



## Letters from Readers

Sir — I was amused by the idea in Part III of “Black Racial Consciousness” of a future Museum of Racial Egalitarianism, dedicated to an ideology that was false and suicidal but finally discredited. I would love to be curator—what a wealth of material we would have! It would be fun to display movie clips and commercials full of black geniuses alongside real reports of school test scores. You could have Jared Diamond jabbering about how New Guineans are smarter than we are, and then show how New Guineans actually live. But I suppose the most telling exhibit would be a graphic representation of the unequal group distributions of genes for intelligence, diligence, running speed, rhythmic ability, etc. It’s a pity we won’t be building the museum any time soon, but when the day comes, virtually every big city in the Western world would be an appropriate location for it.

Ellen Hope Caldwell, Rumson, N.J.

Sir — I greatly enjoyed both Mark Richardson’s article on the Jonestown massacre, and the conclusion of Jared Taylor’s series on black racial consciousness. Readers may be interested in a parallel between the two. Mr. Taylor discusses the absurd conspiracy theories blacks subscribe to about evil whites. Certainly then, if there was a crazed multiculturalist whose largely black followers killed themselves, it must have been the fault of “the man.” Indeed, within weeks of the massacre, black political activist Dick Gregory was claiming that the CIA killed the Jonestown members and used their bodies to smuggle heroin into the US. Other theo-

ries were that Jones himself was a government agent trying to undermine the credibility of black churches, or the CIA and/or FBI were behind the attacks on Jones to discredit his multiracial paradise. Jones and his followers are certainly not the last to drink the Kool Aid.

Finally, according to a scholar of Guyanese origin, Khaleel Mohammed, one reason Guyana was so hospitable to Jonestown was that the ruling People’s National Congress “sought to fully exploit for the Afro-Guyanese voters, the Afrocentrism that had become rampant based on the Black Power movement in the US. Jim Jones coming to Guyana with a group of predominantly African Americans to escape his own country’s racism showed that Guyana was somehow a model of tolerance at best; at the very least it was a haven for people of African origins, regardless of their citizenship. Guyana was . . . becoming the South American land of promise for the African people.”

Alexander Hart, Virginia

Sir — I was fascinated to learn from the November issue that the “white skin privilege” people are actually trying to gather data to support their theories. They will soon think better of this, of course, because “white skin privilege” is like Freudianism: It is pure speculation and introspection, and falls apart on analysis.

One can imagine several tests for the theory. Match black and white high school students for grades and SAT scores, and then compare the college admissions offers they get. Who wants to bet we would find “black skin privilege?” Or compare the number of white and black college football players to the

number who make it to the pros. Looks like more black skin privilege to me. Linda Gottfredson of the University of Delaware has found that if you match blacks and whites for age and IQ, the blacks earn higher salaries. More black privilege? And then there is the problem of East Asians. They do better than whites in school, commit fewer crimes, and make more money. There must be “yellow skin privilege” floating around out there, too.

As Mr. Jackson noted in his review, the idea of “white skin privilege” is a particularly idiotic example of the idiocy whites cling to when, in spite of every effort to help blacks get ahead, they persist in staying behind. Dat ol’ debbil racism just will not go away!

Paul Hollander, Lexington, Ky.

Sir — Your October review of *State of Emergency* quotes a number of remarkable passages from Patrick Buchanan’s new book: “Language, faith, culture, and history—and, yes, birth, blood, and soil—produce a people, not an ideology.” And likewise: “We are conducting an experiment rooted neither in common sense nor the American experience, but in an ideology that declares, against all historical evidence, that people of every country, creed, culture, or civilization are equally and easily assimilable into America, and all have an equal right to come here.”

These are arguments AR readers have heard and made many times, but it is remarkable to find them in the pages of a mainstream book. My question is this: How does Pat Buchanan get away with it while the rest of us would be pilloried for saying the same things publicly?

Oliver Knight, Boston, Mass.

Sir — Mikael Widmark was as interesting as ever in his report on the Swedish elections, but I was particularly struck by the advantages European countries enjoy from having parliamentary systems. If the United States had such a system, surely a race-realist list would win at least 10 or 15 percent of the vote. Can you imagine a race-realist caucus of 50 congressmen? Such a group could hold hearings and investigations, and some of its members might end up as committee chairmen. The impact would be enormous.

Sarah Wentworth, Richmond, Va.



## American Renaissance

Jared Taylor, Editor  
 Stephen Webster, Assistant Editor  
 Ronald N. Neff, Web Site Editor

American Renaissance is published monthly by the New Century Foundation. NCF is governed by section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; contributions to it are tax deductible.

Subscriptions to American Renaissance are \$28.00 per year. First-class postage is an additional \$8.00. Subscriptions to Canada (first class) are \$40.00. Subscriptions outside Canada and the U.S. (air mail) are \$40.00. Back issues are \$3.00 each. Foreign subscribers should send U.S. dollars or equivalent in convertible bank notes.

Please make checks payable to: American Renaissance, P.O. Box 527, Oakton, VA 22124. ISSN No. 1086-9905, Telephone: (703) 716-0900, Facsimile: (703) 716-0932, Web Page Address: [www.AmRen.com](http://www.AmRen.com)

*Continued from page 1*

signed to allow tiny minority parties to maintain seats solely in order to keep the Swedish People's Party—which gets about four percent of the vote—in the *Eduskunta* or Parliament.

Even unpleasant historical events that might embarrass this minority are suppressed. After the Winter War of November 1939 to March 1940, the Soviet Union forced Finland to cede Karelia in the east (a tenth of its territory and one fifth of its industrial capacity). Over 400,000 refugees had to be resettled in Finland but many Swedish-speaking towns on the west coast would not accept any for fear of being outnumbered by Finnish-speakers. Official Finnish history books often omit this.

Traditionally, Swedish-speakers have thought of Finnish-speakers as a Mongolian people, and there may be some justification for this. The Finnish language is part of the Finno-Ugric language group and, along with Estonian and Hungarian, is one of the few European languages that is not Indo-European. Some anthropologists have argued that Finns are about half Mongoloid and half European; the Nazis considered only the Swedish-speakers white. Some anthropologists, however, have suggested that only about one quarter of Swedish-speakers are of Swedish descent; the rest are Finns who changed their names along with their language.

As a result of this complicated and not always savory past, powerful Swedish-speaking interests suppress anything that could call attention to race. They fear that free discussion could stir up unpleasant memories and even lead to the loss of their privileged status. If Finns begin to consider immigration from a

racial point of view, they may question the position of Swedish-speakers, a position that was once justified in racial terms. The Swedes and other elites want silence on the subject, especially since



**Fighting the Soviets.**

Finnish nationalists—the very people who doubt the wisdom of Third-World immigration—question the status of Swedish-speakers as well.

This helps explain why the influential Swedish People's Party has vociferously condemned anyone who has doubts about immigration. Its candidate for the presidency in 2006, Henrik Lax, even built his campaign on the theme of “a Finland of many cultures.” Of course, virtually all immigrants will learn Finnish, not Swedish, and eventually reduce his interest group to insignificance. This is typical of the self-destructive thinking behind those who promote immigration.

Ida Asplund, president of the Finland-Swedes Association, has a different ap-

proach to maintaining the Swedish minority's powerful position. She says Swedish-speakers are generally a different race from Finnish-speakers, and wants the differences established by genetic testing. Miss Asplund, who has been called the “Swedish-Finnish Joan of Arc,” says “Finland-Swedes,” as she calls them, should defend Swedish-speaking areas so as to preserve their race and culture. Far from admitting their privileged position, she argues that Finland-Swedes are a persecuted minority because there are parts of the country where Swedish is not understood. She complains that Finnish-speakers are moving into traditional Swedish-speaking areas and turning them Finnish. She welcomes immigrants who are willing to learn Swedish rather than Finnish, and claims they face “double discrimination” for being foreign and Swedish-speaking.

Miss Asplund therefore promotes multiculturalism, on the grounds that Finland-Swedes are just another minority suffering discrimination at the hands of the Finnish-speaking majority. Despite its interest in preserving race and culture, the Finland-Swedes Association is therefore on the multi-cultural bandwagon along with everyone else.

Another problem for Finnish nationalists is that, traditionally, Finns are afraid to rock the boat. This timidity goes back at least to the immediate post-war period when Finland was essentially a Soviet satellite. Finland was independent, but Soviet influence was so great and economic ties so close that sovereignty was in some respects only theoretical. “Finlandization” came to mean the client status the West feared other countries might eventually assume.

*De facto* dictator Urho Kekkonen, who ruled from 1956 to 1981, encouraged this submissive relationship with the Soviet Union. He essentially banned criticism of the Communists for fear it might jeopardize economic relations or even trigger an invasion. His government outlawed all nationalist organizations, and open expression of nationalism remained suppressed until the end of the Cold War. From 1962, he essentially faced no real opposition until declining mental powers led to his resignation in late 1981 at age 81.

Since his time, Finland has edged towards greater dissent and democracy, but the October 1994 referendum on whether to join the European Union showed how difficult it is for the coun-