

Another Issue BushGore Won't Talk About

by **Scott McConnell**

Don't count on hearing anything from BushGore about the ongoing invasion of the United States by illegal aliens from Mexico and other points south.

Bush has made it clear that his "friendship" with Mexico's leadership counts for more than the Americans whose property is being trashed by illegal alien smugglers: "Family values don't stop at the Rio Grande" has been his one contribution to this subject. And the Gore campaign is entirely in synch with the left Latino activist groups, who are, of

course, pro-illegal immigration.

Pat Buchanan has demonstrated several times his solidarity with the folks on the Arizona border, a fact not mentioned in accounts of the pressure the illegal alien flow is putting on Arizona ranchers. At campaign stops around the nation, he tells the story of Theresa Murray, an elderly American made a virtual prisoner in her own home by the illegals.

Years ago, Cesar Chavez, the late Mexican-American labor union leader, made clear that the concrete economic interests of his membership were damaged by the ceaseless flow of cheap labor

from across the border.

This is a point Pat Buchanan has made again and again during this campaign, the uncontrolled flow of illegal aliens pushes down the wages of all Americans. But BushGore are well funded by the people who benefit from cheap labor; they say nothing about the border but "keep it open" and "look the other way." The only borders they care about are the ones in the Balkans, where they support full American military intervention. We think differently.

[Scott McConnell is a former editorial-page writer for the New York Post, now a contributor to the e-magazine www.vdare.com.]

Defending Against the Wrong Army

by **Paul Craig Roberts**

Ten years after the end of the Cold War, the United States still spends a large sum on national defense. Arguments are made that we need to

Paul Craig Roberts is a syndicated columnist. © 2000 by Creators Syndicate. Reprinted by permission.

spend more. But spending may not be the answer if the purposes of defense are being undercut by other policies.

For example, our defense with respect to China has been undercut by a U.S. defense contractor transferring our missile technology to the Chinese in order for U.S. firms to obtain cheaper and more reliable launchings for their communication satellites. What good does it do to spend more

billions on defense when our own defense contractors, with a wink and nod from President Clinton, transfer the technology and weapons systems that we develop to the Chinese?

Take another example. U.S. businesses are hell-bent on building up China's economy in order that they might profit from the development of the Chinese market. But this build-up will make it easy for China to

outspend us militarily and prevent us from closing our markets once they are able to out-compete us.

But these concerns, as real as they are, are minor. To see the big problem, consider the purposes of national defense. Countries have armies in order to prevent their being overrun by foreigners who would displace their language, destroy their cultural and communal integrity, and economically exploit the overrun population.

From the standpoint of its main purposes, U.S. national defense is a total failure. National defense has lost to immigration policy.

Did you know that 120 languages are spoken in Los Angeles? According to the Census Bureau, the United States now has such a diverse population that 330 languages are in use.

Many immigrants have strong values and are a positive addition to the population, but liberal politicians have created incentives for immigrants not to assimilate. In some states, assimilation has stopped. Immigrant communities are so large and insular that there is no need or pressure to learn English. Ethnic TV programming and radio broadcasts have made news and entertainment independent of English language ability. In place of the English-language schools that were prevalent during the "melting pot" era, today there are ethnic-language schools teaching Persian, Hindi, Mandarin, Korean, Farsi and so forth.

Formerly, the federal government mandated bilingual courses

as a way to immerse immigrants in English. Today, English immersion is seen as "racist" and "cultural oppression." Because of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and Supreme Court rulings, all non-English-speaking immigrants must be dealt with in their native tongues to ensure they are not denied welfare benefits, medical care, schooling, access to job training programs and employment.

In order for government handout agencies to service the teeming millions of non-English speakers, the demand for interpreters has escalated, putting more financial stress on government budgets and, ultimately, the taxpayers.

Legal-aid agencies are suing government social-service agencies — which cannot handle languages such as Wolof, Tswana, Hmong and Queche — for discriminating on the basis of national origin. To avoid the lawsuits, government agencies now discriminate against the English-speaking native born. The Santa Ana police department, for example, will only hire bilingual persons.

Millions of those who make up our Tower of Babel are illiterate in their own languages. They cannot be taught English when they cannot read or write in their native languages.

Debate over immigration, to the extent there is one, is about money: Do immigrants pay more in taxes than they take out in social services? A more pertinent question is: Have we lost our

country to legions of foreigners who have no incentive to assimilate? Some Hispanic leaders in the Southwest have declared that their intention is secession.

U.S. immigration policy does not differentiate between legal and illegal immigration, as illegals are periodically amnestied and given citizenship. The word has gone out to Third World peoples: "If you make it to America, you are likely to stay — unless Castro wants you back."

The 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 immigration reform have loaded the dice against native-born citizens of European descent. Ted Kennedy manipulated the "reform" to guarantee that almost all of our immigrants are "people of color." The Civil Rights Act was manipulated so that "people of color" became "preferred minorities" with legal rights over and above those of American males of European descent, who have become legally disadvantaged by their gender and light skin color.

IRS statistics show that the bulk of the income tax is paid by 10 percent of the population. You can safely bet that this 10 percent speaks English.

Our current immigration policy means that by the year 2050 Americans of European descent, a group that comprised 90 percent of the population in 1960, will be in the minority and will have lost control over their political destiny. How does this differ from being overrun by the Chinese army? ■

Immigrants Have No Plans to Assimilate

by Sam Francis

One reason there's not much of a debate about the mass immigration that has swept into the country during the last 30 years is that most of the eggheads who expound on immigration harbor the fond illusion that the immigrants will assimilate — that is, learn the English language, adopt Western and American values and live, work and conduct themselves like everybody else in the country. That, of course, is pretty much what earlier generations of immigrants did, and the result has been satisfactory for everyone.

But that's not what present-day immigrants are doing, which means that they're not behaving the way the eggheads — and the lawmakers who listened to them — anticipated. Not only does the United States now sport such quaint Third World customs as child marriage, female genital mutilation and alien religions that are little more than voodoo and black magic, but also we enjoy

Samuel Francis, Ph.D. is a nationally-syndicated columnist. © 2000, Creators Syndicate, reprinted by permission.

the rising babble of more than 300 different languages.

Language is one of the major bonds that holds a nation together and distinguishes it from other nations, and it's also one of the easiest things for immigrants to adopt in the process of assimilation. And if immigrants don't adopt the language of their new country it's very likely they haven't assimilated and don't intend to assimilate. In the case of recent immigrants to this country, it's now pretty clear they're not assimilating and have no plans to get on with it.

This week, the *Washington Times* published a story about the language enclaves developing in the United States precisely because of unassimilated immigrants. It turns out that there are some 300 different languages now spoken in this country, and as of 1990, some 31.6 million people who speak them. That's one-seventh of the entire population, and that was 10 years ago. Today, there are a lot more.

"The changes," the story tells us, "are reducing the prevalence and primacy of English in American life and culture. More than ever, modern America is multilingual." You don't really need newspapers to tell you that. Go to the bank in most metropolitan areas, and the teller

machine asks you which language you want to do business in. Churches, shopping centers, and many stores and restaurants sport signs and ads in languages other than the mother tongue.

Immigration is the overwhelming reason for the sprouting of the linguistic jungle in America, but there are also other forces at work. For one thing, as the article also notes, "Immigrant communities in some states have become so large and insular that greater numbers of people find no need to learn English." Little Havana in Miami is the example the story offers, but it's not alone.

Indeed, this points to the whole problem with mass immigration that brings in too many people too fast. When immigrants can have their own languages — and their customs and values — reinforced by large numbers of people like themselves from the same places, they don't need to assimilate. Instead, they form their own communities and enclaves, and the surrounding society has to assimilate to them.

Add to that the general weakening of the social disciplines in American culture over the last 30 years, and what you have is not the assimilation of immigrants but what may be the impending disintegration of the