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Yet at present, the United States is unwinding strand by strand, rather like the Soviet Union.

—WILLIAM REES-MOGG, 1992

The histories of bilingual and bicultural societies that do not assimilate are histories of turmoil, tension and tragedy.

—SEYMOUR MARTIN LIPSET

In 2007, on the 400th anniversary of the Jamestown’s settlement, Queen Elizabeth II arrived to commemorate the occasion. But it took some fancy footwork by Her Majesty to run the Powhatan gauntlet.1

1Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Panaemonium: Ethnicity in International Politics (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 24. [All notes are Buchanan’s unless otherwise indicated.]


3Jamestown: Founded in 1607, Jamestown, Virginia, was the first permanent English settlement in North America. [Eds.]

4Powhatan gauntlet: The Powhatan tribe led a confederacy of more than thirty other tribes during the period of the Jamestown settlement; the gauntlet refers to a tribal initiation ritual in which young men submitted to an extended period of severe physical and mental discipline before emerging as mature men and recognized leaders. [Eds.]
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For the queen had been there before, fifty years ago, for the 350th anniversary, in a less progressive era. As the Associated Press reported, "the last time the queen helped Virginia mark the anniversary of its colonial founding, it was an all-white affair in a state whose government was in open defiance of a 1954 Supreme Court order to desegregate public schools."3

That was the time of massive resistance to integration in Virginia. And the queen was quick to recognize and embrace the change: "Since I visited Jamestown in 1957, my country has become a much more diverse society just as the Commonwealth of Virginia and the whole United States of America have also undergone a major social change."4

Both nations are indeed more diverse. But the most recent reminder of diversity in Virginia, to which the queen alluded, was the massacre of thirty-two students and teachers at Virginia Tech by an immigrant madman.

And now that London is Londonistan,7 Muslim imams preach hatred of the West in mosques, and Pakistani subway bombers find support in their madrassas.8 Race riots are common in the northern industrial cities. Crime rates have soared. In parts of London, people fear to walk. Yes, the Britain of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown9 is more diverse than the Britain of Victoria and Lord Salisbury,10 Lloyd George and Churchill.11 Is it also a better,

6Ibid.
7Londonistan: Ironic reference to the large immigrant Pakistani population of London. [Eds.]
8madrassas: Islamic religious schools. [Eds.]
9Tony Blair and Gordon Brown: Blair (b. 1953) served as the British prime minister, 1997–2007; he was succeeded by Brown (b. 1951). [Eds.]
10Victoria and Lord Salisbury: Queen Victoria (1819–1901) was Britain's longest-reigning monarch; Robert Cecil, Third Marquess of Salisbury (1830–1903) served as her prime minister three times. [Eds.]
11Lloyd George and Churchill: David Lloyd George (1863–1945) was Britain's prime minister during much of World War I, 1916–1922; Sir Winston Churchill served as prime minister throughout World War II, 1940–1945, and again in the early 1950s, 1951–1955. [Eds.]
lovelier, stronger, more respected nation than the Britannia that ruled the
waves and a fourth of the world?

The prevailing orthodoxy demands that we parrot such platitudes. And
Her Majesty was careful to conform. "Fifty years on, we are now in a posi-
tion to reflect more candidly on the Jamestown legacy," said the queen, as
she began to reflect less candidly on that legacy.12

Here, at Jamestown, "Three great civilizations came together for the
first time — western European, native American and African."13

Well, that is certainly one way of putting it.

Even Her Majesty must have smiled inwardly as she delivered this
comic rendition of history. For the Jamestown settlers were not Western
Europeans but English Christians. They despised French Catholics and the
great event in their lives had been the sinking of the Spanish Armada. And
the first decision taken at Jamestown was to build a fort to protect them
from Chief Powhatan’s tribe, whom they thought might massacre them, as
they suspected Indians had massacred the Roanoke14 colony. Their leader,
Capt. John Smith, would escape being clubbed to death by Powhatan,
thanks only to the princess Pocahontas. Or so Smith liked to tell the tale. In
1622, the Indians succeeded in massacring a third of all the inhabitants of
Jamestown.15

As for the Africans, they arrived in 1619 in slave ships, and were not
freed for 246 years. Then they were segregated for a century.

Jamestown was no coming together of "three great civilizations." It was
the beginning of centuries of imperial conquest by British Christians who
drove the pagan Indians westward, repopulated their lands, and imposed
their own faith, customs, laws, language, and institutions upon their New
World. Jamestown was the beginning of America — and of the British
Empire.

"With the benefit of hindsight, we can see in that event [Jamestown]
the origins of a singular endeavor — the building of a great nation, founded
on the eternal values of democracy and equality," said the queen.16

A great nation did indeed arise from Jamestown, but, intending no dis-
respect to Her Majesty, democracy and equality had nothing to do with it.

---

12Patrick J. Buchanan, "Queen’s Fancy PC Footwork in Jamestown," May 7, 2007. VDARE.com
13Ibid.
14Roanoke: Located in what is now North Carolina, Roanoke Island was the site of the
first attempts by the English to settle in North America. The first group of settlers, in 1585,
encountered such hardship that they returned to England the following year; a small group of
men who remained were killed by Indians. The second group of colonists, in 1587, mysteri-
ously vanished. [Eds.]
15"From Jamestown’s Swamp: Pocahontas Was the Least of It," editorial, Washington
16Ibid.
17Robert
Stuart (1833–Confederate)
18Multi
The House of Burgesses, formed in 1619, was restricted to white males, men of property. The American Revolution was not fought for equality, but to be rid of British rule. Four of the first five presidents — Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe — were Virginia slaveholders. Exactly two and a half centuries after Jamestown, in 1857, came Chief Justice Roger B. Taney's *Dred Scott* decision declaring that slaves were not Americans and that none of them had any of the rights of American citizens. Few Americans then, certainly not Abe Lincoln, believed in social or political equality.

Now, if, in 1957 — 350 years after Jamestown, 100 years after *Dred Scott* — the state of Virginia had a declared policy of massive resistance to racial integration, how can the queen claim that Jamestown or Virginia or America were always about "the eternal values of democracy and equality"?

History contradicts the politically correct version the queen had to recite about the Jamestown settlement — and raises another question.

If Jamestown and Virginia were not about democracy, equality, and diversity for the 350 years between 1607 and 1957, who invented this myth that America was always about democracy, equality, and diversity? And what was their motive?

At Jamestown the queen performed a service to America which she was surely unaware. By radically revising her views of fifty years ago, about what Jamestown was, the queen revealed the real revolution that occurred between the era of Eisenhower and that of George W. Bush.

It is a revolution in thought and belief about who we are as a nation. In the half century since massive resistance, Virginia has indeed become a radically changed society. No longer does Richmond proudly call herself the Capital of the Confederacy. Lee-Jackson Day is out. Martin Luther King Day is in. The Confederate flag flies nowhere. On Monument Avenue, which features the statues of Robert E. Lee, "Stonewall" Jackson, J. E. B. Stuart, and Jefferson Davis, a statue of Arthur Ashe, an African American tennis player, has been added. "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia" was retired by the legislature as the state song ten years before the queen's return. Within days of her arrival in 2007, the Virginia legislature apologized for slavery.

Virginia 2007 is ashamed of who she was in 1957. But how then can Virginia be proud of what Jamestown was in 1607? For the first Jamestown was not some multicultural village but the first outpost of an imperial nation determined to settle and conquer North America for English Christians, to wipe out or drive out Indians who got in its way, and to bring in Africans as slaves to do the labor English settlers would not do.

17Robert E. Lee . . . and Jefferson Davis: Lee (1807–1870), Jackson (1824–1863), and Stuart (1833–1864) were Confederate generals; Davis (1808–1889) served as president of the Confederate States. [Eds.]

18-Multimedia Tour: Monument Ave.,” Discover Richmond, discoverrichmond.com
An Inconvenient Truth

The point here is unpleasant to modernity but critical to recognize: The United States, the greatest republic since Rome, and the British Empire, the greatest empire since Rome, may be said to have arisen from that three-cornered fort the Jamestown settlers began to build the day they arrived. But that republic and that empire did not rise because the settlers and those who followed believed in diversity, equality, and democracy, but because they rejected diversity, equality, and democracy. The English, the Virginians, the Americans were all “us-or-them” people.

They believed in the superiority of their Christian faith and English culture and civilization. And they transplanted that unique faith, culture, and civilization to America’s fertile soil. Other faiths, cultures, and civilizations — like the ones the Indians had here, or the Africans brought, or the French had planted in Quebec, or the Spanish in Mexico — they rejected and resisted with cannon, musket, and sword. This was our land, not anybody else’s.

But today America and Britain have embraced ideas about the innate equality of all cultures, civilizations, languages, and faiths, and about the mixing of all tribes, races, and peoples, that are not only ahistorical, they are suicidal for America and the West. For all over the world, rising faiths like Islam, rising movements like the indigenous peoples’ movement rolling out of Latin America to Los Angeles, rising powers like China reaching for Asian and world hegemony — ignore the kumbaya we preach, and look to what our fathers practiced when they conquered the world.

What the queen said at Jamestown 2007 was that we are not the same people we were in 1957. She is right. For we now reject as repellent and ethnocentric the idea that the British who founded our republic and created the British Empire were not only unique but superior to other peoples and civilizations. And to show the world how resolutely we reject those old ideas, we threw open our borders in the last forty years to peoples of all creeds, cultures, countries, and civilizations, inviting them to come and convert the old America into the most multicultural, multilingual, multiethnic, multiracial nation in history — “The First Universal Nation” of Ben Wattenberg’s warblings. But if the Jamestown settlers had believed in equality and diversity, and had shared their fort with the Indians, the settlers would never have been heard from again.

No matter the lies we tell ourselves and teach our children, no great republic or empire — not Persia, Rome, Islam, Spain, France, Britain, Russia, China, the United States — ever arose because it embraced democracy,

...
diversity, and equality. None. The real question is not whether the values
the queen celebrated at Jamestown created America — they had nothing to
do with it — but whether America can survive having embraced them. . . .

The Disuniting of America

America is today less a nation than an encampment of suspicious and
hostile tribes quarreling viciously over the spoils of politics and power. We
live on the same land, under the same set of laws, but we are no longer the
one people of whom John Jay\textsuperscript{21} wrote in \textit{Federalist} No. 2.

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 cus-
toms, and who, by their joint counsels, arms, and efforts, fighting side
by side throughout a long and bloody war, have nobly established their
general liberty and independence.\textsuperscript{22}

“This country and this people seem to have been made for each other,”
Jay wrote, calling his countrymen “a band of brethren.” Even before the Con-
stitution had been ratified, Jay regarded Americans as “one united people,”
“one connected country,” “brethren,” of common blood.\textsuperscript{23}

But what held this “one united people” together — a common heritage,
history, faith, language, manners, customs, and culture — today pulls us apart.

Are we united by language? Children in Chicago are taught in two hun-
dred languages. Our fastest growing media are Spanish speaking. Half the
9 million in Los Angeles County speak a language other than English in
their homes. Today’s vile talk on radio and television, in the movies, mag-
zines, and books, would have been an embarrassment in a marine barracks
fifty years ago.

Are we united by faith? While 99 percent Protestant in 1789, we are
now Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Mormon, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist,
Taoist, Shintoist, Santería, Sikh, New Age, voodoo, agnostic, atheist, Rasta-
farian. The mention of the name of Jesus by the preachers President Bush
chose to give invitations at his inauguration evoked cries of “insensitive,”
“divisive,” “exclusionary.” A \textit{New Republic} editorial lashed out at these
“crushing Christological thugs” from the inaugural stand.\textsuperscript{24}

Many of the Christian churches have split asunder over abortion,
female bishops, homosexual clergy, and gay marriage.

\textsuperscript{21}John Jay: Founding father (1745–1829) and first chief justice of the United States. [Eds.]
\textsuperscript{22}James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, \textit{The Federalist Papers}, with an introd-
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24}Jeff Jacoby, “The Role of Religion in Government: Invoking Jesus at the Inauguration,”
In 2007, after a court battle by the American Civil Liberties Union, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs agreed to add the five-point star of the Wiccan neo-pagan religion to the list of thirty-eight “emblems of belief” allowed on VA grave markers. The thirty-eight include “symbols for Christianity, Buddhism, Islam and Judaism, as well as . . . for . . . Sufism Reoriented, Eckankar and the Japanese faith Seicho-No-Ie.”

Are we united by a common culture? To the contrary. We are in a raging culture war in which peaceful coexistence is a myth.

In the nineteenth century, America was torn apart by slavery and the tariff. Those issues were settled in a civil war that resulted in 600,000 dead. Today, America is divided over issues of race, ethnicity, religion, language, culture, history, morality, the very things that once defined us and united us as a people and a nation.

Protestants and Catholics, a hundred years ago, disagreed passionately over whether beer, wine, and spirits were wicked. Today, we Americans disagree over whether annihilating 45 million unborn babies in the womb since Roe v. Wade is a mark of progress or a monstrous national evil causing us to echo Jefferson, “I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just.”

In the 1960s, to do penance for all her sins, from Jamestown on, the United States threw open its doors to peoples of all colors, continents, and creeds. And today, the America of John F. Kennedy, 89 percent white and 10 percent of African descent, an essentially biracial country united by a common culture, creed, history, and tradition, is gone. We threw it away.

Today, America is twice as populous as in 1950—with 300 million people. Instead of 1 to 2 million Hispanics, there are 45 million, with 102 million expected by 2050, concentrated in a Southwest that 58 percent of Mexicans say belongs to them. Our population is down to 67 percent European, and falling; 14.5 percent Hispanic and rising rapidly, 13 percent black and holding, and 4.5 percent Asian and rising. By 2040, Americans of European descent will be less than half the population, when, as President Bill Clinton told an audience of cheering California students, we will all belong to minorities. White Americans are already a minority in California, New Mexico, Texas, Hawaii. Twelve to 20 million illegal aliens are in the country. We may not have believed in diversity in the old America, but we are practicing it now. But has all this diversity made us a stronger nation than we were in the time of Eisenhower and Kennedy?

In October 2006, the Financial Times reported the findings of Robert Putnam, author of Bowling Alone, on diversity in America.

26Roe v. Wade: The 1973 Supreme Court case that legalized abortion. [Eds.]
A bleak picture of the corrosive effects of ethnic diversity has been revealed in research by Harvard University's Robert Putnam, one of the world's most influential political scientists.

His research shows that the more diverse a community is, the less likely its inhabitants are to trust anyone — from their next-door neighbour to the mayor.

The core message... was that, "in the presence of diversity, we hunker down," he said. "We act like turtles. The effect of diversity is worse than had been imagined. And it's not just that we don't trust people who are not like us. In diverse communities, we don't trust people who do look like us."

Prof. Putnam found trust was lowest in Los Angeles, "the most diverse human habitation in human history..." 27

The city Professor Putnam references, Los Angeles, was the scene of the Academy Award-winning film Crash, which portrayed a feral zone in which whites, blacks, Asians, and Hispanics clashed violently again and again, as they could not understand one another or communicate with one another.

Wrote columnist John Leo, after perusing the report, "Putnam adds a crushing footnote: his findings may underestimate the real effect of diversity on social withdrawal." 28

With another 100 million people anticipated in the United States by 2050, most of them immigrants and their children, legal and illegal, Putnam's findings are ominous. If the greater the diversity the greater the mistrust, Balkanization beckons — for all of us.

Is diversity a strength? In the ideology of modernity, yes. But history teaches otherwise. For how can racial diversity be a strength when racial diversity was behind the bloodiest war in U.S. history and has been the most polarizing issue among us ever since?

Our most divisive Supreme Court decision, Dred Scott, was about race. The War Between the States was about race. Reconstruction was about race. Segregation was about race. The riots in Harlem, Watts, Newark, Detroit, then Washington, DC, and a hundred other cities after the assassination of Dr. King were about race. The riot in Los Angeles following the Simi Valley jury's acquittal of the cops who beat Rodney King was about race. Forced busing, affirmative action, quotas, profiling are about race. The O. J. trial, the Tawana Brawley and Duke rape-case hoaxes, and the Don Imus affair... were

29 The O. J. trial... the Don Imus affair." In 1995, O. J. Simpson was found not guilty of murder after a long and highly publicized criminal trial; in 1996, a New York grand jury found that Tawana Brawley's claim that she was raped and brutalized by white men was fabricated; in 2006, another African American woman charged that she had been raped by a group of white Duke University lacrosse players, but the charges were dropped the following year; talk-radio host Don Imus was fired in 2007 after making racist comments about female African American basketball players. In each case, opinions tended to divide along racial lines. [Eds.]
about race. When Gunnar Myrdal wrote his classic *American Dilemma*, about the crisis of our democracy, the subject was — race.

All Americans believe slavery was evil and the denial of equal justice under law was wrong. But because they were wrong, does that make what we are doing — inviting the whole world to come to America — right or wise?

Today, tens of thousands of corporate and government bureaucrats monitor laws against discrimination and laws mandating integration in housing and employment. To achieve equality, Americans are sacrificing freedom. Police are ever on the lookout for hate crimes. Hardly a month passes without some controversy or crime rooted in race being forced through cable TV and talk radio onto the national agenda. How does all this make us a more united, stronger people?

Among the educated and affluent young, resegregation is in vogue. Columnist Leo writes that at UCLA, racially separate graduations have become the norm. “The core reason,” he writes, “is the obvious one.”

On campus, assimilation is a hostile force, the domestic version of American imperialism. On many campuses, identity-group training begins with separate freshman orientation programs for nonwhites, who arrive earlier and are encouraged to bond before the first Caucasian freshmen arrive. Some schools have separate orientations for gays as well. Administrations tend to foster separatism by arguing that bias is everywhere, justifying double standards that favor identity groups.

Leo concludes on a note of despair, “As in so many areas of national life, the preposterous is now normal.”

Quo Vadis, America?

Again, history teaches that multietnic states are held together either by an authoritarian regime or a dominant ethnocultural core, or they are ever at risk of disintegration in ethnic conflict.

The Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, artificial nations all, disintegrated when the dictatorships collapsed.

In democracies it is an ethnocultural core that holds the country together. England created a United Kingdom of English, Scots, Welsh, and Irish, with England predominant. Now that Britain is no longer great, the core nations have begun to pull apart, to seek their old independence, as the English have begun to abandon the land they grew up in.

In “Vanishing England,” in August 2007, columnist Cal Thomas reported a startling fact: Between June 2005 and June 2006, 200,000 British citizens (th as more than gals eniere one comm for them.)
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31 Ibid.
32 *Quo Vadis* Latin phrase meaning “Where are you going?” [Eds.]
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citizens (the equivalent of a million Americans) left their country for good, as more than a half million legal immigrants and unknown thousands of illegals entered. “Britons give many reasons for leaving, but their stories share one commonality,” Thomas wrote; “life in Britain has become unbearable for them.”33 There is the lawlessness and the constant threat of Muslim terror, but also

the loss of a sense of Britishness, exacerbated by the growing refusal of public schools to teach the history and culture of the nation to the next generation. What it means to be British has been watered down in a plague of political correctness that has swept the country faster than hoof-and-mouth disease. Officials say they do not wish to “offend” others.34

Intellectuals deceive themselves if they believe the new trinity of their faith — democracy, equality, and diversity — can replace the old idea of what it meant to be a Briton, what it meant to be an Englishman.

In the thirteen North American colonies, the ethnocultural core was British-Protestant, with a smattering of Germans whose growing numbers alarmed Ben Franklin. After the wave of Irish from 1845 to 1849, and the steady German influx, and then the great wave from Southern and Eastern Europe between 1890 and 1920, America was no longer British-Protestant, but a European-Christian nation whose institutions, language, and culture remained British. Bismarck said the most important fact of the twentieth century would be that the North Americans spoke English. Indeed, that is why we fought on Britain’s side in two world wars. Despite our eighteenth- and nineteenth-century quarrels and wars, the Brits were still “the cousins.”

By 1960, 88.6 percent of our nation was of European stock and 95 percent Christian. America had never been a more united nation. African Americans had been assimilated into the Christian faith and national culture if not fully into society. While Jews, perhaps 4 percent of the population, were non-Christians, their parents or grandparents had come from European Christian nations.

Since the cultural revolution of the 1960s and the Immigration Act of 1965, however, the ethnocultural core has begun to dissolve. Secularism has displaced Christianity as the faith of the elites. The nation has entered a post-Christian era. There is no longer a unifying culture. Rather, we are fighting a culture war. And the European ethnic core is shrinking. From near 90 percent in 1960, it is down to 67 percent today, and will be less than 50 percent by 2040.

Here we come to the heart of the matter.
Quo Vadis, America? Where are you going?

34Ibid.
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higher and the far such wary abstractions.

9. Does the fact of the relationship and the idea of the nation or the nation and the idea of the people? The idea of the people is central to the idea of the nation, which is derived from the idea of the people. This idea of the people is derived from the idea of the nation. The idea of the people is derived from the idea of the nation.

7. How does the relationship between the two writers, then, determine whether the idea of the nation is a concept or a fact? The relationship is a concept, the idea of the nation is a fact. The idea of the nation is a concept, the idea of the people is a fact.

8. How would you describe your ideal vision of America? Why not? How would you describe this ideal vision of America?

5. According to Buchanan, what is the role of the liberal and the conservative in preserving the workings of the economy?

6. Which of the models of economic relations described by George M. Reisman is illustrated in the text?