

The Ethnic Case Against Immigration

Is what's good for Guam not good for Wausau?

**An internet debate between Perry Lorenz
and Delegate Robert Underwood**

This debate between Delegate Robert Underwood of Guam, United States House of Representatives, and me began after he replied to a message that I had e-mailed to 150 congressmen. The topic — ethnicity and immigration — is not only a sensitive subject, it is taboo. Its impact on our society is enormous, but the mainstream press will not discuss it.

Below I summarize the message I communicated to Senator Dianne Feinstein's (D-CA) state director, Bill Chandler, and office director, Russell Lowe, in their San Francisco office on April 8, 1996.

— PERRY LORENZ

The vast majority of people all over the world, are opposed to the transformation of their societies — ethnically, culturally or racially — by massive immigration. All nations have the right to preserve and defend their cultures, and to exclude aliens. Every immigrant-sending country actively defends its borders and its way-of-life.

The multiculturalist would have us abolish all national borders. In that event the poor nations would overwhelm the successful nations.

Tibet and Inner Mongolia are being over-run, as we speak, by massive numbers of Chinese immigrants. In 500 years, their cultures, their languages, races, and ethnicities will be gone. Extinct. They are doomed societies.

Here in America, as recently as 1965, there were only

Perry Lorenz is an electrical engineer at an electronics firm in California. Formerly a libertarian, his views of the nation-state rose out of the campaign for Proposition 187 in 1994 and his realization that American people were being displaced in California.

800,000 Asians. Now there are 8 million. In 50 years there will be 40 million (Census Bureau data). The Asians have all of Asia, the biggest continent in the world. The Hispanics have all of South America, Central America, and Mexico. Yet they colonize this country.

Now I'm not suggesting that the Asians and the Hispanics should commit cultural suicide and allow 50 million Europeans to colonize their land. All I'm suggesting is that we Americans are a people! We are a nation! We have a right to this land! We have a right to close the borders!

In 1965, the European-Americans — the ethnic core of America, the people that have given this country its identity, its characteristics, its language and its culture — were 88 percent of the population. We have declined to 73 percent. We are losing 4 percent per decade. By the time my preschool children retire, we will be a minority in our own country (American Almanac, Bureau of the Census, p.18). That is national suicide. That is cultural self-destruction. We not only have the right, we have the obligation to pass on our culture, our land — our heritage — intact to our descendants.

* * *

Delegate Underwood, 5-9-96: I feel sorry for your view of America. It is so at variance with the ideals of the country.

Mr. Lorenz: I don't believe our country's ideals include making America's descendants into a minority. Ask your constituents.

Delegate Underwood: It is ideals which this country is about, not European origins.

Mr. Lorenz: If Congress were showing proper stewardship for this country, instead of embarking on a multicultural experiment, we would be maintaining our European origins and our European ideals.

If ideals were what this country is about, then those who share those ideals would be citizens and

those who don't would be non-citizens. However, almost all nations recognize citizenship by descent. Americans who rape and murder, do not share America's ideals. They may be executed, but they are never stripped of citizenship. This is true for all countries.

Delegate Underwood: To be sure, we can and should regulate immigration in a way that makes sense (too few resources, economic effects, etc.), but to argue that regulations should be based upon a sense of loss about the European origins of the "core" of America is off base.

Mr. Lorenz: You must realize that you can not preserve the Chamorro culture, i.e. the culture of Guam, without the Chamorro people. Had immigration to Guam been restricted so that the

***"Free migration, or open borders,
in a world that adds one billion
Third Worlders every 13 years
means the destruction of every
small ethnic group..."***

Chamorro numbered 95 percent of the population instead of 47 percent, their culture and future would have been secure. If immigration is allowed to drive the Chamorro population down to 30 or 20 percent, ethnic and cultural survival are even less likely.

Free migration, or open borders, in a world that adds one billion Third Worlders every 13 years means the destruction of every small ethnic group and even large nations if they are wealthy. What do you think would happen to the Chamorro, or their culture, if one or two thousand Filipinos arrived every year?

Is it common for the Chamorro to marry Filipino, Asian, or Caucasian people? If so, their ethnicity will rapidly dissipate. If not, they must compete with rival ethnics for land and resources. They must also struggle to preserve a culture while immersed in the cultures of others. Either way, the Chamorro suffer the losses, while the colonists grab new land for their ethnic groups. The Chamorro know this and appropriately oppose immigration to their island.

Delegate Underwood, 6-3-96: I just do not agree with your analysis that America is a country meant to exist for the benefit of those of European descent.

Mr. Lorenz: Europeans and their descendants, who settled this land and forged a new nation, would be very surprised to hear a member of Congress suggest this country was not meant for their descendants.

Your views are remarkable, not because they are unusual, but because among the elite they are common. But only recently common. From George Washington's administration to Eisenhower's you would not find such sentiments spoken in Congress.

Sen. Hiram Fong of Hawaii, [said] that under the [1965 immigration] bill "the Asian population would never surpass one percent of the U.S. population. I just want to make this point because the argument that the cultural pattern of the U.S. will change needs to be answered. Our cultural pattern will never be changed as far as America is concerned" (Auster p.21). Senator Fong's statement indicates that he and evidently the rest of the Senate would disagree with you. With all due respect, Delegate Underwood, your views stand outside the mainstream of American history.

And for whose benefit, do you think, is America meant to exist? Does Mexico exist for the benefit of Mexicans? Japan for the benefit of Japanese? Or is America the only country given this unusual colonial purpose? Do you think Americans want to become a minority in their own country?

[As Senator Eugene McCarthy says in his book,] "What distinguishes the United States from other colonized societies is that we have the power to prevent it, and choose not to use it. The backward societies of Asia and Africa were powerless to oppose the colonial hegemony exercised by the European powers in centuries past. We, on the other hand, have come to question whether the culture that built a society that has the world beating a path to our doors is even worth trying to preserve" (p.101).

Delegate Underwood: Your article is racist and not merely racist.

Mr. Lorenz: Sometimes my friends say, "Perry, your argument is racist." I gently remind them that their multiculturalist open-border view is treason. So to avoid the pointless: "racist!" "traitor!" "racist!" "traitor!" exchange, we elevate the discussion to the level of intellect.

My article is not racist. It's patriotic. Patriotism is about the survival of my country and my people. "Racism" is a term used by multicultural leftists to intimidate patriots, so they can have a free hand to do harm to my country.

I believe I am standing on higher moral ground when I argue that every race, every nation, and every ethnic group has the right to survive. Every ethnic group that considers itself a nation of people has the right to self-determination, on their own land, with secure borders. I believe this is a fundamental American value and that most people around the world would agree with it. Certainly the vast majority of people all over the world oppose the racial transformation of their societies. With all due respect, Delegate Underwood, the contrary view is held by only a small group of multiculturalist dissenters. But they are powerful, they dominate the media and they don't like to debate this issue.

Delegate Underwood: It views the existence of human beings as being primarily determined by their ethnic origins.

Mr. Lorenz: They fight in Bosnia and Rwanda because ethnicity is important. Canada is on the verge of breaking up, as is India, because ethnicity is important. Borders separate Germany, France, and Italy, because ethnicity is important. The Kurds are demanding a separate state, because ethnicity is important. Because of its large impact on personal and political behavior, ethnicity is important.

Delegate Underwood: I stand for the survival of the Chamorro people and the Chamorro culture, but it is foolhardy to do so on racist grounds.

Mr. Lorenz: Demographers have projected the end of the line of pure-blood Hawaiians in the middle of the next century. Just about the same time European Americans become a minority due to Congressional immigration policy.

Dilution of Hawaiian ethnicity will continue for several more centuries. Then they are gone. Forever. Extinct.

This story of Man is commonplace. One or more groups migrate to a new land and push aside, displace, and absorb the natives. That is how ethnic groups become extinct.

I know by your efforts on behalf of the Chamorro that your heart is in the right place. But that's not

good enough. If you support immigration to Guam, you unwittingly support the process that is extinguishing the Chamorro. Do you want them to follow the Hawaiians into oblivion?

Immigration must be terminated immediately. A non-binding measure must be put on the Guam ballot for voter approval: "Financial incentives shall be established to encourage the non-Chamorro to return to their homelands." The incentives should remain in place until the Chamorro fraction of the population returns to 80%, or 88% or 95%.

The late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin was quoted as saying: "For me what is most important is

"Every ethnic group that considers itself a nation of people has the right to self-determination, on their own land, with secure borders."

to have a Jewish state in which at least 80 percent of its population is Jewish." (*Time*, November 13, 1995, p.64.) The U.S. population was 88 percent European-American in 1965; 95 percent may qualify as "homogeneous."

As a leader in Guam, you are responsible for the destiny of the Chamorro. If your policy is wrong; then by the next millennium, the Chamorros' only presence will be in a footnote of an anthropologist's textbook.

Historians will write this epitaph: "The Chamorro dissipated in a flood of immigrants, guided by officials who promoted 'multiculturalism,' and 'diversity.' Now the world has one less culture, and diversity has been reduced by one ethnic group. But the good news is — and this is *really* important — the officials were not racists. Thank God."

Delegate Underwood, 6-18-96: Your ideas are racist. By this, I mean you seem to assume that ethnic origin determines or should determine the course of thinking of human beings and the essence of political states.

Mr. Lorenz: Why use such a pejorative term? Do you believe the road to truth is paved with epithets?

"Ethnocentric" is more neutral. However, "patriotic" is appropriate for any American who will defend this nation.

The formation of states and borders must accommodate human family and ethnic behavior. Homogeneous societies are what we evolved in; they are best suited to the human character; and they have less internal ethnic conflict. States must be formed to accommodate human character. It is folly to attempt to remold humans to fit a recent ideological construct.

Perhaps I'm wrong. Perhaps the cities Americans dream of moving to are New York, LA, and Miami — those blissful havens of multi-ethnic peace and harmony. I know Third Worlders want to move to those cities, but only for the money, not the

"It is much easier to grant each nation its own land, government and defensible borders than it is to change human character. Until this lesson is learned, the carnage will continue."

experience of diversity.

Delegate Underwood: Of course, ethnicity does influence the course of nations and can be a positive force. It could also be all-consuming and become destructive.

Mr. Lorenz: The ethnic conflict in Bosnia and elsewhere is not the fault of humans who are behaving like humans. It is the fault of world leaders and intellectuals who insist that nations (i.e. ethnic groups) be divided and recombined with other nations into arbitrary political states without regard to the people's ethnic sensitivities.

This is not an excuse for atrocity or war. Ethnic wars are preventable, if the conditions that lead to them are studied, recognized, and avoided. When it comes to forest fire management, any idea is open to consideration, including allowing natural fires to burn or the use of controlled fires. But when it comes to preventing ethnic war, the multiculturalists

insist that they, and only they, have the solution. All other ideas must be excluded from the debate. Unfortunately pluralistic societies rarely work, but homogeneous societies work well in regard to ethnic conflict.

There is a reason that multiculturalists are so adamantly opposed to former Yugoslav ethnic groups separating into independent states. If peace ensues, it becomes an embarrassing example of ethnic peace without reforming the human character. TV commentators assume it will work but disparage it as a "primitive" arrangement. It is "primitive" in the sense that human character evolved over hundreds of thousands of years and therefore human character itself is primitive. But it is not morally primitive.

It is much easier to grant each nation its own land, government, and defensible borders than it is to change human character. Until this lesson is learned, the carnage will continue.

Delegate Underwood: Your views in a country predicated upon a history of immigration seem contradictory.

Mr. Lorenz: We had a history of *European* immigration. Which explains why we were 88% European in 1965. We have never had a history of transforming this country into large Asian and Latino regions.

We are not a nation of immigrants. We are a nation of Americans. We are a nation of European descendants. We have many important characteristics. "Immigrant" is not one of them. An immigrant can be anyone in the world. If you move from one country to another, you are an immigrant — it doesn't make you an American. Immigrants have nothing in common — neither source- nor destination-country. To say America is a nation of immigrants is to say we have no ethnic or national characteristics in common. Which is to say we have nothing in common. And if that were true, we would not be a nation, but a land of many nations.

Delegate Underwood: I do not see multiculturalism as a lack of patriotism nor do I see calls for the restriction of immigration inherently racist.

Mr. Lorenz: Multiculturalism, taught in grade-school, means less time spent on America's history, heroes, and glories. For American culture to share the stage

with other cultures on an equal footing, diminishes its stature. Its special status as “our culture” has been lost. Its special status as “the best country in the whole world” has been lost. [All countries teach that theirs is the best. It’s part of building cohesiveness, unity, and pride. There is plenty of opportunity in high school or college to be more objective.] In its place is a smorgasbord with no indication of what is ours. A five-year-old might be taught that the Fourth-of-July is an American celebration and Cinco-de-Mayo is a Mexican celebration but he might well ask “and which country is ours?” Since Cinco-de-Mayo attracts thousands of celebrants in San Jose, it is no longer obvious, even to the adult, what country we are in. This is not the process of teaching children to be loyal citizens of America. This is a process of teaching them to be citizens of the world. This is a mild form of multiculturalism and it is devoid of patriotism.

Malignant multiculturalism is explicitly anti-American, anti-Western, and pro-Third World. It selects the worst historical episodes for high-lighting, in addition to distortions and fabrications. It’s a hatchet-job on our culture. Mexican-Americans go into a class like this and come out Mexicans, hating the “gringo” who “stole their” land and “oppressed” their people. This is anti-patriotic. It’s also a damned lie!

Peter Brimelow quotes a local Mexican American: “I’m reverting to my original culture. I’m doing that along with many, many people because there are so many of us in the United States. My radio and television are always tuned to Spanish. I surround myself with Spanish-speaking people. I deal daily with bilingual people. [Other Americans] should face it — this is not going away. We’re here to stay.” (Brimelow, p.273)

Delegate Underwood: Your rationale for the restriction of immigration, however, is clearly racist and racistic.

Delegate Underwood, 7-8-96: You are obviously not a run of the mill racist; you are a well-read one (although a selective one).

Mr. Lorenz: I’m not a racist. But now that we’ve got the customary insult (which is a proclivity among people of your persuasion) out of the way, let’s return to matters of substance.

Delegate Underwood: Let me see if you can catch my

basic point — ethnicity is an important human characteristic from which cultural expressions (as in folk culture) are generated. But there is no discernable link between a person’s ethnic heritage (as in blood lines) and his/her cultural expressions or affinity. To believe that there is a connection between ethnic blood lines and cultural expression (which fuels your Eurocentric view of America) is racist. This is neither an idle charge or one which attempts to disguise the argument. It is central to the argument.

Mr. Lorenz: To illustrate your basic point, suppose hypothetically that all the Japanese sterilized themselves. And let’s further suppose that the

“Malignant multiculturalism is explicitly anti-American, anti-Western, and pro-Third World. It selects the worst historical episodes for high-lighting, in addition to distortions and fabrications.”

Europeans provided them a million or so babies each year. After a century the Japanese race would be extinct. But would the Japanese culture still be largely intact? (For the sake of this argument, let’s ignore the genetic differences between races.) Thus your argument concludes that the essence of the Japanese — their culture — may be preserved without the non-essentials: the Japanese people. This example shows culture and ethnicity to “have no discernable link.” Is that a fair rendering of your argument?

The biggest problem with this line of thought is the suggestion that culture is more important than ethnicity; that cultural survival is more important than ethnic survival — that culture can survive without an ethnic base, and that ethnic survival is a matter of indifference. Run this idea past the people of Japan and the universal response would be one of abhorrence. That’s because the Japanese (and the

rest of the world) disagree with you, Delegate Underwood.

As a thought experiment, I fancied myself in a multicultural hospital nursery full of newborns here in California where your ideas prevail. I was surprised to hear the mothers say: "I'll take that baby. No, I think I'll take that one instead." So I questioned one mother, "Why are you not picking your own baby?" "Well," she said, "blood lines don't matter. Only culture. What babies need is a culture of love. That's what I have." "But," I objected, "what about kinship ties, what about ethnicity?" "Look," she said, "even the staff agrees. Newborns are newborns. They are interchangeable. Notice, they have no identification tags. This is the cure for

***"In all our debates you haven't said
one word about preserving
Chamorro ethnicity.***

***A prudent person would think twice
about the casual destruction of
that..."***

***"Yes, I do favor a Guam-only
immigration policy. But I also favor a
Guam-only environmental policy and
a Guam-only labor policy."***

prejudice and racism. You obviously are prejudiced towards newborns not related to you and you discriminate in favor of your own babies." Ethnicity is all about kinship and bloodlines.

The Japanese example is hypothetical. The displacement of European-Americans in California over the same time frame will approximate the results of the Japanese example if immigration trends continue. That's not hypothetical. It's real. And it's happening now.

Another problem with your no-links-between-ethnicity-and-culture is that people carry their culture with them. That's why when the British colonized this land, the people who bet the culture

would turn out Anglo, won their bets against those who thought it would turn out Vietnamese.

I gather from your use of epithets that you believe your anti-ethnicity ideology to be morally superior. But how can it be superior or even moral to wipe out various ethnicities like the Hawaiians, the Tibetans, the Mongolians — and yes, the Chamorro you supposedly represent — as well as doing serious damage to American and European ethnicities. If I could, I would turn back the Chinese from Tibet and Inner Mongolia. I would encourage the non-Chamorro to leave Guam, and I would defend America and Europe against the alien invasions. But you wouldn't. You, who are responsible for the Chamorro, are going to let their ethnicity slip gradually into oblivion, aren't you? In all our debates you haven't said one word in support of preserving Chamorro ethnicity. A prudent person would think twice about the casual destruction of that which nature or humans have evolved into over hundreds or thousands of years. After the Chamorro blood is thoroughly diluted, they'll never be back.

I believe Mr. Solzhenitsyn would oppose the loss of the Chamorro ethnicity. In 1970 he wrote: "The disappearance of nations would impoverish us no less than if all peoples were made alike, with one character, one face. Nations are the wealth of mankind, they are it's generalized personalities: the smallest of them has its own particular colors, and embodies a particular facet of God's design" (Brimelow, p.233).

Delegate Underwood: Yes, I do favor a Guam-only immigration policy. But I also favor a Guam-only environmental policy and a Guam-only labor policy.

Thank you, Perry.

Mr. Lorenz: You're welcome.

TSC

REFERENCES

Lawrence Auster, *The Path to National Suicide*, (Monterey, VA: American Immigration Control Foundation, 1990).

Eugene McCarthy, former Minnesota Senator, *A Colony of the World: The United States Today*, (New York: Hippocrene Books Inc., 1992).

Peter Brimelow, *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster*, (New York: Random House, 1995).

What Kind of City Do You Want, Mr. Mayor?

In search of a compassionate immigration policy

by Roy Beck

New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani's pronouncements this week in favor of the present high levels of immigration seem to make for good local politics. But they provide a poor model for Congress to follow in designing a logical and compassionate national immigration and urban policy.

A new city report stoked the mayor's enthusiasm for the national policy of allowing nearly one million foreign workers and relatives to enter the country each year. Narrowly focused on demographic changes, the report claims that if it had not been for the heavy influx of immigrants in the 1980s, New York City would have lost 9 percent of its population instead

Roy Beck is Washington editor of THE SOCIAL CONTRACT and author of The Case Against Immigration: The Moral, Economic, Social and Environmental Reasons for Reducing Immigration Back to Traditional Levels (W.W. Norton). This op-ed appeared January 11, 1997 and is reprinted by permission. © 1997, The New York Times Company, distributed by New York Times Special Features/Syndication Sales.

of gaining 3.5 percent.

That apparently proves to Mr. Giuliani that unfettered immigration helps maintain good housing and a healthy economy. Yet the mayor's vision seems limited. Yes, immigrants have contributed to New York's economy and have revitalized some poor neighborhoods. But at current levels, the influx is not the total economic boon that the mayor claims it is. Immigrants also raise the city's costs in many areas, including Medicaid, schools and housing.

Has the mayor forgotten the overcrowding of the city's schools that caused such disruptions last fall? The districts with the most crowded schools — for instance, District 24 in Queens — were largely those with high numbers of immigrants. The Board of Education has projected that by 2003 almost 400 schools would have to be built at a cost of \$10 billion to accommodate new immigrants.

Worse, Mr. Giuliani's promotion of unfettered immigration comes at the expense of other residents. William Frey, a sociologist at the University of Michigan, has documented that blue-collar workers, facing

competition for fewer and fewer relatively well-paying jobs, have fled cities with the highest levels of immigration.

Things are even tougher for low-skilled blacks. Katherine Newman, a Columbia anthropologist, found in a 1995 study that black teenagers in Harlem consistently lose minimum-wage jobs to immigrants. For instance,

"Worse, Mr. Giuliani's promotion of unfettered immigration comes at the expense of other residents."

fast-food restaurants hired 38 percent of Latino and Asian applicants but only 13.6 percent of African-Americans.

In this brutal labor climate, large numbers of welfare recipients will soon have to compete for those same jobs. Wages, already depressed because of the large pool of cheap labor, could fall even lower.

And despite Mr. Giuliani's conceit that immigration affects only New York City, this population growth puts enormous pressure on the rest of the region. As more residents leave the city in search of uncrowded