

cepted by the Left.

What do today's neoconservatives actually stand for? They prate constantly about "permanent values," but Prof. Gottfried notes that this is largely a charade designed to give the appearance of a moral and philosophical pedigree. Their so-called values are mostly mush. Prof. Gottfried quotes neoconservative Jonah Goldberg as saying that what unites conservatives is a belief in "human rights" and "universal values." By this standard Trotsky and Ted Kennedy are "conservatives."

The "permanent value" with which neocons justify their foreign wars is "global democracy." They have decided that welfare-with-elections is the only acceptable way to run a country, and are prepared to kill people if that is what it takes to get them into voting booths. Prof. Gottfried notes that this neo-Wilsonian war-mongering is an essential aspect of neoconservative support for Israel.

"Values" are also a conveniently fluid way to give ground. Prof. Gottfried cites David Brooks of the *New York Times*, who explained that his support for homosexual marriage grew out of his conservative support for "family values"! Of course, the Left, too, whoops so much about "values" and its "moral compass" that the squabble over virtuousness has left many Americans politically dyslexic: A February 2005 poll found that one third of Hillary Clinton's supporters called themselves "conservative." The "values" game has so blurred political boundaries that neoconservatives get away with promoting a concept that would have left the Old Right gasping: "big-government conser-

vatism."

More insidiously, "values" detach "conservatism" from any association with



Somalis: Jonah Goldberg will turn them into 'conservatives.'

place, tribe, or nation. It doesn't matter if America is flooded with Hmong, Haitians, and Somali Bantus. Once Jonah Goldberg has taught them "human rights" and "universal values" they will be flawless conservatives.

Needless to say, if conservatism is to conserve anything, it must start with the biological and cultural patrimony of a people. When neoconservatives promote mass immigration from anywhere and everywhere—though with some signs of skepticism about Muslims—they are destroying the country as surely as are the worst liberals. It is partly to prove their indifference to race and peoplehood that neocons trumpet their support of Martin Luther King, whom they hold up as the champion of pure race unconsciousness and equal opportunity. Of course, King would almost certainly have whinnied with happiness if he had lived long enough to see race preferences.

Prof. Gottfried writes that it is possible to imagine a different and more authentic conservatism, one that never lost its hatred of big government or of overseas adventures—but that it is possible *only* to imagine it. This would be a Right that would be far more difficult for the regnant liberals to co-opt or refute, but Prof. Gottfried says such a Right shows no sign of emerging. What remains of the Old Right opposition to neoconservatism "is now battered and without friends in high places."

Prof. Gottfried has inhabited the Right for a long time and knows what he is talking about. And yet, there are signs of hope. Ron Paul's startling success as a fundraiser is proof that many people admire the one politician who actually reads the Constitution. The massive outrage that smashed the recent plan to grant amnesty to millions of illegal Mexicans shows how few people have swallowed neoconservative rubbish about America as a "universal nation."

There is still good sense deep in the bones of the people. That it is why it is increasingly only real conservatives who want to circumvent legislative sausage-making and submit as many questions as possible directly to voters. Traditionalists have always held government in deep suspicion (though they also worried about the people running off in wild directions if they had unchecked power). Today, thanks in no small part to the fakes who call themselves "conservatives," there is no question that the establishment threatens our nation and way of life far more than would the blunt instincts of ordinary Americans. **Ω**

Can Blacks be Our Allies?

They could—but won't—act in our interests, too.

by Ellison Lodge

Blacks have more to lose from Hispanic immigration than anyone else in America. They should be at the forefront of the immigration-control movement, but are not. What keeps them on the sidelines?

The *Los Angeles Times* recently wrote about Ted Hayes, a black who has tried to rally other blacks to fight illegal immigration (Teresa Watanabe, "Activist Fails to Rally Blacks on Illegal-Immigration Issue," *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 31, 2007). He has been a complete failure.

Mr. Hayes started out as a homeless advocate in Los Angeles, but when he showed some interest in stopping illegals, immigration-control activists eagerly adopted him. Minuteman groups

that feared being called racists helped Mr. Hayes start the Crispus Attucks Minuteman Brigade, and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) set him up with something called Choose Black America.

As the *Times* pointed out, even Mr. Hayes himself admits his work has been a bust. Not only has he failed to attract blacks, he has lost the support of many left-wing white allies.

I once met Mr. Hayes at a Minuteman

rally in Washington, D.C., in the summer of 2006—and was shocked by his appearance. He was in dreadlocks and a Rasta cap, and wore a chain with a large image of Africa attached to it. As it turned out, he nearly sank the rally single-handedly.

Like so many immigration-control gatherings, this one attracted the usual group of loud, unkempt, “anti-racist” protesters. All the Minutemen wisely stayed away from them, knowing any altercation would be blamed on them—that is to say, everyone but Mr. Hayes, who shoved a protester right in front of a news camera.

The only thing that prevented a PR disaster was Mr. Hayes’s outlandish appearance. Television commentator Lou Dobbs, who is a strong campaigner for immigration control, got hold of the film and showed it on his program, thinking Mr. Hayes was an open-borders activist. You can hardly blame Mr. Dobbs; anyone would have thought this aggressive, wild-looking character was a lefty.

What does this say about the role of blacks in the movement?

Opposition to mass immigration comes from across the political spectrum, and there are even some people from the Left who are on our side. However, the backbone of the movement is white Americans who do not want a culturally alien underclass taking over their neighborhoods and schools.

Many such white people see blacks as a greater threat than Hispanics. With a few exceptions, such as teenage pregnancy rates, on almost all indices of social failure, blacks are a bigger problem than Hispanics. Although they speak English, in some respects blacks are more culturally alien than Mexicans, and even the staunchest immigration-control activists have to admit that many Hispanics work hard. The current tidal wave of Hispanics is a serious threat to our way of life, but many whites see blacks as a bigger threat, especially in places that do not yet have large numbers of Hispanics.

That is why I think trying to join forces with the likes of Ted Hayes—who first came to prominence by setting up shanty towns for the homeless in the middle of Los Angeles—will alienate or at best confuse our natural following. It is a little like trying to work with the Bloods and Crips because they don’t like MS-13 and

the Latin Kings.

Mr. Hayes is not the only black who is opposed to illegal immigration, but not one has established a real following among other blacks. Nor have any whites. Both the Center for Immigration Studies



Ted Hayes: our natural ally?

(CIS) and Numbers USA—the two biggest anti-immigration groups along with FAIR—have bent over backwards to promote blacks. Both have placed advertisements in major newspapers on the harm immigration does to blacks, and CIS has sponsored congressional testimony and studies on the danger to blacks.

None of this has attracted blacks to the cause, nor has it won any credit with the Left. Shayla Nunnally, a black professor at the University of Connecticut, says black activists are being co-opted by groups “who may not have the African-American community’s best interests in mind.” She says it leads to “minorities fighting minorities,” while “fighting the overall oppression isn’t being addressed.” Like so many liberals, she thinks all non-whites must unite against the real oppressor: the white man.

This is the Southern Poverty Law Center’s line as well. It says black activists like Mr. Hayes are just “pawns in [the racists’] game.” It recently listed FAIR as a hate group.

Of course, blacks have every reason to be more opposed even than whites to illegal immigration. They compete directly with low-wage immigrants for welfare, jobs, and classroom space, and they are not the ones likely to save a buck by hiring Mexican day labor at \$7.00 an hour. Nor will Mexicans listen guiltily to tales of woe about slavery and Jim Crow. At the same time, blacks have no qualms about explicitly pushing their racial interests. They oppose anything they think is bad for blacks, and Mexican immigra-

tion is certainly bad for them.

However, nothing indicates blacks will contribute much to the anti-immigration movement, much less lead it. Blacks outpoll whites in support for school vouchers and in opposition to gay marriage and abortion, but this does not translate into a useful role in any of those movements either.

Immigration-control advocates never seem to get over the delusion that blacks will eventually rally to the cause. This is why, of all the Republican presidential candidates, Tom Tancredo was the only one who spoke to the NAACP. Blacks should be carrying Mr. Tancredo around on their shoulders, but they pay him no attention at all. The congress-

man’s support came almost exclusively from whites.

Smart conservatives learned long ago that blacks have essentially no political role outside of the narrow band of issues the liberal establishment sets aside for them, and that even there they are not very effective. Blacks have always blindly followed “leaders” who are aligned with the left wing of the Democratic Party. Those leaders want to increase Hispanic political power in order to entrench anti-white policies. Many have spent their entire careers blaming whites for anything and everything. This either blinds them to threats from anyone else, or makes them incapable of working with white allies even if they see a common threat. There are no black congressmen in the Immigration Reform Caucus—but there is a theoretical chance of getting one in November.

On January 3, Mr. Hayes announced he would challenge Los Angeles’s black congresswoman Maxine Waters. It will be interesting to see whether his immigration-control message appeals to black voters.

It would be logical—it would even be helpful—if ordinary blacks would turn on the demagogues, and do something in their own interests that was actually in ours as well. Don’t count on it. Massive outreach by Republicans and conservatives has had little success on any front, and I think it has long since passed the point of diminishing returns. **Ω**

Ellison Lodge works in immigration on Capitol Hill, and can be reached at ellisonlodge@gmail.com

O Tempora, O Mores!

Another Apology

On January 7, New Jersey followed Alabama, Maryland, North Carolina and Virginia in issuing an apology for slavery. The resolution of regret passed overwhelmingly in the assembly (59-8) and senate (29-2). A first for a Northern state, the resolution expresses “profound regret for the wrongs inflicted by slavery and its aftereffects in the United States of



America.” Among these supposed aftereffects are: “the overt racism of hate groups . . . the subtle racism encountered when requesting health care, transacting business, buying a home, seeking quality public education and college admission, and enduring pretextual traffic stops and other indignities.” New Jersey, according to the resolution, was particularly wicked because it had one of the largest slave populations in the North and, in 1846, was the last Northern state to abolish slavery. New Jersey also regrets that it did not ratify the Thirteenth Amendment until January 1866, a month after it had gone into effect.

The apology, like those issued by other states, includes no provisions for reparations. “This resolution does nothing more than say New Jersey is sorry about its shameful past,” says Assemblyman William Payne, a Democrat who sponsored the measure. [Tom Hester, Jr., *New Jersey Apologizes for Slavery*, AP, Jan. 7, 2008.]

Betrayal

In 2006, Congress passed the Secure Fence Act, which requires the federal government to build 854 miles of a

double-layer border fence on the US-Mexico border. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) under Secretary Michael Chertoff has never been enthusiastic about the fence and has built just a few miles of it. Thanks to Republican Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas, Mr. Chertoff may no longer need to worry about thwarting the will of the American people single-handedly. In December 2007, Sen. Hutchison attached an amendment to a \$555 billion Senate spending bill that explicitly leaves fence-building up to the discretion of the secretary of homeland security.

Critics say that if the House accepts the Senate’s amendment the fence is as good as dead. Steve Elliott, president of the conservative activist group Grassfire.org, says that “DHS would not be required to build fencing in any particular location—and the double-layer mandate is totally gone.” Chris Simcox, president of the Minutemen Civil Defense Corps, says, “Congress truly pulled the rug out from under us while we were doing our last-minute holiday shopping, deceiving the American people and only showing goodwill to the 12 million lawbreakers living among us.” [Joe Murray, *U.S. Senate Turns Back On Border Fence*, *Bulletin* (Philadelphia), Jan. 2, 2007.]

No Hate Crimes

On Tuesday, Dec. 4, 2007, Sarah Kreager, a 26-year-old white woman, got on a Baltimore city bus, along with her boyfriend, Troy Ennis. Several blacks were on the bus, and prevented the couple from sitting in various seats. They eventually found a seat in the back, but a group of young blacks began pestering them. Accounts of what happened next vary. Miss Kreager says a black teenaged girl told her to move. When she refused, the girl attacked her, and six boys and two more girls joined in. They kicked and punched her, shouted racial insults, and eventually dragged Miss Kreager off the bus. The blacks broke several bones in her face. They also beat her boyfriend, but not as badly.

One of the nine blacks arrested for the assault, 14-year-old Britny Carter, says Miss Kreager asked for the beating when she spat on a girl who was making fun of

her because she had a black eye. Miss Carter says none of the blacks who beat Miss Kreager used racial slurs, and that the victim’s race was irrelevant. Monalisa Carter, Britny’s mother, says, “It wasn’t a hate crime. That’s so untrue. I did not raise her that way. Britny is not a racial person. She has white friends, black friends; she gets along with everybody.”

Prosecutors evidently agree. Margaret T. Burns, a spokeswoman for the prosecutor’s office, says the blacks face charges of aggravated assault and malicious destruction of property, but that her office will file no hate crime charges. The Maryland Transit Administration Police Force, which judged Miss Kreager to be in danger and put her in the witness protection program, concluded that although racial insults were used, it was only a fight over a seat.

Less than a week after Miss Kreager’s assault, another gang of blacks attacked two white men, Patrick Green and Robert Rothe, as they got on a bus in south Baltimore. The blacks used racial slurs, but MTA police say it was just a “common assault.” [Kelly Brewington, Gus G. Sentementes and Michael Dresser, *Interviews Raise Questions About Race’s Role in Bus Attack*, *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 8, 2007. Sumathi Reddy, *Hate Crime Charges Rejected*, *Baltimore Sun*, Dec. 29, 2007. *Surveillance Photos Released In Bus Attack*, *WBAL-TV*, Dec. 13, 2007.]

Failing in Oz

One of former Australian Prime Minister John Howard’s last changes to immigration procedure before he was turned out of office in December 2007 was to establish a new citizenship test. Its 20 questions cover Australian history, values, and way of life, and require “competence” in English.

More than 10,000 would-be Australians have taken the test since it went into effect on October 1, and 2,311—about 20 percent—have failed. That’s too many for Australia’s non-white lobby. Stepan Kerkyasharian, president of something called the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Board, wants a test that is less Australian. “Let’s have a test that’s practical, that basically finds out whether