

even for expensive, long-term treatments like kidney dialysis. Dialysis is virtually unobtainable in many Central American countries, so patients are especially eager to come to California.

Los Angeles County is slowly waking up to how expensive it is to play host to millions of illegals. The county alone spent \$276 million on services for illegals in 1991 and the federal government kicked in another \$140

California has only 1.2 taxpayers for every recipient of tax dollars. By 1999 there may be only 0.8.

million. Part of the expense is for criminal processing. Four hundred illegal aliens enter the California prison system every month. Illegals commit over half the murders in Orange County and one third of the rapes and murders in San Diego County.

The economic structure that supports this massive system of services and give-aways is breaking down. In 1990, there were 6.21 California taxpayers for every welfare recipient. In ten years, the ratio was projected to be fewer than *three to one*. Part of the reason for this change is that in 1992 and 1993, hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants who were granted amnesty under the 1986 immigration law became or were to become eligible for welfare payments. As part of their amnesty applications they were obliged to show that they were not public charges, but now that the

processing period is over they are free to go back on the dole.

Welfare is only part of the burden that taxpayers must shoulder. The broader dependent population of California includes prisoners, non-working students, retired people, and consumers of state-funded medical care. Currently, California has only 1.2 taxpayers for every recipient of tax dollars. By the end of the 1990s, there are likely to be only 0.8 taxpayers for every recipient.

All this puts terrible pressure on the state's finances. While the charity budget climbs, the traditional functions of government wither. Although travel on California's highways has more than doubled since 1970, the number of miles of highway lanes has gone up only 15 percent. In the 1950s and 1960s, before "social" programs tore such a large hole in state spending, 20 cents out of every state dollar was spent on capital projects like roads and canals. By the 1980s, it was only five cents, and most of that money was borrowed. Now, in a state-by-state ranking of spending per person on highways, California is dead last. The once-fabled California freeways are a clogged morass of frustration and ill-temper.

By 1992, the state had an \$11 billion deficit, and in July, Moody's downgraded its bonds. This added \$113 million to the year's interest expenses. For part of the summer, while the legislature was trying to pass a budget, California ran out of money and started paying its employees in IOUs. The state was ready to consider

nearly any proposal to save money, as long as it was not a "racist" measure that would deny benefits to illegals. It very nearly decided to raise the age at which children would be admitted to kindergarten, which would have saved \$325 million.

California will soon go broke if it



continues its prodigal policies of give-aways to all comers, and Governor Pete Wilson was once actually brave enough to suggest that immigration is part of the problem. This idea was hooted down by Hispanic groups and liberal editorialists, and in any case, immigration is a federal matter over which no single state has control. Even if immigration were to stop tomorrow, the state has become a volatile ethnic mix that could ignite at any time.

The concluding part of this article examines growing racial tensions in California and describes the solution that increasing numbers of whites have found.

The Critics Find Much to Criticize

P*aved With Good Intentions*, the bare-knuckles account of race relations by the editor of *American Renaissance*, has slowly been gaining critical attention. Some reviewers have clearly been baffled by the book—impressed by its careful research and relentless logic but unwilling to accept its conclusions.

For example, the *Wall Street Journal* (Nov. 30, 1992) called the book "easily the most comprehensive indictment of the race-conscious civil rights policies of the past three

decades." It then went on to complain that it "too easily dismisses the continuing impact of racism, which most blacks face every day of their lives," and concluded that the book will do very little to "improve understanding."

The *Forward* (Dec. 4, 1992), the national Jewish newspaper based in New York, appeared to be even more confused. On the one hand, it wrote that the book's "straight talk suggests hope of an exhilarating breakthrough: a chance to move on finally toward a

Paved
The Failure of Race Relations
With
in Contemporary America
Good
by Jared Taylor
Intentions

more accurate diagnosis." The paper also called the book a "deep and powerfully damning indictment of the way that most Americans have come to think about race."

Despite all this, the *Forward* concluded that "it's hard to imagine that it will spur much rethinking," because of such flaws as its "smug tone and blatantly sloppy arguments." The reviewer offered no examples of either.

The *Baltimore Sun* (Nov. 23, 1992) had no mixed feelings about the book at all; it hated it. This is how its

"The most scurrilous work about blacks since Thomas Dixon's 'The Clansman'."

reviewer paraphrased the book's thesis: "American race relations have gone to hell in a hand basket, and it's all the fault of those horrible, horrible Negroes." He accused the book of "indulging in racist statements" and "Dixie-bashing," and called it "the most scurrilous work about American blacks since Thomas Dixon's *The Clansman* was published in 1905."

A black reviewer for the *Detroit Free Press* (Nov. 8, 1992) called the book a "mean-spirited tirade" and warns that its "relentlessly bitter tone . . . serves as a warning of troubles ahead" because so many whites are likely to agree with it. The *Free Press* did not dismiss it out of hand, however. It went on to say, "Some might denounce Taylor as a bigot—perhaps even a genocidal one—but it's not that simple. For all the spite and anger in his arguments, there's an uncomfortably large portion of truth."

The *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette* (Oct. 18, 1992) published what has been the most unemotionally factual review so far. It describes the book's central arguments and discreetly applauds what it sees as an effort to open an honest discussion of racial questions. One Arkansas man read the review, bought the book, and then ordered 50 more copies.

So far, only one reviewer has really understood what the book sets out to do. Writing in the Jan. 18, 1993 issue of *National Review*, Peter Brimelow says this: "The single greatest strength of Jared Taylor's *Paved With Good Intentions* is its massive and merciless crushing of this type of hysterical denial [of the facts], which currently paralyzes all discussion of race relations in America. Considered entirely by itself, this achievement makes his book the most important to be published on the subject for many years." Mr. Brimelow also recounts the central arguments of the book and even includes a frank account of the horrors of anti-white crime committed by blacks. This is the only review so far that has been more than tepid—and it is openly enthusiastic.

William F. Buckley has not yet bothered to read the book, but he cribbed from *National Review* to write a recent column. Mr. Buckley called the book's thesis "bizarre," but then went on to repeat, word for word, some of the arguments that the *National Review* article found most convincing. Perhaps Mr. Buckley meant "startling" rather than "bizarre."

Samuel Francis, who also mentioned the book in his syndicated column, has obviously read it. He called *Paved With Good Intentions* "a

shattering new book," and quoted from it at some length on anti-white crimes and on the decline in white racial consciousness that accounts for the media silence about such crimes.

In some respects, it is a small miracle for so heterodox a book to have been published and to get any critical notice at all. Of course, the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Boston Globe*, *Chicago Tribune*, *San Francisco Chronicle* and virtually every other paper have ignored it. The *New York Times Book Review*, which is probably the single

"The most important book to be published on the subject for many years."

most influential books publication in the country, has also ignored it. Presumably, these papers think the silent treatment is the most effective weapon against dangerous ideas.

Talk radio, which reflects the views of Americans far more closely than either television or newspapers, has been more receptive. A blizzard of talk shows—sometimes as many as six in one day—has informed listeners in some parts of the country about the book. Television, however, has kept at a safe distance.

A very gratifying number of *AR* readers have bought the book directly from us, and many have sent complimentary letters in return.

Autographed copies of *Paved With Good Intentions* are still available, postage paid, for \$19.95, which is three dollars less than the retail price.

Life Along the Fault Line

Elijah Anderson, *Street Wise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*, University of Chicago Press, 1990, 279 pp., \$11.95 (paperback).

An unblinking look at racial friction in an American city.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

Despite the official lip service that Americans pay to racial integration,

most whites live far away from underclass blacks and are glad they do. However, in a multi-racial society, some whites will, inevitably live along the racial fault lines. Even middle-class whites sometimes live close to the ghetto and share parks and sidewalks

with underclass blacks. How does this change the texture of life?

Street Wise, a fascinating account of just how powerfully race affects life in the city, is the result of more than ten years of careful observation of how the races deal with each other. The