

# The Myth of Diversity

by Jared Taylor

Originally published in AR, July-August, 1997

*Seldom have so many pretended to believe something so absurd*

The idea that “diversity” is one of the country’s great strengths is now so firmly rooted that virtually anyone can evoke it, praise it, and wallow in it without fear of contradiction. It has become one of the great unassailably American ideas, like democracy, patriotism, the family, or Martin Luther King.

The President of the United States glories in diversity. In May, 1995, in a message recognizing the Mexican holiday, Cinco de Mayo, William Clinton said, “The Fifth of May offers all of us a chance to celebrate the cultural diversity that helps to make our nation great.” A few days later, when he designated May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month, he said, “With the strength of our diversity and a continued commitment to the ideal of freedom, all Americans will share in the blessings of the bright future that awaits us.” In his 1996 speech accepting the nomination for President, he asked the audience to look around the hall and take heart in how varied the Democratic party was.

In his 1996 Columbus Day proclamation, he said, “The expedition that Columbus... began more than 500 years ago, continues today as we experience and celebrate the vibrant influences of varied civilizations, not only from Europe, but also from around the world. America is stronger because of this diversity, and the democracy we cherish flourishes in the great mosaic we have created since 1492.”

Appeals to diversity are not just for domestic consumption. In a 1996 speech before the Australian parliament, President Clinton noted that both the United States and Australia were becoming increasingly diverse, and added, “And, yes, we [Australia and America] can prove that free societies can embrace the economic and social changes, and the ethnic, racial and religious diversity this new era brings and come out stronger and freer than ever.”

Hillary Clinton feels the same way. In February 1995, she spoke to the students of her former high school in the Chicago suburb of Park Ridge. She noticed there were many more non-whites among the students than when she was a student, 30 years earlier. “We didn’t have the wonderful diversity of people that you have here today,” said Mrs. Clinton. “I’m sad we didn’t have it, because it would have been a great value, as I’m sure you will discover.”

Diversity has clearly become one of those orotund, high-sounding sentiments with which politicians lard their speeches. Of course, the idea that diversity— at least of the kind that Mr. and Mrs. Clinton are promoting— is a great advantage for America is one of the most obviously stupid propositions ever to see the light of day.

Nevertheless there is one kind of diversity that is an advantage. A contractor, for example, cannot build houses if he hires only electricians. He needs carpenters, plumbers, etc.— a diverse work force. However, functional diversity of this kind is not what the Chief Executive is on about. He is talking about largely non-functional differences like race, language, age, sex, culture and even whether someone is homosexual. One might call this status diversity.

What advantages would a contractor get from a mixed work force of that kind? None. What are the advantages the United States gets from a racially mixed population? None.

The idea that status diversity is a strength is not merely a myth, but a particularly transparent one. Explaining why diversity is bad for a country is a little like explaining why cholera is bad for it; the trick is to understand how anyone could possibly think it was good.

In fact, diversity became a strength *after the fact*. It became necessary to believe in it because skepticism would be “racist.” Otherwise intelligent people began to mouth nonsense about diversity only because of the blinding power of the race taboo. After diversity began to include sex, mental disabilities, perversions, and everything else that was alien or outlandish, to disbelieve in the power of diversity was to show oneself to be “intolerant” as well as “racist.”

Of course it is only white societies— and white groups within multi-racial societies— that are ever fooled by guff about diversity. Everyone else recognizes the Clinton-Harvard-*New York Times* brand of diversity for exactly what it is: weakness, dissension, and self-destruction.

## **Immigration**

Despite President Clinton’s view that “diversity” started with Columbus, for most of its history the United States was self-consciously homogeneous. In 1787, in the second of *The Federalist Papers*, John Jay gave thanks that “Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people, a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs...”

This is not exactly a celebration of diversity, nor was Jay an eccentric. Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Paine, and Thomas Jefferson were all explicit about wanting the United States to be a white country, and in 1790 the first federal naturalization law required that applicants for citizenship be “free white persons.” Until 1965, it was very difficult for non-whites to immigrate to the United States and become citizens (an exception being made for the descendants of slaves). Immigration law was explicitly designed to keep the United States a white nation with a white majority. It was only in the 1950s and 60s that the country turned its back on nearly 200 years of traditional thinking about race and began its long march down the road to nowhere.

Once the country made the fatal assumption that race was a trivial human distinction, all else had to follow. Congress abolished not only Jim Crow and legal segregation but, with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, put an end to free association as well. The Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965, which abolished national origins quotas and opened immigration to all nations, was a grand gesture of anti-racism, a kind of civil rights law for the entire world.

As has been pointed out in such books as Lawrence Auster’s *The Path to National Suicide* and Peter Brimelow’s *Alien Nation*, the backers of the immigration bill were at pains to explain that it would have little effect on the country. “Under the proposed bill,” explained Senator Edward Kennedy, “the present level of immigration remains substantially the same. Secondly, the ethnic mix will not be upset. Contrary to charges in some quarters, it will not inundate America with immigrants from any one country or area.” The senator suggested that, at most, 62,000 people a year might immigrate.

When President Lyndon Johnson signed the bill into law, he also downplayed its impact: “This bill that we sign today is not a revolutionary bill. It does not affect the lives of millions. It will not reshape the structure of our daily lives, or really add importantly to either our wealth or power.”

The point here is not that the backers were wrong about the bill— even though in 1996, for example, there were a record 1,300,000 naturalizations and perhaps 90 percent of the new citizens were non-white. The point is that “diversity” of the kind that immigration is now said to bless us with was never even hinted at as one of the law’s benefits.

No one dreamed that in just 20 years ten percent of the entire population of El Salvador would have moved to the United States or that millions of mostly Hispanic and Asian immigrants would threaten to reduce whites to a racial minority in California by 1998. In 1965, before the discovery that “diversity is our strength,” most people would have been shocked by the thought of such population changes.

Today, the intellectual climate is different, but in entirely predictable ways. “Racism” looms ever larger as the greatest moral offense a white person can commit, and anyone who opposes the arrival of yet more non-whites cannot but be “racist.” There is therefore no longer any moral basis for opposing the prospect of minority status for whites, and what would have been an unthinkable prospect before 1965 must now be seen as an exciting opportunity. Thus did diversity become a “strength,” despite the suspension of disbelief required to think it so.

This is a perfect example of an assertion, for purely ideological reasons, of something obviously untrue. Like the equality of the races, the equivalence of the sexes, the unimportance of heredity, the normalcy of homosexuality, and the insignificance of physical or mental handicap, the strength of diversity is one of a whole series of monstrous absurdities on which liberalism depends.

Having started with race, diversity now includes just about anything. Feminists, angry people in wheel chairs, AIDS carriers, militant homosexuals, and people who would rather speak Spanish than English have all taken much of their style and impetus from the civil rights movement. Demands for “inclusiveness” almost always include the language of grievance and compensation pioneered by blacks. Fat people fight discrimination, ugly people struggle against “lookism,” and at least one local government has required that the stage set for a strip tease show be wheel-chair accessible. Anyone who opposes the glorification of the alien, the abnormal, and the inferior can be denounced with much fanfare and a huge sense of superiority. The metastasis of diversity is a fascinating story, but the disease began with race.

Occasionally a mainstream author sniffs around the edges of the population problem. At some risk to his professional respectability, columnist Scott McConnell of the *New York Post* has pointed out that if it will be such a good thing for whites to become a minority, there is no reason to wait until the next century. We could throw open the borders right now and become a minority in just a few years. “Why deny ourselves and our children the great benefits of Third Worldism that we are planning for our grandchildren?” he asks.

### **Advantages of Diversity**

On those rare occasions when people actually attempt to defend diversity, the one claim they make with any semblance of conviction is that its advantages will become evident as the world becomes more “international.” It will be a great thing to have citizens from all around the world as nations have more and more contact; specifically, our “international” population will boost American exports. Of course, since this view is based on the assumption that people communicate better with people like themselves, it is an argument against national diversity. If it takes a Korean to deal with the Koreans, how are Americans supposed to get along with the Koreans who live in America?

If anyone really thought a diverse population is good for trade, we would presumably be adjusting the mix of immigrants in accordance with trade potential. There would be no point in admitting Haitians, for example, since Haiti is a pesthole and never likely to be an important trade partner. After Canada, Japan is our largest trading partner. Does this mean we need more Japanese? No one ever talks about immigration this way, because no one really believes immigration has anything to do with promoting exports.

The example of Japan in fact shows just how little racial diversity has to do with international trade. Japan is one of the most racially homogeneous nations in the world. By American standards, Japanese are hopeless “racists,” “homophobes,” “sexists,” and “nativists.” They even eat whales. Here is a country that should therefore be a complete failure in the international economy— and yet it is probably the most successful trading nation on earth.

Taiwan and Korea are close behind, with China now recording huge trade surpluses with the United States. These countries are even more closed and exclusionist than Japan. If they could ever be made to

understand the American notion of diversity, Asians would politely wait until we had left the room and then die laughing. Germany is likewise one of the world's great exporting nations. Who would dream of thinking this was due to the presence of Turkish *Gastarbeiter*.

The fact that millions of Mexicans now live in the United States does not make our products more attractive to anybody— certainly not to Mexico, which already has plenty of the things Mexicans know how to make. “Diversity” adds exactly nothing to our international competitiveness.

Racial diversity is also supposed to bring cultural enrichment, but what are its real achievements? The culture of ordinary Americans remains almost completely untouched by the millions of non-white immigrants who have arrived since 1965. Perhaps they have now heard of the *Cinco de Mayo* festival, but even if they live in California or Texas how many Americans know that it commemorates a Mexican military victory against the French?

Immigrants do not teach us about Cervantes or Borges or Lady Murasaki and it would be silly to think they did. Chinese stowaways do not arrive with a curator's knowledge of Ming ceramics and copies of the *Tao-te Ching* in their pockets. The one cultural artifact immigrants bring with them is their language— which increasingly becomes an Americanized farrago that would astonish their countrymen— but the so-called “culture” of immigrant settlements is a tangle of peasant folkways, Coca-Cola, food stamps, T-shirts with writing on them, and truculence.

High culture and world history cross borders by themselves. Who in America first learned of Tchaikovsky or the Mayans from an immigrant? Nearly every good-sized American city has an opera company but it wasn't established by Italians.

What, in the way of authentic culture have Miami's dwindling non-Hispanic whites gained from the fact that the city is now nearly 70 percent Hispanic? Are the art galleries, concerts, museums, and literature of Los Angeles improved by the fact that its population is now nearly half Hispanic? How has the culture of Washington, D.C. or Detroit been enriched by majority-black populations? If immigration and diversity bring cultural enrichment, why is that the places being the most intensively enriched are the places where whites least want to live? Like the trade argument, the “cultural enrichment” argument collapses with a pinprick.

It is true that since 1965 more American school children have begun to study Spanish, but fewer now study French, German, or Latin. How is this an improvement? People can, of course, study any language they want without filling the country with immigrants. Virtually all Norwegians speak excellent English, but the country is not swarming with Englishmen.

Any discussion of the *real* advantages of ethnic diversity usually manages to establish only one benefit people really care about: good ethnic restaurants. Probably not even William Clinton would claim that getting an authentic Thai restaurant in every city is a major national objective.

### **Public Services**

At a different level, it is now taken for granted that public services like fire and police departments should employ people of different races. The theory is that it is better to have black or Hispanic officers patrolling black or Hispanic neighborhoods. Here do we not have an example of one of diversity's benefits?

On the contrary, this is merely the first proof that diversity is a horrible burden. If all across America it has been demonstrated that whites cannot police non-whites or put out their fires it only shows how divisive diversity really is. The racial mix of a police force— touted as one of the wonders of diversity— becomes necessary only because officers of one race and citizens of another are unable to work together. The diversity that is claimed as a triumph is necessary only because diversity does not work.

The same is true of every other effort to diversify public services. If Hispanic judges and prosecutors must be recruited for the justice system it means whites are incapable of dispassionate justice. If non-white teachers are necessary “role models” for non-white children it means that inspiration cannot cross racial lines. If newspapers must hire non-white reporters in order to satisfy non-white readers it means people cannot write acceptable news for people of other races. If blacks demand black television newscasters and weathermen, it means they want to get information from their own people. If majority-minority voting districts must be set up so that non-whites can elect representatives of their own race, it means that elections are nothing more than a racial headcount. All such efforts at diversity are not expressions of the inherent strength of multi-racialism; they are admissions that it is a debilitating source of tension, hostility, and weakness.

Just as the advantages of diversity disappear upon examination, its disadvantages are many and obvious. Once a fire department or police force has been diversified to match the surrounding community, does it work better? Not if we are to judge from the never-ending racial wrangles over promotions, class-action bias law suits, reverse discrimination cases, acrimony over quotas and affirmative action, and the proliferation of racially exclusive professional organizations. Every good-sized police department in the country has a black officers’ association devoted to explicit, racially competitive objectives. In large cities, there are associations for Asian, Hispanic, and even white officers.

Many government agencies and private companies hire professional “diversity managers” to help handle mixed work forces. This is a new profession, which did not exist before the idea that diversity is a strength. Most of it boils down to trying to bridge the gaps between people who do not understand each other, but since it concerns subjects about which management is afraid to ask too many questions, some of it is pure snake oil.

Maria Riefler has trained Nestle, Walt Disney, Chrysler and Chevron. She likes to divide employees into groups that represent the body and the “triune brain.” This is supposed to help them understand how “stereotypes are hidden deep within the primitive part of ourselves.”

It is a very peculiar “strength” that requires the constant attention of experts and other buncombe artists. Like hiring black police officers to patrol black neighborhoods, “diversity training” is an admission that a mixed work force is a liability.

This is the merest common sense; it is hard to get dissimilar people to work together. Indeed, a large-scale survey called the National Study of the Changing Work force found that more than half of all workers said they preferred to work with people who were not only the same race as themselves, but were the *same sex and had the same level of education*. Even more probably felt that way but were afraid to say so.

These days there is much chirping about how diversity is going to improve profits. American companies are hard-headed about profits. A great deal of research, much of it quantitative, goes into decisions about product lines, new markets, establishing joint ventures, issuing stock or moving the head office. If there has been any serious research showing that “diversity” improves profits it would have been first-page news long ago. Not even the most desperate data massage seems to have produced a study that can make such a claim.

Just how big a headache diversity actually is for companies is clear from the endless stream of news stories about corporate racial discrimination. In just one month—November, 1996—”diversity” made quite a lot of news. Texaco agreed to spend \$176 million on black victims of company “racism,” and lawyers for the firm that sued Texaco were getting about ten calls a day from people asking how to file for discrimination settlements. Just a few days later, 22 former employees of the nation’s largest printing company, R.R. Donnelley and Sons, sued over what they claimed was \$500 million worth of racism.

In the same month, both the U.S. State Department and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms settled multi-million dollar class action discrimination suits brought by blacks. Likewise in November, three blacks brought a class action suit against an Avis Rent-A-Car franchise with outlets in North and South Carolina, claiming they had been turned away because of race. Within the month, the owner of Avis said it would break its contract with the franchisee, and hired a law firm to check up on other Avis operators. Every one of these cases, which are expensive, time-consuming, and emotionally damaging, is a consequence of racial diversity—and these were just the cases that made the news.

It would be edifying to count the number of public and private organizations that exist in the United States only because of its diverse population, and that are not needed in places like Japan or Norway. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, and every state and local equivalents of these offices exist only because of racial diversity. Every government office, every university, every large corporation, and every military installation has employees working full-time on affirmative action, discrimination claims, and other "diversity" issues.

Countless outreach programs, reconciliation commissions, blue-ribbon panels, and mayoral commissions fret professionally about race every day. Not one of these would be necessary in a nation of a single race. There must be tens of thousands of Americans consuming hundreds of millions of dollars every year enforcing, adjusting, tuning, regulating, and talking pure nonsense about the racial diversity that is supposed to be our strength.

Indeed, Tom McClintock, a former candidate for controller of the state of California estimated that before the 1996 state ballot initiative was approved to abolish racial preferences, the annual cost *just to administer* California's affirmative action programs was from \$343 million to \$677 million. This figure did not include the cost of private preference programs or the cost of state and local anti-discrimination machinery, none of which was affected by the 1996 measure.

If diversity were a strength people would practice it spontaneously. It wouldn't require constant cheer-leading or expensive lawsuits. If diversity were enriching, people would seek it out. It is in private gatherings not governed by some kind of "civil-rights" law that Americans show just how much strength and enrichment they find in diversity. Such gatherings are usually the very opposite of diverse.

### **Other Races**

Generally speaking, whatever timid opposition to diversity that ever arises is characterized as the whining of resentful, ignorant whites. Non-whites are thought to have a better appreciation of the importance of inclusiveness. This is just so much more nonsense. Now that immigration has added Hispanics and Asians to the traditional black-white racial mix, fault lines are forming in all directions.

Though we are told over and over that it is ignorance and lack of contact that cause antipathy, it is groups that have the *most* contact that *most* dislike each other. This is why "outreach" and "bridge building" do not work, as even the *New York Times* unintentionally revealed in a June 18, 1990 headline: "Ethnic Feuding Divides Parade for Harmony."

The idea that hostility is cured through contact is now enshrined as part of the diversity myth. George Orwell touched on this in his essay, *England Your England*:

"During the war of 1914-1918 the English working class were in contact with foreigners to an extent that is rarely possible. The sole result was that they brought back a hatred of all Europeans, except the Germans, whose courage they admired."

In America one need not go overseas to have contact with foreigners. What has been the result? In Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, and New York City, blacks have tried to drive Korean merchants out of their neighborhoods. They firebomb stores, assault shopkeepers, and mount boycotts against "people

who don't look like us." In Los Angeles, relations were so bad that in 1986 a Black-Korean Alliance was formed to reduce tensions. It staggered on uselessly until late 1992, when it was dissolved in mutual recrimination and accusations. The more blacks and Koreans talked to each other the angrier they got.

There are now schools and school districts completely dominated by blacks and Hispanics, which have race wars involving no whites at all. Some examples? Locke High School in Los Angeles is almost exactly half-black and half-Hispanic. In February 1996, 50 police officers had to be called in to break up a pitched battle involving hundreds of students. After order was finally restored and school dismissed, police in riot gear had to keep students from rejoining battle in the streets. What touched off the battle? Hispanics were annoyed— certainly not “enriched”— by the February observances of Black History Month.

A similar incident took place at Los Angeles' North Hollywood High School, when it took police in riot gear to calm a melee that started when an estimated 200 to 700 black and Hispanic students pitched into each other. The spark was reportedly a clash over what kind of music to play at the homecoming dance, neither side having felt particularly “inclusive.”

Norman Thomas High School is located at Park Avenue and 33rd Street in Manhattan. In 1992, tension between blacks and Hispanics erupted into a free-for-all involving both boys and girls. “The only thing people cared about was skin color,” explained one 16-year-old. The New York City Board of Education has “rapid mobilization guards” for just such emergencies.

Farragut High School in Chicago is two-thirds Hispanic and one third black. Recently, racial tension built up to what the principal called “total polarization,” and it became dangerous to let students mix without police supervision. At the height of the tension, extracurricular activities were canceled for 30 days and the school's homecoming football game had to be played without a single student in the stands, for fear they would attack each other.

In Huntsville, Texas, Hispanic students say they need to arm themselves against violent blacks. In Dallas, Hispanic parents say their children are afraid to go to school for fear of attacks by blacks. Tensions of this kind are usually reported only in local newspapers, and are probably quite widespread.

There is the same racial animosity in jails. Guards keep some cellblocks in a near-constant state of lock-down because blacks and Hispanics kill each other if they are allowed to mingle. Life in prison is more intensely integrated than anywhere else in the country. If diversity is such a good thing why is racial segregation always one of the top demands when prisoners list their grievances?

Of course, high-school fistfights and jailhouse brawls are nothing compared to what can happen when diversity really goes wrong. In the summer of 1967, 83 people were killed and nearly 2,000 injured when blacks rioted all across the country. The National Guard had to be called out to stop violence in Tampa, Cincinnati, Atlanta, Newark, northern New Jersey, and Detroit.

Nor are race riots a relic from the 1960s. The single worst outbreak in the nation's history was in Los Angeles in 1992, when rioters killed 58 people and injured more than 2,300. They also burned 5,300 buildings, causing nearly a billion dollars in damage. There was smaller-scale violence— all of it directed at whites— in Atlanta, Las Vegas, New York City, and Richmond and San Jose, California.

The Los Angeles riots showed that Hispanics can behave as badly as blacks. Although the grievance was ostensibly about a miscarriage of justice for the black criminal, Rodney King, more than half of the 15,000 people arrested for looting were Hispanic.

“Diversity” can pit one set of Hispanics against another. Puerto Ricans in Miami have rioted, claiming to have been excluded by the city's Cuban power structure. “Cubans get everything; we get nothing,” explained one rioter. The greater the diversity, the more varied the possibilities for disaffection and violence.

There has been a Sahara of hot air about why blacks riot, with the official pronouncement on reasons dating back to the Kerner Commission Report of 1968: “[T]he most fundamental is the racial attitude and behavior of white Americans toward black Americans.” Whatever one may think of this finding, there is one conclusion no one can deny: Race riots cannot happen without racial diversity.

An occasional glance at a newspaper is all it takes to learn that diversity of the kind that is supposed to benefit the United States is a problem wherever it is found. Every large-scale and intractable blood-letting, be it in the Middle East, Ireland, Burundi, or the former Yugoslavia is due to “diversity,” that is to say, people who differ from each other trying to live in the same territory.

Most of the time, the reasons for discord are not even as salient as race. They can be religion, language, or ethnicity. From time to time, Americans have fought each other for these reasons, but race is the deepest, most constant source of antipathy. Unlike language or religion, race cannot change. Differences between men that are written deep into their bodies will always be a source of friction.

### **The Diversity Double Standard**

Diversity, of course, is only for whites. Wherever only whites gather charges of “racism” cannot be long in coming. On the other hand, it would be tedious to list the racially exclusive non-white gatherings the country takes for granted. Shule Mandela Academy in East Palo Alto, California is only a little more outspoken than most when its students meet every morning and pledge to “think black, act black, speak black, buy black, pray black, love black, and live black.”

The same racial double standard is found in national policies. It is only white nations— Canada, the United States, and Australia— that permit large-scale immigration. Non-white nations are careful to maintain racial and cultural homogeneity and most permit essentially no immigration at all.

Some nations, of course, could attract no immigrants even if they wanted to; there is not much pressure on the borders of Bolivia or Uganda. However, as soon as Third World countries become even only a little bit more prosperous than their neighbors they quickly become keen to keep strangers out. Malaysia, for example, recently announced that in the case of repeat offenders, it will flog illegal aliens, their employers, and anyone who smuggles them into the country. The Ivory Coast, which is better-run and more successful than its West African neighbors, has launched an *Ivoirite* (Ivorian-ness) campaign to expel all residents who cannot prove that their grand parents were born within the national territory.

Even nations that are unattractive to immigrants sometimes display their feelings about diversity by expelling what few aliens arrived in the past. Idi Amin became ruler of Uganda in 1971. The very next year, his government expelled the 70,000 to 80,000 Indians and Pakistanis whom the British had brought in to be merchants. Black Ugandans, who did not like dealing with people unlike themselves, were delighted.

Hundreds of thousands of poor Mexicans sneak into the United States every year, but even Mexico is attractive to some Central Americans, whose countries are poorer still. Mexico guards its southern border with military troops, and is ruthless about expelling illegals. Not even United States citizens have an easy time moving to Mexico, which has no intention of diluting its national culture in the name of diversity.

Only whites babble about the advantages of diversity. One of the alleged advantages is so nutty, it is hard to believe it can be proposed by people capable of human speech, but since we are shooting fish in a barrel why not fire a final round? We are told that since whites are a minority of the world population (they are about 15 percent of the total), they should happily reconcile themselves to minority status in America, that such a status will be good training for life on an ever-shrinking planet.

Of course, in a world-wide context, every human group is a minority. There are many more of everyone else than there are Hispanics or Africans, for example. Does this mean that Mexicans and



Nigerians, too, should strive to become minorities in Mexico and Nigeria? Like so much that is said about race or immigration, this idea falls to pieces as soon as it is applied to anyone but whites.

It is only whites who have ever attempted to believe that race is a trivial matter, so it is only whites who think it may be “racist” to preserve their people and culture. Having decided to deny the findings of biology, the traditions of their ancestors, and the evidence of their senses, they have denied to themselves any moral basis for keeping out aliens. They have set in motion forces that will eventually destroy them.

E. Raymond Hall, professor of biology at the University of Kansas, is the author of the definitive work on American wildlife, *Mammals of North America*. He states as a biological law that, “*two subspecies of the same species do not occur in the same geographic area.*” (emphasis in the original) Human races are biological subspecies, and Prof. Hall writes specifically that this law applies to humans just as it does to other mammals: “To imagine one subspecies of man living together on equal terms for long with another subspecies is but wishful thinking and leads only to disaster and oblivion for one or the other.”

Human nature is part of animal nature. Racial diversity, which only whites promote— and always at their own expense— is nothing more than unilateral disarmament in a dangerous world. If current population movements continue, and if the thinking of whites remains unchanged, there will be little doubt as to which group’s fate will be the “disaster and oblivion” Prof. Hall so confidently predicts.