

# SCIENCE FOR TOMORROW

---

## **The Science of Human Diversity:**

### **A History of the Pioneer Fund**

Richard Lynn

Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2001

lxii + 581pp.

\$75 U.S.

---

## **Eugenics:**

### **A Reassessment**

Richard Lynn

Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2001

ix + 367pp.

\$67.50 U.S.

---

*Reviewed by Louis Andrews*

**A**mong today's egalitarian ideologues, the studies sponsored by the Pioneer Fund and the ideas of eugenics are perhaps the object of more hatred than the Second Amendment, patriarchy, and homophobia combined. In two recent books, Richard Lynn, a British psychologist, explores both the contributions of the Pioneer Fund and the promise of eugenics from the standpoint of reason, not political correctness. Lynn has published widely on psychological issues, especially on the worldwide variations in IQ based on ethnicity and race, for over thirty years. These two most recent of his books are the culmination of his career.

*The Science of Human Diversity* begins with a long introduction to Wickliffe Draper and the Pioneer Fund by the latter's president, Harry F. Wehyer. By all reasonable standards, Wickliffe Preston Draper was a memorable man. Born in New England in 1891 to a prominent and wealthy family, he had on his father's side an uncle who had been a congressman from Massachusetts and another who

The Ontario public service, many municipal workforces, and also the federal civil service have their own workplace equity programs. These principles have also been upheld for several years by all of the big charter banks in Canada. Many large and medium-size corporations, such as Bell Canada, have such plans in place. They are also being carried out in public library systems, in many school boards at all levels (teachers, senior staff, administrative staff, support services), and in many media outlets. Furthermore, the enactment of workplace equity policies is often a precondition for private firms being allowed to compete for lucrative federal, provincial, and municipal contracts, and for being considered for the vast cornucopia of government loans or subsidies.

With the increasing immigration of visible minorities to Canada, their “percentage of population” is continually growing larger, with the result that continual increases in the hiring of visible minorities become mandatory. There is also a deliberate ambiguity as to whether the “percentage of population” is supposed to be that in a given urban region (visible minorities are now over 50 percent of Toronto’s population), or of the country as a whole (which is far less, of course). These ambiguities are typically resolved in favor of visible minorities. This might mean that, in order to fulfill legally mandated employment equity obligations, no white males can be hired *at all* in some government institutions and private corporations! And then, the further complaint is made that, while designated groups may indeed be well represented at junior levels, they are still “drastically under-represented” at managerial levels.

As with affirmative action in the U.S., employment equity often tends to undermine the confidence of ordinary people in professionals who happen to be from “designated groups.” It raises suspicions about the objective credentials of such professionals. An honest outlook would generally prefer to have *one* doctor or lawyer from a given group, who had successfully completed training based on strictest merit, and whose credentials were unimpeachable, rather than *ten* doctors or lawyers, some with possibly questionable credentials.

The success in the rescinding by Premier Mike Harris of the particularly onerous NDP quota legislation in Ontario can be seen as only the first step in the long road to restoring genuine equality of opportunity throughout the province of Ontario, and throughout Canada.

---

*Mark Wegierski is a Canadian freelance writer and historical researcher.*

---

## REFERENCES

Loney, Martin. *Pursuit of Division: Race, Gender, and Preferential Hiring in Canada*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998.

It is true that a large majority of corporate heads are white males, however, do they actually collude with each other, in an exclusionary manner? Furthermore, how much influence do white males, *as white males*, have on the media, social, cultural, academic, and political sectors of society? Cannot a white male often be an ardent left-liberal, who would be totally disinclined to in any way help or promote another white male, unless they happened to be ideologically congruent? Also, considering the fact that the large urban areas of Canada have been truly multicultural for about twenty years (in a country with established European settlement of hundreds of years) is it at all surprising that Canadians of British or European descent are heavily represented in the nation's elites?

Another point to be made is that there are of course places in society where visible minorities are notably over-represented (for example in some sports, entertainment, and popular music areas). Those are highly prestigious, well-enumerated positions. Are white males allowed to complain that they are significantly under-represented in those areas? What should also be considered is that, while the concentration of economic wealth at the top of society is unlikely to change much, millions of middle-class, lower-middle-class, and working-class white men will be increasingly marginalized by the ongoing "equity" process. Should middle- and working-class white men be penalized for the sake of enacting the obsessions of the Canadian elites, who are in any case the most insulated from the possibly deleterious effects of "equity"?

Does the average person even realize how much of Canadian society is structured around employment equity? For example, virtually all universities have these formal or informal criteria governing such crucial aspects of their functioning as admissions (to undergraduate and graduate—including doctoral—levels, and especially to professional areas like law and medicine); the disbursement of scholarships; the hiring of academic faculty, of all support staff, of academic librarians and library assistants. College admissions in Canada, unlike in the U.S., are not determined by a standardized test like the SAT, although there are standardized tests for professional faculties such as law and management studies. Admissions to undergraduate studies at university are formally determined by looking at high school marks—although it is said that all of the more prestigious universities informally rely on ranking of high schools, to put the marks in some kind of context. Admission policies also definitely take employment equity into account—although it is not as easy to show what is happening as in the U.S., with its obvious disparities in the SAT scores of white/Asian and black/Hispanic students admitted. There is also the fact that such initiatives were pushed by the NDP onto the provincial justice system in Ontario: in the appointment of judges, crown attorneys, and police service board members; in the professional workings of the Law Society of Upper Canada (Ontario's professional legal body); and in the hiring of court support workers. For example, the NDP government tried to fire hundreds of (aging, white male) World War II veterans who worked as court support workers to make way for quota appointees.

which is increasingly defined in an ever more radical fashion by a rather small, but very, very powerful leadership cadre. As far as disabled persons, they have probably been included as a “designated group” to give the employment equity policy an increased aura of “fairness” and “compassion.” It could be argued that there is not all that much being done for most disabled persons—apart from giving them disability pensions and some subsidies for housing and assistive devices—which are not excessively generous. However, because employment equity includes disabled persons as a “designated group,” publicly criticizing employment equity is given a stigma akin to kicking a person in a wheelchair.

It should also be noted that “white ethnic” groups such as Ukrainian, Italian, Portuguese, and Polish Canadians were never considered for inclusion under employment equity, although these groups had been subject to significant discrimination in Canada’s earlier history. They are now considered part of the “dominant majority.” How likely is it that a WASP liberal or visible minority manager will want to hire a member of a “white ethnic” group?

In the 1995 election in the Province of Ontario, the “employment equity quota law” of the New Democratic Party (Canada’s social democrats, elected in Ontario in 1990) was a major issue. Mike Harris and the Ontario Progressive Conservatives (who are certainly more right-leaning than the federal PCs) promised to abolish “the quota law” upon election. They won the election over the disenchantment of many Ontarians with the left-wing agenda of the NDP. However, only a few weeks after employment equity (in its most extreme variant) had been formally rescinded in Ontario, the Liberal federal Canadian government of Jean Chretien reintroduced it at the national level! Chretien has recently won (on November 27, 2000) a third majority government (following victories in 1993 and 1997), and employment equity continues to be supported by the federal Liberal government. Mike Harris was re-elected with a majority in the Ontario Provincial Parliament in 1999.

It is important to look just how far formal and informal “employment equity” extends in Canada today. The term “employment *equity*” could itself be seen as dishonest. The American term, “affirmative *action*,” is arguably more honest, as it identifies that extraordinary initiatives are being taken, and implicitly admits that equality of opportunity is not really being upheld. Unlike in the U.S., affirmative action-type policies are mostly considered a “closed issue” in Canada with no debate or questioning permitted.

### DOUBLE STANDARDS FOR CANADIAN WHITE MALES

What does “employment equity” in fact amount to? It might well be seen, despite its gloss of “equality for all,” as having the effect of significantly diminishing the career-prospects and life-chances of many men of British or European descent in Canada. Of course, the left argues that white males are the overarching power-elite in Canada today in that they invariably look out for each other’s interests, and, furthermore, this alleged dominance is a moral outrage.

There are also federal and provincial laws against discrimination and against “hate speech,” which tend to stifle the expression of any more pointed public criticisms of employment equity, aboriginal policy, multiculturalism, bilingualism, and current-day immigration and refugee policies. And a decidedly left-wing media elite reinforces this climate of political correctness, especially in regard to social and cultural issues. While a considerable degree of free-market, economic conservatism is openly debated, social conservatism (focusing on upholding traditional notions of nation, family, and religion) is usually excluded and pejoratively ridiculed.

Finally, there is extensive government support for feminist groups, who have—among various other causes—championed “pay equity.” Indeed, the wedge for employment equity in Canada was “pay equity” or “equal pay for work for equal value.” It could be argued that there is an important difference between “equal pay for work of equal value” and “equal pay for equal work.” The latter means that women should not be paid less than a man doing exactly the same job, whereas the former brings into play a vast, arbitrary adjudicating mechanism whose results are inevitably raising the pay of jobs where women predominate. So a secretary is supposed to earn practically the same amount as an engineer. In one major pay equity settlement, the “quasi-judicial” tribunal, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, ordered the Canadian Federal Government to pay \$3.5 billion (Canadian) in back pay to women working or formerly working for the Federal Government. (By contrast, the entire budget for the Canadian military in the year 2000 was \$10 billion.)

Indeed, employment equity is probably most strongly enforced in government workplaces. It has been argued that government, typically white-collar, jobs in many cases offer comparatively easy work at comparatively high salaries—especially when compared to most private sector jobs. They also offer generous pensions, and virtually ironclad job security, as layoffs in the public service are virtually unheard of, regardless of the economic situation. However, many government jobs demand a strong cleaving to politically correct orthodoxy, and those persons who are unwilling to step into line are unlikely to be hired, or, even if hired, they will probably find workplace relations very difficult, and have little hope of advancement.

Among the “designated groups,” the most intensive efforts are probably focused on visible minorities and aboriginal peoples. If such a person has at least average competence, the benefits offered him or her are perhaps the most unstinting, and would usually only be withheld if the person were perceived as excessively “pro-majority” (derided as an “Uncle Tom”). Attitudes in Canada are very similar to the U.S. where, for example, Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas is subject to considerable public criticism, for being a black conservative. In regard to aboriginal peoples, it has been argued that a small circle of official aboriginal leaders and activists—while living extravagant lifestyles themselves—often does not pass on too many benefits to their own group.

It could also be argued that most of the advancement of women happens only insofar as they quite strongly hold feminist outlooks. Of course, in Canada today, many women are indeed highly enamored of feminism—

It should be remembered that in Canada there are several other areas of governmental and corporate policy that overlap with employment equity. For example, there is the federal bilingualism policy, which requires that, in many cases, civil servants be bilingual (i.e., speak both French and English). This has meant that French-speaking persons in Canada, who are far more likely to know English, have easier entry into and advancement in the federal civil service. It also operates in favor of the English-speaking elites (most of whom tend to be liberal in political orientation), who find it easier to educate themselves and their children in French. It effectively discriminates against ordinary, English-speaking Canadians. The province of Ontario, with a French-speaking population of about 5 percent, has also moved to extensive bilingualism in the *provincial* civil service. The province of New Brunswick in the Atlantic region, with a French-speaking population of about 35 percent, espouses full official bilingualism. However, the predominantly French-speaking province of Quebec—with about one-seventh of persons whose first language isn't French—is characterized by a unilingual provincial policy: French only.

### MULTICULTURALISM, IMMIGRATION & EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

There is also the multiculturalism policy, which valorizes the maintenance of distinct, non-English, non-French, cultural affiliations in Canada, and requires that they be to some extent supported by all levels of government. The federal budget for multiculturalism is officially said to be \$20 million (Canadian) a year (in the federal Department of Multiculturalism), but there are numerous funding initiatives through further areas of federal, provincial, and municipal governments. Although notions of multiculturalism in theory include “white ethnic” groups such as Ukrainian and Italian-Canadians, in practice, multiculturalism is increasingly defined as synonymous with *multiracialism*—signifying the enormous and enriching diversity of persons of color in Canada. Multiculturalism is now generally said to be the defining characteristic of Canada, and the touchstone of Canadian identity.

There is also the policy of aboriginal relations. The aboriginal peoples of Canada (Indians, Metis, and Inuit), are increasingly hoping to wrest vast resources from all other Canadians, based on claims of compensation for past abuses, and renegotiation of earlier treaties. It has been calculated that tens of billions of dollars are involved. The aboriginal peoples already receive support from all levels of government. In the Far North, a semi-sovereign entity called Nunavut has been created, and has already received \$580 million (Canadian) from the federal government in about a year, to cover its budget deficit. Aboriginal peoples are also exempt from most taxes. For many people, being relieved from income tax would in itself be a distinct advantage.

There are also Canada's immigration and refugee policies. Since the 1960s, Canada's immigration policy has emphasized non-traditional sources of immigration. Since the 1960s, about 75 percent of immigrants have been from non-European countries. The combination of wide-open immigration and refugee policies results in the constant increase of the percentage of visible minority populations in Canada, which means that the perception that there are not enough visible minorities in certain Canadian institutions becomes exacerbated.

# 'EMPLOYMENT EQUITY'

## Affirmative Action, Canadian Style

MARK WEGIERSKI

---

What is called “employment equity” in Canada often amounts to a system of preferential hiring and promotion in many significant areas and levels of society for so-called “designated groups” (women, visible minorities, aboriginal peoples, disabled persons). This policy is often officially explained as being an attempt to utilize the talents of every person in society, as simply being about “fairness.” Officially, employment equity is said to offer an opportunity to a person from a designated group only when their qualifications are equal to those of a person from a non-designated group. Officially, the policy is supposedly based on employment “targets”—not “quotas.” However, looking at the workforce composition of many federal, provincial, and municipal government workplaces, as well as of, e.g., big-city bank branches, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that what is taking place must in fact be preferential hiring and promotion for designated groups. A prominent recent book that gives a comprehensive critique of these policies is Martin Loney’s *Pursuit of Division: Race, Gender, and Preferential Hiring in Canada* (McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998).

The manager who wishes to be considered “sensitive” today is faced with constant dilemmas in hiring decisions, although they would be very unwilling to discuss these problems in public. Since these designated groups encompass such a large percentage of the general population, there is required a constant process of deliberation, as to which job candidate is the most appropriate. In some cases, where very technical skills are needed, or where some candidates are overwhelmingly stronger, hiring continues to be decided on merit. However, there are many jobs that can be done at a basic level of competence by most persons. From the politically correct standpoint, unless there are special circumstances, such as very ardent left-liberalism, or gay sexual orientation, there is a general consensus that an able-bodied white male will not get the position. It is then a matter of delicate judgment deciding on the relative weight of the “designated” categories. For example, should a disabled white male be hired instead of a black female? An Oriental female instead of a white female or an aboriginal male or an aboriginal female? The person who bridged the most “designated” categories would probably have the best chance of obtaining the position.

Nelson, Brent A. *America Balkanized: Immigration's Challenge to Government*, Monterey, VA: The American Immigration Control Foundation, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. "El Republica del Norte: The Next American Nation," *The Social Contract*, Fall 2000: 42-45.

\_\_\_\_\_. "What Was The Frankfurt School?" *Citizens Informer*, January-February 2001, p. 9.

"No Shortage of Blacks," *American Renaissance*, March 2001, p. 14.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## REFERENCES

- Barzun, Jacques. *From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life*, New York: Harper Collins, 2000.
- Bernstein, Richard. *The Dictatorship of Virtue*, New York: Knopf, 1994.
- Brimelow, Peter. *Alien Nation*, New York: Random House, 1995.
- Brociner, Ken. "Utopianism, Human Nature, and the Left," *Dissent*, Winter 2001: 89-92.
- Burke, B. Meredith. "The Coming White Minority," *The Social Contract*, Summer 1997: 301-304.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Faulty Demographic Road Map To the Future," *The Social Contract*, Spring 2000: 179-84.
- "Bush: No Friends on the Right," *The New American*, January 29, 2001, p. 5.
- Camarota, Steven A. "Immigrants in the United States, 2000: A Snapshot of America's Foreign-Born Population," *Center for Immigration Studies Backgrounder*, January 2001, Washington, DC, 19pp.
- Chang, Maria. "Multiculturalism, Immigration and Aztlan," *The Social Contract*, Spring 2000: 207-211.
- Chapman, Bob. "An International Financial, Economic, Political, and Social Commentary." *The Toulouse-Lautrec Tables: World Markets Topic du Jour*, December 23, 2000. (www.emetropolecafe.com,), pp. 6-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The International Forecaster - May 2001 (1)." *The Toulouse-Lautrec Table: World Markets - Topic du Jour*, May 9, 2001, pp. 3-4, (www.lemetropolecafe.com/toulouse-lautrec-table.cfm).
- Childress, Edwin. "The 'Sojourner' Argument." *The Social Contract*, Spring 2001: 206-9.
- Chittum, Thomas W. *Civil War Two: The Coming Breakup of America*. Show Low, AZ: American Eagle Publications, 1996.
- Coleman, James S. *Nationalism and Development in Africa*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.
- Collier, Peter and David Horowitz, eds. *The Race Card: White Guilt, Black Resentment, and the Assault on Truth and Justice*. Rocklin, CA: Prima Publishing 1997.
- Cuddihy, John Murray. "The Elephant and the Angels; or The Incivil Irritations of Jewish Theology." In *Uncivil Religion: Interreligious Hostility in America*. (Ed.) Robert N. Bellah and Frederick E. Greenspahn. New York: Crossroads, 1987.
- D'Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education*, New York: Free Press 1992.
- Ellis, John H. *Liberation Lost: Social Agendas and the Corruption of the Humanities*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1999.
- Fallon, Joseph E. *Deconstructing America: Immigration, Nationality and Statehood*. Washington, DC: Council for Social, Economic Studies, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Funding Hate: Foundations and The Radical 'Hispanic' Lobby." *The Social Contract*, Fall 2000: 56-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pushing Out Whitey." *American Renaissance*, March 2000, pp. 1; 3-7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "UK-USA: The British Character of America." *The Social Contract*, X1: 2 (Winter 2001): 91-94.
- Francis, Samuel. *Middle American Revolution*, Raleigh, NC: Middle American News, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Other Face of Multiculturalism," *Chronicles*, June 1998, pp. 19-22.

41. See: Barzan (2000). Cf: Kaplan (1994).

42. On the parameters of such “deconstructionism,” see: Fallon (1998). While some of this scholarship is corrective, the overwhelming corpus derives from the academic New Left’s disenchantment with traditional American values and institutions. Accuracy in Academia’s monthly *Campus Report* provides a continuous update on manifestations of this ongoing “culture war.” Cf: Ellis (1999), Satel (2000) and Jenkins (2001).

43. This because of a relatively open opportunity structure for all - not withstanding moderate SR among European-Americans. Historically a similar situation existed for Japanese, Chinese, Irish, Jews, and Poles as well as Italians who prospered despite intense aversion and ubiquitous exclusionary practices. These legacies are diametrically at odds with contemporary “civil rights” redistributive collectivism. See: Raimondo (2001).

44. Its power was demonstrated by both JFK and Reagan, as it was more recently by the McCain campaign.

45. Poll data indicates that approximately 85 percent of Americans identify themselves as Christians, while less than 25 percent oppose its symbolic or active role in the public civic institutional sector. In a nominal yet important sense, America remains a predominantly Christian national culture at the outset of the new millennium. Hence the enormous popularity of Bush’s “faith-based initiative.”

46. Thus the “Christian Coalition” and other faith-bound socially conservative denominations (e.g. Southern Baptists, Church of the Latter Day Saints), as well as certain evangelicals, join traditionalists in Roman Catholicism and mainline Protestant churches as a natural constituency. Their egalitarian universalism is generally limited to spiritual relationships between man and God within Christianity.

47. Although clans and tribes in the OECD area were primary performers of this role until the classical era, broader ethnic groups and nation-states have increasingly so functioned since then in the North. Tribalism and clan loyalties remain predominant in much of the Third World. Cf. Pearson (1996).

48. Cuddihy (1987) applies this to high capability differentials. He argues that anti-Semitism is partly a function of Jewish attitudes reflecting a sense of both intellectual and *moral* superiority vis-a-vis gentiles. This is reflected in the context of intense in-group loyalties and refusal to publicly acknowledge such characteristics.

49. See: Sowell (1996).

50. In both the UK and Germany (Karapin, 1999), the effectiveness of immigration control movements was linked to *local* social mobilization, which began to incorporate “normal citizens” despite initial activism by culturally defensive “extremists” who rioted in London and attacked asylum abusers in some German locales. Restraint becomes less probable the longer an effective response is delayed. As preferences assume the character of customary expectations among minorities, the latter are more likely to resort to overt and indiscriminate violence against whites to maintain them.

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

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