

WELCOMING REMARKS

FOR OUR CHILDREN'S CHILDREN

WILLIAM H. REGNERY, II

The following is the text of opening remarks to a small gathering of conservatives at the St. Petes Beach Conference held from December 10-12, 1999.

In 1950 an ex-communist turned anarcho-libertarian named Frank Choderov wrote an essay titled "For Our Children's Children." Using the Intercollegiate Society of Socialists as his model Choderov proposed establishing a right wing counterpart. The ISS was founded in the early part of the century by Fabian socialists Sidney and Beatrice Webb in England and sought to infect the best university students with collectivist notions. By the half-century mark its successes were legion. Choderov's vision was fleshed out as the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists and launched in 1953.

ISI, albeit with a different name, survives today as a robust if little known organization which operates on the paleocon side of the establishment Right. It considers its mission more cultural than economic, is informed in manners by Kirk rather than Kristol, and in economics looks to Roepke rather than Friedman. Regrettably, after its first fifty years ISI cannot claim the same results as its collectivist antecedent. But this said, Choderov's goal expressed a sentiment for his cultural posterity that should both animate our deliberations and sketch a time line.

In antiquity a change of the magnitude that we're living through is summarized by James C. Russell in his book *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*. He maintains that the Peloponnesian Wars and then the conquests of Alexander "appear to have irreversibly disrupted the harmonious ethos of the Classical world and destabilized the entire Mediterranean region." Russell lays out the following chain of events:

From whatever point of view Alexander's campaigns are judged...their consequences were profound and irrevocable. After Alexander the historical profile of the world was radically changed...[while his] empire was basically the old Persian Empire plus Greece...the demographic center...lay in Asia [but] its driving force was clearly European and its conscious aim was to promote the Greek way of life. The number of Greek settlers was, in absolute terms insignificant...but as agents for the spread of Hellenism they proved sufficient. [But] despite [these] intentions the ultimate result was not cultural conformity but... cultural confusion, and the loss of cultural identity by native and immigrant alike...native Greek culture was gradually transformed and "de-Hellenized."¹

A nation absorbs what it conquers and a culture becomes what it colonizes.

The two world wars interleaved by worldwide economic chaos are eerily analogous to the internecine carnage of the Peloponnesian conflicts.

While any number of commentators have fixed the epicenter of the damage to the first half of the Terrible Twentieth B. G. Brander does as good a job at any sketching the destruction in his book *Staring into Chaos*:

The shock of the cataclysmic conflict to Western culture was devastating... Never had a single war desolated a civilization so severely... Values and virtues built and nurtured over centuries were questioned, challenged and overthrown... the morale of the West had suffered irreparable damage.... The Roaring Twenties collapsed [and] a century of economic growth was thrown into reverse and no sooner was the Great Depression lifting than Europe teetered on the brink of World War II... At the war's end... much of Europe lay in ruins... [and] people of the West felt less certain than ever about their progress.... All around the world doubts were raised about the civilization's claim to moral leadership... great empires crumbled.... Europe had lost the ability to govern... And Western society's once-supreme confidence in progress without end was sinking into a mire of doubt and confusion. ²

And into this void from an estranged intelligensia rose a shadow elite that recognized that "control over the means of communication" rather than "ownership of the means of production" was key to controlling a society. This elite is an adversarial one that in the words of Unibomber victim David Gelernter "loathes the nation it rules." ³ And while he means the United States, the geography increasingly covers the Anglo-Saxon countries and to a lesser extent continental Europe.

The invention of the global corporation since World War II provided the elite with an ideal economic Mixmaster that obliterates racial, cultural and economic distinctions much as Alexander's forces did 2,500 years before.

Listen to Jurgen Schrempp, born in Germany but now citizen of the world. In an interview published in *Forbes* of January 11, 1999, this CEO of Daimler Chrysler noted:

just as we businessmen have had a dialogue with politicians on a national basis, we need now a dialogue with politicians on an international basis. First of all we have to do this on a transatlantic basis. Once we get this right, then we can do it on a global basis. At the end of the day we will have a transatlantic union—and then let's take it further, eventually building a world union. No barriers anymore. International companies. Internationally accepted corporate governance. Access to all markets, with management coming from all parts of the world. Daimler Chrysler can be a catalyst in moving in that direction. ⁴

And of course the most efficient business environment would be a one-world nation, one government that would incorporate what are now local, state and federal jurisdictions, one language, one currency, and one set of standards.

A final consolidation would be a racial amalgamation that Michael Lind of *Harper's Magazine* [writing in *The New York Times Magazine*] celebrates:

Senator Theodore G. Bilbo of Mississippi... like other racists of his era believed that the inevitable result of dismantling segregation would be the amalgamation of races through intermarriage. He was right since the U. S. Supreme Court... struck down the last anti-miscegenation laws... marriage across racial lines has grown at a remarkable rate.⁵

Animal spirits, too, play a role in corporate globalism. Capitalism might be called war by another means and the military arrangement of the organization and martial language that is often employed speak to this point. Robert E. Lee observed that “it is well that war is so terrible or we should get too fond of it.” In the modern business setting these successors to Alaric can range the whole world over and hardly raise a sweat.

As the shock troops of the internationalists, the global corporation is encouraged and aided by a domestic support team that includes: the media, both major political parties, the professional class, the establishment Protestant denominations, the civil service, and the academy. Even the military is throwing its lot in with this crowd as General Wesley Clark, late Supreme Allied Commander of the heroic Balkan campaign, indicated when he remarked:

There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That’s a 19th Century idea, and we are trying to transition into the 21st Century, and we are going to do it with multi-ethnic states.⁶

As the general’s comment suggests, the motivation of the elites is inspired more by ideology than economics or adventure. However, while different, these goals are complementary and their parallel progression should not lead to the kind, mutual antagonism that occurred in an earlier age between the landed aristocracy and the rising commercial class. There is no chink in the facade of self-interest that invites a wedge. And, generation by generation, our kind will be winnowed out. One of the few accurate comments issuing from the Clinton White House was Hillary Clinton’s remark that “it takes a village to raise a child” and our off spring are being reared by the global village.

The West was grievously wounded by the genetic and psychic consequences of forty years of torment—two back-to-back world civil wars which were hinged by economic strife. *In extremis* we turned to a rogue culture that now in the person of the president of the United States, William J. Clinton, celebrates the end of European dominated United States. And the corporatists take their cue from these new Mandarins.

Our science and technology have swept the world and, like the Greeks before us, the pupils deem the teacher redundant and an embarrassing reminder of their debtor status. And, in apparent sympathy with this universal opprobrium, Europeans—who make up only 10 percent of the world’s population—ratchet down their numbers by contributing only 5 percent to the birth rate. Finally, as if to hasten our demise, national borders are thrown open and aliens are encouraged to colonize ancient kingdoms. *The Wall Street Journal* of November 5, 1999 put an economic spin on diversity, in the lead editorial calling for “...a more expansive immigration policy, one that doesn’t limit the inflow of Indian graduates in computer science.” The prickly Tom Fleming declared in a 1999 *Chronicles* column, “White folks of America, know this: your world is gone.”⁷

The communist experiment in Russia and China pressed psyche and flesh into a Marxist mold that was to produce a “new economic man.” But like scrap parts from a machine out of control the only result was millions upon millions of broken bodies. The globalists’ vision of a “new social man” will not change the world of the “sun peoples” but it will scrub the people they “loathe” from the planet. The Soviets had no trouble sacrificing the bourgeoisie to their vision, and our present masters have just upped the ante to include an entire race.

I am going into my sixtieth year and have reluctantly come to the conclusion that reshuffling the deck will not improve our chances for winning. We need to start a new game but realize that, as Jefferson said, “the generation which commences a revolution rarely completes it.”

Put this notion into historical perspective and it’s hardly unique. If we were living five hundred years ago and speaking English, we’d be planning a Calvinist settlement in the New World. Or even as late as the mid nineteenth century we could have set our sights on New Zealand. So while this objective might be less than novel there are no more open lands. Thus what we seek is *sovereign redistribution*. Here, some recent examples of peaceful separation: Slovenia, Montenegro, the Baltic states, Belarus, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bylorussia and Ukraine. Most were created with little or no bloodshed and have become viable nation-states.

It’s an understandable conceit that politicians have for their handiwork to insist that countries are immutable. But consider Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s 1993 observation that, “There are just eight states which both existed in 1914 and have not had their form of government changed by violence since.” And the notion of the dismemberment of super states owes its contemporary articulation to none other than George Kennan, the author of the “containment policy” that did so much to thrust the US into world affairs. In his book *Around the Cragged Hill* Kennan proposed breaking up the US and other “monster countries” such as Brazil, China, and India. But before we hoist him on our shoulders, we should remember that he specifically disavows drawing borders on “ethnic or racial distinctions.” This said, Kennan broke ranks with the establishment and gave a patina of respectability to the ultimate form of devolution. Another and more tangible expression of this possibility surfaced in the pages of *Commentary*. In the November 1999 issue Ron Unz, former primary opponent of California Governor Pete Wilson, forecast:

as Americans of European ancestry fall increasingly into minority status during the first half of the new century...two alternate futures present themselves-which might be labeled the new American melting pot and the coming of white nationalism.... America’s continued viability as a nation may well depend upon which of these paths we choose.⁸

And in contemporary America there is anecdotal evidence that not all is right in the Emerald City. America Online conducted a poll on Southern Nationalism in May 1997. America Online encouraged its subscribers to answer the following question: If representatives from southern states did propose secession to Congress, what do you think Congress should do? 21% “let them go,” 11% answered “not sure” and 68% “de-

feat the measure.” My definition of “radical federalism” has a way to go but it has the support or neutrality of 30% of a slice of arguably well educated computer types. In 1997 *The New York Times* reported:

In a smaller-scale rerun of an exodus from the central cities to the suburbs a generation ago, many whites are leaving the metropolitan areas...for more far flung areas in states like Colorado, Utah, Missouri, Idaho, Kansas, Texas, Montana and Nevada.⁹

In a column in *Southern Partisan* Joe Sobran concludes:

If peaceful secession were a live option, many Americans would favor it today. But for now, the question is effectively closed.¹⁰

And on both counts I would add it should be our mission to increase those who favor a reconfigured continent and to pry open the question of self-determination to popular will.

From an economic view, small countries work. *The Wall Street Journal* comments, “Economists say it is increasingly clear that no nation is too small to prosper.”¹¹

Estonia, Iceland, Singapore, Malta, and Slovenia are a few examples of viable micro nation-states none of which has more than three million people or occupies more land than greater Los Angeles.

But George Kennan sees great difficulty in reconfiguring the United States.

It is indeed hard to imagine any such changes (national breakups), bound as they would be to tread painfully on a great many entrenched political interests, having their origin, or even finding any response, in the present American political establishment.¹²

Yes and yes, but then history does not necessarily move in a straight line nor is it determined by a preordained dialectic. The very fissures that we find troublesome work against the power of those who created them. I do not think that the “new social man” has been perfected or will be. Human beings will always tend to divide along racial, cultural, and social lines. So if we would like our own bit of turf to call a national home, why not the Mexican and Central Americans? The native Hawaiians are calling for a return to sovereign status of an island or two. In the last referendum the Quebecois lacked only a few votes to claim their independence. The deplorable state of the American Indian homelands under federal jurisdiction speaks to the need for a new arrangement. There is a loud and active movement to change Puerto Rico’s status from U. S. commonwealth to free state. Blacks once asked for forty acres and a mule—would they be happy with their own country and Israel’s generous foreign aid allotment? How about an Orthodox Jewish homeland? And once beyond these groupings of consanguinity there are powerful economic and religious interests. For instance the Massachusetts Bay Colony might be reconstituted and repopulated with devout Christians who want to live in a state that will not interfere with the public observance of their religion and will not tolerate abortions. Or how about resurrecting New Harmony, filled with committed pacifists and socialists?

I am for the United States ceding territory to prime number states drawn from the existing North American population that are indivisible by reason of race, religion, or mutual interests and want to form a more perfect union than that in which they now live. These sovereign entities at their discretion could form a confederacy of equals to facilitate trade and secure their borders. And to this end there is no better checklist around which to develop a game plan than that suggested by one of the animators of the Czech Republic, Vaclav Klaus:

1. "Reformers must have a clear vision of their goal."
2. "Reformers must have a pragmatic strategy to achieve their goal."
3. "Reformers must engage in a 'permanent campaign' to persuade and mobilize the public to support change."¹³

In closing I charge the participants of this conference with the sacred task of beginning to secure for our children's children a proper home.

ENDNOTES

1. James Russell, *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
2. Bruce G. Brander, *Staring Into Chaos: Explorations in the Decline of Western Civilization*, Dallas: Spence Publishing, 1998.
3. David Gelernter, "How the Intellectuals Took Over (And What to Do About It)," *Commentary*, March 1997, p. 33.
4. *Forbes*, January 11, 1999.
5. Michael Lind, *New York Times Magazine*, "The Beige And The Black," August 16, 1998, p. 38.
6. *Sam Francis Newsletter*, July 1999.
7. *Chronicles*, December 1999.
8. Ron Unz, "California and the End of White America," *Commentary*, November 1999, p. 17.
9. *New York Times*, "Many Whites Leave Suburbs for Rural Areas," October 19, 1997.
10. *Southern Partisan*, 1st quarter 1996.
11. *Wall Street Journal*, February 25, 1999.
12. George F. Kennan, *Around the Cragged Hill*, W. W. Norton, 1993, p. 151.
13. Quoted in *Wall Street Journal* op-ed article.

RIVERS OF BLOOD

ENOCH POWELL

This article reproduces the full text of Enoch Powell's famous speech to the Annual General Meeting of the West Midlands Area Conservative Political Centre, Birmingham, England, April 20, 1968. Spelling and punctuation are as in the original.

The supreme function of statesmanship is to provide against preventable evils. In seeking to do so, it encounters obstacles which are deeply rooted in human nature. One is that by the very order of things such evils are not demonstrable until they have occurred: At each stage in their onset there is room for doubt and for dispute whether they be real or imaginary. By the same token, they attract little attention in comparison with current troubles, which are both indisputable and pressing: whence the besetting temptation of all politics to concern itself with the immediate present at the expense of the future. Above all, people are disposed to mistake predicting troubles for causing troubles and even for desiring troubles: 'if only', they love to think, 'if only people wouldn't talk about it, it probably wouldn't happen'. Perhaps this habit goes back to the primitive belief that the word and the thing, the name and the object, are identical. At all events, the discussion of future grave but, with effort now, avoidable evils is the most unpopular and at the same time the most necessary occupation for the politician. Those who knowingly shirk it, deserve, and not infrequently receive, the curses of those who come after.

A week or two ago I fell into conversation with a constituent, a middle-aged, quite ordinary working man employed in one of our nationalized industries. After a sentence or two about the weather, he suddenly said: 'If I had the money to go, I wouldn't stay in this country.' I made some deprecatory reply, to the effect that even this Government wouldn't last for ever; but he took no notice, and continued: 'I have three children, all of them have been through grammar school and two of them married now, with family. I shan't be satisfied till I have seen them settled overseas. In this country in fifteen or twenty years' time the black man will have the whip hand over the white man.'

I can already hear the chorus of execration. How dare I say such a horrible thing? How dare I stir up trouble and inflame feelings by repeating such a conversation? The answer is that I do not have the right not to do so. Here is a decent, ordinary fellow Englishman, who in broad daylight in my own town says to me, his Member of Parliament, that this country will not be worth living in for his children. I simply do not have the right to shrug my shoulders and think about something else. What he is saying, thousands and hundreds of thousands are saying and thinking—not throughout Great Britain, perhaps, but in the areas that are already undergoing the total transformation to which there is no parallel in a thousand years of English history.