

young prostitutes. I don't know why that is. Maybe the girls here are more naïve and vulnerable. And from my experience, most of these girls are not the poor kids from the inner city. They are the kids—a few runaways—from good homes from the suburbs and rural communities." None of the police or media com-

mentators dared delve too deeply into the racial aspects of the case. Maybe Minnesota girls are more naïve and trusting than most, but there is more to it than that. Minnesota, the land of Hubert Humphrey, Walter Mondale, and Eugene McCarthy, has been one of the strongholds of modern liberalism, egalitarian-

ism, and multiculturalism—ideologies that fuel minority racism while promoting white guilt and undermining the confidence of many white children. Could this help explain why so many Minnesota girls have let black pimps force them into degradation? **Ω**

Mr. Rosit lives in Minnesota.

We Should Not Support Patrick Buchanan

Why I believe Michael Masters is mistaken.

by Shawn Mercer

In the December, 1999, issue Michael Masters writes that the Republican Party should make a frank appeal to white voters by strongly opposing immigration and affirmative action. He concludes that if the GOP fails to do this, racially conscious whites should support Patrick Buchanan, whose positions come closest to theirs. I believe Mr. Masters' analysis is incorrect, and given the high stakes in this year's elections his arguments should be reconsidered.

First, there is little evidence that strong stands against quotas and immigration are the silver bullets Mr. Masters makes them out to be. These ideas certainly have huge majority support in polling, and black businessman Ward Connerly's ballot initiatives continue to knock down state racial preferences programs as if they were dominoes. But these ideas don't seem to work as political tools for the Republicans.

For example, Mr. Connerly reports that California's Proposition 209, banning preferences, was nearly sunk when Robert Dole and the GOP injected themselves into the campaign. Throughout 1996, the initiative had enjoyed broad support, even drawing a *majority* of self-identified Democrats. But when the Dole campaign, trailing badly and desperate for a lift, tried to ride the measure's popularity by backing it, 209's support immediately fell. Poll analysis suggested that voters saw Mr. Dole's involvement as a cynical ploy, and support for the initiative began to divide along party lines. Mr. Connerly pleaded with the GOP to butt out of his campaign. The proposition passed, but the Republican drag reduced its originally overwhelm-

ing support to only 54 percent. And despite the success of the initiative, Mr. Dole—who had supported it—lost California in the presidential election by a whopping margin. What worked as a



Patrick Buchanan

voter initiative didn't seem to work as a campaign issue.

Opposition to immigration doesn't fare much better as a political strategy. Polls suggest that support for immigration restriction is broad but shallow. It is simply not something most non-border state voters get exercised about, especially in good economic times.

Moreover, a recent California poll showed that even with whites now in the minority, the now-dead Proposition 187, which would have cut off illegals from virtually all state benefits including public education, is still supported by roughly the same margin by which it passed in 1994. It even continues to enjoy considerable support from Hispanics and Asians. These groups support Democrats because they have come to view the GOP as not just backing commonsense restrictions on public benefits, but as being against *them*. The issue mobilizes nonwhites against the GOP but just doesn't move enough white voters to make up the difference.

It is true that Republican Governor Pete Wilson campaigned on the measure and was reelected comfortably but he was helped by the incompetence and militant tone of the campaign against 187, as well as by the national Republican tidal wave that year. Four years later, with California's white population declining even further, Republican Dan Lungren never stood a chance. Mr. Masters gets it wrong when he says the Lungren campaign's overtures to immigrants "cost the GOP the California governorship." The Republicans never had a chance—partly because of their anti-immigrant image.

Mr. Masters also argues that recent "Hispanic-friendly" gestures by the party leadership, like a vote on Puerto Rican statehood, yielded no returns. This is not true. Robert Dole got only 21 percent of the Hispanic vote in 1996, but Congressional Republicans took 37 percent in 1998—basically a return to normal levels. National Hispanic support for the GOP has always fluctuated between a quarter to a third and has never been as meager as Mr. Masters suggests. In fact, Hispanic support in Texas for George W. Bush hit 39 percent (the figure of 49 percent has been bandied about), while his brother Jeb in Florida won 60 percent. Whether we like it or not, Hispanics can be wooed without offending the white base.

The pattern seems clear: the two issues of greatest importance to AR readers are not yet effective political weapons. Their appeal doesn't transfer to politicians if people think they are being used to stir resentment for political gain rather than being addressed sincerely. And if it isn't a sensible strategy for a major party with an established base, it is folly for a minor third-party candidate.

If Patrick Buchanan "speaks for" white middle class and blue collar work-

ers as Mr. Masters says, someone should tell them. He doesn't poll very well with these groups, and the Teamsters, who should be his natural allies, recently decided not to endorse him. Since he has had two high-profile runs for President before, to say nothing of his exposure as a television pundit and syndicated columnist, it would be hard to argue that Americans aren't familiar with him.

Many see him as a little man whose fifteen minutes of fame are up but who refuses to leave the stage. He claims to have abandoned the GOP for reasons of "principle" but his new, black Marxist comrade Lenora Fulani arranges meetings for him with Al Sharpton! Are these the actions of someone who values principles over the pursuit of power?

It is tempting to look to the recent success of our philosophical counterparts in Europe and dream that the same thing might happen here. Put aside for a moment the question of whether Mr. Buchanan could actually lead such a movement. A closer look at the Austrian Freedom Party's and the Swiss People's Party's victories raises questions about what similar results would mean in the United States.

Final support for both parties was well below 30 percent, under a system of proportional representation that guarantees seats in the legislature. Even a national vote at this level—unlikely given the historically abysmal record of American third parties—would not necessarily net a Buchananite party a single seat in the House. Third party candidates would have to run district by district against the two major parties, and their

presence could siphon off enough conservative voters to reduce our imperfect allies, the GOP, to a laughable minority.

As bad as things are now, surely no AR reader wants the havoc Democrats could wreak: worse immigration laws, an emasculated border patrol, public schools turned into multicultural indoctrination centers, and pro-quota Supreme Court justices. The non-white strategy is to wait until there are no longer enough whites to mount a real opposition and then fight over the spoils once

It may take a Hispanic-friendly moderate like Bush to say "enough" to multiculturalism run amok.

they achieve dominance. We must not be frustrated into a kamikaze effort that would help make this happen.

One last try for the GOP

Our strongest position both strategically and substantively is continued, if tentative, support for the GOP. It is true that George W. Bush's current position on immigration is indistinguishable from that of the Democrats, but he does come across as a decent man who might listen to reason. He is nothing if not a savvy politician, and as Mr. Masters points out, the very survival of the GOP is threatened by nonwhite immigrants. (This is why virtually all prominent restriction-

ists in the two major parties are Republicans: Lamar Smith, (R)-TX, Elton Gallegly, (R)-CA, and Bob Stump, (R)-AZ, for example, and why even the leaders of Democratic constituencies for whom restrictionism would be an obvious benefit—labor unions, environmentalists, advocates for blacks, etc.—don't press for it.)

If Mr. Bush takes the White House in 2000 and carries a GOP Congress with him, we will have an established and viable party that is privately sympathetic to our concerns in complete control of government for the first time since the immigration and "civil rights" revolution of the 1960s set us on the road to disaster. And, more importantly, we might well have the only Republican with enough political capital with non-whites to avoid the kind of racial backlash that has dogged his party for so long. It took a strong anti-Communist, Richard Nixon, to open up Red China; it may well take a Hispanic-friendly moderate to say "enough" to multiculturalism run amok.

It will not be easy for AR activists to hold their noses and support a party that attacks their philosophy with as much ferocity as liberal Democrats do (just ask the Council of Conservative Citizens). Still, it is worthwhile to help grant full operational power to the GOP. If it fails us as it has in the past we should certainly reassess our support, but we owe it to ourselves, if not to the Republicans, to give them one more try. **Ω**

Shawn Mercer lives in Milledgeville, Georgia.

Black Magic

Jon Entine, *Taboo: Why Black Athletes Dominate Sports and Why We're Afraid to Talk About It*, PublicAffairs, 2000, \$25.00, 387 pp.

A cautious but useful endorsement of racial differences.

reviewed by Thomas Jackson

To the usual yelping that accompanies the slightest dissent from racial orthodoxy, someone has finally written a book that states the obvious: blacks dominate many sports because they have a genetic edge. Bravo for author Jon Entine but bravissimo for

PublicAffairs publishing, which has broken with what is one of the most conformist and cowardly industries in the country (see Mr. Entine's account below).

Only two kinds of people will be surprised or offended by this book—crazed egalitarians and people who have never watched the Olympics or a pro basketball game. Since it is the former group that sets the intellectual tone for the country, reviewers will probably either ignore this book or cluck worriedly over it, but whatever happens, another blow

has been struck against anti-scientific foolishness.

But is this a good book? For people who like their racial analysis stuffed with facts and close reasoning, and devoid of pulled punches—for people who enjoy Michael Levin, Arthur Jensen, Philippe Rushton, and Richard Lynn—this is thin gruel. It's breezy and meandering, and does its own share of clucking about the "slippery slope of racism," but it does a great many useful and important things. And by doing them in a mass-market book that will probably find its way into