

Philadelphia in 1817, free blacks publicly declared their opposition to resettlement. It was better to stay in "racist" America than return to the land of their ancestors.

The War Between the States essentially brought colonization to a close. The sectional quarrel split the society and some state chapters started independent repatriation efforts as the organization continued to have problems with funding. Although post-war emancipation created a huge supply of free, potential emigrants, the trauma of war had disrupted the society's operations.

Though never a member of the society, Lincoln was a strong proponent of colonization, and during the war had appointed a minister to inves-

tigate sites in Central and South America that would be nearby, inexpensive destinations for colonization. As the war drew to an end he became increasingly worried about the problem of what to do with freed blacks, and even considered setting aside Texas for forcible resettlement. Had he not been assassinated, there is little doubt that he would have worked energetically for a separatist solution to the Negro problem.

Although the ACS survived the war, the days of colonization were over. The society continued its work until 1912, though by then this consisted mostly of support for Liberia, which had declared independence in 1847. The society acted as caretaker for the fledgling nation and encouraged mis-

sionary work among the natives. In 1959 it received what is described as a "small legacy," but by then the organization was defunct.

Ultimately the American Colonization Society failed to free the United States from "a troublesome presence." William Lloyd Garrison got his wish for a multiracial America. The men of the ACS had warned against trying to make a nation out of two incompatible and hostile groups and predicted that blacks would be a terrible burden on white America. Of course, they were right. Had he been able to see the future, perhaps even a fanatic like Garrison would have remained a supporter of colonization. ●

## South Africa Under Black Rule (Part II)

### Prospects for the future—there may yet be surprises.

by Gedhalia Braun

*In the previous issue, Mr. Braun described how South Africa—particularly those areas that had previously been all-white—has changed under majority rule. He concludes with an assessment of how South Africans feel about the current regime.*

One of the few relatively bright spots in South Africa is the white-run press. It has retained most of the independence and freedom it enjoyed under apartheid. When I first arrived here I was surprised to find the press full of indignation directed against the white government. "This is oppression?" I thought to myself.

The most prominent critic of the old regime was probably *The Weekly Mail*. Left wing and very ideological, it left no stone unturned in attacking apartheid and white rule. Now that it has achieved its aim, it doesn't much like what it got but, to its credit, has been uncovering corruption on a stupendous scale. Such publications must be having some kind of restraining effect on the government, though only time will tell how long they will be tolerated. Interestingly—and as an indication of the status whites have

retained—black journalists who report on corruption are severely rebuked by the authorities, who accuse them of being whites' lackeys, etc.

A second bright spot, also a hold-over from the previous regime, is the still mostly-white judiciary, which retains an independence that is vir-

---

### Africa is full of countries where the people starve and the leaders drive Mercedes.

---

tually unheard of in black Africa. Gradual replacement by more compliant black judges—who won't understand that a court *can* go against the government—will eventually end this check on government power.

Perhaps the single most important constraint on the ANC government so far has been the influence of international corporations. Nelson Mandela has been told, in no uncertain terms, that if he wants foreign investment he had better forget about nationalization, keep government spending down, control labor unions' wage demands etc., all of which are contrary to the ANC's natural tendencies, which are to see government as an infinite trough from which all can feed. The government is the natural

ideological ally of the socialist- and communist-led Confederation of South African Trade Unions (Cosatu). Cosatu has already pressured it into accepting a labor bill highly favorable to workers and unfavorable to employers, as well as affirmative action laws that virtually force businesses to increase black employment at all levels.

In this ideological tug-of-war between labor interests and overseas investors, there seems little doubt that the wrong side will eventually win, though this probably spells doom for the South African economy. Should that not influence President Mandela and his chosen successor, Thabo Mbeki? Unfortunately, it will not. The country and its black majority may become dirt poor, but high-ranking government officials are unlikely to suffer. Africa is full of countries where the people starve and the leaders drive Mercedes.

### White Attitudes

There is unquestionably great uneasiness among whites. Many are leaving and many more are thinking of leaving. Accurate figures are difficult to come by because many whites simply go on a "visit" and never return, but the number who would leave if they could must be considerable, especially

among those with school-age children. Black rule plus draconian affirmative action makes many whites feel there is no future for them.

At the same time, there is no doubt that whites will continue to dominate the economy for the foreseeable future. The case of Zimbabwe is instructive: In spite of a much smaller white population and a militant black government constantly threatening white interests, there is a never-ending chorus of complaints to do something about "white control" of the economy, 18 years after "independence"!

One also hears more and more about black disaffection. I know a young "street-wise" black woman who always seems to know the "township scuttlebutt." Around the time of the 1994 elections, she was spouting the usual rhetoric: Whites had stolen their country and now they were going to get it back. Four short years later, with none of the grandiose promises fulfilled, her tune has changed: "Oh, it's these foreigners who are causing all the problems!" Who are these foreigners? Black immigrants from neighboring countries. They are the cause of all the crime, are taking all the jobs away from South African blacks. And so on. The solution? "When the [white] National Party comes back into power they will throw all these foreigners out!"

My own view is that South Africa will gradually sink towards the level of the rest of the continent, though it is unlikely to reach the same depths, given a continuing white presence. Black disaffection with black rule is to be expected as is the case throughout black Africa.

But South Africa, due to liberal ideological influence, is a bit like America, where blacks systematically vote for blacks no matter what. South Africa stuck to this mold when it elected an ANC government in 1994 by a nearly two-thirds majority. I once thought that disappointment with black rule might lead to a black backlash by the 1999 national elections, but I have been largely disabused of that idea. If blacks had the sense to vote against the current government they would not have elected it in the first place.

Nevertheless, as I say, I hear repeated stories about blacks lamenting present conditions. A Romanian

woman who supervises 60 black workers says that all she hears is how bad the government is, how much better the white government was, etc. So one cannot completely rule out increasing numbers of blacks voting for whites, in spite of the numerous factors militating against this. After all, the colored (mixed race) majority in Western Cape Province has twice elected a white provincial government, which is an example of non-white voting for whites.

One thing that counts against this exercise in common sense is black superstitiousness—they readily believe that others can "see" who they are voting for inside the booth—which makes them easy to intimidate. My "scuttlebutt" informant recently confirmed, unprompted and with eyewitness testimony, what I had heard during the 1994 elections: that blacks were constantly threatened that if they didn't vote ANC their houses would be burned down, etc., implying that "someone" would know—by magic—how they voted. Add to this the typical black awe of authority and you get manipulability.

The almost limitless credulity of blacks means that many will be suckered into believing that a black government will make them rich—that they will own the houses, factories and farms of their employers. This is associated with the common black failure to understand the nature of wealth creation: To them it is just sitting there waiting to be taken, not something that requires sacrifice, hard work, discipline and foresight. All of this explains why blacks vote for blacks.

Yet in the past four years they have seen that dreams of sudden wealth were chimeras. More important, the



vast majority don't understand how an election works. It would therefore not be surprising if, with the awareness

that miracles did not occur the last time, masses of blacks simply lose all interest in the electoral process and do not vote at all, thus proportionately increasing the power of the white electorate.

The 1994 election was widely hailed as a "miracle" simply because it took place, though views differed as to just what was miraculous about it. Outside the country, self-righteous commentators seemed to think natural laws must have been suspended in order for the wicked white regime to hand over power to blacks—but this process had been set in motion years before, and would have been nearly impossible to turn back. Within South Africa, the "miracle" was that there had not been riots or even full-scale civil war between Zulus and the largely-Xhosa ANC. But blacks had no reason to riot; they were getting everything they wanted. In any case, the election was covered by nearly every media organization in the world, and even unsophisticated blacks had some notion that something important was going on. For the 1999 elections, there will be nothing like the media hype there was for the last one, and this too should reduce the black turnout, giving whites more influence.

On the other hand, white political parties cannot campaign in the townships. All attempts so far to hold public rallies have been disrupted. I suspect the reason for this is that the ANC elite at some level shares my view that if ordinary South African blacks are left to their own devices—and to the extent that they are free from Western ideological influence (as I believe many are)—a large number would indeed vote for whites. One way to prevent this is not to let white politicians anywhere near them. A similar fear most likely explains why President Daniel Arap Moi of Kenya prevented the registration of the Sarafina party, headed by the formidable figure of Richard Leakey (of the famous family of anthropologists), who otherwise might have won an embarrassingly large number of votes.

South Africa has sophisticated opinion polling techniques. If the ANC were going to lose an election it would be known in advance. What would a black government do? Not a single person I've asked, black or white, has ever differed in his answer:

The ANC would cancel the election and declare some kind of one-party/military government. In that case, South Africa's decline could be sudden rather than gradual.

I have independent confirmation of my view that when blacks are not encumbered by Western liberal-egalitarian dogma they are happy to vote for whites. Blacks are a large majority of the Brazilian state of Bahia, but they consistently elect white governments. Therefore, I would not totally rule out blacks here doing the same if they had the chance. Whether the ideological brainwashing—which is by no means as widespread in South Africa as in the U.S.—can be overcome is an open question, but it seems to me that the

"loyalty" on which ANC rule is based is a house of cards. Given the extremely volatile and unstable African temperament, the possible outcomes are not nearly as predictable as many are likely to assume.

South Africa should, of course, be a lesson for America. Both countries are making the same mistake, which is to assume that there is no such thing as racial differences. It is this mistaken assumption that prevents recognition of the fundamental paradox of black-white relations. Blacks want to live in white neighborhoods, go to white schools and hospitals *because they are white*. Yet these objects of their desire will remain desirable and superior only as long as they remain white. A few blacks can live in a white neighbor-

hood or go to a white school without seriously affecting it, but as soon as their numbers approach predominance, the very things that made the blacks want to go there cease to exist and blacks find themselves in the very situation they sought to flee: black slums, broken-down black schools, hell-hole hospitals, etc.

Blacks can enter into these white structures only if their numbers are controlled; but that is impossible so long as everyone assumes that the very idea of fundamental racial differences is somehow shameful and morally abhorrent. To bring about any real racial progress this assumption must be irrefutably—and, most of all, publicly—shown to be the profound and pernicious fallacy that it is. ●

## Closed Minds are an Open Book

Roberto Suro, *Strangers Among Us: How Latino Immigration is Transforming America*, Alfred A. Knopf, 1998, 349 pp., \$26.95.

### Good data, wrong conclusion.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

**T**his book's premise is all in the subtitle: Hispanic immigration is transforming the United States. But unlike the countless books and articles that would have us celebrate transformation, *Strangers Among Us* sounds the alarm. Hispanic immigration is causing *big problems* and they are getting worse:

"[T]he outcome [of how we handle these new immigrants] will determine whether the nation's cities work or whether they burn."

"Latino immigration could become a powerful demographic engine of social fragmentation, discord, and even violence."

Because of the surging number of Hispanics, "the size of America's underclass will quickly double and in the course of a generation it will double again."

"The choice [of making immigration a success] is still possible, but the opportunity is rapidly disappearing."

So, do we have here another Peter Brimelow-style argument for restriction? Well, no. Roberto Suro, a half Puerto Rican-half Ecuadorean

reporter for the *Washington Post* says that the crisis is proof we are *neglecting* the millions of Hispanics now pouring into the United States. It is to spur us to ever-greater acts of liberalism that he describes the failures of Hispanic immigration and the dangers that loom ahead.



This is a risky game for a liberal to play. The very picture of Hispanic failure Mr. Suro paints in the name of better schools, more jobs, more effective assimilation, etc. is the very one a restrictionist would use to argue that Third World immigration should stop right now. This book, therefore, is built around a gaping logical flaw. It is a readable, honestly-drawn, some-

times agonized portrait of the major Hispanic immigrant groups in the United States, but not once does it consider the most obvious solution to the problem of Hispanic immigration: end it. It is like discovering that the house has a leaky roof, and then devising ingenious and complicated ways to channel the water around the furniture and away from the clothes closets. Why not just fix the roof?

Mr. Suro, like so many others, seems to think that Hispanic immigration is an unstoppable force of nature like an earthquake or hurricane. We can prepare for it and try to deal with its consequences but there is no hope of stopping it. Indeed, the last words of the book's first chapter, in which Mr. Suro introduces the problem, are "they will keep coming."

### Portraits of People

Most of the book is a report of what Mr. Suro has found while roaming, notebook in hand, among his fellow Hispanics. But he has also done some research, and keeps dropping interesting little facts into the narrative: During one 15-year period, half of the entire population of the town of San Cristobal, Guatemala, moved to Houston. The fertility of Hispanics is