Women May Pass Men in Job Force," *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 2009.
48. Rothbard, "Egalitarianism as a Revolt Against Nature."
49. Leo Congdon, *George Kennan: A Writing Life* (Wilmington, DE.: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2008), 145.
50. Ibid., 143.
51. Monica Gabriel, "Former Bush Solicitor General Ted Olson Files Suit Claiming Same-Sex Marriage Is Constitutional Right," cnsnews.com, June 23, 2009.
52. Thomas Jefferson, "A Bill for Proportioning Crimes and Punishments," 1778, Amendment VIII, The Founders Constitution, press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders.
53. Charles Murray, *Real Education: Four Simple Truths for Bringing America's Schools Back to Reality* (New York: Crown Forum, 2008), 58.
54. Daniel Goleman, "Richard Herrnstein Dies; Backed Nature over Nurture," *New York Times*, Sept. 16, 1994.
55. Murray, *Real Education*, 60, 62, 66.
56. Heather Mac Donald, "Nation of Cowards?" *City Journal*, Feb. 19, 2009.
57. Sewell Chan, "The Highest Per-Pupil Spending in the U.S.," *New York Times*, May 24, 2007.
58. Stacy Teicher Kadaroo, "Graduation Rate for U.S. High Schoolers Falls for Second Straight Year," *Christian Science Monitor*, June 10, 2010.
59. Joel Schectman and Rachel Monahan, "Cuny's Got Math Problem: Report Shows Many Freshmen from City HS Fail at Basic Algebra," *New York Daily News*, Nov. 12, 2009.
60. Sharon Otterman and Robert Gebeloff, "Triumph Fades on Racial Gap in City Schools," *New York Times*, Aug. 15, 2010.
61. Meredith Kolodner, Rachel Monahan, and Adam Lisberg, "Just Who Is Cathie Black?" *New York Daily News*, Nov. 10, 2010.
62. Trip Gabriel, "Proficiency of Black Students Is Found to Be Far Lower Than Expected," *New York Times*, Nov. 9, 2010.
63. Ibid.
64. Ibid.
65. Robert Weissberg, *Bad Students, Not Bad Schools* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010), 7.
66. Ibid.
67. Sam Dillon, "Top Test Scores from Shanghai Stun Educators," *New York Times*, Dec. 7, 2010; Christine Armario, "'Wake-Up Call: U.S. Students Trail Global Leaders,'" AP, Dec. 7, 2010, msnbc.com.

68. Ibid.
69. Steve Sailer, "PISA Scores Show Demography Is Destiny in Education, Too—But Washington Doesn't Want You to Know," vdare.com, Dec.19, 2010.
70. Jason Richwine, "The Myth of Racial Disparities in Public School Funding," Backgrounder, Heritage Foundation, April 20, 2011, 1.
71. Weissberg, *Bad Students, Not Bad Schools*, vii.
72. Michelle Rhee, "New York Needs Its Best Teachers in the Classroom," *Wall Street Journal*, March 11, 2011.
73. Jonah Lehrer, "Why Rich Parents Don't Matter," *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 22, 2011.
74. Justin Pope, "Transcript Shows Harvard Professor Arguing Differences Between Genders Play a Role in Science Careers," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 17, 2005; Patrick D. Healy and Sara Rimer, "Furor Lingers as Harvard Chief Gives Details of Talk on Women," *New York Times*, Feb. 18, 2005; Leonard Fein, "The 'Availability' of Aptitude," *Jewish Daily Forward*, Feb. 25, 2006.
75. Sam Dillon, "Harvard Chief Defends His Talk on Women," *New York Times*, Jan. 18, 2005; Marcella Bombardieri, "Summers' Remarks on Women Draw Fire," *Boston Globe*, Jan. 17, 2005; Christina Hoff Sommers and Sally Satel, "Where Were You on 1/14?" American Enterprise Institute, Aug. 14, 2005, aei.org.
76. Cahal Milmo, "Fury at DNA Pioneer's Theory: Africans Are Less Intelligent Than Westerners," *The Independent*, Oct. 17, 2007.
77. Ibid.
78. Charles Murray, *Human Accomplishment: The Pursuit of Excellence in the Arts and Sciences, 800 B.C. to 1950* (New York: Cox and Murray, 2003).
79. Charles Murray, "Intelligence and College," *National Affairs*, Fall 2009, 96.
80. Charles Murray, "The Inequality Taboo," *Commentary*, September 2005, [biblesearcher.com](http://bibleresearcher.com).
81. Williams, *Trousered Apes*, 139.
82. Samuel Francis, *Beautiful Losers: Essays on the Failure of American Conservatism* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 209.
83. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, translated by Henry Reeve, vol. 2 (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 2003), 320–21.
84. Dougherty, "Two Treatises on the Acquisition and Use of Power."
85. Francis, *Beautiful Losers*, 209.

7. The Diversity Cult

1. Ann Coulter, "At the End of the Day, Diversity Has Jumped the Shark," *Human Events*, Nov. 18, 2009.
2. Peter Skerry, "Beyond Sushiology: Does Diversity Work?" Brookings Institution, Winter 2002.
3. "Brigadier General Pinckney to Head New Diversity Task Force," Army News Service, Dec. 3, 2007.
4. Ben Wattenberg, *The Good News Is the Bad News Is Wrong* (Washington, D.C.: AEI Press, 1984), 84.
5. John Derbyshire, "Ethnomasochism: The Musical," Cultural Caviar, Nov. 10, 2010, takimag.com.
6. Ibid.
7. Christopher Lydon, "Carter Defends All-White Areas: Says Government Shouldn't Try to End 'Ethnic Purity' of Some Neighborhoods," *New York Times*, April 6, 1976.
8. Ibid.
9. Dan Quayle, "Murphy Brown Speech," Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, May 19, 1992, commonwealthclub.org.
10. Peter Wood, *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept* (San Francisco: Encounter, 2003), 5.

11. Ibid., 5–6.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 6.
14. John Derbyshire, *We Are Doomed: Reclaiming Conservative Pessimism* (New York: Crown Forum, 2009), 22.
15. Bill Clinton, “Transcript of Clinton’s 1997 State of the Union—Jan. 21, 1997,” [cnn.com](#).
16. Steve Sailer, “The Michigan Mess: On Cognitive Dissonance About Quotas—and the Need for a Constitutional Amendment,” [vdare.com](#), June 29, 2003.
17. Wesley Clark, Amicus Brief to the United States Supreme Court, Feb. 19, 2003, Issue Briefs—Affirmative Action, Clark 04, [texasforclark.com](#).
18. Wood, *Diversity*, 81.
19. Ben Franklin, “Letter to Peter Collinson,” May 9, 1753, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin, Philadelphia, 1726–1757*, [historycarper.com](#); “Ben Franklin on ‘Stupid, Swarthy Germans,’” [dialoginternational.com](#).
20. John Jay, Federalist No. 2, “Concerning Dangers from Foreign Force and Influence,” Oct. 31, 1787, *Independent Journal*, [americanconservativedaily.com](#).
21. Ibid.
22. Peter Brimelow, *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America’s Immigration Disaster* (New York: Random House, 1995), 76–77.
23. Ibid., 77.
24. Hua Hsu, “The End of White America?” *The Atlantic*, Jan.–Feb. 2009.
25. Skerry, “Beyond Sushiology.”
26. Orlando Patterson, “Equality,” *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas*, Winter 2009, 9, [democracyjournal.org](#).
27. “Remarks as Prepared for Delivery by Attorney General Eric Holder at the Department of Justice African American History Month Program,” Department of Justice, Feb. 18, 2008, [doj.gov](#).
28. Orlando Patterson, “Race and Diversity in the Age of Obama,” *New York Times*, Aug. 16, 2009.
29. Ibid.
30. Mireya Navarro, “National Parks Reach Out to Blacks Who Aren’t Visiting,” *New York Times*, Nov. 2, 2010.
31. Amanda Paulson, “Resegregation of American Schools Deepening,” *Christian Science Monitor*, Jan. 25, 2008.
32. Ibid.
33. Bill Bishop, “An Election Story for Those Who Like to Watch,” [slate.com](#), Oct. 21, 2008.
34. Robert J. Samuelson, “Political Perils of a ‘Big Sort,’” *Washington Post*, Aug. 6, 2008.
35. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X: As Told to Alex Haley* (New York: Ballantine, 1964), 348; Edward Banfield, *The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970), 67; Patrick J. Buchanan, *Conservative Votes, Liberal Victories: Why the Right Has Failed* (New York: Quadrangle, 1975), 67.
36. Scott Stossel, “Subdivided We Fall,” *New York Times*, May 18, 2008.
37. Ibid.
38. Rich Benjamin, *Searching for Whitopia: An Improbable Journey to the Heart of White America* (New York: Hyperion, 2009), p. 6.
39. Alan Ehrenhalt, “Like-Minded, Living Nearby,” *Wall Street Journal*, April 22, 2008.
40. Jennifer Harper, “Immigration, Loss of Culture Worry Nations,” *Washington Times*, Oct. 5, 2007.
41. David Gauvey Herbert, “Americans Divided Along Race, Class Lines,” [nationaljournal.com](#), Dec. 1, 2009.
42. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Criminal Victimization in the United States*,

Statistical Tables, 2007 (Washington, DC, 2010), Table 42.

43. Heather Mac Donald, "Nation of Cowards?" *City Journal*, Feb. 19, 2009.
44. Walter Williams, "Is Racial Profiling Racist?" townhall.com, Aug. 19, 2009.
45. "Racial Profiling of Taxi Passengers," My Fox New York, Dec. 8, 2010, myfoxny.com; Bryce Watkins, "Un-fare: New York Taxi Driver Rep Endorses Racial Profiling," *Atlanta Post*, Dec. 7, 2010.
46. *Ibid.*; Walter Williams, "Is Profiling Racist?" lewrockwell.com, Aug. 3, 2010.
47. "Jesse Jackson's Car Stolen in Detroit," *Chicago Sun-Times*, Sept. 4, 2010.
48. "Resegregation Now," *New York Times*, June 29, 2007.
49. "Black Sorority Protests 'Old South' Days," AP, *Montgomery Advertiser*, April 30, 2009.
50. *Ibid.*
51. Katherine Kington, "Kappa Alpha's 'Old South Week' Bans Confederate Uniforms," wtvm.com, April 23, 2010.
52. Skerry, "Beyond Sushiology."
53. Ryan O'Donnell, "The Corporate Diversity Scam," frontpagemagazine.com, Jan. 27, 2003.
54. Barbara Barrett, "Black Farmers to Share in Settlement," *Washington Post*, Dec. 12, 2010.
55. "Federal Government Offers Payouts to Hispanic, Female Farmers," aberdeennews.com, May 13, 2011; Mary Clare Jalonick, "USDA Offers Settlements to Women, Hispanic Farmers," washingtonpost.com, Feb. 25, 2011.
56. *Ibid.*
57. Derbyshire, *We Are Doomed*, 23.
58. Fay Hansen, "Diversity's Business Case Doesn't Add Up," workforce.com, April 2003.
59. Hans Bader, "Diversity Training Backfires," openmarket.org, Dec. 26, 2007.
60. Roland S. Martin, "Commentary: Obama's Press Office Needs Diversity," cnnpolitics.com, Feb. 4, 2009.
61. "Blacks Equaled or Exceeded Their Relevant Civilian Labor Force Representation in 17 of 18 Executive Departments [and] ... All 24 Independent Agencies," FY 2008 FEORP, U.S. Office of Personnel Management.
62. Danielle Douglas, "Winding Down Fannie and Freddie Could Put Minority Careers at Risk," *Washington Post*, Feb. 22, 2011; Chris Isidore, "Fannie, Freddie Bailout: \$153 Billion ... and Counting," cnnmoney.com, Feb. 11, 2011.
63. Richard Slimbach, "The Transcultural Journey," *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, vol. 11, 2005.
64. Richard Garnett, "The Minority Court," *Wall Street Journal*, April 17, 2010.
65. Noah Feldman, "The Triumphant Decline of the WASP," *New York Times*, June 27, 2010.
66. *Ibid.*
67. James A. Barnes, "Obama's Team: The Face of Diversity," *National Journal*, June 20, 2009.
68. Daniel de Vise, "Naval Academy Professor Challenges Rising Diversity," *Washington Post*, July 3, 2009.
69. *Ibid.*
70. Bruce Fleming, "The Cost of a Diverse Naval Academy," *The Capital*, June 14, 2009, hometownannapolis.com.
71. *Ibid.*
72. Daniel de Vise, "Naval Academy Defends Move to Adjust Image on National TV," *Washington Post*, Nov. 11, 2009.
73. Fleming, "The Cost of a Diverse Naval Academy."
74. De Vise, "Naval Academy Defends Move."
75. Admiral Gary Roughead, USN, "Shaping the Navy," interview by Gina DiNicolo, *Military Officer*,

October 2009, 73.

76. De Vise, "Naval Academy Professor Challenges Rising Diversity."
77. Fleming, "The Cost of a Diverse Naval Academy."
78. "High Seas Segregation: The Navy Is Listing Dangerously in Politically Correct Waters," *Washington Times*, July 30, 2010.
79. Ron K. Unz, "Some Minorities Are More Minor Than Others," *Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 16, 1998, [onenation.org](http://www.unz.com/unz/onenation.org).
80. "Record Retrospective: Obama on Affirmative Action," *Harvard Law Record*, Oct. 30, 2008; *Harvard Law Record*, vol. 91, no. 7, Nov. 16, 1990.
81. Unz, "Some Minorities Are More Minor Than Others."
82. Patrick J. Buchanan, "Our Self-Selecting Elite," Jan. 1, 1999, [buchanan.org](http://www.buchanan.org).
83. Russell K. Nieli, "How Diversity Punishes Asians, Poor Whites and Lots of Others," [mindingthecampus.com](http://www.mindingthecampus.com), July 12, 2010.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid.
87. James Webb, "Diversity and the Myth of White Privilege," *Wall Street Journal*, July 23, 2010.
88. "Harvard Tries to Diversify Portraits on Campus," [whdh.com](http://www.whdh.com), Nov. 7, 2010.
89. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Henry Reeve, vol. 2 (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House), 114.
90. Ibid., p. 115.
91. Jason Richwine, "A Smart Solution to the Diversity Dilemma," *The American*, Aug. 12, 2009.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid.
94. John Leo, "Bowling with Our Own," *City Journal*, June 25, 2007.
95. John Lloyd, "Study Paints Bleak Picture of Ethnic Diversity," *Financial Times*, Oct. 8, 2006.
96. Ibid.
97. Leo, "Bowling with Our Own."
98. Ibid.
99. Eduardo Porter, "Race and the Social Contract," *New York Times*, March 31, 2009.
100. Ibid.
101. Ibid.
102. Skerry, "Beyond Sushiology."
103. Ibid.
104. Schlesinger, 10.
105. Richwine, "A Smart Solution to the Diversity Dilemma."
106. Ibid.
107. Paul Gottfried, "Multiculturalist International," *Orbis*, 2002, [fpri.org/orbis](http://www.fpri.org/orbis).
108. Samuel Francis, "The Other Face of Multiculturalism," *Chronicles*, April 1998.
109. Ibid.
110. H. A. Scott Trask, "The Whale in Times Square," *Chronicles*, May 2011, 30.
111. Ibid.
112. Nick Allen, "Fort Hood Gunman Had Told U.S. Military Colleagues That Infidels Should Have Their Throats Cut," *Telegraph*, Nov. 8, 2009.
113. Dorothy Rabinowitz, "Dr. Phil and the Fort Hood Killer," *Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 10, 2008.
114. Bryan Bender, "Ft. Hood Suspect Was Army Dilemma: His Extreme Views Possibly Overlooked in Favor of Diversity," *Boston Globe*, Feb. 22, 2010.

115. Peter Baker and Clifford Krauss, “President, at Service, Hails Fort Hood’s Fallen,” *New York Times*, Nov. 11, 2009.
116. Radio Derby, Transcript, Nov. 13, 2009, johnderbyshire.com.
117. “Police: Gunman in Binghamton, N.Y., Immigration Center Massacre Was a Coward,” foxnews.com, April 4, 2009.
118. Michael Vlahos, *Fighting Identity: Sacred War and World Change* (Westport, CT.: Praeger Security International, 2009), 34–35.
119. Rabinowitz, “Dr. Phil and the Fort Hood Killer.”

8. The Triumph of Tribalism

1. “Remarks by the President at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize,” Dec. 10, 2009, whitehouse.gov.
2. Christopher Meyer, “A Return to 1815 Is the Way Forward for Europe,” *London Times*, Sept. 2, 2008.
3. Arthur Schlesinger Jr., *The Disuniting of America*, 10.
4. Nathan Gardels, “Two Concepts of Nationalism: An Interview with Isaiah Berlin,” *New York Review of Books*, Nov. 21, 1991.
5. Jerry Z. Muller, “Us and Them: The Enduring Power of Ethnic Nationalism,” *Foreign Affairs*, March–April 2008.
6. *Ibid.*, 19.
7. *Ibid.*, 28.
8. *Ibid.*, 19–20, 18.
9. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Pandaemonium: Ethnicity in International Politics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1994), 10.
10. *Ibid.*, 11.
11. Lord Byron, “The Isles of Greece,” *The Oxford Book of English Verse*, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), 708.
12. Jasper Ridley, *Mussolini: A Biography* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 66.
13. Roy Denman, *Missed Chances: Britain and Europe in the Twentieth Century* (London: Indigo, 1997), 30; Ralph Raico, “World War I: The Turning Point,” in *The Costs of War: America’s Pyrrhic Victories*, John Denson, ed. (New Brunswick, NJ; Transaction, 1999), 240.
14. Moynihan, *Pandaemonium*, 83.
15. Wenzel Jaksch, *Europe’s Road to Potsdam* (New York: Praeger, 1963), 276–77.
16. H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, vol. 2 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), 795.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*, 793.
19. Benjamin Disraeli, *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 182.
20. Thomas Cahill, *How the Irish Saved Civilization* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 6.
21. Sean Clarke, “Am I a Horse,” *Guardian*, March 17, 2008.
22. Anthony Pagdon, “Of Skulls and Buttocks,” *National Interest*, March/April 2010, 90.
23. James K. Robinson and Walter B. Rideout, eds., *A College Book of Modern Verse* (Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, 1960), 62–63.
24. *Ibid.*, 65.
25. Albert Einstein, thinkexist.com.
26. Andrew Roberts, *Eminent Churchillians* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 211.
27. Ilya Ehrenburg, “Vojna (Moscow: 1942–43),” wikipedia.org; Alfred-Maurice de Zayas, *The German*

- Expellees: Victims in War and Peace* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 34.
28. Jonathan Yardley, "A Distinguished Philosopher Asks If Killing Innocents Is Ever Justifiable," *Book World*, *Washington Post*, April 9, 2006.
 29. Ho Chi Minh, thinkexist.com.
 30. Meyer, "A Return to 1815."
 31. Clifford J. Levy, "President of Ingushetia Is Wounded in Suicide Bombing," *New York Times*, June 23, 2009.
 32. "Opposition Activist Shot Dead in Ingushetia," *Guardian*, Oct. 25, 2009.
 33. Charles Clover, "Changing Face of Terror in Russia," *Financial Times*, Apr. 3–4, 2010, 2.
 34. "Suicide Bomber Kills 16 in North Caucasus," *Washington Post*, Sept. 10, 2010.
 35. Leon Aron, "Vladimir Putin Charts His Return," *Washington Post*, Oct. 16, 2010.
 36. "Islamist Rebel Urges 'Total War' with Russia," AFP, Breitbart.Com March 3, 2011.
 37. Shaun Walker, "Russians Name Muslim Convert as Prime Suspect for Airport Bombing," *Independent*, Jan. 28, 2011.
 38. Elena Milashina, "The Roots of Moscow's Chechen Problem," *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 2, 2011.
 39. Charles King and Rajan Menon, "Prisoners of the Caucasus: Russia's Invisible Civil War," *Foreign Affairs*, July/Aug. 2010, 22.
 40. Ibid.
 41. Ellen Barry, "Russian Protests Erupt over Soccer Fan's Killing," *New York Times*, Dec. 13, 2010; Charles Clover, "Racists Battle Riot Police in Moscow Streets," *Financial Times*, Dec. 14, 2010.
 42. Ibid.
 43. Gregory L. White, "Russia Vows Action After Riots," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 14, 2010.
 44. Charles Clover, "'Managed Nationalism' Turns Nasty for Putin," *Financial Times*, Dec. 24, 2010.
 45. Kadyr Toktogulov and Alan Cullison, "Ethnic Clashes Rekindle Kyrgyz Strife," *Wall Street Journal*, June 12, 2010.
 46. Sarah Lyall, "Rule, Britannia, But Maybe Not over Scotland," *New York Times*, July 18, 2008.
 47. Victor Mallet, "Catalonia Pays Homage to Independence," *Financial Times*, Oct. 7, 2009.
 48. "Catalans Turn Out for Greater Autonomy," *Washington Post*, July 11, 2010.
 49. Alessandra Galloni, "An Italian Fringe Firebrand Gains Votes, Power in Crisis," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 13, 2010.
 50. "Europe's Backlash Against Immigrants," *Financial Times*, April 5, 2010.
 51. Ibid.
 52. Tony Paterson, "Far-Right Leader Claims He Is 'Real Victor' in Austria," *Independent*, Sept. 30, 2008.
 53. James Blitz, "Five European States Back Burka Ban," *Financial Times*, March 1, 2010; James Blitz, "FT Poll Shows Support for Burka Ban," *Financial Times*, March 2, 2010.
 54. "Hungarian Demons," *Financial Times*, April 12, 2010.
 55. Charles Kupchan, "The European Union, Going Its Separate Ways," *Washington Post*, Aug. 29, 2010.
 56. John F. Burns, "Rightist on BBC Panel Draws Protests and Viewers," *New York Times*, Oct. 24, 2009.
 57. "Court Ruling Puts Future of Belgian Far-Right Party in Doubt," *International Herald Tribune*, April 23, 2004, hartford-hwp.com.
 58. Burns, "Rightist on BBC Panel Draws Protests and Viewers."
 59. Diana West, "Free Susanne Winter," April 3, 2008, dianawest.net.
 60. Paul Belien, "Appeasing the Islamists: Geert Wilders's Ordeal and the Lessons of the Past," *Washington Times*, March 26, 2008.
 61. "Dutch Election: Liberals Take One-Seat Lead As Far-Right Party Gains in Influence," *Telegraph*, June 10, 2010.
 62. Ben Berkowitz, "Muslim Cleric Calls for Beheading of Dutch Politician," Reuters, Sept. 3, 2010,

news.yahoo.com.

63. Steve Erlanger, "Racial Tinge Stains World Cup Exit in France," *New York Times*, June 23, 2010.
64. Ibid.
65. Ben Hall, "Sarkozy Comes Out Fighting After Rampage in Grenoble," *Financial Times*, Aug. 14–15, 2010.
66. Stanley Pignal and Peggy Hollinger, "Sarkozy Rages at EU 'Humiliation,'" *Financial Times*, Sept. 16, 2010; Ben Hall and Peggy Hollinger, "Divisive and Defiant," *Financial Times*, Sept. 18–19, 2010.
67. "Marine Le Pen Poll Rating Shock for French Politics," BBC News, March 6, 2011.
68. Anthony Faiola, "Italy Closes the Door on Gypsies," *Washington Post*, Oct. 11, 2010.
69. Anthony Faiola, "Official's Views on Muslim Immigration Divide Germans," *Washington Post*, Sept. 10, 2010.
70. Nicholas Kulish, "Long Dormant, Ethnic Pride Blinks and Stirs," *New York Times*, Sept. 11, 2010.
71. Ibid.
72. "Merkel Says German Multicultural Society Has Failed," BBC News, Oct. 16, 2010, bbc.co.uk.
73. Matt Falloon, "Multiculturalism Has Failed in Britain—Cameron," Reuters, Feb. 5, 2011.
74. "Greece Follows U.S. Example by Building Giant Border Wall to Keep Out Illegal Immigrants," *Daily Mail*, Jan. 4, 2011.
75. Michael Kimmelman, "With Flemish Nationalism on the Rise, Belgium Teeters on the Edge," *New York Times*, Aug. 4, 2008.
76. Muller, "Us and Them," 19.
77. Bret Stephens, "Europe Needs a Tea Party," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 13, 2010.
78. Carl Gershman, "China's Invisible Atrocity: Who Will Stand Up for Uighur Rights?" *Washington Post*, July 5, 2010.
79. Edward Wong, "China's Money and Migrants Pour into Tibet," *New York Times*, July 28, 2010.
80. Michael Wines, "On a Day for Chinese Pride, Little Interest in Ideology," *New York Times*, Oct. 1, 2009.
81. Ibid.
82. Ibid.
83. Akash Kapur, "Growing Yes, but India Has Reasons to Worry," *New York Times*, Nov. 29, 2009.
84. Krishna Pokharel, "Maoist Rebels Ambush Indian Troops, Kill 76," *Wall Street Journal*, Apr. 7, 2010.
85. "India Is 'Losing Maoist Battle,'" BBC News, Sept. 15, 2009, newsvote.bbc.co.uk.
86. Thomas Fuller, "Fleeing Battle, Myanmar Refugees Head to China," *New York Times*, Aug. 29, 2009; Michael Wines, "China Fails to Prevent Myanmar's Ethnic Clashes," *New York Times*, Sept. 4, 2009.
87. Tim Johnston, "Renegade Soldiers Seize Burma Town," *Financial Times*, Nov. 9, 2010.
88. Cassie Fleming, "Thailand: Ethnic Violence Spreads: Muslims, Buddhists Fight in South," *Washington Times*, July 24, 2009.
89. Seth Mydans, "Churches Attacked Amid Furor in Malaysia," *New York Times*, Jan. 11, 2010.
90. Ibid.
91. Norimitsu Onishi, "In Philippine Strife, Uprooting Is a Constant," *New York Times*, Nov. 23, 2009.
92. Pia Lee Brago, "UN, EU, US Condemn Maguindanao Massacre," *Philippine Star*, Nov. 26, 2009.
93. Jim Gomez, "At Least 21 Killed in Attack on Journalists and Supporters of Philippine Politician," *Washington Post*, Nov. 24, 2009.
94. "Remarks by the President at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize, Dec. 10, 2009," whitehouse.gov.
95. Meyer, "A Return to 1815."
96. Ishaan Tharoor, "Pakistan's Other Problem Area: Baluchistan," *Time*, Nov. 1, 2009.
97. "Barzani Says Kurdistan Nation Should Have Its Own State—Paper," *Aswat al-Iraq*, July 16, 2010, en.aswataliraq.info.

98. Pamela Constable, "In Afghanistan, Shifting Political Fortunes," *Washington Post*, Dec. 24, 2010.
99. Ibid.
100. Jeffrey Gettleman, "Violence Grips Southern Sudan as Vote on Independence Nears," *New York Times*, Dec. 12, 2009.
101. Hamza Hendawi, "Sudanese Split May Set Risky Precedent," *Washington Times*, Jan. 24, 2011.
102. Laura Kasinof, "Yemen Used Lethal Force to Quell Southern Secession Protests, Says Report," *Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 15, 2009.
103. Moynihan, *Pandaemonium*, 11.
104. "Gadaffi Tells Palestinians: Revolt Against Israel," Reuters, Feb. 13, 2011.
105. "Survey: Arabs to Form Majority in Historic Palestine After 2014," Agence France Presse, *Daily Star*, Dec. 31, 2010.
106. Spencer Ackerman, "So About Israel," *American Prospect*, Oct. 1, 2006.
107. Peter Beinert, "The Failure of the American Jewish Establishment," *New York Review of Books*, June 10, 2010.
108. Glenn Kessler, "'Jewish State' Concept Could Pose Another Hurdle in Peace Deal," *Washington Post*, Oct. 3, 2010.
109. Martin Arostegui, "Vote Reflects Racial Divide," *Washington Times*, Jan. 27, 2009.
110. "A Passport to Utopia: Evo Morales Campaigns for a Great Leap Forward. Or Back, Say Some," *Economist*, Jan. 24, 2009.
111. Arostegui, "Vote Reflects Racial Divide."
112. Joshua Partlow, "Bolivian Referendum Points Up Clashing Visions," *Washington Post*, Aug. 6, 2008.
113. Ibid.
114. John Zmirak, "Should We Tolerate Intolerance?" insidecatholic.com, Aug. 11, 2010, catholicity.com.
115. Amy Chua, *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability* (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 6; "Albion's Seedlings," March 14, 2006, anglosphere.com.
116. Amy Chua, "A World on the Edge," foster.20megsfree.com; Emily Eakin, "On the Dark Side of Democracy," *New York Times*, Jan. 31, 2004.
117. Chua, *World on Fire*, 136.
118. Ibid., 270.
119. Thomas Fuller, "Malaysia to End Quotas That Favor Ethnic Malays," *New York Times*, July 1, 2009.
120. Chua, *World on Fire*, 112.
121. Joshua Hammer, "(Almost) Out of Africa: The White Tribes," *World Affairs*, May/June 2010, 38.
122. "Zuma Must Bury Terre'Blanche," *Financial Times*, April 7, 2010.
123. Ibid.; Chris Makhaye and Terna Gyuse, "White Supremacist's Death Highlights Post-Apartheid Tensions," *The Final Call*, April 12, 2010.
124. Dan McDougall, "Jacob Zuma Warns ANC to Halt Racial Anger," *Sunday Times*, April 11, 2010.
125. Robert Guest, "The World's Most Extreme Affirmative Action Program," WSJ Opinion Archives, Dec. 26, 2004.
126. Simon Wood, "Race Against Time," *The Observer*, Jan. 22, 2006.
127. Frank Salter, "The Misguided Advocates of Open Borders," Quadrant Online, June 2010, quadrant.org.au.
128. Ying Lowrey, "Race/Ethnicity and Establishment Dynamics, 2002–2006," Office of Advocacy, Small Business Administration, census.gov/econ/sbo/02/asiansof_korean.html.
129. "Black Korea," Ice Cube lyrics, azlyrics.com.
130. "Andrew Young Resigns from Wal-Mart Group," AP, Aug. 18, 2006, msnbc.msn.com.
131. R. Asmerom, "Why Do Koreans Own the Black Beauty Supply Business?" *Atlanta Post*, Sept. 27, 2010.

132. Chua, *World on Fire*, 142.
133. Simon Romero, "Dueling Beauty Pageants Put Income Gap on View," *New York Times*, Dec. 1, 2010.
134. *Ibid.*
135. Jonathan Wheatley, "Brazil's Leader Blames White People for Crisis," *Financial Times*, March 27, 2009; Gary Duffy, "Brazil's Lula Raps 'White' Crisis," BBC News, March 27, 2009.
136. Orlando Patterson, "Jamaica's Bloody Democracy," *New York Times*, May 29, 2010.
137. *Ibid.*
138. Andrew Higgins, "As China Finds Bigger Place in World Affairs, Its Wealth Breeds Hostility," *Washington Post*, Sept. 8, 2010.
139. *Ibid.*
140. Chua, *World on Fire*, 143.
141. "Interview with Dmitry Rogozin," *Russia Today*, Nov. 18, 2008.
142. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Nobel Lecture, 1970, nobelprize.org.
143. Muller, "Us and Them," 18.

9. "The White Party"

1. Soledad O'Brien, CNN Transcripts, Nov. 4, 2008.
2. CNN Transcripts, Nov. 4, 2008.
3. "Howard Dean Shares Plan to Unite Dems," interview by Michel Martin, NPR, Aug. 15, 2008.
4. Bruce Bartlett, *Wrong on Race: The Democratic Party's Buried Past* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 55.
5. *Ibid.*, 57–58.
6. Adam Liptak, "Stevens, the Only Protestant on the Supreme Court," *New York Times*, April 9, 2010.
7. Greg Garrison, "1921 Slaying of Catholic Priest Gets Renewed Interest," Religion New Service, May 27, 2010, religionnews.com; Bartlett, *Wrong on Race*, 120–21.
8. Bartlett, *Wrong on Race*.
9. Robert George, "Back in Black," *National Review*, July 12, 2000.
10. Richard Nixon, "Statement on Signing the Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, June 22, 1970," John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters, The American Presidency Project, presidency.ucsba.edu.
11. Zoltan Hajnal, "The GOP's Racial Challenge," *New York Times*, Nov. 10, 2010.
12. Amy Chozyck and Laura Meckler, "Race Re-Enters the Spotlight As Candidates Turn Negative," *Wall Street Journal*, Aug. 6, 2008.
13. Kelefa Sanneh, "Beyond the Pale: Is White the New Black?" *New Yorker*, Apr. 12, 2010.
14. Norman Podhoretz, "Why Are Jews Liberal?" *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 10, 2009.
15. Chuck Todd and Sheldon Gawiser, *How Barack Obama Won: A State-by-State Guide to the Historic 2008 Election* (New York: Vintage Books, 2009), 31.
16. Thomas Edsall, "For the Modern GOP, It's a Return to the 'White Voter Strategy,'" HuffingtonPost.com, Aug. 4, 2009.
17. Bill Greener, "My GOP: Too Old, Too White to Win," salon.com, July 20, 2009.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Ron Brownstein, "Obama's White-Out," *National Journal*, Jan. 20, 2010.
20. Michael Moore, "17 Reasons Not to Slit Your Wrists," *Mike's Letter*, Nov. 5, 2004, michaelmoore.com.
21. Frank Rich, "The Pit Bull in the China Shop," *New York Times*, Nov. 22, 2009.
22. Ruy Teixeira, "Demographic Change and the Future of the Parties," Center for American Progress, June 2010.
23. "Rightward March," *New York Times*, Nov. 7, 2010.

24. Campbell Robertson, "White Democrats Lose More Ground in South," *New York Times*, Nov. 7, 2010.
25. Ben Evans, "White Southern Democrats Nearly Wiped Out After Mid-term Elections," AP, Nov. 5, 2010, ljworld.com.
26. Ronald Brownstein, "White Flight," *National Journal*, Jan. 7, 2011.
27. Ibid.
28. Ronald Brownstein, "Dems Find Electoral Safety Behind a Wall of Blue," *National Journal*, Jan. 17, 2009, rbrownstein@nationaljournal.com.
29. Jeff Jacoby, "Cradle of Democracy?" *Boston Globe*, March 18, 2009, jeffjacoby.com.
30. Cathleen Decker, "For the GOP, California Is a Deep Blue Hole," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 19, 2010.
31. Michael Blood, "California Avoids GOP Wave," *Washington Times*, Dec. 1, 2010.
32. Ronald Brownstein, "The March of Diversity," *National Journal*, Dec. 19, 2009.
33. Teixeira, "Demographic Change and the Future of Parties," 9.
34. Adam Nagourney, "Orange County Is No Longer Nixon Country," *New York Times*, Aug. 30, 2010.
35. Gustavo Arellano, "Loretta Sanchez on Univision: 'Vietnamese' Trying to Take Her Congressional Seat Away from Democrats," Sept. 20, 2010, blogs.ocweekly.com.
36. Nagourney, "Orange County Is No Longer Nixon Country."
37. John C. Calhoun, *Disquisition on Government*, The Online Library of Liberty, oll.libertyfund.org.
38. Ibid.
39. Sara Murray, "Obstacle to Deficit Cutting: A Nation on Entitlements," *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 15, 2010.
40. Ibid.
41. James Bovard, "The Food-Stamp Crime Wave," *Wall Street Journal*, June 23, 2011, A17.
42. "U.S. Vote Rate Dips in '08, Older Whites Sit Out," *USA Today*, July 20, 2009.
43. Frank Rich, "She Broke the G.O.P., and Now She Owns It," *New York Times*, July 11, 2009.
44. Ibid.
45. Katharine O. Seelye and Jeff Zeleny, "On the Defensive, Obama Calls His Words Ill-Chosen," *New York Times*, April 13, 2008.
46. Mike Allen, "Bill Clinton: Right Wing Is Weaker," *Politico*, Sept. 27, 2009.
47. Richard Benedetto, "GOP: We Were Wrong to Play Racial Politics," *USA Today*, July 14, 2005.
48. Ben Wattenberg, "Winner for the Harshest Political Rhetoric of the Year," *Jewish World Review*, Aug. 3, 2001.
49. Kathy Kiely and Jill Lawrence, "Clinton Makes Case for Wide Appeal," *USA Today*, May 7, 2008.
50. Joan Walsh, "The Brazile-Begala Smackdown," salon.com, May 7, 2008.
51. Frank Rich. "She Broke the G.O.P."
52. Jacob Weisberg, "The Lou Dobbs Democrats: Say Hello to the New Economic Nationalists," slate.com, Nov. 8, 2006.
53. Todd and Gawiser, *How Barack Obama Won*, 39.
54. Karl Vick and Ashley Surdin, "Most of California's Black Voters Backed Gay Marriage Ban," *Washington Post*, Nov. 6, 2008.
55. "Teaching the Bible," CBS News Poll, April 16, 2006, cbsnews.com.
56. "Religion a Strength and Weakness for Both Parties: Public Divides on Origin of Life," PEW Forum on Religion & Public Life: Summary of Findings, Aug. 30, 2005, people-press.org.
57. Ibid.
58. Scott Keeter, "On Darwin's 200th Birthday, Americans Still Divided About Evolution," Pew Research Center Publications, Feb. 5, 2009, pewresearch.org.
59. "Religion a Strength and Weakness."
60. Anthony York, "The GOP's Latino Strategy," salon.com, Jan. 13, 2000.

61. Justin Ewers, “Republicans and Latino Voters: Has the GOP Shifted on Immigration Reform?” *U.S. News & World Report*, Jan. 30, 2009; “Meet the Press Transcript for Nov. 9, 2008,” msnbc.msn.com.
62. “87% Say English Should Be U.S. Official Language,” Rasmussen Reports, May 11, 2010, rasmussenreports.com.
63. “Poll Shows Support for Official English at New High,” Zogby International, U.S. Newswire, March 21, 2006; Edward Rothstein, “In the U.S. and Europe, Tensions Between a National and Minority Languages,” *New York Times*, May 29, 2006.
64. “77% Oppose Driver’s Licenses for Undocumented Immigrants,” Rasmussen Reports, Nov. 6, 2007, rasmussenreports.com; Bonnie Erbe, “Poll: Immigration Amnesty Is Unpopular Outside the Beltway, Poles Remain Clueless,” *U.S. News & World Report*, April 16, 2009.
65. N. C. Aizenman, “Economy, Not Immigration, a Main Worry of Hispanics,” *Washington Post*, Jan. 16, 2010.
66. “April 2006 Field Poll (Blacks Sampled),” Public Opinion Polls, numbersusa.com.
67. “Mass Migration vs. Black Americans,” numbersusa.com.
68. Ralph Z. Hallow, “Steele: GOP Needs ‘Hip-Hop’ Makeover,” *Washington Times*, Feb. 19, 2009.
69. “The 14th Biannual Youth Survey on Politics and Public Service,” Institute of Politics, Harvard University, Spring 2008, 12.
70. “Executive Summary: The 14th Biannual Youth Survey on Politics and Public Service,” Institute of Politics, Harvard University, April 2008.
71. Philip Rucker, “As Fla. Tea Party’s Rubio Surges, Crist and Meek Turn Firepower on Each Other,” *Washington Post*, Oct. 1, 2010.
72. “Carol Moseley Braun: Clinton Endorsement of Rahm ‘A Betrayal,’” huffingtonpost.com Jan. 19, 2011.
73. “Danny Davis Tells Clinton to Back Off as Racial Tension Grows in Mayor’s Race,” huffingtonpost.com, Dec. 28, 2010.

10. The Long Retreat

1. Englishforums.com.
2. Andrew Bacevich, “American Triumphalism: A Postmortem,” *Commonweal*, Jan. 30, 2009.
3. Anne Applebaum, “The Slowly Vanishing NATO,” *Washington Post*, Oct. 20, 2009.
4. Garet Garrett, *The People’s Pottage* (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Press, 1958), 158–59.
5. *Ibid.*, 159.
6. Bacevich, “American Triumphalism.”
7. Tony Smith, “It’s Uphill for the Democrats,” *Washington Post*, March 11, 2007.
8. Bacevich, “American Triumphalism.”
9. *Ibid.*
10. Steven Thomma, “Americans Turning Sharply Inward Toward Isolationism,” Yahoo News, Dec. 3, 2009; “Poll: America’s Place in the World,” Pew Research Center, Dec. 3, 2009, historynewsnetwork.org.
11. Walter Lippmann, *U.S. Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1943), 6–7, 9–10.
12. *Ibid.*, 8
13. Amanda Bransford, “U.S. Military Spending Far Outpaces Rest of the World,” antiwar.com, May 29, 2010.
14. CNN Opinion Research Poll, CNN Opinion Research Corporation, Jan. 25, 2011.
15. Laurence Vance, “Same Empire, Different Emperor,” lewrockwell.com, Feb. 11, 2010.

16. Ibid.
17. John Gray, "A Shattering Moment in America's Fall from Power," *Observer*, Sept. 28, 2008.
18. Gary Hart, Joan Meyers, "The Shield and the Cloak: The Security of the Commons," Carnegie Council, March 3, 2006, cceia.org.
19. Stephen Whitfield, Synopsis, *The Culture of the Cold War (The American Moment)*, powells.com.
20. Richard Lugar, "Lugar Says It's Time to Reaffirm the Fundamental Value of NATO," press release of Senator Lugar, Sept. 28, 2009, lugar.senate.gov; Richard Betts, "The Three Faces of NATO," *National Interest*, April 10, 2009.
21. "Top General: It's a Draw in Afghanistan," ABC News, May 13, 2010.
22. Steven Erlanger, "Europeans Fear Crisis Threatens Liberal Benefits," *New York Times*, May 22, 2010.
23. Ibid.
24. Geoffrey Wheatcroft, "Boxed In, the Constraints of U.S. Foreign Policy," *World Affairs*, Jan./Feb. 2010, 48–49.
25. Ibid., 49.
26. William Knowlton, "Economy Helps Make Chinese the Leaders in Optimism, 24-Nation Survey Finds," *New York Times*, July 2, 2008.
27. Lester Brown, "Can the U.S. Be China's Breadbasket?" *Washington Post*, March 13, 2011.
28. Jerry Seper and Matthew Cella, "Signs in Arizona Warn of Smuggler Dangers," *Washington Times*, Aug. 31, 2010.
29. George F. Kennan, *Around the Cragged Hill: A Personal and Political Philosophy* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1994), 154.
30. Jerry Seper and Matthew Cella, "Signs in Arizona."
31. Michael Webster, "Mexico Federal Troops and Police Rush Into Juarez to Try and Retake the City," articlesbase.com, March 4, 2009.
32. "Mexican Police Chief Quits After Officers Killed," Reuters, Feb. 20, 2009.
33. "Calderon Vows to Win Mexico's Drug 'Cancer' Fight," Agence France Presse, Feb. 27, 2009, google.com.
34. Joshua E. Keating, "Freedom Gone South," *Foreign Policy*, Jan. 13, 2001.
35. "Military Report: Mexico, Pakistan at Risk of 'Rapid and Sudden Collapse,'" foxnews.com, Jan. 14, 2009.
36. Milton Friedman, "Prohibition and Drugs," *Newsweek*, May 1, 1972.
37. "Czech President Signs Lisbon Treaty," EUBusiness, Nov. 4, 2009.
38. Louis Charbonneau, "Czech President Tells UN to Stay Out of Economics," Reuters, Sept. 25, 2010.
39. "The Return of Economic Nationalism," *The Economist*, Feb. 7–13, 2009.
40. Ibid.
41. Charles Kupchan, "As Nationalism Rises, Will the European Union Fall?" *Washington Post*, Aug. 29, 2010.
42. Ibid.
43. Jude Dougherty, "National Identity," *Nationale und kulturelle Identität im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, ed. Anton Rauscher, vol. 18 of the series *Soziale Orientierung* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2006), 23.
44. Ibid, 19.
45. Rudyard Kipling, "Sussex," oldpoetry.com.

11. The Last Chance

1. Silla Brush and Gautham Nagesh, "Controversial Beck Rally is an Event Heavier on Religion than

- Politics,” thehill.com Aug. 28, 2010.
2. Duncan Williams, *Trousered Apes: Sick Literature in a Sick Society* (New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House, 1991), 140.
 3. Herbert London, “U.S. Endorses Tolerance of Dictators Killing Their Own,” *Human Events*, March 26, 2011.
 4. Edward Kennedy, “Address at the Public Memorial Service for Robert F. Kennedy,” June 8, 1968, St. Patrick’s Cathedral, New York, American Rhetoric, Top 100 Speeches, americanrhetoric.com.
 5. Claes Ryn, *The New Jacobinism: America as Revolutionary State* (With a Major New Afterward by the Author) (Bowie, Md.: National Humanities Institute, 2011).
 6. “German Lessons,” German Historical Institute, Washington, DC, ghi-dc.org, reprint of *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nov. 27, 2008.
 7. Rev. Martin Luther King, “Beyond Vietnam: A Time to Break Silence,” Riverside Church, Apr. 4, 1967, hartford-hwp.com.
 8. Justin Driver, “Robust and Wide-Open,” *The New Republic*, Feb. 17, 2011, 37.
 9. Ed Pilkington, “Obama Angers Midwest Voters with Guns and Religion Remark,” *Guardian*, April 14, 2008.
 10. “A More Perfect Union,” Remarks of Sen. Barack Obama, Constitution Center, Philadelphia, huffingtonpost.com, March 18, 2008.
 11. Murray Rothbard, “A Strategy for the Right,” *The Irrepressible Rothbard*, lewrockwell.com/rothbard/ir/Ch1.html.
 12. Michael Kinsley, “Cordoba House: Charles Krauthammer, and the First Amendment,” theatlanticwire.com Aug. 16, 2010.
 13. Chilton Williamson, Jr., “The New American Mob,” *Chronicles*, July 2010, 17.
 14. *Ibid.*, 18.
 15. Carol Swain, *The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenge to Integration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 423.
 16. “President Nixon’s ‘Silent Majority’ Speech, November 1969,” vietnamwar.net.
 17. “Military Needs to Close More Bases,” reuters.com, Sept. 15, 2010.
 18. Yaakov Katz, “Stuxnet Virus Set Back Iran’s Nuclear Program by 2 Years,” *Jerusalem Post*, Dec. 15, 2010.
 19. Ralph Gomory, “A Time for Action: Jobs, Prosperity and National Goals,” huffingtonpost.com, Jan. 25, 2010.
 20. *Ibid.*
 21. Abraham Lincoln, “The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions,” Lyceum Address, Jan. 27, 1838, Speeches and Writings, Abraham Lincoln Online, showcase.netins.net.
 22. James Gimpel, “Immigration, Political Realignment, and the Demise of Republican Political Prospects,” backgrounder, Center for Immigration Studies, Feb. 2010, 5.
 23. *Ibid.*
 24. Toby Hamden, “Barack Obama in Turkey: US ‘Will Never Be at War With Islam,’” *The Telegraph*, April 6, 2009.
 25. “Novak’s Secret Source Revealed: Former Sen. Tom Eagleton Labeled ’72 Dem Nominee as Candidate of ‘Amnesty, Abortion and Acid,’” Crown Forum, July 10, 2007, yubanet.com.
 26. David Gordon, “Courts and Congress: America’s Unwritten Constitution,” *The Mises Review*, April 2008, mises.org.
 27. “Letter from a Birmingham Jail [King Jr.],” African Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, africa.upenn.edu.

Index

The index that appeared in the print version of this title does not match the pages in your e-book. Please use the search function on your e-reading device to search for terms of interest. For your reference, the terms that appear in the print index are listed below.

abortion

Jews supporting

John Paul II on

Obama supporting partial-birth Abramowitz, Alan

achievement gap

Adams, John

advanced technology products affirmative action

abolishing

Ciongoli on

in government

Murray, Charles, on

Obama on

Sotomayor on

in South Africa

test scores and

young voters and

Afghanistan

cost of war in

ethnonationalism in

NATO in

withdrawal from

Ajami, Fouad

Akaka, Daniel

Alesina, Alberto

Algerian war

Alito, Sam

Allen, John

Allenby, Edmund

Allensworth, Wayne

Amalrik, Andrei

• • •

Americanism
Amin, Idi
Anglican Church
anti-Catholicism
antiwar movement
Aquinas, Thomas
Arbatov, Georgi
Aristotle
Arizona
Army
Arnold, Matthew
Aron, Leon
Asmerom, R.
Ataturk, Mustafa Kemal
atheism
Atias, Ariel
Atwater, Lee
Aung San Suu Kyi
Aushev, Maksharip
Australia
Austria

Babeu, Paul
Baca, Lee
Bacevich, Andrew
Bader, Hans
Bagundang, Kim
Bailey, David
Baker v. Carr Bakiyev, Kurmanbek
Bakke, Alan
Baldwin, James
Balkan wars
Baluch
Bandow, Doug
Barak, Ehud
Barletta, Lou
Barnes, Fred
Barrow, John
Barzani, Massoud
Beck, Glenn
Begala, Paul
Beinart, Peter
Belgium
Belien, Paul
Bell, Chris

Belloc, Hilaire
Benedict XVI (Pope)
Benes, Eduard
Benjamin, Rich
Berger, Raoul
Bernanke, Ben
Betts, Julian
Bey, Enver
Bhatti, Shahbaz
Bibi, Asia
birth control
birth rate
 Feffer on
 Germany
 Haub on
 Hispanic
 Japan
 OECD on
 reasons for falling
 Russia
 Singapore
 white
Bishop, Bill
black(s)
 illegitimacy rate
 Proposition 8 support from religion and
 vote
Black, Hugo
Blackmun, Harry
Blankfein, Lloyd
Blood, Michael
Bloomberg, Michael
Bolivia
Bond, Julian
Bonhoeffer, Dietrich
Bonner, William
Bork, Robert
Born Alive Infant Protection Act Bossi, Umberto
Boumediene, Houari
Boxer, Barbara
Brady, Roger
Braun, Carol Moseley
Brazil
Brennan, William
Breyer, Stephen

Brokaw, Tom
Brooks, David
Brown, Jerry
Brown, Lester
Brown, Scott
Brown v. Board of Education Brownstein, Ron
Buckley, Reid
Buffett, Warren
burka
Burke, Edmund
Burke, Raymond L.
Burma
Burnham, James
Bush, George H. W.
 on New World Order
 Supreme Court nominations of Bush, George W.
 approval of
 on diversity
 on homeownership gap
Byrnes, "Jimmy"
Byron (Lord)

Calderón, Felipe
Caldwell, Chris
Calhoun, John C.
California
 Brooks on
 Hispanic population in
 home language in
 immigrants to
 income tax
 Obledo on
 Orange County
 Proposition 8
 Proposition 187
 white population in
Calvin, John
Camarota, Steven
Cameron, David
Campbell, David
Carpenter, Amanda
Carter, Jimmy
Carville, James
Catholic Seattle University Catholics
 decline of

Hispanic
immigrant
militancy of
population of
sexual abuse
supporting same-sex marriage Cauchon, Dennis
Cavallaro, Cosimo
censorship
Cha, Ariana Eunjung
Chagoya, Enrique
Chambers, Whittaker
Chaplin, Vsevolod
Chaput, Charles
character decline
Chatel, Luc
Chávez, Hugo
Chesterton, G. K.
China
Brown, Lester, on
Cha on
competition from
devaluing currency
Eberstadt on
economic nationalism
ethnic solidarity emphasized in ethnonationalism in
Gershman on
Hitchens on
ideology in
imported food dependence of loans from
minorities in
nationalism
one-child policy
patriotism in
political ads targeting population crisis
savings rate in
trade deficit with
Chism, Sidney
Christianity
Belloc on
Bonhoeffer on
decline indices
desecration of icons
dying people and
Eliot on
Gramsci on

Habermas on
Hitler on
Nietzsche on
Obama on
persecution of
Santayana on
Stark on
Supreme Court on
voting concerns
Yeats on
Christie, Chris
Chua, Amy
Churchill, Winston
Ciongoli, A. Kenneth
Civil Rights Act
Civil Rights Initiative
civil rights revolution
Civil War
Clark, Wesley
Clay, Henry
Clay, William Lacy
Clegg, Roger
climate change
Clinton, Bill
 Davis, Danny, on
 on demographic transformation on diversity
 endorsing Emanuel
 racism and
Clinton, Hillary
Coakley, Martha
Cohen, Steve
Cold War
Coleman, David
Coleman Report
Collins, Michael
Colombia
Communism
Community Reinvestment Act Congdon, Leo
Congressional Black Caucus Congressional election 2010
Connerly, Ward
conservatives
Constable, Pamela
construction jobs
Corato, Riccardo de
Coulter, Ann

creationism
Crick, Francis
Crist, Charlie
Crowley, James
Crusades
Cruz, Roberto Orduna
Cuccinelli, Ken
culture wars
Cushing, Robert
Czech Republic

da Silva, Lula
Dalrymple, Theodore
D'Arcy, John
David, Larry
Davis, Danny
Davis, John W.
Dawson, Christopher
de Gaulle, Charles
Dean, Howard
debt
 to finance foreign aid
 interest on
Defense of Marriage Act
Deiss, Joseph
Dell, Robert
democracy
 Adams on
 Aristotle on
 Chua on
 Dawson on
 Patterson on
 sustainability of
Democrats
 base
 divisions of
 exploiting financial crisis illiberal
 Kuhn on
 Protestant
 Sailer on
Dempsey, William
Deneen, Patrick
Deng Xiaoping
Derbyshire, John
Dershowitz, Alan

Diderot, Denis
Dimon, Jamie
Disraeli, Benjamin
diversity
 Army
 Bush, George W., on
 Clinton, Bill, on
 Derbyshire on
 devastating communities Greenstein on
 group functioning impeded by Hart on
 ideal of
 as ideology
 in Japan
 language and
 McGowan on
 Mullins on
 of Navy
 O'Reilly, Charles, on
 Putnam on
 Quayle on
 of religion
 Richwine on
 Roughead on
 Skerry on
 social withdrawal and
 strength of
 of Supreme Court
 training cost
 Williams, Katherine, on Wilson, James Q., on
 Wood on
Djerassi, Carl
Dodd, Chris
Dolan, Timothy
dollar, purchasing power of Donahue, Bill
Dormandy, Bill
Dougherty, Jude
Dowd, Maureen
Dreher, Rod
drugs, decriminalizing
Du Bois, W. E. B.
Dukakis, Michael
Dunham, Ann
Dunn, Anita
Durant, Ariel
Durant, Will
- . . . - . . .

Durbin, Dick
Dwight, Timothy

Eagleton, Tom
Earned Income Tax Credit Easter Rising of 1916

Eberstadt, Nicholas
economic nationalism
economic patriotism

Edsall, Thomas
Education Trust

egalitarians
Kennan on
Rothbard on
Tocqueville on

Egypt

Ehrenburg, Ilya

Einstein, Albert

Eisenhower, Dwight

Elder, Larry

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Eliot, T. S.

Emancipation Proclamation Emanuel, Rahm

Emmerich, Roland

employment

English, as official language environmentalism

Episcopal Church, division of Equal Rights Amendment

equality. *See also* egalitarians Blackmun on

Constitution and
curtailing freedom

Durant, Ariel, on

Durant, Will, on

feminism and

Fourteenth Amendment and Francis on

Jefferson on

Johnson, Lyndon, on

Johnson, Samuel, on

Kendall on

Lincoln on

Mead on

Obama on

Pareto on

as political weapon

power and

of religion

revolutions dedicated to Russell on

Summers on

test scores and
Watson on
Williams, Duncan, on
Erdogan, Recep Tayyip
Espenshade, Thomas
Ethiopia
ethnomasochism
ethnonationalism
in Afghanistan
in Africa
in Austria
in Belgium
in Bolivia
in Burma
in China
European
financial crisis fueling in France
in Germany
in Greece
in Hungary
in India
in Iran
in Iraq
in Israel
in Italy
in Lebanon
in Libya
in Malaysia
in Mindanao
Moynihan on
post–World War II
products of
in Russia
as secessionism
in Sudan
in Switzerland
in Thailand
in Turkey
in Yemen
eugenics
Evangelicalism
evolution theory

Fair, T. Willard
Fairbanks, Richard

Fairlie, Robert
Fannie Mae
farmer compensations
federal compensation advantage Federal Reserve
Feffer, John
Feldman, Noah
feminism
Ferdinand, Francis
Ferguson, Colin
Ferguson, Ronald
Ferraro, Geraldine
financial crisis
 blame for
 Blankfein on
 da Silva on
 Democrats exploiting
 ethnonationalism fueled by Federal Reserve and
Financial Crisis Inquiry Committee Fiorina, Carly
Fisk, Robert
Fleming, Bruce
Folden, Kathleen
Food Stamp Act
food stamps
foreign policy
Founding Fathers
Fourteenth Amendment
Fox, Vicente
France
Francis, Sam
Franklin, Benjamin
Freddie Mac
free trade
freedom
 equality curtailing
 Johnson, Lyndon, on
 King, Martin Luther, on from religion
Freeman, Gary
Frey, William H.
Friedman, Milton
Friedman, Thomas
Fukuyama, Francis

Garner, “Cactus Jack”
Garnett, Richard
Garrett, Garet

Gates, Henry Louis, Jr.
Gates, Robert
Gawiser, Sheldon
gay rights
Gelb, Leslie H.
George, Lloyd
George, Robert
George III (King)
Georgetown University
Germany
 birth rate of
 Disraeli on
 division of
 economic nationalism
 ethnonationalism in
 Klingholz on
 National Socialist Party population of
 reluctant to bail out Greece World War I perspective of Gershman, Carl
Gerson, Michael
Giannoulas, Alexi
Gibbs, Robert
Giffords, Gabrielle
Gimpel, James
Ginsburg, Douglas
Ginsburg, Ruth Bader
Glaeser, Edward
globalization
 consequences of
Goddard, Henry
Goldstone, Jack
Goldwater, Barry
Gomez, Jose
Gomory, Ralph
Gonzalez, Antonio
Gottfried, Paul
government downsizing
government theft
Gramsci, Antonio
Grant, Madison
Gray, John
Great Britain
 Coleman on
 illegitimacy rate in
 immigration into
 Muslim population of

population of
Sharia accommodated in
social decomposition in Great Depression
Greece
Green, Andrew
green cards
Greener, Bill
Greenstein, Fred
Gregg, Judd
Griffin, Nick
Ground Zero mosque dispute Groves, Robert
Guest, Robert
Gurria, Angel
Gutfeld, Arnon
Gutiérrez, Carlos González Habermas, Jürgen
Hacker, George
Haering, Hermann
Halik, Tomas
Hamilton, Alexander
Hamilton, Lee
Hammer, Joshua
Harden, Blaine
Harp, Gillis
Harrison, Selig
Hart, Peter
Hasan, Nidal Malik
Haub, Carl
Hawaii
Hawkins, William
Hayworth, J. D.
Hazara
Head Start
health care debates
Hegel, G. W. F.
Helms, Jesse
Henderson, David
Henry, Patrick
Henry VIII
Herbert Stein's Law
Herenton, Willie
Heriot, Gail
Heritage Foundation
Hernandez, Juan
Herrnstein, Richard
Heyn, Andrew

high school graduation rate Higham, John

Hindemith, Paul

Hispanics

birth rate

California population

Catholic

illegitimacy rate

on immigration

political strategy

Popenoe on

population

Hiss, Alger

Hitchens, Peter

Hitler, Adolf

Holder, Eric

Hollings, "Fritz"

Holocaust

home ownership

Home Rule Act of 1973

Hoover, Herbert

Hopkins, Harry

Hopkins, Nancy

Horowitz, Donald L.

Horthy, Miklós

housing bubble

Hsu, Hua

Hu Jintao

Hudson, Deal

Humphrey, Hubert

Hungary

"Hunger in America"

Hungerman, Daniel

Huntington, Samuel

Hurricane Katrina

Hybels, Bill

Ibrahim, Sherif

Ice Cube

ideologue

illegitimacy rate

black

in Britain

Coulter on

Hispanic

Murray, Charles, on

white
immigration
 into Britain
 into California
 Catholic
 Franklin, Benjamin, on
 Hispanics on
 home ownership and
 Irish
 Islamic
 from Mexico
 moratorium on
 reform
 voting patterns and
 young voters and
Immigration Act of 1965
immigration amnesty
imperialism
import tariffs
income tax
India
Indonesia
Iran
 ethnonationalism in
 justifications for attacking nationalism
 population of
Iraq
 Christian persecution in cost of war in
 ethnonationalism in
 withdrawal from
Irish immigration
Irish rebellion
Iroquois Confederacy
Islam. *See also* Muslims Belloc on
 immigrating to Europe
 Jenkins, Philip, on
 Steinlight on
 total war against Russia Williams on
Israel
 Benedict XVI visiting
 ethnonationalism in
 Mearsheimer on
 nationalism
Italy
Ivry, David

Ivy League schools, discrimination in Jackson, Jesse

Jamaica riots

Jamestown

Japan

birth rates

diversity in

Eberstadt on

economic nationalism

Harden on

Kotkin on

security pacts with

trade deficit with

Jay, John

Jealous, Benjamin Todd

Jefferson, Thomas

on equality

on George III

on overthrowing government Russell on

on Shay's rebellion

Jenkins, John

Jenkins, Philip

Jenner, William

Jeon Jae-hee

Jesus

Jews

John Paul II (Pope)

John XXIII (Pope)

Johnson, Chalmers

Johnson, Gregory

Johnson, Hank

Johnson, Lyndon

Johnson, Samuel

Jones, Kenneth C.

Jordan

Jouvenel, Bertrand de

Judis, John

Julian the Apostate

Jundallah

Kagan, Elena

Kahane, Meir

Kanjorski, Paul

Kasper, Walter

Kassarji, Michel

Kaufmann, Eric

Kawarja
Keller, Jon
Kendall, Willmoore
Kennan, George
Kennedy, Anthony
Kennedy, Edward
Kennedy, John F.
Kennedy, Patrick
Kennedy, Robert F.
Keynes, John Maynard
Khadafi, Muammar
Khomeini (Ayatollah)
King, Alveda
King, Charles
King, Larry
King, Martin Luther
Kinsley, Michael
Kipling, Rudyard
Kirk, Mark
Kirk, Russell
Kirkpatrick, Jeane
Klaus, Václav
Klein, Joe
Klingholz, Reiner
Kochan, Thomas A.
Korean-owned businesses
Kosmin, Barry
Kotkin, Joel
Kristol, Irving
Krugman, Paul
Kuhn, David Paul
Kuhner, Jeffrey
Kumano, Hideo
Küng, Hans
Kupchan, Charles
Kuralt, Charles
Kurds
Kurtz, Joseph
Kyrgyzstan

Lansing, Robert
Le Pen, Jean-Marie
Lebanon
Lee, Debra L.
Lefebvre, Marcel

Lehman Brothers
Leising, Matthew
LeMay, Curtis
Lenin, Vladimir
Leo, John
Leo XIII (Pope)
Lewis, John
Libya
Lieberman, Avigdor
Lincoln, Abraham
Lincoln Review Lippmann, Walter
Lisbon Treaty
Liu, Betty
Lloyd, Mark
Longman, Phillip
Lowery, Joseph
Loyola University
Luce, Clare Boothe
Lugar, Richard
Luther, Martin
Luttmer, Erzo F. P.

Mac Donald, Heather
MacArthur, Douglas
Madison, James
Maguindanao massacre
Maher, Bill
Maher, Ryan
Malaysia
Malcolm X
Malema, Julius
Manhattan Declaration: A Call to Christian Conscience manufacturing jobs
March on Washington
Marshall, Paul
Martel, Charles
Martin, Malachi
Martin, Roland
Martinez, Mel
Marx, Karl
Marxism
Mateo, Fernando
McCain, John
 campaign of
 platform of
McChrystal, Stanley

McCloskey, John
McDonnell, Bob
McGovern, George
McGowan, William
McInerny, Ralph
McMillion, Charles W.
McReynolds, James C.
Meacham, Jon
Mead, Margaret
Mearsheimer, John
Medicaid
Medicare
Meek, Kendrick
Mehlman, Ken
Mein Kampf (Hitler) Mencken, H. L.
Merkel, Angela
The Message Mexico
 annexation of
 constitution changes by corruption in
 drug related killings in Fox on state policy goals of immigration from
 Juárez
 loyalty to
 at risk of failure
Meyer, Christopher
Meyerson, Harold
Michel, Karen Lincoln
Micklethwait, John
Milashina, Elena
military. *See also specific branches* bases
 dismantlement
Miller, Aaron David
Mindanao
Minitzer, Richard
modernity
Mohler, Albert
Molina, J. Mario
Monroe Doctrine
Moore, Michael
Moore, Russell D.
Moore, Stephen
Morales, Evo
Mormons, population of
Moulitsas, Markos
Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán Moynihan, Daniel Patrick Mugabe, Robert
Muggeridge, Malcolm

Muhammad (Prophet)
Muhammad, Feiz
Muller, Jerry Z.
Mullins, Mike
multiculturalism
 failure of
 Francis on
 Gottfried on
Murchison, William
Murdock, Steve
Murray, Charles
 on affirmative action
 on Coleman Report
 on Elementary and Secondary Education Act on illegitimacy
 on No Child Left Behind Murray, John Courtney
Muslims. *See also* Islam Britain population of
 in Catholic universities at Georgetown University Goldstone on
 population of
 Russian population of
Mussolini, Benito

NAFTA. *See* North American Free Trade Agreement Nagourney, Adam
Napolitano, Janet
National Assessment for Educational Progress NAACP national convention National Commission on Fiscal
Responsibility National Day of Prayer
National Immigration Survey National Portrait Gallery National Prayer Service
nationalism. *See also* economic nationalism; ethnonationalism Brazil
 China
 Dawson on
 Einstein on
 Iran
 Israel
 returning
 Russia
 Schlesinger on
 Turkey
NATO. *See* North Atlantic Treaty Organization Navy
 diversity of
 double standards
 Gates, Robert, on
Naxalites
Nazism
Neather, Andrew
neoconservatism
net worth, family

Nicholas I (Czar)
Nieli, Russell K.
Nietzsche, Friedrich
Nisbet, Robert
Nixon, Richard
No Child Left Behind
nonintervention policy
Norris-LaGuardia Act
North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in
Afghanistan
 in Libya
 withdrawal from
Notre Dame
 Dempsey on
 McInerney on
 Obama honored by

Obama, Barack
 on affirmative action
 atheism and
 border fence scrapped by as change candidate
 on Christianity
 D'Arcy on
 on equality
 on ethnonationalism
 on federal pay
 Ferraro on
 on Ground Zero mosque dispute Notre Dame honoring
 partial-birth abortion supported by on Pennsylvanians
 platform of
 Powell endorsing
 race consciousness of
 tribal politics and
 on values
Obledo, Mario
occult
O'Connor, Sandra Day
OECD. *See* Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development oil dependence
Olmert, Ehud
Olson, Ted
O'Reilly, Charles
Orfield, Gary
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on birth rates
Ortega y Gasset, Jose
Orthodox International

Paez, Richard
Pagden, Anthony
Paine, Thomas
Painter, Nell Irvin
Pakistan
 Christian persecution in at risk of failure
Palestinians
Palin, Sarah
 Rich on
Pape, Robert
Papoutsis, Christian
Pareto, Vilfredo
Parker, Jay
Partlow, Josh
Pashtun
pastorpreneurs
Patrick, Deval
patriotism. *See also* economic patriotism in China
 Simpson on
Patterson, Orlando
 on democracy
 on equality
 on ethnonationalism
 on self-segregation
Paul VI (Pope)
Pelosi, Nancy
Penner, Rudolph
periti Perry, Mark
Pfaeffle, Frederick
Philadelphia Plan
Phillips, Kevin
Piatak, Tom
Pillai, G. K.
PISA. *See* Program for International Student Assessment Pius XII (Pope)
Plesl, Jaroslav
Plessy v. Ferguson Podhoretz, Norman
Pollard, Jonathan
Popenoe, David
Porter, Eduardo
Pouillon, James
Powell, Colin
power
 equality and
 Tocqueville on
Price, Hugh

Princip, Gavriilo

Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) Heritage Foundation analysis of Sailer's analysis of Prophet, Danish cartoons mocking protectionism

Protestants

Democrat

emerging minority of

public debate, crudeness of Puerto Rico statehood

Putin, Vladimir

Putnam, Robert

on diversity

on social capital

on trusting places

Quayle, Dan

Quirk, William

Rabin, Yitzhak

racial profiling

racial ratio

racism

Brokaw on

Carter on

Clinton, Bill, and

Johnson, Lyndon, on

Parker, Jay, on

Tea Party and

Radford, Alexandria

Rahman, Abdul

Ramos, Jorge

Ratzinger, Georg

Rayburn, Sam

Reade, Winwood

Reagan, Ronald

Supreme Court nominations of recession

Federal Reserve and

government workers and

Woods on

Recovery Act

Reding, Viviane

Reese, Thomas

Reformation

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke Reid, Harry

Reilly, Patrick J.

religion

Belloc on

blacks and
Churchill on
in Czech Republic
Dawson on
diversity of
Dwight on
equality of
in Europe
as foundation of morality freedom from
Gallup poll on
Henry on
Hitler on
low and high tension
Marx on
necessity of
in New England
Piatak on
positive outcomes from
Riley on
in schools
Solzhenitsyn on
Stark on
Supreme Court and
Swift on
Tocqueville on
Washington on
Webster on
Religious Landscape Survey Republicans
Brownstein on
comeback
existential crisis
loyalties to
Martinez on
opposition to taxes
Teixeira on
as white party
“Restoring Honor” rally
Revkin, Andrew
Rhee, Michelle
Rich, Frank
on illiberal Democrats
on Palin
Richardson, Bill
Richwine, Jason
on diversity

on social capital
Riley, Naomi Schaefer
The Rising Tide of Color Against the White World-Supremacy (Stoddard) Roberts, Andrew
Roberts, John
Robinson, Gene
Rocard, Michel
Roe. v. Wade Rogan, Eugene
Rogozin, Dmitry
Roosevelt, Franklin
Roosevelt, Theodore
Rothbard, Murray
Roughead, Gary
Rowan, Carl
Rubenstein, Edwin
Rubio, Marco
Rushdie, Salman
Russell, Bertrand
Russia
 birth rate
 death rate
 Eberstadt on
 ethnonationalism and
 Fairbanks on
 Hawkins on
 Islamic total war against King, Charles, on
 Muslim population of
 nationalism
 North Caucasus
 population of
 relations with
 terrorism in
 Ukraine aligning closer to Walker, Martin, on
Rutenberg, Jim
Ryn, Claes

Sabih, Wassim
al-Sadr, Moqtada
Sailer, Steve
Salama, Salama Ahmed
Salisbury (Lord)
Salter, Frank
same-sex marriage
 Catholic support of
 Fourteenth Amendment guaranteeing Scripture and
 voting on

Samuelson, Robert
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanneh, Kelefa
Santayana, George
Sarajevo
Sarkozy, Nicolas
Sarrazin, Thilo
Saudi Arabia, population of
Saunders, Dave “Mudcat”
Scalia, Antonin
Schillebeeckx, Edward
Schlesinger, Arthur
Schönborn, Christoph
Schori, Katharine Jefferts Schwarzenegger, Arnold
Scott, Tim
segregation
 Clegg on
 Orfield on
self-determination
self-segregation
 Bishop on
 Carter on
 Cushing on
 Holder on
 Patterson on
 Samuelson on
 Stossel on
Sestak, Joe
sexual revolution
Shanghai Cooperation Committee
Sharia
Shaw, Russ
Silk, Mark
Simpson, Alan
Singapore
Singh, Manmohan
Sirba, Joseph
Skerry, Peter
Skolnick, Jerome
Smith, Adam
Smith, Christian
Smuts, Jan
Sobel, Robert
social capital
 defined
 depleting
 Putnam on

Richwine on
Social Darwinism
social decomposition
in Britain
Eliot on
social issues
Social Security
households paying no
socialism
Dawson on
Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr
Sontag, Susan
Sotomayor, Sonia
Souter, David
South Africa
South Korea
security pacts with
South Park Southern Manifesto
Southern Strategy
Soviet Union
Spanish Civil War
Spanish-American War
Specter, Arlen
Speer, Albert
Spencer, Michael
Spitzer, Eliot
SSPX. *See* Society of Saint Pius X
Stalin, Joseph
Stark, Rodney
Starr, Penny
Steele, Michael
Steele, Shelby
Steinfels, Peter
Steinlight, Stephen
stimulus bill
Stoddard, Lothrop
Stossel, Scott
Strache, Heinz-Christian structural deficit
Stupak, Bart
Stuxnet virus
subprime mortgage
Sudan
Suharto
suicide rate
Sukarno

Summers, Larry
Supreme Court
 Bush, George H. W., nominations for on Christianity
 diversity in
 Feldman on
 Garnett on
 on homosexuality
 Lincoln on
 Reagan's nominations for religion and
 tribal politics and
Surin, Jacqueline Ann
Swain, Carol
Swift, Jonathan
Swift, Taylor
Switzerland
Syria

Taiwan
"The Talented Tenth"
Tantillo, Auggie
Tarrance, Lance
Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act Tax Foundation
Tax Policy Center
Taxpayers for Common Sense Tea Party
 racism and
Teixeira, Ruy
Terre'Blanche, Eugène
terrorism
test scores
 affirmative action and
 equalizing
 global gap in
 Mac Donald on
Texas war of 1835–1836
Thailand
Thomas, Clarence
Three Gorges Dam
Tibet
Tiller, George
Tinker, Nikki
Tobin, Thomas
Tocqueville, Alexis de
Todd, Chuck
Toomey, Pat
Tower of Babel

Tracey, Evan
trade deficit
 Buffett on
 with China
 fixing
 with Japan
 national decline and
 Tantillo on
Trask, H. A. Scott
tribal politics
 in Hawaii
 Obama and
 Sotomayor and
 Supreme Court and
Truman, Harry
Turkey
Twenty-sixth Amendment
Twenty-third Amendment

2012

Ukraine, Russia aligning closer to Umarov, Doku
UNITY: Journalists of Color Unz, Ron
Updike, John
Urban II (Pope)

van Gogh, Theo
Vance, Laurence
Vasari, Giorgio
Vatican II
Venezuela
Veillot, Louis
Villarreal, Luis
violent crime
Volcker, Paul
Voltaire
Voting Rights Act

Walker, David
Walker, Martin
Walker, Scott
Walker, Vaughn
Walmart
War of 1812

Warren, Rick
Washington, George
Washington D.C.
Watkins, Sharon
Watson, James
Wattenberg, Ben
Webb, James
Webster, Daniel
Wechsler tests
Weigel, George
Weisberg, Jacob
Weissberg, Robert
Wells, H. G.
West, Kanye
Western suicide ideology
Wexler, Robert
Wheatcroft, Geoffrey
white(s)
 alienation
 Benjamin on
 birth rate
 California population
 Hsu on
 illegitimacy rate
 as minority
 racial identity forbidden to Republicans and
 votes
Whitman, Meg
Whoriskey, Peter
Wilders, Geert
Williams, Duncan
Williams, Katherine
Williams, Rowan
Williams, Walter
Williamson, Chilton, Jr.
Williamson, Richard
Wilson, James Q.
Wilson, Joe
Wilson, Pete
Wilson, Woodrow
 Fourteen Points
 on self-determination
Windchy, Eugene G.
Wines, Michael
Winter, Susanne
Wise, Tim

Wojnarowicz, David

Wong, Jiverly

Wood, Peter

Woods, Thomas E., Jr.

Wooldridge, Adrian

World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability

(Chua) World War I

German perspective on

World War II

ethnonationalism post

Wright, Jeremiah

Wuerl, Donald

Yeats, William Butler

Yemen

Yevkurov, Yunus-Bek

Young, Andrew

young voters

Zedillo, Ernesto

Zenawi, Meles

Zhang Ming

Zimbabwe

Zinczenko, David

Zuma, Jacob

ALSO BY PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Churchill, Hitler and “The Unnecessary War”

Day of Reckoning

State of Emergency

Where the Right Went Wrong

The Death of the West

A Republic, Not an Empire

The Great Betrayal

Right from the Beginning

Conservative Votes, Liberal Victories

The New Majority

PATRICK J. BUCHANAN, America's leading populist conservative, was senior adviser to three American presidents, ran for the Republican nomination in 1992 and 1996, and was the Reform Party's presidential candidate in 2000. The author of eight other books, Buchanan is a syndicated columnist and founding member of three of America's foremost public affairs shows, NBC's *The McLaughlin Group* and CNN's *The Capitol Gang* and *Crossfire*. He lives in McLean, Virginia.

SUICIDE OF A SUPERPOWER. Copyright © 2011 by Patrick J. Buchanan. All rights reserved. For information, address St. Martin's Press, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010.

www.thomasdunnebooks.com

www.stmartins.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Buchanan, Patrick J. (Patrick Joseph), 1938– Suicide of a superpower : will America survive to 2025? / Patrick J. Buchanan.—1st ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

e-ISBN 9781429990608

1. United States—Civilization—21st century.
2. United States—Politics and government—21st century.
3. United States—Social conditions—21st century.
4. United States—Religion—21st century.
5. Christianity—United States—21st century.

I. Title.

E169.12.B7818 2011

973.932—dc23

2011024811

First Edition: October 2011