

China, too, was well ahead of the West until the Renaissance. Why did it not keep its lead? Prof. Lynn speculates that Asians may be more conformist than Europeans, and therefore less likely to strike out in new directions. He also argues that since China was ruled centrally for millennia, it may have encouraged more uniformity of thought than the competing kingdoms of Europe. Whatever the explanation, there are signs European people are losing their confidence and could slip behind again.

As Prof. Lynn has already shown in *IQ and the Wealth of Nations*, the intelligence of a people is highly correlated

with its economic success. In fact, there is much about the world that hardly makes sense without an understanding of racial differences in intelligence. Egalitarians are left with a welter of contradictory, inadequate, *ad hoc* explanations for world-wide patterns that have persisted for centuries, and that fall into almost perfect alignment when understood in the light of racial differences. How can so many people refuse to acknowledge the obvious? This review can do no better than end with Prof. Lynn's own conclusion:

"The position of environmentalists that over the course of some 100,000

years peoples separated by geographical barriers in different parts of the world evolved into ten different races with pronounced genetic differences in morphology, blood groups, and the incidence of genetic diseases, and yet have identical genotypes for intelligence, is so improbable that those who advance it must either be totally ignorant of the basic principles of evolutionary biology or else have a political agenda to deny the importance of race. Or both." **Q**

*This book, together with many other excellent titles, is available for purchase at the AR web page: [www.amren.com](http://www.amren.com).*

## Texas Showdown

### Jared Taylor debates José Gutierrez.

by Scott Wilson

On Friday, April 29th, *American Renaissance* editor Jared Taylor met with José Angel Gutierrez, professor of political science and co-founder of the La Raza Unida Party, for a spirited debate about immigration. The event, titled *Hispanicization: Good or Bad for America?*, was hosted by the College Republicans of the University of Texas at Arlington, and brought out a racially mixed crowd of almost 400. Security guards waved metal-detector wands and ordered all entrants to empty their pockets. The security line stretched down a lengthy hall and around a corner. The debate itself was delayed several minutes because of security concerns as the audience packed the auditorium. (Prof. Gutierrez claims there have been plots to kill him, and likes to threaten people with lawsuits if they disagree with him. During the debate he even warned that if any harm ever came to him his estate would sue Mr. Taylor!)

As to the question of whether increasing Hispanicization is good for America, in his opening remarks Mr. Taylor answered with "an unqualified no." He began with a long list of statistics that summarize the burden of Hispanics on this country. "This dismal recitation gives me no pleasure," he said "but these are serious times that demand serious reflection."

Twenty-three percent of Hispanics in the US are living in poverty.

Their per capita income is about half that of whites, and their median net worth is about one ninth that of whites.

Hispanics are twice as likely as whites to be unemployed, and 50 percent more likely to be on welfare.



Jared Taylor at the University of Texas.

Hispanics are three times more likely than whites to commit violent crimes, and three times more likely to be incarcerated.

Hispanics are 19 times more likely to be members of youth gangs.

Forty-six percent of Hispanic births are illegitimate, and Hispanics are three times as likely as whites, and twice as likely as blacks to drop out of high school.

Thirty-five percent do not have medical insurance, and the cost of free treatment for illegals has bankrupted dozens of hospitals.

According to one think-tank study, each adult immigrant from Mexico will

consume \$55,000 more in social and government services than he will pay in taxes over his lifetime.

Mr. Taylor argued that this is not a population to which we should be adding. "We claim to be fighting poverty but we import poor people," he said. "We claim to be fighting crime but we import people with high crime rates. We claim to be fighting school failure but we import dropouts."

He added that another reason we must stop the tsunami of Hispanic immigrants, especially Mexicans, is because Mexico is the only country in the world that claims US territory. Most Mexicans believe our southern border is illegitimate, and that the Southwest United States belongs to them. High school and college chapters of MEChA (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán*), an irredentist student union, are found throughout the Southwest, and assert that "gringos" have no claim to the area and should be expelled. It is foolish and dangerous, Mr. Taylor argued, to admit millions of people who do not consider our borders legitimate, and who even want to chase us out of our own territory.

In his opening remarks, Prof. Gutierrez was smiling and jocular with the many Hispanics in the audience, who laughed and applauded in response. He changed his tone, however, when addressing his opponent, punctuating his charges with a finger aimed at Mr. Taylor.

He claimed the negative traits listed by Mr. Taylor were not an indictment of Hispanics but of the oppressive American government, and that immigrants must deal with "the racist in the suit, like

Mr. Taylor.” He said Hispanics are not in control in America and therefore cannot be faulted for their failures.

He offered a brief history lesson. The US Southwest and Central America, he claimed, were all peace and harmony until “the illegal aliens came from Kentucky, from Tennessee, from Georgia . . . who came . . . predominantly to pillage, to plunder and steal . . . And yes, Texas was stolen. In 1846, the rest of the Southwest was stolen.” “This is *not* a white country,” he said. “This is not *going* to be a white country. And we will paint this White House brown.”

Mr. Taylor pointed out that the professor had failed to list a single reason why Hispanicization is good for America, which was presumably the subject of the debate. Despite Prof. Gutierrez’s depiction of America as oppressive and racist, Mr. Taylor noted that millions still come; not because they will be oppressed in a nation they do not control but because life is vastly better here than in the nations they *do* control. As for the Southwest being stolen, Mr. Taylor reminded the audience that Mariano Paredes, dictator at the time of the Mexican-American War, was itching for a fight, hoping to win back not only Texas but to conquer Louisiana and Mississippi.

Prof. Gutierrez assailed Mr. Taylor for questioning the loyalty of Mexican-Americans, noting that no one with a Spanish surname has ever been charged, indicted or convicted of treason. Although Mr. Taylor did not say so, the Constitutional standard for treason is so

high that no one has been convicted of it since 1952. Mr. Gutierrez also claimed Hispanics have shown their loyalty by winning 39 of 3,427 Congressional Medals of Honor.

Mr. Taylor responded to Prof. Gutierrez’s claims of Hispanic loyalty by citing a recent poll that showed only eight percent of Mexican-American citizens consider themselves American, first and foremost, while over three-quarters think of themselves first as Mexican or Hispanic/Latino.

In response to questions from the audience, Mr. Taylor discussed border security, the need for a wall on the southern border, the fact that miscegenation does not promote diversity but destroys it, and why our immigration policies should not be a global charity but should promote the folkways and ethnic identity of the nation.


Prof. Gutierrez tried to evoke sympathy for poor, struggling immigrants. He recalled with horror President Eisenhower’s expulsion of Mexicans in the mid-1950s, and spoke hopefully of poor Latinos on the streets of El Paso who may grow up to be the next Picasso or American President. He claimed that the purpose of the Statue of Liberty was to welcome immigrants. (Mr. Taylor pointed out it was a gift from France, named “Liberty Enlightening the World,” and was offered on America’s centennial. He noted that the lines about “huddled masses” and “wretched refuse” were added decades later.)

Prof. Gutierrez fell back again and again on charges of racism. He waved

AR articles at the audience in an accusing manner, read a few excerpts and half-jokingly said that one of the policemen on security duty should arrest Mr. Taylor for having written them. He claimed that his own response to “racism” was to say, “Forgive them, they don’t know what they do. They’re paranoid but they’re just sick people.”

Mr. Taylor pointed out that name-calling was the most graceless way someone could admit he had lost the argument. “Call me more and worse names,” he added. Mr. Taylor also wondered how Mr. Gutierrez squared his current pose of benevolent brotherhood with the claim, some years ago, that “We have got to eliminate the gringo, and what I mean by that is if the worst comes to the worst, we have got to kill him.”

At the beginning of the debate, I must say I was worried by the mood of the audience, when Prof. Gutierrez was introduced to cheers and Mr. Taylor to silence. Several audience members behind me whispered darkly about the “white supremacist” on stage. However, I have never seen such a turnaround in a crowd, and Mr. Taylor’s closing remarks were greeted with wild applause. Prof. Gutierrez must have sensed the shift too, since he quickly left the auditorium, leaving Mr. Taylor to descend to the audience and greet a host of questioners and well-wishers.

My only complaint about the debate was that the audience was not ten times larger. 

*Mr. Wilson is a former assistant editor of American Renaissance.*

## O Tempora, O Mores!

### Outlawing Dissent

The Brussels Court of Appeal has convicted Daniel Féret, founder and leader of the National Front party and a member of parliament, of violating Belgium’s law against propagating racism and xenophobia. His crime was to have published pamphlets critical of African and Muslim immigrants. Mr. Féret was sentenced to 250 hours of public service helping immigrants, and was



banned from standing for election for the next ten years. If he refuses the public service, he will get ten months jail time.

The court ruled that the pamphlets were illegal because they suggested all immigrants were criminals, caricatured Africans as savages, and suggested all Muslims were terrorists. They were therefore “grave attacks against democratic values” that “encouraged

hate against foreigners.” The court conceded, however, that the pamphlets contained no incitement to violence. The prosecution demanded that the entire National Front be dissolved, but the court refused. [Dix Ans d’Inéligibilité pour le Leader du FN, L’Express (Paris), April 18, 2006.]

Mr. Féret has said he will seek political asylum in Russia, which he calls “a democratic country in which freedom of expression still has meaning.” Russia, however, does not accept political refugees from stable democracies like Belgium where people have the right to a fair trial. Mr. Féret says he will appeal